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Form criticism developed as a method in gospel research about 1920. It soon precipitated a flood of articles. It was a great boon when Erich Fascher published his history and evaluation of the method in 1924. (Die formgeschichtliche Methode). What Fascher did for German students was done for the English world by Vincent Taylor's The Formation of the Gospel Tradition, 1933.

There is a new look in gospel studies in the last few years. Interest has shifted from trying to find only those "primitive" elements in the gospels to a study of the presuppositions and interests, both literary and theological, that have controlled and informed the writing of each gospel. Interest has shifted from sources to the documents as they now stand.

This redaction-history method has been in use since about 1945. Joachim Rohde has now provided the German counterpart to Fascher's book in the present volume (the title already reminds one of the similarity).

The book is welcome; it provides in its first major section an overview of recent research in the gospels, primarily German language in orientation. This survey describes the methods of form and redaction criticism, the meaning of the term Sitz im Leben as applied in redaction criticism, and the methodological steps that led up to the method.

This is followed by a detailed summary and evaluation of the major works of redaction criticism written from 1945 to about 1964 (an appendix of five pages lists articles and books published in 1965 and 1966).

Eight studies on Matthew (Rohde gives the palm to Georg Strecker), two on Mark, nine on Luke-Acts (it was wise to include Acts), and two that cut across the boundaries of individual gospels are examined in detail. The Gospel of John was not included.

Unfortunately, interest was concentrated on German works. The only exceptions are Krister Stendahl's School of St. Matthew (not treated extensively) and J. M. Robinson's The Problem of History in Mark (published in German translation). This reviewer would have expected to see Paul Schubert's study of Luke 24 (in the Bultmann Festschrift) included at a minimum. Thus there is some parochialism in the volume. (Rohde attempts to cover this by suggesting that there were no real works of redaction criticism outside of the German language area.)

Rohde is certainly correct in pointing out that these books have rehabilitated the authors of the gospels as theologians of the first rank. It is a primary contribution of the method. He might also have added that they materially aid in writing the history of first-century Christianity.

The book is attractively printed and bound. There is only one bad printing error: on p. 127, the sixth line from the bottom of the page should be the ninth. The publisher has printed all footnotes in the back pages in order to save cost. It is particularly exasperating in a book that, like this one, was originally a dissertation and therefore has hundreds of notes.

EDGAR KRENTZ


THE SON OF MAN IN MARK: A STUDY OF THE BACKGROUND OF THE


Since the rediscovery of Jewish apocalyptic literature in the 19th century, together with Hans Lietzmann's suggestions that the Aramaic behind "Son of Man" really meant only "someone," a kind of indefinite pronoun, the study of this term has led to a bewildering mass of theories as to the source, the meaning, and the authenticity of the title on Jesus' lips.

The first phase of this study drew to a close about 1930 with the publication of Thomas Walter Manson's 《The Teaching of Jesus:》. Manson regarded the sayings as reflecting the corporate use of the term in Daniel 7. Bultmann, on the other hand, regarded only the futuristic sayings as genuine and held that Jesus was not referring to Himself with the term.

The discussion was opened to a new phase of study with the stimulus of the new quest of the historical Jesus. Philipp Vielhauer, a post-Bultmannite, argued (1957) that no Son of Man sayings were authentic, and was followed by Hans Conzelmann and Ernst Käsemann. Vielhauer's arguments opened a new discussion that is still under way. The first full-scale monograph on the topic was that of H. E. Tödt, which appeared in 1959. (This volume was reviewed in CTM, XXXIX (July—August 1968), 499, by Frederick W. Danker.) The three volumes briefly reviewed here are more recent contributions to the ongoing debate.

While there were many articles and shorter reactions to Vielhauer's thesis, these three volumes are the bulkiest contributions since Tödt's book. Each illustrates a quite different approach.

Higgins in many ways parallels the conclusions of Tödt, though his book was written in independence of him. The question of background to the term interests him very little; he covers it in a very short introductory chapter, which also surveys modern research. Chapters 2 to 7 survey, in order, the Son of Man passages in Mark, Luke, Matthew, and Q outside the gospels, and finally in John. (It is not clear why the Q passages are considered later, since Higgins ought to regard them as earliest in date.) A final chapter totals up the results and discusses Jesus' use of the term. Higgins argues that Jesus used Son of Man only in eschatological passages. The early church, in line with Jesus' unique consciousness of sonship to the Father and the genuine predictions of His suffering, death, and resurrection, made the identification of Jesus and the Son of Man explicit in creating new sayings. Thus Higgins saves a kind of legitimacy for the Son of Man sayings that are not authentic.

Borsch's volume is quite different, indeed somewhat unique in the present debate. He first outlines the problem and classifies the proposed solutions. This is followed by a broadly conceived survey of relevant material in the Old Testament and the ancient Near East. The First Man idea of Gnosis and Mandaeans, the Royal First Man of the Semitic Near East, the anthropos of later Judaism and sectarian Jewish or Christian sources are all passed in review, evaluated fairly, and finally put in their place in the tradition history. Borsch finds the idea of the ideal Royal First Man as very important for the understanding of Jesus as the Son of Man.

The following chapters discuss the second anthropos in Paul, the Johannine Son of Man, and the synoptic Son of Man, and then draw conclusions. Borsch's discussion of the Johannine passage is noteworthy; he finds many more points of contact with the synoptic usage than do most scholars. He also has a much greater number of authentic Son of Man passages in the synoptics. Borsch's conclusions are quite conservative but not because of a conservative bias. He is convinced that Jesus took up the Son of Man myth only to transcend it. The early church rightly dropped the title in witnessing to the One who was greater than the office in the myth.

The volume by Miss Hooker goes its own
way in the debate. She cries a pox on all current discussions of Son of Man. Form criticism has shown itself illegitimate. So she proposes to study the sayings in one gospel, Mark, to see what impact they made. She finds that Daniel 7 and the Similitudes of Enoch both emphasize the nation of Israel as the chosen one under the picture of Israel as the true descendent of Adam, who carries out God’s purposes. Thus suffering is a part of the Son of Man’s career.

After this the Markan passages are reviewed. She finds the key to the passage in the concept of authority. This insight, gained from Mark 2:10 and 28, is reinforced by the Passion predictions. It also runs through the eschatological sayings, which argue that His authority will be vindicated. He is proclaimed, denied, and vindicated. Mark’s usage is consistent and logical.

Hooker also argues that this Markan interpretation of the Son of Man sayings would make sense in the life of Jesus. While not every passage in Mark may be authentic, the whole picture is.

These three approaches differ widely. Their conclusions make evident how much assumptions and method have to do with Biblical study. Each would repay careful study, but if only one could be used, this reviewer would prefer Borsch. His argumentation is clear, it is not subject to preconceived ideas of what is or is not possible, and most illuminates, to this reviewer’s mind, the historical course the materials in the gospels must have taken.

EDGAR KRENTZ


This review calls attention to a commentary whose comprehensive character, fullness of discussion, and exegetical worth are outstanding in every way. No greater praise can be given.

Its fullness can be seen from the fact that 196 pages are devoted to matters of introduction, 16 to the listing of bibliography (modern), 11 to a listing of abbreviations. The whole is conceived on a scale that can be matched only by Prüm’s commentary on Corinthians.

Schnackenburg recognizes that there are differences of language, structure, and emphasis between John and the synoptics, yet argues that John nevertheless belongs to the genus gospel because it anchors its presentation in history. To be sure, “the historical interest is not the preeminent and final purpose” (p. 3), so that the Gospel of John is not historical presentation in the modern sense. The speeches of Jesus have all been filtered through “the medium of faith” (p. 14) and the gospel is “a presentation totally dominated by the viewpoint of faith.”

This accounts for many of the differences from the synoptics, though the tradition underlying John is also very old. It must be evaluated as an independent tradition, with fewer narratives in it than the synoptics, totally subordinated to the gospel’s purpose.

A discussion of the literary history of the gospel suggests to Schnackenburg that the entire gospel is of a linguistic and literary piece (except for chapter 21 and a few other touches). He agrees that there was probably some sort of miracle-story-source (Bultmann’s semeia-Quelle) but no separate sayings-source.

He posits a three-stage origin of the gospel in its present form: The basis of the gospel is a tradition that goes back to John, the son of Zebedee. This view is supported both by the external evidence, the good historical details in the gospel (such as names and places), and the Semitisms in its language. The gospel as it stands was written down by a pupil of John. This accounts for its Hellenistic language, the form of the sermons of Jesus, and some of the Tendenz of the gospel.

Thus, “the actual writer is someone else” (p. 85), though the gospel is still apostolic and Johannine. Finally, a redactor added chapter 21 and some other material.

An examination of the thought world of the gospel and its language suggests that the old tradition of Asia Minor provenance is good, though Schnackenburg suggests that it was also filtered through Syria.

The introduction has extensive discussions
of the theological character, the textual criticism, and the history of interpretation of the gospel.

The commentary proper takes up critical and historical questions, gives a careful exegesis verse by verse of the text, and at times includes a discussion of "the deeper interpretation." Seven excursuses discuss the logos, the concept of preexistence, the Messianic titles in John 1, the idea of σώματος, the Son of Man in John, the gnostic Redeemer and John, and faith in John. All betray a careful, learned, and basically conservative mind.

The commentary is scheduled for English translation. It joins the list of major works on Johannine thought. It deserves wide praise and wider use. (Incidentally, it betrays almost no confessional bias!)

EDGAR KRENTZ


This volume is a competent translation of Die Einladung Gottes, a publication by the Furch-Verlag of Hamburg in 1938. The original preface introduces it as a volume of 26 sermons preached to the congregation at Tübingen composed of both university personnel and townspeople. Köberle was conscious of preaching in the pulpit of Adolf Schlatter and Karl Heim. He tried to expound his Epistle and Gospel texts carefully and to resort to no sensational language. The result is in the high tradition of the German Lutheran preachers who were also university theologians. The sermons are marked by explicit evangelical content and by painstaking application to contemporary need. The publishers have done a genuine service to American preachers by making this volume available.

RICHARD R. CAEMMERER SR.


Henry F. Wind was a pioneer in the welfare work conducted in and by The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, a long-time head of the Associated Lutheran Charities, the first executive of the Synod's Department of Welfare. A mark of his excellence is the appearance, 2 years after his death, of this biography by his associate and successor. Wind was the grandson of the Rev. F. J. Buenger, founder of several welfare agencies that this year celebrate their centennial, and this volume is a useful contribution to that observance. Weber's book is an apt delineation of the many-sidedness of Wind's work through the years, his leadership in ecumenical cooperation, his concern for the elevation of the church's standards in welfare work, his charm and eloquence as a man. Dr. O. P. Kretzmann contributes an introduction of remarkable brevity and insight. The volume contains well-chosen illustrations, and the portrait cover is lovely.

RICHARD R. CAEMMERER SR.


A symposium on a general theme, such as is offered by this book, raises its own difficulties of choice between topics, treatment, and scope. Necessary compromises will have to be accepted in the interest of producing a useful treatise of general interest. Accordingly, this is an excellent book for the student and layman interested in the fields treated within its limits by the various authors. Mention should be made of the essay by John W. Klotz, professor at Concordia Senior College, Fort Wayne.

The central viewpoint of the book, exhibited also repeatedly by the various authors, is evangelical. But the writers are more interested in offering information than engaging in polemics, although their opponents are likely to argue that a Christian point of view is ipso facto polemical. Some of the authors appear not yet to have reached firm conclusions regarding the relation of their disciplines to the implications of the Christian faith, and in other essays we see questions raised and discussed that seem to provide no important contribution to the theme of the book.

RICHARD KLANN