

these acquire on this side of the Atlantic. Some sentences, however, have retained some degree of complexity not called for by the original. For example, "According as the effective influence is that of the age-old primitive conceptions of impersonal numinous power or that of a clear theistic faith, so . . ." (p. 443), and "By concentrating as regards the concept of sin on the Law, . . ." (p. 400). Others have in them expressions which seem out of place in a work that maintains scholarly discourse at a very high level. Expressions like "all along the line" (p. 282), "not for nothing" (2 x p. 282), "tuned to a different wave length" (p. 398) sound a bit colloquial, and "in the teeth of" (pp. 178, 440, 456) is used in contexts which would have been served better by "in spite of." The sentence, "Through thick and thin it is tribe-centered thinking which exerts the decisive influence upon him" (pp. 236-237), just does not sound right. Finally, this reader must confess that he had never seen before "once in a way" (pp. 164, 176) for "once in a while." But in view of the massive accomplishment of this translation, carping at this minutia is trespassing on another monument.

Andrews University

HEROLD WEISS

Filson, Floyd V., *'Yesterday': A Study of Hebrews in the Light of Chapter 13*. "Studies in Biblical Theology," Second Series, 4. Naperville, Ill.: Alec R. Allenson, 1967. 88 pp. \$ 2.35.

In this monograph, Professor Filson seeks to demonstrate that the contents of Heb 13 are not alien to the rest of the book of Heb. and that therefore, it is an integral part of the epistle. But in showing this, Filson has also presented a helpful summation of the theology of Heb.

Filson first points out the form and function of ch. 13. It is clearly different from the previous twelve chapters, and for this reason various scholars have challenged its authenticity. But Heb is an epistle intended for a group and the author in his pastoral concern concludes his letter in a similar way as other NT epistles. The fourfold structure of the chapter (varied teaching, formal benediction, personal greetings, closing brief benediction) is also found in 1 Th, 2 Th, Gal, Php, 1 Pe, and Rom. But if ch. 13 is an integral part of the book, similarity in content should also be expected. Filson's thesis is that there is such similarity, and the rest of the monograph is devoted to this.

The following key themes of ch. 13 are discussed: (1) "my word of exhortation"; (2) "yesterday"; (3) "Jesus Christ"; (4) "a sacrifice for sin"; (5) "we have an altar"; (6) "the eternal covenant"; (7) "outside the camp"; (8) "we have no lasting city"; (9) "remember your leaders . . . pray for us"; (10) "to do good and to share."

Filson seeks to show the relationship of each theme to the theology of the rest of Heb, thus demonstrating the basic unity of the chapter with the epistle. The most significant discussions are found in the theme

"yesterday" and "we have an altar." He places great emphasis on the idea expressed by "yesterday," as evident also from the title of the monograph. "Perhaps no word expresses the thought framework of Hebrews so well as does 'yesterday' (ἔχθές), no word serves better to prevent a false understanding of the author's viewpoint" (p. 30). He seeks first to relate the verse very closely to its context. The author has just mentioned the leaders of the group to whom he is writing and their faithfulness unto death. They should imitate such faithfulness in their lives. But their greatest inspiration should be Jesus "the same yesterday and today and forever" who exemplified faithfulness and unswerving loyalty in his obedience unto death. So too they must be loyal and "not be led away by diverse and strange teachings" (v. 9). While there is a semblance of connection with its surrounding verses, the cryptic and enigmatic quality of the verse still remains and one continues to wonder just what the author had in mind.

Filson relates the conception, however, more fully to the earlier part of the book. "Yesterday," "in these last days," Jesus learned obedience and became our qualified high priest. At a particular time Jesus offered himself as a sacrifice. And these events are decisive. They are "once and for all."

That Heb deals with this theme is undeniable, but whether the cryptic verse contains all these conceptions is a serious question. Whether we can say therefore that this verse on this basis alone is theologically related to the first twelve chapters of Heb is debatable.

It seems somewhat condescending for the author to write, "This may seem to us a shocking statement" (p. 33), and, "To many Christians this entire discussion may seem theologically disturbing" (p. 34) in a work of this nature. He is referring to his interpretation of "yesterday" which is contrary to the usual one which interprets the verse as emphasizing the unchanging nature of Jesus Christ.

The author's discussion on the theme "we have an altar" begins with a caveat that we should not force the author's thought into the mold of other NT writers but let him be himself. This warning is understandable, for Filson has the author saying in this verse that we who serve the tent (the heavenly sanctuary) have no right to eat continually from the heavenly altar since the sacrifice of Christ is a once-for-all offering. This surprising interpretation is in line with the theology of Heb, but this in itself is no assurance that it is correct. The objection to this view is the wording of the text itself. "We have an altar from which those who serve the tent have no right to eat" is a strange way of putting the matter, if the statement means what Filson says it means. Two distinct groups are clearly in mind, as indicated by the change of persons from the first to the third. It can only mean that the adherents of the old-covenant sanctuary, the Jews who have become Christians, do not have the right to partake of the Christian altar. It seems that Filson makes too much of the earthly-heavenly polarity in a "spatial" sense, when he conceives of the altar as in heaven. The book of Heb with its many types pointing to

the coming of Jesus Christ, deals not so much with an eternal Platonic vertical antinomy as a Hebraic horizontal antinomy. The heavenly must be understood in terms of the realities of salvation fulfilled by Jesus Christ here on earth. If this is so, the Christian altar need not be an altar in heaven any more than the offering of Christ need be a sacrifice in heaven. Again to eat from the altar need not be equated with a continual sacrifice.

There is very little, however, in the rest of the monograph that one can argue with. Filson has done his work carefully, judiciously, and well, and any who challenge the authenticity of the chapter will have to reckon more seriously with the relationship between the contents of the two parts because of Filson's work.

Andrews University

SAKAE KUBO

Grant, Robert M., *After the New Testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967. xxiii + 228 pp. \$ 6.00.

*After the New Testament* is a compilation of fifteen of Grant's essays which have appeared in various scholarly publications (mainly journals) since 1947. Some of these have been revised "for the sake of either accuracy or clarity" (p. xi). In the author's words, "They are primarily concerned with historical continuities, between the New Testament and the early church, 'orthodox' and 'heretical' alike, and between early Christianity and the Greco-Roman culture into which it was moving. This is to say that they reflect an effort to relate both the New Testament and, especially, early Christianity to their historical contexts" (*ibid.*). This publication could well carry the sub-title "Studies in Early Christian Literature and Theology" (found on the dust jacket, although not on the title-page).

According to Grant, the principal element lacking "is an emphasis upon the close relations between early Christianity and Judaism, but to some extent this relation is indicated in the essays on Ignatius (ch. 3 below), on the book of Wisdom (ch. 6), and on Theophilus of Antioch (ch. 10)" (p. xi). Is this, however, really a lack? Indeed, when we consider the nature of this book as a compilation of previously published essays, we find its coverage to be amazingly comprehensive. It has two chapters on "The Study of the Early Fathers," four chapters on "Early Christian Tradition," five chapters on "Early Christianity and Greco-Roman Culture," and four chapters on "Aspects of Christian Gnosis."

If *After the New Testament* does have a lack, I would suggest that it is to be found in the fact that various pieces of early Christian literature dealt with are at times treated without sufficient attention to their immediate historical context—the problems and concerns which gave occasion for their being written. On the other hand, the effort to relate such literature to the wider historical and literary context of the day