toward both Jeremias and Bultmann. While it is of interest to see how the author has moved from the position of his former teacher, the average layman will probably find the dialogue somewhat confusing.

While Käsemann is more optimistic about the possibility of retrieving authentic information about Jesus and the earliest community from the NT and positive about the importance of doing so, he is nonetheless more skeptical than most Anglo-Saxon or French-speaking scholars. This is unfortunate in my opinion, for he has great skill in the area of historical reconstruction, and his interpretation of the evidence leads him to place at a later date sayings and events which may well belong to a much earlier time. In accord with prevailing German scholarship, Käsemann accepts only seven letters of Paul as authentic. While this conclusion is perhaps "safe" in that possibly later material is excluded, it suffers from the reverse danger of leaving out too much. The obvious result is a distorted picture of Pauline theology and the situation in the early church.

In a similar vein, Käsemann charges that neither Anglo-Saxon nor French-speaking scholars have ever really come to terms with the question of the "Jesus of History" and that they are unfair to the German form critics (pp. 11-12). He does not seem to allow the possibility that these scholars have, in fact, given consideration to this question, but have arrived at different conclusions as to the nature of this problem and its urgency. A similar variance of approach is seen in his criticism of Jeremias referred to above. In many places it appears that Käsemann and Jeremias are working on the basis of different assumptions and toward different goals, so that argument and counterargument do not meet each other as they should.

In his preface Käsemann explains that in his view "disputation" is an "indispensable element in theology" and that "disagreement" in the field of critical scholarship is in fact the "outward form of gratitude" (p. ix). In his essays Käsemann has provided the basis of much disputation, disagreement and constructive scholarship. For this all partners in the search for understanding can be grateful.
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This book, a revised doctoral dissertation from Basel, is a further contribution to the growing list of works in the exciting area of redaction-criticism. In harmony with this method Kingsbury examines Mt 13 on the premise that as Jesus used parables to meet the requirements of his own situation, so Matthew employs parables that had come down to him to meet the demands of the situation of the church to which he belonged. This material is then studied to determine what can be learned about Matthew's own "age and theology" (p. 10).
Kingsbury approaches his study by first reviewing modern trends in parable interpretation (ch. 1) and then proceeds to examine the “structure and context” of Mt 13 (ch. 2) which chapter, he points out, falls into two main parts: Jesus’ parables to the Jewish crowds beside the sea (13:1-35) and Jesus’ parables to the disciples in private (13:36-52). This arrangement in turn reflects the pivotal position of ch. 13 in the “ground plan” of the first Gospel, as it serves “to signal the great ‘turning-point’” in the “flow of events in the ministry of Jesus as recorded by Matthew” (p. 130). This “turning point” is described as Jesus’ turning from the Jews who reject Him toward His disciples whom He now addresses as the true people of God. Because of their rejection the Jews are described as “blind, deaf, and without understanding in regard to God’s revelation to them” while the disciples, on the other hand, are privileged to perceive the “mysteries of the kingdom of heaven.” Kingsbury declares that for Matthew the great turning point is “not a mere matter of past history,” but has relevance for his own church, which he believes to be the agent through which Jesus continues His mission. This church too has carried on a mission to the Jews and has for the most part experienced failure. There is the same relationship of animosity between the church and Pharisiac Judaism as existed in the time of Jesus, with each side denouncing the other and claiming to be exclusively the people of God (p. 130).

Kingsbury’s study is carefully written, easy to read, and generally well documented. Summaries at the end of each section add to the clarity and coherence of the presentation. While the author usually reveals a healthy prudence not always found in studies of this type, he nonetheless does occasionally succumb to the temptation of finding significance in what may well be incidental. For example, the fact that Jesus sits in the boat while the crowd stands on the shore is, we are told, to be understood apocalyptically on the basis of the similar picture in Rev 7:9-12 where God is pictured sitting on His throne with a great crowd of worshippers before Him (p. 23). Matthew, it is claimed, emphasizes this element (he employs the verb “to sit” twice; Mark only once) in his description to ascribe divine, “not merely rabbinic” (p. 23), dignity to Jesus. But this argument is tenuous at best. The people before Jesus hardly worship Him, for according to Kingsbury’s own argument, they are the ones who have rejected Him and are therefore unable to perceive the mysteries conveyed in the parables. The basic question here as elsewhere is whether this feature is in fact a deliberate and theologically significant adjustment to the tradition, or is, on the other hand, purely incidental. Kingsbury would strengthen his work at several points by demonstrating more convincingly than he has that the adjustments to the tradition upon which his argument depends are truly Matthean and theologically significant.

Also, a more convincing explanation is needed as to why so much (vss. 10-23, approximately one-third) of the first half of ch. 13, which
is supposed to be basically a public presentation to the crowd, is
taken up with private instruction to the disciples. Kingsbury does
not completely overcome this difficulty. Another aspect of his argu-
ment that will raise some doubt is the assertion that the affinity between
the Parable of the Tares (13:24-30) and "the interpretation of the
parable of the tares" (13:36b-43) is "formal and accidental rather
than real and essential" (p. 14), so that in his opinion the interpreter
should deal with each unit separately. The question here does not
concern the authenticity of one or both of these passages but rather
Matthew's understanding of the relationship of one to the other.
Again, the chapter dealing with the last half of Mt 13 (Jesus' parables
to the disciples in private) needs further development. He describes
the intention of the Interpretation of the Parable of the Tares, and
of the parables of the Hidden Treasure, the Pearl, and the Net as
"paraenetic." Surely it is that, but in this reviewer's opinion, much
more. Matthew's use of each of these parables needs to be more clearly
delineated and integrated into the overall argument being developed.
These last observations notwithstanding, Kingsbury has provided an
exposition of Mt 13 with many new insights that will be of value to
any student of the Gospels.
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Mays, James Luther. *Amos.* "Old Testament Library." Philadelphia:
Mays, James Luther. *Hosea,* "Old Testament Library." Philadelphia:

Ever since Henderson published his monumental commentary on
the Minor Prophets a little over a hundred years ago, English-writing
scholars in nearly every decade have attempted to solve the manifold
literary, historical, and philological problems of the earliest collec-
tions of canonical prophecy. To the distinguished list of commentaries
and individual studies on Amos and Hosea may now be added the
excellent exegetical study by Mays in "The Old Testament Library"
series, one that not only demonstrates mastery of the secondary
materials, but gives evidence of original insight in dealing with
primary sources.

The format for each book includes a brief introduction which sub-
stantively brings out what the author has developed in the exegesis
which follows. The bulk of the books is deceptively compact in content,
and the works discuss with illuminating perception the traditional
topics of authorship, time, composition, messages, editorial redaction,
and personality of the prophets. The arrangement of a verse-by-verse
commentary is carefully planned and should make the volumes very
useful for the non-specialist in the field. The author's gallant attempt
in part to make a new translation of the MT, supported by brief footnotes