

up his mind as to what theology is, we can hope for another tentative theological construction in the future. In the meantime we have to make up our own minds, or live with our minds in process of moving on from the last decision.

Nottingham, England

EDWARD W. H. VICK

Von Campenhausen, Hans. *Ecclesiastical Authority and Spiritual Power in the Church of the First Three Centuries*. Tr. by J. A. Baker. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1969. vii + 308 pp. \$ 8.95.

This publication is an English translation of the author's *Kirchliches Amt und geistliche Vollmacht* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1953). The translator has done a valuable service indeed in making this work available in eminently readable English. On rare occasions the language may even become too colloquial, as for example in the expression on p. 68, "Paul makes no bones about recognizing this arrangement. . . ." On the whole, however, the language is superb.

Inasmuch as this work has been in existence for some years in the original German, no full-scale review of it will here be necessary. However, a few comments will be in order.

First of all, that this work has become and will continue to be one of the standard treatments of the subject seems assured by the author's thorough acquaintance with and wide attention to both the primary and secondary literature relating to the subject. He moves as a master in the field and not only gives the reader provoking food for thought in the text itself but also furnishes a valuable introduction to the sources by means of extensive footnote references. In any serious study of ecclesiastical development during the earliest Christian centuries, this book is one which cannot afford to be overlooked.

Second, the thesis presented in this work is certainly subject to debate, but this is not surprising in view of the gaps in knowledge pertaining to the field. For the reader unfamiliar with the author's thesis, a reading of the concluding chapter entitled "Retrospect" (pp. 293-301) will give a quick synopsis. Briefly stated, some of the high points of the thesis are as follows: The apostle Paul developed a charismatic church order which was devoid of office except for "the quasi-office of his own apostolate" (p. 296). Alongside this Pauline church, there "grew up at the same time the opposite type of congregation, led by presbyters" (*ibid.*). The two forms began to fuse early, Luke playing an important role in this fusion. Official authority tended to gain ascendancy, and this "trend toward an unbalanced ascendancy of office is the one uniform feature in the otherwise widely varying concepts of power and authority in I Clement, the Epistles of Ignatius, and the Pastoral Epistles from Asia Minor; and in the course

of the second century this development continued unchecked" (p. 297). In the 3d century "the exclusive authority of office" attained "full stature" (p. 299).

Third, although there are various strengths in von Campenhausen's presentation, there are also, in my opinion, some rather crucial weaknesses, relating especially to a lack of appreciation for historical backgrounds and a somewhat unbalanced treatment of the textual materials themselves at times. Three examples will be noted:

(1) In chapter 3, the author elucidates a concept which becomes fundamental to the further development of his thesis; namely, that Paul played down the concept of any official type of church office, laying stress on the charismatic manifestations within the congregation. Not only are inadequate historical foundations laid for the discussion, but of some 300 citations from Pauline epistles, nearly 200 of them come from the Corinthian epistles alone! Furthermore, when it is later concluded that Luke puts into Paul's mouth the reference in Acts 20 to "elders" and that Luke is active in fusing the Pauline charismatic system with the non-Pauline system of elders, one may wonder whether von Campenhausen is not depending more on his own pre-suppositions than on analysis of historical backgrounds.

(2) In dealing with Clement of Rome, the author admits difficulty in knowing what the real historical situation was; but without knowing what that situation was, he nevertheless seems to have little difficulty in discerning that the concept that "everything should be done 'decently and in order'" has become for Clement "a piece of sacred knowledge which touches the essence of the Church," whereas for Paul it was only a "peripheral comment" (p. 87). "It is no longer faith in Christ which directs and defines what concrete application is to be made of the idea of order," he says, but the idea of order itself "is now extolled as, so to speak, an autonomous principle of an abstract and formal kind, the power controlling both the world and the Church, and the true norm of the spiritual life" (*ibid.*). I Clement is referred to as exhibiting "an impoverishment of spiritual content" (pp. 85, 86); in it the "abstract concept of order has become completely detached from any specifically Christian meaning" (p. 94). Is this fair treatment of I Clement?

(3) Ignatius presents, according to von Campenhausen, a fundamentally new picture, his letters revealing "an advanced stage of developed hierarchical order, which is connected with the fact that they are of Syrian provenance" (p. 97). But why is the fact ignored that most of these letters are addressed to churches in the Roman province of Asia? Furthermore, the fact that Ignatius' letter to the Romans does not portray this "advanced stage of developed hierarchical order" should in itself be a warning that the supposed and so-called Syrian provenance has less to do with the church organization depicted in most of the Ignatian letters than do actual conditions in the province of Asia at the time. But von Campenhausen appears to be strangely unaware of this.

In my opinion, a careful study of what the documents themselves say is indeed basic, but such a study must be made within the context of the most serious attention to what is known (both on internal and external grounds) of the specific historical conditions related to those documents. To do otherwise may lead the scholar to a reconstruction more in line with his own fancy than with what actually happened in history. One wonders if von Campenhausen's book does not suffer from a certain degree of weakness along this line. But regardless of any shortcomings it may have in this respect, and regardless of how serious those shortcomings may seem to be, this book must be considered as a classic in the field. From it we may learn much, and no one with a serious scholarly interest in the topic can afford to bypass it.

Andrews University

KENNETH A. STRAND

Von der Osten-Sacken, Peter. *Die Apokalyptik in ihrem Verhältnis zu Prophetie und Weisheit*. "Theologische Existenz heute," 157. München: Chr. Kaiser, 1969. 63 pp. DM 6.80.

This is a brief but significant study. The author's undertaking is a critical investigation of the thesis of the famous OT scholar Gerhard von Rad, who claims that apocalyptic had its origin singularly in the wisdom tradition. It should be noted that von Rad is the first German scholar in this century who treated the theme of apocalyptic within a work on OT theology (cf. his *Old Testament Theology* [1965], II, 301 ff.). He thus has a prominent place in the renaissance of interest and study of apocalyptic among German scholars of various theological disciplines, viz., O. Plöger, *Theokratie und Eschatologie* (1959); W. Panzenberg, *Kerygma und Dogma*, V (1959), 218-237; D. Rössler, *Gesetz und Geschichte, Untersuchungen zur Theologie der jüdischen Apokalyptik und der pharisäischen Orthodoxie* (1960); E. Käsemann, "Die Anfänge christlicher Theologie," *ZThK*, LVII (1960), 162-185; etc. Von Rad denies vehemently the widely held view (especially among Anglo-American scholars) that apocalyptic is a child of OT prophecy. To his mind, "this is completely out of the question" (*Old Testament Theology*, II, 303; the wording in the 4th German edition of 1965 is softened into "this is not possible.>"). What is new in von Rad's position is not that he considers the wisdom tradition to have a partial influence upon apocalyptic (so already G. Hölscher, "Die Entstehung des Buches Daniel," *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, XCII [1919], 113-138, to whom curiously von Rad does not refer), but rather that apocalyptic has its exclusive origin in wisdom literature. In his view there is a one-way street moving from wisdom to apocalyptic whereby he expressly denies any inner contact with prophecy.

Von der Osten-Sacken attempts to go beyond the justified critique of von Rad's thesis by P. Vielhauer in E. Hennecke, *New Testament Apocrypha*, ed. by W. Schneemelcher (Philadelphia, 1965), II, 596 ff., who has pointed out that in the wisdom materials of the OT "there is