

adopted 1900 years ago? What part shall be accorded to the historical fact itself? Here Léon-Dufour's position is conservative, and the author remains wary of current "gnostics" who propagate a doctrine which, while inspired by the gospel, has cut itself off from its historical roots. By way of example, an appendix suggests a few models of a way of preaching the Easter message on the basis of the gospel narratives (pp. 250-261).

A short bibliography, a useful glossary, and an index add to the scope and usefulness of this important work, a model of clarity and order. Léon-Dufour, however, seems to have been badly served by his translator and publisher. I have unfortunately not been able to lay my hands on the French original. But, besides all too frequent misprints, the text is rather incoherent on p. 236; the last complete sentence on p. 242 is intelligible only if the "not" is removed; and the last sentence on p. 243 only makes sense if a "not" is added at the beginning.

My recommendation? Read the book, but preferably in French.

Andrews University

RAOUL DEDEREN

Longenecker, Richard N. *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1975. 246 pp. Paperback, \$4.95.

In this solid piece of work, the author first sets forth the principles of Jewish hermeneutics in the first century. Then, beginning with Jesus himself and moving on throughout the NT, he deals with the treatment of the OT in the NT. After Jesus, he discusses early Christian preaching, Paul, the Evangelists, Hebrews, and the rest of the NT books. The orientation of the book is conservative but with an awareness of the spectrum of views current today.

Since Christianity arose out of Judaism, it is natural to look for Jewish hermeneutics for points of contacts. Characteristic of Jewish hermeneutics are literalist, midrashic, peshet, and allegorical interpretations. The Qumran sectaries especially employed peshet interpretation, while Philo was the champion of allegorical interpretation. All of these types of interpretation are found in the NT in varying degree, but the important difference between Jewish and Christian interpretation is the latter's Christocentric perspective, which found its origin in Jesus himself and continued after his ascension through the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

While there is this dominating hermeneutical key throughout the NT, there are still differences in emphasis and patterns. In the distribution of OT quotations, a clear pattern emerges. Those writings which are addressed to Jews or Jewish Christians are understandably rich in quotations, while the writings addressed to a non-Jewish audience generally lack OT quotations. Within certain books both of these phenomena appear, such as Mark and Luke, since while they address non-Jewish audiences, they include the sayings of Jesus. The editorial comments lack quotations, but where they report Jesus' sayings these quotations naturally appear. And this is somewhat true with Paul's writings, depending on the kind of audience to which he is writing.

Another difference is in the use of peshar interpretation. This type of interpretation is limited exclusively to Jesus and his immediate disciples. These saw in Jesus Christ the great goal to which the OT pointed and thus sought to show the correlations between him and the OT. This type of exegesis began with Jesus himself, and the disciples simply developed it further. But this approach is not characteristic of the material attributed to those outside of this group. Paul, for example, has closer affinity to the rabbinical modes of interpretation.

The question that inevitably arises in exegetical and hermeneutical questions is, How does this relate to us? Are we obliged to follow the pattern of exegesis used in the NT? Longenecker goes into this question at the end of his book. His answer unfortunately is too brief. He answers "No" and "Yes." "Where that exegesis is based upon a revelatory stance, where it evidences itself to be merely cultural, or where it shows itself to be circumstantial or *ad hominem* in nature, 'No.' Where, however, it treats the Old Testament in more literal fashion, following the course of what we speak of today as historico-grammatical exegesis, 'Yes.' Our commitment as Christians is to the reproduction of the apostolic faith and doctrine, and not necessarily to the specific apostolic exegetical practices" (p. 219).

He also leaves too many questions unanswered. Does the matter of relevant exegetical practice for us include the exegetical practice of Jesus Christ, since the apostles based their practice on his? Is there any validity to the peshar approach in Scripture, or is it the same as the Qumranic use? Without a fuller elaboration of exactly what the author means, it would have been better if this topic had not been treated at all.

This does not, of course, invalidate the basic structure of the work, even though one does not agree with every point made.

Andrews University

SAKAE KUBO

McHugh, John. *The Mother of Jesus in the New Testament*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1974. xlvii + 510 pp. \$12.50.

Modern Roman Catholic Christology has been increasingly concerned with the human life of Jesus. Since the close of Vatican II, Catholic writers have not hesitated to tackle primary and central problems such as the miracles of Jesus or his claim to be the Messiah and the Son of God. Using the tools of modern biblical scholarship to lay bare the roots of the Marian tradition, John McHugh has contributed to this reexamination a detailed study of *The Mother of Jesus in the New Testament*.

The prominence of Marian doctrine in Catholic theology and the widespread uneasiness felt over attacks on the historical value of the Infancy Narratives must have recommended this topic. Besides, a book about Mary in the NT does have real interest for those who wonder how a Catholic can accept the modern methods of biblical criticism and still retain full confidence in the teaching of his church concerning the Virgin Mary.

The book is divided into three main parts: "Mother of the Saviour" (pp. 3-153) analyzes the sources, the literary form and the theology of the first