Word to the church in a fresh and vital way. While evangelicals will still be reluctant to embrace wholeheartedly the critical methodologies of Brueggemann and Wolff, they doubtless will follow with keen interest the direction that this approach will take.

Fletcher, N.C.

JOSEPH J. BATTISTONE

Carlston, Charles E. The Parables of the Triple Tradition. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975. xviii + 249 pp. \$11.95.

This is a redaction-critical study of the parables common to the Synoptic tradition. Previous critical approaches to the parables, those of Dodd and Jeremias, applied the form-critical method to determine what materials in the parables go back to Jesus himself and what may be attributable to the development within the Christian community. Carlston expressly states, in opposition to these, that he studies these parables not in themselves as part of the message of Jesus Christ but only as a part of the total text. This somewhat enigmatic statement is partly explained by the reason he gives for this, i.e., the temptation to rescue as much of the tradition as possible and to depreciate the contributions of the evangelists. The previous statement, however, is filled with hidden assumptions, i.e., that the form-critical approach neglects the rest of the text and that the contribution of the evangelists is necessarily substantial.

Carlston's method magnifies any differences noted between the particular Gospel being studied and its source and labors to find some theological significance in the change.

Three sections make up this book. The first deals with the Markan Parables in Matthew, the second with the Markan Parables in Luke, and the last chapter all the Markan Parables, not only those found in Matthew and Luke. The author indicates that this book is only a part of a larger work, presumably one dealing with all the parables, those in a dual tradition as well as those found only in one. It is understandable that this work should be limited to the parables of the triple tradition inasmuch as the author is doing a redaction-critical study. However, since he is not studying the parables in themselves but only as part of the total text, he should have given some rationale for limiting himself to this particular part of the tradition. In other words, if it is not for the message itself of the parables, why does he focus on them? Does he expect to find them to be more fruitful than narrative sections or non-parabolic sayings sections for redaction-critical study? If so, why?

Carlston, following his presuppositions, does a very careful analysis of the changes he sees being made by the evangelist. His discussion of Lk 5:36-39 may be taken as an example. When one compares Luke's version of this with Mark's, he will notice how awkward it is. Then Luke adds a somewhat ambiguous statement at the end: "And no one after drinking old wine desires new; for he says, 'The old is good.'" Carlston fairly gives three possible interpretations of Luke's passage based on the differences noted

above, then concludes that Luke "urges the incompatibility between the old and the new and at the same time insists on the superiority of the old" (p. 65). The reason this conclusion is reached may possibly be because the method tends to emphasize differences rather than similarities. Actually, Marcion's omission, even if he understood it in the sense given above, is not conclusive. Also the method attempts to relate these differences to the issues present at the time of the evangelists rather than at the time of Jesus. Carlston speculates that there could very well have been in existence some Christian innovators who were Marcionite in tendency and needed to be told that the old was also good. Because of the nature of the study, it emphasizes the creativity of the evangelist. In this case, he intentionally makes his text say the opposite of what Jesus actually said. In actuality the Lukan passage could very easily have been interpreted to mean that the old and new are incompatible and that it is difficult for people who are used to the old to change to the new, which of course is a fact of life.

A good example of the type of strata that are posited in the Gospels before they are fixed in the form known to us is given in Carlston's discussion of Mk 4:30-32, the parable of the mustard seed. The first stage is in the Sitz im Leben of Jesus when it emphasized the contrast between the small beginning and great ending. In the second stage the tree imagery suggests Dan 4, which was brought in to legitimize the entrance of the Gentiles into the Church. In the third stage we return to the first, when Mark again returns to the original emphasis. It is difficult to see how one can say that Mark returns to the original emphasis without changing any of the contents of the parable but by simply placing it before the Parable of the Seed Growing Secretly. Also, without more explicit indications in Mark, it is not very clear to see the tree and its shade as representing a shelter for the Gentiles.

It is unfortunate that Carlston has not given a summary of each of its three sections showing the result of his redaction-critical study. The very purpose of his work to indicate the tendencies and theological emphases of each evangelist would have been well served by such summaries.

Andrews University

SAKAE KUBO

Conzelmann, Hans. A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians. Translated by James W. Leitch; bibliography and references by James W. Dunkly; edited by George W. MacRae, S.J. Hermeneia—A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975. xxii + 323 pp. \$19.95.

This is a translation of Conzelmann's commentary first published in 1969 as part of the Meyer series. English-reading students are fortunate in having this translation, and the attractive format of the series invites the reader to its contents. No doubt because of space limitations the exegesis is short, and full discussion is not possible. Too often the author must simply give his opinion without providing the full evidence necessary. Nevertheless, the