

How does the author of Luke-Acts portray the Jews? Has Luke-Acts played a role in Christian anti-semitism? Sanders, an established New Testament scholar and professor of religious studies at the University of Oregon, studies in detail all references to the Jews in Luke-Acts and finds that this New Testament writing has played a 'major ... part' in anti-Jewish sentiment among Christians.

The thesis of the book is proposed in two major parts: I, a thematic investigation which presents the Lucan treatment of Jewish leaders, Jerusalem, the Jewish people, and the periphery (outcasts, Samaritans, proselytes, and God-fearers); then II, a systematic analysis, which proceeds through Luke-Acts in a commentary-like explanation of relevant passages. Finally, part III offers a concluding evaluation, which examines the author's motives in exhibiting a consistent, systematic hostility towards the Jews. The book ends with bibliography, notes, and several indexes.

Sanders maintains that according to the Lucan account Jewish leaders not only arrest Jesus, but also crucify him. Moreover, he recognises that, though in Acts 1–5, 'the Jerusalem springtime,' thousands of Jews became Christians, thereafter in Acts there are non-Christian Jews, who not only reject the gospel, but oppose it, and also Jewish Christians, who accept the gospel, but also the Mosaic law. Among these are the Pharisees 'who had become believers' (Acts 15:5), who insisted that Gentile converts be circumcised and observe the Mosaic law. Luke's story of the 'Council' shows how this insistence was defeated and how the salvation promised to Israel of old has passed to the true Israel (at first Jewish converts, and ultimately the Gentiles); thus 'a direct line of continuity runs from Moses and the Prophets to the church; ... it is not Christianity that has rejected Judaism, but Judaism that has rejected Christianity' (p. 33). 'The leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy' (Luke 12:1) really refers to Pharisaic converts (Acts 15:5), who were trying to poison the whole by insisting on the gospel *and Moses*. Further, the outcasts, the Samaritans, the proselytes, and the God-fearers represent the periphery through which God's salvation passes on its way from the Jews to the Gentiles. Luke envisages no continuing mission among the Jews after the conclusion of Acts, for the Jews of the Diaspora fall under the same condemnation as that pronounced against those of Jerusalem (Acts 13:27). To put it another way, 'what Jesus, Stephen, Peter and Paul say about the Jews—about their intransigent opposition to the purposes of God, about their hostility towards Jesus and the gospel, about their murder of Jesus—is what Luke understands the Jewish people to be in their essence' (p.81). Why? Because Luke knew in his day and locale of not only Jewish opposition to Christianity, but also of Jewish Christian opposition to Gentile Christianity. To resist such opposition, all Jews are attacked and Acts '13–28 ... are therefore the trial of Israel, in particular of its *Diaspora*' (p.316, quoting E. Trocmé).

But is Sanders's thesis acceptable? It may be such, if one can agree with the interpretation of the individual passages that he cites. But that is a big IF! In a limited review such as this one cannot enter into detailed criticism; a few examples of his tendentious interpretation will have to suffice. Sanders notes the striking contrast between Mark 14:43, where a 'crowd' comes out to arrest Jesus, and Luke 22:52, where Luke identifies the 'crowd' (22:47) as 'the chief priests and captains of the temple and elders' (cf. Acts 4:1; 5:24). This is correct, but only partly so, because in Mark it is said that the crowd came 'from the chief priests and the scribes and the elders.' Is Luke's more specific identification really that much of a contrast to the Marcan description? Sanders further insists that the 'soldiers' involved in the crucifixion of Jesus (23:36) are Jewish and not Roman so that in the Lucan passion narrative it is the Jews themselves who crucify Jesus. Does not the soldiers' taunt in v. 37, 'If you are the King of the Jews?' suggest that they are rather Romans? Sanders squirms in his interpretation to avoid that conclusion. Again, any

normal reading of the prayer in Acts 4:24–28 would understand that Luke meant to ascribe Jesus' fate to both 'Gentiles' and 'the peoples' (4:25; see v.27 where the latter phrase is interpreted as 'the peoples of Israel') or to 'Herod and Pontius Pilate' (4:27)—i.e., Luke ascribed the death of Jesus to both Romans and Jews. Yet Sanders can say of it, 'This passage could thus hardly be cited as evidence that Luke intended to designate the Romans and not the Jews as the executioners of Jesus' (p.14). Luke's intention is not 'either/or'; it is 'both/and'.

Sander's discussion of the Pharisees is generally good and well-balanced, but it becomes contorted in his discussion of Christian Pharisees (Acts 15:5). Thus, 'it is not the non-Christian Pharisees in Acts on whom the label 'hypocrites' is to be attached; it is the Christian Pharisees' (p.111). But it is well known that Luke uses *hypokritai* only three times, and never of any Pharisees: in Luke 6:42 it occurs in the singular and is used of a 'brother'; in 12:56 it is used of 'crowds'; and in 13:15, of people and their leader in a synagogue. That pejorative label is never found in Acts. True, Luke speaks in 12:1 of 'the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy'—the only time that he uses that term. But then who would ever expect that it is the mark of Christian Pharisees. Sanders is convinced that he has made out a strong case for this in his discussion; but it is too contorted to be convincing. The extreme of this interpretation is met on p. 113, where Sanders says that 'the truly contrite sinner (the toll-collector of Luke 18:10–14) 'goes down to his house justified instead of 'the pharisee—yes, instead of even the Christian Pharisee'! Is that the real point of the parable?

Sanders has written a detailed, provocative book, which has many good insights into individual passages. But the thesis of the book as a whole is questionable.

JOSEPH A. FITZMYER, SJ

PSEUDO-DIONYSIUS, THE COMPLETE WORKS. Translation by Colm Luibheid. Foreword, notes and translation collaboration by Paul Rorem. Preface by René Roques. Introductions by Jaroslav Pelikan, Jean Leclercq and Karlfried Froehlich. *Paulist Press and SPCK, 1987. Pp. x + 312. No price given.*

This latest volume in the *Classics of Western Spirituality* deserves a warm welcome. There has been no complete translation into English of the writings of the Areopagite since Parker's quaint (though not inaccurate) version in the 1890's, and the partial English translations that have appeared this century have been woefully inadequate. Given the enormous importance of Denys (or pseudo-Dionysius, as this translation calls him) for subsequent Christian tradition, both in the East and the West, this translation immediately fills a real gap. It is prefaced with introductions by Jaroslav Pelikan, Jean Leclercq and Karlfried Froehlich, and annotated by Paul Rorem, the author of the best recent book on Denys (*Biblical and Liturgical Symbols within the Pseudo-Dionysian Synthesis*, Toronto, 1984). The volume has many merits: the translation (by Colm Luibheid) is readable and largely accurate, the annotation, especially in its cross-referencing within the *Corpus Areopagiticum* and its wealth of biblical references, is invaluable. The introductions are, however, something of a missed opportunity. Froehlich's contribution on the attitude to Denys in the Renaissance and Reformation is masterly, but Pelikan's and Leclercq's contributions are one-sided and skimpy. From Leclercq one would get the impression that John Sarrazin translated only the *Celestial Hierarchy*, and Pelikan places Denys all too uncomplicatedly in the milieu of early sixth-century Monophysitism. Denys certainly fits well amongst those Eastern Christians who, through faithfulness to the memory of Cyril of Alexandria, were unhappy with the Chalcedonian Definition, but to label all such

462