

have read but I am not sure that it solves all the difficulties in dispensing with that hypothesis. Because Drury thinks that Luke copied Matthew he dates Luke very late, early in the second century (then why didn't Luke extend Acts to take in the end of the first century?). He likens Luke's theology to that of the Deutero-Pauline letters because they each domesticate the severity of Paul's gospel, in Luke's case by giving Christianity a history with a past. Luke's model historian is

the Old Testament Deuteronomist and Drury tries to show how Luke 9:51–18:14 builds original material and material from Matthew onto a structure derived from Deuteronomy. Whatever one makes of Drury's arguments, and I find them impressive but not always convincing, this is a most important contribution to the study of an evangelist who has not found too much favour recently with theologians.

GEOFFREY TURNER

**THE USES OF SCRIPTURE IN RECENT THEOLOGY, by David H. Kelsey. SCM Press, London, 1975. 227 pp. £5.50.**

As its title implies, this is a purely factual investigation into how scripture has been used by half-a-dozen recent theologians in the reformed tradition. It makes no attempt to suggest, on the author's own count, how scripture should be used in theology, though it does point out limitations and illogicalities in the uses made by the theologians whose work is examined. The author is interested not primarily in the theologians themselves, but in their use of scriptures as types or examples of a wide spectrum of uses; this is why he includes B B Warfield, a Princeton theologian of the late nineteenth century, whom he takes as exemplifying the theory of plenary verbal inspiration.

Professor Kelsey asks of each of the theologians chosen a set of questions about their use of scripture. What aspect of scripture is authoritative: concepts, history, symbols or doctrines? What makes this authoritative? What is the logical force of this authoritativeness? The diversity of the answers shows the importance of these questions in attempting to construct a theology which is both based on scripture and relevant to modern man. Broadly speaking the theologians examined fall into three classes. There are

those who stick on the level of words or concepts, the sort of approach popularised by Kittel's TWNT, and often liable to the criticisms of James Barr. A newer school of theologians stresses the importance of biblical narrative, since scripture is "the self-revelation of God in historical events". A third school prescind almost entirely from history and concentrates on symbols which occasion an encounter now between the believer and the Lord, so that it becomes entirely unimportant whether the Bible claims to be talking about public events or not. This final position is that of Bultmann, and an interesting exposition of his Heideggerian approach to biblical statements and their logic is one of the clearest I have met (p. 78ff). Another less extreme, representative of this point of view is Paul Tillich.

Perhaps the most interesting observation (p. 206) is that the way scripture is treated by each of these theologians depends on the theological position of each, which in turn is shaped by a prior decision of what Christianity is about. And what does this say about the authority of scripture? The questions asked are profoundly challenging, and the evidence is presented with clarity and good humour.

HENRY WANSBROUGH

**PAUL'S LETTERS FROM PRISON, Commentary by G.B. Caird. Q.U.P., 1976. 224 pp. £2.25**

This commentary, we are told, appears without the text of the Letters for reasons of economy and to facilitate references to other versions than the RSV. The type and format are small; but let no one think that this is an insignificant commentary.

Rather it is a splendid example of what thorough and patient scholarship can accomplish; and it is refreshing to read that the first three chapters of Ephesians are an almost continuous prayer (page 31) or that the heart of Paul's theology is con-