

searching critique of Conzelmann's 'Satan-free' period with a perceptive attempt to understand what Luke meant by the Temptation narratives (they were parabolic and paradigmatic explanations of the cosmic struggle of the *whole* ministry, Fitzmyer argues (chiefly from 22.28) ), the 'fall of Satan' (Lk 10.18—Jesus' symbolic interpretation of the disciples' success prefiguring the decisive victory Jesus will himself win), and the 'return of Satan' in 22.3.

The final lecture reexamines Luke's soteriology in the light of Luke's crucifixion account, and especially 23.43, 'Today you shall be with me in paradise'. If Luke lacks the more explicit soteriology of e.g. Mk 10.45, that is not because he has exchanged a *theologia crucis* for a *theologia gloriae*, rather Luke's *narrative* brings out the saving significance of the cross in the contrast between the jeering taunts that Jesus cannot save himself and the Lord's own assurance to the repentant thief that his death is the gateway to the thief's share in his kingly destiny. At the same time the 'today' of 23.43 must be taken seriously. For Luke, Jesus' death and burial accomplishes his 'entry into glory' (24.46) and exaltation to the right hand of God (Acts 2.33), and this is what Luke means by Jesus' coming into 'paradise'. If this appears to conflict with the alternative presentations in Luke-Acts—either that Jesus was raised on the third day (traditional!) or that he was exalted only after forty days (Acts 1), there can still be no doubt, Fitzmyer argues, which view is the distinctively Lucan one.

My initial disappointment at receiving a collection of essays where I had expected (from the title) a more systematic study was rapidly dispelled by this perceptive, fresh and admirably lucid book. It provides much to rethink, much with which to disagree, but above all a stimulating guide both to the thought of Luke and to that of one of his most outstanding interpreters.

MAX TURNER

**THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS** by Simon Tugwell OP. *Outstanding Christian Thinkers Series*. Geoffrey Chapman, 1989. Pp. xii + 148. £14.95 (Hb), £7.95 (Pb).

There are not many books on the Apostolic Fathers, and at least one reason for that is that it is difficult to find any convincing 'net' in which to catch them all. They are not outstanding thinkers, not even outstanding Christian thinkers. Eusebius the Church Historian remembered them and quoted passages from several of them, but after him the Church seems to have soon forgotten them. Few of them survive in more than one complete manuscript: these lay unread for centuries and were only discovered by the efforts of scholars inspired by the Renaissance ideal of *ad fontes*. Their title 'Apostolic Fathers', i.e. fathers who lived in apostolic times, was given them by such scholars in the 17th century: the Church's tradition did not preserve them as such. Scholars put them together because of their date (eventually stretched to span from 50 to at least 150). Fr Tugwell catches them in a single net, *not* by making out that they are outstanding thinkers, but by following through his intuition in *Ways of Imperfection* that the Apostolic Fathers claim our attention,

not because they are exciting, but because they bear witness to a Christianity that is content with the rum lot that the Church, the communion of saints, is and must be. This rather low-key approach does, I fear, make for a rather dull book. One's pulse only quickens enough to raise a scholarly eyebrow—over, for instance, Tugwell's enthusiasm for early dates: only with St Ignatius (over two-thirds way through the book) do we advance beyond AD 70 (though Tugwell's footnotes are more cautious: in small print he seems to accept the conventional 90's date for Clement, which ought to pull Hermas into the 90's too).

Fr Tugwell devotes most space to Hermas (two chapters). It is only recently that Hermas has attracted much attention, but in the last few years both Robin Lane Fox and Peter Brown have been drawn to him. Tugwell seems unaware of this, which is a pity, as a rather more colourful figure emerges from their pages than from his. On Ignatius, Tugwell succumbs to the English weakness for thinking that his seemingly extravagant language about his own martyrdom must find its explanation in Ignatius' personal psychology and situation (which is all conjecture). It seems to me that Jewish apocalyptic and its understanding of martyrdom make much more sense of Ignatius, and remove the need for guesswork: the links between his letters and 4 Maccabees seem almost demonstrable. Martyrdom attracts Tugwell's attention very little: neither in the case of Ignatius nor—very surprisingly—in that of St Polycarp. He has nothing to say about the *Martyrdom of Polycarp* except to note a 'small point of interest': the use of the term 'catholic church'. But there are, I would have thought, some rather large points of interest, not least the extraordinary eucharistic echoes of Polycarp's prayer as he waits for the pyre to be kindled. Ignatius also casts his coming martyrdom in eucharistic terms. None of this seems to interest Tugwell. Nor has he anything much to say about the germs of Christian dogma found in their writings.

Despite all this, Fr Tugwell's book is one of the few books on the Apostolic Fathers (the only one in English I can think of) that treats them as Christians worth trying to understand, rather than the literary equivalent of archaeological remains. But it need not have been so dull.

ANDREW LOUTH

**THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ANGLICAN LITURGY 1662—1980** by R.C.D. Jasper. *SPCK*. 1989. Pp 384. £19.95.

The title of this book is misleading in more ways than one. Firstly, it implies that there is but one Anglican liturgy, whose development has been a steady progress from a 'given' in 1662 through to the present day. In fact, Prayer Book revision in the Church of England, reacting against the theological nadir of 1552 with the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI, began at the first possible moment, at the beginning of the reign of Elizabeth I in 1559, and in the following hundred years various subtle but significant alterations marked a definite shift away from the Cranmerian ethos. It is at this point that Dr Jasper takes up the story, and thus misses the opportunity to make clear that 1662 was in fact a point of

301