

THE SAYINGS OF JESUS IN THE CHURCHES OF PAUL, by David L. Dungan. *Blackwell*, Oxford, 1971. 180 pp. £3.

This neat and penetrating little monograph examines the New Testament tradition of two sayings of Jesus, those on the payment of missionaries and on divorce. The starting point in each of the two halves is the version of Paul, but from there the author moves on to some very thorough work on the gospel texts, both what lies behind them and the work done by the synoptic writers themselves. He moves on a field beset with sacred cows, which jostle one to such an extent that it is sometimes difficult to breathe, although he strikes a shrewd blow at some of them, moving them resolutely out of the path he has planned for himself.

Dungan maintains that Paul disobeys the command of the Lord that the apostle should receive his livelihood from those to whom he is preaching: 'a startling impression of wilful disobedience to an explicit command of the Lord' (p. 33). He continues with a long explanation that Paul 'relativizes' all commands of the Lord if this is necessary for missionary purposes, for being all things to all men. Not only that, but Paul is dishonest to the Corinthians, because Dungan reckons that at the time he is high-mindedly refusing their contributions he is receiving them from other Churches. This is unnecessarily hard on Paul; it does not seem to me that Paul's pastoral suppleness justifies such strictures. But in any case the interest of the discussion is that in combination with the history of the saying in the synoptic gospels (however much one disagrees with the author's negative attitude to the Two Source theory), one can see mirrored in the development not only the history of the abuse which the Lord's permission occasioned, but more importantly the liberty with which the Church treated it, and the breadth of interpretation which they felt to be justified by

changing circumstances. The history of the command concerning divorce is dealt with lucidly and firmly. Dungan argues that remarriage is not envisaged by any New Testament text. Jesus' command is to be seen in the context of, and as opposed to, the current practice of frequent divorce and remarriage; to this the Lord opposes the teaching of Genesis about two in one flesh. Even Matthew's so-called exceptive clause is in fact only a supplement, recognizing *de iure* the *de facto* situation that the bond has been broken by the adultery of one of the parties. But even so there is no hint of permission to re-marry, and this would weaken the whole of Jesus' stand against current permissiveness. Jesus' ruling is compared to that of the Essenes in CD 4.20-21, where the prohibition of remarriage is based on the same text of Genesis. Less convincingly he views both prohibitions as eschatologically orientated; this is an attractive view, but not backed up by evidence (p. 117).

This is certainly an important contribution to the study of the history of the gospel tradition. So many positions in the long controversy about the relationship of Paul to Jesus, and the puzzling failure of gospel sayings to appear in his letters, have been based on *a priori* grounds. Dungan puts this failure to quote the sayings in the context of the general failure to quote them exactly evidenced in the early fathers before Irenaeus (e.g. Justin, Clement), which makes it seem much more plausible. Both Paul and the gospel writers seem to have treated the sayings of the Lord with a combination of respect and flexibility which later ages have failed to grasp or emulate, but which is certainly reminiscent of Jesus' own attitude to the Jewish Law.

HENRY WANSBROUGH

PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION: THE HISTORIC APPROACHES, by M. J. Charlesworth. *Macmillan*, London, 1972. 216 pp. £2.50. (= 'Philosophy of Religion' Series, Gen. ed. John Hick.)

This book is concerned with the study of four possible logical structures within the philosophy of religion: four ways of relating philosophy and religion.

There is first the option for total identification, either by replacing religion by philosophy (Greek philosophers, including the Neo-

Platonists) or by turning religion into philosophy (Rationalist philosophers since Descartes).

For the more religious-minded thinkers, Jews and Christians, philosophy is merely the handmaid of religion, either confirming its claims (Philo, Augustine), or producing