will not be afraid to say 'I don't know'. He will be ready to learn from others, of whatever school of thought. He will bring all things to the test of a mind which is nourished on the Word of God. And with it all he will remain a man of passion for the things which he most surely believes; the fire of evangelical conviction and evangelistic zeal will burn brightly in his soul. So he will tread the path to maturity, trusting firmly that Christ who dwells within him will present him perfect and mature.

I. Howard Marshall

Introduction to the New Testament


1 and 2 CORINTHIANS

1 and 2 Corinthians raise some of the most theologically important issues in New Testament studies. In addition to more detailed exegetical questions, the following issues are of far-reaching significance: (1) Do the divisions at Corinth reflect genuinely doctrinal disagreements, or are the 'parties' merely cliques created by an excessive concern about leaders and their personalities? (2) Are the many errors to which Paul replies as disconnected as they might appear to be at first sight? Or is there some deep, underlying connection between them? (3) In what historical setting or settings are we to attempt an exegesis of 2 Corinthians? This third question, in turn, raises three others: (a) How many letters did Paul write to Corinth, and in what order did he write them? (b) Who are his 'opponents' in 2 Corinthians? And (c) does 2 Corinthians constitute one letter which has been preserved in the correct sequence? For the sake of convenience, we shall tabulate Kümmel's discussions under the above numerical divisions.

(1) In effect, Kümmel follows the convincing arguments of Johannes Munck that the supposed 'parties' at Corinth were not theological parties at all. The divisions are caused, he points out, 'by the Corinthians' over-estimation of human teachers...'. (p. 201). This means, incidentally, that he rejects the many ingenious theories which try to suggest a theological significance for 'I am of Christ' (1: 12); he also rejects the theory that it is a gloss. (It does, however, seem possible that 'I am of Christ' could be a 'gnostic' *reductio ad absurdum* which repudiated all personalities, rather than, say, all but the one favoured teacher.)

(2) Kümmel's comments on the reasons for errors at Corinth are valuable, and yet also disappointing. We may welcome his cautious acceptance of the thesis of Schmithals and Dinkler that 'the entire Epistle shows a front against a new Gnostic interpretation of the Christian message' (p. 202), for he is careful to reject the more extreme conclusions of Schmithals' *Die Gnosis in Korinth*, whilst recognizing its broad value as an explanation of the situation. What is disappointing, however, is the failure to mention, let alone to take up, the suggestion that it was a misunderstanding of eschatology that lay behind the superficially diverse errors in this church. Only one or two writers have drawn attention to this seriously, namely R. M. Grant and Johannes Munck. But it is perhaps because of this omission that Kümmel is forced to remark, 'the Epistle has no connected train of thought' (p. 199).

(3) Questions about Paul's correspondence with Corinth are discussed in the chapter on 2 Corinthians. Kümmel insists that 2 Corinthians as a whole was written after 1 Corinthians, and suggests the following order of events (pp. 206-211): (i) the sending of the 'previous letter' referred to in 1: 5: 9ff.; (ii) the sending of Timothy with 1 Corinthians in AD 54-55; (iii) the return of Timothy with an unfavourable report, and the visit which caused Paul deep sorrow; (iv) the sending of Titus with the so-called 'stern' or 'intermediate' letter; and (v) the return of Titus with news that the majority of the church had undergone a change of heart; after which
Paul sent him back once again to complete the good work, carrying our present 2 Corinthians more or less as it is now.

Kümmel gives no attention to the possibility that 1 Corinthians might itself be in whole or in part the 'stern' letter. Nor does he adopt the view that this intermediate letter is to be identified with 2 Corinthians 10-13 (which has been a widespread theory, advocated by T. W. Manson, C. H. Dodd, R. Bultmann, W. Schmithals and many others). Kümmel concludes, 'Although it is hardly possible that II 1-9 and II 10-13 were dictated one right after the other, it cannot be declared as inconceivable that Paul, after a certain interval of time, added to the Epistle a conclusion in which he expressed more sharply his continuing concern for the congregations.'

But we should forego proposing more specific hypotheses ... (p. 213. One of the most memorable of these is Lietzmann's suggestion that 10-13 follow a sleepless night).

Kümmel's balance and restraint in these two chapters are noteworthy, and his comments on partition theories apply to a wider situation than even theories about the unity of 2 Corinthians. Apart from the absence of a discussion about eschatology, the only really serious omission, which was presumably inevitable, concerns J. C. Hurd's monumental book The Origins of 1 Corinthians (London, 1965). (In spite of a cool reception from one or two reviewers who gave no evidence of having examined it adequately, Hurd's book is an indispensable tool for the exegesis of such passages as the notoriously difficult chapter 7.)

ROMANS

The chapter on Romans offers useful discussions on the standard 'introductory' issues, but would require considerable supplementation on its theology (cf., for example, J. Jeremias on justification, G. Stählin on wrath, W. D. Davies and C. K. Barrett on Adam, D. E. H. Whiteley and perhaps H. J. Schoeps on the law, C. A. Pierce on conscience, J. Munck on chapters 9-11, and especially A. Nygren on the whole Epistle). In his list of contents, Kümmel helpfully places chapter 5 with 6-8 rather than with 1-4 (as does Nygren). He tends to labour the point that the church contained both Jewish and Gentile Christians, but he rightly questions whether an identification with the 'strong' and the 'weak' respectively can be proved (p. 219).

Probably only two points call for special attention. Firstly, Kümmel strikes yet another blow against the well-worn notion that Romans represents an entire Pauline systematic theology (pp. 220-222). As he rightly points out, some crucial themes are not touched upon at all, such as the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, or particular aspects of eschatology and the church. On the other hand, he adds, Paul includes a polemic against some quite specific false teaching such as the issues concerning the 'strong' and the 'weak'. Hence, whilst it is true to say that chapters 1-11 deal with the fundamentals of the gospel, it is not true to say that Romans contains everything that is fundamental in Christian theology.

Secondly, Kümmel categorically rejects 'the Ephesian hypothesis' as an explanation of the textual problems which relate to Romans 16. T. W. Manson conjectured that Paul originally prepared his Epistle without the sixteenth chapter for all the Pauline churches, to summarize for them conclusions which he had hammered out with the Galatians and Corinthians. In addition, Manson argued, he sent (1) a copy of chapters 1-15 to Rome, by way of self-introduction; and (2) a copy with the addition of the sixteenth chapter to Ephesus. Manson's theory could well answer textual problems. But as Kümmel shows clearly, there is no compelling reason why chapter 16 should apply so much more obviously to Ephesus than to Rome itself. He sets out a strong four-point argument to this effect (p. 225).

THE PRISON EPISTLES

Most textbooks on the present subject fall into predictable grooves on the Prison Epistles, and Kümmel is no exception. More than half of his chapter on Philippians is devoted to that ancient examination chestnut of the place of Paul's imprisonment. But the arguments are clear, balanced, and well set out; and he distinguishes helpfully between the more important and less important theories of modern writers. The question, he concludes, 'cannot be answered with certainty' (p. 235). Questions about date, however, depend on an answer to this; he suggests, therefore, both a date for Caesarea (AD 56-58), and a date if the place of writing was Rome (AD 58-60). Ephesus, he argues, is the least likely of the three possible places.

Extreme caution is shown over theories concerning non-Pauline interpolations: 'There is ... no sufficient reason to
doubt the original unity of the transmitted Philippians' (p. 237). And Kümmel does not regard it as a serious possibility that the whole Epistle could be non-Pauline. Very little is said about the famous hymn of 2: 5-11 (On this, cf. R. P. Martin's excellent and definitive treatment Carmen Christi, 1967); although the obvious but sometimes neglected point is made that its very inclusion by Paul makes it also 'Pauline', whatever its origin.

Discussions about Colossians tend also to run along familiar grooves, which may well be an encouragement to exampess! Once again, Kümmel deals usefully with the three standard questions: (1) the nature of the Colossian 'heresy' (questions about the occasion or purpose of the Epistle, or about 'Gnosticism' turn mainly on this point); (2) the authorship of the Epistle; and (3) special questions about Colossians 1: 15-20.

On (1), Kümmel concludes that the false teaching threatening the church represents 'a form of Jewish Gnosticism combined with Christianity' (p. 240). He is reluctant, however, to interpret 2: 11 as a heretical demand for circumcision. By putting 'philosophy' in inverted commas, he presumably wishes to remind us that Paul's warning is against the particular brand of speculation which the false teachers had dignified with that name. Kümmel does not bother with J. B. Lightfoot's well-worn theories about Essenism, and his account here of Gnostic ideas is reasonable. What might have been brought out more clearly, however, is the fair inference that the 'heretics' probably claimed to supplement apostolic Christianity, which they might plausibly have argued was only a first step towards grasping deeper powers and mysteries. W. L. Knox stresses this point well in his St Paul and the Church of the Gentiles, and it remains a relevant consideration in the light of some modern sects (cf. also the commentaries by F. F. Bruce, C. F. D. Moule, and F. W. Beare).

(2) As against Bultmann, Käsemann, and Schweizer, Kümmel believes that Colossians is 'doubtless Pauline' (p. 244). He notes the peculiarities of its vocabulary and sentence-structure, as well as its thirty-three *hapax legomena*. He comments, 'The style is cumbersome, verbose and surfeited to capacity with subordinate clauses' (p. 241). But he also notes what will strike anyone who carefully examines the Greek text, namely that these linguistic peculiarities are largely found in the sections of the Epistle in which the author is attacking the false teaching, or when his own thought verges on hymnic form. And in addition to this, it can also be said that there are 'clear stylistic peculiarities of Paul' (ibid.). Paul wrote it, Kümmel believes, probably either from Rome or from Caesarea, some time between AD 56 and 60.

(3) On the famous 'hymn' of 1: 15-20 Kümmel concludes that, quite apart from their unconvincing character on other grounds, theories about its pre-Christian origin founder on the important phrase 'first-born from the dead'. Even the notion that the passage is pre-Pauline is also, he believes, unproven (p. 242). And he might well have drawn on further theological arguments such as the particular role of 'image' both in Jewish and Christian thought.

Many of the questions about Ephesians are dominated by considerations about its authorship and destination. Kümmel comes to the conclusion that Ephesians is not Pauline, but he refuses to reach it by arguments which contain no force. He admits, for example, that the Epistle almost completely lacks concrete details of a type which we should expect to find in a letter addressed to Christians whom Paul knew well. (And this would certainly have applied if he had been writing to the church at Ephesus.) But he reminds us that the words 'in Ephesus' in 1: 1 do not occur in the earliest manuscripts and that the argument may therefore be irrelevant. On the other hand, he accepts the validity of the three standard arguments which are usually put forward against Pauline authorship. These turn on (1) language and style; (2) the relationship between Ephesians and Colossians; and (3) the theology of the Epistle, which supposedly reflects a greater emphasis on ecclesiology than can be found elsewhere in Paul.

What weight do these arguments actually have? Many writers, including Kümmel, concede that neither the first nor the second can be regarded as decisive. The crucial question is whether Ephesians is too 'catholic' to be Pauline. But two versions of 'catholicizing' interpretations should be distinguished:

(a) Käsemann contends that the ecclesiology of this Epistle exclusively interprets its Christology. If this could be substantiated, the case against Pauline authorship would be strong. But Käsemann's particular way of describing the
Epistle's perspective is surely open to question. (b) The sheer prominence of ecclesiology cannot be questioned. But this is not quite the same point as Käsemann's. Admittedly it allows us plausibly to picture the Epistle as a call to renewed zeal for the catholic faith in the setting of the post-apostolic age. But it does not make Pauline authorship impossible, and Kümmel admits that the question remains debatable (cf. his earlier comment on p. 178. D. Guthrie offers a detailed discussion of it in N. T. Introduction: the Pauline Epistles, pp. 99-128).

One other point deserves special note. Kümmel firmly rejects E. J. Goodspeed's well-known theory that the Epistle was composed by a later writer to serve as an introduction to a collected Pauline corpus. He insists that it 'cannot be regarded as probable' (p. 258), and alludes to Guthrie's arguments to this effect. In spite of C. L. Mitton's attempts to modify and develop Goodspeed's thesis, it is extremely doubtful whether it can still be sustained against the combination of arguments which have been brought against it (cf. also F. W. Beare's convincing case in The Interpreter's Bible, vol. 10, New York, 1953, pp. 602ff.).

HEBREWS AND JAMES
Kümmel cautiously restricts himself only to negative conclusions about the circumstances in which Hebrews may have been written or read. He rejects the theory that the readers were Essene priests or former members of Qumran, and dismisses W. Manson's plausible thesis that the readers had sought shelter from persecution within the fold of Judaism. The most he will say is that they were probably 'predominantly Gentile Christians, or simply Christians' (p. 280). For as he rightly reminds us, Gentile Christians become so completely the heirs of the Old Testament promises that allusions to Old Testament passages fail to constitute a reliable argument for assuming a Jewish-Christian readership. Kümmel does not regard the readers as being endangered by a definite heresy. Nor does he accept the traditional arguments for the destination of Rome or even Italy. He points out, rightly, that 'those who come from Italy send you greetings' (13: 24) can mean either that the author is writing from somewhere outside Italy, and that his associates send greetings to their fellow-countrymen, or that the author himself is writing from Italy. Hence 'Rome or another Italian congregation remains only one possibility' as the destination of the Epistle (p. 281). Similarly, 'the person of the author is no longer ascertainable' (p. 282).

Less caution is shown, however, about the theological affinities of Hebrews. Kümmel draws attention to similarities with Pauline theology, as well as to differences from it (p. 277). He notes affinities with Philo, and 'a clear connection with Gnostic ideas' (p. 278), but rejects the supposition of significant affinity with Qumran. With scarcely a word of comment, he also repudiates W. Manson's thesis of a close affinity with the outlook of Stephen's approach, although he accepts C. P. M. Jones' arguments as having 'demonstrated' that Hebrews is both linguistically and conceptually closely related to Luke-Acts (p. 282). But whilst earlier Kümmel maintained that Luke was certainly 'a Gentile Christian' (p. 105), he believes that 'Hebrews belongs entirely in the sphere of influence of Hellenistic Judaism and of the original Gnosticism which came into contact with part of this Judaism' (p. 278).

It is a pity that Kümmel has been unable to include any discussion of the two important English commentaries by H. W. Montefiore and F. F. Bruce (both London, 1964). The former has a fascinating but unconvincing theory about connections between Hebrews, Apollos, and Corinth (op. cit., pp. 9-31); and the latter contains a valuable short note on the use of the Old Testament in this Epistle (op. cit., pp. xlvii-lii). Both of these commentaries, particularly that of F. F. Bruce, also tend to put a question-mark against Kümmel's hastily-argued conclusion that 'the Epistle was probably composed between 80 and 90' (p. 282). In view of a near-quotations by Clement of Rome in the mid-nineties, Kümmel's date is perhaps better thought of as a terminus ad quem.

On the authorship of James, Kümmel concludes that 'an unknown Christian placed his exhortatory writing under the authority of the former leader of the church in Jerusalem' (p. 291). He suggests a date at about the end of the first century. The tradition that the Epistle was written by James the Lord's brother certainly involves well-known difficulties, and it is hardly surprising that to Kümmel they are insuperable. On the other hand some kind of answer has been offered by other writers for each point, and D. Guthrie presents a careful list of them in N. T. Introduction: Hebrews to Revelation (London,
1962), pp. 71-77. On the important question of the kind of Greek which was spoken in Galilee, readers may also wish to consult N. Turner, Grammatical Insights into the New Testament (Edinburgh, 1965), pp. 174-188.

What can be said about the relationship between James and Paul? Kümmel rightly stresses that ‘we must properly take into consideration the terminology and the divergent polemic direction’ of their respective writings (p. 292), but his discussion has less success than the clear and helpful treatments of J. Jeremias (see especially the article ‘Paul and James’ in The Expository Times, vol. 66, Sept. 1955, pp. 368-371). Kümmel’s view of James is that it contains many scattered insights, but that it cannot be accepted as an adequate theological basis in its own right. A similar comment might be made about Kümmel’s chapter. (Incidentally, we can seldom forget the translator for long. ‘Watch your tongues’ is perhaps inevitable. But we have twice to put up with ‘catchwordwise’, p. 284.)

I PETER

Modern discussions about 1 Peter usually involve two major issues above all others, apart from its theology. The first concerns its purpose and literary character, which includes the question of its unity; the second concerns its authorship. In comparison with his other chapters, however, Kümmel’s discussion is surprisingly thin, especially in view of the many ‘liturgical’ theories which relate to the Epistle. Many readers will still turn to F. W. Beare’s commentary for his clear arguments in favour of the ‘baptismal homily’ theory, and for his appendix on modern writings from 1946 to 1957 (2nd ed., pp. 186-203). Three excellent treatments come from conservative writers: A. F. Walls in the Tyndale Commentary (pp. 13-68), D. Guthrie, op. cit. (pp. 95-136), and R. P. Martin in Vox Evangelica, 1962 (pp. 29-42). Kümmel mentions other sources in his bibliography.

As long ago as 1911, R. Perdelwitz argued that the major part of 1 Peter (1: 3 - 4: 11) constitutes a sermon for a service of baptism. The theory received fair support, especially from B. H. Streeter and F. W. Beare. It is noteworthy, therefore, that Kümmel returns to the traditional view that 1 Peter is a letter of exhortation to Christians who are undergoing suffering. The suggestion of a partition, he argues, is ‘unnecessary and improbable’ (p. 295).

Whilst his final conclusions may very well be justified, Kümmel does not perhaps lay sufficient stress, from the viewpoint of the student, on the differences and logical relationships between various types of ‘liturgical’ theory. Some of these depend logically on the validity of others, whilst some necessitate independent critiques. Readers who meet these theories for the first time will need to distinguish initially between: (1) the baptismal homily theory, which is ‘liturgical’ only in the broader sense of the term; (2) baptismal liturgy theories such as those of Preisker and Cross; and (3) classifications of the Epistle into various hymnic and credal forms, such as were pioneered by Hans Windisch and radically developed by Rudolf Bultmann. A further sub-division must then be made within (2) between H. Preisker’s general theory that the Epistle embodies a baptismal liturgy, shorn of its rubrics, and F. L. Cross’ particular theory that this was an Easter liturgy, celebrated by the bishop. Kümmel shows no more enthusiasm for liturgical theories about 1 Peter than he does over Carrington’s hypothesis about Mark or G. D. Kilpatrick’s about Matthew (cf. pp. 63 and 83). But he might well have mentioned explicitly some of their crucial difficulties, such as the embarrassing aorist at 1: 3 which undermines Preisker’s contention about the supposed moment of baptism. (The misprint ‘F. C. Cross’, which occurs in the bibliography, is faithfully reproduced in the index. The result is three allusions to F. L. Cross, and three further allusions to a non-existent F. C. Cross.)

Questions about baptismal allusions deserve a wider discussion than Kümmel gives at this point. Some writers tend almost automatically to think of baptism whenever they meet such words as ‘new’ or ‘water’, and often when they meet an aorist tense. And almost any teaching about the Christian life can be viewed as appropriate instruction for the newly baptized. But the whole question demands careful attention, and C. F. D. Moule’s writings on the subject especially repay study. (His classic essay on 1 Peter is mentioned in Kümmel’s bibliography.)

Kümmel cannot accept the Petrine authorship of the Epistle. The issues at stake have become virtually routine, turning mainly on (1) style and language; (2) relationship to Pauline theology; and (3) assessments of the allusions to persecution or suffering. The issues are fully discussed in the works cited above, and W. C. van Unnik adds some useful com-
ments in *The Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible*. Kümmel’s one additional argument that ‘1 Peter contains no kind of hint of an acquaintance with the earthly Jesus’ (p. 298), apart from being perhaps debatable, might be accounted for by the particular slant of the Epistle’s Christology. (On this last point, cf. A. M. Hunter in *The Interpreter’s Bible* vol. xii.)

**THE JOHANNINE EPISTLES AND APOCALYPSE**

The chapter on 1 John provides excellent value in proportion to its length. In a mere seven pages Kümmel makes some very useful comments on three main issues, namely (1) the purpose of the Epistle and its primary themes, (2) the nature of the false teaching which it attacks, and (3) its authorship and relation to the Fourth Gospel.

Kümmel’s first contribution is to confirm that John writes coherently and with definite aims. A. M. Hunter has justly complained that ‘nineteenth-century criticism often saw in 1 John only a rambling collection of meditations, suggesting in places signs of senility in its writer’ (*Interpreting the New Testament*, London, 1951, p. 95). Kümmel sees that the Epistle presents two main themes, namely ‘right faith in Christ, and the necessary connection between faith and proper conduct’ (p. 306). It thus contains a Christological thesis (confession of Jesus as the Christ), and an ethical thesis (walking in the light). Its ‘meditations’ simply present variants on these two ideas.

Also of value is Kümmel’s insistence that we are not necessarily involved in inconsistency if we believe (1) that the Epistle attacks a specifiable type of heresy; and (2) that it is also ‘a tractate for all of Christendom’ (p. 307). The false teaching was definitely Gnostic, and probably of a more developed type than that which is in question in Colossians, the Pastorals, Jude, or 2 Peter, as it has crucial effects in the realm of Christology quite apart from its lack of concern about ‘doing righteousness’. Kümmel does not allude to J. C. O’Neill’s theory in *The Puzzle of 1 John* (London, 1966), but many will doubt whether this is likely to receive much support.

Kümmel’s third contribution is to give a cool assessment of the relationship between 1 John and the Fourth Gospel. C. H. Dodd compiled an impressive list of linguistic and theological differences between the two writings. But Kümmel points out, and fairly, that W. F. Howard and W. G. Wilson have put forward a case for linguistic affinities which results in a stalemate on linguistic grounds alone. Hence the decisive issue becomes that of theological content. Kümmel cites a standard list of supposed differences of this kind (p. 311), but then convincingly questions their force. He thus concludes, ‘There hardly exists adequate reason to suppose another author for 1 John than for John’ (p. 312).

2 and 3 John occupy a separate chapter. 2 John, Kümmel argues, is addressed not to an individual, but to a congregation; for ‘according to the entire attitude of the Epistle we must suppose that the word *Kuria* here has a metaphorical meaning’ (p. 313). Indeed in 2 John ‘the elder’ warns his readers against a similar kind of false teaching to that which 1 John is combattng. But although their respective purposes are quite different, ‘2 and 3 John have the same author. They speak the same language’ (p. 315). The title *ho presbuteros*, Kümmel argues, is likely to indicate, not ‘the prebyter’, but ‘the elderly man’. The designation, he believes, must remain an unsolved riddle.

Kümmel introduces his chapter on the *Book of Revelation* with a useful twopage section on the nature of apocalyptic. Those who are interested in this important subject, however, should also consult D. S. Russell, *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic*, and H. H. Rowley, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic* (as well as virtually anything that bears on the subject from the pen of G. B. Caird). All the same, the Johannine apocalypse has many features of its own. Kümmel reminds us, for example, that ‘John writes under his own name’ (p. 321), and that his book is certainly more than ‘only a superficially Christianized Judaism’ (p. 332). In his own assessment, however, Kümmel tries to mediate between unrestrained criticism and uncritical acceptance. Certain elements of the book do stand, he believes ‘in tension or in contradiction with the central NT proclamation (e.g. the cry for vengeance in 6: 10, or the expectation of an earthly millennium, 20: 2ff.)’ (p. 333). And he argues that the Apocalyptist is in danger of falsifying the message of God’s goal with world history. On the authorship of the book he remarks, ‘We know nothing more about the author . . . than that he was a Jewish-Christian prophet by the name of John’ (p. 331); and he suggests a probable date towards the end of Domitian’s reign, between about AD 90.
and 95. To Kümmel’s bibliography should certainly be added the excellent commentary by G. B. Caird (London, 1966). (Strangely, Kümmel mentions none of Caird’s books or articles, although The Apostolic Age remains something of a classic among smaller textbooks.)

Pressure of space prohibits discussions of the chapters on the Pastorals and 2 Peter. Kümmel concludes that we can know nothing concrete about the author of the Pastorals, and, on 2 Peter, that ‘Peter cannot have written this Epistle’ (p. 302). Most of the arguments, however, are well known, and cases for the traditional views have been put forward most notably by D. Guthrie and J. N. D. Kelly on the Pastorals, and by E. M. B. Green on 2 Peter. (On questions about Luke, for which we left no space in the first part of this survey, see particularly Bo Reicke’s small but penetrating book The Gospel of Luke, London, 1965; E. E. Ellis’ commentary The Gospel of Luke, London, 1966; and essays by P. S. Minear and several others in the standard work edited by L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn, Studies in Luke-Acts, London, 1968.)

COMPARISONS WITH OTHER BOOKS

How does Kümmel’s book compare with other available tools in terms of, say, the requirements of a university syllabus? It would be misleading to group all academic books on New Testament introduction in the same broad category. For since different types of books perform differing functions for the student, his tools will not be restricted to one given type. Kümmel’s work belongs to the main category of heavy-weight textbooks, except that it moves out of this class on textual criticism and canon. Three questions must therefore be asked: (1) how does Kümmel compare with heavy-weights of the same textbook class? (2) what about books on text and canon? And (3) does Kümmel’s book perform additional functions as a tool for the student, which would invite further comparisons with smaller or more specialized books?

Firstly, changes and advances in New Testament studies have taken place so rapidly in recent years that today two or three books stand almost alone in the class of all-round detailed textbooks. With Kümmel and Guthrie we can perhaps place Alfred Wikenhauser’s New Testament Introduction (Herder, Dublin, 1958) as a useful contribution from a Roman Catholic scholar. But in terms of scale alone, it hardly competes closely with Guthrie and Kümmel. Without any doubt at all, time has left too many marks on even the revised edition of A. H. McNeile to allow it a place today in the same class. M. C. Tenney’s New Testament Survey may well be invaluable for the non-theolog, but it dodges too many difficulties to invite consideration as a textbook. Among more recent books, W. Marxsen’s introduction scarcely rivals Kümmel, just as E. F. Harrison’s conservative work hardly rivals Guthrie.

This leaves the field clear for a straight comparison between Kümmel and Guthrie. The following factors are inescapable. (i) The greatest single disadvantage of Kümmel’s book is its irritantly inelegant translation. One is almost forced to assume that the translator spent so much time collaborating with Kümmel at Marburg that he simply forgot how Englishmen actually speak. The nature of the subject-matter and his fondness for passives may mean that even Guthrie’s style is not exactly dash­ ing, but it is always clear, matter-of-fact English. Indeed beside Kümmel it reads almost like a novel. (ii) Another prominent feature in Kümmel is his prodigious scattering of scholarly names. His book forms a roll of honour, a memorial to all who have fought and died (mainly in Germany) in the cause of New Testament studies. To have names in such fantastic quantity is magnificent for the research student, but a very mixed blessing for the undergraduate. For apart from the fact that he is unlikely to know which are the important ones, they constantly interrupt the flow of the argument. In contrast, Guthrie makes excellent use of footnotes. Thus all the names are there, but only the more important ones appear in the main text. (iii) Both writers admire caution, which is an important quality in the subject concerned. But whereas Guthrie begins, continues, and ends in caution, Kümmel allows himself an occasional fling, and indeed has a number of them on the Gospels and Acts. The crucial factor to note, however, is that whilst he is often restrained in his conclusions, Kümmel is not always judicious in his words. Thus, where Kümmel might say (at the end of a seven-line sentence) ‘... was demonstrably proved to be unquestionably untenable (von Camperhausen)’, Guthrie may well have written more accurately, ‘This view has certain difficulties’. Each, of course,
writes in his own national tradition. (iv) In general neither author allows a theological slant to obscure the fair presentation of both sides of a case (although cf. our comments on Kümmel's chapter on Acts). The only serious difficulty which Guthrie's books raise for the student arises from their sheer mass of material. Only the exceptionally brilliant (or exceptionally unimaginative) could plough through every page of each book in the length of a normal course. But ideally neither Kümmel nor Guthrie is dispensable as a source for constant reference. On a few topics, each complements the other. On some, Kümmel presents a fair case but perhaps more selectively than Guthrie does. On others, however, Guthrie remains infinitely more satisfying than Kümmel. Guthrie never dismisses what might conceivably be proved true. And what may appear, in the light of cheap criticism, to be like sitting on the fence, in reality reflects an honest respect for the industry and integrity of other writers.


Our third and final question was about Kümmel's relationship to books of other categories. Does Kümmel's availability mean that neither short surveys nor specialized books on given topics now serve the student as useful tools? There will always be a place for specialized studies. Bo Reicke on Luke, A. F. Walls on 1 Peter, and C. K. Barrett on Luke and John are only a few examples of a score of valuable studies. Such studies usually add a freshness and stimulation which is sometimes missing in the full-scale textbook. For when an author chooses to write on a special subject it is usually (although not always) because he has something special to say about it.

Light-weight short surveys remain as relevant as ever to student needs. They perform two functions. Firstly, they introduce readers gently to a new subject, so that they don't miss the wood for the trees. Secondly, in the final weeks before the exam they offer a ray of hope to those who, even if brilliantly, have covered only their favourite quarter of the syllabus and who still need to hope for a gamma plus on their fourth and fifth questions. Many a life was once saved by the short-cuts provided by F. B. Cogg. But Cogg is now a book of the past. A. M. Hunter is justly renowned as a clear and able summarizer of trends and views, and his book *Interpreting the New Testament 1900-1950* still has value for the period which it covers. Far more useful today, however, is R. H. Fuller's small book *The New Testament in Current Study* (London, 1963). This takes up the story shortly before A. M. Hunter's book leaves off. Fuller's conclusions are often radical, but his work provides an excellent supplement to Kümmel or Guthrie. Another book by R. H. Fuller, *A Critical Introduction to the New Testament* (London, 1965), is a useful addition to the Duckworth series. Once again it is far from conservative, but always clear, concise and relevant. R. M. Grant's *A Historical Introduction to the New Testament* (London, 1963) also covers each book in sections of only a few pages, in spite of the total size of the volume. Grant seldom bothers to mention views other than his own, but his book gains thereby in directness and simplicity, and should not be overlooked. We might also mention such books as W. Barclay's *The First Three Gospels*; but we must draw a line somewhere.

The general point is simply that Kümmel's book does not necessarily eclipse the contributions of smaller ones. Here and there he has tried hard to simplify complex issues, and to communicate a sense of perspective to the reader. But his success is far from uniform. Those who are rich, however, would be well advised to buy Kümmel as well as Guthrie. At the very least, this will give to those who are diligent but destitute a better chance of borrowing a copy. Finally, those who are poor but not destitute can invest a copy. Finally, those who are poor but not destitute can invest confidently in part-ownership, knowing that if the time comes to sell, they will be assured of a firm market. For whether one's ambitions are modest or high, Kümmel must not be ignored. Many of the chapters give first-class value.