

work; on his well-known study of *The Meaning of Righteousness in Paul* (1972); on his interesting notion that the tenth commandment, quoted in 7.7, in mind throughout the whole chapter; on his suggestion that the wild olive shoots *could* be grafted into an old tree to re-invigorate it. On one question at least, he has changed his mind: he now interprets 7.14–25 of pre-Christian experience, having concluded that Paul's negative statements are inappropriate for Christians: he is surely right. But, like many other judgements in this book, this conclusion is adopted 'tentatively' (p. 194); Ziesler is all too well aware of the arguments on either side. He is a cautious guide, courteous and unaggressive in his judgements. Some readers may wish that he had been more decisive in his comments; he states every point of view so fairly that sometimes one is not quite certain what Ziesler himself believes on a particular point: one wishes that he had been asked to offer his own translation, instead of commentating on the text of the R.S.V., for the necessity to translate forces one to make decisions.

Nevertheless, the commentary is to be warmly welcomed, as an excellent introduction for non-specialists to the new scholarly approach to Romans. Just one niggling doubt remains: granted that Ziesler is right in his emphasis on the fact that Paul is concerned with communities rather than individuals; and granted that he is right in accepting Sanders' evidence that first-century Judaism was not concerned with the idea of acquiring righteousness through merit: is there not, nevertheless, something to be said for the truth of the traditional interpretation? Certainly God's grace was primary for Judaism, and the Law was seen as the people's response to God's grace. But is it not an instinctive human reaction to imagine that those who are obedient to God's demand deserve divine favour? Were first-century Jews exempt from a temptation which befell nineteenth-century Protestants as well as sixteenth-century Catholics, or those of any age who imagine that their (comparative) innocence gives them a hold over God? Ought we to exclude the idea of merit quite so firmly from the discussion? And does not Paul's insistence on faith mean that the role of the individual within the community takes on greater significance? Perhaps the shift from the traditional interpretation will prove to be less dramatic than it seems!

MORNA D. HOOKER

JESUS CHRIST IN MODERN THOUGHT by John Macquarrie. S.C.M. Press, London, 1990. Pp. 454. £17.50.

The title of this book may lead one to expect that it is entirely devoted to a survey of modern christology. In fact the book has a wider scope. It is divided into three parts. In the first part Macquarrie examines the christology of the New Testament; in the second part he summarizes various attitudes to Christ and various formulations of christology from the eighteenth century until today; in the third part he offers his own christology. He states the conclusion of Part 1 thus on p 147. 'Within the New Testament we can see development in the understanding and interpretation of the material, from the early adoptionism which told of a crucified man being made Lord and Christ by God, to the later incarnationism which told of the divine Word living as a human being in the midst of the human race'. Although MacQuarrie provides evidence for such development, I think that he invalidly follows James Dunn

203

in denying that Paul ascribed preexistence to Christ. Part 2 contains many valuable summaries of and acute comments on the following movements in christology and the thinkers included in them: rationalist christology (Kant), humanistic christology (Schleiermacher), idealist christology (Hegel), mid-century misgivings (Kierkegaard), positivist christology (Ritschl), critical responses and theological renaissance (Kahler, Barth, and Brunner), existentialist christology (Bultmann, Gogarten, and Tillich), Roman Catholic thought (Rahner, Schillebeeckx and Teilhard de Chardin), eschatological christology (Moltmann and Pannenberg). MacQuarrie ends with some British and American christologies, among which he includes those of D.M. Baillie, Norman Pittenger, Schubert Ogden and J.A.T. Robinson.

After so long and complex a survey in Parts 1 and 2 readers will naturally be interested to discover its outcome in MacQuarrie's own christology that he presents in Part 3. In the latter he deals with many matters (such as the Virgin Birth, the Resurrection, and the relation between 'the Jesus of history' and 'the Christ of faith'); but I shall concentrate on his fundamental views on Christ's person which are these. In the company of many twentieth century theologians Macquarrie holds that we must begin with a christology 'from below' (that is, from the human Jesus); but he also says that we must proceed to a christology 'from above' (that is, one which interprets Christ with reference to God's presence in him). Thus on p 376 he affirms that 'the second of the two ways is the more profound and is a necessary condition of the first'. Yet despite this affirmation he writes that 'the difference between Christ and other human beings is one of degree rather than of kind'. (p 382) This leads him to interpret "incarnation" as a continuous process. "Incarnation was not a sudden once-for-all event which happened on 25 March of the year in which the archangel Gabriel made his annunciation to the Blessed Virgin, but is a process which began with the creation. If I were to offer a definition of 'incarnation', I would say that it is the progressive presencing and self-manifestation of the Logos in the physical and historical world. For the Christian, this process reaches its climax in Jesus Christ' (p 392). It is therefore not surprising that Macquarrie, in his last chapter, where he compares Christ with other saviour figures, claims that 'what they have in common with Jesus Christ is more important than their differences' (p 419).

In maintaining that Christ differs in degree and not in kind from other men Macquarrie avowedly follows Schleiermacher, who has here been followed by many other theologians. I can now offer only two, closely related, observations. First, on p 383 Macquarrie claims that his christology is in accordance with the 'governing intention' of the Chalcedonian Definition, which he regards as an authoritative norm of dogma. But surely the whole point of the Definition is to affirm that although Christ was fully man he differed in kind from all other men in being also God. Secondly, Macquarrie redefines 'incarnation' by giving to it a meaning that is radically different from the one given to it in orthodox tradition, where it signifies a wholly unique and supernatural event. Of course Macquarrie's christology merits independent examination. Moreover even those who disagree with him can profit from Part 2, which further exhibits a theological and philosophical scholarship, together with a capacity for lucid and balanced exposition, that have for a long time characterized him as an historian of Christian thought.

H.P. OWEN