

completed beatitude. But how can the temporal 'become' timeless? Surely for any being which has lived in time, there must always be a 'time before this'; souls in beatitude have a past; so are they not temporal still? Perhaps they become 'perfectly immobile': after the breathless passing of time, one changeless beatitude. Yet this beatitude must be the consummation of past time; and is that really plausible? Is my actual life, centred on a day's cricket and a pint at the *Prince of Wales*, going to be consummated by an immutable vision of the Divine nature? Of course, I have the alternative, says Tugwell, of a continued endless temporal existence; but its name is Hell. I can only report that I do not find the choice attractive.

There is also a small problem about bodies and what timeless beings could do with them. Fr. Tugwell toys with the thought that we may be able to ride bicycles after the Resurrection, even if we could not before (159); but what is timeless cycling like? He suggests that the temporality of resurrected bodies may 'not affect the essential non-temporality of the blessed' (168); but by then he has given up: 'we are out of our depth', he says. I tend to agree; but I suspect what this shows is the basic incoherence of the view that our final end is both a timeless contemplation of eternity and the possession of new and glorious physical bodies. As for the complication of Purgatory, wherein some post-mortem progress of a sort is apparently re-introduced and pains are suffered without bodies, Fr. Tugwell says little about it; perhaps only those can consider it seriously who have already entered it.

My conclusion is that after all this the problems are no less; speculative viability, in my view, still eludes us. But one can enjoy Fr. Tugwell's wit, learning and intellectual humility as he guides us through the labyrinth of explorer's tales about the geography of a country which may not even exist. It should contribute significantly to reflection on human immortality, and I hope it will be widely used as a resource.

KEITH WARD

LUKE THE THEOLOGIAN: ASPECTS OF HIS TEACHING by J.A. Fitzmyer, *Geoffrey Chapman*, London, 1989, Pp xiii + 250, Pb. £10.95.

In these eight Martin D'Arcy lectures given at Campion Hall, Oxford, in 1987, Professor Fitzmyer not only distills some of the wisdom of his massive commentary on Luke (Anchor Bible 28 and 28A), and of his extensive studies in Acts, but also seeks to provide a fresh look at some of the key issues of Lucan interpretation.

Despite the title, the first two lectures are mainly devoted to matters of introduction. In the first, Fitzmyer takes up his argument for the traditional authorship of the third Gospel, but argues the possibility that Luke was only an *occasional* companion of the apostle (the lacunae in the 'we' source of Acts being taken to suggest Luke stayed in or around Philippi for the vital years from 50–58 in which Paul developed his theology). A valuable section of this lecture gives a careful critique of Vernon Robbins' implausible thesis that the first person plural of the 'we' sections is to be explained as a standard literary convention for recounting sea-voyages (compare Hemer, *Tyndale Bulletin* 36 (1985)).

In the second lecture, he rather sketchily deals with 'Problems in the Lucan Infancy Narrative' and we may perhaps fairly summarise his findings in his own assertion that 'preoccupation with historicity is not a prime concern in such narrative' (46).

Two later lectures also proved disappointingly thin: the fifth (on 'Discipleship in the Lucan Writings', and the seventh 'on 'The Jewish People and the Mosaic Law in Luke-Acts') were perhaps simply too wide-ranging to afford genuinely new perspectives, and occasionally proved surprisingly lacking in nuance (e.g. the treatment of riches and poverty in Luke-Acts; contrast Seccombe's monograph!). The second of these lectures addresses a vital, complex and much-disputed issue of Lucan scholarship, but even Fitzmyer, for all his clarity and conciseness, can barely manage more than a mild rearming of Jervell's thesis—and without any defence against its notable weakness (namely, that a Jewish church living in the light of the vision in Acts 10, and accepting the Gentiles as an associate people of God on the sole condition of faith and the apostolic decrees, cannot credibly be portrayed as zealously nomic!).

The remaining lectures are more thematically united in treating various aspects of Luke's view of salvation-history. Catholic readers may especially appreciate the gentle but penetrating study of 'Mary in Lucan Salvation History', but their Protestant brethren may enjoy it too, as much for the cautious reassertion of Conzelmann's (or rather von Baer's) 'three period' division of Lucan salvation history which Fitzmyer attempts.

The fourth lecture, on 'The Lucan Picture of John the Baptist as Precursor of the Lord', gives much to ponder. Fitzmyer argues that the historical Baptist probably *did* have contact with the Qumran community, that he *probably* considered *Jesus* to be the Elijah-prophet (the intended referent of the phrase 'the Coming One' (cf. Mal 3.1)), and that Jesus' cleansing of the Temple (early, as in the Fourth Gospel) may have been what confirmed this belief. Jesus' subsequent ministry, however, with its focus on God's grace for the outcast, would have caused the doubts evinced in Lk 7.19. It was the Lord's response, in turn, identifying John as greater than the prophets, which firmly put the mantle of the Elijah-prophet round the Baptist's shoulders instead, and so made him a strictly *messianic* precursor (otherwise unknown to pre-Christian Judaism). Luke for his part accepted this picture of John (*pace* Conzelmann), setting the colossus with one foot in the age of Israel and the other in the period of the kingdom, and reasserting the Elijianic precursor role (so 7.26f. where he is not only greater than the prophets, but cast as a fulfilment of Mal 3.1 (cf. Luke 1.17)). This lecture is a nice example of Fitzmyer's determination to avoid what he regards as the twin pitfalls of 'the fundamentalism of the fearful' (which, he alleges, confuses the Historical with the Redactional stages of the tradition) and 'the cynicism of the foolish' (that would write off all the historical value in the tradition' (89))—though some may feel that in avoiding the first danger he has himself sometimes come uncomfortably close to the second.

The sixth lecture on 'Satan and Demons in Luke-Acts' combines a

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,