

logical structures matched those of the creative constitution of being. Thomas's ontology is understood as a 'prolongation and development of Pseudo-Dionysius's Aristotelianisation of Proclus's ontology' (p.218). The discussion of participation in regard to Boethius's *De hebdomadibus* clearly rules out a sharing in *esse* as a separate form, although the dependence in being on a communication of *esse* manifests the concealed hand of Proclus, the 'Cryptoproclean'. The exposition of *De divinis nominibus*, now being critically edited in Toronto, stresses the similarities between the Pseudo-Dionysius and Aristotle. A useful comparison here with Albert's exposition (pp 227—36) shows how Thomas dispensed with the irradiation of forms in asserting the individuation of God's activity with regard to each individual and the reduction of the ideas in God to the simplicity of his being. With his recognition of the transformation of Proclus in the *Liber de causis*, Thomas was able to eliminate a multiplicity of intermediate principles of God's creative activity.

It is the rehandling of Neoplatonist material that the author sees above all as the place where Thomas was most seriously challenged to reshape the earlier tradition: the Plato-critique of Aristotle is

largely replaced by a view in which individual things depend wholly on God's universal exemplarity, participating immediately in his most characteristic act. Thomas's fusion of views from Ibn Rushd and Boethius on the identity of universals with individual things may have obscured the aporetic of the universal in the individual, kept alive by the condemnations of 1277 and a position such as that of the Pseudo-Grosseteste's *Summa philosophiae*. There is little evidence to support the view that this work is by the former Oxford Blackfriars regent, Robert Kilwardby. His influence might have been sought with more probability in the logical writings of Albert. Much of this is difficult reading and those concessions have not always been made that might aid the reader. There is, however, a thesis that deserves careful evaluation and a weighing of texts in context beyond the scope of this review. This study can be read not only as a history of forgetfulness of something that was integral to Aristotle's own thinking, but as a diagnostic of the itch that refuses to go away however cunningly the salve is blended. If it wins acceptance, it may lead us to see Thomas not so much as an 'Aristotelianiser' as a 'Dionysianiser'.

OSMUND LEWRY O.P.

THE INTERPRETATION OF MATTHEW edited by Graham Stanton. *Issues in Religion and Theology* 3. SPCK and Fortress. 1983. p/b £3.50. pp. xi and 164.

The aim of this new series, *Issues in Religion and Theology*, is to collect and reproduce key papers in religious and theological studies which are neither too long nor too technical to be made available to students, teachers, clergy and general readers. The editor of each volume selects and introduces the collection.

Professor Stanton has selected the following papers:

Ernst von Dobschütz, *Matthew as Rabbi and Catechist*, 1928.
Otto Michel, *The conclusion of*

Matthew's Gospel: a contribution to the history of the Easter message. 1950.

Nils A Dahl, *The Passion Narrative in Matthew*, 1955.

Krister Stendhal, *Quis et unde? An analysis of Matthew 1—2*. 1960.

Georg Strecker, *The concept of history in Matthew*. 1966.

Günther Bornkamm, *The authority to 'bind' and 'loose' in the church in Matthew's Gospel: the problem of sources in Matthew's Gospel*. 1970

Ulrich Luz, *The disciples in the*

Gospel according to Matthew. 1971.
Edward Schweizer, *Matthew's Church*. 1974.

Robert Morgan translated from German into English for the first time the papers by von Dobschütz, Michel, Luz, Schweizer, and the first part of Strecker's study. Professor Stanton provides brief notes about contributors, a select bibliography, a short index of subjects, and an index of Matthaean references, as well as an 18-page introduction. He suggests that important historical, exegetical and hermeneutical questions have been raised about the first Gospel in the last 20 years, and selects seminal studies in these areas. In discussing each of them, he draws attention to other works which support, develop or criticise the theses advanced. The papers are placed in historical order and illustrate the development of redaction-criticism. The editor half apologises for failing to include studies on Matthew's use of the Old Testament, his attitude to the Law, and the relationship of his community to contemporary Judaism.

A student reading these papers will gain a clear understanding of the methods, presuppositions and interests of typical New Testament scholarly work since the 1950s. Professor Stanton believes that in future progress will be made by setting questions in a wider context of Jewish-Christian relations in the first two centuries. This is probably true, and the volumes edited by E.P. Sanders *Jewish and Christian Self-definition SCM*, 1971, 1981, 1982 provide a useful starting point. However, this will give a surer grounding only for historical questions. In addition, what seems to be necessary is a much broader awareness of developments outside of Biblical Studies altogether. A claustrophobic atmosphere pervades the volume. Exegetical and hermeneutical questions need to be set in the context of discussions by philosophers and literary critics, whose concern is not with the New Testament but from whom New Testament critics can learn. Theology need no longer be conducted in the ghetto. It can take advantage of being a university subject.

MARGARET PAMMENT

VISIONARIES AND THEIR APOCALYPSES, edited by Paul Hanson. *SPCK and Fortress*. 1983. pp 162

This volume is one of a new series entitled 'Issues in Religion and Theology' which will bring together scholarly essays which have proved significant in dealing with important topics. Such collections are worth having if the contents are not easily accessible elsewhere and if they are fairly cheap. Most of the essays in this book are written by American scholars and are readily available. For instance, Norman Perrin's article on 'Apocalyptic Christianity' which comes from his New Testament Introduction. The two contributions by Michael Stone are taken from his recent book 'Scripture, Sects and Visions'.

Most of the essays deal with the standard problems of what the genre of apocalyptic consists of and of how it arose (from prophecy, wisdom, Persian dualism etc.) The most interesting essay I

found came from a non-biblical perspective. J.Z. Smith looks at apocalyptic from a wider standpoint, that of comparative religion. He sees the motifs in apocalyptic within the archaic religions of the Near East and in fact typical of all modes of Hellenistic religiosity. After studying both Babylonian and Egyptian texts he concludes that apocalypticism 'is wisdom lacking a royal court and patron and therefore it surfaces during the period of Late Antiquity not as a response to religious persecution but as an expression of the trauma of the cessation of native kingship' (115). Another interesting essay is John Collins' 'Apocalyptic Eschatology as the Transcendence of Death'. The difference for him between prophecy and apocalyptic is not so much in the idea of 'definitive end' or 'the distinction of two