

confront us, we are now at least relieved of the need or temptation to begin with Jesus, or the early church, or the New Testament, if we wish to develop coherent ethical positions" (p. 130).

Thus, Sanders rejects the teachings of Jesus as an ethical model because they are inseparably connected with his imminent eschatology; he finds that Mark sets out merely the ethics of endurance in a hostile world; Luke is no longer ruled by the closeness of the Parousia, but he presents only a vague "goodness"; Matthew intensifies ethical demands in a manner that becomes unthinkable on the non-occurrence of the Eschaton. Likewise, according to Sanders, is Paul governed by the nearness of the End: he intends *agapē* as primarily eschatological and makes frequent use of tenets of holy law. The NT "Paulinists," on the other hand, no longer find eschatology as definitive for ethics, but for them Christian behavior tends to collapse into merely good citizenship. Nor is the Johannine ethic any better: the temporal understanding of eschatology has been replaced by tension between the "in" group (believers) and the "world" outside, so that behavior is concerned only with one's fellow-believer—a way of thinking that displays "weakness and moral bankruptcy" (p. 100). The later epistles follow the general direction of the "Paulinists," while the Apocalypse, retaining the aspect of imminent eschatology but retreating from ethical responsibility, is "evil" (p. 114).

Professor Sanders' analysis gives rise to several questions. He has (correctly) pointed out the role of imminent eschatology in NT thought, but to what extent are the ethics in that thought *contingent* upon the eschatology? He assumes that the radicality of the love command is viable only on a short-term basis; a lengthened view makes it preposterous. If, however, love of neighbor rests upon a particular time view, is it not thereby qualitatively devalued? On the other hand, what if the ethics of the NT are bound up with *religion* rather than a specific eschatology (which is part of that religion)? It is in this latter regard—the relation of ethics to NT religion—that Sanders' work appears most vulnerable. He has exegeted passages of the NT which appear to take up ethical concerns, but he has overlooked the larger picture of life in the Spirit and the vitality of the new sense of community. While he has dealt with the words of Jesus, he has quite neglected the most potent factor from the life of Jesus—the cross. As John H. Yoder has argued convincingly in *The Politics of Jesus* (1972; see my review in *AUSS* 13 [1975]: 96-97), the cross-ethic colors NT behavior.

Whatever one's final estimate of *Ethics in the New Testament*, the book seems destined to influence subsequent writing in the area. While it cannot rank in scope or impact with Schweitzer's *Quest*, it will, like the *Quest*, serve as a point of reference. It is a significant work in the study of NT ethics.

Andrews University

WILLIAM G. JOHNSON

Swanson, Reuben J. *The Horizontal Line Synopsis of the Gospels*. Dillsboro, N.C.: Western Carolina Press, 1975. xx + 597 pp. \$23.95.

The unique feature of this Synopsis is its new arrangement of the gospel materials. Instead of placing the parallel accounts in vertical columns, Swanson has arranged them in parallel horizontal lines. It is evident that

the Professor of Philosophy and Religion at Western Carolina University has given careful thought to the matter of an effective format for arranging the substance of the gospels.

The book is divided into four parts: one part for each of the gospels, using the canonical order beginning with Matthew and ending with John. The text employed is the Revised Standard Version. The material is arranged in blocks of parallel lines. Swanson describes his procedure thus: "The lead gospel is almost always the gospel in bold-faced type on the top of the block of lines. Exceptions occur only when there is material in the supporting gospels not found in the lead gospel. Such material is included, since it is important to see what the other gospel writers are saying which is not repeated in the lead gospel" (p. x).

Each gospel is preceded by a table of contents and cross references. The text of each is divided into sections. Matthew has 79; Mark, 72; Luke, 106; and John, 44. Six of Matthew's sections, those containing the five discourses around which the gospel is built (5:1-7:29; 9:35-11:1; 13:1-53; 18:1-19:2; 24:1-26:2), plus the account of the Jerusalem controversies (21:23-22:46), are subdivided into from 5 to 10 subsections each. In Mark the account of the controversies in Jerusalem (11:27-12:35-37) and the Eschatological Discourse (13:1-37) are also subdivided. The same is true of the Sermon on the Plain (6:20-49) and the Controversies in Jerusalem (20:1-45).

The material is to be studied in blocks of lines. There are two kinds of parallel materials included: (1) primary, printed in bold-faced type, and (2) secondary, printed in light italics except when the text agrees exactly with the lead gospel. The account of the Last Supper, for example, in Matthew includes parallel lines from 1 Cor 11:24-27 in bold-faced type and material from Jn 13 and 6 in light italics. The horizontal-line arrangement is flexible enough to include materials outside the gospels. As further illustration the list of the 12 apostles given in Acts 1:13 is also given as a parallel to Mt 10:2,3 (p. 49) as well as to Mk 3:16-19 (pp. 213-214) and to Lk 6:14-16 (pp. 362-363).

In the Marcan section, both the "long" and the "short" ending of the gospel are included (pp. 324-326). In John the Pericope adulterae is given as a regular part of John (7:53-8:11). The work, unfortunately, contains no textual notes or variant readings.

For a convenient comparison of the wording of the parallel accounts of the gospels as rendered in the RSV it is a valuable tool. We look forward to Swanson's production of a Greek Synopsis based on the same format.

Loma Linda University  
Loma Linda, Calif.

WALTER F. SPECHT

Via, Dan O., Jr. *Kerygma and Comedy in the New Testament: A Structuralist Approach to Hermeneutic*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975. xii + 179 pp. \$8.95.

In recent years we have seen the NT studied by the methods of form criticism and redaction criticism, and now right on the heels of the latter the method of structuralism. While form criticism and redaction criticism are not heterogeneous to each other, structuralism is to them and therefore