Following the examples set out in his handbook, *New Testament Exegesis* (Westminster Press, 1983), Fee frequently assists our understanding of Paul’s arguments by dividing up the text of I Corinthians diagrammatically to display chiastic and other literary patterns (e.g. 7:2-4; 11:2-16; 12:4-11; 14:2-4; 15:39-41) although one of the helpful diagrams in *Exegesis*, namely, I Cor. 2:6-7, is not reproduced in the commentary.

The English text of I Corinthians is of course that of the New International Version (NIV), although Fee has occasionally made changes (e.g. at 10:9 ‘Christ’ printed with the Majority Text is preferred to ‘the Lord’). Most of his textual preferences are however to be found only in the footnotes and in the exegesis. In the 250 or so textual notes, Fee generally agrees with the text behind NIV: in about 100 of them the preferred reading is against the Majority Text and these discussions will be hotly debated by those who disagree with the text behind the NIV. Fee is on record elsewhere expressing disquiet about thoroughgoing eclecticism in textual criticism, thus it is an interesting novelty to see in this commentary that he says that the text of 14:34-35 is secondary: the words of NIV are double bracketed. There are no mss. supporting the omission of these verses. Fee does however base his rejection of the Pauline authorship of these words on text-critical grounds: the omission of the instruction for women to keep silence in the church will doubtless be welcomed in some quarters particularly at a time when some Christians are debating the ordination of women-priests (? priestesses). Among other modern ‘issues’ of church politics it is significant to note that Fee is not drawn to reinterpret Paul’s unambiguous denunciation of homosexuality in 6:10 by accepting dubious proposals for alternative lexicography.

Fee frequently takes inspiration from many previous commentators including Hurd, Murphy-O’Connor, Findlay and of course Grosheide, whose commentary in this series is now superseded. It is a comprehensive and thoughtful work. We are comparatively well served by commentaries on I Corinthians, but Fee’s work deserves a place beside Conzelmann’s and Barrett’s as an inspiring guide for both pastor and scholar.

J. K. Elliott


This edition of the New Testament apocryphal writings is the direct descendent of the one volume collection edited by Edgar Hennecke in 1904. The third edition of 1959 and 1964 revised by Wilhelm Schneemelcher appeared in two volumes (due to the increased number of texts included). An English translation appeared in 1963 and 1965. The fifth edition represents a further revision. I understand an English translation of this is being prepared. The cover ignores Hennecke’s name, but the title pages tell us that the edition is based on the collection founded by Hennecke. I suspect the edition will continue to be known as Hennecke-Schneemelcher and this review will refer to it as HS⁵.

The editions tell of a continuing story of expansion. The section on the gospels in Hennecke² was twice as long as its predecessor; HS³ made further expansion, HS⁴ I ran to 377 pages; HS⁵ I has 442 pages.

Among the changes in this fifth edition are a partly rewritten *Haupteinleitung* by the editor; the addition of an article by H. Merkel on Morton Smith’s so-called Secret Gospel of Mark; a new translation of the Fayyum fragment; the repositioning of the Strasbourg fragment—now under ‘Fragmente’; and the use of the addi-
tional fragment of P. Egerton 2 found in the Cologne collection (views on the
dating of which encourage Schneemelcher to warn (p. 82) that P. Egerton 2 need
not be as early as 150 A.D.).

A more conspicuous change is the addition of a new category ‘Dialoge des
Erlöseres’ introduced by Schneemelcher, but containing contributions by others.
This replaces the chapter in HS³ ‘Wechselgespräche Jesu mit seinen Jüngern nach
seiner Auferstehung’. It includes two documents found in the earlier category, the
non-gnostic Epistula Apostolorum and the Freer Logion (which I would have
thought really belonged among the Agrapha), but now adds the Letter of James,
the Dialogue of the Redeemer and the Book of Thomas the Athlete (all previously
noted under the section on Gnostic Gospels, written by H.-C. Puech), as well as
three new documents, the two apocrypha of James and the Letter from Peter to
Philip. The Questions of Bartholomew are however not included here: this text
appears in the section ‘Jesu Wirken und Leiden’. Whether the newly created Gatt-
tung is correctly included in a volume on the apocryphal gospels is debatable:
inssofar as the risen Jesus is the principal character a case could be made for the
category being a type of apocryphal apocalypse. For example, in Erbetta’s Italian
translation of the apocalypses of James they appear in his third volume ‘Lettere
e Apocalissi’. Some may even question the validity of including within a collection
of New Testament apocrypha a category of writing not represented in the
canonical New Testament literature. However, the texts in ‘Dialoge des Erlöseres’
are included, and are included in volume I: for each full translations, some
appearing for the first time in HS, are given and there are new introductions to
all texts, except the Freer Logion.

One of the main motives behind the publication of the third edition was the
addition of much gnostic material in the wake of the Nag Hammadi finds. The
long chapter written by Puech there covered over 100 pages. In HS³ Puech’s con-
tribution is justly acknowledged as of pioneering significance, but, inevitably, it
has been superseded in places by the publication since 1959 of much of the Nag
Hammadi material. Thus in Beate Blatz’s revision of this chapter (now reduced
to only forty-five pages), the Nag Hammadi material has been shortened or
removed. The chapter now entitled ‘Andere Gnostische Evangelien und verwandte
Literatur’, assuming we have identified gnostic gospels already covered in
preceding chapters, is very different from Puech’s original in HS³; what stays in
is generally the same save for a few bibliographical additions, although the sections
on Marcion (G3) and on the Nag Hammadi Egyptian Gospel (H) differ. In addi-
tion to the repositioning of material previously introduced by Puech and already
referred to above we note that the Gospel of Philip is now given a chapter (V) to
itself, introduced by H. M. Schenke: this includes a full translation, instead of
Puech’s first impressions (HS ³ I p. 197).

Naturally Coptic Thomas also merits a separate chapter and a full translation
in which the Oxyrhynchus papyri 1, 654, 655 appear in parallel. In HS ³ there
was a certain duplication because of the inclusion of these fragments both within
Puech’s contribution on Thomas and in the chapter containing these and other
fragmentary gospels. The three Oxyrhynchus papyri are now rightly seen together
with the Coptic gospel as representations of the same original apocryphon. It is
somewhat strange that readers of HS ³ are advised (p. 94) to refer to Puech’s
preparatory investigation into the relation of Coptic Thomas and these papyri in
the discussion in HS ⁴ (= HS ³) pp. 212f. and pp. 61f. for bibliographical and
introductory matter on the separate papyri! Blatz’s essay introducing the text of
Thomas is restrained in its bibliography. The absence of a full discussion on the
alleged gnosticism of this document is surprising. F. T. Fallon’s introduction in
ANRW II 25, 6 pp. 4195-4251 is more helpful on this—and other—issues.