The present volume is the *Festschrift* for Alexander J. M. Wedderburn, teaching at the University of Munich in Germany, on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday. The various contributions have been summarised under the three headings that make up the title *Paul, Luke and the Graeco-Roman World*. The editors provide a brief appreciation of Sandy Wedderburn (viii.), a list of the abbreviations used and of the contributors.

H. Räisänen opens the first part on Paul with the question ‘Did Paul Expect an Earthly Kingdom?’ (2–20). He outlines the history of millenarian readings for Pauline eschatology from A. Schweitzer and J. Weiss to the recent proposals of E. P. Sanders, P. Stuhlmacher and B. Witherington. Räisänen wants to ‘weigh the merits of the “earthly fulfillment” interpretations. How do Paul’s main eschatological sections fit with the notion that the believers will reign (or fight) with Christ on a (transformed?) earth, either temporarily or even eternally?’ A survey of key passages is followed by observations on Paul’s general attitude to the world (6). Eventually he argues against such a notion. R. H. Bell describes ‘The Myth of Adam and the Myth of Christ in Romans 5:12–21’ (21–36). Bell outlines four exegetical and theological problems of this passage and suggests that ‘if the mythical nature of the text is taken seriously, these problems can to some extent be solved’ (21). He concludes: ‘Understanding the Adam-myth in terms of identical repetition solves the seemingly intractable problem of competing causality in regard to sin. We both sin in Adam and his sin is manifest in the lives of everyone in responsible action. This pattern of identical repetition breaks down, however, in the Christ-myth. Participation in Christ is only possible through faith. The one who believes in Christ finds that he has been taken out of himself and placed in a new reality’ (36).

R. Jewett writes on ‘Impeaching God’s Elect: Romans 8:33–37 in its Rhetorical Situation’ (37–58). He argues that the verses do not refer to the scene of the final judgement in the divine court but are closely bound up with the rhetorical situation of the letter, ‘in which voices were being raised in Rome against the “weak” who consisted predominantly of Jewish Christians whose leaders had been expelled from Rome…’. These critics suggested that the afflictions suffered by other believers indicated divine disfavour and inadequate faith. Paul is insisting that such afflictions suffered by Christians do not imply a separation from Christ’s love, and that those who make any such allegation are wrong’ (49). M. E. Thrall describes the ‘The Initial Attraction of Paul’s Mission in Corinth and of the Church He Founded There’ (59–73). She examines the religious and sociological reasons that may have motivated those Corinthians who responded to Paul, and uses them to explain the problems that arose later in Corinth and in the church’s relationship with its founder. O. Wischmeyer analyses ‘Paul’s Religion: A Review of the Problem’ (74–93), interacting with G. Theissen’s science-of-religion perspective on Paul and ‘comes to a conclusion regarding Pauline religion between Judaism and primitive Christianity that differs from Theissen’s religio-psychological model’ (76, ‘…the duality between Jews and Gentiles is replaced by a new duality: Jews/Gentiles on the one hand, and the Church of God on the other. And here in the Church of God the new religion developed’, 93).

H. Klein outlines the possible ‘Craftsmanship Assumptions in Pauline Theology’ (94–101), beginning with the note of Paul’s trade in Acts 18.3 and Paul’s only mention of tents in 2 Cor 5:1: ‘That a specialist is talking here is not obvious. Examining his letters more closely, however, it is noticeable that Paul presupposes his job relatively frequently. A compilation of these passages has… not yet been undertaken. Neither has there been an attempt to shed light from this point of view on the main assertions of his theology…’. These reflections… serve as an evaluation of Paul’s thinking from the characteristic features of his profession. This is important today to the extent that “craftsmanship thinking” has taken firm hold everywhere and “agricultural thinking”
has receded' (95, are these really mutually exclusive ways of thinking in an ancient, largely agrarian society?). Klein describes Paul the craftsman, his view of the congregation as a union of craftsmen and argues that Paul's craftsman's way of thinking was not useful when envisaging relationship with God, for which the thinking of a farmer would have been more to the point. While it raises fresh interesting perspectives, the article hardly refers to ancient sources (which ancient literary sources are actually written by craftsmen?) and interacts very little with secondary literature. Were other factors that shaped Paul's thinking perhaps more dominant? C. Hoegen-Rohls writes on 'Κτίσις and καινὴ κτ́ισις in Paul's Letters' (102–22). F. Hahn contributes 'Observations on the Soteriology of the Letters to the Colossians and Ephesians' (123–35), the emphasis being on Col 1:15–20 and Eph 1:3–14.


In ‘Dionysius’s Narrative “Arrangement” (οίκονομία) as the Hermeneutical Key to Luke’s Re-Vision of the “Many”’ (149–64) D. P. Moessner also studies the Lukan prologue and claims ‘that the first-century B.C.E. teacher of rhetoric, historian and literary critic, Dionysius of Halicarnassus (c. 60–68 B.C.E. sic), presents in his critique of Thucydides’ “arrangement” (οίκονομία) of the Peloponnesian War, the closest parallel in thought and rationale to Luke’s opening assertions’ (150). S. E. Porter outlines ‘The Reasons for the Lukan Census’ (165–88). After a brief introduction to the problems of the census, Porter surveys ‘the six major views of the Lukan census that do not simply state that Luke has confused his facts’ (166, 167–72). He then analyses what major arguments have been marshalled (172, the legateship of Quirinius, πρῶτη for προτέρα and other grammatical issues, Egyptian and other censuses and property returns) while adding some references to primary sources (three papyri regulating property return) not previously discussed in this context: ‘Rather than suggesting a new solution, my purpose here is to introduce to NT scholars, and to the scholarly debate, some material that has not to my knowledge been explicited in NT circles to date, and that might provide help in clarifying the issues involved’ (167). Porter concludes: ‘…there is growing evidence from what we know of ancient census-taking practices to believe that in fact Luke got far more right in his account than he got wrong’ (188).

C. Wolff examines the expression ‘Λαλεῖν γλώσσαις in the Acts of the Apostles’ (189–99, Acts 2:1–13; 10:46; 19:6) and formulates his conclusion in a comparison with Pauline usage in 1 Cor 12–14. Luke regards speaking in tongues as inspired praise of God and belonging to prophecy, ‘which for him, in correspondence with the early Jewish view, can express itself doxologically. . . . for Luke speaking in tongues is no longer a charism of the community; on each occasion the phenomenon marked an important initial moment in the missionary history of primitive Christianity, now in the past…. it is not unintelligible articulation, but speech in the languages of the nations of the world; as such, in the beginning phases of mission, it proclaimed the universal relevance of the gospel’ (199). There is no effort made to explain the different emphasis of both authors. Could it be that Luke is focussing on the unusual and Paul regulating the (un)usual practice in early Christian assemblies?