Scott's insights range from indispensable to implausible. For almost every parallel, Scott manages to consider the text from a fresh and provocative angle. In many instances, his interpretations prove riveting: the rich look (Lk. 13:23-33) illustrates how to mismanage a miracle (p. 127); the Pharisees and the tax collector (Lk. 18:9-14) shows what had been considered holy is now outside the kingdom, while the unclean may now be inside the temple (Mt. 21:35-41)'s parables legal form for the same reason (Jesus makes the rabbinic testifying in the yoke of the law for freedom' (p. 225)), and the unjust steward (Lk. 16:1-15) breaks the bond between power and justice', showing that 'the kingdom is so vulnerable, for masters and stewards who do not get even' (p. 266).

In other cases, however, Scott's readings seem less than fully persuasive. Scott insists on seeing the leaves (Lk. 13:21-23) as a metaphor for evil and so concludes that the parable teaches about the kingdom of God to appropriate the gospel of control. He plays down the abundant harvest in the sower (Mc. 4:1-8) and so rejects any apocalyptic interpretation of the narrative. He speculates too much about the minor details of the wicked tenants (Mt. 21:31-32) and so decides that it 'in the plot the kingdom fails and the inheritance is in doubt' (p. 251). And he finds in the potentially unethical behaviour of the man who buys the field with hidden service because (Mt. 18:21-23)'s lawless narrative, which the kingdom creates because it is based on grace alone.

More desconcertingly disquieting are five of Scott's overarching presuppositions and hermeneutical principles. (1) One can learn about Jesus from rabbinic parallels, not least that approximately three-quarters of the extraliteral is allegorical. But Scott refuses to consider this information because he finds it not pertinent for interpreting Jesus' parallels because of the time gap between first century and the earliest attested forms of the rabbinic material. Yet currently he is well informed enough to use these later parallels to shed light on first-century rabbinic and even Jewish texts of the Old Testament. (2) His dissection between parables and allegories as 'two categories', which in nature of things is hard to prove. It is therefore misleading, therefore, that the book is dubbed about the methods of a readiness in critical John. Sanders is persuaded by M. Gould that Luke knew Matthew but not necessarily that Matthew had no source other than Mark. He is not, however, aware of the complex utilitarian which in the nature of things is hard to prove. It is therefore misleading, therefore, that the book is dubbed about the methods of a readiness in critical John. Sanders is persuaded by M. Gould that Luke knew Matthew but not necessarily that Matthew had no source other than Mark. He is not, however, aware of the complex utilitarian method in John which the nature of things is hard to prove. It is therefore misleading, therefore, that the book is dubbed about the methods of a readiness in critical John. Sanders is persuaded by M. Gould that Luke knew Matthew but not necessarily that Matthew had no source other than Mark. He is not, however, aware of the complex utilitarian method in John which the nature of things is hard to prove. It is therefore misleading, therefore, that the book is dubbed about the methods of a readiness in critical John. Sanders is persuaded by M. Gould that Luke knew Matthew but not necessarily that Matthew had no source other than Mark. He is not, however, aware of the complex utilitarian method in John which the nature of things is hard to prove. It is therefore misleading, therefore, that the book is dubbed about the methods of a readiness in critical John. Sanders is persuaded by M. Gould that Luke knew Matthew but not necessarily that Matthew had no source other than Mark. He is not, however, aware of the complex utilitarian method in John which the nature of things is hard to prove. It is therefore misleading, therefore, that the book is dubbed about the methods of a readiness in critical John. Sanders is persuaded by M. Gould that Luke knew Matthew but not necessarily that Matthew had no source other than Mark. He is not, however, aware of the complex utilitarian method in John which the nature of things is hard to prove. It is therefore misleading, therefore, that the book is dubbed about the methods of a readiness in critical John. Sanders is persuaded by M. Gould that Luke knew Matthew but not necessarily that Matthew had no source other than Mark. He is not, however, aware of the complex utilitarian method in John which the nature of things is hard to prove. It is therefore misleading, therefore, that the book is dubbed about the methods of a readiness in critical John. Sanders is persuaded by M. Gould that Luke knew Matthew but not necessarily that Matthew had no source other than Mark. He is not, however, aware of the complex utilitarian method in John which the nature of things is hard to prove. It is therefore misleading, therefore, that the book is dubbed about the methods of a readiness in critical John. Sanders is persuaded by M. Gould that Luke knew Matthew but not necessarily that Matthew had no source other than Mark. He is not, however, aware of the complex utilitarian method in John which the nature of things is hard to prove. It is therefore misleading, therefore, that the book is dubbed about the methods of a readiness in critical John. Sanders is persuaded by M. Gould that Luke knew Matthew but not necessarily that Matthew had no source other than Mark. He is not, however, aware of the complex utilitarian method in John which the nature of things is hard to prove. It is therefore misleading, therefore, that the book is dubbed about the methods of a readiness in critical John. Sanders is persuaded by M. Gould that Luke knew Matthew but not necessarily that Matthew had no source other than Mark. He is not, however, aware of the complex utilitarian method in John which the nature of things is hard to prove. It is therefore misleading, therefore, that the book is dubbed about the methods of a readiness in critical John. Sanders is persuaded by M. Gould that Luke knew Matthew but not necessarily that Matthew had no source other than Mark. He is not, however, aware of the complex utilitarian method in John which the nature of things is hard to prove. It is therefore misleading, therefore, that the book is dubbed about the methods of a readiness in critical John. Sanders is persuaded by M. Gould that Luke knew Matthew but not necessarily that Matthew had no source other than Mark. He is not, however, aware of the complex utilitarian method in John which the nature of things is hard to prove. It is therefore misleading, therefore, that the book is dubbed about the methods of a readiness in critical John. Sanders is persuaded by M. Gould that Luke knew Matthew but not necessarily that Matthew had no source other than Mark. He is not, however, aware of the complex utilitarian method in John which the nature of things is hard to prove. It is therefore misleading, therefore, that the book is dubbed about the methods of a readiness in critical John. Sanders is persuaded by M. Gould that Luke knew Matthew but not necessarily that Matthew had no source other than Mark. He is not, however, aware of the complex utilitarian method in John which the nature of things is hard to prove. It is therefore misleading, therefore, that the book is dubbed about the methods of a readiness in critical John. Sanders is persuaded by M. Gould that Luke knew Matthew but not necessarily that Matthew had no source other than Mark. He is not, however, aware of the complex utilitarian method in John which the nature of things is hard to prove. It is therefore misleading, therefore, that the book is dubbed about the methods of a readiness in critical John. Sanders is persuaded by M. Gould that Luke knew Matthew but not necessarily that Matthew had no source other than Mark. He is not, however, aware of the complex utilitarian method in John which the nature of things is hard to prove. It is therefore misleading, therefore, that the book is dubbed about the methods of a readiness in critical John. Sanders is persuaded by M. Gould that Luke knew Matthew but not necessarily that Matthew had no source other than Mark. He is not, however, aware of the complex utilitarian method in John which the nature of things is hard to prove. It is therefore misleading, therefore, that the book is dubbed about the methods of a readiness in critical John. Sanders is persuade...
...on so martyr assumptions that are largely in vogue in the world of biblical scholarship, but which cry out to be questioned — at least rather a number of his preferences. In particular, the community's mission, both then formidable. Rensberger offers no formula, but church) to contemporary application becomes today the synagogue does not persecute the way to relate these findings to what is 'some­what further the rulers of both synagogue and Empire' (p. 100).

28 THIELMOES

Chapter six attempts in an exploratory way to derive connections of this world, whose servants do not fight but remain in the world bears witness to the truth before the rulers of both synagogue and Empire (p. 100).

Quite apart from the application of Rensberger's reading of John, is his reading itself justifiable? Because it is critical in the text, the question taught us that although this or that para­phrase deed with his life, and do not include historically accurate reminiscences, the paraphrase also reflects the social and historical situation in the church. Tradition and redaction critics, for example, Lougher, indicate a special situation in the church ari­VM on the way to relate these findings to what is 'some­what similar in the Johannine tradition, but a minority group, the messianic community, the Johannine community is best thought of as being on the margins of society. Nicodemus— that is, the group of people in the late first century who symbolize— is being called upon to leave a secure, if ambivalent, situation by making known his solidary with an oppressed minority. He is the son of the ce­cilites, is told that on one side, and on one side only, lies the eternal God of Life. He is told to come out of the dead­end world (p. 14). Where is Nicodemus to be found? Nicodemus is to be found, to begin with the most exact analogy, where Christians in power relate to powerless Christians. This is true whether power is derived from money, class, gender, race, eduCa­tion, political connection, or other­wise. Nicodemus is to be found wherever one whose life is secure must face those whose life is insecure, or who struggle in the cause of God, must be born from above' is all about; and, and put together. J. Louis Martyn taught us to go farther: he insisted that the church situation...