ferent from animal and is to rule over the earth. Then precedence was given to one race over others. Abraham was chosen, and God freely offered to grant blessing to his children. The third stage consisted in a distinction within Abraham's family, a more limited scope of election. Later on when the whole Israel was chosen as a nation, only a spiritual remnant shared the grace of salvation. In this context the final stage of election is: the election of individuals. For 'God has made a covenant of personal life and calls any people to himself; a special mode of election is employed for a part of them, so that he does not with indiscriminate grace effectually elect all.' Equal distribution of grace is not divine obligation, and inequity indicates that it is free.

General election is not always effectual because the Spirit of regeneration is not immediately bestowed on those with whom God has made a covenant. And the external calling, without the internal illumination of the Spirit, is an intermediate stage between the rejection of some and the election of others. God has the full right to give or to withhold the working of the Spirit. Thus the entire Israel was called the inheritance of God, but there were many foreigners.

What, then, is the relation between election and vocation? Will the eternal counsel of God conflict with the temporal proclamation of the gospel? In resolving these apparently opposite motifs, Calvin insisted that the two standpoints must not be mixed. On the divine side, there is no duality of will, though it is not demonstrable to us. On the human side we should confine our attention to scriptural instruction. The invitation of the gospel always has existential significance for the audience. When the Word is preached, it means a time for decision. The election of some through universal invitation does not rule out a sincere offer of the gospel to the non-elect. Calvin repudiated the way of preaching which consists in telling the people that if they do not believe, the reason is that they have already been destined for destruction. Sloth and bad intention will be produced by this perversion of the gospel message. This will be cursing rather than teaching.

Calvin's basic approach in dealing with the tensions in his concept of predestination is to keep both the human and the divine perspective unconfused. The inadequate human way of knowing cannot scrutinize the infinite council of the decree, which is only partially revealed in Scripture. Man should stay within scriptural limits and be satisfied. This theological division of labour enables Calvin to resolve the conflicts in his theology. Reckless consistency is applied to the hemicentric of the two-fold decree. After human effort has been exhausted, Calvin seeks 'refuge in the realm of divine mystery in face of irreconcilable tenets. His argument stems from sound reasoning although his theology may not be convincing enough to some people's point of view.

sensitive approach to the subtle and delicate theological and practical issues with which Romans deals. The author richly deserves the chair in Durham to which he has recently been elevated. To think his thoughts after him is to be given a lesson in theological scholarship at its very best—and it is in the peculiarly delightful combination of godliness and good learning.

Any treatment of Romans in this detail is bound to make considerable demands on the reader. Cranfield’s approach is thorough. Though most Hebrew words are transliterated, they are usually left untranslated, as are quotations from (e.g.) Chrysostom, Pelagius, Bengel and the modern French and German scholars. At the same time, it should quickly be said that almost all non-English material occurs in the footnotes, so that readers with only English and Greek will have no trouble with the text: and that it is of course in the interests of exact scholarship that more should speak for themselves (Cranfield is quick to point out weaknesses in some translations). Otherwise the commentary is easy to use. It follows the Nestle text (though Cranfield disagrees with it at certain points, and differs on the variant readings of the manuscripts, e.g. the well-attested one in 2:4, 10), and this is a notable commendable feature), and the use of heavy type ensures that one can see at a glance (in contrast, for instance, with Käsemann) exactly where one is. The pagination runs on from the first to the second volume (cfr. p. 440, text on this Murray), so that there is no chance of references being missing. The indices are very full and helpful, with the odd exception that sub-apostolic literature is not listed in the usual way, but instead occurs, by author's name only, in the general index, as for example (e.g. that, though the Martyrdom of Polycarp is cited (e.g. p. 809), one cannot tell at a glance whether use is made elsewhere of this or other early Christian writings. The bibliographies, though occasionally needing supplementation from Käsemann, are extremely helpful. In particular, the list of commentaries at the start compares well with Käsemann (109 in the 1973 edition, against Käsemann's 40): and Cranfield has made careful use of almost every one he lists. This use, and with debate, with his predecessors, is an important feature of the work: unlike many writers, he has cast the net wide and culled the best of Christian scholarship of the last two thousand years. The index reveals that his favourites are Barrett, Barth, Bengel, Calvin, Chrysostom, Gaugler, Käsemann, Lagrange, Michel, and of course Sanday and Headlam. Others who crop up regularly are Huby, Origen.

Pelagius (who emerges with more credit than one might have thought) and Zahn. This underlines Cranfield's stated intention of making exegesis prior to the wider theological issues: and it is no doubt because of this that Cranfield is so well known in recent times. (v. Davies, Schoeps, Stendahl, Wrede, Schweizer—are hardly mentioned at all. Riddderbos is one of the most striking absentees, in view of the fact that his commentary takes a theological stance fairly close to Cranfield's own. But in general the coverage is extremely full: and Cranfield is always scrupulously fair to his opponents.

In one respect Cranfield stands out from most recent writers. He does not think that Romans essentially gives to every single part of the epistle. After 44 pages of introduction (authenticity, structure, purpose, the church in Rome, etc.: and a good brief history of exegesis), chs. 1-8 occupy 400 pages, with ch. 15 on 150, and the rest on 200. Cranfield says of Michel's: it is just as true of himself: it is very difficult to find him unaware of questions which need to be asked. The section on chs. 12-13 reproduces almost exactly the earlier Commentary on Romans, except that Käsemann's material is omitted. The detailed practical applications in the earlier volume are missing, and one or two others, including a rare peep into the author's background, are added. The only significant modification of stance is that, though Cranfield still thinks that Romans is a history, he dismiss the idea of a double reference for exordium in 13.1 (i.e. to heavenly powers as well as to earthly ones), he has 'now come to regard it as less probable than the interpretation according to which Paul in the whole of the former chapter is laid in mind simply the civil authorities as such'

The commentary is then concluded with two essays. The first deals with Paul's purposes in writing. This is entitled 'Concluding remarks on some aspects of the theology of Romans'. Of this, about one-third is taken up with a revised form of Cranfield's deservedly famous article 'St Paul and the Law', the other two-thirds are critical. Käsemann, Black and Schiller appeared too late to be used in vol. I: the third volume of Kuss, and the first of Winkens, came too late for either volume.

fent from animal and is to rule over the earth. Then precedence was given to one race over others. Abraham was chosen, and God freely offered to grant blessing to his children. The third stage consisted in a distinction within Abraham's family, a more limited scope of election. Later on when the whole Israel was chosen as a nation, only a spiritual remnant shared the grace of salvation. In this context the final stage of election is: the election of individuals. For 'God has made a covenant of personal life and calls any people to himself,' a special mode of election is employed for a part of them, so that he does not with indiscriminate grace effectually elect all.46 Equal distribution of grace is not divine obligation, and inequity indicates that it is free.47

General election is not always effectual because the Spirit of regeneration is not immediately bestowed on those with whom God has made a covenant. And the external calling, without the internal illumination of the Spirit, is an intermediate stage between the rejection of some and the election of others. God has the full right to give or to withhold the working of the Spirit. Thus the entire Israel was called the inheritance of God, but there were many foreigners.

What, then, is the relation between election and vocation? Will the eternal counsel of God conflict with the temporal proclamation of the gospel? In resolving these apparently opposite motifs, Calvin insisted that the two standpoints must not be mixed. On the divine side, there is no duality of will, though it is not demonstrable to us. On the human side we should confine our attention to scriptural instruction. The invocation of the gospel always has existential significance for the audience. When the Word is preached, it means a time for decision. The election of some through universal invitation does not rule out a sincere offer of the gospel to the non-elect. Calvin repudiated the way of preaching which consists in telling the people that if they do not believe, the reason is that they have already been destined for destruction. Sloth and bad intention will be produced by this perversion of the gospel message. This will be curing rather than teaching. Calvin's basic approach in dealing with the tensions in his concept of predestination is to keep both the human and the divine perspective unconfused. The inadequate human way of knowing cannot scrutinize the infinite decrees of God. Reckless consistency is applied to the incoherence of the two fold decree. After human effort has been exhausted, Calvin seeks 'refuge in the realm of divine mystery in face of irreconcilable tenets. His argument stems from sound reasoning although his theology may not be convincing enough to some people any more.

Sensitive approach to the subtle and delicate theological and practical issues with which Romans deals. The author richly deserves the chair in Durham to which he has recently been elevated. To think his thoughts after him is to be given a lesson in theological scholarship at its very best—indeed, it is in the peculiarly delightful combination of godliness and good learning.

Any treatment of Romans in this detail is bound to make considerable demands on the reader. Cranfield's book is unique in its approach. Though most Hebrew words are transliterated, they are usually left untranslated, as are quotations from (e.g.) Chrysostom, Pelagius, Bengel and the modern French and German expositors. At the same time, it should quickly be said that almost all non-English material occurs in the footnotes, so that readers with only English and Greek will have no trouble with the text: and that it is of course in the interests of exact scholarship that those speaking them should read them for themselves (Cranfield is quick to point out weaknesses in some translations).48 Otherwise the commentary is easy to use. It follows the Nestle text (though Cranfield disagrees with it at certain points, and differs notably with those of the variant readings which I would call 'credable'), and the use of heavy type ensures that one can see at a glance (in contrast, for instance, with Käsemann) exactly where one is.

The pagination runs on from the first to the second volume of this series, which was published in 1961. This means that, though the Martyrdom of Polycarp is cited (e.g. p. 809), one cannot tell at a glance whether use is made elsewhere of this or other early Christian writings. The bibliographies, though occasionally needing supplementation from Käsemann, are extremely helpful. In particular, the list of commentaries at the start compares well with Käsemann (109 in the 1973 edition, against Käsemann's 40), and Cranfield has made careful use of almost every one he lists. This use of, and debate with, his predecessors, is an important feature of the work: unlike many writers, he has cast the net wide and culled the best of Christian scholarship of the last two thousand years. The index reveals that his favourites are Barrett, Barth, Bengel, Calvin, Chrysostom, Gaugler, Käsemann, Lagrange, Michel, and of course Sanday and Headlam. Others who crop up regularly are Huby, Origin, Pelagius (who emerges with more credit than one might have thought) and Zahn.49 This undermines Cranfield's stated intention of making exegesis prior to the wider theological issues: is and it is no doubt because of this that one can place it well known in recent years. I am sure that news is to Davies, Scoups, Stendahl, Wrede, Schweizer—are hardly mentioned at all. Ribberos one is of the most striking absences, in view of the fact that his commentaries takes a theological stance fairly close to Cranfield's own. But in general the coverage is extremely full: and Cranfield is always scrupulously fair to his opponents.50

In one respect Cranfield stands out from most recent writers. He does not write in the full coverage he gives to every single part of the epistle. After 44 pages of introduction (authenticity, structure, purpose, the church in Rome, etc.): and a good brief history of exegesis), chs. 1-8 occupy 400 pages, with ch. 9 an additional 250. According to Cranfield says of Michel that it is just as true of himself: it is very difficult to find him unaware of questions which need to be asked. The section on chs. 12-13 reproduces almost exactly the earlier Commentary on Romans (Oxford, 1956), and for the most part of the detailed practical applications in the earlier volume are missing, and one or two others, including a rare peep into the author's background, are added. The only significant modification of stance is that, though Cranfield at one time dismisses the idea of a double reference for Exodus 11:3 in 13.1 (i.e. to heavenly powers as well as to earthly ones), he has 'now come to regard it as less probable than the interpretation according to which Paul in using it thus had in mind simply the civil authorities as such'.51

The commentary is then concluded with two essays. The first deals with Paul's purposes in writing Romans, and the second is entitled 'Concluding remarks on some aspects of the theology of Romans.' Of this, about one-third is taken up with a revised form of Cranfield's deservedly famous article 'St Paul and the Law', and the remaining two-thirds is devoted to a head in mind simply the civil authorities as such.'

The great work is finished at last. Four years after the first volume, Cranfield's commentary on Romans (the first in the new series of the International Critical Commentary, of which is joint editor) has now been completed by the arrival of the second.52 And a great work it truly is. It represents the best part of a lifetime of patient and careful exegetical study, an easy grasp of the classical languages, a thorough familiarity with the work of commentators from the earliest times to the present day, and, by no means least, a godly, wise and hermeneutic of the two fold decree. After human effort has been exhausted, Cranfield seeks 'refuge in the realm of divine mystery in face of irreconcilable tenets. His argument stems from sound reasoning although his theology may not be convincing enough to some people any more.
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The great work is finished at last. Four years after the first volume, Cranfield's commentary on Romans (the first in the new series of the International Critical Commentary, of which is joint editor) has now been completed by the arrival of the second. And a great work it truly is. It represents the best part of a lifetime of patient and careful exegetical study, an easy grasp of the classical languages, a thorough familiarity with the work of commentators from the earliest times to the present day, and, by no means least, a godly, wise and hermeneutic of the two fold decree. After human effort has been exhausted, Cranfield seeks 'refuge in the realm of divine mystery in face of irreconcilable tenets. His argument stems from sound reasoning although his theology may not be convincing enough to some people any more.

4 A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, by C. E. Sangster, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark: vol. 1 (Rom. 1-8) 1975, vol. 2 (Rom. 9-16) 1979. The first volume is a further edition, in which mention is made (p. 44) of commentaries which have appeared since 1975, and in which many misprints in the first edition have been corrected. Of these, warning should be given to possessors of the first edition that on p. 66 the phrase 'the faith which consists in obedience' has replaced 'faith which consists in obedience' (due to, Pelagian greeks at the printers) as option (vii) on the phrase hypoklesis.

46 P. 809. 47 P. 807. 48 E.g. p. 393. 49 See p. 778 re Michel. 50 Cf. pp. 1, 22f.


52 P. 688. 53 P. 689. 54 Not only the phrase 'quite often even in ours' in the last sentence on 13: 10 (p. 679).
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analyses of: 11: 30f.; 14: 16f. and 15: 4, 7 and 9.
Second, the sensitivity to the finer points of grammar, and their theological significance. It is good to have pointed out the significance of the presence of τηθ in 1: 16, of το in 9: 5, 9 and of the adverbial ον το in the same verse. There is also a nice distinction between γαρ in its explanatory and confirmatory senses (Cranfield) never tires of pointing out the importance of Paul's connecting words, and the significance of the occasional sentence that appears to be a mere periphrasis. Paul's argument, on suggestion, on the basis of the aorist indicative active in 16: 12, that Persis may have already completed a significant amount of Christian work; and countless other similar points. I particularly enjoyed his English and German readers not to assume that, just because 'so' in both languages could translate ουσα in the sense of 'therefore', ουσα could also carry the meaning of 'in the ... sequence—all by this way of going out that 7: 1-3 is not an allegory but an argument.' With this kind of thing always present, though never obtrusive, one feels one has learnt more from the commentary than just theology, for the reader is enabled to weigh the book is tied in to the central theological themes.

Third, godliness (I can think of no better word. 'Pieté' sounds a bit wet, and 'devotion' suggests that the book is 'devotional' which, though heartening, is not what Paul was up to.) It is always apparent, though again never obtrusive, that Cranfield takes very seriously indeed the responsibility of the theological exegete towards the text he handles and towards the church he serves, as well as his responsibility towards the members of the church, the many challenges and exhortations the text provides. His practical comments are always worth pondering and his various remarks on prayer, though brief, are excellent. As the new editor of the section of the epistle, and his masterly

P. 869.
18 Occasionally the method becomes too heavy: e.g. pp. 354-356, dealing with 12: 3, where we are invited to compare 'the combination of (b)(b), (c)(c) and (c)(d) with the combination of (b)(b), (b)(b) and (c)(c)' and both again of (b)(b) and (d)(d). And Cranfield's clear and logical mind sometimes draws him into sentences where only the verb will remain free without a prepositional phrase: e.g. (p. 239): 'Paul's meaning may then be understood to be, not that it was not through the instrumentality of the law but through the righteousness of faith that the promise was given, but that it was through the law but through of the righteousness of faith that the promise was given.' This is as clear as a bell.

PP. 582-6.
19 Pp. 582-6.
20 Pp. 715f.
21 Pp. 739f., 742: an example, this, of Cranfield's patient exegete even at the stage when most commentators, with the end in sight, are skating quickly over complex issues.

P. 91 (though it is odd to criticize RV here and not AV which is identical).
22 Pp. 454.
23 Pp. 454n.
24 P. 582: though it seems very forced to take γαρ in 12: 3 for an indication of conclusions of, rather than explaining the reason for, 12: 1-2.
25 Pp. 793 n. 2.
26 Pp. 793.
27 E.g. p. 610f., 611, see the last phrases of 12: 2.
28 E.g. pp. 396f., 422, 777 n. 1.
29 NB, p. 88f., where this is set out very clearly.

throughout. It is hard to think that anyone could work humbly and attentively through this commentary and not be a better Christian for it: and it is not every work of massive NT scholarship of which that could be said.

Cranfield's great gift is not to treat his commentary as a theological treatise in which to argue a point of view. Nevertheless, a definite theological stance emerges: and it is so distinctive, and so important, that we must describe it a little and direct some questions to Cranfield on it in the light of two typically Cranfieldian sentences, from p. 867:

Because he kept his eyes so steadily fixed on Jesus, the author of Romans was able to hear and to comprehend the message proclaimed by the OT; and, because in his total commitment to Jesus as Saviour and Lord he never ceased to be seriously engaged with the OT scriptures, he perceived with amazing clarity of vision vast and splendid reaches of the truth of Christ which he bequeathed to all of us. Cranfield's conception of the OT, and particularly its role in the New Testament, is one in which the OT is a valued resource for understanding the NT, and not simply a record of the old covenant.

Yet there remain questions. Without any desire at all to be unkind in any of its forms, it may be suggested that the stress on the continuity of the purposes of God (it is important to see the argument against Marcionism and that against anti-Semitism, the arguments that the law is not abolished and that Israel is not 'replaced by the church', as essentially the same point), right and proper though we believe it to be not least as a correction of current imbalance, needs in turn to be balanced by the emphasis on the discontinuity of the OT and the new covenant. The OT does not allow at all. This discontinuity is not a Marcionite invention, nor need it be understood in a Marcionite fashion. It is there in Paul, particularly in Galatians, at which Cranfield is clearly uncomfortable. We possess a warming plea to the Jews to be reconciled against each other, but look for a larger theological framework within which both will be at home. The Luthers have traditionally started from Galatians and ignored (e.g.) Romans 3:11: Cranfield begins as the new editor of the section of the epistle, where Paul explicitly says that the law (while no doubt retaining a permanent validity in the sense of Gal. 5:14: this is most important) held nevertheless a temporary function in order to determine certain issues; and the function ceases when the Messiah comes. Bound up with this is of course the exegesis of Romans 10:4, particularly the meaning of relaps. Here it may be asked whether the concept of 'the function' needs a function (which Cranfield supports) and 'termination' (which he rejects) are necessarily mutually exclusive. If I travel by train from Edinburgh to King's Cross, the latter station is surely the goal, fulfilment and termination of the journey. Until a solution is found in which the temporary purpose of the law, and its abolition in

26 The obvious barbarian overtones of this—to which we will return—are symptomatic of Cranfield's deep indebtedness to Barth. (e.g. pp. 37ff., 111), but will occasionally leads the exegete into unusual conclusions, e.g. p. 754f. on 15:15.
27 E.g. pp. 722 n. 2, 858 point (2).
revisions consisting mainly of the deletion of material now covered in the body of the commentary. For the rest, the reader is offered a useful summary of Cranfield’s understanding of Paul, particularly of his Christology, soteriology, pneumatology, and theologies. In the present volume one can see that Paul has been given, as the servant and apostle of Jesus Christ, the ‘legitimate freedom . . . from time to time to take a certain liberty with a particular passage, in order thereby to bring out the more faithful meaning of the OT’ (as opposed to the OT’s ‘witness’, as opposed to the idea that Paul shows ‘a readiness to force [the text] to render service to the interpreter’s own purpose, in other words, a freedom of arbitrariness’). I suspect that Cranfield had to curtail these essays—some sections of which are very brief—in the interests of the publisher’s plans: were he to enlarge some of them (perhaps particularly his welcome rejection of the common assumption that Paul wrongly believed that the Parousia would certainly occur in the very near future) he would win considerable further gratitude.

Three features of this commentary, hinted at in the title of this review, call for particular comment. First, Cranfield—by analogy with, I think, one who has waded through many discussions of difficult points in Romans, reading Cranfield is always refreshing, because of the painstaking clarity and honesty with which he sets out the alternative options (he suggests or permits, and the ruthless logic with which he examines their strengths and weaknesses and reaches his conclusion—which is sometimes the matter to be left undecided between two or more possibilities. Even where one disagrees with Cranfield, it can always be more clearly just where the issue lies. I think particularly of his discussion of 8:28 (in which he understands ‘all things’ as the subject of ‘work together’): his arguments for treating 5:1, not 6:1, as the start of the second section of the epistle; and his masterly analysis of 11:30ff, 14:16ff, and 15:4, 7, and 9.

Second, the sensitivity to the finer points of grammar, and their theological significance. It is good to have pointed out the significance of the presence of το in 1:16, of το in 9:5, of the ELT—of the potential and actual metaphorology of the text. There is also a nice distinction between Bär in its explanatory and confirmatory senses (Cranfield never tires of pointing out the importance of Paul’s connecting words, and the significance of the occasional sentence that is clarified by the choice of the connecting word). A very persuasive suggestion, on the basis of the aorist indicative active in 16:12, that Persis may have already completed a significant amount of Christian work; and countless other similar points. I particularly value my English and German readers not to assume that, just because ‘so’ in both languages could translate hòste in the sense of ‘therefore’, hòste could also carry the meaning of ‘for’ in the ‘. . . so . . . sequence—all by this way of phrasing out that 7:1-3 is not an allegory but an argument. With this kind of thing always present, though never obtrusive, one feels one has learnt more from the commentary than just theology, and this is a very considerable achievement. The book is tied in to the central theological themes.

Third, godliness (I can think of no better word. ‘Pieté’ sounds a bit wet, and ‘devotion’ suggests that the book is ‘devotional’ which, though heartening, exaggerates what I think it is not). It is always apparent, though again never obtrusive, that Cranfield takes very seriously indeed the responsibility of the theological exegete towards the text he handles and towards the church he serves, as well as the theologian’s need to defend the core of his own faith. As a member of that church, the many challenges and exhortations the text provides. His practical comments are always worth pondering, and his various remarks on prayer, though brief, are excellent. And it is the new all entirely in keeping with the peace, grace and loving God of whom Paul speaks is reflected in his writings throughout. It is hard to think that anyone could work humbly and attentively through this commentary and not be a better Christian for it; and it is not every work of massive NT scholarship of which that could be said. Cranfield would be the last to wish to treat his commentary as a theological treatise in which to argue a point of view. Nevertheless, a definite theological stance emerges: and it is so distinctive, and so important, that we must describe it a little and direct some questions at it. This is not a task that can be managed in two typically Cranfieldian sentences, from p. 867:

Because he kept his eyes so steadily fixed on Jesus, the author of Romans was able to hear and to comprehend the message proclaimed by the OT; and, because in his total commitment to Jesus as Saviour and Lord he never ceased to be seriously engaged with the OT scriptures, he perceived with amazing clarity of vision vast and splendid reaches of the truth of Christ which he becomes the bearer of all Maccionites and semi-, crypto-, and unmitting, Maccionites. Because he saw Christ steadily in the light of the OT—not abandoning the real Christ, who is the Christ of Israel, for any imaginary Christ more flatteringly to meet the expectations of his day. He did not refuse to grapple with the mystery of God’s gracious election or fail to hold firmly to the truth of God’s faithfulness—His faithfulness (which does not exclude, but includes, severity) to the Jewish people, all human unbelief and disobedience notwithstanding. His faithfulness to all mankind (Paul saw the Gentile mission foretold in the OT) and His faithfulness as the Creator of heaven and earth to His whole creation.

From these two sentences there emerges Cranfield’s main theological contention. Against all suggestions that God has had two plans of salvation, that Jews were to obey the law but that, when they failed to do so, God made an easier way of justification (i.e. faith), or that Israel was to be got rid of as ‘the less desirable branch of God’s kingdom’ on such suggestions, standard though many of them have been in NT scholarship (not to mention evangelicalism), Cranfield reasserts the Reformed position which often goes by default in these debates unchallenged. Both are fulfilled: faith is not a work, but the surrender of man to the gospel in which all the ‘work’ is done for him: Jesus Christ, by his obedience culminating in but not to be reduced to his death, has earned right to have faith in him. In the same way, Israel is not abolished: God still has purposes for the Jews (Romans 9-11 is no mere apocalyptic dream), purposes whose all-embracing end is mercy. It is good to see Maccion, and his many modern followers, thus put in their place, though one would wish that Cranfield had attached himself so strongly to the position above! They have for too long had the field of Pauline studies all to themselves, with the only debate being whether Paul was a Lutheran or a Rabbi. And at virtually no point can Cranfield be accused of special pleading. He has outgunned his opponents by good- fashioned exegesis. Yet there remain questions. Without any desire at all to support any of its forms, it may be suggested that the stress on the continuity of the purposes of God (it is important to see the argument against Maccionism and that against anti-Semitism, the arguments that the law is not abolished but that Israel is not ‘replaced by the church’, as essentially the same point), right and proper though we believe it to be not least as a correction of current imbalance, needs in turn to be balanced by the emphasis on the discontinuity of the law. Though the former allows at all. This discontinuity is not a Maccionite invention, nor need it be understood in a Maccionite fashion. It is there in Paul, particularly in Galatians, at which Cranfield is clearly uncomfortable. We are warming up to the task of dealing with each other, but look for a larger theological framework within which both will be at home. The Luthers have traditionally started from Galatians and ignored (e.g. Romans 3:1) Cranfield begins as the Luthers do—though they would point out that Paul explicitly says that the law (while no doubt retaining a permanent validity in the sense of Gal. 5:14: this is most important) held nevertheless a temporary function, the over-arching purpose of which is to engender deceit. This function ceases when the Messiah comes. Bound up with this is of course the exegesis of Romans 10:4, particularly the meaning of reloa. Here it may be asked whether the ‘Luther’s goal’ which Cranfield supports (and ‘termination’ (which he rejects) are necessarily mutually exclusive. If I travel by train from Edinburgh to King’s Cross, the latter station is surely the goal, fulfilment and termination of the journey. Until a solution is found in which the temporary purpose of the law, and its abolition in
that sense by Christ, can be explained in a non-Marcionite sense (i.e. within a wider view of the single and unchanging purpose of God), one of the most pressing of all Pauline problems remains on the agenda. This problem can also be expressed as follows. Granted that Marcionism presents an odd picture of God, setting out on an impossible plan and changing his mind halfway, is it not equally odd to think of God promulgating a law with the intention of one man, the Messiah, eventually coming to keep it all to himself?** and for his people, but equally with the intention that his people should in the meantime understand the law quite differently, namely, as something to provoke not works but faith? In other words, does not Cranfield's theology3 give either himself, or for the legalist, or the legalist's charter (assuming for the moment that they did) they were not misunderstanding it at all, but merely doing with it what God intended the Messiah to do? I suspect that this view, like the one it opposes, is possible, but derives from an ethical meaning of 'righteousness' and fully grasped the forensic nature of the word: though to take up that question would require several more articles at least as long as this one.44 (To avoid misunderstanding, the latter, I mean a Marcion-like legalist, or legalism in general.) In particular, he exposes the shallow view of the Christian life, and of sin and ethics, that presumes to have left behind a state in which the believer says 'the evil I would not, that I do.'45 He is right to see, beyond the formal (existentialist) view of the same incipient Marcionism which he attacks elsewhere. But I am not quite convinced. It seems to me that Cranfield has not fully allowed for the fact that the passage is not first and foremost describing anyone's experience (though no doubt, in some sense at least, it does that even if incidentally): the passage is basically about the law, and its conclusion is that the law is God's law, holy and just and good, but at the same time impotent to rescue man from the plagues of sin. This does not settle the burning issue, since it could still be the Christian who realizes that the law by itself could not save him, but only (8:1-11) the law fulfilled by the Spirit. It is possible, however, to maintain on the one hand that Paul agrees with Cranfield's view of the Christian life as a struggle for obedience in which one is always conscious of indwelling sin, while asserting on the other hand that this does not happen to be what he is talking about. While, therefore, I refer Cranfield's interpretation to any others I have read—and particularly to the standard Kümmel-Bultmann-Käsemann line—I cannot help feeling that the last word has not been said on the subject.

Finally, the vexed question of Romans 9-11. One cannot but applaud Cranfield's determination to wrestle seriously throughout with this notorious passage, and there are several discussions which I shall often return for illumination. But I do not feel he has done full justice either to the section itself, or to its integration within the whole epistle (though his exposition of the latter point is better than the former). 9-11 is certainly a merely a discussion that Paul cannot omit without loss of integrity,46 but a vital part of the same argument that has occupied him in the first eight chapters. Though Cranfield suggests that this may be so,47 he does not develop the point: and, when it comes to the connection between 9-11 and 12ff., he notices the link of 'mercies of God' in 12:1 with 9-11 rather than with 1-8 specifically and yet seems to play it down.48 For the detail, he appears to regard the questions of election and predestination, rather than the issue of God's purposes for the Jews, as the main problem in these chapters: and this, I believe, starts off a false (though well-trodden) trail which results in distortion at several points. Thus, for example, he reads the passage in connection with predestination in ch. 9 (cf. 'sonship' and 'glory', coming so soon after ch. 8), he takes the old line that predestination is not here to salvation but to a place in God's purposes. Again, he gets ch. 11 confused with ch. 10, yet in 10:9ff., he seems to regard this as incidental to the real point of the passage, which he takes to be the proof of the Jews' responsibility. This in turn leads to a false proof of ch. 11:10, that is, not the Gentiles', hearing and obeying (or not of the) gospel. Despite p. 533, it is surely more natural to identify the subject of 'call' in v. 14 with that of the same verb in the previous verse. This does not settle the wide category of (potential) believers, not merely Jews. To maintain that in vv. 18-19 Paul was proving that the Jews must have heard the gospel by saying that the Gentiles had heard it is surely much more adequate, as basic passages as in ch. 9:30ff., where this section begins, the inclusion of Gentiles within the people of God. Cranfield's very proper concern to counter any suggestion that Paul had fallen into anti-Semitism, I believe, led him astray in a good cause. Cranfield himself champions fully in ch. 11. By that stage, though, Cranfield is on course for a Barthian solution, which is duly propounded: though universalism is not required by ch. 11 (since Paul 'may actually in this context only have meant that God has shut in the various groups he has mentioned so that they will not hear of salvation), Cranfield draws on both from seeking to establish the doctrine on the basis of this or other possible texts and to refrain from treating the solemn and urgent warnings, of which the NT accredits the Gentiles an abundance, as already coincidingly proclaiming the certainty of the final exclusion of some from the embrace of God's mercy. This is a typically cautious solution (even non-universalists would hardly countenance so many Gentiles: e.g., the potter and the clay). But the whole discussion leaves one with the impression that Cranfield would like to be a universalist even though he realizes that the text of scripture not only does not support the doctrine of universalism, but also goes as far as it can to oppose it. Though I do not enjoy this debate at all, I have argued against such a position elsewhere.49

My underlying impression throughout the discussion of chs. 9-11 is that, though there are undoubtedly many issues, the most clarified by the recognition that Paul has indeed in some sense transferred the privileges of Israel to the Christian (Jew-plus-Gentile) church: that this is precisely the point which raises the question of God's sovereignty: see, e.g., ch. 1:16f. and 3:21 ff: that Paul's answer to the problem is given in terms of the OT prophecies which warned Israel that God would (rightfully) both punish her and call Gentiles to join a remnant of Abraham.50 and that, though 11:1 ff. shows Paul's awareness of a potential anti-Semitism at this point, justified not least by the history of exegesis, a deeper understanding of God's purposes makes for his people something like an element of disappointment, though this must be formulated in a very different way than has usually been imagined. I would like to emphasize in conclusion that these comments are in no way intended to detract

---
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59 About 22:42, January 1979, pp. 54-64, and other references in the first footnote of that article.
60 E.g., the way in which Graeme/Eckersberg's background to Rom. 9-11 (in terms of the 'potter and the clay') is set in the context of God's strange ways (not in men in general but) with Israel.
that sense by Christ, can be explained in a non-Marcionite sense (i.e. within a wider view of the single and unchanging purpose of God), one of the most pressing of all Pauline problems remains on the agenda.

This problem can also be expressed as follows. Granted that Marcionism presents an odd picture of God, setting out on an impossible plan and changing his mind half way, is it not equally odd to think of God promulgating a law with the intention of one man, the Messiah, eventually coming to keep it alive and for the benefit of his people, both for his people, but equally with the intention that his people should in the meantime understand the law quite differently, namely, as something to provoke not works but faith? In other words, does not Cranfield's theologia crucis either make himself a legalist (i.e. one who misunderstood the law's purpose, wrongly imagining it to be a means of acquiring merit or 'righteousness' by works), or imply that, when the Jews treated the law as God's law, the legalist's charter (assuming for the moment that they did) they were not misunderstanding it at all, but merely doing with it what God intended the Messiah to do? I suspect that this view, like the one it opposes, gains no support from an ethical meaning of 'righteousness' and fully grappled the forensic nature of the word: though to take up that question would require several more articles at least as long as this one.  

(A further consequence is that he is unable to attack the Luthersans here with the corresponding, and equally Pauline, theologia resurrectionis, which does not reverse the verdict of the cross so much as break out into newness of life beyond it. This, I believe, points the way to the resolution of some of the issues currently under discussion. If the issue is to state the abolition of the law without Marcionism, so we need to state the theologia crucis, and its implications for Israel, without anti-Semitism. In other words, Cranfield's perfectly valid points need to be set against this backdrop, which would include the strengths of the opposing case as well.

The law is also central in the issue which may well regard as the most controversial in the whole commentary, namely, Cranfield's support for the 'minority' position that sees in Romans 7: 13-25 a description of (one aspect at least of) normal Christian experience. As usual, Cranfield has unerringly put his finger on important weaknesses in the opposing majority view (which, contrary to usual suppositions, is not so much that the passage describes how Paul remembers feeling before his conversion, but rather that it is how Paul, the Christian, analyses what in fact had been the case before his conversion, from an ethical point of view). In particular, he exposes the shallow view of the Christian life, and of sin and ethics, that presumes to have left behind a state in which the believer says 'the evil I would not, that I do'.  

He is right to see, be sure, that when 'sonship' and 'glory', coming so soon after ch. 8, he takes the old line that predestination is not here to save us to a place in God's purposes. Again, and also in ch. 9: 23, he sees this as incidental to the real point of the passage, which he takes to be the proof of the Jews' responsibility. This in turn leads to the conclusion that in v. 10: 'it is not the Gentiles', hearing and obeying (or not) of the gospel. Despite p. 533, it is surely mere natural to identify the subject of 'call' in v. 14 with that of the same verb in the previous verse, and so to make Paul's concern with the wider circle of (potential) believers, not merely Jews. To maintain that in vv. 18-19 Paul was proving that the Jews must have heard the gospel by saying that the Gentiles had heard it is surely much more about grace in this passage than a rough-and-ready reading of 9: 30ff, where this section begins, the inclusion of Gentiles within the people of God. Cranfield's very proper concern to counter any suggestion that Paul had fallen into anti-Semitism has, I believe, led him astray in a great case. Cranfield is more right when Paul himself champions fully in ch. 11. By that stage, though, Cranfield is on course for a Barthian solution, which is duly propounded: though universalism is not required by ch. 11 (since Paul may actually in this context only have meant that God has shut in the various groups which he has mentioned as well as 'the whole world') he, like others, refrains from treating the solemn and urgent warnings, of which the NT address is quite an abundance, as if daringly proclaiming the certainty of the final exclusion of some from the embrace of God's mercy. This is a typically cautious solution (even non-universalists would hardly dare to make such an absolute statement), but it does leave one with the impression that Cranfield would like to be a universalist even though he realizes that the text of scripture not only does not support the doctrine of universalism (though he does) at least precisely, to oppose it. Though I do not enjoy this debate at all, I have argued against such a position elsewhere.  

My underlying impression throughout the discussion of chs. 9-11 is that, though there are undoubtedly problems, the main lines are clarified by the recognition that Paul has indeed in some sense transferred the privileges of Israel to the Christian (Jew-plus-Gentile) church: that this is precisely the point which raises the question of God's promise to Israel. As Paul also in ch. 1: 16ff. and 3: 21 ff: that Paul's answer to the problem is given in terms of the OT prophesies which warned Israel that God would (righteously) both punish her and call Gentiles to join a remnant of Abraham.  

That, and that, though 11: 1 f. shows Paul's awareness of a potential anti-Semitism at this point, justified not least by the history of exegesis, a deeper understanding of God's purposes for his people must be added to the discussion, that this must be formulated in a very different way than has usually been imagined. I would like to emphasize in conclusion that these comments are in no way intended to detract from
from the deliberately high praise given above. Cranfield's theological judgments are a breath of fresh air and an incentive to hard work and further debate, and it is towards that task, not to destroy but to fulfill its true intentions, that my questions are directed. This is a remarkable, a thirteenth-century masterpiece of Christian scholarship: to presume even to criticize it makes me feel uncomfortably like the thistle challenging the cedar. Before I am trampled down by my impudence, let me conclude with a bold assertion and prediction: this book is the finest work on Romans to appear in English in this century, and has a good chance of remaining at the top of the list for several decades to come.

**Book Review**

William McKane, Studies in the Patriarchal Narratives (Edinburgh: Handsell Press, 1979), x + 262 pp., £5.50.

This work shows considerable sympathy with the growing trend in current scholarship which argues that the Patriarchal narratives of Genesis 12–50 is not a form of history waiting to be confirmed or refuted, in the sense that concerning the methods and conclusions of authors such as Bright. Neither does it claim, as some, to contain the tenet of the book is that any evidence from external sources relating to the patriarchs is essentially of secondary importance in an internal study of the biblical text. The major part of the book is therefore devoted to the narrative, but remains discussed by its advocates, in particular the careful detailed consideration of various twentieth-century studies on the patriarchs, though surprisingly little attention is given to works appearing since 1970. The first chapter, on the history of the literary genre of the patriarchal narratives, is largely taken up with an appreciation of Gunkel's work, whose account, according to McKane, is 'studded with errors'. He is clearly biased against him. A rather negative assessment is made of Eisfeldt's attempt to interpret Genesis 12–50 as tribal history, and it is followed by the longest chapter where the tradition-historical approaches of Noth, Hoffner, Jepsen, Seebass, and Kilian are examined in turn. Finally an attempt is made to evaluate the religious and theology of the patriarchal narratives, though it is conclusions emphasized that one's understanding of the religious content is conditioned by a prior decision about the literary genre.


McKane is undoubtedly correct to draw attention to the importance of the literary problems posed by the patriarchal narratives, though his treatment raises some difficulties. His concern for genre has become the emphasis, producing an unfortunate divorce between the literary and theological issues, it is arbitrary and questions cannot be so easily pushed aside. Indeed, it is precisely the internal historical features of Genesis 12–50 which conservatives and others need to investigate in much greater depth, rather than assume that the original text can be achieved. Another problem is that the theology of the patriarchs arising out of McKane's method is somewhat artificial and arbitrary. He does not always adhere to the original text, and will hardly strike the fire of the preacher's heart. Nevertheless, this is an important book which is a powerful weapon to examine Genesis 12–50 in depth, though the debate about the patriarchs is certainly far from final.

M. J. Selman
(The reviewer is a lecturer at Spurgeon's College, London.)

Professor Kaiser divides his work into three parts: I. Definition and Method, II. 'Materials for an Old Testament Theology' wherein he applies his method defended in Part I. and finally a brief treatment of seven pages. According to his preface and title I think it fair to say that he is chiefly trying to convince his audience that the approach is valid. In fact, however, one of the most valuable sections is his treatment of the prophetic books in Part II. The presentation is clear and convincing, and it is clear that the book is well-researched and filled with detailed and helpful excursions on various texts and theological issues. It is unfortunate, however, that he opted to use the technical term 'diachronic' to describe his method without informing his readers that he has filled it with new meaning.

Regarding the nature of an Old Testament theology Kaiser concludes that it should be a presentation of the doctrine contained in the Old Testament, revelation which he finds to be both progressive and unified. To find a method that satisfies this inherent nature he looks for a centre progressively revealed throughout the Old Testament, and proposes to uncover this theme inductively from the Jewish and Christian sources, etc. in a way that is within the antecedent theological context behind the later authors or the 'Mosaic' (p. 10).

The centre, he argues, is promise, a promise that essentially includes the provisions found in Genesis 12: 1–3 and 22: 15–18 (p. 11). This promise makes clear, also includes the 'Mosaic Law', 'the fear of the Lord', etc. (p. 11). Accordingly he develops the materials of the Old Testament chronologically around this theme.

Regarding the nature of Old Testament theology, his handling of the nature of Old Testament theology gives expression to the concept of 'Theology of the Old Testament', in the interpretation of the Old, Eisroth was certainly correct when he wrote: 'The Old Testament is Oecumenical, and provides a balanced treatment of other themes such as fall, judgment, repentance. None of these appear in the outline of Old Testament theology without their obvious significance in Old Testament theology.

Kaiser's work is also enriched by his appreciation for what is written in the Old Testament in the sense by appealing to the phrase 'fear of the Lord'. The Instructive book will be a book that contains the Old Testament, and is therefore a contribution to Old Testament interpretation. It is certainly a book that has much to offer for a Christian theologian and exegete, who contends for the centrality of the Old Testament in his work of interpreting the New Testament in his interpretation of the Old, Eisroth was certainly correct when he wrote: 'The Old Testament is Oecumenical, and provides a balanced treatment of other themes such as fall, judgment, repentance. None of these appear in the outline of Old Testament theology without their obvious significance in Old Testament theology.

Kaiser's work is also enriched by his appreciation for what is written in the Old Testament in the sense by appealing to the phrase 'fear of the Lord'. The Instructive book will be a book that contains the Old Testament, and is therefore a contribution to Old Testament interpretation. It is certainly a book that has much to offer for a Christian theologian and exegete, who contends for the centrality of the Old Testament in his work of interpreting the New Testament in his interpretation of the Old, Eisroth was certainly correct when he wrote: 'The Old Testament is Oecumenical, and provides a balanced treatment of other themes such as fall, judgment, repentance. None of these appear in the outline of Old Testament theology without their obvious significance in Old Testament theology.


There is no scholarly task more formidable than that of writing an introductory text. Such an endeavour requires tremendous scholarship, a high level of technical expertise, familiarity with countless technical arguments on specific points, and conversance with disciplines outside one's speciality. In addition, there is a need for the small accomplishment that Brevard Childs, distinguished Old Testament scholar at Yale University, has contributed to Old Testament introduction with evident mastery.

This is without doubt a provocative and exciting book. It rises like a towering landmark on the contemporary scene of Old Testament studies and deserves attention by generations of future scholars. Its combination of approaches makes it accessible to all readers. It is a useful introduction to every student's feet. Those who have in the past laboured through Eisfeldt's endless piles of text and sections will find this book to be sheer pleasure by comparison.

This book is divided into six parts: an introductory section in which Childs sets the stage for his theological approach, followed by sections treating the Pentateuch, Former Prophets, Latter Prophets, and the Writings; in the last part, the 'Hebrew Scriptures and the Christian Bible', Childs argues for the continuity and discontinuity of the Old and New Testaments. After introducing each canonical section, Childs parsing through the Old Testament book by book, discussing the influence of Israel's history on the development of the canonical shape of the book at hand, and the theological and hermeneutical implications to be drawn from that aspect.

Particularly of importance are the lengthy bibliographies which enable the reader to become acquainted with a variety of price of the book and make this volume an invaluable resource for both the student and the scholar. The footnotes are provided at the end of the book, but those likes who are accustomed to consulting Eisfeldt's index of scripture references to obtain bibliography concerning individual