

Philippian community. Paul preaches the gospel beyond Macedonia as the representative of this community, and in return they support him financially. To support his contention S. asserts (1) that Phil 4:10-20 contains a receipt for the gift or payment Paul has received via Epaphroditus (note the use of *apechō* in 4:18); (2) that *koinōnia* is used here in the sense of consensual partnership known in Roman law as *societas*; and (3) that there is a prominent use of *societas* terminology, especially *phronein*. Sampley argues against corpus harmonization and says that Paul's relationship with the Philippian church is unique.

This special partnership does not exist between Paul and other communities because, according to the other letters, conditions of hostility and mistrust exist. This would present a situation fundamentally alien to the establishment or continuance of *societas*.

Philemon (v. 17) does use *societas* partnership language, but there is not enough evidence to suggest that Paul had a formal *societas* with Philemon. Elsewhere in his correspondence Paul employs *societas* terminology even though his audience did not necessarily understand themselves in partnership with Paul. Sampley admits that at this stage it is difficult, if not impossible, to determine when for Paul the terminology retains an explicit connection to *societas*. The heart of S.'s thesis, in any case, is the chapters on the Jerusalem Council and the Philippian church which together comprise half the book.

I agree that it is important to learn as much as possible about the Greco-Roman culture in which Paul and his converts lived. In this regard S. joins a growing list of scholars who are enlarging our view of the social world of early Christianity. For this we should be grateful. However, the fact that the partnership of consensual *societas* was widely known in Roman law does not necessarily mean that Paul had this in mind while composing his letters. Even if we admit that the language of contract is being used here, we need not conclude that it is a partnership of consensual *societas*. That step rests to a large extent on S.'s claim that in Gal 2:9 *koinōnia* is equivalent to the Latin *societas*. I find it more difficult to accept the claim that Paul entered into partnership with the Philippian community and refused to take money from other churches because there was not the degree of friendship and trust required. Finally, I am left wondering why this book was necessary. Its major arguments and thesis were presented in S.'s earlier article. Perhaps a second article would have served as well.

*Dennis M. Sweetland, Saint Anselm College, Manchester, NH 03102*

PIUS-RAMON TRAGAN, *La parabole du "Pasteur" et ses explications: Jean, 10, 1-18: La genèse, les milieux littéraires* (Studia anselmiana 67; Rome: Editrice Anselmiana, 1980). Pp. 479. Paper N.P.

This present volume in *Studia anselmiana* is a slightly revised version of a doctoral dissertation written under the direction of Prof. Joseph Schmitt and submitted to the Theological Faculty of the University of Strasbourg. The subtitle of

the work describes very accurately the nature of the enterprise: a tradition-historical study of John 10:1-18 from its earliest stages to its present position in the Fourth Gospel.

Tragan's approach to and treatment of John 10:1-18 may be placed squarely within two contemporary and complementary lines of interpretation in Johannine scholarship. First of all, he clearly subscribes to a redactional view of the composition of the present Gospel narrative, i.e., the belief that the present document has gone through a series of major changes and alterations before attaining its final, and present, form. In this regard, as he himself recognizes, the work of M.-E. Boismard, one of his teachers, has been most influential upon his own work. Following the redactional line, T. believes that these changes and alterations have left their mark in the Gospel narrative in the form of numerous literary *aporiae* and that, consequently, the process of accretion may be carefully delineated, identified, and followed. Second, T. explains this process of accretion in terms of a "school" hypothesis, thus assigning these changes and alterations ("lectures" and "relectures") to a very specific and continuous group ("le groupe johannique") in early Christianity.

At the same time, I would describe T.'s position within both the redactional and "school" theories as being rather extreme. Thus, for example, while accepting the basic thrust of M.-E. Boismard and A. Lamouille's work (*Synopse des quatre évangiles en français: Tome III. L'Évangile de Jean* [Paris: Cerf, 1977]), T. regards their concrete proposal concerning the redactional process—four stages—as too precise and too systematic. The process of accretion, he argues, was much more involved and complex; it cannot be captured in specific stages. Similarly, that process, he continues, involved a good number of "évangélistes," authors from the Johannine group, none of whom provided the Gospel with a coherent structure.

In the specific case of John 10:1-18, the process of accretion is delineated and explained as follows:

(1) Verses 1-5 constitute the parable proper. Two distinct literary layers may be identified: (a) Verses 1-2 represent a traditional *mashal* of Palestinian, pastoral origin. The *mashal* presents a fundamental antithesis between the figures of the shepherd and the thief. (b) Verses 3-5 provide a first commentary on the *mashal*. Also of pastoral background, the commentary is implicitly christological and describes the respective behaviors of the shepherd and the sheep.

(2) Verses 7-18 constitute the explanation of the parable. Five distinct literary layers may be outlined: (a) Verses 7-8 represent the first explanation. Its purpose is to identify the antithetical figures of vv. 1-2. As such, it emerges as a devastating anti-Jewish polemic which opposes all religious figures to Jesus as the Christ. (b) As a second explanation, vv. 9-10 develop and justify the preceding identification from a soteriological perspective. (c) Verses 11-13 constitute the third explanation. Its purpose is to replace the original antithesis of vv. 1-2 with that of the shepherd and the hireling. As such, it emerges as a pastoral parenthesis addressed to the community in the light of emerging heresy. (d) As a fourth explanation, vv. 14-15, 17-18 provide an explicitly christological reflection which deals with the relationships of love and knowledge that exist between the Father and Jesus. (e) Verse 16, the final addition, introduces the theme of unity among the churches.

(3) Finally, v. 6 comes from the redactor who brought together chaps. 7–10 with a strong anti-Pharisaic polemic as his chief trait and concern.

Although I believe that both the redactional and “school” theories are very fruitful approaches in Johannine scholarship, I wonder whether such a radical position as this one does not, in effect, create as many problems as it attempts to solve. Three serious problems immediately come to mind.

To begin with, one must seriously question whether every literary *aporia* or even variation points to different literary strata, different authors, and different *Sitze im Leben*—especially when eight such layers are proposed in a small unit like John 10:1-18. Secondly, the process of accretion envisioned emerges as a rather haphazard and disjointed affair—two verses here, three verses there—so that the original “lecture” keeps on growing through manifold and largely unrelated “relectures.” Thirdly, the “evangelist,” i.e., the person most responsible for the present arrangement and structure of the Gospel narrative, emerges basically as a collector of originally independent and largely unconnected units. These units the redactor brought together without really much change and also without much overall planning.

There is no doubt that T. has a fine critical eye, but I wonder to what extent the redactional theory can be pressed.

*Fernando F. Segovia, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI 53233*

ULRICH WILCKENS, *Der Brief an die Römer. 1. Teilband: Röm 1–5* (EKKNT VI/1; Zürich/Einsiedeln/Köln: Benziger; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1978). Pp. x + 337. Paper DM 58.

In the *Vorarbeiten*, Heft 1 to this new series the editors set out the following principles of work and intention: (1) Each author is to write his commentary with the conscious intention of entering into dialogue with all, especially with his immediate co-workers; (2) the significance of the OT for the NT should be investigated with special intensity; (3) the commentary, committed to the use of the historical-critical method, shall be consciously directed to the parish and to proclamation; and (4) the writers of both confessions shall be deliberately selected from different theological directions or schools (*Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, Vorarbeiten Heft 1* [1969] 5 [my translation]). The names of the authors selected show that principle 4 has been carefully followed. The success of the first three depends on the authors of the individual commentaries.

The present volume on Romans is the first of three projected on the book. Wilckens, a Lutheran, meets principles 2 and 3 quite well. Principle 1 can only be evaluated by other members of the team of scholars working on this ecumenically-oriented commentary. Wilckens testifies in his foreword (p. v) that the use of historical criticism does not make the conversation difficult, but actually compels him to read and converse with scholars of every age from the patristic to the present. The need to be ecumenical does not obviate the necessary scholarship in philological and



#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.