

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *Irish Biblical Studies* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_ibs-01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_ibs-01.php)

**IF CHRISTIANS REFUSE TO ACT, THEN CHRIST IS NOT RISEN.\*\*\***

Once more 1 Corinthians 15

Guy Wagner

Some time ago I edited a thesis and published a booklet on the resurrection /1, and ever since chapter 15 of 1 Corinthians continues to fascinate me. So I was very interested in an article by Simone Frutiger which appeared in Études théologiques et religieuses (1980:2: 199). I quite agree with her that the central issue dealt with in this passage is more the Christian life than the after life. I find her formula really excellent: 'imaginer le même et le recevoir autre' (213) i.e. imagine the same thing and receive it differently for defining hopes based on the resurrection. Her method of repeating the theme throughout the whole chapter appears to me very illuminating in its clarity.

I do not, however, share her point of view when she states that 'Paul tries to rid the Corinthians of foolish questions on the resurrection of the dead... which hinder them from living' (226). The aim Paul pursues is not, in my opinion, to correct mistakes in the direction of their thought by 'making a way between categories of event, symbol and myth', but rather to take issue with an attitude which he found unacceptable. The chapter has a greater unity than that granted by Simone Frutiger and the great majority of commentators. Since it is her wish 'to encourage others to take up the issue, pursue it and correct it... .' (199), let us take up the challenge! In any case, is it not worthwhile to give a new momentum to theological and exegetical research by stimulating discussion?

**The work of God begun with the resurrection of Christ and the task of believers.**

Where are we to start? At which end do we take up this impressive chapter? We propose to approach it from the end. Not much attention generally is given to the last verse. It is not, however, a mere link with what goes before. It suits well to take it as a conclusion. The introductory conjunction (hōste: 'so that') means: 'Here is what results from all that I have said'. Paul hopes and wishes that 'his well-loved friends' should be steadfast and make progress in their work. Let us express it more precisely 'in the work of the Lord' for the work has begun, the work of God through Christ the Lord. Every

believer is to take part in this work. We do not think it overmuch to claim that the goal sought after by Paul throughout this whole chapter is to arrive at this exhortation, i.e.

So my beloved brethren, be steadfast, immoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, knowing that your work is not in vain in the Lord. (15.58)

We should note (with Simone Frutiger) that the theme of the work of God and of the believer appears at several points:

1. I worked harder than the others, or rather, it was not I but the grace of God with me (15).

Thus Paul claims that he has worked harder than all the other witnesses of the Risen One. This implies that they, too, have worked. But Paul here makes it plain that Christian action is of God (not I but the grace of God with me). He does not speak of his work to make himself important or to make up for his past as persecutor of the church. He speaks of it because for him it is an essential preoccupation. The work of God should stir up the activity of men (cf. 1 Cor. 3 and 4; 2 Cor. (all); Phil. 1.21,27,30; 2.12-16 etc.).

2. If in this life we only have hoped in Christ, we are of all men most unfortunate (19).

This is a curious statement. Why the superlative, 'most unfortunate'? Is Paul so unfortunate to be a Christian now? Does he not lack elementary modesty in believing himself the most unfortunate of all? To understand we need to remember what he said of himself in 2 Cor. 11, e.g. imprisonments, near death, scourgings, stonings, shipwrecks, innumerable dangers (23-26), and earlier, at the start of this epistle. There he reproaches his friends for finding a pleasure in looking on at the spectacle of the apostles and preachers being defiled (1.12;3.5). He writes in chapter 4.8

Already you are filled! Already you have become rich! Without us you have become kings!

They appoint themselves judges instead of joining in the work. They are seated on the royal platform while the apostles are in the arena, unfortunate gladiators!

We are weak, but you are strong. You are held in honour, but we are in disrepute.

There is no more absurd or unhappy situation than to lead such a life without having to do it, for a cause that could be claimed to have no real foundation, being accused of lying, of false witness at a time when one is undergoing such an assault. It does appear that these charges were not put together by the Corinthians. Paul is following through to the end the logic of his point of view. If Paul plays such a role for his friends to become spectators, imagine what this means! The statement makes no sense except as a sharp rebuke to the Corinthians.

3. Then comes the end when he will hand over the kingdom to God his Father destroying every rule and every authority and power. For he must reign until he has put all his enemies under his feet. (24,24)

In these verses Frutiger, with good reason, speaks of the work of Christ. The risen Christ does conduct a battle in which he yields obedience for at the end he will submit himself to the Father. For him, in contrast with the Corinthians, to reign does not mean to do nothing and sit in judgment on others. It means struggle. He has to establish his authority, and in a unique way, if he is to hand it over finally to the Father. He does not strive for his own glory. It can be seen that this passage, though apparently apocalyptic, is really polemic. Paul uses biblical texts to show how Christ crucified carries out God's work. He mentions this work of Christ because he wants his friends to share in it.

4. Why am I in danger every hour? (30)

Finally, Paul returns (it is a leit-motiv) to the dangers that surround his life as apostle: 'What do I gain if, humanly speaking, (i.e. 'say to my credit' and 'for my own glory') I fought with beasts at Ephesus?' He continues: 'If the dead are not raised, "let us eat and drink for to-morrow we die" '(32). Then without any kind of transition he passes on to the exhortation 'Do not be deceived: "Bad company ruins good morals" '(33). Once more, it is evident that we have to do here, not with general truths or even personal testimony, but with indirect rebuke. The Corinthians enjoy themselves while he risks his life. Chapter 14 shows that Paul can think of a mystical drunkenness but 11.21 ('For in eating, each one goes ahead with his own meal, and one is hungry and another is drunk') shows that earthly food and drink can also be in mind. In every way, the Corinthians' creed exempts them from action rather than encouraging and upholding it.

Karl Barth, in the study that impressed Bultmann so much, Auferstehung der Toten (1924), insists that the resurrection of the dead is not one question among others that Paul takes up in this letter. Rather it is the first and last question. The resurrection chapter ends the epistle because Paul wants to take to its basic origins everything with which he charges his friends. Karl Barth here presents the resurrection as the statement of the radical otherness of God. Because the Corinthians are satisfied with themselves, Paul sets before them 'the flaming sword of the word', calling everything into question. We can well understand the stupefaction such as interpretation produced among the exegetes! We are convinced that Barth, using the provocative language of the period, has got to the heart of the profound intention of Paul. We may note the solemnity of the first mention of the word 'God' and its repetition (15.10,15,28,34,38,50,57). God is presented as the one who, by intervening in the resurrection of Christ, makes all things new.

The work of God is not ... and should not be for nothing.

We turn now to the last verse of the chapter: (58)

Therefore, my beloved brethren, be steadfast,  
immovable, always abounding in the work of the  
Lord, knowing that your labour is not in vain  
in the Lord.

We are specially concerned with the final words, 'knowing that your labour is not in vain in the Lord'. The adjective for vain (kenos, empty, vain, for nothing) has already occurred in v.10 and v.14 (cf. Frutiger, 205).

We need to approach the word kenos from the eikē, 'in vain' of v.2, from mataios (illusory, futile) (v.17) and from ōphelos (useful) (v.32). Why is faith vain if the dead do not rise? Because it has no object? But are we not here forced to admit that its object is the after life! Is it because faith has no basis? Yes, for in the logic of the apostle the resurrection of Christ implies that of the dead. Yet it is necessary to observe the exact phrase: 'our preaching is vain, and your faith is vain'. Preaching finds its basis in the event of the resurrection of Christ. Indeed preaching itself is action insofar as it extends the event by making it known. For Paul, preaching is a

demonstration of the Spirit's power (1.18). It bears fruit. The conversion of the Corinthians proves its effectiveness: 'You yourselves are our letter of recommendation' (2 Cor. 3.2). Faith itself if it is genuine, cannot but share in this dynamic action. Insofar as the Corinthians deny the future of God by denying the resurrection of the dead, they place themselves on the margin of this mighty action. They halt its movement. Everything whether it be their faith, the apostolic preaching, the resurrection of Christ counts for nothing. Paul of course cannot resolve the issue, but he is obliged to take everything up where it began. His friends are still 'in their sins' (v.17). Like pagans, they know absolutely nothing. If they imagine they are of the truth but do not hold on to the apostle's message 'as he preached it to them' (v.2.), then their faith is nothing. Indeed Paul has to make it known to them (v.1) as if they had never heard it!

But Paul knows that Christ has not died for nothing and that he has truly risen. He believes that the grace of God in him and through him is not 'for nothing' (v.10). The work of God has not been halted by the stupidity or disbelief of men. The Corinthians of course did not recognize God in his work but Paul is convinced that once his friends have read his letter, they see their mistake; now you know that if you take the trouble, it will not be 'for nothing'. He writes: 'The trouble you take' because he thinks of them as already active and so he calls them 'beloved brethren' (58).

**The resurrection is a new creation. Resurrection implies death.**

This chapter should be entitled 'Death and Resurrection'. It is, in fact, as much a matter of death as of resurrection. Statistics show this, for Death: nekroi (dead) occurs 13 times; thanatos (death) 6; apothnēskō (die) 4; koimāō (to 'be asleep', 'to be dead') 4; in all, 27 references; for Resurrection: egeirō (raise, resurrect) 19; anastasis (resurrection; lit: put in standing position) 4; zōopoieō (make alive, quicken) 3; in all 26 references. It needs to be pointed out that Paul is not in the habit of using redundant words (it is the least we can say of an author whose brevity often makes him obscure) and yet he repeats unwearingly resurrection of the dead and to raise the dead as if the Corinthians were not aware that 'raising' means 'coming out' of death. As Frutiger puts it: 'to raise one must first die' (203). The Corinthians appear to have forgotten this! They were no longer thinking of the present reality of salvation. They were not challenging the

resurrection of Christ but it had lost for them its significance as the dawn of a new world. All it meant for the believer was the possibility of an immediate deliverance and the flowering of mystic enthusiasm. They are fittingly described in the words of 2 Timothy 1.18: 'They have swerved from the truth by holding that the resurrection is past already'. /2

We agree with Frutiger (217) that the question in verse 36 is rhetorical: 'How are the dead raised? With what kind of body do they come?' The question is put by Paul and not by the Corinthians, and there is nothing specifically hellenistic about it. Paul makes use of it to show the difference between the present (mortal) and the future (divine). The interpellation 'You foolish man!' (aphrōn) comes from Psalm 14.1: 'The foolish man says in his heart, "there is no God"'. /3 Paul does not go on to discuss a philosophical error but views this objection as the denial of the whole power of God. There's more than a mere break between the life we know and that promised to us. There is total renewal. The present body is like a mere seed, the body looked for like a plant. And Paul insists that the plant cannot come unless the seed dies. Death, however, is not necessary to establish the natural continuity that exists between the seed and the plant. Paul goes much further when he spells out that it is God with his creative power who makes the plant what it is. So Paul's purpose is to show that the future will not only be different but it will be the work of God alone. From v.39 on Paul makes use of different aspects of creation, sun, moon and stars to show the truly limitless possibilities open to the Creator. And he does it of course in the perspective of the new creation inaugurated by Christ. This thought is also found in 2 Cor. 5. 17-19: 'Therefore if any one is in Christ, he is a new creation; the old has passed away, behold, the new has come. All this is from God'; and in Galations 6.15: 'For neither circumcision counts for anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creation', where the RSV translates ktisis 'creation', not 'creature'; and in 1 Corinthians 8.6: where Paul writes: 'One Lord Jesus Christ through whom are (or 'will be?') all things (creation).

The appearance of the risen Lord is, then, understood by Paul both as the first act in a radical transformation of the world and as the emergence of a new man, the heavenly Adam. This explains why Paul can present Christ both as 'Lord' (kurios, a term used by the LXX for 'God') and 'New Adam'. In the chapter, it is not men renewed by Christ who bring in again a new world but God who at the coming Parousia will

renew men and the world. Can we then speak legitimately of man's action and what is the use of such action if the kingdom is due to arrive soon in any case? We may note, however, that Paul's insistence does not include this 'soon' for he seems to reckon on a delay in the Parousia.

In Romans 8, he speaks of the future differently: the suffering creation does not expect - as we might have expected having read chapter 15 - the resurrection or the Parousia but it does expect 'the glorious revelation of the sons of God' (19). Man who has become a son of God in the image of Christ will finally be able to exercise the responsibility as God requires. In the epistle to the Romans, Paul speaks in particular of the present effect of the resurrection. It must rather be said that sometimes Paul lays emphasis on the present effect of the resurrection and sometimes he emphasizes the future aspect, depending on what his aim is. His method of reasoning stems rather from his own intuitions or in relation to situations than from within the framework of a coherent system. /4

#### The resurrection does not prevent us dying

'Christ has died' - this is how the famous confession of faith begins, a confession quoted by Paul at the start of this chapter. We are so used to the statement that we no longer see the paradox. A man dead and buried as at the heart of our faith! He has not, of course, died for nothing. He has died 'for our sins'. In 2 Corinthians 4.12 Paul writes: 'So death is at work in us (the apostles) and life in you', (the beneficiaries). So death continues after a fashion in the sufferings of the apostolate and bestows life. We do not consider that it is forcing the text to say that Paul, when he quotes the confession of faith, is already thinking of the dangers he faces and, in contrast, the easy lot of the Corinthians.

In giving the list of witnesses of the resurrection, Paul refers to 500, 'Most of whom are still alive though some have fallen asleep'./6 The explanation generally is: 'they can still bear witness to what they have seen. Thus your faith has a solid foundation.' We are tempted to reply: but now that they are dead, the foundation is shaking. Does Paul really imagine that the Corinthians are going to initiate an inquiry? Does he fear such an inquiry? Is he anxious in case they might find only 450 or 480? Barth is right to say that Paul has no apologetic intention in the chapter. He is not out to prove that the resurrection



is such an obvious event that no one, believer or unbeliever would be able to deny it except in bad faith. Paul, former persecutor, knows better than anyone that the certainty of faith depends on no other proof than the intervention of Christ, perceived by faith! /5 The resurrection of Christ is for him a divine act which bewilders, disturbs and shatters all certainties. The resurrection is the unexpected sign of the rise of a world so renewed that no one could describe it. If he lists all the witnesses then he does it to show that he is not the only one to have experienced the event which gathers together the whole Christian community in hope. It is the common experience of those who have been brought into the church through the message. /6 Paul obviously could not envisage that centuries later people would read his text with a positivist mentality, looking for proofs to gain reassurance!

All these people have been witnesses to the breaking in of the eschatological and divine life in the person of Jesus crucified but that did not make them immortal! Some, in fact, have died. It often happens that Paul introduces a topic with a brief preliminary reference, taking it up again more explicitly. /7 As he develops a topic, he is already thinking of another aspect of what he is saying. He has recalled the fact that 'Christ has died' before speaking of the resurrection. But he will come back to it again later when he mentions on two occasions that death has not yet been conquered. We know from 1 Thess. 4.13 ('But we would not have you ignorant, brethren, concerning those who are asleep, that you may not grieve as others who have no hope'.) that the first Christians were preoccupied with the fate of believers who had died before the Parousia. Note in passing that this shows that the resurrection was understood at the start (1 Thess. is the earliest book of the NT) as the sign of the coming Parousia. It can be conjectured that the Corinthians who were baptized for the dead, may well have been influenced by a fear of the same kind (v.29). It is more likely, taking the chapter as a whole, that such people practised vicarious baptism for friends or relatives who had died before receiving baptism because they saw in it a pledge of immortality. Such immortality would have been understood as an extension in the beyond of the divine life given here below by Christ. If any criticism was to be passed on Paul, it would not be that he is too much a theologian but rather not enough. He does not enter upon a discussion or reflection on what people had done nor does he inquire after the philosophical or theological presuppositions of what they do. He does not digress from his initial project, i.e. to show the Corinthians that they placed themselves on the periphery of the movement opened up by the resurrection of Christ.

One of the major difficulties of the text stems from the different meanings Paul gives to death. Physical death is not, as such, the foe. (v.26) Paul confronts death almost daily, yet he writes to the Philip-pians (in our view at the same period and at Ephesus) that he does not fear death but would prefer it since it would bring him perfect commun-ion with Christ (1.21). Note again that the way in which he puts it does not agree with what he says in 1 Thess. 4.13. Death conjures up at times that of Christ whose death is seen as covering men's sin and sin committed in the name of the law (v.56). It also conjures up, as Montaigne would say the 'act of dying', i.e. the suffering that wears one out, the 'necrosis' (dying). It is thus the power of destruction set over against the quickening power of the risen one. Globally it is the sign that we are not in the kingdom, that the world is still struggling under the power of sin and of evil. In Paul's view, we do not live under an illusion but we shirk the necessary struggle when we act as if sin and death were already conquered and wiped out. If we were to paraphrase Paul, we could say:

Friends of Corinth, you act as if Christ had had no struggle, as if he had not paid for it with his life, as if he had not risen, as if he had been content to teach you a way of denying evil, suffer-ing and death. How is it you do not see that this has nothing to do with the gospel I preached to you, a gospel which the witnesses of the resurrection discovered and preached and which the apostles live out?

When we look again at vss 20-28 against the perspective of death, we see that Paul wants to convince the Corinthians that they have not yet risen. Why does he speak of the 'first fruits of those who are dead' (v.20) and not 'of those who have risen'? Is he not once again shooting an arrow at his friends? If they deny death, then it does not concern them! The reference to the account of Genesis 3 shows that the mortal condition of the sons of Adam is the wage of sin (Romans 5). Paul writes:

But each in his own order: Christ the firstfruits,  
then at his coming those who belong to Christ. (v.23)

The rather brutal remark 'each in his own order' reminds the Corinthians that Christ alone is glorified. They are not then to take his place! They will know glory at the Parousia in advance!

We agree with K.Barth that the to telos of v.24 has to be taken adverbially (then, at the end); that verses 24 and 25 are parentheses ('Then finally when he delivers the kingdom to God the Father after destroying every rule and every authority and power. For he must reign until he has put all his enemies under his feet'); and that the main proposition is to be found in v.26: 'The last enemy to be destroyed is death'; it anticipates the statement 'Death is swallowed up in victory' (v.54), the latter verse being the true completion of the theme. The difficulty of the phrase (v.26) is explained by the intersection of two themes we have marked out, the action of God and of Christ on the one hand and on the other, the reality, still present, of death. /8

The death of Jesus and his resurrection, then, will end in a decisive victory over death but it will involve a long and difficult struggle for Christ and Christians. Paul's exposition as it unfolds seems chaotic but finally emerges as very structured. It reflects in its way the ambiguous situation in which we find ourselves between the 'already' of Easter and the 'not yet' of the Parousia.

The theme of the second Adam, begun in v.22, is resumed by Paul in v.45: 'Thus it is written, "The first man Adam became a living being"; the last Adam became a life-giving spirit'. In the preceding sentences he contrasted the body we know, a body corruptible, contemptible, feeble with the glorious body to come. The present life even if it is regenerate is not yet the divine life. The eschatological Adam (the Greek word eschatos is not to be translated 'last' but, at the very least, 'of the end') is 'life-giving spirit'. The resurrection of Christ is elsewhere presented as a reality of the Spirit (pneumatikos) (2 Cor. 3.17; 4.4). Paul sets the Christ-Spirit over against the 'psychic' Adam. The latter description is borrowed from Genesis 2.7 (LXX). The translation 'animal being' is unsuitable because the difference does not lie between animality and humanity but between the humanity of Adam and that of Christ. V.46 is surprising, it seems so banal: 'But it is not the spiritual which is first but the physical, and then the spiritual.' J.Jeremias is right in stating that it has to do with the human body which is first 'psychic' and, then, at the moment of the Parousia 'pneumatic'. /9 But it is necessary to grasp once again that this statement is directed against the Corinthians who imagine that they are already fully transformed by the Spirit. But Paul's intention does not waver. He uses the doublet 'heaven-earth' (v.46) to remind his friends that they are not yet in heaven.

Paul anticipates an objection (v.50): 'I tell you this, brethren: flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, nor does the perishable inherit the imperishable.' He considers that the Parousia is at hand and reckons that many people he knows will still be alive when it takes place. 'They will not die.' They will be transformed in every way. He had not mentioned this to the Thessalonians. Did he consider it not very useful to be specific at the time? We do not know but, at all events, he considered this affirmation essential for the Corinthians. Man as he actually is (flesh and blood), even as a believer, baptised, regenerated by Christ and the Spirit would not be able, neither by right of inheritance nor by nature (v.50) to enter as he is into the kingdom of God.

The astounding event of the resurrection of Christ will be followed by the event even more extraordinary and truly cosmic of the general resurrection and the establishment of the kingdom. Then, and only then, will victory be achieved over death. It is of course God's victory but a final victory preceded by the struggle of Christ and of believers. This explains why Paul writes: 'thanks be to God who gives us the victory'. In the 'us' Paul includes his friends at Corinth. He assumes that from now on they will be convinced and faithful once more. He urges them with confidence:

Therefore, my beloved brethren, be steadfast, immovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, knowing that in the Lord your labour is not in vain.

## NOTES

\*\*\* This article first appeared in Études théologiques et religieuses, 1981:4:599-607 as 'Si les chrétiens refusent d'agir, alors Christ n'est pas ressuscité.' It is here reproduced in translation by kind permission of Pastor Guy Wagner of L'Église réformée de France, member of the distinguished panel of translators responsible for the French Ecumenical Version of the Bible; English translation is by the editor of IBS.

1. La Resurrection signe du monde nouveau, Paris 1970, Le Cerf.

2. K.Barth seems to be right when he says that the Corinthians had no proper theology and that they did not consider themselves to be in error. It is Paul who sees clearly the implication of their behaviour. They are satisfied with their 'spiritual springtime' and avoid the God who is 'wholly other'. Barth puts more emphasis on the revelation of God than on his action. It is beyond dispute that the Corinthians had been subject to an influence from the world in which they lived. But we are one with Frutiger in saying that it is through such a bias that we find the meaning of this chapter. There is no need, however, to speak of heresy. Paul perceives a vexatious tendency but does not denounce a fixed doctrine.
3. It is possible that the lack of knowledge of God mentioned in v.34 arises as an echo of the text.
4. OT texts which have given support to this idea should be noted and especially Ezekial 1.26, where God takes on a human appearance, and Daniel 7.13 where the Son of Man makes his appearance; also 7.22 where the reign of the 'saints' takes the place of that of the Son of Man.
5. R.Bultmann (Glauben und Verstehen, 1,34) says 'that it is impossible for me to understand what Paul says other than as an attempt to give credibility to the resurrection by presenting it as an historic and objective fact'. We agree with Bultmann (and Barth) that the resurrection was not an event which could be proved or verified. Paul nowhere mentions the empty tomb! We do not, however, agree with Bultmann when he claims that Paul wanted to present it as such. It leads Bultmann, nevertheless, to render Barth the astounding homage of having understood Paul better than he understood himself! Exegetes along with unsuspecting readers find great difficulty in grasping the very special character of the NT language and especially that of Paul. The first Christians found it a major difficulty to express their newly-born faith, not as a doctrine of man, but as the discovery of the glorification of the Crucified. They took up, of course, the message of Jesus and found support in the OT when interpreted christologically. They used the language of their milieu and especially apocalyptic language. But they also blended their experience whether personal or ecclesial. The net result of all this was not a very structured or restricted language but an affair of signs and mirrors. They may deny it but

exegetes do have the tendency to treat the epistles as a long elaboration in private of theological thought. Who, we may ask, will write a study of the successive improvisations of Paul?

6. According to Barth, Paul wants to show them that his teaching is not some Paulinism but everybody's faith.
7. Especially in 2 Cor.2.14 to 5.21.
8. A translation suggested by Von Hoffman, Die Heiligen Schriften des NT, 11,2,p.366; also X. Léon-Dufour, Resurrection de Jesus et message pascal, Paris 1971, p.306.
9. In TDNT, 1, p.143.

---

Raymond E. Brown,

The Epistles of John

Anchor Bible Series, Geoffrey Chapman,  
London 1983 pp xxviii, 812

Some seventeen years ago the later Professor Joachim Jeremias of Göttingen pointed out to a number of us, present at 26 Brüder-Grimm Allee a book that he had just received from a former student. The book was in fact a commentary with introduction on the first twelve chapters of the Gospel of John by a scholar named 'Raymond E. Brown'. It was our first introduction to one who today has established himself an authoritative position in Johannine studies, in addition to an international reputation for careful, meticulous and discerning scholarship. This present volume on the Epistles, like the two-volume work on the Gospel, is equally thorough and exhaustive.

It is clear that in a review of this kind any major examination cannot be undertaken. It is proposed, therefore, to select those aspects that appeal to the reviewer as of major interest and importance. We find, for example, in the Preface mention of the anonymity of 1 John, leading to the suggestion that it is not a letter and nothing in it would support such a view (p.ix). Its main concern 'is to reinforce the belief and morality of the readers against a group that is doing the work of the devil and of Antichrist (2.18; 4.1-6), a group that has seceded from the Community (2.19) but is still trying to win more