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sively in English, although the general bibliography at the beginning of the book cites essential foreign-language works. The footnotes, not overwhelming for the intended audience, are useful for scholars. M.'s occasional elucidations from modern culture may prove less effective for U.S. than for U.K. readers. Author, subject, and scriptural indexes are thorough, and the book is attractively produced. Even the price, given the number of pages, is fair. All in all, this engaging and lucid resource is highly recommended to anyone interested in NT theology.

Ronald D. Witherup, S.S., Sulpician Provincial House, Baltimore, MD 21210


*La figure de Pierre dans l'oeuvre de Luc* is the publication of Yvan Mathieu's doctoral thesis written for Saint Paul University in Ottawa under the direction of Marcel Dumais. As the title states, M. employs a synchronic reading of the figure of Peter in the Lucan corpus and defends this approach on the ground that there are very few parallels between the Lucan texts and the other three Gospels in their respective mention of Peter. In addition, Luke alone states that the resurrected Jesus has appeared to Peter (24:34), and he alone has a second volume in which Peter is most prominent. On this basis, M. believes that Luke offers the most developed Petrine theology in the NT. For his methodology, M. employs redaction criticism and a discriminating use of narrative criticism, thereby avoiding reader-response analysis. By this work, M. wishes to distinguish and define Peter's role in Luke as well as the relation of Peter to the Twelve and to the disciples. His presentation is clear, concise, and informative, and he succeeds in his endeavor.

In chap. 1, M. presents an overview of research on Peter within the Lucan corpus. Chapter 2 features the main Lucan pericopes in which Simon (Peter) plays a major role: the curing of his mother-in-law (4:38-39), the miraculous catch of fish (5:1-11), and the calling of the Twelve, in which Simon receives the name Peter (6:12-16). In chap. 3, M. discusses the three Petrine scenes before Jesus' ascent to Jerusalem (9:51): the cure of the hemorrhaging woman and the raising of Jairus's daughter (8:40-56), Peter's confession (9:18-22), and the transfiguration (9:28-36). In chap. 4, M. moves into the Lucan depiction of Peter at Jesus' death and resurrection in Jerusalem. Next M. considers Peter in Acts 1-7 (chap. 5), and he then turns to Peter's journeys to Samaria, Lydda, Joppa, Caesarea Maritima, and back to Jerusalem (chap. 6). In chap. 7, M. concentrates on Peter's release from prison (Acts 12) and his presence at the Council of Jerusalem (Acts 15), and he concludes the research in chap. 8 with a synthesis of the main traits presented in the Lucan picture of Peter. The result of this effort is a Lucan portrait that underlines three roles for Peter in the Gospel. He is to gather people for Jesus (5:10), strengthen his brothers (22:32), and, along with the other apostles, judge the tribes at the end of time.

Much of Peter's role rests on his reaction to the news of the resurrection (Luke 24:12). Whereas the other apostles and disciples dismiss the witness of the three women,
Peter runs to the empty tomb. M. sees this action as Peter’s rehabilitation after his earlier threefold denial, and it allows him, before the commission given by the resurrected Christ in Acts 1:8, to be the “premier witness of the word upon which rests the paschal faith of all the Church” (p. 347). Yet Peter’s witness is not limited to the church’s beginnings; his role continues into the eschaton, for once the kingdom of Christ is fully established, and once Peter and the apostles sit on the throne judging the twelve tribes of Israel (22:30), only then will disciples of every age be able to believe without depending on the Petrine and apostolic witness.

Although M. briefly critiques Matthew’s treatment of Peter, particularly the commission (16:18), one wishes that he would have commented on the Marcan depiction of Peter or the evangelist Mark’s relation to him; indeed, Luke displays a subtle connection between the Third Gospel and the Marcan narrative (Acts 12:12, 25; 15:37, 39). Likewise, Peter’s role in the Johannine Gospel receives the scantest notice, despite the presence of this apostle in John 21. A minimal treatment of these Petrine portraits would have placed the Lucan one in greater relief, which could have rendered greater insight into M.’s argument.

Nonetheless, M.’s work is a valuable contribution not only for biblical scholars, but also for any contemporary theologian who wishes to explore ecclesiological issues. Especially impressive is his methodology, which demonstrates a responsible and creative use of narrative criticism. The book’s extensive bibliography and indexes for biblical passages, authors, and Greek terms are exceptionally helpful.

Michael Patella, O.S.B., Saint John’s School of Theology, Collegeville, MN 56321


In this volume of essays, Jerome Neyrey addresses what he calls (borrowing a phrase from Nils Dahl) “the neglected factor in New Testament study,” by which he means “God.” To attend to this neglected factor, N. has assembled a series of studies that ask what it is that particular books of the NT in fact do say about God.

For those familiar with N.’s many books and essays, it will come as no surprise to find that his chief contribution in this discussion is the attention he gives to the use of social-science models to enhance our understanding of the ancient world. Take, for example, the common NT notion of God as father. For early Christians to speak of God as “Father,” he argues, has less to do with feelings of intimacy (N. cites with approval James Barr’s essay, “‘Abba isn’t ‘Daddy,’” JTS ns 39 [1988] 28-47) than with the ancient pattern of patron–client relations that formed around the paterfamilias and his dependents. God, in Mark, Matthew, Acts, 1 Corinthians, and Galatians, is seen as a patron who grants certain benefactions to his clients. Jesus in these texts is seen either as the ideal client exhibiting loyalty to God, his patron, or in some cases as the broker who mediates the relationship between patron and other clients.

But N.’s observations are not entirely about social-scientific models. His deeper con-