refrains from using *proseuchein* at all. That is surely no accident and is worthy of the best explicatory efforts of a future Clouseau.

Meanwhile, we may bask in the sunshine flooding into, and enjoy the melodies sounding in, K.'s forest of NT prayer.

*Mark Kiley, St. John's University, Staten Island, NY 10301*


This book is a revision of Kelhoffer's dissertation written at the University of Chicago under the direction of Adela Yarbro Collins. The first part of K.'s work (chaps. 1–4) concentrates on the literary relationship between the longer ending (LE) of Mark (Mark 16:9-20) and the other NT gospels. Following his review of scholarship (chap. 1), K. offers a scrupulous analysis of the language and style of the LE (chap. 2). His findings suggest that "the LE's author wrote in conscious imitation of other valued traditions" (p. 121). The avenue through which these traditions were made available is the subject of chap. 3. K. concludes that literary dependence on actual copies of the four NT gospels (and probably Acts) best explains the similarities reflected in the LE. Consequently, the LE becomes an important witness to the respect accorded the four-gospel canon before 200 C.E. In chap. 4, K. tackles the questions of the origin and genre of the LE. His examination of the literary "micro-forms" in the LE indicates that it is a compositional unity composed ca. 120–150 C.E.

In the last three chapters, K. investigates the more unique elements of the LE in order to relate it to those texts containing analogous formulations. In chap. 5 he considers the association between miracles and missionary activity. K. finds that the LE's promise that all believers will perform "signs" (Mark 16:17-20) corresponds most closely to John 14:12. The acts of snake-handling (Mark 16:18a) and drinking poison (16:18b) are the subjects of chaps. 6–7. Although K. considers a wide variety of Greco-Roman, Jewish, and early Christian writings, he is unable to reduce either of these latter acts to a single source (literary or historical). A brief epilogue offers a summary of K.'s observations about the author of the LE.

There are a few points on which K.'s understanding of the LE can be challenged. Chief among these is the relationship between miracles and mission. In chaps. 5–7, K. contends that the signs described in 16:17-18 function as evangelistic tools performed deliberately by believers for the purpose of conversion. However, the three-part sequence of vv. 15-17 does not corroborate this view. In v. 15, Jesus enjoins his disciples to "go . . . and preach the gospel." This proclamation leads some to believe and be baptized (and thus saved, v. 16). Then "these signs . . . accompany those who believe" (v. 17). According to its literary structure, the LE is evidently presenting the signs as a consequence or verification of faith, not as its impetus. Indeed, the signs are accorded no purpose at all outside of v. 20, where they simply serve to confirm "the word" (i.e., the disciples' message of salvation). This they do since, ostensibly, those who believe and are baptized ("the saved") experience them.
This interpretive nuance has numerous ramifications for K.’s study. It suggests a somewhat different set of texts for comparison in chap. 5. It also recommends episodes like those recorded in Acts 28:3-6 (Paul’s encounter with a viper) and Hist. eccl. 3.39 (Justus Barsabbas’s ingestion of a harmful drug) as precursors to Mark 16:18a-b. (K. is reluctant to endorse these passages precisely because they lack missionary contexts.)

A second point of potential improvement involves the relationship between the author of the LE and the Gospel of Mark. Here, some minor issues require clarification. For instance, was the author of the LE a close reader of Mark? On p. 68 K. suggests he was not, but on p. 73 he asserts otherwise. Did the LE’s author intend to follow the narrative left off by Mark? K. dismisses this idea on p. 161, but elsewhere (p. 474) he describes the author of the LE as a Marcan imitator. Lastly, was this author geographically affiliated with the Marcan community? K. establishes a date for this composition but never addresses the question of provenance.

Aside from the above observations, I find much to admire in K.’s scholarship. He demonstrates a superior command of both the primary and secondary literature. He supplements his painstakingly detailed analyses with clear and concise summaries, and he regularly succeeds in drawing logical conclusions from his raw data. For these reasons, the strengths of Miracle and Mission far exceed its weaknesses. It is, to my knowledge, the most comprehensive work available on the LE of Mark.

Steven L. Bridge, St. Joseph’s College of Maine, Standish, ME 04084


In this study of the traditions of the Lord’s Supper in the NT, John Koenig argues that the meals of the early Christian communities had a significant missionary function; that is, they were occasions in which outsiders were brought into the community and won over to the faith. He buttresses his argument by tracing this form of meal, which he calls a “eucharistic” or thanksgiving meal, throughout the NT documents. He sees this form of meal as having originated with Jesus himself, who declared the Last Supper to be a meal of expectation for the coming kingdom of God.

That early Christian meals had a missionary component is a helpful emphasis that provides a strong counterargument to the traditional view that the meal was always reserved for baptized believers. The evidence for this different perspective is quite strong, ranging from Paul’s reference to unbelievers being present at services of Christian worship—presumably, therefore, at their table (1 Cor 14:23-25)—to references in the gospels to Jesus eating with tax collectors and sinners (e.g., Mark 2:15-17).

On the other hand, the weakest argument of the book, and the one with which it has unfortunately become identified (as seen in the jacket blurbs), is the idea that the historical Jesus started it all. K. argues for a historical Last Supper at which Jesus uttered basically what Mark records. This, he says, was an event at which Jesus recognized his messianic status, foreshowed his impending death, and interpreted his death as sacrificial and as the instigator of the “ultimate flowering of God’s covenant” (p. 39). Indeed, he argues that “christological consciousness” originated not in the early church but in the mind of Jesus himself (p. 40).