

***Jesus, Criteria, and the Demise of Authenticity.* By Chris Keith and Anthony Le Donne, eds. New York: T&T Clark, 2012, xvii + 230 pp., \$34.95 hardback. ISBN-13: 978-0567377234.**

Historical method and historical Jesus research go hand in glove. Through the past few centuries, modernism has emphasized scientific study of the Scriptures, culminating in historical Jesus research as one by-product. Chris Keith and Anthony Le Donne, editors and contributors, compiled a team of writers to contribute to *Jesus, Criteria, and the Demise of Authenticity*. Inundated with books flowing from the peaks of historiography and criteria of authenticity, I hope this book surfaces among the multitudes on the desks of those interested in or involved with historical Jesus research.

Through partially disparate approaches, each contributor shares the central thesis of the book: end or substantially modify the traditional methods of the historical Jesus endeavor, and clear “the ground of several crumbling foundations” to make space for new discussions within the discipline (3, 200). In order to demonstrate their shared thesis, three sections serve as the skeletal outline.

“Part I: Historical Methodology and the Quest for an Authentic Jesus” highlights current trends and advancements in historiography and subsidiary methodologies. Keith (25–48) demonstrates how form criticism and the presuppositions therein serve as a foundation to the continued affirmation of the criteria of authenticity. “The criteria of authenticity,” explains Keith, “even in modified forms, simply cannot deliver what they are designed to deliver” (26). After assessing the past trajectories of form criticism, he calls scholars not to affirm a both/and approach to historicism. “Either one should dispense with the theological interpretations in the narratives of the Gospels in order to reconstruct critically the past, or one should begin with these theological interpretations as the crucial links to the past...But it cannot be both” (47).

Jens Schröter (49–70) has a multi-pronged assessment of historiography and gospel studies. The Third Quest is distinguished by an emphasis on 2<sup>nd</sup> Temple literature and their political, social, and religious contexts as a means to rightly understand Jesus and his mission (49). Consequently, some use these criteria to determine the authenticity of individual units. Schröter’s possible solution is to admit the historiographer’s position and assess *what* the Gospels *can provide* the modern reader. The documents supply a theological idea for a religious community. The intent of these sources is to maintain unity and not undergo scrutiny as individual units. The documents are

committed to the past and presently remain as a source, though selective and tendentious of the past, to limit historiographical questions (69–70).

“Part II: Specific Criteria in the Quest for an Authentic Jesus” focuses upon individual criterion either with the hope of serious revision or complete abandonment. Loren Stuckenbruck (73–94) interacts with the problems of using the criterion of Semitic or Aramaic traces for determining authentic material. Dagmar Winter (115–31) observes the criterion’s dependence “on a history of religions or comparative religion approach” (118) and it is founded upon a Hegelian dialectical method (119–20). For those who desire a post-criteriological Jesus, Rafael Rodríguez (132–51) exposes a faulty foundation because of their dependency upon other criteria, namely redaction criticism. Balancing concern for historical questions and wading carefully in the brief limitations of the criterion of multiple attestation, Mark Goodacre (152–69) strikes an even-keeled approach to historiography.

A particularly noteworthy chapter is Anthony Le Donne, in “The Criterion of Coherence: Its Development, Inevitability, and Historiographical Limitations” (95–114). He calls into question the coherence criterion and its limitations by interacting with his Social Memory theory (97). Le Donne is not seeking to jettison the criterion altogether; rather, it should be reconsidered in light of a coherent mnemonic continuum (97). Carefully navigating the historical use of the criterion of coherence, he encourages the discussion to affirm generally coherent data while allowing the possibility of historical nuances or potential randomness (110).

“Part III: Reflections on Moving Past Traditional Jesus Research” includes Scot McKnight and Dale Allison reflecting on their autobiographical journey within historical Jesus research. Like a seasoned man expressing concerns to a young scholar, these two chapters are sobering and helpful to the discussion. McKnight (173–85) reflects on the inability of historical Jesus research to aid the church. Scholars have produced multiple portraits of Jesus; he concludes Jesus, either (re-)constructed, the canonical Jesus, or the Jesus of the *regula fidei* is a theological Jesus (173, 176). McKnight concludes, “Historical Jesus proposals are of no use to the church” (175). The church’s Jesus, the orthodox Jesus, the historical Jesus “is someone less, someone else, and therefore not the same Jesus” (176).

Allison (186–99) kindly pulls back the curtain for the reader to travel with him through history as he recounts his internal struggle with historical Jesus accomplishments. Its sobered tone and careful composition will benefit and should be a “must-read” for any budding

historical Jesus scholar and the intelligentsia of historiographical erudites. He begins with his introduction to historical criteria, initial concerns he had, intellectual oversights, and how he modified his views during each of his historical Jesus publications. His conclusion is that, "If we really want to recover and reconstruct Jesus, then, we will cast our nets far wider than the criteria can ever reach" (199).

Upon finishing the book, one is left pondering, "So, what is next?" If the authors' analysis is accurate, what do scholars use to engage historical Jesus research? This book is not a deafening blow, but it is enough to anticipate that a new generation will question and modify the enterprise. Moreover, characteristics of a post-criteriological project are still too new to have an organized front. Nonetheless, this source will hopefully encourage such organization. It is evident within each article that a unified critique of traditional criteria exists, but there lacks a unified vision for moving forward.

I have only a minor critique of this work. Namely, it would have been helpful to see a unified reconstruction. Where does historical Jesus reconstruction go next if traditional criteria are not the solution? This book is a shot across the bow, calling for major revisions or complete abandonment of the criteria. If solutions are not paired with deconstructions, scholars will probably continue to use existing methods.

It will be profitable to watch the works of Keith and Le Donne as time progresses. I anticipate future organization to coalesce around mnemonic and memory criteria, leaving behind form-critical units in order to approach the Gospels as whole documents, and a growing skepticism of traditional criteria. Second, Robert Webb wrote "The Historical Enterprise and Historical Jesus Research," in *Key Events in the Life of the Historical Jesus* (2010). I was surprised to find no interaction with this article. It is nearly 90 pages of articulating historiography, primary and secondary criteria, and is one of the more up-to-date summations of the criteria's use in modern Jesus reconstructions.

Historical Jesus researchers would be amiss if they fail to engage this source. Current students engaging in historiography, the Synoptic Problem, or anyone favoring traditional historical criteria ought to engage this source for continued historical refinement and methodological modification. *Jesus, Criteria, and the Demise of Authenticity*, in my estimation, will be the first of many in a postmodern era calling into question a modernist discipline.

Shawn J. Wilhite

Southern Seminary, Louisville, KY

***One Bible, Many Versions: Are All Translations Created Equal?* By Dave Brunn. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2013. ii+205 pp., \$16.00 paperback ISBN-13: 978-0830827152.**

Dave Brunn is the Director of Education for the New Tribes Mission Missionary Training Center. He has been associated with New Tribes for over thirty-five years, twenty-one of which were spent translating the New Testament for the Lamogai people of Papua New Guinea.

*One Bible, Many Versions* is an investigation of the theory and practice of Bible translation, with the goal of finding the similarities and differences in the various English translations of the Bible. Brunn then evaluates the significance of the differences, and concludes that the current sharp debate over whether English translations should strive for the highest degree of literalness is unhelpful and unnecessary.

Brunn's first two chapters describe the controversy over degrees of literalness in English translations, and give a brief outline of the two major philosophies of Bible translation: formal equivalence and functional equivalence. Formal equivalence seeks to retain as much of the grammar and word order of the original language as possible in the target language, and to translate single words in the original language with a single expression in the target language wherever possible. The Greek word *logos* is an example. The most common word for *logos* in English is "word," so this is the rendering that a functional equivalent translation will attempt to use in as many contexts as possible, leaving the reader to determine the intended meaning in each context. The King James Version (KJV), the New American Standard Bible (NASB), and the English Standard Version (ESV) are three examples of formal equivalent translations that Brunn considers throughout the book.

Functional equivalence, also known as meaning-based translation, seeks to express the contextual meaning of the original language idiomatically in the target language, without necessarily representing the grammar, word order, and individual words of the original. If we continue to use the example above, the Greek word *logos* has dozens of slightly different meanings in particular contexts. A functional equivalent translation will attempt to translate *logos* using clear, natural English that expresses its precise meaning in each context. Brunn uses the New International Version (NIV), the New Living Translation (NLT), the Holman Christian Standard Bible (HCSB), and the several others (CEV, NET, GW, the Message) as his examples of functional equivalent translations.

He then offers a long list of examples taken from the translations listed above, and shows that the labels "formal equivalent" and

“functional equivalent” cannot be applied strictly. His first data table alone shows 93 verses from both Testaments in which translations that are widely known as formal equivalents, such as the NASB and ESV, resort to thought-for-thought rendering, where functional equivalent translations, such as the NIV, NLT, proceed word-for-word. His conclusion is that meaning has priority over form. The formal equivalent translations merely try to minimize the situations in which they depart from their stated ideal, but there are still numerous instances in which practical problems force a meaning-based approach, rather than a formal approach.

The largest section of the book (chapters 3-8) describes the various reasons for which the ideal of formal equivalence must be abandoned for meaning-based translation, and what this implies about the common claim that formal equivalent translations reflect a more robust doctrine of divine inspiration of the Scriptures. Brunn himself holds a very conservative view of plenary verbal inspiration and inerrancy, naming Charles Ryrie as a scholar whose view is most similar to his own. He then sums up his view of the relationship between translation and inspiration concisely: “If the doctrine of verbal inspiration requires consistent word-for-word translation, then every English version is disqualified” (129).

Brunn continues with his irenic refutation of the superiority of formal equivalence by considering the special problem of translating New Testament Greek into completely unrelated languages, such as Lamogai, rather than a more closely-related language, such as English. He then explores the translation practices of the New Testament writers themselves. He contends that strict word-for-word translation becomes unworkable for reasons of idiomatic expressions in the original languages, contextual requirements, differences in grammar between languages, and ease of reading in the target language.

The last section of the book (chapters 9-10) argues for greater unity in the church regarding the use of a wide range of translations, while excluding the most extreme examples of each philosophy, such as *Young’s Literal Translation* (formal equivalent) and *The Cotton-Patch Version* (functional equivalent). According to Brunn, all translations that avoid either extreme are useful to Christians. All translations within the acceptable range have more in common than is usually acknowledged, and all are limited in different ways.

The strengths of Brunn’s work are numerous. His writing style is suitable for non-specialists in Bible translation without being oversimplified. His twenty years of successful experience as a Bible translator in an extremely remote people group enable him to write

with authority on the practical difficulties of translation, and the compromises that inevitably result. His experience also lends his conclusions about the commonalities and imperfections of English translations excellent credibility. He includes copious, relevant examples in every chapter to support his views. Brunn makes a strong case against the use of exclusively formal equivalent translations, but his tone remains very gracious throughout the book.

Brunn's main weakness is in his use of examples from the Old Testament. Some of the Old Testament examples he cites betray a limited knowledge of Biblical Hebrew. For example, his rendering of  $\text{לְשֵׁנְךָ}$  as "navel" in Prov. 3:8 in Table 2.5 (53) fails to consider other textual options for what is a curious image in Hebrew. The example supposedly shows that the formal equivalent translations (NASB, ESV) resorted to a meaning-based rendering at this point ("body, flesh") rather than staying with the strict formal equivalent, "navel." However, the editors of *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* suggest that the reader consider the Septuagint text, which reads  $\tau\tilde{\omega}$  σώματί σου, and translates as "for your flesh (body)." The back-translation of  $\tau\tilde{\omega}$  σώματί σου into Hebrew is  $\text{לְשֵׁנְךָ}$ , "for your flesh," which shows a one letter difference from the Masoretic Text. It is easy to see how the *aleph* may have dropped out of the text, as it was becoming a silent letter even in biblical times. In the context of healing, "flesh" makes much better sense than "navel." The Septuagint reading appears to be warranted here, which means that the NASB, ESV, and NIV all translated the word in essentially literal fashion. The textual evidence contradicts Brunn at this point.

In Table 2.7 he reads the *beth* in  $\text{בְּרַגְלֶיךָ}$  from Deut. 11:10 in its common spatial meaning as "in," yielding the meaning "water in your foot." Brunn does not realize that the preposition *beth* in Biblical Hebrew may be used in an instrumental sense, expressing "by" or "with." All of the versions understood the *beth* of  $\text{בְּרַגְלֶיךָ}$  as an instrumental *beth*. In addition, the NIV and ESV translators correctly understood  $\text{וְהִשְׁקִיטָהּ}$  as "irrigate (cause to drink), respecting the causative nuance of the *Hiphil* stem of the root  $\text{שָׁקַט}$ , "to drink." These shortcomings in Biblical Hebrew make his example moot: all of the English translations cited used "water" or "irrigate," which are synonyms in a gardening context, and all of the translations understood the instrumental *beth* better than he did.

Although his use of Old Testament examples is weak, the New Testament examples that Brunn cites are very accurate and strong. His

errors in Hebrew are not numerous enough to undermine his overall argument, which can stand on the strength of his New Testament examples only. One may hope that a second edition of the book will be strengthened by the input of experts in the Old Testament.

*One Bible, Many Versions* is a well-researched and compelling case for the value of a diversity of English translations, and the value of meaning-based translations in particular. Brunn's effort should lead Christians to greater unity in the important debate over Bible translation philosophy.

Brendan Kennedy

Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary

***Reviving the Heart: The Story of the 18<sup>th</sup> Century Revival.* By Richard Turnbull. Oxford: Lion Hudson, 2012. 191 pp. \$16.95, paperback. ISBN-13: 978-0745953496.**

This overview of what was a remarkable work of God in the eighteenth century by the former Principal of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford—Turnbull was the Principal from 2005 to 2012—is a well-needed addition to the literature on the revival. While written in a popular vein, it is clear that Turnbull is familiar with some of the most significant literature on the evangelical revival published in the past twenty-five years. The first chapter, dealing with the origins of the revival, reveals Turnbull's grasp of some of this literature. After surveying recent scholarly perspectives as well as the claim that the revival is to be considered solely through the lens of a divine work of the Holy Spirit (a view that Turnbull does not reject but he rightly recognizes that God works through means), he concludes that there is a threefold origin to the revival: it was a movement that was "reacting against mere moralism," while "reclaiming Reformation doctrine, and appropriating experience" (26–27).

The second and third chapters introduce the two figures whose "names dominate the story of the Revival" (30): George Whitefield and John Wesley. In the first of these chapters, Turnbull also introduces us to two other remarkable figures of this era, the Welsh preachers, Howell Harris and Daniel Rowland (50–52, 59–60, 79) and to note one of the key methodologies of this period, itinerant preaching, which is a defining characteristic of much of the revival (60). Chapter four looks at various disputes and divisions within the revival, particularly, Wesley's quarrel with the Moravians over the use of the means of grace (67–71), and Wesley's dispute with his friend Whitefield over the subject of

predestination (71–78) — a conflict that did much to seriously damage their relationship (71).

In chapter five, Turnbull looks at two other pioneer figures in the revival: William Grimshaw of Haworth (83–97) and Samuel Walker of Truro (97–104), both moderate Calvinists, but whose methodologies differed widely. Grimshaw believed it his duty to preach in neighboring parishes where the gospel was a foreign sound and to do this he often employed lay preachers. Walker, on the other hand, rejected both itineracy and the use of lay preachers, though he shared Grimshaw's theological and spiritual beliefs to the full.

Selina Hastings, the Countess of Huntingdon, the remarkable woman who all but founded a denomination—the Countess of Huntingdon's Connexion—is the subject of the next chapter. Turnbull regards her as “the glue that held the Revival together” in the mid-eighteenth century (105). This will be a surprising judgment for some, but Turnbull provides evidence to support this assertion: her deep pockets helped support a goodly number of revival leaders, including Whitefield, and also build a variety of chapels throughout England. As an aristocrat, she was able to take advantage of a legal loophole that allowed her to have private chaplains attached to places of residence, where they would lead worship that the public could attend (115). She thus appointed various men to act as her chaplains, but eventually she was forced to register her chapels as places of dissenting worship, and a new denominational body was born. Turnbull does an excellent job of tracing this development and its impact on the revival.

Chapters seven and eight look at the consolidation of the revival and its maturation. To illustrate how the revival was consolidated, four key figures are examined: Henry Venn, William Romaine, John Newton, and John Fletcher. An overview of the shape and legacy of the ministry of these men display well the changes that came to the revival, but also how continuity with the pioneering work of Whitefield and the Wesleys was retained. This reviewer was struck by the profound biblicism of these men. Newton made it clear in his first sermon in London to the congregation of St. Mary, Woolnoth, that the “Bible is the grand repository of the truths that it will be the business and pleasure of my life to set before you” (132). William Romaine was sure that the Bible was “the infallible standard of truth” that he had personally found to be “more precious than gold and...really sweeter than honey” (143). Turnbull ventures that it was local pastors like these men, “practitioners on the ground,” who “formed and shaped the Revival, with the more famous itinerants,” Whitefield and Wesley, “providing the icing on the cake” (148).



The maturation of the revival, treated in the final chapter, especially looks at the development of the revival in the Established Church. Charles Simeon and William Wilberforce are profiled as well as the departure of the Wesleyan Methodist wing of the Revival from the Church of England. Notably, within a generation the Methodists themselves experienced a division over the validity of open-air preaching. Methodist radicals like Hugh Bourne and William Clowes, the founders of the Primitive Methodist Connexion, were “unacceptable to the new Methodist establishment” (159). Turnbull rightly notes that this story “illustrates how the Revival both matured and was then once again radicalized” (159).

In his conclusion, Turnbull argues that while there are a number of possible explanations for the origin of the revival, it must be admitted that the dynamism of the awakening supports the view held by the participants themselves that this was none other than the hand of the Lord (162). He reiterates the importance of John Wesley—“a towering figure”—and of Charles’ “wonderful hymns” (162). The Wesleys’ legacy would dominate the memory of the Revival since Whitefield, the other key pioneer, spent so much time in America and died there more than twenty years before Wesley (163). Whitefield’s “classic moderate Calvinism” would flourish inside the Church of England, but not outside of it. The Countess of Huntingdon’s Connexion, a direct result of Whitefield’s ministry, has never been a large body.

Of course, Turnbull is forgetting the way the revival re-energized the Calvinism of Old Dissent (though there are numerous references to the Dissenters scattered throughout the book). By the time that the Wesleyan Methodists had left their mother church, the Congregationalists and Calvinistic Baptists were undergoing a profound revitalization that had deep roots in the Anglican awakening. The Calvinistic Baptist John Fawcett, for example, who was the author of the hymn “Blest be the tie that bind,” was converted under George Whitefield and thrilled to his preaching and that of William Grimshaw. He reckoned that “for natural, unaffected eloquence” Whitefield was “superior to any person he ever heard.” He was one of several score of Baptist ministers and deacons who were indebted to Whitefield and his co-workers in the revival in the latter half of the eighteenth century, as can be readily seen from scanning the obituaries of *The Baptist Magazine* (1809–) between the 1810s and the 1830s.

An appendix ably and helpfully takes stock of recent historiographical approaches to the Revival. Turnbull believes that the influential work of David Bebbington, who stresses the “newness” of the revival, fails to see more of the revival’s essential continuity with

what had gone before in the Puritan era. He rightly regards “Bebbington’s great achievement” to have been setting the revival in its cultural matrix of the Enlightenment (166–167). Turnbull also discusses the studies by Gordon Rupp and J.C.D. Clark, who have explored the presence of genuine faith in the period following the twilight of Puritanism (167–170). These studies help correct the idea that all was darkness prior to the conversion of Whitefield and the Wesley brothers. Finally, Turnbull notes the influence of Continental Pietism on the origins of the revival, which has been especially elucidated by W.R. Ward (170–174): in fine, “Pietism is crucial to the background of the Revival” (170).

Although there is a degree of choppiness to the book at times, Turnbull has given us an excellent survey of the revival, a book that is at once eminently readable and comprehensive. On the eve of the tercentennial of the birth of a number of key figures in the revival—Samuel Walker was born in 1713, while George Whitefield and William Romaine were both born in 1714—this is a great book by means of which we can remember a remarkable period and through which we can be stimulated to pray God may do a similar thing in our day.

Michael A. G. Haykin  
Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

***The Early Text of the New Testament.* By Charles E. Hill and Michael J. Kruger, eds. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2012, xiv + 483 pp., \$175.00. ISBN-13: 978-0199566365.**

The conversational pendulum of New Testament text critical foci has morphed over the past couple of decades. This magnificent new work, *The Early Text of the New Testament*, is a highly welcomed addition for this shift in discussion. Editors Charles E. Hill and Michael J. Kruger assemble an incredible team of textual critics, New Testament intellectualists, and Patristic scholars in a project that spanned over six and a half years (v). This work will hopefully influence the field, advance broader scholarly conversations, and serve as an authoritative voice in the coming years in New Testament textual criticism and Patristic textual studies.

Three sections provide the skeletal outline for thematic division. Various *types* of scholars help contribute to the value of this work. Textual critics are joined with various NT/Patristic scholars. A total of

twenty-two scholars encompass the team of writers on topics ranging from early sociological and culture readings, evaluation of papyri, to evaluation of Patristic and early Church writings. The overall methodological concern of each chapter and scholar is to evaluate the “state” of the text or examine the cultural repertoire of the early text and cultural setting; that is, the era “before the great uncial codices Sinaiticus and Vaticanus of the fourth century” (2). *The Early Text of the New Testament* seeks to “provide an inventory and some analysis of the evidence available for understanding the pre-fourth-century period of the transmission of the NT materials” (2).

“Part I. The Textual and Scribal Culture of Early Christianity” highlights various cultural norms and scribal tendencies during early Christendom. Harry Y. Gamble, in “The Book Trade in the Roman Empire” (23–36), observes the general milieu of early book production and their dissemination. Scott Charlesworth, in “Indicators of ‘Catholicity’ in Early Gospel Manuscripts” (37–48), evaluates the consistency in codex size and *nomina sacra* abbreviations to help determine common use of Gospel manuscripts (37–39). Visual features of manuscripts, such as textual division, punctuation, and other reader’s aids (42) argue for manuscript production for public and private use; therefore, contrary to the Bauer-thesis, catholic and orthodox sources were formed with more organization than non-orthodox sources (46–47). Within erudite cultures, the prevalence for MS care, aesthetic letter shaping, careful and elegant calligraphy, etc. marked pagan circles. According to Larry Hurtado, in “Manuscripts and the Sociology of Early Christian Reading” (49–62), early Christian communities ranged from poor to rich, young to old, and illiterate to literate; therefore unlike erudite communities, the early papyri MSS are clearer, more readable, contain larger letters, careful spacing between lines, etc. so as to demonstrate a deliberate shift in Christian communities encouraging broader reading (57–58). Michael J. Kruger, in “Early Christian Attitudes toward the Reproduction of Texts” (63–80), examines how early Christians viewed the NT text as being Scripture and how early testimony viewed the reproduction of the NT text (66).

“Part II. The Manuscript Tradition” provides an extremely detailed and up-to-date analysis of the early NT papyri; that is, text classification, singular and comparative readings, manuscript features, etc. Discussions include individual books and groups of books—the Gospels (Tommy Wasserman, Peter M. Head, Juan Hernández, Jr., and Juan Chapa), Acts (Christopher Tuckett), the Pauline corpus including Hebrews (James R. Royse), the Catholic Epistles (J.K. Elliot), Revelation

(Tobias Nicklas), and various versions (Peter Williams). Peter Head, in "The Early Text of Mark" (108–20), has the most arduous manuscript analysis because there is only one extant— "rather poorly preserved" (108)—papyri manuscript that qualifies as an "early text" (i.e. k<sup>45</sup>). Conversely, J.K. Elliott, in "The Early Text of the Catholic Epistles" (204–24), is able to interact with the *Novum Testamentum Graecum: Editio Critica Maior* and early papyri manuscripts. Part II is the most technical because of its strenuous, though helpful, textual analysis of individual books.

"Part III. Early Citation and Use of New Testament Writings" explores Patristic and early church literature, and their quotation and borrowing practices in order to evaluate the state of the NT text. Charles E. Hill, in "In These Very Words': Methods and Standards of Literary Borrowing in the Second Century" (261–81), evaluates early citation practices of the NT during 2<sup>nd</sup> Century literature. Providing samples of non-sacred texts (Homer, Herodotus, Platonic traditions, Philo citing Plato, Plutarch citing Philo) and sacred texts (Porphyry, Philo, Josephus, Jubilees and Pseudo-Philo, Justin), Hill concludes that a lack of accuracy in citation does not prove there is no established text. A helpful investigation for this chapter would have included consideration of how the Gospels cite OT texts; do they follow the same principles? Paul Foster, in "The Text of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers" (282–301), observes loose NT citations in the Didache, 1–2 Clement, Shepherd of Hermas, Epistle of Barnabas, Epistles of Ignatius of Antioch, and Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians and concludes that citation techniques of these Fathers prohibit any clear text forms of an established NT text (300). Dieter T. Roth, in "Marcion and the Early New Testament Text" (302–12), contends that although Marcion's text contains one Gospel and ten Pauline letters, "all readings" should be examined carefully (312), but is a limited study because Marcion's text appears only in the testimony of his opponents (303). Joseph Verheyden, in "Justin's Text of the Gospels: Another Look at the Citations in *1Apol.* 15.1–8" (313–35), evaluates how Justin comments, quotes, and alludes to various portions of the Gospels. Tjitze Baarda, in "Tatian's Diatessaron and the Greek Text of the Gospels" (336–49), attempts to answer how the Greek Diatessaron has been preserved in various versions (Syriac, Armenian, Arabic). He was initially chosen to provide textual Diatessaronic data for the first UBS edition but later withdrew after investigation because of the vast amounts of variants amongst the versions (345). Limiting the apocryphal data prior to 4<sup>th</sup> Century in Greek literature and able to find direct quotes of the NT, Stanley Porter, in "Early Apocryphal Gospels

and the New Testament Text" (350–69), examines the *Gospel of Peter*, the Egerton papyrus, P.Vindobonensis Greek 2325 (Fayyum Fragment), P.Merton II 51, P.Oxyrhynchus X 1224, the Greek *Gospel of Thomas*, and the *Protevangelium of James*. Lastly, D. Jeffrey Bingham and Billy R. Todd, Jr., ("Irenaeus's Text of the Gospels in *Adversus haeresus*," 370–92) and Carl P. Cosaert ("Clement of Alexandria's Gospel Citations," 393–413) provide highly technical comparative analysis of their respective corpus.

*The Early Text of the New Testament* provides major contributions to their relevant disciplines. One primary contribution, not as explicitly emphasized in previous decades, is vertical readings of individual manuscripts. Rather than comparing multiple manuscripts side-by-side, thereby creating multiple variants, more attention is given to individual manuscripts highlighting their scribal tendencies, codex size, reading aids (spacing, punctuation, breathing marks), and distinguishing between private and public use. Second, this source joins together two scholarly disciplines: New Testament textual criticism and early church history. Patristic textual studies are greatly enhanced by careful study of the text and observing the early use and reception of the NT text by Patristic and early literature enhances the NT discipline. Lastly, though not exhaustive, any advanced students (Th.M. or Ph.D.) needing thesis/dissertation topics in the field of text criticism and early patristic literature ought to mine the pages for ideas and tentative solutions for their writing projects.

Though an incredible source and worthy of high praise, it is not without some shortcomings. First, with a book of this magnitude, there are far too many spelling errors, character errors, and, at times, ambiguous thesis statements and portions needing further editorial revisions. Take for example the inconsistency of title spellings: "Early Citation and Use of the New Testament Writings" (19) should delete the "the", providing continuity with other occurrences (viii, 259). The papyri symbol appears in normal script (P), as opposed to gothic script (k); and, the papyri number is not super-scripted: P45 (115). ICC should read International Critical Commentary and not International Critic Commentary (xii). There are other errors as well as sentence and thesis restructuring problems ("very significant contributions to method in investigating patristic texts..." 262). Second, as can be expected with a multi-author book, not all chapters are equal and some outshine others. For example, the research and writing abilities of Elliot's chapter is exquisite and creates a standard in research that others didn't necessarily match. Lastly, this excellent book, written by top tier

scholars, is held back by a potentially truncated readership because of its steep price: \$175.00.

This book can and should influence the ongoing text critical discussions. Pertinent to future conversations, topics including “vertical readings” of manuscripts, the organization of an early text, and the usefulness of Patristic literature ought to continue. This is not a book for beginning text critical or Patristic studies students. However, any NT intellectualist, intermediate NT students, NT text critical thinkers, intrigued pastors, or any intermediate Patristic students should read this book in order to join a greater conversation that will aid their studies and make them conversant with a portion of valuable scholarship.

Shawn J. Wilhite  
Southern Seminary, Louisville, KY