principal parts of "difficult" verbs, and paradigms). The work is completed by 5 indexes.

The order in which material is tackled is unusual: after a succinct discussion of the alphabet, Swetnam begins with the verb "to be", running rapidly through the present and imperfect indicative, the infinitive, imperative, subjunctive, optative and participle (lessons 2-8). Concurrently, the student is introduced to adjectives, second and first declension nouns, use of the cases, Greek punctuation, demonstrative pronouns, personal and reflexive pronouns, and the accusative and infinitive construction. All this in 7 lessons! Then follow the present and imperfect indicative active of *luō*, and the third declension (lesson 12), the present subjunctive and optative (in full), present infinitive and participle of *luō* together with *tis* (lessons 11-16), the aorist and perfect active (all moods). The middle voice is thoroughly covered in lessons 26-35 (along with comparatives of adjectives, irregular adjectives, and verbs with consonant stems), and the passive in lessons 37-40. Next come "strong" aorists, deponent verbs, contract verbs, and *-mi* verbs (given in full). The morphology section is completed in lesson 67 by a short section on transcribing Greek into the roman alphabet. Lessons 68-81 cover syntax. The remaining lessons (82-100) are readings from the Gospel of John.

So much for a general description and some "plusses". What about "minusses"? There are a few misprints (a small number, considering the length of the text), and occasional unidiomatic sentences for translation. In common with many other course books, the author says virtually nothing about semitic influence on NT Greek usage. In the early chapters the sentences for translation are not always very close to the cited NT parallels; in the first part of the book I think most students would find working through the prescribed verses of Mark heavy going, containing as they do much unfamiliar morphology and vocabulary. More seriously, the very thoroughness of this work is bound to prove a problem for all but the most able students. One wonders whether, for the average student, some of the detail would not be better postponed until it is met in the course of exegetical study.

On the other hand, anyone who wants to have the kind of thorough, active knowledge of Greek once common among those trained in the Classics, will benefit immensely from this book. I believe it could prove a most useful help to Bible translators, especially to those who have already completed a more simplified course.

RUTH B. EDWARDS

Patzia, Arthur G.: **The Making of the New Testament: Origin, Collection, Text and Canon.** Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press 1995. 205 pp, $14.95. ISBN 0 8308 1859 6.

Patzia, who teaches New Testament at Fuller Theological Seminary in Northern California, has written a volume that is intended for the non-specialist and that should be most useful for this intended audience. He summarizes the main lines of NT scholarship, looking in Part I at the literary world of the early church. Parts II-IV look at how the Gospels, Paul's letters and the remaining NT writings were written and collected. Part V examines the criteria of canonicity, and Parts VI and VII focus on the copying and transmission of NT manuscripts.

This is not a study of the NT text itself or its meaning. As the subtitle indicates, this is a study of the origin, transmission, and collection of the NT writings, written

for the layperson or beginning student. Translators without a seminary education will find much valuable information here, presented clearly and judiciously.

This volume is a good summary of mainline conservative biblical scholarship. But it also continues to repeat some things that should no longer be claimed. P. writes, regarding $\mathfrak{P}^{52}$, "Its discovery in Egypt shows that the Gospel of John had circulated in this area by the first half of the 2nd century A.D. This is quite amazing when one considers that the Gospel was written in Ephesus near the end of the 1st century A.D." (114-15). Because P. is not alone in making this unfounded claim, I quote the recent comment by Bart Ehrman:

> Once it was recognized that [$\mathfrak{P}^{52}$]...could be paleographically dated to the first half of the 2d century, scholars had a field day with the possible implications, some claiming that it demonstrates that the Fourth Gospel must have been penned by the end of the 1st century, others asserting that it documents the presence of Christians in Middle Egypt by 125 C.E.,...the fact is that we can only approximate the date of this fragment's production within fifty years at best (it could as easily have been transcribed in 160 as 110). Moreover we do not know exactly where the fragment was discovered, let alone where it was written, or how it came to be discarded, or when it was. As a result, all extravagant claims notwithstanding, the papyrus itself reveals nothing definite about the early history of Christianity in Egypt. One can only conclude that scholars have construed it as evidence because, in lieu of other evidence, they have chosen to. [Ehrman and Holmes, ed.,"The Text As Window" (371-72) in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research*, 1995.]

In his discussion of the changes that scribes made in the manuscripts that they copied, P. states, "Heretics were both able and willing to change the text or to twist its meaning" (145). To quote again from Ehrman, "...all of the intolerant parties [in the early church] appear certain of their own interpretations, which means among other things that every group understood itself to be orthodox...and every other group to be heretical" [*The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture*, 1993, 11]. To claim that "heretics" "twisted" the meaning implies a deliberate rejection of what they knew to be the true meaning. Such a claim falsifies history and ignores the fact that the "orthodox" scribes themselves of the 2nd and 3rd centuries occasionally altered their sacred texts for polemical reasons.

A ten-page Glossary explains technical terms and concepts and identifies places and things. The definition of the terms "Apocrypha/Apocryphal" is clearly written from a Protestant perspective, with no reference to the term "Deuterocanonical." Codex Bezae (D) is incorrectly identified as "a sixth-century uncial manuscript containing the Gospels, Acts and Paul's Letters." P. has been confused by the fact that two manuscripts share the symbol "D": Codex Bezae (D or 05) is a 5th century manuscript containing the Gospels and Acts, and Codex Claromontanus (D or 06) is a 6th century manuscript of Paul's letters.

This volume has twenty-two pages of endnotes that contain much useful information and valuable bibliographic help. On p 186, note 55, P. incorrectly includes a 1991 article by D.B. Wallace among a list of writings that defend the

Byzantine text. That article is, in fact, a refutation of the claims made about the superiority of the Textus Receptus/Majority Text.

ROGER L. OMANSON

NOTE

Contributors are asked to use the following system of transliteration from the Hebrew:

HEBREW			HEBREW		
א		'	ל		l
ב	}	b	מ		m
ב			נ		n
ג	}	g	ס		s
ג			ע		‘
ד	}	d	פ	}	p
ך			פ		
ה		h	צ		ts
ו		w	ק		q
ז		z	ר		r
ח		ch	שׂ		ś
ט		ṭ	שׁ		sh
י		y	ת	}	t
כ	}	k	ת		
כ					

Short vowels unmarked; long vowels both full and defective marked with circumflex (â); vocal and composite shewas marked with tilde (ā).