

intentional on the side of Joel and partly intentional on the side of the editor(s) of the Book of the Twelve.

Joel and Amos, for example, influence each other, and Seitz declares that “we have a mutual influencing of Amos and Joel, with an expectation that this is intended to have us attend to both contexts and their present association as well” (p. 212). Who intends what? Does Joel intend to work with Amos? Did Joel and Amos collaborate (cf. p. 65)? Did the editor place Joel and Amos alongside one another to create this association (p. 213 n. 39)? One must, however, grant that the interplay of author and editor is clouded in history, and so one cannot fault Seitz too strongly for his occasional lack of clarity.

In other places, he is much clearer. For example, Seitz argues that Joel is aware of Isaiah 13, Jeremiah 14, Exodus 10, and certain psalms. Joel thus draws on these passages for his day of the Lord theology (p. 63). In speaking of the day of the Lord within the Book of the Twelve, Seitz argues that Joel anticipates dedications of the day of the Lord in other books of the Twelve as well (p. 63). He then says, “His [Joel’s] intention is, in our view, to cooperate with them, so that the generations he anticipates as hearers of his testimony might hear him alongside them” (p. 63). Seitz sees Joel as self-consciously hoping his book would be read in the future with other prophetic books.

Lest my review seem overly negative, I would like to recount a number of virtues of the commentary. First, as mentioned, Seitz uniquely outlines Joel’s argument and the argument plays a strategic role throughout the commentary. Second, Seitz interacts with and knows well the academic literature discussing Joel. Third, Seitz skillfully outlines the theological subject matter found with Joel.

Even with its faults, Seitz’s contribution to the ITC series and to biblical commentary literature as a whole must be recognized. The ITC series, and Seitz’s Joel commentary in particular, breathe fresh air into the commentary genre because *Joel* focuses on the theological content of the book. Christian leaders, scholars, and pastors will benefit from reading Seitz’s volume in order to understand the theological import of Joel within the canon.

Wyatt A. Graham

The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Hamilton, ON

*The Language and Literature of the New Testament: Essays in Honor of Stanley E. Porter’s 60<sup>th</sup> Birthday.* Edited by Lois Fuller Dow, Craig A. Evans, and Andrew W. Pitts. Biblical Interpretation Series 150. Leiden: Brill, 2016, xxv + 821 pp., \$271.00.

This *Festschrift* honoring Stanley Porter contains 32 essays organized in two parts, “The Texts and Language of the New Testament” (13 essays) and “The Literature and Theology of the New Testament” (19 essays). One essay is in German; all other essays are in English. The volume commences with a 60-page essay on “Interdisciplinary New Testament Scholarship: An Introduction to the Research of Professor Stanley E. Porter” by his former student, Andrew Pitts, who also served as one of the editors. As Pitts notes, while Porter is primarily known for his work

in Greek language and linguistics, he is a noted practitioner of interdisciplinary scholarship as evidenced by his numerous contributions to a large variety of fields. Pitts proceeds to discuss Porter's contribution as an editor; in papyrology, text criticism, and canon studies; NT Greek grammatical and linguistic study; translation theory and application; Pauline studies; historical Jesus research; Synoptic Gospels and Luke-Acts research; Johannine studies; hermeneutics, history of interpretation, and interpretive methodologies; rhetorical criticism; the social world of the NT; the use of the OT in the NT; and pedagogy and philosophy of education/scholarship.

"Part 1: The Texts and Language of the New Testament" contains the following essays: (1) "Setting Scholarship Back a Hundred Years? Method in the Septuagint Commentary Series" (Richard S. Hess; 6 pp.); (2) "The Past, Present, and Future of the OpenText.org Annotated Greek Corpus" (Christopher D. Land and Francis G. H. Pang; 37 pp.); (3) "Computer-Aided Linguistic Analysis for a Single Manuscript Witness: Preparing to Map the OpenText.org Annotation" (Catharine Smith and Matthew Brook O'Donnell; 32 pp.); (4) "Überlegungen zur angeblichen Textverderbnis von Apg 17,27 (Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis) und zu Joh 8,25" (Hans Förster; 20 pp.); (5) "Restoring a Vernacular Form of the Word for 'Glass' in the Text of Revelation" (John A. L. Lee; 12 pp.); (6) "Sense Units and Manuscript Families: A Test Proposal" (Sean A. Adams; 31 pp.); (7) "Christian Demographics and the Dates of Early New Testament Papyri" (Craig A. Evans; 17 pp.); (8) "The Use of Greek in First-Century Palestine: An Issue of Method in Dialogue with Scott D. Charlesworth" (Hughson T. Ong; 19 pp.); (9) "Grappling with Paul's Language: How a Greek Might Struggle" (R. Dean Anderson; 20 pp.); (10) "Exploring Linguistic Variation in an Ancient Greek Single-Author Corpus: A Register Design Analysis of Josephus and Pauline Pseudonymity" (Andrew W. Pitts and Joshua D. Tyra; 27 pp.); (11) "*Oum* in the New Testament: The Minimal Semantic Contribution of a Discourse Marker" (Cynthia Long Westfall; 19 pp.); (12) "The Telic Conjunctions of Isaiah 6:9–10 in Mark's Mythopoeia" (Thomas R. Hatina; 25 pp.); and (13) "Greek Tenses in John's Apocalypse: Issues in Verbal Aspect, Discourse Analysis, and Diachronic Change" (Buist M. Fanning; 26 pp.). Some of these studies contribute to a minor detail in biblical and/or linguistic research (e.g. Förster, Lee, Hatina), while others have broader relevance (e.g. Evans, Ong, Anderson).

"Part 2: The Literature and Theology of the New Testament" features the following essays: (14) "The Gospel according to Malachi" (Mark J. Boda; 14 pp.); (15) "*Sēmeia*, Signs, as a Hyperlink between the Fourth Gospel and the Greek Pentateuch" (Ronald D. Peters; 27 pp.); (16) "The Authentication of John: Self-Disclosure, Testimony, and Verification in John 21:24" (Charles E. Hill; 40 pp.); (17) "Getting Along: Politeness Theory and the Gospels" (Jonathan M. Watt; 17 pp.); (18) "The Structure and Content of Stephen's Speech compared to Old Testament Credos" (Thomas H. Olbricht; 16 pp.); (19) "Minding the Gap: Why Paul's Conversion Matters in Christology" (Darrell Bock; 11 pp.); (20) "Introducing Foreign Deities: The Documentary Evidence" (Eckhard J. Schnabel; 39 pp.); (21) "The Apostle of the Heretics?" (James D. G. Dunn; 15 pp.); (22) "Habakkuk, Paul, and the End of Empire: A Fresh Perspective on Romans 13:1–7" (Nicholas Perrin; 19 pp.); (23) "The Apostle and the Doctor: Lloyd-Jones on Romans" (Stephen

Westerholm; 19 pp.); (24) “A Comparison of the Fruit of the Spirit in Galatians 5:22–23 with Ancient Thought on Ethics and Emotion” (Craig S. Keener; 25 pp.); (25) “To Incline Another’s Heart: The Role of Attitude in Reader Positioning” (James D. Dvorak; 26 pp.); (26) “‘Think’ and ‘Do’ Like the Role Models: Paul’s Teaching on the Christian Life in Philippians” (Jae Hyun Lee; 19 pp.); (27) “Post-colonial Perspectives on Paul’s ‘Jew-Gentile Problem’” (Christopher D. Stanley; 16 pp.); (28) “A Reexamination of Paul’s Opponents in Colossians” (David L. Mathewson; 20 pp.); (29) “First Timothy 5:18 and Early Canon Consciousness: Reconsidering a Problematic Text” (Michael J. Kruger; 21 pp.); (30) “The Epistle of James and the Maccabean Martyr Tradition: An Exploration of Sacred Tradition in the New Testament” (Bryan R. Dyer; 21 pp.); (31) “Common Exegetical Fallacies in New Testament Scholarship Rectifiable through External Evidence” (Craig L. Blomberg; 16 pp.); and (32) “Jesus is God with Us: Applying Porter’s Criteria for the Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament to the Theme of Divine Presence” (Beth M. Stovell; 26 pp.).

Due to my own previous research, I was particularly interested in Ronald Peters’s work on *sēmeia* (signs) as a hyperlink between John’s Gospel and the Greek Pentateuch. Peters discusses John’s use of “signs” within the framework of hypotext (the LXX) and hypertext (John’s Gospel), arguing, “John’s intention was that the observant reader would intuitively discern the hypertextual relationship, which would then influence his or her understanding of the hypertext. In this manner, the hypotext serves as a hermeneutical guide to the hypertext” (p. 395). Peters writes, “I am not aware of a study that considers John’s use of *signs*, among other terms, as part of a broad, comprehensive program of literary and theological production” (p. 385 n. 25). While this may be technically accurate, it is unfortunate that Peters is apparently unaware of studies such as my own that have sought to probe literary and theological connections between LXX references to *sēmeia* and the Fourth Gospel. This may reflect the frequent compartmentalization in biblical research that separates scholars working with a given methodology from others working from a different vantage point and shows the need for greater interdisciplinary work (something for which the honoree is commended in this volume). Peters’s study is also limited by the fact that he only considers the Greek Pentateuch but not the prophetic literature. However, consideration of Isaiah’s use of “signs” terminology, in particular, is vital for a full exploration of the subject (note that Peters himself in his conclusion stresses the need for a comprehensive reading; p. 396). The author also does not consider the temple cleansing as a possible Johannine sign but moves straight from John 2:1–11 to 2:23–25 even though the word *sēmeion* is found in John 2:18.

Another essay that caught my attention is Charles Hill’s fine study of John 21:24 in which the author shows that the “we” in the phrase “and we know that his testimony is true” is likely an authorial “we,” authenticating the contents of the entire Gospel. As Hill notes, this renders proponents of a form of the “Johannine community hypothesis” without a key text in support of their position. Hill’s work here stands in close harmony with my own work on the authorial “I” in the phrase “I suppose” in John 21:25.

Readers of this *Journal* may also be interested in Michael Kruger's conclusion in his article on the source of Paul's quotation in 1 Tim 5:18b: "While Luke seems to be the preferable option [to Q], ... the importance lies in the fact that 1 Tim 5:18b reveals that Christians, at least by the beginning of the second century, had already begun to conceive of a new corpus of writings—writings about Jesus—as bearing scriptural authority. This fact alone ought to reshape the way we think about the development of the New Testament canon" (p. 694).

This is not the place to discuss and critique each essay in detail (nor do I possess the technical expertise to do so for each article). Most students and scholars will skim the "Table of Contents" and identify one or several essays in their area(s) of interest and interact with those. The collection impresses with its vast scope of areas covered, reflecting the span of research interests of the honoree. Given Porter's relatively young age, the present volume is only a snapshot of his contributions to date with doubtless many more to follow. Yet this collection of essays reveals that already at the present time Porter clearly has made a considerable impact on his scholarly peers because of both the quality and the quantity of his work.

Andreas J. Köstenberger  
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wake Forest, NC

*Copying Early Christian Texts: A Study of Scribal Practice.* By Alan Mugridge. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 362. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016, xx + 558 pp., €159.00.

*Copying Early Christian Texts* is the published version of Alan Mugridge's 2010 Ph.D. thesis from the University of New England (New South Wales). According to Mugridge, the research tests the common assumption "that most Christian texts were produced 'in house' by Christian copyists who were mostly unskilled" (p. vii). Mugridge has compiled and processed mountains of papyrological data to discover whether this assumption is true, resulting in a work that is highly technical but supremely informative.

The foundation of Mugridge's analysis consists of 548 manuscripts, or more specifically, 548 catalogue entries of manuscripts. These 548 entries are divided into two data sets, each of which is subdivided into groups. Of the "Christian papyri," there are: OT texts (Group A); NT texts (B); "apocryphal" texts (C); patristic texts (D); hagiographic texts (E); liturgical hymns, prayers, etc. (F); Gnostic and Manichaean texts (I); and unidentified Christian texts (J). For comparison, Mugridge also includes in his study five groups of "non-Christian papyri": amulets (Group G); magical texts (H); Jewish OT texts (K1); other Jewish texts (K2); and school texts (L). Mugridge frequently refers to collections of manuscripts by their group designation. Some individual manuscripts have multiple entries. Codex Sinaiticus, for example, is 12 in Group A (OT texts), 150 in Group B (NT texts), and because it contains the Epistle of Barnabas and Shepherd of Hermas, 302 in Group D (patristic texts).