

and Lamedh He verbs the paradigms are partial, with reference to the corresponding lesson for the remaining forms. Since laryngeal verbs and Pe-weak verbs are completely exhibited in Lessons X and XI, they are not included in the paradigms but there are cross references to these lessons. A thirteen-page glossary completes the material; no index is really needed because of the logical, topical organization followed throughout, the table of contents giving clear and adequate assistance in finding any topic.

The printing, done by the Jerusalem Academic Press Ltd., is excellent. A very few corrections made on the proof were overlooked. The following corrections may be noted: on page 37, the Roman numerals IX in the heading have dropped out; on page 61, fourth line of paragraph (B), the point is lost because the hypothetical הִפְעֵל * has been misprinted as הִפֵּל ; on page 100, after הִפְעֵל , instead of "haphel" it should read "h/aph.," meaning both haphel and aphel; on page 106 under רָמָה there should be added "—peil—to be thrown"; on the same page under the ש heading three words contain ש instead of שׁ ; these should read שָׁב *, שָׁבָא *, and שָׁטַר .

When the author uses his lessons in a class, the same class is enrolled in the following term for his course in Exilic Prophets in Hebrew and Aramaic, in which the Aramaic portions of Daniel are studied as well as other parts of Daniel and selected portions of Ezekiel. This is the reason why the Biblical material used for translation in the grammar book under review is drawn exclusively from Ezra (aside from the Aramaic verse in Jeremiah 10 and the Aramaic phrase in Genesis 31). Some Aramaic in Daniel may also be read in the first term following completion of these twenty lessons.

The logical and clear presentation is highly commendable; the book should be very serviceable for use in seminaries and also for independent study by those who know something of Biblical Hebrew.

Andrews University

LEONA G. RUNNING

Kubo, Sakae, *P⁷² and the Codex Vaticanus*. "Studies and Documents," ed. by Jacob Geerlings, Vol. XXVII. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1965. 196 pages. \$ 10.00.

This is a condensation of Kubo's doctoral dissertation, done under Allen Wikgren of the University of Chicago. It represents an excellent example of the new approach to textual criticism. Once the new canons for the practice of this science (or should one say art?) are accepted, the use to which Kubo puts them can only call forth our admiration for his command of the chosen methodology. He has adopted "an eclecticism in which the internal evidence outweighs the external" (p. 5) because "there is no real alternative to this rather subjective method" (p. 6).

As a preliminary step, Kubo tries to determine the text of P^{72} and B. This is done by eliminating careless or intentional substitutions of words, omissions, additions and transpositions, as well as carelessness in spelling, haplography, dittography and homoeoteleuton. The result is the evaluation of the author of P^{72} as "not the best of scribes" who "cannot in any way be compared to that of Codex Vaticanus" (p. 17). The same operation is then performed on Codex Vaticanus. The conclusion of this section is that "where one manuscript is singular, the reading of the other can be regarded as the text" (p. 21). But the necessity for this conclusion does not seem to be apparent, and what is meant by "the text" is not quite clear. It would appear that neither the basic text of P^{72} nor the basic text of B is meant.

In trying to establish P^{72} within a text type, Kubo somewhat disagrees with the conclusions of Massaux, and suggests that von Soden's system is in need of revision. In his study of 1 Peter in P^{72} , Massaux established its position within the Hesychian group, particularly close to the minuscules rather than the uncials within the group. He also found that 1 Peter in P^{72} was to be grouped with von Soden's I^{b2} classification. But Massaux classified Jude in P^{72} with von Soden's I^{b1} . Kubo reports that he has done his own study for 1 and 2 Peter and Jude, and has found P^{72} closer to B than to the minuscules in the Hesychian group. In this his results are different from Massaux's, but Kubo has also found P^{72} related to von Soden's I^{b2} (especially 1739 and 323). This leads Kubo to suggest that in reality P^{72} is not related to I^{b2} , but rather "that von Soden's classification needs to be adjusted" (p. 24). The evidence for this is given in an appendix to the author's dissertation which is not included within this volume.

Chapter III represents the major portion of the present study. In it Kubo does a careful analysis of each disagreement between the basic texts of P^{72} and B "with the view of establishing a superiority of one text over the other" (p. 31). Chapter IV, then, evaluates the combination P^{72} -B against other readings "in order to understand how they arose and to confirm on a sounder basis their inferiority" (p. 96). This evaluation, as would be expected, is done on the basis of significant representative readings only. Seventy-five readings are considered in this chapter. Of these only fourteen are found to be superior in MSS other than P^{72} and B.

Kubo's main conclusion is that " P^{72} has as a whole a text superior to that of B" (p. 152). He admits that this conclusion may be questioned on the basis of the methodology employed, but he has confidence in his method. As a corollary to this basic conclusion, Kubo suggests that the text of B "is not so free of 'improvements' of the primitive text as have [*sic.*] been thought" (p. 152).

The book includes an appendix in which the editor of the series provides a collation of Codex 904. This collation, however, has no connection with what the title announces is to be found in the book. It is to be wished that this valuable addition will not pass unnoticed in spite of its omission from the title-page.

Kubo's ability as a textual critic is well demonstrated in the body of this monograph where he patiently scrutinizes variant after variant to determine which reading has the strongest claim to originality. He is guided by the canon that the harder reading which best suits the context and which best explains the reasons for the origin of the other variants is to be preferred. There are ample examples of the author's resourcefulness in the positing of possibilities for the way in which variants may have arisen, as well as of reasons for a particular reading's claim to originality. One may have questions on some of these, but on the whole one can only show respect for a job well done. When textual criticism is carried on according to the modern canons, a true sense of the correct Greek idiom becomes an indispensable piece of equipment for the textual critic. Kubo demonstrates that he is not in want of it. This study will undoubtedly become a basic reference work for any future commentary on 1 and 2 Peter and Jude.

Since variants are discussed in two chapters and are organized within these chapters according to type, variants that stand in organic relation are often discussed in separate sections. This seems inevitable, but cross references would have helped for clarity. On page 141, e.g., the variant readings for Jude 5 are discussed rather briefly. The pronouncement which follows, "this section should then read *ἀπαξ παντῶς ὅτι θεός*," does not appear to stem from the short discussion. Five variants are listed, but only three are considered. It would seem that some reference should have been made to page 86 where the reasons for adopting the reading *θεός* are given.

Unfortunately, due to the pressures imposed by publication deadlines, the book did not receive careful proofreading and the benefit of editorial assistance. Often sentences are less clear than one would wish. It is to be hoped that a basic study of this nature will be revised for a second printing in which English grammar and syntax will be more carefully heeded. An index of Scriptural references would also greatly enhance the value of the book.

Andrews University

HEROLD WEISS

McIntyre, John, *The Shape of Christology*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1966. 180 pp. \$ 4.50. London: SCM Press, 1966. 30 sh.

The book is suggestive. This is both its strength and its weakness. The methodological analyses undertaken and their application to selected historical materials are the basis for an invitation to Christological construction. Its strength is in its unrelenting adherence to its methodological aim. Its weakness is that of all methodological treatises: we want to be told *how* to move from analysis to construction. The "shape" is not of things to come, but of what was and is. Such analysis of the situation, if it is comprehensive enough, is useful as a preliminary