

observance of the first day of the week does not come into the category of normative patterns of practice" (p. 387). But he goes on to suggest that Rev 1:10 provides "more promising data." In his view, the limited evidence of Rev 1:10 suggests that "a precedent had already been set in the practice of at least John's churches" (p. 387). It was, according to him, undergirded by the "theological rationale of Christ's lordship demonstrated in His Resurrection on the first day of the week"; and furthermore, its applicability was not just to Roman Asia nor to only the early-church period, but is one that remains in effect "throughout the church's life" (p. 388). Thus, he finds that, after all, "the practice of Sunday worship . . . lays high claim to bearing the mark of canonical authority" (ibid.).

But, pray tell, how can this diminutive and attenuated string of suppositions lead to such a lofty conclusion? It would seem that Lincoln and the other authors of this volume, in their effort to steer a course which avoids both the "sabbath-transfer theology," on the one hand, and the conclusions of Samuele Bacchiocchi in favor of the continuation of the Saturday-sabbath, on the other hand, have set forth a view of Sunday in the early Christian church which simply cannot give the day the virtually normative status that in the final analysis is here claimed for it.

The foregoing negatives do not minimize the significance of *From Sabbath to Lord's Day*. This book is an important publication, and it will undoubtedly be recognized as such by modern biblical scholarship for years to come. Its authors show an outstanding acquaintance with relevant secondary literature. In many ways, the vast amount of material to which they call attention, as well as their own incisive analysis, is instructive indeed. Their critiques of differing viewpoints are usually penetrating. As is so often the case, however, these are frequently of better quality than are their own positive contributions. In any event, this publication is one which will be—and should be—read, though such reading should necessarily be with cautions of the sort sampled in this review.

The volume contains no bibliography, but the chapters close with sections of endnotes that provide in themselves an outstandingly rich mine of information. Several helpful indexes conclude the book.

Andrews University

KENNETH A. STRAND

Hodges, Zane C., and Farstad, Arthur L., eds. *The Greek New Testament According to the Majority Text*. Nashville, Camden, and New York: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1982. xlvi + 810 pp. \$13.95.

The title clearly indicates the contents of this book. The editors, especially Hodges, have for many years promoted the Textus Receptus (TR) or the majority text. Textual critics have not generally concerned themselves

with this resurgence of the TR. They feel that that battle was fought long ago and the superiority of the TR has been discredited once and for all.

Besides the other editor of this volume, supporters of the TR are Terence Brown, David Otis Fuller, Edward F. Hills, Wilbur N. Pickering, and Jakob van Bruggen. The most influential book in promoting this point of view is that edited by Fuller, entitled *Which Bible?* (1970). Pickering and van Bruggen have presented the most significant arguments, the former in *The Identity of the New Testament Text* (1977) and the latter in *The Ancient Text of the New Testament* (1976). D. A. Carson, in *The King James Version Debate: A Plea for Realism* (1979), and Gordon Fee, in "Modern Textual Criticism and the Revival of the Textus Receptus," *JETS* 21 (1978):19-33, have most effectively refuted this point of view.

In the introduction, an explanation is given for the editors' selection of the majority text as that which represents the earliest tradition, followed by an explanation of their apparatuses, discussion of John 7:53-8:11, and a discussion of the apparatus for the Apocalypse. There is a select bibliography at the end of the volume. The text is printed in very readable type, with English subtitles.

There are two apparatuses. The first includes all the significant divisions within the surviving manuscripts, and also the differences between this text and the 1825 Oxford edition of the TR. The second apparatus includes the differences between this text and that of the United Bible Societies' and Nestle-Aland's texts which are not already included in the first apparatus.

Since the TR is characterized by fullness, the significant difference between this text and modern critical texts lies in its additional matter. The following are readings added in this text but omitted in critical texts: Matt 5:44 (parts); 6:13b; Ὑποκριταὶ and τοῦ προφήτου in 16:3-4; 17:21; 18:11; 23:14; καὶ ἐστρώννυσον εἰς τὴν ὁδὸν in Mark 11:8; 15:28; 16:9-20; ὡς καὶ Ἡλίας ἐποίησε in Luke 9:54; καὶ εἶπεν . . . ἀλλὰ σῶσαι in 9:55-56; 23:17; 24:12; καὶ λέγει . . . ὑμῖν in 24:36; 24:40; καὶ ἀνεφέρετο . . . αὐτόν in 24:51-52; ἐκδεχομένων . . . νοσήματι in John 5:3-4; 7:53-8:11; Rom 14:24-26 (instead of at 16:25-27); 16:24.

There are two significant readings, however, that have not been added in this text. These are Acts 8:37 and 1 John 5:7-8. The reason is that these do not have the support of the majority text. In Rev 22:14, this text reads "Blessed are those who do his commandments," but better manuscripts read, "Blessed are those who wash their robes."

It is unfortunate that this anachronistic text should appear at this time along with its companion volume *The New King James Version*, at a time when manuscripts of a very early age (2d and 3d century) have been discovered which contradict its claims.