

Schlatter, his times, and his Christology are comprehensive (within the scope of his focus) and compelling. This book deserves wide and careful reading. It should also spark interest in exploration of Schlatter's underrated dogmatics in numerous other directions.

ROBERT W. YARBROUGH

Professor of New Testament
Covenant Theological Seminary
Saint Louis, MO

Martin Wallraff, Silvana Seidel Menchi, and Kaspar von Greyerz, eds. *Basel 1516: Erasmus' Edition of the New Testament*. Spätmittelalter, Humanismus, Reformation 91. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016. Pp. xix + 319.

As the editors explain in the preface (p. x), this volume on Erasmus's 1516 edition of the New Testament reproduces contributions to a commemorative conference on Erasmus in Basel in late summer 2014. Thus, the date of the conference corresponds to the five-hundredth anniversary of the arrival of Erasmus in Basel in 1514, and the date of the publication of this volume marks the five-hundredth anniversary of the publication of Erasmus's groundbreaking New Testament.

Basel 1516: Erasmus' Edition of the New Testament contains studies by sixteen international scholars. While four chapters are in German, most were written in English, and a few (originally written in French, Spanish, and Italian) were translated into English. Naturally, given the location of the conference, several Swiss scholars participated, but there were also Dutch scholars (from the country of Erasmus's birth) and representatives from Canada, England, France, Spain, and Italy. The reading of the volume is facilitated by a detailed preface by the three editors and English abstracts following each article. The book contains numerous reproductions of pages of editions and manuscripts, figures, and charts. While there is an index of proper names, an index of sources and topics would have been helpful.

The chapters introduce either the results of many years of studies on Erasmus or newer approaches to his contributions as a humanist. For instance, Erika Rummel, who penned *Erasmus' Annotations on the New Testament: From Philologist to Theologian* (1986), and Jan Krans, who wrote *Beyond What Is Written: Erasmus and Beza as Conjectural Critics of the New Testament* (2006), both contributed to the volume. Others are actively involved in the critical edition of Erasmus by Brill (Erasmus's *Opera Omnia* [1969–] = ASD): Andrew J. Brown, for example, edited several of the volumes of the text of *Novum Testamentum*, and Mielske van Poll-van de Lisdonk is

involved in the edition of the *Annotations*. In this edition, the texts connected to the *Novum Testamentum*, Latin and Greek text, annotations, and prefaces have either been recently published or are in preparation. Some of the essays, by contrast, reflect more emerging studies. Martin Wallraff, for his part, explores the neglected paratexts (i.e., accompanying materials such as introduction, apparatus, and notes) to the various editions of the *Novum Testamentum*, and Valentina Sebastini explores the marketing of Erasmus's New Testament.

This collection of essays, as hinted at in the preface, reveals that there are a variety of views about Erasmus and his New Testament. Thus, it will be helpful to consider the following questions in relation to this book. When was the idea of the *Novum Testamentum* conceived? What is the relationship between the Greek text and the Latin translation in Erasmus's project? How do we evaluate him as a New Testament text critic? In what ways do his endeavors relate to those of the Reformers?

Regarding the origin of the *Novum Testamentum*, the book follows Brown's groundbreaking study, where he shows that the Latin translation dates from 1516, not from ten years earlier, as P. S. Allen and many others claim (p. 14, n. 32; cf. p. xiii and Mark Vessey's essay).

The discussion of the relative importance of the Greek text vis-à-vis the Latin translation is influenced by the claim by Henk Jan de Jonge that for Erasmus, the role of the Greek text was secondary to establishing an accurate Latin translation (p. 15, n. 35; cf. pp. xiv–xv). Krans underlines the significance of the Greek text five hundred years later, but claims that ironically it was “not Erasmus' main concern” (p. 187). By a consideration of understudied elements of Erasmus's edition, Krans shows that Erasmus's chief goal was “deconstruction [and correction] of the Vulgate” (p. 205). Historically speaking, the Greek text had the last word (p. xviii). Rummel observes a crucial difference between the Complutensian Polyglot and Erasmus's edition: “[The former] corrected the Greek text on the basis of Greek manuscripts, the Latin Vulgate by collating Latin texts. ... Erasmus ... did not shy away from changing the Vulgate text on the basis of the Greek original” (p. 40), a much more radical approach at the time! On the subject of the connection to the Complutensian Polyglot, Ignacio García Pinilla proposes, in contrast to previous views and partly based on the analysis of readings in John, that Erasmus's New Testament was likely relying on the Polyglot.

Text critics have usually offered a negative assessment of Erasmus's work as a text critic, especially as his work helped shape the *Textus Receptus*, which such critics view as representing New Testament manuscripts of lesser worth. Patrick Andrist, by studying the “structure and history” of the

Greek manuscripts used by Erasmus, concludes that he employed “not five but up to eight biblical direct witnesses to the New Testament” (p. 124). Thus, Erasmus would have access to a greater variety of textual evidence. Brown offers a reassessment of the “textual character” of Erasmus’s Greek text; he offers a more positive picture of Erasmus as a textual critic partly by challenging the consensus about the Byzantine manuscripts and the criteria of the “shorter reading” and the “harder reading” (pp. 138–42). Krans advances a different view: though he acknowledges Erasmus to be an “astute” text critic, he considers that he got into difficulty by correcting the Latin Vulgate with the help of Byzantine manuscripts (pp. 203–6). Christine Christ-von Wedel uncovers the limitations of the Erasmus-Beza paradigm and the merits of later efforts of text critics such as Hugo Grotius and Jean Le Clerc (pp. 300–309). Though different opinions arise here, a more positive picture of Erasmus as text critic emerges.

The complexity of Erasmus’s relation to the Reformation is reflected in this volume. Rummel shows how Erasmus tempered his criticisms of the Catholic Church as the Reformation gained ground (p. 41). Silvana Seidel Menchi argues that Erasmus’s declining interest in translating the New Testament into the vernacular (expressed early in the *Paraclesis*) was not chiefly the result of accusations of heresy against him, but rather due to the success of the Reformation on this front (pp. 220–21). Marie Barral-Baron claims that Erasmus intended “a return of the Golden Age” through a biblical renewal with his 1516 New Testament, but that instead he unintentionally pushed the rift in the church that resulted in the Lutheran Reformation (pp. 253–54). Greta Kroeker shows, by contrast, how Erasmus impacted Catholic cardinals (e.g., Jacopo Sadoletto). Sundar Henny discusses the impact of Erasmus on Beza: though Beza was more open to the Semitic character of the New Testament than Erasmus, Beza relied on the authority of Erasmus’s Greek text for the church. Christ-von Wedel points to aspects of the Reformation in which Erasmus anticipated the Reformers (pp. 292–300).

Basel 1516 is a must-read for those interested in Erasmus and his *Novum Testamentum*. It provides a one-stop compendium of up-to-date research, well grounded in previous scholarship and open to new vistas. It will be of interest not only to historians of the Renaissance and the Reformation, but also to New Testament scholars.

BERNARD AUBERT

Westminster Theological Seminary
Philadelphia, PA