

182); 9, "Zwingli's Reformation between Success and Failure" (183-199) and 10, "One Epoch—Three Reformations" (201-220).

The foregoing chapter titles indicate that the major emphasis of this volume is on Luther and the German Reformation. A reading of the chapters (or even a glance at the subtitles within the chapters) further reveals that in spite of Oberman's stated intent, as quoted above, this volume does contain a fair amount of material dealing with the Protestant Reformation as viewed from the perspective of the later Middle Ages. That such is the case is not bad, of course, but it does make certain material reiterative of what Oberman had already published earlier in book form or in other articles. For instance, the section on Gregory of Rimini unavoidably duplicates, albeit in a different manner, material which Oberman published in 1975 in *Luther and the Dawn of the Modern Era* (see my review in RQ 39 [1976]: 395-400) and *The Dawn of the Reformation* mentioned above. There is overlap, as well, with information set forth in Oberman's Luther biography, also noted above. Nevertheless, the chapters in this present volume do contain much information and many insights unique to them; furthermore, a number of readers who are unacquainted with the original German version of the articles will undoubtedly find this very-readable English translation informative indeed.

The final chapter of the book deserves special mention in view of the fact that its provocative title, "One Epoch—Three Reformations" may seem enigmatic. In essence, what Oberman does in this chapter is first, to discuss the Protestant Reformation as a "theological revolution" that must also be broadened to take into account social and political factors; second, to describe what he calls "Three Disguised Reformations"; and third, to give further attention to the aspects of reformation among "the refugees" and "deportees." The so-called "Disguised Reformations" are (1) the conciliar movement, (2) the "emancipation of the urban bourgeoisie and the establishment of urban elites" who came to have increased religiopolitical power and functions (the "priesthood of everyone eligible to serve on the council was the disguised revolution carried out by the Reformation at Zurich" [212]), and (3), the "universalization" that became characteristic of Calvin's reform movement in Geneva (as contrasted with the "localization" in Zurich).

Again, as in his previous publications, Oberman has made available to us not only a considerable amount of significant information but also a multitude of his characteristically keen insights. His *The Reformation: Roots and Ramifications* is a volume well worth reading (and well worth the somewhat steep price). Three indexes conclude the volume: "Index of Persons" (223-225), "Index of Modern Authors" (227-229), and "Index Verborum Latinarum" (231-232).

Andrews University

KENNETH A. STRAND

Paroschi, Wilson. *Crítica Textual do Novo Testamento* [Textual Criticism of the New Testament]. São Paulo, Brazil: Sociedade Religiosa Edições Vida Nova, 1993. 248 pp. n.p.

This book is a pioneer work in the field of NT textual criticism in South America. It provides a concise introduction to the history of transmission of the

NT text, and to the theory of textual criticism, including the criteria used to establish the original reading. The author leads the readers through the steps involved in the evaluation of variant readings by analyzing several difficult texts. The book is well documented and provides appendixes containing 4 graphs, 17 plates of manuscripts, papyrus, and NT editions.

Berrien Springs, MI 49103

JOAQUIM AZEVEDO

Saldarini, Anthony J. *Matthew's Christian-Jewish Community*. Chicago Studies in the History of Judaism. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997. 326 pp. \$42.00.

Stanton, Graham N. *A Gospel for A New People: Studies in Matthew*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1992; Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 1993. xiv + 424 pp. \$21.00.

Saldarini presents here the fullest application yet of sociological methods to the Gospel of Matthew. Other notable forays using this approach in Matthean studies include J. Andrew Overman's *Matthew's Gospel and Formative Judaism*, and the essays coming out of the conference on "The Social History of the Matthean Community in Roman Syria" held at Southern Methodist University and reported in *Social History of the Matthean Community: Cross-Disciplinary Approaches*, edited by David Balch and including an essay by Saldarini. In Matthew's Christian-Jewish community, as well as that earlier essay, Saldarini applies sociological studies of deviance, particularly those of Nachman Ben-Yehuda in *Deviance and Moral Boundaries*, and Kai Erikson (which he consistently misspells as Ericson) in *Wayward Puritans*.

It is on this point that Saldarini's thesis stands or falls. While his use of a sociological approach is clearly the most appealing and intriguing feature of Saldarini's work, it also represents its greatest weakness. Saldarini does not quite avoid the danger of importing something from the twentieth century into his reading of this first-century document. His approach invalidates the native's (in this case, Matthew's) self-description. For surely the implication of passages such as 1:21; 16:18-19; 21:43; and 23:13 is that the Matthean community is a distinct entity.

Saldarini's insistence on deviant groups being an essential and integral part of a society raises some interesting questions. First of all, which society? Roman? Jewish? This aspect of deviance theory depends on the notion of society as a closed group. That may be the case for seventeenth-century Puritans, but it cannot be so for Matthew's relation to Jewish groups in Roman Antioch. While Jewish groups must play some role in the larger Roman society, did Jewish society constitute a closed environment? Then there is the further problem of determining when a group would become a distinct sociological entity. Saldarini doesn't give any clear criteria for determining this. If Matthew's group is no longer associated with the synagogue (Saldarini doesn't specify whether they withdrew or were expelled) and has its own leadership and structure (including discipline), in what way is it not a separate and distinct entity? Saldarini has a point when he argues that it acts like a deviant group in recruiting members, but it is not clear that Matthew's group