

## Erratum

*Jesus in Memory: Traditions in Oral and Scribal Perspectives*, edited by WERNER H. KELBER AND SAMUEL BYRSKOG. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2009. 291 pp. \$49.95.

*Jesus in Memory* commemorates and appraises Birger Gerhardsson's theories on the transmission of the Gospel tradition, especially as found in his landmark *Memory and Manuscript*. Byrskog's introduction provides background on the development of Gerhardsson's theories, focusing primarily on his disagreements with form criticism and desire to break the method's hegemony on Gospels scholarship. Byrskog also describes Gerhardsson's subsequent scholarly contributions, which is particularly helpful because many scholars equate Gerhardsson with his *Memory and Manuscript* (ignoring the rest of his corpus) and because some of his subsequent research was not in English.

Christophet Tuckett's "Form Criticism" functions as an introduction to form criticism, Gerhardsson's disagreements with form criticism, and the subsequent discussion of NT scholarship on the issues up until the present. Tuckett shows clearly where form criticism has been open to critical disagreement, which Gerhardsson often initially voiced. He also, however, reminds readers of the lasting contributions of form criticism, including areas where Gerhardsson agreed with Bultmann and Dibelius.

"The Jesus Tradition as Oral Tradition," by Terence Mournet, engages Gerhardsson's "rabbinical model" of Gospel transmission. Mournet contrasts it with the "literary model" of oral tradition associated with the form critics and the "orality model" of Dunn and himself. Along the way, Mournet clarifies mischaracterizations of Gerhardsson's model (such as that by Bailey), but ultimately argues that the orality model best accounts for the character of the Jesus tradition as fixed and flexible.

David Aune's "Jesus Tradition and the Pauline Letters" makes a fresh contribution to discussions of Jesus tradition in the Pauline corpus and the canonical formation of that corpus. After covering previous discussion of Paul's knowledge of Jesus tradition, beginning with Gerhardsson, Aune proposes that Paul's epistles themselves functioned originally as *aides-mémoire* ("memory-aids") for Pauline interaction with his churches, and eventually as *lieux de mémoire* ("memory-sites") for Christian appropriation of the Pauline tradition. As such, he helpfully conceptualizes Pauline appeals to Jesus tradition, the authorship of Pauline and deuteropauline epistles, and the formation of the Pauline canon as parts of the construction and maintenance of early Christian identity.

Jaffee's brave "Honi the Circler in Manuscript and Memory" addresses the problematic issue of identifying oral tradition in written texts. This chapter's inherently hypothetical "re-oralizing" of rabbinic written tradition is open to criticism at multiple levels, not the least of which is Jaffee's foundational assertion that "all rabbinic tradition of whatever sort" can be

broken into one-breath units (94). That rabbinic tradition can be broken down in such a manner is clear; whether that procedure helps, ultimately, in reconstructing the oral tradition underlying it is not. Jaffee is aware of the tendentious nature of his proposal (see esp. 96–97), however, and on this account one can characterize his chapter as brave because he refuses to be paralyzed by the unknowns about the transmission of rabbinic tradition. Rather, he proceeds in light of his reasoned assumptions about oral tradition and the rabbinic tradition. Others may disagree with his reconstruction of the oral-performative nature of the rabbinic texts concerning Honi, but thanks to the new ground Jaffee has broken, there is something to disagree about and a platform upon which future proposals may build.

Loveday Alexander's lengthy "Memory and Tradition in the Hellenistic Schools" balances Jaffee's focus upon the re-oralization of rabbinic tradition by studying the re-oralization of texts and traditions in Hellenistic pedagogy. This contribution follows Gerhardsson's suggestion for further studies comparing memorial functions in early Christianity with those of the Hellenistic school. One important contribution is Alexander's thorough descriptions, with multiple examples, of the technical language of commemorative processes used by Justin Martyr, Papias, and others.

Alan Kirk's "Memory" argues that, while Gerhardsson was entirely correct to posit the role of memory in the formation of the Jesus tradition, in contrast to the form critics who offered it no place in the discussion, his conception of the memorial-traditioning process was based on a fixed-text model of repetition (156). Based upon more recent research, Kirk argues persuasively that the relationship between memory and both oral and written transmission processes is even more variable than Gerhardsson had envisioned.

Werner Kelber, an early critic of Gerhardsson and, in some sense, the co-founder with Gerhardsson of media studies within NT scholarship, ends the volume with his appreciative essay, "The Work of Birger Gerhardsson in Perspective." At points, Kelber concedes that his prior criticism of Gerhardsson was wrong (on, for example, Gerhardsson's conception of the nature of oral and textual tradition, 255 n. 21); at other points, Kelber continues to disagree with Gerhardsson (on, for example, the usefulness of Lord's studies of Yugoslavian bards for understanding the oral Jesus tradition, 180). In general, however, Kelber's insightful essay, which mimics the outline of the volume as a whole and provides commentary on each of the previous chapters' respective contributions, is a fitting conclusion that demonstrates the immense contributions of Gerhardsson.

This volume is ideal for scholars desiring an entrée into Gerhardsson's work or issues of orality, textuality, and memory more broadly, as well as scholars who are well-versed in these areas. It appropriately offers tribute to Gerhardsson in a manner that makes clear the past, present, and future of an exciting area of NT scholarship he helped create.

Paul, His Letters, and Acts, by THOMAS E. PHILLIPS. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2009. 256 pp. \$24.95.

Thomas E. Phillips compares and contrasts Paul as described in Luke's Acts and Paul as described in the undisputed epistles. In the first chapter, "The Plurality of Plausible Pauls," Phillips summarizes two books, Bruce Chilton's *Rabbi Paul* and *In Search of Paul* by John Dominic Crossan and Jonathan Reed. Phillips uses these works to demonstrate the current state of Pauline scholarship. Some scholars (such as Crossan and Reed) contend that the Paul of Acts bears little resemblance to the historical Paul, while other scholars (such as Chilton) contend the opposite.

In the second chapter, "Paul, Let me Introduce you to Paul," Phillips outlines the 1845 work of F. C. Baur, who argued that the Paul of the undisputed epistles is historical, while the Paul of Acts is historically suspect. For a century the discussion on the historical reliability began and ended with Baur. Phillips also summarizes the work of John Knox and Philip Vielhauer, who wrote one hundred years after Baur. Phillips demonstrates how Knox and Vielhauer answered criticism of Baur's work, in essence continuing in much the same vein as he.

In the second chapter Phillips also sets out his methodology for examining the Paul of the letters and the Paul of Acts: (1) independent inquiry into Acts and the letters, (2) intentional separation of Paul's life and thought, (3) conscious focus upon lesser data sets; and (4) disciplined comparison moving from the lesser data sets to the greater data sets.

In chapters 3–6 Phillips uses this methodology as he examines four aspects of Paul's life. In chapter 3 he examines the chronology of Paul's life. In chapter 4 he examines Paul's place in the Greco-Roman world. In chapter 5 he examines Paul's relationship to the church and the participants of the Jerusalem conference. In chapter 6 he examines Paul's relationship to his associates, his converts, and Apollos. In each of these chapters, Phillips first examines the Pauline data set (the undisputed Epistles) and then the Acts data set, and he concludes by comparing the data sets.

Phillips's conclusions are traditional ones, and while he notes the divergences between the Paul of Acts and the Paul of the Letters, he does not attempt to reconcile these divergences. Rather, in his conclusion Phillips suggests two interesting and closely connected reasons that there is such a difference between the Paul of Acts and the Paul of the Letters. First, Phillips contends that Acts attempts to rehabilitate Paul for the post-Pauline churches. Second, Phillips also suggests that the rehabilitation of Paul was one of Luke's major purposes for writing Acts: that Luke rehabilitated Paul by giving him a more impressive pedigree, by giving his financial status a boost, and by establishing Paul's place within the church by connecting him more closely to the Jerusalem church. Phillips also suggests that "this rehabilitated Paul recognized James's authority to interpret the OT law for the Gentile church and gladly announced the decision that James handed down—things the historical Paul would never have done" (196).

Phillips's book is a welcome addition to the discussion of the historical Paul. Phillips does a good job of succinctly describing the seminal work of

Baur. His discussion of Knox and Vielhauer, along with the more recent works of Chilton, Crossan, and Reed demonstrates the varied approaches to the differences between the Paul of the Letters and the Paul of Acts. It is worth noting that the five works that Phillips addresses in the first two chapters all discuss the historical reliability of Acts. His own analysis of Paul in chapters 3–6, while recognizing the divergences between the Letters and Acts, carefully avoids getting entangled in debate about the historical reliability of Acts.

Phillips's suggestion that Acts is an attempt to rehabilitate Paul is both an interesting and a welcome approach. However, the book fails to develop fully both why and how Luke attempts to rehabilitate Paul. Instead, the author focuses on the differences between Acts and the epistles, not Luke's reasons for these differences. Perhaps a fuller discussion of this issue may be the subject of a future volume by Phillips.

Silver Spring, MD

DEREK MCNAMARA