

developments. Taken as a whole, this work sketches the rise, development, and transformation of theology in its early modern contexts.

The Oxford Handbook of Early Modern Theology leaves the development of particular theological questions open for further investigation. This includes every theological locus in each tradition, as well as related areas such as exegesis and philosophy. With some notable exceptions, the question of the relationship between theology and piety in various branches of thought is largely underdeveloped, though this reflects the limited scope of the book as an introduction to its subject rather than marking a deficiency in the work. The seed thoughts presented for further development in such areas will enable students and scholars to pursue their own studies more fruitfully. The one area that this reviewer would have liked to have seen more developed is the influence of medieval thought on early modern theology. While medieval theology and philosophy permeates many of the chapters, more direct interaction with medieval trends would have been helpful.

While this work touches cross-confessional traditions, students of Reformed orthodoxy in particular cannot afford to be without this book. It is a scholarly benchmark that provides us with most of the tools needed to engage in serious study. Its chapters contain an almost complete library of relevant issues to early modern theology across confessional lines. While it is appropriate and necessary to retain and teach the distinctive features of our own confessional traditions, we cannot appreciate the nuanced depths of these traditions without setting the context more broadly than is often done. This book will greatly help students, pastors, and scholars as they continue to plumb the depths of our Christian heritage. This is likely the single most important resource available to date to help us do exactly that.

—Ryan M. McGraw

Nicholas P. Lunn. *The Original Ending of Mark: A New Case for the Authenticity of Mark 16:9–20*. Eugene, Ore.: Pickwick Publications, 2014. 378 pp.

The scholarly consensus among academic textual critics since Westcott and Hort in the late nineteenth century has been that the

traditional (longer) ending of Mark (Mark 16:9–20) is not original to the second Gospel. This has even become the consensus view among many Reformed and evangelical scholars and pastors who now regularly dismiss Mark 16:9–20 as an uninspired addendum. Nicholas P. Lunn, a translation consultant with Wycliffe Bible Translators and an associate tutor at Spurgeon's College in London, is the first scholar to publish a full-length, scholarly monograph that challenges this consensus since William R. Farmer's *The Last Twelve Verses of Mark* in 1974.¹ Lunn's case is well researched and cogently argued. This work must now be reckoned with by any who would reject the traditional ending of Mark.

In the introduction, Lunn surveys the history of interpretation regarding the ending of Mark's gospel within text criticism. This includes the current mainstream scholarly consensus that Mark originally intended to end at Mark 16:8, and that Mark 16:9–20 is an uninspired scribal creation. He then boldly rejects this "almost universally accepted dogma" (19), and affirms Mark 16:9–20 as the original, authentic ending of the Gospel. One of Lunn's most convincing arguments against the ending at 16:8 is the fact that this would indicate the existence of another canonical Gospel that did not include a narrative account of the resurrection appearances of Jesus. This would make Mark out of step both with the other canonical Gospels and with early Christian proclamation (cf. 1 Cor. 15:3–10).

Lunn proceeds by tracing the external evidence regarding this debate. Many who are unfamiliar with the manuscript evidence might be surprised to discover that only two extant Greek manuscripts (Sinaiticus and Vaticanus) end the second Gospel at 16:8, and both of these give evidence that their scribes knew of the longer ending. Also striking is the fact that the traditional ending appears in many early Greek manuscripts (including Codex Alexandrinus), and was known by the early Church Fathers, such as Justin Martyr and Irenaeus. Controversy regarding Mark's ending was, in fact, unknown until Eusebius in the fourth century.

1. William R. Farmer, *The Last Twelve Verses of Mark* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974). Mention should also be made, however, of various online publications by James Snapp, Jr., who supports the authenticity of Mark 16:9–20. The most recent is in 2016 by James Snapp, Jr., *Authentic: The Case for Mark 16:9–20* (available electronically at Amazon.com).

Further on, Lunn examines the internal or linguistic evidence in regards to the previously mentioned debates. He demonstrates that arguments based on the supposedly non-Markan vocabulary and style of 16:9–20 are vulnerable when under close scrutiny, especially when a comparison is made to passages of similar length in Mark. He also provides convincing counter-analysis to demonstrate that the vocabulary and style of 16:9–20 is consistent with the vocabulary and style found both in Mark and in the wider canonical Gospel tradition.

Lunn proceeds to trace further literary and thematic evidence, which argues for the traditional ending of Mark as consistent with the original scope and plan of the second Gospel. He also addresses the often suggested literary dependence hypothesis that Mark 16:9–20 is a “patchwork,” drawn from the endings of the other canonical Gospels. He interacts, in particular, with the more recent scholarly development of this idea in James Kelhoffer’s *Miracle and Mission* (cf. 275–283). Lunn finds that there are, in fact, “very few points of lexical contact” between Matthew and John and the ending of Mark (317). As for Luke, Lunn finds the evidence more convincing for the ending of Mark’s influence on the Lukan writings rather than vice versa.

If original, why then did controversy arise over Mark’s ending? Lunn addresses the possibilities of both accidental or intentional omission. He concludes that the best explanation is likely “intentional excision” first occurring in Alexandria, Egypt under Platonic or Gnostic influence (352).

Lunn has rendered a valuable service in offering this scholarly defense of the traditional ending of Mark. He covers the most often raised objections to the passage, and offers an able and engaging apologetic defense of its originality, inspiration, and canonicity. However, not all of Lunn’s analysis is of equal strength, as not all his literary arguments were equally convincing. An example of a weak argument is the peculiar and completely speculative suggestion that Mark’s account of the fearful women in 16:8 came from the fact that they “passed by the house of Mark en route for that of John” (329). I also found his suggestion of possible literary “telescoping” incompatible with a view of the narrative’s historical reliability (cf. 320–325). With regard to terminology, I believe Lunn’s references to Jesus’s raising the dead to life (as with the daughter of Jairus) as “resurrection” miracles would better be designated as “resuscitation” or “revivification” miracles (e.g., 239). These, however, are all minor concerns and

should not detract from the general admiration of Lunn's accomplishment in this work.

Modern challenges to the traditional ending of Mark have created what might well be called a "canonical crisis" with regard to the text of the second Gospel. Some modern English translations not only bracket Mark 16:9–20, thus casting doubt on its authenticity, but a few have even begun to include the weakly attested "shorter ending" in the printed text or footnotes (e.g., the NRSV, the ESV, and the NLT). Many preachers, even otherwise conservative, evangelical, Calvinistic, or Reformed men, have abruptly ended sermon and teaching series through Mark at Mark 16:8, announcing to their congregations that Mark 16:9–20 is uninspired and spurious. Therefore, before announcing any conclusion to his congregation about the authenticity of Mark 16:9–20, I would urge every conscientious pastor carefully to read Lunn's book and prayerfully consider his arguments in favor of the traditional ending of Mark.

—Jeffrey T. Riddle

Francesca Aran Murphy, ed. *The Oxford Handbook of Christology* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015). 670 pp.

Christology demands the attention of all who are interested in Christianity, since the very names of both terms are derived from the name of Jesus Christ. Christology ties together with important doctrines such as the doctrine of the Trinity, salvation, and the church. *The Oxford Handbook of Christology* introduces readers to prevalent ideas about Christ, both past and present. As such, it is a useful introduction to cross-confessional views regarding the church's perception of Jesus Christ, in the past, and today. While Protestant readers might disagree with many of its chapters, this book forms a remarkably comprehensive introduction to Christology from the New Testament to the present day.

The volume discussed here includes the work of forty authors on the subject of Christology. The book is arranged largely in chronological fashion, moving from the teaching of the Bible, to the early church, through the medieval period, into the Reformation and post-Reformation periods, and concluding with modern and post-modern