

A NEW EDITION OF NESTLE–ALAND, GREEK NEW TESTAMENT

J. KEITH ELLIOTT

University of Leeds
J.K.Elliott@leeds.ac.uk

Abstract

This new edition of Nestle (= NA) is to be welcomed. The 26th edition with a new text and *apparatus criticus* was published in 1979; a revised edition, the 27th, with a newly redesigned apparatus but with the same text, appeared in 1993. (The latest version of that was the 8th corrected and expanded reprinting, which appeared in 2001.) The new edition, Nestle–Aland 28 (= NA28), has the same text as that in NA26=27 (except for the Catholic Epistles) but has a completely revised apparatus and new editorial preliminaries and appendices. The original editors are therefore still credited on the title pages (Barbara and Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M. Metzger). Those responsible for this latest revision are named, somewhat unobtrusively on the reverse of the German title page and, with further names added, in the Foreword. The whole enterprise comes under the auspices of the Institute for New Testament Textual Research in Münster and its director, Holger Strutwolf. All those concerned are deserving of our praise for having accomplished this exacting work.

NA28 is the first step on a long road that will eventually see the ongoing work of the *Editio critica maior* (= ECM) being adopted gradually for this popular and serviceable hand edition.¹ So far only the Catholic Epistles have been published in ECM, now in a revised second edition (= ECM2); its editors are named on p. 48* note 1.² NA28 was published in the autumn of 2012 and we await the innovative online version soon, as well as the companion volume (the United Bible Societies' *Greek New Testament*, hereafter UBS) which will have the same text as NA28. (This should appear by the end of 2013.) A promised

¹ Nestle–Aland, *Novum Testamentum Graece*. Pp. xi + 1*–94* + 890. 28th rev. edn.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012. ISBN 3438051561. €28. I reviewed the 26th edn. in 'An Examination of the Twenty-Sixth Edition of Nestle–Aland, *Novum Testamentum Graece*', *JTS* 32 (1981), pp. 19–49.

² Throughout I refer to the pages of the English *Introduction*, i.e. pp. 46*–88*. There is a German *Einführung* on pp. 1*–45*.

introductory volume by David Trobisch (initially in German only) is also in the pipeline.

This review-article will concentrate on only the printed form of NA28. At the time of writing ECM2 had not yet appeared but the new readings adopted in that revised version of ECM are found in NA28. The only difference between them is that, for places where alternative readings are proposed in the Catholic Epistles, NA uses a rhomboid siglum; ECM2 is to print the alternatives in a split running line of the initial text. Interestingly, the introductory matter now, unlike that in NA27 pp. 45*-46*, no longer invites readers to use the text as a working tool that can be verified or corrected.

I turn now to those places where most changes have been made: (a) the critical apparatus, (b) the appendixes, and (c) the text of the Catholic Epistles.

APPARATUS

One of the major changes in NA28 is the streamlining of the apparatus. Some variants have been deleted. In many cases the number of manuscripts cited in support has been changed and corrected. For example, the apparatus at 2 Cor. 11:3 (and p. 831), wrong in NA27 with reference to D, has now been corrected. P74 not P23 is printed at Jas. 1:12. Previously confusing entries in the apparatus have been clarified; see e.g. Mark 5:37; 15:4 (where the transposition has been relegated to Appendix II, 'Variae lectiones minores'); Acts 14:17 (likewise). The bewildering entries 630 h.t. at Rom 7:17 and Ψ h.t. at Philm. 11 have been removed in NA28, even though 630 and $\Psi = 044$ are called *consistently* cited witnesses in Paul! So, we now still need to ask what Ψ does actually read at Philm. 11 and 630 at Rom. 7:17. Whereas NA27 cited a non-canonical manuscript in the apparatus at John 5:39 (P.Eg. 2) that *v.l.* is no longer shown in NA28. Some manuscripts are now more fully represented; I note that 046 is regularly included in the apparatus to Revelation.

There has been some shortening. However, the more generous spacing between the lines in the apparatus and the need to specify manuscripts for and against many more readings than hitherto, plus the avoidance of abbreviating Greek words in the apparatus, have all resulted in an increase in the total number of pages. A good example is how the bizarre presentation of Jas. 1:17 in NA27 has been clarified and corrected. Similarly, the avoidance of the fusing of more than one variation unit linked by *et* has been avoided. See, for instance, Matt. 15: 35-6 in the two editions with

the precision now evident in NA28 and the correcting of what manuscript 892, especially 892*, actually reads. The whole of the text now runs to 789 pages (cf. NA27, which was only 680 pages long). The additional one hundred pages due to the increased spaciousness—and therefore legibility—of the apparatus, are to be applauded. Some readings, inevitably, justify much space (see e.g. Tit. 1:9, where the reading of 460 runs to three lines; Rev. 1:1–2 2050 to two lines; Matt. 20:28 D six lines; Luke 3:23–31 D six lines; 1 John 5:9 Lvg three lines; Acts 11:2 D four lines).

As an example of the changes to the apparatus we may pick at random a few samples:

1. The Endings of Romans (Rom. 14:23; 15:33; 16:20, 24, 25–7). The issues here are of course very complicated, but whereas previously one was obliged to write out for oneself the apparatus in order to learn what P46, L, 1506, or Marcion, for instance, actually supported, one can read the present apparatus with confidence to see such matters clearly. Much has been rearranged logically; *sed* and *hic* are still used.
2. The opening of Mark (Mark 1:1–6) strikes me as clearer. Such a serendipitous example is typical.
3. Acts 10:16–23 is another good sample.
4. When we compare the Catholics in NA28 with ECM we note that, inevitably, there are fewer variants in the hand edition, as at Jas. 1:1, 3, 6, 8, and 15. Differences from ECM1, which may now be regarded as a transitional stage between NA27 and ECM2/NA28 as far as the Catholic Letters are concerned, will be discussed below.

Overall we commend the greater clarity now seen in the apparatus.

APPENDICES

There are only four appendixes in NA28. (The former Appendix *Editionum differentiae* has been, regrettably, jettisoned). Appendix I remains *Codices Graeci et Latini*; II is *Variae lectiones minores*; III is *Loci citati vel allegati*; and IV is retitled *Signa et Abbreviationes*. Latin titles here, like the book's own title, seem to be preferred. We shall look at each in turn, paying most attention to the first appendix.

Appendix I

This contains only manuscripts 'used' in the edition, *scil.* in the apparatus (according to p. 86*). Insofar as the text has not been changed (apart from in the Catholics) we cannot deduce that 'used' means manuscripts 'used in the establishing of the printed text' because the manuscripts included here differ from many of the manuscripts found in Appendix I of NA27; rather, it must mean 'those manuscripts used in the establishing of the critical apparatus'.

First, we look at the manuscripts found in the lists in this Appendix. As far as this appendix is concerned we are told on p. 61* that there are three categories of manuscripts:

1. Consistently cited witnesses (and these are listed on pp. 62* ff. and identified in the Appendix with an asterisk preceding the number,³ or, if the consistent citing is only for one section of a particular manuscript, the asterisk is surrounded by square brackets preceding the number, and with the relevant section identified);⁴
2. Frequently cited MSS; this applies only outside the Gospels, Catholics, and Revelation, i.e. in Acts and the Paulines;⁵
3. Occasionally cited manuscripts.

It could have been assumed that only those manuscripts whose sigla were encountered by a reader in a variation unit in the apparatus would figure in the Appendix. But that cannot be so. Not all manuscripts listed in Appendix I are actually found in the apparatus. Ought one therefore assume instead that these witnesses were indeed examined but did not yield any variant worth reporting? Otherwise the lists in Appendix I would contain much window-dressing. Ideally, only manuscripts encountered by the reader in the apparatus should appear in Appendix 1. As NA28 is a hand edition we would not expect the same number of *v.ll.* with as full a display of witnesses as that found in ECM. Indeed we are categorically informed that

³ This is in contrast to the listing of these manuscripts in the card-inserts where manuscripts *without* an asterisk are the ones consistently cited!

⁴ This is made clear in Appendix III (d), p. 885, but not on p. 86*. (*) is now no longer used.

⁵ As so often, it would have been better to divide the parts of the New Testament into five sections e, a, p, c, r rather than the conventional four e, a (= a+c), p, r, as, sometimes, a and c need to be separate.

with reference to the Catholics, manuscripts are cited only if they are the 'most important for reconstructing the text' (p. 50*).

i. Papyri

NA editions have been assiduous in including readings from newly published papyri even if those witnesses (among the oldest witnesses to the text) seem not to have conspicuously influenced the readings adopted as the text, a cause of chagrin and a fact sorely regretted by some critics. In the recent editions of NA27, from the 8th reprinting in 2001, the reverse of the title page boldly proclaims that papyri 99–116 have been incorporated. We shall need to wait until the Acts and Revelation are re-edited for ECM to see how the recently published and significant fragments P127 and P115 respectively have been made use of. See, for instance, the inclusion of P127 alongside D in the significant addition reported at Acts 11:2.

The highest numbered papyrus in NA 28 is now P127. All papyri are included in the list, which should mean that 125 have been 'used'.⁶ (The numbers P58 and P67 have been expunged from the apparatus as the fragments previously given those numbers have been subsumed under P33 and P64 respectively.⁷) Many of the small papyri listed are not found in the apparatus and so ought not be in Appendix I.

An allied question still remains whether all papyri manuscripts included in the official register (the *Liste*) should really be there. Is P76 justified? It is likely to be an amulet; it does not appear in the apparatus (at John 4:9, 12). So too P12, containing only one verse of Hebrews, is not included in the apparatus. P10, a scroll containing Rom. 1:1–7, could also be an amulet; that too does not appear in the apparatus. P10 and P62 were used as amulets. Is P78 an amulet also? However, P50, an amulet containing parts of Acts 8 and 10, *does* appear in the apparatus. *En passant*, one wonders how many amulets are not registered with a Gregory–Aland number. Should all of those identified be in—or none of them? And what about P99, a Greco-Roman glossary of Paul's letters? Ought that be in the *Liste*? These and other such queries exercise the user reliant on the *Liste*. Incidentally: why should the intriguing P46^{vid} (!) *still* appear at Heb. 12:15?

It is when we come to the other categories (majuscules, minuscules, and lectionaries) where we see a large *diminution* of

⁶ P44 is still shown as if it were one manuscript.

⁷ P11 and P14 are still listed separately; P4 is not marked as (possibly) part of P64=P67.

witnesses used (*sic*), compared with NA27, i.e. those manuscripts now no longer listed in NA28.

ii. Majuscules

The highest-numbered majuscule remains at 0303 but NA28 lists only 181 majuscule manuscripts. NA27 had 240. There are thus 60 majuscule manuscripts in NA27 not in NA28.⁸

Among those deleted are some 18 manuscripts previously cited as consistent witnesses (e.g. 057 and 0118, graded as a category I manuscripts in Aland and Aland *Text*,⁹ pp. 107–28, as well as 077 and 0155, both category II, 0259 category III, etc.).

Those majuscules known by a letter and a number appear (as is usual) in an apparatus only by their literal siglum, despite the double use of D, K, or P and the triple use of H, all of course remnants of now obsolete registers. This old-fashioned but venerable tradition is dropped in ECM1 (and presumably in ECM2 too), where all uncials are cited only by number.

Among manuscripts previously listed by NA27 and which have been jettisoned if they are not in an apparatus are 077 and 0118, yet 0245 is shown, albeit bracketed, in NA27 at 1 John 3:23 but is similarly not in NA28.

iii. Minuscles

The highest numbered minuscule manuscript remains 2818 (the former 36a).

NA28 has 107 minuscule manuscripts; NA27 lists 219. This is a large drop in NA28. 122 minuscules found in NA27 are now not present. There are, however, ten minuscules in NA28 not in NA27. Thus there are 97 minuscules common to both editions. The ten newcomers in NA28 are 5, now cited consistently in the Catholic Epistles, 18, 30 (also included in the Catholics), 288, 606, 1718, 2200, 2473, 2521, 2685. 5 and 18 had been used in other Greek testaments. As far as I am aware, 30, 288, 1718, 2200, 2433, 2521 are new additions to the apparatus in any major critical edition. (606 and 2685 were used in Metzger's *Commentary*.)

Among the many manuscripts deleted from NA27 are 4(e), 472, 473, 474, 544, and there are even several that contain the

⁸ 0211 is newly added to NA28. This manuscript was not included in NA27. It appeared in B. M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994²).

⁹ Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland, *The Text of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans and Leiden: Brill, 2nd edn. 1989).

Catholics, e.g. 94, 181, 206, 321, 398, 431. P. 49* lines 6–7 states: ‘Witnesses not cited consistently are listed only if they contribute variants of text-historical relevance.’ This may explain many deletions.

The relatively recent proof that the Chicago Mark (2427), previously ‘consistently cited’, is a modern forgery has caused its deletion. No other consistently cited minuscule has been removed.

The motive for these removals should have been explained explicitly by our editors. Some family 13 manuscripts have gone: 124, 543, 788, 826, 983, and 1709 (but not 13, 69, 174, 230, 346, or 828!). Appendix I no longer includes the manuscripts normally deemed to be constituent parts of Family 1 and Family 13 (although the lists are to be found on p. 62*). Family 13, strangely, includes 1709 but does not include 1547. Surprisingly, some of the manuscripts removed are those which regularly appear in the apparatus of other critical editions of the Greek New Testament; these include 1093, 1194, 1216, 1229. Can we assume that these omissions are due only to (or, mainly to) the pruning of witnesses in the apparatus and the deleting of some variants? Some (possibly nearly all) manuscripts now jettisoned but listed in NA27 seem never to be found in the apparatus (I note that is true of several, including 51, 63, 76, 117) so there was no reason to retain them in the latest list—and one wonders why they were there in NA27 Appendix I in the first place.

A few minuscules such as 33, 81, 565, 700, 892 are consistently cited throughout and a few partially so, i.e. marked with [*] e.g. 5, 28. In NA28 there is now no longer a vast and elastic list of additional minuscules said to belong to M (see NA27, p. 714). If such a list was deemed relevant for readers of NA27, why are current readers not permitted to see such an array?

iv. Lectionaries

There are 69 lectionaries (= *ll*) in GNT4. NA27 always had far fewer—only nine in fact. Now in NA28 even that tiny representation has been halved. *l*32, *l*44, *l*145, *l*1575 have been expunged. Significantly, the deleted manuscripts are not Jerusalem lectionaries and three of the four are not in uncial script (the exception is *l*1575), whereas all the five manuscripts remaining in NA28 are uncial lectionaries. And all but *l*1602 in NA28 are Jerusalem lectionaries. We question why the abbreviations *l*^a, *le*, *lesk*, *l*⁺*a*sk remain in the *Introduction*, p. 87* and on p. 888.

Appendix II

This remains as a useful clearing house for the apparatus.

Appendix III

The cross-referencing to parallels in other sources has been splendidly revised. And readers will be more confident than hitherto. Changes in the outer margin of each page are readily conspicuous, as too are changes in this appendix, which serves as a useful index to the marginal references. Unlike the old Appendix III, this newly revised former Appendix IV has convincingly been worth the effort. The revisers are credited in the Foreword; we readily endorse the gratitude expressed there. Appendix III, Section B, p. 878: 'E scriptoribus Graecis' has been shortened and Epimenides is now absent.

Appendix IV

In this full list of abbreviations we note a few features. The several abbreviations using the letter p should be clear in context (p=Pauline Epistles (except in the outer margins), *p.*=*post*, *p.*=*pagina* (not explained on p. 889), *p*) in the outer margins = parallel(s)).

The siglum that resembles an italic hooked s with inserted dot in an apparatus is said on pp. 57* and 880 to be used to denote the transposing of a single word. It is to be found at Luke 19:11 to denote three possible positions for *μελλει* and at John 13:8 to denote three positions for *μου*. At Rev. 13:15 it applies to two positions of *να* but also an omission. Thus readers of the text at Rev. 13:15 are not alerted to a variant giving a choice between a shorter and a longer text. Elsewhere in the Nestle text transpositions would be indicated with the range of words affected being enclosed with angled brackets in the text and the sequences of wording shown by italic numerals in the apparatus. This siglum appears at Luke 6:5, where it applies to the transposition of the whole verse—a function explained on p. 57* but, bizarrely, not on p. 880. However at 1 Cor. 15:34–5 the sign to show that the verses are transposed in some manuscripts is marked, as one should expect, by an angled bracket at the beginning and end of the two verses.

Some Latin terms have been avoided as part of the desire to remove ambiguities or confusing catch-all expressions. *h.t.* is no longer found, although other explanations within the apparatus to suggest how and why a change was caused still survive (in abbreviated form) e.g. *ex. err.*, *ex itac.*, *ex lat?*, *ex lect.*

remain. We are informed on p. 49* that *pc* and *al* have gone but *pm* remains, as do certain other Latin abbreviations; see pp. 60*-61*, pp. 885-90, and the inserted loose cards. See also Appendix IV, albeit in subsection (c), rather than (d), for Latin words. *rell* is not used nor is *cet*; these have been silently avoided.

The list of abbreviations informs readers about the significance of round brackets in the apparatus, but nowhere are readers told about round brackets () in the text. Those brackets have nothing to do with text-critical decisions (e.g. see John 9:7; 20:16; Col. 4:10; 1 Tim. 3:5) and are typographical devices to denote words in parenthesis. (Elsewhere hyphens of differing lengths (!), sometimes placed before, sometimes after a verse number, are used for what seems to be the same function: e.g. cf. Mark 7:3-4, Acts 12:3, Heb. 3:14, and 1 John 1:2, where the convention survives into ECM.) And what are single dashes signifying? (See Matt. 9:6; Mark 2:10; 11:32; 1 Cor. 9:15 etc.) These survive from NA27. But occasionally typographical alternatives, as opposed to changes in the text, are seen outside the Catholics, e.g. a punctuation change at John 20:16 has round brackets in NA27 but a comma in NA28. Readers more eagle-eyed than I may spot other such changes.

The use of square brackets in the text (excluding the Catholics) is described on p. 54* (and in Appendix IV) as applying only to editorial indecision about the choice of a longer or a shorter reading. Readers of 1 Cor. 10:20 should be assisted with an explanation that [] there indicates the *position* of the word bracketed within the sentence. (No manuscript omits the word.)

Whereas NA26 and NA27 showed in the apparatus by means of a dagger (†) where the new text differed from NA25 (a practice abandoned in NA28), it is unfortunate that NA28 does not show by a similar typographical device in the apparatus where the printed main text in NA28 differs from its predecessor, especially now that we have lost a guide to earlier editions' text because the old Appendix III (*Editionum differentiae*) has been jettisoned. The disappointing reason for the abandonment of the former Appendix III is claimed (on p. 50*) to be 'that the effort of revising it would not have been in reasonable proportion to its prospective usefulness', despite its having been an admirable and useful feature in previous editions. It is a regrettable absence. Such a cue as this appendix once provided would alert and benefit readers who may value such a prompt, especially when they are confused by a now outdated entry in a concordance. Such a practice would help not only for the entries listed

on pp. 50*-51*, but also those alternatives signalled with the diamond-shaped siglum, and places where brackets and/or the word(s) bracketed have been removed.

THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES

The seven Catholic letters in NA28, the only section of the New Testament so far to have been published in the ECM series, repeats this new text; it thus differs from the text in NA27. Throughout the Introduction there are many exceptions to the general editorial preliminaries to take account of those differences. And although we still await ECM2 (promised on p. 48* to have been published in 2012 or at least the first two parts (1: *Text* and 2: *Begleitende Materialien*¹⁰)) its new text and the proffered alternative readings are revealed in NA28. I assume that, as further instalments of ECM are published, future editions of NA will gradually change and include the new text of all books as this appears in ECM. We are promised that ECM will be finished in 2032. Only then may we expect the complete text of NA to have been changed.

Pages 52*-53* (section 2.2.2) list manuscripts consistently cited in the Catholic Epistles. Those manuscripts are also found listed for the separate letters on pp. 65*-66*. On p. 52* 642 is said to be 'numbered [*sic*] among the consistently cited witnesses because it documents [*sic*] the text of a group of late Byzantine witnesses'.¹¹ Those late Byzantine witnesses include 218, 808, 1127, 1359, 1563, 2374; they are apparently to be included in ECM2 but, because those are represented by 642, they are not included in NA28 nor its Appendix I and thus there seems little point in enumerating them in its *Introduction*. Certainly, mention in the *Introduction* is no guarantee of their inclusion in the lists in Appendix I even if mention in an apparatus is (or should be¹²).

The text of the Catholics in NA28 has only 34 changes compared with NA27. These may be seen at Jas. 1:20*; 2:3, 4, 15*; 4:10*; 1 Pet. 1:6, 16*bis*; 2:5*, 25; 4:16; 5:1*, 9, 10; 2 Pet. 2:6, 11, 15, 18*, 20*; 3:6, 10, 16*bis*, 18; 1 John 1:7; 3:7*; 5:10, 18; 2 John

¹⁰ We still await the completion of ECM with the crucially important part 3: *Begleitende Studien*. Until that part is published, it is impossible to assess all the editorial decision-making processes adequately.

¹¹ 'Numbered' for *aufgenommen* should be 'included' and 'documents' should be 'represents' (*vertritt*). See further (below) for an assessment of the English form of the *Einführung* and other editorial matter.

¹² Readers who may relish such an exercise could check if all manuscripts found in the apparatus are actually in Appendix 1 and *vice versa*.

5*, 12*; 3 John 4*; Jude 5, 18*bis*. Details are set out on pp. 50*f. 1 Pet. 5:9, 10; 2 Pet. 2:11; Jude 18a also show us a choice of alternatives (indicated by a diamond, see further below); it is surprising that a reading can appear as 'new' (pp. 50*-51*) and also appear as a split *A* reading.

The new text at Jude 5 is read by B only (*υμας απαξ παντα οτι Ιησους*). This complicated variation unit runs to some 30 alternatives in the ECM apparatus; there are 13 variants (containing within them inner variants) in NA28. NA27 read *παντα οτι* [ο] *κυριος απαξ*. The eleven references with an asterisk in my list above are new readings in ECM2 compared with ECM1 and it will be seen that where 2 and 3 John had the same text in ECM1 as NA27 there are now three new differences. However, the new and different reading formerly in ECM1 at Jas. 1:22 has reverted to the text of NA27 in ECM2 = NA28! No apparatus is given for the orthographical change at 1 Pet. 2:25. (According to ECM1 *αλλα* is read by only B.)

Among the changes in ECM2 compared with NA27 some are orthographical such as *ου/ουκ* and these do not affect the meaning. Some concern word order. Others delete a word previously bracketed e.g. [οτι], [ειμι], [τω], [Ιησους], [ημων], [αμην], and [του]. Very few are likely to change meaning and interpretation. Jude 5 stands out as important and it is significant that no alternative reading is suggested—such is our editors' confidence in the new text.

It seems as if the editors decide on the text to be printed (the *A* text, i.e. the *Ausgangstext*) by discussing the text in NA27 and reaching agreement over its variants. At a later stage they revisit their decisions and may make further changes in the light of the revelations of their guiding methodology, the Coherence Based Genealogical Method (= CBGM), devised by Gert Mink, a *Mitarbeiter* at the Münster Institute. Among the principles of the methodology is the tracing of the textual flow between manuscripts. Regardless of the date given to those documents by palaeographers, the documents themselves are treated as mere bearers of the tradition and, as such, an early witness may contain a reading that is a descendent from the text known to us from a manuscript of later date. It remains to be seen what the editors do when at some stage they take a manuscript's date into account. What changes will they make if they see that there is a consistent preference for the textual flow between two manuscripts running from x to y if manuscript x is younger than manuscript y?

An examination of the manuscripts supporting the *A* text at the 34 places where NA28 has a text different from that in NA27 is of

interest. In some cases we have a reading with relatively sparse support (e.g. Jas. 2:3 (B), 4 (P Byz), 15 (A P Ψ Byz); 4:10 (P100 Byz); 1 Pet. 4:16 (P Byz); 2 Pet. 3:6 (P 1175), 16 (P72 C*); 18 (B 1175 1243 1739*); 1 John 1:7 (Ψ 1243 1739 1881); 3:7 (A C P Ψ); Jude 5 (B). If any tendency is detectable it is that Byz readings are more prominent than hitherto. However, one must assume that for the most part CBGM has selected its chosen readings without regard to the manuscript attestation, and that the witnesses are arbitrary.

We await a promised commentary volume that should explain the way in which, and the extent to which, CBGM has influenced editorial decision-making. In an age when transparency is a common mantra, a running textual commentary should give the reasons why the NA text was changed or why its readings were maintained as the *A* text. As far as NA28 is concerned, the only part of the New Testament where the CBGM methodology has been applied to date is the Catholic Epistles and there for the new text printed the tried and trusted *vade mecum* of old, Metzger's *Commentary* (in effect a verbatim record of the editorial decision-making of the 4th edition of the UBS testament (= NA27)), is only partially useful.

It is when decisions were difficult to reach that ECM2 has decided occasionally to print a split running (*A*) text where both readings are equal (and throughout it is only two alternatives that are given). That device papers over any disagreements or indecisiveness among the editors and, more importantly, has caused the abandonment of the much despised use (rather, overuse) of bracketed words within the text. Obviously, this luxury is found so far only for the Catholic letters; elsewhere readers are still left to decide whether to ignore the brackets or to ignore the words bracketed.¹³ However, it is clear that in the Catholic letters readers are given an even greater possibility to reach their own decisions on the 43 places where the editors felt unable to exercise their own editorial decision. In ECM2 these are the places where the primary line is split and two alternatives are presented as readings that are deemed to be equally valid. (More on these below.)

¹³ I have long campaigned against the use of brackets in NA (e.g. in *NovT* 15 (1973), pp. 288–90; *BT* 30 (1979), p. 137; *TLZ* 119 (1994), cols. 493–6; *TRev* 90 (1994), cols. 9–20; *Biblica* 60 (1979), pp. 575–7). And see also Reidar Aasgaard, 'Brothers in Brackets? A Plea for Rethinking the Use of [] in NA/UBS', *JSTNT* 3 (2004), pp. 301–21.

On purely typographical grounds these 43 places are marked in NA28 with a diamond siglum and with the reading that tallies with NA27 maintained in the text in most instances, although the following eight places are exceptions to that procedure: 1 Pet. 1:22, where NA27 has [καθαρὰς]; 5:9, where [τῶ] in NA27 has now been deleted; 5:10, where [Ἰησοῦ] has been deleted; 2 Pet. 2:11, where, more significantly, the reading of NA27 is not one of the two alternatives in ECM2 = NA28 (NA27 reads κατ' αὐτῶν παρὰ Κυρίου with P72 1241¹⁴); 1 John 1:7, where the running line of NA28 deletes δε, previously the reading of NA27; likewise at 2:4 NA28 has the shorter text where NA27 had read οτι; 2:6 NA27 reads [οὐτως]. At Jude 18 the reading in NA27 ([οτι]) is deleted. At 1 John 2:29 there is now a choice in NA28/ ECM2 (ειδητε/ιδητε) where NA27 had read ειδητε but where no bullet points nor even a *v.l.* are shown.

Obviously, the use of brackets in the rest of NA28 is confined (as it was in NA27) to those readings where the choice is between a longer and a shorter text. The split text in ECM2 still offers a choice, but by using this new display, the editors let readers see the effect of the alternatives in context. That is welcomed.

Insofar as the particular manuscript support is of no significance when CBGM is applied, we may nonetheless examine the witnesses in support of each of the readings when an alternative is proffered. For the most part the manuscripts supporting the alternatives are the age-old allies, B on one side, X on the other (e.g. at James 1:22; 4:9; 1 Pet. 5:14; 2 Pet. 1:4). Others are of more interest, especially where a reading supported by Byzantine manuscripts is now deemed equal to one supported by X, B and their allies (e.g. Jas. 2:11; 4:12; 1 Pet. 3:20, etc.).

As far as the Catholic Epistles are concerned, brackets were used in NA27 at Jas. 4:12; 5:14*; 1 Pet. 1:6*, 9*, 12*, 22; 2:5*; 3:1*, 22*; 4:17*; 5:2*, 5*, 8*, 9, 10; 2 Pet. 2:6*, 20*; 3:3, 11*, 18*; 1 John 2:6; 3:13*, 19*, 21*; 5:1*; Jude 5 [υμας]* and [οι]*, 18 [οτι].¹⁵ Some of those passages have been long-standing 'problem' cases; see e.g. 1 Pet. 1:12, a 'C' rated reading in UBS and the cause for a signed dissentient note in Metzger's *Commentary*; 1:22; 3:1; 5:8, which were also 'C'-rated in UBS. In all instances bar eight the brackets have been removed and thus the longer reading stands unambiguously in the text; the

¹⁴ In NA28 the apparatus replaces 1241 with 5 and 307.

¹⁵ References in this list followed by an asterisk mean that here NA28=ECM2 has not used the diamond siglum and has thus confidently removed the brackets silently.

exceptions are 1 Pet. 2:5; 5:9, 10; 2 Pet. 2:20; 3:18; Jude 5 [o] (new text), 18*bis* (where the words bracketed are removed).¹⁶

In ECM1 certain words are preceded and followed by bold dots (or with a space filled with a single bold dot); those places are keyed in the apparatus to an alternative reading that may be, at least according to the ECM James fascicule p. 11*, of equal status to an alternative, although in ECM 1 and 2 Peter p. 24* the editors claimed that the bold dotted alternatives had no absolute or precise definition! In the fascicule on 1 John p. 37* we were told that bold dotted variants merited special critical consideration or were equal. In ECM2 each alternative is now said (pp. 51*, 55*, 88o) to be of 'equal' status and validity. We take this latest statement about the equality of alternatives to be definitive.

There are 72 places in ECM1 where we find bold dots (James has 11, 1 Peter 25, 2 Peter 16, 1 John 13, 2 John two, 3 John three, Jude two), of which only 21 of these survive as alternatives in ECM2. Many are now ignored (e.g. in 1 Pet. 1:8 (*ιδοντες*), 9 (+ *υμων*), 12 (*εν πνευματι*); 2:5 (*εποικοδομεισθε*). Like the removal of brackets, the printing of one reading as the definitive *A* text betrays the editors' new confidence in these readings, in some instances resulting in a changed and new reading (Jas. 1:20; 2:3; 1 Pet. 2:5b; 2 Pet. 2:18b, 20; 3:18). We return to the 43 places where NA28 inserts a black diamond-shaped siglum (a rhomboid) in the text and apparatus to show these are equal alternative readings. (An asterisk shows alternatives *not* marked with bold dots in ECM1). They are Jas. 1:22*; 2:11*; 3:4, 4:9*, 12, 14; 5:4*, 18; 1 Pet. 1:22; 2:12*; 3:5*, 20*; 4:11; 5:9* (changed text), 10* (changed text), 11, 14; 2 Pet. 1:4*bis*, 5*, 9, 21; 2:3*, 11* (changed text), 22; 3:3, 10*; 1 John 1: 4, 7, 8; 2:4, 6*, 17*, 29*; 4:12*, 20*; 5:6, 11, 21; 2 John 9, 12*; Jude 17, 18.

At the following verses ECM1 had bullet points; these readings no longer have an alternative in ECM2 i.e. there is no rhomboid in NA28: Jas. 1:20#;¹⁷ 2:3#, 19; 3: 4, 8, 15; 4:12a, 14b; 5:10; 1 Pet. 1:8, 9, 12, 18; 2:5a, 2:5b#, 6, 11, 16, 20, 25; 3:1*bis*, 22; 4:5, 14, 17,

¹⁶ These eight appear in ECM1 with bold dots (bullet points). Bold dots in ECM1 replace brackets at Jas. 4:12; 1 Pet. 1:9, 12, 22; 3:1, 22; 4:17; 5:5, 8, 9, 10; 2 Pet. 2:6, 20; 1 John 3:13; Jude 5 ([o]). The brackets and the word(s) bracketed were removed from ECM1 at 1 Pet. 5:10; 2 Pet. 3:18; Jude 5 ([o]) new text; 18 ([οτι]), 18 ([του]). (At Jas. 5:14; 1 Pet. 1:6; 5:2; 2 Pet. 3:11 words bracketed in NA27 are now printed in ECM1 and ECM2 without alternative.)

¹⁷ References bearing # are for the most part places where ECM2 has introduced a new *A* text without there now being a designated alternative of equal status.

19; 5:2, 5, 8; 2 Pet. 1:2, 12, 2:6, 13, 18a, 18b#, 19, 20#; 3:3*bis*, 18#; 1 John 2:4b; 3:13, 19, 23; 5: 5; 2 John 2; 3 John 3, 9, 10; Jude 5a, 5b#, 14, 16, 18b#, ¹⁸ 20, 21, 25. Such changes seem to reflect a greater decisiveness by the editorial committee, who now felt able to remove an alternative reading as a potential candidate to share a possible *A* text.

The choices offered in ECM2 seldom make much difference to exegesis or theology. Several (e.g. Jas. 1:22; 2:11; 2 Pet. 1:4, 5; 1 John 1:8; 4:12; 5:11) concern word-order transpositions; a few offer a choice between a longer or shorter reading (e.g. 1 Pet. 3:5; 4:11 (cf. 1 Pet. 5:11); 2 Pet. 2:11; 1 John 2:4 (*οτι!*)); a couple involve the *υμων/ημων* interchange. At 1 John 4:20 the *ου/πως* change is more significant but few others are surprising or bold. Some references with bullet points in ECM1 are now no longer places where the editors wish to display an alternative of equal importance (if that is what they intended in the first place) in the revised ECM2.

The current ECM looks as if it is still 'work in progress' because we are warned (on p. 55*) that the new method of splitting the text when a decision could not be reached on a single *A* text 'does not mean that the editors regard the text as definitively established in all other passages'. Oh! *Caveat emptor*.

If CBGM discusses all variants objectively before arriving at *A* we may assume (until the appearance of a commentary volume that reveals the bases of the editorial principles applied) that intrinsic probability, the style of the composition,¹⁹ consistent vocabulary, and grammatical practice were all on the negotiating table. If all manuscripts agree consistently over such a matter five times, say, then a textually insecure sixth possible occurrence of the feature can be decided upon by accepting the variant reading that is in accordance with the other five. If so, CBGM is compatible with the thoroughgoing principles of textual criticism. Age and the alleged weight or quantity of the manuscripts supporting a reading are less decisive with such a methodology. If this is so, then we might indeed have expected further changes in the initial text of the Catholic Epistles or in the possible alternatives. A brief trawl through variants that were

¹⁸ 18a has a new reading *and* a rhomboid!

¹⁹ An 'author's' style and usage may no longer be applicable principles if we agree the 'original' author's copy is irretrievable in its entirety, but, nonetheless, there is sufficient uniformity within our manuscript heritage that one may detect common features of grammar, style, and usage within all texts that an *Ausgangstext* that conforms to such usage is achievable when assessing textual variation.

apparently not considered viable suggests the following (among many others) merit further consideration: Jas. 1:25 (+ *ουτος*); 2:1 (+ *την*); 3:12 (+ *ουτως*); 4:13 (+ *ενα*); 5:5 (+ *ως*); 1 Pet. 2:6 (+ *τη*); 3:10 (+ *αυτου bis*); 4:1 (+ *εν*), 2 (+ *του βιου*), 11 (*ως*); 5:5 (+ *υποτασσομενοι*), 8 (+ *οτι*), 12(*om. του*); 2 Pet. 2:21 (*ανακαμψαι*); 1 John 2:7 (+ *απ' αρχης*), 28 (*εχομεν*); 3:5 (+ *ημων*), 13 (+ *μου*), 18 (+ *μου*); 5:2 (*τηρωμεν*), 20 (*θεον*); 2 John 5 (*γραφω*); 3 John 5 (*εργαζη*), 5 (*τους*), 7 (*αυτου*), 13 (*γραφειν*); Jude 6 (*δε*), 15 (*εξελεγειναι*). In the last two cases the variants are not in the apparatus of NA28 but can be imported from ECM. Thoroughgoing principles would encourage these variants to be given fair wind.

We now turn to some smaller, but not insignificant, issues, namely conjectures, the versions and Fathers, and, finally, some editorial matters.

CONJECTURES

The editors say they have reluctantly jettisoned a long-standing convention in Nestle editions of referring to modern scholarly conjectures (some, bizarrely anonymous, e.g. 'comm. *cj*' in the apparatus of NA27 at Luke 1:46; Phil. 1:25; 1 Thess. 5:11)! NA25 had 220 such references from 87 different authors cluttering its apparatus. That was pruned to c.130 conjectures from 73 authors in NA27. Some of us have long considered that there is no place in the footnotes of a critical edition for such guesses about the original text. Rather, such reports could be more appropriately included in a learned commentary. Thankfully, the intrusive and puzzling *cj* is no longer in the apparatus, although we do find conjectural readings in the text without any Greek support at Acts 16:12 and in NA28, ECM1, and ECM2 at 2 Pet. 3:10.

VERSIONS

1. *Latin*

The Old Latin manuscripts are designated only by letters in the apparatus. Beuron numbers, which should be used, are still not being adopted in the apparatus to Greek testaments. As with certain lettered Greek majuscules, some letters in the list of Latin manuscripts refer to different witnesses, depending on which part of the New Testament they include, e.g. d, e, t, etc. but this remains from NA27 and should cause no real problems to observant readers.

According to p. 69* the edition of the Stuttgart Vulgate utilized seems to be the 4th edition of 1994, but on p. 885 and the card inserts it is said to be the 5th edition of 2007. Which is right?

The abbreviations lat, latt, and lat(t) still stand; they are explained on pp. 69* and 883-4.

2. *Coptic*

Several changes have been introduced (see pp. 73*-76*): some Coptic evidence in John has come in from current work being undertaken for the ECM=the International Greek New Testament Project's edition of the Fourth Gospel. Wherever P127 was added to the apparatus to Acts we are told (p. 76*) that 'Coptic notes' [*sic*] were incorporated. There are some Coptic additions such as cv (Dialect V) and fa (Fayyumic). Some sigla have been altered: ac has now become ly and mf has become cw, so we shall need to become accustomed to these. Much work in progress on the Coptic will see the light of day in future editions of NA.

Much new work has improved the attestation. Sampling suggests that references to the Sahidic version now agree with the attestation in NA27 only in about half of the occurrences. For the rest NA28 cites sa (Sahidic) in a new reading or with modified support for an existing variant.

3. *Syriac*

In addition to Latin and Coptic the Syriac versions are well represented. The abbreviations sy^p sy^(p) and (sy^p) are explained on p. 73* but are not gathered into Appendix IV.

Other versions have been (undeservedly) underutilized.

FATHERS

Much remains unchanged. Sometimes a reading supported only by Patristic witnesses is printed, e.g. at Luke 24:25; Gal. 1:1; 2:5; 5:14. At Acts 2:9 the *v.ll.* Armeniam and Συριαν are in, although Ἰνδιαν (Chrys), previously included, is now avoided. It is odd, then, to read on p. 78* that fathers are cited 'only if they can be considered reliable witnesses to the *text of the manuscripts quoted*' (italics mine). However, some readings by a Father included in the apparatus of NA27 have been removed (e.g. Eph. 3:11). The list of Fathers on pp. 80*-81* is said to show only names that are abbreviated (yet Ophites and Didache in that list are given in full), thus we cannot readily see how many more Patristic witnesses written in full are cited.

SUMMARY

Inevitably, NA28 and all subsequent editions of NA (until the day dawns when an edition in the distant future contains only the text of ECM throughout) are hybrids. Hence the bulk of manuscripts (once subsumed under the siglum K (= Koine) and in NA27 under M (= majority of manuscripts including the koine type 'in its narrow sense' (p. 60*)) is still frequently found as M, maintaining the usage of NA27, but when NA28 has adopted the text and apparatus from ECM then its siglum Byz with its different origin and usage (also defined on p. 60*) replaces M; the practice must be remembered. UBS uses the siglum 'Byz.' (= Byzantine text), albeit differently arrived at, to include the majority of Byzantine manuscript witnesses, 'especially of the second millennium' (UBS4^{rev.} p. 19*). Thus readers of NA28 may be forgiven if they are bewildered not only by 'Byz', but also by the new lozenge-shaped siglum and also by readings not all of which may be included in a concordance. It will behove such people to commit to memory all the exceptions found now in the Catholic Epistles as set out *passim* in the *Introduction* to NA28.

This review has concentrated on the printed edition. At the time of writing neither ECM2 nor Trobisch's introductory volume nor UBS had been published nor had the allied digital version of NA28 trumpeted on p. 48* of the printed NA28 as being an innovation which will appear 'from now on' (!). When the digitized forms of the edition appear advance demonstrations and trials suggest it can be a helpful resource that will enable readers of the text to access not only the usual apparatus but through it links to photographs and digitized versions of chosen manuscripts, dictionary definitions of vocabulary, and links to conjectural emendations (now no longer printed). The proofs of those puddings await the tastings.

Insofar as NA28 has a text in the Catholics differing from that in NA27 we must expect that tools dependent on the text of NA27 (such as the *Vollständige Konkordanz*, *Computerkonkordanz*, Bauer's *Wörterbuch*, and (eventually when the ECM and NA reach the Gospels) Kurt Aland's *Synopse* too will need updating.

EDITORIAL MATTERS

The names of the biblical books prefacing the text itself in NA28 remain for the most part as in NA27, except for the titles of the Catholic Epistles. However, the running heads of five of these

differ from the form shown on the page preceding p. 1 (is this p. 97*?) in NA28 by following instead the titles as used in ECM.

There has been a great attempt to make sure that the editorial matter appears in both German and English. However, the endpaper maps are only in English. There are two card inserts, one for both languages. The final appendix, now Appendix IV and still headed in Latin (but changed to *Signa et Abbreviationes*), gives the definitions in German and English, whereas previously all were only in Latin. Klaus Wachtel and Simon Crisp are thanked on p. viii for their work, including the 'Preface' (*sic*). The edition contains no Preface as such; the English of p. vii is headed 'Foreword'. We do, however, congratulate them on their expertise in rendering the German into a serviceable English translation. I do wonder about 'timeliness' (p. 48*) for *Aktualität* where 'promptness' may be better; and about the apparent ambiguity of rendering *verwertet wurde* on p. 72*, especially as the Rylands syr 15 is to be used in ECM. On p. 890 *entstand* should be 'originated'; s = 'supplemental part of manuscript' (as on the English card insert) would be better as 'later addition to a manuscript', as on p. 882 and p. 59*. On page 884 (and inserted card in English) M^A should not be 'manuscripts of the Commentary of Andreas' but 'manuscripts with...'; the German, correctly, has 'mit'. Only the abbreviated German titles of books (Ap, 1K, 2K, Kol, Jc) are used in the outer margins of the text pages and in Appendix I, column 4. (See p. 84*, section II, where the German Hen(och) is used for Enoch in the outer margins²⁰).

An obligatory 'Post Scriptum' must note typographical slips! On p. 55* l. 18 read 85* (not 86*); p. 884 ll. 7–8 read *Revelation*; p. 52* l. 27 *Ausgangstext* should be abbreviated as *A* (as in ll. 14, 20). That there seem to be so few slips is a credit to all concerned. Doubtless if users identify typos and inform the press these can be corrected in any future reprinting and, presumably, immediately in the online edition.

²⁰ But in Appendix III among the pseudepigraphical books (included under section (A) Ex Vetere Testamento!). Latin forms are used, so Enoch rather than Henoch is the heading on pp. 875–6.