

16.9-20; Luke 9.55b-56a, 22.19b-20, 43-44, 23.17, 24.12; John 5.3b-4; Acts 28.29; Romans 16.24. Elsewhere also the longer text (unless it is represented by D) is, in general, printed.

The pericope of the adulteress, taken as Johannine, and Revelation are treated to extensive discussions in the introduction, because the editors claim to have established family trees for the mss. containing this material and that Schmidt's K group in Revelation, and von Soden's  $\mu^6$  for the *pericope de Adultera* are close to the autographs. It is the editors' deluded hope that the history of the text for the rest of the NT can be similarly reconstructed. Such stemmatic reconstructions are dubious. Before decisions on groups can be made all variants need to be resolved objectively first: acceptance of a group deemed to be close to the original should not be the reason for preempting discussions of *v. ll.* deviating from that group. The editors have not demonstrated clearly enough why they favour K in Revelation or  $\mu^6$  in John 7.53-8.11. Too often it seems as if the decision on *v. ll.* has been prejudiced by which group supports the variants.

Despite some dogmatic statements in the introduction, the authors are modest enough to acknowledge that their use of  $M^{Pt}$  is tentative, that von Soden's influence needs careful monitoring, and that their genealogical stemmata are only provisional.

The Greek typeface is beautifully clear. Paragraphs are separated by English subheadings and, where appropriate, cross-references. A select bibliography is appended. Typographical errors are few.

J. K. ELLIOTT

Aland, Kurt, and Barbara Aland: **Der Text des Neuen Testaments.** Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft 1982. 342 pp.

The sub-title of this book defines its scope as that of an "Introduction to scholarly editions, and to the theory and practice of modern textual criticism". Not only the specialist in textual criticism, but also any scholar with a general interest in the NT, can find useful information in this book about: (1) the editions of the Greek NT from Erasmus to the 26th edition of Nestle-Aland (pp. 13-56); (2) the tradition of the Greek NT (pp. 57-81); (3) the Greek manuscripts (pp. 82-190); (4) the ancient versions (pp. 191-226); (5) the use of modern critical editions, especially the 26th edition of Nestle-Aland and the third edition of the UBS Greek text (pp. 227-270); (6) other helps such as gospel synopses, lexica, grammars of NT Greek etc. (pp. 271-281); and finally (7) the practice of textual criticism (pp. 282-318). The 71 tables, including those of manuscripts, previous printed editions, and statistics, interspersed throughout the book, give the reader an immediate view of the material, but sometimes disturb continuous reading of the main text, especially when the tables follow one after the other.

Other useful aids for the student of NT textual history are the descriptions of the 88 papyri (pp. 106-111), the 274 uncials (now identified as 241 by the Münster Institute for NT Textual Research) (pp. 117-137), and about 150 of the 2795 minuscule manuscripts (pp. 140-164). It should however be pointed out that the chapter which refers to the Byzantine lectionaries is somewhat inadequate. Perhaps this is due to the writers' opinion concerning the value of the Byzantine text; but even so a description and evaluation of the lectionaries

would have been useful and interesting.

The writers' theory of the history of the NT text may be outlined as follows: (1) the four decades between the persecution of Decius (250–260) and that of Diocletian (303) are very important for the history of the NT text, because during that time the text had been "corrected"—the correction or "recension" being connected in Antioch with the name of Lucian, and in Alexandria with that of Hesychius. It is from this period, and from the East, that the ancestor of Codex D also originates. Thus the Alands accept that only the three following types of text can be distinguished with scientific certainty: the Byzantine, the Alexandrian, and the D-text (which agrees with P<sup>75</sup>). What critics usually say about the "western", the "Caesarean" and the "Jerusalem" texts is "only theory based on uncertain ground" (p. 77).

(2) The manuscripts are divided into five categories according to the value of the text they contain: (a) manuscripts with an extremely good quality text, such as the Alexandrian text; (b) manuscripts which differ from (a), mainly because of Byzantine influence, but which are also useful for the reconstruction of the original text; the Egyptian text falls into this category; (c) manuscripts with a singular and independent type of text, certainly useful only for the history of the NT text (for instance, f<sup>1</sup>, f<sup>13</sup>); (d) manuscripts of the D-text; and (e) manuscripts of the Byzantine text, having no great importance for the reconstruction of the original text (see the table of the five categories, pp. 167–170).

It must be acknowledged that the Alands' book is the result of many years of scientific research in Münster, and no critic of our time can overlook or neglect this. Nevertheless, it must be added that textual criticism is a discipline in continual evolution: theories succeed one another, and no final agreement has yet been reached among scholars. I find particularly interesting the Alands' theory of the history of the NT text during the last years of the third century; also their opinion that, after the excitement caused in the 19th century by the discovery of the uncials, and during the first half of the 20th century by the papyri, this is the age of the minuscule manuscripts.

Two points in the Alands' theory however leave me sceptical. First, their relegation of the Byzantine text to the fifth category of their classification is in accordance with the views of Westcott and Hort, and with the prevailing opinion in contemporary textual criticism; but what about the shorter Byzantine readings which may claim originality, and which we might call "eastern non-interpolations"? Second, the five-fold classification and evaluation of the manuscripts cannot be acquitted of a certain element of subjectivity.

Such objections apart, one must acknowledge that in this book, the two Münster critics have condensed many years of scientific research, and have certainly made a very important contribution to all concerned with the translation, as well as with the textual criticism, of the NT.

J. KARAVIDOPOULOS