

THREE DEVELOPMENTS IN NEW TESTAMENT TEXTUAL CRITICISM:  
WETTLAUFER, HOUGHTON AND JONGKIND (-WILLIAMS)

Frank Shaw

Cincinnati, OH

Back in the mid-late-1970s leading New Testament textual critic Eldon Epp could speak of an ‘interlude’ and then of a ‘continuing interlude’ in New Testament textual criticism (henceforth, NTTC).<sup>1</sup> Since that time the field has not stood still. Radical or thoroughgoing eclecticism morphed into reasoned eclecticism and swept the discipline. The idea of a ‘living NT text’, largely espoused by David Parker and presaged by the work of Bart Ehrman, has flourished. Michael Holmes has produced the official SBL Greek New Testament text, available for free in the electronic version. Detailed work on scribal habits by James Royse, Juan Hernández and others has mushroomed. A new UBS committee has been appointed. Peter Head and Tommy Wasserman now host their Evangelical Textual Criticism website with nearly immediate news on any developments within NTTC, and Larry Hurtado’s blog often deals with such issues. Published papyrus fragments keep trickling out of the Oxyrhynchus collection. All in the field look forward to the publication of the manuscripts in the Museum of the Bible Collection (previously the Green Collection) under the direction of Michel Holmes and Jeffrey Kloha. The *Editio Critica Maior* (ECM) volumes of the Catholic Epistles and Acts have appeared thanks to the exhaustive work of those at the Institut für Neutestamentliche Textforschung in Münster (INTF), and future volumes are underway, all being produced under their Coherence Based Genealogical Method (CBGM). The term *Ausgangstext* has entered the field from the work

1. See Eldon J. Epp, ‘The Twentieth Century Interlude in New Testament Textual Criticism’, *JBL* 93 (1974), pp. 363-414; *idem*, ‘A Continuing Interlude in New Testament Textual Criticism?’, *HTR* 73 (1980), pp. 131-51.

of Gerd Mink and the INTF people, and now the analysis of Mink's CBGM by Peter Gurry has been published. The early versions continue to be studied, and Jan Krans has laboriously been collecting the thousands of scattered New Testament textual emendations proposed since the Renaissance on his Amsterdam website. The 'interlude' is long over and the field is vibrant with activity.

The last two subfields just mentioned have each received individual attention in recent monographs, and a new edition of the entire Greek New Testament has appeared. First, Canadian Ryan Wettlaufer has published his dissertation on New Testament textual emendation, developed under the guidance of John Kloppenborg and numerous others, as an NTTSD volume.<sup>2</sup> Then Hugh Houghton of Birmingham has produced a gem that will doubtless become the standard text-critical introduction, reference tool and catalogue of manuscripts on the Latin New Testament.<sup>3</sup> Finally, just in time for the 2017 SBL Annual Meeting in Boston, Dirk Jongkind's long-term project of crafting a Tyndale House Greek edition of the New Testament was published.<sup>4</sup> Since each of these three works plays an overall separate role within the field of NTTC, the present writer has thought it best to review them in standard book review format. Given their diversity of area and approach, each one is considered individually with only minor and occasional interconnections being noted.

*Wettlaufer's Contribution: The Role of Conjectural Emendation  
Reconsidered*

Wettlaufer's book on a highly debated topic is informative and, at times, quite creative. The volume is divided into two parts, as are standard primers on NTTC: theory and practice. The theoretical section is the more interesting and encompasses three chapters. The first introduces and defines the topic;

2. Ryan D. Wettlaufer, *No Longer Written: The Use of Conjectural Emendation in the Restoration of the Text of the New Testament, the Epistle of James as a Case Study* (NTTSD, 44; Leiden: Brill, 2013).

3. H.A.G. Houghton, *The Latin New Testament: A Guide to its Early History, Texts, and Manuscripts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016).

4. Dirk Jongkind (ed.), *The Greek New Testament, Produced at Tyndale House, Cambridge* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017).

the author then spends four pages documenting how classicists positively view and have long employed textual emendation as a standard tool, calling it NTTC's 'pedigree'.<sup>5</sup> In the final portion of the chapter he documents the diverse reception of the method among New Testament textual critics, with some accepting it but far more rejecting it, sometimes with considerable disdain.

In his lengthy and significant second chapter Wettlaufer sets about explaining the reasons for the widespread dismissal of a methodology with such a fine ancestry. He offers three motives for the phenomenon, the most common being 'Survival of the Fittest', namely, 'a persistent and pervasive belief in the idea of *textual survival*', that is,

in the face of mass variation across all known copies of the New Testament, the original reading has nevertheless managed to survive at every variant passage in one manuscript or another. Somewhere in the totality of extant manuscripts the original can always be found.<sup>6</sup>

Behind such thinking, of course, lies the facts that New Testament textual critics have a great quantity of manuscripts, versions and patristic quotations from which to draw their data and that the quality of these manuscripts is frequently good, often due to their age. This contrasts sharply with most classical authors. Outside of Homer in Greek and Vergil in Latin, classical composers exist in a comparatively small number of usually rather late manuscripts. Contrariwise, Epp can refer to the 'genuine embarrassment of riches'<sup>7</sup> available to New Testament text-critical scholars. The common thinking then runs like this: since the sources for classicists are so paltry, their employing conjectural emendation is necessary; we biblical scholars, however, need not stoop to such drastic measures.

Wettlaufer probes beyond this and reminds his readers that the greatest period of corruption in the New Testament textual tradition occurred in the first two hundred years of its transmission, precisely when our witnesses are the weakest, and are, in fact, quite meager. Thus, neither the number of

5. Wettlaufer, *No Longer Written*, p. 5.

6. Wettlaufer, *No Longer Written*, p. 15.

7. Eldon J. Epp, 'Decision Points in Past, Present, and Future New Testament Textual Criticism', in Eldon J. Epp and Gordon D. Fee (eds.), *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism* (SD, 45; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), p. 31.

manuscripts from the third–fourth centuries onward nor their quality need not necessarily preclude the need for emendation if the corruptions occurred early enough. Here he tackles more serious questions in headings like ‘How Could a Corruption Completely Overtake Such a Rich Manuscript Tradition?’<sup>8</sup> and then ‘How Could It Dominate the Entire Tradition?’<sup>9</sup> Wettlaufer explains the first by drawing on the CBGM of Mink, explaining that a ‘cross-pollination of readings created an intricate network of manuscripts wherein a text could change and morph from copy to copy until, in the final accounting, the original reading could be found in most, some, or even none at all’.<sup>10</sup> The second he meets by highlighting the fact that although a great number of manuscripts have survived, a far greater number have been lost. ‘The natural corollary of such manuscript loss’ then, ‘is that at least some readings would have been lost with them’.<sup>11</sup> He accesses the work of Robert Hull, who notes that often a reading known to an early church father may be supported by a tiny number of manuscripts today. More pointedly, Wettlaufer recalls Nestle’s observation that the Vulgate reading at Jn 16.13 is found in no Greek manuscript. As an interesting aside, NA<sup>28</sup> fails to note fully the Vulgate’s testimony here—namely, that its *docebit vos omnem veritatem* seems to represent *διηγῆσεται ὑμῖν τὴν ἀλήθειαν πᾶσαν*, at least according to Nestle.

Wettlaufer next tries to approximate the number of lost manuscripts via an Einsteinian thought experiment by considering the amount of copying that has gone on within the history of the church. By even a conservative estimate the number of these lost manuscripts must have been much larger than those which have survived. In his NTTC introduction, Parker emphasizes that

the degree of copying has been largely overlooked in the study of the New Testament text. In particular the oldest period suffers from a desperate paucity of evidence. To piece together the relationship between the manuscripts of that period can seem like trying to reconstruct a jigsaw picture with ten out of three thousand pieces.<sup>12</sup>

8. Wettlaufer, *No Longer Written*, p. 20.

9. Wettlaufer, *No Longer Written*, p. 25.

10. Wettlaufer, *No Longer Written*, p. 23.

11. Wettlaufer, *No Longer Written*, p. 26.

12. David C. Parker, *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and Their Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), p. 148.

After quoting some of these words, Wettlaufer continues that ‘the earliest text that we can reconstruct from manuscript evidence’<sup>13</sup> is no doubt, in Mink’s words, ‘not identical with the original, the text of the author. Between the autograph and the initial text considerable changes may have taken place which may not have left a single trace in the surviving textual tradition.’<sup>14</sup> Wettlaufer concludes, ‘primitive corruptions were able to enter the manuscript stream at the earliest date, while subsequent manuscript loss then erased the record of their entry. In this way a corruption can dominate what is left of the manuscript tradition while not betraying any external signs of being secondary.’<sup>15</sup>

Our author next deals with the resulting question in his subheading: ‘Could Corruption Really Have Overtaken Even the Surviving Portion of the Manuscript Tradition?’<sup>16</sup> He recalls that to New Testament textual critics the notion of evenly balanced evidence is no stranger. What this implies is that ‘about half of the surviving manuscript tradition has been overtaken by corruption’, at least in places.<sup>17</sup> Wettlaufer then presses the matter further by noting that according to the work of Maurice Robinson, who worked with the NA<sup>27</sup> text, there are at least thirty loci in the New Testament where the accepted reading is supported by merely a single manuscript.<sup>18</sup> Wettlaufer concludes by asking whether ‘there are cases where a corruption was actually able to overtake every extant witness’.<sup>19</sup>

In a final bit prior to his conclusion in this section, Wettlaufer takes up why one should think that such a scenario actually did occur. First, he argues that since we have multiple passages where the accepted text exists in merely a small number of manuscripts, or according to Robinson, only one, ‘it is logical to assume that there are yet more cases where secondary readings have

13. Wettlaufer, *No Longer Written*, p. 28.

14. Gerd Mink, ‘Problems of a Highly Contaminated Tradition: The New Testament: Stemmata of Variants as a Source of a Genealogy for Witnesses’, in Pieter van Reenan, August den Hollander and Margot van Mulken (eds.), *Studies in Stemmatology II* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2004), pp. 13-85 (25).

15. Wettlaufer, *No Longer Written*, p. 28.

16. Wettlaufer, *No Longer Written*, p. 28.

17. Wettlaufer, *No Longer Written*, p. 29.

18. Unfortunately, this study is evidently unpublished. Wettlaufer, however, provides a list of the thirty passages (*No Longer Written*, p. 30 n. 55).

19. Wettlaufer, *No Longer Written*, p. 30.

overtaken all surviving witnesses'.<sup>20</sup> Of course, Wettlaufer notes that 'it is quite impossible to prove [this] absolutely by external means'.<sup>21</sup> His second point is founded on the overall substantial integrity of the vast majority of the New Testament text. Because this is unquestionably established, it provides 'a basis for the expectation of consistency, violations of which can therefore be identified as textual deficiencies'. As soon as an author's style is established, anything that deviates from that manner 'creates an implication that the word(s) in question did not originate with the author. The same can be said for other intrinsic criteria traditionally employed by textual critics, such as the logical flow of the author's argument or contextual concord'.<sup>22</sup> In this way, then, Wettlaufer finds internal criteria for the notion that in places total textual corruption really did occur. More will be said about this notion of authorial consistency later when J.K. Elliott's reaction to Wettlaufer is considered.

Before launching forth into the second motive for the widespread rejection of the practice of conjectural emendation within NTTC, Wettlaufer offers a ten-page excursus on the CBGM because he sees this methodology as supporting his concept of manuscript loss. As Krans has noted in his review of Wettlaufer, the latter's presentation of the CBGM is a nice précis of a notion that has proven difficult for many to grasp.<sup>23</sup>

Wettlaufer then takes up the second reason for the scorn traditionally given to emending the New Testament text, namely, the 'doctrine of preservation

20. Wettlaufer, *No Longer Written*, p. 30.

21. Wettlaufer, *No Longer Written*, p. 31.

22. Wettlaufer, *No Longer Written*, p. 31.

23. Krans calls it a 'useful explanation of the Coherence Method'. Jan Krans, review of *No Longer Written: The Use of Conjectural Emendation in the Restoration of the Text of the New Testament, the Epistle of James as a Case Study* (NTTSD, 44; Leiden: Brill, 2013), by Ryan Donald Wettlaufer, in *TC* 19 (2014), pp. 1-7 (2). For an introductory overview of the CBGM, the reader may consult Peter Gurry, 'How Your Greek NT Is Changing: A Simple Introduction to the Coherence-Based Genealogical Method (CBGM)', *JETS* 59 (2016), pp. 675-89, and for more depth, his new book *A Critical Examination of the Coherence-Based Genealogical Method in New Testament Textual Criticism* (NTTSD, 55; Leiden: Brill, 2017), as well as his co-authored primer on the subject; see Tommy Wasserman and Peter J. Gurry, *A New Approach to Textual Criticism: An Introduction to the Coherence-Based Genealogical Method* (SBLRBS, 80; Atlanta: SBL, 2017).

... that God has supernaturally protected the text, preventing any part of it from being totally lost'.<sup>24</sup> Wettlaufer offers some insightful observations here. Noting that many New Testament textual critics would 'resist the insinuation that their conclusions were influenced by such theological beliefs',<sup>25</sup> he quotes Stephen Jay Gould's notion that many scientists unwittingly bring 'their own mental impositions upon the world's messy and ambiguous factuality'.<sup>26</sup> Wettlaufer encourages all to explore their own bias in this area.<sup>27</sup>

Next he demonstrates that the doctrine of preservation follows from that of inspiration, and it finds support—in the eyes of its adherents—from the Scriptures themselves. Wettlaufer parses such thinking into two types which he terms 'the mainstream and the minority'.<sup>28</sup> The latter group believes 'that the *textus receptus* is God's preserved text', and its adherents are 'confined to the remote extremes of conservative Christianity'.<sup>29</sup> Interestingly, Wettlaufer also associates his mainstream faction with the doctrine of preservation: for them 'God preserved the scriptures in the totality of extant manuscripts'.<sup>30</sup> He elucidates,

While this version of preservation right away seems more reasonable, given that it admits the reality of textual variation and allows for the practice of modern textual criticism, in truth it differs from the first version only by degree. The first version depended on God asserting a 100% protective force on the New Testament text, protecting it completely from corruption. This second version counts on God exerting a protective influence and differs only in that it allows for the protection to be something less than 100%. God may well have let all the manuscript copies experience corruption, and he might even have allowed the loss of a great number of those copies, but he stopped short of letting the original text be lost completely at any point. Rather, at every point in the text he exerted just enough power to make sure that the correct reading survived somewhere in the extant manuscript base. Thus, while

24. Wettlaufer, *No Longer Written*, p. 43.

25. Wettlaufer, *No Longer Written*, p. 47.

26. Stephen Jay Gould, *The Mismeasure of a Man* (New York: Norton, rev. edn, 1996), p. 406.

27. Wettlaufer, *No Longer Written*, pp. 43-44.

28. Wettlaufer, *No Longer Written*, p. 47.

29. Wettlaufer, *No Longer Written*, pp. 47-48.

30. Wettlaufer, *No Longer Written*, p. 49.

it downgrades the level of divine preservation from “complete” to “adequate,” this belief nevertheless claims that God himself supernaturally intervened in the transmission process.<sup>31</sup>

For Wettlaufer, then, those who reject the practice of New Testament textual emendation and advocate the idea that at every point in today’s New Testament text our witnesses are sufficient are actually subscribing to the notion of divine preservation. Of course, not all who dismiss textual emendation would consider themselves supporters of the idea of divine preservation, a fact that our author does not address. Nevertheless, this enunciated concept should give pause to those who reject the notion of textual emendation in practice.

The third reason Wettlaufer delineates for putting a damper on the need for conjectural emendation within NTTC is the recent notion of narrative textual criticism popularized by Parker and Epp. If the goal of the field is not to recover an original text, then ‘there appears to be little need for a technique that looks back to a text prior to the church’s corruption of it’.<sup>32</sup> He counters this by (1) showing that Krans has stipulated a sort of ‘narrative conjectural emendation’,<sup>33</sup> (2) appealing to Ehrman’s statement that recent developments in this area ‘may be going too far’<sup>34</sup> and (3) agreeing with Hull when the latter says, ‘One cannot detect the alteration unless one can identify the original’.<sup>35</sup> No chapter in Wettlaufer’s book is as fascinating ideologically as the second one.

The third chapter, entitled ‘Method’, contains detailed criteria for when and how to make a conjecture, as well as how to reject one. Here the author stipulates some helpful benchmarks, his ‘three-part control’, namely, ‘internal deficiency’,<sup>36</sup> coupled with ‘confirmation [among] ... ancient

31. Wettlaufer, *No Longer Written*, p. 50.

32. Wettlaufer, *No Longer Written*, p. 58.

33. Wettlaufer, *No Longer Written*, pp. 58-59.

34. Bart Ehrman, *Misquoting Jesus* (New York: HarperOne, 2005), p. 210.

35. Robert F. Hull, *The Story of the New Testament Text: Moves, Materials, Motives, and Models* (Atlanta: SBL, 2010), p. 154.

36. By this he means, ‘if the text appears to contain some unexplainable error, then this could indicate some primitive corruption’ (Wettlaufer, *No Longer Written*, p. 64).



interpreters',<sup>37</sup> and finally 'the scholarship of modern interpreters'.<sup>38</sup> However, on his first point an interesting proviso is found. Wettlaufer cautions that 'the extant manuscript base alone cannot serve as an acceptable system of control' since '[c]onfining conjectures to existing points of variation' is faulty because 'the majority of manuscripts have been lost'.<sup>39</sup> Therefore, his 'internal deficiency' is not restricted to textual problems already visible to us today, but may include 'secondary mistakes that have overtaken the extant manuscript tradition'.<sup>40</sup>

The second half of the book on the practice of conjectural emendation focuses entirely on the book of James, a wise choice for two reasons. First, this is present in the lone volume of the ECM that was published when Wettlaufer composed his book, so he had a complete catalogue of the external testimony. Secondly, the manuscript tradition of James is not as rich as many other New Testament books, so the subject at hand is less unwieldy. Four chapters comprise this section: in three our author takes a lone problem within a single verse (Jas 3.1; 4.2, 5) and argues for an emendation; in the last chapter he examines proposed conjectures for Jas 1.1 and 2.1 and rejects them. It should be noted here that all of these conjectures are old ones, long predating Wettlaufer. The value that he provides is a comprehensive description of the problems and some new perspectives on why acceptance of the proposals in the first three is fitting.

Discussing them all in detail is beyond the scope of this article, but two are particularly interesting. The first is reading *πολυλάλοι διδάσκαλοι* instead of *πολλοὶ διδάσκαλοι* at Jas 3.1, that is, 'teachers should not become garrulous' instead of 'not many should become teachers'. According to the Amsterdam website of Krans this proposal dates back to Patricius Junius in 1642.<sup>41</sup> Wettlaufer highlights several reasons why this emendation makes sense: rare compounds occur elsewhere in James; the word is found in other early Christian writings; it can explain the origin of the other readings—by

37. Wettlaufer, *No Longer Written*, p. 67.

38. Wettlaufer, *No Longer Written*, p. 67.

39. Wettlaufer, *No Longer Written*, p. 63.

40. Wettlaufer, *No Longer Written*, pp. 64-65. An example of this may well be the well-known textual crux at 1 Cor. 6.5.

41. See this resource online: [ntvmr.uni-muenster.de/nt-conjectures](http://ntvmr.uni-muenster.de/nt-conjectures), subject entry: Jas 3.1.

haplography *πολυλαλοι* became *πολλοι*, with the medial *υλα* being lost.<sup>42</sup> Most importantly, the conjecture is in keeping with the context of the passage: it fits the overall exhortation to control one's tongue, first to the teachers, then to all. There is no need to press the *κριμα* beyond its usual 'judgment' meaning to 'scrutiny', as some have been wont to do with the received reading. Finally, Jas 3.1 as usually understood is the only New Testament passage that limits teachers; other loci encourage the role (Mt. 28.20; Col. 3.16; Heb. 5.12). By reading *πολυλαλοι διδασκαλοι*, one understands this command to be in harmony with the rest of the larger picture.

Another emendation our author argues for at length in his Chapter 6 is a *πρὸς τὸν θεόν* (the last word being the *nomen sacrum* *θν*, for the received reading *πρὸς φθόνον* at the opaque Jas 4.5. Krans states that this conjecture probably does go back to Wettstein (as Wettlaufer believes), but that such cannot be established.<sup>43</sup> Wettlaufer stipulates multiple problems here and crafts eleven questions that need answering before one can find a resolution. In support of his argument he finds vocabulary from Eccl. 12.7 and Ps. 41.2 in the LXX also present in Jas 4.5. His solution yields, 'do you think that in vain the scripture says "the spirit he caused to dwell within us yearns for God"?'.<sup>44</sup> As something of a gauge of the reception of Wettlaufer's work, one should note that the Allison ICC volume on James was published after his dissertation but

42. Wettlaufer notes the Old Latin *Speculum* reads *multiloqui* at Jas 3.1 (*No Longer Written*, pp. 87, 95, 101) and believes this supports *πολυλαλοι*. Evidently, he gets this from NA<sup>27/28</sup>, as well as BDF §115, the latter being cited in *No Longer Written*, p. 95. The testimony may be even stronger, as the *Vetus Latina* edition has the Spanish text-type (S) as reading *nolite multiloqui esse fratres mei*, (Walter Thiele, *Epistulae Catholicae* [Vetus Latina, 26; Freiburg: Herder, 1956–1969], p. 35). In the ECM this information is tucked away in the supplementary material volume: Barbara Aland et al. (eds.), *Novum Testamentum Graecum, Editio Critica Maior, IV: Catholic Letters. Part 2. Supplementary Material* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2nd rev. edn, 2013), p. 104. Houghton refers to the OL *Speculum* as the Pseudo-Augustine *Liber de diuinis scripturis* (see below). The comment by Burkitt, citing Sanday, that the character of this work 'is generally considered to contain a degenerate African text' (F. Crawford Burkitt, *The Book of Rules of Tyconius* [TS, 3; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1894], p. lxi), is probably outdated given the current principles of NTTC. A complete stemma is provided by Wettlaufer for all the Greek readings with the proposed conjecture at the top (*No Longer Written*, p. 98).

43. See online: [ntvmr.uni-muenster.de/nt-conjectures](http://ntvmr.uni-muenster.de/nt-conjectures), subject entry Jas 4.5.

44. Wettlaufer, *No Longer Written*, p. 151.

before his monograph. On the Jas 3.1 passage Allison is impressed: after discussing the conjecture ἐθελοδιδάσκαλοι by Völter, Allison states, ‘Much more tempting is the conjectural emendation of Wettlaufer’.<sup>45</sup> He does not, however, adopt it. Allison merely lists Wettlaufer without comment in a footnote in his comments on 4.5.<sup>46</sup>

In the bigger picture the publishing of Wettlaufer’s work is timely for more than one reason. First, the influence of scholars from the INTF has been gaining momentum, not least because of the concrete appearance of, and doubtless the future dominance in the field by, the ECM. They are open to the idea of textual emendation.<sup>47</sup> More interesting, however, are individuals who are known for having generally been against the procedure in the past but who have been changing their stance on the matter. Thus, there currently appears to be going on a reassessment of the role of conjectural emendation within the discipline, at least in some important circles.

One example is Bart Ehrman. In his co-authored fourth revision of the classic NTTC primer originally penned by Metzger alone, Ehrman and his mentor have kept unchanged their basic castigation of the practice with the words, ‘the amount of evidence for the text of the New Testament ... is so much greater than that available for any ancient classical author that the necessity of resorting to emendation is reduced to the smallest dimensions’.<sup>48</sup> If

45. Dale C. Allison, Jr, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle of James* (ICC; London: Bloomsbury, 2013), p. 520 n. 49. He refers here to Wettlaufer’s 2011 dissertation.

46. Allison, *Epistle of James*, p. 613 n. 138.

47. It is noteworthy that they are still quite sparing in their use of it so far. In the ECM volume on the Catholic Epistles, just the reading of οὐχ at 2 Pet. 3.10 could possibly be cited as an example, and only if one sees the testimony of the Syriac and Coptic witnesses as ancient attempts at emendation. In the Acts volume, only 13.33 is presented as an emendation. Of course, both of these loci have long been debated as textually problematic. Furthermore, the ECM now rejects the old NA<sup>28</sup> conjecture of πρώτη[ς] μερίδος τῆς at Acts 16.12.

48. Bruce M. Metzger and Bart D. Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2nd edn, 2005), p. 230. It is striking that missing from the fourth edition are the following words, which are found immediately after the above quotation in the third edition: ‘It is perhaps chiefly in the Catholic Epistles and the Apocalypse, where the manuscript evidence is more limited than for any other part of the New Testament, that the need for attempting conjectural emendation may arise with any degree of urgency’ (Bruce

we accept the common definition of conjectural emendation as adopting a reading that is found in no ancient or mediaeval witness, then Ehrman must have changed his position on the procedure with his acceptance of the unattested rejection of 1 Cor. 14.34-35 as genuinely Pauline.<sup>49</sup> The evidence that

M. Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 3rd edn, 1992], p. 185). This absence might be understood to indicate an even more strident anti-emendation stance than Metzger's position alone.

49. There are some chronological problems with dating just when this shift in thinking occurred. In Bart D. Ehrman, *The New Testament: A Historical Introduction to the Early Christian Writings* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 3rd edn, 2004), he argues 'it may be, then, that the intervening verses [14.34-35] were not part of the text of 1 Corinthians but originated as a marginal note that later copyists inserted into the text after verse 33 ... it does not appear that they were written by Paul but by someone living later' (p. 402). A year afterward in *Misquoting Jesus*, Ehrman is more definitive, with no 'it may be' (pp. 183-84). Perhaps this change was occurring while the 3rd edition of *The Text of the New Testament* was coming into print. Whatever the exact chronology, that Ehrman has changed his attitude toward the concept of emendation seems established. Of course, others preceded Ehrman in taking this position, especially Gordon Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), pp. 699-702. According to Anthony Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), p. 1148, this view goes back over a century at least to Johannes Weiss. Fee's torch has been passed to Philip B. Payne who has been arguing for decades that marginal sigla in MS B/03, as well as the representation of this passage in the Vg MS Fuldensis (F), indicate that 1 Cor. 14.34-35 is an interpolation; see Philip B. Payne, 'Fuldensis, Sigla for Variants in Vaticanus and 1 Cor 14.34-5', *NTS* 41 (1995), pp. 240-62; *idem*, 'MS. 88 as Evidence for a Text without 1 Cor 14.34-5', *NTS* 44 (1998), pp. 152-58. Scholarly reaction has not been generally favorable: David Parker finds his argument 'weak, indeed part of it seems hopelessly confused' (*Introduction*, p. 276); Peter Gurry remains unconvinced; see Peter Gurry, '2015 ETS and SBL Paper Summaries', online: <http://evangelicaltextualcriticism.blogspot.com/2015/12/>. However, recently, scholars at the Vatican have embraced Payne's work. Paul Canart co-authored the article with Payne, 'Distigmai Matching the Original Ink of Codex Vaticanus: Do They Mark the Location of Textual Variants?', in Patrick Andrist (ed.), *Le manuscrit B de la Bible (Vaticanus graecus 1209)* (Lausanne: Éditions du Zèbre, 2009), pp. 199-226. In his extended review of NA<sup>28</sup>, Anthony Forte not only finds Payne and Canart's thinking valid but chastises the NA editors for not employing it, 'Observations on the 28th Revised Edition of Nestle-Aland's Novum Testamentum Graecae', *Bib* 94 (2013),

he and his predecessors have rallied for this conclusion is threefold: (1) with the removal of vv. 34-35 ‘the passage seems to flow seamlessly as a discussion of the role of Christian prophets’;<sup>50</sup> (2) in five manuscripts, three Greek and two Latin, these verses are found not where they are in most witnesses but after verse 40;<sup>51</sup> (3) those holding to this view think the thoughts expressed in vv. 34-35 do not harmonize with Paul’s expressions of the role of women elsewhere in the undisputed Pauline letters. It is noteworthy that the only text-critical appeal here is reason number two, the placement of these verses in five (?) manuscripts. There are no witnesses that entirely lack the text. Thus declaring the material as not genuinely Pauline is a case of textual emendation.

Another New Testament textual critic who has apparently modified his view of emendation is Philip Comfort. In his 2005 book *Encountering the Manuscripts*, in his discussion of conjectural emendation where he uses 1 Pet. 3.19 as an example, he states:

These are ingenious conjectures [“in Enoch” or “by which spirit Enoch”] ... but could not be considered as reconstructions of the original. In fact, the present thought among New Testament scholars is that conjectural emendations should be eliminated from the textual apparatus of the Greek New Testament because they do not have any manuscript support.<sup>52</sup>

Yet in his large commentary of a few years later he states the following regarding Eph. 1.1:

[I]n the original document ... a blank space was likely left between τοῖς οὖσιν (“the ones being”) and καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (“and faithful

pp. 268-92 (289-91). In his more recent ‘Vaticanus Distigme-obelos Symbols Marking Added Text, Including 1 Corinthians 14.34-5’, *NTS* 63 (2017), 604-25, Payne offers further response and ideas, and cites one point of approval by Parker (p. 607).

50. Ehrman, *Misquoting Jesus*, p. 184.

51. ‘In three Greek manuscripts and a couple of Latin witnesses’ (Ehrman, *Misquoting Jesus*, p. 183). According to Parker the actual evidence is a bit stronger: ‘Greek manuscripts 06 010 012 88 915, the Syriac Peshitta and the Latin manuscripts 61 89 with Ambrosiaster and Sedulius’ (*Introduction*, p. 275).

52. Philip Comfort, *Encountering the Manuscripts: An Introduction to New Testament Paleography and Textual Criticism* (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2005), p. 382.

ones in Christ Jesus”). The blank would be filled in with the name of each local church (“in Ephesus,” “in Laodicea,” “in Colossae,” etc.) as the epistle circulated from city to city. Later manuscripts reflect the insertion of “in Ephesus” because Ephesus was the leading city in that region.<sup>53</sup>

Certainly this would qualify as a correction ‘made to the text on the basis of scholarly conjecture without having any actual manuscript support’,<sup>54</sup> since no witnesses have such a blank space.

Intriguing is the case of J.K. Elliott. He has long had a self-admitted reputation for viewing conjectural emendations as ‘fripperies’.<sup>55</sup> Many in the field may not know, however, that surprisingly he took a position against his own view in 2000 when he proposed that Mark’s Gospel began not with the introduction we have, namely Mk 1.1-3.<sup>56</sup> Since no witness lacks this introductory material, this is a conjectural emendation. Reflecting on the implications of this position, largely from his later contact with Wettlaufer’s research, he describes it as his own softening on the issue. Indeed, he has interacted with Wettlaufer twice in print. The first of these is his review of Wettlaufer in 2013,<sup>57</sup> and the second is a journal article three years later which represents,

53. Philip W. Comfort, *New Testament Text and Translation Commentary* (Carol Stream, IL: Tyndale House, 2008), p. 578.

54. Comfort, *Encountering the Manuscripts*, p. 381. It should be noted that this emendation is missing from Comfort’s more recent *A Commentary on the Manuscripts and Texts of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2015), p. 340. Whether he has backed off this conjecture or it is missing because of the reduced size of the volume (compared to his much larger *New Testament Text and Translation Commentary*) is unknown. I am unaware of any indication in print on the matter.

55. J.K. Elliott, review of *No Longer Written: The Use of Conjectural Emendation in the Restoration of the Text of the New Testament, the Epistle of James as a Case Study* (NTTSD, 44; Leiden: Brill, 2013), by Ryan Donald Wettlaufer, in *FN* 26 (2013), pp. 165-69 (166).

56. J.K. Elliott, ‘Mark 1:1-3: A Later Addition to the Gospel?’, *NTS* 46 (2000), pp. 584-88.

57. Elliott, review of *No Longer Written*, pp. 165-69.

in revision, his contribution to the SNTS Annual Meeting held in Hungary in 2014.<sup>58</sup> In his review he states:

Throughout Wettlaufer is persuasive in arguing the case for allowing conjectural emendation to play its part in establishing the *Ausgangstext* of the New Testament. The modern acknowledgement that the original authorial text is itself a chimera, and an initial text the only logical text we may achieve, is part of his convincing armoury of arguments against those (like the present reviewer—until recently) who are reluctant to allow inspired guesses to influence the establishing of a critical text.<sup>59</sup>

In his article not long afterward, Elliott brings up a point that Wettlaufer discusses (above): that an individual author's style, and especially the modern text critic's appeal to the consistency of that style, plays a major role in proposing conjectural emendations, and indeed in New Testament text-critical judgments overall.<sup>60</sup> While there must be a general acknowledgment of the importance of this principle by and large, the present writer is uncomfortable with some factors that seem to have been underemphasized in discussions of this point.

Space limitations prohibit an in-depth discussion of the matter here, but the principal objections can be mentioned. The first is the necessary premise that New Testament authors rarely did anything just once. If we argue as a foundation that anything which appears as idiosyncratic to the composer's style is suspect, then what are we to do with phenomena that appear singularly? For example, verbal adjectives in *-τέος* occur but once in the New Testament, not surprisingly in Luke's Gospel, at 5.38. Even though there are text-critical issues here, most accept that Luke indeed used this verbal adjective. Does he do so elsewhere? Is this not then idiosyncratic to his known usage? Then there are the many *hapax legomena* within the New Testament. By nature these can all be viewed as exceptions to any author's vocabulary, a deviation from his style, but they often are not viewed as suspect textually. Secondly, there is *variatio* or syntactic variation of style. Of course, authors like Philo and Josephus are better known for this than New Testament ones, but

58. J.K. Elliott, 'Using an Author's Consistency of Usage and Conjectures as Criteria to Resolve Textual Variation in the Greek New Testament', *NTS* 62 (2016), pp. 122-35.

59. Elliott, review of *No Longer Written*, p. 166.

60. Elliott, 'Using an Author's Consistency', pp. 131-35.

even lower-caliber writers made some attempt at this,<sup>61</sup> for it was the style of the time.<sup>62</sup> Therefore, when Elliott asks whether one should have the liberty of moving the one example of ταῦτα that comes after its verb at 1 Tim. 4.11 so that it corresponds to all the other instances of the same construction in the Pastorals where it stands before the verb, he never brings up the notion that the Epistle's author may have just been displaying *variatio*.<sup>63</sup> This too is missing from Wettlaufer's discussion of individual style, yet it is, like the aforementioned singular linguistic or lexical phenomena, a very real consideration. Do text critics not want to deal fully with this reality that can throw a wrench into their suppositions?

As for those who espouse the benefits of textual emendation, a frequently heard assertion to support their position is that there are plenty of examples of emendations made that were later substantiated by manuscript finds. Georg Luck, a classicist who turned his attention to the matter of New Testament conjectural emendation a few years before he died,<sup>64</sup> is among this number. He provides a few examples but claims 'there are many more'.<sup>65</sup> While Wettlaufer wisely avoids such a sweeping statement, he does latch on to the idea. He calls upon the reading of P<sup>66</sup> at Jn 7.52 (for this, see below on the discussion of Jongkind), and in a lengthy footnote a set of others is mentioned from an article of Michael Holmes on *1 Clement*.<sup>66</sup> It would seem to the

61. Indeed, Jenny Dines has noted that the first-language text-bound LXX translator of Amos 'renders his Hebrew meticulously', even fitting 'the "interlinear" bill', yet occasionally waxes fancy at times, merely for stylistic purposes (*The Septuagint* [London: T. & T. Clark, 2004], pp. 54-57). If literal LXX translators sometimes utilized such standard rhetorical flourishes, then surely New Testament composers did all the more since they worked in a single original language.

62. Kathryn Gutzwiller, *A Guide to Hellenistic Literature* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2007), pp. 41-43, 60-61, 151-52.

63. Elliott, 'Using an Author's Consistency', p. 134.

64. See Georg Luck, 'Conjectural Emendation in the Greek New Testament', in M. Sanz Morales and M. Librán Moreno (eds.), *Verae Lectiones, Estudios de crítica textual y edición de textos griegos* (Huelva: Publicaciones Universidad de Huelva, 2009), pp. 169-202. For anyone interested in the subject in the article's title, this reading is vital.

65. Georg Luck, 'Conjectural Emendation', pp. 170-71. Wettlaufer is clearly dependent on him in multiple places in his monograph, referring to this article six times: *No Longer Written*, pp. 9, 14, 17, 74, 77, 81.

66. Wettlaufer, *No Longer Written*, pp. 10-12, with n. 33.



present writer, who, as a classicist, is generously open to the idea of textual emendation, that if such a frequent claim has genuine merit, why has a list of such ‘many’ instances not been made? If such has already been accomplished and been published somewhere, then why has it not been referred to as frequently as the common claim has been made?

Before leaving the Wettlaufer book, this reviewer needs to make three further observations. First, our author shows yet further creativity by his utilizing principles from the social (and other) sciences. In his third chapter on methodology, under his subheading on how to make a conjecture, he examines the question: ‘[H]ow do errors occur?’<sup>67</sup> Moving beyond those often-discussed ‘mistakes that have a direct and predictable cause that is usually rooted in the mechanics of the text itself’,<sup>68</sup> Wettlaufer brings in principles of psychology and psycholinguistics. This seems a much-needed perspective in NTTC, one which, since the rarely cited work on the matter by Sebastiano Timpanaro originally published in 1974,<sup>69</sup> has been largely neglected. In fact, Parker has observed that such study ‘has passed New Testament scholarship by’.<sup>70</sup> That statement should be qualified as more specifically NTTC, for other fields within New Testament studies have taken advantage of the timeless principles and findings that the social sciences can offer.<sup>71</sup> Wettlaufer has continued his work in this regard, penning an article on scribal priming in 2017.<sup>72</sup> Given that human factors such as dysgraphia and dyslexia must have remained fairly consistent in populations over time, why has no one in NTTC ever brought the findings of the social sciences to bear on these two facets of

67. Wettlaufer, *No Longer Written*, p. 68.

68. These mistakes include: haplography, dittography, homoeoteleuton, homoearchton and errors in oral dictation; see Wettlaufer, *No Longer Written*, p. 68.

69. Sebastiano Timpanaro, *Il lapsus freudiano: Psicanalisi e critica testuale* (Florence: La nuova Italia, 1974). See also the English translation: *idem, The Freudian Slip: Psychoanalysis and Textual Criticism* (trans. Kate Soper; London: NLB, 1976).

70. Parker, *Introduction*, p. 152.

71. The success of relatively new sections of the SBL such as Social Scientific Criticism of the New Testament is witness to this fact. Pauline studies is a good example of how the appropriation of social scientific principles has borne fruit.

72. Ryan D. Wettlaufer, ‘The Well Primed Scribe’, *ASE* 34 (2017), pp. 497-512. Priming here means subliminal stimuli that provoke conceptual mental associations.

human life? Surely, they must have played a role in the transmission history of the New Testament text. The discipline of NTTC can use such influxes of fresh thought.

Secondly, the negative aspects of Wettlaufer's work should not be ignored. Krans has noted a significant number of minor errors.<sup>73</sup> Elliott has highlighted a more serious gaff, where Wettlaufer did not know how to read the critical apparatus of the ECM Catholic Epistles volumes, specifically, wrong conclusions our author drew from misunderstanding how a negative apparatus works.<sup>74</sup> Surely a text critic should be certain he knows how to use such an apparatus before drawing conclusions in print. Striking to the present reviewer is the colloquial low-brow style that Wettlaufer employs, complete with plentiful dangling modifiers, overemphases that mark popular speech and a general character of writing that seems more fitting to teaching undergraduates than dialoging with colleagues. This will not serve an up-and-coming scholar well. We can hope that he will mature in this respect as he finds his legs in the fleet of academia.

Finally, Wettlaufer's emphasis on trying to picture, in realistic, feet-on-the-ground terms, how the New Testament text came into being and was preserved, has caused the present writer to give serious consideration to the more practical elements of the history of the New Testament text than ever before. For example, how long did the autograph of each New Testament book last? Did they all have a 'normal' (whatever this might mean) lifespan? How protected were they, especially before they came to be viewed as authoritative? Did one or a few undergo early loss due to factors such as fire, shipwreck, infighting<sup>75</sup> or persecution? When the first copy was made of a book, then that

73. One and half pages of errata are listed by Krans, review of *No Longer Written*, pp. 6-7.

74. Elliott, review of *No Longer Written*, p. 166.

75. This appears to be yet another unexplored area within NTTC. There seems to have been little attention paid to the possibility that at least some of the earliest copies we have of letters from, say, the apostle Paul, reflect a history of having been copied by individuals who were at least somewhat influenced by the very opposers he castigates. How would that scenario have affected their copying? Did individuals like Hymenaeus, Philetus, Diogenes, the Jezebel at Rev. 2.20 and likely untold others exercise enough influence that some copyists with ties to them made some early modifications in the texts? To my knowledge such a notion within NTTC only begins with Ehrman's work.

copy contained its unique changes. If a second copy was then made from the original, and then a third, all independently of one another, and then the original was lost, there would have been only three extant copies, each with its own idiosyncrasies. Then once copies were made from each of these and so on, there would have been no way to check these later copies against the original. Given the frequencies of the mishaps mentioned by Paul at 2 Cor. 11.23-27 (which surely other missionaries and carriers of works that later became part of the New Testament likewise experienced) and the accounts of persecution known from other writings of the early church, how long are we to think that the autographs lasted? Was any kind of text-critical work done on them in the first and early second centuries? If so, what? How often were copies destroyed and had to be recreated? Such vagaries are only highlighted by the fact that no one today knows whatever happened to the mysterious letter to the Laodiceans referred to in Col. 4.16, to the now lost letter that Paul had written to the Corinthians prior to our 1 Corinthians and to which he there refers, or to the 'many' who had compiled accounts of Jesus' activities mentioned at Lk. 1.1. Wettlaufer's rich contribution is indeed thought-provoking in light of all these factors.

*Houghton's Great Service for His Fellow Text Critics*

A second notable work on NTTC to appear recently is that of Hugh Houghton on the Latin New Testament: *The Latin New Testament: A Guide to its Early History, Texts, and Manuscripts*. The book has a six-page preface and is divided into three sections: a five-chapter portion on history (110 pages); a three-chapter section on texts (73 pages); and the largest section of just two chapters on manuscripts (112 pages with three appendices). The immediately following bibliography of 48 pages indicates how well-read Houghton is on his topic.<sup>76</sup> The succeeding indices then appear in this order: manuscripts, biblical passages, ancient authors and writings, subjects. No index of modern authors is present, though a few are included in the subject index (the criteria used for determining this inclusion are unclear). The volume contains 16 black and white images, the first of which is a map of Europe and

76. Houghton self-describes his research as 'extensive' (*Latin New Testament*, p. ix).

the Mediterranean area. The others are of manuscripts of wide-ranging dates, save one that is a sample page of the *Vetus Latina* edition (VL).

The first chapter, while focused of course on its subject of the Latin Bible's origins in the second and third centuries, is also the reader's first encounter with Houghton's style: stating the facts succinctly yet often with surprising detail, and then quickly moving along to the next point. Rarely does our author tarry on his mission of progressively making the traditionally opaque subject of the Latin New Testament understandable to his reader. Another feature regularly found throughout the volume is the final paragraph which is a nice summary of each chapter. An excerpt from the first one illustrates the point:

... the adoption of Latin in the early church was a gradual development, lasting at least a century. The origins of the translation of the New Testament are obscured by the continuing use of Greek texts by authors familiar with both languages who made ad hoc translations of their biblical quotations into Latin. Even so, a Latin translation of most if not all books of the Bible, probably made in the first half of the third century, was used by Cyprian in North Africa ... the early biblical translations, including features from an initial period of experimentation, exert a strong and lasting influence on most Christian writing in Latin throughout its history.<sup>77</sup>

The second chapter deals with the fourth century (and early fifth) and discusses Latin authors such as Lactantius, Tyconius, Victorinus Afer, Fortunatianus and Hilary among others, as examples of the Old Latin text. The oldest surviving Latin Gospel, Codex Bezae of the fourth century, is Houghton's first picture. Bilingual Greek-Latin manuscripts get coverage (with a photo of Codex Bezae), before the focus moves to Jerome and the Vulgate (Vg) Gospels. Here the reader is treated to one of Houghton's several relatively short (here two-page) outpourings of intense detail: a barrage of examples showing how Jerome changed the Old Latin Gospel text in multiple ways. Then Rufinus, Augustine and Pelagius are covered. It is in his presentation of Augustine that Houghton discusses the above-mentioned *Speculum* (in the Wettlauffer material) as two separate collections of *testimonia*: one of

77. Houghton, *Latin New Testament*, pp. 17-18.

Augustine's genuine last works,<sup>78</sup> and an earlier Pseudo-Augustine one that is cited in some Greek New Testament editions as *Spec.* (UBS, NA) or *m* (Tischendorf, Merk, Souter). This latter collection preserves Old Latin readings.

Chapter 3 is entitled 'Competing Texts: The Fifth to the Seventh Centuries', and it documents the 'combining [of] features of both Vulgate and pre-Vulgate' traditions so that 'mixed texts' became common.<sup>79</sup> Furthermore, 'One of the editorial innovations of this period was the creation of manuscripts containing the whole New Testament and even pandects comprising the whole Bible, often with new sets of prologues or *capitula*.'<sup>80</sup> Five plates of manuscripts appear here. The Eusebian apparatus is introduced; the proceedings of episcopal councils are mined for information on the state of the Latin New Testament books circulating at the time; Greeks, Goths and Arians merit a subheading, as do lectionaries and harmonies, before the role of Cassiodorus in the transmission of the biblical text is presented. The chapter closes with geographical considerations: Africa and Spain, France, Ireland and Britain.

Chapter 4 on the eighth and ninth centuries covers how fewer later manuscripts survive than earlier but how complete Bibles (in one or two volumes) and full New Testaments became more common. Scriptoria receive mention in the contexts of the twin Northumbrian monasteries of Wearmouth and Jarrow, as well as the monastery of St Gall in Switzerland, at Echternach in Germany and at Tours in France, where a chronology can be reconstructed based on manuscript variation. Well-known manuscripts such as Codex Amiatinus, the Cuthbert Gospel of John (seventh century and still in its original binding), the Book of Kells, the Lindisfarne Gospels and Codex Grandivallensis are discussed, sometimes with plates. Characters like Bede, Charlemagne, Alcuin and Theodulf have their roles vis-à-vis the Latin Bible explained. At this time full interlinear translations begin to appear (earlier generally limited to glosses), and, of course, illustration and decoration increase. The importance of the map on p. 4 becomes clear as the reader works his or her way through this chapter.

78. This is 'the only work in which Augustine quotes the Vulgate version of Acts, the Epistles, and Revelation' (Houghton, *Latin New Testament*, p. 39).

79. Houghton, *Latin New Testament*, p. 43.

80. Houghton, *Latin New Testament*, p. 43.

The comparatively short fifth chapter ends Houghton's historical Part I. This covers developments from the tenth century onward. Although 'the affiliation of the vast majority of Bibles is Vulgate', still 'several codices copied between the tenth and fourteenth century provide evidence for the pre-Vulgate text'.<sup>81</sup> Manuscripts from several Spanish pandects are discussed (with one plate) along with less common lectionaries. Next are large Bibles from northern Italy, called 'Atlantic Bibles' (named after the classical giant Atlas) which includes the famed Codex Gigas. While most of this 'largest Latin Bible in existence' is Vulgate, Acts and Revelation are 'the principal witnesses to the Vetus Latina text-type I'.<sup>82</sup> Irish Gospels or 'pocket gospel books', such as the Book of Deer (with plate) follow; then the *Glossa Ordinaria*, Paris Bibles and the rediscovery of Greek close out this chapter.<sup>83</sup>

Part II will particularly interest those actively involved in NTTC. Chapter 6 is on the scholarly editions of the Latin New Testament and how Latin testimony is presented in UBS<sup>5</sup> and NA<sup>28</sup>, as well as in the ECM. The chapter is divided into 12 subheadings, the first of which is devoted to explaining the three-volume *editio princeps* of the complete Old Latin by Sabatier (1743–49). Reprinted by Brepols in 1976 with an appendix of manuscripts used, the original is today available online, but 'is now of only antiquarian interest'.<sup>84</sup> The second subheading is at the opposite end of importance: a pithy and naturally valuable introduction to the Vetus Latina edition out of the Archabbey in Beuron, Germany. After a listing of volumes done and in progress, a helpful exposition of the two introductory volumes of the Vetus Latina, the *Repertorium* (sigla of sources) and *Register* (catalogue of manuscripts) follows, including a rich discussion of details and idiosyncrasies. All entries in these works are in German or French. Next Houghton lists and explains the sigla used for text-types and sub-types with the proviso that their 'identification depends on the judgement of each editor, and is fraught with

81. Houghton, *Latin New Testament*, p. 96.

82. Houghton, *Latin New Testament*, p. 100.

83. Although earlier bilingual codices had 'offered a means of engaging with the Greek tradition ... there is a gap of some three to four centuries before the next surviving bilingual Greek-Latin New Testament manuscript,' but by the late thirteenth to fifteenth centuries 'twelve Greek-Latin bilinguals demonstrate humanist interest in the original language' (Houghton, *Latin New Testament*, p. 109).

84. Houghton, *Latin New Testament*, p. 115.

difficulties',<sup>85</sup> regarding which a large paragraph is offered. Then, in a manner similar to that of the Alands in their NTTC introduction,<sup>86</sup> Houghton provides a sample page of the *Vetus Latina* (Image 14) on the left page with a corresponding explanation on the right page (pp. 122-23). Further details and tips round out the discussion of the *Vetus Latina*.

The third subheading is on the *Itala*, 'an edition of the principal Old Latin gospel manuscripts', begun by Adolf Jülicher and completed by Kurt Aland (1938–76).<sup>87</sup> It is still of value while the *Vetus Latina* edition of the Gospel volumes remains incomplete. The fourth subheading is merely one paragraph on the *Vetus Latina Hispana*. The fifth is on the far more important Stuttgart Vulgate, now in its fifth edition, though its text has remained the same since the third in 1983. The four paragraphs devoted to it are lush with interesting detail. The sixth subheading covers the Oxford Vulgate, 'the fullest edition of the Vulgate New Testament with a substantial critical apparatus recording the readings of over fifty Vulgate manuscripts, ... numerous Old Latin witnesses, ... Christian authors, ... and several editions ...'.<sup>88</sup> Pointers for use and warnings are offered, but 'the Oxford Vulgate continues to provide a rich treasury of readings and material not otherwise easily accessible'.<sup>89</sup>

The seventh subheading is on the Clementine Vulgate, the *Nova Vulgata* and electronic Vulgates. Two paragraphs are devoted to the mediaeval text, followed by one on the project resulting from the Second Vatican Council. The latter then leads to a discussion of the problems with using online editions of the Vulgate, nicely illustrated in Houghton's chart on p. 133. The eighth subheading will again prove valuable to those utilizing the current Greek editions of the New Testament: 'Latin evidence in Greek editions'. How Latin testimony is presented in the ECM, NA<sup>28</sup> and UBS<sup>5</sup> is reviewed in that order. A paragraph is devoted to the difficulties with citations of Latin sources in Tischendorf, along with a single sentence on the IGNTP volumes of Luke.

The final sets of subheadings (nine to twelve) discuss the publication of individual manuscripts, both in print and digitally, paratextual material, biblical quotations in Christian authors (including Biblindex, the online edition of

85. Houghton, *Latin New Testament*, p. 121.

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

87. Houghton, *Latin New Testament*, p. 126.

88. Houghton, *Latin New Testament*, p. 129.

89. Houghton, *Latin New Testament*, p. 131.

*Patrologia Latina* and the *Library of Latin Texts*) and information on how to keep abreast of current publications in the field of Latin NTTC via both print and electronic bibliographic resources.

Houghton's Chapter 7 offers sage advice to those who would attempt to use the Latin versions as a source for NTTC. He cautions readers to recall the differences (expounded at some length) between the Greek and Latin languages, how the character of the Latin versions changed over time (e.g. the tendency to bring the Latin versions into closer correspondence to the Greek), how regional forms sometimes gave way to replacement and stylistic and internal adjustments within the Latin tradition. Omissions and additions may represent paraphrases, glosses, or some other translation issue. Our author warns of the dangers of using the Latin versions to support word order variation, and in discussing biblical quotations, he summarizes:

A guiding principle is that, if a reading can be explained as a development internal to the Latin tradition, this should be preferred to any other explanation. It is also important to remember that the attestation by more than one Latin witness of a particular reading does not mean that the Latin sources provide independent evidence for the corresponding Greek form: the variation only needs to have been introduced on one occasion for it to spread more widely within Latin tradition.<sup>90</sup>

Chapter 8 contains a book-by-book description of the Latin tradition of the New Testament. Certain parts of the Gospels such as the Beatitudes of Matthew and the opening of John are described as 'very stable',<sup>91</sup> whereas other parts of the Gospels reveal fascinating textual variety (e.g. Mk 1.41<sup>92</sup>

90. Houghton, *Latin New Testament*, pp. 152-53.

91. Houghton, *Latin New Testament*, p. 165.

92. Here 'four Latin codices state that Jesus was "angry" (*iratus*) rather than "full of compassion"' (Houghton, *Latin New Testament*, p. 162). Cf. Ehrman, *Misquoting Jesus*, pp. 133-39.



and 15.34;<sup>93</sup> Lk. 1.46<sup>94</sup> and 3.22<sup>95</sup>). The situation in Acts is, of course, something of a special case because of its connections with the so-called ‘Western text’. Encouragingly, Houghton reports, ‘The *Vetus Latina* edition of Acts is currently in preparation at Mainz, where it has been accompanied by unpublished studies of its text in Cyprian’. Adumbrations of its content may be found in multiple articles by Jacobus Petzer.<sup>96</sup>

The Pauline epistles receive seven dense pages in Chapter 8. While ten of these letters already have *Vetus Latina* volumes out, four principal ones are still to be published: Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians and Galatians. Those involved in studying the Latin Paulines disagree as to their history, with Fischer taking text-type D as a later development and Frede assigning it as the most ancient. Early commentators play a special role in establishing the Latin text since so many commentaries on these missives were written. Houghton provides dozens of intriguing textual variants found in the Latin Pauline corpus. A few examples are the following: more support for *καίρω* over *κυρίω* than NA<sup>28</sup> reports at Rom. 12.11;<sup>97</sup> the reading *ut cancer serpit*, ‘creeps like cancer’, throughout the Latin tradition at 2 Tim. 2.17 for the Greek *ὡς γάγγραινα νομὴν ἔξει*, ‘will spread like gangrene’, has prompted Frede to suggest ‘that it may derive from an unattested Greek form *νεμεθῆ* rather than *νομὴν ἔξει*’;<sup>98</sup>

93. ‘[I]n place of “forsaken”, the earliest Latin tradition appears to support “scorned” ... corresponding to *ὠνεΐδας* on the Greek side of Codex Bezae’ (Houghton, *Latin New Testament*, p. 162). Cf. Ehrman, *Misquoting Jesus*, pp. 172-73.

94. Here, rather surprisingly in the Latin West, ‘some Old Latin sources name Elizabeth rather than Mary as the speaker of the Magnificat’ (Houghton, *Latin New Testament*, p. 163).

95. ‘Old Latin witnesses, including Hilary of Poitiers and manuscripts known to Augustine, incorporate a line from Psalm 2:7, “you are my son, today I have begotten you”’ (Houghton, *Latin New Testament*, p. 163). Cf. Ehrman, *Misquoting Jesus*, pp. 159-61.

96. Houghton, *Latin New Testament*, pp. 163, 332. Parker reports that Petzer began the work on Acts but that the task ‘has now been taken up by another scholar’ (*Introduction*, p. 292).

97. ‘Cyprian and Ambrosiaster as well as the bilinguals’ (Houghton, *Latin New Testament*, p. 175). Naturally UBS<sup>5</sup> is better here.

98. Houghton, *Latin New Testament*, p. 176. Hermann Josef Frede, *Epistulae ad Thessalonicenses, Timotheum, Titum, Philemonem, Hebraeos* (*Vetus Latina*, 25; Freiburg: Herder, 1991), p. 721; Pierre-Maurice Bogaert believes that the *serpentes*

regarding 1 Cor. 11.10, while ‘most Latin witnesses read *potestatem*, corresponding to ἐξουσίαν ... the use of “veil” to gloss this word is found in several versions and Christian authors, and *uelamen* has replaced *potestatem* in VL 7 and 58’<sup>99</sup>—a good example of what Houghton warned about in Chapter 7. Of course, better known textual cruxes in the traditional Paulines receive attention: the final chapter of Romans and the placement of the doxology there; 1 Thess. 2.7; Heb. 2.9; and 1 Cor. 14.34-35,<sup>100</sup> although the publications of Philip Payne receive no mention here (see above, n. 49). Houghton’s discussion of the Latin handling of ἐφ’ ᾧ at Rom. 5.12 is particularly welcome,<sup>101</sup> given D.B. Hart’s recent insightful translation and exposition of the phrase in its context.<sup>102</sup>

The Latin Catholic Epistles merit four and a half pages, likewise replete with information. Some noteworthy points include there being no complete Old Latin manuscript of Jude and the dominance of interpolations in the General Epistles, a prominent, but not widely known, example of which is the middle of 1 Pet. 3.22 where most Latin witnesses add that Jesus swallowed death (or from death) so that he, or we, might become an inheritor (or inheritors) of life. Houghton discusses problems in James, with the lead of ‘the earliest surviving manuscript of James, VL 66’.<sup>103</sup> One of these is the lack of *deus* at Jas 1.12 in VL 66, and others are variants between *deum* and *dominum* in witnesses in the wider Latin tradition at 3.9. Our author mentions that the phenomenon in the former passage ‘has been linked to the Jewish practice of avoiding direct reference to God’.<sup>104</sup> However, consideration should also be given to the notion that some books of the New Testament may have had original instances of Ιαω in them, and such variants are the remnants of proto-orthodox copyists replacing Ιαω with standard substitutes found within

*velut cancer* reading, found ‘dans toute la tradition latine’, may well predate Tertullian (‘La Bible latine des originaux au moyen âge’, *RTL* 19 [1988], pp. 137-59, 276-314 [143]).

99. Houghton, *Latin New Testament*, p. 174.

100. Houghton, *Latin New Testament*, pp. 173-76.

101. Houghton, *Latin New Testament*, p. 174.

102. David Bentley Hart, *The New Testament* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017), pp. xv, 296-97.

103. Houghton, *Latin New Testament*, p. 179.

104. Houghton, *Latin New Testament*, p. 180.

Judaism.<sup>105</sup> Of course, the Johannine Comma receives considerable space in this subheading.

A discussion of the Apocalypse closes out Chapter 8 and Part II. Houghton notes:

The recent *Vetus Latina* edition by Gryson (2000–3) provides a state-of-the-art account of the Latin text and has been accompanied by new editions of several of the more significant Latin commentaries. Gryson includes information from a wide range of Vulgate manuscripts, which gives an indication of textual developments in later tradition.<sup>106</sup>

He informs the reader that only one manuscript comes close to having the entire text of Revelation, and that crucial textual evidence for this book derives from the Latin commentary tradition with various text-types resting primarily on such authority. The final paragraph reviews some interesting variants of the number 666 at Rev. 13.18.

Part III begins with a lengthy description of the physical features of Latin manuscripts (Chapter 9, 22 pages). The chapter's four subheadings start with 'Material and Format'. Its opening words, 'There are no surviving papyrus manuscripts of the Latin New Testament', may be initially surprising,<sup>107</sup> yet once one remembers that these usually come from the Greek-speaking eastern

105. See F. Shaw, *The Earliest Non-mystical Jewish Use of Iαω* (Leuven: Peeters, 2014), pp. 283-90. This position is a modification of George Howard's thesis that tetragrams were present in certain New Testament autographs; see George Howard, 'The Tetragram and the New Testament', *JBL* 96 (1977), pp. 77-83. UBS committee member David Trobisch, Wheaton New Testament scholar John McRay and Pauline specialist Lloyd Gaston have favored (McRay) or even embraced (Trobisch, Gaston) Howard's position: David Trobisch, *Die Endredaktion des Neuen Testaments* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), pp. 102-103 (ET: *The First Edition of the New Testament* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000], pp. 66-67); John McRay, *Archaeology and the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1991), pp. 370-71; Lloyd Gaston, *Paul and the Torah* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1987), pp. 117, 131, 173, 178-83. The last-mentioned calls Howard's thesis 'a very important discovery that has been strangely neglected in New Testament studies' (p. 117).

106. Houghton, *Latin New Testament*, p. 181.

107. Houghton, *Latin New Testament*, p. 187.

Mediterranean, the statement becomes understandable.<sup>108</sup> After a discussion of purple parchment, basic terms such as folio, recto, verso, quire and text block are defined and expounded; following these, ink and page shape are reviewed. Under ‘Script, Abbreviations, and Punctuation’,<sup>109</sup> Houghton handles technical jargon like rustic capitals, uncial, minuscule, textura (= Gothic script) and ligatures, before delving into the topic of the much-mooted *nomina sacra*. To add to the mystery of their Greek origins, he notes, ‘it is intriguing that there is not more explicit discussion of if it by Latin authors’.<sup>110</sup> General abbreviations, sound changes, ekthesis, *litterae notabiliores*, the evolution of punctuation and the marking of quotations round out the subheading.

‘Contents and Paratext’ constitutes the largest subheading in Chapter 9.<sup>111</sup> Collections of books within manuscripts as well as their sequencing receive two pages, but the majority of this section is on paratextual material: prologues, introductions and capitula get attention. Pride of place, however, is given to the Eusebian apparatus in the Gospels: ‘the Eusebian apparatus is far better attested in Latin manuscripts than in the Greek tradition’.<sup>112</sup> Jerome thought that section numbers and canon numbers should be written in different colors, but other, evidently earlier textual workers had alternatives. Image 15 is of the canon tables in the Lindisfarne Gospels. A similar system developed for the Paulines by the Spaniard Priscillian of Avila, and a *Concordia epistularum* is attributed to Pelagius. A discussion of poems and various marginalia finishes the subheading. The last is on decoration. This feature begins with capital letters of different colors or zoomorphic elements and continues to develop with attributes like the head of Paul in the first initial of Romans ‘or the depiction of John on Patmos in Revelation in VgS I’.<sup>113</sup> They reach their apex in thirteenth- to fourteenth-century Romanesque Bibles and some may derive from classical models. Variant sources associating the four evangelists with the creatures of Rev. 4.7 are noted, and others contain set imagery

108. It is not surprising that we do not have papyrus manuscripts of the Latin New Testament. We have altogether hardly 2000 Latin papyri, in contrast to far more than half a million Greek papyri. Furthermore, Latin was spoken by a small number of people in Egypt, mainly the military and Roman administrators.

109. Houghton, *Latin New Testament*, p. 190.

110. Houghton, *Latin New Testament*, p. 191.

111. Houghton, *Latin New Testament*, p. 194.

112. Houghton, *Latin New Testament*, p. 200.

113. Houghton, *Latin New Testament*, p. 204.

specific to their locale (Insular Gospels, books copied in Tours and Spanish Pandects).

The volume's largest chapter is the final one, Houghton's catalogue of Latin manuscripts. The list is divided into thirds: first are all the manuscripts in the *Vetus Latina's Register*, updated with three further ones identified since the Register's publication in 1999; second are those in the Stuttgart Vulgate; last are the ones in the Oxford Vulgate. The entries themselves are self-described as 'brief',<sup>114</sup> but others might disagree. For certain they are packed with information: siglum, location, name, date and provenance, script, physical description, contents, other features, images available (in print and online), edition(s) and further literature.

The murky mysteries of the traditional sigla for Old Latin witnesses are deciphered for the uninitiated in our author's Appendix I, 'Concordances of Manuscript Sigla'.<sup>115</sup> This appendix is then further divided into two, a section on the Old Latin and another on the Vulgate. In the first case, after an introductory paragraph in smaller font than the rest of the book on the historical reasons for the variant systems, a chart is provided that coordinates the following sigla groupings: NA<sup>28</sup>, UBS<sup>5</sup>, Tischendorf, Itala, Fischer, Oxford Vg, VL, along with 'Other' and the now standard system of listing a manuscript's content by the divisions eapcr under 'Scope'. The second section does the same for the Vulgate, but with slightly different headings, the first being LNT (for Latin New Testament?), 'a single reference scheme',<sup>116</sup> and, of course, no NA and UBS headings. The second appendix lists a large number of additional manuscripts that are cited in the *Vetus Latina* volumes. The third is of 19 further ones mentioned in the Stuttgart Vulgate.

One interesting benefit found throughout our work is Houghton's regular employment of the sigla found in the *Vetus Latina* tomes. This is not just for manuscripts but for the church fathers as well. For example, Tertullian's *Adversus Praxean* is TE Pra, and the *Speculum* cited in Greek New Testament editions is PS-AU spe. Initially Houghton puts these, likely for most of us, foreign symbols in parentheses after he first cites the work with full title, but then he expects the reader to make the connection when he refers to the same

114. Houghton, *Latin New Testament*, p. 209.

115. Houghton, *Latin New Testament*, p. 283.

116. Houghton, *Latin New Testament*, p. 285.

work later.<sup>117</sup> In other words, he is somewhat subconsciously preparing the reader to use the Beuron edition, a useful thing for anyone wishing to take his or her interests in the Latin New Testament beyond just the Houghton guide. For those whose Latin is rusty or nonexistent, Houghton provides an English translation of all substantial Latin quotations and quite a number of one-to-three-word Latin expressions.

As was noted above, Houghton usually speeds along in his presentation, only periodically pausing to make a point explicit via some substantially sized exposition. One instance of his doing this has been especially noteworthy to the present reviewer and will likely be so to others as well. Throughout the volume our author states that he subscribes to the belief that there was a single original Old Latin translation of the New Testament (indeed, of the entire Latin Bible) from which all the Latin text-types evolved. This begins in the Preface (p. viii), appears here and there (pp. 156, 167, 170), but is discussed in earnest on pp. 12-14 via one of Houghton's recurring ample expositions. A different position, that multiple versions sprang up independently in the Latin-speaking west on a sort of grass-roots level, is the only version of Old Latin origins that many have been taught. A check of the texts used in standard NTTC courses (Metzger's introduction and his volume on the versions<sup>118</sup>; the Alands' introduction) reveals no coverage of the notion that this has been a debated point among Latin New Testament textual critics for decades.

One likely reason for this misperception is Metzger's presentation of Augustine's words:

... Latin translators are out of all number. For in the early days of the faith, every man who happened to gain possession of a Greek manuscript [of the New Testament] and who imagined he had any facility in both languages, however slight that may have been, dared to make a translation.<sup>119</sup>

117. See Houghton, *Latin New Testament*, where the first of these occurs on p. 3 but full explanation is held off until pp. 118-19.

118. Bruce Metzger, *The Early Versions of the New Testament: Their Origin, Transmission, and Limitations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977).

119. *Doctr. chr.* 2.16, as translated in Metzger, *Early Versions*, p. 290. Metzger also mentions Jerome's words that there were almost as many Latin versions as manuscripts.

Later, in a discussion about Augustine's further words in the same treatise regarding the *Itala* and modern scholarship's understanding of that term, Metzger adds this: 'Present-day scholars prefer to speak of the Old Latin Bible or the pre-Vulgate, though to be strictly accurate they ought to speak of the Old Latin versions.'<sup>120</sup> His use of the plural here is memorable, particularly as these words end his section on the 'Origin of the Old Latin Versions'.<sup>121</sup>

The reality of the matter is quite different and goes back to well before Metzger's *Early Versions* volume. Indeed, the first citation by Houghton on the subject is the mention of the other view by Birdsall in 1970. After discussing the 'German scholars in the *Vetus Latina* Institut of Beuron, where a rich collection of data made over many years is now in process of systematisation and analysis', Birdsall states:

The studies of the team of scholars working at Beuron have shown the truth of an older conclusion that the Old Latin is basically one version, successively revised both in language and style, and by correction of its original text form to an agreement more and more with the norm of the Greek Alexandrian text-type.<sup>122</sup>

Houghton then cites a total of eight other scholars in publications spanning from 1972 to 2013 who also discuss this view. None of these publications, however, are of the sort that would make their way into most courses taught on the subject of NTTTC.<sup>123</sup> Therefore, those academics who do such teaching may wish to supplement their materials with Houghton's discussion.

As expected, his treatment of the evidence is detailed but succinct; only a portion of it can be provided here. At Mk 9.15, all pre-Vulgate manuscripts read *gaudentes*, 'rejoicing', rather than the Greek's *προστρέχοντες*, 'running', obviously a misreading of it as *προσχαίροντες*. The early Latin testimony agrees with *introitus eius*, 'his entry', for the Greek's τῷ λόγῳ at Lk. 1.9. 'Most Old Latin manuscripts reverse the sequence of phrases in Luke 9:62,

120. Metzger, *Early Versions*, p. 293.

121. This is the title of the subheading that begins on p. 285.

122. J. Neville Birdsall, 'The New Testament Text', in P.R. Ackroyd and C.F. Evans (eds.), *The Cambridge History of the Bible. I. From the Beginnings to Jerome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), p. 371.

123. Evidently, Parker does not discuss the matter in his *Introduction*, a fact that is not surprising given his emphasis on manuscripts and printed editions.

with “looking backwards” before “putting his hand to the plough”.<sup>124</sup> While each other occurrence, in the entire Old Latin tradition (save one manuscript known to have been influenced by the Vulgate), of *ὁ λίθος* in Matthew is rendered by *lapis*, at Mt. 27.60 it is *saxum*, despite *lapis* appearing just seven verses later for the same stone. Why all this erroneous consistency/consistent usage when the overall trend was to bring the Latin tradition back into harmony with the Greek, as mentioned above?

This phenomenon appears both inside and outside the Gospels. The *hapax legomena* *ἀμαράντινον* and *ἐπιούσιον* appear only at 1 Pet. 5.4, and at Mt. 6.11 and Lk. 11.3, individually. Houghton explains:

If the surviving manuscripts derived from independent translations, one would expect variation in these unusual words for which there was no obvious Latin equivalent, rather than the universal agreement on *immarcescibilem* and *cottidianum* respectively. Even the more common word *τέκτων* (‘builder’) in Matthew 13:55 and Mark 6:3 is always rendered by *faber*, while at John 21:5 almost all witnesses have *pulmentarium* for the unique *προσφάγιον*.<sup>125</sup>

In addition to the linguistic data, practical considerations weigh in. Since books in the Mediterranean area circulated widely, if a translation was known to exist already, then early Christians would likely have obtained it rather than start afresh, especially if it had already achieved some prestige in the community, perhaps due to its translator’s status. Houghton does not mention it, but this is the model followed in Septuagint studies. It should be noted, however, that our author is not naïve but recognizes that this single-translation model has its problems and admits that it ‘remains possible that the single versions claimed to underlie the surviving Latin tradition had various origins’,<sup>126</sup> although he does not subscribe to that notion.

As for problems with this work, Houghton has exercised considerable forethought and care so that they are not easy to find. I discovered just a few. In the footnotes authors are cited solely by their last name; thus ones with the same surname are only distinguished in the bibliography (two Colemans, Fischers, Greens, Harrises, Hoffmanns, Krafts, Löfstedts, Palmers, Schmids, Smiths, Turners and three Browns and Williamses), so it requires more work

124. Houghton, *Latin New Testament*, p. 12.

125. Houghton, *Latin New Testament*, p. 13.

126. Houghton, *Latin New Testament*, p. 14.



than one expects to figure out which one is being referred to in the notes. There is an erroneous page reference on p. 22 n. 13 (228 should be 210). There must be a typo on p. 176: ‘*quod est Christus*’. Pagination is missing for the Guignard article in the bibliography. My lone major disappointment is that there is oddly no serious entry for the CLA (*Codices Latini Antiquiores*).<sup>127</sup> This is particularly inept since Houghton refers to this major reference tool on Latin manuscripts many times. It is present in his Abbreviations List (p. xix) and is referred to in footnotes in the main text (e.g. p. 22 n. 13, p. 61 n. 47) before its explanation on p. 187 where its description consists of part of a sentence. It is briefly referred to again on p. 194. Then it is regularly cited in his catalogues and appendices well over 100 times. By contrast, Parker gives it a large, highly informative paragraph with the lead, ‘The starting point for all study of the [Latin] manuscripts is the volumes of E.A. Lowe’s *Codices Latini Antiquiores*. This remarkable work ...’.<sup>128</sup> Even Wikipedia offers far more than Houghton does on the CLA.

This already heavily reviewed volume<sup>129</sup> will no doubt sweep the field. Beside its currency, a handy benefit for English speakers is the fact that while most of the academic literature on the Latin Bible has been penned in Latin, French and German, Houghton has provided in English the foundation necessary to pursue more advanced study. This will be especially appreciated in America where students frequently do not begin their study of German and French until graduate school, and biblical scholars increasingly have little or no Latin. A hearty εὖγε or rather, *macte virtute*, should be extended by all to Houghton for creating a paradigm of how such a guide should be written.

127. Elias Avery Lowe, *Codices Latini Antiquiores: A Palaeographical Guide to Latin Manuscripts Prior to the Ninth Century* (11 vols. and supplement; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1934–1971).

128. Parker, *Introduction*, pp. 58–59.

129. On the webpage <https://sites.google.com/site/haghoughton/Int> there are listed twelve reviews that have appeared since May of 2016. At least two more are in process.

*The Tyndale House Greek New Testament—Looking Forward or Backward?*

The work of Dirk Jongkind (and Peter J. Williams), the Tyndale House Greek New Testament<sup>130</sup> was published just in time for the 2017 SBL Annual Meeting in Boston where one could pick up a hardback in a slipcase for just \$15 (US). The volume is published jointly by Crossway and Cambridge University Press. It is good looking, quite sturdy with a Smyth-sewn binding, in a solid black cover with a single black ribbon marker. The pages are in 10-point UBS-LCL type font in single-column format. The text itself is free of headings and each page has no cross references, marginalia or footnotes other than the critical apparatus. About 30-35 lines of text are on each page, roughly two-to-three times as much as the UBS text. There are no supralinear signs that so fill the lines of NA. Such a clear looking text can easily be viewed as uncluttered and refreshing when contrasted to NA.

In just a short perusal of this new work, the reader is struck by several things. First, most parts of what normally comprise the front matter are found after the main text. The lone exception is the small, merely one-and-a-half-page preface which is loaded with information. There the reader discovers the surprising fact that this volume is ‘based on a thorough revision of the great nineteenth-century edition of Samuel Prideaux Tregelles’.<sup>131</sup> Further important points to be noted from the preface include these:

1. An emphasis on taking into account ‘scribal habits and typical transmission errors of individual manuscripts to establish which readings are likely to be prior’.<sup>132</sup>
2. There is a marked limitation in the use of some mechanical features we are all used to seeing in critical Greek New Testaments. There are no brackets around suspect material, nor are any dashes or parentheses present. Punctuation is limited to the comma, high point, full

130. Since the work is principally that of Jongkind, that is how it is primarily referred to below, though ‘Jongkind-Williams’ also appears as the review progresses.

131. Jongkind (ed.), *Greek New Testament*, p. vi.

132. Jongkind (ed.), *Greek New Testament*, p. vi.

stop/period, and question mark. The use of paragraphing and capitalization is described as restrained.<sup>133</sup>

3. The editors follow some manuscripts in the order of New Testament books with the Gospels first, then Acts and the general Epistles, followed by the Paulines and Revelation. In other words, they follow the book order in Westcott and Hort.<sup>134</sup>

The rest of the important information available for the edition must be obtained by carefully digesting the, again, comparatively short introduction near the end of the volume (again, in imitation of Westcott and Hort?), short because it is only 13 pages of regular printed text, followed by a six-page chart of the witnesses used, and this chart serves as the only reference point for the edition's sigla. Here the user quickly notices the absence of groupings such as *f*<sup>1</sup>, *f*<sup>3</sup> and *Byz* or Gothic *M* for the majority text. More significantly, gone are any references to the ancient versions and fathers. Just how serious a drawback this is becomes clear in just a short period of use. One must wonder (1) just how 'critical' such a work can be considered if it throws out such important bodies of testimony, as well as (2) about the motives behind such a decision.

The total number of Greek MSS listed in the chart is 130. These break down as 69 papyri; 51 uncials; 10 cursives. Of the last figure, only two of them are cited beyond a single passage. In other words, manuscripts 69 and 1424 are the only two cursives used with any regularity, explained as 'these are diverse and significant textual witnesses and contain almost the entire New Testament'.<sup>135</sup> Noticeable is the fact that the valuable minuscule 33, 'the queen of the cursives', is absent, as is, with one exception, 1739, 'one of the most important witnesses in Paul', according to David Parker.<sup>136</sup> The same goes for manuscripts 81, 892, 1175 and 1881, all considered rivals to that title 'queen of the cursives'. If this number of 130 total manuscripts used strikes a person as a small one on which to base a critical edition, even more does the fact that the majority of these MSS contain very little text, often just a few verses. These more specific statistics drive the point home further: just 13

133. Jongkind (ed.), *Greek New Testament*, p. vi.

134. Jongkind (ed.), *Greek New Testament*, p. vi.

135. Jongkind (ed.), *Greek New Testament*, p. 516.

136. Parker, *Introduction*, p. 290.

manuscripts form the basis of Colossians; for James it is 15 manuscripts, one of which is cited merely once, three of which are cited just twice, and one just five times. For Mark the base is 20 manuscripts. Of these, 15 are uncials; two are cited just once and one only twice; three are papyri, two of which are cited just once each. Given that so many of these 130 manuscripts are used so infrequently, upon the basis of how many manuscripts is the main part of the text really based?

What else is in the ‘Introduction’? Most importantly, one can pick up on clues as to the overall textual philosophy of the two main editors, although this is nowhere specifically spelled out. Indications are found, such as in these four statements:

[W]e originally used Tregelles’s text as our base ... because of Tregelles’s strong reliance on the testimony of documents and on the principle of proven antiquity.<sup>137</sup>

We have sought to reduce the likelihood that any reading adopted is a mere scribal aberration by insisting that our text be attested in two or more Greek manuscripts, at least one being from the fifth century or earlier.<sup>138</sup>

[W]e have not felt it our job as editors to go back behind the witnesses that survive.<sup>139</sup>

We recognize, of course, that versional and patristic witnesses add significantly to our knowledge of the history of the transmission of the New Testament text. Nevertheless, we have not felt at any point their witness was strong enough to change the decisions we made on the basis of the Greek manuscripts.<sup>140</sup>

So much, then, for the notion of genuine reasoned eclecticism—it too seems banished from the volume. Thus, one will not find readings that are largely based on versional testimony or some degree of conjecture such as at 1 Cor. 2.4 *πειθοῖ σοφίας*, ‘with the persuasiveness of wisdom’, adopted by

137. Jongkind (ed.), *Greek New Testament*, pp. 505-506.

138. Jongkind (ed.), *Greek New Testament*, p. 506.

139. Jongkind (ed.), *Greek New Testament*, p. 505.

140. Jongkind (ed.), *Greek New Testament*, p. 507.

Holmes in the SBL edition for the standard *πειθοῖ[ς] σοφίας [λόγοις]*, ‘with persuasive words of wisdom’, in the NA/UBS. Or at 2 Pet. 3.10, where judgment day comes like a thief, the heavens noisily disappear, the elements are dissolved and the earth and things in it are—what? Burned up? Discovered? Not found? The much-debated *οὐχ* now read by the ECM is found only in two versions.<sup>141</sup> No note of this last option then is in our Tyndale House text.

The above-stated policy of needing two early Greek witnesses for a reading in the main text has implications that apparently reach well into the critical apparatus. For example, it rules out the possibility of the Pharisees telling Nicodemus, ‘Look it up and you will not find *the* Prophet, *ὁ προφήτης*, coming out of Galilee.’ This reading at Jn 7.52 with the article is found in P<sup>66</sup>. It has been adopted as the main text in the *Anchor Bible*, the *Revised English Bible* and the *Common English Bible*. It has been accepted as most likely original by conservative text critic Philip Comfort,<sup>142</sup> and in his *Word Bible Commentary* Beasley-Murray can say that this reading ‘is increasingly viewed as authentic’.<sup>143</sup> Of course, one reason for this position is the context; just a few verses earlier, in v. 40 a textually sound *ὁ προφήτης*, *the* Prophet, occurs. Yet in our Tyndale Greek New Testament there is not even an entry for this variant. However one wants to view the textual history of the passage here, does not the fact that there is no presentation of the evidence for this crux indicate that our text’s producers are at least somewhat out-of-touch with the very community that they hope will use their volume? The lack of an entry here seems all the more poignant when there is one at Acts 19.15 regarding whether a *μέν* should be present to correspond to a *δέ* later in the verse, or at

141. That such readings may not always be viewed as true conjectural ones may be found in the fact that there still is some support for them in a few witnesses. In the case of the former, the Vulgate manuscript A reads *persuasione sapientiae verbi* (Vg ed. Weber-Gryson<sup>4</sup>). This, along with the four late Greek manuscripts cited in NA<sup>28</sup>, none of which have *πειθοῖ* alone, i.e. without some form of *λόγοις* later, can be viewed as versional support for Holmes’s suggestion. That may be why the NA<sup>28</sup> editors have ‘*sine test.*?’ for *πειθοῖ σοφίας* in the apparatus. In the case of the latter passage, some Syriac and Coptic versions have the reading adopted in the ECM. The question remains, however, whether these witnesses themselves represent early conjectural emendations.

142. Comfort, *Commentary on the Manuscripts*, p. 258.

143. G.R. Beasley-Murray, *John* (WBC, 36; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2000), p. 121.

Mt. 3.6 regarding whether Jesus was baptized in simply the ‘Jordan’ or the ‘Jordan River’.<sup>144</sup> These are certainly not as important historically and theologically as the Jn 7.52 locus. One of the criteria for choice of variants found in the edition is stated as those ‘which have high exegetical importance’.<sup>145</sup> How does that measure up here?

One emphasis found in the introduction that may strike some readers as odd is the stress given to orthography. Of the 13 pages comprising the introduction, 4.2 pages are devoted to a discussion of this topic. That is 31 per cent of the introduction, and it is twice the size of the discussion proper of the apparatus (i.e. not counting the chart). If reading *γείνομαι* instead of *γίνομαι* interests certain ones, then they may find this feature of the edition to their liking. In this section is also found the following statement which serves to indicate where the Tyndale Greek New Testament project is headed: ‘At this stage we have not represented in our text the use of the *nomina sacra* ... It would be a desideratum for future editions to contain information on these.’<sup>146</sup> As this scholar worked more and more with our new text, the commonly heard statement ‘one can only wonder’ kept occurring with increasing frequency in his mind. At least some clarity may be in the offing, however, as the following words are also in the introduction: ‘We will seek to give further transparency to our editorial reasoning in a textual commentary to be published subsequent to this edition’.<sup>147</sup>

A few points from the text proper are revealing. That the papyri are especially important to Jongkind and Williams is manifest in the extent to which they go to report their readings when such readings are not clear. Instead of just a superscript ‘*vid*’ for ‘apparently’ they often provide the reconstructed reading in the apparatus. For example, on p. 189 (Jn 6) the editors cite two different papyri, P<sup>28</sup> and P<sup>75</sup>, both times where the reading is unsure. In v. 2 there is a variant, whether the verb is a form of *ὀράω* or *θεωρέω*, and if the latter, what the precise form of the verb is. Noteworthy is how carefully the editors deal with this: one set of witnesses has *ὅτι ἐθεώρων*, and the leading manuscript, P<sup>75</sup>, has its reading reported with the omicron tau in a bracket, the

144. Or whether an ‘amen’ really closes out the letter to the Philippians or Philemon.

145. Jongkind (ed.), *Greek New Testament*, p. 515.

146. Jongkind (ed.), *Greek New Testament*, p. 511.

147. Jongkind (ed.), *Greek New Testament*, p. 506; this is mentioned again on p. 516.

iota with a subscript dot, and the imperfect verb with four letters similarly marked: ‘P75<sup>(vid)</sup> στ[ι] εθεωρω[ν]’. We see this again with variants in v. 11, here with whether the verb is compound or simplex: ‘P75<sup>(vid)</sup> δ[ι] εδωκεν) ... P28<sup>(vid)</sup> εδω[κεν]’. Generally speaking, this only occurs with the papyri.<sup>148</sup> Is such detail of the readings of the papyri within the apparatus unique among New Testament Greek texts? Apparently so.

As is well known in text-critical circles, the Epistle of Jude has many textual issues. The Jongkind-Williams self-imposed policies evidently do not allow them to convey the reading of an important manuscript here. If we look at p. 330, we see there are reported variants in vv. 15, 22 and 25. Without getting into the specific details of the issues involved in each locus, one notes that the reading of P<sup>72</sup> is reported for v. 15 and v. 25, but not v. 22. Why not? Is the manuscript defective here? No, again the editors’ policies have seemingly prevented them from reporting its reading. According to the ECM P<sup>72</sup>’s reading stands without any further support from Greek witnesses; rather its testimony is also present in certain Latin, Coptic and Syriac manuscripts. Many, likely most, textual critics would consider the fact that three versions agree with P<sup>72</sup> to be pretty significant, but not our editors who fail to report any of this.<sup>149</sup>

Not altogether dissimilar are the reading and apparatus entry for Rom. 14.12. The accepted text may be rendered, ‘each one of us will give an account of himself/herself to God’. A pretty well-known variant here is whether ‘to God’ belongs. The critical entry in our Tyndale House text gives the ‘counting heads’ impression—perhaps not intended—that it is 9 to 1, with the Vaticanus reading being the odd man out. But the NA/UBS text puts brackets around τῷ θεῷ. Why? A check of the UBS apparatus reveals that the reading of manuscript B is not so odd after all: uncials F and G, minuscule manuscripts 6, 424, 1739, 1881 and 2200 all lack these words, and so do several Old Latin and Armenian manuscripts. Quite importantly, Polycarp of Smyrna who died in the mid-second century, and Cyprian of Carthage who died in the mid-third century witness no τῷ θεῷ here. In other words, such testimony, 100–200 and more years prior to the limited witnesses cited in our Tyndale House text, is clearly the oldest evidence, and this fact explains why

148. Two exceptions are in Mark at 10.7, 47 (bis).

149. The same may be said for a text-critical entry at Jude 9.

the UBS/NA scholars have bracketed the text as doubtful. One would never get this information from the Tyndale House ‘critical’ Greek New Testament.

There are some interesting, even positive things in the Jongkind-Williams Greek New Testament. Of course, another Greek New Testament produced by competent scholars is always welcome, and it is important to recognize, *and appreciate*, the vast amount of labor involved in producing it. Its availability online is also a big plus,<sup>150</sup> and its emphasis on different orthography, paragraphing and punctuation will cause textual critics to rethink some of these issues. This portion of the article presented here was offered as a talk at the 2018 Midwest Regional SBL Meeting in early February. Another presenter at that textual criticism session, Jeremiah Coogan, who knows Jongkind and Williams, offered the idea that our THGNT was a thought experiment, one that presented a fifth-century text, and a goal of it was to call into question ‘standard’ punctuation and paragraphing. If one may be so free as to draw a moderate parallel from Septuagint studies, as is well-known, there are only two regularly used LXX critical texts, the hand edition of Rahlfs and the multi-volume, still-underway edition from the Septuaginta-Unternehmen at Göttingen. But there is a third option, that of H.B. Swete, produced from 1896–1901.<sup>151</sup> It used a limited number of manuscripts<sup>152</sup> and its punctuation is sometimes different from the Rahlfs and Göttingen editions. It is handy for checking on the punctuation matter, but in reality, how many LXX users really consult it? If the editors of the THGNT had such a thought experiment in mind, will this new Greek New Testament wind up, with the passage of time, like the LXX edition of Swete?

Do the above-mentioned potentially positive features of the THGNT outweigh the strange and negative ones? I have here focused on a few of the work’s shortcomings. As Daniel Wallace says on his blog entry for this Greek

150. See online: <https://www.stepbible.org/version.jsp?version=THGNT>.

151. H.B. Swete, *The Old Testament in Greek According to the Septuagint* (3 vols.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1896–1901).

152. It is sometimes said that the Swete text is a diplomatic edition. However, that is not quite accurate. For example, the text in 2 Maccabees does not always follow MS A, but Swete sometimes follows the text of MS V and in other places accepts emendations of previous scholars. See F. Shaw, ‘2 Maccabees’, in James K. Aitken (ed.), *The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint* (London: Bloomsbury T. & T. Clark, 2015), p. 314.



New Testament: ‘Criticism is easier than construction’.<sup>153</sup> Yet when its editors were constructing such a work, some important considerations seem to have been overlooked or not given enough serious thought. Overall what seems to mark this edition is one thing: a failure to take into account fully, in any way that can possibly be construed as practical, the needs of its intended users. This is manifest in at least three ways: (1) The absence of a handy card with sigla such as the UBS and NA texts provide their users—don’t we all just love to constantly have to flip pages back and forth to get necessary information? (2) The limited number of important entries, or in other words, the lack of entries that would truly prove helpful to one wishing to research passages with known and/or important variants. (3) The full reporting of variants within the entries that are provided.<sup>154</sup>

Rather the work appears to be two statements by its producers, again, whether intended or not: (1) Here is what *we* think the Greek New Testament should look like according to what *we* think is important—there is a real ‘trust us’ mentality here, the kind of thinking that is opposed to the spirit of textual criticism. (2) We do not like much of what is going on in the post-interlude period of New Testament textual criticism, especially full-fledged reasoned eclecticism, the stress on studying the transmission history of the New Testament (outside of orthography, punctuation and so on), the CBGM and the work of the INTF in Münster, taking seriously the evidence of the versions and the church fathers and any hint of the practice of conjectural emendation. Is it any wonder, then, that a nineteenth-century text should have served as this volume’s inspiration? To what extent are this book’s editors looking forward to where NTTC is going? To what extent are they looking backward?

153. See online: <https://danielbwallace.com/2017/11/13/some-random-thoughts-on-the-tyndale-house-greek-new-testament>.

154. In his blog entry for the THGNT, Protestant minister James Snapp, no stranger to the field of NTTC, speaks of ‘how the textual apparatus invites frustration’, and bluntly summarizes the matter this way: ‘An apparatus this incomplete and imprecise is worse than no apparatus at all’ (online: <http://www.thetextofthegospels.com/2017/11/the-tyndale-house-greek-new-testament.html>).