treat the Vulgate without prejudice as representing a kind of text current in the latter part of the fourth century. We wish the editors and publishers continued success in their undertaking.

G. D. Kilpatrick


The definite article in the sub-title to New Testament Vocabulary (= NTV) refers to Aland's Vollständige Konkordanz (variously given in full in either German or English or as VK or as 'the Concordance') but it is also claimed that NTV can be a companion to Moulton and Geden's. In a series of characteristically well-documented and trenchant critiques in ETL (1976-1980) (now conveniently reprinted in Evangelica (= BETL LX) pp. 955-1002) Neirynck drew attention to serious shortcomings in VK. Many of the desiderata expressed there fell on deaf ears (cf. Aland's references to 'A Belgian reviewer' in the Introduction to VK, and also H. Kunst's ghosted rebuff in the Münster Bericht (1977) p. 28) and it is therefore not surprising that Neirynck began to remedy the deficiencies he painfully indicated. His results are to be found in this work, in which he has been ably assisted by his colleague Frans Van Segbroeck, with help from H. Leclercq.

Following a compact Introduction, the intricate instructions in which can readily be digested before the reader embarks on the body of the work, NTV is divided into three parts. Part I includes a list of words compounded with prepositions and a privative, a list of other compounds and derivatives and a list of proper names. Words not included in these three are given in a separate—and surprisingly short—list. Part II deals with synoptic parallels and synonyms. Part III compares the text of VK in the Synoptic gospels (N-A26) with that in N-A25, UBS1-2, Greeven's Synopse (= H-G) and in the margin of Westcott and Hort (= WH).

VK refers at the head of an article to certain related compound forms: NTV sets out a full range of compound forms in Part I in a way that is not only easier for consultation but is more complete than VK. By concentrating the statistical tables into 12 columns on one page rather than into 28 columns over a double spread NTV is easier to handle than VK II. New Testament scholars who analyze an author's style and usage either in text-critical discussions or when dealing with the vocabulary of individual authors ought to keep their eyes open for cognate forms of each word as this information can often be relevant. NTV Part I makes such cross-referencing simpler.

VK lost contact with the so-called standard text because it included in its statistical surveys those passages of one verse or longer omitted by N-A26. NTV adjusts these statistics so that they agree completely with N-A26. The details were set out in ETL 54 (1978) pp. 329-37, 344-5 and are reprinted here in the Introduction (with the corrected frequency of the definite article in the pericope of the adulteress). A consistent policy regarding crasis forms and combined words makes the statistics of NTV follow N-A26 precisely and (unlike VK) in a way that does not distort the figures. NTV also accent and capitalises in accordance with the orthography of N-A26. One regrets that the counsel of Neirynck was not sought in the consultative stages of VK! The corrections and adjustments of the statistics of VK are set out in the Introduction (where, for good measure, the statistical tables of Morgenthaler are also corrected.)

Part II (Synoptic Parallels) is the most valuable section of NTV. Apart from its sheer statistical worth, it will be of immense help to those who try to assess the

characteristic vocabulary of the individual synoptic evangelists and also to those who attempt to trace source and redactional elements in the synoptic tradition. This section is divided into two major elements: (a) A list of references to all parallels where the same word is used in two or three of the synoptics. In addition, the entire vocabulary of Mark is included. Agreements of vocabulary between Matthew and Luke against Mark in the triple tradition are also indicated: there are very few examples in fact. Where Matthew and Luke’s agreement is due to their having drawn on Q this is indicated. Mk/Q doublets are shown sometimes as Q? (when Mk, not Q, is counted as the source (cf. &ypq p. 207)). (b) A list of synonyms and substitutes in the order of both Matthew and Luke for the parallels Matthew/Mark, Q^MT/Luke, Luke/Mark, Q^LK/Matthew. An index of Markan words is appended (IIC). Thus, for Mark’s peculiar vocabulary a check in IIC will reveal if the parallels have substituted a synonym (see ἐνιλέω, ὀνάριον, πτητή, κράσιμπτως). Such information needs to be considered for any theory on the inter-relationship of the synoptics, and is easily checked in NTV. Minor agreements of Mt and Lk in the triple tradition are also shown in this list; and, again, this phenomenon is rare (cf. IIA where the Mark column has a dash: there is some overlap here between the two lists (e.g. καλείω Mt 22:45)).

Although Neirynck is the leading living scholar advocating the 2 Document theory, NTV may be used by those whose solution to the synoptic problem differs from his. Q here is strictly used as a shorthand reference to words shared by Matthew and Luke. The authors are judicious in their use of Q and in the list in IIB they refer us for all Mt-Lk parallels to the reconstructions of Q by Harnack, Bussmann, Polag and Schulz. An appendix to NTV details allegedly Q vocabulary in passages peculiar to one gospel. Possibly because of the difficulty in assigning the peculiar vocabulary of Lk or Mt to Q, NTV does not attempt to list the distinctive vocabulary of Luke or Matthew. This information would nevertheless have been valuable: it is not easily abstracted from either VK or NTV except for hapaxes. We should urge Neirynck and Van Segbroeck to prepare such lists. (Other desiderata are mentioned below.)

In his ETL reviews Neirynck regretted thatVK (and N-A^26 Appendix II) ignored differences in earlier editions of the UBS text. These are set out in Part III. In addition this section contains a chapter on the changes in vocabulary (i.e. orthographical changes are ignored, an exception being Νασταπέτ-θ) between N-A^26 and earlier editions of Nestle (esp. N-A^25) both in the order of the gospels (cf. ETL 52 (1976) pp. 364-79) and in an alphabetical word list which is of especial value when using the statistical tables. Lists of changes in the use of brackets (not so easily abstracted from ETL (1976)) are clearly set out here and are instructive in combination with my articles in Biblica (60 (1979) pp. 575-7 and 62 (1982) pp. 401-5). Changes within N^1 to N^25 and in Tischendorf from 1869 to 1873 are described: these enable us to use VK and N-A^26 Appendix II more accurately. All these tables are concerned only with the synoptic gospels. Differences between H-G and N-A^26 were set out in ETL 58 (1982) pp. 123-34: another version of this list (simplified, corrected and concentrating only on changes in vocabulary) also appears in Part III. In this section the authors make VK even more ‘complete’ and thereby of use of those who work from editions ignored by Aland. Neirynck in the ETL reviews frequently bemoaned the absence from VK of WH’s marginal readings and he drew up tables to show how these h readings affect VK in ETL 59 (1983) pp. 114-26. These pages are reprinted here, together with similar lists for WH’s readings.

A few minor errata and questions come to mind. (1) Footnote 29 (not signalled in the text) mistitles Metzger’s Commentary. (2) The abbreviation [br] for Mark 16:8 conclusio brevior occurs regularly in Part I but is explained neither in the list