significant variation within the papyri and within 23 uncial mss. is displayed. Originally the editors planned to include only those uncials that could be dated contemporaneous with the papyri but in the end decided to include all the uncials (excluding the missing codex 0157) that contain the Catholic letters, regardless of the judgement on the textual characteristics of these uncials (as categorized by the Alands). (The former 0129 and 0203 are now l 1575 and therefore excluded.) Thus it is puzzling to find in the apparatus to 2 Pet 2:5 the gospel uncial II. This limited apparatus is of limited value: it would have been desirable to have seen as full an apparatus as possible, especially as it is useful to be alerted (as we have been recently by Harry Sturz's work on the Byzantine text-type) to links between readings in the minuscules and early papyri (e.g. 1 Pet 1:20 εὐχαριστοῦ (τῶν) χρωμών; 2:5 + τῶ; 5:8 + τω; 5:10 + ἤησος; 2 Pet 2:15 καταλαμ.; Jude 25 + καί; 25 + longer text). And if contemporaneity were to have been a relevant issue in deciding which witnesses to display in the apparatus, to have included those versions and Patristic citations that can be dated early would have been of significance. For instance we could then test the view that P72 in Jude has affinities with the Old Latin and Philoxenian Syriac. If consistency with the practice of the Münster Institut elsewhere in using constant witnesses were to be applied here, one would at least have expected to find those minuscules used as constants in N-A26 for the Catholic epistles (listed in its Introduction pp. 52*-53*). Sometimes one can use N-A26 to supplement exiguous information in the present apparatus (e.g. at Jude 13 αἱ ἐπαθὲν.) but this is not always possible. Inevitably, sometimes variants absent from N-A26 are shown in ANTF 6 and we need to keep an eye on this new apparatus for new readings.

Insofar as papyri are often given undue prominence in a textual apparatus by New Testament critics it is valuable to have the readings of these papyri as accurately and as clearly displayed as possible. And this clear presentation is what we must thank Dr Junack and Dr Grunewald for in their book. The chosen method of providing this information is rather extravagant: one should really have been able to expect to see all the purely non-orthographical variants found in the papyri accurately displayed in a conventional apparatus to the Greek testament without the need of this separate publication. The cost of this volume is just under one DM per page.

J. K. Elliott


This is the first of a series that will be a major reference tool for work on the Syriac New Testament. The present fascicle is restricted to James, I Peter and I John, i.e. those Catholic letters found in the Peshitta. The texts are given on pp. 141-286: these pages are also numbered K (= Katholische Briefe) 1-K146, the intention being that when the texts for the rest of the NT are published these could be reprinted as a totality independent of the introductory matter found in each of the separate fascicles.

The pages of text give us first the Peshitta and Harklean, and patristic citations and translations; then follow the extracts from the major Catholic epistles found in the Western Syriac Massora; then a short collation of the BFBS Peshitta text of

Novum Testamentum XXX, 1 (1988)
1920 with three other major printed editions, a) Leusden and Schaaf (1709 on pp.
17, 267, 307 but 1708 on p. 3 fn. 4), b) Lee (1816 on pp. 3 and 307 but cf. p. 267)
and c) that published in Mossoul in 1898-1900; finally comes a retroversion into
Greek of the Harklean text of New College ms. 333 (called H1 here), a task that
proved relatively easy for such a literal version but which is virtually im-
possible—and not attempted!—for the Peshitta.

The Syriac text substantially reproduces a) the Peshitta text of the BFBS edition
to which has been added an apparatus of readings taken from 9 Peshitta mss. and
b) the Harklean text of New College ms. 333 and variants in two other mss.
(Deficiencies in White’s edition are criticised fully by Barbara Aland in her in-
troduction.) To these lines of continuous text are added, where available, citations
found in the works of various Syriac fathers (among whom Dionysius bar Salibi,
Isho’dad of Merv, and Severus of Antioch figure frequently) and translations.
There are about 150 separate works included and it is one of the strengths of this
edition that the citations from these patristic works are available to us in this way.
Each quotation is given in full and the reader can see at a glance the relationship
of the citation to the Peshitta and to the Harklean version. Each patristic text title
and its reference are set out in abbreviated form: this enables the reader to locate
the citation within its context in a printed edition. This method is similar to that
adopted in the IGNTP apparatus to Luke. As with the Luke project so here
similar problems occur in identifying and displaying the patristic material, for
example, the accuracy of the father in citing scripture. (I have tried to itemize
these issues in “The Purpose and Construction of a Critical Apparatus to a Greek
New Testament” in the recently published Greeven Festschrift.) An additional
benefit in this fascicle is that the patristic citations are listed in chronological
order. An index of all the fathers cited appears as an appendix where the works
are grouped both chronologically and by theological affiliation (Monophysite or
Nestorian). It is anticipated that there may well be debate about some of these
details but the principle applied is to be commended because the judgement
passed on the relationship of a patristic citation to the Peshitta and/or Harklean is
of course crucial not only in studies on the father but for these versions
themselves.

This volume does not therefore print a critical text: it sets out to provide a
thesesaurus of variants and readings on which ultimately the much needed critical
editions of the Syriac versions may be built.

Each page of the text includes an apparatus giving details of v. ll. (including or-
thographic v. ll.) in the Peshitta and Harklean mss. used, of the Harklean
marginalia and signs (which, for the Catholics, does not include the obelus), and
of the v. ll. in the patristic works as taken from the printed editions. Another ap-
paratus lists those citations that more properly are mere adaptations. An
“overflow apparatus” lists those citations that agree precisely with a citation
already given in full above: this is purely a space-saving device and in fact occurs
only twice in this volume (for those texts that are most popular, namely I Pet 2:22
and 4:1).

Much of the introductory matter deals with general questions such as the tex-
tual character of the Philoxenian, the identity of the translator of the Peshitta, the
apparatus of the Harklean: issues not of relevance to the Catholics (e.g. concern-
ing the Old Syriac and Tatian’s Diatessaron) are left to one side in this fascicle.
The allegedly pre-Peshitta nature of the citations in the translation of Cyril’s
de recta fide is discussed.

One important section in the introduction is on the Greek behind the Harklean.
Thanks to the resources of the Münster Institut about 540 Greek mss. containing
the major Catholic epistles have been sampled. From these collations and with the