remember that both the LXX and the NT were read to congregations whose principal language was Greek, and which were sensitive to the different standards which obtained in the Greek world. Some hearers would be alert to the practice of a more literary Greek.

We may observe, for example, a development within Greek. In the old language there were many particles which could not come first in their clause or sentence. In the later language they were dropped and their place was taken by other connectives which could come first, e.g. κατά for δέ, ἐκτὸς γιὰ γὰρ, δὲ lasted longest but even it has disappeared from modern Greek. The Greek of Mark is nearest to that of L in many respects. οὖν rarely occurs in Mark and γα γα never. Neither οὖν nor γα appear in L.

The possessive adjectives (as distinct from pronouns) ἓμαστά etc. do not appear in Mark. We may question whether ὅσ σ occurs in L and suggest that we should read a different text in L 18:10. ἡμέτερος, ὑμέτερος do not occur in L and at L 25:23 we should perhaps read not ἐμῆ but ἐμοί. Otherwise ἓμόσα does not appear in L. The possesives are rare elsewhere in the text of the Pentateuch and we should perhaps alter the text.

ἀποκόμμα is very rare in the NT apart from Luke-Acts. Otherwise in the Gospels it may occur only at Mt. 6:32, and elsewhere only at Eph. 6:13. ἀποκόμμα seems to belong to the older language and has been intruded in some manuscripts of the NT. Wevers prints it at L 6:22, 8:27. At 8:27 we should perhaps read πάντα for ἀπαντά. Otherwise ἀποκόμμα as distinct from πᾶς is rare and doubtful in the Pentateuch.

The variation between ἀναγγέλλειν (L 14:35) and ἀναγγέλλειν (L 5:1) is questionable. ἀναγγέλλειν is the Attic word, ἀναγγέλλειν came into use in Hellenistic Greek. John seems always to use ἀναγγέλλειν. L appears to agree with John and at L 5:1 we should read ἀναγγέλλειν. Apart from Genesis ἀναγγέλλειν seems to be the regular form in the Pentateuch.

Another variation common to the LXX and the NT is between ὡς and ὡσβ. Apart from Luke-Acts ὡσβ seems not to occur in the NT. ὡσβ is the form usual in L but ὡσβ is printed by Wevers at L 26:19, 37. Perhaps at both passages we should accept the reading ὡσβ.

From these examples it is clear that the textual variations in L are frequently studied in connexion with the practice of NT writers. In this respect Wevers' edition of L is particularly useful to the student of the NT. We recognize that in books like Hebrews any edition of L is bound to have something to say to the NT. In general we are indebted to the Göttingen Septuaginta Unternehmen and to Professor Wevers who has done so much for the LXX Pentateuch.

G. D. KILPATRICK


The English translation of Der Text des Neuen Testaments seems to have been made with care and competence by Errol F. Rhodes, one time pupil of R. P. Casey. In addition to the German edition, the authors have taken note of Farstad and Hodges, The Greek New Testament According to the Majority Text (p. vii). The present translation "represents a revision of the original German edition of 1982" (p.

Novum Testamentum XXX, 4 (1988)
The translator's preface is dated 29.9.1986, but little appears to have been added to the original edition. Nonetheless the English version will enable many who may not approach the German original to gain an idea of the Alands' approach to the New Testament (NT) textual criticism.

Supplementary to Der Text is the Bericht (B), the first number of which appeared in 1969. It recurs biennially, reporting the work of the Institute at each point. The present fascicle contains a foreword from Dr. W. Scheel and Bischof H. Kunst. This is followed by Aland's report of his forty years' work on the text of the NT (pp. 9-75), and by Barbara Aland's report on the NT manuscripts recently discovered at Sinai (pp. 76-89). Next come two items from Bischof Kunst on the publications of the Institute (pp. 90-101) and on the present state of the work of the Institute (pp. 102-118). At the end we have the membership of the Kuratorium and of the Vorstand and more particulars of publications.

Vorstand and more particulars of publications.

Let us now look at the substance of the Bericht. It reports on the products of the Münster Institute, in particular on the Greek Testament, now Nestle-Aland 26, on concordances to the Greek Testament and on other undertakings.

From various references we might easily conclude that B was concerned not so much with the text of the NT as with the activities of Kilpatrick. In principle these may be irrelevant, but two matters may be mentioned here. First, Aland refers to the Diglot NT and to my plans for an edition of the Greek NT, but it will not surprise Aland's readers that I have not taken Aland into my confidence.

Secondly, when the committee for the United Bible Societies' Greek Testament was formed, I inferred what the character of the text would be and decided to have no part in it. At that time Cardinal C. Martini and Professor K. Aland were not yet members of the committee, but became so later. It is clear, however, that Aland and the committee now sponsor the same text, Nestle-Aland 26 and UBS 3, and to this my reservations apply.

Notwithstanding, Aland's comments go deeper. He rejects my view of N-A 26 and expounds his theory about the witnesses to his text, (B 48-51). He complains of my decisions in the Diglot that "... Kilpatrick... in nicht wenigen Fällen seine vorher feststehende Meinung über den Text zur Grundlage genommen (hatte), auch da, wo das Zeugnis der griechischen Handschriften wie der Übersetzungen sehr schmal war" (B 13). This implies correctly that Aland and I differ in principle.

Aland's view can be seen from The Text of The NT 275f, "Twelve Basic Rules for Textual Criticism". These assert the requirements of both external and internal criteria. He insists that "internal criteria (the context of the passage, its style and vocabulary, the theological environment of the author, etc.) can never be the sole basis for a critical decision, especially when they stand in opposition to the external evidence" (Rule 4). In keeping with this we are told that "manuscripts should be weighed, not counted" (Rule 6). Rule 7 may be quoted in full: "The principle that the original reading may be found in any single manuscript or version when it stands alone or nearly alone is only a theoretical possibility. Any form of eclecticism which accepts this principle will hardly succeed in establishing the original text of the New Testament; it will only confirm the view of the text which it presupposes." Rule 8 advises that "the reconstruction of a stemma of readings for each variant (the genealogical principle) is an extremely important device." In the light of these opinions we can understand Aland's complaint that the evidence of Greek manuscripts and of versions was very limited and his reservations against WH's opinion about D (B 49).

This statement of views goes to the root of the matter, to the question: 'how did variant readings come into being?'. If we have the answer to this question, we can