

## FROM PAPYRUS TO PIXEL I: THE MOST IMPORTANT GREEK NEW TESTAMENT MANUSCRIPTS AND THE QUESTION IF THERE REALLY ARE »TEXT-TYPES«

For over one hundred years Greek manuscripts that contain all or part of the New Testament have conventionally been registered according to their script, writing material or contents. These practices have resulted in four differing listings: papyri, majuscules, minuscules and lectionaries. We shall examine each category soon. If we were to start anew I suspect that most scholars would prefer a more consistent classification, but as politicians are nowadays fond of saying, »we are where we are«!

The extant 5,000 or so manuscripts currently registered have traditionally been subdivided first into differing styles of handwriting i.e. those which use only block capital letters without spaces between words as opposed to those which use a form of joined-up writing for individual words, a method which I assume most of you use! The former sounds more difficult to decipher but I find is not actually a problem. That style known as majuscule script, or less accurately for Greek as opposed to Latin script »uncial script«; this has generally followed lettering found in carved inscriptions. It was a popular form of handwriting that seems to have continued up to the 9<sup>th</sup> century. Many *de luxe* and large majuscules look as if they were indeed

written out for public reading. This style of handwriting was relatively easy for trained readers and the general public. Most people would easily decipher epigraphical writing: it occurs on public buildings and on epitaphs; stones too were often carved with lettering written in this way. Greek as a language has few common endings and readers would easily see where each word to be pronounced ended and therefore the beginnings of the words to follow.

As far as writing materials are concerned, manuscripts written on papyrus are separated from those written on vellum (or parchment). As an indication of the popularity of writings on papyrus,<sup>1</sup> most have been unearthed (literally in many cases) during archaeological digs. New Testament fragments written on papyrus and known as P1 to P12 appear in the German C.R. Gregory's *Textkritik*<sup>2</sup> in 1900, 1902 and 1909.

If any one finds a manuscript that contains all or part of the New Testament, the registry is here in Germany, at the University of Münster. I am not being facetious about relatively casual encounters with new manuscripts. Several re-discovered witnesses have come to light recently. In some cases a church or monastery put familiar old

manuscripts in obscure hiding places once their institutions went over to new-fangled printed bibles from the 16<sup>th</sup> century onwards. Rather than destroy familiar and in many cases well-thumbed manuscripts, its custodians put them somewhere »safe«. Such treasures were forgotten and/or lost. It was only the insatiable curiosity of modern scholars that finds such witnesses. One does not need to embark deliberately on a *Handschriftenreise* to find these items. Michael Welte, for many years the Registrar at Münster, made it a professional practice when on his holidays in countries like Greece to enquire at churches if they happened to possess hand-written copies of the scriptures. And so it was that several copies of the New Testament texts came to light again and were duly registered. More recently, Dr Daniel Wallace of Texas sets out with his team of dedicated photographers to digitize manuscripts, often in former communist lands where several manuscripts were once known, and subsequently reported as having been lost. In some cases these witnesses were not actually lost, merely neglected and forgotten by custodians and librarians who, until the fall of communism, had to take more care of their own skins rather than the manuscripts for which they were, at least nominally, responsible. Silence was often a popular means of safety. In Wallace's expeditions several newly rediscovered manuscripts are now known about and some have come to light for the first time.

Should anyone here ever come across a manuscript in majuscule handwriting then one has an old witness from Christianity's first millennium. Cursive handwriting is found from the 7<sup>th</sup> century up to (and even

beyond) the invention of printing especially in remote or conservative places; these are now referred to as a minuscule hand and thus give rise to the word »minuscule« of manuscript witnesses. Most extant manuscripts are, of course, written like this, mainly because medieval manuscripts inevitably survive better than earlier witnesses from late antiquity. I find that to read such manuscripts quickly one must study, plot and list the features of the scribe's preferences and idiosyncrasies, especially how a scribe has written out certain combinations of letters. Some scribes used ligatures, joining together certain, usually commonly occurring, letters, Others abbreviate regularly recurring words like »and« or »but«. Only once one has successfully learned each scribe's handwriting can one then read with confidence what it is that a scribe has written.<sup>3</sup>

Didier Lafleur, an active text-critic currently working in Paris at the Collège de France as a librarian and CNRS researcher has undertaken numerous visits (some twenty-seven times!) to Albania, where in Tirana its capital he has reported on a large number of Greek New Testament manuscripts, some previously unknown to scholarship.<sup>4</sup>

So: those often chance discoveries and the deliberate digs especially in Egypt<sup>5</sup> are of significance and great importance. The Greek-speaking inhabitants of Oxyrhynchus seem to have been largely Christian from 2<sup>nd</sup>-5<sup>th</sup> centuries A.D. Many of today's New Testament texts were found there but also in (apparently) other sites nearby. The famous Bodmer library in Cologne near Geneva, named after the banker and

bibliophile, Dr Martin Bodmer, possesses some fine examples, as too does the Sir Chester Beatty Library currently housed in Dublin Castle where his large collection was donated in the late 1940s to the then relatively fledgling Republic of Ireland. And its treasures are regularly displayed. Inevitable exhibitions regularly feature New Testament manuscripts. Obviously Bodmer and Beatty and others worked through middlemen in places like Cairo where everyone involved in such (often nefarious) activities tried to protect and preserve their sources of supply.

This categorization separates the numbers of manuscripts written on papyrus from those composed on parchment or, very occasionally, on paper. Thus the medium of the writing material is made to appear important.

Now, to the four listings:

1. Since the first New Testament manuscript written on papyrus was reported, the number of finds has grown exponentially over the past century and a half. In 1994 ANTF's *Liste*<sup>6</sup> ended its section of papyri with P99. Thirty years on we have now reached P138. Greg Paulson, a *Mitarbeiter* at Münster, is currently working on the 3<sup>rd</sup> edition of the *Liste* in print although online resources over the recent past also keep adding to each category of manuscript, including, of course, papyri.

Papyri are easily spotted in reference tools, but, as far as I see it, their priority in such reference works is unwarranted. They normally appear first in lists of manuscripts, in discussions in textbooks or in the *appara-*

*tus criticus* and in the footnotes of a critical edition of the New Testament — even a hand- or pocket-edition. One reason may be that many, but by no means all, papyri are from the earliest Christian centuries, and it is often to be heard that their age deserves recognition. But age is not in itself of importance, as we shall discover!

New Testament manuscripts on papyrus are usually recorded with a gothic P (= papyrus) and with a distinctive superscript number following (and these numbers start at 1 and proceed *seriatim*); and, more recently as an ordinary upper case P and the number following on the line.

But here, as with all such classifications, we must not assume that the highest number tells us the precise totals in each category or how many extant witnesses are registered. There are actually only some 100 extant papyri and not 138, because sometimes dealers tore up a manuscript and sold different parts to different Western buyers to maximize their profits. Originally and unintentionally those fragments may have been registered separately, each therefore bearing a different number prior to the publication of those portions of the same manuscript.

What is surprising is that our fund of papyri has but seldom influenced an editor's choice of text in new critical editions. Papyri may figure first in many an *apparatus criticus*, and will appear predominantly in listings of all extant New Testament manuscripts, but their distinctive readings and especially their allegedly original readings have not always been taken as seriously as some scholars may have wished to see in

a published Greek New Testament. Modern editions are often changed but not necessarily on the bases of readings now located in older witnesses nor of witnesses that happen to be written on papyrus.

To examine a few chosen papyri, let us look first at P52:

This is the number allocated to our oldest New Testament fragment and indeed may be our oldest piece of Christian writing. The experts usually date it *c.* 125 A.D. (that is between 100 A.D. and 150 A.D., shortly after *Neutestamentler* date the original composition of John's Gospel. (Prior to the chance finding of this papyrus fragment—due to the prodigious memory of its then cataloguer of Manchester's new manuscripts from the Greek Bible who duly recognized that this credit-card sized fragment came from the Fourth Gospel—some scholars were prepared to say the original date for the composing of John's Gospel was well into the 2<sup>nd</sup> century.

**P52** contains parts of only four or five verses from the Fourth Gospel (i.e. John 18:31-33, 37-38) on its two sides. The fact that it contains writing on both sides proves that it came from a codex (like a modern book—a style adopted by Christians from their beginnings) rather than a scroll (favoured typically by Jews for their scriptures). P52 is now on permanent display at the John Rylands Library in the University of Manchester, England. This library, like those named after Sir Chester Beatty and Dr Martin Bodmer, was named by his widow in honour of her late Mancunian husband, the famous cotton-broker and non-conformist bibliophile, John

Rylands. The library soon acquired many previously collected hordes of books and manuscripts. It is most likely that Mrs. Rylands obtained this tiny fragment of John in Greek amid multitudes of papyri bought by her or, previously, by her husband.<sup>7</sup>

**P45**<sup>8</sup> is in Dublin Castle and part of the Sir Chester Beatty bequest. **P47** contains some ten pages with Revelation on these mutilated sheets. Only chapters 9-17 are represented in what survives and, although close to our famous Codex Sinaiticus, it is quite independent. One finds it regularly cited in *critici apparatus*.

**P75**. This witness was in the Biblioteca Bodmeriana near Geneva; currently it is in the Vatican Library. P75 contains very early copies of two New Testament Gospels, those of Luke and of John. These are dated to around the 3<sup>rd</sup> century. The writing has been described as being not only clear but carefully executed. The text is very close to that of another famous majuscule on parchment, the Codex Vaticanus.

(We meet Sinaiticus and Vaticanus shortly!)

**P66**, currently used on the flyer to advertise the lectures in Stuttgart, could readily be made available for us to see, as it clearly demonstrates how early manuscripts were checked carefully and changed, wherever necessary.

2. Our next category are those majuscule manuscripts that were, by definition, written prior to the 9<sup>th</sup> century. (Minuscule manuscripts were gradually being intro-

duced from the 7<sup>th</sup> century and dominated the writing style from the 9<sup>th</sup> century onwards—we turn to these shortly.)

But first the majuscules or uncials, the latter being a term that technically belongs to written Latin witnesses described in that way, somewhat exaggeratedly I always think. These witnesses have letters allegedly one inch in height, hence they are *uncials* having letters one *uncial* (= *inch*) in size.

Majuscules are classified by the registrar with an initial O (possibly the numeral zero or the initial letter of the French word »oncial«) whereas minuscules are now known by consecutive numerals beginning with 1. Today we have the highest number for majuscules above 0320<sup>9</sup>

Majuscules were originally known by the capital (or »upper case«) letters of the Latin alphabet—all twenty-six of them. Several differing manuscripts were known originally by the same letter if there was no ambiguity about their contents i.e. those that are re-used to refer to a different manuscript which contains another part of the New Testament (e.g. D can refer to the 5<sup>th</sup> century majuscule 05 in Cambridge, UK which has the Gospels and Acts as well as originally probably all seven Catholic epistles but the letter D is also used to refer to a sixth-century manuscript (D 06) now in Paris and containing Pauline letters). Then the ten distinctive capital letters of the Greek alphabet were utilized and finally, due doubtless to the influence of Konstantin (von) Tischendorf of Leipzig who was responsible for discovering our most famous New Testament manuscript in Greek, Codex Sinaiticus, one letter and

only one from the start of the Hebrew alphabet, aleph, was used of Tischendorf's *Jahrhundertfund*. Thereafter scholars started renumbering all those majuscules currently registered and adding to them. Thus majuscules all have separate *numbers*. As we have already said, the siglum is preceded by a zero. We should never use letters again! Yet NA and UBS and most writers give us the majuscule manuscripts as alphabetical letters and some contemporary modern writers still write the letters wherever these apply, alongside the more modern, unambiguous and therefore preferred Gregory numbers. Old habits die hard....

**B and 8:** Now to two majuscules on parchment: B 03 or Codex Vaticanus, now, as its name tells us, is housed in the Vatican Library, and also to the other majuscule, the justly famous Codex Sinaiticus from St Catharine's Monastery on Mt Sinai – hence, of course, the name – this latter is associated with its »discovery« by the 19<sup>th</sup> century German academic Konstantin Tischendorf, latterly calling himself *von* Tischendorf on the strength of the honours bestowed on him by Russia. The two earliest codices were originally complete copies of the New Testament in Greek; both 01 and 03 contained the whole of the Septuagint (= the Old Testament in Greek commonly written as the Latin numerals LXX) and the complete New Testament.

Old catalogues from the Vatican library show that it looks as if it possessed this biblical manuscript in Greek by 1475 and probably even earlier, by 1443, according to these catalogues, although the manuscript itself was written eleven centuries

earlier. The scribe(s) were probably working in Caesarea and perhaps the manuscript was composed for the newly founded churches, especially those in the new capital of the Eastern Christian empire, Byzantium, later named Constantinople; this is today's Istanbul. T.C. Skeat a famous librarian in London who as a young man received the bulk of Codex Sinaiticus when it first arrived in England in 1933 maintained his interest in biblical manuscripts right up to his death at the advanced age of 96 in 2003. He argued in several places<sup>10</sup> that both aleph and B may have been among the fifty manuscripts commanded by Emperor Constantine for his prestigious new churches. As these two manuscripts are among the very few that contain the whole of the Old Testament and the New Testament in Greek and are both the earliest such manuscripts extant this claim is possible. Both are clearly beautiful creations. We do need to ask why it was that after the Fall of Constantinople in 1453 it may have been wise, tactical – even tactful – and safe to offer B 03, as a great treasure to the Western church, hence its arrival in Rome. Skeat suggested that although we know nothing of B between the 4<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> centuries i.e. between its date of composition and its appearance out of the blue as it were in the Vatican it may have arrived in Italy as a gift for the inter-church conversations at Ferrara-Florence of 1438-1439 before ending up in Rome.

The story of the finding of 01 in Sinai at St Catharine's Monastery is well known and does not require much retelling. Even the children's series in English, Ladybird Books, tells the story of Tischendorf and

his miraculous discovery of the manuscript from 1844 onwards - during the first of his three visits to the venerable Greek orthodox monastery in the Sinai peninsula. Elaborations of the background to and results from its being published by Tischendorf himself<sup>11</sup> and the ubiquitous writer from North America, Stanley Porter, who wrote a hagiographical study of Tischendorf and his work.<sup>12</sup>

Even today, I understand that Tischendorf's own handwritten letter to the monastery promising the swift return of their »beloved«<sup>13</sup> manuscript, remains on public display pinned up for all to see in the monastery library. Most importantly and more recently, Christfried Böttrich was allowed access to the Russian concerning Tischendorf's dealings with the diplomats of the time and with the monks of St Catharine's. As a former East German obliged to learn Russian, Böttrich was well-placed to read the original transcripts of letters, documents and other papers about the *affaire*. As it transpires, all was, apparently, proper and in good order; the naïve monks seem to have been well treated by the diplomatic niceties of this Victorian imperial story.<sup>14</sup> Even the old yarns that the monks were »well satisfied« to have been given (rather incongruously, I always felt) Russian imperial military medals seem to have died out! Böttrich's researches have now confirmed Kurt Aland's suspicions of several years earlier.

Codex Sinaiticus contains more than the conventional twenty-seven books of the New Testament proper. There were at least two further works: The Epistle of

Barnabas, and *The Shepherd* by Hermas. These and possibly other so-called Apostolic Fathers' writings were included in some ancient codices because they and books like them stood on the fringes of those that were comparatively easily adopted by the church because of the early dates of their composition, their supposed apostolic authorship and their alleged influence within and on the wider church. (Usually the Apostolic Fathers now stand in collections of non-biblical manuscripts.) But we do need to assess the significance not only of those in Codex Sinaiticus but also 1 and 2 Clement, now found in Codex Alexandrinus (A or 02). All those works, orthodox in their theology, early dates and importance to the literate Christian faithful, were also clearly assessed at the time(s) when the church needed to define which of its growing number of texts were to be deemed canonical — that is given the status of Holy Writ and of especially its allegedly divine status. One may assume that these pandects (if such a term applies to Greek as well as to Latin manuscripts that contain the whole of the Old Testament and the New Testament) were prepared precisely to indicate that these — and no more — were the special canonical texts of Christians. The canon lists and what we may see in contemporary early manuscripts is that the uniquely important status bestowed on certain books was principally one of exclusion and not so much of inclusiveness. Such a necessity may well have become useful when the Eastern Empire was founded in the late-fourth century. Skeat's supposition may therefore be correct even if only these two are the sole survivors of the fifty ma-

nuscripts with these definitive contents actually expected and possibly written at the Emperor's command.

Most extant manuscripts of the New Testament contain one part of the whole. This may be for purely practical reasons: very few manuscripts were intended to be complete. Few of the extant 5,500 manuscripts were ever meant to hold all twenty-seven New Testament works; I know of a mere sixty extant today which contain the whole New Testament. Also, if we look at the sheer bulk of, say, Codex Sinaiticus, once a complete Bible, it was obviously huge in size and very heavy to carry around; it could well have been impractical for use in church as a lectionary-type text. Also, the costs and the time involved in writing everything anew would be prohibitive for most private owners or small worshipping communities. As the four Gospels were the most frequently penned for reading aloud, for private study and for consultation, it was often only these four Gospels that would commonly or normally need rewriting. That is probably why most of our currently extant witnesses contain only those four canonical Gospels.

But to return to Codex Sinaiticus. This manuscript gives an astonishing array of relevant information in its *apparatus* mainly because, somewhat akin to P66 which we highlighted above, it contains many corrections or changes dating contemporaneously with the original 4<sup>th</sup> century scribe. It is a pity that we know nothing of how textual variants originated. The nearest we get is Codex Sinaiticus itself or to P66 because we

can actually see editorial changes being made to those witnesses—and sometimes unmade, e.g. in 01 the original exclusion then restitution of John 21:25 and the subsequent cancellation in that manuscript of Lk 22:43-44—all done in the scriptorium, either by the scribe correcting his own work or by a professional *diorthetes*, responsible for checking each scribe's work.

As we can readily read, Sinaiticus, like many other manuscripts, was divided up in differing places. Codex Sinaiticus is now located in Leipzig, St Petersburg, London and, most recently, ironically, in St. Catharine's at the foot of Mount Sinai where several folios were re-discovered mostly in the 1960s. By the 1930s, Uncle Joe (Stalin) and the USSR were more interested in and certainly in need of Westerners' money than in a dusty old manuscript of the Christian Bible at that! So the USSR offered what they had for sale. £100,000 was their asking price. (Obviously Stalin and his junta were in possession of these folios because of Tischendorf's gift to the Tsar.) The British public contributed half of that sum and the U.K. Government of its day and in those days kept its part of this publicly declared bargain and matched this collection pound for pound. On December 26<sup>th</sup> 1933 (a holiday day in Britain) the Russian leaves of Codex Sinaiticus duly arrived in London amid much ceremony at the British Museum. A recent and regular correspondent of mine, Theodore C. Skeat, whose name crops up on several occasions in my story, was a junior member of staff at its library then<sup>15</sup> and it was he who regularly worked on Sinaiticus after its arrival in London.<sup>16</sup>

Now to return to Saint Catharine's Monastery on Mount Sinai. It is still a Greek Orthodox Monastery founded in the 6<sup>th</sup> Christian century on the site of the Burning Bush and close to the Holy Mount where Moses had his famous sight of YHWH—or so we are told! The famous biblical scholar and philologist Konstantin Tischendorf, taking advantage of the relative peace in the Mediterranean world and of the consequent ease of travel, transport and communications of the day, made several trips to the Middle East to seek biblical and other appropriate finds. His most famous discovery came in 1844 when he found forty-three leaves of an ancient manuscript of the Old Testament in Greek (= the LXX) which he later donated to Friedrich, King of Saxony. These pages may be seen at the Library of the University of Leipzig. I saw them there, unloved, unread and, to my untutored eye, poorly preserved in 1986 when Leipzig was in the DDR. More recently, I understand that these folios are now properly looked after and duly conserved and preserved in the University Library.

Tischendorf returned to Sinai twice more looking for further sheets. His visit in 1853 was unfruitful in this regard but in 1859 on a third visit the monks were more generous to his requests and he was allowed to see and eventually copy out then remove a large portion of the manuscript, including many sheets of the New Testament. It is a good yarn that was worth his while dining out on. He relished the opportunity to tell and retell (and doubtless to elaborate) the story. The famous eighth edition of his published and edited Greek New Testament owes much



to Sinaiticus 01; in fact he had always regularly up-dated and changed his editions once another noteworthy manuscript came into his possession.

The second tranche of pages was removed to Cairo and then to St Petersburg where they were handed over with much pomp and circumstance to the Tsar of Russia, Alexander II to be published and printed as a splendid book bound into four folio volumes to mark the 1,000<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Russian Imperial Empire. It was thus published in 1862. As we indicated earlier, several further folios have come to light, comparatively recently, when a wall in the monastery was under repair; it revealed a whole pile of old writings in several different languages, including sheets of our famous New Testament witness. A few folios of Sinaiticus were also discovered at St Petersburg where they had been inadvertently abandoned in 1933. Ten years ago the four holding authorities, Leipzig, London, St Petersburg plus the somewhat nervous and wary monks from St Catharine's collaborated on a project to photograph and digitize all the surviving pages of this codex. One can now buy a facsimile copy of it. I have one in my home, which duly impresses the neighbours and our visitors! More cheaply, everybody with access to a laptop or to a computer can freely and easily download it to the privacy of their own home to admire an ancient majuscule manuscript.

Two lightings are available online and one may choose which is the better to reveal words and markings. The results are often superior to what one finds when

you see the manuscript itself! However, the London portions are always on show. The manuscript was rebound after arrival and a double page spread is always opened in the Ritblat Exhibition room of the Library, because of the public's generosity in donating to its purchase.

**D 05:** Another famous majuscule is Codex Bezae, currently in England at the Library of the University of Cambridge.<sup>17</sup> It had been presented in 1581 to the vice-chancellor of Cambridge by the famous French scholar Theodore Beza. A letter attached to the manuscript warns the v.c. of the virulent, dangerous nature of the manuscript being presented—perhaps that was why our French colleagues were keen to give it to the English.<sup>18</sup> This is a bilingual manuscript: Greek on one side of every page, Latin opposite. It was written in sense lines divided into *cola et commata* in order to facilitate reading and comprehension.

But it is even more famous because of its famously different text to that found in most other witnesses. In chapter 4 we shall look at some of its distinctive readings. When we open a critical edition of the Greek New Testament like NA28, D (= 05) is regularly there, often alone, in the footnotes to virtually every page, especially in Luke and Acts; this *apparatus criticus* shows the distinctiveness especially in, say, Luke 24 or throughout Acts where its text is very much longer than that in other manuscripts. Even if its text is proven to be secondary, not original and deliberately expanded, its importance in our discipline is undeniable. The question must still remain: why it is that it is

so different and why is it in both Greek and Latin.<sup>19</sup>

Codex Bezae (D 05) is often called an edited text; it is certainly the most systematic in the way it expands the original Acts and is certainly more regular in so doing than is usual. It may well be dubbed »maverick manuscript« — but its scribe or editor was not consistent in his editing. D was not 100% accurate in this regard, as Eldon J. Epp emphasised in his own revelatory thesis. Likewise, no scribe of a later manuscript ever seems regularly to alter all the *nomina sacra* in one consistent direction; the same may be said of later attempts to standardize the word »Jerusalem« or to avoid a few abbreviations in its vocabulary or even to change terms which the Atticist grammarians like Phrynichus or Moeris denounced as poor Greek<sup>20</sup>. Our unearthing of the »correct« readings to print seldom looks at only one witness; we need as full an *apparatus criticus* as possible because that correct / original reading (the *Ausgangstext*) may survive anywhere in our manuscript tradition.

3. As far as minuscules are concerned these began in the 7<sup>th</sup> century and like majuscule manuscripts were written on parchment (or increasingly from the Middle Ages on paper too) until the invention of printing made manuscripts impracticable. Hand-copying was generally abandoned although occasionally some more recent examples are to be seen. If we are to show but one example we may look at minuscule numbered 2; this was one of the minuscules used in Basle by Erasmus and his printers. In it

we may observe the notes scribbled on it by Froben and/or his assistants to aid the typesetters.

The highest number for minuscule manuscripts is currently over 2903.

4. The other category, lectionaries, also has many copies—some 2,500 exist. Very few have been studied systematically, and even fewer have made it into an *apparatus criticus*. Metzger, using evidence from Chrysostom, was prepared to state that the lectionary system evolved from the 4<sup>th</sup> century. On the other hand, the Alands were prepared to defend only a later system of lectionaries (say, from the 8<sup>th</sup> century). Most earlier lectionary manuscripts i.e. those from before the 8<sup>th</sup> century, such as 11604, 11043 11276 11347 and 11354, merely add notes to continuous-text witnesses indicating where lessons (readings in church) began and ended. From a date later than the 8<sup>th</sup> century the Alands were prepared to speak of a »proper« lectionary system allied to the Byzantine (majority) text-type of continuous-text manuscripts. Several earlier systems are, for example, called »Jerusalem-based«.

Most lectionaries were, unsurprisingly, needed for Greek Orthodox communities in what are now Greece, Cyprus, Asia Minor and the Middle East more generally. Lectionaries, unlike all the other three categories above, were designed for the church's year, its special feasts and significant days. The other categories were continuous texts written from the beginning to the end of every book. By contrast, lectionaries split the New

Testament books into gobbets making designated readings easier to find. These texts are often very important despite the problems many Western readers find coping with a lectionary's often difficult hand to decipher, especially whenever two or more virtually identical readings occur in the manuscript. Students are usually advised to establish in each lectionary the days and readings included before assessing each reading's distinctive variants.

Among technical terms used of lectionary manuscripts are: *menologion* to refer to those manuscripts using a system devised in the 10<sup>th</sup> century by Symeon Metaphrastes in order to indicate readings allocated for special occasions and celebrations relating to the lives of saints. These lectionaries typically incorporate hagiographical, homiletic as well as biblical texts. The lectionaries called *synaxarion* manuscripts follow the ecclesiastical year from Easter Day to Holy Saturday; they note those readings for special ecclesiastical events including each Sunday.

Each lectionary manuscript is prefaced by an initial *l* (= lectionary) usually in italics followed by cardinal numbers.

Our current highest number of lectionaries registered is 12445.

**To sum up:** It may surprise us to learn that our trove of manuscripts is increasing exponentially. This is partly due to teams of photographers e.g. those under Daniel Wallace's direction. It is also partly due to new finds or new pu-

blications resulting from archaeological digs. Those papyri found a century ago by Grenfell and Hunt, for example, are gradually, albeit slowly, carefully and conscientiously being prepared in Oxford for their eventual publication.<sup>21</sup> We ought to note also that many erstwhile Communist states, such as Albania, are gradually re-discovering valued and potentially »lost« manuscripts.

### **Excursus**

One digression we ought to allow ourselves to make is the problem of the longevity of parchment and papyrus. Our query concerns the length of time a manuscript may have been in use and therefore read before its possible recopying. Churches, monasteries and individuals tried to conserve and preserve their texts in manuscript sheets and in codex form. Thoroughgoing textual critics, therefore, may declare with confidence that even though an artefact (i.e. a manuscript) may be given a date on palaeographical grounds by the experts, regardless of the age and origin of any readings found within it, it may have subsequently survived in use for a few further centuries before it was eventually recopied. Only then could its distinctive text be found to have influenced a much later manuscript. That is why I am prepared to show that merely because a witness is mediaeval its text may go back, say, only very few steps or stages of copying to the presumed *Ausgangstext* or even to the authorial text itself.

Coupled with that, it is noticeable just how durable many parchment and indeed papyri texts are. We are used to seeing papyrus fragments which now are badly

abraded, torn or eaten into by white ants, but in their heyday they would have been complete and easily legible pages in perfectly formed codices. Today's funds of papyri have obviously been subjected to weather and to time. Several papyri from Oxyrhynchus, for instance, are very old scraps indeed and all of them were found disposed of as rubbish in the spoil-heaps alongside other discarded matter. The scraps had been discovered in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century or in the early decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Such manuscripts would have been written some 1,600 years previously, yet, nowadays, these fragments may still gradually yield legible writings, private letters, legal documents, literary works, as well as biblical and apocryphal texts too. Sometimes palaeographers have to resort to boiling in water lumps of papyrus that was rolled up when reused to serve as packing around mummies. They have to do so in order to restore and read any writing. It is amazing that such drastic measures are successful: we amateurs may indeed consider such drastic treatment would obliterate whatever has survived. Not a bit of it!

Theodore Skeat, the great papyrologist and librarian at the British Library, where he ended his distinguished career as its Keeper of Western Manuscripts, was determined to explode the wrong teachings that papyrus was expensive and fragile. Skeat, in many articles and elsewhere, was successful in showing that papyrus was plentiful, especially in Egypt, was not prohibitively expensive for the average *literati* and as a writing medium would last for decades and centuries if cared for properly. Obviously what he said about papyrus was equally true of parchment (vellum).

### **Versions**

Editors of a critical edition of a Greek New Testament look not only at the Greek itself but also at *versions*, that is to say translations of the Bible into other Christian languages like Latin, Coptic or Syriac even when one may be editing a *Greek* New Testament. Thus, one usually includes in one's critical *apparatus* Latin manuscripts, including not only the Latin Vulgate but the pre-Jerome text found in manuscripts usually called the Itala or, better and more commonly, when used of the whole Latin Bible, the Old Latin. As far as the Vulgate is concerned that is the version, usually associated with the name of St Jerome, even if he edited only parts of the Old Latin manuscripts, despite (or perhaps, regardless) of his having been allegedly commissioned to undertake work throughout the Old and New Testaments by the then Pope, Damasus. (Today some 10,000 Vulgate manuscripts are extant, although they, unlike manuscripts of the Greek New Testament, remain largely unread by scholars and unregistered in the ways Münster has done.

As Latin for centuries was the main language for Christians in the West and as I have written most on that version in other places we shall devote most of the space following to the New Testament in that version. I shall then refer briefly to what is readily accessible for those interested in other languages!<sup>22</sup>

### **Latin**

Latin was the major Western European language used by the church until the Reformation. Latin translations of the Bible were dominant throughout those centuries

and still have an important role to play in current biblical studies. The Latin Vulgate in common speech ought to refer more accurately to a *collection* of differing translations. It was never a unified version of the scriptures and St Jerome's role in its dissemination was merely one partial revision amid many others and yet another re-translation of only parts of the Bible.

Typically, it is the editors of the *Vetus Latina* volumes who provide in their publications' introductory matter details of all Latin manuscripts available and/or consulted or used by them in their editions. No one *Vetus Latina* manuscript contains the whole of the New Testament in its entirety and, to date, the series does not cover the whole of the Bible. However, all existing translations into Latin including the Old Latina should take pride of place in a full examination of the version.

Manuscripts identified with a Beuron number appear in some (albeit, irritatingly and bizarrely, not in all) volumes to indicate that they have been identified as containing in whole or in part a Latin text independent of, and possibly even preceding, Jerome's revision of the New Testament.

Most editors of the *Vetus Latina* volumes present readings from witnesses in groupings such as **X** = Tertullian or **K** = 55 plus Cyprian or **I** = gigas. («**V**» in these editions means the officially recognised Vulgate version, now known as the Stuttgart Version, promoted by the Roman Catholic church and which always appears even in an edition of the *Old Latin*). Ironically, if we wish to learn

the history of the Latin New Testament it is to these volumes dedicated to the *Old Latin* that we must turn primarily whenever we need to trace the history of the variants and changes to all Latin texts, as well as their possible relationship to the underlying Greek from which much in this version originally derived. (It is, however, clear that one should never automatically assume that any parallels between Greek and Latin must necessarily derive from the Latin's having adopted and translated a distinctive variant in the Greek tradition.)

Within the history of the Latin Bible the term »Old Latin« is not helpful. Many allegedly Old Latin manuscripts contain changes first introduced by Jerome himself; these have usually become known as »mixed« manuscripts, where some predominantly Vulgate manuscripts have been »contaminated« with Old Latin readings. No early literary text that was regularly copied over many centuries by numerous scribes would escape accidental or, especially in the case of these living religious texts, deliberate changes, created by countless believers within a multiplicity of fissiparous sects. Many texts were obviously used liturgically too, often as lectionaries. This »vulgate« language dominated worship. However, it was the use of the Bible in the church's liturgy that delayed the dominance of Jerome's revised Bible; the familiar words were those taken originally from a Latin text older than the so-called Vulgate. It was only in the 9<sup>th</sup> century that the version associated with Jerome ousted the Old Latin text. But even then we note that an Old Latin manuscript like 6 or *c* was being copied in the 12<sup>th</sup>-13<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>23</sup>

Accompanying church usage came theological exegesis, which inevitably created adaptations and changes. Many of those may be attempts to revise and correct the Latin and to produce a more accurate, and acceptable, translation. We need to examine the history of constant *revisions*.

Jerome's Latin Bible (or, rather, mainly the New Testament, as his Old Testament was virtually unchanged) was then followed by editions associated with the names Theodulph and Alcuin, the latter being most popularly associated with his work in Tours *c.* 650. Christopher de Hamel<sup>24</sup> calculates that forty-six surviving complete Bibles and thirteen Gospel books descend from Alcuin's revision. In 1546 the Vulgate<sup>25</sup> was said at the Council of Trent to be uniquely authoritative but in urgent need of revising. That Council's decision resulted in the Sixtine edition of 1590 (hailed as *the* authoritative edition by its promoters) which was briskly followed by a corrected version, known as the (Sixto-)Clementine edition of 1592 and which duly replaced its flawed predecessor; this was itself also trumpeted by the Vatican as *the* authoritative edition of the Vulgate. We note that Stephanus had also tried to restore Jerome's Latin. All these activities make it abundantly obvious that a re-creation of a chimeric Jerome *Urtext* is a difficult if not a fruitless exercise.

The critical *apparatus* to printed editions of Greek New Testaments normally contain the early versional evidence and Patristic citations of biblical passages in addition to the evidence of Greek conti-

nuous-text and lectionary manuscripts. Usually, the evidence of Latin is relatively frequent, with fuller variations from manuscripts being included. Many of those manuscripts, especially the oldest, have been extensively studied.<sup>26</sup>

We are normally concerned with the pre-Jerome Old Latin, especially if a manuscript comes from the earliest Christian centuries. Jerome's Latin Vulgate Gospels (on which he worked from *c.* 382 to *c.* 384) are usually referred to in Greek New Testament editions as »Lvg« and less usually, by distinctive and separate Latin codices as »Lvg<sup>ms</sup>« or »Lvg<sup>mss</sup>«. <sup>27</sup> Latin was the dominant language in areas from which most scholars come i.e. Western Europe, although scholarship emanating in the USA and the New World is supremely important too. The role of Roman Catholicism is equally significant. Until quite recently, worshippers and much Catholic scholarship used and encouraged the exclusive reading of the Latin Bible. Its place in worship and in theology influenced English and other Western European languages. This means that Latin still ought to be thoroughly understood by serious speakers of many languages and indeed by biblical scholars.<sup>28</sup>

The Roman edition of the Latin Old Testament, the *Vetus Latina* volumes, the Oxford edition, commonly called Wordsworth-White, named after its first two editors, J. Wordsworth and H.J. White, and the Stuttgart Vulgate edited by Robert Weber and, from its 4<sup>th</sup> edition published in 1994, by Roger Gryson, are the main Latin Bibles that have been

regularly used in the 20<sup>th</sup> century and beyond.

Scholarship such as theirs can trace its significance back to Erasmus (who saw himself as a Jerome *redivivus*); his own Latin translation of the New Testament was printed by Froben in Basle in 1516, and was part of the first published Greek New Testament (originally entitled *Novum Instrumentum*). The Greek text was provided alongside Erasmus' own new Latin translation only to demonstrate his Latin translation's validity and closeness to the underlying »original« Greek of its biblical authors; it also enabled scholars to assess the importance of the Latin. (The 4<sup>th</sup> edition of his Latin and Greek New Testament in 1527 – by then entitled *Novum Testamentum* – also included not only his own Latin but a late mediaeval version, allegedly close to Jerome's Vulgate.)

Ironically, it was Erasmus' *Greek* that came to dominate New Testament textual scholarship thereafter. A later but derivative edition by the Elzevi(e)r family promoted itself and came to be known as the *Textus Receptus* in 1633. That tag was subsequently applied to all editions from Erasmus' of 1516 onwards. It began as a piece of publishers' blurb but was true insofar as scholarship made sure that the »*Textus Receptus*« was indeed very popular in general usage. Erasmus' editions were increasingly promoted by Protestants, thanks to their lying behind Luther's German New Testament of 1522 and Tyndale's English New Testament of 1525-26 (and through that edition to the English »Authorised« Version in 1611). In fact, the *Textus Receptus* and editions of other comparable

texts based on it dominated the future of biblical scholarship for 350 years, rather in the way that the Latin Vulgate attributed to Jerome had dominated Christianity for at least 1,000 years previously.<sup>29</sup> We turn in our next chapter to look at Erasmus' editions and his influence more fully.

But, suffice it here to add here that the *Textus Receptus* was toppled from its dominant position in 1881 when Westcott and Hort printed a Greek New Testament representing the »original« Greek. Then we had a text differing not only from the *Textus Receptus* but also from the Vulgate. Protestant scholars like Kurt Aland tried to coerce Roman Catholic colleagues to promote a Latin translation that paralleled the Greek New Testament i.e. the Nestle text which he disingenuously stated was indeed that requisite standard-text. Carlo-Maria Martini, one-time Rector of the Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome and later Cardinal Archbishop of Milan was recruited to serve on the board of the Nestle-Aland text in order to promote Aland's ideas among the Catholic hierarchy. The resultant Nova Vulgata (sometimes known strangely as the *Neo-Vulgata*) was an attempt to print a Latin text that matched this »standard« Greek text.<sup>30</sup> The Nova Vulgata duly received approval in a papal encyclical of 1979, thus making it one of the Roman Catholic church's official Vulgate bibles. Bilingual (Latin-Greek) editions by K. and B. Aland were similarly published: NA<sup>26</sup> was printed alongside the Nova Vulgata in 1984 and <sup>2</sup>1991.<sup>31</sup> (Its *apparatus* displays differences between the Nova Vulgata and eleven other Latin versions.) Similarly, Nestle's New Testament in Latin was revised by the Alands. Nowadays Münster's

editors are much more circumspect. The Neo-Vulgata has been unceremoniously laid to rest - as too should the dubious bilingual editions that utilize it.

i. Catalogues of some Latin manuscripts include the older lists that include the one that Caspar René Gregory (assisted by E. Abbot) compiled and which forms volume three of Tischendorf's eighth edition.<sup>32</sup> Its list of Old Latin witnesses (pp. 949-971) is impressively full and fairly complete, especially given its date of publication. Some useful facts, figures and general information not always readily acquired elsewhere, including dimensions of pages, dates, contents etc., are to be seen here. Details about the Vulgate are on pp. 971-1108 especially pp. 983-1108.

ii. B.M. Metzger, *Versions*<sup>33</sup> pp. 295-312 gives the following totals for his listing of Old Latin manuscripts (and shows their contents in the sequence e a c p r = the Gospels, Acts of the Apostles, the Catholic Epistles, the Pauline Epistles, the Book of Revelation):

e: forty-six manuscripts (including m/Speculum)

a: nineteen manuscripts (including 5d 6c m/Speculum)

c: twelve manuscripts (including 5d 6c 55h 59dem 67l m/Speculum 54p 64q 53s 56t 65z)

p: fifteen manuscripts (including 6d 59dem 67l 56t m/Speculum)

r: seven manuscripts (including 6c 59dem 51gig 55h m/Speculum 56t 65z)

Detailed descriptions of certain other manuscripts follow in his book on pp. 312-319; these include 3a 6c 2e 10f 51gig 12h 1k 67 86 89. Metzger then turns to printed editions of the Old Latin New Testament.

As far as his descriptions of Vulgate manuscripts are concerned, his book contains (pp. 330-348) studies of Σ F J A Y C I Λ<sup>L</sup> T Q L R D, Sangermanensis (i.e. g<sup>1</sup> an Old Latin witness in Matthew), Beneventanus, Colbertinus, the Alcuin manuscripts, the St Adelbert Codex, Φ<sup>v</sup> Φ<sup>o</sup> Φ<sup>p</sup>, B, the Theodulf manuscript Θ, Codex Aniciensus and H, followed by printed editions of the Vulgate on pp. 348-352.

iii. *ANRW*<sup>34</sup>

There are c. sixty-one Old Latin manuscripts here:

3a 16a<sup>2</sup> 61ar 15aur 4b 26β 6c 5d 75d 59dem 27δ 2e 50e 75e 10f 78f 66ff 9ff<sup>1</sup> 8ff<sup>2</sup> 77g 7g<sup>1</sup> 52g<sup>2</sup> 51gig 12h 55h 17i 22j 1k 11l 67l m/Speculum 86mon 35μ 16n 16o 54p 20p 18n 13q 14r<sup>1</sup> 28r<sup>2</sup> 57r 62r 64rr<sup>1</sup>r<sup>2</sup>r<sup>3</sup> 80r<sup>4</sup> 24p 21s 53s 19t 56t 25e 81p 57w 83w 65z 23 33 34 82 and 89.

Also introduced are sixty-two Vulgate witnesses:

A B B<sup>2</sup> C D E F G H J Ie Iacr J K Lc Lc Le L2 Mc Ma M2 N O2 O2 Oa P Q R R2 R3 Se S2 Sp T U U2 V W X Y Ze



Z2 BF EP MT Δ\* Θ Λ Π Σε Σr Φp and ten others including the Book of Mulling.

iv. Gryson<sup>35</sup>

Part 1 deals with New Testament manuscripts proper and includes the following, all under the Beuron numbers:

e 1-49;

a c r 50-74;

p 75-89.

v. Parker<sup>36</sup>

Parker (p. 63) calculates that we have

a) 68 Old Latin manuscripts dated up to the 9<sup>th</sup>. Century

b) 23 Old Latin manuscripts from the 10<sup>th</sup>-14<sup>th</sup>. Centuries

c) 153 Vulgate manuscripts which have been dated up to the 9<sup>th</sup>-Century.

Parker provides useful lists of manuscripts per century in Tables 1.1 & 1. p. 63.<sup>37</sup>

vi. Houghton<sup>38</sup>

The manuscripts available to editors of the Nestle and United Bible Society editions include a full list of Old Latin manuscripts; this is found in Houghton's catalogue in his chapter 10 pp. 209-281 and Appendix I pp. 283-5.

Wisely, Houghton uses only Beuron numbers. The manuscripts briefly introduced

are 1-109 (including 9A 11A 19A 22A 135 [189] 251 259 262 271 330 411 414 415 & an *addendum*, being a lectionary from Graz).

Latin Editions:

The Stuttgart New Testament in Latin has the word »Vulgata« in disproportionately large letters on its cover although its title page modestly reads »iuxta vulgatam versionem«. This edition contains not only the Biblical texts but Jerome's prefaces which precede many of the books. In one he claims (like Erasmus 1,000 years later) that speed marred his accuracy. Jerome complains that the Gospels were translated hurriedly (»levius« in the *Praefatio*). Other books in the New Testament were revised by unknown assistants and later translators.

Stuttgart: This edition of the Vulgate includes thirty-one Old Latin manuscripts. These are:

A C D F G I K (L) M N P R p R c Se Sar Sp Sc Z (Λ ) Φ<sup>E</sup> Φ<sup>T</sup> Φ<sup>B</sup> Φ<sup>G</sup> Φ<sup>V</sup> k(p) k(James) l r s(e), s(p).

The earlier, Oxford edition started by Wordsworth and White includes fifty-one Vulgate (and »mixed«) manuscripts plus five extras (arg div haf m s) i.e. 56 witnesses: A Be Bapc BF C D Ee Ep EP F G E Ie Iacr J K Le Lp Lc Me Ma Mp MT N Oe Oa Oc Op Or Pe Pp Q Re Ra Rp Se Sa Sp T Ue, Uapr V W X Y Ze Zp Δ Θ Π Σ as well as arg div haf m s<sup>39</sup>. This edition uses twenty-nine manuscripts for the Gospels, twenty-eight for Acts, twenty-one for the Epistles and twenty-four in Revelation.

A Bilingual Latin-Greek Edition:

Bover-O'Callaghan<sup>40</sup> (= the 6<sup>th</sup> edition of the bilingual text with a Catalan version by J. O'Callaghan):

The Latin manuscripts are listed on pp. xxiii-xxvii.

The Use and Limitations of Latin Evidence in the *apparatus criticus*:

As far as biblical scholars and text-critics of the Greek New Testament are concerned, the function of versional evidence is of paramount significance in a critical *apparatus*. The evidence of Latin may contain readings found in extant witnesses older than any surviving Greek evidence. This is true not only for continuous text manuscripts but for patristic citations too. Latin citations may add to our stock of readings that differ from Jerome's Vulgate, especially if even a late Father is using and quoting from a version independent of Jerome's revision. Obviously, all citations need to be carefully examined in the light of each Father's reliability and the overall context of every quotation. However, we may gain information from Patristic citations when and where a certain form of a text emerged.

The Latin version(s) spread widely; manuscripts and Patristic citations come from Italy, Gaul, Spain, Africa and Ireland. The Old Latin survived longest in Ireland and Spain because of the isolation of these two countries from the rest of Christendom. The version by Jerome consequently only gradually made fewer inroads there.

Most of the early Latin versions seem to have been literal renderings of the underlying Greek and some Latin words are mere transliterations, e.g. *agape*, *anastasis*, *eremus*, while other words from an early Latin rendering (such as *angelus*, *martyr*, *hypocrite*, *baptisma*, *thesaurus*) survived the revisions by Jerome and his successors. In a few cases modern scholars can dub some over-literal translations »dubious Latin« or »unliterary forms«. Nevertheless, students of the history of the Latin language omit the study of the Old Latin Bible at their peril. Philip Burton's book on the language of the Old Latin Gospels shows what can, and should, be achieved<sup>41</sup>.

As to the limitations of using Latin or any early version for that matter to bolster our stock of Greek textual readings in the New Testament, the appendix by Bonifatius Fischer in Bruce Metzger's book on *Versions* is essential reading. Obviously in a study of the Greek text we need to eliminate from the *apparatus* purely inner-versional variants, i.e. readings that most plausibly belong to the version itself regardless of what it was translated from. And in some cases text-critics ought to consider if an oral transmission of the Latin may have been responsible for a variant rather than its being due to a translation directly from Greek.<sup>42</sup>

Unwary readers may count the numbers of manuscripts included in an *apparatus* but the wise will hesitate before adding to a list of witnesses versional evidence, even where the Latin happens to agree with a Greek reading. Counting noses, despite its appeal to be an allegedly democratic assessment of readings, is not an appropriate method

of proceeding. Each reading must be considered carefully before we let versional witnesses sway our decisions.

We may be on surer ground if a version (or some manuscripts of that version) happen to support either longer or shorter readings. Similarly, where two or three manuscripts from a version in different languages agree in support of one reading we may wish to add that versional evidence here in favour of a Greek reading. But our overall conclusion is to urge caution in accepting a Latin versional reading in support of a Greek variant.

One particularly significant section to end each chapter in Metzger's book on the versions is given over to an acknowledged specialist on the language being discussed; he writes authoritatively on the limitations of each separate language.

Here we merely sketch briefly what is currently found in the *Editio critica maior* and the Nestle hand-editions. However, one ought to look at all versions, including some like Arabic which all-too-often have been neglected, despite their utility in determining the text underlying each translation.<sup>43</sup> The most commonly found are:

Syriac. here one encounters the Old Syriac and the Curetonian as well as the more commonly used Peshitta, as well as the Philoxenian and Harklean versions.

Coptic. Among the several dialects are the Sahidic and Bohairic as well as the Akhmimic, Middle-Egyptian and other versions of the Coptic. Work by Anne Boud'hors and Sofia Torallas Tovar is notable here.

In addition are:

Georgian where we note publications by Bernard Outtier and by Neville Birdsall,<sup>44</sup> Armenian (where we note publications by Charles Renoux), Ethiopic (now attracting researchers from outside Ethiopia, including Judith S. McKenzie and Francis Watson in their *The Garima Gospels: Early Illuminated Gospel Books from Ethiopia* (Oxford: Manar al-Athar, 2016) (= *Monograph 3*)<sup>45</sup>, Gothic (this 4<sup>th</sup> century version exists basically only in the Gospels. Carla Falluomini is a leading current researcher into this version), Old Church Slavonic (A. Alexeev of St Petersburg is currently a main researcher into this version now generally only found as a liturgical language in Russian orthodox worship.)

Now finally to some headings that seem to address our concerns here:

### ***1. Calculating the Numbers of Extant Manuscripts and Digitizing.***

There are in excess of 5,000 witnesses of the New Testament in Greek alone. One hesitates to specify a total, as more witnesses seem to be coming to light, others are being reclassified and often renumbered, some are now apparently lost, others inadvertently bear more than one number or are now seen as belonging to a manuscript already registered, thus rendering one or more previously assigned Gregory-Aland numbers redundant. The listing of the manuscripts is therefore regularly on the change.<sup>46</sup>

The current programmes of digitizing manuscripts, be those from organisations such as the Center for the Study of New Testament Manuscripts, under the direction

of Prof. Dan Wallace or the holding institutions themselves, have made it possible for the scholar in his/her private study to be able to access many New Testament manuscripts and the huge textual riches each displays. This very accessibility potentially overwhelms the vast majority of editors.

The bulk of Greek New Testament witnesses, insofar as samples are taken by the likes of the *Text und Textwert* (= *TuT*) programme (now including Revelation<sup>47</sup>) are concerned, is Byzantine, not only in age and provenance but in its textual character. Previous generations tried to classify manuscripts into alleged text-types and label their methodologies in differing ways. Thus Colwell's quantitative analysis was followed by the »Claremont Profiling Method«, and the Alands' »Local Genealogy Method«. Differing sorting procedures were adopted for the International Greek New Testament Project (IGNTP), for the *TuT* volumes, and, earlier by Westcott and Hort. Now, of course, we try to understand and learn what it is that underlies the Coherence-Based Genealogical Method, espoused by the researchers in Münster. All may claim to assist our coping with the growing numbers of mediaeval minuscule manuscripts. (See no. 3, below.)

## 2. Text-Types (as in our lecture's subtitle):

Münster has now abandoned its use of the words »text-types« (Caesarean, Alexandrian, Western etc.) although »Byz(antine)« is a term it maintains often merely to describe (quantitatively) the bulk of majuscules. But even though (or indeed because) authorities in Münster (still the

Mecca for such study) have jettisoned these names, it cannot mean that we may nowadays easily move on to assess the vast majority of witnesses, manuscript by manuscript. Most witnesses are only ever sampled, never read through in their entirety. We may well ask if thoroughness and exhaustiveness would ever yield much that is new. As far as the text itself is concerned, all that could happen is our adding to the existing stocks of already well-known *variae lectiones* (= *v.ll.*). Very few genuinely new deliberate *v.ll.* emerge from new collations.

## 3. CBGM

Seeing that in our increasingly digital age only computers could help us, Gerd Mink rode to our rescue and devised his Kohärenz-basierte genealogische Methode (= Coherence Based Genealogical Method [CBGM hereafter]). That his work was acceptable and successful is seen in the second edition of the *ECM* volumes on the Catholic Letters (which began using CBGM during the editorial process) and especially in Acts. (John and Revelation and other books will, doubtless, follow suit.) Ultimately the whole New Testament in future, including hand-editions like N-A and UBS as well as translations based on those, will become CBGM-generated texts.

Mink's work, apparently on each and every significant textual variation, results in impressive flow charts, in which a key number of manuscripts is shown to influence, or have been influenced by, other manuscripts. The actual age of each manuscript, having been diligently and carefully examined by expert palaeogra-

phers, will be used to give dates to manuscripts that lack a formal dating. They work from handwriting and individual scribes' characteristic ways of writing letters of the alphabet which may then be dated, if not precisely to a given year, as representative of the characteristics of a particular century. In such ways a manuscript *qua* artefact may usually be given an agreed date<sup>48</sup>.

In Mink's opinion all the distinctive readings in a New Testament book can be of any age. Manuscripts are mere »tradents« (to use the newly coined jargon, to describe such phenomena) *i.e.* these witnesses are to be thought of as mere carriers of readings from earlier times. A reading may be much older than the palaeographical dating of the witness bearing such a word.<sup>49</sup>

Such methodology seems to chime in with what those (few) of us who espouse thoroughgoing text-criticism have said for many decades. In earlier years H.-J. Vogels, followed by George D. Kilpatrick, used to claim that most deliberate theological changes are likely to have arisen prior to a time when most New Testament documents were branded as canonical. Typically they claimed 200 A.D. as a reasonable *terminus ad quem*. Obviously, silly mistakes, scribal slips even, but not necessarily grammatical changes, could have occurred any time later during a manuscript's transmission. Hence thoroughgoing criticism may (often reluctantly) accept as the *Ausgangstext* a reading presently known in only a handful of late manuscripts. The reading itself is obviously the (a ?) potential original text and is clearly centuries earlier than

its chance survival in, say, a mediaeval manuscript.

Gerd Mink is often criticised for being rather opaque or obscurantist in setting out for the »general public« how his methodology works. Unfortunately, he is conspicuously absent from most colloquia. Similarly, CBGM is seen as a »black-box«, indecipherable and inscrutable to those outside a closed and esoteric circle of *cognoscendi* and initiates into the holy mysteries. Now two outsiders, one from the USA whose PhD thesis was written during his years in the UK, the other from Sweden, have tried to shed light on those mysteries. »Transparency« is an attribute required not only from figures in public life like politicians or CEOs but apparently now also expected from academic writers. The two analyses of CBGM are those by Peter Gurry and by Tommy Wasserman as attempts to demonstrate this much-needed »transparency« into Mink's processes<sup>50</sup>. Following the publication of Gurry's Cambridge thesis, he and Wasserman wrote a more »popular« version of it for an interested wider public. Generally they are sympathetic to Gerd Mink's approach despite their having some criticisms of it.

Wasserman tries to illuminate the frequent difficulties of CBGM e.g. when trying to decide if the sequence of change be the order A to B or B to A. He exposes the teething troubles with *ECM* Catholics but, despite them, also looks in particular at how *v.ll.* in Mark (!) should be treated.<sup>51</sup> Wasserman and Gurry analyse Mink's neologism »pre-genealogical« and »general coherence«. Gurry (generally very successfully) elucidates Mink's work.<sup>52</sup>

But whatever our view of the scientific approach of CBGM, the two prongs discerned in its title (i.e. it looks at coherence *and* genealogy), show that it cannot be applied to a text mechanically or automatically. It passes through an editor's or editors' intellectual powers. My recent<sup>53</sup> review of *ECM Acts* says AI (= Artificial Intelligence) does *not* »rule OK« here! (More on this theme in no. 5, below.)

The online journal *TC* (2015) includes seven articles about CBGM in Acts while work on *ECM Acts* was underway. One essay was delivered in full at a conference by Dirk Jongkind. Elsewhere,<sup>54</sup> he gives a survey detailing the differences between NA/ *ECM* and his Tyndale House *Greek New Testament*. I, for one, am not blinded by (pseudo-)science and, like Jongkind, am prepared to see how CBGM works in practice and if it works at all.

#### 4. *An/The Initial Text*

As far as the jargon term *Ausgangstext*, now espoused by most modern text-critics, is concerned, it was obviously popularised by the Münster Institut. The word ought to be compatible with views such as those I had previously expressed. We, like most text critics, were and are concerned with printing as our base text the earliest recoverable wording possible. Such is »the« or »an« *Ausgangstext*. It may or may not be exactly what the author actually wrote; autograph copies are unlikely ever to come to light, but an »initial-text« (as »*Ausgangstext*« is best translated), is the earliest recoverable form from which our current stock of known *v.l.l.* emerged. Text-critics like those who espouse or owe allegiance

to the CBGM also wish to demonstrate how the text developed. That history of the text is itself important, almost as important as the initial text itself, as some historians may say. It is from the variants and their being accessible in an *apparatus criticus* that much church and theological history may be seen; and parallels to so-called deviant exegetical comments by a Father's citation of a New Testament verse may often emerge.

#### 5. *ECM: The Acts of the Apostles*

Unfortunately, I was not privy to the voting systems applied in Münster (for Acts) or Birmingham UK (for John), but the too-often niggardly comments on what was achieved in Acts are significant; they inevitably and wisely concentrate on the changes made by the editors from the earlier work on Acts for NA28. Would that I had been the proverbial fly on the Institut's wall while the editors were deciding on the text to print as the *Ausgangstext* in *ECM Acts*. Old Münster habits die hard e.g. at Acts 2:7a (*ECM Acts* III p. 6). As far as the changes in *ECM Acts* compared with the readings in N-A28 are concerned, differences that matter to the elusive »average« reader include *απο/ εκ; ημεν/ ημεθα; εγινετο/ εγενετο*; the meaning of the sentences where such variants occur may change. Most alterations do matter and often even versions change in the light of changes to the underlying Greek manuscripts. In English readers who are concerned by marginalia telling them that »some ancient authorities«, meaning manuscripts, add, omit or change the wording and meaning need to be shown what is at stake. Textual criticism *is*

important - nay, basic to exegesis and biblical study.

Dr Klaus Wachtel, senior editor at the Institut für neutestamentliche Textforschung at the Wilhelms-Universität Münster, Westphalia has written this chapter (in only English) in volume 3 of the recently published *ECM* Acts, entitled »Textual Commentary«. In that volume there are twelve essays by differing authors; these are in either German or in English. Wachtel briefly looks at three types of variants we detect in the volumes of the text of Acts. Two are (a) readings where the editors were undecided what text to print and (democratically?) left the decision to readers to decide on what should be the *Ausgangstext* and those variants are introduced by the letter S (= split text) and (b) the other obvious places meriting Wachtel's comments are those labelled N (= new readings), i.e. those readings where *ECM* differs from NA28. The third category is »M« which stands for miscellaneous readings. A good catch-all phrase if ever there was one! (See 11:20). Wachtel does not reveal why he comments on a number of miscellaneous readings in this commentary. They are apparently »important readings that merit some comment«! Wachtel, inevitably, refers frequently to Metzger's *Commentary* e.g. at Acts 15:29; 16:28; 18:26. I would therefore recommend that what I typically do for my first port of call when assessing variants is to read what Metzger reports, especially in Acts where 224 pages of its 696+ pages are given over to this book. Metzger's *Commentary* is a valued and well established

*vade mecum* and most of his reports are concise and precise.

The new »Commentary« by Wachtel recalls only rare minority votes, where »minority« must mean only one or two from a five-person committee. I have spotted only two dissenting notes (written respectively by Klaus Wachtel in his personal capacity (at 2:7) and by the Director, Holger Strutwolf, (at 7:46)). In Metzger's *Commentary* such signed (initialled) notes are relatively commonplace and they accompany other places where Metzger can report on a minority or majority opinion among its own small editorial committee. Are we to deduce from this unanimity in the *ECM* team, so reminiscent of voting by the Chinese communist party, a consistent general agreement among the scholars in Münster in recent days?

Often Wachtel's comments merely refer us to Rule 1 or Rule 2. These »Rules« (Diktates?) are set out on pp. 1 and 2 of his essay. Clear guidelines (not »rules«) based on firm examples are what are necessary in my work. »Rules« imply inviolability and rigid obedience. As we have just seen, scribes did not follow rigid instructions. Otherwise, his notes come under GC (= General Coherence) or TC (= the »old-fashioned« Transcriptional Probability — often comparable with Metzger's own methodology. But we may ask if scribes were indeed so rule-bound? My own work implies few were. Over several decades I looked at issues ranging from Atticism and grammatical, stylistic and language variants to matters of exegesis and theology.<sup>55</sup> As

a thoroughgoing eclectic critic, I was usually able to see from the number of firm examples available what an author's normal practice was. Such examples then enabled me to make a judgement at places where the text is uncertain and variants are recorded. I am thus normally able to accept a reading that matches those firm examples, regardless of what the correct reading's attestation may be. Sometimes, one is obliged by the evidence to accept or print a reading with little ancient Greek manuscript support. Authors rather than scribes tended to be consistent. (It is true that theoretically such a pool of firm examples may shrink but, as I deduced above, not many newly collated manuscripts give us genuinely new *v.l.*).

In their use of CBGM colleagues in Birmingham are not displaying a methodology that is quicker than that employed by earlier workers, and this despite generous endowments, teams of scholars and professional leadership. Work on the Fourth Gospel began once the IGNTP volumes on Luke were completed and published<sup>56</sup> in 1987. Thus the ITSEE team subsequently set up in Birmingham to work assiduously on John has been at work for over 30 years (!) and we still await its *ECM* John with breath becoming increasingly less and less bated. I suspect that the German team in Wuppertal (Revelation) will publish its volumes more briskly. Time will tell!

Supporters of thoroughgoing textual criticism (often unwittingly) include commentaries by James Voelz on Mark; David Aune on Revelation and articles by text-critics such as Didier Lafleur. They,

like me, base many of their judgements on text-critical variation on readings on the author's style, language and theology. So, although thoroughgoing textual criticism may have only a few scholars prepared to put their necks through the noose, we are certainly not alone. In any case, textual criticism is always a minority sport.



## ENDNOTES

- 1 Some majuscule manuscripts found alongside papyri have even been classified as »Papyri« even when they were written not on papyrus but on parchment.
- 2 Caspar René Gregory, *Textkritik des Neuen Testaments* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1894).
- 3 »Palimpsest« is a strange word but one often finds it in writings about textual criticism, Those who are fluent in Greek may see here a combination of two Greek words *παλιν* meaning »again« with a form of *ψαω* = »to rub«. It refers to manuscripts that are recycled. A redundant manuscript can have its original text rubbed out and the papyrus or parchment could then be re-used for a new writing. It may be possible to rediscover the underwriting and it may sometimes be the case that it is the expunged underwriting that is the one that contains biblical text. (Not always but »sometimes«!) Palimpsesting was relatively common as it was cheaper to reuse a codex or (sc)roll. Its cost may have played a part. Scrolls typically were used on only one side, the side that was on the inside of a rolled-up work; the outsides of the sheets that formed the roll were not used. Another positive reminder is to say palimpsests may show that, because many owners and users of manuscripts were often reluctant to throw away writings, any surviving recoverable and legible under-writing, currently decipherable, a rewriting indicates the longevity of those texts. That may be seen in Latin as well as in Greek palimpsests. For instance, once churches decided to adopt Jerome's Latin Vulgate, because of its allegedly authoritative version of the scriptures, it can be seen that by writing the Vulgate onto a previously perfectly functional, albeit by then unwanted, Old Latin rendering, the manuscript may reveal that its (Old Latin) under-writing had probably remained in use underneath the palimpsesting up to the time they were recycled. In some cases, therefore, the Itala or Old Latin text which had been written several centuries earlier continued to be read in that community until the overwriting was added in its stead.
- 4 Didier Lafleur with Luc Brogly, has published the latest discoveries in Greek in *Greek New Testament Manuscripts from Albania* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2018) (= *NTTSD* 57).
- 5 Grenfell and Hunt discovered numerous manuscripts in Oxyrhynchus in its rubbish piles (spoil heaps). These are now kept in boxes in the Ashmolean Library in Oxford, UK. They are painstakingly being sifted and gradually published. The series in which they are edited and whose photographs are usually also included has now reached 83 volumes. About one volume per year is published. Not all contain biblical manuscripts, although there are other early Christian writings, the Apocryphal New Testament, the Fathers as well as devotional and religious texts. The Egyptian city

of Oxyrhynchus was obviously one where Greek scholarship flourished. Several fragmentary texts contain Greek literary treasures. Others are documentary, i.e. they contain private letters or contracts and bills. This latter category has yielded useful hints about the dates when literary texts, Christian and secular, were probably composed, thanks to their generally containing precise dates. Scholars typically look in the latter for distinctive vocabulary or proper names, especially when certain events may be reported, and particularly characteristics of how handwriting, which often changed in style as fashions also altered, may be repeated in undated manuscripts. Peter Parsons, *City of the Sharp-Nosed Fish* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 2007) is a popular but authoritative account of Oxyrhynchus, its society and its digs.

- 6 Kurt Aland, *Kurzgefasste Liste der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments* (Berlin & New York: de Gruyter, 21994) (= *ANTF* 1).
- 7 Colin Roberts, the cataloguer, published this news. The text of the fragment occurs also in an article by me, »The Manuscripts of the John Rylands Library of Manchester« *BJRUL* 81 (1999) pp. 1-50.
- 8 See the book of this treasure in the Beatty Library in Dublin: Charles Horton (ed.), *The Earliest Gospels: The Origins and Transmission of the Earliest Christian Gospels - The Contribution of the Chester Beatty*

*Gospel Codex P45* (London and New York: T&T Clark, 2004).

- 9 T(alismans) and O(straka). Nowadays some scholars wish that other and further categories (including, say, amulets) should be included, even to maintain the earlier but now abandoned categories T and O.
- 10 See my edition of *The Collected Biblical Writings of T.C. Skeat* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2004) (= *Supplements to Novum Testamentum* 113).
- 11 Among the last works by Kurt Aland is his biography of Tischendorf with its vindication of his propriety in dealing with the Sinai monks. The results of his research exonerated Tischendorf of any wrongdoing and explain that all appropriate and proper 19<sup>th</sup> century diplomatic niceties were duly and dutifully followed to the letter on all sides.
- 12 Stanley E. Porter, *Constantine Tischendorf: The Life and Work of a 19<sup>th</sup> Century Bible Hunter* (London: Bloomsbury, 2015).
- 13 Quite how »beloved« a manuscript was, if it was dismembered, never studied, with many pages lost and dispersed and, incongruously, used for fires despite the stench which burning parchment doubtless caused, is dubious!
- 14 For instance in his *Tischendorf: Lesebuch* (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1999).
- 15 After his retirement in 1972, by which time he was Keeper of Western Manuscripts in the British Library, he devoted much of his remaining (twenty) years to New

- Testament research, especially on Codex Sinaiticus.
- 16 One result was his publishing with his colleague H.J.M. Milne *Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus* (London: British Museum, 1938). His personal copy of that book sits proudly in my home.
  - 17 That and other manuscripts are featured in a film called »Fragments of Truth«, made in 2018 and distributed by Faithlife Films in Washington State, USA.
  - 18 Shakespeare's play *Hamlet* includes a line which states that everyone is mad in England!
  - 19 Parker's thesis, examined by me in Leiden, suggests that the manuscript came from Berytus (= Beirut). Beirut was a bilingual community which may well have required its scriptures in both main Christian languages, the original Greek and an early copy into Latin. The Latin is known by the typical lower case letter d used in former days for Vetus Latina manuscripts or by the Beuron number 5, which happens to be the same number for the Greek side of the manuscript.
  - 20 A synthesis of earlier separate articles appears in J.K. Elliott, *Essays and Studies in New Testament Textual Criticism* (Cordoba: El Almenadro, 1992) (= *Estudios de Filología Neotestamentaria* 3) ch. 3.
  - 21 The volumes of the Oxrhynchus papyri often contain biblical material.
  - 22 Other witnesses in languages such as Gothic, Georgian, Armenian, Ethiopic and Slavic (Old Church Slavonic) are sometimes found in critical editions, albeit if several of these versions are used only sparingly. I refer briefly to each of those, below.
  - 23 Even often benign and modest revisions designed to »purify« the well-loved biblical text of its inevitable accretions and changes would generally produce a reactionary response intended to restore the wording cherished by believers, despite its being deemed by scholars to be flawed. Erasmus learned of this conservative attitude to the biblical text to his cost, as we shall see ch. 3. As it was, much criticism of Erasmus' translation did come from churchmen concerned that Erasmus' Latin could undermine the church's teachings e.g. *verbum* for the more familiar *sermo* in John 1:1 and his *mysterium* for *sacramentum* at Eph 5:33 where the church's teaching on the sanctity of marriage was deemed to be threatened.
  - 24 Christopher de Hamel, *The Book: A History of the Bible* (London: Phaidon, 2001) pp. 37-38.
  - 25 The designation was only then formally used to refer to Jerome's Latin; thus the term, Vulgate, is technically anachronistic if used of a Latin revision in existence before that date.
  - 26 Cf. the collations, studies and examination of early Latin witnesses in learned series like *CSEL*, or the editions by Lowe (usually referred to in the bibliographies of introductions to the Old Latin).
  - 27 One can not re-assemble in its entirety the original Latin of a manuscript using only the samples given

- in the *apparatus* to a Greek New Testament. If one needs to do so (and I cannot see why anyone would ever wish to do so, given the ready availability of digitized and photographic reproductions of many Latin manuscripts) I suppose that one *may* be able to do so from a *Vetus Latina* volume if its manuscripts are given *in extenso*.
- 28 Unfortunately, the learning of Classical languages has been declining, particularly in Anglophone countries recently, thanks in part to unionism's mephitic and dominating educational policy in the U.K.; its spokesmen mouth distaste for allegedly elitist (*sic*) studies. This philistinism is then encouraged by »populist« politicians, who dislimn most language-learning in schools and this in turn impoverishes and »dumbs-down« theological study at the tertiary level in the English-speaking world. To misquote William Wordsworth one could make his allocution not to Milton but to the famed 19<sup>th</sup> century British politician, Charles Sibthorp: »Sibthorp: Thou shouldst be living at this hour.«
- 29 See J.K. Elliott, »»Novum Testamentum editum est«: The Five-Hundredth Anniversary of Erasmus' New Testament« *The Bible Translator* 67 (2016) pp. 9-28.
- 30 The *apparatus* to the Latin pages shows Vulgate manuscripts G C E W S L P S C W S. Some 2,000 or so changes had been made in the Gospels alone compared with the Stuttgart Vulgate.
- 31 *Nova Vulgata Bibliorum Sanctorum*. The New Testament had originally been issued as three separate fascicules in 1970-71. Frans Neirynck's review in *ETL* 1986 complains that the Alands failed to disclose the changes made compared with previous editions; they played their cards too close to their respective chests.
- 32 C. Tischendorf, *Editio octava maior* vol 3: De Versionibus pp. 803-1128. Gregory (and Abbot) list an impressive number of 2,228 Vulgate manuscripts as well as several Old Latin witnesses.
- 33 B.M. Metzger, *The Early Versions of the New Testament: Their Origin, Transmission, and Limitations* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977).
- 34 J.K. Elliott, »The Translations of the New Testament into Latin« in Wolfgang Haase (ed.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* (= *ANRW*) II *Principat* vol. 26 (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1992) pp. 198-245.
- 35 Roger Gryson, *Altlateinische Handschriften/ Manuscripts vieux latins* 2 volumes (Freiburg: Herder, 1999, 2004).
- 36 D.C. Parker, *New Testament Manuscripts and their Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).
- 37 See also Parker's references on his pp. 59-60 to work by Lowe, Bischoff and other editors.
- 38 H.A.G. Houghton, *The Latin New Testament: A Guide to its Early History, Texts, and Manuscripts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016, 2018).

- 39 B, K and V are repeated in Houghton's list in Appendix I B p. 288.
- 40 José M. Bover, *Nuevo Testamento Trilingüe* (Madrid: Biblioteca de autores christianos, 1997).
- 41 Philip Burton, *The Old Latin Gospels: A Study of their Texts and Languages* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001) (= *Oxford Early Christian Texts* 1).
- 42 In reconsidering my editing of the versions in the International Greek New Testament project's *Luke*, I was perhaps too willing to include in its *apparatus* versional readings that probably merely agree coincidentally with a Greek variant. Possibly, if I were to re-visit my earlier efforts I should delete Latin support for many variants concerning the addition or omission of particles, word order, conjunctions and possibly even tenses. Latin, of course, lacks the subtleties of the Greek aorist or perfect; the optative and middle voice, rare though those may be in biblical Greek, are absent from Latin. Definite articles are common in Greek but do not exist as such in Latin. Certain plurals are also to be viewed with extreme caution. Similarly, we must be alert to the special use of participles with the verb »to be« in Greek. Differences in prepositions, especially those that seem to be synonymous (e.g. *απο/εκ, εν/επι*) can mislead unwary tyros. Other synonyms may cause similar problems. The same obviously may apply to other versions cited here. I was probably too hasty when drafting the *apparatus criticus* to Luke, generally in accepting all readings in each version. Nowadays one needs to be more circumspect than I was to limit oneself to *v.ll.* that *unambiguously* agree with or disagree with the Greek, longer and shorter readings being an obvious place where one may identify such genuine variant readings. Often, word order, the non-use of the definite article(s), particles and verbal tenses may or may not agree with the underlying Greek but often it is the distinctive features of each language which ought to be influential here — agreements and disagreements with another language may be purely coincidental.
- 43 The four scholars, Sara Schulthess; Samir Arbache; Hikmut Kasuoh; Keith Small, have published monographs on this version.
- 44 A conference in 2007 in Tblisi gave rise to a collection of papers on the Georgian Psalter and Gospels edited by Christian-B. Amphoux and J. Keith Elliott (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2012) (= *Supplements to Novum Testamentum* 142).
- 45 The Garima Gospels are said to have been much earlier than is usually said to be the case with other Ethiopic manuscripts. See also Mary-Anne Fitzgerald with Philip Marsden. *Ethiopia: The Living Churches of an Ancient Kingdom* (Cairo and New York: The American University in Cairo Press, 2017).
- 46 The *Kurzgefasste Liste* of all registered Greek New Testament manuscripts is accessible from [ntvmr.uni-muenster.de](http://ntvmr.uni-muenster.de).

- 47 Markus Lembke, Darius Müller, Ulrich B. Schmid with Martin Karer, *Die Apokalypse: Teststellenkollationen und Auswertungen* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2015) (= ANTF 49).
- 48 Brent Nongbri, *God's Library: The Archaeology of the Earliest Christian Manuscripts* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2018), is duly sceptical about »experts«' opinions on the dating of manuscripts *passim*.
- 49 The unwieldiness of much in the CBGM methodology may sometimes be described as »a sledgehammer to crack a nut« as in my Leuven paper of 2016: »Greek New Testament Papyri in the Second-Third Centuries« in Jens Schröter, Tobias Nicklas and Joseph Verheyden (eds.), *Gospels and Gospel Traditions in the Second Century* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2018) ch. 1.
- 50 Peter J. Gurry, *A Critical Examination of the Coherence-Based Genealogical Method in New Testament Textual Criticism* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2018) (= NTTSD 55). Tommy Wasserman and Peter J. Gurry, *A New Approach to Textual Criticism: An Introduction to the Coherence-Based Genealogical Method* (Atlanta: SBL Press and Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2018) (= *Resources for Biblical Study* 80).
- 51 Wasserman claims that scribes copying Mark 1:1 would not be careless or tired at the beginning of the work but Mark is not necessarily the start of a scribe's working day if Matthew had already been copied immediately before the scribe then turned to Mark.
- 52 Oddly, no chapter on CBGM is given in the second edition of Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes (eds.), *The Text of the New Testament: Essays on the Status Quaestionis* (Leiden: Brill, 2013) (= NTTSD 42).
- 53 TLZ 143 (2018) columns 1274-1276.
- 54 In another on-line forum: the (oddly named) Evangelical Textual Criticism blog.
- 55 Many of these studies were gathered together into my collection: J.K. Elliott, *New Testament Textual Criticism: The Application of Thoroughgoing Principles. Essays on Manuscripts and Textual Variation* (Leiden: Brill, 2010) (= *Supplements to Novum Testamentum* 137) and reprinted in *id., ibid.* (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014).
- 56 The American and British Committees of the International Greek New Testament Project, *The New Testament in Greek: The Gospel according to St Luke*. Two volumes (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984 and 1987).