Keith Elliott

From Papyrus to Pixel II: Printed Editions of the Greek New Testament

Readers of this book and those able to have listened to the original lectures on which these chapters are based may well enjoy having seen photographs of famous New Testament manuscripts but for most people it is the printed vernacular translations, such as those into English or German, that most will regularly encounter.

In this chapter we shall turn to the printed editions of the Greek (and to a lesser extent, the Latin) editions from which our modern translations are derived.

Sometimes the translators tell us in their introductory matter what text or texts they have used when undertaking the tasks of rendering them into a modern spoken language. This is where we may actually observe textual criticism/research at work. Footnotes too in our modern editions often nowadays tell us which textual variants are important and which oftentimes yield alternatives that have baffled a translator. The footnotes often call individual manuscripts »authorities«—for that is what they usually are: these alternatives may be as authoritative as the texts underlying the translation proffered in the main texts printed above those footnotes.

All our modern translations of the New Testament ultimately actually go back to the early 16th century. That is why one of our dates to hold onto is 1516, the year when Erasmus published the first New Testament in its original language, Greek. That too explains why Erasmus is to figure large in what I write below. Erasmus' Greek (and Latin) edition of 1516 underlies all printed Bibles until 1881—our other key date in this chapter. Erasmus' New Testament text was eventually known as the *Textus Receptus* and it held sway until Westcott and Hort's edition of the Greek New Testament came out in 1881. As we shall see, Westcott and Hort, two British scholars and churchmen, based their texts on the two famous manuscripts, B 03 (Vaticanus) and 01 א (Sinaiticus) which we have already examined. Those two witnesses had, in the case of B, been only relatively recently carefully studied and, in the case of aleph, had, as we heard earlier, been recently rediscovered in the Sinai peninsula. Both of those editions tended to print texts that were shorter than hitherto used by academics and the »ordinary« churchgoers. Familiar phrases were changed, popular verses obliterated. Hence there was much furore in the late 19th century about the translations

based on those two manuscripts. »Two« only! It strikes modern democratically-minded readers that nose-counting alone would oppose such results.

Towards the end of this paper we shall turn to modern editions of the Greek New Testament. Its editors often bridle at descriptions of their texts and the translations made from them as examples of clones of Westcott and Hort, as Westcott and Hort *redivivus* and the like. But that is exactly what these modern texts are. Few readers outside very conservative circles in the USA now promote the older versions. There exists in the US a Dean Burgon Society set up to espouse the validity of the KJV (=AV) and the majority of Byzantine manuscripts behind this. There is a Majority Text Society too; that has similar aims and one may buy editions of the old *Textus Receptus* and the Trinitarian Bible Society still sells it. [1] But that is by no means the usual or mainstream approach.

In repeating what we have already said about textual criticism as applied to Greek New Testament manuscripts and editions in our modern age (when the *Editio critica maior* is becoming our dominant and prominent source) we now note that textual criticism is always needed when ancient literature, like the New Testament, was copied by hand and its surviving copies display alterations, both accidental (as all such writings were subjected to carelessness on the part of even professional copyists) and deliberate changes. In the case of Biblical literature what readers actually saw had to be clear in meaning and conform to a pattern of theological orthodoxy, insofar as the users of the manuscript defined it. In any case, these writings, especially once they had eventually received the status of authorised, canonical literature and were therefore afforded special treatment, became sacred texts. Readers worshipped the writings and the authors, and lived their lives in accordance with their manuscript's precise wording. Each manuscript was thus seen as a text to revere, venerate and *use.*

Today's textual critics are conscious that their trade plies scientific enquiry as well as a careful art form where every change and nuance are open to investigation. Under the heading »science« come the collecting, classifying and collating of these artefacts—ideally nowadays with all the readers' aids that were included alongside its text (punctuation, orthography, *capitula* or contents, canon tables etc.) generally known as a manuscript's »paratext«—for such information tells us much about the way the text itself was intended to be read and used. Such analyses are rarely controversial. It is the »art« of textual criticism that varies not only across the two millennia since the New Testament texts were composed but in our fissiparous contemporary world where authorial intentions and »readers' responses« to such writings are relevant. That is because what is printed as the running line, the text proper, is dependent on an editor's judgement or nowadays, more probably, an editorial board's judgement about what to print. For readers interested in Christianity's early history, it is not only the (editors') alleged authorial (or initial) text that is important. The text itself is obviously significant but the changes made within a few centuries of the creation of the New Testament's

writings are of paramount importance too and need to be displayed prominently.

As a committee product, the editions of the *Editio critica maior* currently on the market are the seven Catholic letters and Acts. All are published by the German Bible Society, as too are the constantly reissued hand-editions, Nestle, now in its 28th edition, and the United Bible Societies' *Greek New Testament*, now in its 5th revised edition. Other items nearing completion in *ECM* are Mark and Revelation. These texts will gradually be incorporated into the hand-editions and through them into vernacular translations in due course. We look at these before the ending to this chapter.

Now, let us turn to printed Greek New Testaments from the 16th century onwards:

2. Erasmus (cf. also ch. 2)

In 2016 we celebrated the 500th anniversary of the publication of the first Greek New Testament[2]. It was made in the city of Basle in 1516 by the publishing house of Johann Froben (1460-1527). Frobenius, as he was called, following the convention that learned people Latinized their name, was born in Hammelburg in Franconia. After having completed his studies at Basle University, he made the acquaintance of his compatriot, the printer Johann Amerbach (1440-1513) and himself became a famed printer. After Amerbach's death in 1513 Froben continued to run the publishing business together with Amerbach's sons. Froben's printing house attained a reputation for accuracy and was highly profitable.

Printing, using movable metal type, had been introduced around 1440. Among the first books printed using this new invention were Gutenberg's 42-line Latin Bible printed not far from here along the Rhine in Mainz in 1455 and his 36-line Latin Bible published five years later. Soon afterwards in 1487 the five books of Moses were printed in Hebrew in Soncino; there were also many printed Bibles in Latin.

But it was not until 1514 that the first *Greek* New Testament was printed, in Alcalá de Henares in Spain (Complutum in Latin), which was to form part of a multi-language and multi-volume Bible to be known as the Complutensian Polyglott, but that edition was not actually published and made available until around 1522. The number of people able to read Greek in Western Europe was small and for Catholics there would be no encouragement to read any Bible other than the Latin Vulgate hence the seventy-five year delay between the invention of printing and the appearance of a Greek New Testament in print.[3]

Froben was keen to publish the first printed Greek New Testament in full. For the task he called upon the services of Desiderius Erasmus in 1514. Erasmus (1466-1536) was already an internationally well-known and peripatetic scholar. When he was persuaded by Froben to come to Basle and edit a bi-lingual, Greek-Latin, New Testament, he readily accepted the challenge and opportunity. The book was published in 1516 and was first entitled *Novum Instrumentum* rather than *Testamentum*, perhaps a clue to indicate that his translation was merely to be

an »instrument« to assist in the teaching of the (Latin) Bible.

Jerome's Vulgate was the official Bible of the Church. It had been in use for 1,000 years but, obviously, its text had become corrupted like all manuscripts over the centuries, through careless copying and by many scribal emendations and changes. Erasmus had been inspired to produce an improved and revised New Testament by the work of two predecessors, Lorenzo Valla whose annotations correcting the Latin of the New Testament by comparison with the Greek had been written in 1440, and Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples who had published a set of linguistic notes, commentary and translations of the letters of Paul as recently as 1512. Erasmus had discovered Valla's work in Leuven and was so impressed by it that he had it printed; it was published in 1504. Erasmus used the work of both Valla and Lefèvre extensively – usually without the due acknowledgements expected nowadays when citing another's work!

Erasmus's bilingual edition of 1516 had possibly only included Greek merely to allow the few able to appreciate it to check his own Latin translation against the underlying original language used by the New Testament's authors. It is also possible that Erasmus' Latin translation was never intended to supplant the time-honoured Vulgate but merely to show how improvements to it should be made. (We shall return to Erasmus and Jerome's Vulgate shortly.) The sub-title to Erasmus' New Testament confirms that his main focus was on the Latin: according to its title page the contents were said to be revised and improved, which could apply only to the Latin not to the Greek column.

Eventually, of course, the Church after the Council of Trent (1545-63), formally issued its own officially authorised version of Jerome's Bible that was said to be free from corruption. That was the Sixtine Vulgate of 1590, named after Pope Sixtus V. Yet this edition was so faulty that another officially approved edition, the Clementine Vulgate, appeared under Pope Clement VIII two years later. Since then further revised versions of the Latin Vulgate have emerged up to and including our current Stuttgart edition. What Erasmus printed in 1516 was thus merely the start of an on-going piece of work intended to improve the clarity and accuracy of the Latin New Testament for the better enlightenment of the faithful.

Modern scholarship, correctly, tries to place Jerome's own work into its proper context. His revision of the New Testament Latin was not as extensive as previously assumed. Earlier scholars had often repeated the dictum that, having been commissioned by a pope (Pope Damasus), Jerome duly set out to translate the whole of the New and Old Testaments (or at least the Hebrew Bible if not those additional works found only in the LXX). For the New Testament we now have more measured assessments of Jerome's work and influence. At one time we may have learned that the term »Old Latin« referred to *any* of the translations into Latin that preceded Jerome's time. Now we are taught more properly that Jerome not only did not need to translate absolutely everything that had preceded his time and that even when he did change earlier Latin it was not always successful,

popular or accepted. Regular usage had fixed much vocabulary in a believer's mind; the pious are often notoriously reluctant to embrace alteration. *Plus ça change*! Thus, many of Jerome's revisions failed to hit their intended mark and we have many so-called mixed texts. The mixing may in many cases reflect deliberate resistance to change or merely accidentally repeat familiar phrases.

Scholarship on Greek and Latin sources such as this can trace its significance back to Erasmus (who saw himself as a Jerome *redivivus*); his own Latin translation of the New Testament was, as we have already seen, printed by Froben in Basle in 1516, and was the first published Greek New Testament (originally entitled *Novum Instrumentum*). So: Erasmus' supplying a Greek text alongside his own new Latin translation only served 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 4th edition of his Latin and Greek New Testament in 1527 – by now entitled *Novum Testamentum* - also included not only his own Latin but a late mediaeval version, allegedly close to Jerome's Vulgate.)

It is significant that Erasmus' scholarly instincts and practices do not always match the proper and honest academic approach expected of today's scholars. Nevertheless, Erasmus avoided using all the manuscripts accessible in Basle such as E 07 (Basle University Library A.N.III 12) [or B 03 (Codex Vaticanus), known to him from its being held in the Vatican Library]. Their distinctive Greek was alien to his purpose. What he needed from a Greek manuscript was a text that had a close proximity to the Latin he had produced and which the Vulgate also, generally, matched. (He received 365 distinctive readings from B 03 sent to him from Rome by Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda.) Erasmus preferred to use more familiar manuscripts' readings and referred to only one reading from B in his *Annotationes* of 1535 at Acts 27:16. He was aware that any New Testament text too different from the wording that he was familiar with would prove to be unacceptable. An excursus on the manuscripts likely to have been available to Erasmus in Basle occurs at the end of this chapter.

Erasmus' well-known ending to Revelation was re-translated from Latin into Greek as the Greek manuscript of Revelation available to him in Basle lacked Rev. 22:16-21. Erasmus' faulty »*bread* of life« occurs at 22:19. Also, some other verses were retained e.g. Acts 8:37 (a verse which he claimed had been »accidentally omitted«!) and Acts 9:5-6, a reading that found its way into the »Authorised« Version in English (the KJV). His having avulsed the famed Comma Johanneum from 1 John 5 was adversely criticised. Erasmus was later persuaded by the unexpected appearance of this disputed longer reading in a newly-discovered Greek manuscript to reinstate the words; the 3rd edition of his *Novum Testamentum* in 1522 therefore contains the Comma. Erasmus, ever the pragmatist, knew that he could not lose an otherwise sympathetic readership if his Latin were to have been *too* different from the familiar text, not least in his jettisoning familiar verses such as the Comma Johanneum or his changing popular wording and ideas.

There are further variants including relatively familiar ones, especially in Acts, Revelation etc.

In 1516 Erasmus' edition was rather conservative by modern standards. This is exactly as Jerome's revisions of the Latin Bible had been.

The reason why this first Latin-Greek New Testament printed *and* published was so successful is that it cornered the market. Froben had succeeded in acquiring a legally binding imperial *Privilegium*, which was duly emblazoned on the cover of Erasmus's first edition. In the name of Maximilian I, the Holy Roman Emperor, the *Privilegium* forbade the importing of any other printed Greek New Testament into the whole of the Empire for four years thereafter. The embargo was obeyed. In those four years Erasmus's first two editions of 1516 and 1519 sold some 3,000 copies, a remarkably high figure by any standard, especially when we recall that few people could read Greek and that Erasmus's new Latin translation was seen to challenge the prevailing and familiar Vulgate.

Inevitably perhaps, Erasmus's first Greek text of 1516 was poorly printed and contained a high number of errors; there were hundreds of typos. Erasmus who was often »economical with the truth« made the excuse that Froben had made him work too quickly and that the work was »precipitated rather than edited«. Revisions were soon undertaken. There are in fact five editions of Erasmus' text – all published in Basle during his lifetime. Each made increasingly extensive changes to Jerome's Latin. Significantly perhaps, the fourth edition in 1527 had three columns, one each for the Greek, Erasmus' Latin translation as well as now a late Latin version of Jerome's Vulgate itself. In addition to his stylistically enhanced Latin, Erasmus also published annotations and paraphrases of the New Testament. He seems to have intended his work not to be for the man or woman in the pew but for educated clergy who could use all these aids to interpret more accurately the scriptures for their Christian congregations. Froben's publishing house continued to print Latin Bibles and Basle maintained its pre-eminent position as a publishing and printing centre for many decades thereafter.

Erasmus had two copy-editors as helpers whose work on the Greek manuscripts was not always done with his approval. One of his collaborators was Nikolaus Gerbel (or Gerbelius); the other had the Graeco-Latinized name Oecolampadius (translated from the family name of Johann Hussgen or Hausschein or Husschyn), a statue of whom we may see today in the cloisters of Basle Minster. In 1521 Gerbel printed in Hagenau in Germany a copy of Erasmus' Greek – without the accompanying Latin. Whether he duly obtained approval from Erasmus and Froben I do not know but to have a free-standing printed Greek testament made available was an important marketing ploy which set a precedent followed regularly thereafter.

It is clear that Erasmus's bi-lingual edition of 1516 had two possibly unintentional consequences. One was the ecclesiastical

disapproval of Erasmus even daring to tamper with the Vulgate, and many critics were quick to condemn him for changing time-honoured and hallowed words. For instance at John 1:1 Erasmus's translation now had »In principio erat *sermo*« not »In principio erat *verbum*« and he was equally severely chastised for apparently attacking the *sacrament* of marriage at Eph 5:32 by replacing Jerome's *»sacramentum*« with »*mysterium*«.

The other consequence was the promoting of the original language of the New Testament. After the publishing of Greek testaments Protestantism latched onto the idea that vernacular translations *must* be made from the original languages, Hebrew for the Old Testament, Greek for the New. Hence, rather than publications of a Latin text or a bilingual Latin-Greek text, later editions of the New Testament were increasingly in Greek alone. We note also that a major consequence of Erasmus's publications was the encouraging of students who wish to take theology seriously to turn to a Bible in Hebrew and in Greek.

In both those spheres, criticizing the Vulgate and promoting Greek as the basis for translations, Erasmus looked like a closet Protestant. He regularly criticised his church leadership and much of its current practices and he encouraged a nascent Protestantism to make vernacular translations from his Greek. Luther's German New Testament of 1522 was based on Erasmus's Greek, as too was Tyndale's English of 1525-6. (Admirers of the Authorised, King James, Version in English of 1611 will note that its New Testament used Stephanus's Greek of 1551 and Beza's of 1588-9 and 1598, all of which were based on Erasmus's 1516 published edition.) Simultaneously, renaissance man became increasingly interested in Classical literature and civilisation generally and along with that learning came an appreciation of the Bible in its original languages.

But Erasmus, the acerbic critic of his church, remained a Catholic throughout his life. The 1516 edition was dedicated to the Pope and his other early editions contained a fulsome letter from Pope Leo X to Erasmus. Despite having finally settled in Basle again in 1521, Erasmus left this city eight years later when Protestantism was knocking at its doors during the bloodless period of Basle's iconoclasm; he sought refuge in Freiburg-im-Breisgau. It was in 1536 though, *en route* to Brabant, when he returned to Basle to work on the publication of his work on the church Father, Origen, and died there. His tomb lies in Basle Minster[4]. (Regensburg today has a building known as Valhalla (!) in which German worthies are commemorated, among them Erasmus, the Dutch being deemed to be Deutsch.)

When Erasmus came to Basle he probably had an annotated Vulgate with the corrections marked on it to help him to prepare his revised Latin. We have no idea which Latin manuscripts he had to hand in Basle nor which he may have previously consulted, but we do know which *Greek* manuscripts he had here (as the Excursus to this chapter shows[5]). Some of these witnesses had been donated by John Stojković of Ragusa (Dubrovnik) to the Dominican house in the city; two

of them were borrowed from Erasmus's friend Johann Reuchlin (1454/5-1522), the famous humanist whose Hebrew and Greek edition of the Psalter clearly showed him to be a close ally of Erasmus.

At the beginning of the 16th century few other cities would have had Greek manuscripts accessible, as Basle did. Erasmus was fortunate! Several émigrés fleeing from Byzantium brought Greek manuscripts with them to the West, especially to Italy. Erasmus had hoped to find in Basle one single manuscript that contained all twenty-seven New Testament books in Greek. That was not to be – not surprisingly. Even today, when over 5,000 Greek New Testament manuscripts are registered, a mere sixty manuscripts contain the whole testament – the rest contain only the four Gospels, or the Book of Revelation, or the Pauline letters, for example. Anyway, Erasmus was lucky to find enough manuscripts to cover all but a few verses of the New Testament.

One may imagine that in this new age of printing the old and obsolete manuscripts could have been thrown away once a printed version had been copied from them. But that was not done. Fortunately for us, most of the New Testament manuscripts were returned by Erasmus to the Dominicans. (Those not returned eventually emerged elsewhere, such as in Augsburg or in Oxford. However, all were preserved!) When the Dominicans' house was dissolved its manuscript treasures were eventually housed in the University's Library, where one may still consult them.

2. The Years of the Printed Book

Ironically, it was Erasmus' *Greek* that came to dominate New Testament textual scholarship. We referred earlier to the survival of Erasmus's legacy in later editions of the Greek New Testament prepared by Stephanus and by Beza. Then come editions printed and published by a large Dutch family, the Elzeviers, who used the expression *Textus Receptus* to refer to their 1633 edition. That term, *Textus Receptus* (meaning, 'the text received by everybody'), has now become used of *all* editions that were close to Erasmus' text.

The term had begun as a piece of publishers' blurb but was indeed true insofar as scholarship made sure that the »*Textus Receptus*« was very popular in general usage and it is often used in Biblical contexts of all Byzantine Greek New Testament editions up to 1881. In fact, the *Textus Receptus* and editions of other comparable editions or 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.[6]

We referred earlier to the survival of Erasmus's legacy in later editions of the Greek New Testament prepared by Stephanus and by Beza. Then come editions printed and published by a large Dutch family, the Elzeviers, who used the expression *Textus Receptus* to refer to their 1633 edition. After the Elzevier editions we may continue the list. The editions by Fell, Mill, Bentley, Bengel, Wettstein (whose editions of 1751-1752

were prepared here in Basle), as well as those by Griesbach and by the famous Karl Lachmann. Details of their and other editors' work may be seen in Christian-B. Amphoux (ed.), *Manuel* 1 chapter 7.

This is not the place to rehearse the names of all editions and editors of every printed Greek New Testament to have been printed and published. This would include Manuce, de Colines, Étienne (Stephanus), Beza, numerous polyglots, the Elzevier family, Walton, Griesbach, Mill, Bentley, Wettstein, Semler, Bengel and many others.[7]

Although these later editors had knowledge of an increasing number of recently recovered manuscripts, several of them quite different from those used by Erasmus, nonetheless the printed Greek text remained remarkably constant for over 350 years after 1516. Changes, especially variants located in different manuscripts, were typically shown only in the marginalia in those later editions.

3. Westcott and Hort

The *Textus Receptus* in various guises and under differing editors had held sway from 1516. After over 375 years it fell from its pedestal: in 1881 a new era in editions of the Greek New Testament began, although the BFBS maintained its text until 1904. (Even today, especially in the USA, some believers cling to that text's apparent sanctity, thanks to their bestowing upon it and the KJV, a »providential protection«!).

In 1881 two British scholars, B.F. Westcott and F.J.A. Hort, published a completely new and differing edition, based largely on two famous old manuscripts encountered earlier. One manuscript was Codex Vaticanus that had only recently been studied by scholars in the Vatican. The other was Codex Sinaiticus discovered only comparatively recently at St Catharine's Monastery on Mount Sinai by Constantin Tischendorf. Thereafter most editions of the New Testament have followed their example, as may be seen in the most popular editions on the market today: Nestle-Aland's 28th edition and the United Bible Societies' 5th edition, both published by the Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft in Stuttgart. Nevertheless, as indicated, editions of the Byzantine text-type have their adherents and one may still purchase an edition which reflects the majority of extant manuscripts and which has a text that resembles the 1516 edition of Erasmus.

Handwritten copies were only sporadically made once the New Testament was being disseminated in printed book form. That is understandable. Old manuscripts were then relegated to library archives and the backs of cupboards. Many were doubtless destroyed. In recent centuries an interest among academics to locate ancient sources was reignited. From the 19th Century onwards *Handschriftenreisen* undertaken by individual travellers, such as the Russian Porphyry and the German Tischendorf, began scouring monasteries and churches in the Middle East for ancient Biblical manuscripts. Mount Athos and Mount Sinai proved to be profitable hunting-grounds for them.

More recently, several long-forgotten manuscript treasures have re-emerged in former Communist states, as was indicated above. In the past one hundred years or so several early texts, usually on papyrus, have literally been unearthed in various archaeological sites, mainly in Egypt, the spoil heaps of Oxyrhynchus being particularly fruitful.

Erasmus had harnessed the advances in communication brought about by Gutenberg's invention of the printing press. Were Erasmus to have been living in today's Basle he would doubtless have revelled in this, our new democratic electronic age of communication and publishing. Our question is: Who will be our twenty-first-century Erasmus?

As far as recent editions currently on the market are concerned and as a consequence perhaps meriting greater attention is a brief survey of the recent Nestle and United Bible Societies pocket editions as those are freely used by students, preachers and others. That is what follows. The *Editio critica maior* progresses apace through the New Testament and scholars, for whom its fascicles are directed, are increasingly using them. We look briefly at this. Also currently available are the SBL and now, recently, an evangelical edition associated with Tyndale House, Cambridge UK.

1. Nestle, now in its 28th edition, began life in 1896. Originally desiged as a compromise edition, showing a text based on the agreements of Tischendorf and Westcott and Hort plus Weymouth's text, which had been introduced from Nestle[2] and Weiss' text from 1901, in order to give a casting vote whenever Tischendorf's and Westcott and Hort's texts were in disagreement. Eventually from Nestle[17], Erwin Nestle started to add a proper critical *apparatus* in which real manuscripts' alternative readings were increasingly displayed. Today the edition (NA28) has about 10,000 variants in its margins. To my mind this is our best hand-edition.

2. For me, I often wonder why the United Bible Societies' text is available. It now has basically the same text as the Nestle edition although it »claims« to be designed for translators. As a consequence of that claim and aim, only 1,400 variants appear in this edition. I doubt the validity of including all. Metzger's *Commentary*[8] has *c*.2,000 variants that match the originally 1,400, plus some 600 additional variants (conspicuous for their lacking the ludicrous rating lettering system, adopted by the editors), giving us that total being discussed by him. Each unit is well set out in the margins but the excessive use of Fathers' names (not texts or otherwise useful references to their works) seems excessive for the intended readership. Add too the large number of versional witnesses and we therefore have an overloaded and bottom-heavy edition. The English form of the *Introduction* is not always accurate or unambiguous.[9]

3. Such criticism about the choices of variants cannot be made of the *Editio critica maior*. Each text is carefully printed on an octavo page and is filled with user-friendly and helpful variants. In each the manuscripts used were carefully selected, controlled and justified. At the moment only the two volumes containing Acts and the Catholic Epistles are published, although

Mark and Revelation are well advanced. These too plus (eventually) all the New Testament texts should be published in the coming decades and these will eventually appear in successive editions of the NA and UBS hand-editions as the text of each is re-published.

4. So: on to the edition published by the American Society of Biblical Literature; its *Greek New Testament* was edited by Michael Holmes. Although the Society had it in mind to promote its use, I do not see it cited as much as the Society wished for or as often as I had expected.[10] My brief review of it follows at the end of this volume.

5. The Tyndale House *Greek New Testament* is our most recently published edition and concludes our brief survey here.[11] The publication of a Greek New Testament is not usually a headline event but this Tyndale edition (under the editorship of its researchers led by Dirk Jongkind and Peter Williams) is significant. It takes a proud place alongside other edited Greek testaments currently on the market. Some scholars will consult this edition for the critical *apparatus* and examine the text-critical variations from the running text printed above it, but most general readers will use this new edition to compare its printed running text alongside other editions and translations. As the product of a conservative evangelical institution in Cambridge, it will be of little surprise that, unlike other modern editions, it tends to support longer rather than shorter readings, although the disputed longer ending to Mark is marked as disputed and the trinitarian formula in 1 John 5 is (wisely) jettisoned. Among other novelties of this edition is that the editors' study of scribal conventions in the earliest surviving manuscripts means that they have adopted a rigorously philological approach; there are thus orthographical changes and new paragraphing decisions. The seven Catholic letters (attributed to James, Peter, John, and Jude) follow Acts. (In most Bibles those epistles precede Revelation.)

The edition is based on early extant manuscripts (typically witnesses from the first few Christian centuries): mainly some 69 papyri and 49 other majuscule witnesses on vellum. Hardly any mediaeval or Byzantine minuscules are referred to, so this really is an edition respecting the oldest witnesses to the text. The Byzantine text-type is sidelined. The witness of early translations (Latin, Coptic, Syriac) expected in critical Greek testaments is absent. Nor do the editors include the usual references to citations from early church writers. However, plans are afoot to keep this edition updated and doubtless the *apparatus* and its body of witnesses (rather thin in this first edition) need expanding. Another promise is for there to be a textual commentary published to explain all editorial decisions. That too will be welcomed.

Variants marked in the footnotes with a diamond are indicative of editorial indecisiveness; some represent readings that could qualify as the ›original‹ text, instead of the editorial running text. Other variants in this *apparatus* are printed to indicate important theological changes made by scribes throughout the copying

processes. Disconcertingly for some fundamentalist readers is that such change indicates that the Biblical text has not been inviolably copied.

Latin:

Finally a few brief observations on a few editions' use of Latin manuscripts.

Our main concern is obviously with the Greek text but I append these few notes on the Latin evidence that are included in popular hand- or pocket-editions. The two hand-editions of the Greek New Testament most frequently used by contemporary scholars are Nestle (-Aland) in its 28th edition and the United Bible Societies' *Greek New Testament* 5th revised edition. We now set out the Latin evidence in their editions.

Nestle-Aland, *Novum Testamentum Graece* 28th edition.[12]

Pages 68*-69* (to cite only the pagination of the Introduction in English) and Appendix 1B (= pp. 815-819 »Codices Latini«) refer to and list its Old Latin manuscripts. One easy lesson that ought to be picked up from this list is its helpful use of Beuron numbers for each manuscript. This habit should be followed by every editor and appear in the *apparatus*. The usage should be used to avoid the obvious ambiguity of the lettering systems when one letter can refer to different manuscripts.

Appendix 1B sensibly divides the witnesses into the five categories of the New Testament into which Latin manuscripts are typically given, using the normal sequence e a p c r.

The details are:

e: 28 manuscripts, one of which is 5d (eac);

a: 11 manuscripts, one of which is eac (5d), two are ar (51gig 74sin); one is acr (55h); one is apcr (56[13] t = the Liber Com(m)icus); and two are ac (53s 67l);

p: 14 manuscripts two of which are pc (64r 65z), one pr (61ar) and one apcr (56t);

c: 9 manuscripts one of which is eac (5d); one is acr (55h); two are pc (64r 65z); two are ac (53s 67l); and one apcr (56t[14]);

r: 56 manuscripts one of which is pr (61ar); two are ar (51gig, 74sin); one acr (55h) and one apcr (56t).

(Readers need to check if all the manuscripts in the above categories actually occur in the *apparatus*.)

The following also include Vulgate manuscripts for part of the material contained in what is described as an Old Latin witness. They are thus »mixed« manuscripts. The Vulgate sections occur here within square brackets:

6c ea[cpr].

51gig [e]a[cp]r

54p [e]a[pcr]

58w [ep]a[cr]

59dem parts of eacpr are normally cited as Old Latin

61ar [e]p[c]ra, but this manuscript is not used in Nestle[28] in p and r.

The total number of manuscripts in NA[28] seems to be 65 but we then need to deduct fourteen to reach the number of separate manuscripts (i.e. 51), because those fourteen manuscripts contain one, two or three parts of the New Testament in Old Latin.

The ages of the oldest Old Latin manuscripts include: 4th century 3a; 5th century 2e, 4b 5d 8ff[2] 12h 7i; and 5th-6th centuries 75d.

UBS

The total number of Old Latin manuscripts in its list is 63[15]. Of these the contents are not precisely given for 5d; 6c; 51gig; 56t; 61ar; 109aur[16]; (thus: 109 contains eapcr but only p is Old Latin.) We assume that these other portions are (predominantly) Vulgate; those sections are therefore deleted from the contents column in UBS[5]. 59dem containing all the New Testament is however predominantly Vulgate and although now lost is cited in Matthaei's edition throughout. But such information is likely to mislead the unwary. When, for instance, one sees on pp. 31*-33* »eacp« one could be forgiven for assuming that this manuscript is extant in Old Latin for *each* section and thus appears in the *apparatus*. Tyros may indeed forget that only seldom is a long manuscript Old Latin throughout.[17]

The UBS edition contains the following manuscripts:

e: 28 manuscripts including 6c and 5d.[18]

a: 17 manuscripts including 5d (6c) 51gig 53s 55h 56t 59dem 61ar 67l 74sin.

p: 18 manuscripts including 56t 59dem 61ar 65z.

c: 8 manuscripts including 53s 55h 56t 65z 67l. [Manuscript 5d ought also be added to the list.]

r: 5 manuscripts including 51gig 55h 56t 61ar 74sin.

[Few Old Latin witnesses are complete for the whole New Testament; many are fragmentary or contain a (small) portion of the New Testament. For instance, 15 Codex Aureus (= aur) is complete for the Gospels; 8ff[1] and 77g[1] are complete for only Matthew's Gospel; 20p is fragmentary in Jn 11:14-44; 16o contains Mk 16:14-20 etc.]

Of these 63 witnesses seventeen refer to eleven manuscripts in the list above and these contain more than one part of the New Testament.

The following manuscripts are not in NA[28]: 109comp; 59dem (see Houghton p. 40); 63ph mainly vg; 43φ[19] (see Houghton p. 230); 62ro Houghton claims that this manuscript is Old Latin; 60sa Houghton also says that this witness is Old Latin; 25v; 87s is mainly Vulgate; 65z = cpr although it is used only in pr; 61ar is not used in ac only pr. The following is in NA but not UBS; 80p (in Rom 5)[20].

Excursus

Manuscripts in Basle in 1516:

1 e a p* (formerly 1eap) Basle Universitätsbibliothek A.N. IV 2; 12th century

2 e (2e) Basle Universitätsbibliothek A.N. IV 1; 12th century

3 e a p (used in 1519+) Vienna Nationalbibliothek Suppl. Gk 52; 12th century

817 e Basle Universitätsbibliothek A.N. III 15; 15th century

2105 p Oxford: Bodleian Library Auct. E 1.6; 14th century

2814 r (1r) Augsburg Universitätsbibliothek Cod. I 1.4.1; 12th century

2815 a p (2ap) Basle Universitätsbibliothek A.N. IV 4; 12th century

2816 a p (4ap) Basle Universitätsbibliothek A.N. IV 5; 15th century

2817 p (7p) Basle Universitätsbibliothek A.N. III 11; 11th century.

[The Majuscules B 03 e a p (Vatican City: Vat Gr 1209); 4th century and E 07 e (Basle Universitätsbibliothek A.N. III 12); 8th century were *not* used by Erasmus.]

e = Gospels; a = The Acts of the Apostles and the Catholic Letters; p = the Pauline Corpus; r = The Book of Revelation.

ENDNOTES

1 Maurice A. Robinson and William G. Pierpont, *The New Testament in the Original Greek*: *Byzantine Textform 2005* (Southborough: Chilton, 2005); Zane C. Hodges and Arthur L. Farstad, *The Greek New Testament according to the Majority Text* 2nd edition (Nashville: Nelson, 1985).

2 My lecture there then was published as an article, »Vom Erstdruck bis zum Ausdruck: Erasmus, Basel und die erste gedruckte griechische Bibel« *TZ* 73 (2017) pp. 325-38. Parts of that article are reproduced here with permission.

3 All we know is that there is evidence of some small portions of the Greek Bible that had already been printed in various places; those included the Magnificat and Benedictus from Luke's Prologue annexed to a Greek Psalter in Milan in 1481 and in Venice in 1486 and 1496-7 and a few early chapters of John's Gospel printed in Venice in 1504 and in Tübingen in 1514. The Aldus Press in Venice, a city that had welcomed a large number of Greek speakers after the Fall of Constantinople in 1453, had published Greek classics and grammars as well as other titles – but *not* a Greek New Testament in its entirety. The first Greek New Testament there appeared in print in 1518—*after* Erasmus' Greek-Latin edition.

4 Ought he be »Erasmus of Basle« rather than the conventional »Erasmus of Rotterdam«? We have already referred to his many activities in Switzerland; he certainly lived in Basle many more years than he had done in Rotterdam, and some historians even query if he had *ever* spent much (or any) time there! In a letter to Johann Witz, conventionally known as Sapidus, (a letter now numbered by scholars as 391A and dated from February 1516) Erasmus described how he felt comfortable and at home in Basle; he wrote that Basle is »a charming sanctuary of the Muses where a multitude of learned persons, scholars of no ordinary type, appears as a matter of course. I certainly have never before had the luck to live among such a gifted company«.

5 Among the manuscripts available to Erasmus during his time in Basle there were at least four Gospel manuscripts, a few others contain the Pauline letters with the Catholic Epistles and the Acts of the Apostles, and one has the Revelation of St John, containing all but its very last verses. The ones he chose to use were all mediaeval manuscripts, dating from the 12th to the 15th centuries. One cursive minuscule no. 2 with the editor's marginal marks for the typesetters was shown in lecture 2. Where he had a choice of readings Erasmus was able to select one when these manuscripts differed. Thus he was an eclectic textual critic, editing out of several sources one continuous text by making an informed, academic, choice. To that extent Erasmus was like a modern text-critic – but, generally in his *Novum*

Instrumentum (later *Novum Testamentum*), we must conclude that Erasmus was not a creative writer as far as his Greek column was concerned, merely a copier of the Greek texts available to him in Basle.

6 See J.K. Elliott, »"Novum Testamentum editum est«: The Five-Hundredth Anniversary of Erasmus' New Testament" *The Bible Translator* 67 (2016) pp. 9-28.

7 See *Manuel* (*op. cit.)* I ch 7 for thumb-nail introductions to those and others.

8 Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (Lonon, New York: United Bible Societies, 1971, [2]1994).

9 For instance, UBS[5] *Introduction* speaks of its trying to print the »initial« text (p. 4*) whereas elsewhere it is the »original« text that the editors are striving for (pp. 7*-8* 11* 37*); both are presumably translating the *Ausgangstext*.

10 *The Greek New Testament* (Atlanta: SBL, 2010). The comments to follow come from my review in the *Journal of Theological Studies* 62 (2011) pp. 288-94.

11 *The Greek New Testament* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018). The comments here are based on my review in the *Times Literary Supplement* 6018 (July 4, 2018) p. 35.

12 Re NA[26] Appendix IV: *Textuum Differentiae*, (and see also its *Introduction* pp. 70*-72*). This most useful appendix has been jettisoned in subsequent editions of the Nestle texts. As Parker indicates, if used in conjunction with Scrivener's edition (*The New Testament in the Original Greek*), which lists the differences between the Textus Receptus and Lachmann, one may »chart the varying decisions of most of the important editions of the critical era« (D.C. Parker, *An Introduction to New Testament Manuscripts and their Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008, p. 213). See also H.A.G. Houghton, *The Latin New Testament: A Guide to its Early History, Texts, and Manuscripts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016) Appendix I.

13 Nestle-Aland[28] does not give this manuscript its Beuron number.

14 Nestle-Aland[28] uses t for the Catholic Letters on p. 819 (Appendix B), not its usual ᴛ!

15 This listing (on pp. 31*-33*) does not separate manuscripts into categories e a p c r and is confusingly given the sequence e a c p r. In its third column UBS[5] specifies the whole contents of eleven long codices and shows where they are claimed to be predominantly Old Latin; it lists them using the usual abbreviations. ea (5d; 6c), ar (51gig; 74sin), acr (55 h), ap (59 dem), ac (53a; 67 l), apcr (56 t or Liber Com(m)icus; 61ar). cpr (65 z) and does not set these out by manuscript number: 5d ea+ c; 6c e al; 51gig a r; 53s a c: 55h a c r: 56t a c r; 59dem a p; 61ar a c p r; 65z c p r; 67la c; 74sin a r.

16 See Houghton Appendix I.

17 Many manuscripts are indeed mixed i.e. Old Latin and Vulgate.

18 63φ, shown on p. 32* to contain only a, is in fact bound with c.

19 φ lacks its Beuron number in UBS, but it seems to be Beuron 43 (cf. The Book of Dimma: 43 in some registers).

20 In NA[26] manuscript Beuron number 80 (containing a fragment of Romans) is not found or used in the Pauline Letters.