

*The Greek New Testament*, ed. by Kurt Aland, Matthew Black, Bruce Metzger, and Allen Wikgren. Published simultaneously in New York by the American Bible Society; in London by the British and Foreign Bible Society; in Edinburgh by the National Bible Society of Scotland; in Amsterdam by the Netherlands Bible Society; and in Stuttgart by the Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1966. 920 pp. \$ 1.95.

The publication of this *Greek New Testament* is a unique and significant event: unique because this is the first time that a Greek text has been prepared for the express use of translators (this characteristic is especially evident in the selection of the types of variants included in the apparatus), and significant because we have not had a critical Greek text established by a team of scholars since the days of Westcott and Hort. It is true that in a sense the Nestle text represented such a venture, but it was mechanically established rather than through live debate and discussion. Besides, what we have today is the consensus of modern 20th-century scholars and not that of the 19th century.

The editors list four special features of this edition:

(1) A critical apparatus restricted for the most part to variant readings significant for translators or necessary for the establishing of the text.

This feature is easily noticeable by checking the variants listed on any page of the edition. These are few and highly selective. In making a quick comparison on the quantity of variants, it is found that in Mt 1 (the examples cited are all taken from the Gospel of Mt, where a careful study of the edition has been made), there are seven variation units compared with 28 in Nestle-Aland (24th). The difference is even greater in the next three chapters. Therefore, the statement above lacks clarity. If the critical apparatus was selected for the purpose of establishing the text, it is highly inadequate and prejudicial. It has left out too many possibilities. In Mt 13: 22, while single brackets are placed around *τουτου*, no variants are listed in the apparatus even though *τουτου* is omitted by RV, RSV, NEB, and NA (Nestle-Aland). In 3: 7 *αυτου* has been included in the text without indicating any variants, while RSV, NEB, and NA omit it. The same situation is present in 5: 39 with *σου*, except that single brackets are placed around it by BS (the text presently under discussion). Again in 22: 21 BS adds *αυτω* without indicating any variants, while it is omitted by RSV, NEB, and NA. In 22: 20 BS has the support of NA in its omission of *ο Ιησους* and is opposed by RSV and NEB but does not indicate any variants.

In the following places BS should have at least indicated a variant, if only because NEB does not follow its reading: 1: 4-5, 19; 9: 27; 10: 19, 25; 11: 16; 13: 1, 11; 16: 4; 19: 14; 20: 8; 21: 9, 23, 28; 23: 5; 24: 48; 26: 25, 33 (at 9: 27; 13: 11; 20: 8, and 20: 28, BS is also opposed by NA). At 24: 38 BS is opposed by NA (in brackets), RV, and RSV.

The variants in the above list may not all be significant for translators, but some of them definitely are. Furthermore, the placing of the readings selected by BS within the text is debatable, to say nothing about the omission of any indication of variants.

(2) An indication of the relative degree of certainty for each variant adopted as the text.

Each variation unit in the critical apparatus is accompanied by a letter preceding it (A.-D) enclosed within braces. This letter informs us concerning the relative degree of certainty for the reading adopted as the text. "The letter A signifies that the text is virtually certain, while B indicates that there is some degree of doubt. The letter C means that there is considerable degree of doubt whether the text or the apparatus contains the superior reading, while D shows that there is a very high degree of doubt concerning the reading selected for the text" (pp. x, xi).

If the translators can rely on the editors, they will concern themselves only with those readings which are rated C or D. This is helpful, for not all translators can be expected to be experts in textual criticism. Yet they will know where even the experts are in doubt.

However, there are places where one wonders what exactly is meant. Mt 21:44 is enclosed in double square brackets within the text. The explanation given for words enclosed in double square brackets is that these "are regarded as later additions to the text." Yet this particular variant is given a rating of C. The explanation contradicts the rating.

Single square brackets enclose words which are regarded as having dubious textual validity. This may seem to indicate that all words rated C would be indicated in this way, but apparently such is not the case. Above we mentioned 5:39 and 13:22 where single square brackets were used but where variants were not even indicated in the apparatus. At 3:16; 6:15 and 20:30 single square brackets are used with a C rating, but at 14:27 with a D rating. But a C rating is found without single square brackets in numerous places—e.g., 1:18; 9:14; 14:22.

(3) A full citation of representative evidence for each variant selected.

This feature is a great improvement over previous Greek editions. In this respect it is more systematic and complete than any previous Greek edition, including Legg. The textual support for each variant is given, including a systematic citation of 62 minuscules which show significant difference from the Byzantine text-type and a selective citation of 181 others. It also includes a systematic citation of 52 lectionaries and a selective citation of 97 others, and an adequate citation from the papyri, uncials, versions, and church fathers. This feature is by far the most helpful as far as the contents are concerned. For the purpose of the edition, however, it may be doing too much of a good thing.

(4) A second apparatus giving meaningful differences of punctuation.

This last feature is definitely needed for this type of edition as well as for exegetical purposes. The meaning of a passage can be altered by a change in punctuation.

Concerning the quality of the text itself, see my discussion in *AUSS*, V (1967), 131-157, of the text of NEB in which its relationship to BS is also indicated.

While no unanimity need be expected, this Greek text prepared by four eminent textual critics will undoubtedly find favor among scholars. The second volume, which will give the Committee's reasons for adopting one or another variant reading, will be anticipated with great interest. The full citation for the variants in the apparatus will be much appreciated by many a student perplexed by methods of citation found in other Greek editions. Another important and attractive feature of this edition is the easy-to-read Greek type which is used.

Andrews University

SAKAE KUBO

Hamilton, Kenneth, *Revolt Against Heaven*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1965. 183 pp. Paperbound. \$ 2.45.

In 183 small pages it is impossible to give a comprehensive survey of modern theology, but Hamilton has succeeded in his attempt "to review some of the outstanding varieties of anti-supernaturalism, showing how present-day theories have their roots in the past."

Hamilton's survey may not appeal to the scholar who has read widely in the fields of philosophy and theology, but the person who would like to know what the "God is dead" theology means and what it is all about should find this brief study very helpful.

Hamilton's position is that the "God is dead" theology of Bishop Robinson, Paul M. van Buren, Thomas J. J. Altizer, and the others of their school is really nothing new, that its traditions have been an essential part of modern theology for a century and a half, and that the men mentioned above are simply going a step farther in their thinking than men like Tillich, Barth, and Niebuhr dared to go.

Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768-1834), according to Hamilton, is the High Priest of modern theology; and the radical theologians of our day, whether they admit it or not, are his debtors. The aim of the modern theologian is to get God out of heaven and down to earth, and we find that the God of Schleiermacher had the marks of an earthbound God. Schleiermacher taught that "man provides his own revelation. The divine is known in the human to the extent to which the human can manifest the divine under the limitations of temporal existence."

Schleiermacher too saw no need for the supernatural. Speaking of the divinity and incarnation of Christ, he said: "For in the first