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tur från vald period är inte överraskande, givet den disparata arten av undersökningsmaterial. Det intressanta i denna bok är dels de tendenser författaren identifierar i olika undergrupper av det studerade materialet och dels det sätt dessa tendenser tar sig uttryck i olika typer av textmaterial. Sammanfattningsvis, givet den ansenliga bredden av undersökningsmaterialet och författarens förtrogenhet med detsamma, kommer denna bok att läsas och användas främst som ett slags referenslitteratur vid studiet av enskilda judiska skrifter och deras tolkningar av änglarnas roll i Gamla testamentets berättelser.

Blaženka Schauer, Lunds universitet


In Klaus Wachtel and Michael W. Holmes’s introduction “The Textual History of the Greek New Testament: Changing Views in Contemporary Research,” the authors discuss the relationship between authorial, “initial” and archetypal text; David Trobisch’s observation that the production of NT manuscripts involves several persons and should be distinguished from the author’s text, and the possibility of more than one edition of NT books; the problem of the pejorative term “contamination” and the potential of the Coherence-Based Genealogical Method (CBGM) to quantify degrees of coherence; and finally, the criteria for doing textual criticism as well as the importance of identifying an author’s style.

In “Is ‘Living Text’ Compatible with ‘Initial Text’? Editing the Gospel of John,” (ch. 1) David Parker discusses the possibility of combining his own living text theory with the quest for the initial text. Parker’s account for the theological—rather than text-critical—background of The Living Text produces both question marks and exclamation marks in the reader’s mind. Parker finds common ground between his own theory and CBGM and asserts that the living text theory in fact agrees with regard to the efforts to establish an initial text: that is, the original text is unrecoverable.

“Original Text and Textual History” (ch. 2) by Holger Strutwolf addresses the issue of whether the “original text” is still a valid concept. Strutwolf makes a case for an original text by a close study of the Lord’s Prayer in the Gospel of Luke. He also points to the significance of the early church fathers as a resource, particularly in cases when the original text is not preserved in the extant manuscript tradition. Strutwolf concludes that “the living text of the Gospel” takes us back to the notion of an “original text.”

David Trobisch (ch. 3) underlines “The Need to Discern Distinctive Editions of the New Testament in the Manuscript Tradition,” arguing that the critical edition of the Greek NT should not only supply a reconstruction of the initial text, but
also information about such things as titles of individual writings, collection units and *nomina sacra*.

In “Conceptualizing ‘Scribal’ Performances: Reader’s notes” (ch. 4), Ulrich Schmid argues that there are readers’ notes in manuscripts not deriving from scribes only. Schmid notes the alleged role of scribes as editors, interpreters and even writers when they feel at liberty to alter their Vorlage. Not denying this possibility, he observes that it is untypical. Potential non-scribal notes—identified by their placement and hand—should not be lumped together under the general category of scribal activity. Rather, a wider set of roles should be identified in the creative relationship with the manuscripts.

In “Working with an Open Textual Tradition: Challenges in Theory and Practice” (ch. 5), Michael Holmes addresses the problems that stem from contamination in textcritical practice and textual theory. A manuscript tradition can be either closed, i.e., with only a vertical relationship, or open, i.e., with both inherited readings (vertically from the exemplar) and acquired readings (horizontally from other sources). Mixing can be block, simultaneous, or incidental mixture. Holmes argues that every manuscript in the NT text tradition is “contaminated” by mixing, which fact renders methods used for closed text traditions inoperative, meaning that “both the lines of descent and the direction of descent are obscured.” Some of the consequences are that methods of the purely quantitative kind cannot be adopted; it becomes difficult to decide whether shared errors are genetic or accidental; it requires that a differentiation be made between texts and the manuscripts that contain them; late manuscripts may carry original readings; reference to “a best tradition” is disallowed. The solution is —on a variant-by-variant basis—to create stemmas of readings rather than manuscripts to identify “the earliest recoverable reading,” or *Ausgangstext*. Holmes warns against over-simplification of complex problems. He underlines the importance of reasoned eclecticism because it approaches every variation with attention to its individuality. Holmes finishes by pointing to the potential of CBGM to help us pay attention to detail while at the same time handling the big picture.

In Eldon Jay Epp’s long chapter on “Traditional ‘Canons’ of New Testament Textual Criticism: their Value, Validity, and Viability – or Lack thereof” (ch. 6), he describes how the external and internal criteria emerged, discusses criteria and their weight, and finally addresses the issue of the goal and task of textual criticism. The emergence of the two-pronged approach of external and internal criteria—the first assessing factors dealing with such matters as age, geographical distribution and quality and the second with what writers and scribes were likely to write—became foundational for textual criticism. In 1725 Bengel divided the manuscripts into textual groups/types, an understanding that with some refinement is still adhered to by most textual critics. Opting for the use of either the term “criteria” or “probability” and stating that his goal is to establish “the earliest attainable text,” Epp lists and comments on sixteen criteria and their validity. The pre-eminent criterion is the variant that is able to account for all other variants within its variation-unit, and second to this, the variant that is supported by the earliest manuscripts. The old preference for the short/er reading has increasingly been challenged in favour of the longer reading, since, according to Elliot
(1992) and Jongkind (2007), scribes were more likely to omit than to add; nevertheless, case by case adjudication is till necessary. Overall, simplistic and mechanical application of criteria must be banned and once again the realization that textual criticism is an art that requires broad thinking and big picture visualization must be underlined.

In chapter seven on “What should be in an Apparatus Criticus? Desiderata to Support a Thoroughgoing Eclectic Approach to Textual Criticism,” J. K. Elliot notes that the practice of most major editions, i.e., to “print as the original text readings that may have few manuscripts as witnesses” is acceptable, if the apparatus—by means of electronic assembling and storage—is complemented as fully as possible with other variants. For thoroughgoing eclectics “types of variants” are paramount.

The perhaps most important contribution of the volume is Gerd Mink’s 75-page chapter “Contamination, Coherence, and Coincidence in Textual Transmission: The Coherence-Based Genealogical Method (CBGM) as a Complement and Corrective to Existing Approaches,” where a number of issues are brought together and he outlines the workings and potential of CBGM. Mink addresses how coherence can be interpreted in a context of contamination and how the priority and posteriority of variants can be established, taking the whole material into account. Mink positions CBGM relative to other methods and accounts for its basic terminology. The essence of the CBGM method is a manner to “map genealogical relationships between variants into coherent fields within a global stemma of witnesses,” and takes as its point of departure four basic assumptions: (i) scribes strive to copy a Vorlage with fidelity; (ii) in case of diverging variants these are not “invented” but imported from another source; (iii) scribes make use of few rather than multiple sources; (iv) the sources that are used are texts that are closely related rather than less related. In the application of CBGM there is a frequent interaction between philological assessments and computerized procedures that require massive computing power. The long-term goal is to make CBGM available to external users for attempts to create optimal substemmata. In “Conclusions” Klaus Wachtel summarizes his reflections on the contributions to the volume.

The volume does indeed provide the reader access to an overview of the latest developments within textual criticism. The variation of perspectives is striking and the specialization does no longer come forth as one that pertains to textual criticism as a whole but rather within the field, in particular with regard to the advanced CBGM project. Teamwork and co-operation seem to be keywords for the future developments of textual criticism.

Jan H. Nylund, Lund University


Professor J. Ross Wagner har skrivit en monografi baserad på en analys av Jes 1 i Septuaginta. Det är en undersökning, som utöver tolkningen av denna perikop vill