

**Richard Simon, *Critical History of the Text of the New Testament. Wherein is Established the Truth of the Acts on which the Christian Religion is Based* (Translated, Introduced and Annotated by Andrew Hunwick) (NTTSD 43), Leiden: Brill 2013. Pp. xxiv + 368. ISBN13: 978 90 04244 207; E-ISBN: 978 90 04244 214. € 146,00/\$203,00.<sup>1</sup>**

- [1] A fresh translation of a scholarly title after more than three hundred years! Simon, often regarded as “the father of biblical criticism,”<sup>2</sup> first published his *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament*, which comprises for the Old Testament the elements (even called “Livres”) that would become three separate books in his treatment of the New Testament, namely the history of the biblical text, of its translations, and of its commentators.<sup>3</sup>
- [2] The current edition gives the first book of the New Testament side of Simon’s project, and readers should be aware that they have just that: a specific part of Simon’s work on biblical criticism, which in itself was even larger.<sup>4</sup>
- [3] The issues dealt with by Simon typically belong to New Testament introduction and textual criticism: the New Testament books, and their forms (e.g. was there a Hebrew Gospel of Matthew?); the canonical status of the books; Marcion and his version of Paul’s letters; the authorship of Hebrews; inspiration; language; the use of Old Testament citations; Greek manuscripts; 1 John 5:7–8.
- [4] Simon’s *Histoire critique du texte du Nouveau Testament* has actually seen an earlier English translation, as early as 1689,<sup>5</sup> a fact of which the present translator seems to have been unaware.
- [5] At first sight, the book delivers what the title page promises: it contains a translation of Simon’s text, with an introduction, and with annotations that indicate Simon’s sources and provide background information. The translation is eminently readable, the “Sketch of Life and Career” discusses Simon’s work, and the annotations are extensive. The book has a table of contents (as does the original edition), acknowledgements, a short list of abbreviations, and an index, though only of names and not of scriptural references or manuscripts.
- [6] So far, so good, and the publishers’ “blurb” according to which Simon’s work “deserves to reach a wider audience” cannot be contradicted, although it is debatable whether one can

<sup>1</sup> In this review ordinary page numbers refer to the book itself; numbers followed by “a” or “b” refer to the pages and columns of the first original French edition of Simon’s work (see below for the reference).

<sup>2</sup> The first to do so seems to have been Alfred Loisy in 1892 (*Histoire critique du texte et des versions de la Bible 1* [Amiens: Rousseau-Leroy], p. 192: “Le fameux oratorien a bien mérité d’être appelé le père de la critique sacrée”) and 1903 (*Autour d’un petit livre* [Paris: Picard], p. 23: “l’ex-oratorien Richard Simon, le père de la critique biblique et la victime du grand Bossuet”).

<sup>3</sup> The 1689 *Histoire critique du texte du Nouveau Testament* was followed in 1690 by *Histoire critique des versions du Nouveau Testament, où l’on fait connoître quel a été l’usage de la lecture des Livres Sacrés dans les principales Eglises du monde*, and in 1693 by *Histoire critique des principaux commentateurs du Nouveau Testament, depuis le commencement du Christianisme jusques à nôtre tems ...* (all Rotterdam: Leers). Simon planned the books together (e.g. p. 180 refers to “the second book of the present study”; p. 211b in the original edition; the third volume also contains a “Dissertation critique sur les principaux Actes Manuscrits qui ont été citez dans les trois Parties de cet Ouvrage”).

<sup>4</sup> For instance *Nouvelles observations sur le texte et les versions du Nouveau Testament* (Paris: Boudot, 1695).

<sup>5</sup> *A Critical History of the Text of the New Testament; Wherein is Firmly Establish’d the Truth of those Acts on which the Foundation of the Christian Religion is laid* (London: Taylor, 1689). The translator is unknown (there is only a “Translator’s Postscript” on p. 187). Simon’s second volume has also been translated: *The Critical History of the Versions of the New Testament* (London: Newborough & Bennet, 1692, with 10 pages of “The Translator to the Reader” to counter Simon’s catholicism).

really ascribe to Simon a “scrupulously ‘scientific’ approach.” It is more like witnessing the foundations being laid for real historical-critical thinking.

- [7] All that glisters is not gold. On closer inspection the book falls short in almost all respects except its beautiful typeface. First the translator’s introduction will be discussed, and then the editorial choices that were made. The translation will be shown to fail in the terminology that is adopted, and to contain numerous serious mistakes. A closer look at the translator’s annotations will reveal several problems in that area as well.
- [8] The introduction (pp. xxv-xxxvi), under the title “Richard Simon (1638–1712) Sketch of Life & Career,” comes *after* the translation of Simon’s Preface, and is followed by the translation of Simon’s 33 chapters. This order is confusing, to say the least. It should have preceded the translation, including Simon’s Preface.<sup>6</sup>
- [9] The introduction should have focussed more on the place of the present work in Simon’s oeuvre (on which see p. xxix), instead of the “Sketch of Life & Career” it now offers. One even looks in vain for the complete original French title of Simon’s book (the short title only occurs on the copyright page). It is *Histoire critique du texte du Nouveau Testament, où l’on établit la vérité des actes sur lesquels la religion chrétienne est fondée* (Rotterdam: Leers, 1689).<sup>7</sup> Also hidden is the information that it is the first volume of three, and that its structure is parallel to Simon’s earlier *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament*, which was published in one volume.<sup>8</sup>
- [10] The introduction should also have established the need, use or interest for the current edition. After all Simon’s book is available in French,<sup>9</sup> and serious scholars of both the history of biblical textual criticism and the history of Roman Catholicism in the seventeenth and eighteenth should be expected to have some proficiency in this language.
- [11] Moreover the information given on Richard Simon is marked by unevenness. While it is perhaps useful to elaborate on the relation between Bossuet and Simon, the readers do not need a detailed snapshot of the way Bossuet accused Simon of semi-Pelagianism (pp. xxxiv-xxxv). After that section the two opinions cited on Simon’s contribution to biblical exegesis (p. xxxvi) seem completely unconnected to the rest of the chapter.
- [12] Finally there should have been space for a clear exposition of the editorial principles followed here; some indications are found scattered in the footnotes, but only a diligent comparison with the original French reveals what really has been done. The results are not reassuring.
- [13] Interestingly Simon’s *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament* has recently been republished by Pierre Gibert.<sup>10</sup> It is worthwhile to briefly describe Gibert’s editorial policy in order to gauge the possibilities and problems editors of such works are faced with.

<sup>6</sup> Some errors in the internal references to footnotes (see also the appendix to this review) show that an earlier version of the book had the correct order (i.e. the translator’s Introduction followed by Simon’s text); see p. xxxvi l. 4, which also reflects a stage in which the footnote numbering did not yet restart every chapter.

<sup>7</sup> In the same year, there were two editions, the second called “Seconde Edition revuë et corrigée par l’Auteur”; an error on p. 77 of the translation suggests that for the translation the second edition was used (as it omits with that second edition [p. 63] an essential phrase still found in the first edition [p. 91a]).

<sup>8</sup> Some information is found on p. 185 n. 39: “As sequels to the present study, he wrote two further ‘parts’: textual criticism of the versions and principal commentators on the New Testament.” (The word “textual” is unnecessary.)

<sup>9</sup> A good online version (without OCR) of the first edition can be found at Bonn University (<http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:hbz:5:1-16197>; last consulted 10 June 2014).

<sup>10</sup> Richard Simon, *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament suivi de Lettre sur l’inspiration*. Nouvelle édition annotée et introduite par Pierre Gibert (Montrouge: Bayard, 2008). The year 1678 is given on the

- [14] Simon's texts are complicated for modern readers because of their layers, with footnotes, Latin citations and the like, and for their language, seventeenth-century French. The contents as well pose difficulties, for many unfamiliar scholars, works, and issues are referred to. Gibert's new edition gives the entirety of Simon's text. He includes its Latin terms and citations,<sup>11</sup> and its occasional Greek words, though the latter are transcribed. All marginal notes and footnotes are reproduced in full, and if necessary Simon's many abbreviations are expanded. As Simon's Catholic book was published by a Protestant printer, it contains additional footnotes that support Protestant views. Both types of notes are clearly distinguished by Gibert. In addition there are many editor's notes, in turn set apart from the original notes. These notes also contain the translation of the Latin citations and terms in Simon's text. Simon's seventeenth-century French is modernised, both in spelling and punctuation, but not in its terminology; terms that have become unclear to modern readers are explained in editor's notes. In my view Gibert produced the ideal edition for our times as closely as humanly possible.
- [15] Needless to say, a translation differs from a republished edition. Yet the translator would have done well to emulate the exemplary editorial standards adopted by Gibert. Most importantly it should have been clear at every moment which part of the text belongs to the direct translation of Simon's text and which part is added by the translator/annotator. Instead the reader is often thrown into hopeless confusion.
- [16] Notably missing or hard to find is information on the translational and editorial principles followed here. It turns out not everything is translated, and the mixture of French, Latin and Greek (and occasional Hebrew, Syriac, and Arabic!) is dealt with very inconsistently. Latin and Greek citations are mostly omitted—without notice!—not only in the footnotes, but also in the running text. Admittedly there are citations that only repeat what was just stated in French—though even those are relevant in showing how Simon works—but many do contribute something to the argument. Greek phrases and words are often taken over, though they can also be omitted when Simon himself translates them.<sup>12</sup> The original footnotes and marginal notes are generally omitted. Comparison with the translator's own footnotes shows that they often serve as the starting-point for the latter, a fact hidden for the ordinary reader.<sup>13</sup> Without the citations and the original references, it is impossible obtain a precise image of Simon's actual scholarship.
- [17] Apparently the aim is to provide references to all sources to which Simon also refers, but possible discrepancies between those sources and Simon's use of them are not indicated. For patristic quotations and sources, references are not to the editions known to and used by Simon, but to later, apparently more convenient editions. In general, PL and PG are used even if more recent (and better) editions are available. These references generally replace Simon's own, an editorial choice which is highly infelicitous.

---

cover, though Gibert actually gives the 1685 Rotterdam edition, not the censored 1678 one (which survives in a few copies). Gibert's book is mentioned, but surprisingly never referred to.

<sup>11</sup> There are also citations in Spanish and Italian.

<sup>12</sup> E.g. on p. 163 Simon discusses the titles given to the Epistle of James in Greek manuscripts and editions; he consistently gives the Greek and then translates it (p. 192b); the translation however omits all the Greek (similarly on p. 166 [p. 195b]). A special case is found on p. 26, where a Greek book title given by Simon in his main text (p. 32a-b) is omitted. On the same page, the corresponding Latin book title is not taken over but translated (see p. 32a), which is odd and should better be done in a footnote, as is done with another title (see p. 27 with n. 53; p. 33b).

<sup>13</sup> For Simon's original footnotes, which mostly contain quotations (a way of satisfying his critics), it is only at the end of the Preface, tucked away in an Editor's footnote, that we learn that "these actual quotations are not reproduced in the present edition," but "specific references to them are to be found in the footnotes." The problem then remains that readers of the new translation will have no clue as to which precise passages Simon was referring to. Moreover the translator is rather selective in the notes he takes over, and as a rule replaces Simon's references by modern ones.

- [18] It should be stressed that these choices and policies are not just matters of detail. If this translation is to help many modern readers attain knowledge on Simon's biblical criticism of the New Testament, it should not obfuscate the original, but convey as clear and faithful a picture of it as possible.
- [19] It is also unclear why some notes are marked "Editor's note," while most others, which are just as much "editor's notes" are not.<sup>14</sup> Also surprising is p. 65 n. 17, which is marked "Note by R. Simon": the reader should know that most notes with simple references are derived from Simon's marginal notes, but updated into modern references by the translator. In other words: the impression should not be given that Simon does not give references; in fact he does, and for the end of the seventeenth century in a remarkably reliable and consistent manner, an aspect of his work now completely invisible in this annotated translation.
- [20] Another aspect is "annotating by translation," which also creates a skewed image. For example on p. 227 Simon states in translation: "In Acts 2:27 St Peter uses Psalm 16:10";<sup>15</sup> here the translator adds the exact verse references *as if* Simon gives them, while Simon only refers to Ps 15 (not Ps 16 because he refers to the Septuagint, an aspect also "lost in translation"). Less serious but still unnecessary is "in the two preceding chapters" (p. 254) for Simon's simple "cy-dessus" (p. 302b).<sup>16</sup> On p. 187 the years of birth and death of three Greek Church fathers are added directly into the translation, and even "younger brother of St Basil" for Gregory of Nyssa. It is no use to skimp on footnotes.<sup>17</sup>
- [21] The practice can even have disastrous consequences. In an instance where Jerome, in Simon's words, "says that Micah 5:2 reproduces the words of Jewish scholars" (p. 217),<sup>18</sup> "Micah 5:2" is supplied in order to make the text more clear, but as a result it becomes incomprehensible. The context is Jerome's effort to explain why the citation of Micah 5:2 in Matt 2:6 differs so much from its source. Jerome's (second) solution is to point out that *in Matthew's account* the words are actually cited by the chief priests and the scribes, and that their inaccuracy demonstrates how unreliable they are. Thus Simon's words "en ce lieu-là" ("there") refer to Matt 2:6, not to Micah 5:2.
- [22] In an attempt to make the text easier for modern readers, the translator deals anachronistically with the New Testament Greek manuscripts mentioned by Simon. In the text of the translation original catalogue numbers and descriptive names are replaced<sup>19</sup> by modern

<sup>14</sup> See p. xv and p. 306 for striking examples. There are also long editor's notes as part of the main text at the end of Chapter Three (pp. 30–31; the closing square bracket is missing) and Chapter Five (pp. 48–49; again the closing square bracket is missing).

<sup>15</sup> "St. Pierre a expliqué ... dans les Actes des Apôtres ces Paroles du Pseaume 15."

<sup>16</sup> There is another problem directly related: the translation has "as expounded in the two preceding chapters as well as by the Louvain Jesuits" (p. 254; for p. 302b "de la maniere qu'on l'a supposée cy-dessus avec les Jesuites de Louvain"); here "as well as" is wrong (see e.g. the titles of chapters 23–24).

<sup>17</sup> See also for instance p. 4 "Disciples of the adoptionist Theodotus" (for p. 6b "Theodotiens"); p. 189 the years of Pope Zephyrinus; p. 293 "the Oratorian Jean Morin" (for p. 345a "Le Pere Morin"); p. 302 "Alfonso Salmerón, S.J." (for p. 355a "Salmeron"). In all these cases information is added to the text that would normally be put in a footnote.

<sup>18</sup> p. 257a "Il dit, que se sont les Docteurs Juifs qui parlent en ce lieu-là."

<sup>19</sup> E.g. p. 173 "In the King's Library I consulted seven [manuscripts], six of which have the numbers 5, 302, 337, 465, 605, 2298" for p. 204a "J'en ay lû cependant sept de la Bibliotheque du Roy, dont il y six cottés 1885. 2247. 2248. 2870. 2871. 2872."; p. 338 "not in 22" for p. 400a "point dans un manuscrit de la Bibliotheque de Mr. Colbert" (with the manuscript number 2467 in the margin); p. 339 "in 23 and 24" for p. 400a "dans deux Exemplaires de Mr. Colbert" (with the manuscript numbers in the margin); p. 344 "K 017 has" for p. 408a "un des Colberts."

Gregory-Aland numbers.<sup>20</sup> This choice, mentioned on p. 173 n. 1, is problematic for two reasons: first, if there is an error it is very difficult to detect; second, the perspective of Simon's text is drastically changed when it is made to refer to a virtual collection of Greek New Testament manuscripts, instead of real historical libraries. At the end of chapter 32 Simon himself states that he wanted to give some more information on the relatively unknown manuscripts of Colbert's library (see p. 351; p. 416ab), but in translation the chapter's text consistently obscures that Simon did just that because it only contains the Gregory-Aland numbers.<sup>21</sup> The easy and elegant solution would have been to leave the descriptions in the translation, and to provide footnotes with (1) the catalogue numbers Simon has in his marginal notes; (2) the modern Gregory-Aland sigla and numbers; (3) the modern BnF catalogue numbers.<sup>22</sup>

[23] In a similar vein modern manuscript names are introduced into the translation, such as "Codex Alexandrinus" (p. 126) for Simon's "l'Exemplaire Alexandrin" (p. 147b). The same is done to "l'Exemplaire de Cambrige" (p. 362b), which becomes "Codex Bezae" (p. 308),<sup>23</sup> and to many other manuscripts.<sup>24</sup> This seemingly innocent practice again denotes an unwelcome change of perspective. Simon's descriptive terms were not yet codified, but the translation presents him as using present-day conventions, thus obscuring his role as a pioneer.

[24] Another anachronism sometimes occurs when Simon cites the Greek New Testament. The translator, doubtlessly armed with an electronic version of the modern critical text, copy-pasted the passages from this version. In principle such a practice is advisable, not only as a safeguard against easily-made typing errors, but also as a nice check of the original text, provided however one carefully verifies the results. The latter has not always been done in this book, as the following examples show. On p. 113 Luke 13:5 is cited as "ἐὰν μὴ μετανοήτε πάντες ὡσαύτως ἀπολείσθε"; however Simon (p. 131b) has ὁμοίως instead of ὡσαύτως. The meaning is not affected, but the impression is given that Simon follows the text of modern editions instead of the Textus Receptus. On p. 325 Simon now has Rom 3:12 with οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ ποιῶν χρηστότητα, whereas he actually cites the Textus receptus without ὁ (p. 386a). On p. 331 Rom 16:16 is given as ἀσπάζονται ὑμᾶς αἱ ἐκκλησίαι πᾶσαι τοῦ Χριστοῦ, but in fact Simon knows and cites the text without πᾶσαι (p. 391b). Similarly on pp. 114–115 Epiphanius is cited on Marcion's omissions in Luke, but in the translation, without notice, the Greek is adapted to the common reading.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>20</sup> The system of Gregory-Aland numbers originates with Wettstein's 1751–52 edition. Since then it has been repeatedly corrected, refined, expanded, and simplified. It is very useful in allowing New Testament scholars to refer to manuscripts in an unequivocal manner. Still it should be kept in mind that it is no more than a virtual collection of physical objects widely dispersed in place and time.

<sup>21</sup> For most manuscripts somewhere in the translator's notes the former Colbert manuscript number can be found, but one looks in vain for Colbert 3947 (min. 23; now BnF Gr. 77).

<sup>22</sup> On pp. 178–179 (with nn. 14–15) the modern BnF numbers are indeed listed alongside Simon's BR and Colbert numbers.

<sup>23</sup> On other occasions the translation does contain expressions such as "the Cambridge manuscript" (p. 307), "the Cambridge document" (p. xxiv), or "the Cambridge copy" (p. 89).

<sup>24</sup> "Codex Sangermanensis" (p. 307 for p. 361a "celuy des Benedictins"); "this early manuscript Codex Regius" (p. 102; for p. 118b "cet ancien Manuscrit de la Bibliotheque du Roy"); "Codex Vaticanus" (p. 123; for p. 143b "ce très-ancien Exemplaire du Vatican"); "Codex Alexandrinus" (p. 126 [cf. p. 139]; for p. 147b "l'Exemplaire Alexandrin"); "the one called Claromontanus" (p. 139; for p. 161a "celuy qu'on appelle de Clermont"). In fact *passim*; some more examples: "Codex Sangermanensis" (p. 353; for p. 417b "celuy des benedictins de l'Abbaye de Saint Germain"); "269" (p. 361; for p. 426b "un autre Exemplaire ... dans la même Bibliotheque"; with Simon's marginal note referring to BR 2858).

<sup>25</sup> Namely τοῦ θεοῦ is added in Luke 13:29; ἔχατοι οἱ ἔσονται πρῶτοι instead of οἱ ἔσχατοι ἔσονται πρῶτοι in Luke 13:30; προσήλθάν τινες Φαρισαῖοι λέγοντες αὐτῷ, Ἐξελθε καὶ πορεύου ἐντεῦθεν, ὅτι Ἡρώδης θέλει σε ἀποκτεῖναι instead of προσήλθον οἱ Φαρισαῖοι λέγοντες, ἔξελθε καὶ πορεύου, ὅτι

- [25] The book suffers from serious defects in the terminology that is used. Most strikingly, when Simon uses the French word “critique” without qualification, the translator wants something more specific, and asks whether it means “exegesis” or “textual criticism” (see p. xv n. 1). In fact it is something else, and more general, which he could have discovered if he had consulted a New Testament scholar:<sup>26</sup> the term “critique” in Simon’s work encompasses what is nowadays distinguished as literary criticism, historical criticism, and textual criticism; it denotes the combination of what typically came to be distinguished as “lower” and “higher criticism,” the former dealing with textual matters, the latter with introductory questions on authorship, sources, inspiration, etc. These are precisely the subjects of Simon’s book. In many instances, if a more specific term were needed, “textual criticism” would have been the best and even only choice;<sup>27</sup> this book is titled “Histoire critique du *texte* ...” for a reason after all.<sup>28</sup>
- [26] For some reason<sup>29</sup> it was decided that Simon’s book is mainly about “exegesis,” which is a serious mistake. Some examples out of a great many serve to illustrate the consequent damage. Chapter 18 is titled “Critique du passage ...” and concerns the famous case of 1 John 5:7–8; yet the translation has “Exegetical Discussion of ...” which is just plain wrong. Jerome is said to be “correcting the Latin Bibles ... in accordance with exegetical criteria” (p. xv), but with “les regles de la Critique” (p. \* 2r) of course *text-critical* rules are meant.<sup>30</sup> Infelicitous also is

---

Ἡρώδης σε θέλει ἀποκτείνειν in Luke 13:31; ποσάκις for πολλάκις in Luke 13:34, omitting ὄρνις, but leaving ὡς which is very strange; πολλοὶ λεπροὶ ἦσαν ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ ἐπὶ Ἐλισαίου τοῦ προφήτου, καὶ οὐδεὶς αὐτῶν ἐκαθαρίσθη εἰ μὴ Ναυμὰν ὁ Σύρος instead of Πολλοὶ λεπροὶ ἦσαν ἐν ἡμέραις Ἐλισαίου τοῦ προφήτου, καὶ οὐκ ἐκαταρίσθη [sic] εἰ μὴ Νεεμὰν ὁ Σύρος from Luke 4:27; ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ for ἐν Ἰουδαίᾳ in Luke 21:21; πάντα omitted before τὰ γεγραμμένα in ἕως πληρωθῆ πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα in Luke 21:32 (it would have been worthwhile to mention that the normal reading is ἕως ἂν πάντα γένηται). In the light of all these examples, it is remarkable that a footnote (p. 115 n. 27) is spent to point out that Simon has τρίξ where the normal spelling is θρίζ.

- <sup>26</sup> This remark may sound condescending, but it is difficult to explain why “exegesis” occurs almost everywhere, also where it is entirely off the mark. When Simon himself discusses the term “Critique” (in the Preface, p. \* 4<sup>v</sup>), the translation correctly has “textual criticism” (p. xxi), and even includes a very relevant reference to a discussion by Gibert (p. xxi n. 15).
- <sup>27</sup> Not however on p. 258 where the issue is the Greek of the New Testament; there Origen should be called a “critic,” not a “textual critic.”
- <sup>28</sup> See also Gibert’s reference to Huet’s description (contemporary to Simon), which also clearly points to *textual* criticism (Simon, *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament*, 2008, pp. 26–27 n. 3).
- <sup>29</sup> A clue may be found on almost the last page of the book, where “la critique des Exemplaires Grecs du Nouveau Testament” (p. 430a) is rendered as “Greek New Testament manuscript exegesis” (p. 363). Perhaps the translator really thinks that “exegesis” is more or less a synonym of “criticism”; it is not so.
- <sup>30</sup> Some more examples: p. xvi “a few other able exegetes” for p. \* 2<sup>v</sup> “quelques autres habiles Critiques”; p. xvi “in strict observance of exegetical principles” for p. 2<sup>v</sup> “selon les loix les plus exactes de la Critique”; p. xviii “The present exegetical survey” for p. \* 3<sup>r</sup> “cette Histoire Critique”; p. xviii “in line with exegetical criteria” for p. \* 3<sup>r</sup> “selon les regles de la Critique”; p. xviii “the study of exegesis” for p. \* 3<sup>v</sup> “l’étude de la Critique”; p. xix “the true principles of exegesis” for p. \* 3<sup>v</sup> “les veritables loix de la Critique”; p. xix “the most learned exegetes of our own day” for p. \* 3<sup>v</sup> “les plus sçavans Critiques de nôtre temps”; p. xx “this exegetical survey” for p. \* 4<sup>r</sup> “cette Histoire Critique” (that is part of the title of the book!); p. xxi “exegetes” for p. \*\* 1<sup>r</sup> “Critiques”; p. xxi “justification for scriptural exegesis” for p. \*\* 1<sup>r</sup> “autoriser l’usage de la Critique dans les Livres Sacrés”; p. xxiii “scriptural exegesis” for p. \*\* 1<sup>v</sup> “la Critique des Livres Sacrés”; p. xxiii “learned exegetes” for p. \*\* 2<sup>r</sup> “sçavans Critiques”; p. 295 “exegesis” for p. 347b “Critique”; p. 297 “basic principles of exegesis” and “This exegetic principle” for p. 349b “les regles de la Critique” and “cette regle”; p. 299 “in accordance with exegetic principles” for p. 351a “selon les regles de la critique”; p. 300 “my exegetic history of the Old Testament” for p. 353b “l’Histoire Critique du Vieux Testament”; p. 332 “the second part of this history of exegesis” for p. 392 “la seconde

the phrase “this task of exegesis is called *textual criticism*” (p. xv), where “*textual criticism*” for “*Critique*” is correct, but “of exegesis” is wrong and cannot be justified.<sup>31</sup>

[27] This terminological problem recurs in almost every chapter; in most cases, simple terms such as “criticism” and “critics” would have been far better than “exegesis” and “exegetes.” Similarly “toute cette matière” in the title of chapter 29 is not “New Testament exegesis in general” as the translation now has it.<sup>32</sup>

[28] In any case, “exegesis” is definitely not the correct term, for the focus is not on the interpretation of the texts but on their “criticism.” Therefore readers of this translation should silently supply “criticism” and “critic” for every instance of “exegesis” and “exegete,” as well as “critical principles” for “exegetical principles.” And if “textual criticism” etc. works in a passage, it is even better. In short, the translator’s choice of terms is seriously misleading and distorting.

[29] There are also some issues with the use of text-critical terms. The translation often has “source” where the French has “exemplaire”<sup>33</sup> or even “manuscrit.”<sup>34</sup> Thus unnecessary and deceptive imprecision is introduced, perhaps for the sake of variation or elegance. At some other places “exemplaire” is rendered as “text”<sup>35</sup> or “version”;<sup>36</sup> these terms are too vague as well. Almost invariably “copy” or even “manuscript” would be better. A “source” can be anything, but Simon has written copies of the New Testament text in mind. It is also strange to translate “Exemplaires Grecs” (p. 382b) as “Greek manuscript sources” (p. 333) (even in the chapter title). In the case of “leçons” it is almost always best to retain the reference to “readings” and not to dilute it into “text.”<sup>37</sup>

[30] The translation itself is clear, fluent and free. Hunwick makes good use of transformations and idiomatic English, and the admirable result is a text that does not feel like a translation. However in precision it leaves much to be desired.<sup>38</sup> Translators should understand the texts they render, but here the point of Simon’s text is missed on many occasions. Words have been misread and negations have been omitted or added. A selection—indeed just a selection—of the more serious blunders may illustrate these points:

[31] “Justice was ... done by this Church Father” (p. xvi)<sup>39</sup> should be “... done *to* this Church Father.”

---

Partie de cette Histoire Critique.” In all these cases simple terms such as “critics” would have been better, and if needs be, “textual” could have been added. Invariably the reference to exegesis creates a distorted image of Simon’s work.

<sup>31</sup> Simon has “Ce travail” (p. \* 2<sup>r</sup>).

<sup>32</sup> Also on the same page (p. 285) Origen is called “an expert in exegesis,” where Simon only writes “très-habile dans cette matière” (p. 336a) and the reference is to dealing with Greek manuscripts. In the title of chapter 31 “Exegetic Observations” (p. 319) is given for “Reflexions critiques” (p. 377b). Only on p. 300 “examination” is chosen for Simon’s “critique” (p. 353a) of 1 John 5:7–8, and on p. 338 finally “the laws of textual criticism” are found (for p. 399a “les lois de la Critique”).

<sup>33</sup> E.g. p. 285 (p. 336a); p. 291 (p. 343b).

<sup>34</sup> E.g. p. 292 (p. 344a).

<sup>35</sup> E.g. p. 286 (p. 337a); p. 282 (pp. 343b–344a). See also p. 299 “Greek New Testament texts” for p. 351b “Exemplaires Grecs du Nouveau Testament,” or p. 298 “three criteria for deciding which texts are better” for p. 350a “trois qualités qui nous doivent faire preferer un Exemplaire à un autre”: Simon has manuscripts in mind. Further p. 299 “some scriptural discrepancy” for p. 352 “de la difference dans les Exemplaires.”

<sup>36</sup> E.g. p. 287 (p. 338b).

<sup>37</sup> E.g. p. 287 (p. 338b).

<sup>38</sup> *Pace* Paul Foster, who in a short review wrote that “Hunwick’s translation is clear throughout and faithful to Simon’s original text” (*ExpTim* 125 [2013], pp. 95b–96a, p. 96a).

<sup>39</sup> p. \* 2<sup>v</sup> “On a fait justice à ce Pere.”

- [32] “Celsus, who was constantly urging Christians to alter their Gospels” (p. 4):<sup>40</sup> however the French means that Celsus *held against* the Christians that they constantly changed their Gospels.
- [33] “... persons who have dared to falsify Scripture, such as the Sophists, whose false doctrine derived solely from philosophy” (p. 4):<sup>41</sup> (1) the false impression is given that Simon sees the sophists as engaged in the corruption of Scripture; (2) the final phrase has been translated beyond recognition; the idea is that the sophists have a false doctrine which *cannot* be derived from true philosophy.
- [34] “... if St Matthew really were the author in the title of the Gospel” (p. 12):<sup>42</sup> Simon’s entire discussion, for several pages, is about the origin of the Gospel titles. The phrase should therefore be “if St Matthew really were the author *of* the title of his Gospel.”
- [35] “... saying interpretations had been made by defenders of Judaism” (p. 13):<sup>43</sup> Simon’s source speaks about *interpolations*, not “interpretations.”
- [36] “Although religion is the standard governing basis” (p. 34):<sup>44</sup> Simon writes “Ecriture” (“Scripture”), not “religion.”
- [37] “The Ebionites, who use solely the Gospel according to Matthew, were convinced that it was by Matthew himself” (p. 75):<sup>45</sup> for once, a quote given by Simon is included, this one being a rather famous one by Irenaeus; however “convincuntur” does not mean “they were convinced” (and even then the Latin should be something like “Evangelium ... ab illo ipso esse”) but “they are refuted,” thus: “The Ebionites ... *are refuted on the basis of that same Gospel.*”
- [38] Mark and John are said to “both present Jesus as the son of David” (p. 84):<sup>46</sup> yet the French has a negation which is missing in the translation; it should be “both *do not present* Jesus as the son of David.”
- [39] The title of chapter 10 contains the following: “Greek Manuscript Copies of St Mark Cited in this Regard. His Gospel ...” (p. 87);<sup>47</sup> however “Mark” is a new subject, not related to the preceding; a correct translation would be “Some Greek Manuscripts Cited in this Regard. St Mark. His Gospel ...”
- [40] In a complicated passage on Eusebius and Papias, Simon is said to observe that “Christopherson did not translate the phrase thus in his Latin version, as he believed that the Greek μετὰ δὲ τὴν τούτων ἔξοδον should be *quo edito* in Latin” (p. 91).<sup>48</sup> Several things went awry here. The wrong Greek phrase was copy-pasted from an earlier passage. It should be μετὰ τούτων ἔκδοσιν, not μετὰ δὲ τὴν τούτων ἔξοδον. Somehow a Latin element was added which is not found in the French. All in all the point made here by Simon is completely missed, namely that Christopherson bases his translation (“Quo ... edito”) on a different Greek text (probably a conjecture), with τούτων ἔκδοσιν instead of τούτων ἔξοδον. A correct translation would be “... as he believed that the Greek *should be* μετὰ τούτων ἔκδοσιν.”

<sup>40</sup> p. 5b “Celse, qui a objecté autrefois aux Chrétiens de changer tous les jours leurs Evangiles.”

<sup>41</sup> p. 6a “ceux qui ont osé le corrompre. Il apporte l'exemple des Sophistes, dont la fausse doctrine ne peut pas être attribuée à la véritable Philosophie.”

<sup>42</sup> p. 15b “quand même il seroit vray que Saint Matthieu est l'auteur du titre de son Evangile.”

<sup>43</sup> p. 17a “il disoit *avoir esté interpolé par ceux qui autorisoient le Judaïsme.*”

<sup>44</sup> p. 38a “Quoy que l'Ecriture soit la regle de droit.”

<sup>45</sup> p. 87b “Ebionaei ... *eo Evangelio, quod est secundum Matthaeum, solo utentes, ex illo ipso convincuntur.*”

<sup>46</sup> p. 99a “conviennent en ce qu'ils ne font point Jesus fils de David.”

<sup>47</sup> p. 101a “On produit là-dessus quelques Exemplaires Grecs MSS. De Saint Marc. De son Evangile ...” Apparently the first “De” (“About”) was read as “de” (“of”).

<sup>48</sup> p. 106a “Christopherson ne les a point exprimés dans sa Version Latine, ayant crû qu'il falloit lire dans le Grec μετὰ τούτων ἔκδοσιν.”

- [41] On p. 103 the long ending of Mark is described as “the words ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ and so on till the end of the Gospel.”<sup>49</sup> This will be a copy-paste error: the original has ἀναστὰς δέ, not ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ.
- [42] “Tertullian then says the true authority of the Gospel of St Luke is the universal consensus of the Churches founded by the apostles” (p. 110):<sup>50</sup> however the issue is the *form* of the Gospel (against Marcion), not its authority. A correct translation would be: “Tertullian then shows that the *true* Gospel of St Luke *is based on* the universal consensus ...”
- [43] “Tertullian further relies on this semi-ecclesiastical tradition” (p. 110):<sup>51</sup> probably somewhere “same” became “semi”; a correct translation is “... relies on this *same* ecclesiastical tradition.”
- [44] Marcion is said to resist the idea “that Jesus had called his Father δημιουργός ‘the creator’” (p. 112):<sup>52</sup> the translation however inverts the meaning (and omits “Christ”). It should be “that Jesus Christ has called the δημιουργός or “creator” his Father.”
- [45] In the context of the Eusebian canons, or tables, surprisingly the word “Canticles” is used (p. 128).<sup>53</sup> This blunder is hard to understand, as elsewhere the correct term “Eusebian canons” occurs (p. 128 n. 43).
- [46] In the context of Marcion’s text of Gal 5:9 it is said of Codex Claromontanus that “the reading is corrupt” (p. 138); however the French has “on lit δολοῖ” (p. 160b), which in translation could be “the reading is δολοῖ (*corrupts*).”
- [47] A reading in 1 Cor 14:19 is said to be “as in today’s Greek churches” (p. 139):<sup>54</sup> was “Eglises” read instead of “Exemplaires”? In any case it should be “as in the Greek *manuscripts* we possess today.”
- [48] On the authorship of Hebrews according to the Western Church, Simon is said to remark that “the authority of these western writers must not be discounted” (p. 148):<sup>55</sup> “not” is wrong.
- [49] Simon is said to comment on Augustine and the letter to the Hebrews: “Here indubitably this church Father was not referring to Catholic writers” (p. 154):<sup>56</sup> again “not” is wrong.
- [50] Part of the title of chapter 18 is “The impossibility of proving that the text of St Cyprian contained” 1 John 5:7 (p. 173).<sup>57</sup> Simon however explicitly refers to *the manuscript used by Cyprian*. The translation loses this aspect.
- [51] According to the translation Simon states that “Erasmus ... had also consulted the manuscripts used by St Jerome” (p. 176):<sup>58</sup> that would be nice; however what is meant is manuscripts *of* Jerome’s works; after all, Erasmus published a Jerome edition.
- [52] “Erasmus was one of the first to take the opportunity of omitting the passage” (p. 183):<sup>59</sup> however Simon is speaking about later Greek editions that omit the Comma Johanneum; in his view these editions simply follow earlier editions, such as the first two by Erasmus, and as such have no critical value; thus the absence of the Comma in Erasmus’s 1516 and 1519 editions *gave* them that opportunity.

<sup>49</sup> p. 120a “ces mots ἀναστὰς δέ et le reste jusqu’à la fin de l’Evangile.”

<sup>50</sup> p. 127b “Tertullien établit ensuite le véritable Evangile de St. Luc sur le consentement universel des Eglises fondées par les Apôtres.”

<sup>51</sup> p. 127 “Il s’appuie de plus sur cette même tradition des Eglises.”

<sup>52</sup> p. 130a “que Jesus-Christ avoit appelé le δημιουργός ou *Createur*, son Pere.”

<sup>53</sup> pp. 149b–150a “Canons”; the same blunder occurs on p. 128/p. 150a (2x) and p. 129/p. 150b.

<sup>54</sup> p. 161a “comme il y a dans les Exemplaires Grecs d’aujourd’huy.”

<sup>55</sup> p. 172b “on doit compter pour rien l’autorité de ces Ecrivains Occidentaux.”

<sup>56</sup> p. 182a “Or il est certain que ce Pere parle en ce lieu-là d’Auteurs Catholiques.”

<sup>57</sup> p. 203a “On ne peut point prouver que St. Cyprien ait lû ce même passage ... dans son Exemplaire.”

<sup>58</sup> p. 206b “Erasmus ... qui avoit de plus consulté les Livres MSS. de Saint Jérôme.”

<sup>59</sup> p. 216a “Erasmus est un des premiers qui ait donné occasion à l’omission de ce verset.”

- [53] The title of chapter 29 begins as follows: “Overall view of Greek Manuscripts, including sources already mentioned” (p. 285):<sup>60</sup> however the French means: “On Greek manuscript copies in general, *and on those who have spoken about them.*”
- [54] About the text of Stephanus’s 1550 edition Simon is said to state that “one is spared the trouble of consulting the latter” (p. 288).<sup>61</sup> However he is making the point that thanks to the marginal apparatus included in the 1550 edition the reader can freely adopt one of the variant readings. Thus the French means “one is *not forced to keep to it* [i.e. Stephanus’s text].”
- [55] On p. 297 Simon quotes Ambrosiaster: “We should, he says, approach Greek codices as if they did not vary from each other.”<sup>62</sup> Here Ambrosiaster’s words as well as Simon’s intention in quoting them have been misunderstood. The idea is: “This way they [our opponents] want to make us trust the Greek manuscripts, as if these do not vary from each other.” Ambrosiaster dismisses the Greek reading in Rom 5:14, and Simon uses his general remark as an example of the long tradition that prefers the textual quality of the Vulgate over the Greek transmission.
- [56] Chapter 32 begins as follows: “Our libraries hold quite a number of Greek manuscript sources for the New Testament, referred to and used by Greek scholars” (p. 333).<sup>63</sup> Simon however does not speak about scholars, but about Greeks in general; moreover the verb he uses, “décrire,” here and elsewhere means “to copy,” not “to refer to” or “to describe” (though the latter is the more common meaning). Thus the final part of the sentence should be “*copied and used by Greeks.*” Besides, it would be more to the point to simply translate “Greek *manuscripts of the New Testament.*”
- [57] “It may be also that the text of Stephanus’s edition, based on comparisons with several Greek manuscripts held in Italy, also contains readings from those same corrupt sources, including the Old Latin version” (p. 334):<sup>64</sup> hopefully Simon will never be quoted as having said this. A correct rendering would be: “It may also be that *one of Stephanus’s manuscripts, the one collated in Italy from several Greek manuscripts,* also contains readings ...” The reference is to one of the 15 manuscripts readings of which are listed in Stephanus’s 1550 edition (siglum β), and in fact it concerns none other than Codex Bezae (which Simon did not know).<sup>65</sup>
- [58] On the Ammonian section numbers as printed in Erasmus’s editions and in Stephanus’s *Editio regia*, Simon speaks in translation about “the canons to which they correspond being indicated by a Roman numeral” (pp. 361–362);<sup>66</sup> here “Roman” is added to Simon’s text, which is wrong: in the editions mentioned the Eusebian canon numbers are invariably indicated with Greek numerals.<sup>67</sup>
- [59] A huge amount of energy, travel time and letter writing must have gone into the annotations. The most useful part is found in the full titles of the many sixteenth- and seventeenth-century works used by Simon. For such books Hunwick often mentions their BnF shelf marks as well,

<sup>60</sup> p. 336a “Des Exemplaires Grecs MSS. en general, et de ceux qui en ont parlé.” The translation would be correct if the French had “... et de ceux [= et de ces Exemplaires ] dont on a [déjà] parlé.”

<sup>61</sup> p. 340b “on n’est pas obligé de s’y arrester.”

<sup>62</sup> pp. 349b–350a “*Sic praescribitur nobis, dit-il, de Graecis codicibus quasi non ipsi ab invicem discrepent.*”

<sup>63</sup> p. 392b “On trouve dans nos Bibliothèques un assez grand nombre d’Exemplaires Grecs du Nouveau Testament qui ont été décrits par des Grecs, et qui ont servy à leurs usages.”

<sup>64</sup> p. 394a “Il se peut faire de plus, que l’Exemplaire d’Estienne qui avoit été conferé en Italie sur plusieurs Manuscrits Grecs, contienne aussi quelques leçons de ces mêmes Exemplaires qui avoient esté retouchés, et auxquels on avoit joint l’ancienne Version Latine.”

<sup>65</sup> Simon is actually mistaken, for it concerns only one manuscript consulted in Italy.

<sup>66</sup> p. 427b “Les Canons auxquels ces sections répondent sont marqués par d’autres lettres.”

<sup>67</sup> For correctness’s sake: there are no section and canon numbers in Erasmus’s first edition (1516); further Simon mentions that Stephanus’s edition distinguishes section numbers from canon numbers by putting a small line above the former; the same is actually already done in Erasmus’s editions as well.

which is not necessary, but may stand as homage to the services rendered by the Bibliothèque nationale de France.

- [60] The annotation of a seventeenth-century text implies a fair share of detective work, which deserves admiration precisely because its results may seem so marginal. Inevitably some things could have been done better. If possible the very editions Simon consulted could have been referred to, not other, mostly later editions which he did not use or could not even know because they did not yet exist. Beza for example is mostly consulted in the 1642 Cambridge edition, but Simon himself used one or more of the original major editions.
- [61] Somewhat embarrassing are cases where the translator detects an error committed by Simon or someone else, and states so or applies a “sic,” when it turns out that in most cases the error lies elsewhere.
- [62] Such a “sic” is found on p. 128 n. 40 (“*potius Ammonij [sic]*”); it is however unnecessary, as “ij” is a common typographical way of spelling “ii” in Latin.
- [63] In n. 19 on p. 91 the following information is given: “Marginal note reads Ch. [*sic*] Τὴν ἔκδοσιν (“desisting”).” This marginal note indeed occurs in the 1612 edition of Christopherson’s text and translation of Eusebius’s *Hist. eccl.* (see the reference given in the same footnote), but it actually reads “Ch. τούτων ἔκδοσιν.” Moreover, there is no reason for a “[*sic*]”: “Ch.” stands for “Christopherson,” who apparently made a conjecture on Eusebius’s Greek text here.<sup>68</sup>
- [64] In n. 11 on p. 202 the comment is given that “Seemingly in error, R. Simon reads כרבה,” but Simon’s p. 239a has the correct ברמה;<sup>69</sup> the only problem may be that the left arm of the *mem* is very thin.
- [65] On p. 205 Simon writes—in translation—“τά [*sic*; τὰ] τέκνα αὐτοῦ *her sons*”;<sup>70</sup> the footnote (n. 22) comments: “Actually *his* sons (or “his children”).” Well of course, but the French “ses enfants” can denote both “his sons” and “her sons,” so the translation could have been the former to begin with.
- [66] On p. 219 Simon speaks about changes “depending on the whim of the copyists who, as the mood took them [*sic!*], ...”: why did the translator add this “[*sic!*]”? If he did not agree with Simon a footnote could have been given.
- [67] On p. 257 Simon mentions Henricus Stephanus’s well-known essay on the style of the New Testament authors. Yet the annotation states that “Simon mistakenly refers to Henri, the eldest son of Robert Estienne” (p. 257 n. 1). No: Simon is correct and the annotation is mistaken. Simon even explicitly refers to Henricus Stephanus’s 1576 edition in which the essay was published for the first time (see p. 303b marginal note), but this reference is replaced by a nonsensical reference to Robertus Stephanus’s famous 1550 edition (p. 257 n. 2).<sup>71</sup> The mistake is actually odd, for the 1576 edition is referred to elsewhere (p. xvii n. 11), even accompanied by such information that should have precluded the error.
- [68] In n. 5 on p. 287 it is stated that Valla did not cite Latin manuscripts in his New Testament annotations, in spite of Simon’s remarks and of the title given by Erasmus. The latter mentions manuscripts in “both languages” (i.e. Latin and Greek). Simon is correct in following Erasmus: Valla explicitly refers to his use of various Latin manuscripts, for instance in his annotation on Matt 27:22.<sup>72</sup>

<sup>68</sup> The translation (?) “desisting” is elusive. Furthermore, “quo quidem edito” does not mean “when this had been proclaimed” (p. 91 n. 10); μετὰ τὴν τούτων ἔκδοσιν (as well as “quo quidem edito” in this context) means “after their publication.”

<sup>69</sup> In the second edition (p. 167) the Hebrew is also correct.

<sup>70</sup> p. 242a “τέκνα αὐτοῦ, *ses enfans*.” τὰ is added in the translation.

<sup>71</sup> The reference to p. 21 of the 1550 edition (p. 257 n. 3) is also void; the words cited by Simon (p. 304a n. (a); not taken over in the translation) actually occur on p. \*\* vii” of the 1576 edition.

<sup>72</sup> See p. 69 in the 1526 Basel edition referred to by Simon and Hunwick.

- [69] In Rom 11:6 part of the textual tradition has a long addition. In this context Simon writes about “Erasmus, inclining towards the standard reading” (p. 328);<sup>73</sup> the translation is acceptable, but it muddles the historical perspective: Simon does not speak about a “standard” reading, but about the “old” one. This “old” reading is the short one, found in the Vulgate, and the “new” one is the long one introduced with Erasmus’s edition. The annotation (p. 328 n. 35) suggests that Simon is wrong just because the Textus Receptus includes the addition, and Hunwick wonders: “Does R. Simon mean Erasmus was inclined to *omit* the words?” Indeed he (Simon) does and indeed he (Erasmus) was, as the *Annotationes* show (see ASD VI-7, p. 264). Whereas most of the time Erasmus simply had the Greek text printed from the Basel manuscripts, he could indicate doubt and other preferences in his annotations.
- [70] On p. 345 Simon informs his readers that in Matt 16:17 “Junius also included Ἰωvva in the Greek edition of Wekel”;<sup>74</sup> the accompanying note 53 states that “R. Simon’s memory plays him false,” as the edition referred to (F. Junius, 1597) simply has Βὰρ Ἰωvã as its text (it actually has βὰρ ἰωvã). However its *apparatus*, referred to by note number 7 in the text, contains the note “al. ἰωávva” (i.e. “other manuscripts have ἰωávva”), and that information is obviously what Simon refers to.
- [71] On p. 347, when Simon states about Matt 23:14 that “the Louvain scholars also cite ten manuscripts which do not include it,” the annotation (n. 65) asks whether Simon had a “mis-recollection,” as such references cannot be found in the French Louvain Bibles of 1550 and 1573. They can be found in the *Latin* revised Louvain Bibles of 1583, 1584 or 1590.<sup>75</sup>
- [72] All in all the current reviewer’s conclusions about this book are mainly negative.
- [73] Simon’s text and the translator’s interventions are not clearly distinguished in at least four respects: (1) the structure of the book has Simon’s own preface put before the modern introduction; (2) Simon’s original footnotes are updated, shortened or even left out at will, and end up at the same level as the translator’s own footnotes; (3) on some occasions the translator introduces fresh information directly into the translation; (4) citations included by Simon are left out in the translation, without notice, and sometimes even with an adaptation of Simon’s words in order to preserve the coherence of the text.
- [74] There are serious problems of terminology, notably one that confuses exegesis and textual criticism. The translation, though fluent, lacks precision and contains too many imprecisions, errors, and even blunders, both through misunderstanding of Simon’s text and through inadvertence. The translator’s introduction is not well balanced, and fails to properly introduce the work itself. The annotations, on which a considerable amount of energy must have been spent, are often useful but just as often anachronistic. They also contain some serious errors.
- [75] Overall the impression prevails that the magnitude of the task was underestimated. Simon’s critical work on the history of the biblical text indeed “deserves a wider audience,” but with this edition such an audience is being led astray. Scholars will do well to refrain from citing this English translation or referring to it. They should better use the original French edition instead. Every contribution to the history of New Testament scholarship deserves to be welcomed, but in its current form this book should never have been published.

*Jan Krans*  
*VU University, Amsterdam*

<sup>73</sup> p. 388b “Erasmus neanmoins est pour l’ancienne leçon.”

<sup>74</sup> Ἰωvva should be ἰωávva (see p. 408b).

<sup>75</sup> The same applies to the doubt about Simon’s reference to “fifteen manuscripts” cited on p. 350 (see p. 350 n. 82).

## Appendix: Errata

- [76] In every book, every article, and every review oversights occur. A misspelled word, a sentence gone astray after too much editing, it just happens and the phenomenon can never be completely remedied. The current book indeed contains a fair number of such expressions of human frailty. They are duly noted below as far as they were detected, if only out of a sense of duty and service.
- [77] In two respects however the book betrays the standard that could reasonably be expected from a publication at this price, in this series, from this publisher, and with such scholarly aspirations.
- [78] First, the numerous cross-references (mostly from footnote to footnote) are more often wrong than correct for two reasons: (1) at an earlier stage the footnote numbering did not yet restart at the beginning of each chapter, and several references from that stage were never updated; (2) when during the task footnotes were added to the chapters, the footnote numbers changed but the references were not updated. One could also state that there is actually just a single reason: no computer-assisted cross-references were used.<sup>76</sup>

p. xvii n. 10 *infra*, ch. 30 nn. 1–5, and especially n. 5 ] *infra*, ch. 30 nn. 3–7, and especially n. 7 {pp. 306–307}

p. xvii n. 11 *supra*, ch. 17 n. 534 ] *infra*, ch. 17. n. 16 {p. 163}

p. xxii n. 19 *infra* ch. 29 n. 5 ] *infra*, ch. 29 n. 15 {p. 289}

p. xxxvi l. 4 *infra*, Preface, nn. 45, 46 ] *supra*, Preface, nn. 2, 3 {p. xv}

p. 17 n. 24 *infra*, ch. 16 n. 34 ] *infra*, ch. 16 n. 32 {p. 155}

p. 21 n. 13 *supra*, ch. 3 n. 30 ] *infra*, ch. 3. n. 30 {p. 24}

p. 31 l. 1 *infra*, ch. 7 nn. 233, 258 ] *infra*, ch. 7 nn. 10, 37 {pp. 64, 71}

p. 48 l. 32 ch. 7 nn. 244–246 ] ch. 7 nn. 22–24 {p. 67}

p. 67 n. 26 *supra*, n. 245 ] *supra*, n. 23 {on the same page}

p. 75 n. 1 *supra*, n. 9 ] *infra*, n. 9

p. 126 n. 33 *supra*, ch. 11 n. 31 ] *supra*, ch. 11. n. 23 {p. 104}

p. 138 n. 4 *supra*, ch. 15 n. 19 ] *infra*, n. 19 {in the same chapter 15; p. 142}

p. 138 n. 9 *infra*, ch. 30 n. 4 ] *infra*, ch. 30 n. 8 {p. 307; or ch. 10 n. 6; or ch. 31 n. 5; or ch. 31 *in toto*}

p. 155 n. 32 *supra*, ch. 2 n. 23 ] *supra*, ch. 2 n. 24 {p. 17}

p. 160 n. 4 See *supra*, ch. 13 n. 32 of the present work ] See *supra*, ch. 13 n. 45 {p. 129}

p. 180 n. 20 *supra*, n. 578 ] ?

p. 183 n. 32 *infra*, ch. 20 n. 13 ] *infra*, ch. 20 n. 14 {pp. 202–203}

p. 184 n. 38 *supra*, ch. 13 n. 34 ] *supra*, ch. 13 n. 47 {pp. 129–130}

p. 204 n. 21 *infra*, n. 666 ] *infra*, ch. 21 n. 7 {p. 211}

p. 211 n. 7 *supra*, ch. 13 n. 14 ] *supra*, ch. 13 n. 27 {p. 125}

p. 211 n. 8 *supra*, n. 666 ] *supra*, n. 7 {in fact the preceding note on the same page}

p. 224 n. 30 *supra* n. 709 ] *supra* n. 27 {p. 223}

p. 233 n. 9 *infra*, ch. 26 n. 13 ] *infra*, ch. 25 n. 7 {p. 254; or ch. 23 n. 11 (p. 234)}

p. 258 n. 6 *supra*, ch. 2 n. 13 ] *supra*, ch. 2 n. 14 {p. 13}

p. 273 n. 15 *supra* nn. 642–643 of present work ] *supra* ch. 20 nn. 5–6 {p. 199}

p. 288 n. 10 *supra*, ch. 20 n. 13 of the present work ] *supra*, ch. 20 n. 14 {pp. 202–203}

p. 294 n. 34 *supra*, ch. 20 n. 13 ] *supra*, ch. 20 n. 14 {pp. 202–203}

p. 295 n. 36 *supra*, n. 25 ] *supra*, n. 26 {p. 292}

p. 296 n. 45 *supra*, n. 2 ] *supra*, n. 3 {p. 286}

p. 301 n. 61 *supra*, ch. 10 n. 1 ] *supra*, ch. 10 n. 2 {p. 87}

<sup>76</sup> There is also something peculiar in the use of the cross-references: the reference to a footnote often actually stands for a reference to the text to which that footnote was added. Perhaps this practice was adopted to preclude the confusion occasioned by ever-changing page numbers, but it did not help very much.

- p. 301 n. 62 *supra*, ... ch. 12 n. 24 ] *supra*, ... ch. 12 n. 25 {p. 114}  
 p. 309 n. 11 *infra*, ch. 33 n. 31 ] *infra*, ch. 33 n. 32 {p. 361}  
 p. 313 n. 24 *supra*, ch. 29 n. 11 ] *supra*, ch. 29 n. 12 {p. 289}  
 p. 319 n. 2 *supra*, ch. 30 n. 12 ] *supra*, ch. 30 n. 9 {p. 307}  
 p. 320 n. 5 *infra*, n. 962 ] ? {probably n. 8 (pp. 320–321)}  
 p. 334 n. 4 *supra*, ch. 29 n. 10 ] *supra*, ch. 4 n. 8 {p. 35}  
 p. 356 n. 9 *infra*, n. 1102 ] ? {probably n. 19 (p. 358)}  
 p. 360 n. 28 *supra*, n. 1097 ] ? {perhaps “*infra*, n. 35” (p. 361)}  
 p. 361 n. 35 *supra*, n. 27 ] *supra*, n. 28 {p. 360}  
 p. 363 n. 41 *supra*, n. 12 ] *supra*, n. 13 {p. 357}  
 p. 363 n. 42 *supra*, n. 28 ] *supra*, n. 29 {p. 360}

[79] Second, Greek has been treated poorly. Not only is the present-day general principle not followed according to which the final word of a Greek phrase always has the acute accent instead of grave,<sup>77</sup> but there are many other errors as well.

- p. 37 l. 4 ὡς ] ὡσει {see Simon, p. 41b}  
 p. 111 l. 24 ἐν αὐτῶν ] ἐν αὐτοῖς {correct in n. 21}  
 p. 113 l. 30 κρατοθμένους ] κρατουμένους  
 p. 116 ll. 10–11 ἐφ’ οἷς ] ἐφ’ οἷς {also l. 13}  
 p. 127 l. 22 ἐξομολογουμένην ] ἐξομολογουμένων {see p. 149a}  
 p. 128 n. 43 κανόνης ] κανόνες  
 p. 141 l. 5 καθῶς ] καθῶς  
 p. 164 n. 20 Διαφήκη ] Διαθήκη {also p. 359 n. 24}  
 p. 174 l. 24 πνεύματος ] πνεύματος  
 p. 205 l. 1 τὰ ] τὰ  
 p. 211 l. 23 δυνάμι ] δυνάμει  
 p. 213 l. 25 καλέσευσεις ] καλέσεις {also p. 213 n. 14 and p. 214 l. 4}  
 p. 220 l. 37 μυστικῆ θεωρία ] μυστικὴ θεωρία<sup>78</sup>  
 p. 227 l. 9 διαφθοράν ] διαφθορά  
 p. 235 l. 14 θεόπνευστος ] θεόπνευστος  
 p. 252 l. 12 ἔχειν ] ἔχειν  
 p. 258 n. 5 τό ] τὸ  
 p. 291 n. 20 Ἡ Καινῆς Δαιθήκης ] Ἡ Καινὴ Διαθήκη  
 p. 323 l. 26 κληπτοῖς ] κλητοῖς  
 p. 324 l. 6 ἄσπονδους ] ἀσπόνδους  
 p. 324 ll. 18–19 ὀνόσαν ] ἐνόησαν  
 p. 324 n. 19 ἐνοησαν ] ἐνόησαν {or ενοησαν}  
 p. 326 l. 31 ἀμαρτήματος ] ἀμαρτήματος  
 p. 326 l. 33 σικαίωμα ] δικαίωμα  
 p. 327 l. 28 γραφήν ] γραφήν  
 p. 328 l. 25 ΚΥ ] ΚΩ {the original also has an abbreviation bar}  
 p. 330 l. 17 ἀναφύξω ] ἀναψύξω  
 p. 334 l. 34 Ἰακείμ: ] Ἰακείμ  
 p. 334 l. 36 Ἰωακείμ ] Ἰωακείμ  
 p. 335 l. 17 Ἰακείμ ] Ἰακίμ {Simon takes over Beza’s orthography (p. 395b), but it is “normalized” in the translation}

<sup>77</sup> Thus p. 111 l. 11 δὲ should be δέ; similarly p. 111 l. 29 μετὰ; p. 112 l. 8 αὐτοῦς; p. 113 l. 19 πατήρ; p. 114 l. 14 Ἰερουσαλήμ; 115 l. 12 πατήρ; p. 157 l. 2 αὐτὸν; p. 159 l. 12 καθολικαί; p. 174 l. 20 θεός; p. 174 l. 24 πατρός; p. 202 l. 9 Ραμὰ; p. 325 n. 23 κοινή; p. 326 l. 9 περιτομήν; p. 327 l. 10 γὰρ and δέ; p. 330 l. 29 ὑπὲρ; p. 331 l. 12 ἦ; p. 334 l. 34 Ἰακείμ; p. 335 l. 1 Ἰακείμ; p. 338 l. 2 διὰ; p. 343 l. 9 διὰ; p. 343 l. 11 διὰ; p. 344 l. 21; p. 344 l. 31 δέ; ἐπτά; p. 347 l. 9 καί; p. 347 l. 9 ἦ (2x); p. 347 l. 11 ἦ; p. 348 l. 28 αὐλήν; p. 350 l. 21 νυκτός; p. 360 l. 27 ἀρχή.

<sup>78</sup> Simon’s text has μυστικὴν θεωρίαν because the Greek case is applied according to the grammatical function in the French sentence; the current practice is to simply use the nominative case.

- p. 335 l. 18 ἐγέννησεν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸν Ἰεχονίαν ] ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἰεχονίαν  
 p. 345 l. 10 Ἰωννα ] Ἰωάννα  
 p. 354 l. 28 ἔν ὃ γέγονεν ] ἔν ὃ γέγονεν  
 p. 359 l. 6 τίτλους ] τίτλοι<sup>79</sup>  
 p. 359 l. 6 κεφάλια ] κεφάλαια {also l. 27; p. 360 l. 3; l. 15; p. 361 l. 20}  
 p. 359 l. 7 κεφάλιον ] κεφάλαιον {also l. 11; p. 360 l. 7; l. 11; p. 361 l. 13; but correct on p. 359 n. 25}  
 p. 360 l. 21 Ἀναστὰς ] Ἀναστὰς {also l. 24}  
 p. 361 l. 10 σμά(241) ] σμα´ (241) {similarly p. 362 l. 19 σλέ(235) instead of σλε´ (235) and p. 359 l. 22 ξή (instead of ξη´)}

[80] On a minor note, there is some inconsistency in the use of ligatures; e.g. Oecumenius (p. 269 ll. 1.3 and n. 5) and C̄ecumenius (p. 363 l. 12 and n. 40).; *Oeuvres* (p. xxxiii n. 41) and C̄euvres (p. xxxi n. 34 and p. 232 n. 6).

- [81] p. xvi l. 7 East ] West  
 p. xxvi n. 7 biobiobliographic ] biobibliographic  
 p. xxvii l. 20 squabble in 1609 ] ... 1669  
 p. xxxi l. 16 made very attempt ] made every attempt  
 p. 5 l. 8 most Western Churches ] most Eastern Churches  
 p. 15 l. 35 seems to means ] seems to mean  
 p. 21 l. 18 *Vulgate* ] *Vulgate*  
 p. 30 n. 63 *zir* ] *zur*  
 p. 40 l. 5 Solicia ] Cilicia  
 p. 57 l. 35 *Sedor* ] *Seder*  
 p. 103 l. 1 notbly ] notably  
 p. 137 l. 26 Colossians ] Galatians  
 p. 157 l. 3 *faithful from* ] *faithful to*  
 p. 164 l. 1 Simon Colines ] Simon de Colines {correct in the footnote}  
 p. 182 l. 15 1 John ] 1John {also p. 176 n. 6; p. 178 l. 6; p. 184 n. 38; the use of “1 John” alongside “1John” is inconsistent, though a space is actually preferable}  
 p. 185 n. 39 *cités* ] *citez*  
 p. 193 l. 21 Justine ] Justin  
 p. 202 n. 13 Complutensis Polyglot ] Complutensian Polyglot  
 p. 219 l. 17 *aluph* ] *aluphe* {also l. 22}  
 p. 205 l. 1 בניו ] בניו  
 p. 222 l. 22 Paraleipomenon ] Paraleipomena {or “Paralipomena”; perhaps “Chronicles” would have been better here}  
 p. 225 l. 21 *a Prophet like unto me* ] *a Prophet like me*  
 p. 227 l. 6 *shiycha* ] *shachat* {the untranscribed Hebrew, added compared to Simon’s original text (p. 269a), is correct}  
 p. 229 l. 22 Paraleipomenes ] Paraleipomena {or Paralipomena}  
 p. 232 l. 12 the apostles writings ] the apostles’ writings  
 p. 286 l. 8 most western churches ] most Eastern Churches  
 p. 299 ll. 18–20 scriptural texts ... was ] scriptural texts ... were  
 p. 303 l. 16 the Western versions ] the Eastern versions  
 p. 335 l. 4 Simon de Coline ] Simon de Colines {a printer’s error in the original, p. 395}  
 p. 337 ll. 1–7 {the paragraph is a citation by Jerome, but that is not obvious in the translation}

<sup>79</sup> Simon puts the word in the accusative case, because it is the direct object in his French sentence (p. 424a-b: “On appelloit ... les grandes sections τίτλους”); as said above such a practice is not followed any longer today.

- p. 338: ch. XXX ] ch. 30 {compare p. 104 n. 22; p. 296 n. 39}  
p. 344 l. 31 *being answered* ] *answering* {ἀποκριθεῖς is from a deponent verb}  
p. 351 n. 83: *Testament* ] *Testament*,  
p. 363 l. 4 Mariana ] Mariano {it concerns Mariano Vittori, mentioned on p. 362}

### **Version history**

16 June 2014: corrections made to the version published 10 June 2014:

- p. 1 § 4 *du Nouveau Testament* ] *du texte du Nouveau Testament*  
p. 3 § 14 unfamiliar ] unfamiliar  
p. 11 § 64 {Hebrew font was missing}