

The Future of New Testament Textual Scholarship

Edited by
GARRICK V. ALLEN

*Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament*

Mohr Siebeck

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament

Herausgeber / Editor

Jörg Frey (Zürich)

Mitherausgeber / Associate Editors

Markus Bockmuehl (Oxford) · James A. Kelhoffer (Uppsala)
Tobias Nicklas (Regensburg) · Janet Spittler (Charlottesville, VA)
J. Ross Wagner (Durham, NC)

417



The Future of New Testament Textual Scholarship

From H. C. Hoskier to the Editio Critica Maior
and Beyond

Edited by
Garrick V. Allen

Mohr Siebeck

GARRICK V. ALLEN, born 1988; 2015 PhD; Lecturer in New Testament Studies at Dublin City University, Republic of Ireland.
orcid.org/0000-0003-4428-1775

ISBN 978-3-16-156662-2 / eISBN 978-3-16-156663-9
DOI 10.1628/978-3-16-156663-9

ISSN 0512-1604 / eISSN 2568-7476
(Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament)

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2019 Mohr Siebeck Tübingen, Germany. www.mohrsiebeck.com

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was printed on non-aging paper by Gulde Druck in Tübingen, and bound by Großbuchbinderei Spinner in Ottersweier.

Printed in Germany.

Table of Contents

Preface.....	IX
--------------	----

Intellectual History of Textual Scholarship

Garrick V. Allen

The Patient Collator and the Philology of the Beyond:

H. C. Hoskier and the New Testament	3
-------------------------------------------	---

Juan Hernández Jr.

Hoskier's Contribution to the Apocalypse's Textual History:

Collations, Polyglots, Groupings.....	39
---------------------------------------	----

Martin Karrer

Herman Charles Hoskier and the Textual Criticism of Revelation.....	51
---------------------------------------------------------------------	----

Jan Krans

Hoskier in the Spiritual World	69
--------------------------------------	----

Jennifer Wright Knust

On Textual Nostalgia: Herman C. Hoskier's Collation of Evangelium 604

(London, British Library Egerton 2610; GA 700) Revisited.....	79
---------------------------------------------------------------	----

Peter J. Gurry

'A Book Worth Publishing': The Making of Westcott and Hort's

Greek New Testament (1881)	103
----------------------------------	-----

The Status Quaestionis and Future of Textual Scholarship

Stanley E. Porter

The Domains of Textual Criticism and the Future of Textual Scholarship....	131
----------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

Gregory Peter Fewster

Finding Your Place: Developing Cross-reference Systems
in Late Antique Biblical Codices 155

Christina M. Kreinecker

Papyrology, Papyrological Commentary, and the Future
of New Testament Textual Scholarship 181

Jacob W. Peterson

Patterns of Correction as Paratext: A New Approach with Papyrus 46
as a Test Case..... 201

Dirk Jongkind

Redactional Elements in the Text of Codex B 231

H. A. G. Houghton

The Garland of Howth (Vetus Latina 28): A Neglected Old Latin
Witness in Matthew..... 247

Curt Niccum

Hoskier and His (Per)Version of the Ethiopic..... 265

Thomas J. Kraus

Ostraca and Talismans: The Story of Two Former Text-Critical
Categories and What to do with Them Today..... 283

An-Ting Yi

The Critical Apparatus of Stephanus' Greek New Testament of 1550:
Early Printed Editions and Textual Scholarship..... 305

Tommy Wasserman

Methods of Evaluating Textual Relationships: From Bengel
to the CBGM and Beyond..... 333

J. K. Elliott

Thoroughgoing Eclectic Textual Criticism: Manuscripts and Variants
of Revelation..... 363

Jill Unkel

Speaking in Tongues: Collecting the Chester Beatty Biblical Manuscripts... 379

Editing the New Testament in a Digital Age

<i>D. C. Parker</i> The Future of the Critical Edition	395
<i>Catherine Smith</i> Old Wine, New Wineskins: Digital Tools for Editing the New Testament....	407
<i>Klaus Wachtel</i> The Development of the Coherence-Based Genealogical Method (CBGM), its Place in Textual Scholarship, and Digital Editing.....	435
<i>Annette Hüffmeier</i> Apparatus Construction: Philological Methodology and Technical Realization.....	447
Contributors	461
Bibliography	463
Ancient Sources Index.....	503
Modern Author Index.....	513
Subject Index	521

Preface

The title of this volume is intentionally audacious – how can any individual, or even the collective groupthink that his book represents, claim to pronounce or to even glimpse the future of a discipline, especially a discipline as multifaceted as textual scholarship? Even the great Bruce Manning Metzger was ambivalent about addressing such a topic in another context.¹ The truth is that we cannot speak definitively about the future of our disciplines, for none of us, we of unclear lips, are soothsayers or prophets (as far as I can tell). But imagining the future by way of analysis of the past, which is the working method of most of the contributions in this volume, provides perspective on the present, which offers a roundabout way of self-critical reflection on our present projects and future aspirations. We imagine the future by analysing the past in an effort to better understand how we came to be in our present. This perspective is the underlying contention of this book and the larger project of which it is an outgrowth, the *HoskBib* project funded by the Irish Research Council’s New Foundations scheme, with support from Dublin City University’s School of Theology, Philosophy, and Music and the Faculty of the Humanities and Social Sciences.

Herman Charles Elias Hoskier, as I argue in my own article, is an ideal figure to use as a baseline platform for this discussion. The goal of this project was never to better understand Hoskier, his life, work, and context – although this is a by-product as most contributors touch on Hoskier as a point of departure for their own studies – but to ask how this semi-obscure figure, an outcast in his time, working in a period of intense disciplinary instability helps us to image what we do not yet know about our field and its critical questions. Hoskier’s work is valuable for this critical self-reflection because it does not lend itself to hagiography; the mixture of his positive and negative contributions to the discipline makes him ideal for seeing the variegated value of our own work. He also provides some solace insofar as poorly designed studies or idiosyncratic projects can sometimes make positive contributions to the discipline beside themselves. This point, at least for me, is comforting. This volume is not interested in resurrecting Hoskier as a paragon of text-critical virtue, and even less an attempt to justify his critical take on the *Textus Receptus*, his invective polemics, or his all-encompassing polyglot theory. But it is interested to probe how technological,

¹ Bruce M. Metzger, “The Future of New Testament Textual Studies,” in *The Bible as Book: The Transmission of the Greek Text*, ed. S. McKendrick and O. O’Sullivan (London: British Library, 2003), 201–208.

ideological, and political changes in textual scholarship from a century ago altered the discourse in the field, and to see if the vast technological changes in media and materials that are part and parcel of textual scholarship today are having similar effects.

To this end, the volume explores “textual scholarship” a rather new, but helpful collocation, as a broader phenomenon. Textual scholarship, at least in this iteration, refers not only to the practice of textual criticism and textual analysis of chirographic traditions, but also the integrally linked facets of manuscript literacy, like paratexts and various forms of material philology. Many of the studies in this book deal with explicitly textual issues, but the reality that these texts are transmitted on manuscripts or printed artefacts whose arrangement, format, and larger bibliographic contexts inform analysis, is never far from the broader conversation. Textual scholarship is more than textual criticism, it is a tradition of scholarship that focuses on the most primary of sources in all their textual and material variety. Therefore, contributions explore a variety of topics – from papyrology to paratexts, from Westcott and Hort to Chester Beatty, from text types to the CBGM, from Stephanus to the Garland of Howth – in an effort to understand how our past has brought us to the present, so that we can make some (hopefully informed) guesses about the future of the discipline. What will the next generational task of textual scholarship on the New Testament be? I have some ideas, but perhaps other answers lie among the various critical emphases, and even contradictions and arguments, that appear in the articles that follow this preface.

The book is divided into three main sections: (1) *Intellectual History of Textual Scholarship*; (2) *The Status Quaestiones and Future of Textual Scholarship*; and (3) *Editing the New Testament in a Digital Age*. The first of these sections focuses primarily on the context of textual scholarship at the turn of the twentieth century, exploring in rich detail the motivating factors and intellectual pressures that contributed to the production of some lasting critical tools. Much of this section focuses especially on Hoskier and his connections and rivalries with other more prominent figures, but attention is also given to others like Westcott and Hort. This section argues that those who practice textual scholarship are complicated and indeed human and that the intellectual context of our own endeavours is often more complex than we ourselves are aware. Most of our connections and debts to the past are unknown, unacknowledged, and obscured by lacunae is institutional, social, and personal memory.

The second section deals more directly with possible avenues of future research. These studies are always informed by study of the past of course, but provide some innovative pathways for engaging the tradition, be that specific textual, material, or intellectual traditions. These studies demonstrate a method, an idea, or phenomenon that requires further investigation. (Calling all PhD Students and Postdocs!)

The final section of the book deals directly with a constellation of major editorial projects – the *Editio Critica Maior* (ECM) – and the challenges it produces.

These projects, currently being carried out in Münster, Wuppertal, and Birmingham, are leading the way not only in re-evaluating textual relationships, but also the materiality of the tradition, and the ways that both text and material are handled in a digital medium. A major development that the next generation of textual scholars will continue to grapple with and refine is the change to digital modes of editing and analysis. These studies bring this facet of scholarship to the forefront, demystifying the editorial process for the uninitiated and calling out for further engagement from a diverse array of scholarly disciplines. The future of textual scholarship is collaborative.

To conclude, I should, as is customary, note that this book is the product of a conference held at Dublin City University's All Hallows Campus on 28–30 August 2017. In addition to the financial support from the bodies listed above, I would like to thank my colleagues, especially Bradford Anderson, Jonathan Kearney, and Ethna Regan for their support in organising this event. Thanks also go to the presenters and delegates for making the meeting a true learning experience.

Dublin 9

Garrick V. Allen

Intellectual History of Textual Scholarship

The Patient Collator and the Philology of the Beyond: H. C. Hoskier and the New Testament

Garrick V. Allen

The shared goal of this volume is to explore the developing fault lines in text-critical and editorial praxis that pervade the discipline of New Testament studies. These changes in the field are as multifaceted as the reasons for their manifestation, wrought by fundamental transformations in media, changes in theological attitudes toward the wording of the New Testament, re-evaluations of the significance of the history of the tradition, and many other factors. The work of Herman Charles Elias Hoskier (1864–1938), who published under the name H. C. Hoskier but was called Charles by friends, was selected as the lens through which to analyse changing trends in research because Hoskier himself was a transitional figure who was active precisely a century ago. This article unpacks this decision by examining the eccentricities of Hoskier’s life, work, and his contribution to textual scholarship on the New Testament. Hoskier provides a model, sometimes a cautionary one, for grappling with substantial disciplinary instability and for personal dedication to a sometimes thankless vocation, both of which are recurring themes in his body of work. I conclude the discussion with a complete and extended annotated bibliography of Hoskier’s publications, because many (if not all) of his books and articles are out of print and difficult to locate, and because the foibles of his individual outputs are explained, at least in part, when his broader body of work is taken as a whole. The discussion that follows is my justification for selecting Hoskier as an interlocutor for this volume, even though his milieu was populated by many other more distinguished individuals and more adept analytical minds. Hoskier keeps a volume like this from becoming nakedly hagiographic.

Hoskier’s transitional status is firstly represented in the contours of his biography.¹ He lived and produced his scholarship in a period defined by change and upheaval. Born in Blackheath, Kent to a prominent merchant banker, Hoskier is much less renowned than his father (also called Herman Hoskier), who made his name shipping cotton past the Union blockade at the outset of

¹ For a fuller biographical treatment, cf. Garrick V. Allen, “‘There is No Glory and No Money in the Work’: H. C. Hoskier and New Testament Textual Criticism,” *TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism* 23 (2018): 1–19.

the American civil war in 1859, as the head of the largest bank in the world (the Union Bank of London in 1881), and as the financial director of Arthur Guinness Son & Co. Brewery from 1886. We are still able to enjoy a pint of Guinness today, in part, because of the labours of Hoskier's father. Hoskier benefitted from his father's prominence, earning a place at Eton College (1878–1881) – although perhaps “earning” is not the right word here in this culture of privilege – and a healthy inheritance, equivalent to nearly \$28 million in current terms.²

Hoskier took his father's connections and financial backing to Gilded Age Manhattan in the mid-1880s, settling in the East Egg enclave of South Orange, New Jersey and marrying Amelia Wood in a heralded ceremony graced by many a titan of finance in 1888. Following what was by all accounts a successful career in brokerage and finance for the firms Hoskier, Wood & Co. and the L. von Hoffmann & Co., he retired in 1903 to the lucrative career of textual criticism. He briefly returned to finance to co-chair J. P. Morgan's short-lived Foreign Finance Corporation – a precursor to the World Bank – following the First World War. Although he published his first book *A Full Account and Collation of the Greek Cursive Evangelium 604* in 1890, he lamented the lack of relaxation available to him in his career as a financier, even though he was also a noted man of leisure, collecting numismatics, incunabula, manuscripts, *objets d'art*, and horses.³ Hoskier valued intellectual pursuits over and above financial gain and security, rejecting the dominant ethos of übercapitalist late-nineteenth century New York. A career change at the age of thirty-nine marks the first major transition in Hoskier's life. He never held an academic post, but appears to have lived off the wealth that he had amassed as inheritor and financier.

The level of Hoskier's idealist commitment to his personal convictions is also on display in his participation in what I suspect is the defining event in his life: the First World War. After producing a number of publications from 1910–1914, Hoskier's bibliography has a five-year gap that reflects his volunteer service in an American detachment of the French Ambulance corp. He saw combat, was twice wounded on the Western front (injuries that slowed his rigorous scholarly work), awarded the Croix de Guerre, and made member of the Legion of Honour. His volunteer service was motivated by his family background on one hand – he had deep connections to France (his uncle Emile

² £211,027 7s. 6d. according to John Orbell, “Hoskier, Herman,” in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (2004) (<https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/49026>) [accessed 19 February 2018].

³ Hoskier's financial issues famously led to the selling of some of his collections. Cf. *A Catalogue of a Portion of the Valuable Library of H. C. Hoskier, Esq. of South Orange, New Jersey, U.S.A.* (London: Sotheby, 1908) and *Auctions-catalog einer höchst bedeutenden Sammlung Griechischer und Römischer Münzen, Collection H. C. Hoskier* (Munich: Hirsch, 1907).

Hoskier was a prominent French banker, for example) and boasted Serbian heritage – and by his son’s own zeal for the justice of the Allies’ cause on the other.⁴ Ronald Wood Hoskier, Hoskier’s son and a student at Harvard, was the first American fighter pilot to perish in the war. He served in the *Escadrille de La Fayette* and was shot down over San Quentin on 23 April 1917.⁵ Both Hoskier and his family continued to advocate for the victims of the war long after its conclusion.⁶

Following the war, Hoskier resumed his text-critical work. Closely aligned with Henry A. Sanders of the University of Michigan, as well as other prominent scholars like J. Rendel Harris with whom he left a voluminous correspondence,⁷ Hoskier donated much of his library, manuscripts, and coins to the University of Michigan library, benevolence that earned him an honorary Master of Arts in 1925 and an appointment as Honorary Curator of the University’s Museum of Archaeology (1929).⁸ He only accepted the latter position after receiving assurances that it required no actual work. He moved from New Jersey

⁴ Cf. the introduction in *Literary Fragments of Ronald Wood Hoskier 1896–1917* (Boston: McKenzie, n.d.), 5–8, which I suspect was edited by H. C. Hoskier, although the editor is anonymous and it bears no date. The copy that I have consulted was donated by H. C. Hoskier himself to the University of Michigan Library.

⁵ Cf. “American Flier Killed in Combat,” *New York Times*, 25 April 1917.

⁶ Amelia Wood Hoskier, for example, wrote a letter to the editor of *The New York Times* that was published on 8 February 1926, advocating for French Refugees.

⁷ Hoskier carried on a long-lasting and rather intimate correspondence with Harris touching on a range of issues, including Harris’ survival of a German torpedoing off Corsica, Hoskier’s experience at the Western front, text-critical concerns, and serious interest in spiritualism, although it is not clear that Harris reciprocated this interest (Hoskier refers to Harris’ “discreet silence” on the matter, which to me indicates that Harris was more interested in the text-critical aspects of their conversation, Birmingham Library DA21/1/2/1/25/7, 17 May 1922). Among Hoskier’s correspondence with Harris exists a short work by Hoskier, unpublished, reflecting on his appreciation of Patience Worth, a supposed spirit of a seventeenth century woman in a long-term communication with a Mrs Curran of St. Louis (*Appreciation of “P.W.” by an Outsider*, signed H.C.H.), along with a copy of a book composed by Patience through the medium Mrs Curran (DA21/1/2/1/25/3, 19 December 1921). The earliest letter to Harris (7 May 1917) is characteristic of Hoskier idiosyncrasies, discussing Harris’ “escape of the Boche torpedoes,” the death of his son in a dogfight, sarcastic thoughts on the news that C. R. Gregory was a German lieutenant on the Western front, and hope that pro-German academics in Great Britain would “see the light” (DA21/1/2/1/25/1). Harris also uses Hoskier as a sounding board for expensive purchases of manuscripts, which Hoskier at times offers to fund on his behalf (DA21/1/2/1/25/4, 20 January 1922). Hoskier also informs Harris that he has met Patience in person, since the family that received the spirit communication named an adopted child after the spirit (DA21/1/2/1/25/6, 22 April 1922). Their letters are not always entirely friendly in tone (e.g. DA21/1/2/1/25/15, 25 March 1928).

⁸ The British Museum was also a benefactor of Hoskier’s donations. Cf. H. R. Hall, “Other Donations to the Egyptian and Assyrian Department,” *The British Museum Quarterly* 5/2 (1930): 48–9.

to Jersey in the Channel Islands in 1927, where he travelled frequently to France. In June 1938, three months before his death on 8 September, Hoskier was awarded an honorary ThD from the Universiteit van Amsterdam. Amendments to his will after his wife's death in 1929 (amended 2 August 1935) indicate his poor financial state. He requests not to be transported to his family plot in South Orange, but to be buried in a simple box on Jersey. He also notes that his son Walter in fact owes him £359 and that this amount should be deducted from his inheritance should there be any. Not to dissuade potential PhD students, but Hoskier is proof that one rarely gets rich on textual scholarship.⁹

The many significant transitions of Hoskier's life are deeply connected to his body of academic and philosophical work. The primary aim of Hoskier's activities was, even to the end of his life, to reclaim the value of the *Textus Receptus* that Westcott and Hort had dethroned decisively, with much assistance from distinguished predecessors, in Anglophone scholarship in 1881. Hort's introduction in particular satisfied Hoskier's need for a foil, even though he adopted many of the presuppositions that stand behind Westcott and Hort's method, including the idea that textual criticism properly done can fully and securely recover the "original" or "true" text of the New Testament, that scribal proclivities were always aimed toward the mechanical reproduction of texts, especially sacred ones, and that the goal of editorial work was the identification and removal of accreted errors.¹⁰

Hoskier is often identified, and therefore dismissed, with John William Burgon (1813–1888), the indefatigable champion of all things traditional, who, in addition to being a thoroughgoing polemicist and righteous supporter of the *Textus Receptus* and the authenticity of the long ending of Mark, fought to keep women out of Oxford and considered changing student housing policies since some residences employed women who had previously been incarcerated. The introduction to Hoskier's *Greek Cursive Evangelium 604* (1890) reinforces his connection to Burgon, since it contains an anecdote that opens at midnight with Burgon on the staircase of his Chichester home, recounting his assertion that "as certainly as the sun will rise to-morrow morning, so surely will the traditional text be vindicated."¹¹ Burgon and his acolytes perceived the paradigm-

⁹ In a letter to J. Rendel Harris, Hoskier notes that "I have completely ruined myself in Jersey & would accept a few old piece of furniture from the manor" (DA/21/1/2/1/25/22, 14 March 1929).

¹⁰ Cf. B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort, eds., *The New Testament in the Original Greek: Introduction and Appendix* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1882), 1–3, 6–7, 24–30. Although Hort in particular served as Hoskier's nemesis, he could also have benefitted from the example of Westcott and Hort's partnership, which they describe thusly: "No individual mind can ever act with perfect uniformity, or free itself completely from its own idiosyncrasies: the danger of unconscious caprice is inseparable from personal judgement" (here 17).

¹¹ H. C. Hoskier, *A Full Account and Collation of the Greek Cursive Evangelium 604 (with two facsimiles)* (London: David Nutt, 1890), v. Hoskier is also referred to as a "scion

shifting edition of Westcott and Hort and its influence on the Revised Version as outright assaults on orthodoxy, tradition, and divine inspiration, often responding as combatants in a holy war.¹² Traces of this influence are felt in Hoskier's pre-war writings, but Hoskier never considered himself one of Burgon's followers, although they did share some critical goals and suppositions.

The transitional nature of Hoskier's project is on full and clear display in the ways that Hoskier breaks from Burgon, especially in his changing rhetorical strategies for vindicating the *Textus Receptus*. Hoskier's academic work can be divided into pre and post-war epochs; the former defined by polemical attempts to vindicate the *Textus Receptus* through rigorous textual data and invective prose, and the latter characterised by methodological devotion to digesting the totality of the evidence, although the polemical edge of his rhetoric never entirely dissipated. The war changed the tenor and tenacity of Hoskier's project; it is no accident that his work that has endured was produced after the war.

The obvious pinnacle of Hoskier's pre-war rhetoric is found in the two-volume *Codex B and its Allies: A Study and an Indictment* (1914),¹³ which constitutes an attempt to undermine Codex Vaticanus as a witness to Hort's neutral text, as well as Hort's methodological principles.¹⁴ The critique fails in its

of the Burgon school" in a review of Henry A. Sanders' *New Testament Manuscripts in the Freer Collection*, in *The Biblical World* 42 (1913): 59–69 (here 59) by a certain A. D. Nonetheless, the relationship between Hoskier and Burgon is not so clear-cut, and although Hoskier continued to hold affinities for Burgon's quest to justify the *Textus Receptus*, there is no evidence that he did so out of allegiance to Burgon, even though he did have personal knowledge of Burgon's library, noted in a letter to J. Rendel Harris (DA 21/1/2/1/25/2, 6 October 1920). Cf. Daniel B. Wallace, "Historical Revisionism and the Majority Text Theory: The Cases of F. H. A. Scrivener and Herman C. Hoskier," *NTS* 41 (1995): 280–85: "neither Scrivener nor Hoskier followed in Burgon's steps" (here 281). See also the introduction to Annette Hüffmeier's article and also both Tommy Wasserman and Jennifer Knust's articles in this volume.

¹² Cf. *The Oxford Debates on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (London: George Bell, 1897) and John William Burgon, *The Revision Revised: Three Articles Reprinted from the Quarterly Review* (London: John Murray: 1883).

¹³ *Codex B and its Allies: A Study and an Indictment*, 2 vols. (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1914).

¹⁴ Westcott and Hort's method for evaluating witnesses led to an extremely high valuation of readings that belonged to a document that they felt was usually correct, especially if it was ancient, aesthetically beautiful, and in uncial script. Cf. *The New Testament in the Original Greek*, 10–11, 30–9, 60–2, 232 especially the section on "Internal Evidence of Documents" and "Internal Evidence of Groups," where the valuation of the overarching textual character of a particular witness or group of witnesses, evaluated partially by genealogical reconstruction can at times override intrinsic and transcription probability. A large portion of Hort's introduction (93–179) is devoted to establishing the hierarchical relationships between his main (and ancient) textual families, the neutral, Alexandrian (α), Western (β), and Syrian (δ), of which the neutral text is clearly the group that takes priority, due to the

virulence and lack of structure. The first pages, enveloped in legal language of indictment and accusation, aim to prick “the bubble of codex B,” and lay “hundreds of separate accounts” (apparently on a reading by reading basis) against Westcott and Hort.¹⁵ The conflict is personal, as Hoskier’s confrontation of Alexander Souter – on the first page of the preface! – demonstrates. He notes that despite a negative review of his *Concerning the Genesis of the Versions of the N.T.* (1910), Souter

ended up expressing gratitude for my collations...but added some very strong advice to hold my tongue as regarded commenting on the evidence so painfully accumulated...I refuse to be bound by such advice. I demand a fair hearing on a subject very near my heart, and with which by close attention for many years I have tried to make myself sufficiently acquainted to be able and qualified to discuss it with those few who have pursued a parallel course of study.¹⁶

Hoskier never got his “fair hearing,” due in large part to the *ad hominem* and almost panicked nature of his discourse. If Edgar J. Goodspeed described Hoskier’s earlier two volumes on the versions as “a mass of individual textual notes, with an occasional paragraph of bold generalization,”¹⁷ then the same can easily be made of *Codex B and its Allies*. And the work is indeed just so: a series of collations designed to undermine the text of Codex B as a legitimate witness of the “true text” and support some other of Hoskier’s idiosyncratic pet theories, like the deep antiquity of the versions and the idea that Mark was initially composed in both Latin and Greek simultaneously.

In contrast, the *modus operandi* of Hoskier’s work changed fundamentally following the war in a way that still animates text-critical projects like the *Edictio Critica Maior* that emphasise comprehensiveness. From 1919 until his death in 1938, Hoskier retained an interest in editing Greek and Latin manuscripts that he perceived to preserve especially important texts, like *The Text of Codex Usserianus 2., or r2 (“Garland of Howth”)* (1919) and *The Complete Commentary of Oecumenius on the Apocalypse* (1928), or other traditions that he found interesting, like *De Contemptu Mundi: A Bitter Satirical Poem of 3000 Lines upon the Morals of the XIIth Century by Bernard of Morval Monk of Cluny* (1929). But a larger overarching project, centred on the New Testament Apocalypse took pride of place in his trajectory, and it remains the most

periphrastic and interpolatory nature of some Western readings and the conflate nature of a number of Syrian readings, not to mention the fact that, according to Hort, the Alexandrian grammatical schools would have kept “a more than usual watchfulness over the transcription of the writings of the apostles” (p. 127). Codex B is Hort’s preeminent witness to the pre-Syrian neutral text (pp. 150–51, 170–72, 210, 220–60).

¹⁵ *Codex B*, 1.i.

¹⁶ *Codex B*, 1.i.

¹⁷ Edgar J. Goodspeed, “Review: Hoskier’s Study of the New Testament Versions,” *AJT* 16 (1912): 652–54 (here 653).

important aspect of his body of work. Although he published a number of studies on Revelation, including a five-article series in the *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* (1922–1924), his two-volume magnum opus *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse* (1929) represents a herculean individual effort to compile a master collation of every known witness of the book of Revelation in an edition organized around the 1550 Stephanus text. Polemical interjections remain essential to the fabric of Hoskier’s discourse in the post-war period, but methodological principles of patience and data aggregation replace pure textual rhetoric. Hoskier never achieved Lachmannian “scientific” proof of the “originality” of the *Textus Receptus* for the Apocalypse – his underlying and sometimes stated goal – but he did provide a valuable resource for textual scholarship that accurately supplements hand editions of the New Testament and provides access to now-lost artefacts and their texts (e.g. GA 241, Hoskier 47). *Concerning the Text* did not rescue the *Textus Receptus*, but undermined it further by clearly demonstrating the fundamental uncertainty of many places in the tradition and the peculiarities of many individual witnesses.

The methodological purity of Hoskier’s post-war programme continues to inform textual criticism on the New Testament, which is now grappling with basic changes in media, digital infrastructure, and the requirements of funding bodies, even if his influence remains primarily subconscious. The production of collaborative digital workspaces and electronic transcriptions is now making it possible for editors and scholars to once again build comprehensive sets of data for New Testament works beyond Revelation.¹⁸ Hoskier too, utilised technological innovations to produce his lasting contribution. Using his once vast personal financial resources, he purchased photographs of manuscripts from far-flung libraries and personal collections, plying the improvements in the cost of photographic technology in the early twentieth century to his advantage, while at the same time complaining about the prices that libraries charged for reproductions. Continuing changes in modern text-critical praxis are enabled by technological changes in the field, like the burgeoning archives of quality digital images, published transcripts, and digital editions. Although his project ultimately failed in its stated goals, Hoskier’s working method and reliance on modern technology anticipated more sophisticated modes of research, many of which are visible in the work of the contributors to this volume.

¹⁸ The *Editio Critica Maior* of Revelation is currently in production at the Institut für Septuaginta- und biblische Textforschung at the Kirchliche Hochschule Wuppertal/Bethel under the supervision of Martin Karrer. Cf. Marcus Sigismund, “Die neue Edition der Johannesapokalypse: Stand der Arbeit,” in *Studien zum Text der Apokalypse II*, ANTF 50, ed. M. Sigismund and D. Müller (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2017), 3–17, and Darius Müller, “Zur elektronischen Transkription von Apokalypsehandschriften: Bericht zum Arbeitsstand,” 19–30 in the same volume.

The final piece of evidence for the transitional nature of Hoskier's complex life is the series of philosophical treatises that he authored in the late 1920s and 1930s. As the flustered polemics of *Codex B and its Allies* demonstrates, pre-war Hoskier is motivated by an explicit desire to uphold what he perceived as orthodox Christian adherence to a traditional text form of the New Testament. However, following the war marked by his own service and the tragic death of his son, the apologetic strain in his academic writings ebbs and a moral call for humanity to realise its own essential deific essence gains prominence in these writings. His philosophy is important because it is never entirely divorced from his academic work, as Jan Krans' article in this volume incisively demonstrates. Hoskier appeals to mediums and spirit guides to enforce his textual decisions and even includes readings created by a spirit at a nineteenth century séance. He also comments in a copy of a letter sent to J. Rendel Harris that he is "in slight touch himself with the other side."¹⁹

These moves are undergirded by his philosophic ideals, laid out in his panentheistic treatises that were part of a much larger re-enchantment of the world known as theosophy, a movement that garnered a significant amount of popular interest after the war in Europe, even though its origins can be traced to the early nineteenth century. Two of these works were written under the appropriately esoteric pseudonym Signpost.²⁰ Although these writings, at times, are prescient in their suggestion that the world was hurtling toward another major conflict, the prose is often as incohesive and its message is incoherent.²¹ In his self-proclaimed creed in the form of a prayer, *What is Nirvana?*, Hoskier builds his case using familiar Christian language. For example:

And so, Great Father – see, I dare to call Thee Father – taught by Him of lowly Nazareth, –
Thine Angel-Messenger, – Gabriel, God-man – I bow my head I bow my knees, I bow my

¹⁹ Copy of a letter to Mrs Curran 1 December 1921 (DA/21/1/2/1/25/3). When D. C. Parker, *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and their Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 231 asks "was he [Hoskier] serious" about including readings from spirit communications in the apparatus of *Concerning the Text*, the answer must undoubtedly be affirmative.

²⁰ H. C. Hoskier, *In Tune with the Universe* (London: Rider & Co., 1932) and Hoskier, *The Back of Beyond* (London: C. W. Daniel, 1934), although Hoskier wrote the preface for *In Tune with the Universe* in his own name (in which he declares that "Signpost has lifted a corner of the veil by his differentiation between the vibrational world and the non-vibrational"), and although H. C. Hoskier is included on the title page of *The Back of Beyond*.

²¹ See for example, Hoskier's comments on Japan in 1930: "If I turn my eyes to Nippon, I am but bewildered. Is the backwater of to-day but the maelstrom of to-morrow? Who knows?" (*The Bronze Hoses': A Comment on the Prose-Poem of Amy Lowell* [Portland, ME: Mosher Press, 1930], 14). This appraisal is commensurate with his pessimistic appraisal of nation states at this time (pp. 13–8). In *In Tune*, 120–21 Hoskier also calls for a body like the United Nations. Cf. also *Back of Beyond*, 62–70.

dust-clad spirit and acknowledge Thee: All-Good, All-Wise, All-Just, All-True, All-Pure, to be.....Me.....And I.....Thee.²²

Hoskier contends that all that exists is really one living eternal organism and that human conflict of all forms is inimical to the all-encompassing “All-Life.” The goal of human activity, according to his theosophonic philosophy, is to transcend the “vibrational world of effects” to what he calls the “back of beyond” or the “world of Causes lying behind it,”²³ a place accessible by looking inside oneself in an effort to locate one’s own “godhood” where we find “our coequality with that Essence.”²⁴ Ultimately, for Hoskier, once we realise that we are “essentially deific,” we are free to escape to the world of ultimate causes,²⁵ since all are one and one are all, death has no significance and organized religion is a false path to “Wholeness.”²⁶ This is borne out also by his burial wishes recorded in his will:

I declare that I die in the certainty of the continuity of life both molecular and spiritual; attached to no particular school of thought nor to any particular religion, but in love with all man’s striving towards the recognition of his birthright as part of an indivisible All-life, which in reality constitutes the Whole, so that he cannot ‘die’ in any sense whatever.

Many have scoffed at Hoskier’s naïveté for believing in spirits and theosophy and have thereby written-off his contribution to the discipline. But it is important to remember that his interest in the occult was shared by many, especially following the rebirth of theosophy in Europe after the trauma of the war. These aspects of Hoskier’s work are not disqualifying, but instead further illuminate his context and influences.

The persistence of resolve found in some corners of Hoskier’s scholarship are identifiable also in his life. There is no division for him between academic work and the working out of the complexities of life and the ultimate fate of humanity. In this sense, Hoskier views textual scholarship as essential to understanding the world and as a basic foundation for life. It is more than academic tedium and even more than an essential preliminary task necessary for interpretation; it is not just an essential discipline in the humanities, but an essential discipline for humanity, whether or not we agree with his philosophical proclivities. The detail-oriented rigor and persistence required for textual criticism were characteristics that Hoskier perceived as essential to living. Textual scholarship mirrors life, and textual rhetoric is the language of science. Despite his idiosyncrasies and foibles, all textual scholars can see parts of themselves in Hoskier’s principled integrity and earnestness of conscience,

²² H. C. Hoskier, *What is Nirvana?* (Portland, ME: Mosher Press, 1930), 12.

²³ E.g. *In Tune*, 1.

²⁴ “You don’t look up, but you look within.” “No longer Three in One, but All in One, and we are not only of it or a part of it, but It Itself” (*In Tune*, 5, 7); cf. *Back of Beyond*, 21.

²⁵ Cf. *Back of Beyond*, 41–5 on how to accomplish this task, according to Hoskier.

²⁶ *Back of Beyond*, 28–9, 53–7, 70–82.

even if we ultimately exclude spirit communications from our apparatuses and decide to keep our philological efforts to this side of the Back of Beyond.

The many transitions in Hoskier's life and work coalesce to mark him as a transitional figure in textual scholarship on the New Testament. He stands between the Lachmannian sensibilities of the nineteenth century and the radical insecurity of textual traditions and editorial decision that defined some quarters of editorial work in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries.²⁷ A basic tension of his medial position is his insistence in many publications that one must first gather *all* data before making any interpretations or judgments, even though he has an obvious agenda and makes interpretive judgements throughout. The contradiction reinforces the concept that, even if one claims otherwise, all textual scholarship is interpretive, all collation is rhetoric, and every manuscript has a voice as a legitimate witness to the tradition. Hoskier could not have admitted this, but his method and body of work speaks plainly. This is precisely why using him as a frame to re-imagine the discipline of New Testament textual scholarship is both legitimate and right. He is not the most famous or decorated scholar of his generation; he never held an academic post, earned a university degree, relieved a funding body of its reserves, had a PhD student, won any awards, or sold many books – many of the copies of his books that I have examined at different European libraries were in fact donated by him personally to these institutions. But he created the space through his methodological emphases for important projects and trends in the field that are finally being realised today. Hoskier provides space to imagine what we do not yet know – to think about how the choices made by scholars and editors today will change the discipline in the future.

²⁷ Cf. Sebastiano Timpanaro, *The Genesis of Lachmann's Method*, trans. G. W. Most (London: The University of Chicago Press, 2005), esp. 84–9, 119–38, sections that enlighten Hoskier's intellectual context, his simultaneous radical departures from it, and his unknowing accession to his own time.

Annotated Bibliography²⁸

A Full Account and Collation of the Greek Cursive Evangelium 604 (with two facsimiles). London: David Nutt, 1890.²⁹

Hoskier's first book is both misleading and instructive for understanding his larger body of work. The preface opens with an anecdote of a conversation with John William Burgon about the vindication of the *Textus Receptus* and the book is fawningly dedicated to Burgon.³⁰ However, as I mentioned above, the relationship between Hoskier's work and Burgon is complicated, and although Burgon is the better rhetor, Hoskier is the more creative scholar. The book is instructive insofar as it introduces Hoskier's dominant mode of discourse (collation and textual notes) and an early insight into his larger, but developing project (the scientific vindication of the *Textus Receptus*, against Hort [cf. pp. cxv–cxvi], through study of the text of neglected New Testament manuscripts). The main argument that the evidence in the book is designed to support is that the text of the fourth and fifth century uncials is corrupt, a point

²⁸ Hoskier is also credited with another book that is not included in this bibliography because it is comprised of tables of calculations for identifying the prices of securities in arbitrage sales between the New York and London stock exchanges. H. C. Hoskier, *Table of Arbitrage Parities between New York and London* (London: Richard Clay and Sons, 1892). This volume has nothing to do with textual scholarship, but it does demonstrate Hoskier's interest in careful data aggregation, and this type of work appears to be the equivalent of textual criticism for the financial sector, although I imagine that it is much more lucrative. Another, unpublished article, entitled "Λόγια or the 'Oracles of God' and χορηγία or the Supply of the Spirit by Direct Intervention between God and Man," was sent by Hoskier to J. Rendel Harris on 22 June 1922 (DA21/1/2/1/25/9–10), seeking advice for a publisher. One was not found for this article that, among other things, leans heavily on the comparison of prayer and the new-fangled wireless.

²⁹ Cf. the positive review of Appendix C of this work in E. Nestle, "Some Points in the History of the *Textus Receptus* of the New Testament," *JTS* 9 (1910): 564–68; the criticism in Isaac H. Hall, "The Title-Page of the Elzevir Greek New Testament of 1624," *JBL* 10 (1891): 147–50; and A. Plummer's review in *The Classical Review* 4/10 (1890): 478, who refers to the work as "a labour of love." Wilhelm Bousset, *Textkritische Studien zum Neuen Testament*, TU 9/4 (Leipzig: Hinrichs'sche, 1894), 118–19 argues that Hoskier refuses to comment on the significance of his data, but Hoskier rebuts that it would be too hasty in *Concerning the Genesis of the Versions*, ix–x. In *Concerning the Text*, l.xxxviii he retorts again: "This is foolish. We have had too many cheap and hasty deductions from insignificant or insufficient data." Bousset, "Textkritik II," *Theologische Rundschau* 17 (1914): 187–206 (esp. 199–200) also critiques Hoskier. He begins his review thusly: "Ein Textkritiker, der ganz einsam und abseits von den gewöhnlichen Wegen seine Bahnen zieht, ist Hoskier."

³⁰ See also p. vi: Burgon's "*Magnum Opus*, had he lived to edit it, would have for ever vindicated his reputation, his views, his methods, nay, the very manner of expressing himself, if by a too decided front he had made himself enemies and curtailed the extent of his hearing for a time."

reinforced by the continued unearthing of texts that disagree with them in substantive ways, especially when these new texts are independent in their textual affiliations.

Hoskier goes about this by examining the text of GA 700 and comparing it to readings in earlier uncial witnesses, an appraisal that illustrates to his satisfaction that “the compilers of such [uncial] codices were, to an enormous extent, their own critics, leading them to altogether independent treatment of the Sacred Text” (p. xiv). The age of the manuscript does not guarantee the quality or age of the text (p. xv), and the text of GA 700 is of higher quality than more ancient exemplars. Hoskier comments first on the palaeographic, codicological, and scribal profile of the manuscript, as well as offering corrections to antecedent collations, as he is often wont to do (pp. i–xxviii). This is followed by a list of singular readings, counting 270 in this Gospel manuscript, and a list of readings poorly attested elsewhere without comment (pp. xxix–cxv). The introduction gives way then to the collation of the manuscript *in toto* against Stephanus’ 1550 edition (pp. 1–43). The book concludes with ten appendices that describe other manuscripts, correct some of Scrivener’s collations, collate various printed editions, contain library reports, and other text-critical concerns.

The book also provides some delightful notes on the importance of collating and careful study of the documents,³¹ alongside some invective statements that anticipate the full-blown polemics of *Codex B and its Allies* (e.g. p. xvi). Appendix J – a note on 1 Tim 3:15 – is a reprint of an article Hoskier published in *Clergyman’s Magazine* in February 1887.³² See also Jennifer Knust’s article in this volume.

The Golden Latin Gospels: JP in the library of J. Pierpont Morgan (formerly known as the “Hamilton Gospels” and sometimes as King Henry the VIIIth’s Gospels) now edited for the first time, with critical introduction and notes, and accompanied by four full-page facsimiles. New York: Private Printing, 1910.³³

This volume is a sumptuously produced edition and discussion of a seventh or eighth century purple bicolumnar Vulgate manuscript that the famed financier

³¹ E.g. p. vi: “Though seemingly dry and laborious work (and of a truth it is the latter to a large extent) some of the most wonderful truths, some of the most interesting problems present themselves to his mind as letter by letter, line by line, and page by page the patient collator toils along slowly at his task.” See also p. xxi: “Die grösste Frucht unserer Arbeit ist oft die Arbeit selbst.”

³² Cf. also Wilbur N. Pickering, *The Identity of the New Testament Text III* (Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2012), 71.

³³ Cf. Hoskier’s correspondence with Rudyard Kipling in November 1910 on the provenance of the manuscript’s scribe in T. Pinney, ed., *The Letters of Rudyard Kipling*, vol. 3 1900–10 (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1996), 464–66. Cf. reviews by Edgar J. Goodspeed,

J. Pierpont Morgan purchased from Hoskier's own dealer and sometimes publisher Bernard Quaritch of London. Only 200 hundred copies were printed in a private printing arranged by Morgan (printed by Frederic Fairchild Sherman), including some colour images of the manuscript printed on the finest Italian paper with interlocking sea horse watermarks that bear the text "FFS Italy." The volume is an artistic work regardless of its contents; the beauty of the printed edition corresponds to the aesthetics of the manuscripts it aims to represent. In his review, Sanders refers to it as "a book-lovers' prize" (p. 218).

The introduction to the volume, however, is as arduous to read as it was onerous to construct. It attempts to localise the production context of the manuscript, which Hoskier locates in the UK or Ireland, even though JP – the siglum he invents for the manuscript – is in "a class by itself as regards English and Irish MSS" (p. xv). The arguments of the volume are twofold: (1) to acknowledge the high value of JP's text (the stemma on p. xcvi emphasizes the significant place this witness has in Hoskier's reconstruction of the tradition); and (2) to demonstrate that the Greek uncials were influenced by readings particular to JP and its tradition (e.g. pp. liv–lxvii).³⁴ Hoskier's overriding polyglot theory takes shape here. The means of making these arguments is through data in the form of extensive collation, which Hoskier makes for each Gospel in the manuscript, even though much of the data is repeated in his lengthy introduction (116 pages, followed by 71 pages of "Preliminary Remarks"). The collations are made against the Sixto-Clementine Vulgate of 1592 and it includes readings from dozens of other witnesses (see pp. 75–8; collations pp. 80–344).

An interesting feature of the introduction is that Hoskier is sometimes specific about the mechanics of how the polyglot theory plays out in process of copying. For example, he imagines the working conditions of the scribe of Codex Sinaiticus thusly: "Project yourself in theory into the cell or *cabinet de travail* of the scribe of \aleph about A. D. 400. You find him surrounded by his library at his desk. You think to find him close to the Apostolic autographs. But

"The Golden Latin Gospels," *The Biblical World* 38 (1911): 67–70, which, again, is quite negative, noting, "in all this one feels that Mr. Hoskier, in his natural enthusiasm for a notable and beautiful manuscript, has been carried too far" (p. 70). In particular Goodspeed criticises Hoskier's identification of forty different scribal hands in such an expensively crafted manuscript; he does, however, admit Hoskier's "extraordinary learning and diligence," despite his "discursive and casual, rather than orderly" working method (pp. 69–70). Cf. also Henry A. Sanders' review in *The American Journal of Philology* 32 (1911): 218–20 and Arthur H. Weston's review in *Classical Philology* 8 (1913): 378–82, who is pedantically critical of Hoskier's paragraphing and the linguistic peculiarities of his prose.

³⁴ This basic goal of the project is explicated in the subtitle to the collation, which includes the phrase "*etiam in multis locis explicatur de testimonia codd. Graec.*" Understanding the shape of the Greek text is Hoskier's overriding goal in examining Latin manuscripts like JP.

the retrospect of 350 years to him seems just as great as that of 1850 years today to us...But approach closer and watch him at his task. He sits with a handsome volume open on his left. As far as we can see, it is bicolunar, but his immaculate sheets of thin white vellum overlies parts of it, and possibly cover a third and yet a fourth column, containing Syriac and Coptic in parallel columns. At any rate, what he appears now to be transcribing from is Graeco-Latin in separate columns, the Greek in the left-hand column. He is at John ii:14, and as his eye goes to the Greek column, he reads *βοας και προβατα*, the *προβατα* in the line below; *προβατα* then is the last thing in his mind. As his eye passes over the Latin he sees *oves*, the last thing on his retina. What more natural than for him to invert and write *προβατα και βοας*” (pp. lxiv–lxv). This volume is in many ways the fountainhead of the larger project of identifying polyglot interference in the uncials, a project patronised in this instance by the prominent Morgan and his manuscript. This volume is a direct outworking of Hoskier’s relationships cultivated on Wall Street. Such patrons are rare and beautiful butterflies.

Concerning the Genesis of the Versions of the N.T. Remarks Suggested by the Study of JP and the Allied Questions as Regards the Gospels. 2 vols. London: Bernard Quaritch, 1910.³⁵

This book stands in the medial position between Hoskier’s edition of JP (see previous entry) and his transcription of Codex Usanianus 2 (cf. esp. pp. 109–340). Using his edition of the Golden Latin Gospels as a starting point for his discussion, Hoskier makes a number of critical points that crop up in other works, including his negative appraisal of the text of B and other uncials (e.g. pp. 387–88), criticism of Hort (e.g. pp. viii–ix, 57–60, 97), his polyglot theory, the importance of minuscule witnesses (pp. 61–3), and polemic rebuttals of perceived opponents.³⁶ This volume is essentially an aggregate of multiple

³⁵ Cf. Henry A. Sanders, “Hoskier’s Genesis of the Versions,” *American Journal of Philology* 33 (1912): 30–42, who accepts the basic polyglot principle of Hoskier’s theory, but rejects his assertion for two early concurrent forms of Mark; and an anonymous, mostly positive, review in *The Academy and Literature* 82 (1911): 107.

³⁶ Many, but not all of these attacks are religiously charged. For example, Bousset’s critique of Hoskier’s 1890 book for his inaction to drawing conclusions is “foolish” (p. x), because Hoskier is building a cumulative case. On Burkitt: “This is truly unscientific of Professor Burkitt, and he must know a great deal better than that” (p. 61); on von Soden’s volumes on Cyprian: “I may be very stupid, but I have failed to glean anything new from them, and I do not see in what direction his labours tend” (p. 78); on Albert Edmunds: “Mr. Edmunds is apparently blissfully ignorant, when he write himself down ‘as a Christian believer though attached to no sect or Church whatever,’ that he is in Marcion’s class, and is returning to the vain gods of the second century” (p. 107c); on Tischendorf and Westcott-Hort’s use of text types: “we have used the foregoing example, and have illustrated it as

studies that all coalesce around the interrelations of the versions and the Greek text – especially Latin traditions – and their deep antiquity, construed at times as nearly concurrent compositions alongside the Greek. If one was forced to identify a thesis, it would be that “there is abundant evidence that the mistakes in κ and D, with other like survivals in other Greek and Latin MSS., are due to the use of a polycolumnar polyglot in copying... whichever way we turn we are met with polyglots” (pp. 15–6; cf. p. 75). Hoskier’s reconstruction of the materiality of the tradition forms his view of its textual history.

This book also provides the first evidence of his long-term work on the Apocalypse. He notes that as of 1910, he had already collated over one hundred manuscripts and that the text of many of the later minuscules go “far back of κ ” (p. 17), because they bear the influence of trilingual (Syriac-Graeco-Latin) or even perhaps quadrilingual (Syriac-Graeco-Coptic-Latin) manuscripts that predate κ (p. 23). His work on the Apocalypse is deeply connected to his other pet theories. He is correct, however to critique a range of suppositions in textual criticism, many of which have also been critiqued in recent discourse, like the dissolution of geographically bound textual families (p. 24)³⁷ and the inflexible application of rules like the preference of the shorter reading (pp. 375–76). The book is valuable for understanding Hoskier’s programme not only in terms of content, but mode of argumentation, which is, once again, eminently textual in orientation. The main body of the work is a collation that illustrates the relationship between κ_2 and other Latin texts, attempting to identify the witness that best preserves the archetype of the tradition and to argue for the close relationship between the Latin and Syriac, which explains his turn to the Diatessaron following lengthy discussion of the Latin (pp. 341–69). Volume 2 is over 400 pages of appendices, comprised primarily of collations of various manuscripts (e.g. the books of Dimma and Moling, among other Latin manuscripts) and comments on some recent text-critical publications and the medical discourse on the blood and water that flowed from Jesus’ side at his execution (John 19:34). This is a prime example of the rhetoric of text and data that Hoskier employs in service to those without access to the manuscripts, but also in service to his arguments and polyglot theory. The versions, especially when they agree with the *Textus Receptus*, are more valuable witnesses to the text than the early Greek uncials and papyri. This point comes through clearly in Hoskier’s note on W referring to readings that he identifies as “IInd or IIIrd century glosses” (p. 2.379): “that the Church knew what she was doing when she disallowed the reproduction of such unscriptural addenda, and her wisdom is

profusely as space will allow, in order to show in how senseless a way Tischendorf and Westcott-Hort clung to ‘type’ as a fetish, though opposed to good scholarship and common sense and the consentient voice of the document” (p. 395).

³⁷ This was applied, not surprisingly, especially to Hort’s Western text (e.g. p. 55). Cf. also *Concerning the Date of the Bohairic Version*, 124.