

Thomas J. Kraus and Tobias Nicklas, eds. *New Testament Manuscripts: Their Texts and Their World. Texts and Editions for New Testament Study, no. 2. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2006. Pp. 344. ISBN-13: 9789004149458. €134.00 EUR; \$181.00 USD.*

1. This volume is a remarkable group of essays by a disparate set of scholars, most of whom have gotten their hands on the manuscripts of ancient Christianity. Although the essays in Kraus and Nicklas's volume for the most part involve a good deal of technical detail, their appeal to the generalist should not be ignored by our field. The unifying goal of the book is an attempt to use ancient mss to learn about the communities that produced them, rather than seeking the *Urtext* of the NT. There is no overt "postmodern" denial in any of the essays that such an *Urtext* existed. The authors, however, want to use material literary remains to glean information about ancient Christianity.

2. After a brief and illuminating introduction (1-11) by Kraus and Nicklas entitled "The World of New Testament Manuscripts: 'Every Manuscript Tells a Story,'" the book begins with a lengthy essay by Eldon Jay Epp on "The Jews and the Jewish Community in Oxyrhynchus: Socio-Religious Context for the New Testament Papyri" (13-52). Epp's goal is interdisciplinary in the sense that he wants to "bring into close proximity New Testament manuscript studies, Jewish-Christian relations, and papyrology more broadly, inasmuch as the Jewish community at Oxyrhynchus was a relevant aspect of the environment of early Christianity there, and, accordingly, part of the context for the Christian manuscripts in use at that locality" (14). Using the papyri, Epp (and others before him, 16) argues that from 117 on until the end of the third century there is little evidence for Jews in Egypt (and in Oxyrhynchus in particular). He notes the excessively inclusive policy of *CPJ* with regard to Jewish names (16-17). One problem is that Christians began to use biblical names. He lists (19-23) several names from the first century C.E. that might be Jewish, although there is no other textual evidence than the names themselves. After a discussion of several texts that mention Jews during the revolt of 115-117, Epp surveys names that may be Jewish up to the sixth century. Even though the texts are "virtually silent" about Jews from 117 until late third century, *P.Oxy.* 1205 (291 C.E.) seems to show a steady if slow recovery of the Jewish community there after the revolt (a woman and her two children are manumitted with money given by the "community of the Jews"). One of Epp's important conclusions is that "Jose son of Judas, Jew" in *P.Oxy.* 3203 (two nuns let out a room to a Jewish man) is the only specific identification of a person as Jewish through the fourth century. Two others survive from the sixth century (45). Of course, any criticism will center on the issue of whether a given name is "Jewish" or "Christian."

3. Marco Frenschkowski contributes the longest essay of the book, "Die Geschichte der Bibliothek von Cäsarea" (53-104). Despite its length, the investigation is a model of clarity. The conclusions are fairly simple: the library of Caesarea was private and was passed down to successive owners who certainly allowed their theological friends to use its contents. The library was closely related to *scriptoria* where its contents could be copied for others. Probably around the time of Jerome the library passed into uninterested hands and slowly disappeared. At this point the history is not clear, but the sources do not justify the attempt to blame the disappearance of the library on the Arab invasions (102-103). To arrive at these conclusions Frenschkowski reviews all the primary texts that bear witness to the existence of the library at Caesarea. The patristic references are given with precision (editions, page numbers, etc.) and many of the texts are quoted in the original (he should give the edition and translation used of the

[History] *Tarikh*, referred to on 101). For those in our guild with less skill in ecclesiastical Latin, translations would make the process of reading easier. What does emerge with increasing force is that no church institution owned the library—given the evidence of the ancient sources. One desideratum I have is a longer treatment of the colophons that mention the library (they are still only accessible in full in Harnack’s *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* I/2, 543-545). Although he briefly discusses them (86-91), Frenschkowski admits more needs to be said, and he would be the one to do it.

4. “A Newly Discovered manuscript of Luke’s Gospel (De Hamel MS 386; Gregory-Aland 0312)” is the topic of Peter M. Head’s contribution (105-120). Unfortunately the provenance of the ms is unknown. Head describes the process of initial reading, supplemented by ultra-violet photography. What “emerged is a relatively early majuscule manuscript of Luke in an interesting format with an unusual text” (107). Page A (hair side) is Lk 5:23-24. Page B (flesh side) is Luke 5:30-31. Page C (flesh side) is Lk 7:9, and Page D (hair side) is the end of Lk 7:17. Head’s calculations provide the conclusion that each page would have had 28 lines (+/-1), with 26 letters on each line (+/-1). Each page would have held about 728 (+/-50) letters and may have measured 12 (+/-1) x 10 cm (+/-1). The letters are quite small. Two sheets (eight pages) are missing between 5:31 and 7:9. The standard format (Gregory’s rule) is that four-sheet quires have flesh on the outside of sheet 1 (the outer sheet of the quire) and flesh on the inner fold of sheet 4 (the inner sheet of the quire). The second and third sheets match hair and flesh sides respectively (e.g. the hair side of sheet one matches the hair side of sheet two). This is much easier to see with a diagram as on 113. The ms itself would be the second sheet of such a quire. Using paleographical comparisons, Head dates it to the second half of the fifth century (114-116). A singular reading the ms contains is the lack of $\sigma\tau\rho\alpha\phi\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ in 7:9. Head notes that most of the miniature codices in one listing (47 of 55) are Christian and many contain non-canonical texts such as Hermas (110, 120).

5. Dirk Jongkind examines the most famous of all NT mss in “One Codex, Three Scribes, and Many Books: Struggles with Space in *Codex Sinaiticus*” (121-135). Jongkind argues that three scribes produced the ms, not the four proposed by Tischendorf in his original 1862 edition of most of the LXX and the entire NT. Quaternions (quires of four sheets = 8 folios = 16 pages) are the primary unit of the ms, although three of the quires have one, two or three sheets and three quires have folios cut out. At this point Jongkind’s arguments become highly detailed (although definitely not overly technical for any interested generalist). One of his conclusions, for example, relates to the two scribes who copied 1 Maccabees and Judith respectively. 1 Maccabees (copied by Scribe A) starts on the third folio of quire 39 (39.3) in the second column of the folio (125). Judith, however, ends on folio 39.2 (last column). The prose books of the ms all have four columns per page. Scribe D (who copied Judith) stretched the text out by decreasing the number of letters per line. This fact and the presence of the blank column indicate that 1 Maccabees had been written before Judith. The “situation surrounding the end of the NT [Revelation, which precedes Barnabas and Hermas] is muddled and it seems that at least two errors on the side of scribe A need to be supposed in order to explain the resulting situation” (134). One of his main conclusions is that, although the scribes were professionally trained, the ms was probably not produced in an experienced *scriptorium* (given the absence of 2 and 3 Macc). Jongkind also argues against the thesis that the ms was produced by dictation by using some arguments similar to those referred to above.

6. Tommy Wasserman (137-160) wrestles with the function of text of Jude in “P⁷⁸ (P.Oxy. XXXIV 2684): The Epistle of Jude on an Amulet?” The text is part of a miniature codex (5.3 x 2.9 cm). It consists of two leaves: Fol. 1, recto (Jude 4), Fol. 1, verso (Jude 4-5), Fol. 2, recto (Jude 7-8), Fol. 2, verso (Jude 8). Around 335 letters are missing (part of Jude 5-7). Wasserman’s conclusion is that the ms once was part of a codex that comprised a larger portion of Jude (perhaps 1-13), and that it was originally created as an amulet. This goes against K. Aland’s assumption that it was a single-quire codex holding all of Jude (141). Wasserman believes texts such as Jude 6 (which mentions the Lord sending fallen angels into the darkness for judgment) could have “functioned as *historiolae* in apotropaic texts.” The dispute of Michael with the devil in Jude 9 was also a text used often in Jewish magic. Wasserman thinks the unusual readings in the text may be the result of the magical purpose of the text. An alternative function for the text Wasserman mentions is “Schmuckcodex,” although an amulet could be worn for several purposes (137). His essay can be considered part of the ongoing investigation of magic in antiquity. The generalist reader of these essays will ask more than once if every short text written by unprofessional scribes in antiquity served as one of the magician’s tools for manipulating reality. One of the editors noted to me that a line of P⁷⁸ was dropped in the process of formatting the transcription of Fol. 2 (arrow down): namely the fifth line with NOI and a high/middle stop.

7. Tobias Nicklas and Tommy Wasserman (161-188) investigate a ms which includes P⁷² (perhaps the oldest witness to Jude and both canonical Petrine epistles) in “Theologische Linien im *Codex Bodmer Miscellani*?” The authors note that scholars have often ignored the fact that this witness to the NT text is part of a larger codex that itself poses many problems and questions. The ms comprises The Birth of Mary (*P.Bodm.* V), 3 Corinthians (*P.Bodm.* X), Ode of Solomon 11 (*P.Bodm.* XI), Jude, Melito’s Paschal Homily (*P.Bodm.* XIII), a hymn fragment (*P.Bodm.* XII), the Apology of Phileas (*P.Bodm.* XX), Ps 33 and 34 LXX (*P.Bodm.* IX), and 1 and 2 Peter (*P.Bodm.* VIII). Four scribes are responsible for the material, and the authors go into much more codicological detail about the steps involved in the construction of the ms. The authors next investigate various hypotheses that have been proposed that seek a unifying theme or element of form that runs through all the texts included in the ms. Their conclusion is that there is no unifying element of form, no common *Sitz im Leben*, and no dominant theme that unifies the entire ms. In many cases they do discover a very high Christology (Jesus as divine) which also retains the bodily nature of Jesus. Jude 5, for example (177-178), has $\theta(\epsilon)\sigma \chi\rho(\iota\sigma\tau\omicron)\varsigma$. Many of the texts are related to questions that proto-Orthodox groups might have raised in their encounters with Gnostics and so forth. But not all are (e.g. Ode of Solomon 11). The educated collector(s) had access to different texts and trained Christian scribes.

8. A papyrus that is “uniquely important” for the recovery of the text of Paul is the topic of Michael W. Holmes’ “The Text of P⁴⁶: Evidence of the Earliest ‘Commentary’ On Romans?” (189-206). The article opens with something of a tribute to G. Zuntz’s classic work in this area (*The Text of the Epistles: A Disquisition upon the Corpus Paulinum* [SchL 1946, London 1953]). The ms is important, even though it contains numerous scribal errors, since it along with a few others may preserve the “true wording” of the Pauline archetype. Holmes, however, chooses to concentrate on the “significant errors” by using readings from Romans in the following mss: the bilingual D, F, and G (“western” witnesses); and one or more of the group P⁴⁶, B, and 1739 (“proto-Alexandrian” witnesses). The final result of his investigation is that before Marcion, an early reader of Romans “actively and thoughtfully engaged with the content of the text being

read” (205). Marginal comments, in other words, made their way into the ms. Another important result is that there is evidence, for Holmes (and Zuntz), of early contact between a pre-Western and pre-Alexandrian stage in the transmission of Romans.

9. Larry W. Hurtado (207-226) investigates the iconography of an ancient Christian symbol in “The Staurogram in Early Christian manuscripts: The Earliest Visual Reference to the Crucified Jesus?” The superimposed majuscule form of the *tau* and *rho* is much earlier than the commonly considered date for pictorial representation of the crucifixion (V-VI C.E.). Hurtado makes the point that the other monograms (such as the *Chi-Rho* symbol) refer to names or Christological symbols (212). The earliest occurrence of the staurogram is from around 200 C.E. in P⁶⁶. In that ms, three uses of $\sigma\tau\alpha\upsilon\rho\sigma$ and seven of the verb $\sigma\tau\alpha\upsilon\rho\omega$ employ the monogram (cp. the similar situation in P⁷⁵ from the same period). Consequently scholars who dated the staurogram to the period after Constantine are in error. In explanation of the device Hurtado mentions F. J. Dölger’s citation of ancient evidence (examples of “isosephy) that *rho* can represent “good fortune” (*rho* = 100 and that the letters of $\epsilon\pi\prime\alpha\gamma\alpha\theta\acute{\alpha}$ add up to 100). Ephraem (IV C.E.), commenting on an apparent monogram with *alpha* and *omega* to the left and right respectively of the *tau-rho* identified the rho with help ($\beta\omicron\rho\eta\theta\iota\alpha$) = 100. This could have meant, “salvation is in the cross.” The freestanding monogram, however, is different from that incorporated into the words of the mss. Hurtado ends with the hypothesis that the staurogram may not be isosephy, but a representation of the crucified Jesus. A small point to consider here also is that the author does not cite Ephraem explicitly, and there are problems with the Rome edition (1732-1746 Assemani, et al.) of the Syrian father who probably knew little Greek. Hurtado does not use CPG § 4062, which would have alerted him to the dubious nature of the text (*In sanctam Parasceven*) Dölger quoted. One immediate result of Hurtado’s work is that J. van Haelst’s reason for denying *P. Taur. inv.* 27 (Ps 1:1; van Haelst § 84) a II C.E. date because of the staurogram is incorrect.

10. Thomas J. Kraus reviews a number of mss of the *Lord’s Prayer* in: “Manuscripts with the *Lord’s Prayer*—They are More than Simply Witnesses to that Text Itself” (227-226). Kraus notes that the prayer served as the mainstay of ancient Christian liturgy, proclamation, catechesis and lived faith. However, with the exception of the codices which do have Gregory-Aland numbers (ms § 18, 19), the first seventeen mss are not used in text criticism (including an ostrakon, ms § 4 = Gregory-Aland 0152). Kurt Aland’s attempt to take some account of the other mss (*Varia* in his scheme) helped some, but those mss are held in low opinion. Although recovering the *Urtext* is a legitimate goal, the mss also provide evidence for “the real life contexts of variant readings” (231). Kraus discusses 19 mss, of which one (§ 4) is an ostrakon, and two (§ 15, 16) are on wood. He also refers to two inscriptions that include the prayer (252). Some of them are clearly amulets (253), but others perhaps had functions or origins as diverse as the following: liturgy, a damaged book, writing exercises, and even a scribal note that incorporated the Lord’s prayer (ms § 2). To complete his study, Kraus (254-266) gives a close reading of *P. Princ.* II 107 = *Suppl. Mag.* I 29. That text comprises an invocation of the archangel Michael, Ps 90:1-2, Mt 6:9-11, *Liturgia Marci* (*trisagion*, doxology), and a set of names. The texts were used against fever. Clearly there is a problem with the lists of NT mss that leave out such intriguing texts.

11. Malcolm Choat directs his attention to letters in “Echo and Quotation of the New Testament in Papyrus Letters to the End of the Fourth Century” (267-292). He uses both Greek and Coptic

letters to create an intriguing picture of a use of scripture by early Christians that has not been considered by the other essays in the volume. “Citations” are invocations of biblical authors or “the scriptures.” “Quotations” are demonstrable uses of scripture (without identification). “Echoes” are either a “purported biblical locus (including coming in a religious context),” or a usage in which the only relationship to the NT is a “word found therein but rarely elsewhere” (268). The citations and quotations can be evidence for the text of the NT. Echoes and citations can indicate that a letter is Christian. “Echo” has to be used carefully, however, as in *P. Lond.* III 981.8-11 where “a deacon tells a famous monk or bishop that his fame has encircled ‘the entire world.’” There may, or may not, be a reference to Rom 1:8. The Manichean use of scripture in letters indicates their view of themselves as true Christians (277-280). Identifiable echoes of the NT “do not appear until the late third century,” and explicit citations do not appear until after Constantine (280). Choat admits that such phrases may come from scripture, sermons, reading of other literature, or hearing the phrase in another way (280). He ends with four helpful tables that include the phrase in question and the relevant Greek or Coptic scriptural phrase: I, Citations; II, Quotations or Clear Allusions; III, Word or Phrase in Religious Context; and IV, Word or Phrase not in Religious Context.

12. Kim Haines-Eitzen investigates “constructions” of “popular culture” and “women’s culture” that have been associated with the apocryphal literature in “The Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles on papyrus: Revisiting the Question of Readership and Audience” (293-304). She notes that “we have evidence to suggest that women served a variety of roles in the production, reproduction, dissemination, and consumption of ancient literature” and quotes this line from *P.Oxy.* LXIII 4365, “To my dearest lady sister, greetings in the Lord. Lend the Ezra, since I lent you the little Genesis,” as an example (293). Wealthy women, as owners of libraries, were also involved in borrowing, lending, and copying of Christian literature. The thesis that Haines-Eitzen attacks is the view that the Apocryphal Acts (AAA) are women’s literature or popular literature (295). One immediate problem (296) with the adjective “popular” with regard to the Greek novels is that there are far more papyrus fragments of Homer (1000 by one count) than of the novels (42). Haines-Eitzen lists 12 Greek papyrus fragments of the AAA (298) that are from pre-6th century codices. By comparison there are over 100 NT papyri fragments from the same period (299; on 312 S. Porter gives the number as ca. 116). Presumably Haines-Eitzen does not include NT magical texts (etc.) in that figure—just fragments of papyrus codices. Nine of the twelve (of the AAA fragments) are from the Acts of Paul. None of the codices of the AAA she investigates are by unprofessional scribes. If the codex form is any indicator, then the AAA were read by “members of the upper-echelons who likewise enjoyed poetry, history, and perhaps philosophy” (303). Exit “popular culture” and “women’s culture” as the *Sitz im Leben* of the AAA.

13. Stanley E. Porter attacks the Gregory-Aland classification scheme for NT mss in his “Textual Criticism in the Light of Diverse Textual Evidence for the Greek New Testament: An Expanded Proposal” (305-337). The critique is constructive, however, and Porter recommends classifying mss based on this fundamental criterion: continuous-text mss would be in one category, and non-continuous mss would be in the other (314). As evidence becomes available any given non-continuous ms might be placed in the other category. The present system, for example, ignores many mss relevant for the textual history of the NT including the apocryphal gospels (some of which are dated quite early). MSS without Gregory-Aland numbers end up getting ignored. Porter also notes that some of the majuscule mss are older than the papyri, even though the

papyri are given “theoretical priority” in the current system (309). Lectionaries “are virtually dismissed” even if they are earlier (as some are) than many of the papyri or majuscules (310). For his second category (non-continuous texts), Porter suggests as a broad classification scheme the following: Lectionary and Liturgical texts; Miniature codices and Magical Papyri/Amulets; Commentaries; Apocryphal Texts; Excerpts; and a category Porter calls “Unknown.” For each of these sub-categories he offers examples and indicates their usefulness for textual criticism. This essay will provoke some soul-searching among text critics and NT generalists. Have we gone too far down the road Caspar René Gregory, Ernst von Dobschütz (cf. 229), Kurt and Barbara Aland and many others have paved to stop now?

John Granger Cook
LaGrange College

© Copyright TC: *A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism*, 2007.