

“There Is No Glory and No Money in the Work”

H. C. Hoskier and New Testament Textual Criticism

Garrick V. Allen*

Abstract: Focusing on the work and life of H. C. Hoskier, this article explores the broader intellectual context of late nineteenth and early twentieth century textual criticism. This examination illuminates the deep context of current trends in textual scholarship on the New Testament, arguing that the discipline has much to learn from the dark corners of the tradition.

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.¹

In an age where textual criticism of the New Testament is defined by electronic editorial tools, advanced tagging of digital images, and a fairly stable list of witnesses, it is difficult to discern what, if anything, modern scholars can learn from research carried out in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. At first glance, the differences appear too great. But at second glance, even though the technology, praxis, and goals of textual criticism have changed in fundamental ways, revisiting the work of past scholars, even those that are now perceived as obscure, can better contextualize current work in the field and help us to recognize a broader critical arch in the multigenerational work of grappling with the text of the New Testament and its history. There is much to be learned from the efforts of our intellectual forbearers, even if they are rarely read today. To put this supposition to the test, I argue that H. C. Hoskier’s text critical praxis, exemplified in his *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse* (1929), is a precursor to a number of current trends in textual scholarship, which illuminates the relationship between changes in technology and text-critical praxis.

* I am thankful to the Irish Research Council’s New Foundations Scheme which funded research on this article and to Alice Ford-Smith for her assistance during my visit to Bernard Quaritch in February 2017. The quotation in the title is located in H. C. Hoskier, *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse* (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1929), 1:xiv.

¹ H. C. Hoskier, *A Full Account and Collation of the Greek Cursive Codex Evangelium 604 (with Two Facsimiles) [Egerton 2610 in the British Museum]* (London: David Nutt, 1890), vi.

Herman Charles Elias Hoskier’s (1864–1938) life, philosophical proclivities, and scholarship were deeply eccentric,² driven by an aspiration to live according to his own convictions. These convictions motivated Hoskier to retire from banking in 1903 at the age of thirty-nine and devote himself to textual scholarship on the Bible.³ He commented on important Greek manuscripts, including Codex Vaticanus, \mathfrak{P}^{46} , and the codex Washingtonianus of the gospels, along with the versions (esp. Latin and Bohairic) and particular manuscripts thereof. His scholarly activity coincided with an active period in textual scholarship related to the ongoing evaluation of nineteenth century discoveries and the continual unearthing of new witnesses.⁴ Hoskier worked in a context where the material available to the textual critic was expanding at an exponential rate, and not only in the form of transcriptions, but also in photographs as the medium became more affordable in the late nineteenth century.⁵ The proliferation of access to the text of documents through apparatuses of editions, publications of transcriptions and collations, and photographs made a work like *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse*, Hoskier’s most lasting contribution, possible. Technological advancements influenced the shape of the field and Hoskier’s scholarship in particular.

However, his work was, and remains, controversial. This controversy revolved primarily around two issues. First, Hoskier continually asserted that the versions heavily influenced the shape of the Greek text in an early period due to confusion that arose from copying polyglottal manuscripts, coupled with the occasional insinuation that many of the Greek manuscripts today represent “retranslations” from versional languages back to Greek.⁶ He imagined a social context defined by a polylingualism in which the Greek text was corrupted by interference from other vernaculars. Second, Hort’s critical methodology and preference for codex Vaticanus (B) were constant targets of Hoskier’s ire as well as, by proxy, the editors of the 1881 Revised Version. His two volume *Codex B and Its Allies* is an attempt to “sing the Death-song of B as a neutral text,” constituted by pages of collations and textual commentary, peppered with polemic invectives and noncontextualized exasperated exclamations.⁷ Edgar Goodspeed

² Hoskier went by Charles according to J. Rendel Harris’s obituary published in *The Times* on 19 September 1938 (p. 8). For more on Hoskier’s father, see John Orbell “Hoskier, Herman,” in *ODNB*.

³ In the preface to *Cursive Codex Evangelium 604* (1890), Hoskier notes that his work took place during his “scant leisure” (p. xxi). His convictions also motivated his service in the volunteer French ambulance service in the Great War. Hoskier was twice wounded (his injuries are mentioned in the prolegomena to *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse*, 1:ix), awarded the *Croix de Guerre*, and made a member of the Legion of Honour. His family continued to advocate for the victims of war, as evidenced by his wife’s letter to the editor of the *New York Times* on 8 February 1926 appealing for French refugees.

⁴ Hoskier himself notes that between 1883–1890 an additional 1500 manuscripts were brought to light—a 75 percent increase (*Full Account*, xx). Cf. E. J. Epp and Gordon D. Fee, *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 12–14.

⁵ For more on the social context of editing and textual criticism in the late nineteenth century, which points out the “wealthy amateurism” that maintained a certain influence (a category to which Hoskier certainly belonged), cf. Kathryn Sutherland, “Anglo-American Editorial Theory,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Textual Scholarship*, ed. N. Fraistat and J. Flanders (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 42–60. The process of photographic reproduction was felt in other humanistic fields as well. Cf. Daniela Saxer, “Archival objects in motion: historians’ appropriation of sources in nineteenth century Austria and Switzerland,” *Arch Sci* (2010): 315–31 for a detailed analysis of the process and its social consequences in a particular test case.

⁶ E.g., H. C. Hoskier, *Codex B and Its Allies*, 2 vols. (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1914), 1:136 where Hoskier confuses versional support for Greek readings in W with retranslation.

⁷ Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:iii. His exclamations are, if nothing else, entertaining in their directness and sarcastic tone. E.g., “This is criticism gone mad” (1:64); or on Luke 11:37: “This omission is no more ‘neutral’ or ‘pre-syrian’ than I am a centaur” (1:229).

characterizes Hoskier's two books on the origins of the versions in a similar way, as "a mass of individual textual notes, with an occasional paragraph of bold generalization."⁸

Part of the controversial nature of Hoskier's enterprise was the fact that he adopted his own distinct set of methodological habits that emphasized patient tedium over flashy conclusions based on partial data, undergirded by a religious belief that the wording of the *textus receptus* (TR) was almost equal to the "original text." Although Hoskier had a group of allies that accepted parts of his work,⁹ other contemporaries were dismissive of his eccentricities.¹⁰ The pinnacle of his outputs is undoubtedly the two-volume *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse*, which represented the first attempt by any scholar to singularly digest the comprehensive data for a particular New Testament work. This momentous individual effort and Hoskier's praxis as a textual scholar were outliers in their time;¹¹ his conviction that it was imperative to collect and organize all the available textual data in order to make judgements about the originality of a reading represented a genuine advancement in the field wrought by the purity of Hoskier's will and his pocketbook's ability to purchase photographs of manuscripts strewn about world libraries. Unfortunately, his level of tenacity was not always equal to the level of his analytical skill. Nonetheless, his body of work and *Concerning the Text* in particular represent an important transition regarding the praxis and goals of textual scholarship, a bridge that parallels many current editorial projects, especially the *editio critica maior* (ECM), where technological advances continue to make possible the type of comprehensive work that the field demands.

In what follows, I first explore the Hoskier's life and influences in an effort to contextualize his outputs and perspectives. Then I examine the important and lasting features of this key work and its contribution to the field, organized around his participation in the Great War. I conclude with some observations about the relationship between Hoskier's work and current trends in the field, arguing that this obscure figure anticipated many developments over the past century. I am convinced that analyzing significant past endeavors can illuminate present realities in the discipline.

⁸ Edgar J. Goodspeed, "Review: Hoskier's Study of the New Testament Versions," *AmJT* 16 (1912): 652–54 (here 653).

⁹ Notably: Henry A. Sanders, "The Beatty Papyrus of Revelation and Hoskier's Edition," *JBL* 53 (1934): 371–380, which at times reads like a summary of Hoskier's *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse*; and Sanders's review of the *Golden Latin Gospels* in *AJP* 32 (1911): 218–20, where he endorses Hoskier's polyglot theory, connecting it to Harris's work on Codex Bezae. So also Sanders, "Hoskier's Genesis of the Versions," *AJP* 33 (1912): 30–42. Sanders also offers a hearty thanks to Hoskier in the acknowledgements of his *The Washington Manuscript of the Four Gospels: The New Testament Manuscript in the Freer Collection, part I* (London: Macmillan, 1912). Hoskier contributed a strange article to Harris' *Festschrift*: "Concerning 78 and Its Very Special Use in the Old Testament," in *Amiticiae Corolla: A Volume of Essays Presented to James Rendel Harris, C.Litt. on the Occasion of His Eightieth Birthday*, ed. H. G. Wood (London: University of London Press, 1933), 96–117. E. Nestle, "Some Points in the History of the *Textus Receptus* of the New Testament," *JTS* 9 (1910): 564–68, also refers to Hoskier as "one of the most conscientious workers in the field."

¹⁰ Cf. F. C. Burkitt, "Additional Note," *JTS* 12 (1911): 457–59: "I would not quibble over a word, but Mr Hoskier has such a well-deserved reputation for minute accuracy in textual matters, and he is so severe on the lapses of other people, that his statement might very well be understood to imply a higher degree of similarity between Z and Vulgate portion of Cod. Claromontanus that I imagine to exist" (here 458); cf. also Goodspeed, "Review," 652–54.

¹¹ Not everything about *Concerning the Text* was entirely positive, including the more technical aspects of sifting subvariants and properly arbitrating between itacism, spelling conventions, and substantive textual variation.

A Biographical Sketch

Hoskier was born in 1864 in Blackheath, Kent to Herman Hoskier and Elizabeth Catherine Byrne of New Orleans. H. C. Hoskier’s father was the son of a Norwegian merchant banker (Herman Christian Hoskier) and his brother (Emile Hoskier, H. C. Hoskier’s uncle) founded the Parisian bank Emile Hoskier & Cie, for which the elder Herman served as the London agent in the late nineteenth century. In 1859 the elder Hoskier was dispatched to Mobile, Alabama to act as the agent for the Brown Shipley & Co. merchant company, purchasing cotton for British textile mills. Even after the outbreak of the American civil war, Hoskier managed to move 30,000 bales of cotton past the Union blockade in its early days, cementing his legacy in the British merchant trade. In 1861, Hoskier and his family returned to England, and he was made partner of Brown Shipley’s house in London in 1866. Retiring in 1880, he became a financier and a director of the Union Bank of London (the largest in the world at the time) in 1881 and a financial director of the London business of the Arthur Guinness Son & Co. Brewery in Dublin in 1886. Hoskier’s estate at the time of his death was £211,027, around \$28 million in current value.¹²

All this to say that H. C. Hoskier was born into an upper-class family with strong international ties and a healthy bank account, all valuable characteristics for someone interested in biblical scholarship. He attended Eton College (1878–1881) and emigrated in the mid-1880s to New York, where he took up the family business, working in banking and brokerage first for Hoskier, Wood & Co., then for L. von Hoffmann & Co. After the First World War, Hoskier was appointed as the Vice President of the short-lived Foreign Finance Corporation—a precursor of the World Bank—which was headed by J. P. Morgan and designed to streamline American loans abroad. He was given the handsome annual salary of \$18,000 (nearly \$300,000 today) for his expertise in exchange.¹³ Although the corporation was short-lived, the salary seems more than fair for a job that demanded the chairing of a twice monthly meeting in Manhattan.

Hoskier seems to have led a very East Egg type of life, settling in South Orange, New Jersey about 20 miles from Manhattan.¹⁴ In 1888 he married Amelia Wood in a country wedding that

¹² Cf. John Crosby Brown, *A Hundred Years of Merchant Banking* (New York: Private Printing, 1909), 334–38. His obituary was printed in the *New York Times*, 10 May 1904. His father’s business relationship with Guinness is not Hoskier’s only connection to Ireland. His time on the western front of the Great War was bracketed by research on the “Garland of Howth” (Usser. 2) of Trinity College, and in the 1930s he was one of the first scholars after Kenyon to explore the Pauline letters in the Chester Beatty biblical papyri (P⁴⁶). Cf. Hoskier, “A Study of the Chester-Beatty Codex of the Pauline Epistles,” *JTS* 38 (1937): 148–63; Hoskier, *A Commentary on the Various Readings in the Text of the Epistle to the Hebrews in the Chester-Beatty Papyrus P⁴⁶* (circa 200 A.D.) (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1938); F. G. Kenyon, *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: Descriptions and Texts of the Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible* (London: Emery Walker, 1934–1937).

¹³ Cf. Trevin Stratton, “Mammon Unbound: The International Financial Architecture of Wall Street Banks, 1915–1925,” in *The Impact of the First World War on International Business*, ed. A. Smith, S. Mollan, and K. D. Tennent (London: Routledge, 2017), 185–210.

¹⁴ BL MS 64220, 94 names Hoskier as Bernard Quaritch’s only client in South Orange, NJ. He is noted as interested in “Greek liturgies.” Cf. also the notice of sale of Hoskier’s land in South Orange to a developer in the *New York Times* on 1 June 1928, corresponding to his move to Jersey in the Channel Islands. Some of the metaphors that Hoskier uses in his work (e.g., the pheasant hunt in H. C. Hoskier, *Concerning the Genesis of the Versions of the N.T.* [London: Bernard Quaritch, 1910], 65 or the horse metaphor in Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:462–463) reinforce the idea that he was an East Egger.

attracted “many people from New York.”¹⁵ Together Herman and Amelia had four sons, two of whom died prematurely: their oldest, Cyril Herman Hoskier, at the age of five,¹⁶ and Ronald Wood Hoskier, who was shot down near St. Quentin in France on 23 April 1917.¹⁷ A Harvard man, Ronald was the first American fighter pilot to perish in Europe during the First World War.

Following his own decorated military service, Hoskier continued his scholarly work with vigor. The war seems to have been a turning point in Hoskier’s academic and personal lives.¹⁸ Prior to the conflict, Hoskier was a well-known collector of coins, incunabula, manuscripts, and horses,¹⁹ although he was not always very successful at these pursuits.²⁰ He sold most of his library in 1908 to avoid “oppressive” taxes,²¹ although he continued to bid on early printed Bibles and other classical literature at auction in England via his agent Bernard Quaritch until the very day of Archduke Ferdinand’s assassination. He donated the majority of his collections to multiple libraries and museums, including the British Museum and the University of Michigan library. The most lasting impact of Hoskier’s collecting activities occurred in late 1905 when he attempted to sell his numismatics collection to the United States Mint. He corresponded with then President Theodore Roosevelt about this purchase, taking the liberty to suggest that the design for new coinage that was in preparation should follow ancient Greek prototypes.²² The mint declined to purchase his collection.

In 1927 Hoskier moved from New Jersey to Jersey in the Channel Islands, two years before he was commissioned as Honorary Curator of the University of Michigan’s Museum of Ar-

¹⁵ Cf. Marcia Worth, “Local History: WWI Pilot Ronald Wood Hoskier,” South Orange Patch, 11 November 2010: <https://patch.com/new-jersey/southorange/local-history-wwi-pilot-ronald-wood-hoskier> [accessed 19 Dec 2017].

¹⁶ Obituary published in the New York Times 19 April 1894.

¹⁷ Cf. “American Flier Killed in Combat,” New York Times 25 April 1917.

¹⁸ In this period, Hoskier also produced a number of philosophical works that were part of the broader movement of theosophy, a postwar spiritual movement that rigorously argued for the re-enchantment the world. 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 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”—a place accessible by looking inside oneself in an effort to locate one’s own “godhood” where we find “our coequality with that Essence.” These deeply held beliefs also influenced his scholarly work. For example, in *Concerning the Text* he includes readings gleaned from a spirit communication in a report of a nineteenth century séance. See the bibliography below for more detail.

¹⁹ Hoskier’s champion horse Lord Brilliant won a \$200 prize in 1900 (over \$5000 today). Cf. *Brooklyn Daily Eagle Almanac* (1900): 138.

²⁰ For example, Hoskier’s numismatics collection was burgled in April 1925 by a Finnish sailor who was only apprehended because a beat cop spotted a man exiting from his cellar window. Upon raising his hands dozens of gold coins jangled onto the pavement. The burglar told police that he had travelled from Philadelphia to “make some easy money.” The story in the New York Times closes by noting that in 1915, \$50,000 of paintings had been stolen from Hoskier’s home (30 April 1925).

²¹ Cf. *Catalogue of a Portion of the Valuable Library of H. C. Hoskier, Esq. of South Orange, New Jersey, U.S.A.* (London: Sothebys, 1908).

²² This letter seems to have motivated Roosevelt to impress upon Augustus Saint-Gaudens the importance of his commission to produce new American coinage. Cf. Vladimir Clain-Stefanelli, *History of the National Numismatic Collections* (Washington: US Government Printing, 1968), 91. Hoskier’s collection was eventual sold by Jacob Hirsch in 1907. Cf. *Auctions-Catalog einer höchst bedeutenden Sammlung ... Collection H.C. Hoskier* (Munich: Hirsch, 1907).

chaeology.²³ He had previously been awarded an honorary Master of Arts in 1925 following a generous donation of rare books and coins. Although Hoskier continued to write from Jersey, his wife died in 1929, and he forwent his American citizenship in 1932. He was awarded an honorary ThD from the Universiteit van Amsterdam in June 1938, three months before his death on 8 September.

At the end of his life, Hoskier was alone and penniless, his surviving sons based in London and San Francisco. The trajectory from wealthy gilded-age Manhattan banker to poor biblical scholar on a Channel Island is reflected in his will of 1927 (amended 2 August 1935). In the amended version, Hoskier forgoes the expense of the transfer of his body to his family plot in South Orange and requests to be buried in a casket made of “wicker enclosed in a plain deal box” since he considered an ornamental casket “a waste of money” that “restricts the prompt absorption of remains by dear mother-earth.” In the 1935 codicil, Hoskier also notes that his youngest son Walter now owes him £359 (ca. £24,000 today) and that this amount should be subtracted from his inheritance, should there be any. Hoskier is an object lesson. And not merely that one rarely gets rich on biblical scholarship, but that it also has the power to make rich people of conviction poor.

Prewar Hoskier

Before moving on to Hoskier’s work on the Apocalypse and its significance for current trends in the field, it is important to first establish the trajectory and focus of his scholarly outputs with the preceding biographical sketch in the background. His magnum opus *Concerning the Text* was the product of a career of study of the biblical text toward a particular ideological end. Prior to the war, Hoskier’s work revolved around an organizing idea: the countless variants emerging in new witnesses could be ascribed to the production of polyglottal exemplars in an early period and to the influence of the versions, especially Latin, Coptic, and Syriac. Hoskier set out to prove his theory by collating and editing Greek and Latin manuscripts.

His first book, published before his retirement from finance, examined GA 700 (B. L. Egerton 2610), and it is this publication that unduly underwrote the idea that Hoskier was a disciple of Westcott and Hort’s virulent opponent John William Burgon (1813–1888), the dean of Chichester and Oxford don described by one biographer as “an indefatigable champion of lost causes and impossible beliefs.”²⁴ Hoskier’s first book is dedicated to Burgon, in part, for “his untiring zeal and unflagging efforts to prepare reliable foundations upon which might securely rest the true science of the textual criticism of the New Testament.” Hoskier’s early work was expressly influenced by changes in textual criticism wrought by Westcott and Hort and their text’s influence on the 1881 Revised Version, and he adopted a position close to Burgon’s

²³ In a series of uncatalogued correspondence at the University of Michigan, Hoskier shows reticence to accept the position until he was assured that it came with absolutely no duties, official or otherwise.

²⁴ Hoskier, *Full Account* (1890). On Burgon, cf. G. Martin Murphy, “Burgon, William,” in *ODNB*. Burgon opposed not only the textual scholarship of Westcott and Hort, but also the education of women at Oxford, the striking down of the religious test for university entry, and the housing system for undergraduates because the lodging house-keepers sometimes hired women recently released from the penitentiary. Additionally, Burgon’s work has been used since the late nineteenth century to support proponents of the majority text theory, who still use Westcott and Hort as a critical foil, despite serious advances in editorial theory since then. 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.

insofar as they both opposed Westcott and Hort in no uncertain terms. However, beyond his fawning praise of Burgon in the book's first handful of pages, there is little evidence in the rest of his body of work that Burgon was a major influence.²⁵ Despite their shared propensities for polemic and love of the TR, Hoskier was a much more creative and focused thinker. Daniel Wallace goes so far as to say that viewing Hoskier as a champion of the majority text due to his contacts with Burgon is tantamount to "historical revisionism."²⁶ Hoskier perceived the same issue in textual criticism as Burgon, but sought to create a method that moved beyond an appeal to the "traditional" understanding of the text advocated by Burgon and his ilk.²⁷ Hoskier built a method based on arduous study of the documents, the fundamental importance of detail and accuracy, and patient digestion of the evidence, convinced that serious and scientifically minded scholarly work—not naked appeal to tradition—would vindicate the TR. His work is so deliberate that he is even critiqued by Wilhelm Bousset for essentially standing dumb before his data.²⁸

Regardless of his relationship with Burgon, Hoskier's evaluation of GA 700 (eleventh century) emphasizes the singularity of the text of the early pandect codices. For Hoskier, the scribes of the early uncials "were, to an enormous extent, their own critics, leading them to altogether independent treatment of the Sacred Text."²⁹ Despite their age, these manuscripts (esp. \aleph B D) were the products of scribes who, according to Hoskier, did more than simply copy their exemplars. Hoskier is determined to distinguish between reading "foisted on to the Sacred Text and what is the genuine survival of ancient reading or readings."³⁰ The goal of recovering the original reading is the overarching goal of Hoskier's program—to strip away the corruptions that have infected the pure text like an archaeologist excavates a tel searching for the foundation of the most ancient layer. These corruptions arose, according to Hoskier's deductions, due to the critical work of scribes and, most prevalently, the influence of the versions, since many scribes copied their Greek texts from polyglot exemplars.

Hoskier goes about this task by describing GA 700, its physical characteristics, paratexts, scribal intricacies, itacisms, textual changes, and singular readings. The introduction concludes with nearly eighty pages of select collations (pp. xxxvii–cxv) of rare or significant readings that concludes with a page of commentary arguing that the manuscript represents a mixed text. This data, for Hoskier, argues against the hasty assignment of manuscripts to particular text families, like the "neutral text"—a clear allusion to Hortian thinking.³¹ In all this one observes an approach that attempts to take the characteristics of each exemplar seriously. The body of the book follows with a forty-three-page collation of the manuscript where it differs from Stephanus's 1550 edition with no further comment. Reading this book is like driving down a twenty-mile driveway to get to supermarket two blocks away. It concludes with a series of unrelated appendices, comprising collations of other manuscripts, reports on library visits, and the differences between various early printed editions.

Hoskier continued this tack in a more specific way in his edition of a purple Latin Gospel codex (JP) owned by financier J. P. Morgan of which only two hundred copies were printed on

²⁵ Although, cf. Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:415–16.

²⁶ Wallace, "Historical Revisionism," 280–85.

²⁷ Cf. Burgon's famous *The Revision Revised* (London: John Murray, 1883), 235 in which he refers to Hort as "some ingenious theory-monger."

²⁸ Wilhelm Bousset, *Textkritische Studien zum Neuen Testament*, TU 9.4 (Leipzig: Hinrichs'sche, 1894), 118–19, although he agrees with Hoskier's criticism of Hort's western text.

²⁹ Hoskier, *Full Account*, xiv.

³⁰ Hoskier, *Full Account*, xv.

³¹ Hoskier, *Full Account*, cxvi.

the finest Italian paper and gifted as Morgan saw fit.³² Despite the handsomeness of the rare volume, it proved controversial. In addition to Hoskier’s unorthodox editorial practices and less-than-academic tone, his precise identification of the manuscript as the product of Irish scribes (more than forty of them) in an English monastery, even though it was a “class by itself as regards English and Irish MMS,”³³ proved less than convincing.³⁴ Hoskier’s analysis also traversed tricky ground because he saw in JP support for his polyglot theory. He compared readings in JP to Sinaiticus, concluding that Sinaiticus was corrupted by the influence from its antigraph which was either a Greco-Latin or even Greco-Latin-Syriac-Coptic polyglot.³⁵ This versional influence not only accounts for the numerous forms of variation in the Greek tradition, but also undermines Sinaiticus as a reliable witness in particular. Hoskier’s view of the role of the versions in the process of copying and their venerable age have been universally panned.³⁶

The interrelationship of the versions, scribal habits, and variation in the Greek tradition is a hallmark of Hoskier’s project, which he pressed further—perhaps to the edge of credulity—in two volumes on the versions. The first, *Concerning the Genesis of the Versions* (1910), demonstrates Hoskier’s contention that the minutiae of the tradition and its witnesses must be grappled with prior to the construction of stemmata and other theories of transmission. In the preface, he uses Rendel Harris’s study of Codex Bezae as a foil to Hort to exemplify the type of study that he deems necessary.³⁷ A cumulative case must be mustered: “exhaustive methods are the only ones worth using, and accurate transcriptions or photographic copies the only ways of presenting the primary evidence of important documents.”³⁸ The thread that holds together this aggregate of a book, if one can be divined at all, is that the versions are important evidence of the corruption of the Greek text because “there is abundant evidence that the mistakes in **Ⲙ** and D, with other like survivals in other Greek and Latin MSS., are due to the use of a poly-columnar polyglot in copying.”³⁹ The mechanics of copying alone cannot fully account for the readings in Greek manuscripts that agree with versions against the TR; the source must be from the versions themselves.

Hoskier’s approach raises a number of issues, the first of which is his extreme early dating of the versions. He argues that the Syriac and Latin versions have a “concurrent origin” and are

³² Hoskier, *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 Hoskier, *Golden Latin Gospels*, xv.

³⁴ Edgar J. Goodspeed, “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). Cf. also Henry A. Sanders’s review in *AJP* 32 (1911): 218–20; and Arthur H. Weston’s review in *CP* 8 (1913): 378–82, who is pedantically critical of Hoskier’s paragraphing and linguistic peculiarities.

³⁵ Hoskier, *Golden Latin Gospels*, liv–lxvii.

³⁶ E.g., R. Gryson, *Vetus Latina: Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel*, 26.2 (Freiburg: Herder, 2000), 93: “Si l’auteur a traité les témoins grecs avec la même légèreté que les latins, sans parler des versions orientales, il y a vraiment de quoi s’inquiéter.”

³⁷ Hoskier, *Genesis of the Versions*, viii. Cf. Harris, *Codex Bezae: A Study of the So-Called Western Text of the New Testament* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1891), and F. H. Chase, *The Old Syriac Element in the Text of Codex Bezae* (New York: Macmillan, 1893) who was also a proponent of the polyglot theory similar to Hoskier.

³⁸ Hoskier, *Genesis of the Versions*, x–xi.

³⁹ Hoskier, *Genesis of the Versions*, 1–34 (here 15).

“practically as old as the Greek.”⁴⁰ There is no support for these conclusions today, although we can charitably chalk up this proposal as an attempt to interpret the real overlap between the versions and what Hoskier considers to be secondary readings in the Greek tradition. However, his approach takes the versions as serious witnesses to the history of the text, and Hoskier uses them to his advantage when they and the church fathers agree with TR, which Hoskier held to be preserved by Providence apart from “plain and clear errors”⁴¹ against the pandects. This explains his lengthy treatment of r_2 at Trinity College (TCD MS 56), to which he later devoted a book-length study⁴²—its “fundamental text” goes back to Cyprian and Tertullian and retains affinities to the Syriac.⁴³

This approach calls into question the value of the papyrological discoveries of Hoskier’s day and the value of the great codices because the versions take us back closer to the original Greek.⁴⁴ He goes so far as to say that “in the first place we do not believe that the scribe of B was Christian. He seems to have been more or less a Western Unitarian.”⁴⁵ The book is an attempt to undermine the importance of the text of ancient Greek copies in comparison to the versions.

In a sister volume, *Concerning the Date of the Bohairic Version*, Hoskier focuses on the Apocalypse. He endeavors to prove that the Bohairic version of the Apocalypse influenced the copying of Sinaiticus, which, again, would suggest that the versions are more reliable witnesses. For Hoskier, even the early correctors of Sinaiticus used diglots in the process of controlling the text’s production.⁴⁶ Although he constructs a cumulative case, none of his examples are convincing in and of themselves. For example, the order of idol material in Rev 9:20 in \aleph reads $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\alpha\ \xi\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\iota\nu\alpha\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\alpha\ \lambda\acute{\iota}\theta\iota\nu\alpha$ (“and the wood and stone”), an inversion of the order in the majority of Greek witnesses, follows the order of the Bohairic version, not the Sahidic, which, for Hoskier, “prove[s] pretty conclusively ... that \aleph was handling the *bohairic* and not *sah*.”⁴⁷ Even in combination with other examples, minor agreements like this are inconclusive in light of the fluctuating order of lists in the Apocalypse’s witnesses. One need not appeal to versional influence to explain this inversion when copying practices and the fluidity of transmission are more than sufficient. A more obvious issue is that the prevailing view of the date of the production of the Sahidic Apocalypse is the fourth–fifth century at the earliest and the Syriac Apocalypse is usually dated even later into the early sixth century.⁴⁸ The deep antiquity of the versions that Hoskier envisions is unlikely, if not implausible.

Hoskier’s analysis of Rev 12:9 is similarly problematic. He notes the \aleph and *boh* both omit the $\kappa\alpha\iota$ equivalent between $\delta\iota\alpha\beta\omicron\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ and $\sigma\alpha\tau\alpha\nu\alpha\varsigma$, which leads him to exclaim “what more proof is required, especially when we point out that *sahidic* does *not* drop $\kappa\alpha\iota$... so it was from *boh* that \aleph followed the omission.”⁴⁹ Again, the idea that the agreement between *boh* and \aleph in this instance are genetically related is far from intuitive.

⁴⁰ Hoskier, *Genesis of the Versions*, 42, 75.

⁴¹ Cf. his comments on Apoc. 47 (GA 241) in Hoskier, *Concerning the Text*, 1:137.

⁴² Hoskier, *Genesis of the Versions*, 109–66, 193–338. Cf. Hoskier, *The Text of Codex Usserianus 2., or r_2 (“Garland of Howth”) with Critical Notes to Supplement and Correct the Collation of the Late T. K. Abbott* (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1919).

⁴³ Hoskier, *Genesis of the Versions*, 166, 219–20.

⁴⁴ Hoskier, *Genesis of the Versions*, 86–88, 380–90.

⁴⁵ Hoskier, *Genesis of the Versions*, 396.

⁴⁶ Hoskier, *Bohairic Version*, 7.

⁴⁷ Hoskier, *Bohairic Version*, 27.

⁴⁸ Christian Askeland, “The Sahidic Apocalypse in Early Islamic Egypt,” in *Studien zum Text der Apokalypse*, ed. M. Sigismund, M. Karrer, and U. Schmid, ANTF 47 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2015), 271–87.

⁴⁹ Hoskier, *Bohairic Version*, 36.

Before turning to focus on his work on the Apocalypse, Hoskier’s most polemical work, two volumes published in 1914, requires some attention, since it represents the climax of his anti-Hortian enterprise. *Codex B and Its Allies: A Study and an Indictment* is a turning point in the development of Hoskier’s method. While malicious in its opposition to “the extraordinary Hortian heresy,”⁵⁰ this work is the last that is overtly polemical and his final major pre-war publication.

Hoskier ensures that his disdain for Hort is articulated with malevolent clarity. He presents a forensic “indictment against the MS B and against Westcott and Hort, subdivided into hundreds of separate counts.”⁵¹ He seethes in this unrelenting critique. Hoskier opposes the arbitrary deployment of readings from B in Westcott and Hort’s edition and the use of marginal readings therein, as well as the idea of a “neutral” text, which he misinterprets to mean “original” or “uncorrupted.”⁵² He also attacks Hort’s method as “unscientific.” “Where is the science,” he says, commenting on Hort’s choice of marginal reading in Matt 18:16.⁵³

The book is primarily comprised of dense collations punctuated with sometimes sarcastic exclamations. For example, in the chapter attempting to demonstrate that the text of B is riddled with intentional editorial alterations, Hoskier suggests that to print συνέταξεν (with B and a handful of other witnesses) instead of προσέταξεν in Matt 21:6 is “criticism gone mad.”⁵⁴ The arduousness of his cumulative case also leads him to interject “how many more instances of this kind must I adduce before the worshippers of B and the obsequious slaves of Hort will allow that I am right?”⁵⁵ But Hoskier’s righteous indignation only shows near the end of the volume with a cascade of insults and accusations. For example: “But I am sick and tired of being told that Hort’s methods are sound, his principles good, and his text the best yet published.”⁵⁶ Or: Burkitt “has said, rather unnecessarily, of me that I do not know the difference between a dilettante and a scholar. However that may be, I think I can detect the difference between an unbeliever and a believer.”⁵⁷ Hoskier goes on to accuse Burkitt of apostasy for debating the historicity of John 11.

The virulence of Hoskier’s polemic is motivated not by professional rivalry (although this certainly exists), but by his perception that critical scholarship, girded by textual changes in Hort’s edition, was “pulling the house [of faith] down upon its ears.”⁵⁸ His prewar program maintained traditional views about the role of the biblical text in faith communities by using the tools of historical and textual criticism. In this sense, we should read Hoskier’s prewar portfolio as a form of Protestant apologetics. Textual criticism is more than a game of deciphering readings, but a discipline that deeply influences those for whom the Bible is more than academic text. There is no divide between academy and church for Hoskier, and academic work ought to be in service of the church—this is where historical criticism becomes a dangerous game that leads to heresy, because, for Hoskier, there is only one true revelation and it is to be found not in the tradition of the church or in the ebb and flow of textual transmission and variation, but in a single authoritative and original inspired text form. A text-critical method that obfuscates the wording of the original is heretical.

⁵⁰ Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:i.

⁵¹ Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:i.

⁵² For Hoskier, Hort’s neutral text is a revision of the Alexandrian family (cf. *Codex B*, 1:81).

⁵³ Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:6.

⁵⁴ Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:64.

⁵⁵ Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:84.

⁵⁶ Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:304.

⁵⁷ Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:357.

⁵⁸ Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:473.

Hoskier and the Apocalypse in the Postwar Period

Hoskier's work on the Apocalypse, however, takes on a different tone. His engagement with this book was a long-term endeavor, beginning over thirty years before the publication of *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse*. In 1910 he reports that he has collated over one hundred manuscripts and that they had begun to fall into easily identifiable categories.⁵⁹ Despite the fact that the work on this momentous project began before the war, its tempo and urgency increased after his service in the French ambulance corp.⁶⁰

A major precursor to his magnum opus was a series of five articles in the *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* (1922–1924), which previewed a number of his findings. Hoskier provides some meta-reflection on his selection of the Apocalypse, noting

never before has a comprehensive examination such as this been undertaken of any book of the New Testament. I selected the Apocalypse simply because it was possible for an individual to handle the matter within his lifetime, as the supply of known MSS. was sufficiently small to make this feasible.⁶¹

Although not explicitly articulated, Hoskier's postwar work moved away from invective to constructive methods, emphasizing digesting the totality of textual data for a particular work. Data collection replaced rhetoric as Hoskier's primary mode of discourse. The majority of these articles focus, however, on the minutia of the texts of various manuscripts instead of reflections on his editorial praxis or goals. Polyglot theories, the deep antiquity of the versions, and retranslation are still present in this analysis, but Hoskier was questing at a larger critical ideal.⁶²

This ideal is articulated further in the introduction to *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse* itself.⁶³ Hoskier seeks to fully undertake textual work to securely recover the "proper foundation" upon which interpreters can build, arguing for a firm partition between lower and higher criticism.⁶⁴ Although this division between text and interpretation is for the most part seen as untenable in modern textual scholarship, Hoskier's goal is admirable in its earnestness and scope. He attempts to comprehensively and dispassionately examine all readings in every witness to (1) better understand the text in and of itself, (2) to prove that the oldest witnesses (of his time) are prone to error, and (3) to attain a text behind the fourth century witnesses.⁶⁵

⁵⁹ Hoskier, *Genesis of the Versions*, 17–18.

⁶⁰ Cf. note 3.

⁶¹ Hoskier, "Manuscripts of the Apocalypse—Recent Investigations I," *BJRL* 7 (1922): 118. In *Concerning the Text*, 1:xxxix, Hoskier claims that he would have rather worked on Paul or the Catholic Epistles, but that Apocalypse seemed like a project that a single person might manage in a lifetime. It was selected purely out of convenience; it was the most expeditious way to test his approach.

⁶² E.g., Hoskier, "Manuscripts of the Apocalypse—Recent Investigations IV," *BJRL* 8 (1924): 240–45, 261–75. Hoskier's explanation of his polyglot theory in this article (esp. 267) indicates not that ancient exemplars were corrupted by the influence of the versions, but simply that the Greek base of the versions differs from *textus receptus*.

⁶³ This work was originally designed to be published in the University of Michigan's Humanistic series. The series editor Francis Willey Kelsey met with Hoskier in New York in 1921 to check in on things (cf. John G. Pedley, *Francis Willey Kelsey: Archaeology, Antiquity, and the Arts* [Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2012], 320). Kelsey's death changed the financial situation of the series.

⁶⁴ Hoskier, *Concerning the Text*, 1:ix.

⁶⁵ Hoskier, *Concerning the Text*, 1:x.

In this self-proclaimed objective method, Hoskier retains a number of critical presuppositions that color his work. First, he assumes that all variant readings derived from a “common original” whose serial arrangement, but not precise wording, is easily recoverable and consistent. The text of the autograph still exists among the variation of the known manuscripts. As a result, Hoskier perceives textual variation as purely negative phenomenon that obfuscates the inspired, original text. For Hoskier the goal of transmission is the precise preservation of wording; harmonization is “one of the greatest evils in the text of the Apocalypse.”⁶⁶ The removal of variation is the absolution of sin, particularly since Hoskier viewed the TR as a very good representative of the “original.”⁶⁷

The first volume of *Concerning the Text* is a descriptive catalogue for every manuscript of the Apocalypse that Hoskier could get his hands on.⁶⁸ He takes account of every known manuscript at the time representing a comprehensive effort. Manuscripts are grouped based on their shared textual characteristics, allowing Hoskier to avoid a comprehensive textual analysis of every exemplar despite his complete collations made between 1896 (Hoskier 2; GA 82) and 1926 (Hoskier 251; GA 254).⁶⁹ A typical example is found in Apoc. 25 (GA 149). The manuscript’s group is first presented without comment (25-58-70-78-84-94-207) and its various sigla in other locations are noted. Hoskier tells us that he collated it in 1904 from photographs. He comments on the date, placing its production in the vicinity of 1400 and notes the textual affinities that it shares with Apoc. 94 (GA 201), arguing that they are likely copied from a common ancestor. He continues, noting the lack of iota subscript and postscript, its lack of “movable-nu,” punctuation, use of *nomina sacra*, and ligatures—all noted for the sake of dating. In an effort to substantiate the connection between 25, its family, and other groupings, he points to their shared inscription and a reading in Rev 2:5, in addition to a page of collation of telling readings. He concludes that the scribe was a faithful copyist and also musters thirteen readings that connect 25 to 78 (GA 1948).

Other entries are more extensive (e.g., Apoc. 56, pp. 1:170–78), but the next three entries (Apoc. 26–29; GA 506 517 2015 385), take up half a page in their totality. Instead of examining their texts and peculiarities, Hoskier directs the reader to the manuscripts that comprise the groups of which they are a part and toward Scrivener’s collations. Regardless of consistency in entry, this volume is a key interlocutor for anyone working with the Apocalypse’s textual and material record, despite the fact that seventy-one additional manuscripts have since been added to the *Liste*⁷⁰ and despite the fact that his philological analysis is idiosyncratic. Its import lies in the fact that it constitutes the first serious attempt to comprehensively accumulate the material evidence for making informed textual decisions.

The second volume of *Concerning the Text* is an indiscriminating edition of the Apocalypse using the comprehensive data from the Greek manuscripts described and catalogued in the first volume, the versions (Syriac, Coptic, Arabic, Ethiopic, Armenian), and a number of Greek and Latin Christian authors, although his data for the versions and quotations is eminently

⁶⁶ Hoskier, *Concerning the Text*, 1:xiii.

⁶⁷ Hoskier, *Concerning the Text*, 1:xlvii.

⁶⁸ For a recent update on the Greek manuscripts of the apocalypse, cf. M. Lembke et al., eds., *Text und Textwert der Griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments: VI. Die Apokalypse; Teststellenkollation und Auswertungen*, ANTF 49 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2017), 85–87* (here after *TuT Apk*) and the list on 2–22.

⁶⁹ Cf. Josef Schmid, *Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen Apokalypse-Textes*, 3 vols. (Munich: Karl Zink, 1955–1956), 7–8 for an evaluation of Hoskier’s work. He critiques, and rightly so, Hoskier’s use of the versions, fathers, and philological descriptions (which he describes as *unzulänglich*), but notes that the value of the project is in the accuracy of its collations.

⁷⁰ Cf. *TuT Apk*, 86*.

suspect. The text of Stephen's 1550 edition comprises the first line of each verse and the variation of the tradition is subordinated to this text. To a degree, volume 2 is a diplomatic re-edition of Stephen with, what was at the time, a comprehensive and readily accurate apparatus, at least for the Greek witnesses. The extensiveness of the apparatus is what imbues the project with longevity long after its critical assumptions have been for the most part discarded.⁷¹ Hand editions take us only so far when attempting to comprehend the textual history of a passage and the way in which tradents and reading communities have engaged with the work. This is the lasting value of Hoskier's work. Despite critical issues in its design, colored by Hoskier's own prejudices and pet theories, he was an accurate and methodical collator.⁷² Kirsopp Lake even goes so far as to describe Hoskier as "an almost supernaturally accurate collator."⁷³ The quantity of accurate textual data in the volume means that Hoskier's work will remain relevant even after the eventual publication of the Revelation fascicle of the ECM.

Reflections

Where does this evaluation of Hoskier's body of work leave us? How does it help us to understand changes in the field? The most obvious conclusion from this deep dive into Hoskier is that his praxis and method are executed with an idealism—bordering at times on naïveté—to which textual critics should still aspire, even though he acts upon them for different reasons. He was convinced that the only way to rescue the TR from Hort and his ilk was not to polemically appeal to traditional conceptions of the sanctity of a particular text form or other theological beliefs (this he tried and failed at in his prewar work), but to prove the value of the TR as a venerable representative of the original text. His faith in scientific method and text critical comprehensiveness was equal to his faith in the TR.

His project is also instructive for modern text-critical practice, even though the tools have changed. First, Hoskier repeatedly emphasizes the value of collation and knowledge of the documents: "the actual collator must also be the one to present the full table of results. He [or she] alone can assess at their true value the testimonies of various scribes."⁷⁴ Direct knowledge of the manuscripts and their scribes assists in the process of weighing particular readings. And Hoskier has a developed moral hierarchy when it comes to scribes. The scribal act is one of pure mechanical reproduction and scribes are either "good" or "bad" based on their ability to dispassionately copy their exemplar. Hoskier is his own ideal scribe. Copying a manuscript has moral consequences due to the sacredness of the text. Scribes that use synonyms or itacism are "vicious" (e.g., scribe of Apoc. 62, GA 2028);⁷⁵ *monstra* are perturbing signs of a scribe that "wanders into fairyland" (e.g., Apoc. 80, GA 2037);⁷⁶ it would have been better for the scribe of Apoc. 187 (GA 1894) to have not been born due to his poor performance.⁷⁷ In contrast, the

⁷¹ Cf. Schmid, *Studien*, 8.

⁷² Cf. D. C. Parker, *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and Their Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 230–31.

⁷³ Kirsopp Lake, *The Text of the New Testament*, 6th ed. (London: Rivingtons, 1933), 76.

⁷⁴ Hoskier, "Manuscripts of the Apocalypse IV," 241.

⁷⁵ Hoskier, *Concerning the Text*, 1:198. Cf. similar language by proponents of Hort, e.g., *The Oxford Debate on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (London: George Bell, 1897), vii where omission in transmission is described as "vicious" as "the deliberate rejection of some words of the sacred text."

⁷⁶ Hoskier, *Concerning the Text*, 1:261.

⁷⁷ Hoskier, *Concerning the Text*, 1:613. Cf. also his note on "impish monks" who scrawled nonsense in the margins of Apoc. 221 (GA 1733) on 1.705.

scribe of Apoc. 127 (GA 1841) is “absolutely reliable in his copying; one of the very finest scribes whose work I have followed [God rest his dutiful bones and spirit].”⁷⁸ Although impressionistic and influenced by the idea that the “true” text had been corrupted by heretics and other unwitting participants, he emphasizes that a first-hand knowledge of the documents remains an essential part of the text critical task and few have exhibited this ideal with more conviction than Hoskier.

Hoskier’s emphasis on collation and personal acquaintance with manuscripts is matched also by his critical stress on patience. Throughout his body of work, he criticizes the bright lights of his day for too hastily drawing conclusions from partial sets of data or for relying on too few, but ancient exemplars. “Why stop to cross swords,” he says, “and fill thousands of pages with discussions of readings, when convincing data are to hand but unexamined. . . . Instead of this, we have Kenyon and others regarding Hort’s classification as final, and Lake . . . using Hort’s classification as gospel, while confounding himself out of his own mouth at every turn.”⁷⁹

The evidence at hand to which Hoskier refers is the mass of minuscule manuscripts that were continuing to come to light during the early twentieth century, their late dates used to relegate them to the status of secondary witnesses. But Hoskier saw value in them, realizing that old texts can be preserved in younger documents, a point that he drives home on numerous occasions.⁸⁰ His interest in these manuscripts is perhaps influenced by the fact that the manuscript basis for the TR was based on minuscules, but he also recognized that “existing Sacred Manuscripts *teem* with information if we will only dig below the surface.”⁸¹ This assertion has held true in recent research, a notable example being Markus Lembke’s recent work on GA 2846 which agrees with the Nestle-Aland text against the majority text at a percentage only slightly lower than Sinaiticus.⁸² The value of the minuscules has also been a central finding of the Coherence-Based Genealogical Method (CBGM) as it pertains to the Catholic Epistles and Acts, a computer-assisted method for evaluating readings used in the ECM project.⁸³ Surely there is more work to be done on the minuscules, even those that Hoskier catalogued ninety years ago.

Hoskier also drives home some text-historical ideas that, while commonly acknowledged today, were controversial in his day. First, he attacks the idea of geographically local developments of textual families. In his volume on the Bohairic version, he notes that “overmuch

⁷⁸ Hoskier, *Concerning the Text*, 1:437.

⁷⁹ Hoskier, *Genesis of the Versions*, 63.

⁸⁰ Hoskier, *Genesis of the Versions*, 62, 391, 416; Hoskier, *Bohairic Versions*, 102; Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:66, 110, 416, 434; Hoskier, “Manuscripts of the Apocalypse I,” 118; Hoskier, “Manuscripts of the Apocalypse V,” 421; and Hoskier, *Concerning the Text*, 1:xv; xxxvi, 70–71, 327, 370.

⁸¹ Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:416 (emphasis original).

⁸² Markus Lembke, “Die Apokalypse-Handschrift 2846: Beschreibung, Kollation und Textwertbestimmung eines wichtigen neuen Zeugen,” *NT 54* (2012): 369–95. Other important works on the minuscule manuscripts apart from Revelation includes Barbara Aland’s work a group of manuscripts that seem to correlate to the Greek *Vorlage* of the Harclensian version of the Catholic Epistles (*Das Neue Testament in syrischer Überlieferung I: Die grossen Katholischen Briefe*, ANTF 7 [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1986], 41–90), and Klaus Wachtel’s work on the Byzantine text of the Catholic Epistles (*Der byzantinische Text der katholischen Briefe*, ANTF 24 [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995]). Cf. also Michael W. Holmes, “From Nestle to the *Editio Critica Maior*: A Century’s Perspective on the New Testament Minuscule Tradition,” in *The Bible as Book: The Transmission of the Greek Text*, ed. S. McKendrick and O. O’Sullivan (London: British Library, 2003), 123–37.

⁸³ Cf. Tommy Wasserman and Peter J. Gurry, *A New Approach to Textual Criticism: An Introduction to the Coherence-Based Genealogical Method*, RBS 80 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2017).

has been made historically of geographical divisions and boundaries. The circulation of the scriptures overleaped *all* boundaries!”⁸⁴ Although geographical distinctions like western, Alexandrian, Byzantine, and Caesarean are still common in text critical parlance, these text types are not as closely associated with these locations as they were at the outset and the CBGM in particular has problematized geographic theories.⁸⁵

Second, Hoskier regularly assaults the principle of *lectio brevior potior*, the idea that the shorter reading is to be preferred.⁸⁶ This critical reaction, again, is motivated by anti-Hortian tendencies⁸⁷ (although the articulation of this rule goes back to Griesbach) and a preference for external evidence, but it nonetheless has proved prescient. As both James Royse and Juan Hernández Jr. have demonstrated in their studies on scribal habits, and E. C. Colwell before them,⁸⁸ it is not always the case that texts acquire additional material in transmission. In fact, copyists tend to omit more material, at least in some exemplars, than they add due to a range of mechanical issues relate to the process of copying, at least when singular readings are the dataset.⁸⁹ Again, Hoskier anticipates larger trends in the field, but traverses a fraught road to arrive there.

However, the most striking aspect of Hoskier’s work on Revelation is his method’s relationship to the process of the production of the ECM. Although he draws from previously published collations when necessary, the foundation of Hoskier’s work was the collection and fresh transcription of each witness. He often compares his collations to other existing ones, frequently criticizing the inaccuracy of other transcribers in entertaining ways.⁹⁰ He bemoans the partial collation of witnesses and constantly urges comprehensiveness as a prerequisite to evaluation.⁹¹ Although the editors of the ECM did not draw on Hoskier for inspiration for the design or method of the edition, Hoskier and the ECM share similar methodological convic-

⁸⁴ Hoskier, *Bohairic Version*, 124 (emphasis original). Cf. also Hoskier, *Genesis of the Versions*, 66; Hoskier, *Concerning the Text*, 1:55 (among many others).

⁸⁵ Cf. D. C. Parker, *Textual Scholarship and the Making of the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 81–84, 92–94; Hugh A. G. Houghton, “Recent Developments in New Testament Textual Criticism,” *Early Christianity* 2 (2011): 245–68 (here 255–56); Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland, *The Text of the New Testament*, tr. E. F. Rhodes (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), 48–71. This distinction between location and text-type is not always clearly articulated in some handbooks, e.g., Stanley E. Porter and Andrew W. Pitts, *Fundamentals of New Testament Textual Criticism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015), 74–79.

⁸⁶ E.g., Hoskier, *Genesis of the Versions*, 375, 400–416; Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:53–54, 2:59, 2:113. On the contrary, cf. Hoskier, *Genesis of the Versions*, 23–24; Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:435, 460.

⁸⁷ Cf. Hort, *Introduction*, 122–24, 175.

⁸⁸ E. C. Colwell, “Scribal Habits in Early Papyri: A Study in the Corruption of the Text,” in *The Bible in Modern Scholarship*, ed. P. J. Hyatt (Nashville: Abingdon, 1965), 367–77.

⁸⁹ Cf. J. K. Elliott, “The Text of Acts in the Light of Two Recent Studies,” *NTS* 34 (1988): 251; James R. Royse, *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri*, *NTTS* 36 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 705–36; and Juan Hernández Jr., *Scribal Habits and Theological Influences in the Apocalypse*, *WUNT* 2/218 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 194. For a more nuanced take on this issue, cf. E. J. Epp, “Traditional ‘Canons’ of New Testament Textual Criticism: Their Value, Validity, and Viability—or Lack Thereof,” in *The Textual History of the Greek New Testament*, ed. K. Wachtel and M. W. Holmes, *SBLTCS* 8 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), 106–16.

⁹⁰ For example, see his comments on Apoc. 33 (GA 218) and its edition published by Alter: “His tomes, so unwieldy in arrangement, and with such horrible paper, may well be neglected. As regards accuracy we need say nothing, but that his work is useless for purposes of exact comparison” (Hoskier, *Concerning the Text*, 1:68).

⁹¹ Cf. Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:438; Hoskier, *Concerning the Text*, 1:301, 316.

tions in this regard.⁹² Hoskier even goes above and beyond the ECM in terms of exhaustiveness since he does not preface the collation of witnesses with a process of elimination akin to *Text und Textwert* evaluations. Instead, all witnesses are collated and all data is presented in his apparatus. The process for Hoskier of must be fully inductive.⁹³

The ECM likewise upholds this virtue with the added benefit of first eliminating witnesses based on *Text und Textwert* data. The ECM process is more sophisticated and further streamlined in comparison to Hoskier’s personal collations, but it is still based on the same principle of comprehensiveness, using data-driven methods to make the process more efficient. All manuscripts that are used in the ECM editions are collated twice and reconciled electronically, agreeing in every detail. Hoskier follows this model of *eliminatio* haphazardly, and points to the fact that his volumes are designed to contribute just to this end: “Mistake not the object of this examination. It is to reduce, not to multiply witnesses.”⁹⁴ *Concerning the Text* represents Hoskier’s combination of *TuT* and collation embodied in the ECM method, although he does not justify his grouping of witnesses, nor does he adopt a coherent or explicit method. Hoskier’s work is questing at a level of editorial sophistication only realised independently two-generations later.

The primary difference between the ECM and Hoskier, beyond the preparatory nature of Hoskier’s edition and their quite different editorial aims, is that fact that the ECM has a coherent method for eclectically sifting between readings that arise in the process of transcription: the CBGM.⁹⁵ Hoskier never developed a method by which the variation he catalogued could be weighed nor did he attempt to build his own eclectic text or even a coherent textual history. He does, however, make copious individual judgments on readings, often siding with the TR against the early pandects, but not with any level of consistency. Although Hoskier was motivated by a desire to vindicate the TR as a venerable ancient text form, his emphasis on comprehensiveness and accurate data collection is methodologically similar to the principles of the ECM, even though the ECM uses a wider array of sophisticated editorial tools and has an entirely different text-critical goal.

Hoskier’s work is also comparable to the context of the ECM in that both projects owed their existence to technological changes. For Hoskier, the major change was the affordability and availability of photographic reproduction, and for the ECM it is the digital turn in textual scholarship. Although invented in the mid-nineteenth century, photography only prevailed in academic settings in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century with the development of portable and relatively inexpensive models, like the Kodak #1, rolled out in 1888, and the development of 35mm portable cameras in the early twentieth century. Hoskier transcribed primarily from photographs and notes explicitly that he did so in 105 of his entries, although

⁹² This comparison between Hoskier and the ECM is not to say that the ECM is in anyway based up or inspired by Hoskier. But it demonstrates that Hoskier, despite all of his singularities and quirks, recognized at an early stage what needed to be done to build a sufficient dataset to make more precise judgments about the textual history of New Testament works.

⁹³ Hoskier, *Concerning the Text*, 1:xlvi. The only other published attempt to undertake this task comprehensively is Tommy Wasserman, *The Epistle of Jude: Its Text and Transmission*, CBNTS 43 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 2006).

⁹⁴ Hoskier, *Concerning the Text*, 1:108.

⁹⁵ Cf. Gerd Mink, “Contamination, Coherence, and Coincidence in Textual Transmission: The Coherence-Based Genealogical Method (CBGM) as a Complement and Corrective to Existing Approaches,” in *The Textual History of the Greek New Testament: Changing Views in Contemporary Research*, ed. K. Wachtel and M. W. Holmes, SBLTCS 8 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), 141–216; Peter J. Gurry, *A Critical Examination of the Coherence-Based Genealogical Method in New Testament Textual Criticism*, NTTSD 55 (Leiden: Brill, 2017).

it is clear that this was his normal *modus operandi*. He also notes that he tried to acquire others, but was unable due to expense (Apoc. 1 and 77). Even for a person of means, however, this was not a simple task in this period and Hoskier laments that he paid \$400 for photos of Apoc. 16 (GA 336), which is the equivalent of approximately \$11,000 in today's terms. The proliferation and portability of cameras is a technological advance that is rarely acknowledged,⁹⁶ but it allowed Hoskier to systematically access nearly every known witness and compile a quasi-comprehensive apparatus. His herculean individual effort would not have been possible physically or financially without the advent of more affordable photographic technology. The late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were party to a media culture with far reaching consequences for research and cultures more broadly.⁹⁷

Likewise, the ambitious ECM is facilitated by numerous technological developments and creation of a range of editorial tools. These include the digitization of manuscripts,⁹⁸ the advent of the internet, and cooperative and crowdsourced platforms like the New Testament Virtual Manuscript Room and the Workspace for Collaborative Editing, where digitized manuscripts can be indexed, transcribed, reconciled, and managed by numerous people from remote locations.⁹⁹ The entire process of production is handled online in an electronic medium; the ECM is born digital, even though it appears in print. The quantity and quality of the work input in to the production of the various ECM fascicles would not have been possible without changes to technology that made the process more efficient¹⁰⁰—a statement that also holds true for Hoskier's work, although enabled by different technologies. Hoskier was in some ways a precursor to the ECM in his use of technological advances (and in his arduous and patient devotion) to bring the project to completion.¹⁰¹ Hoskier worked in a milieu of technological transformation, changes in the field that parallel the critical situation of the field in the past thirty years. Hoskier's work demonstrates that, even if critical attitudes change, even if new material is discovered, and even if the medium of tradition changes, there is a lasting place in the field for those who strenuously take on the tradition in far-reaching ways supported by long-term effort.

Modern large-scale text critical projects owe much of their theoretical underpinnings and

⁹⁶ Although cf. Parker, *Textual Scholarship*, 128–30.

⁹⁷ For example, cf. Ahmet A. Ersoy, "Ottomans and the Kodak Galaxy: Archiving Everyday Life and Historical Space in the Ottoman Illustrated Journals," *History of Photography* 40 (2016): 330–57 (esp. 356–57).

⁹⁸ Cf. the major digitisation projects to the British Library (<http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/>), Bibliothèque Nationale de France (<http://gallica.bnf.fr/>), Bibliotheca Apostolica (<http://www.mss.vatlib.it/guui/scan/link.jsp>), and the Swiss Libraries (<http://www.e-codices.unifr.ch/>), as well as the digitization efforts of the Center for the Study of New Testament Manuscripts (<http://www.csntm.org/>).

⁹⁹ Cf. Hugh A. G. Houghton and Catherine J. Smith, "Digital Editing and the Greek New Testament," in *Ancient Worlds in Digital Culture*, ed. C. Clivaz, P. Dilley, and D. Hamidović, DBS 1 (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 110–27; D. C. Parker, "Through a Screen Darkly: Digital Texts and the New Testament," *JSNT* 25 (2003): 395–411.

¹⁰⁰ Efficiency is a relative term since it still took nearly thirty years for the first fascicle to appear after its announcement in 1970. K. Aland, "Novi Testamenti Graeci Editio Critica Maior: Der gegenwärtige Stand der Arbeit an einer neuen grossen kritischen Ausgabe des Neuen Testaments," *NTS* (1970): 163–77.

¹⁰¹ He also has played an outsized roll in the shape of the Nestle-Aland text since his work was fundamental for Josef Schmid's Studien, X (*Die alten Stämme*): "Das größte Verdienst darum, daß uns die griechische Apk-Überlieferung in solcher Vollständigkeit vorliegt, gebührt H.C. Hoskier ... dessen mächtiges, in 30jähriger unverdrossener Arbeit geschaffenes Werk alle frühen Leistungen auf diesem Gebiet weit hinter sich läßt."

practical methods to the long trajectory of critical engagement that was influenced not only by the bright lights of previous generations, but also by ancillary and idiosyncratic figures like Hoskier, even when direct lines of correspondence cannot be traced. Textual scholarship on the New Testament has much to learn from revisiting old and perhaps even absurd theories, since the conceptual seeds of many major modern projects lie in the dark corners of criticism and in the pages of out-of-print tomes. Retracing our steps back to these corners helps us to better comprehend the trajectories of our own endeavors.

The Bibliography of H. C. Hoskier

- A Full Account and Collation of the Greek Cursive Evangelium 604 (with Two Facsimiles)*. London: David Nutt, 1890.
- Concerning the Genesis of the Versions of the N. T. Remarks Suggested by the Study of P and the Allied Questions as Regards the Gospels*. 2 vols. London: Bernard Quaritch, 1910.
- 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.
- “The Elzevir New Testaments of 1624 and 1633.” *JTS* 12 (1911): 454–57.
- “The Authorized Version of 1611.” *BSac* 68 (1911): 693–704.
- “New Edition of the Codex Veronensis (b).” *AJP* 32 (1911): 220–21.
- Concerning the Date of the Bohairic Version: Covering a Detailed Examination of the Text of the Apocalypse and a Review of the Some of the Writings of the Egyptian Monks*. London: Bernard Quaritch, 1911.
- “Evan. 157 (Rome. Vat. Urb. 2).” *JTS* 14 (1912–1913): 78–116; 242–93; 359–84 (3 parts).
- “The Lost Commentary of Oecumenius on the Apocalypse.” *AJP* 34 (1913): 300–314.
- “The New Codex ‘W.’” *Expositor* 8.5 (1913): 467–80.
- “Von Soden’s Text of the New Testament.” *JTS* 15 (1914): 307–26.
- Codex B and Its Allies: A Study and an Indictment*. 2 vols. London: Bernard Quaritch, 1914.
- The Text of Codex Usserianus 2., or r₂ (“Garland of Howth”) with Critical Notes to Supplement and Correct the Collation of the Late T. K. Abbott*. Old Latin Biblical Texts. London: Bernard Quaritch, 1919.
- “Manuscripts of the Apocalypse—Recent Investigations, part I.” *BJRL* 7 (1922): 118–37.
- “Manuscripts of the Apocalypse—Recent Investigations, part II.” *BJRL* 7 (1923): 256–68.
- “Manuscripts of the Apocalypse—Recent Investigations, part III.” *BJRL* 7 (1923): 507–25.
- “Manuscripts of the Apocalypse—Recent Investigations, part IV.” *BJRL* 8 (1924): 236–75.
- “Manuscripts of the Apocalypse—Recent Investigations, part V.” *BJRL* 8 (1924): 412–43.
- Immortality*. Boston: The Stratford Company, 1925.
- The Complete Commentary of Oecumenius on the Apocalypse: Now Printed for the First Time from Manuscripts at Messina, Rome, Salonika, and Athos*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1928.
- Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse: Collation of All Existing Available Greek Documents with the Standard Text of Stephen’s Third Edition Together with the Testimony of Versions, Commentaries and Fathers*. 2 vols. London: Bernard Quaritch, 1929.
- De Contemptu Mundi: A Bitter Satirical Poem of 3000 Lines upon the Morals of the XIIth Century by Bernard of Morval Monk of Cluny (fl. 1150) Re-edited, with Introduction and Copious Variants from all the Known MSS*. London: Bernard Quaritch, 1929.
- The Bronze Horses: A Comment on the Prose-Poem of Amy Lowell*. Portland, ME: The Mosher

Press, 1930.

What Is Nirvana? Portland, ME: The Mosher Press, 1930.

In Tune with the Universe. London: Rider & Co., 1932 [Pseudonym "Signpost"].

"Concerning \aleph and Its Very Special Use in the Old Testament." Pages 96–117 in *Amiticiae Corolla: A Volume of Essays Presented to James Rendel Harris, C.Litt. on the Occasion of His Eightieth Birthday*. Edited by H. G. Wood. London: University of London Press, 1933.

The Back of Beyond. London: The Daniel Company, 1934 [Pseudonym "Signpost"].

"A Study of the Chester-Beatty Codex of the Pauline Epistles." *JTS* 38 (1937): 148–63.

Appendix to an Article on the Chester-Beatty Papyrus of the Pauline Epistles known as \mathfrak{P}^{46} in the Journal of Theological Studies no. 150 Setting Forth Here in Supplementary Detail the Shorter Text of that Important Document. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1937.

A Commentary on the Various Readings in the Text of the Epistle to the Hebrews in the Chester-Beatty Papyrus \mathfrak{P}^{46} (circa 200 A.D.). London: Bernard Quaritch, 1938.