

Hugh A. G. Houghton, Christina M. Kreinecker, Rosalind F. MacLachlan, and Catherine J. Smith, *The Principal Pauline Epistles: A Collation of Old Latin Witnesses*, New Testament Tools Studies and Documents 59, Leiden: Brill, 2019. Pp. xi + 442. ISBN 978-90-04-31599-0. Hardcover, €145.00/\$175.00.

- [1] The book under review is a product of The Earliest Commentaries on Paul as Sources for Biblical Texts project (COMPAUL) that was led by the Institute for Textual Scholarship and Electronic Editing at the University of Birmingham, United Kingdom, and took place between 2011 and 2016. All the publications of the project—researching into the role of commentaries for the transmission of the text of New Testament with a focus on Paul—are available as open access, because “the COMPAUL project was funded by a European Research Council Starting Grant awarded to Dr Hugh Houghton” (see <https://www.birmingham.ac.uk/compaul>; also see p. ix).
- [2] In the twentieth century, “much of the Old Latin evidence for the New Testament has been newly edited” (ix) so that volumes of the *Itala* (i.e., *Vetus Latina*) are available for all of the New Testament texts with the exception of the “four principal Pauline Epistles.” Unfortunately, the Vetus Latina Institute in Beuron has not continued their work on Romans, 1–2 Corinthians, and Galatians so far (see, for instance, Houghton on <http://www.vetuslatina.org>). Consequently, the present volume is a welcome contribution to and indispensable tool for any serious study of the Latin text of the major Pauline letters until a complete critical text in the *Vetus Latina* series is available.
- [3] Outline and method of the team work for this volume are given in the brief preface (xi–xi). “Full electronic transcriptions were produced ... in three types of material:
- 1) Manuscripts identified as having an Old Latin affiliation;
 - 2) Existing scholarly reconstructions of the Pauline text of individual early Latin commentators;
 - 3) Early collections of biblical *testimonia*.
- These were then automatically collated to provide a representative sample of early Latin readings which might be reflected in commentaries and their textual tradition.” The team led by Houghton (contributing to the work itself and responsible for proofreading) consists of the papyrologist Christina M. Kreinecker and Rosalind F. MacLachlan (involved in the *Evangelium secundum Iohannem* fascicles of the *Vetus Latina*), who both produced most of the transcriptions, and Catherine J. Smith (Institute for Textual Scholarship and Electronic Editing, ITSEE), who converted these into XML (see <http://www.epistulae.org>, where interested readers may find the COMPAUL project and its outcomes together with the Catena and the Museum of the Bible Greek Paul projects by the International Greek New Testament Project, IGNTPT).
- [4] From the introduction readers learn the essentials and method in a very concise form so that this section is not only worth reading but crucial for assessing and using the book (1–10). The editors evaluate the Old Latin tradition of the Pauline epistles, explain the selection of witnesses and how they prepared the data, and introduce the principles and layout of the collations to follow thereafter. Consequently, the list of witnesses (11–26) provides fundamental pieces of information for every manuscript (11–20, mainly descriptive and, if at all, basic in respect to palaeography), commentary (20–24), and *testimonium* (24–26), that is, the three kinds of witnesses that are utilized and investigated into for the transcribed and collated texts. A very handy and convenient “Summary of Material” enables the readers to check on their own which witness has something to offer for the text of which verse (27–29). Of course, conventions (30–31, bold print, certain

sigla, signs, and symbols) and sigla, that is, numbers and short forms or abbreviations of commentaries and *testimonia* (32–33), are salient for identifying the witnesses in the summary and, even more importantly, in the major bulk of the book (34–436), that is, the presentation of the readings and/or variants. The editors take the *Stuttgart Vulgate* (5th ed., 2007) as their guiding text.

- [5] Of course, it must be assumed that the readers who will actually use the book—and that will certainly be scholars specializing on textual-criticism and/or the (Old) Latin text of the New Testament, maybe even some exegetists working on Paul’s major epistles—are familiar with other conventional abbreviations that are given, for example, in the “Concordance of Sigla” (the appendix, 437), such as NA²⁸ (Nestle–Aland, 28th edition, of *Novum Testamentum Graecum*), UBS⁵ (United Bible Societies, 5th edition, of *Novum Testamentum Graecum*), CLA (*Codices Latini Antiquiores*), TM (the Trismegistos number for manuscripts at <http://www.trismegistos.org>), and Tischendorf’s short forms.
- [6] The bibliography is far from being comprehensive, but that it not a shortcoming or inconsistency, as the editors provide the essential editions and special articles that are crucial for the discussion of the individual manuscripts, commentaries, and *testimonia*. Therefore, for further research, readers are advised to take the entries in the bibliography as starting points in order to find more literature on certain aspects. Unfortunately, the book does not contain any indices. This is, however, venial and does not diminish the impressive quality of the present work, since the outline of the book—verse by verse—guides its readers safely through the pages.
- [7] Just as the “Summary of Material” already indicates, the entries on specific chapters of the Pauline letters treated in the book may be considerable extensive or rather short. The same is true for entries on individual verses. Thus, Rom 2:17, as an example of a short entry, looks as follows:

Present: 51 54 58 61 76 <77> 86 88 89 135 AMst RUF PEL

si autem tu] si tu autem 58 61, si autem PEL^{var}

iudaeus cognominaris et requiescis in lege et gloriaris in deo 51 54 58 61 76 86 88 135

The numbers determine the manuscripts according to the list of witnesses (11–20); AMst is a commentary of Ambrosiaster (20–21); RUF is the shortcut of the “Latin translation of Origen’s Commentary on Romans by Rufinus of Aquileia”; and PEL is short for “the biblical text in the lemmata of the Pauline commentary of Pelagius” (22–23). There are no *testimonia* extant with this verse (see 24–26). Bold print marks the “editorial text of the Stuttgart Vulgate” and italics indicate a “witness with a different orthographic form of this reading,” while angled brackets (e.g., <77>) tell the readers that this is a “witness only partially extant supporting this reading” and parentheses (not relevant for Rom 2:17) are used with a “witness with an erroneous form of this reading” (30).

Even without having the book in front of them, readers will easily take for granted that other verses require a much longer list of variants and their testimonies. Naturally, Rom 16:19 covers more than half a page with diverse variants and witnesses from the three major categories (169–70), just to mention a very special example case. Variants of abbreviations in the Latin text, however, are not represented in the listings in order to provide lucid and manageable entries. Layout and presentation are similar to the volumes of the *Editio Critica Maior* published by the Institut für neutestamentliche Textforschung (“Institute for New Testament Textual Research”) in Münster, Germany. Although large thematic units cannot easily be grasped at a glance, the policy of presenting the evidence verse-by-verse has the advantage for readers of finding a special text-critical issue immediately just by shuffling through the pages.

- [8] The editors are to be thanked for the service of supplying textual critics who may also wish to check the Old Latin witnesses of Romans, 1–2 Corinthians, and Galatians with a meticulously elaborated presentation of the evidence and, thus, with a reliable tool that is definitely needed until the volume(s) in the *Vetus Latina* series will finally be out at some point in the future.

Thomas J. Kraus
University of Zürich