

**Justin J. Soderquist and Thomas A. Wayment, *A New Edition of Codex I (016): The Washington Pauline Manuscript, Texts and Studies 20*, Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2019. ISBN 978-1-4632-4054-7. Hardback, pp. ix + 175. \$125.00.**

- [1] Books that are restricted to the analysis of a single manuscript tend to be complex. On the one hand, a study's narrow purpose can limit its usefulness for a larger scholarly community; on the other hand, the depth into a single manuscript can turn the research into an invaluable resource for understanding not only the manuscript itself, but also—as a piece to a much larger puzzle—the study of manuscripts in general. This complex significance characterizes the present book as well. Both of the authors are associated with Brigham Young University, with Thomas Wayment being a professor of classical studies and Justin Soderquist being a former student of Wayment.
- [2] This book constitutes a comprehensive study of the damaged and fragmented Codex I (016), a Pauline manuscript, which looks like a “blackened, decayed lump of parchment as hard and brittle on the exterior as glue” (1). The authors supply a picture of the manuscript on page 159 (plate 1). The manuscript, although unidentifiable at the time, was among three other manuscripts purchased in Egypt by Charles Lange Freer on December 19, 1906 (1). Compared with the other Freer manuscripts, Codex I has received relatively little scholarly attention. The authors blame this primarily on the manuscript's deteriorated condition as well as the lack of a facsimile edition (3). However, as the authors note, this state of affairs has been changing, particularly with the creation of high-definition color images of the Freer manuscripts in 2002–2003 (3).
- [3] With the use of these images, the authors have produced this volume in order to “provide an update of the Pauline codex in the form of a new edition of the manuscript, offering both a fresh transcription and commentary for this valuable, albeit somewhat neglected text” (4). By completing this task, the authors hope to supply a clearer and more accessible edition of 016, which may consequently lead to future and more comprehensive studies (4).
- [4] Aside from the appendices and plates, the structure of the book contains two main parts: an introduction and the transcription. The introduction includes discussions on the background and history of research on Codex I. Concerning the manuscript's contents, Soderquist and Wayment note that the codex contains all of the Pauline epistles except Romans, though with Hebrews inserted between 2 Thessalonians and the Pastorals (4). However, estimates of the manuscript's original size allow sufficient space for the missing Pauline fragments, as well as Acts and the Catholic letters (4). The manuscript itself is significantly damaged, with every page surviving only in decayed fragments (7). Furthermore, the authors observe that the legibility of the manuscript in the images from 2002–2003 is in worse condition than the initial study by Henry Sanders in 1918 (7).
- [5] The authors nevertheless date the handwriting of the codex to sometime between the fifth and sixth centuries (8). Soderquist and Wayment argue further that “the overall effect is that of a text produced by a professionally trained scribe” (10). Among the characteristics of the handwriting, the authors identify “rather consistent bilinearity, with an overly enlarged phi and (occasionally) psi, the lengthened tails of both rho and upsilon; and also the inclusion of ornamental dots or serifs to the ends of [several] letters” (9). Two other elements relevant to dating are the presence of ekthesis and the form of certain titles, which are shorter than what is typical of later manuscripts (11). The manuscript's provenance is another issue entirely and is impacted by the confusion characteristic of the other Freer manuscripts.

- [6] Concerning the text, the authors note that “the scribe of Codex I was very adept and produced a text relatively free of nonsense readings, though they do occur on occasion” (26). This assertion, of course, does not mean that variant readings, in general, are only occasional, but rather that such readings are usually intelligible. Aside from this, the authors note that the large majority of variants are orthographical in nature (26). Furthermore, after analyzing the differences between Codex I, the NA28, and the Robertson Pierpont (RP) edition, Soderquist and Wayment conclude that “the text of Codex I more closely resembles the earliest textual tradition (represented by the NA28) rather than the Byzantine (represented by the RP)” (37).
- [7] Following this discussion, the authors immediately shift to introducing their transcription in the following section. Soderquist and Wayment claim that their goal in producing the transcription was simply to draw on the image sets from 2002–2003 in order to represent the manuscript’s text accurately (38–39). One should note briefly that the time difference between the production of the image sets and this volume is about sixteen years. Nevertheless, the transcription itself takes up most of the volume (almost ninety pages) and contains the text in capitals with the reconstructed text in lowercase and brackets. The transcription is divided according to manuscript pages, with the relevant passages supplied by the authors and comments given below the text with numbers corresponding to the relevant lines.
- [8] Verification of the transcription’s accuracy is not possible since the manuscript’s images are not presently accessible—at least, if they are, then the authors are not clear on how to access them. Nevertheless, the transcription is clear, thoughtful, and easy to understand even without access to the full images, which illustrates the usefulness and success of the transcription.
- [9] One point worth questioning concerns the authors’ assertions on at least two occasions (37, 132) that Codex I follows more closely “the earlier textual tradition represented by the editorial text of NA28 than it does with the Byzantine tradition (as represented by the RP)” (132). Although the point is understood, this assertion seems to present an unnecessary level of ambiguity into the discussion concerning the manuscript’s tendencies. For example, since the NA<sup>28</sup> does not technically represent any particular textual tradition, composing the comparison this way is somewhat imprecise. Granted, this issue perhaps relates more to the authors’ categorical distinctions than the assertions themselves, but Soderquist and Wayment are nevertheless unclear on the motivations behind their chosen distinctions.
- [10] Another critique, though brief, is rather an attempt to call attention to the accidental misplacement of the plates in the bibliography. These plates appear in the middle of the bibliography with the page numbering reflecting this error. Thus, pages 159–66 are inserted between pages 168 and 169, leaving a gap between pages 158–67.
- [11] Soderquist and Wayment have provided in this volume a necessary overview of the history, contents, and important issues related to Codex I. Therefore, the authors’ hope to supply an updated edition, including “a fresh transcription and commentary” (4), has been sufficiently accomplished. Additionally, their method and format represent a useful guide for future, similar studies. The work involved in analyzing Codex I was clearly difficult given the severe damage of the manuscript; yet, Soderquist and Wayment have nevertheless produced an edition that offers clarity and insight for anyone interested in knowing more about the manuscript’s background and contents. Both the specialized nature of the book and its price make this volume most valuable for libraries with special-

---

ized sections on biblical manuscripts, as well as for students and scholars who either want to study Codex I or wish to use the book as a reference for their own research projects.

*Dustin M. Rigsby*  
*New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary*