

Herman Charles Hoskier and the Textual Criticism of Revelation

Martin Karrer

1. The Work and Life of H. C. Hoskier

Herman Charles Hoskier's (1864–1938) work on Revelation is both fascinating and bewildering. He was financially independent for most of his life,¹ funding his work at his own expense. This commitment deserves the highest respect. He also regarded text-critical research into the Apocalypse to be indispensable and wrote: “textual study must always be the forerunner of any interpretation. The solution of any textual difficulties must precede any final and authoritative explanation of the text.”² This critical goal is likewise admirable.

Yet, at the same time, he ran from controversy to controversy. He refused to follow the main stream in textual criticism and provoked other scholars, never holding a chair or academic post. He pursued his text-critical targets like a matador waving a red flag in front of a bull.³ And he read the prophecies of Revelation in a way that was curiously imbued with the atmosphere of the *fin de siècle*. The times were, as he thought, far removed from the beginnings of Christianity, gloomy, and characterised by an “agony of confusion.” The “ultra-Modernists” laboured, as he said, in vain. The Seer of the Apocalypse, however, cries out;⁴ his loud voice must be heard immediately in the here and now.⁵

¹ Cf. the sketch of Hoskier's biography in Garrick Allen's contribution to the present volume and Garrick V. Allen, “‘There is No Glory and No Money in the Work’: H. C. Hoskier and New Testament Textual Criticism,” *TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism* 23 (2018): 1–19.

² H. C. Hoskier, *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse. Collations of All Existing Available Greek Documents with the Standard Text of Stephen's Third Edition*, 2 vols. (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1929), 1.x.

³ Cf. Juan Hernández Jr.'s article in the present volume.

⁴ H. C. Hoskier, “Manuscripts of the Apocalypse – Recent Investigations, part V,” *Bulletin of The John Rylands Library* 8/2 (1924): 412–43 (here 442).

⁵ He supported this opinion in the Prolegomena of his opus magnum *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse* by way of the Great War: the destruction of one third of the ships of the world between 1914 and 1918 corresponded to Rev 8:9 in his view, since the Apocalypse

From the older generation of scholars, Hoskier regarded only Frederick H. A. Scrivener (d. 1891), a conservative, as a friend.⁶ Otherwise, he delighted in polemics. He diminished the worth of the Codex Vaticanus against Westcott and Hort and called the theories concerning the “Syrian” (in today’s terminology, Byzantine) text of the New Testament an “old bosh.”⁷ He attacked Hermann von Soden’s edition,⁸ which was, at the time, the most up-to-date treatment of the text of Revelation. It was, according to Hoskier, unreliable and “worthy of the strongest condemnation.”⁹

It is no wonder that his habits and text-critical theses elicited some negative reactions from his contemporaries. This perspective is captured in a caricature produced in his life time celebrating prominent residents of South Orange, New Jersey.¹⁰ In this image, Hoskier sits at his desk, proud and elegant. Regal furniture along with a painting bespeaks his affluence. But his head is larger than his body; he is literally “egg-headed,” overly intellectual. Codices lay before him and bookrolls behind. He studies them thoroughly and accurately. Nevertheless, he is alone, isolated. He stares to a point far off in the distance. Said in another way, his access to the manuscripts, his accuracy and his care may be marvellous, but his self-confidence compels him to distance himself from his peers. He lives in his own world.

Hoskier’s research on the text of Revelation took place in the midst of all these tensions. In what follows, I sketch his work on this text, proceeding from his early studies, on to his deliberations concerning the textual history of Revelation, and finally to his masterpiece, the great collation of the Apocalypse. We will see that some of his contributions remain relevant and continue to stimulate critical engagement in current research.

2. The Early Investigation into the *Textus Receptus*

Hoskier’s early research focused on the *Textus Receptus* and the Gospels. In 1890 (when he was 26 years old), he published the transcription of a Gospel

records that τὸ τρίτον τῶν πλοίων διεφθάρησαν (“a third of ships were destroyed”); *Concerning the Text*, 1.x).

⁶ Hoskier, *Concerning the Text*, 1. xi: “My old friend Dr. Scrivener...”

⁷ H. C. Hoskier, *Codex B and Its Allies. A Study and an Indictment*, 2 vols. (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1914), 1.270.

⁸ Hermann von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt hergestellt auf Grund ihrer Textgeschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht), 1902–1913.

⁹ H. C. Hoskier, “The Lost Commentary of Oecumenius on the Apocalypse,” *The American Journal of Philology* 34 (1913): 300–14 (here 314).

¹⁰ The caricature was posted by Peter Gurry on The Evangelical Text Criticism Blog (24 March 2017), <http://tinyurl.com/yb8mgprz> [accessed 6 June 2017].

manuscript along with a pioneering investigation into the origin of the printed text of the New Testament.¹¹ He was thrilled by every detail and worked very accurately.

This initial study established his renown, and his accuracy was verified by succeeding transcriptions. His fame as a detail-minded collator spread to the continent. Even Eberhard Nestle, the founder of the *Novum Testamentum Graece*, praised Hoskier's meticulousness in 1910.¹²

Let us look back in order better to understand the achievement of his first study. The *Textus Receptus* developed from the edition of the New Testament by Erasmus (published in 1516 and updated in following editions up to 1535).¹³ Erasmus had only a few manuscripts at his disposal. Concerning Revelation, he used just one manuscript, the minuscule GA 2814, which he procured via Johannes Reuchlin (therefore, famously titled Codex Reuchlini; later on Gregory Apk 1 / Hoskier 1). In this particular manuscript, the text of Revelation is embedded in the Byzantine commentary written by Andrew of Caesarea, and Erasmus had to fill up lacunae (esp. Rev 22:16–21) and make some minor improvements to the text due to the state of the manuscript.¹⁴

Erasmus's narrow-based edition was controversial.¹⁵ The Complutensian Polyglot which was published soon thereafter (distributed from 1522 onwards) allowed textual comparisons. Yet, Erasmus did not devote much attention to the Complutensis. He did not consider its text of Revelation and other parts of the New Testament better than that of his own edition; the polyglot, too, used only one or two manuscripts of the Apocalypse (these manuscripts were young and

¹¹ H. C. Hoskier, *A Full Account and Collation of the Greek Cursive Codex Evangelium 604* (London: David Nutt, 1890), Appendix B (a comparison of editions from Erasmus up to Elzevir's 1624 printing) and Appendix C, "Collation of Elzevir 1624 with Elzevir 1633."

¹² E. Nestle, "Some Points in the History of the *Textus Receptus* of the New Testament," *JTS* 11 (1910): 564–68 (here 565).

¹³ Critical edition: A. J. Brown, ed., *Novum Testamentum ab Erasmo recognitum*, Opera Omnia Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami 6. Revelation: part IV (Leiden: Brill, 2013).

¹⁴ Cf. M. Heide, *Der einzig wahre Bibeltext? Erasmus von Rotterdam und die Frage nach dem Urtext*, 5th ed. (Nürnberg: VTR, 2006), esp. 86–111; J. Krans, "Erasmus and the Text of Revelation 22:19: A Critique of Thomas Holland's Crowned With Glory," *TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism* 16 (2011): 1–19; J. M. Ross, "The Ending of the Apocalypse," in *Studies in New Testament Language and Text*, NTSup 44, ed. J. K. Elliott (Leiden: Brill, 1976), 338–44. Erasmus acted jointly with a team (Gerbel, Oecolampad) in the printing house of Froben in Basel; see M. Karrer, "Der Codex Reuchlins (Minuskel 2814 GA), Erasmus und die Textgeschichte der Apokalypse," (forthcoming).

¹⁵ Cf. U. Dill, "Kontroversen: Erasmus verteidigt seine Ausgabe," in *Das bessere Bild Christi. Das Neue Testament in der Ausgabe des Erasmus von Rotterdam*, ed. U. Dill and P. Shierl (Basel: Schwabe, 2016), 167–79; R. Coogan, *Erasmus, Lee and the Correction of the Vulgate: The Shaking of the Foundations* (Genf: Droz, 1992) and A. Coroleu, "On the Reception of Erasmus's Latin Version of the New Testament in Sixteenth-Century Spain," *The Bible Translator* 67 (2016): 56–68.

are lost today). Thus, Erasmus made do with small corrections in his succeeding editions.¹⁶ An indeed, his edition outmatched the Complutensis.

After Erasmus's death, various printers (from Stephanus in 1550 up to Elzevir 1624 and 1633) made some changes to Erasmus' text, following new manuscripts and new ideas. The most prominent example is a conjecture by Theodore Beza. He suggested that, at Rev 16:5, the text read ὁ ἐσόμενος ("he who will be") instead of ὁ ὅσιος ("the holy one"). This reading alluded to Exod 3:14 and was taken up by the King James Version: "O Lord, which art, and wast, and shalt be."¹⁷ Other corrections followed, but were minor in scope. In the foreword to their 1633 edition, Bonaventura and Abraham Elzevir dared the statement: *Textum ergo habes nunc ab omnibus receptum*.¹⁸ That statement became eponymous for the *Textus Receptus*.

The *Textus Receptus* dominated up to the nineteenth century. The textual differences between Erasmus and Elzevir did not interest scholars in that period. Thus, Hoskier breaks through with a new perspective. He explored the genesis and early development of the *Textus Receptus* by comparing the editions of Erasmus, Stephanus, and so on up to Elzevir's 1624 and 1633 printings. He noted all the differences, including punctuation, accents and breathings for the whole New Testament. In Revelation, he found very few differences between editions. The result is relevant for today and future research: the *Textus Receptus* of Revelation is not to be traced primarily to the text of the 1633 Elzevir edition, but rather directly back to the sixteenth century, to Erasmus and Stephanus.

Even the conjecture of Beza in Rev 16:5 did not prevail in the long run against Erasmus and Stephanus' texts: Hoskier demonstrated that Elzevir accepted Beza's change only in the 1633 edition (not the 1624 edition).¹⁹ This was in fact a concession to the King James Version, and was corrected already in the time of the *Textus Receptus*. The same applies to a second change in the 1633 edition, namely the omission of καὶ at Rev 22:3.²⁰ In Scrivener's edition (1887), which, for the last time, printed the *Textus Receptus* as the main text, neither of these variant readings are noted in the apparatus, and the main text is based on

¹⁶ Cf. M. Karrer, "Das Neue Testament des Erasmus und Luthers," *Theologische Zeitschrift* 73 (2017): 299–324. For details concerning Revelation, see Brown, *Novum Testamentum* 6/4, 11–3.

¹⁷ Thus, thanks to Beza, we find a unique description of the name of God in Revelation deriving from Exod 3:14; there is no parallel in either in Hellenistic Jewish writings or in the New Testament connecting the potential future tense formulation within God's name evoked by the Exodus passage (אֲנִי־אֶהְיֶה). J. Krans, *Beyond What is Written: Erasmus and Beza as Conjectural Critics of the New Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 2006) proffers more information on early conjectures.

¹⁸ *H KAINH ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ. Novum Testamentum...*, ed. Bonaventura and Elzevir (Leiden, 1633), fol. *2v.

¹⁹ Hoskier, *Full Account*, Appendix C, 15.

²⁰ Noted in Hoskier, *Full Account*, Appendix C, 15.

Stephanus' 1550 edition instead of Elzevir's 1633 edition.²¹ Hoskier proved decisively that Scrivener's preference for Stephanus was correct (an important element of their friendship).

Hoskier's meticulous research remains relevant up to the present day, since it facilitated two further critical investigations of the early editions of the New Testament. First, in 1910 Eberhard Nestle drew attention to the fact that one of the exemplars of Elzevir's 1633 edition did not agree entirely with the information presented by Hoskier. A fruitful exchange between the two scholars²² resulted in the following finding: the printing process was so slow in the fifteenth and sixteenth century and, even in 1633, corrections were made during the drawn out process of the actual printing of the edition. For that reason, differences in early examples of the same print run are indicative of the fact that the exemplars originated in different stages of the print run. In a sense, the correspondence between Hoskier and Nestle anticipated the modern discipline of analytical bibliography of early printed books, which eventually led to the conclusion that every book of the early printing period is a unique witness, even if part of the same edition. Second, Hoskier's observations helped some eighty years later to another discovery: Henk Jan de Jonge used details of Hoskier's collation of the New Testament to solve the riddle of who prepared the text for the Elzevir print. He demonstrated that Jeremias Hölzlin, the Greek scholar from Leiden, was the editor responsible for Elzevir's 1633 edition.²³

The current hand edition of the Greek New Testament, NA²⁸, does not present the history of the *Textus Receptus* and its conjectures in the apparatus. Hoskier's study fills this gap. It therefore remains an important interlocutor for specialists in addition to the electronic databases which list the New Testament conjectures of the old editions in a more comprehensive way.²⁴

Hoskier's meticulous cataloguing of differences in orthography (e.g. edition 1624 ἔλκος / 1633 ἔλκκος at 16:2), punctuation (e.g. colon / middle dot after λέγοντες, disputed at 13:4 and 15:3), final consonants (e.g. ἐστὶ or ἐστὶν at 21:16), breathings and accentuation (e.g. 18:10, where 1624 reads κῆρῖς whereas 1633 attests κῆρῖς, followed by modern editions) draws attention to a

²¹ F. H. A. Scrivener, *Novum Testamentum Textus Stephanici*... (London: George Bell, 1887), 583 on Rev 16:5.

²² See Nestle, "Some Points," 565–68, and the response by H. C. Hoskier, "The Elzevir New Testaments of 1624 and 1633," *JTS* 12 (1911): 454–57.

²³ H. J. de Jonge, "Jeremias Hoelzlin: Editor of the 'Textus Receptus' Printed by the Elzeviers Leiden 1633," in *Miscellanea Neotestamentica. Studia ad Novum Testamentum Praesertim Pertinentia a Sociis Sodalicii Batavi c.n. Studiosorum Novi Testamenti Conventus Anno MCMLXXVI Quintum Lustrum Feliciter Complentis Suscepta*, NTSup 47, ed. T. Baarda et al. (Leiden: Brill, 1978), 105–28.

²⁴ See the Amsterdam database of conjectures (created by Jan Krans) linked to the New Testament Transcripts database of the Institut für Neutestamentliche Textforschung Münster.

further problem in every edition. Modern editions normalize the orthography and text-organizing signs. The text-structuring devices (e.g. punctuation) and typographical matters (ranging from orthography to movable-v) of the manuscripts are lost to large degree.

It is only in recent years that all these details and their import have again garnered similar attention as devoted to them by Hoskier. Nevertheless, the *Editio Critica Maior* (ECM) of the New Testament will outpace Hoskier in the end, since it maintains the *orthographica* of manuscripts in the electronic transcriptions that underlie the edition. The ECM of Revelation will record the text-structuring characteristics of selected manuscripts and list the accents of manuscripts at places where semantic differences arise depending on accentuation. It is even planned to include select readings from some historic editions (e.g. Erasmus, Stephanus, Beza) in the apparatus. Hoskier's habits of collation anticipated future research trends.

3. The Search for an Organization of Textual History

The number of known manuscripts of the New Testament has increased century to century, and yet, additional criteria were needed to deal with various ambiguities and difficulties of the New Testament text. Erasmus instigated the pertinent deliberations at the outset of humanist engagement with the text. In his annotations, he preferred the witness of Church Fathers and held the annotations of Lorenzo Valla, the most famous humanist of the fifteenth century,²⁵ in high regard. Vice versa, he downgraded the Latin version because he was convinced of deteriorations in the transmission of the Vulgate and wanted to improve the Latin text.²⁶ Later generations upgraded the importance of the ancient translations of the Greek New Testament. The Latin traditions (Vetus Latina and Vulgate), especially, increased in text-critical value; at the time of Hoskier, Bousset regarded the Vulgate to be highly relevant for the text of Revelation,²⁷ against Erasmus' perspective. What is more, the nineteenth century brought great advances in the knowledge of the other ancient translations like Syriac, Coptic, Ethiopic, and

²⁵ Cf. A. Perosa, ed., *Lorenzo Valla. Collatio Novi Testamenti* (Firenze: Sansoni 1970).

²⁶ H. J. de Jonge, "Novum Testamentum a nobis versum. The Essence of Erasmus' Edition of the New Testament," *JTS* 35 (1984): 394–413 (395–407); de Jonge, "Erasmus' Translation of the New Testament, Aim and Method," *The Bible Translator* 67 (2016): 29–41.

²⁷ W. Bousset, *Die Offenbarung Johannis*, KEK 16, 6th ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1906), esp. 149 and 155 on the AC Vulgate group (repr. 1966). Hoskier, *Concerning the Text*, 1.xxxviii criticises Bousset's text-critical studies from 1894 (*Textkritische Studien zum Neuen Testament*, TU 11.4, Leipzig: Hinrichs'sche, 1894) but does not deal with Bousset's commentary.

Armenian. This led to disputes as to how to establish relationships between these divergent witnesses.

Every textual critic from the sixteenth up to the early twentieth century cited Church Fathers and versions as textual witnesses in addition to the Greek manuscripts. Nevertheless, the majority of scholars were cautious in their appraisal of these additional witnesses, owing to the difficult questions concerning the re-translations of foreign languages into Greek and the knowledge and date of the Church fathers. R. H. Charles, for instance, did not always cite Hippolytus.²⁸ Here, Hoskier swam against the tide in his evaluations of Revelation's text. He paid special attention to Hippolytus, who, according to the early Church tradition, wrote his *Commentarius in Joannis Evangelium et Apocalypsin* shortly after 200 CE.²⁹ Furthermore, he tied the old text form of Hippolytus to that of the young *Textus Receptus*.³⁰ Consequently, the value of the *Textus Receptus* increased in Hoskier's perspective.

Looking back at Hoskier's early work, one catches sight of a special love for the *Textus Receptus*. Hoskier inherited this love from his text-critical ancestors and Scrivener. But this love biased him for a textual theory that went beyond Scrivener and the textual criticism of his generation. He committed mistakes, like not using the text of Hippolytus in its best form³¹ and overestimating the possibility for conclusions from the only existing fragments. As a result, the link from Hippolytus to the *Textus Receptus* could not hold. Josef Schmid, who in 1930³² (still during Hoskier's lifetime) started the next great exploration on the text of the Apocalypse, sharply criticised Hoskier's thesis and cast considerable doubt on the value of Hoskier's use of patristic citations.³³

Hoskier's thesis concerning the versions was even bolder. He suggested that the ancient versions may be traced to the earliest period of transmission of the New Testament writings (first to third centuries CE), and postulated the existence of ancient multilingual (tri- or quadrilingual) editions for many of the New

²⁸ Esp. R. H. Charles, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St. John*, ICC, 2 vols. (New York: Scribner's Sons, 1920). Hoskier, *Concerning the Text*, 1.xxxvii criticises Charles' rejection of a reference to Hippolytus on one example passage.

²⁹ See P. Prigent and R. Stehly, eds., "Les Fragments du *De Apocalypsi* d'Hippolyte," *Theologische Zeitschrift* 29 (1973): 313–33. Interpretations of Revelation are also found in M. Richard, ed., *Hippolytus: Commentarius in Danielelem*, GCS NF 7 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2000). Nevertheless, Hippolytus' quotations of the text of Revelation are fragmentary and incomplete.

³⁰ Cf. Hoskier, *Concerning the Text*, 1.xlviii.

³¹ He passed over the edition of Hippolytus by H. Achelis and N. Bonwetsch, eds., *Hippolytus Werke*, vol. 1, Exegetische und homiletische Schriften (Leipzig: Hinrichs'sche, 1897).

³² This date is mentioned by J. Schmid, *Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen Apokalypse-Textes*, vol. 2, Die Alten Stämme (Munich: Karl Zink, 1955), xi.

³³ Schmid, *Studien*, 8 n.1.

Testament writings.³⁴ For Revelation in particular, he undertook to prove this theory in a 1911 study.³⁵ His thesis proved untenable immediately, based on his view of the age of the Coptic and Syriac manuscripts, which were of special interest to Hoskier. Edgar J. Goodspeed dismissed Hoskier's theory in an important review from 1912,³⁶ but Hoskier himself never abandoned this idea.³⁷

Despite the lack of acceptance of his views on the versions, we should not overlook an essential side effect: Hoskier's thesis compelled him to document the ancient versions of Revelation in all their breadth. He ventured on that difficult project, learned the languages as far as allowed by the current state of lexicography and grammar, and collated the accessible texts. That major undertaking helped generations of scholars and should earn our respect despite his project's many errors.³⁸

Josef Schmid, who critiqued Hoskier one generation later, was well aware of the problems of associated with working with the old versions and avoided them altogether.³⁹ Today, scholars from various disciplines share this burden. The *Vetus Latina* of Revelation was edited not earlier than two generations after Hoskier, accomplished superbly by Roger Gryson in 2000–2003 (with sharp critiques against Hoskier).⁴⁰ The Syriac version was in recent years newly investigated and is now edited by Martin Heide in preparation for the ECM; the Sahidic Coptic text has also been recently edited by Christian Askeland, and variants from the Ethiopic are currently being prepared for the use in the ECM by Curt Niccum.⁴¹ While Hoskier's use of the versions is definitively outdated by these

³⁴ Cf. H. C. Hoskier, *Concerning the Genesis of the Versions of the N.T.*, 2 vols. (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1910) and Juan Hernández' contribution to the present volume.

³⁵ H. C. Hoskier, *Concerning the Date of the Bohairic Version: Covering a Detailed Examination of the Text of the Apocalypse and a Review of Some of the Writings of the Egyptian Monks* (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1911).

³⁶ Edgar J. Goodspeed, "Review: Hoskier's Study of the New Testament Versions," *AJT* 16 (1912): 652–54.

³⁷ Cf. Hoskier, *Concerning the Text*, 1.xlviii: "the scholars, who reviewed my previous volume on the date of the Bohairic Version of the Apocalypse, refused...to believe in the existence of Graeco-Syriac documents in the first, second and third centuries, unless I could offer tangible proof of a fragment of papyrus or parchment bearing a few lines of such a bilingual text. The faith that is in me, thereagainst, is based on this study of origins."

³⁸ See Curt Niccum's article in this volume.

³⁹ Schmid, *Studien*, x–xi and 10–2.

⁴⁰ R. Gryson, ed., *Apocalypsis Johannis*, VL 26/2 (Freiburg: Herder, 2003), 93 comments on Hoskier's work (cf. n.69 below).

⁴¹ These three editions are made electronically for the *ECM Revelation*. Cf. M. Heide, "Die syrische Apokalypse oder Offenbarung an Johannes. Kritische Edition der harklensischen Textzeugen," in *Studien zum Text der Apokalypse II*, ANTF 50, ed. M. Sigmund and D. Müller (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2017), 81–187; Heide, "Die syrische Johannes-Apokalypse. Zum gegenwärtigen Stand der Forschung," in *Die Johannesoffenbarung: ihr Text und ihre Auslegung*, ABG 38, ed. M. Karrer and M. Labahn (Leipzig: Evangelische

editions and the forthcoming publication of the ECM of Revelation, he nonetheless deserves credit for providing an overview, for the first time, of ancient translations at the variation-units of the Apocalypse.

His unusual views concerning the textual history of the New Testament isolated Hoskier.⁴² In that situation, he published his aforementioned investigation into Codex Vaticanus (1914) and attempted to diminish the importance of this most famous New Testament codex (B).⁴³ He overestimated his abilities, as a contemporary reviewer charged.⁴⁴

The Vaticanus controversy is of less importance for our subject, since the codex does not contain the Apocalypse (either it was missing already in the scriptorium or the portion with the Apocalypse was lost later). Indirectly, the debate stands in line with Hoskier's assessment of Erasmus. Let us briefly return to the sixteenth century, a time when B was available in the Vatican Library, although the relevance and age of the codex were unknown. Neither Erasmus nor the editors of the Complutensian Polyglot made a journey to consult it. After the publication of his edition, Erasmus asked for variants in the codex when looking for arguments in the dispute over the *Comma Johanneum*. Transcriptions of illustrative passages and variants were sent to him. This list of 365 readings is lost, unfortunately. Nevertheless, we know Erasmus' reaction: he observed that variants of B agreed with the text of the Vulgate against his proposals for a correction of the Latin text. However, he did not attempt his own thesis concerning the Vulgate, but concluded in 1534 that the Vulgate influenced the text of Vaticanus.⁴⁵ This conclusion allowed Erasmus to defend his own edition, the

Verlagsanstalt, 2012), 71–82; Heide, “Zur Vorlage und Bedeutung der äthiopischen Bibelübersetzung,” in *Studien zum Text der Apokalypse*, ANTF 47, ed. M. Sigismund, M. Karrer, and U. Schmid (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015), 289–314; C. Askeland, “An Eclectic Edition of the Sahidic Apocalypse of John,” in *Studien zum Text der Apokalypse II*, ANTF 50, ed. M. Sigismund and D. Müller (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2017), 33–79; Askeland, “The Sahidic Apocalypse in Early Islamic Egypt,” in *Studien zum Text der Apokalypse*, ANTF 47, ed. M. Sigismund, M. Karrer, and U. Schmid (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015), 271–88; C. Niccum, “Apokalypse Now: The Ethiopic Version of Revelation Fifty Years after Hofmann,” in *Studien zum Text der Apokalypse II*, ANTF 50, ed. M. Sigismund and D. Müller (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2017), 211–30.

⁴² In 1914 Wilhelm Bousset put it well when he wrote: Hoskier is “a textual critic, who pursues his course all alone, away from usual roads.” (Bousset, “Textkritik II,” *Theologische Rundschau* 17 [1914]: 187–206 (here 199).

⁴³ Hoskier, *Codex B*.

⁴⁴ “This...task has proved beyond his power”: (H. St. John Thackeray, “Book Note: Codex B and its Allies,” *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 35 (1915): 275–76, (here 275).

⁴⁵ P. S. Allen et al., eds., *Opvs epistolarvm Des. Erasmi Roterodami Erasmus*, vol. 2 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1910), nr. 2906, lines 39–45. Cf. J. K. Elliott, “‘Novum Testamentum editum est’: The Five-Hundredth Anniversary of Erasmus’s New Testament,” *The Bible Translator* 67 (2016): 9–28, esp. 19 and 22 n.36.

forerunner of the *Textus Receptus*. He erred in his underappreciation of B long before Hoskier.

But did it make sense for Hoskier to diminish B anew centuries later? In the nineteenth century, in the midst of the demise of the *Textus Receptus*, B became a chief witness of the critical editions against the Erasmian and Byzantine textual tradition. In reaction to this development, Hoskier downgraded B and voted for a continuing preference of the *Textus Receptus*. His approach was too narrow, but would go on to win unexpected followers in the twentieth century, attracting attention from various Majority Text theorists, since Hoskier appeared to advocate for the Byzantine Majority text and *Textus Receptus*.⁴⁶

Hoskier's criticism of B, however, did not mean that he was uncritical of Erasmus. He presented for his own position when he was confronted with the rediscovery of the Codex Reuchlini, Erasmus' base text for his edition of Revelation (GA 2814). The codex was found in the library of Maihingen (Fürsten von Oettingen) in 1850.⁴⁷ Franz Delitzsch evaluated the problematic conjectures in Erasmus' edition and condemned his editorial laxness,⁴⁸ a criticism that Hoskier applauded: "Delitzsch' [*sic*]... investigations of the Erasmian texts are worthy of all praise. He is hard enough on Erasmus."⁴⁹

Nevertheless, Hoskier did not doubt that Erasmus utilised an important and widely disseminated text form. He classified related manuscripts and called the text, which was typical for Andrew's commentary tradition, the "Erasmian family."⁵⁰ Thus, the Erasmian text became part of Andrew's textual form, the "Andreastext" as it was called later on. To be sure, Hoskier overvalued this specific textual form – the "Andreastext" is more differentiated, holding many subgroups, than he thought.⁵¹ Nonetheless, his grouping was ground-breaking.

Additionally, Hoskier identified the textual form of the manuscripts that were used in Alcalá near Madrid for the Complutensian Polyglot. He categorised other manuscripts of this group and showed that the "Complutensian text" is later than

⁴⁶ Note the comments in D. B. Wallace, "Historical Revisionism and the Majority Text: The Cases of F. H. A. Scrivener and Herman C. Hoskier," *NTS* 41 (1995): 280–85; and Wallace, "The Majority Text Theory: History, Methods, and Critique," in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*, ed. B. D. Ehrman and M. W. Holmes (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 711–44, esp. 715.

⁴⁷ T. F. Karrer, "Antiquarisches," *Zeitschrift für die gesammte lutherische Theologie und Kirche* 11 (1850): 121–24, esp. 122.

⁴⁸ Franz Delitzsch, *Handschriftliche Funde I. Die Erasmischen Entstellungen des Textes der Apokalypse. Nachgewiesen aus dem verloren geglaubten Codex Reuchlin* (Leipzig: Dörfpling & Franke, 1861).

⁴⁹ Hoskier, *Concerning the Text*, 1.7.

⁵⁰ Hoskier, *Concerning the Text*, 1.8; cf. Hoskier, "Manuscripts of the Apocalypse – Recent Investigations, part I," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 7 (1922): 118–37, esp. 118.

⁵¹ State of research in 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).

the text found in Erasmus' main manuscript (GA 2814).⁵² This particular finding was confirmed by later research: the text of the Complutensian Polyglot is of middle Byzantine origin.⁵³

In the end, Hoskier's appraisal of the versions and Hippolytus was erroneous, as was his verdict against Codex Vaticanus. His theory concerning the early transmission of the Apocalypse and other New Testament writings was untenable. But he laid the foundations for the differentiations of textual groups from the Byzantine period onwards, and he cut his losses in abstaining from his own reconstruction of the oldest text of Revelation.⁵⁴

One may add another aspect in ecumenical perspective. GA 2814 (Codex Reuchlini) was purchased in Constantinople for the Council of Basel,⁵⁵ a council that assayed the possibility of a union between the Eastern and Western churches. Erasmus and many generations after him, including Hoskier, neglected this historical context. Perhaps the interest in this codex and the "Erasmian" text will be renewed from a historical perspective, once the scholars rediscover the ecumenical aspects of the New Testament's textual history.

4. The Collation of the Greek Witnesses to the Text of the Apocalypse

Hoskier's magnum opus is the collation of the Greek witnesses to the text of Revelation published in 1929.⁵⁶ Transcriptions of manuscripts, examination of their textual worth, and text grouping had begun long before. Scrivener, for instance, transcribed thirteen minuscules of Revelation,⁵⁷ and Tregelles had

⁵² Hoskier, "Recent Investigations, part I," 119; Hoskier, *Concerning the Text*, 1.xv–xxxiii and 1.8.

⁵³ Cf. M. Lembke, "Der Apokalypsetext der Complutensischen Polyglotte und sein Verhältnis zur handschriftlichen Überlieferung," in *Studien zum Text der Apokalypse*, ANTF 47, ed. M. Sigismund, M. Karrer, and U. Schmid (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015), 33–134; and U. B. Schmid, "Editing the Apocalypse in the 21st Century," in *Book of Seven Seals: The Peculiarity of Revelation, its Manuscripts, Attestation, and Transmission*, WUNT 363, ed. T. Kraus and M. Sommer (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 231–40, esp. 233–34.

⁵⁴ Schmid, *Studien*, 8 puts it more sharply: "Eine eigene Rekonstruktion des Urtextes hat Hoskier nicht unternommen. Dies ist aber kein Verlust für die Wissenschaft."

⁵⁵ All the manuscripts from Basel used by Erasmus were procured for the Council of Basel in the fifteenth century. Cf. M. Wallraff, S. S. Menchi, and K. von Greyerz, eds., *Basel 1516: Erasmus' Edition of the New Testament* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016) and U. Dill and P. Schierl, eds., *Das bessere Bild Christi, Das Neue Testament in der Ausgabe des Erasmus von Rotterdam* (Basel: Schwabe, 2016).

⁵⁶ Vol. 2 of Hoskier, *Concerning the Text*.

⁵⁷ Schmid, *Studien*, 4 n.1.

transcribed the Codex Reuchlini (GA 2814),⁵⁸ among other examples. But not a single scholar before Hoskier undertook a comprehensive examination of all the manuscripts of one single New Testament book or sought to compile all their variant readings. Hoskier set foot in new territory.

He was aware of his innovation and proud to dedicate thirty years of his life to it. He collected photographs or copies of the manuscripts, successively completed the collation, and reworked his manuscript descriptions several times.⁵⁹ In all of these years, he was motivated by the desire to demonstrate that it was feasible to manage a full collation of a biblical book. He was convinced that other scholars would follow him and accomplish comparable collations of further New Testament books.⁶⁰

Although this was not to be, due to the abundance of New Testament manuscripts, the goal had the desired effect. After Hoskier, all manuscripts for each biblical book were examined at *Teststellen* for the *Text und Textwert* volumes, which prepared the selection of manuscripts for the ECM volumes. These selected manuscripts are then fully transcribed. Hoskier's comprehensiveness extends also beyond the *Text und Textwert* volumes. It is a dream at least of the *ECM Revelation* to extend the full collation to all manuscripts, made possible by the electronic medium of editing that can be updated as new manuscripts become available.

Hoskier's longstanding commitment to his project imposed a substantial personal financial burden. Von Soden and Lietzmann, who promoted textual scholarship in Germany, received financial support through Elise König. Hoskier, by contrast, was on his own financially. His wealth melted in the second half of his life, and this financial strain endangered the printing of his two volume investigation. The work was ready in 1927, as Hoskier writes in the preface, but the publication in the academic context of the University of Michigan was delayed

⁵⁸ S. P. Tregelles, "A Few Notes on Codex Reuchlini of the Apocalypse, together with a collation of it's [*sic*] text with the common editions," in Franz Delitzsch, *Handschriftliche Funde 2. Neue Studien über den Codex Reuchlins und neue Textgeschichtliche Aufschlüsse über die Apokalypse aus den Bibliotheken in München, Wien und Rom* (Leipzig: Dörffling & Franke, 1862), 1–16.

⁵⁹ The extensive work (Hoskier, *Concerning the Text*) betrays its long growth at multiple places. On occasion, Hoskier himself indicated dates of entries; for instance, he examined MS 12 (GA 181) in 1901, but supplemented it ten years later in 1911 (*Concerning the Text*, 1.24).

⁶⁰ In his own words: "Towards the close of our labours, it becomes apparent that the task we suggest to others of the collation of the existing rich material of the other books of the N.T. is not at all superhuman, and ought to have been undertaken long ago" (Hoskier, *Concerning the Text*, 1.xii).

despite Hoskier's proactive approach.⁶¹ Publication only took place two years later, when Hoskier's friends stepped in to help.⁶²

The lover of frank speech that he was, Hoskier articulated his endeavours for getting manuscripts in a special "Note" at the beginning of volume 1:

I do not feel that I am under any obligations to the public or private libraries, the authorities of which have allowed their MSS. to be photographed at my expense, as this is an insurance on their part against destruction of such records by fire, and I have had to provide such libraries as a rule with two and sometimes three copies of each MS., which copies are probably kept apart from the MSS. themselves. But I am, of course, under considerable obligations to the Librarians of these institutions.⁶³

I would not mention this statement had some of the manuscripts he collated not been lost subsequently. I may note here two manuscripts from Dresden: GA 2039 (= Hoskier 90 / Sächsische Landesbibl. A 95) from twelfth century and GA 241 (= 47 Hoskier / Sächsische Landesbibl. A 172) from the eleventh century. GA 2039 was burnt in the Second World War, but is documented by Hoskier, and my quest for Hoskier's photos of GA 241 in Dresden yielded a surprising result: there are no photographs, but the manuscript is not burnt as was promulgated in the last generation. It was handed over to the Soviet military administration on 26 August 1947 as a part of the collection Matthaei, and is located today in Moscow.⁶⁴ Access to this manuscript that was once thought lost is now possible,⁶⁵ thanks in part to the hints of Hoskier.⁶⁶

Other manuscripts of Revelation remain inaccessible, or are preserved only in incomplete photographs. In these fortunately rare cases, Hoskier's collation currently constitutes the only extensive evidence. The *ECM Revelation* takes this

⁶¹ Several reports indicate that Hoskier supported the University of Michigan collection in the 1920s and early 1930s: *Michigan Alumnus* 36 (1930): 264; University of Michigan, *The President's Report for 1932–1933*, Suppl. p. 247; *University of Michigan Official Publication* 41 (1939): 243, and suppl. 397.

⁶² See the reference at the beginning of the volume: Hoskier, *Concerning the Text*, 1.iii.

⁶³ Hoskier, *Concerning the Text*, 1.vii.

⁶⁴ The entry in Lembke et al., *Text und Textwert*, 5 must be complemented. I thank the Saxon State and University Library Dresden for informing me by email, 12 June 2017.

⁶⁵ I am very grateful to Mikhail Seleznev who identified the manuscript in Moscow (personal correspondence in 2017) and the Institut für Neutestamentliche Textforschung Münster for providing digital photographs.

⁶⁶ Hoskier thought that GA 241 not only was a witness to the Byzantine Koine text, but that it also contained valuable agreements with Hippolytus and ancient versions (*Concerning the Text*, 1.xxvi, 133–37). Schmid corrected Hoskier in a series of articles in 1936 (Schmid, "Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des griechischen Apokalypsetextes. Der K-Text," *Biblica* 17 [1936]: 11–44, 167–201, 273–93, 429–60, esp. 438) and again in 1955 (*Studien*, 27). In Schmid's view, both manuscripts of Dresden fully belong to the Koine tradition; GA 241, which Hoskier regarded so highly, has less value for the text of Revelation than Hoskier thought.

into consideration, recording readings for GA 242 1678 and 2039 using Hoskier's collation.⁶⁷

It was difficult for a long time to scrutinise the quality of Hoskier's work because his photographs were lost.⁶⁸ Josef Schmid, the great scholar of the textual history of Revelation of the mid-1950s,⁶⁹ was the first who rigorously re-examined many of the manuscripts of Revelation. Although he criticised Hoskier's theses regarding the early transmission of Revelation, Schmid spoke in Hoskier's favour concerning the collation: Hoskier "collated the majority of manuscripts, which had been then known, independently and with great accuracy. Here lies the value of his work."⁷⁰ Schmid held his collations in high esteem and, at the same time, was critical when he perceived numerous inaccuracies in other areas.⁷¹

Other scholars augmented the critiques, looking at Hoskier's errors in handling the patristic evidence and ancient versions. I quote the editor of the *Vetus Latina* of Revelation, the aforementioned Roger Gryson. Hoskier's collation is, in his view, neither "an edition, nor a history of the text, but a simple collection of variants, coupled with endeavour to characterise and classify the Greek manuscripts; to our knowledge, its reliability has never been put to systematic scrutiny... If the author [Hoskier] treated the Greek witnesses with the same flippancy as the Latin ones, not to mention the oriental versions, there is truly a reason to be worried."⁷²

The contrast between Schmid and Gryson's overall evaluation of Hoskier can now be solved. The Institut für Neutestamentliche Textforschung (INTF) in Münster owns microfilms of almost all manuscripts of the New Testament which have been put to use by the *ECM Revelation* project, outstripping the analytical

⁶⁷ Lembke et al., *Text und Textwert*, 7*.

⁶⁸ The search for Hoskier's private copy of the photographs has started. How nice it would be if the current search for hard copies in Hoskier's own estate (carried out by Garrick Allen) proved successful!

⁶⁹ We cannot discuss Josef Schmid further here. His important work on the Apocalypse has recently been published in English as Juan Hernández Jr., Garrick V. Allen, and Darius Müller, trans. and eds., *Studies in the History of the Greek Text of the Apocalypse: The Ancient Stems* (Atlanta: SBL, 2018).

⁷⁰ Schmid, *Studien*, 8. This corresponds to Hoskier's comment in his Prolegomena (*Concerning the Text*, 1.x.): "Let it be clearly understood at the outset that my investigation of the transmission of the text of the Apocalypse has been and is being made without the slightest prejudice or bias, or preconceived ideas."

⁷¹ Schmid, *Studien*, 8 n.2 asserts strongly: "Die paläographische Beschreibung der Hss ist ganz unzulänglich."

⁷² Gryson, *Apocalypsis*, 93 (the English translation is my own): "une édition, ni une histoire du texte, mais un simple recueil de variantes, assorti d'un effort pour caractériser et classer les manuscrits grecs; à notre connaissance, la fiabilité n'en a jamais été systématiquement éprouvée... 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."

potential of earlier times.⁷³ The Wuppertal team of the ECM (directed by the author of this contribution) gathered two datasets for the test passages of Revelation's *Text und Textwert* volume. One dataset was based purely on the INTF photographs, and the second also considered Hoskier's collation.⁷⁴ The comparison of data corresponded to Schmid's observations, confirming the high regard for Hoskier's collation of Greek manuscript, which to this day has not been seriously challenged.⁷⁵ To put it plainly: in his collation of manuscripts, Hoskier was not led by his own interests, or his theories of textual history and prophecy. His collations are of high quality.

On the other hand, many witnesses unknown to Hoskier were discovered in the last century, as the number of the registered manuscripts has grown from 252 to 310. J. Keith Elliott⁷⁶ and David Aune⁷⁷ have taken the trouble to coordinate Hoskier's idiosyncratic numbering with the data of the current editions, and individual changes were executed in the *Kurzgefasste Liste* through the preparatory work on the ECM.⁷⁸ The selection of manuscripts for the ECM transcends Hoskier's important work.

These observations have significant consequences. On the one hand, the previous studies of Hoskier retain their value. Hoskier, for example, documented the solecisms in the manuscripts well beyond his predecessors, and investigations on the peculiarities of scribal habits in the main manuscripts of Revelation are correct to use his collations.⁷⁹

Moreover, Hoskier presents a repository for variants in all the manuscripts known to him, a body of data that will not be overtaken until the complete

⁷³ Only a few manuscripts seen by Hoskier are now lost or missing. I mentioned the most important ones and add that already Hoskier himself lamented manuscript losses during First World War (Hoskier, *Concerning the Text*, 1.ix).

⁷⁴ Cf. Lembke et al., *Text und Textwert*, 18*–25* (98*–103*).

⁷⁵ See, e.g., D. C. Parker, *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and Their Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 230.

⁷⁶ J. K. Elliott, "Manuscripts of the Book of Revelation Collated by H.C. Hoskier," *JTS* 40 (1989): 100–11.

⁷⁷ D. E. Aune, *Revelation 1–5*, WBC 52A (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1997), cxxxix–cxlviii.

⁷⁸ See U. Schmid, "Die Apokalypse, überliefert mit anderen neutestamentlichen Schriften – eap-r-Handschriften," in *Studien zum Text der Apokalypse*, ANTF 47, ed. M. Sigismund, M. Karrer, and U. Schmid (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015), 421–41, esp. 432–36; J. K. Elliott, "Recent Work on the Greek Manuscripts of Revelation and the Consequences for the *Kurzgefasste Liste*," *JTS* 66 (2015): 574–84; and Lembke et al., *Text und Textwert*, 9*–12*.

⁷⁹ Cf. James R. Royse, *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 47 and J. Hernández Jr., *Scribal Habits and Theological Influences in the Apokalypse*, WUNT 2/218 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 201. Naturally, the newer studies always make use of, in addition to Hoskier, the best possible access to the documents, facsimiles, and now also microfilms, digital images, etc.

transcription of all manuscripts known today has been achieved by the ECM.⁸⁰ Let us not forget that the ECM is not meant to ensure absolute completeness – Hoskier’s ideal – but rather to offer a representative selection, whereby its users can get a proper overview of the material.

To put this more succinctly, the apparatus of the ECM will cite around 110 manuscripts, as is usual in the ECM for all New Testament books.⁸¹ This number is more than one third of all the manuscripts of Revelation. At the same time, a number of Hoskier’s manuscripts will be omitted in favour of witnesses that came to light after 1929.⁸² In effect, only about 80 manuscripts that Hoskier collated will be fully represented in the ECM of Revelation. Whoever wishes to consult the textual variants of the more than 160 other manuscripts that Hoskier collated will still have to refer to his volumes. It is hoped, of course, that this necessity will cease one day, when the electronic edition of the Apocalypse gradually incorporates all the manuscripts. But there is still a long way to go.

In contrast to his lasting contributions, we have to mention Hoskier’s limitations. First, the new imaging technology enables researchers to recognise readings that Hoskier missed or transcribed incorrectly. For instance, multispectral images of Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus (C)⁸³ show that our manuscript does not read βλεπεις at Rev 1:11 (as Tischendorf perceived), but βλεψεις. Also, at 3:7, it does not read κλιει (as Tischendorf and Lyon suggested), but the first hand rather wrote κλιω, which was then corrected to κλιω.⁸⁴ Hoskier’s collation requires a thoroughgoing update based on modern technological capabilities.

Second, there are serious imprecisions in Hoskier’s treatment of patristic evidence, extending beyond his treatment of Hippolytus. For instance, he discovered the importance of the Oecumenius text, an old textual form, and criticised von Soden for his failure to recognise it.⁸⁵ But he himself examined only a meagre number of manuscripts of Oecumenius (the oldest Byzantine commentary on the Apocalypse). Hoskier’s edition of this commentary (1928), which supplemented

⁸⁰ Incidentally, Hoskier’s collation has proven valuable even in producing transcriptions for the ECM, especially, as something of a “secondary confirmation” at places where the currently available images are unclear or where the manuscript’s state of preservation has deteriorated since the time of Hoskier.

⁸¹ These manuscripts are selected according to the groups, which emerged in the whole breath of the transmission. The exact number cannot be given yet, since, in theory, transcriptions can be added until the end of the editorial process (ca. 2023).

⁸² Hoskier did not have access to important materials like P⁴⁷, which was first edited in 1934, or P¹¹⁵. Cf. P. Malik, *P. Beatty III (P⁴⁷): The Codex, Its Scribe, and Its Text*, NTTSD 52 (Leiden: Brill, 2017) and D. C. Parker, “A New Oxyrhynchus Papyrus of Revelation: P115 (P. Oxy. 4499),” *NTS* 46 (2000): 159–74.

⁸³ These multispectral images were acquired by the Graduiertenkolleg Dokument – Text – Edition of the University of Wuppertal, in which the Kirchliche Hochschule Wuppertal (the main location of the ECM-Apocalypse project) participates.

⁸⁴ I am grateful to Darius Müller (Wuppertal) for this reference.

⁸⁵ Hoskier, “Oecumenius,” 314.

his collations,⁸⁶ was from the very beginning outmoded. Marc de Groote produced an adequate edition finally outdating Hoskier in 1999.⁸⁷ Schmid edited the second ancient commentary, written by Andrew of Caesarea in 1955–1956,⁸⁸ and J. Hernández has recently brought some text historical consequences of Schmid's treatment of the "Andreastext" to the fore.⁸⁹ The text forms are clearer now, and the sequential citations (formulated by the interpreters inside their commentaries) of both of these major Byzantine commentaries can be collated only on the basis of these newer editions.

Third, Hoskier's references to the ancient versions must always be read in a way that respects the limited knowledge of his time and the context of his (obsolete) efforts to prove the existence of an early multilingual edition of the Apocalypse. For example, Sahidic witnesses betray some affinities with the Greek text in the papyri. This fact is easily explained, since both originated in Egypt, but Hoskier sought to identify parallels even at places where simple scribal errors seem more probable.⁹⁰ To put it briefly, Hoskier's collation is to be held in high esteem, but to be used with critical caution.

5. Conclusion

Hoskier esteemed clear words and puzzling quotations. He was convinced that he was the best text-critical scholar of his time, setting the standard for accurate collations and promoting the reflection on textual history of the Gospels and Revelation. At the same time, he embellished the title page of his investigation into Codex Vaticanus with the first aphorism of Hippocrates in Greek; I paraphrase:

⁸⁶ H. C. Hoskier, *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).

⁸⁷ M. de Groote, ed., *Oecumenii Commentarius in Apocalypsin* (Leuven: Peters, 1999); de Grotte, ed., *Index Oecumenianus* (Gent: Olms-Weidemann, 2001).

⁸⁸ J. Schmid, *Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen Apokalypse-Textes I. Der Apokalypse-Kommentar des Andreas von Kaisareia. Text* (München: Karl Zink, 1955); Schmid, *Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen Apokalypse-Textes I. Der Apokalypse-Kommentar des Andreas von Kaisareia. Einleitung* (München: Karl Zink, 1956).

⁸⁹ J. Hernández, Jr., "The Creation of a Fourth-Century Witness to the Andreas Text Type: A Misreading in the Apocalypse's Textual History," *NTS* 60 (2013): 1–15 and other studies.

⁹⁰ Nevertheless, each instance must be discussed separately. For example, Hoskier (*Concerning the Text*, 2.545) relates the reading $\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon$ of the first hand of Sinaiticus (instead of $\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\omicron\nu$) to the Coptic *eke* and interprets it in the sense of $\alpha\lambda\lambda\omicron\nu$ (cf. $\alpha\lambda\lambda\omicron\nu$ $\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\omicron\nu$ by corrector 2). On this, see Hernández, *Scribal Habits*, 73 n.75.

Life is short, art is long (ὁ βίος βραχύς, ἡ δὲ τέχνη μακρὴ)...and decision difficult. Not only must one be prepared and willing to do what is right (τὰ δέοντα) himself, but one must be prepared as well to support also the ill of the subject (νοσέων) and other external circumstances (καὶ τοὺς παρεόντας, καὶ τὰ ἐξωθεν).⁹¹

It seems to me that Hoskier related this quotation to his own labour. The first part of the aphorism expresses that his life was too short (βραχύς) to bring his art (τέχνη μακρὴ) to completion, and that the text-critical decisions he faced proved too difficult to produce a critical text of the Apocalypse. In that situation, he did what was necessary (τὰ δέοντα). He threw a theory concerning the origin of the Apocalypse and the New Testament into the ring, and he confidently collated the manuscripts of the Apocalypse, being the first scholar to do so exhaustively for any New Testament book. His text historical reflections are passé. His collation remains.

The second part of the aphorism sounds sceptical. Hoskier construes the contemporary text-critical situation as “ill,” brought into a bad state, and he is sure, that an improvement depends on favourable circumstances needing acknowledgement and affirmation by others. He alludes to his conflicts with other scholars, annoyed by the opposition that he himself not seldom provoked. Let us turn this aphorism into a wish, following Hoskier’s analogy: May Hoskier’s readers acknowledge his merits, and may the currently available sources lead to new textual discoveries through good scholarly cooperation and favourable external circumstances.⁹²

⁹¹ Hoskier, *Codex B*, vol. 1 title page, my own free translation.

⁹² I thank Peter Malik for a first English translation, Niklas Voltmann for some further research, and Garrick Allen for English corrections.