

Louis Charles Willard, *A Critical Study of the Euthalian Apparatus* (ANTF 41; Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 2009). xiv + 182 pp. ISBN 978-3-11-021567-0. Cloth. €79.95/\$112.00.

- [1] Willard wrote his dissertation on the Euthalian apparatus back in 1970, and for many years, sadly, the dissertation was only available through the rather awkward dissertation services. Now it has finally been published, thanks in large degree to Simon Crisp who according to the foreword oversaw the scanning and editing of the original dissertation. When Nils Dahl, the supervisor of the original dissertation, published himself an essay on the Euthalian material in 2000, he mentioned Willard's work and sighed that 'unfortunately this work has not been published'.¹ Now that it has, it should provide a fresh impetus to a most fascinating paratextual phenomenon.

There are obviously problems with a delayed publication. What to do with new bibliography? The line chosen in this volume is to update only the bibliography and to point out two significant developments in the foreword. The actual body of the text has not been updated. As such this work should be reviewed as what it is, a 1970 dissertation, and not on what it is not.

- [2] Perhaps it is good to review what exactly is contained in the Euthalian apparatus. It consists of three sections—introductory material to Acts, to the Catholic Epistles, and to the Pauline Corpus. In each of these sections there is 1) a prologue (a narrative introduction), 2) a 'lection list', which divides the text of the respective corpus into a number of ἀνάγνωσις and these consist each of one or more κεφάλαια, 3) quotation lists, in which the sources for the quotations used in the text are listed and numbered, and 4) the chapter lists, giving a descriptive title to each κεφάλαιον. In addition there are a couple of 'minor pieces' more or less specific to the various sections but which tend to float around. Willard lists under these also the *Argumenta*, the introductions prefixed to each individual book or letter. These may be the most widespread part of all features labelled as Euthalian.
- [3] It remains of course an open question whether all the individual elements go back to a single source (or at one time have been edited by a single person who used pre-existing material), but it is convenient to call all the material the Euthalian apparatus. The Greek text of the Euthalian material is not yet part of the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* and therefore we have to rely on the Migne edition who gives the text of Zacagni (1698). The only advantage these days is that Migne's PG 85 is available online as scanned page images (<http://books.google.com/books?id=ZZLYAAAAMAJ>). The Euthalian material covers column 627-790 (pp. 320-401).
- [4] The goal of Willard's work is not to give a fresh edition of the Greek text or a comprehensive translation of the Apparatus; rather it concentrates on two other projects. First it reviews and discusses the literature on the subject up to 1970, and secondly it gives an overview of which parts of the Apparatus can be found in which Greek New Testament manuscript. Both of these endeavours are worthwhile in themselves. The overview of the literature summarises the various proposals for the dating and the actual author of the material. It is clear that Euthalius (if it was really the Euthalius from the late 4th century) used pre-existing material, but it is also likely that he is not responsible for all of the material that is subsumed under the title

¹ Nils A. Dahl, "The 'Euthalian Apparatus' and the Affiliated 'Argumenta.'" In *Studies in Ephesians: Introductory Questions, Text- & Edition-Critical Issues, Interpretation of Texts and Themes*, edited by David Hellholm, Vemund Blomkvist and Tord Fornberg (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 232.

of the ‘Euthalian apparatus’. Willard also deals with the discussion on each of the individual parts and makes clear that much of the material is waiting for a more in-depth treatment. It is surprising that in the past much ink has been spilled on the big reconstructions that cover the whole of the Euthalian material, such as authorship, provenance, and authenticity, but relatively little attention has been given to discussing its actual content.

- [5] The listing of which manuscripts actually contain the Euthalian material is most helpful. Willard based his work on the available microfilms in Münster and provides much of the material needed for a critical edition of the Euthalius. However, there are real deficiencies in the list too. For example, it only covers the occurrence of the Euthalian material as introductory material but leaves out how this material shows up in the margins of the actual biblical text. As we will see below there is certainly room for further documentation here. A major issue is also that it does not give us the actual order in which the listed elements occur. As Willard himself notes, the placement of the ‘Travels of Paul’ (Ἀποδημία τοῦ Παυλοῦ, Migne 85:649B-652A) is rather fluid, and the text shows up in the introductory material to Acts, but regularly also within the Prologue to the Pauline material. Details such as these are not listed.
- [6] In an appendix Willard gives a translation of the Prologue to the Pauline material, which should help access to it. However, if there is a disadvantage in this work it must be that no Greek text is given, just as conversely in many places Willard cites the Greek without an English translation. Also the commentary on this translation is minimal. A certain consistency in approach would have increased the value of this work.
- [7] If Willard’s book were published earlier, some of his valuable recommendations for further research could have been picked up earlier. One of these is his comment on the quotation lists. In one form of these lists, the actual quotations from (predominantly) the Old Testament are written out verbatim, and normally in the form in which they occur in the text of the New Testament. Thus, for the *Corpus Paulinum* we have a list of 127 citations, initially copied from the Pauline text and subsequently independently transmitted as part of the introductory material. Willard’s list gives at least 17 manuscripts in which this particular quotation list has been transmitted. Willard writes (130), “These lists reflect a text that has not always been harmonized with the text of the New Testament with which it is associated in a particular manuscript. It is likely, therefore, that variants found in the lists represent a tradition that is older than the associated text of the New Testament.”
- [7.1] Besides the text-critical value of these μαρτυρία lists, they also help to understand what is going on in the margin of certain manuscripts. In the Pauline lists, the citations are numbered starting afresh with each individual letter while also keep a tally of how often each source is cited. The start of the list of Romans looks something like:

Ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ῥωμαίους ἐπιστολῇ μαρτυρία μῆ´.

a. Ἀμβακοῦμ προφήτου

b. Ἡσαΐου προφήτου α´

“In the letter to the Romans there are 48 witnesses

a. From the prophet Habakkuk

b. The first one from the prophet Isaiah”

In this example one would expect an α in the margin at Romans 1:17 and a β at Romans 2:24. Birdsall, in his essay on the Old-Georgian version of the Euthalian apparatus, mentions that

this is exactly what happens in manuscript Gani (ms. 176, Historical-Ethnographical Museum in K'utaisi).² As for the Greek tradition, Swanson lists a minuscule with the numbers at the correct place in the margin in his volume on *Romans*. This minuscule, GA 1175, is not reported by Willard as containing the text of the Euthalian apparatus for Paul. However, the more detailed description of this manuscript on the CSNTM website indicates that at least some of the Pauline material is in fact present.³ It would be interesting to see more examples of the inclusion of the Euthalian material in the actual presentation of the biblical text, rather than its occurrence in the preliminary section of a manuscript.

[7.2] Willard gives attention to the irregularities in the citation lists and also mentions Galatians 6:15 as being attributed to Μωϋσέως ἀποκρύφου (this is citation 11 in Galatians, ια'). Though most scholars hold that Euthalius mostly edited existing material rather than compiled all this afresh, a testimony to his influence is that many later commentators (Photius et al.) took over this ascription to the Apocalypse of Moses.

[8] An area which is hinted at by Willard but completely ignored in the manuscript listing is the variety in redactional shapes of the Prologues. As an example we may take Gregory-Aland 1956 (British Library Add. Ms. 7142). Here the Prologue to Paul appears in a curtailed form without the introductory paragraph (starting at Migne 85:696C finishing at 700C with an adapted final sentence), and then inserts the 'Travels of Paul'. Interestingly, the original title of this work appears in the margin (Ἀποδημία τοῦ Παυλοῦ). The text of the redaction then picks up the Euthalian version at 701A (with some modifications to the first paragraph), but omits the ordered listing of the letters of the Euthalian version from 701A(end) to the end of 708A. The two versions run again parallel until the end of 712C, after which 712C to 713B is only present in the Euthalian version but not in the redaction.

That GA 1956 is not unique in having this redaction is demonstrated by GA 619 (Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Conv. Soppr. 191), which has both versions of the Prologue to Paul (the second including the 'Travels of Paul'), thus duplicating a substantial part of text!

[9] Willard's explicit goal with this volume is to facilitate further research into the Euthalian Apparatus. Therefore it must count as a success that after reading of the book this reviewer was left with more questions about the Euthalian material than he had before taking up Willard's study. What Willard does well to give an account of previous scholarship, at times bringing these discussions forward by a re-analysis, and directing the research towards its basis, namely the actual manuscripts that carry the text of Euthalius. One could quibble with the fact that this study was already nearly 40 years old when it appeared. However, not having this book available would have been a greater loss than to have a slightly dated version.

Dirk Jongkind
St Edmund's College, Cambridge

² J. Neville Birdsall. "The Euthalian Material and its Georgian Versions." In *Collected Papers in Greek and Georgian Textual Criticism* (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2006 [1978]), 226.

³ http://images.csntm.org/Manuscripts/GA_1175/GA_1175.pdf.