

How the Books Became the Bible

The Evidence for Canon Formation from Work-Combinations in Manuscripts*

Michael Dormandy, University of Cambridge

Abstract: This paper contributes to a developing conversation about the New Testament canon. I consider the way manuscripts combine different works and investigate to what extent, even before canon lists became widespread, manuscripts combined only those works that were later affirmed as canonical. My method is to establish the works contained in all Greek New Testament manuscripts, dating from before the end of the fourth century. There are a number of cases where only a fragment survives, containing a small part of one work, but where there are also page numbers that enable us to estimate what else might have been present. My results demonstrate that the works that are now considered canonical were rarely combined with works now considered noncanonical. However, they also demonstrate that single-work manuscripts were widespread.

1. Introduction

The origins of the New Testament canon continue to be a subject of controversy. In this paper, I aim to examine what light can be shed on this question by considering how literary works are combined in manuscripts.

The scholarly debate on the canon is complex, but nevertheless it is possible to identify at least two types of view: the “open canon” and the “closed canon.” Two ideas characterize the open canon view, though not all scholars who hold one necessarily hold the other. Firstly, the open canon view, as represented by Jens Schröter and Geoffrey Mark Hahneman, holds that the canon did not become established until the fourth century. Although the corpora which

* My thanks to Markus Bockmuehl and Daniela Colomo, under whose wise and helpful supervision this paper began life; Mary Marshall, who asked challenging and helpful questions in the viva; Dirk Jongkind, who kindly gave time and input while supervising another project; Jeremiah Coogan and Katherine Dormandy, who commented helpfully on drafts; and to the anonymous reviewers at *TC*, whose suggestions greatly improved the article. Funding for the research which became this paper was generously provided by Rochester Diocese, the James William Squire Bursary, the Hall-Houghton Studentship in the Greek New Testament, and the Gosden Water-Newton Scholarship. I am grateful for helpful discussion of this project at the Birmingham New Testament Textual Criticism Colloquium, the British New Testament Conference, and the Society of Biblical Literature Annual Meeting, all in 2017. Funding to attend these conferences was generously provided by the Christ’s College and the Faculty of Divinity, University of Cambridge.

make up the modern New Testament, such as the four gospels and the letters of Paul, were stable earlier, it is only in the fourth century that a list of authoritative Christian writings resembling the modern New Testament was established.¹ Secondly, open canon scholars, as represented by Schröter and Francis Watson, argue that we can discern no property in the canonical books that made it clear that they alone would be selected as canonical. When the gospels (canonical and not) were being written, there was no reason to think that only four of them would be later received as canonical, let alone which four.²

The closed canon view, represented most comprehensively by David Trobisch, is that the canon of the New Testament was fixed by the end of the second century. Trobisch specifically argues that all or most of our New Testament fragments originally came from copies of the “complete edition” of the New Testament, containing all twenty-seven books. He does not claim that all the books were bound in one physical codex, but he stresses that the works of the New Testament were from the earliest times produced as part of complete sets, just as a modern encyclopedia may exist in several volumes, which are always produced and sold as a set. He specifically claims that 01 and 03 were not exceptional manuscripts in their time, but represent the standard format for how the New Testament circulated.³

Harry Gamble, Graham Stanton, and Theo Heckel propose a more moderate version of this model: they argue that the gospels (Stanton and Heckel) or the Pauline corpus (Gamble) were not only fixed by the end of the second century (which even open canon scholars would accept), but also that the relevant works standardly circulated in those corpora and most of our gospel or Pauline fragments came originally from four-gospel codices or complete Pauline codices.⁴ In this paper, I assess the various different open and closed canon views in the light of work-combinations within manuscripts.

I follow Matthew Driscoll’s distinctions between work, text, and artifact:⁵

Hamlet is a work. The New Swan Shakespeare Advanced Series edition of *Hamlet* by Bernard Lott, M.A. Ph.D., published by Longman in 1968, is, or presents, a text. My copy of Lott’s edition, bought from Blackwell’s in Oxford in 1979 and containing my copious annotations, is an artefact.⁶

¹ Jens Schröter, *From Jesus to the New Testament: Early Christian Theology and the Origin of the New Testament Canon*, trans. Wayne Coppins, Baylor-Mohr Siebeck Studies in Early Christianity 1 (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2013); Geoffrey Mark Hahneman, “The Muratorian Fragment and the Origins of the New Testament Canon,” in *The Canon Debate*, ed. Lee Martin McDonald and James A. Sanders (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002), 405–15.

² Schröter, *From Jesus*; Francis Watson, *Gospel Writing: A Canonical Perspective* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013).

³ David Trobisch, *The First Edition of the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000). For the specific point about 01 and 03 being representative of all early New Testament manuscripts, see 37–38. For the analogy with a modern encyclopedia, see 9–10.

⁴ Theo K. Heckel, *Von Evangelium des Markus zum viergestaltigen Evangelium*, WUNT 120 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999); Harry Y. Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995); Graham Stanton, “The Fourfold Gospel,” *NTS* 43 (1997): 317–46.

⁵ The OED records both spellings (*artifact* and *artefact*) as valid today and both are used in the literature. I use artifact throughout but do not change quotations where the other spelling is used (“artefact | artifact, n. and adj.” OED Online. December 2016. Oxford University Press. <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/11133?redirectedFrom=artefact>).

⁶ Matthew James Driscoll, “The Words on a Page: Thoughts on Philology Old and New,” in *Creating the Medieval Saga: Versions, Variability, and Editorial Interpretations of Old Norse Saga Literature*, ed. Judy Quinn and Emily Lethbridge (Odense: Syddansk Universitetsforlag, 2010), 85–102 (93).

Manuscript can be used almost synonymously with *artifact* in this sense, though obviously many nondocumentary objects are considered *artifacts*.

The terms *canonical* and *New Testament* are problematic, because they carry more historical and theological weight than is helpful to my present purpose. This project does not discuss the rise of the word *κανών* to refer to a collection of authoritative works. It does not even chart the development of the concept of a bounded set of authoritative works. Rather, it concentrates specifically on the development of the bibliographic practice of combining particular works together. This raises an obvious question about the relationship between the concept and the practice: did the early Christians believe certain works were canonical because they were normally part of the same bibliographic unit, or did they regularly include them in the same bibliographic unit because they considered them canonical? This question is also outside my present scope. In this paper I merely aim to present, more comprehensively than before and all in one place, the data on the bibliographic practice and to analyze and summarize that data. In order to make this clear, I use the term *collection-evident*, rather than *canonical*, to refer to a combination that contains only works that today are considered canonical. This is because such a combination may be evidence for the bibliographic practice of combining particular works, but not direct evidence for the theological concept of canon.

This project is necessary for answering the questions I do not discuss regarding the rise of the concept of canon. To answer those questions, we must consider my research alongside explicit statements and discussions of the canon by early Christian writers. Edmon Gallagher and John Meade have recently collected a large number of such texts, and it is hoped that my research will compliment theirs. Gallagher and Meade's findings reveal that the first complete and largely undisputed New Testament canon lists begin to appear in the fourth century. There are lists that may well be earlier, but that are uncertain in date or content. Origen's most detailed list is from the third century, in his *Homilies on Joshua*, but is preserved only in Rufinus's fourth century translation, and Rufinus may have edited the work to reflect the state of the canon in his own time. The Muratorian Canon is a text containing a list of canonical books, but the text preserved today is probably only a translation, the original of which has been dated anywhere from the second to the fourth century. In the fourth century, New Testament canon lists that closely resemble the modern canon are relatively common: in the East they include the lists of Eusebius, Athanasius, and Cyril of Jerusalem; in the West there are the list in Codex Claromontanus, the Cheltenham list, and the list in Jerome.⁷

My research could certainly be used alongside that of Gallagher and Meade to reconstruct how the canon developed, by comparing the bibliographic and literary evidence at different points in time.⁸ Charles Hill's 2013 article is an example of this kind of project: he presents

⁷ Edmon L. Gallagher and John D. Meade, *The Biblical Canon Lists from Early Christianity: Texts and Analysis* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017).

⁸ The scholarly blogosphere witnessed a debate not so long ago on the relative epistemic importance of patristic statements about the canon versus bibliographic evidence. John Meade criticised Michael Kruger's book, *Canon Revisited* (Crossway: Wheaton, 2012) for overemphasising the material evidence. This resulted in an exchange of posts between Meade and Kruger. Kruger's closing words in the final blog of the exchange arguably provide a synthesis: "If [Meade's] point is simply that we have to be recognize [sic] the limitations of the material evidence, then (of course) I heartily agree. The material evidence is not absolute. And it cannot tell us everything. But, I think it can still tell us a lot.... And for that reason, I think the material evidence still has much to teach us." I offer the present paper in the same spirit: the material evidence "cannot tell us everything," but it is nonetheless worthy of research. Meade's posts are available at the Evangelical Textual Criticism blog (<http://evangelicaltextualcriticism.blogspot.co.uk>) and Kruger's at his personal blog, entitled "Canon Fodder" (<https://www.michaeljkruger.com>). The quotation

a short survey of artifactual evidence for the development of the gospel canon, in order to compare it with the explicit discussions in early Christian literature. However, he does not discuss work combinations in this article and elsewhere does so only in Johannine literature.⁹ My research will also help show whether the explicit statements of the canon are the consequence or the cause of the bibliographic practice of collection-evident combinations. As noted above, the earliest reliably dated, complete, and explicit statements of the New Testament canon are from the fourth century, but there are earlier statements of disputable date (e.g., the Muratorian Canon) and earlier statements of only parts of the canon (e.g., Irenaeus's famous remarks about the four-fold gospel in *Haer.* 3.11.8). My research will allow us to see how collection-evident artifacts date in relation to these statements: if we find that the modern canon appears in bibliographic practice from very soon after the earliest possible date for explicit statements, this implies these statements are less likely to be the cause of the bibliographic practice than the consequence, since the statements are not likely to have been so widely and quickly heeded.

This project does not investigate the order of works in an artifact. This is not because the order is unimportant or reveals nothing of the attitude that makers and users of manuscripts took to different works. I decline to investigate order partly because of the limited scope of the project and partly because, significant though order is, regular combinations are surely more significant: it is more important for the status of the four gospels in the early church to note that they were never combined with other gospels than to note the particular order in which the four were combined.

A number of scholars have investigated work-combinations, but less comprehensively. Trobisch has examined manuscripts for evidence of canon-consciousness, but he excludes manuscripts which contain only one work or which are fragmentary.¹⁰ Schröter similarly presents only a brief analysis, using a small number of manuscripts.¹¹ Hill also investigates work-combinations, but focuses exclusively on the developing Johannine corpus, rather than the entire New Testament.¹² J. K. Elliott similarly provides a briefer and less systematic consideration than the one offered here.¹³ Hurtado advances a similar argument to mine, but also does not offer a comprehensive analysis of the data.¹⁴

Any attempt to make generalizations about the bibliographic habits of early Christians from our surviving artifacts will face the challenge that, although we have access to a rich quantity of New Testament artifacts, it is only a tiny fraction of the total that were produced. Many of those that have survived have ended up on the black market, rather than in scholarly hands. The vast majority of our early papyri come from a particular region of Egypt (indeed a particular city, Oxyrhynchus). However, we have to analyze the evidence before us, even when it is incomplete. Further, P.Oxy III 405 is a manuscript of Irenaeus, dated to no later than the first half of the third century. Within a generation of the work being composed in Lyons, a

is from Kruger's second post in the exchange, entitled "Codex and Canon: A Response to John Meade (Part 2)."

⁹ Charles E. Hill, "A Four-Gospel Canon in the Second Century? Artifact and Arti-fiction," *EC* 4 (2013): 310–34; Charles Hill, *The Johannine Corpus in the Early Church* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 152–55, 453–59.

¹⁰ Trobisch, *First Edition*, 28.

¹¹ Schröter, *From Jesus*, 285.

¹² Hill, *Johannine*, 152–55, 453–59.

¹³ J. K. Elliott, "Manuscripts, the Codex and the Canon," *JSNT* 63 (1996): 105–23.

¹⁴ Larry W. Hurtado, *The Earliest Christian Artifacts: Manuscripts and Christian Origins* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 35–40.

copy had reached Egypt.¹⁵ This suggests that ancient literary culture was less geographically segregated than we might think: papyri found in Egypt are not necessarily unreliable evidence for the rest of the Christian world.¹⁶

2. The Evidence of Work-Combinations

2.1. Methodology

I have attempted to establish the works represented in every Greek New Testament artifact from before 400. I compiled my catalogue of artifacts from the Leuven Database of Ancient Books (LDAB), because it is the most comprehensive, up-to-date database of ancient manuscripts.¹⁷ I used the LDAB to isolate all artifacts carrying New Testament material, in Greek, from before 400. I excluded search results where the New Testament material was in a language other than Greek, but where there was Greek New Testament material present. It would be an excellent further development of the project to extend it to other languages. Dating of ancient literary artifacts is notoriously problematic, since they must normally be dated paleographically, by comparing the handwriting to that found on other artifacts. This process is inherently subjective and Willy Clarysse and Pasquale Orsini argue that New Testament papyri are particularly liable to be dated too early, sometimes due to apologetic bias.¹⁸ I therefore did a “non-strict” dating search of the LDAB; that is, I instructed the search program to include manuscripts within a certain range outside my specified date range. Although I used the LDAB as my primary research tool, most manuscripts are better known to New Testament scholars by their Gregory-Aland numbers, so, in the main text of this article, I cite these where possible, rather than LDAB numbers.

Theodore de Bruyn and Jitse Dijkstra have suggested that there might be known, already-discovered artifacts not in the LDAB. They investigate late antique Egyptian amulets and state that “almost all, fortunately, are included in the Leuven Database of Ancient Books (LDAB) and in TM-Magic.”¹⁹ Their phrase “almost all” suggests that some, potentially with collection-evident content, might have been excluded from the LDAB, so I searched their full catalogue to find any in the catalogue without a Trismegistos number (which would indicate not being in the LDAB), within my date range. I found only one, which had neither a Trismegistos number nor an assigned date, that is SEG 47 2153.²⁰ However, this is an Egyptian βους amulet, with no contentful text, but the words βους and probably βαινχωωχ and a cross.²¹ The SEG entry defines βους as “the personification of the ‘premier décan’ of Scorpion who is sup-

¹⁵ Lincoln H. Blummel and Thomas A. Wayment, *Christian Oxyrhynchus: Texts, Documents and Sources* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2015), 287–88.

¹⁶ For further evidence for literary mobility in the ancient world, see Kim Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians of Letters: Literacy, Power and the Transmitters of Early Christian Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 77–78.

¹⁷ Leuven Database of Ancient Books, <http://www.trismegistos.org/ldab/search.php>.

¹⁸ Willy Clarysse and Pasquale Orsini, “Early New Testament Manuscripts and Their Dates: A Critique of Theological Palaeography,” *ETL* 88 (2012): 443–74.

¹⁹ Theodore S. de Bruyn and Jitse H. F. Dijkstra, “Greek Amulets and Formularies from Egypt Containing Christian Elements: A Checklist of Papyri, Parchments, Ostraka, and Tablets,” *BASP* 48 (2011): 163–216 (166).

²⁰ De Bruyn and Dijkstra, “Amulets,” 192.

²¹ Thomas J. Kraus, “βους, βαινχωωχ und Septuaginta-Psalm 90? Überlegungen zu den sogenannten ‚Bous‘ Amuletten und dem beliebtesten Bibeltext für apotropäische Zwecke,” *ZAC* 11 (2007): 479–91 (482).

posed to exercise a beneficent influence on the genitalia.”²² This combined with the cross, is a fascinating example of late antique Egyptian syncretism, but none of the material would ever be considered canonical, so it is of no relevance to me.

In analyzing the results of the search, it is insufficient to focus simply on those few artifacts that contain text from more than one work. We must also give attention to the fragments that probably come from artifacts that originally contained multiple works. We can identify such fragments by the size of the work and page or column numbering. A fragment of Philemon is highly likely to have come from an artifact that contained more works, since Philemon is so short. If a page or column number indicates that an artifact originally had more pages than were needed to contain the work on the fragment, then that artifact almost certainly contained multiple works. It is normally possible to gauge, from a fragment, approximately how many characters there were per page or column. I have also performed electronic character counts of all the works of the New Testament in NA²⁸, obviously excluding punctuation, verse numbering, and other characters that come from the modern editors. These figures are given at the conclusion of the article. Using this data, one can calculate whether a fragment with a page number would probably have contained more than the work that is preserved.

There are obvious possible inaccuracies. Page and column numbers were frequently added by a different hand.²³ This does not mean the numbers are unreliable, especially since in most cases the second hand is probably contemporary. They were probably added later because, as Eric Turner argues, it is prohibitively difficult to write evenly on a page already bound in a quire, so most codices were probably bound after their pages had been written.²⁴ It would be natural to add page numbers after the binding, which would mean they were added when the codex was out of the hands of its scribe. It is not always certain if the numbers are of pages or folios or quires. 02 has quire numbers and 03 numbers folios on the verso. On the other hand, 0169 and 0189 have two consecutive numbers on adjacent pages, so the numbers clearly refer to pages. Colin Roberts and T. C. Skeat argue and Turner’s data implies that page numbers were more common than quire numbers in the earliest centuries.²⁵ I therefore assume that a number refers to pages unless there is reason to take it as referring to anything else.

There is also no guarantee *that* the manuscript in question had a text identical to NA²⁸ throughout the work in question; indeed, most manuscripts probably did not. One could attempt to mitigate this problem by counting the characters in a form of the text, which reflects the variants in the fragment (e.g., assuming the whole original artifact had a “Western” text throughout if the fragment exhibits a “Western” reading). However, this involves speculating about the nonextant portions so far beyond the evidence as not to be worth the complexity of the task. Another problem is that NA²⁸ does not reproduce the abbreviations that occur frequently in early Christian manuscripts, such as *nomina sacra*, numbers written as numerals, and horizontal bars at the end of lines for the letter *nu*. This means that a work’s character count in a manuscript will be less than in NA²⁸, even if the text was identical. A very serious

²² A. Chaniotis, H. W. Pleket, R. S. Stroud, and J. M. H. Strubbe, “SEG 47-2153. Egypt. Unknown Provenance. Christian Amulet, Undated,” in *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*, ed. A. Chaniotis, T. Corsten, N. Papazarkadas, and R. A. Tybout. On-line edition. http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1874-6772_seg_a47_2153.

²³ Eric Gardner Turner, *The Typology of the Early Codex* (Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 1977), 75.

²⁴ Turner, *Codex*, 74.

²⁵ Colin H. Roberts and T. C. Skeat, *The Birth of the Codex* (London: Oxford University Press, 1983), 51; Turner, *Codex*, 73–78.

problem is that letters per page are far from constant throughout a manuscript.²⁶ None of these problems render my approach futile, but they do recommend caution in drawing conclusions.

When the calculations indicate that there were more works present than the surviving one, scholars frequently speculate regarding what the other works might have been. However, given that this project aims to investigate how and when various collections became standard, it is important not to beg this question, by assuming that a particular fragment originally came from a manuscript with a particular work-combination, simply because that combination seems logical to us today.

I assume that if a fragment contains a work that is long enough to have reasonably filled the roll or codex, and there is no evidence that there was any other work present, then no other work was present. This is because there are a considerable number of manuscripts that appear to carry only a single work, either because they survive largely intact or because their pagination indicates that the codex began with the work on the fragment. The fact that a work is at the beginning of a codex does not, of course, mean that nothing else was present after that work, but it seems unlikely that all ten of the fragments where this is the case just happen to have come from the beginning of their codices.²⁷ There are of course also a considerable number of multiwork manuscripts, so arguably I could equally well assume that a fragment with a single-work comes from a multiwork manuscript. However, this investigation is about to what extent work-combinations are collection-evident. Therefore I must avoid making any assumptions about what additional works may have been present in lost parts of manuscripts. Assuming that a manuscript contained no additional works means I avoid making any assumptions how collection-evident it is. This means that the number of single-work manuscripts I find may be artificially high, and it would be wise not to draw too many conclusions from that about the prevalence of single-work manuscripts, but it also means that my findings regarding work combinations are free of dangerous assumptions.

It is frequently debated whether or not two fragments originally came from the same manuscript. Certainty on this point is rarely possible, since, even if the hands are the same, this does not mean they came from the same manuscript. When the two fragments contain different works (e.g., 0171) the issue is particularly pertinent. In all cases of doubt, I assume that the fragments do not come from the same manuscript. This is partly because the probability is intrinsically low, given the amount of manuscripts an active scribe could be expected to produce in a lifetime. It is also because I am investigating work-combinations and it is methodologically sound to “stack the odds” against my research coming to positive conclusions. Therefore I assume that any given manuscript did not combine any works, unless there is overwhelming evidence to the contrary. This is why, in the results tables, some manuscript sigla appear twice (e.g., 0171). Occasionally a manuscript will have two sigla in one numbering system (Gregory-Aland or LDAB) and one in the other.

Using all of the above reasoning, I placed the manuscripts turned up by the LDAB search into the following categories:

1. “Certainly Collection-Evident”: Artifacts containing more than one work, all of which are today considered canonical.
2. “Plausibly Collection-Evident”: Fragments, containing only one work, which, more plausibly than not, came from artifacts containing more than one work, all of which are today considered canonical.

²⁶ My thanks to Jeremiah Coogan for this point (personal communication, 28 November 2017).

²⁷ The ten manuscripts are listed in the table on pp. 19–20 of this article.

3. “Certainly or Plausibly One Work”: Artifacts containing only one work, fragments which, more plausibly than not, came from artifacts containing one work or fragments which have no evidence suggesting that their original manuscripts contained multiple works.

4. “Plausibly Multiwork, Indeterminably Collection-Evident”: Fragments which, more plausibly than not, came from manuscripts containing more than one work, where it is impossible to say whether or not those additional works were among those considered canonical today. This category contains mainly fragments of the shorter New Testament, that is, the letters other than Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, and Hebrews. It would be unlikely to make a manuscript for merely one of the short works. Although 0173 has pagination suggesting that it began with James and sufficiently little text per page that it could have contained only James, we can presume that such small, inefficient codices were not the norm. If there is evidence from pagination or column numbering or otherwise regarding the identity of the other works in the parent manuscript, the fragment can be placed into category 2 or 5, but if not, it is categorized here.

5. “Plausibly Not Collection-Evident”: Fragments, containing only one work, but which, more plausibly than not, came from manuscripts that contained more than one work, at least one of which was not a work that is canonical today. Many manuscripts in this category are fragments of works that are too small to occupy a codex or roll alone, but which have pagination or column numbering that cannot be reconciled with any standard collection of the works now considered canonical.

6. “Definitely Not Collection-Evident”: Artifacts containing more than one work, at least one of which is not today canonical.

I consider translations or commentaries on the main work in the artifact not to be additional works, since inclusion of a translation or commentary in the same artifact does not imply that this secondary work is of equal status to the main work. If a New Testament text is found with a Septuagint text, I consider the artifact to be collection-evident, since a fundamental aspect of the development of the New Testament canon is certain early Christian works being accorded the same status as the Septuagint. Regarding palimpsests, where a second text is copied over the original artifact centuries later, I do not consider the second text to represent an additional work.

In the appendix, I present the artifacts found by the LDAB search, sorted into the above categories, with the date given by the LDAB and the contents. In the case of small fragments, I give the full biblical reference for the contents; unless the specific verses are both irrelevant and impractical. In all cases, I have attempted to check the contents in an alternative authority to the LDAB—either the *editio princeps* or another scholarly work. References to the verifying source are given for every artifact in the appendix. Even in the case where the *editio princeps* has been used, I give the full reference, rather than merely the siglum of the manuscript, since I am citing that particular edition of the manuscript, rather than the manuscript itself, in order to verify the LDAB’s report on the contents. I use Philip Comfort and David Barrett and Karl Jaroš as little as possible to verify contents, since Clarysse and Orsini have significantly problematized their dating.²⁸

²⁸ Clarysse and Orsini, “Manuscripts,” 444–47; Philip W. Comfort and David P. Barrett, *The Text of the Earliest New Testament Greek Manuscripts: A Corrected, Enlarged Edition of the Text of the Earliest New Testament Manuscripts* (Wheaton: Tyndale House, 2001); Karl Jaroš, *Das Neue Testament nach den ältesten griechischen Handschriften* (Ruhpolding: Verlag Franz Philipp Rutzen, 2006), 72.

I follow the LDAB's dates throughout, rather than those given in my scholarly verifying sources because, in Roger Bagnall's words "[the LDAB] has the advantage of being more or less up-to-date and possesses the characteristic—for better or worse—of not embodying any single idiosyncratic viewpoint about the dating of manuscripts."²⁹ If I were to use a different scholarly work to verify the date of each artifact, as I have done for the contents, I would end up comparing data gathered by observers with a whole range of different biases and approaches and therefore not truly comparing like with like. The LDAB is also the only database that contains so wide and comprehensive a range of artifacts. If I were to use a different database or catalogue, such as the *Liste*, I would have to supplement that with the LDAB, which would once again mean that I was comparing dates that had been derived using different methods and approaches. Ultimately little in my conclusions will hang on the date of an artifact: this project is more aiming at a general picture of canon-consciousness in the early centuries than any change that may be detectable within the early period. The problem of biases and subjectivities does not apply to the contents of the manuscripts, because determining that is obviously much more objective.

The only artifacts turned up by the LDAB search, but not ultimately included in the final results were LDAB 2862 and 3232. 2862 is an ostrakon with some lines of praise to Mary.³⁰ Although the LDAB lists it as containing text from Luke 1, it makes a number of significant changes not elsewhere attested, such that it becomes more correct to call it a paraphrase of, or work inspired by, Luke 1 than a manuscript of it. Similarly 3232 has the text of a homily that alludes to Matt 19:29, rather than quoting it.³¹ It is beyond my scope to address the general question of when two manuscripts differ so much that they should be considered manuscripts of two different works, but in order to keep my results manageable and tightly focused on attitudes to collection-evident relationships between particular texts, I do not include these two.

I now discuss a number of manuscripts, where the categorization requires some explanation. Space forbids detailed discussion of any of these manuscripts and since this study aims to consider a wide and varied body of data, an in-depth analysis of each individual datum is not possible. I aim that gain of breadth may make up for loss of depth. I discuss some general groups within each category and consider individual manuscripts in LDAB date order.

2.2. Specific Comments on Significant Manuscripts

2.2.1. Certainly Collection-Evident

This category includes manuscripts which have not survived completely, but are collection-evident in their surviving form, including 03, 04, and 05. It is impossible to know what these manuscripts contained in their original form. Moreover, the fact that 01 and 02 contain early patristic material, thus rendering them not collection-evident, makes it plausible that the other early great majuscules did as well. However, such reasoning is speculative. A manuscript that is collection-evident in its surviving form is a strong indicator that its producers thought that the works now considered canonical belonged together, even if they may have also included other works in the manuscript.

²⁹ Roger S. Bagnall, *Early Christian Books in Egypt* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009).

³⁰ W. E. Crum, with a contribution by F. E. Brightman, *Coptic Ostraca from the Collections of the Egypt Exploration Fund, the Cairo Museum and Others* (London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1902), 81.

³¹ G. Vitelli, *Papiri greci E Latini VII* (Florence: Società Italiana per la ricerca dei Papiri greci e latini in Egitto, 1925), 43–45.

℘³⁰: 1 Thess 4:12–2 Thess 2:11. There is a page number, ΣΖ, 207. Lincoln Blumell and Thomas Wayment reason that the codex could have contained the entire Pauline corpus, from Romans.³² The page number does not prove this, but the manuscript in its present form is collection-evident, so I categorize it here.

o212: Gospel harmony; 175-256. There is disagreement amongst scholars as to whether or not this fragment comes from Tatian's Diatessaron (so Jan Joosten) or a different harmony (so D. C. Parker, D. G. K. Taylor, and M. S. Goodacre and, more recently, Ian Mills).³³ If it is a fragment of Tatian, then it certainly originally contained Mark. However, either way, it undoubtedly contains material from more than one of the four gospels, so it is collection-evident.

LDAB 2786/3477 (includes ℘¹⁸): the end of Exodus on one side and the beginning of Revelation on the other. The hands are different, and it is possible the second scribe was just using the Exodus artifact as a convenient writing surface, but it is more likely he or she was deliberately associating the two texts since he or she has deliberately caused the end of Exodus to be on the reverse of the beginning of Revelation. There are arguably thematic links between the passages. The Tabernacle in Exodus and the New Jerusalem in Revelation are both instances of God dwelling with his people. Eldon Jay Epp suggests that priesthood is another common theme between the passages.³⁴ There is thus ample reason to think that the scribe of Revelation deliberately chose to copy the text onto an artifact that already contained Exodus, possibly with the aim of making a testimonium of some kind. This hypothesis is strengthened by Brent Nongbri's papyrological arguments that this artifact is a page from a codex.³⁵ It is notable that when producing this artifact, the scribe chose to combine a work in our New Testament with a Septuagint work.

LDAB 2993 (includes ℘⁶²): Matt 11:25–30 in Greek and Coptic and LXX Dan 3:50–55 in Greek. Leiv Amundsen suggests that the whole fragment is in one hand (the two languages are written in a sufficiently similar script that one can compare them) and that the passages may be combined as they are because the fragment came from a lectionary.³⁶ I suggest that it is unlikely to be a lectionary, since the Old Testament passage comes after the New Testament one. Whatever its original *Sitz im Leben*, this artifact is, like the one discussed previously, an interesting example of one of the works in our New Testament being given apparently equal status with the Septuagint.

³² Lincoln H. Blumell and Thomas A. Wayment, *Christian Oxyrhynchus: Texts, Documents and Sources* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2015), 116–19.

³³ Jan Joosten, "The Dura Parchment and the Diatessaron," *VC* 57 (2003): 159–75; D. C. Parker, D. G. K. Taylor, and M. S. Goodacre, "The Dura-Europos Gospel Harmony," in *Studies in the Early Text of the Gospels and Acts*, ed. D. G. K. Taylor (Birmingham: University of Birmingham Press, 1999), 192–228; Ian Mills, "The Wrong Gospel Harmony: Against the Diatessaronic Character of the Dura Parchment" (paper presented at Lives of the Text: The Tenth Birmingham Colloquium on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament, Birmingham, England, 22 March 2017).

³⁴ Eldon Jay Epp, "The Oxyrhynchus New Testament Papyri: 'Not Without Honor Except in Their Hometown?'," *JBL* 123 (2004): 5–55 (18–19).

³⁵ Brent Nongbri, "Losing a Christian Scroll but Gaining a Curious Christian Codex: An Oxyrhynchus Papyrus of Exodus and Revelation" *NT* 55 (2013): 77–88.

³⁶ Leiv Amundsen, "Christian Papyri from the Oslo Collection," *Symbolae Osloenses* 24 (1945): 121–47 (128, 136).

℘⁹⁹: This artifact is an unusual manuscript, containing grammar tables and a list of Pauline terms. The term *dictionary* is misleading, since the entries are nonalphabetical. Alfons Wouters can give no exact parallel. It is difficult to discern the original use, beyond the connection to language study.³⁷ However it is relevant to this project because the collection of works from which the glossary takes its lemmata is a collection-evident combination. It thus shows a consciousness that in some sense the Pauline epistles belonged together.

l1043: passages from all four gospels. The manuscript was probably a lectionary. The fact that all and only the four appear to have been included is evidence for a sense that they belonged together. At the top of a page beginning with Mark 6:18, there is the number KE, 25, with red adornment. This may be a page number, but given that such numbers are not found consistently on each page it is more likely to be a marker of a section (possibly related to the Eusebian divisions) or a lectional number (i.e., a reading for the twenty-fifth day or similar). Wendy and Stanley Porter note that there is the faint trace of a sigma underneath the number, which may indicate Eusebian canonical table VI. Even if this were a page number, we could not use it to establish what else was in the artifact, since the fact that it is a lectionary makes it likely that the pericopes were not in their standard order.³⁸ Clearly, however, the artifact is collection-evident.

LDAB 2991: small ostraca with extracts from the four gospels. The text of Luke flows continuously from one ostrakon to the next, leading Gustav Lefebvre to suggest there was originally a complete text,³⁹ but, as Cornelia Römer points out, this is highly unlikely, given how many ostraca would be needed to carry all of Luke's Gospel. Further, the Lukan ostraca are numbered, and the first number comes in chapter 22. They may have been used for some sort of drawing of small pericopes by lot, since ostraca would have been cheaper than parchment or papyrus.⁴⁰ Whatever the details of the *Sitz im Leben*, these shards are of interest to us, since their texts come from all and only the four gospels and whoever produced them evidently thought those gospels belonged together.

LDAB 3484: This is an ostrakon, containing LXX Pss 117:27 and 26. There then follows some badly preserved words, which W. E. Crum regards as Luke 1:28 and certainly are some form of praise to Mary. There follows και τω ... τω.⁴¹ It is debatable whether the Marian material should quite be classed as containing text of Luke's Gospel, but I classify the ostrakon here, because it clearly represents an attempt to connect the Septuagint psalms to the Lukan Mary tradition. The και τω ... τω are so vague that it is impossible to tell what text they originally represented or what text they were originally part of, but it seems safest to assume that they come from one of the works already represented on this artifact, rather than from something completely new.

³⁷ Alfons Wouters, *The Chester Beatty Codex AC 1499: A Graeco-Latin Lexicon on the Pauline Epistles and a Greek Grammar* (Leuven: Peeters, 1988). Comment on no parallels 93.

³⁸ Stanley E. Porter and Wendy J. Porter, *New Testament Greek Papyri and Parchments: New Editions; Texts*. *Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek* 29 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008), 123–29, 146–76.

³⁹ Gustave Lefebvre, "Fragments grec des Évangiles sur ostraca," *BIFAO* 4 (1905): 1–15 (1).

⁴⁰ Cornelia Eva Römer, "Ostraka mit christlichen Texten aus der Sammlung Flinders Petrie," *ZPE* 145 (2003): 183–201.

⁴¹ Crum, *Ostraca*, 81.

Reused Manuscripts: 088, 067, 0208, and 026 were reused as palimpsests in later centuries, which means we have an entirely random selection of surviving leaves. I place them in this category, because there is more than one work on the surviving leaves. It is tantalizing to wonder what else they might have contained. 088 is especially interesting, since it contains parts of both 1 Corinthians and Titus, associating the pastorals with the Pauline Hauptbriefe.⁴²

2.2.2. Plausibly Collection-Evident

There are two gospel manuscripts that have only one work preserved in their extant portions, but also have the Eusebian canon markers, suggesting strongly that they were originally four gospel codices. There are 0214 and 0242.⁴³

There are a number of fragments where calculations based on pagination suggest that the manuscript was originally collection-evident, although text from only one work survives. The details are given in this table:

Manu- script	Work Pre- served	Page Number (Greek/Arabic Numerals)	Approx. Let- ters per Page	Probable Contents Prior to Preserved Portion	Source
ϕ ¹³	Hebrews	MZ/47 (column number)	875	Romans and Hebrews	Blumell and Wayment ⁴⁴
0185	1 Corinthians	NB/52	700	Romans and 1 Corinthians	Porter and Porter ⁴⁵
0201	1 Corinthians	PMZ/147	Güting does not give this figure	Romans and 1 Corinthians	Güting ⁴⁶
0206	1 Peter	ΩΙΘ/819 or ΩΚΘ/829	250	Romans–1Peter on the mod- ern order ⁴⁷	Barker ⁴⁸

⁴² Carla Falluomini, *Der sogenannte Codex Carolinus von Wolfenbüttel (Codex Gulferbytanus 64 Weissenburgensis)* (Wiesbaden: Harassowitz, 1999), 9, 14, 19, 35–57; Kurt Treu, *Die griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments in der UdSSR: Eine systematische Auswertung der Texthandschriften in Leningrad, Moskau, Kiev, Odessa, Tbilisi und Erevan* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1966), 20–23. Alban Dold, “Griechische Bruchstücke der Paulusbriefe aus dem 6. Jahrhundert unter einem Fragment von Prosper’s Chronicon aus dem 8. Jahrhundert,” *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen* 50 (1933): 76–84.

⁴³ Porter and Porter, *Papyri and Parchments*, 105; R. Roca-Puig, “Un pergaminio griego del Evangelio de San Mateo. (P.Cairo, Catálogo, núm. 71942. Mt. VIII 25–IX 2; XIII 32–38, 40–46,” *Emerita: Revista de lingüística y filología clásica* 27 (1959): 59–73. On the Eusebian canons, see Bruce M. Metzger and Bart D. Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption and Restoration* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 38–39.

⁴⁴ Blumell and Wayment, *Oxyrhynchus*, 119–32. Calculation Blumell and Wayment’s.

⁴⁵ Porter and Porter, *Papyri and Parchments*, 209–11. Calculation mine.

⁴⁶ Eberhard Güting, “Neuedition der Pergamentfragmente London Brit. Libr. Pap. 2240 aus dem Wadi Sarga mit neutestamentlichem Text,” *ZPE* 75 (1988): 97–114. Calculation Güting’s.

⁴⁷ Although by no means standard in the ancient world, in 01 the Paulines come before the Catholic Epistles.

⁴⁸ Don Barker, “How Long and Old is the Codex of which P.Oxy 1353 a Leaf?,” in *Jewish and Christian Scripture as Artefact and Canon*, ed. Craig A. Evans and H. Daniel Zacharias (London: T&T Clark 2009), 192–202. Calculation Barker’s.

0232	2 John	PÉE/165	450	John's Gospel and letters	Roberts ⁴⁹
0274	Mark	PKE/125	1,100	Matthew and Mark	Plumley and Roberts ⁵⁰

2.2.3. Certainly or Plausibly One Work

℘¹¹⁴: Heb 1:7–12. The manuscript has text from near the beginning of Hebrews on one side and nothing on the other, which may indicate a page left blank between works, meaning there was a work in the original artifact before Hebrews.⁵¹ This is, however, so speculative that it does not compel me to place the manuscript into category 4.

0230: Eph 6:5–6 in Latin and 6:11–12 in Greek. This appears to come from a bilingual manuscript, not unlike 05. Because it was written in two languages, the length of Ephesians would in effect have doubled, with the result that it could reasonably have filled a codex. Both H. A. G. Houghton and also Medea Norsa and Vittorio Bartoletti claim that it is likely this came from a manuscript containing all the Paulines. While this is entirely plausible, it would beg the question of my project to assume it, and therefore, since there is no reason to think Ephesians did not stand alone, I place the artifact here.⁵²

℘⁵⁰: Acts 8:26–32; 10:26–31. Although there are two nonconsecutive passages on this fragment, I place it in this category, because they are from one work. They have obviously been deliberately selected for some reason to form the collection of two. The passages are both conversion narratives: that of Cornelius and that of the Ethiopian eunuch. The fragment may have been an amulet, but Cook suggests it is more likely to have been traveler's notes or preacher's notes.⁵³ This artifact seems to represent one of the earliest attempts at something like systematic theol-

⁴⁹ Colin H. Roberts, *The Antinoopolis Papyri* (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1950), 24–25. Calculation mine. I respectfully disagree with Roberts. He suggests that there are approximately four hundred words per page and from that he reasons that the original codex could have contained John's Gospel, Revelation, and 1 John, prior to 2 John. Apart from the obvious inaccuracy that results from using words per page rather than characters per page (because words vary so much more in length than characters), Roberts errs in saying the manuscript contains four hundred words per page. It is in fact approximately one hundred. One is obviously reluctant to make such a claim against a respected scholar, but the reader is invited to confirm the plain fact, using the image in Roberts's own volume. It is possible Roberts intended to write four hundred characters per page, which approximately agrees with my figure.

⁵⁰ Martin J. Plumley and Colin H. Roberts, "An Uncial Text of St Mark in Greek from Nubia: The Text," *JTS* 27 (1976): 34–45 (37). Calculation mine.

⁵¹ Blumell and Wayment, *Oxyrhynchus*, 83–85.

⁵² Medea Norsa and Vittorio Bartoletti, *Papiri greci e latini XIII: n. 1296-1310*, 2nd ed. (Florence: Istituto Papirologico "G. Vitelli." Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 2004), 87; H. A. G. Houghton, *The Latin New Testament: A Guide to Its Early History, Texts, and Manuscripts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 28.

⁵³ John Granger Cook, "℘⁵⁰ (P.Yale I 3) and the Question of Its Function," in *Early Christian Manuscripts: Examples of Applied Method and Approach*, ed. Thomas J. Kraus and Tobias Nicklas, *TENTS* 5 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 115–28. For an example of scholarly arguments that the passage is an amulet, see Stanley E. Porter, "Textual Criticism in the Light of Diverse Textual Evidence for the Greek New Testament: An Expanded Proposal," in *New Testament Manuscripts: Their Text and Their World*, ed. Thomas J. Kraus and Tobias Nicklas, *TENTS* 2 (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 305–37 (320).

ogy: it shows an attempt to group together passages on a common theme, in this case the conversion of gentiles, and use them to build up an overall picture of the teaching of a particular work or collection on that topic. However, since both the extracts come from one work, this artifact is not collection-evident.

027: Luke 1–23. There are various numbers found here, but they are clearly not page numbers, because of their irregular occurrence and position on the page, so are most likely lectional numbers, from which we can draw no firm conclusions about the manuscript's contents.⁵⁴ Therefore, since there is no evidence about any additional content, I classify the manuscript here.

℘¹⁰⁵: Matt 27:62–28:5. Although this artifact clearly functioned as an amulet, as is indicated by the still extant string and holes, it was clearly originally a fragment from a codex.⁵⁵ As with many of the manuscripts in this category, I assume, since Matthew is a work that could comfortably fill a codex, that the codex contained nothing more. Porter suggests that, since it was a miniature codex, it quite possibly contained only the resurrection narrative.⁵⁶

There are a number of fragments in this category, where it is disputed whether they were originally part of the same artifact or not. Given my methodological assumptions, I assume they were not (see §2.1). The relevant manuscripts are: 0171, ℘⁵³, ℘⁷⁷, and ℘¹⁰³. I follow the general consensus in assuming that ℘⁶⁴ and ℘⁶⁷ were the same artifact, but that ℘⁴ was not part of it.

There are also a number of fragments here where pagination indicates that the codex began at the beginning of the work on the fragment. In accordance with my assumptions set out above, I assume that this was all there was in the artifact (see p. 9). The details of these manuscripts are given in the following table:

Manu- script	Work Pre- served	Page Number (Greek/ Arabic Numerals)	Approx. Let- ters per Page	Source
℘ ³⁶	John	ΛΕ/35	200	Vitelli ⁵⁷
℘ ³⁸	Acts	ΝΘ/49	1120	Sanders and NTVMR ⁵⁸
℘ ³⁹	John	ΟΔ/74	340	Greenfell and Hunt ⁵⁹
℘ ¹⁰⁶	John	Γ-Δ/3-4	900	Head ⁶⁰

⁵⁴ Constantine Tischendorf, *Monumenta sacra inedita. Nova collectio. Volumen alterum. Fragmenta evangellii Lucae et libri Genesis* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, Bibliopola, 1857), xi–xxiii.

⁵⁵ Brice C. Jones, *New Testament Texts on Amulets from Late Antiquity* (London: Bloomsbury, 2016), 127–30.

⁵⁶ Porter, “Textual Criticism,” 320–21.

⁵⁷ G. Vitelli, *Papiri greci e latini I*, 2nd ed. (Florence: Istituto Papirologico “G. Vitelli.” Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 2004), 5–6. Calculation mine.

⁵⁸ Henry A. Sanders, “Acts XVIII, 27–XIX, 6; XIX, 12–16,” in *Papyri in the University of Michigan Collection: Miscellaneous Papyri*, ed John Garrett Winter, Michigan Papyri III (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1936), 14–19 (14). Calculation Sanders.

⁵⁹ Bernard P. Greenfell and Arthur S. Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri: Part XV* (London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1922), 7–8. Calculation mine.

⁶⁰ Peter Head, “Some Recently Published New Testament Papyri from Oxyrhynchus: An Overview and Preliminary Assessment.” *TynBul* 51 (2000): 1–16 (10). Calculation Head's. Greek page number confirmed W. E. H. Cockle, “4445: John i 29–35; 40–46” in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri: Volume LXV*, ed. M. W. Haslam, A. Jones, F. Maltomini, M. L. West, W. E. H. Cockle, D. Montserrat, R. A.

ⲡ ¹²⁷	Acts	PIB/112	538	Parker and Pickering ⁶¹
0169	Revelation	ΛΓ and ΛΔ/33 and 34	235	Hunt ⁶²
0173	James	IZ and IH/17 and 18	116	Blumell and Wayment ⁶³
0189	Acts	IE/15	832	Salonius ⁶⁴
0217	John	PK/120	300	Porter and Porter ⁶⁵
0270	1 Corinthians	NΘ/59 or NE/55	600	Image of MS ⁶⁶

2.2.4. Plausibly Multiwork, Indeterminably Collection-Evident

ⲡ¹¹⁹: John 1:21–44. Juan Chapa uses methods similar to mine, working from quantities of letters in John and typical page size, and calculates that, in this codex, John would have begun on the middle of the right-hand page, not at the top of the left. He argues that this in turn makes it extremely likely there was another work in the codex as well.⁶⁷ There is no evidence, internal to the artifact, as to what that additional work or works were and it is begging the question of this project to speculate. We simply cannot know therefore if it was collection-evident.

ⲡ²³: Jas 1:9–18. We have the page numbers B and Γ, that is, two and three, preserved. The text of James prior to the start of page two would need about 1.25 pages to accommodate it. The most probable explanation for this is Barker's: since pages B and Γ are two sides of the same leaf, the first leaf must have had page A and also a "page zero" containing the title and a few lines of text. The codex therefore likely began with James, and the pagination gives no clue as to what came after it. It is unlikely that a codex would contain only so short a work, so, by the principles I have outlined, I class the manuscript here.⁶⁸

059 and 0215: Mark 15:20–38. These two fragments are so widely understood to be from the same manuscript that I take them together. On one of the fragments, there are a few letters visible on the conjoining leaf, which are in a different ink and perhaps a different hand. They

Coles, and J. D. Thomas, with contributions by numerous other scholars (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1998), 11–14 (12).

⁶¹ David C. Parker and S. R. Pickering, "4968: Acta Apostolorum 10–12, 15–17," in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri: Volume LXXIV*, ed. D. Leith, D. C. Parker, S. R. Pickering, N. Gonis, and M. Malouta, with contributions by numerous other scholars (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 2009), 1–45 (1–3). Calculation mine.

⁶² Arthur S. Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri: Part VIII* (London: Egypt Exploration Fund 1911), 15. Calculation mine.

⁶³ Blumell and Wayment, *Oxyrhynchus*, 177–79. Calculation mine. Although normally I suggest that the shorter works were too short to occupy a complete artifact, this codex had such small pages that it could have plausibly contained only James.

⁶⁴ A. H. Salonius, "Die griechischen Handschriftenfragmente des NT zu Berlin," *ZNW* 26 (1927): 97–118 (116). Calculation mine.

⁶⁵ Porter and Porter, *Papyri and Parchments*, 194. Calculation mine.

⁶⁶ Image obtained from Klaas van der Hoek, University of Amsterdam, 2 June 2016. Calculation mine.

⁶⁷ Juan Chapa, "4803. Gospel of John 1 21–8, 38–44," in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri: Volume LXXI*, ed. R. Hatzilambrou, P. J. Parsons, and J. Chapa, with contributions by numerous other scholars (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 2007), 2–6.

⁶⁸ Bernard P. Greenfell and Arthur S. Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri: Part X* (London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1914), 16–18; Don Barker, "The Reuse of Christian Texts: *P. Macquarie inv. 360 + P. Mil. Vogl. inv. 1224* (ⲡ⁹¹) and *P. Oxy. X 1229* (ⲡ²³)," in Kraus and Nicklas, *Early Christian Manuscripts*, 129–44 (136–38).

do not appear to be from Mark, or even early Luke, but there is so little text preserved that it is difficult to be sure. It is also unclear if it came before or after the better-preserved leaf, since we do not know which way the sheets were folded. It is therefore difficult to say what was here, in addition to Mark.⁶⁹

0165: Acts 3:24–4:7; 4:7–13, 17–20. There is page number of Γ or 3 here.⁷⁰ However the amount of text prior to the preserved portion is significantly too big for only two pages. It is possible that the pagination was added after earlier leaves were lost, but it is at least as likely that this fragment came originally from some sort of florilegium, rather than a continuous text of Acts. Since there is a significant possibility of it being a florilegium, where we cannot know the remaining content, I classify the manuscript here.

℘⁸⁰: John 3:34 and some other text, with commentary. The “front” (María Spottorno does not use “recto” and “verso”) of this papyrus has John 3:34 with a brief ἐρμενεῖα. On the back all that is preserved is ΡΩΠΙΕ ΜΗ ΚΑΙ. It does not seem that this can be a fragment of the next consecutive lemma in John, and the vocative form suggests that it is not the commentary either. It is therefore likely to be a lemma drawn from elsewhere. Spottorno notes various possible biblical texts, of which this might be a fragment. However, there is simply no way to prove where this lemma came from, so we cannot tell if this manuscript was collection-evident.⁷¹

2.2.5. Plausibly Not Collection-Evident

℘⁷⁸: This is a fragment of a very small codex, apparently an amulet, containing parts of Jude 4–8. Tommy Wasserman performs a detailed paleographic analysis to determine what else might have been in the codex. To get all of the beginning of Jude into the codex, prior to what survives, would require twelve pages. Either the codex could have been multiple quires with the twelve pages prior to what is preserved forming a three-sheet quire, or the codex could originally have been one large quire, in which case, the twelve pages were six leaves prior to our fragment, with another six leaves coming afterwards. However, these subsequent six leaves would not, according to Wasserman’s calculations, be enough for the remainder of Jude. To contain the remainder of Jude in one quire would require more sheets and therefore obviously more leaves at the beginning as well as the end. We are thus either dealing with a multiple-quire codex, a codex containing only part of Jude, or a codex containing something else prior to Jude, possibly a prayer. Wasserman dismisses the first option because the scribe seems to be trying to squeeze more letters on to lines and pages in order to fit text into the codex, which would presumably be less pressing if there were multiple quires. To this we can add the inherent implausibility of a scribe making a multiple-quire codex out of such small pages (5.3x2.9 cm), when one quire with larger pages would have been significantly less “fiddly.” Wasserman argues by Occam’s razor that we should not posit more texts in the codex than we have evidence for, but I suggest it is at least as likely that there was some sort of introductory matter in the codex as that it broke off part-way through Jude, especially since it was probably an amulet and some sort of introductory prayer would have been highly appropriate. Therefore it is likely there was something else here than Jude and it is likely to have been very

⁶⁹ Dirk Jongkind, “059 (0215) and Mark 15:28,” *TC* 19 (2014): 1–3.

⁷⁰ Saloni, “Die griechischen Handschriftenfragmente des NT zu Berlin,” 97–118 (111).

⁷¹ María Victoria Spottorno, “51: John 3:34 + Commentary,” in *Greek Papyri from Montserrat (P.Monts.Roca IV)*, ed. Sofia Torallas Tovar and Klaas A. Worp, *Scripta Orientalia* 1 (Barcelona: Publicacions de l’Abadia de Montserrat, 2014), 124–28.

short. It may have been a verse or incipit from a work now in the New Testament, but a prayer, perhaps expressing the purpose of the amulet, seems more likely. Hence I place the fragment here, because it was more likely not collection-evident.⁷²

This category contains some fragments, similar to those in previous categories, that contain only one work, but whose pagination indicates that they contained more. In this category, however, the pagination is not consistent with any collection-evident combination, so we must conclude that there is a reasonable likelihood that the other works in the manuscript were not collection-evident. These manuscripts are set out in this table.

Manu- script	Work Pre- served	Page Number (Greek/Arabic Numerals)	Approx. Letters per Page	Notes on Possible Other Works	Source
ⲡ ⁵⁴	James	KΘ and Λ/29 and 30	628	Too much space for only the earlier part of James ⁷³	Kase ⁷⁴
ⲡ ¹²⁶	Hebrews	PEA/161	600	Too much space for only Romans before Hebrews, not enough for the whole Corpus Paulinum	Clivaz ⁷⁵
0207	Revelation	YQH/478	750	Too much space for the New Tes- tament without the gospels and Acts or the Johannine corpus; too little for the entire New Testa- ment or even the New Testament without the gospels	Naldini; Pintau- di ⁷⁶

⁷² Tommy Wasserman, “ⲡ⁷⁸ (P.Oxy. XXIV 2684): The Epistle of Jude on an Amulet?,” in Kraus and Nicklas, *New Testament Manuscripts*, 137–60 (140–41, 138 for the dimensions).

⁷³ Kase’s proposal that other Catholic letters came earlier in the codex is unlikely, given that, as Parker says “the order of the seven Catholic letters is very uniform, especially among Greek manuscripts” (D. C. Parker, *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and Their Texts* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008], 285–86).

⁷⁴ Edmund Harris Kase, *Papyri in the Princeton University Collections*, 2 vols. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1936), 2:1. Calculations mine.

⁷⁵ Claire Clivaz, “A New NT Papyrus: ⲡ¹²⁶ (PSI 1497),” *Early Christianity* 1 (2010): 158–62. Calculations Clivaz. Clivaz concludes differently to me despite a similar method. She suggests this papyrus is evidence for an alternative ordering in the Pauline canon. While it is certainly consistent with that, it is begging the question of my project to see this artifact in these terms, rather than as possible evidence for an entirely alternative collection.

⁷⁶ Mario Naldini, *Documenti dell’antichità Cristiana esposti nella Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana* (Liberia Editrice Fiorentina: Fiorentina, 1964), 19–20; Rosario Pintaudi, “Note codicologiche su due codici tardoantichi: PSI X 1166 (*Apocalisse* 9, 2–15) e PSI X 1171 (Aristofane, *Nuvole* 577–635),” *Analecta Papyrologica* 21–22 (2009–2010): 127–30 (127–28). Pintaudi is not only confident about the omicron, which, having observed an image, I dot; he also reports observing on the next page the next number, YOZ. I could only make out the merest traces of the initial two digits of the second number and would not have seen them had I not first read Pintaudi, who admits they are “in truth barely visible” (“davvero poco visibile”). However, one page number is sufficient to indicate the possibilities for whatever other works might have been in the manuscript and I allow Pintaudi to confirm the doubtful omicron in YOH, because he appears to have studied the manuscript itself, not images.

2.2.6. Certainly Not Collection-Evident

o1 and o2: approximately the entire modern canon of both testaments (including the Old Testament apocrypha), with some early patristic material. Although o1 and o2 are in an important sense very strong evidence for collection-evident bibliographic practices, they nevertheless include material not in the canon today (Hermas and Barnabas in o1, the letters of Clement in o2). Importantly the patristic material is presented in exactly the same format as the canonical works: there is no material evidence that the scribes considered them any different.⁷⁷ Therefore, in this sense, the combinations in o1 and o2 are not collection-evident, and they must be categorized here.

ℱ^{no}: Rom 1:1–7 and some nonsensical writing. Blumell and Wayment suggest this is almost certainly a school exercise, in which the writer has copied out the opening lines of Romans in majuscule script and then some nonsense practice in cursive. The Romans passage is written at the top of the page; then there is a gap in which several lines of writing could fit, and then there is the nonsense, about halfway down the page. The rest of the page is blank. Although there is the page number, A, 1, at the top, it is most likely that the later pages contained further school exercises. Blumell and Wayment suggest the opening of Romans was probably chosen because it provides particularly plentiful opportunities to practice *nomina sacra*.⁷⁸ I categorize it here because the copyist clearly did not hesitate to place the nonsense on the same page as Romans, so the artifact is not collection-evident.

LDAB 2565 (includes ℱ⁷²): This so-called Bodmer Miscellaneous Codex (henceforth BMC) contains the Petrine epistles and Jude and a rich variety of Septuagint and patristic material. As such it is one of the most extreme examples of a noncollection-evident artifact. Scholars debate exactly how the various parts of the codex came to be together and which parts were intentionally collected. The most recent study on the subject is Nongbri's. Nongbri argues that P.Bodmer VIII (the part of the codex that contains 1 and 2 Peter) was originally part of a different codex and only bound into the present day codex subsequently. P.Bodmer VIII is the only part of the codex to contain marginalia. This on its own is weak evidence, since there are many reasons why a reader might only annotate the Petrine material. The stronger arguments are that it has different pagination to the rest of the material in the codex. Further, Nongbri's detailed examination has revealed that the papyrus patching of the central folds of certain sheets did not merely reinforce places where folding had weakened the papyrus, but also joined pieces of papyrus which did not originally belong together. Specifically, in P.Bodmer VIII, leaf λα–λβ and leaf λγ–λδ are a one-sheet quire. Nongbri argues, following close examination of the fibres and joins, that they were originally not part of the same sheet. Originally they were adjacent leaves of a multiple-sheet quire. The two last leaves of the quire were cut away and the two first leaves joined together to make a single sheet. It is rather like tearing the first few pages out of a modern codex and then sticking them together to make a new, shorter codex. This strongly suggests that P.Bodmer VIII was originally in a different codex with other

⁷⁷ Elliott, "Manuscripts," 111. Batovici makes this point in particular with respect to Hermas in o1. Dan Batovici, "The Appearance of Hermas's Text in Codex Sinaiticus" in *Codex Sinaiticus: New Perspectives on the Ancient Biblical Manuscript*, ed. Scot McKendrick, David Parker, Amy Myshrall, and Cillian O'Hagan (London: The British Library/Hendrickson, 2015), 149–60 (157–58).

⁷⁸ Blummel and Wayment, *Oxyrhynchus*, 194–97.

material.⁷⁹ It is irrelevant that the Petrine letters and Jude are copied by the same scribe and that, according to Wasserman's arguments, they display the same scribal *Tendenz* towards high Christology.⁸⁰ This is a good explanation for why the two codices were combined, but it is not evidence against Nongbri's proposal, since an active scribe could have produced many codices over the course of a career and many would display the same *Tendenz*.

How then do we categorize the BMC? We have in effect three codices: the one originally containing P.Bodmer VIII, the one containing the rest of today's codex, and the combination, that is, today's codex. The latter two are obviously in category 6, since they contain a variety of works. I list them there as LDAB 2565* and BMC respectively. The codex containing 1 and 2 Peter, I list as P.Bodmer VIII and place in category 1, since it contains a collection-evident combination. Although it almost certainly originally contained more, such that it might not have been collection-evident, it is a collection-evident combination in its surviving form, like, for example, 03, 04, and 05. Therefore, like those manuscripts, I place it in category 1, because it certainly contained a collection-evident combination, whatever else we may speculate was present.

Many proposals have been made regarding the common theme or purpose that led to the collection of so diverse a literary corpus as the BMC. David Horrell fruitfully compares the codex to a similar, relatively recently published Coptic codex containing a similar diverse array of contents, but including some overlap. Horrell argues, partly by comparison to the Coptic codex, that 1 Peter is the thematic hub of the BMC: the works in the codex have many themes and do not all connect to each other, but they all connect in some way to 1 Peter.⁸¹ If this is true, then, in a sense, although this artifact is not collection-evident by my definition, it nevertheless regards a work which is in modern terms canonical as the heart of the collection. Kim Haines-Eitzen suggests that the body and the flesh are a common theme to all the texts. After the conversion of Constantine, when persecution and martyrdom ceased to be a part of regular Christian experience, asceticism became popular as an alternative and this led to theological reflection on the body and physicality.⁸² Ultimately it is a subjective judgement what theory is most convincing. Presumably there was some purpose to the collection, and it is not difficult to propose hypotheses of what it might have been: after all, if one gives a scholar even a randomly chosen collection of literary works and ask him or her to find thematic connections, then doubtless he or she will find many interesting ones. However, it is difficult to see how one would substantiate any proposal for the uniting theme of the BMC with objective evidence.

ⲡ⁶: 1 Clement 1–26 and Jas 1:18–5:20 in Coptic and John 10:1–11:46 in Coptic and Greek. The pagination shows that there is a gap of thirty-two pages between 1 Clement and James. This is obviously an unusual combination of works and invites speculation, both about the manuscript's *Sitz im Leben* and what works were found between 1 Clement and James. However, there is no evidence on which to base an enquiry.⁸³

⁷⁹ Brent Nongbri, "The Construction of P.Bodmer VIII and the Bodmer 'Composite' or 'Miscellaneous' Codex," *NT* 58 (2016): 394–410. The point that the presence of marginalia in P.Bodmer VIII alone is weak evidence is mine.

⁸⁰ Tommy Wasserman, "Papyrus 72 and the *Bodmer Miscellaneous Codex*," *NTS* 51 (2005): 137–54.

⁸¹ David G. Horrell, "The Themes of 1 Peter: Insights from the Earliest Manuscripts (the Crosby-Schøyen Codex ms 193 and the Bodmer Miscellaneous Codex Containing P⁷²)," *NTS* 55 (2009): 502–22.

⁸² Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians*, 102–4.

⁸³ Jaroš, *Neue Testament*, 4886–911.

Ⲣ: uncertain content. This manuscript is apparently lost and has never been photographed. According to Jaroš, it was noted by Gregory in 1908, in the Ukrainian national library, in Kiev, but Kurt Aland, on his 1954 visit, was unable to find it. Jaroš suggests that it was removed from Kiev during the war, and its whereabouts is now unknown. There was apparently an unidentified patristic text before Luke 4:1–3, and there is another fragment in the inventory of the Archaeological Museum of the Academy of Humanities, Ukraine, listed under the same inventory number, which contains Matt 6:33–34 and 7:2. Jaroš includes a transcription of the patristic text, but it is too fragmentary to make sense out of it. Although it is frustratingly hard to have certain knowledge of this fragment, there is no reason to doubt that it contained Matthew, Luke, and an unknown patristic text, so I place it in this category.⁸⁴

LDAB 6107. It is difficult to identify precisely which works are being quoted on this artifact. This is partly because the copyist evidently used an exemplar, with multiple columns per page, and copied across the columns, rather than down them. Even when the text is rearranged to reveal the exemplar, verses are conflated and the copyist uses Matthew's version of the Lord's Prayer, with Luke's introduction. The text begins εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Μαθθαῖον; there follows some Matthean and Lukan material, including the Lord's Prayer and an exorcism text, not drawn from a work now in the New Testament, at least part of which is attributed to Solomon and which includes a quotation from LXX Ps 90:13.⁸⁵ Whatever the original *Sitz im Leben* was, the poor copying suggests the manuscript was produced by a private and untrained scribe and as such is poor evidence for how trained scribes combined works.

There are several groups of manuscripts in this category that merit comment. One is where material from works in the modern canon is combined with documentary material (notably Ⲣ⁹⁸ and Ⲣ¹²). Although it is quite likely that the documentary texts are simply being used as convenient writing surfaces, I categorize these manuscripts here, because it is plausible the scribe wished in some way to associate the religious text with the documentary business, perhaps as a means of invoking God's blessing. If this were the case (and it would beg the current question to make assumptions), the artifact is not collection-evident.⁸⁶

Secondly, this category includes a number of amulets that combine material from works in the modern canon with other prayers or similar material (LDAB 5971, 2802, 5835, 6096).⁸⁷ This kind of combination of works, across the boundaries of the modern canon, is more collection-evident than it seems. To see this, it is important to consider how ancient amulets "worked." Brice Jones argues that they were thought to have a protective and curative power.⁸⁸

⁸⁴ Jaroš, *Neue Testament*, 3816–21. For transcription of the Patristic text, see 3817n.8.

⁸⁵ Jones, *Amulets*, 87–94.

⁸⁶ Thomas J. Kraus, "When Symbols and Figures Become Physical Objects' Critical Notes About Some of the 'Consistently Cited Witnesses' to the Text of Revelation," in *Book of Seven Seals: The Peculiarity of Revelation, Its Manuscripts, Attestation, and Transmission*, ed. Thomas J. Kraus and Michael Sommer, WUNT 363 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 51–69 (60); Bernard P. Greenfell and Arthur S. Hunt, *The Amherst Papyri: Being an Account of the Greek Papyri in the Collection of the Right Hon. Lord Amherst of Hackney, FSA at Didlington Hall, Norfolk* (London: Oxford University Press, 1900), 28–31.

⁸⁷ Jones, *Amulets*, 124–27; Thomas J. Kraus, "Manuscripts with the *Lord's Prayer*: They Are More Than Simply Witnesses to That Text Itself," in Kraus and Nicklas, *New Testament Manuscripts*, 227–66 (254–66); Arthur S. Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri: Part VIII* (London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1911), 251–53; Karl Preisindanz, *Papyri Graecae Magicae: Die griechischen Zauberpapyri* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1931), 193–94.

⁸⁸ Jones, *Amulets*, 28–29.

De Bruyn and Dijkstra note that some may also have been more devotional. Of course, the boundary between the effective and the merely devotional may have been less clear at the time the artifacts were being produced.⁸⁹ In either case, there might be material on the amulet in addition to the core text that possesses metaphysical power or is the object of devotion. For example, an amulet making use of gospel *incipits* might also include a prayer for healing. This hardly indicates that the amulet-maker placed the healing prayer in the same category as the *incipits*. The important issue is not what works are represented on the amulet, but what works are used as texts of power or devotion. De Bruyn concludes from his survey of amulets that certain works were very popular, notably the gospels and LXX Ps 90.⁹⁰ Although de Bruyn and Dijkstra emphasize the variety and even syncretism evidenced by the varied works chosen as texts of power, a variety that is not collection-evident, this becomes significantly more marked after the chronological cut-off point for this study. In the early centuries studied here, it is rare to find multiple texts, in a noncollection-evident combination, used as texts of power on the same artifact. Excerpts from the four gospels may be combined with prayer material, but never with the Gospel of Thomas. Thus many of the amulets in category 6, for all the variety of the works present, are in fact more collection-evident than they might appear.

The same is true of the homiletic artifacts in category 6. A number of artifacts combine material from works in the modern canon with homiletic material. As with the amulets, this is paradoxically collection-evident, since the homiletic material is secondary. Some text from the four gospels, combined with a homily, is very different to an alternative gospel collection, since the former clearly does not place the homily on the level with the gospels.

3. Results and Conclusions

The table below shows the numbers of manuscripts, tabulated by category and century according to LDAB date. When there is a spread over several centuries, I assign a proportional fraction to each century; for example, for a manuscript dated 350–450, the fourth century gets 0.5 and the fifth century 0.5. Approximations are necessary for more complex date spreads.

	Second cent.	Third cent.	Fourth cent.	Fifth cent.	Sixth cent.
Certainly Collection-Evident	0.8	4.7	6.5	12.8	2.8
Plausibly Collection-Evident	0	0.5	3	4	0.5
Certainly or Plausibly One Work	6	30.8	39.5	35.9	7.3
Plausibly Multiwork, Indeterminably Collection-Evident	0	8	6.6	9.5	2
Plausibly Not Collection-Evident	0	0	2.3	1.8	0
Certainly Not Collection-Evident	0	1.7	4.3	8.4	2.6

The results are striking. The significant majority of multiwork artifacts, in any century, are collection-evident. Noncollection-evident artifacts are relatively rare. Importantly, there are no artifacts with noncollection-evident combinations of gospels.⁹¹ The nearest one comes to this phenomenon is \mathfrak{P}^7 , which contains something in addition to Matthew and Luke, the precise

⁸⁹ De Bruyn and Dijkstra, “Amulets,” 180; Theodore S. de Bruyn, *Making Amulets Christian: Artefacts, Scribes, and Contexts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 181–82.

⁹⁰ De Bruyn, *Amulets*, 235.

⁹¹ A point made by both Schröter (*From Jesus*, 291–92) and Elliott (“Manuscripts,” 107), in both cases without extensive analysis of data to prove the point.

nature of which is difficult to establish since, as discussed above, it is so fragmentary. This manuscript is also of limited evidential value, because it has been lost without any photographs. It is crucial to note that in the later categories in my catalogue, there is nothing even resembling an alternative Bible, that is, a set of works, different to the ones now canonical, that are regularly combined. Although there are occasional minor variations (e.g., Hermas and Barnabas in 01 or certain letters omitted from the Pauline corpus), there are no alternative gospel collections, containing, say, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and Thomas. There are no particular works that are not canonical today, yet that seem regularly to be combined with the (in modern terms) canonical ones, as a rival collection. There may be *other gospels*, but there is no *other gospel collection*. Although a variety of gospels circulated, work-combinations provide minimal evidence that any others had equal status with, or were interchangeable with, the canonical four.

The equivalent point can be made, with only slightly less force, regarding the letters. There is very little evidence for alternative letter collections. The BMC is a rarity for combining letters considered canonical today with such a wide range of other material. This point has slightly less force for the letters than for the gospels, however, because there are many fragments of small letters that probably did not come from single-work manuscripts, because the letters were so small, but where we simply cannot know the manuscript's original contents. The manuscripts surveyed here contain twenty-two small fragments of the shorter New Testament letters.⁹² It is impossible to know for certain how many originally belonged to small codices containing one short letter, like 0173, how many came from longer, collection-evident codices, like \mathfrak{P}^{46} , and how many came from noncollection-evident artifacts, like the BMC. If all the twenty-two fragments came from miscellanies, then \mathfrak{P}^{46} , not the BMC, was the rarity. This is however unlikely, since there are also eight manuscripts that contain collection-evident combinations, such that they could quite plausibly have come from codices containing the Pauline corpus, the catholic letters, or both, though perhaps in an unusual order.⁹³ There is only one manuscript, \mathfrak{P}^6 , that resembles the BMC. This ratio of 8:2 does suggest that the BMC, even in its own time, was unusual compared to \mathfrak{P}^{46} . We cannot make for the letters the equivalent claim we made for the gospels, that our existing manuscripts contain only single-work artifacts and collection-evident combinations, but we can make the more moderate one that noncollection-evident artifacts are rare among what has survived.

The fact that this trend is so consistent suggests that the bibliographic practice is not a straightforward consequence of explicit statements of the canon: it seems unlikely that any explicit statement could have sufficiently extensive influence. This conclusion must be tentative, partly because there are few, if any, artifacts prior to the earliest statements (few, if any, collection-evident gospel manuscripts predate Irenaeus's statement of the four-fold canon) and partly because the dating of both artifacts and canon lists is problematic (if the earliest date for the Muratorian Canon is accepted, there would be few New Testament manuscripts which precede it). Tentative as this conclusion is, however, it is still evidence that early Chris-

⁹² \mathfrak{P}^{87} , \mathfrak{P}^{100} , \mathfrak{P}^{32} , \mathfrak{P}^{133} , \mathfrak{P}^{23} , \mathfrak{P}^{132} , \mathfrak{P}^{65} , \mathfrak{P}^{49} , \mathfrak{P}^9 , \mathfrak{P}^{125} , \mathfrak{P}^{81} , \mathfrak{P}^{51} , \mathfrak{P}^{78} , 0240, 0174, 061, 062, 0254, 0261, 0158, 0159, \mathfrak{P}^{54} .

⁹³ \mathfrak{P}^{46} , \mathfrak{P}^{30} , \mathfrak{P}^{92} , 0208, 048, 0251, 0247, 088.

⁹⁴ I am aware that the exact content of \mathfrak{P}^{46} is itself disputed, in that Duff has argued that it contained the Pastorals and, if this is possible, it might also conceivably have contained other material, which would make it not collection-evident (Jeremy Duff, " \mathfrak{P}^{46} and the Pastorals: A Misleading Consensus?," *NTS* 44 (1998): 578–90). However, my argument here is valid, even if this was the case. There are still eight manuscripts which are definitely collection-evident in their surviving form and only possibly and speculatively also included material that would render them not collection-evident. There is, on the other hand, only two miscellaneous codices. For an overview of the debate on \mathfrak{P}^{46} and the Pastorals, see Parker, *Introduction*, 253–54.

tian bookmakers did not have to be told by ecclesiastical superiors what was in the canon. This in turn suggests that the early Christians may have perceived particular qualities in the works that we consider canonical, even before explicit statements of the canon arose. This challenges one aspect of the open canon view, that “differentiation between canonical and noncanonical gospels is not based on identifiable criteria inherent to the texts.”⁹⁵

Although the number of single-work manuscripts identified by this study is high, this is partly due to my decision, discussed above, to assume that a manuscript is single-work, unless there is evidence to the contrary. On the other hand, at least some of the manuscripts in category 3 are in fact likely to have been single-work manuscripts, rather than merely being assumed to be such. Notably, there are the ten listed on pp. 19–20 that have pagination suggesting that they were the first work in the manuscript. As argued above, it is possible that most or all ten are in fact from multiwork manuscripts, and coincidentally it is the first work that has survived in most or all cases. However, this seems improbable. This suggests that single-work manuscripts, even if not the majority, were common enough. This in turn casts doubt on Trobisch’s thesis that the works of the New Testament very commonly circulated together. It is possible that each “volume” of Trobisch’s proposed complete edition of the New Testament was independently paginated, as tends to be the case with multivolume books today. However, it would presumably be economical for book producers to produce Trobisch’s proposed complete edition in as few volumes as possible, and therefore multiple single-work volumes are unlikely. Further, Watson makes the point, with specific regard to the gospels, that if the four gospels commonly circulated together from the earliest times, one would expect to find a roughly equal number of fragments from all four gospels, since, throughout the early centuries, each of the four would have been copied the same number of times, since they would always have been copied together. However, in fact the vast majority of our surviving fragments come from Matthew and John. One might expect slightly fewer fragments of Mark, because it is shorter, and therefore a single surviving page has less chance of being from Mark than any of the others, but this does not account for how much more numerous fragments of Matthew and John are.⁹⁶ In summary, single-work manuscripts were evidently common enough to problematize strong versions of the closed canon view.

In summary, our conclusions challenge both extreme views. They challenge the open canon view, because the frequent combination of (in modern terms) canonical works suggests that they were widely seen to have something in common. Of course, most of the manuscripts that survive date from a time when even open canon scholars would argue that the four-fold gospel and the Pauline corpus were stable. At the very least, however, the data presented here suggests that most book manufacturers did not doubt that the canonical works belonged together, which suggests that they did have some distinctive characteristic in common. It is far beyond the scope of this project to suggest what this might have been.⁹⁷

⁹⁵ Watson, *Gospel Writings*, 609. Watson allows that the early Christians may have discerned certain internal properties in the four gospels, which caused them to be recognized as canonical. However, he argues such properties are indiscernible to gospel-readers today (*Gospel Writings*, 611).

⁹⁶ Watson himself makes this point in *Gospel Writings*, 411n.1.

⁹⁷ This is consistent with Watson’s view. Watson accepts that the early Christians presumably had reasons for choosing the four gospels and that these reasons quite possibly were internal to the works in question. However, he also argues that it is impossible for us now to discern any inherent difference between the canonical and noncanonical gospels (*Gospel Writings*, 611). What my paper adds to this is further evidence that this shadowy factor for differentiating the works we now call canonical was at least understood by early Christian book-producers.

On the other hand, the data presented here also challenges the closed canon view. Single-work artifacts are also too numerous for us to believe that complete editions of the New Testament or four-gospel codices were the normal format for New Testament manuscripts. The data surveyed suggests that the works we consider canonical were commonly associated together, but not always in the same bibliographic unit.

Appendix

1. Certainly Collection-Evident

LDAB Siglum	Gregory-Aland Siglum	Works Present	Other Works Probably Present	LDAB Date	Verification
3017	ⲡ ³⁰	1 Thess 4:12–5:28; 2 Thess 1:1–2; 2:1, 9–11		175–225	Blumell and Wayment 2015, 116–19
3071	0212	Gospel harmony, parallel to Matt 27:57		175–256	Joosten 2003, 159–75
2980	ⲡ ⁴⁵	Several leaves of each of the four gospels and Acts	Four gospels and Acts	200–250	Metzger and Ehrman 2005, 54
3011	ⲡ ⁴⁶	Most of the Pauline corpus		200–250	Metzger and Ehrman 2005, 54–55
2786/ 3477	ⲡ ¹⁸	Exod 40:26–38 and Rev 1:1–7		Third century	Epp 2004, 18–19
3008	ⲡ ⁹²	Eph 1:11–13, 19–21; 2 Thess 1:4–5, 11–12		250–350	Gallazzi 1982, 117–20
2895	ⲡ ⁷⁵	Most of Luke and most of John 1–15	Possibly four-gospel codex	300–350	Martin and Kasser 1961, passim
3487		Gen 31:8 and Heb 12:22–23		Fourth century	Scherer, 1956, 4 n.2, 3
2993	ⲡ ⁶²	Matt 11:25–30 in Greek and Coptic and LXX Dan 3:50–55 in Greek		Fourth century	Amundsen 1945, 121
P.Bodmer VIII ⁹⁸	ⲡ ⁷²	1 and 2 Pet		310–350	Wasserman 2005, 140 and Nongbri 2016, 394–410
3479	03	Most of the modern canon (Heb damaged, Pastorals, Philm, and Rev missing)	At least the complete modern canon	325–400	Metzger and Ehrman 2005, 67–69
5627		1 Cor 15:27; 2 Cor 6:2; and Pss 24:1–2; 26:2, 4; 41:2; 77:54; 144:9		350–400	Manuscript unedited in the Duke papyrus archive; only source LDAB
2929	05	Most of four gospels and Acts in Greek and Latin (and 3 John 11–15 in Latin)		400–450	Scrivener 1864, passim

⁹⁸ Detailed notes on this artifact are in the paper under LDAB 2565, in category 6.

2985	032	Four gospels		Fifth cen- tury	Sanders 1912, 27
3030	ϣ ⁹⁹	Various Paulines and grammar tables		Fifth cen- tury	Wouters 1988, passim
5688		Matt 5:11, 6; Ps 118:2; and Lam 3:27-31		Fifth cen- tury	Roberts 1976, 74-76
3002	0208	Col 1:29-2:15 and 1 Thess 2:4-11	Possibly Pauline corpus	Fifth cen- tury	Dold 1933, 76-84
128512	067	Matt 14:13-14; 15-16, 19-20; and 21-23; and Mark 14:58-61, 62-64, 65-67, and 68-70	Possibly four gospels	Fifth cen- tury	Treu 1966, 22-23
2906	048	Acts and a range of letters, including most Catholic epistles and most Paulines		Fifth cen- tury	Orsini 2005, 152
2986	h1043	Passages from all four gospels		Fifth cen- tury	Porter and Porter 2008, 246-76
2932	026	A wide range of passages in Luke and John 12:3-20; 14:3-22	Four gospels	Fifth cen- tury	Falluomini 1999, 35
2930	04	Various LXX works and most of the New Testament	Complete modern canon	Fifth cen- tury	Metzger and Ehrman 2005, 69-70
2840	0251	3 John 12-15 and Jude 3-5	Catholic Epistles	Fifth-Sixth centuries	Römer 1980, 327-29
2991		Extracts from all four gospels		Fifth-Sixth centuries	Römer 2003, 183-201
3070	0247	1 Pet 5:13-14; 2 Pet 1:6-8, 14-16; 2:1		Fifth-Sixth centuries	Greenlee, 1968, 130
3001	088	1 Cor 15:53-16:2 and Titus 1:1-13		Fifth-Sixth centuries	Treu 1966, 20-21
62323	h1601	Mark 1:9-10; John 2:1-9; Luke 9:39-42; Matt 8:23- 28 ⁹⁹		Fifth-Sixth centuries	Crum 1905, 14
3484		Ps 117:27, 26 and Luke 1:28 in Greek; Pss 128:8, 117:26- 28; and Phil 3:20 in Coptic		Fifth-Sev- enth centu- ries	Crum 1902, 1, and Stern 1885, 100-102

2. Plausibly Collection-Evident

LDAB Siglum	Gregory- Aland Siglum	Works Present	Other Works Probably Present	LDAB Date	Verification
3018	ϣ ¹³	Heb 2:14-5:5; 10:8-22; 10:29-11:13; 11:28-12:17	Rom and Heb	250-350	Blumell and Wayment 2015, 119-32

⁹⁹ Crum does not give the full references. These are taken from the LDAB.

3067	0206	1 Pet 5:5–13	At least Rom–1 Pet	350–400	Blumell and Wayment 2015, 166–69
2945	0242	Matt 8:25–9:2; 13:32–46	Four gospels	350–400	Roca-Puig 1959, 59–73
3027	0185	1 Cor 2:5–6, 9, 13; 3:2–3	Pauline corpus	350–450	Porter and Porter 2008, 209–11
2911	0214	Mark 8:33–34, 34–37	Four gospels	400–450	Porter and Porter 2008, 105–08
3033	0201	1 Cor 11:33–34; 12:2–13; 14:20–29	At least Rom and 1 Cor	Fifth century	Güting 1988, 97–114
2805	0232	2 John 1–9	Johannine corpus	Fifth century	Roberts 1950, 24–25
2912	0274	Mark 6:56–10:22, with gaps	At least Matthew and Mark	Fifth–Sixth centuries	Plumley and Roberts 1976, 34–45

3. Certainly or Plausibly One Work

LDAB Siglum	Gregory-Aland Siglum	Works Present	LDAB Date	Verification
P.Oxy. LXXXIII 5345 ¹⁰⁰	ⲡ ¹³⁷	Mark 1:7–9, 16–18	100–200	Obbink and Colomo 2018a
2774	ⲡ ⁵²	John 18:31–34, 37–38	125–175	Roberts 1938, 1–3
2775	ⲡ ⁹⁰	John 18:36–19:7	150–200	Blumell and Wayment 2015, 21–26
2935	ⲡ ¹⁰⁴	Matt 21:34–37, 43, 45	150–200	Blumell and Wayment 2015, 20–21
2848	0189	Acts 5:3–21	150–250	Salonius 1927, 116
2936	ⲡ ⁶⁴ and ⲡ ⁶⁷	Matt 3:9, 25; 5:20–22, 25–28; 26:2–33	150–250	Skeat 1997
2936	ⲡ ⁴	Luke 1:58–2:8; 3:8–4:2; 4:29–5:9; 5:30–6:16	150–250	Skeat 1997
2982	0171	Matt 10:17–33	175–225	Treu 1966, 26–28
2982	0171	Luke 22:44–53, 61–64	175–225	Vitelli 1913, 24–25
2801	ⲡ ⁹⁵	John 5:26–29, 36–38	200–250	Lenaerts 1985, 117–20
2777	ⲡ ⁶⁶	Most of John, with many gaps	200–250	Metzger and Ehrman 2005, 56–57
2938	ⲡ ¹⁰³	Matt 13:55–56; 14:3–5	200–250	Blumell and Wayment 2015, 26–28
2937	ⲡ ⁷⁷	Matt 23:30–39	200–250	Blumell and Wayment 2015, 28–31

¹⁰⁰ This manuscript is from the Oxyrhynchus Papyri volume which was published only days before I sent the corrected version of this paper to the journal. It does not yet have an LDAB number, and the date is the one given by the editors of the papyrus in the Oxyrhynchus volume, Obbink and Colomo. Although it is obviously an exception to my rule about following the LDAB date, I include it for the sake of completeness.

P.Oxy LXXXIII 5346 ¹⁰¹	℘ ¹³⁸	Luke 13:13–17, 25–30	Third cen- tury	Obbink and Colomo 2018
2851	℘ ⁹¹	Acts 2:30–37; 2:46–3:2	Third cen- tury	Barker 2010, 129
2852	℘ ⁶⁹	Luke 22:41, 45–48, 58–61	Third cen- tury	Blumell and Wayment 2015, 38–41
2853	℘ ²⁹	Acts 26:7–8, 20	Third cen- tury	Blumell and Wayment 2015, 76–77
2778	℘ ⁴⁷	Rev 9:10–17:2	Third cen- tury	Kenyon 1933, 7
2780	℘ ⁵	John 1:23–40; 16:14–30; 20:11–25	Third cen- tury	Blumell and Wayment 2015, 43–53
112360	℘ ¹²¹	John 19:17–18, 25–26	Third cen- tury	Blumell and Wayment 2015, 74–75
2781	℘ ¹⁰⁶	John 1:29–35, 40–46	Third cen- tury	Head 2000, 5, 10–11
2782	℘ ¹⁰⁷	John 17:1–2, 11	Third cen- tury	Head 2000, 5, 12
2783	℘ ¹⁰⁸	John 17:23–24; 18:1–5	Third cen- tury	Blumell and Wayment 2015, 66–68
2784	℘ ¹⁰⁹	John 21:18–20, 23–25	Third cen- tury	Blumell and Wayment 2015, 68–70
2939	℘ ¹⁰¹	Matt 3:10–12; 3:16–4:3	Third cen- tury	Blumell and Wayment 2015, 35–38
2940	℘ ¹	Matt 1:1–9, 12, 14–20; 2:14	Third cen- tury	Blumell and Wayment 2015, 31–35
3000	℘ ⁴⁰	Rom 1:24–2:3; 3:21–4:8; 6:4–5, 16	Third cen- tury	Bilabel 1924, 28–31
3010	℘ ²⁷	Rom 8:12–27; 8:33–9:9	Third cen- tury	Blumell and Wayment 2015, 79–83
7157	℘ ¹¹¹	Luke 17:11–13, 22–23	Third cen- tury	Blumell and Wayment 2015, 41–43
7160	℘ ¹¹⁴	Heb 1:7–12	Third cen- tury	Blumell and Wayment 2015, 83–85
2779	℘ ²²	John 15:25–16:2, 21–32	250–300	Blumell and Wayment 2015, 53–56
2788	℘ ³⁹	John 8:14–22	250–300	Blumell and Wayment 2015, 57–60
2941	℘ ³⁷	Matt 26:19–52	250–300	Sanders 1926, 215–26
7162	0308	Rev 11:15–18	250–300	Blumell and Wayment 2015, 160–62
2785	℘ ²⁸	John 6:8–12, 17–22	250–350	Blumell and Wayment 2015, 100–103
7161	℘ ¹¹⁵	Rev 2–15, with many gaps	250–350	Blumell and Wayment 2015, 142–60

¹⁰¹ See n. 100.

145321		Matt 22:15–22, 35	250–350	Caldwell and Litinas 2012, 229–33
2855	℘ ³⁸	Acts 18:27–19:6, 12–16	250–350	Sanders 1936, 14–15
5425		Lord's Prayer	275–325	Bammel 1971, 280–81
140277		Mark 1:1	275–350	Blumell and Wayment 2015, 335–37
2856	℘ ⁸	Acts 4:31–37; 5:2–9; 6:1–6, 8–15	300–350	Gregory 1900–1909, 1087–90
7311	℘ ¹¹⁶	Heb 2:9–11; 3:3–6	300–350	Porter and Porter 2008, 86–87
2942	℘ ⁷⁰	Matt 2:13–16; 2:22–3:1; 11:26–27; 12:4–5; 24:3–6, 12–15	300–350	Blumell and Wayment 2015, 92–95
2944	0160	Matt 26:25–26, 34–36	300–350	Salonius 1927, 99–100
113259	℘ ¹²³	1 Cor 14:31–34; 15:3–6	300–350	Blumell and Wayment 2015, 177–79
2948	0192	Matt 5:17–19 in Coptic and 7:28; 8:3, 4, 7–9 in Greek	Fourth century	Kahle 1954, 1:399–402
2946	℘ ⁸⁶	Matt 5:13–16, 22–25	Fourth century	Charalambakis, Hagedorn, Kaimakis and Thüngen 1974, 37–40
3016	℘ ¹⁵	1 Cor 7:18–8:4	Fourth century	Hunt 1910, 4–6
2793	0169	Rev 3:19–4:3	Fourth century	Blumell and Wayment 2015, 181–84
2787	0162	John 2:11–22	Fourth century	Blumell and Wayment 2015, 97–100
2790	0258	John 10:25–26	Fourth century	Scherling 1949, 35
2858	℘ ⁸²	Luke 7:32–34, 37–38	Fourth century	Schwartz 1968, 157–58
10034	℘ ¹¹⁷	2 Cor 7:6–11	Fourth century	Salvo 2001, 19–21
2943	℘ ¹⁰²	Matt 4:11–12, 22–23	Fourth century	Blumell and Wayment 2015, 95–96
2952	058	Matt 18:18–19, 22–23, 25–26, 28–29	Fourth century	Porter and Porter 2008, 91–94
3019	℘ ¹⁷	Heb 9:12–19	Fourth century	Blumell and Wayment 2015, 132–34
3024	0230	Eph 6:5–6 in Latin and 6:11–12 in Greek	Fourth century	Lowe 1971, 8
3020	℘ ⁸⁹	Heb 6:7–9, 15–17	Fourth century	Pintaudi 1981, 42–44
3021	0228	Heb 12:19–21, 23–25	Fourth century	Porter and Porter 2008, 243–45
3022	0221	Rom 5:16–18, 19; 5:21–6:3	Fourth century	Porter and Porter 2008, 205–9

5594		Matt 6:11–13	Fourth cen- tury	Knopf 1901, 228–33
7156	℘ ¹¹⁰	Matt 10:13–14, 25–27	Fourth cen- tury	Blumell and Wayment 2015, 171–74
112359	℘ ¹²⁰	John 1:25–28, 33–38, 42–44	Fourth cen- tury	Blumell and Wayment 2015, 174–77
2857	057	Acts 3:5–6, 10–12	Fourth–Fifth centuries	Salonius 1927, 109–10
2950	0231	Matt 26:75–27:1; 27:3–4	Fourth–Fifth centuries	Roberts 1950, 1:23–24
3023	0270	1 Cor 15:10–15, 19–24	Fourth–Fifth centuries	Observation of digitized image obtained from the University of Amster- dam library
3028		Rom 8:31	Fourth– Sixth centu- ries	Tait 1930, 172
2926		Mark 6:11–12 in Greek and Coptic	300–800	Bouriant 1889, 406
2861	℘ ⁵⁰	Acts 8:26–32; 10:26–31	313–400	Cook 2010, 115–28
2854	℘ ⁴⁸	Acts 23:11–17, 25–29	325–375	Blumell and Wayment 2015, 103–6
2791	℘ ²⁴	Rev 5:5–8; 6:5–8	350–400	Blumell and Wayment 2015, 140–42
2947	℘ ⁷¹	Matt 19:10–11, 17–18	350–400	Blumell and Wayment 2015, 169–71
2981	℘ ⁵³	Matt 26:29–40	350–400	Sanders 1937, 151–56
2981	℘ ⁵³	Acts 9:33–10:1	350–400	Sanders 1937, 151–56
2909	℘ ⁸⁸	Mark 2:1–26	350–400	Daris 1972, 80–89
2995	0220	Rom 4:23–5:3, 8–13	350–400	Limongi 2005, 66–67
2859	℘ ⁵⁷	Acts 4:36–5:2; 5:8–10	350–450	Porter and Porter 2008, 34
112361	℘ ¹²²	John 21:11–14, 22–24	350–450	Blumell and Wayment 2015, 192–94
2860	0181	Luke 9:59–10:5; 10:6–14	350–450	Porter and Porter 2008, 123–29
2771	0173	Jas 1:25–27	350–450	Blumell and Wayment 2015, 179–81
220512		John 7:6–10, 15; 9:17–23	350–500	Burkitt and Gibson 1900, 45–46
2794	℘ ⁸⁵	Rev 9:19–10:2; 10:5–9	375–425	Schwartz 1969, 181–82
10081	℘ ¹¹⁸	Rom 15:26–16:12	375–425	Schenke 2003, 33–37
2949	℘ ²¹	Matt 12:24–26, 31–33	400–450	Blumell and Wayment 2015, 190–92
3031	0172	Rom 1:27–30; 1:32–2:2	400–450	Naldini 1964, 18–19
3041	0219	Rom 2:21–23; 3:8–9, 23–25, 27–30	400–450	Porter and Porter 2008, 200–205

10652		Mark 7:4–5	400–450	Orsini 2005, 141
2803	o68	John 13:16–27; 16:7, 8, 12–19	Fifth century	Wright 2002, 344
2951	℘ ¹⁹	Matt 10:32–42; 11:1–5	Fifth century	Blumell and Wayment 2015, 186–89
2798	o264	John 8:19–20, 23–24	Fifth century	Treu 1966, 33
2804	o301	John 17:1–4	Fifth century	Pintaudi 2005, 63–64
2863	o267	Luke 8:25–27	Fifth century	Spottorno 2014a, 121–23
2864	o175	Acts 6:7–15	Fifth century	Naldini 1964, 18
2865	o244	Acts 11:29–12:2, 3–5	Fifth century	Lakmann 2009, 471
2866	o236	Acts 3:12–13; 15–16	Fifth century	Treu 1966, 333
2869	o77	Acts 13:28–29	Fifth century	Lewis 1894, 98
2807	o218	John 12:2–3, 4–6, 9–11, 14–16	Fifth century	Porter and Porter 2008, 197–200
2800	℘ ⁹³	John 13:15–17	Fifth century	Bastianini 1983, 10–11
2808	o216	John 8:51–53; 9:5–8	Fifth century	Porter and Porter 2008, 190–94
2809	o217	John 11:57–12:7	Fifth century	Porter and Porter 2008, 194–97
3037	o252	Heb 6:2–4, 6–7	Fifth century	Spottorno 2014c, 128–32
3039	o227	Heb 11:18–19, 29	Fifth century	Porter and Porter 2008, 242–43
2900	o67	Matt 24:37–25:1; 25:32–45; 26:31–45	Fifth century	Treu 1966, 23–24
119313	℘ ¹²⁷	Acts 10–12; 15–17	Fifth century	Parker and Pickering 2009, 1
2910	o188	Mark 11:11–17	Fifth century	Salonius 1927, 100–102
2953		Lord's Prayer	Fifth century	Kraus 2006, 240–41
3042	℘ ⁹⁴	Rom 6:10–13, 19–22	400–550	Bingen 1987, 75–78
2799	o163	Rev 16:17–18, 19–20	Fifth–Sixth centuries	Greenfell and Hunt 1908, 6
2810	o60	John 14:14–17, 19–21, 23–24, 26–28	Fifth–Sixth centuries	Salonius 1927, 102–4
2812	℘ ³⁶	John 3:14–18, 31–32	Fifth–Sixth centuries	Vitelli 2004, 5–6
3043	℘ ¹⁴	1 Cor 1:25–27; 2:6–8; 3:8–10, 20	Fifth–Sixth centuries	Harris 1890, 54–56
2892	o27	Luke 1–23	Fifth–Sixth centuries	Tischendorf 1857, xi–xxii, and Apthorp 1996, 103
2871	o76	Acts 2:11–22	Fifth–Sixth centuries	Greenfell and Hunt 1900, 41–43
2913	o69	Mark 10:50, 51; 11:11, 12	Fifth–Sixth centuries	Greenfell and Hunt 1898, 7
2920	o72	Mark 2:23–37; 3:1–5	Fifth–Sixth centuries	University of Münster New Testament Virtual Manuscript Room, accessed 3/6/16

2954		Matt 1:19–20	Fifth–Sixth centuries	Sijpesteijn 1984, 145
2955	071	Matt 1:21–24; 1:25–2:2	Fifth–Sixth centuries	Greenfell and Hunt 1903, 1–2
10091		Jas 2:2–3, 8–9; 4:11–13	Fifth–Sixth centuries	Funghi, Messeri, and Römer 2012, 22–23
2957	℘ ¹⁰⁵	Matt 27:62–74; 28:2–5	Fifth–Sixth centuries	Jones 2016, 127–30
2958	0170	Matt 6:5–6, 8–9, 13–15, 17	475–525	Hunt 1912, 5–7

4. Plausibly Multiwork, Indeterminably Collection-Evident

LDAB Siglum	Gregory- Aland Siglum	Works Present	LDAB Date	Verification
3013	℘ ⁸⁷	Phlm 13–15, 21–24	200–250	Kramer, Römer, and Hagedorn 1982, 28–31
2769	℘ ¹⁰⁰	Jas 3:13–4:4; 4:9–5:1	Third century	Head 2000, 12–14
3009	℘ ³²	Titus 1:11–15; 2:3–8	Third century	Hunt 1911a, 10–11
112358	℘ ¹¹⁹	John 1:21–28, 38–44	Third century	Chapa 2007, 2–6
704180	℘ ¹³³	1 Tim 3:13–4:8	Third century	Shao 2016, 3–8
2770	℘ ²³	Jas 1:10–12, 15–18	250–300	Greenfell and Hunt 1914, 16–18
3012	℘ ⁶⁵	1 Thess 1:3–2:13	250–350	Naldini 1964, 18
3014	℘ ⁴⁹	Eph 4:16–5:13	250–350	Emmel 1996, 291–94
2789	℘ ⁹	1 John 4:11–17	275–325	Blumell and Wayment 2015, 184–86
117814	℘ ¹²⁵	1 Pet 1:23–2:5, 7–11	275–325	Blumell and Wayment 2015, 162–66
3016	℘ ¹⁶	Phil 3:9–4:8	Fourth century	Hunt 1910, 8–10
P.Oxy LXXXIII 5347 ¹⁰²	℘ ¹³⁹	Phlm 6–8, 18–20	Fourth century	Lincicum 2018
3068	℘ ⁸¹	1 Pet 2:20–3:1; 3:4–12	350–400	Daris 1967, 20–24
3026	℘ ⁵¹	Gal 1:2–10, 13, 16–20	350–450	Blumell and Wayment 2015, 197–200
9210	059 and 0215	Mark 15:20–21, 26–67, 29–38 and some more characters	350–450	Jongkind 2014, 1–3
704179	℘ ¹³²	Eph 3:21–4:2, 14–16	350–450	Smith 2016, 1–3

¹⁰² See n. 100.

2996	0240	Titus 1:4–6, 7–9	Fifth century	Treu 1966, 353–54
3034	0174	Gal 2:5–6	Fifth century	Vitelli 1913, 10
2872	0165	Acts 3:24–4:7; 4:7–13, 17–20	Fifth century	Salonius 1927, 110–15
3029	061	1 Tim 3:15–16; 6:2	Fifth century	Zahn 1884, 277–78
3035	062	Gal 4:15–30; 30–31; 5:1–15	Fifth century	University of Münster NT Virtual Manuscript Room, accessed 4/6/16
3036	0254	Gal 5:13–17	Fifth century	Horsley 1982, 137
3038	0261	Gal 1:9–12; 4:25–31	Fifth century	Horsley 1982, 135–37
2997	0158	Gal 1:1–13	Fifth–Sixth century	No secondary attestation; original in Damascus; all attempts to contact the museum unsuccessful.
2998	0159	Eph 4:21–24; 5:1–3	Fifth–Sixth century	No secondary attestation; original in Damascus; all attempts to contact the museum unsuccessful.
2795	ⲡ ⁸⁰	Some short lemmata, incl currently canonical material, with commentary	550–600	Spottorno 2014b, 124–28

5. Plausibly Not Collection-Evident

LDAB Siglum	Gregory-Aland Siglum	Works Present	LDAB Date	Verification
10009	ⲡ ¹²⁶	Heb 13:12–13, 19–20	300–350	Clivaz 2010, 158–62
2792	0207	Rev 9:2–15	350–400	Naldini 1964, 19–20
2846	ⲡ ⁷⁸	Jude 4–5, 7–8	375–475	Wasserman 2006, 137–60
2772	ⲡ ⁵⁴	Jas 2:16–18, 21–23, 23–25; 3:2–4	Fifth century	Kase 1936, 2:1

6. Definitely Not Collection-Evident

LDAB Siglum	Gregory-Aland Siglum	Works Present	LDAB Date	Verification
2776	ⲡ ⁹⁸	Rev 1:13–2:1 and documentary text	200–250	Kraus 2016, 60
3475	ⲡ ¹²	Letter, with Gen 1:1–5 in LXX and Aquila and Heb 1:1	264–325	Greenfell and Hunt 1900, 28–31
3025	ⲡ ¹⁰	Rom 1:1–7 and some nonsense writing	300–350	Blumell and Wayment 2015, 194–97

2565*	Contains part of \mathfrak{P}^{72}	Jude, Pss 33–34, 11th Ode of Solomon a variety of apocryphal Christian works ¹⁰³	310–350	Wasserman 2005, 140; Horrell 2009 and Nongbri 2016, 394–410
3478	01	Whole range of works, mostly in the modern canon	325–375	Metzger and Ehrman 2005, 62–67
BMC	Contains \mathfrak{P}^{72}	Petrine epistles, Jude, and many works outside the modern canon	Fourth century	Wasserman 2005, 140; Horrell 2009 and Nongbri 2016, 394–410
2806	\mathfrak{P}^6	1 Clement 1–26 and Jas 1:18–5:20 in Coptic and John 10:1–11:46 in Coptic and Greek	400–450	Jaroš 2006, 4886–4911
5715		Homilies, quoting several sources	Fifth century	Blumell and Wayment 2015, 350–52
3481	02	Complete LXX and NT, Athanasius’s festival letter and the Clementine letters	Fifth century	Metzger and Ehrman 2005, 67, and observation of the digitised manuscript ¹⁰⁴
5971		Lord’s Prayer with closing liturgical material	Fifth century	Jones 2016, 124–27
2867	\mathfrak{P}^7	Uncertain, but apparently contains gospels and a patristic text	Fifth century	Jaroš 2006, 3816–21
6096		Prayers, incipits of Matt, Luke and John and Ps 21:20–23	Fifth–Sixth century	Preisindanz 1931, 193–94
5835		Lord’s Prayer and a variety of LXX materials and works outside the modern canon	Fifth–Sixth century	Kraus 2006, 254–66
6107		Various synoptic texts, Ps 90:13 and materials outside the modern canon	Fifth–Sixth century	Jones 2016, 87–94
2802		John 1:1, 3 and prayer and exorcism language	431–500	Hunt 1911b, 251–53
2813		Johannine Prologue and prayer against illness	431–600	Jones 2016, 140–46

Bibliography of Appendix

- Amundsen, Leiv. 1945. “Christian Papyri from the Oslo Collection.” *Symbolae Osloenses* 24:121–47.
- Apthorp, Michael J. 1996. “New Evidence from the Syriac Palimpsest on the Numerus Versuum of the ‘Iliad.’” *ZPE* 110:103–14.
- Bammel, Ernst. 1971. “Ein Neuer Vater-Unser-Text.” *ZNW* 52:280–81.
- Barker, Don. 2010. “The Reuse of Christian Texts: *P.Macquarie inv. 360 + P.Mil.Vogl. inv. 1224* (\mathfrak{P}^{91}) and *P.Oxy. X 1229* (\mathfrak{P}^{23}).” Pages 129–44 in *Early Christian Manuscripts: Examples of Applied Method and Approach*. Edited by Thomas J. Kraus and Tobias Nicklas. TENTS 5. Leiden: Brill.

¹⁰³ Specifically: the Nativity of Mary, apocryphal letters between Paul and the Corinthians, Melito’s Paschal homily, a fragment of a hymn, and the Apology of Phileas.

¹⁰⁴ Available on the British Library website (http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/FullDisplay.aspx?ref=Royal_MS_1_D_VIII), accessed 4 February 2017.

- Bastianini, Guido. 1983. "4. Ioh. 13, 15–17 (*)." Pages 10–11 in *Trenta testi greci da papiri letterari e documentari editi in occasione del XVII Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia; Napoli 19–26 Maggio 1983*. Edited by Manfredo Manfredi. Florence: Istituto Papirologico "G. Vitelli".
- Bilabel, Friedrich. 1924. *Griechische Papyri (Urkunden, Briefe, Schreibtafeln, Ostraka etc) mit 2 Tafeln*. Veröffentlichungen aus den badischen Papyrus-Sammlungen 4. Heidelberg: Self-published by the author.
- Bingen, Jean. 1987. "P⁹⁴: Romains 6, 10–13; 19–22 (P.Cair. 10730)." Pages 75–78 in *Miscellanea papirologica Ramon Roca-Puig*. Edited by Sebastià Janeras. Barcelona: Fundació Salvador Vives Casajuana.
- Blumell, Lincoln H., and Thomas A. Wayment. 2015. *Christian Oxyrhynchus: Texts, Documents and Sources*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press.
- Bouriant, Urbain. 1889. "Rapport au Ministre de l'Instruction Publique sur une mission dans la Haute-Égypte (1884–1885)." Pages 368–406 in *Mémoires publiés par les membres de la Mission Archéologique Française au Caire*. Edited by M. Mapero. Vol. 1. Paris: Libraire de la Société Asiatique, de l'École des Langues Orientales Vivantes, de l'École du Louvre etc.
- Burkitt, F. C., and M. D. Gibson. 1900. Appendix VI to *Select Narratives of Holy Women from The Syro-Antiochene or Sinai Palimpsest, as Written Above the Old Syriac Gospels by John the Stylite, of Beth-Mari-Qanūn in A.D. 778*. By Agnes Smith Lewis. *Studia Sinaitica* 9. London: Clay & Sons.
- Caldwell, Robert, and Nikos Litinas. 2012. "P.Mich.Invs. 4157A + 4170A. Petition and Exegetical Text on Matthew." *ZPE* 183:227–33.
- Chapa, Juan. 2007. "4803. Gospel of John 1 21–8, 38–44." Pages 2–6 in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri: Volume LXXI*. Edited by R. Hatzilambrou, P. J. Parsons and J. Chapa, with contributions by numerous other scholars. London: Egypt Exploration Society.
- Charalambakis, Ch., D. Hagedorn, D. Kaimakis, and L. Thüngen. 1974. "Vier literarische Papyri der Kölner Sammlung." *ZPE* 14:29–40.
- Clivaz, Claire. 2010. "A New NT Papyrus: P¹²⁶ (PSI 1497)." *Early Christianity* 1:158–62.
- Cook, John Granger. 2010. "P⁵⁰ (P.Yale I 3) and the Question of its Function." Pages 115–28 in *Early Christian Manuscripts: Examples of Applied Method and Approach*. Edited by Thomas J. Kraus and Tobias Nicklas. *TENTS* 5. Leiden: Brill.
- Crum, W. E. 1905. *Catalogue of Coptic Manuscripts of the British Museum*. London: Gilbert & Rivington.
- Crum, W. E., with a contribution by F. E. Brightman. 1902. *Coptic Ostraca from the Collections of the Egypt Exploration Fund, the Cairo Museum and Others*. London: Egypt Exploration Fund.
- Daris, Sergio. 1967. *Un nuovo frammento della prima lettera di Pietro (1 Petr 2,20–3,12)*. Barcelona: Papyrologica Castroriviana.
- . 1972. "Papiri letterari dell' Università Cattolica di Milano." *Aeg* 52:67–118.
- Dold, Alban. 1933. "Griechische Bruchstücke der Paulusbriefe aus dem 6. Jahrhundert unter einem Fragment von Prosper's Chronicon aus dem 8. Jahrhundert." *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen* 50:76–84.
- Emmel, Stephen. 1996. "Greek Biblical Papyri in the Beinecke Library." *ZPE* 112:289–94.
- Epp, Eldon Jay. 2004. "The Oxyrhynchus NT Papyri: "Not Without Honor Except in Their Hometown"?" *JBL* 123:5–55.
- Falluomini, Carla. 1999. *Der sogenannte Codex Carolinus von Wolfenbüttel (Codex Gulferbytanus 64 Weissenburgensis)*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

- Funghi, Maria Serena, Gabriella Messeri, and Cornelia Eva Römer. 2012. *Ostraca greci e bilin-gui del Petrie Museum of Egyptian Archaeology (O.Petr.Mus)*. Papyrologica Florentina 42. Florence: Gonnelli.
- Gallazzi, Claudio. 1982. "Frammenti di un codice con le epistole di Paolo." *ZPE* 46:117–22.
- Greenfell, Bernard P., and Arthur S. Hunt. 1898. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri: Part I*. London: Egypt Exploration Fund.
- . 1900. *The Amherst Papyri: Being an Account of the Greek Papyri in the Collection of the Right Hon. Lord Amherst of Hackney, FSA at Didlington Hall, Norfolk*. London: Oxford University Press.
- . 1903. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri: Part III*. London: Egypt Exploration Fund.
- . 1908. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri: Part VI*. London: Egypt Exploration Fund.
- . 1914. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri: Part X*. London: Egypt Exploration Fund.
- Greenlee, J. Harold. 1968. *Nine Uncial Manuscripts of the Greek New Testament*. SD 31. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.
- Gregory, Caspary René. 1900–1909. *Textkritik des Neuen Testaments*. Leipzig: Hinrichs Buch-handlung.
- Güting, Eberhard. 1988. "Neuedition der Pergamentfragmente London Brit. Libr. Pap. 2240 aus dem Wadi Sarga mit neutestamentlichem Text." *ZPE* 75:97–114.
- Harris, J. Rendel. 1890. *Biblical Fragments from Mount Sinai*. London: Clay & Sons.
- Head, Peter. 2000. "Some Recently Published New Testament Papyri from Oxyrhynchus: An Overview and Preliminary Assessment." *TynBul* 51:1–16.
- Horrell, David G. 2009. "The Themes of 1 Peter: Insights from the Earliest Manuscripts (the Crosby-Schøyen Codex ms 193 and the Bodmer Miscellaneous Codex Containing P⁷²)." *NTS* 55:502–22.
- Horsley, G. H. R. 1982. *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity: A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri Published in 1977*. North Ryde: Macquarie University.
- Hunt, Arthur S. 1910. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri: Part VII*. London: Egypt Exploration Fund.
- . 1911a. *Catalogue of the Greek Papyri in the John Rylands Library, Manchester. Volume 1: Literary Texts*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- . 1911b. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri: Part VIII*. London: Egypt Exploration Fund.
- . 1912. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri: Part IX*. London: Egypt Exploration Fund.
- Jaroš, Karl. 2006. *Das Neue Testament nach den ältesten Griechischen Handschriften*. Ruhpolding: Verlag Franz Philipp Rutzen.
- Jones, Brice C. 2016. *New Testament Texts on Amulets from Late Antiquity*. London: Blooms-bury.
- Jongkind, Dirk. 2014. "059 (0215) and Mark 15:28." *TC* 19:1–3.
- Joosten, Jan. 2003. "The Dura Parchment and the Diatessaron." *VC* 57:159–75.
- Kahle, Paul E. 1954. *Bala'izah: Coptic Texts from Deir El-Bala'izah in Upper Egypt*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Kase, Edmund Harris. 1936. *Papyri in the Princeton University Collections*. 2 vols. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Kenyon, Frederick G. 1933. *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible. Fasciculus I: General Introduction*. London: Emery Walker.
- Knopf, R. 1901. "Eine Thonscherbe mit dem Texte des Vaterunsers." *ZNW* 2:228–33.
- Kramer, Bärbel, Cornelia Eva Römer, and Dieter Hagedorn. 1982. *Kölner Papyri (P. Köln)*. Band 4. Papyrologica Coloniensia 7. Opladend: Westdeutscher.

- Kraus, Thomas J. 2006. "Manuscripts with the *Lord's Prayer*: They Are More Than Simply Witnesses to That Text Itself." Pages 227–66 in *New Testament Manuscripts: Their Texts and Their World*. Edited by Thomas J. Kraus and Tobias Nicklas. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2016. "When Symbols and Figures Become Physical Objects' Critical Notes About Some of the 'Consistently Cited Witnesses' to the Text of Revelation." Pages 51–69 in *Book of Seven Seals: The Peculiarity of Revelation, Its Manuscripts, Attestation, and Transmission*. Edited by Thomas J. Kraus and Michael Sommer. WUNT 363. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Lakmann, Marie-Luise. 2009. "Neutestamentliche Texte aus Khirbet Mird: Ⲫ⁸³ und 0244." *ETL* 85:467–78.
- Lenaerts, Jean. 1985. "Un papyrus de l'Évangile de Jean: PL II/31." *CdE* 60:117–20.
- Leuven Database of Ancient Books. <http://www.trismegistos.org/ldab/search.php>.
- Lewis, Agnes Smith. 1894. *Catalogue of the Syriac MSS. in the Convent of S. Catherine on Mount Sinai*. London: Clay & Sons.
- Limongi, Donatella. 2005. "NT, *Epistula ad Romanos* 4.23–5.3; 5.8–13 (MS 113)." Pages 63–64 in *Papyri Graecae Schøyen*. Edited by Rosario Pintaudi. *Papyrologica Florentina* 35. Florence: Edizioni Gonelli.
- Lincicum, David. 2018. "5347. Philemon 6–8, 18–20." Pages 11–14 in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri: Volume LXXXIII*. Edited by P. J. Parsons and N. Gonis, with contributions by numerous other scholars. London: Egypt Exploration Society.
- Lowe, E. A. 1971. *Codices Latini Antiquiores: A Palaeographical Guide to Latin Manuscripts prior to the Ninth Century*. Supplementary volume. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Martin, Victor, and Rodolphe Kasser. 1961. *Papyrus Bodmer XIV–XV. Évangiles de Luc et Jean*. 2 vols. Cologne: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana.
- Metzger, Bruce M., and Bart D. Ehrman. 2005. *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption and Restoration*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Naldini, Mario. 1964. *Documenti dell'antichità Cristiana esposti nella Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana*. Liberia Editrice Fiorentina: Fiorentina.
- Nongbri, Brent. 2016. "The Construction of P.Bodmer VIII and the Bodmer 'Composite' or 'Miscellaneous' Codex." *NT* 58:394–410.
- Obbink, Dirk, and Daniela Colomo. 2018. "5345. Gospel of Mark I 7–9, 16–18." Pages 4–7 in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri: Volume LXXXIII*. Edited by P. J. Parsons and N. Gonis, with contributions by numerous other scholars. London: Egypt Exploration Society.
- Obbink, Dirk, and Daniela Colomo. 2018. "5346. Gospel of Luke XIII 13–17, 25–30." Pages 7–11 in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri: Volume LXXXIII*. Edited by P. J. Parsons and N. Gonis, with contributions by numerous other scholars. London: Egypt Exploration Society.
- Orsini, Pasquale. 2005. *Manoscritti in maiuscola biblica: Materiali per un aggiornamento*. Studi archeologici, artistici, filologici, letterari e storici. Cassino: Edizioni dell'Università degli Studi di Cassino.
- Parker, David C., and S. R. Pickering. 2009. "4968: Acta Apostolorum 10–12, 15–17." Pages 1–45 in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri: Volume LXXIV*. Edited by D. Leith, D. C. Parker, S. R. Pickering, N. Gonis, and M. Malouta, with contributions by numerous other scholars. London: Egypt Exploration Society.
- Pintaudi, Rosario. 1981. "N. T. Ad Hebraeos VI, 7–9; 15–17 (PL III/292)." *ZPE* 42:42–44.
- . 2005. "NT, *Johannes* 17.1–4 (MS 1367)." Pages 63–64 in *Papyri Graecae Schøyen*. Edited by Pintaudi.
- Plumley, Martin J., and Colin H. Roberts. 1976. "An Uncial Text of St Mark in Greek from Nubia: The Text." *JTS* 27:34–45.

- Porter, Stanley E., and Wendy J. Porter. 2008. *New Testament Greek Papyri and Parchments. New Editions: Texts*. Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek 29. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Preisindanz, Karl. 1931. *Papyri Graecae Magicae: Die griechischen Zauberpapyri*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Roberts, Colin H. 1938. *Catalogue of the Greek and Latin Papyri in the John Rylands Library, Manchester*. Volume 3: *Theological and Literary Texts*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- . 1950. *The Antinoopolis Papyri*. London: Egypt Exploration Society.
- . 1976. “6. Theological Papyrus.” Pages 74–76 in *Collectanea Papyrologica: Texts Published in Honor of H. C. Youtie: Part 1, Numbers 1–65*. Edited by Ann Ellis Hanson. Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen 19. Rudolf Habelt Verlag: Bonn.
- Roca-Puig, R. 1959. “Un pergaminio griego del Evangelio de San Mateo. (P.Cairo, catálogo, núm. 71942. Mt. VIII 25–IX 2; XIII 32–38, 40–46.” *Emerita: Revista de lingüística y filología clásica* 27:59–73.
- Römer, Cornelia Eva. 1980. “Johannesbrief 12–15, Judasbrief 3–5.” Pages 327–29 in *Miscellanea Papyrologica*. Edited by Rosario Pintaudi. Florence: Edizioni Gonnelli.
- . 2003. “Ostraka mit christlichen Texten aus der Sammlung Flinders Petrie.” *ZPE* 119:183–201.
- Salonius, A. H. 1927. “Die griechischen Handschriftenfragmente des NT zu Berlin.” *ZNW* 26:97–118.
- Salvo, Mariarosaria. 2001. “Un nuovo frammento della seconda lettera di Paolo ai Corinzi (7, 6–11): P.Hamb. Inv. NS 1002.” *Analecta Papyrologica* 13:19–21.
- Sanders, Henry A. 1912. *The New Testament Manuscripts in the Freer Collection. Part I. The Washington Manuscript of the Four Gospels*. New York: Macmillan.
- . 1926. “An Early Papyrus Fragment of the Gospel of Matthew in the Michigan Collection.” *HTR* 19:215–26.
- . 1936. “Acts XVIII, 27–XIX, 6; XIX,12–16.” Pages 14–19 in *Papyri in the University of Michigan Collection. Miscellaneous Papyri*. Edited by John Garrett Winter. Michigan Papyri III. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- . 1937. “A Third Century Papyrus of Matthew and Acts.” Pages 151–61 in *Quantulacumque: Studies Presented to Kirsopp Lake by Pupils, Colleagues and Friends*. Edited by Robert P. Casey, Silva Lake, and Agnes K. Lake. London: Christophers.
- Schenke, Gesa. 2003. “406. Epistula Pauli ad Romanos. 15,26–27,32–33; 16,1.4–7,11–12.” Pages 33–37 in *Kölner Papyri (P.Köln). Band 10*. Edited by Michael Gronewald, Klaus Maresch, Fabian Reiter, Gesa Schenke, Giuseppina Azzarello, Patrick Brosch, Jean-Luc Fournet, Holger Kockelmann, Hendrik Obsieger and Christian Schwemer. Papyrologica Coloniensia 7.10. Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh.
- Scherer, Jean. 1956. *Extraits des livres I et II du Contre Celse d’Origène d’après le papyrus No.88747 du Musée du Caire*. Cairo: L’Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale.
- Scherling, Erik von. 1949. “Gospel (St John). Fourth Century AD.” *Rotulus* 5:35.
- Schwartz, Jacques. 1968. “Fragment d’évangile sur papyrus (Luc VII 32–34; 37 s.)” *ZPE* 3:157–58.
- . 1969. “Papyrus et tradition manuscrit.” *ZPE* 4:175–82.
- Scrivener, Frederick H. 1864. *Bezae Codex Cantabrigiensis: Being an Exact Copy in Ordinary Type of the Celebrated Uncial Graeco-Latin Manuscript of the Four Gospels and Acts of the Apostles, Written in the Sixth Century, and Presented to the University of Cambridge by Theodor Beza, A.D. 1581*. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, & Co.

- Shao., J. 2016. "5259. 1 Timothy 3:13–4:8." Pages 3–8 in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri LXXXI*. Edited by J. H. Brusuelas and C. Meccariello. London: Egypt Exploration Fund.
- Sijpesteijn, P. J. 1984. "Matthäus 1,19–20 auf einem Ostrakon." *ZPE* 55:145.
- Skeat, Theodor C. 1997. "The Oldest Manuscript of the Four Gospels?" Pages 158–92 in *The Collected Writings of T. C. Skeat*. Edited and Introduced by J. K. Elliott. NovTSup 113. Leiden: Brill.
- Smith, G. S. 2016. "5258. Ephesians 3:21–4:2, 14–16." Pages 1–3 in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri LXXXI*. Edited by Brusuelas and Meccariello.
- Spottorno, María Victoria. 2014a. "50: Luke 8:25–27." Pages 121–23 in *Greek Papyri from Montserrat (P.Monts.Roca IV)*. Edited by Sofía Torallas Tovar and Klaas A. Worp. Scripta Orientalia 1. Barcelona: Publicacions de l'Abadia de Montserrat.
- . 2014b. "51: John 3:34 + Commentary." Pages 124–28 in *Greek Papyri from Montserrat*. Edited by Tovar and Worp.
- . 2014c. "52: Hebrews 6:2–4, 6–7." Pages 128–32 in *Greek Papyri from Montserrat*. Edited by Tovar and Worp.
- Stern, Ludwig. 1885. "Koptische Inschriften an alten Denkmälern." *ZÄS* 23:96–102.
- Tait, John Gavin. 1930. *Greek Ostraca in the Bodleian Library at Oxford and Various Other Collections*. London: Egypt Exploration Society.
- Tischendorf, Constantine. 1857. *Monumenta sacra inedita. Nova collectio. Volumen alterum. Fragmenta evangelii Lucae et libri Genesis*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, Bibliopola.
- Treu, Kurt. 1966. *Die griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments in der UdSSR: Eine systematische Auswertung der Texthandschriften in Leningrad, Moskau, Kiev, Odessa, Tbilisi und Erevan*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Vitelli, G. 1913. *Papiri greci e latini II*. Florence: Società italiana per la ricerca dei papiri greci e latini in Egitto.
- . 2004. *Papiri greci e latini I*. 2nd ed. Florence: Istituto Papirologico "G. Vitelli." Edizioni di storia e letteratura.
- Wasserman, Tommy. 2005. "Papyrus 72 and the Bodmer Miscellaneous Codex." *NTS* 51:137–54.
- . 2006. "P⁷⁸ (P.Oxy. XXIV 2684): The Epistle of Jude on an Amulet?" Pages 137–60 in *New Testament Manuscripts: Their Texts and Their World*. Edited by Thomas J. Kraus and Tobias Nicklas. Leiden: Brill.
- Wouters, Alfons. 1988. *The Chester Beatty Codex AC 1499: A Graeco-Latin Lexicon on the Pauline Epistles and a Greek Grammar*. Leuven: Peeters.
- Wright, W. 2002. *Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum Acquired Since the Year 1838*. 2nd ed. Gorgias Reprint Series 30.1. Piscataway: Gorgias Press.
- Zahn, Theodor. 1884. *Forschungen zur Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons und der altkirchlichen Literatur, III Theil: Supplementum Clementinum*. Erlangen: Andreas Deichert.

Character Counts of the Works of the New Testament

Matt	90,368	
Mark	55,364	(finishing at 16:8)
Luke	95,974	
John	70,526	(without <i>pericope adulterae</i>)
Acts	95,830	
Rom	34,423	
1 Cor	32,741	
2 Cor	22,261	
Gal	11,082	
Eph	12,001	
Phil	7,994	
Col	7,888	
1 Thess	7,421	
2 Thess	4,048	
1 Tim	8,856	
2 Tim	6,525	
Titus	3,723	
Phlm	1,562	
Heb	26,419	
Jas	8,848	
1 Pet	9,048	
2 Pet	6,083	
1 John	9,463	
2 John	1,128	
3 John	1,105	
Jude	2,568	
Rev	46,040	
Four Gospels	312,232	
Corpus Paulinum	186,944	(incl. Heb and the pastorals)
Corpus Johanneum	128,262	
Catholic Epistles	38,243	(excl. Heb)
Entire New Testament	679,289	