

CANONIZING PAUL: ANCIENT EDITORIAL PRACTICE AND THE *CORPUS
PAULINUM*

Eric W. Scherbenske

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the
Department of Religious Studies.

Chapel Hill
2009

Approved by:

Bart D. Ehrman

Michael W. Holmes

Joel Marcus

David C. Parker

Zlatko Pleše

© 2009
Eric W. Scherbenske
All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

ERIC W. SCHERBENSKE: Canonizing Paul: Ancient Editorial Practice and the *Corpus Paulinum*
(Under the direction of Bart D. Ehrman)

This dissertation investigates the use of the *Corpus Paulinum* as a vehicle for transmitting interpretation of Paul's letters. By utilizing practices developed in antiquity for the preparation of an author's corpus, such interpretation was conveyed via three main channels: the text and contents of a corpus along with ancillary materials to this corpus. Among the three iterations of Paul's corpus studied here, one (Marcion's edition) derives from the second century and two from the late fourth to sixth century (the edition created by a certain Euthalius and the Vulgate revision of the Latin versions, codified respectively in the sixth century manuscripts Codex Coislinianus and Codex Fuldensis). These collections illustrate the ways in which interpretations of what constituted authentic Pauline doctrine affected, on multiple levels, the shape of the corpus itself. This issue of authenticity structured activities from textual correction or emendation to the selection and arrangement of Paul's letters included in his corpus. In addition to framing the text and contents of his corpus in light of their hermeneutic, Marcion, Euthalius, and numerous editors of Latin editions of Paul's letters also deployed ancillary materials before and around the text (e.g. prologues, introductions, chapter headings, and biographies of Paul), through which their interpretations were explicitly transmitted. While ancillary materials became increasingly deployed for shaping interpretation,

textual alteration for the same purpose diminished. This deployment of ancillary materials underscores a shift away from textual manipulation in earlier editions of Paul's letters to introduction as a mode of shaping interpretation in the later editions investigated in this study. Not merely transmitters of the text, editions of Paul's writings incorporated interpretations that were codified both in the text and in paratexts situated before and alongside the text. This dissertation thus opens up new avenues for exploring the role of manuscripts in transmitting interpretation beyond textual corruption to other facets such as the selection, arrangement, and introduction of Paul's letters.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In the course of completing this dissertation I have benefited from the generosity of many. I must express my deep gratitude to my adviser Bart Ehrman; he assiduously read numerous versions of this dissertation and offered invaluable criticism and unflagging support throughout my study at the University of North Carolina and the completion of this work. Thanks are also due to Michael Holmes, Joel Marcus, David Parker, and Zlatko Pleše, who graciously served on my dissertation committee and offered many helpful criticisms. Special thanks must be tendered to Elizabeth Clark at Duke University, who read chapter 5 and offered helpful suggestions and criticism; in this instance and throughout my study at the University of North Carolina, she has provided generous support of my work. The Christianity in Antiquity reading group, comprised of faculty and fellow students at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and Duke University, read and commented on numerous versions and revisions of portions of this dissertation; I benefited greatly from their insightful and penetrating comments. I must also thank Gerda Lobe-Röder at Hochschul- und Landesbibliothek in Fulda, who without hesitation supplied me with a microfilm of Codex Fuldensis. Finally I thank those closest to me: my parents, Nick and Rita Scherbenske for their constant support and encouragement; and Supritha Rajan, my other reader.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS.....	viii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. THE MAKING OF AN EDITION IN ANTIQUITY.....	19
Introduction.....	19
The Text of an Edition.....	20
The Contents of an Edition.....	73
Paratexts Ancillary to an Edition.....	100
Conclusion.....	129
III. MARCIONITE (PRE)TEXTS AND THE <i>CORPUS PAULINUM</i>	132
Introduction.....	132
Marcion's Paratexts.....	134
Marcion and the Text of the <i>Corpus Paulinum</i>	196
Conclusion.....	242
IV. THE EUTHALIAN EDITION OF THE <i>CORPUS PAULINUM</i>	246
Introduction.....	246
The Euthalian Edition of the <i>Corpus Paulinum: Status Quaestionis</i>	248
Euthalian Paratexts.....	259
The Euthalian Text.....	302

Conclusion.....	347
V. CODEX FULDENSIS AND THE <i>CORPUS PAULINUM</i>	350
Introduction.....	350
The Vulgate Revision of the <i>Corpus Paulinum: Status Quaestionis</i>	359
Paratexts and Editorial Hermeneutics in Codex Fuldensis.....	368
The Vulgate Text, Codex Fuldensis, and Editorial Hermeneutics.....	415
Conclusion.....	453
VI. CONCLUSION.....	457
APPENDICES.....	463
REFERENCES.....	467

ABBREVIATIONS

<i>ACO</i>	<i>Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum</i> (Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, 1922–)
<i>AJP</i>	<i>American Journal of Philology</i>
<i>BAG</i>	<i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament</i> , eds. W. Bauer, W. Arndt, and F. W. Gingrich (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979)
<i>CQ</i>	<i>Classical Quarterly</i>
<i>CCSL</i>	<i>Corpus Christianorum</i> , Series Latina (Turnout: Brepols, 1953–)
<i>CSCO</i>	<i>Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium</i> (Louvain: Peeters, 1903–)
<i>CMG</i>	<i>Corpus Medicorum Graecorum</i> (Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1908–)
<i>CLA</i>	<i>Codices Latini Antiquiores; A Palaeographical Guide to Latin Manuscripts Prior to the Ninth Century</i> , ed. Elias Avery Lowe (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1934-1966)
<i>CSEL</i>	<i>Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum</i> (Vienna: C. Gerodi, etc., 1866–)
<i>DS</i>	<i>Dictionnaire de Spiritualité, Ascétique et Mystique, Doctrine et Histoire</i> (Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne, 1932–)
<i>GCS</i>	<i>Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte</i> (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1899–)
<i>GRBS</i>	<i>Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies</i>
<i>Greek Grammar</i>	Herbert Weir Smyth, <i>Greek Grammar</i> (Harvard University Press, 1920 [rev. ed. 1956])
Lampe	<i>A Patristic Greek Lexicon</i> , ed. G. W. H. Lampe (Oxford: Clarendon, 1961)
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
Lewis-Short	<i>Latin Dictionary</i> , eds. C. T. Lewis and C. Short (Oxford: Clarendon, 1956)

<i>LSJ</i>	<i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> , eds. H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, and H. Stuart Jones (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968)
<i>OCD</i>	<i>Oxford Classical Dictionary</i> , rev. 3 rd ed., eds. S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2003)
<i>OLD</i>	<i>Oxford Latin Dictionary</i> , ed. P. G. W. Glare (Oxford: Clarendon, 1982)
<i>NA</i> ²⁷	<i>Novum Testamentum Graece</i> , 27 th ed. rev., eds. Eberhard Nestle and Kurt Aland et al (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993)
<i>PG</i>	<i>Patrologia Graeca</i> , ed. J. P. Migne (Paris: Migne, 1857-1866)
<i>PL</i>	<i>Patrologia Latina</i> , ed. J. P. Migne (Paris: Migne, 1844-1865)
<i>RAC</i>	<i>Reallexicon für Antike und Christentum</i> (Stuttgart: Hiersemann Verlag, 1950–)
<i>RE</i>	<i>Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Alterthumswissenschaft</i> (Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 1893)
<i>REG</i>	<i>Revue des études grecques</i>
<i>RhM</i>	<i>Rheinisches Museum für Philologie</i>
<i>SC</i>	<i>Sources Chrétiennes</i> (Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1943–)
<i>TAPA</i>	<i>Transactions of the American Philological Association</i>
<i>TU</i>	<i>Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des altchristlichen Literatur</i> (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1883–)
<i>VL</i>	<i>Vetus Latina: Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel</i> , ed. E. Beuron (Freiburg: Herder, 1949–).
<i>ZNW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde des Urchristentums</i>
<i>ZPE</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphie</i>

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

At the beginning of the fifth century, the reviser of the Latin versions of the *Corpus Paulinum* composed a prologue introducing what became known as the Vulgate.¹ In the following apology from this prologue, he defends the status of Hebrews as an authentic Pauline epistle:

Some men, however, contend that the letter, which is written to the Hebrews, is not Paul's, for the reason that it is not entitled with his name, and due to the discrepancy of word and style ... To these it is necessary to respond: if therefore it is not Paul's because it does not have his name, it is not anybody's because it is entitled with no name. But if this is absurd, that which shines with such eloquence of his own doctrine, ought all the more to be believed to be his. But, since among the assemblies of the Hebrews by false suspicion he was thought of as a destroyer of the law, he wished to narrate the relationship of the example of the law and the truth of Christ without mentioning his name, lest the hatred of his name displayed in front exclude the utility of the reading.²

This passage encapsulates a fundamental issue in fashioning editions of the *Corpus Paulinum* explored in this study: the effect of interpretive concerns on editorial judgments of authenticity prefaced in an introductory text. The argument that Hebrews represents an authentic Pauline epistle due to coherence of “word,” “style,” and

¹ For a full discussion of the authorship of this prologue and the Vulgate revision of the *Corpus Paulinum*, see chapter 5.

² Epistolam sane quae ad Hebraeos scribitur quidam Pauli non esse contendunt, eo quod non sit eius nomine titulata, et propter sermonis stilique distantiam ... Quibus respondendum est: si propterea Pauli non erit quia eius non habet nomen, ergo nec alicuius erit quia nullius nomine titulatur: quod si absurdum est, ipsius magis esse credenda est quae tanto doctrinae suae fulget eloquio; sed quoniam apud Hebraeorum ecclesias quasi destructor legis falsa suspitione habebatur, uoluit tacito nomine de figuris legis et ueritate Christi reddere rationem, ne odium nominis fronte praelati utilitatem excluderet lectionis (John Wordsworth and H. J. White, eds., *Nouum Testamentum Latine, Editio Maior: Pars Secunda—Epistulae Paulinae* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1913-1941], 1-5).

“doctrine” demands a tacit agreement on what constituted Pauline authenticity and operates on an implicit assumption that Paul can and ought to be interpreted from Paul. In order to interpret Paul from Paul, however, the exegete requires a coherent and consistent image of Paul: who he was; what he did; what he wrote; and what teachings he left in these writings. This prologue to the Vulgate revision of the *Corpus Paulinum* supplied one such image of Paul and Pauline teachings; according to this introductory text, although Paul’s purported antagonism to the law was unfounded, his reputation compelled him to circulate Hebrews without his name lest the teaching that Christ fulfilled the law in this writing be neglected. In this way, problems resulting from a text without ascription, differences in vocabulary, and discrepancy of style were overcome by appealing to the coherence of “doctrine” in his corpus—a doctrine which, according to this prologue, eloquently shines forth from Hebrews. The coherence of Paul’s doctrine—evident in its effulgence—both informed this image of Paul as one who did not seek to destroy the law and provided a key proof for arguing that Hebrews was authentic.

In the early Church, however, there was much disagreement not only on the issue of Paul’s relationship to the law (and his teachings more generally), but also on the authenticity of the scriptures upon which such an image was based, as Tertullian succinctly confirms: “I say mine is true: Marcion his. I assert that Marcion’s is false: Marcion mine.”³ Such disagreements extended from the authenticity of epistles like

³ Ego meum dico uerum, Marcion suum; ego Marcionis adfirmo adulteratum, Marcion meum (*Marc.* 4.4.1 [CCSL 1 549,23-24]). Although specifically written in reference to the Gospel of Luke, Tertullian’s claim to faithfulness and authenticity of his tradition in contrast to Marcion’s in this statement applies equally to their respective collections of Paul and succinctly illustrates how battles for authentic interpretations of Christianity involved attacks on the authenticity of opponents’ scriptural corpus.

Hebrews or the Pastorals to the words of these epistles, and their interpretations.⁴ Since editions of Paul's letters were the very tradents of Pauline traditions, they figured prominently in such disputes.

This study investigates the ways in which editions of the *Corpus Paulinum* were shaped by, and in turn shaped, these traditions and interpretations. I argue that not only do the editions investigated here instantiate struggles over Pauline interpretation, they were themselves products of interpretation. To demonstrate this thesis, I will analyze the ways in which the *Corpus Paulinum* was fashioned in accordance with ancient editorial practices ranging from editing and prefacing the text to selecting and rearranging the contents of the corpus. By investigating how these practices and interpretive concerns left their mark on specific instantiations of the *Corpus Paulinum*, I argue that editorial practices and hermeneutics were deeply, sometimes inextricably, intertwined.

In order to assess the processes by which early Christians employed editorial practices on Paul's corpus, it is necessary to consider more broadly the range of options used in antiquity. For this reason, the second chapter entails a survey of the myriad practices employed in fashioning corpora of pagan authors in antiquity. This overview coalesces around three main editorial rubrics: the text of a corpus, the contents of a corpus, and the paratexts affixed to a corpus.

With respect to the editorial practices on the text, I will investigate by what authority and under what auspices textual alterations were made. To what extent could an editor, corrector, or scribe alter the text? To be sure, the work of editors, correctors, and scribes were quite distinct. By grouping them together in this study I do not intend to

⁴ For an overview of such disagreements regarding Pauline authenticity and interpretation, see Elaine Pagels, *The Gnostic Paul: Gnostic Exegesis of the Pauline Letters* (Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1975), esp. 1-10.

conflate them or imply that their diverse practices were of the same order or magnitude in terms of their impact on a text. Yet at the same time, I maintain that we are to some extent justified in viewing these diverse textual practices less as discrete activities than as interrelated textual practices existing on a continuum. Two fundamental factors warrant placing these diverse textual practices under such a broad rubric: 1) the instability of ancient textual transmission; and 2) the importance of an idea of authorial authenticity upon which textual practices were dependent. Building on arguments advanced by Rudolf Blum and Gregory Nagy, I argue in this section that there is a very fine, often imperceptible, line between an edition or publication (ἔκδοσις) of the text and its correction (διόρθωσις).⁵ Due to the lack of institutional control and vagaries of ancient book production and transmission, every correction was to some extent a new edition.⁶ Furthermore, both the ἔκδοσις and διόρθωσις of a text or corpus were indebted to the interpretive framework and image of what constituted an author's authentic text, an image which guided the editor, corrector, or scribe in following the exemplar, correcting from another MS, or suggesting an emendation instead. Although textual transcription, correction, and emendation depended on the hermeneutic of the reviser, there were limits to textual manipulation. Galen (ca. 129-199/216 C.E.), in particular, offers illuminating insights into the threshold of textual revision (διασκευή) in his assertion that revisions cannot exceed a work's *hypothesis*. Yet even this restriction on textual emendation remains problematic, since ultimately Galen's statement also runs up against

⁵ Rudolf Blum, *Kallimachos: The Alexandrian Library and the Origins of Bibliography*. Translated by Hans H. Wellisch. (Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991), 65 note 10; and Gregory Nagy, *Poetry as Performance: Homer and Beyond* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 115-116.

⁶ The GraecaUBS font used to print this work is available from Linguist's Software, Inc., PO Box 580, Edmonds, WA 98020-0580 USA tel (425) 775-1130 www.linguistsoftware.com.

hermeneutics informed by an image of authenticity; for what constitutes the *hypothesis* may vary from interpreter to interpreter. In sum, I argue that the interpretive image of the author and its interrelationship with textual authenticity remains fundamental for textual transcription, correction, and revision.

In terms of the contents of a corpus, we observe the same issues of authenticity writ large. Whereas the editorial image and interpretation of the author validated and was in turn validated by the authenticity of the specific words of the text, this same dynamic holds for the authenticity of entire tracts in an edition. The inclusion of a work among the writings of a corpus validates it as authentic. If readers harbor doubts about a work's authenticity, such inclusion can alleviate them and may well rehabilitate the work altogether; conversely, its exclusion may cast doubt on its authentic status and marginalize it. The placement of a work within a corpus may also reflect issues of authenticity and marginalization; we see in chapter 2 that disputed or inauthentic works were often segregated at the end of editions. More often though, editors deployed ordering patterns so as to facilitate learning by isagogically leading neophytes from rudimentary to advanced instruction.

The final section of chapter 2 addresses those ancillary materials, or paratexts, with which editors prefaced, abridged, and organized the text, thus mediating the encounter between the reader and the text.⁷ Ancient editions were replete with front matter and marginalia composed to introduce the reader to an author's thought and orient

⁷ The term paratext comes from Gérard Genette's theorizations about all types of ancillary materials that act as mediators of interpretation (*Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation* [trans. Jane Lewin; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997]). While I do not necessarily subscribe to Genette's theory in every detail, the concept of paratext succinctly conveys my understandings of such ancillary texts in early Christianity. For further discussion of paratextuality as embodiments of a range of traditions, editions, and contexts that impinge upon the "text," see Robert A. Kraft, "Para-mania: Beside, Before and Beyond Bible Studies," *JBL* 126, no. 1 (2007): 5-27.

them in his/her oeuvre: e.g. prefatory and marginal works such as *bioi*, prologues, *hypotheses (argumenta)*, and *kephalaia (capitula)*. These paratexts contained all manner of information from simple summaries of the author's life and teachings, to detailed series of prolegomenal topics and précis of the corpus's contents. In addition to guiding the reader into the edition, these compositions also functioned as the primary locus for transmitting the editor's hermeneutic. Quite often, it was here where the reader encountered the editor's image of the author, as well as justifications of authenticity and textual practices. These ancient paratexts then acted as liminal mediators between the text and reader, systematizing, synthesizing, and transmitting an editor's hermeneutic.

Method and Subject-matter

This study investigates early collections of Paul's letters in light of the problematization of the boundaries between edition (ἐκδοσις), revision (διασκευή), and correction (διόρθωσις) outlined in chapter 2. I have defined collection broadly, since it allows for a thorough exploration of the ways in which Paul was collected and edited. When possible I have chosen specific MSS that embody the specific edition of Paul's letters under discussion: so, for example, I analyze Codex Coislinianus and Codex Fuldensis as representatives of the Euthalian and Vulgate revisions respectively. The exception to this focus on specific MSS is Marcion's edition discussed in chapter 3, which I felt warranted inclusion despite the fact that this edition has not been preserved.

By focusing on specific editions or (when possible) individual MSS as embodiments of editorial work, I envision this work as incorporating two trends in recent NT text-critical scholarship: the focus on variant readings as a window for reconstructing

social history; and the importance of MSS themselves as tradents of the text of the NT and this history. In the discipline of NT textual criticism, there has been a renewed emphasis on the importance of the individual variant reading as a site wherein interpretations of the text have been transmitted diachronically. Rather than viewing the mass of variants as obstacles to be surmounted in the search for the original reading of the NT text, the variants have increasingly been conscripted to provide insight into this history of interpretation. Most recently, Bart Ehrman reinvigorated this line of inquiry in a study of textual variants, which, he argued, emerged out of Christological controversies in the early church: quite often scribal corruptions of the text function to oppose heterodox understandings of Christ such as adoptionist, docetic, and separationist, to name just a few.⁸ Others have taken up similar lines of inquiry: Wayne Kannaday focused on variants from the gospels that show evidence of alteration due to apologetic concerns;⁹ Kim Haines-Eitzen located the actual transmitters of variants (i.e. the scribes) in the early church amidst private social networks, who, as producers and users of scripture, exercised considerable power over the text and its transmission.¹⁰

Although these recent books have brought the importance of the variant for reconstructing social history to the forefront of NT scholarship, these concerns were not completely new to the discipline of NT textual criticism. Eldon Epp presaged this turn to corruptions as indicative of theological proclivity in a monograph wherein he

⁸ Bart D. Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993). For the importance of the variant reading more broadly, see Bernard Cerquiglini, *In Praise of the Variant: A Critical History of Philology* (trans. Betsy Wing; Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999).

⁹ Wayne Campbell Kannaday, *Apologetic Discourse and the Scribal Tradition: Evidence of the Influence of Apologetic Interests on the Text of the Canonical Gospels* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004).

¹⁰ Kim Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians of Letters: Literacy, Power, and the Transmitters of Early Christian Literature* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000).

demonstrated an anti-Judaic tendency in the text of Codex Bezae.¹¹ An even earlier nineteenth-century antecedent can be found in J. Rendel Harris's study, in which he argues that the "Western" text of Codex Bezae (especially in Acts) was influenced by Montanist thought.¹²

Alongside this disciplinary shift to viewing variants as windows to social history, recent studies have begun to stress the importance of the material aspects of early Christian MSS themselves. David Parker, articulating the importance of this shift most forcefully, writes: "the individual text must be taken seriously as a physical object...I am impatient of a textual criticism that discusses variant readings but not the scribes who made them, textual history but not the manuscripts in which it is contained."¹³ In this understanding, MSS are not just transmitters of "texts" of writings that made it into the NT, but physical objects produced and used by early Christians. As such, MSS are not only worthy of study as transmitters of the tradition; MSS embody the tradition. As Parker succinctly puts it elsewhere, "[m]anuscripts do not carry a tradition. They are that tradition, for the text has no existence apart from those copies in which it exists."¹⁴ Parker's work on the Codex Bezae, wherein he traces the traditions embodied in this MS, its production around 400 C.E. in a community of Latin speakers in Berytus, and its

¹¹ Eldon Jay Epp, *The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966).

¹² J. Rendel Harris, *Codex Bezae: A Study of the So-called Western Text of the New Testament* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1891), cf. esp. 191-225.

¹³ D. C. Parker, *Codex Bezae: An Early Christian Manuscript and its Text* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 2.

¹⁴ D. C. Parker, *The Living Text of the Gospels* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 209-10.

afterlife, exemplifies this shift to the physical realia of the NT textual tradition.¹⁵

Numerous other studies have focused on the physical MS from detailed analysis of specific MSS and their texts,¹⁶ to the continued stress on importance of the physical MSS of early Christian texts and their contexts as suitable objects of study in their own right.¹⁷ This trend represents a movement away from the *Text* as a disembodied tradition to *texts* embodied in MSS. Early Christian MSS, embedded in the historical time and place of their production, ought to be studied in their own right and may well yield insights, heretofore unimagined, into early Christian history, beyond the text transmitted and its relationship to text-types.¹⁸ Insofar as text critics ignore the very physical aspects of the transmission of the NT text, they risk overlooking the very quotidian and tangible effects of scripture in early Christianity and the rich social history such analysis affords.

I see my work as a continuation of this paradigm shift to explorations of the variant and the MS in the discipline of NT textual criticism in three important ways: 1) I set my discussion of textual variants against the backdrop of ancient theorizations of textual alteration; 2) I investigate the deployment of paratextual materials in editions of

¹⁵ Parker, *Codex Bezae*, esp. 279-86.

¹⁶ Amy S. Anderson, *The Textual Tradition of the Gospels: Family I in Matthew* (Leiden: Brill, 2004); Dirk Jongkind, *Scribal Habits of Codex Sinaiticus* (Piscataway, N.J.: Gorgias Press, 2007); and James Ronald Royse, *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri* (Leiden: Brill, 2008).

¹⁷ Eldon Jay Epp, "The Oxyrhynchus New Testament Papyri: "Not Without Honor Except in Their Hometown"?", *JBL* 123, no. 1 (2004): 5-55; Thomas J. Kraus and Tobias Nicklas, *New Testament Manuscripts: their Texts and their World* (Leiden: Brill, 2006); Larry W. Hurtado, *The Earliest Christian Artifacts: Manuscripts and Christian Origins* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2006); and Thomas J. Kraus, *Ad fontes: Original Manuscripts and their Significance for Studying Early Christianity; Selected Essays* (Leiden: Brill, 2007).

¹⁸ The attention to the physical aspects of early Christian MSS also offers a necessary corrective to the Alands's indictment that "New Testament textual criticism has traditionally neglected the findings of early Church history, but only to its own injury, because the transmission of the New Testament text is certainly an integral part of that history" (*The Text of the New Testament* [trans. Erroll F. Rhodes; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987], 49).

Paul—an aspect of ancient MSS which, with the exception of the occasional study, has been sorely neglected;¹⁹ and 3) where possible I ground the study of these editions of texts and paratexts in specific MSS, since the best way to trace the impact of editorial practices on the *Corpus Paulinum* in all their manifold ways is to investigate how they are deployed in specific editions.

Chapter Summaries

In chapters 2 through 4 I investigate three different instantiations of the *Corpus Paulinum*. In keeping with the significance of the physical aspects of these editions, I focus on specific MSS of Paul's letters; the lone exception is chapter 3, wherein I study Marcion's edition of Paul's letters, which unfortunately is no longer extant. The MSS selected do not necessarily represent the most important editions of Paul's letters in terms of their text, nor in terms of theological perspectives represented. Rather, these have been chosen simply for their utility for investigating all manner of questions regarding textual corruptions and, where possible, relationships to paratextual materials. Codex Fuldensis and Codex Coislinianus represent obvious choices, since they are among the earliest

¹⁹ A notable exception is the recent book by David Trobisch (*The First Edition of the New Testament* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000]). Although Trobisch's attempt to incorporate all manner of evidence from paratextual materials such as titles to textual details should be commended, I disagree with Trobisch's interpretations and conclusions about the emergence of a canonical form of the NT in the second century. Besides being far less sanguine about the unity and uniformity of early Christian collections of books, my study approaches the collection and preparation of editions in early Christianity with a fundamentally different understanding of the importance of the issue of authenticity. I maintain that authenticity stands firmly at the center of editorial issues encompassing both collection and correction; Trobisch (147 note 8) declines to address the problem of authenticity, which, I think, is a, if not *the*, fundamental issue for discussions of editorial practice. For a critical evaluation of Trobisch's book, see D. C. Parker, "Review of David Trobisch, *The First Edition of the New Testament*," *JTS* N.S. 53, no. 1 (2002): 298-305. Also noteworthy are Nils Dahl's works on various early Christian paratextual materials, which we will have opportunity to discuss later ("The Origin of the Earliest Prologues to the Pauline Letters," *Semeia* 12 (1978): 233-77; and "The 'Euthalian Apparatus' and the Affiliated 'Argumenta' " in *Studies in Ephesians: Introductory Questions, Text- & Edition-Critical Issues, Interpretation of Texts and Themes* [eds. David Hellholm, et al.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000]).

extant MSS that transmit the Latin Vulgate revision and Euthalian edition of the *Corpus Paulinum* respectively; additionally, both of these MSS also preserve extensive paratextual apparatuses full of promising material for analysis. The lack of physical evidence for Marcion's edition notwithstanding, the inclusion of this edition among those studied here was also a natural choice for three reasons: first, whether or not Marcion was the first to collect a canon of scripture,²⁰ he definitely appears to have been the first to employ paratextual materials (i.e. the *Antitheses*) designed to ensure a proper reading of his collection of the *Evangelion* and *Apostolikon*; second, whether or not Marcion was the first to collect and edit Paul,²¹ he definitely represents one of the earliest witnesses to the *Corpus Paulinum*; third, some of the paratextual materials attributed to Marcion (the so-called Marcionite prologues) have been preserved in the Latin tradition (most notably Codex Fuldensis, the subject of chapter 5). For these reasons, I deemed the inclusion of Marcion to be warranted, despite the lack of physical evidence for analysis. Finally, let me stress that these editions of the *Corpus Paulinum* merely represent points of crystallization useful for investigating the role of editorial practices in fashioning these editions: e.g. transcribing, correcting, or emending the text; issuing judgments on the authenticity of word and tract; rearranging the corpus; and furnishing the corpus with paratextual apparatuses.

In chapter 3 on Marcion's edition of Paul's letters, I examine the interrelationship between the text of Marcion's *Apostolikon* and his paratexts, i.e. the *Antitheses* and the

²⁰ For an overview of arguments for Marcion's place in the process of canonization, see Bruce Manning Metzger, *The Canon of the New Testament: Its Origin, Development, and Significance* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), 90-99.

²¹ For a proponent of this not-widely accepted view, see Walter Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity* (ed. Robert A. Kraft; trans. Philadelphia Seminar on Christian Origins; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971 [1996 Sigler Press reprint]) 221-24.

so-called Marcionite prologues. I argue that, based on the salient features that can be culled from references to Marcion's *Antitheses*, this work corresponds to the ancient isagogic genre designed both to lead initiates into a proper Marcionite interpretation of his canon and to fortify believers in the Marcionite tenets of the faith. This isagogic work highlights fundamental principles of the Marcionite faith (cf. e.g. the contrast between the creator and Christ, the concomitant rejection of the Hebrew Bible, and Paul's opposition to the "false apostles"), essentially shaping the interpretation of the following texts before they are even encountered.

Another group of paratexts often associated with Marcion are the so-called Marcionite prologues. Although recent studies have called into question the Marcionite origin of these short summaries to Paul's letters transmitted in Latin MSS,²² I argue that the evidence for rejecting this connection to Marcion is unpersuasive; rather, the identification of Marcion, or his followers, as the source of these paratexts continues to offer the most historically compelling reconstruction of the evidence.²³ These short paratexts, prefaced to Paul's letters, consistently preface a proper Marcionite interpretation of Paul; in so doing, these paratexts implicitly underscore the issue of authentic Pauline doctrine. Part of the original arguments for linking these prologues to Marcionite circles was the order of Paul's letters in the edition to which they were prefaced—an order corresponding to Marcion's. I argue that the order of Marcion's edition, in which Galatians occupies first place because of the condemnation of the law and Paul's separation from the false apostles found therein, goes hand in hand with the

²² Most influential has been that by Dahl ("Earliest Prologues"). For a full discussion see chapter 3.

²³ See Donatien de Bruyne, "Prologues bibliques d'origine marcionite," *Revue Bénédictine* 24 (1907): 1-16; and Peter Corssen, "Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte des Römerbriefes," *ZNW* 10 (1909): 1-45; 97-102.

deployment of paratextual materials so as to underscore consistently Paul's opposition to the law and those apostles perverting the gospel.

Since recent studies have analyzed the text of Marcion's *Apostolikon* with great methodological rigor, rather than reconstructing Marcion's text, I am able to focus on specific variants that are particularly noteworthy for teasing out the interplay between Marcion's text and paratexts.²⁴ I demonstrate that the composition of the *Antitheses* as an isagogic text to be read before his editions of Luke and Paul and introducing Paul's letters with prefatory *argumenta* had two important and interrelated effects on the transmission of Marcion's text of Paul's letters. First, the paratexts functioned to introduce the principles by which Marcion edited the text; by isolating the rejection of the law and Hebrew Bible and calling attention to the false apostles, who had corrupted the gospel and Paul's letters, Marcion offered justification for "correcting" the text in accordance with his hermeneutic. Second, not only did these paratexts communicate justifications for text-critical practices, they also introduced interpretations of the text under key Marcionite rubrics and themes. In doing so, the paratexts endeavored to convince readers of the proper Marcionite interpretation, irrespective of any textual corruption or correction. In sum, the texts and paratexts of Marcion's edition reinforced one another, acting in concert to transmit Marcion's hermeneutic and its justification.

Chapters 3 and 4 transition from Marcion's edition produced in the second century to those produced around the end of the fourth or beginning of the fifth. This

²⁴ John James Clabeaux, *A Lost Edition of the Letters of Paul: A Reassessment of the Text of the Pauline Corpus attested by Marcion* (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1989); and Ulrich Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos: Rekonstruktion und historische Einordnung der marcionitischen Paulusbriefausgabe* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995). Less recent, but no less important, is Adolf von Harnack's seminal work, *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott, eine Monographie zur Geschichte der Grundlegung der katholischen Kirche* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1924).

chronological shift accompanies a marked increase in the deployment of paratextual materials for these editions. In creating these editions, the editors took full advantage of the interpretive possibilities presented by prologues and other introductory genres. The MSS incorporating these editions also bear the weight of previous editorial traditions. Hence, for example, Codex Fuldensis, the subject of chapter 5, codifies numerous and disparate editorial enterprises alongside the Vulgate revision and evidences the persistence of earlier editorial traditions transmitted in early Christian MSS.

Chapter 4 investigates the Euthalian edition, which has received relatively short shrift in recent scholarship, even though it represents one of the most sophisticated editions of Paul's letters in terms of its paratextual apparatus.²⁵ Although numerous paratexts have been associated with the Euthalian edition, some of them (e.g. the individual *hypotheses* to each of Paul's letters) have long been recognized as spurious. In contrast to Marcion's edition discussed in chapter 3, we have a description of the scope and purpose of the Euthalian edition of Paul's letters from the pen of its creator. Such information allows us to ascertain not only the authenticity of various materials associated with this edition, but also how this particular editor envisioned his work. Our investigation into the Euthaliana shows how an editor's goals serve to structure an entire edition, from the deployment of numerous paratexts to the physical layout of the text.

Many significant features of prolegomena outlined in chapter 2 are prominent in the Euthalian edition. In addition to the deployment of prologues, *kephalaia*, and other paratextual materials, Euthalius articulates their function in ways analogous to other ancient prolegomena. We see in the prologue, for example, a concern for catechetical

²⁵ Since Charles Willard's dissertation on the Euthalian edition ("A Critical Study of the Euthalian Apparatus" [Ph.D. Dissertation, Yale, 1970]), there have been very few investigations of the Euthaliana. For a full overview and bibliography, see chapter 4.

instruction of neophytes and moral exhortation of adepts, which Euthalius places as the most important goal for his edition. From the organization of the letters in this corpus to the inclusion of a *bios* of Paul as an example of Christian virtue, Euthalius constructs a pedagogical role for his edition; this pedagogical goal even extends to the arrangement of the text in rough colometric fashion so as to facilitate reading and comprehension of the text. Codex Coislinianus (H^P, 015), despite its lacunose state, demonstrates how this editorial telos took root in the physical MSS of Euthalius's edition. In this MS, for example, we see virtue and vice highlighted by paratextual networks and by the text displayed on the page so as to inculcate a new Christian polity, encompassing not only an explicit personal and communal virtue, but also implicitly embracing a Christian hermeneutical hegemony advanced through the very pages of scripture.

The fourth and final chapter takes the Vulgate revision of Paul's letters transmitted in the Latin MS Codex Fuldensis (F) as its object. This edition consisted of the *Primum Quaeritur* prologue cited above, accompanied by a textual revision of the Latin version of Paul's letters. The embodiment of the Vulgate revision in this MS offers a fitting culmination of investigations into editions of Paul's letters. Since the Vulgate prologue and revision are codified in the same MS alongside other paratexts such as the Marcionite prologues, this investigation opens up new vistas for exploring various dynamic textual and paratextual interrelationships—not only between an edition's text and paratexts, but also between a later edition and the paratextual remnants of previous editions, which sometimes convey drastically opposing interpretive stances.

Like the paratexts to the Euthalian edition, the *Primum Quaeritur* prologue emphasizes typical features of prolegomena, some of which were not addressed in that

edition. The issue of authenticity of the tract of Hebrews discussed in the opening quotation represents one such example. With respect to prefacing interpretive issues, this prologue explicitly figures Paul as a new Moses and Paul's ten community letters as Moses' Decalogue; this position not only undercuts any interpretation that could be culled from the Marcionite prologues, it also, I argue, squares well with the high estimation of exempla (especially models of righteousness in the Old Testament) in keeping with the nascent Pelagianism associated with the author of this revision, Rufinus of Syria. Such evidence demonstrates the overt hermeneutical role of the *Primum Quaeritur* and paratexts more generally.

Chapter 5 also elucidates the difficulties associated with the publication of an edition in the late fourth/early fifth century, especially when having to contend with numerous earlier editions of texts and paratexts previously issued. We see evidence of this problem most clearly in the contents of Codex Fuldensis, which transmits the Vulgate textual revision of Paul's letters and its *Primum Quaeritur* prologue alongside numerous other paratexts such as the Marcionite prologues, Old Latin *capitula*, *capitula* drawn from the Euthalian edition, and sundry other paratexts. The blatant hermeneutical tensions between these various paratexts testify to the physical MS as a locus of authority, over which many early Christians through editorial practices were trying to gain interpretive control, if not by altering the text, then by furnishing paratexts. These earlier editorial products are juxtaposed with one another in Codex Fuldensis and are also ultimately subsumed under Victor of Capua's ecumenical inclusivity.

While I envision this study as firmly situated within the discipline of NT textual criticism, my method and approach, predicated on the importance of situating early

Christian textual practices in their intellectual, cultural, and social context, necessitates my foray into the discipline of classical studies. My goals in doing so, however, are modest; I do not presume or imagine that my survey of Greco-Roman editorial practices presented in chapter 2 represents anything resembling “a definitive synthetic presentation” of editorial methods and techniques in antiquity.²⁶ My exploration of the modes by which editors fashioned corpora in light of their hermeneutical concerns in antiquity is merely heuristic and designed to illuminate how these prevalent modes were adopted and adapted for use on the *Corpus Paulinum* by early Christian editors, correctors, or scribes. Yet I hope that this overview will provide further impetus for scholars of early Christianity to continue investigating early Christian MSS within their larger intellectual and social context.

With respect to the fields of early Christianity and NT textual criticism, this study endeavors to stimulate further exploration on the physical aspects of early Christian MSS as material culture as well as repositories of texts and interpretations for social history. In three important and interrelated directions, I hope to facilitate discussion of the intersections of ancient editorial theory and practice in the physical MS: first, by exploring the auspices under which textual alterations are employed; second, by analyzing the justification and limits of such alterations. Both of these, I argue, were related to the image of the author (in this study, namely Paul), which guided the editor, corrector, or scribe in fashioning their edition—an image that quite often accompanied the text in

²⁶ Glenn W. Most, “Introduction,” in *Editing Texts = Texte edieren* (ed. Glenn W. Most; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998), x. Most says “the time is not yet ripe” for such a study; let me reiterate that this cursory investigation is just that. The conclusions of chapter 2 ought not to suggest otherwise. With respect to textual criticism and scholastic inquiry in antiquity more broadly, see Rudolf Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968); and James E. G. Zetzel, *Latin Textual Criticism in Antiquity* (New York: Arno Press, 1981).

paratexts. The correlative interrelationship between the text and paratexts brings me to the third direction: to widen the gaze of the NT textual critic to encompass not merely the text but the host of paratextual materials surrounding and prefacing the text, through which NT MSS transmit the hermeneutics of the editors, correctors, and scribes. By exploring the early Christian MS itself as a locus of authority, producing and reproducing hermeneutical hegemony over scripture, we may discover secrets hitherto unforeseen. The following study represents an attempt at one such investigation.

CHAPTER 2

THE MAKING OF AN EDITION IN ANTIQUITY

Some have suspected that this play is spurious, that it is not Euripides'. Rather it evinces a Sophoclean character. In the *Didaskalia*, however, it is listed as authentic. And moreover, the meddlesomeness in regards to the heavens in it testifies to Euripides. But there are two prologues. For this reason, Dichaearchus, setting out the *hypothesis* for Rhesus, writes word for word as follows, "the beginning of the one prologue has thus 'now the chariot of fire is moonlit' and in some of the copies there is even another prologue, exceedingly pedestrian and not befitting Euripides. Perhaps some of the actors have revised it."¹

Hypothesis to Euripides' *Rhesus*

I. Introduction

This prefatory *hypothesis* to Euripides' *Rhesus* unites the fundamental issues of this chapter and dissertation: authenticity, textual alteration, and paratextual interpretation. Disagreements over authenticity by previous readers compelled the composer of this *hypothesis* to fashion an image of the author in order to differentiate the authentic from the spurious in this play. The problems of authenticity extended beyond the style to a prologue evidently interpolated into some copies. This prologue, according to this *hypothesis*, presented indisputable evidence of inauthenticity and led to the conclusion that it had been interpolated by actors. While we will see in our discussion of dramatic corpora that such interpolations were not uncommon, what is important here is

¹ τοῦτο τὸ δράμα ἔνιοι νόθον ὑπενόησαν, Εὐριπίδου δὲ μὴ εἶναι· τὸν γὰρ Σοφόκλειον μᾶλλον ὑποφαίνειν χαρακτήρα. ἐν μέντοι ταῖς Διδασκαλίαις ὡς γνήσιον ἀναγράφεται. καὶ ἡ περὶ τὰ μετάρσια δὲ ἐν αὐτῷ πολυπραγμοσύνη τὸν Εὐριπίδην ὁμολογεῖ. πρόλογοι δὲ διττοὶ φέρονται. ὁ γοῦν Δικαίαρχος ἐκτιθεὶς τὴν ὑπόθεσιν τοῦ Ῥήσου γράφει κατὰ λέξιν οὕτως· <τοῦ ἑτέρου προλόγου ἢ ἀρχῆς ἔχει οὕτως> ἔνυν εὐσέληνον φέγγος ἢ διφρήλατος' καὶ ... ἐν ἐνίοις δὲ τῶν ἀντιγράφων ἕτερός τις φέρεται πρόλογος, πεζὸς πάνυ καὶ οὐ πρέπων Εὐριπίδῃ· καὶ τάχα ἂν τινες τῶν ὑποκριτῶν διεσκευακότες εἶεν αὐτόν (Eduard Schwartz, ed., *Scholia in Euripidem: Volumen II* [Berolini: G. Reimer, 1887], 324).

that the disagreement in style and integrity of the text was resolved by employing a paratext (i.e. the *hypothesis*) to deal with previous assignations of authenticity, justifications for the authorial construct, and the likely sources of textual corruption. The content of this *hypothesis* reveals that these prefatory materials conveyed more than just the subject (i.e. *hypothesis*) of the following literary work; they provided a venue nonpareil for resolving problems of textual instability or authenticity and for explicitly introducing hermeneutical issues—illuminating, yet typical, examples of the interplay between the text and paratext.

The following chapter offers an exploration of the many practices by which texts were altered, collected, and prefaced in antiquity. In order to isolate the practices which were utilized in the collection, transmission, and introduction of corpora, I will investigate corpora under these three rubrics: the text of an edition; the contents of an edition; paratexts ancillary to an edition. I maintain that the creation of corpora not only conveyed interpretations by transmitting and altering their text, selecting and arranging their content, and furnishing them with paratextual materials, but that the corpora themselves were products of interpretation.

II. The Text of an Edition

Scholars and authors in antiquity were well aware of the problem of dealing with texts and their instability in a manuscript culture. Any edition or copy of a text was subject to, and a product of, the errors of human transcription. An ancient text, if it was to be faithful to its exemplar and its author, had to be faithfully copied and corrected in order to counteract these errors. Crates of Pergamum even wrote a work entitled

Διορθωτικά, which apparently dealt with the problems of ancient textual criticism;² unfortunately, it has not survived the vicissitudes of time. In order to understand how scribes, correctors, and editors interacted with the text, we have to investigate the transmission of ancient texts themselves. In this section on ancient textual transmission, I focus on corpora from Homer to Hippocrates in order to investigate both the ways in which texts transmit interpretations of their producers and the limits of textual manipulation with respect to such interpretations.

A. *Corpus Homericum*

Homer's corpus represents the most obvious choice for embarking on a study of ancient editions of texts. In antiquity Homer and Homeric works were without peer—a point attested to not only by ancient writers but also reflected in the vast amounts of Homeric papyri that have been discovered.³ As a result of this veneration of the Homeric corpus in antiquity, these texts have a long and complicated history. My circumscribed investigation of the Homeric text will focus on three main questions: 1) how and under what auspices was the text changed; 2) by whom and for what reasons was the text altered;⁴ and 3) what effect did this editorial action have on the text transmitted? All three questions dovetail considerably and underscore the questions framing this chapter: how

² See Rudolf Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968) 237ff. In addition to Pfeiffer's study, for the development and transmission of scholastic practices see L. D. Reynolds and Nigel Guy Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature*, 3rd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991).

³ See Roger A. Pack, *The Greek and Latin Literary Texts from Greco-Roman Egypt* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1965). Or search for Homer in the Mertens-Pack³ Database available on the internet at <http://promethee.philo.ulg.ac.be/cedopal/index.htm> or the Leuven Database of Ancient Books also online at <http://www.trismegistos.org/ldab>.

⁴ Issues of intentionality are of course a vexed and complicated issue when attempting to isolate intentions behind any given reading. We can, however, discuss how ancient readers received the readings adopted as well as how they alter the tenor of the text.

was a text of an author, in this case Homer, prepared or altered for publication; and what were the underlying impulses that drove editorial work on the Homeric corpus?

Although the Homeric corpus had revered standing in ancient Greco-Roman society, attempts to correct and revise Homer were met with great ambivalence. Diogenes Laertius's anecdote about acquiring a trustworthy copy of Homer makes this apparent: "They also say that Aratus asked him [Timon] how he might acquire a trusty text of Homer's poetry; he said 'if you get ancient copies and not those already corrected.'"⁵ Rudolf Pfeiffer sees in this vignette a polemical reference to Zenodotus's text-critical work, which we will discuss shortly. Whether or not Timon was speaking with direct reference to Zenodotus, it is clear that he was aware of attempts to correct Homer and that nascent critical work on the Homeric text was not regarded as highly as the antiquity of an actual manuscript. Nevertheless, ancient scholarship on the text of Homer continued despite the criticism that manipulating such a revered text engendered.

Much earlier in the time of Pisistratus and his sons, Hippias and Hipparchus, in Athens (ca. sixth century B.C.E.), Homeric authorship and control of the Homeric text began to be extremely important for political purposes.⁶ There is considerable and ongoing debate concerning the exact nature of Pisistratid influence on the Homeric

⁵ Φασὶ δὲ καὶ Ἄρατον πυθέσθαι αὐτοῦ πῶς τὴν Ὀμήρου ποίησιν ἀσφαλῆ κτήσαιοτο, τὸν δὲ εἰπεῖν, 'εἰ τοῖς ἀρχαίοις ἀντιγράφοις ἐντυγχάνοι καὶ μὴ τοῖς ἤδη διορθωμένοις' (Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum* 9.113 [LCL 185 522]).

⁶ Modern disputes and understandings of the Homeric question—particularly with respect to issues of orality, and the transmission of oral traditions—are of no real consequence for this investigation. For more on these topics, see Albert Bates Lord, *Epic Singers and Oral Tradition* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991); Albert Bates Lord, *The Singer of Tales* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960); and Gregory Nagy, *Homeric Questions* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1996).

corpus.⁷ The earliest report about the correction or collection of an edition of the Homeric corpus in the time of the Pisistratids is found in Cicero;⁸ Cicero reports that Pisistratus was responsible for collecting the Homeric corpus,⁹ a report that has been variously interpreted by scholars. Pfeiffer dismissed the story as legendary and indebted to Ptolemaic book collecting practices.¹⁰ Although Pisistratus and his sons may not have created an edition of Homer as some scholars have thought, Nagy argues that they were instrumental in stabilizing the text of Homer so as to control and facilitate performance in the Panathenaea.¹¹ Nagy sees compelling evidence that they did indeed have some role in stabilizing the Homeric text, even if only insofar as collecting the texts of Homer into what he calls a “transcript.”¹² We will see that this concern to control the contours of a

⁷ For a discussion of the sources used to posit a Pisistratid version of the Homeric text, see Thomas W. Allen, *Homer: The Origins and the Transmission* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924), 225ff; and J. A. Davison, "Pisistratus and Homer," *TAPA* 86 (1955): 1-21. Davison remains unconvinced that Pisistratus had an active role in editing the Homeric corpus. Rather, he sees the reports of Athens's role as stemming from Megarian polemic.

⁸ *Quis doctor eisdem illis temporibus aut cuius eloquentia litteris instructor fuisse traditur quam Pisistrati? Qui primus Homeri libros confusos ante sic disposuisse dicitur ut nunc habemus* (*De oratore* 3.137 [LCL 348]). The editors and translators of Wolf's *Prolegomena* suggest that Cicero thought that “Pisistratus was the first to set in order papyrus rolls that contained Homer's poems, one roll to each book,” (Anthony Grafton, Glenn W. Most, and James E. G. Zetzel, eds., *F. A. Wolf: Prolegomena to Homer, 1795* [Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1985], 137 note b). Josephus, Plutarch, and Strabo also record this legend, although they may be drawing on Cicero or an earlier source and thus are not independent witnesses. For a recent discussion of various attributions of authorship and trustworthiness of the reports, see Jed Wyrick, *The Ascension of Authorship: Attribution and Canon Formation in Jewish, Hellenistic, and Christian Traditions* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2004).

⁹ In addition to Pisistratus, according to Aelian, the legendary Lycurgus of Sparta (not to be confused with Lycurgus of Athens) was also influential in collecting and compiling the Homeric corpus (*Varia Historia* 13.14 [LCL 486]).

¹⁰ Pfeiffer, *Classical Scholarship*, 6-7.

¹¹ Gregory Nagy, *Poetry as Performance: Homer and Beyond* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 69-71. Nagy sees their influence in Plato's comments about Hipparchus's role in stabilizing the rhapsodes' performance; he also compellingly argues that later traditions, which attribute these reforms to Solon, indicate Pisistratid influence, since it would be quite understandable to distance these reforms from a tyrant and attribute them to a “culture hero” instead.

¹² Nagy divides the transmission and stabilization of the text of Homer into five stages according to the role that the text played or did not play in performance. These stages consist in: 1) fluidity without written texts;

tradition for performance, which is evident in Pisistratus's role in stabilizing the Homeric corpus, is paralleled by Lycurgus's (ca. 390-325 B.C.E.) actions to collect and control access to dramatic texts.

Although Pisistratus's work on Homer's text may be the most well known, Athens was not unique in attempting to control the Homeric corpus.¹³ We have in the Homeric scholia numerous references to other so-called city editions of Homer (αἱ κατὰ τὰς πόλεις ἢ πολιτικάί): there are references to editions from Massilia, Sinope, Crete, and Cyprus.¹⁴ While there is much debate about what these city editions looked like and how they were produced, it is clear that they played a central role in political disputes among rival city-states.¹⁵ The most famous example comes from a dispute over Salamis between Athens and Megara first attested by Aristotle.¹⁶ In this conflict over the control of Salamis, Athens appealed to lines from Homer in order to justify their possession of the island. Later traditions indicate that Megara responded by accusing the Athenians of interpolating these verses into their Homeric corpus since they were lacking in their own copies of Homer.¹⁷ Whether or not this story is authentic, this disagreement may give

2) more formalized but still no written text; 3) centralization of the text as *transcript* for use in the Panathenaic performance; 4) standardization of the text as script under Demetrius of Phalerum; 5) a period of stabilization and crystallization as scripture after the second century B.C.E. with Aristarchus's work on Homer (*Performance*, 109-24).

¹³ The parallel with Onomasticritus's collection of Oracles in Athens is also cited by Allen as a similar attempt by Athens to co-opt traditions and texts through collection and control (*Homer*, 233-41). Nagy also sees a parallel between Lycurgus's and Pisistratus's concern for control of the text of tragedians and Homer respectively (*Performance*, 174-6).

¹⁴ For a discussion of and the evidence for the city editions, see Allen, *Homer*, 283-96; and Vittorio Citti, "Le edizioni omeriche 'delle città'," *Vichiana* 3 (1966): 3-43.

¹⁵ See Marchinus van der Valk, *Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad: Part Two* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963), 1-10; and Allen, *Homer*, 271ff.

¹⁶ *Rhet.* 1. 1375b30.

¹⁷ See discussion and references in Davison, "Pisistratus and Homer," esp. 15-18.

further evidence for the circulation of city editions of Homer.¹⁸ At the very least it offers clear evidence that controlling the Homeric text was more than just a pedantic scholarly activity; it had real ramifications in Greek political life.¹⁹

Alongside these references to city editions transmitted in Homeric scholia are descriptions of individual editions of Homer's works (αἱ κατ' ἄνδρα).²⁰ The individuals referred to are sometimes named, e.g. Antimachus, Zenodotus, Aristophanes, and Aristarchus.²¹ These scholars appear to be the first in antiquity to do extensive work on the text of Homer. Although Antimachus (ca. end of the fifth century B.C.E.) is not credited with issuing a διόρθωσις of Homer, references in the scholia led Pfeiffer to conclude that he did issue an ἔκδοσις of Homer's work.²² Significantly, Antimachus is reported to have written on Homer's life, perhaps even composing a *bios* that served as an introduction to his text. It is noteworthy that this *bios* casts Homer as originating from Colophon, Antimachus's hometown.²³

Plutarch's reference to Aristotle's corrected copy of Homer, which Alexander apparently kept under his pillow while asleep, led some scholars to suggest that Aristotle

¹⁸ Davison thinks that the accusation that Athens was responsible for this interpolation only makes sense as Megarian polemic ("Peisistratus and Homer").

¹⁹ The concern for controlling the contours of a tradition is also evident in Lycurgus's attempt to revise and control the performance and text of dramatic works. Note also that the *bioi* of Homer also link him with Athens, another indication of the control Athens tried to exert over Homer, the Homeric text and interpretation. For more on these issues, see discussion below.

²⁰ For a collection of references to κατ' ἄνδρα, see Allen, *Homer*, 297-99.

²¹ For references to individual editions, see Allen, *Homer*, 271-96.

²² Pfeiffer, *History*, 94. Pfeiffer notes references to ἡ Ἀντιμάχου, ἡ Ἀντιμάχου, and ἡ κατὰ Ἀντίμαχον, all of which, he contends, imply an ἔκδοσις—though, the ellipsed substantive could just as easily have been διόρθωσις.

²³ Pfeiffer, *History*, 94.

also engaged in Homeric text-critical work.²⁴ There are also later references to an edition (ἔκδοσις) of the Homeric text published by Aristotle in later Lives of Aristotle by Neoplatonic authors.²⁵ Although Aristotle is known to have engaged in critical study on the Homeric corpus, Pfeiffer points out that he certainly did not create an edition of Homer, otherwise there would be no way to explain the absence of any reference to his text-critical work by later ancient Homeric text critics.²⁶ His work on Homer seems to have been limited to discussions of problems (προβλήματα) or zetemata (ζητήματα) undertaken in Homer's defense.²⁷ Aristotle's collection of problems and solutions to difficulties in Homeric interpretation (some of which are preserved in Porphyry's *Homeric Questions*) both testifies to the cultural importance that Aristotle accorded the Homeric corpus and presages some of the motivations, which may have undergirded later Alexandrian scholars' corrections and revisions of Homer.²⁸

As important as Aristotle is for understanding Homeric interpretation and for setting the stage for Homeric scholarship, he was far more influential in developing and transmitting scholarly and scientific methods than an edition or recension text of Homer.

²⁴ Ἀριστοτέλους διορθώσαντος ἦν ἐκ τοῦ νάρθηκος καλοῦσιν (Plutarch, *Life of Alexander*, 26 [LCL 99]). Φέρεται γοῦν τις διόρθωσις τῆς Ὀμήρου ποιήσεως, ἣ ἐκ τοῦ νάρθηκος λεγομένη, τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου μετὰ τῶν περὶ Καλλισθένη καὶ Ἀνάξαρχον (Plutarch, *Life of Alexander*, 8.2 [LCL 99]). See citations and discussion in Pfeiffer, *Classical Scholarship*, 71-72; and Nagy, *Performance*, 121-122.

²⁵ Pfeiffer, *Classical Scholarship*, 71.

²⁶ Pfeiffer, *Classical Scholarship*, 72.

²⁷ For example, Pfeiffer notes that Aristotle offers a defense of the desecration of Hektor's body by pointing out a practice in Thessaly of drawing corpses around the burial places of men whom they had killed (*Classical Scholarship*, 69-73).

²⁸ See discussion below.

This is evident in his influence on Demetrius of Phalerum.²⁹ After Demetrius of Phalerum was driven out of Athens, where he ruled from 317-304 B.C.E., he went to Alexandria and helped to set up the library there under Ptolemy.³⁰ Pfeiffer sees a clear connection between archival practices at the Alexandrian library and Demetrius's Aristotelian heritage, which he thinks explains Strabo's statement that Aristotle taught the Ptolemies how to collect books.³¹ Nagy argues that Demetrius's role in reforming Homeric performance entailed stabilizing the Homeric text into a canonical, or standard, version (his script).³² For Nagy, Athenaeus's reference to Demetrius's introduction of Homeric poetry into the theater³³ recalls Lycurgus's actions to standardize dramatic performance and presupposes a standard text for these very performances.³⁴ With respect to his Homeric criticism, Demetrius is credited with a scholion on *Odyssey* Γ 267,³⁵ a critical evaluation of an interpolation at the *Iliad* B 405ff on the basis that it is unsuitable (ineptum),³⁶ and studies on Homer (Ὁμηρικὸς, Περὶ Ἰλιάδος, in two books and Περὶ

²⁹ For a collection of references to Demetrius, see William W. Fortenbaugh and Eckart Schütrumpf, *Demetrius of Phalerum: Text, Translation and Discussion* (New Brunswick N.J.: Transaction Publishers, 2000).

³⁰ Our first and fullest ancient life of Demetrius is found in Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum*, 5.75-83 (LCL 184 526-536). See also the discussion in Pfeiffer, *Classical Scholarship*, 95-104.

³¹ Πρῶτος ὧν ἴσμεν βιβλία καὶ διδάξας τοὺς ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ βασιλέας σύνταξιν, Strabo XIII 608, quoted in Pfeiffer, *Classical Scholarship*, 99.

³² Nagy, *Performance*, 156ff.

³³ τοὺς δὲ νῦν Ὀμηριστὰς ὀνομαζομένους πρῶτος εἰς τὰ θεάτρα παρήγαγε Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς (Athenaeus, *Deipnosophists*, 14.12 620B); collected and quoted in Fortenbaugh and Schütrumpf, *Demetrius of Phalerum*, 104.

³⁴ Nagy, *Performance*, 156-162.

³⁵ Gulielmus Dindorfius ed., *Scholia in Homeri Odysseam ex Codicibus Aucta et Emendata: Tomus I*. (Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1962), 143.

³⁶ Hartmut Erbse, ed., *Scholia Graece in Homeri Iliadem: Volumen I* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1969), 271.

Ὀδυσσεύας, in four books).³⁷ Demetrius's nascent critical work and role in standardizing the Homeric text for theatrical performance anticipate later Alexandrian editors.³⁸

Zenodotus (b. ca. 325 B.C.E.) became the first head librarian in Alexandria ca. 284 and was extremely influential in producing a text of Homer. His legacy in the field of Homeric scholarship led to him being called the first corrector of Homer (πρῶτος τῶν Ὀμήρου διορθωτῆς) by the Suidas.³⁹ Nevertheless, Zenodotus's role in stabilizing the Homeric text has been the subject of much disagreement among scholars. The scholia attribute both a correction (διόρθωσις) to him and the development of rudimentary marginal notation in the form of the obelus. In the past, Zenodotus has been accused of emendation (μεταποιέω/μεταγράφω), athetesis (ἀθετέω), or deletion (οὐ γράφειν) for arbitrary, capricious, and often prudish reasons, which approach bowdlerization.⁴⁰ More recently, scholars have been less inclined to attribute such capricious reasons to the readings that Zenodotus offers or point out that Zenodotus may have had manuscript evidence to back up the peculiar readings that he supported. Although the scope and final shape of Zenodotus's editorial work on the Homeric corpus is still debated, it is important to call attention to the foundations underpinning these practices of emendation, athetesis,

³⁷ Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum*, 5.81 (LCL 185 532).

³⁸ Demetrius's role in the development and operation of the Alexandrian library is augmented by the legends about the translation of the Septuagint for the Alexandrian library. While the references to Demetrius's activities in the library, based on the reports in the Letter of Aristeas and later reports on the creation of the Septuagint, are surely legendary (as Pfeiffer claims), the kernel of historicity implies that Demetrius did play an active role in the development of the institution of the Alexandrian library; see Pfeiffer, *Classical Scholarship*, 99-104. See also Wyrick's extensive discussion of the origin of the LXX (*Ascension of Authorship*, 260-72).

³⁹ Ζηνόδοτος...ὅς καὶ πρῶτος τῶν Ὀμήρου διορθωτῆς ἐγένετο. V.s. Z in Ada Adler, ed., *Suidae Lexicon* (Lipsiae: Teubner, 1928).

⁴⁰ See the assessment of Zenodotus's work in Valk, *Researches: Part Two*, 1-83, esp. 14-36.

and deletion. All were deployed by Zenodotus in light of his conception of the Homeric corpus and authorship.

M. van der Valk maintained that Zenodotus's work on the Homeric text was arbitrary and capricious because his interpretation of this text informed the text-critical practices utilized on it.⁴¹ After studying readings attributed to Zenodotus in order to ascertain his text-critical method, Valk concluded that Zenodotus was quick to athetize or excise lines based on many criteria. Among those discussed are Zenodotus's athetization for reasons theological and ethical. That Zenodotus would edit the Homeric corpus on the basis of theological propriety is not surprising; we have already noted Aristotle's defense against Homer's detractors, who can be traced back into the time of the rhapsodes, when Homer was coming under attack for improper depictions of the divine.⁴² Other ancient readers were attempting to ameliorate problematic passages in Homer by means of allegorical exegesis,⁴³ a hermeneutical strategy which was long lived among ancient readers of Homeric and Orphic poetry.⁴⁴ According to Valk, Zenodotus's text-critical decisions show particular concern for athetesis with an eye toward theological decorum and reverence. For example, Valk contends that Zenodotus justified his athetesis of line 5

⁴¹ Valk, *Researches: Part Two*, 1-83.

⁴² Pfeiffer offers the example of Xenophanes of Colophon (born ca. 565 B.C.E.) who inveighed against Homer's portraits of the gods (*Classical Scholarship*, 8-9). Plato's banishment of Homer from the ideal city is, of course, the most well known indictment (*Republic* II 377e-III 398b).

⁴³ For discussion of early allegorical readings in defense of Homer, see Pfeiffer, *Classical Scholarship*, 8-11; for ancient critiques of Homer more generally, John Linton Myres, *Homer and his Critics* (London: Routledge & Paul, 1958), 11-35.

⁴⁴ See Robert Lamberton, *Homer the Theologian: Neoplatonist Allegorical Reading and the Growth of the Epic Tradition* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986); Robert Lamberton and John J. Keaney, eds., *Homer's Ancient Readers: The Hermeneutics of Greek Epic's Earliest Exegetes* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1992); Gábor Betegh, *The Derveni Papyrus: Cosmology, Theology and Interpretation* (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2004); and André Laks and Glenn W. Most, eds., *Studies on the Derveni Papyrus* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997).

of *Iliad* book A in a reverence to Zeus, since Zeus's concern with the mutilation of corpses is below the dignity of the chief Olympian.⁴⁵ Similarly, the move of line 1 from book Θ of the *Iliad* was an attempt to remove the gods from constraints of time by describing the dawn as affecting only the human realm and not the divine.⁴⁶ Valk gives many instances of such tendencies in Zenodotus's text-critical work, but notes that the concern to alter or change the text was not, however, thoroughgoing; rather, it was occasional and sporadic, meeting the needs of the circumstances and difficulties in the text or interpretation.⁴⁷

Considerable debate has surrounded the actual form and content of Zenodotus's διόρθωσις. Did Zenodotus engage in extensive collation so as to produce his own eclectic Homeric text? Or did he, after investigating many ancient copies, simply choose one that he thought was the most authentic and offer marginal notations on suspect lines based on other manuscript evidence? Despite accusations that Zenodotus expunged lines for such capricious reasons, even Valk admits that Zenodotus may have made use of manuscript evidence on occasion.⁴⁸ After a discussion of Zenodotus's reading of δαῦτα in place of πᾶσι in lines 4-5 of the *Iliad* A and other significant variants, Pfeiffer concludes that Zenodotus did consult manuscript evidence for his reading and probably followed one

⁴⁵ Valk, *Researches: Part Two*, 20; Erbse, ed., *Scholia in Iliadem: Volumen I*, 9-10.

⁴⁶ Valk, *Researches: Part Two*, 19; Erbse, ed., *Scholia in Iliadem: Volumen I*, 297.

⁴⁷ Valk, *Researches: Part Two*, 18. In connection to inconsistency of revision, see our discussion of Marcion in chapter 3, who also does not seem to have altered the text consistently.

⁴⁸ Valk, *Researches: Part Two*, 9-10. If Zenodotus did indeed utilize manuscript evidence for his expurgation of what he deemed spurious lines, some scholars think that he may be a witness to an early form of the Homeric corpus and a text that supports the principle of the "shorter reading." For a discussion of the shorter reading in Zenodotus's text, see Valk, *Researches: Part Two*, 10.

carefully chosen copy of Homer which was corrected against other manuscripts.⁴⁹ Klaus Nickau also maintains that Zenodotus used manuscript evidence for his text-critical judgments and that his actions on the text conformed to accepted methods.⁵⁰ With respect to the form of Zenodotus's edition, Nickau notes that part of the problem is the lack of explanation of the use of marginal notation. Such explanation should (or most probably should) come in the form of a commentary; but the use of the commentary for explanations of Homeric text-critical decisions is not known until Aristarchus.⁵¹ Van Thiel has suggested a new hypothesis for Zenodotus's διόρθωσις: the editions published by the Alexandrian critics from Zenodotus to Aristarchus consisted of a base text with annotations containing other readings.⁵² The question for van Thiel is not the critical apparatuses that were utilized, but the organization of the marginal notations for variants, conjectures, parallels, and commentary, all of which could have occupied marginal or

⁴⁹ Pfeiffer, *Classical Scholarship*, 110-14; Erbse, ed., *Scholia in Iliadem: Volumen I*, 9.

⁵⁰ "Das Ergebnis lautet mithin, daß stets damit gerechnet werden muß, daß Zenodots Lesarten schon in vorzenodoteischen Homertexten standen (die freilich weder immer 'gut' noch auch eigentlich 'alt' gewesen sein müssen); lassen sich Konjekturen Zenodots im einzelnen nicht sicher nachweisen, so lassen sie sich aber erst recht nicht generell ausschließen" (*Untersuchungen zur textkritischen Methode des Zenodotos von Ephesos* [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1977], 253-54); "Zenodot habe den Homertext durchgehend nach außerpoetischen Normen oder nach Tendenzen der zeitgenössischen Dichtung zurechtgemacht" (*ibid.*, 258-59).

⁵¹ "Dann ist zu fragen, ob Z. nicht einen durch Recensio ermittelten Homertext zugrundelegte (der jedoch nicht seinen Vorstellungen von der genuinen Form der Epen entsprach), diesen mit Obeloi versah und zu ihm Textvorschläge sowie deren Begründung mitteilte. Z. selbst wie auch seine Hörer machten sich entsprechende Notizen, die, wären sie von Z. schriftlich veröffentlicht worden, 'Hypomnemata' hätten heißen können. Aber die Zeit der schriftlich publizierten Homer-Kommentare begann erst mit Aristarchos. So würden sich auch die späteren Unsicherheiten in der Berichterstattung über Z.s Ausgabe erklären" (Klaus Nickau, "Zenodotos," in *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumwissenschaft: Zweite Reihe* [ed. Konrat Ziegler; München: Druckenmüller, 1972], 30-31).

⁵² H. van Thiel, "Zenodot, Aristarch und Andere," *ZPE* 90 (1992): 1-32. Specifically, Thiel writes: "In der Einleitung zur Odyssee (p.IX-XII) habe ich die Hypothese aufgestellt, daß alle gelehrten Homerausgaben, die Aristarch benutzte, und außerdem wenigstens eine seiner eigenen beiden Bearbeitungen nicht Textausgaben nach unserem Verständnis waren. Allgemeine historische Gründe sprechen dafür, daß es sich um übernommene Texte handelte, denen ein Rand- und Interlinearapparat beige-schrieben war, in Form der Textscholien, wie wir sie aus allen Scholienhandschriften, besonders den Ilias- Codices A und T, und aus einer Anzahl Papyri kennen" (1).

interlinear positions.⁵³ Franco Montanari concurs in principle with the previous formulations but offers the following reconstruction:⁵⁴ Zenodotus must have chosen a copy that he thought was particularly noteworthy to serve as his exemplar. Zenodotus then utilized the obelus and other marginal or interlinear notations to mark off spurious, suspect, or passages to be eliminated. According to Montanari, the corrected text was then given to a scribe who produced a copy accompanied by obeli and marginal notes, perhaps containing expunged verses accompanied by οὐ γράφειν.

Despite the various scholarly interpretations, there is some consensus about Zenodotus's text-critical activities. He was evidently concerned with making judgments on the Homeric text and offering alternative readings for passages that he deemed suspect: quite probably, these alternative readings were often based on collation and manuscript evidence; other variant readings were perhaps the result of conjectural emendation by Zenodotus himself. We should hesitate to castigate these readings as "subjective and...guided by a definite and incorrect principle."⁵⁵ Valk surely goes too far both in his indictment of Zenodotus according to modern text-critical principles and in his reconstructions of the motives behind the variants that Zenodotus offered. Yet we should not dismiss Valk's underlying contention that Zenodotus engaged in conjecture, since we will see similar text-critical methods adopted by his successors, Aristophanes of Byzantium and Aristarchus.

⁵³ Thiel, "Zenodot, Aristarch und Andere," 1-2.

⁵⁴ Franco Montanari, "Zenodotus, Aristarchus and the Ekdosis of Homer," in *Editing Texts = Texte edieren* (ed. Glenn W. Most; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998), 6-7.

⁵⁵ Valk, *Researches: Part Two*, 20.

In contrast to Zenodotus, Aristophanes of Byzantium (ca. 257-180 B.C.E.), played a far less ambiguous role in Homeric textual scholarship.⁵⁶ While we noted the disagreements over references to Zenodotus's edition, the extent of Aristophanes' text-critical activities not only are more well-known, they also extend beyond Homer. Pfeiffer offers this glowing assessment of Aristophanes' wide-ranging scholarship: "three men began the διόρθωσις of epic, lyric, and dramatic poetry at the beginning of the third century B.C.; but it was Aristophanes alone who towards its end made the fundamental recensions of the texts in all these fields."⁵⁷ Even though Aristophanes' work is much better understood than Zenodotus's, its scope remains difficult to assess due to ambiguous descriptions in Homeric scholia: William Slater notes that readings or variants are usually cited in Aristophanes' name as ἡ' Αριστοφάνειος or ἡ' Αριστοφάνους with no clear indication whether ἔκδοσις, διόρθωσις, or λέξις has been ellipsed.⁵⁸ The scholia do, however, seem to offer evidence that Aristophanes' textual criticism differed somewhat from Zenodotus's: at *Iliad* I 23-5 AT we read: "these were not received by Zenodotus, but Aristophanes athetized [them];"⁵⁹ at *Iliad* M 175-80/1: "these were athetized by Aristophanes but were not written by Zenodotus;"⁶⁰ at *Iliad* Θ 284 A where Agamemnon calls Teukros a bastard: "This was omitted by Zenodotus, but was athetized by

⁵⁶ For a full discussion of Aristophanes of Byzantium, see Pfeiffer, *Classical Scholarship*, ch. 5. A very useful overview and full collection of references to Aristophanes can be found in William J. Slater, ed., *Aristophanis Byzantii Fragmenta* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1986).

⁵⁷ Pfeiffer, *Classical Scholarship*, 173.

⁵⁸ Slater, ed., *Aristophanis Byzantii Fragmenta*, 205.

⁵⁹ παρὰ Ζηνοδότῳ οὐκ ἔφέροντο. καὶ Ἀριστοφάνη δὲ ἠθέτει (*Scholia in Iliadem: Volumen II*, I 23—25 [Erbse ed. 402,91-93]).

⁶⁰ ἠθετοῦντο δὲ καὶ παρὰ Ἀριστοφάνει· παρὰ Ζηνοδότῳ δὲ οὐδὲ ἐγράφοντο (*Scholia in Iliadem: Volumen III*, M 175 [Erbse ed. 336,50-51]).

Aristophanes because the genealogy is ill-timed and without encouragement, but instead is shameful and discouraging.”⁶¹ The scholia draw a clear distinction between Zenodotus’s rejection and expunction of what he deemed to be spurious lines (νόθον) and Aristophanes’ conservation and transmission of these lines with marginal notation.

Although Aristophanes refrained from deletion of suspect lines, he is reported to have followed Zenodotus in athetizing what he deemed spurious; for example, at *Iliad* H 475 Eustathius, the twelfth-century commentator and compiler of previous Homeric scholia, reports: “the wording ‘of slaves’ is more contemporary compared to the old. Wherefore both Aristophanes and Zenodotus athetized the line, in which this wording occurs.”⁶² In this case Aristophanes agreed with Zenodotus’s athetesis: both scholars viewed the wording or style (λέξις) found in this passage to be too recent and not archaic enough. In this way, Aristophanes picks up on and adopts one of the criteria (λέξις) used by Zenodotus for judging Homeric authenticity.

In addition to passing judgment on individual lines or small sections of the Homeric corpus, Aristophanes also called into question larger portions of text. Most famously, Aristophanes (and Aristarchus after him) rejected as interpolated the lines after 296 of book Ψ of the *Odyssey*: “both Aristophanes and Aristarchus make this the end of the *Odyssey*.”⁶³ In this case, text-critical judgments called into question the authenticity of the end of this book and the entire next one. This judgment that the end of the *Odyssey*

⁶¹ παρὰ Ζηνοδότῳ οὐδὲ ἦν. ἠθέτητο δὲ καὶ παρὰ Ἀριστοφάνει. ὅτι ἄκαιρος ἡ γενεαλογία καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσα προτροπήν, ἀλλὰ τοῦναντίον ὄνειδισμὸν καὶ ἀποτροπήν (*Scholia in Iliadem: Volumen II*, Θ 284 [Erbse ed. 354,16-19]).

⁶² ἡ δὲ τῶν ἀνδραπόδων λέξις νεωτερικὴ ἐστὶ κατὰ τοὺς παλαιούς· διὸ καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης καὶ Ζηνόδοτος ἠθέτουσαν τὸ ἔπος, ἐν ᾧ κεῖται ἡ λέξις αὕτη (*Scholia in Iliadem: Volumen II*, Η 475 [Erbse ed. 294]).

⁶³ Ἀριστοφάνης δὲ καὶ Ἀρίσταρχος πέρας τῆς Ὀδυσσεΐας τοῦτο ποιοῦνται (*Scholia in Odysseam*, Ψ 296 [Gulielmus Dindorfius ed., 722,19-20]).

was spurious, however, does not necessarily mean that these lines were excised from the Homeric corpus.

Preserving the end of the *Odyssey*, while calling it into question, highlights the conservatism of Aristophanes' textual criticism—i.e. his conservation of the text. Aristophanes was much less inclined to reject and expunge lines, which he deemed spurious, than Zenodotus had been. Rather, building on Zenodotus's use of the obelus, Aristophanes developed an elaborate system of marginal text-critical notes to alert the reader to his research and opinions on spurious or otherwise noteworthy lines.⁶⁴ These marks consisted of: the obelus (ὄβελός) adopted from Zenodotus to mark lines deemed inauthentic (νόθον); the asterisk (ἀστέρισκος) to designate lines repeated elsewhere in the Homeric corpus; the sigma (σίγμα) and antisigma (ἀντίσιγμα) to indicate interchangeable lines that followed one another.

At this point mention should be made of the development of marginal notation for Plato's edition, since it not only parallels their use in the Homeric corpus, but also, according to some reports, Aristophanes himself may have edited Plato's corpus and supplied marginalia.⁶⁵ Once again the obelus was employed to mark spurious passages,

⁶⁴ For a discussion of Aristophanes' marginalia, see Pfeiffer, *Classical Scholarship*, 178. For evidence of the use of marginalia and its presence in actual MSS, see Kathleen McNamee, *Sigla and Select Marginalia in Greek Literary Papyri* (Bruxelles: Fondation Égyptologique Reine Élisabeth, 1992); and *ibid.*, *Annotations in Greek and Latin Texts from Egypt* (New Haven, Conn.: American Society of Papyrologists, 2007).

⁶⁵ Because Diogenes Laertius (*Vitae Philosophorum*, 3.57-66 [LCL 184 326-334]) relates that Aristophanes of Byzantium published an edition of Plato's dialogues in trilogies (following the lead of tragedy), rather than in tetralogies as Thrasyllus (d. ca. 36 C.E.), there has been considerable debate about Aristophanes' editorial work on the Platonic corpus. These disagreements range from those, who deny Aristophanes ever created an edition of Plato (e.g. Pfeiffer, *Classical Scholarship*, 196-97) to those, who think that Aristophanes not only created an edition, but the marginal notes mentioned by Diogenes should even be attributed to Aristophanes (e.g. Alline, *Histoire du texte de Platon*, 84-103). The scope and structure of both of these editions will be addressed in our discussion on the contents of an edition. With respect to their text, Diogenes does not offer extensive commentary; he does, however, mention Thrasyllus's acceptance of fifty-six dialogues as authentic and his use of marginalia. Due to Diogenes' imprecision regarding the

while the dotted obelus marked a passage suspected without evidence (similar to Aristarchus's stigma discussed below). We will discuss below how the dipole and dotted dipole were used by Aristarchus to distinguish his readings from other editions, in this edition they noted Plato's teachings and the editor's corrections respectively. Plato's edition also contained a dotted antisigma which called attention to repeated passages and possible transposition. This edition apparently utilized four additional signs: the chi, dotted chi, asterisk and keraunion. The chi and dotted chi both called attention to style and diction: the first, Plato's idiomatic usage; the second, passages select and beautiful. The asterisk and keraunion indicated the philosophical school and harmony of teaching respectively. In this edition marginal notation extended beyond merely noting textual problems and solutions: signs were employed for rudimentary and preliminary aids for interpreting Plato, understanding his doctrine, and discerning philosophical school traditions. Diogenes Laertius even mentions that proper interpretation would be a fundamental concern for readers of Plato, since not only is Plato abstruse, he is even intentionally obscure.⁶⁶ Because of the differences between Aristophanes' use of marginal notation in his other editions and his purported edition of Plato, most likely the marginalia for Plato's corpus developed out of Alexandrian usage, but was adapted for this specific corpus. If this was the case, then such marginalia was likely not adapted by

attribution of the marginal notation, there has been considerable disagreement over whether these marginal notes ought to be attributed to Thrasyllus, Aristophanes, or someone else. Since the reported use of the marginalia does not correspond to that found among the Alexandrians, Pfeiffer does not think it should be traced to Aristophanes, (*Classical Scholarship*, 196-7); Solmsen, however, adduces Jachmann's argument that they could be traced to Alexandrian researchers ("The Academic and the Alexandrian Editions of Plato's Works," 102). Alline also thinks that they ought to be traced back to Alexandria, in particular he links them to Aristophanes and the edition published in trilogies which Diogenes attributes to him (*Histoire du texte de Platon*, 30 & 84-103). More recently, Harold Tarrant has suggested that these signs are most appropriately assigned to Thrasyllus and his edition, in accordance with his overall editorial hermeneutic (*Thrasyllan Platonism* [Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1993], 182-85).

⁶⁶ Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum*, 3.63-65 (LCL 184 332-334).

Aristophanes but a later editor, perhaps Thrasyllus, whose edition, according to Harold Tarrant, was closely related to his interpretation of Platonic doctrine in the books deemed authentic, its structure, and its scholarly notations.⁶⁷

Some fundamental questions regarding Aristophanes' text and text-critical practices remain. Did he follow one old venerable copy (ἀντίγραφον)? Did he engage in extensive collation (ἀντιβάλλω) of old copies of Homer in order to create his own edition (ἐκδοσις)? Or did he merely offer a correction (διόρθωσις)? Did he engage in extensive emendation (μεταποιέω/μεταγράφω) as Zenodotus is reported to have done? If so under what circumstances did he alter or correct the text transmitted? With regard to the text Aristophanes used, just as he followed and further developed Zenodotus's text-critical symbols,⁶⁸ so too Aristophanes followed his text.⁶⁹ In terms of textual alteration, although his development of text-critical symbols so that he might marginally note variant readings speaks to his concern for conservation of the Homeric text and high estimation of its textual transmission, this should not overshadow that Aristophanes (like Zenodotus before and Aristarchus after) is not exempt from charges of emendation. Slater concluded "that Aristophanes was prone to alter the text or to accept others' alterations, knowing that there was no authority, when he wished to solve zetemata. These solutions

⁶⁷ Tarrant, *Thrasyllan Platonism*.

⁶⁸ Montanari contends that Aristophanes' edition probably corresponded closely to that of Zenodotus: "a copy carefully chosen from among those available, on which to work and annotate his own textual interventions" ("Zenodotus, Aristarchus and the Ekdosis of Homer," 9). Yet the exact shape of Aristophanes' text remains obscure, since it was taken over by Aristarchus; only where Aristarchus disagrees with and notes Aristophanes' judgments can we be sure of Aristophanes' readings. On this problem, see Slater, ed., *Aristophanis Byzantii Fragmenta*, 205-10; and Pfeiffer, *Classical Scholarship*, 174

⁶⁹ Slater contends that it is difficult to imagine Aristophanes merely publishing an *ekdosis* with marginal signs without any commentary or explanations of their use (*Aristophanis Byzantii Fragmenta*, 206) and suggests that Aristophanes' justifications for marginal notation may have been transmitted orally to his pupils or, more likely, that Aristophanes' *diorthosis* contained readings and his explanations for the signs applied to them (*ibid.*).

were apparently preserved for us only because they were rejected by Aristarchus.”⁷⁰ As in our discussion of Zenodotus, again we see the issues of zetemata and interpretation driving manipulation of the Homeric text.

Aristarchus of Samothrace (ca. 216-144 B.C.E.) inherited and refined his predecessors’ work on the Homeric text and their text-critical methods. His nickname ‘Ὅμηρικὸς and the attribution of over 800 books of commentaries on Homer alone give evidence of his productivity and importance for Homeric studies.⁷¹ It should come as no surprise then that scholars have identified Aristarchus as integral in creating the Homeric text that has been transmitted.⁷² Recently, however, Aristarchus’s role has been revised in light the discovery of Homeric papyri. Montanari, Nagy, and Stephanie West, for example, all envision Aristarchus not so much as creating a new edition as stabilizing one version of Homer, the κοινή.⁷³

While others after Aristarchus devoted their studies to the Homeric text (see e.g. Ammonius, Didymus, and Aristonicus), he represents the acme of such research. Tzetze’s *Prolegomena* even identifies him as the last corrector, alongside the first corrector, Zenodotus.⁷⁴ That Aristarchus inherited his predecessors methods and texts is evidenced not only in his development and adoption of Aristophanes’, and in some cases Zenodotus’s, readings and arguments, but also in his deviation from his predecessors.

⁷⁰ Slater, ed., *Aristophanis Byzantii Fragmenta*, 210.

⁷¹ Pfeiffer, *Classical Scholarship*, 219 & 13.

⁷² See Nagy, *Performance*, 182-206.

⁷³ Although Montanari does not refer to the κοινή, he does discuss Aristarchus’s adoption of earlier texts of Homer, whether that of Aristophanes or others ("Zenodotus, Aristarchus and the Ekdosis of Homer," 9-20). On the κοινή, see Nagy, *Performance*, 182-206; and Stephanie West, *The Ptolemaic Papyri of Homer* (Köln: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1967), 11-24.

⁷⁴ Pfeiffer, *Classical Scholarship*, 105-106.

Our discussion of Aristarchus will focus on three main areas: 1) how many editions did he issue and what form did they take; 2) what was his relationship to earlier attempts to create texts of Homer; 3) what effect did his revision, correction, or edition have on the text of Homer that has been transmitted.

The number and form of Aristarchus's editions remains unclear as a result of ambiguity in the scholia, where references to editions or corrections have complicated attempts to isolate his work on the Homeric text.⁷⁵ The regnant *status quaestionis* regarding Aristarchus's edition(s) or correction(s) is still that formulated by Pfeiffer.⁷⁶ Pfeiffer maintains that Aristarchus originally wrote a commentary (ὑπόμνημα) on the edition issued by Aristophanes. Aristarchus later created his own edition along with another commentary; this commentary elucidated his own edition and editorial decisions. Montanari has offered a slight variation on Pfeiffer's theory and suggests that the later commentary was written on a text that Aristarchus himself had reworked after much study.⁷⁷ Montanari further suggests that the disagreement over the number of editions that Aristarchus produced can perhaps be traced to the different understanding of Aristarchus's oral discussions on textual problems in the Homeric corpus by his pupils.⁷⁸

The disagreement over Aristarchus's edition illustrates the problems associated with publication in antiquity. This aspect of book production and dissemination has

⁷⁵ αἱ Ἄριστάρχου, Περὶ τοῦ μὴ γεγονέναι πλείονας ἐκδόσεις τῆς Ἄρισταρχείου διορθώσεως, Περὶ τῆς ἐπεκδοθείσης διορθώσεως; for references and discussion, see Montanari, "Zenodotus, Aristarchus and the Ekdosis of Homer," 10-20.

⁷⁶ Pfeiffer, *Classical Scholarship*, 214ff.

⁷⁷ Montanari, "Zenodotus, Aristarchus and the Ekdosis of Homer," 11-12.

⁷⁸ Montanari, "Zenodotus, Aristarchus and the Ekdosis of Homer," 11-12.

received extensive treatment, so a few comments will suffice.⁷⁹ In short, publication in antiquity operated through social networks, especially in the initial dissemination of a work.⁸⁰ Although there were avenues for entrepreneurial public transmission, such channels were, by and large, secondary to private ones.⁸¹ William Johnson has recently drawn a more fine distinction between circulation and production, both of which could operate through public or private channels.⁸² But, whether public or private, the circulation of a text was integral for initial distribution—quite often through social networks of friends; in contrast, the primary method for public booksellers was production.⁸³ For production of a text in antiquity, Johnson argues that the chief distinction was “between ‘private’ and ‘professional.’”⁸⁴ Although West suggests that Aristarchus’s role in creating an edition of Homer may have led to a demand for his corrected text,⁸⁵ “the view that Aristarchus published the Vulgate [of Homer] involves an anachronistic conception of the relationship between the scholar and the book trade: the

⁷⁹ For the production and dissemination of books more broadly in the Greco-Roman world, see R. J. Starr, "The Circulation of Literary Texts in the Roman World," *Classical Quarterly* 37 (1987): 213-23; R. J. Starr, "The Used-book Trade in the Roman World," *Phoenix* 44 (1990): 148-57; William A. Johnson, *Bookrolls and Scribes in Oxyrhynchus* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004); V. Burr, "Editionstechnik," *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* 4 (1959): 597-610; B. A. van Gronigen, "ΕΚΔΟΣΙΣ," 16 *Mnemosyne* (1963): 1-17; Paulo Evaristo Arns, *La technique du livre d'après saint Jérôme* (Paris: E. de Boccard, 1953); H. I. Marrou, "La technique de l'édition à l'époque patristique," *VC* 3 (1949): 208-24; and H. L. M. van der Valk, "On the Edition of Books in Antiquity," *VC* 11 (1957): 1-10. For books and their relationship to literacy, see William V. Harris, *Ancient Literacy* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1989); and Mary Beard and et al, eds., *Literacy in the Roman World* (Ann Arbor: Journal of Roman Archaeology, 1991).

⁸⁰ See Starr, "The Circulation of Literary Texts in the Roman World"; Harris, *Ancient Literacy*, 222ff; Harry Y. Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Christian Church* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 83-93; Kim Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians of Letters*, 77-104.

⁸¹ For a general discussion of booksellers and public book trade, see Gamble, *Books and Readers*, 85-93.

⁸² Johnson, *Bookrolls and Scribes*, 158-60.

⁸³ Johnson, *Bookrolls and Scribes*, 158-60.

⁸⁴ Johnson, *Bookrolls and Scribes*, 159.

⁸⁵ West, *Ptolemaic Papyri*, 17.

Museum was not a publishing house; there was no Alexandrian University Press.”⁸⁶ Just like any other text, once out of the scholar’s hands, even a carefully corrected edition was subject to the vagaries of chirographic textual transmission, whether private or professional.

To return to Aristarchus’s work on the Homeric text, while his edition(s) surely would have been issued in accordance with the professional standards of his day, ambiguity regarding the nature and scope of his work continues to complicate our understandings. This ambiguity results from the designations applied to Aristarchus’s labor, whether it should be termed ἔκδοσις or διόρθωσις⁸⁷—a problem we have also seen in descriptions of the work on the Homeric text by previous scholars (e.g. Antimachus, Zenodotus, Aristophanes). This consistent problem in defining the exact nature of the textual revision undertaken by these ancient textual critics highlights the difficulty of assigning definitions to ἔκδοσις and διόρθωσις. To be sure, with respect to lexical definitions these activities are discrete;⁸⁸ but in terms of a practical definition such distinctions are difficult to maintain in view of the chaotic and uncontrolled nature of textual dissemination in antiquity. In fact, Blum has made a strong case that διόρθωσις shaded into ἔκδοσις, thus rendering the boundary between ἔκδοσις and διόρθωσις indistinct. Rather, these textual activities existed on a continuum: “there was no ekdosis

⁸⁶ West, *Ptolemaic Papyri*, 16.

⁸⁷ For a discussion of Wolf’s and Lehr’s solutions to this problem, see Pfeiffer, *Classical Scholarship*, 215. Pfeiffer also notes Hartmut Erbse’s difficulties in interpreting references to Aristarchus in the scholia. Erbse thinks that he built on the work of Zenodotus (“Über Aristarchs Iliasausgaben,” *Hermes* 87 [1959]: 275-303, esp. 300).

⁸⁸ V.s. ἔκδοσις and διόρθωσις in *LSJ* and *Lampe*.

without diorthosis, there were only different degrees of diorthosis.”⁸⁹ Formulated in this way, every correction in some respects represents an edition, even if it is not meant as a formal publication of a text. Essential to the issuance of an ἔκδοσις was a thoroughgoing διόρθωσις; every attempt at διόρθωσις, insofar as it was not merely correction against an exemplar, would transmit its own ἔκδοσις.

This brings us to the central question for our investigation: what was Aristarchus’s text-critical *modus operandi*? Did he merely follow and advocate one of a number of old texts? Or was his text an eclectic one based on collation and the application of text-critical principles designed to reconstruct the original Homeric text? Aristarchus’s use of marginal notations testifies to his reverence for the textual transmission of the Homeric text.⁹⁰ Another way that Aristarchus succeeds Aristophanes (and Zenodotus) is his use and further development of marginal signs to explain his thoughts on the text. Aristarchus takes over from Aristophanes the obelus, the asterisk, the stigma (στιγμαίη, Aristophanes’ sigma), and antisigma and utilizes two new signs, the diple (διπλή) to designate his readings against other editions and dotted diple (διπλή περιεστιγμένη) to call attention to his disagreements with Zenodotus’s edition.⁹¹ But does this mean that he did not judge passages inauthentically Homeric? F. A. Wolf maintained that there was a vast gulf between Aristarchus’s and modern textual criticism,

⁸⁹ Rudolf Blum, *Kallimachos: The Alexandrian Library and the Origins of Bibliography* (Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991), 65 note 10; this formulation has also been endorsed by Nagy (*Performance*, 115-116).

⁹⁰ Aristarchus shows his estimation of Aristophanes’ edition by writing a commentary on it. In addition, as we have noted, Aristarchus’s adoption of many of Aristophanes’ readings has all but obscured the scope and content of much of Aristophanes’ text.

⁹¹ Arthur I Ludwig, *Aristarchs homerische textkritik nach den fragmenten des Didymos dargestellt und beurtheilt: Erster Theil* (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1884), 19-22. Pfeiffer relates that Aristarchus employed the stigma to mark a passage he suspected of inauthenticity but did not want to mark with an obelus (*Classical Scholarship*, 218).

citing Cicero's testimony "ut enim Aristarchus Homeri versum negat, quem non probat, sic tu—libet enim mihi iocari—, quod disertum non erit, ne putaris meum"⁹² as proof that Aristarchus engaged in suspect editorial methods.⁹³ According to Ludwich, Nauck concurred with the assessment that Aristarchus engaged in conjecture citing Didymus's scholia to I 222.⁹⁴ While Nagy maintains that ancient text critics, in this case Aristarchus, did not treat the text of Homer in a completely arbitrary fashion employing conjecture indiscriminately when faced with textual difficulties,⁹⁵ he is quick to distinguish ancient text-critical methods from modern ones. The Homeric text that Aristarchus reconstructed corresponded to his understanding of Homeric authorship:

The original Homer of this more critical and suspicious age becomes all the more specific and even brittle in identity, reflecting ever more the critics' understanding of his archetypal creation, his text. Homer was an Athenian who lived around 1000 BC, in the time of Athenian migrations... moreover the scholastic tradition stemming ultimately from Aristarchus implies that Homer *wrote* his poems... and that Hesiod actually had a chance to *read* them.⁹⁶

⁹² Cicero, *epist. ad fam.* 3.11.5 cited in Ludwich, *Aristarchs homerische textkritik: Zweiter Theil*, 172.

⁹³ Grafton, Most, and Zetzel, eds., *F. A. Wolf: Prolegomena to Homer, 1795*, 190-1.

⁹⁴ *Aristarchs homerische textkritik: Zweiter Theil*, 84. ἄμεινον οὖν εἶχεν ἄν, φησὶν ὁ Ἀρίσταρχος, <εἰ> ἐγγράπτο "ἄψ ἐπάσαντο," ἵν' ὅσον χάρισασθαι τῷ Ἀχιλλεῖ γεύσασθαι μόνον καὶ μὴ εἰς κόρον ἐσθλῆν καὶ πίνειν λέγωνται. ἀλλ' ὅμως ὑπὸ περιττῆς εὐλαβείας οὐδὲν μετέθηκεν, ἐν πολλαῖς οὕτως εὐρῶν φερομένην τὴν γραφὴν (*Scholia in Iliadem: Volumen II*, I 222 [Erbse ed. 447,30-34]). Ludwich offers this dissent to this interpretation: "Gewiss, wenn μετατιθέναι nichts Anderes hiesse als 'conjectiren'. Dem ist aber keinesweges so: vielmehr bedeutet μετατιθέναι einfach 'ändern', und ändern kann man einen beliebigen Text bekanntlich auch auf Grund einer besseren handschriftlichen Ueberlieferung. Für diesen Sprachgebrauch bietet Didymos selbst Belege, den schlagendsten I 222, wo die Wendung ἐν πολλαῖς [nicht πάσαις!] οὕτως εὐρῶν φερομένην τὴν γραφὴν, wie oben bemerkt, jeden Gedanken an eine Aristarchische Conjectur ausschliesst" (*Aristarchs homerische textkritik: Zweiter Theil*, 93).

⁹⁵ Nagy, *Performance*, 145-52.

⁹⁶ Nagy, *Performance*, 151.

Therefore while Aristarchus's and his predecessors' conjectures, emendations, or choice of variants may seem arbitrary to *our* tastes, they were in complete accord with *their* conceptions of Homeric authorship.⁹⁷

It is in this light that we should view Aristarchus's distinctions between authentic Homeric works and inauthentic, e.g. those deemed Cyclic (Κυκλικῶς). Beginning with Aristotle there was an attempt to distinguish between genuine Homeric epic and other ancient epic, called Cyclic because it often dealt with specific epic cycles.⁹⁸ Lines that were deemed spurious, yet undoubtedly ancient, could be explained as Cyclic interpolations. In this way Homer's authorial image and corpus could be extricated from baser detritus. Aristarchus, like those before him, then applied this understanding of authenticity to distinguish authentic Homeric lines (Ὀμηρικώτερον) from other coarser Cyclic epic poems, deemed (κυκλικώτερον).⁹⁹ Arguably there were times when Aristarchus based his justifications for his readings on manuscripts themselves. For example, alongside the references to the city or personal editions, the scholia to the Homeric text transmit numerous references to copies designated χαριέστεραι—often contrasted with αἱ κοιναί, αἱ εἰκαιότεραι, τὰ εἰκαιότερα, οἱ φαῦλα.¹⁰⁰ Aristarchus often makes his judgments by referring to such copies.¹⁰¹ While such references indicate Aristarchus's collation and concern for the material of the manuscript tradition, they

⁹⁷ N.B. Marcion's conception of Paul and his understanding of Pauline authorship guided his text-critical principles in ways analogous to the Homeric critics.

⁹⁸ Pfeiffer, *Classical Scholarship*, 227-30.

⁹⁹ Pfeiffer, *Classical Scholarship*, 227.

¹⁰⁰ These references presuppose an antecedent of ἐκδόσεις or ἀντίγραφα depending on the gender of the substantive. For discussions of these references, see M. J. Apthorp, *The Manuscript Evidence for Interpolation in Homer* (Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1980), ch. 4; and Allen, *Homer*, 271-82.

¹⁰¹ Apthorp, *Manuscript Evidence*, ch. 4.

should not overshadow that Aristarchus may have been just as willing to engage in emendation or deletion based on his own conception of Homer and the Homeric corpus, manuscript evidence notwithstanding.¹⁰² So although there is ample evidence that Aristarchus consulted multiple copies of Homer in his attempt to reconstruct his Homeric text, the principles on which he based his decisions were still rooted in his own understanding of Homer and Homeric transmission.

In fact, Aristarchus's text-critical work was not separate from his exegetical work.¹⁰³ His understanding of Homeric textuality was formed by his understanding of the Homeric corpus and Homeric authorship, which in turn gave justification and evidence on which to base his textual judgments. The interdependency of textual criticism and exegesis is succinctly summed up in the exegetical dictum attributed to Aristarchus, "Ὅμηρον ἐξ'Ὀμήρου σαφηνίζειν."¹⁰⁴ Although there is a circular logic to interpreting and reconstructing Homer in this way, its circularity should not belie the popularity of the

¹⁰² M. van der Valk maintains that Aristarchus did indeed alter the Homeric text in accordance with his understanding of Homeric authorship and transmission (*Researches: Part Two*, 87).

¹⁰³ This is also evident in the very definitions of ἔκδοσις, which range from "5. *publication* of a book. b. *edition* of an author's work. c. *translation*" in the *LSJ* to "2. *interpretation*; a. *exegesis*; b. *version* of scriptures; c. *translation, rendering*; of a word or passage; d. *exposition*" in Lampe. Erbse comes to a similar conclusion, when he states, "Ἐκδοσις bedeutet ja nicht nur »Buchausgabe« sondern oft genug auch »Auseinandersetzung, Bearbeitung, Interpretation« wie ἐκδιδόναι nicht nur »publizieren« meint, sondern auch die diesem Akt vorangehende Handlung (das Abfassen oder, in philologischem Zusammenhang, das Interpretieren) bezeichnet" ("Über Aristarchs Iliasausgaben," 291).

¹⁰⁴ That this method of interpreting Homer according to this maxim should be attributed to Aristarchus has not always been accepted: Pfeiffer denies that the tradition preserved in Porphyry's statement, "Ὅμηρον ἐξ'Ὀμήρου σαφηνίζειν, should be traced back to Aristarchus (*Classical Scholarship*, 225ff). This argument has been effectively challenged by scholars who have shown that the principle of interpreting an author from the same author's works can be found in Galen and already in Aristotle (Christoph Schäublin, "Homerum ex Homero," *Museum Helveticum* 34 [1977]: 221-27; and Jaap Mansfeld, *Prolegomena: Questions to be Settled before the Study of an Author, or a Text* [Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994], 204-5).

method.¹⁰⁵ What is important for our discussion here is not only the interrelationship between interpretation and fashioning the text, but also between the fashioning corpora and interpretation. With respect to the former Montanari states, “the idea of the recognition of a disruption and of a method for repairing it reveals the way in which the collaborative organic unity between textual criticism and interpretation had now [among the Alexandrians] become established and operative.”¹⁰⁶ As we will demonstrate in our discussion of the role of authenticity for fashioning an author’s corpus of an author, the inclusion or rejection of books from an author’s oeuvre will also have far reaching consequences for hermeneutics, since the very inclusion and rejection of writings, just like the athetization or emendation of a word or phrase, is itself a hermeneutical decision based on a conception of the author and his/her work.

In sum, Aristarchus represents the zenith of ancient Homeric text criticism.¹⁰⁷ In the attempt to create his text of the Homeric corpus, he engaged in extensive collation of manuscripts and consulted the editions of his predecessors. The further development of marginal notations used to draw attention to his disagreements with previous editors or variant readings also demonstrates his conservatism with respect to the text, a conservatism that continued the trajectory already begun in Zenodotus’s διορθώσεις and

¹⁰⁵ The practice of interpreting scripture from scripture is indebted to this very exegetical principle; it also figures prominently in rhetorical stasis theory codified by Hermogenes (Malcolm Heath, *Hermogenes On Issues: Strategies of Argument in Later Greek Rhetoric* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995]).

¹⁰⁶ Montanari, "Zenodotus, Aristarchus and the Ekdosis of Homer," 2.

¹⁰⁷ This does not mean that work on the Homeric corpus ceased with Aristarchus. See for example the continual study by Aristarchus’s pupil Ammonius evidenced in his references to Περὶ τοῦ μὴ γεγονέναι πλείονας ἐκδόσεις τῆς Ἀρισταρχείου διορθώσεως, Περὶ τῆς ἐπεκδοθείσης διορθώσεως, and the information on the Alexandrian scholars (Zenodotus, Aristophanes, and Aristarchus) that has been transmitted by other successors. For an overview and bibliography v.s. Ammonius, Didymus in *OCD*.

Aristophanes' edition.¹⁰⁸ Even though Aristarchus revered the text and respected its previous transmitters, he too subordinated the text to his understanding of Homeric authorship and the attendant issue of authenticity. Aristarchus's text criticism relied on exegetical principle "to interpret Homer from Homer" (Ὁμηρον ἐξ' Ὁμήρου σαφηνίζειν) predicated on a specific understanding of Homer, Homeric authorship, and Homeric textual transmission.

What connects these ancient Homeric text critics and their methods of textual criticism was a concern to preserve the text of Homer. First and foremost, this entailed preserving the received text from simple errors of transmission or grammatical misunderstanding. This preservation, however, was far from simple and necessitated critical evaluations of the text—evaluations that occasionally required the rejection of one reading for that found in another manuscript, or even one offered by the critic himself as a conjecture. As Montanari succinctly puts it: "I remain convinced that the Alexandrian philologists' production of the ἔκδοσις of a literary work involved both the work of conjectural emendation of the transmitted text and the choice between textual variants discovered through collation of different copies. The term διόρθωσις referred to the combination of both kinds of activity."¹⁰⁹ Correction was more than just comparison of the copy with the exemplar; it was also emendation. Both techniques formed the foundation of Homeric criticism. Furthermore, correction, emendation, and editorial work quite often offered solutions (λύσεις) to Homeric *zetemata* or *problemata* that had vexed interpreters—these stumbling blocks obstructing the reconciliation of the Homeric corpus

¹⁰⁸ Aristarchus also offered the fruits of his extensive study on the Homeric text in the form of commentary on his readings.

¹⁰⁹ Montanari, "Zenodotus, Aristarchus and the Ekdosis of Homer," 1.

with philosophical conceptions of theology. Far from a mere scientific endeavor pursued by scholars disconnected from the world in their bird cage,¹¹⁰ Homeric textual criticism had important theological, political, cultural, and exegetical implications.¹¹¹

The critical work undertaken on the text of the Homeric corpus set the standard for textual practices on other ancient corpora.¹¹² As a result of the vagaries of the transmission of the text, the methods and rationale guiding these enquiries were easily adaptable to other situations and texts. What was foremost in each case was the conception of authorship that would propel the reacquisition, collection, and correction of the text of an author. While these practices used to fashion corpora varied from author to author and genre to genre, what connected these corpora and their texts were the methods for their reconstruction, methods forged in Homeric scholarship.

B. Dramatic Corpora

The multitude of ancient dramatists and dramatic works (not to mention ancient editors of such works) make a comprehensive survey of ancient endeavors at collection, codification, and correction of dramatic works impractical. Moreover, I am more

¹¹⁰ See Timon of Phlius's disparagement of the Alexandrian scholars (βιβλιακοὶ χαρακίται ἀπείριτα δηριόωντες Μουσέων ἐν ταλάρῳ) quoted and discussed in Pfeiffer, *Classical Scholarship*, 97-98.

¹¹¹ In addition to the discussion above, see Franco Montanari, "Alexandrian Homeric Philology: The Form of the "Ekdosis" and the "Variae Lectiones"," in *"Epea Pteroenta": Beitrage zur Homerforschung: Festschrift für Wolfgang Kullmann zum 75. Geburtstag* (eds. Michael Reichel and Antonios Rengakos; Stuttgart: Steiner, 2002); Albio Cesare Cassio, "Early Editions of the Greek Epics and Homeric Textual Criticism," in *Omera tremila anni dopo* (eds. Franco Montanari and Paola Ascheri; Roma: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 2002); and F. Jacoby, "Patrios Nomos: State Burial in Athens and the Public Cemetery in the Kerameikos," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 64 (1944): 37-66.

¹¹² About Hippocratic criticism's roots in Homeric scholarship, Johannes Mewaldt even asserts, "Die antike Hippokrateskritik, wie sie bei Galen erscheint, ist unter allen Töchtern der Homerkritik der Mutter am ähnlichsten. Ganz natürlich; denn nur auf sie konnten und mußten alle Methoden, die jene besaß, in solchem Umfange übertragen werden, weil nur hier das ganze Problem dem homerischen so ähnlich war" ("Galenos über echte und unechte Hippocratica," *Hermes* 44 [1909]: 111-34).

interested in the prevailing ways an author's text would be edited and corrected for publication than in every playwright's corpus in antiquity. For this reason, even though I focus somewhat on Euripides in this section, I will primarily outline issues applicable to dramatic authors more broadly. While the problems of transmission for dramatic works were the same as any other text, there were specific problems that beset such works: different versions of the plays and interpolations added to the text resulting from performance.

One of the first reports about the stabilization of dramatic texts for performance comes from Plutarch, who mentions attempts by Lycurgus of Athens (ca. 390-325 B.C.E.) to collect and maintain the texts of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides as a part of his theater reforms.¹¹³ Plutarch informs that “he commanded that bronze statues of the poets Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides be erected and to preserve their tragedies by writing them in common and the scribe of the city to read out alongside the actors; for otherwise it was not possible for them to perform.”¹¹⁴ Plutarch's report does not specifically give us the reasons that Lycurgus wanted to protect the texts of these tragedians, but Nagy has surmised that the main reasons were preservation against corruption of the texts and control of the production of the plays as part of his theater reform for the Dionysian festival of Anthesteria.¹¹⁵ Nagy also explicitly draws attention to Lycurgus's production of a “state script” for performance as a precursor to Demetrius of Phalerum's Homeric

¹¹³ See the discussion in Denys Lionel Page, *Actors' Interpolations in Greek Tragedy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1934), 2ff; and Nagy, *Performance*, 174-6.

¹¹⁴ τὸν δὲ, ὡς χαλκᾶς εἰκόνας ἀναθεῖναι τῶν ποιητῶν Αἰσχύλου, Σοφοκλέους, Εὐριπίδου, καὶ τὰς τραγῳδίας αὐτῶν ἐν κοινῇ γραφαιμένους φυλλάτειν καὶ τὸν τῆς πόλεως γραμματέα παραναγινώσκειν τοῖς ὑποκρινομένοις· οὐκ ἐξεῖναι γὰρ αὐτὰς ὑποκρίνεσθαι (Marcel Cuvigny and Guy Lachenaud, eds., *Plutarque: Œuvres Morales: TomeXII-1: Il ne faut pas s'endetter; Vies des dix orateurs* [Paris: Belles Lettres, 1981], 65).

¹¹⁵ Nagy, *Performance*, 174-6; v.s. Anthesteria in *OCD* for overview of this festival.

performance reforms.¹¹⁶ Nagy adduces McC. Brown's observations that whether the city scribe in charge of the text followed along with the actors in order to make sure that the official version was followed or dictated the exemplar ahead of time, the performances were either way subject to the official Athenian version of the play.¹¹⁷

Apart from the usual causes of textual corruption, in order to control access to these texts as carriers of cultural ideals and identity by maintaining and correcting an authoritative text, Lycurgus would have had to deal with a problem specific to dramatic works, namely alteration resulting from performance.¹¹⁸ While Jachmann has tried to dismiss interpolation resulting from performance in favor of a literary and editorial source,¹¹⁹ Denys Page puts forward convincing arguments for such actors' interpolations.¹²⁰ Page contends that between 400 B.C.E. and 200 B.C.E. Euripides' plays were subjected to heavy interpolation due to the frequency of performance.¹²¹ These interpolations took many forms: rewritten prologues for later audiences,¹²² attempts at modernization,¹²³ reinforcement of Athenian politics,¹²⁴ *causa metri*,¹²⁵ and stage

¹¹⁶ Nagy, *Performance*, 174-6. See also discussion above.

¹¹⁷ Nagy, *Performance*, 175. Nagy also draws attention to Quintilian's report that later playwrights would revise for re-performance the texts of earlier dramas (in particular Aeschylus), which were sublime but disorganized (*ibid.*, 176).

¹¹⁸ In the main, this is Nagy's argument with respect to the Homeric corpus as well. He argues that the text only fossilized and stabilized after the performance of Homer ceased to exercise an influence on the text (*Performance*, esp. 109-52).

¹¹⁹ Discussed on p. 171 in Michael D. Reeve, "Interpolation in Greek Tragedy, III," *GRBS* 14, no. 2 (1973): 145-71.

¹²⁰ Page, *Actors' Interpolations*. For an assenting opinion, see W. S. Barrett ed., *Hippolytos: Edited with Introduction and Commentary by W. S. Barrett* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1964), 45-47.

¹²¹ Page, *Actors' Interpolations*, 14.

¹²² Page, *Actors' Interpolations*, 17, 94.

¹²³ Page, *Actors' Interpolations*, 20.

directions.¹²⁶ More recently, Reeve has also stressed the role of the actor on the text of the dramatic corpus.¹²⁷ Reeve contends that “whereas almost any motive that can be ascribed to a reader or an editor can be ascribed to an actor or producer, the converse does not hold.”¹²⁸ Thus, it is easier to explain some additions as the result of performance rather than literary editing. Page’s and Reeve’s arguments about actors’ influence on dramatic texts are borne out by evidence from scholia to dramatic texts.¹²⁹ For example, there are numerous references to actors’ manipulation of the text for reasons of performance.¹³⁰ Page even goes so far as to claim that

what the original poet wrote was unimportant; what he said was irrecoverable; but there were those who spoke in his stead—the actors. The spoken word was so much more important than the written word; therefore the text of X at any given time was what the actors spoke when they performed X; and the publisher who made a book wrote what the actors said at the time and so perpetuated the actors’ alterations in the written texts which were soon to lie open before Aristophanes.¹³¹

¹²⁴ Page, *Actors’ Interpolations*, 39.

¹²⁵ Page, *Actors’ Interpolations*, 58.

¹²⁶ Page, *Actors’ Interpolations*, 113. See also Page’s survey in chapter 4.

¹²⁷ Michael D. Reeve, "Interpolation in Greek Tragedy, I," *GRBS* 13, no. 3 (1972): 247-66; *ibid.*, "Interpolation in Greek Tragedy, II," *GRBS* 13, no. 4 (1972): 451-73; *ibid.*, "Interpolation in Greek Tragedy, III."

¹²⁸ Reeve, "Interpolation in Greek Tragedy, III," 171.

¹²⁹ V.s. scaenica in the index in Eduard Schwartz, ed., *Scholia in Euripidem: Volumen II*, 406.

¹³⁰ See scholia at line 380 of *Medea*: “Didymus indicates that the actors arrange this improperly;” Δίδυμος σημειοῦται ὅτι κακῶς οἱ ὑποκριταὶ τάσσουσιν (*Scholia in Euripidem: Volumen II*, ΣΧΟΛΙΑ ΕΙΣ ΜΗΔΕΙΑΝ 380 [Schwartz ed., 164,31-32]); and scholia at line 57 of *Orestes*: “Some of the actors incorrectly make Helen and the spoils enter in the morning. For they explicitly say that she went away at night; but according to the play the spoils were gathered during the day;” οὐκ ὀρθῶς νῦν ποιούσι τινες τῶν ὑποκριτῶν πρὸ εἰσπορευμένην τὴν Ἑλένην καὶ τὰ λάφυρα. ῥητῶς γὰρ αὐτὴν νυκτὸς ἀπεστάλθαι φησὶ, τὰ δὲ κατὰ τὸ δράμα ἡμέρα συντελεῖται (*Scholia in Euripidem: Volumen I*, ΣΧΟΛΙΑ ΕΙΣ ΟΡΕΣΤΗΝ 57 [Schwartz ed., 103,14-17]).

¹³¹ Page, *Actors’ Interpolations*, 180-81.

Page's formulation may be stated in rather stark terms, but his argument that performance of dramatic works played a role in the transmission of their texts is compelling. In fact, not only is there strong evidence that dramatic texts were corrupted in the course of staging the plays, but also that the author himself modified or revised the play in rehearsals on occasion.¹³² Histrionic influence looms large in the textual traditions of dramatic works and must figure into our reconstruction of ancient editorial practices.

After Athenian attempts to stabilize and control the scripts of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides, the major editorial work on dramatic texts happened in Alexandria, where scholars were able to draw on the vast resources of the library, as Galen's report about Ptolemy's acquisition of the tragic corpus from Athens illustrates:

Because that Ptolemy was so zealous for the acquisition of all old books, they say, he made no small assurance to the Athenians. For, after giving them fifty talents of silver as a guarantee and taking the books of Sophocles, Euripides, and Aeschylus to make a copy of them freely then straightaway to return them safely and arranging them most extravagantly on the best sheets, he kept those which he received from the Athenians, and sent back those which he had prepared; and he told them both to keep the fifty-five talents and to receive the new in place of the old books which they gave.¹³³

Galen's statements about the acquisition of these manuscripts have usually been taken as referring to the official Athenian editions corrected and edited as a result of Lycurgus's reforms. If Galen can be trusted on this score, these copies were likely available for use by the scholars in Alexandria.

¹³² Page, *Actors' Interpolations*, 112-113. While this would complicate what constitutes the text of a work, it does not figure as directly into problems of corruption that need correction; our concerns here are corruptions effected by the very performers of the play.

¹³³ ὅτι δ' οὕτως ἐσπούδαζε περὶ τὴν <ἀπάντων> τῶν παλαιῶν βιβλίων κτήσιν ὁ Πτολεμαῖος ἐκεῖνος, οὐ μικρὸν εἶναι μαρτύριόν φασιν ὃ πρὸς Ἀθηναίους ἔπραξεν. δοὺς γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἐνέχυρα πεντεκαίδεκα τάλαντ' ἀργυρίου καὶ λαβὼν τὰ Σοφοκλέους καὶ Εὐριπίδου καὶ Αἰσχύλου βιβλία χάριν τοῦ γράψαι μόνον ἐξ αὐτῶν, εἴτ' εὐθέως ἀποδοῦναι σῶα, κατασκευάσας πολυτελῶς ἐν χάρταις καλλίστοις, ἃ μὲν ἔλαβε παρ' Ἀθηναίων κατέσχευεν, ἃ δ' αὐτὸς κατεσκεύασεν ἔπεμψεν αὐτοῖς παρακαλῶν <κατα>σχεῖν τε τὰ πεντεκαίδεκα τάλαντα καὶ λαβεῖν ἀνθ' ὧν ἔδοσαν βιβλίων παλαιῶν τὰ καινά (Ernst August Wenkebach, ed., *Galenus In Hippocratis Epidemiarum librum iii*, *CMG V 10,2,1* [Leipzig: Teubner, 1934], 79-80).

Aristophanes of Byzantium is once again at the center of this endeavor to edit dramatic texts in Alexandria, which represented the culmination of ancient scholarship that Pfeiffer deems “an epoch making event.”¹³⁴ Since Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff compared Aristophanes’ work on tragedy with that on Pindar and lyric poetry, a few comments regarding his work on the latter as well as comedy are warranted.¹³⁵ Like his work on Homer, Aristophanes built on his predecessors in the field of lyric.¹³⁶ Aristophanes’ labor consisted in: 1) redefining the vocabulary of lyric study; 2) with respect to Pindar, a reorganization of his corpus; 3) colometric organization of the text; and 4) the use of marginalia to mark speakers, meter, and interpolations.¹³⁷ Unfortunately, as was the case with Homer, Aristophanes’ labor on lyric has largely been lost as a result of later scholarship already in antiquity.¹³⁸ This is also true about Aristophanes’ scholarship on comedy, where Heliodorus’s colometric edition in the first century C.E. has partly occluded his work.¹³⁹ Despite the difficulties in discerning the scope of Aristophanes’ actions on the texts of comedy and lyric, evidence suggests that it did not significantly differ in kind from that on Homer. Aristophanes’ use of marginalia

¹³⁴ Pfeiffer, *Classical Scholarship*, 181. See also Barrett, *Hippolytos*, 47.

¹³⁵ Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Einleitung in die griechische Tragödie* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1921), 145.

¹³⁶ Pfeiffer mentions Zenodotus, Eratosthenes, Callimachus, and others as influential in lyric scholarship (*Classical Scholarship*, 181ff). See also the discussion of Zenodotus in Jean Irigoin, *Histoire du texte de Pindare* (Paris: C. Klincksieck, 1952), 30-33.

¹³⁷ Pfeiffer, *Classical Scholarship*, 183-88.

¹³⁸ Pfeiffer, *Classical Scholarship*, 184.

¹³⁹ Pfeiffer, *Classical Scholarship*, 189.

in lyric has already been noted;¹⁴⁰ additionally, he is reported to have emended comedic texts.¹⁴¹ Aristophanes' prominence in editing lyric, comedy, and Homer was rivaled by his work on tragedy, where, in addition to correction and editorial actions on the text itself, he also compiled *hypotheses*, i.e. introductions prefaced to the plays.¹⁴²

While Aristophanes' *hypotheses* will be investigated in detail later in this chapter, at this juncture, it is important to note that these introductions often contained information on the origins and production of the plays. The information found in these *hypotheses* could also play a role in the editing of the text. For example, in the *hypothesis* to Euripides' *Hippolytos* the reader is informed that Euripides issued two versions of this play.¹⁴³ Euripides' first version, taking third place, was not well received, while his second version took the crown.¹⁴⁴ In the case of later interpolations by actors, editors, and others, reconstructing what the author wrote, while perhaps difficult, was somewhat straightforward. Instances of second editions published by the author himself, however, complicate the problems for ancient (and modern) text critics.¹⁴⁵ In the specific case of

¹⁴⁰ For example, Irigoin cites the following scholia, τὸ κῶλον τοῦτο ἀθετεῖ Ἀριστοφάνης· περιπτεύειν γὰρ αὐτό φησι πρὸς τὰς ἀντιστροφούς (*Histoire du texte de Pindare*, 45).

¹⁴¹ See the scholion on Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazousae* where Aristophanes is said to emend (μεταγράπτω) Ἀχαιὸς τὸ Ἀλκαῖος (Slater, ed., *Aristophanis Byzantii Fragmenta*, 154). Barrett is loathe to attribute emendation to Aristophanes on the basis of this scholion; rather he thinks Aristophanes simply chose his reading from the manuscripts at his disposal (*Hippolytos*, 47).

¹⁴² For a brief overview, see Pfeiffer, *Classical Scholarship*, 192-96.

¹⁴³ ἔστι δὲ οὗτος Ἰππόλυτος δεύτερος <ὁ> καὶ στεφανίας προσαγορευόμενος. ἐμφάνεται δὲ ὕστερος γεγραμμένος· τὸ γὰρ ἀπρεπὲς καὶ κατηγορίας ἄξιον ἐν τούτῳ διώθεται τῷ δράματι. τὸ δὲ δράμα τῶν πρώτων (*Scholia in Euripideum, Volumen II, ΥΠΟΘΕΣΙΣ ΙΠΠΟΛΥΤΟΥ* [Schwartz ed., 2,10-13]).

¹⁴⁴ See Barrett, *Hippolytos*, 10-29.

¹⁴⁵ Already in antiquity questions of authenticity regarding parts of Plato's writings were voiced—a point that may lend credence to the possibility that Plato's *Republic* was published in multiple editions: according to Hilarius Emonds, Gellius's report that Xenophon read Plato's *Republic* in two books (*Attic Nights*, XIV 3,3) offered possible evidence that may be adduced to argue for second editions or interpolations in Plato's works (*Zweite Auflage im Altertum: kulturgeschichtliche Studien zur Überlieferung der antiken Literatur*

Euripides' *Hippolytos*, apart from the general plot, little is known about the earlier version.¹⁴⁶ A similar problem is found in Euripides' *Iphigenia in Aulis*, where we have evidence that this play may have been finished by Euripides' eponymous son after his father died.¹⁴⁷ Page contends that this would have created significant problems for Aristophanes of Byzantium, since already with the first performance distinguishing authentic from inauthentic would be nigh impossible.¹⁴⁸

[Leipzig: O. Harrassowitz, 1941], 364-68). Papyrus finds have also raised questions concerning second editions of Plato: in Berlin Papyrus 9782, a second century C.E. commentary on Plato's *Theaetetus*, the anonymous author identifies a second prooimion to the *Theaetetus* as inauthentic (*BKT* II p. 4 3.28-37). For a discussion of the date and author of this papyrus, see the editio princeps, Hermann Diels, Wilhelm Schubart, and Johan Ludvig Heiberg, *Anonymer kommentar zu Platons Theaetet* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1905) VIII & XXVff. See also the newly issued publications of this commentary, Francesco Adorno and et al, eds., *Corpus dei papiri filosofici greci e latini (CPF): testi e lessico nei papiri di cultura greci e latina* (Firenze: L. S. Olschki, 1989); and Heinrich Dörrie and Matthias Baltes, *Der hellenistische Rahmen des kaiserzeitlichen Platonismus: Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar* (Stuttgart Bad-Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog, 1990). Friedrich Solmsen argued that the *Republic* III, 389b—d6 is inappropriate at this place in the argument of this book ("Republic III, 389b-d6: Plato's Draft and the Editor's Mistake," *Philologus* 109 (1965): 182-85, esp. 182-3); for this reason, he hypothesized that this passage was wrongly inserted by an early editor of the Platonic corpus (*ibid.*, 184). Due to the lack of information regarding the early collection and editorial actions on Plato's work, Solmsen concluded that little more can be affirmed than that this passage may have been written by Plato for inclusion in the *Republic*. In its present place it evinces discontinuity and more likely represents a draft inappropriately inserted by an editor (*ibid.*, 183-84). According to Solmsen, if this hypothesis holds, then our version of the *Republic* was not Plato's final product but an editor's. In addition, the instability of early texts of the Platonic corpus seriously challenges any belief in a central and authoritative publication. For example, an early papyrus of Plato's *Phaedo* with vastly divergent variant readings testifies to the early instability of the text of the Platonic corpus and the Academy's lack of control over Plato's text (See Solmsen, "The Academic and the Alexandrian Editions of Plato's Works," 110 note 14). Such caveats notwithstanding, Solmsen still maintained that the collection and publication of Plato's corpus was carried out by Plato's pupils and successors in the Academy ("The Academic and the Alexandrian Editions of Plato's Works," *Illinois Classical Studies* 6, no. 1 [1981]: 102-11). While the specifics of this endeavor have not been transmitted, scholars have hypothesized that upon his death Plato's immediate successors collected and edited the autographs of his writings. This collection or edition then became the property of, and was guarded by, the scholastic institution of the Academy. While this simple reconstruction has much to commend itself, the forementioned textual instability present strong reasons for questioning if there really was such control over the early transmission of the Platonic corpus. On the early collection and transmission of Plato's works by Plato's disciples in the Academy, see also Henri Alline's detailed, yet hypothetical, reconstruction of the early (*Histoire du texte de Platon* [Paris: E. Champion, 1915], 1-64).

¹⁴⁶ Barrett, *Hippolytos*, 10-29.

¹⁴⁷ For discussion, see Page, *Actors' Interpolations*, 9ff.

¹⁴⁸ Page, *Actors' Interpolations*, 10.

Without a doubt, an author's second edition or revision of a work raises a host of problems for determining its text in a culture with little or no control over publication once a book leaves the author's hand. An ancient editor would be faced with at least three issues when attempting to differentiate between versions: 1) distinguishing between subsequent versions by the same author; 2) distinguishing between versions by different authors; and 3) distinguishing between an authorial revision and later interpolations.¹⁴⁹ Aristophanes' comedy *The Clouds* offers an illustrative example: in this case, despite ancient references to Aristophanes' first version and the virtual certainty that this earlier version was integrated into the later one, this earlier comedy has been obscured by Aristophanes' own revisions.¹⁵⁰ According to scholia and *hypotheses*, Aristophanes made a correction (διόρθωσις) of the entire play and a revision (διασκευή) of part of it.¹⁵¹ We shall have opportunity to investigate further the difference between διόρθωσις and διασκευή when we turn to the Hippocratic corpus. At this juncture it is sufficient to note that revisions of plays for later performances would seriously complicate the job of an ancient textual critic and editor in ways not dissimilar to actors' interpolations; these represent still further issues that Aristophanes of Byzantium and other ancient dramatic

¹⁴⁹ This is the main focus of Hilarius Emonds study of second editions, in which he has collected numerous references to such works (*Zweite Auflage*).

¹⁵⁰ Emonds, *Zweite Auflage*, 277-90.

¹⁵¹ Τοῦτον ταῦτόν ἐστι τῷ προτέρῳ. διασκευάσται δὲ ἐπὶ μέρους, ὡς ἂν δὴ ἀναδιδάξαι μὲν αὐτὸ τοῦ ποιητοῦ προθυμηθέντος, οὐκέτι δὲ τοῦτο δι' ἣν ποτε αἰτίαν ποιήσαντος. καθόλου μὲν οὖν σχεδὸν παρὰ πᾶν μέρος γεγενημένη διόρθωσις. κτλ: cited in Emonds, *Zweite Auflage*, 280.

editors of tragedy (e.g. Alexander of Aetolus b. ca. 315 B.C.E.)¹⁵² and comedy (e.g. Lycophron ca. 3rd B.C.E., Erastosthenes, ca. 285-194 B.C.E.)¹⁵³ had to consider.

We conclude our brief foray into the editorial practices on dramatic works by stressing continuity and difference: the practices developed and honed for application on the Homeric corpus were, in some measure, useful for dramatic texts as well, since all texts were subject to transcriptional errors. Yet this similarity should not overshadow that there were differences between the Homeric corpus and dramatic corpora. In contrast to the general stabilization of the text of Homer that we have seen after Aristarchus, Barrett argues that Aristophanes' edition did not have a stabilizing effect.¹⁵⁴ Another prominent difference in dramatic texts was instability as a result of performance, or more precisely, the role of actors as interpolators of the text of the plays. Thus Montanari's warning against extrapolating general text-critical principles from the specific case of Homer should be well heeded.¹⁵⁵

C. Hippocratic Corpus

So far we have been reconstructing editorial work based on second-hand reports or textual traditions rather than statements by those creating or using the corpora themselves. Rarely do Aristarchus, Zenodotus, or Aristophanes give reasons for their text-critical judgments. If we are lucky, we are forced to hypothesize based on the

¹⁵² For a discussion of Alexander Aetolus's work on tragedy alongside Lycophron's on comedy and Zenodotus's on Homer, see Pfeiffer, *Classical Scholarship*, 105ff.

¹⁵³ Little is known about the extent of Lycophron's editorial work on comedy, though Pfeiffer points out that Lycophron's *Περὶ κωμωδίας* indicates that he undertook such research and probably edited texts as well (*Classical Scholarship*, 119-120). Pfeiffer also discusses Eratosthenes' work on comedy (*ibid.*, 159ff).

¹⁵⁴ Barrett, *Hippolytos*, 56-57.

¹⁵⁵ Montanari, "Zenodotus, Aristarchus and the Ekdosis of Homer," 3-4.

evidence transmitted in the text itself (e.g. variants in Plato) or in the scholia (e.g. the Homeric corpus). Quite often, we are given nothing more than ciphers, names of ancient scholars, whose labors have not survived the vicissitudes of history (e.g. Lycophron's edition of comedies).¹⁵⁶ This is not the case with Galen's work on the Hippocratic corpus. Although Galen does not seem to have engaged in active editorial work on Hippocratic writings so as to create an edition for his use or publication, he does offer an illuminating look at how an ancient scholar attempted to navigate the pitfalls of textual transmission in a manuscript culture. Galen also gives considerable information about earlier attempts to collect and edit the Hippocratic corpus by Dioscurides and Artemidorus Capiton and his reception of these editions.¹⁵⁷

In the course of his exegetical work on the Hippocratic corpus, Galen makes numerous references to ancient manuscripts, variant readings, and text-critical work on Hippocrates' writings.¹⁵⁸ For our purposes, it is not necessary to investigate each one of these references. I will instead focus on some particularly noteworthy examples that elucidate Galen's understanding of textual criticism, problems of textual transmission in antiquity, and auspices under which text-critical decisions were made. The most salient feature of Galen's discussions of textual instability is the inextricable relationship between the text and his interpretation informed by his conception of Hippocratic authorship.

¹⁵⁶ Pfeiffer, *Classical Scholarship*, 106 & 19-20.

¹⁵⁷ For an overview and survey of the evidence for Capiton's and Dioscurides' editions of the Hippocratic corpus, see Johannes Ilberg, "Die Hippokratesausgaben des Artemidorus Kapiton und Dioscurides," *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 45 (1890): 111-37.

¹⁵⁸ See the material collected in L. O. Bröker, "Die Methoden Galens in der literarischen Kritik," *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 40 (1885): 415-38.

One particularly noteworthy example of Galen’s discussion of ancient textual scholarship resulting from textual variation in the Hippocratic corpus comes from his commentary on the sixth book of the *Epidemics*, where he alludes to a famous text-critical decision on the Hippocratic corpus.¹⁵⁹ Galen’s discussion is lengthy but worth extensive quotation:

I do not know how even this book, many interpreters mistreat wrongly, just as also some of the writings of Hippocrates, as each changing the style (λέξις) throughout, hope to interpret persuasively, with the result that I was compelled for this reason to investigate the most ancient copies (παλαιότατα τῶν ἀντιγράφων) and commentaries of those who first interpreted the book, in which both Zeuxis, the two Herakleides, both from Tarantinos and from Erythrae, and before them Baccheius and Glaucias. Then if, after setting forth the old reading (γραφή), they said that the wording was probably wrong and for this reason that they conjectured that Hippocrates’ reading was something else, I approved them, if, after correction, I found something useful and at the same time having the intention of the old one. But, since sometimes they are even mistaken about both, it seemed much better to me by guarding the old reading always to be zealous to interpret it, but whenever I was not able to do this it seemed best for a plausible correction (πιθανὴν τὴν ἐπανόρθωσιν) of it to be made, as Herakleides did in the second book of the *Epidemics* as a result of the wording in which it is written: “the tails looked toward the temple of Aphrodite.” Since to the interpreters it unpersuasively offers the reading “tails,” they say, “perhaps ‘doors’ (ΘΥΡΔΙ) was written. Because of the theta the scribe (βιβλιογράφος) thought to write ‘tails’ (ΟΥΡΔΙ) because the middle of the letter was lost.” For, indeed, in this way it is possible that this letter was destroyed from a small destructive force, or an insect eating it, or straightway from the beginning written dimly to become faded by time. Of all those changing the old readings I find Capiton and Dioscurides to have done this most audaciously. Therefore, after investigating which of all of them it is better to make mention of, either those emended reasonably or not at all by anyone, I found it to be best to make mention of all, if in the extent of the commentaries none of those reading them thought [them] to be disagreeable, [to make mention] not only of the many censured by them, but also of those zealous only for useful things by having verisimilitude; [I found it best] for some middle interpretation of these two to be made and straightaway to say this beforehand at the beginning so that those not pleased with these might depart from these commentaries. ...Just as I declared so it is necessary to declare again that the type of the style in this book greatly differs from that throughout the first and third book of *Epidemics* which alone almost everyone thinks were written for publication (πρὸς ἔκδοσιν) by Hippocrates. But of the five others, the fifth and the sixth are clearly inauthentic (νόθα), but the sixth and before that the second,

¹⁵⁹ For a full discussion of this variant, see Wesley D. Smith, *The Hippocratic Tradition* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1979), 210-15; and Hanson, "Galen: Author and Critic," 43-4. For a view of this variant against the backdrop of corruptions more generally, see Karl Lehrs, *De Aristarchi studiis homericis* (Lipsiae: Apud S. Hirzelium, 1882), 349.

which Hippocrates himself prepared for himself, they say was put together by Thessalus his son. Some even think that Thessalus himself added something; some think that others of those after him.¹⁶⁰

Galen's statements offer a remarkable look at the ways in which a learned ancient reader would approach a text, fully aware of the problems of transmitting ancient texts. This passage highlights four important issues that dovetail into our discussion of ancient practices of text criticism: 1) Galen's awareness of problems of textual instability in antiquity; 2) Galen's indictment of textual decisions not in conformity with his understanding of Hippocrates, the Hippocratic corpus, or his interpretations based thereon; 3) Galen's concern for traditions of interpretation, textual emendation, and a

¹⁶⁰ Οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως καὶ τοῦτο τὸ βιβλίον, ὥσπερ καὶ ἄλλο τι τῶν τοῦ Ἱπποκράτους συγγραμμάτων ἐλυμήναντο πολλοὶ τῶν ἐξηγητῶν ἄλλος ἄλλως, ὡς ἕκαστος ἤλπισε πιθανῶς ἐξηγήσασθαι, τὴν κατὰ τοῦτο λέξιν ὑπαλλάττων, ὥστε ἠναγκάσθην ἐγὼ διὰ τοῦτο τὰ τε παλαιότατα τῶν ἀντιγράφων ἐπιζητήσαι τὰ τε ὑπομνήματα τῶν πρώτων ἐξηγησαμένων τὸ βιβλίον, ἐν οἷς καὶ Ζεῦξις ἐστι <καὶ> ὁ Ταραντίνος καὶ ὁ Ἐρυθραῖος Ἡρακλείδης καὶ πρὸ αὐτῶν Βακχεῖος τε καὶ Γλαυκίος. εἰ μὲν οὖν μετὰ τὸ δηλῶσαι τὴν παλαιὰν γραφὴν ἔλεγον ἡμαρτήσθαι τὴν λέξιν εἰκὸς εἶναι καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ὑπονοεῖν αὐτοὶ τὴν Ἱπποκράτους γραφὴν εἶναι τήνδε τινα, κἂν ἀπεδεξάμην αὐτούς, εἴ γε μετὰ τὴν ἐπανόρθωσιν ἐύρων διδάσκοντάς τι χρήσιμόν τε ἅμα καὶ τῆς γνώμης ἐχόμενον τοῦ παλαιοῦ. ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐνίοτε καὶ κατ' ἄμφω σφάλλονται, πολὺ βέλτιον ἔδοξέ μοι φυλάττοντι τὴν ἀρχαίαν γραφὴν αἰεὶ μὲν σπουδάζειν ἐκείνην ἐξηγεῖσθαι, μὴ δυνηθέντι δὲ ποτε τοῦτο πράξαι πιθανὴν τὴν ἐπανόρθωσιν αὐτῆς ποιεῖσθαι, καθάπερ ὁ Ἡρακλείδης ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ τῶν Ἐπιδημιῶν ἐποίησατο κατὰ τὴν λέξιν ἐκείνην ἐν ἧ' γέγραπται· “πρὸς δὲ τὸ Ἄφροδισιον αἰ οὐραὶ ἔβλεπον.” ἐπειδήπερ τοῖς ἐξηγησαμένοις τὴν “οὐραὶ” γραφὴν ἀπιθάνως εἴρηται, “τάχα”, φησὶ “θῦραι” μὲν ἦν γεγραμμένον διὰ τοῦ θ, τῆς μέσης δὲ γραμμῆς ἐν αὐτῷ διαφθαρείσης ἔδοξεν ὁ βιβλιογράφος “οὐραὶ” γεγράφθαι.” δυνατὸν γὰρ δὴ οὕτως καὶ λεπτήσιν ἰνὸς ἀπολωλυίας συναπολέσθαι τὴν γραμμὴν ταύτην, καὶ μυίας <γ> αὐτὴν ἐκφαγούσης, καὶ κατ' ἀρχὰς εὐθὺς αὐτὴν ἀμυδρῶς γραφεῖσιν ἐξίτηλον [αὐτὴν] ὑπὸ τοῦ χρόνου γενέσθαι. πάντων δὲ τῶν ὑπαλλαξάντων τὰς παλαιὰς γραφὰς τολμηρότατα τοὺς περὶ Καπίτωνα καὶ Διοσκουρίδην εὐρίσκω πράξαντας τοῦτο. πότερον μὲν οὖν ἄμεινόν ἐστιν ἀπάντων αὐτῶν ἢ μόνων τῶν εὐλόγως μεταγραφῶντων ἢ μηδενὸς ὅλως μεμνήσθαι, σκοπούμενος εὖρον, εἰ μὲν τῷ μήκει τῶν ὑπομνημάτων οὐδεὶς ἔμελλε <τῶν> ἀναγνωσομένων αὐτὰ δυσχεραίνειν, ἀπάντων μεμνήσθαι κάλλιον εἶναι, μεμφομένων δὲ πολλῶν οὐ τούτοις μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς συμμέτρως ἔχουσι καὶ μόνον σπουδαζόντων τὰ χρήσιμα, μέσῃν τινα τούτων ἀμφοτέρων ποιήσασθαι τὴν ἐξήγησιν καὶ τοῦτο εὐθέως ἐν ἀρχῇ προειπεῖν, ὅπως ἀπαλλάττωνται τῶνδε τῶν ὑπομνημάτων οἱ μὴ χαίροντες τούτοις...θεωρῶν δ' εἰς πολλοὺς ἐκπίπτοντα τὰ γραφόμενα προοιμίῳ τοιούτων ἐδεήθη. ὥσπερ οὖν τοῦτο προεῖπον, οὕτω καὶ τότε προειπεῖν ἀναγκαῖόν ἐστιν, ὡς τὸ τῆς ἐρμηνείας εἶδος ἐν τῷδε τῷ βιβλίῳ πάμπαν διαλλάττει τοῦ κατὰ τὸ πρῶτον καὶ τρίτον τῶν Ἐπιδημιῶν, ἃ σχεδὸν ἅπαντες ἠγοῦνται γεγράφθαι πρὸς ἕκδοσιν ὑφ' Ἱπποκράτους μόνον, τῶν δ' ἄλλων πέντε τὸ μὲν πέμπτον τε καὶ ἕβδομον ἐναργῶς εἶναι νόθα, τὸ δ' ἕκτον τοῦτο καὶ πρὸ αὐτοῦ δεύτερον, ἐξ ὧν αὐτὸς <ὁ> Ἱπποκράτης ἐαυτῷ παρασκευάσατο, φασὶν ὑπὸ Θεσσαλοῦ τοῦ υἱέος αὐτοῦ συντεθῆναι. καὶ τινὲς μὲν ἠγοῦνται καὶ αὐτόν τι παρεγράψαι τὸν Θεσσαλόν, τινὲς δὲ ἄλλους τῶν μετ' αὐτόν (Ernst August Wenkebach and Franz Pfaff, eds., *Galen in Hippocratis Epidemiarum Librum VI Commentaria I-VIII, CMG V 10,2,2* [Berlin: Teubner, 1956], 3-5).

reading's usefulness (χρήσιμον); and 4) the interrelationship between ancient textual criticism and interpretation.

Galen was surely not unique among ancient scholars in his awareness of the problems of textual transmission in antiquity. While it may be rare to find discussions of the reasons for errors that crept into manuscript traditions, this tacit understanding of the vagaries of human copying undoubtedly drove the practice of correction (διόρθωσις). In this passage Galen posits accidental errors, which have created an interpretive stumbling block in the transmission of the phrase “the tails looked toward the temple of Aphrodite.” The difficulty of this phrase forced interpreters and editors to offer alternative readings. Galen neither disputes the possibility of an error entering the manuscript tradition nor the possible reasons which would make a scribe mistake a theta for an omicron.

In order to rectify such problematic passages, Galen first turns to the oldest copies and commentaries to see if any variant readings have been transmitted in the MS tradition or offered by previous interpreters. When recourse to these offer no assistance, Galen then turns to the last option, emendation in the form of a plausible correction (πιθανῶν τῶν ἐπανόρθωσιν). While Galen remains reluctant to emend or reject readings and, if possible, prefers to make some interpretation of the old reading, this reluctance does not obviate the necessity of a meaningful interpretation. Although Galen gives priority to the ancient readings and manuscripts and opposed the work of some correctors and editors, he did not reject correction completely when there was clear evidence of an error in transcription. Even more important, Galen's ultimate guiding principle in reverting to such textual manipulation was hermeneutic: Galen felt justified in altering a text, if he was unable to make a reasonable interpretation from it. His reference to the oldest copies

(παλαιότατα τῶν ἀντιγράφων)¹⁶¹—a clear indication that his judgments were in part based on manuscript evidence—should not belie that Galen himself offered different readings when he thought the context warranted it and he thought there were justifiable reasons for alteration.¹⁶² While Galen may not have been quick to resort to altering the text, he was not completely averse to it.

Galen's justification for introducing changes and his denunciation of other's changes can be traced back to Galen's conception of Hippocratic authorship and teaching.¹⁶³ Galen's disagreements with Hippocratic editors and interpreters result from what Galen views as misunderstandings of Hippocratic doctrine and authenticity. Despite Galen's references to manuscripts and other readings, the primary criterion for an authentic Hippocratic reading was conformity to his own conception of Hippocratic doctrine and interpretation. He explicitly says that he altered the text when unable to interpret it. Other statements also bear out the interrelation of Galen's interpretation and

¹⁶¹ See also references to πλείστα τῶν ἀντιγράφων οἱ παλαιότερα τῶν ἀντιγράφων collected in Bröker, "Die Methoden Galens," 423.

¹⁶² Bröker lists multiple reasons which Galen would adduce in support of his arguments concerning variants: for example, diction that does not correspond to Hippocrates' dialect or archaic expressions and confusions between similarly shaped (Θ and Ο) and similar sounding (ε and η) letters ("Die Methoden Galens.") In every case, of course, the overriding principle was the conformity of Hippocratic doctrine to Galen's interpretation of these teachings.

¹⁶³ It is worth noting that similar concerns may have shaped Plato's corpus. Although the place of doctrinal corruptions of Plato's text has not been studied extensively, John Dillon has put forward compelling arguments that some variants in Plato's works—especially the *Timaeus*—can be traced to debates and competing interpretations over Plato's works ("Tampering with the *Timaeus*: Ideological Emendations in Plato," in *The Golden Chain: Studies in the Development of Platonism and Christianity* [Hampshire, Great Britain: Variorum, 1990]). Moreover he even adduces Hierocles of Alexandria (ca. 5th century C.E.), who already in antiquity accused some of such corruption (ibid., 51 note 2). For Hierocles, the corruption of Plato's—and Aristotle's—text was intimately related to conflicting interpretations. Dillon's investigation offers many compelling examples of such corruption; he adduces variants that either support or call into question the following: 1) the temporal creation of the world; 2) the eternal creation of the world; and 3) the place of the logos in cosmology and anthropology (ibid., 57-66). While these issues may seem picayune, the contours of scholastic allegiance hinged on just such finely articulated points. These later interpreters played a central role in collecting, editing, and transmitting Plato's works; they also played a demonstrable role in changing the text in light of their own hermeneutic. As Dillon succinctly puts it: "all these Platonists are at one in attempting to doctor the text to facilitate their interpretation" (ibid., 59).

judgments of authenticity. In questioning whether or not an aphorism should be attributed to Hippocrates, Galen says, “the diction transitions from the natural style to that called affected.”¹⁶⁴ In another place Galen makes reference to “most of the copies that do not seem to be the style of Hippocrates.”¹⁶⁵ Galen’s distinction between authentic and inauthentic Hippocratic writings based on diction (λέξις) and style (ἐρμηνεία) recalls criteria, which Alexandrian Homeric critics utilized to distinguish inauthentic from the authentic. The importance of Galen’s interpretation of Hippocratic doctrine is evident, when Galen claims that, even if a work is inauthentic (νόθον), the teachings found therein are authentic (γνήσιον) and so should not be rejected.¹⁶⁶ The authenticity of doctrine as arbiter for authenticity of the text also relates to the criterion of a reading’s usefulness (χρήσιμον) for determining whether or not it was genuine.¹⁶⁷ Galen’s statements that a phrase (or book) is authentic (γνήσιον) or inauthentic (νόθον) insofar as it conforms to (Galen’s conception of) Hippocratic doctrine underscores the dependence of authenticity on interpretation.¹⁶⁸ What is noteworthy in such cases is the role of Galen’s interpretation and his belief that Hippocrates, the foremost medical authority, must be correct in his teachings. If Hippocrates is thought to be wrong, he has either been misunderstood, improperly transmitted, or interpolated. The criterion for distinguishing the proper

¹⁶⁴ ἡ λέξις ἀποκεχώρηκε τῆς κατὰ φύσιν ἐρμηνείας ἐπὶ τοῦτο δὴ τὸ καλούμενον κακόζηλον: cited in Bröker, "Die Methoden Galens," 421. For a discussion of the style κακόζηλια, see Eduard Norden, *Die antike Kunstprosa vom VI Jahrhundert V. Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance* (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1909), 278.

¹⁶⁵ πλείστα τῶν ἀντίγραφων δοκεῖ οὐκ εἶναι τῆς Ἱπποκράτους ἐρμηνείας: cited in Bröker, "Die Methoden Galens," 423.

¹⁶⁶ Smith, *The Hippocratic Tradition*, 170-71.

¹⁶⁷ This is not unrelated to early Christian writers who contend that a reading’s orthodoxy proves its authenticity and thus apostolic authority.

¹⁶⁸ We will address the larger problem of inauthentic books as opposed to mere variants below.

interpretation—or text-critical judgment—of Hippocratic writings was Galen’s interpretation. Galen may not state the matter quite so baldly, but the practical result of this interrelationship between Galen’s interpretation and conception of Hippocratic authenticity is that he felt completely justified in dismissing the oldest copies and previous commentators if their reading could not be reconciled with his own interpretation. Smith draws out this point succinctly: “In short Galen varies between carelessness and pedantry in attributing material to Hippocrates, depending on the needs of his argument. He is always concerned that Hippocrates’ view accord with his own, but is not concerned with consistent attribution of Hippocrates works.”¹⁶⁹ Smith also contends that Galen could mount arguments for, or against, the authenticity of any given work if his interpretation required it.¹⁷⁰ This need for Hippocrates and Hippocratic teaching to coincide with Galen’s own understanding and interpretation of Hippocrates and Hippocratic authenticity lies at the heart of Galen’s text-critical and exegetical decisions. Galen’s criteria and methods for determining the veracity and authenticity of a reading are malleable and fluid; they are employed to serve Galen’s interpretation of what is authentically Hippocratic.

This brings us to another crucial point: Galen’s ambivalence with respect to his predecessors. On the one hand, as in the quotation above, Galen makes a point to draw on previous commentators and Hippocratic scholars in order to amass evidence for useful variant readings. On the other hand, he often lambastes them for misunderstanding

¹⁶⁹ Smith, *The Hippocratic Tradition*, 119.

¹⁷⁰ Smith also notes that Galen’s authority hinges on his ability to domesticate and appropriate Hippocrates and the Hippocratic tradition (*The Hippocratic Tradition*, 119).

Hippocratic teaching or corrupting the Hippocratic tradition.¹⁷¹ For this reason, Galen casts aspersions on editorial work done on the Hippocratic corpus.¹⁷² He mentions numerous scholars in the passage above, but his singling out of Dioscurides and Artemidorus Capiton is especially important.¹⁷³ From Galen we learn that the kinsmen, Dioscurides and Capiton,¹⁷⁴ both made editions (ἐκδοσεις) of the Hippocratic corpus in the second century during the reign of Hadrian.¹⁷⁵ In making these editions, Capiton at least drew on methods of Alexandrian Homeric scholarship perfected by Aristarchus: he utilized the obelus to distinguish phrases that ought to be attributed to Hippocrates' son rather than Hippocrates himself.¹⁷⁶ Although Galen appears to have made extensive use of these editions of the Hippocratic corpus, he did not simply accept them uncritically.¹⁷⁷ Rather, the editorial decisions made by Artemidorus Capiton and Dioscurides drew Galen's ire for numerous reasons. Foremost among Galen's reasons for criticizing their editorial efforts was their purported audacious rejection or emendation of old readings,

¹⁷¹ Ann Ellis Hanson draws attention to and summarizes Daniela Manetti's and Amneris Roselli's observation that Galen's use and abuse of his predecessors evinces a peculiar ambivalence: "while Galen privileges Hippocratic medicine above all, criticizing those who followed in Hellenistic times as a quarrelsome lot, unable and unwilling to understand the master, he is, at the same time, valuing as old the Hippocratic commentaries of the scholar/physicians at Alexandria, whose increasing emancipation from Hippocrates' medicine he considers misguided" ("Galen: Author and Critic," in *Editing Texts = Texte edieren* [ed. Glenn W. Most; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998], 44).

¹⁷² Hanson notes that the vociferousness of Galen's attacks on Dioscurides and Capiton gains intensity over time ("Galen: Author and Critic," 42-46).

¹⁷³ For information on Bacchius, Zeuxis, Herakleides of Tarantum, and Herakleides of Erythrae, see Smith, *The Hippocratic Tradition*.

¹⁷⁴ Galen identifies Artemidorus as Dioscurides' συγγενούς. See Ilberg, "Die Hippokratesausgaben," 113.

¹⁷⁵ For a collection of Galen's comments on the editions of Dioscurides and Artemidorus Capiton, see Ilberg, "Die Hippokratesausgaben."

¹⁷⁶ Ilberg, "Die Hippokratesausgaben," 123 note 2.

¹⁷⁷ For a discussion of Galen's use of their editions, see Hanson, "Galen: Author and Critic." For Galen's view of Hippocratic authenticity more generally, see Mewaldt, "Galenos über echte und unechte Hippocratica."

which was coupled with, in Galen's opinion, their ignorance of Hippocratic doctrine. Speaking of Dioscurides and Capiton's work on the Hippocratic text, Galen claims, "they both changed many readings, exchanging the old readings, which alone those who interpret the books of Hippocrates know."¹⁷⁸ Here, as above, Galen faults their editorial work for the rejection of old, accepted readings. But it is not just their departure from his text-critical principles that Galen protests; it is also their ignorance of Hippocratic authorship.¹⁷⁹ In Galen's mind, text criticism on the *Corpus Hippocraticum* was inextricably linked with proper interpretation rooted in knowledge of Hippocratic teaching. According to Galen, Dioscurides and Artemidorus Capiton were deficient in this fundamental respect, whereas his own statements indicate that he saw himself as eminently qualified for the task.

Despite Galen's polemic against Dioscurides and Artemidorus Capiton, they too were concerned with drawing distinctions between authentic and inauthentic Hippocratic readings. Dioscurides, like Galen, also identified and called attention to levels of authorship in the Hippocratic corpus: this, as noted, was one of the primary uses of the obelus.¹⁸⁰ In addition to discerning passages written by Thessalus, Hippocrates' son, Dioscurides also noted interpolations by Hippocrates' eponymous grandson,

¹⁷⁸ πολλὰ μὲν οὖν ἀμφοτέροι μετέγραψαν, ὑπαλλάττοντες τὰς παλαιὰς γραφάς, ἃς μόνος ἴσασιν οἱ ἐξηγησάμενοι τὰ Ἱπποκράτους βιβλία; quoted in Ilberg, "Die Hippokratesausgaben," 113.

¹⁷⁹ Ilberg maintains that "Mag uns Galens hartes Urtheil, der den Herausgeber mit grosser Animosität nicht nur häufig der τόλμα, sondern sogar der ἀμάθεια zeihet, nicht davon zurückschrecken, seine uns erhaltenen Lesarten zu überblicken" ("Die Hippokratesausgaben," 116).

¹⁸⁰ Ταύτης ὅλης τῆς ῥήσεως ἐκάστου στίχου Διοσκουρίδης προσέγραψε σημεῖον, ὃ καλοῦσιν ὀβελόν ὅτι σημεῖον καὶ Ἀρίσταρχος ἐχρήσατο παρὰ τῷ ποιητῇ πρὸς τοὺς ὑποπτευομένους ὑπ' αὐτοῦ στίχους. ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ὁ Διοσκουρίδης ἔγραψεν, εἰκάζων εἶναι τὴν προκειμένην ῥῆσιν Ἱπποκράτους τοῦ Θεσσαλοῦ υἱέος; cited in Ilberg, "Die Hippokratesausgaben," 123 note 2.

Hippocrates.¹⁸¹ In this way, Hippocrates, just like Homer, was spared the disgrace of unseemly passages.¹⁸²

While Galen may have endorsed altering the text under circumscribed conditions, he also acknowledged that there were limits to such textual manipulation. Galen sets even more restrictions on textual alteration beyond his own interpretation. Further qualification of his earlier statements regarding a plausible correction (πιθανὴν τὴν ἐπανόρθωσιν) is especially evident in his discussion of the principle of revision (διασκευή), where Galen informs that:

A second book written in place of one formerly written is said to be revised (ἐπιδιασκευάσθαι), when it has the same *hypothesis* and most of the same words; some (of the words) taken out from the former work; some added; some altered. If you want an example of this for the sake of clarity, you have the second Autolycus of Eupolis revised from the former. Thus the doctors from Cnidus published the second *Cnidian Opinions* in place of the former ones; some having the same in every way; but some added; some taken away; just as some altered. This then is the second book of Hippocrates which they say is more medical than the former.¹⁸³

Galen's discussion of revision (διασκευή) offers an opportunity to investigate briefly the role of revisers (διασκευασταί) of a text and how they differ from a corrector (διορθωτής).¹⁸⁴ We have already extensively discussed the correctors of the Homeric

¹⁸¹ Smith, *The Hippocratic Tradition*, 237.

¹⁸² Smith, *The Hippocratic Tradition*, 237.

¹⁸³ Ἐπιδιασκευάσθαι λέγεται βιβλίον ἐπὶ τῷ προτέρῳ γεγραμμένῳ τὸ δεύτερον γραφέν, ὅταν τὴν ὑπόθεσιν ἔχον τὴν αὐτὴν καὶ τὰς πλείστας τῶν ῥήσεων τὰς αὐτὰς τινὰ μὲν ἀφηρημένα τῶν ἐκ τοῦ προτέρου συγγράμματος ἔχη, τινὰ δὲ προσκείμενα, τινὰ δὲ ὑπηλλαγμένα· παράδειγμα δ' εἰ βούλει τούτου σαφηνείας ἔνεκα, τὸν δεύτερον Αὐτόλυκον Εὐπόλιδος ἔχεις ἐκ τοῦ προτέρου διασκευασμένον. οὕτω δὲ καὶ τὰς Κνιδίας γνώμας ἐπὶ ταῖς προτέραις δευτέρας ἐξέδοσαν οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Κνίδου ἰατροί, τινὰ μὲν ἐχούσας τὰ αὐτὰ πάντα, τινὰ δὲ προσκείμενα τινὰ δὲ ἀφηρημένα, καθάπερ γε καὶ ὑπηλλαγμένα· τοῦτ' οὖν τὸ δεύτερον βιβλίον ὃ Ἰπποκράτης ἰατρικώτερον συγκείσθαι φησι τοῦ προτέρου (Johannes Mewaldt, ed., *Galenus In Hippocratis De victu acutorum CMG V 9,1* [Leipzig: Teubner, 1914], 120.5-14).

¹⁸⁴ Galen uses διασκευάσθαι elsewhere to address revisions, but they do not transmit the detailed information present in the passage above; see e.g. Wenkebach, ed., *Galenus In Hippocratis Epidemiarum librum iii, CMG V 10,2,1* 80.12. According to Emonds the *hypothesis* to Aristophanes' *Clouds* draws a

corpus. Even though their labors were not always embraced, they nevertheless came to occupy an important place in the stabilization of the Homeric corpus. By contrast, those called revisers are often faulted for their text-critical actions on the Homeric text¹⁸⁵ as were their revisions.¹⁸⁶ Similarly, Diogenes Laertius draws a distinction between books properly attributed to Democritus and those which have been revised.¹⁸⁷ Yet the distinction between correction and revision is problematic—just like that between ἔκδοσις and διόρθωσις mentioned earlier; in fact, Diogenes does not reject these revised books as spurious. According to the scholia, even Zenodotus’s actions on the Homeric corpus were sometimes viewed as the work of revision rather than correction.¹⁸⁸ In fact, the reasons

distinction between διόρθωσις and διασκευή, the former introducing “no essential difference” to the play whereas the latter is a complete reworking: “die διόρθωσις keine wesentliche Änderung der Komödie besagt, während es sich bei der διασκευή um eine vollständige Neufassung des betreffenden Abschnittes handelt” (*Zweite Auflage*, 284-85). This understanding stands somewhat at odds with Galen’s formulation. Perhaps the difference should be attributed to the revision (διασκευή) issuing from the author himself (i.e. a second edition by the author), in contrast to διασκευή as a process of editorial revision, which is our foremost concern. See also the discussion of διασκευή in Eduard Stemplinger, *Das Plagiat in der griechischen Literatur* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1912 [1990 G. Olms reprint]), 215-18.

¹⁸⁵ Pfeiffer draws a clear boundary between Zenodotus’s work as a διορθωτής and “the disreputable διασκευαστάς,” (*Classical Scholarship*, 114). Similarly the scholia collected in Lehrs, *De Aristarchi studiis homericis*, 328-331 often find fault with the textual revisions offered by the diaskeuast. Among the many examples which Lehrs isolates, two are representative (*De Aristarchi studiis homericis*, 330). At Z 441 the reviser who added verses 433ff is said to err: ὁ δὲ διασκευαστῆς ἐπλανήθη (*Scholia in Iliadem: Volumen II*, Z 441 a. [Erbse ed. 205,44]); at book Λ of the *Odyssey* 73 uses diction contrary to Homer’s customary usage: κέχρηται δὲ τῇ λέξει ὁ διασκευαστῆς παρὰ τὴν τοῦ ποιητοῦ συνήθειαν (*Scholia in Odysseam*, Λ 584 [Dindorfius ed. 523,17-18]).

¹⁸⁶ There is even a curious reference to a τεκμήριον τῆς διασκευῆς in the scholia. See Lehrs, *De Aristarchi studiis homericis*, 331; and Valk, *Researches: Part Two*, 90. Ilberg also draws attention to Galen’s reference to τὰ διεσκευασμένα τῶν ἀντιγραφῶν (“Die Hippokratesausgaben,” 133).

¹⁸⁷ “But the others which some bring forward as his, some are revisions of his works, others are acknowledged as foreign;” τὰ δ’ ἄλλα ὅσα τινὲς εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ μὲν ἐκ τῶν αὐτοῦ διεσκευάσται, τὰ δ’ ὁμολογουμένως ἐστὶν ἀλλότρια (Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum*, 9.49).

¹⁸⁸ ὅτι Ζηνόδοτος καὶ ἐνταῦθα διεσκεύακε γράφων “καὶ τότ’ ἄρ’ ἐξ Ἰδης προσέφη Ζεὺς ὃν φίλον υἷόν”, ἔν’ ἐκ τῆς Ἰδης προσφωνῆ τὸν ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ Ἀπόλλωνα. γελοῖον δὲ τὸ κραυγάζειν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰδης τὸν Δία. οὐ νενόηκεν οὖν ὅτι τὰ τοιαῦτα κατὰ σιωπώμενον ἐνεργούμενα δεῖ παραδέχεσθαι, καθάπερ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐπάνω περὶ τῆς Ἥρας (*Scholia in Iliadem: Volumen IV*, Π 666 [Erbse ed. 287,89-288,94]). Lehrs draws attention to a reference in the Venetus scholia that this may have been marked with a dotted diiple because of Zenodotus’s revision (*De Aristarchi studiis homericis*, 329).

undergirding revision are often indistinguishable from correction: for example, a scholion on *Iliad* Υ line 269 informs that “four lines are athetized because they have been revised by one of those who want to solve a problem. But they clearly conflict with those that are authentic.”¹⁸⁹ Because they conflict with those acknowledged as authentic, these lines are deemed to have been revised. According the scholiast, an interpretive problem was the reason for this revision.

Lehrs, who made an extensive study of revision, summarizes διασκευή as follows: “therefore to revise (*diaskeuazein*) is said 1) about a book or passage which dismissed the first and genuine form either by adding or some other act of changing, it is revised. 2) The passage itself which is added is called revised (*διεσκευασμένος*), the same as elaborated (*ἐνδιεσκευασμένος*).”¹⁹⁰ In Lehrs’s formulation διασκευή refers to actions on a text that results in a departure from the original. This formulation, however, raises a problem for our discussion and for ancient revisers. The very heart of textual criticism is the differentiation between the originals and later changes. Zenodotus may be faulted by later critics for changing or altering the original; but for Zenodotus the change was surely a correction, even if later commentators deemed it revision.

In this light, Galen’s attempt to draw a distinction between revision and correction offers us an illuminating look at the extent to which he thinks a text can be changed before it ceases to be the same text. Yet imprecision mars his definition. The ambiguity of Galen’s descriptions of the amount of change that is permissible (i.e. “some” [τινά])

¹⁸⁹ ἀθετεοῦνται στίχοι τέσσαρες, ὅτι διεσκευασμένοι εἰσὶν ὑπὸ τίνος τῶν βουλομένων πρόβλημα ποιεῖν. μάχεται δὲ σαφῶς τοῖς γνησιοῖς (*Scholia in Iliadem: Volumen V, Υ* 269—272 [Erbse ed. 47,7-8]). Note that πρόβλημα, which here undergirds the reason for revision, was also applied to difficulties in interpreting Homer and supplied justification for correction and emendation.

¹⁹⁰ ergo diaskeuazein dicitur 1) de libro vel loco qui primam et genuinam formam vel additamentis vel quibusque mutationibus factis amisit, διεσκεύασται. 2) Locus ipse qui additus est dicitur διεσκευασμένος i.q. ἐνδιεσκευασμένος (Lehrs, *De Aristarchi studiis homericis*, 331).

words can be taken out, added, or altered) is mitigated by his claims that: 1) that most (πλείστα) of the words must remain—an extremely vague formulation; and 2) that the work has the same *hypothesis*.

Galen's concern for maintaining the same *hypothesis* offers clarification regarding the limits of textual manipulation; yet it too is ambiguous. The word *hypothesis* has considerable semantic range deriving from the literal meaning “a placing under.”¹⁹¹ A few specific definitions are relevant for interpreting Galen's usage here: the foundation or subject-matter of a discussion, the overarching subject of a writing, and the presupposition that forms the basis of an argument.¹⁹² Neither subject-matter nor subject of a writing strain Galen's possible meaning, but since both of these meanings appear too broad, the more likely possibility is that Galen uses *hypothesis* to refer to the presupposition and foundation that forms the basis of an argument or work. A typical example of this type of meaning of *hypothesis* is Galen's discussion of fevers, where he explains that despite the different origins of fevers, they all proceed from the same foundations or presuppositions regarding the elemental makeup of bodies.¹⁹³ Thus a revised work must maintain the same argumentative foundation or elemental presupposition; to transgress this hypothesis is to create a new work rather than a revision.

Galen's identification as the *hypothesis* as the limit of textual manipulation offers an important corollary to his critiques of emendations that go against the proper (i.e. his) interpretation of Hippocratic teaching. Words can be changed, added, and taken away as

¹⁹¹ V.s. ὑπόθεσις in *LSJ*.

¹⁹² The range of meanings for ὑπόθεσις is broad. *LSJ* devotes almost two full columns (pp.1881-1882).

¹⁹³ *De differentiis febrium librii ii* (Kühn ed., VII 281,2-14).

long as the *hypothesis* of a book is not significantly altered. Despite the clarity of Galen's statements, application of this principle would likely be difficult. How is the *hypothesis* to be determined, when the foundations or presuppositions of a book would be contingent on interpretation? For Galen, of course, this would probably not be a problem, since his text-critical decisions were already subject to his hermeneutic. Furthermore, under whose authority could an acceptable revision be made? Lonie, in discussing this passage, contends that the *Cnidian Opinions*

were improved not by the sort of marginal addition of which we can see the traces clearly enough in other Hippocratic works, and which were perhaps made by individual owners of the text, but by a substantial remodeling, undertaken under the school's authority, to produce a new work which superseded rather than expanded the old.¹⁹⁴

The identification of the school as the locus of transmission and of authority for altering or codifying the transmission of the text of an author calls to mind Plato's successors and their role in collecting, editing, and transmitting their master's writings. Despite its drawbacks, Galen's identification of the *hypothesis* as the sine qua non of justifiable textual manipulations offers a remarkable theorization on ancient textual alteration and the possible role of scholastic institutions in authorizing such changes.

At this point, I should mention another definition of *hypothesis* which adds another layer to Galen's comments: in addition presupposition or foundation of a work and the theme or arc of a work, a *hypothesis* is also short (often prefatory) summary of a work's content. These were usually not written by the author themselves but by later scholars and compilers, who offered their interpretation and summary of the main point of the book. These *hypotheses* came in various types and styles: from the sophisticatedly

¹⁹⁴ I. M. Lonie, "The Cnidian Treatises of the Corpus Hippocraticum," *The Classical Quarterly* 15, no. 1 (1965): 1-30.

erudite to the arid and banal. We will have an opportunity to investigate their role in fashioning and focusing the edition of an author in the third section of this chapter. While I do not want to imply that Galen is necessarily referring to such introductory *hypotheses* in his comment above, a *hypothesis* prefaced to a book played no small role in determining how it was read and the interpreted—a point we will discuss later.

We have covered a considerable amount of material in this first section. In summary, let me isolate three main points from our investigation. First, in antiquity a text could be changed for many reasons such as theological, religious, performative, and interpretive, not to mention, of course, obvious corrections of scribal mistakes. In the specific case of the Homeric text, allegorical reading was one method of ameliorating difficulty; another was corruption of the text itself. Secondly, I have highlighted two fundamental aspects of ancient editorial practice: the imperceptible shift from *διόρθωσις* to *ἔκδοσις*; and the connection of *ἔκδοσις* to the realm of hermeneutics. These two features underscore the impact of the editor/corrector in fashioning a text and the role of his/her hermeneutic in this product. Galen's observations on textual criticism and *διασκευή*, on the other hand, demonstrate that the text was not completely malleable. There were limits to textual manipulations. Third and finally, these limits were often related to the authorial construct. As long as a reading coincided with the perceived style, usage, and thought of an author it was acceptable; if not, a word, phrase, or text was liable to be changed. In this way, emendations or corrections were rooted in the hermeneutics of the editor's authorial image, a point which we will see in decisions regarding authenticity writ large, i.e. with respect to books rather than words.

III. The Contents of an Edition

We turn our focus from text-critical manipulations of an author's corpus to those editorial activities concerned with its content. Two primary issues frame this investigation: the contents and order of the tracts in a corpus. With respect to an author's oeuvre, what books among those written by, or attributed to, an author ought to be judged authentic and collected into a corpus? Fundamentally, the judgment concerning the authenticity of any given book ascribed to an author is the same as those used to critique the authenticity of the text: namely, did he/she write it? From this perspective, issues of authenticity (*γνήσιον*) and spuriousness (*νόθον*) in terms of larger written works (i.e. entire books) magnify the role of the critic and/or editor in determining the scope of an author's corpus and thought. For example, an editor's conception of harmony in an author's writings will determine those writings which he/she feels falls outside the acceptable deviation for any given author. With respect to the arrangement of this corpus, the editor must also make choices about the order (*τάξις/διάταξις* or *ordo*) of its tracts.

How the issue of authentic and inauthentic writings is handled—both in terms of inclusion of books and with respect to the order of these books—will also to some extent reflect hermeneutical choices. With some corpora this issue is moot; it is evident that the stories in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* for the most part follow a specific order dictated by the narrative.¹⁹⁵ This is not the case, however, with other authors; works of Plato, Plotinus, Pindar, and Aristotle—to name a few—do not give themselves over to such a simple arrangement. In such cases an editor is faced with many writings written for many

¹⁹⁵ Where the books are divided, however, is not as evident. Here we may see evidence of editorial work, which perhaps can give some purchase on the interpretive stance of the editor. See, for example, debates over the division of the books of Homer and the attribution of this division to Aristarchus discussed in West, *Ptolemaic Papyri*, 18-24.

occasions and audiences. When faced with such diversity in an author's corpus, how would an editor decide to collect and arrange his/her works? Will the selection of authentic works and their arrangement have any influence on the interpretation of these writings? Moreover, did ancient editors intend to have this influence on the reader/interpreter of the corpus they edited? I argue that editorial selection and arrangement of books did shape interpretation, sometimes intentionally. While not every corpus offers conclusive and decisive evidence, there is enough ancient testimony to maintain that ancient editors often conceived of their actions in this way; their selection of texts and ordering patterns were not unrelated to issues of interpretation. Moreover, the relationship of their ordering patterns to interpretation represented a fundamental editorial concern.

With regard to how the works were to be arranged, there were a host of options and ordering patterns available in antiquity. To anticipate our discussion briefly: alphabetical, chronological, theoretical, topical, pedagogical and other patterns were all used by ancient editors to bring a semblance of order to corpora. Quite often there were even conflicting editions of the same author; such editions utilized alternative ordering patterns, casting them into tension with other corpora based on different hermeneutical foundations. These arrangements were not all arrived at *ex nihilo* or without knowledge of other patterns. To be sure, many patterns could be arrived at independently (e.g. alphabetical). Yet what is striking is the extent to which issues of ordering are often discussed in relation to other corpora. This final point speaks to the knowledge of editorial practices and other corpora in conceiving the arrangement of an author's work more broadly. In this section, rather than deal with corpora by specific authors (how they

were variously compiled, collected, and ordered), I will investigate how these various ancient arrangements we have evidence for are embodied in different corpora. Before investigating ordering patterns, however, we must discuss the role of authenticity and its correlate, inauthenticity, in fashioning an edition. Finally I will conclude with a discussion of the shift from the roll to the codex and its importance in solidifying organizational patterns.

A. authentic (γνήσιον) and spurious (νόθον)

The first questions to resolve when editing an author's corpus is: which books are authentic (γνήσια) and ought to be included in the edition, and which are spurious (νόθα) and ought to be left out or marginalized?¹⁹⁶ Because of the vicissitudes of ancient book publication and transmission this question was far from simple. For authors from the distant past already in antiquity, this problem was fraught with difficulty:¹⁹⁷ we have already discussed Alexandrian scholars' attempts to distinguish between authentic Homeric and so-called Cyclic epics. This was also an issue for well-known authors, as our investigation into Euripides' second edition of *Hippolytos* and his son's completion of *Iphegenia in Aulis* has shown. Even for authors still alive, distinguishing authentic from spurious writings was a problem. Here Galen's oft-discussed story of overhearing a dispute over the authenticity of a book bearing his name is illuminating:

I was recently in the Sandalarium, the area of Rome with the largest concentration of booksellers, where I witnessed a dispute as to whether a certain book for sale

¹⁹⁶ For a discussion of "Echtheitskritik" in antiquity, see Wolfgang Speyer's seminal work, *Die literarische Fälschung im heidnischen und christlichen Altertum: eine Versuch ihrer Deutung* (Munich: C. H. Beck'sche, 1971).

¹⁹⁷ See, for example, the oracle collections of Musaeus by Orpheus or Orphic texts; v.s. Musaeus (1) and Orphic Literature in *OCD*.

was by me or someone else. The book bore the title: Galen the doctor. Someone had bought the book under the impression that it was one of mine; some one else—a man of letters—struck by the odd form of the title, desired to know the book's subject. On reading the first two lines he immediately tore up the inscription, saying simply: 'This is not Galen's language—the title is false.'...For this reason—and also because my books have been subject to all sorts of mutilations, whereby people in different countries publish different texts under their own names with all sorts of cuts, additions, and alterations—I decided it would be best, first to explain the cause of these mutilations and secondly to give an account of the content of each of my genuine works.¹⁹⁸

Galen then goes on to list his books, their occasions and contents, his attempts (or lack thereof) at publication, their correction, and how they may have been corrupted or attributed to other persons.¹⁹⁹ Galen's difficulties in maintaining control over his own compositions highlight the precarious nature of publication in antiquity—especially in relation to distinguishing authentic from inauthentic works. Despite Galen's attempt to wrest his writings back under his control, an author had little or no control over their writings or their ascriptions once they were out of his or her hands. Given this instability, proper attribution of authorship was imperative. Furthermore, assignation of authentic or spurious status to a book hinged on the conception of authorship that the editor or collector employed.

Aristotle was at the forefront of ancient scholarship concerned with determining and assigning authorship.²⁰⁰ By combining antiquarian research with critical assessments

¹⁹⁸ Galen, *Selected Works* (trans. P. N. Singer; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 3.

¹⁹⁹ See Galen's *De ordine librorum suorum* and *De libris propriis* in Johann Marquardt, Iwan von Müller, and Georg Helmreich, eds., *Claudii Galeni Pergameni Scripta Minora v. II* (Lipsiae: B.G. Teubneri, 1884). See also Ann Ellis Hanson's discussion in Hanson, "Galen: Author and Critic."

²⁰⁰ The following discussion is indebted to Pfeiffer, *Classical Scholarship*, 65-84; and Blum, *Kallimachos*, 14-94.

of literary works, Aristotle laid the groundwork for later critics.²⁰¹ Blum argues that ancient philology, codified in later grammatical works, was primarily concerned with the issue of authenticity in relation to usefulness (χρήσιμον) and aesthetics.²⁰² Aesthetic criteria were central to Aristotle's conception of authorial authenticity: his conception of poetics, in particular, was guided by proper order and structure of the parts of the written work.²⁰³ The written corpus should ideally be apportioned like a living corpus.²⁰⁴ For this reason, he lauded Homeric epic and concluded that the proper distribution of its parts demonstrate "Homer's inspired superiority over the rest."²⁰⁵ Beginning with Aristotle, aesthetic judgments with respect to authorship played a major role in circumscribing works and lines ascribed to Homer.

Aristotle also conducted research on dramatic corpora which he codified in his *didaskaliai*.²⁰⁶ The *didaskaliai*, so-called from the authors as teachers (*didaskaloi*) of plays, contained basic information on Attic tragedy (e.g. dates of performances, titles of plays, prizes awarded) that Aristotle collected from the Athenian archives.²⁰⁷ Pfeiffer contends that since Attic tragedy was the apex of literary aesthetics for Aristotle we

²⁰¹ See Wyrick's discussion of the role Aristotle played in developing criteria and forming judgements on literary authenticity and the relationship to Aristotle's conception of authorship (*Ascension of Authorship*, 281-91).

²⁰² Blum, *Kallimachos*, 5. In relation to this point, Blum draws attention to judgments that we have already noted: the rejection of Homeric lines on the grounds that they are unworthy of Homeric authorship, hence spurious for aesthetic reasons and to be rejected.

²⁰³ *Poetics* 1450b 30-1451a 15 (LCL 199 54-56).

²⁰⁴ *Poetics* 1459a 16-23 (LCL 199 114-116).

²⁰⁵ *Poetics* 1459a 30f (Halliwell, LCL 199 117).

²⁰⁶ For a brief introduction, v.s. *didaskalia*, *OCD*.

²⁰⁷ Pfeiffer, *Classical Scholarship*, 81; and Blum, *Kallimachos*.

should not be surprised that he was so interested in investigating and collecting the historical data concerning their productions.²⁰⁸

In addition to Aristotle's role in defining the author and criteria for authorship, his work is important for our study because he influenced Callimachus's bibliographical works, the *Pinakes*, and other early scholarly research.²⁰⁹ Callimachus (ca. 303-post 245/6 B.C.E.) was instrumental in bibliographical research in the Alexandrian library, because his *Pinakes* are the first known attempts to organize and catalogue the vast holdings of that institution.²¹⁰ At the Alexandrian library Callimachus drew on Aristotle's methods and possibly his library.²¹¹ Blum highlighted six rubrics that structured Callimachus's *Pinakes*:²¹² 1) the proper classification of the author (e.g. philosopher or rhetor); 2) alphabetical arrangement of the authors in each class; 3) biographical information on the author; 4) titles of works grouped generically (e.g. rhetorical works, laws, or miscellaneous) and alphabetized within each group; 5) the first lines of each work; and 6) the length of the work. Most important for this discussion are his judgments on authenticity of writings and how writings that were included in each *pinax* were ordered. With respect to the order, it is clear that Callimachus favored an alphabetical organizational pattern. The purpose and usefulness of alphabetizing for a library attempting to catalogue its vast holdings is self-evident. Callimachus's judgments on

²⁰⁸ Pfeiffer, *Classical Scholarship*, 81.

²⁰⁹ For an overview of Callimachus's debt to Aristotle for the development of his *Pinakes*, see Pfeiffer, *Classical Scholarship*, 136-37; and Blum, *Kallimachos*, 139-42. For a discussion of Callimachus's *Pinakes* more generally, see O. Regenbogen, "Πίναξ," in PW.

²¹⁰ See Blum, *Kallimachos*, chs. 3 & 4.

²¹¹ For a discussion of the transmission of Aristotle's library and influence on the Alexandrians, see Pfeiffer, *Classical Scholarship*, 98ff; and Blum, *Kallimachos*, 52-64.

²¹² Blum, *Kallimachos*, 153.

authenticity were sometimes based on that of previous scholars,²¹³ e.g. Aristotle's didaskaliai. Blum hypothesized that in other cases Callimachus relates information found in the manuscripts themselves.²¹⁴ Whatever criteria or sources he utilized, Callimachus's judgments on the authenticity of works had a great effect on later editors, even if they sometimes rejected Callimachus's findings.²¹⁵ If the inclusion of a work among the legitimate and authentic writings by an author in Callimachus's *Pinakes*—mere lists of works and not editions per se—could be very influential for the subsequent editions, how much more influence might the inclusion of a work into an author's corpus have?

While this information explains Callimachus's handling of authentic works, it tells us little about his dealings with those deemed spurious. According to Blum, as Callimachus attempted to identify authentic works, he transitioned from compiler of earlier collections and opinions to scholar.²¹⁶ In such authentication he sometimes distinguished on the basis of style.²¹⁷ Blum is confident of Callimachus's knowledge of style in the case of poetry; prose works, however, were another story.²¹⁸ Callimachus's evaluations of prose works were called into question already in antiquity.²¹⁹ For example, Dionysius rejected Callimachus's distinctions between Demosthenes' authentic and

²¹³ Blum, *Kallimachos*, 158-59.

²¹⁴ Blum, *Kallimachos*, 58-59, 158-159.

²¹⁵ Blum also draws attention to disputes over the authenticity of some speeches ascribed to Demosthenes, or alternatively to Deinarchus; specifically, he notes that while Dionysius of Halicarnasus disagrees with Callimachus's judgment, the edition that serves as the base for our present collection of Demosthenes is nevertheless indebted to Callimachus's opinion of authenticity (*Kallimachos*, 159).

²¹⁶ Blum, *Kallimachos*, 231.

²¹⁷ Blum, *Kallimachos*, 232.

²¹⁸ Blum, *Kallimachos*, 232.

²¹⁹ See Dionysius of Halicarnasus's rejection of Callimachus's attribution to Demosthenes above.

spurious writings.²²⁰ In this case, Dionysius's evaluations of authenticity even affected his ordering patterns: when Dionysius dismissed some of Demosthenes' orations, he ordered them according to the reasons for their elimination from the authentic corpus.²²¹ Callimachus, on the other hand, usually separated the spurious works by attaching them to the end of the list, set apart from the genuine.²²²

This separation of inauthentic works by placing them at the end of catalogues parallels implicit judgments rendered by their placement in actual MSS. Galen offers numerous examples of inauthentic writings appended to the end of books. In his *De Placitis Hippocratis et Platonis* Galen disparages teachings found at the end of *On the Nature of Man* because they are clearly false and thus surely not Hippocratic.²²³ Galen claims that the person interpolating or revising (διασκευάζων) these teachings placed them at the end in order to escape detection.²²⁴ Galen's assertion that the end of a work is the most likely place for tampering with the text is also adduced to support his rejection of Hippocratic teachings and opinions that he rejects elsewhere.²²⁵ Coincidentally, Blum suggests that Callimachus may have included a list of pseudepigrapha at the end of his lists of writings in the *Pinakes*.²²⁶

²²⁰ Blum, *Kallimachos*, 196-99.

²²¹ Blum, *Kallimachos*, 199.

²²² Blum, *Kallimachos*, 234.

²²³ Phillip De Lacy ed., *Galen: On the Doctrines of Hippocrates and Plato, I-II: Edition, Translation, III: Commentary and Indices, CMG V 4,1,2* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1978-84), 379.36-80.24.

²²⁴ De Lacy ed., *Galen: On the Doctrines of Hippocrates and Plato, I-II: Edition, Translation, III: Commentary and Indices, CMG V 4,1,2*, 380.14-24; cf. 492.22-27.

²²⁵ See discussion in Smith, *The Hippocratic Tradition*, 130 & 43; and Mansfeld, *Prolegomena*, 137-38.

²²⁶ Blum, *Kallimachos*, 234.

There are two remaining options for an editor or collector dealing with disputed books: they can be included in a corpus, and thus rehabilitated, or they can be left out. The inclusion of a disputed book into an edition—especially an edition that becomes definitive—can not only affect a work’s later reception and preservation; it can also at times influence the way widely acknowledged genuine works are read and received. Tarrant’s investigation into the edition of the *Corpus Platonicum* issued by Thrasyllus (d. ca. 36 C.E.) offers an illustrative example of this very fact. We will make a full investigation into Thrasyllus’s corpus and alternate ordering patterns of Plato’s corpus shortly. With respect to issues of authenticity, however, we must make mention of Tarrant’s interesting argument that Thrasyllus’s inclusion of Plato’s epistles helped to solidify the belief in Plato’s esoteric teaching, which in turn secured a place for these epistles in his corpus.²²⁷ A different criterion was used to prove that Aristotle’s categories were authentic: later Neoplatonic interpreters contended that these tracts were necessary for the *Corpus Aristotelicum* in the same way a head is necessary for a body—its perfection and completion hinged on the inclusion of these books.²²⁸ This metaphor of the written corpus as perfectly proportioned living body both recalls opinions on Homeric perfection and augurs Porphyry’s divisions of Plotinus’s corpus into *somatia*. Finally, except for the chance survival of ancient works, the rejection of a work from a list or edition of an author will make it more difficult for this book’s survival; see, for example,

²²⁷ Tarrant, *Thrasyllan Platonism*, chs. 4 & 7.

²²⁸ See discussion in Philippe Hoffmann, "La fonction des prologues exégétiques dans le pensée pédagogique néoplatonicienne," in *Entrer en matière* (eds. Jean-Daniel Dubois and Bernard Roussel; Paris: Les éditions du Cerf, 1998), 214, 221.

the mere fragments of the Epic Cycle that have survived once separated from Homer and Homeric authorship.²²⁹

B. Order of the Writings in the Edition (τάξις/διάταξις)

1. Chronological

One of the earliest ordering patterns was chronological. This organizational pattern was probably indebted to archives that preserved the dates and winners of dramatic festivals in Athens that served as sources for Aristotle's research in his *Didaskaliai*.²³⁰ As we have noted, Aristotle's investigations served as the basis for Callimachus's research compiled in his *Pinakes*. In the *Pinakes*, however, Callimachus jettisoned a chronological ordering pattern in favor of one more useful for the vast holdings of the library, namely alphabetical. As a result of Callimachus's work and other attempts at collection in Alexandria (and perhaps Pergamum) rough alphabetical ordering patterns were quite common.²³¹ Yet alphabetization of writings found in corpora did not completely occlude chronological patterns. For example, Blum points out that Wilamowitz isolated a chronological ordering system for Aristophanes' comedies that lay behind an alphabetical one.²³² Ordering according to chronology was not restricted to more ancient collections of corpora. There is also compelling evidence that a

²²⁹ See discussion above and v.s. Epic Cycle, *OCD*.

²³⁰ See Blum, *Kallimachos*, 226-27, 37; and Pfeiffer, *Classical Scholarship*, 81.

²³¹ Blum points out that rough alphabetizing was, early on, the norm, since the works were not fully alphabetized but sometimes only alphabetized by the first letter; not until the 2nd century C.E., according to Blum, was full alphabetization employed (*Kallimachos*, 191-92).

²³² Blum, *Kallimachos*, 192.

chronological edition of Plotinus's works preceded Porphyry's edition.²³³ Chronological ordering also went hand in hand with judgments on authenticity: Dionysius of Halicarnasus attributed orations to Deinarchus based on research into the dates of their delivery, which then served as the organizing principle;²³⁴ subsequently, this criterion for rejection as spurious (along with style) then also served as the organizing principle for those rejected.²³⁵

2. Alphabetical

Despite the attractiveness of chronology, one of the main patterns for organizing tracts in a corpus was alphabetical. Not only did this have obvious advantages for locating a work in a library or scroll, it was also, as noted above, popularized by Callimachus's *Pinakes*. This ordering pattern was particularly widespread, as a few examples suffice to illustrate. It was already mentioned in passing that Aristophanes' comedies were organized alphabetically; so too Euripides' plays. After detailed study of the various orders of Euripides' plays that have been transmitted in later MSS, Günther Zuntz suggested that they were indebted to an edition ordered alphabetically and published by Aristophanes of Byzantium.²³⁶ Barrett concurs with the antiquity of this ordering pattern.²³⁷ If this edition should perhaps be traced back beyond Aristophanes,

²³³ See below.

²³⁴ Blum, *Kallimachos*, 196-99.

²³⁵ Blum, *Kallimachos*, 199.

²³⁶ Günther Zuntz, *An Inquiry into the Transmission of the Plays of Euripides* (Cambridge: University Press, 1965), 174 & 249ff. Zuntz also raises the possibility that this edition may have been popularized as a result of a scriptorium linked to the Museion (*ibid.*, 252).

²³⁷ Barrett, *Hippolytos*, 51. Barrett also cites Wilamowitz in support of this position (*ibid.*).

Zuntz still maintains that it too utilized an alphabetical pattern.²³⁸ Alphabetization also served as a second-order organizational pattern employed to order books arranged by other primary criteria: e.g. Theophrastus's writings preserved in Diogenes Laertius's *Vitae* are first arranged roughly according to discipline and within each discipline alphabetically.²³⁹ The *Corpus Lysiacum* also occasionally betrays an alphabetical pattern; Dover suggests that P. Ryl. 489 may offer evidence for an alphabetized collection of Lysias's speeches.²⁴⁰ Yet Dover maintains that the twelfth century MS he investigated was neither arranged chronologically nor alphabetically; rather, he contends that it was thematically ordered.²⁴¹

3. Topical/Thematic

The possibility that Lysias's orations were ordered by topic and genre turns our attention from ordering patterns for historical or biographical reasons to more thematic ones.²⁴² Here we enter a liminal phase between the utility of chronological or alphabetical patterns and the overtly pedagogical or isagogic patterns often based on distinct hermeneutical principles. The use of themes and genre as organizational patterns was not, however, unprecedented. The author of the *Life of Pindar* divided Pindar's poetry into categories by genre.²⁴³ Similarly, Wilamowitz argued that Aristophanes of Byzantium ordered Pindar's odes according to the dedicatees: eight to gods (εἰς θεούς)

²³⁸ Zuntz, *Inquiry*, 257ff.

²³⁹ Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum*, 5.42-50 (LCL 184 488-502). See discussion in Blum, *Kallimachos*, 59.

²⁴⁰ Kenneth James Dover, *Lysias and the Corpus Lysiacum* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968), 5.

²⁴¹ Dover, *Lysias and the Corpus Lysiacum*, 3-13.

²⁴² Dover, *Lysias and the Corpus Lysiacum*, 11.

²⁴³ Irigoin, *Histoire du texte de Pindare*, 35-36.

and eight to men (εἰς ἄνθρώπους).²⁴⁴ In returning to rhetorical works, we should also mention Blum's observations that Deinarchus's private orations were ordered according to the speech's subject.²⁴⁵ While thematic or topical patterns of arrangement offer a provisional assessment of the content of the works organized, they fall short of theoretical, isagogical, or pedagogical ordering schemes prominent among philosophical corpora.

4. Theoretical, Philosophical, and Pedagogical²⁴⁶

In turning to theoretical, philosophical, and pedagogical ordering patterns for an author's works or corpus, we see much clearer examples of editorial hermeneutics influencing organization. While the organizational patterns employed for the following corpora may not necessarily have changed how entire corpora or individual tracts within corpora were read, it is evident that editions were nevertheless arranged with an eye toward "proper" interpretation; such interpretation usually, if not always, coincided with the editor's reading. The divisions of the books and the sequence in which they were read (not to mention the books included) conspired to introduce and lead pedagogically the neophytic reader from the most simple to the most abstruse thought of an author. As Jaap Mansfeld has illuminated, the issue of organization and reading order of an author was not distinct from other problems that an ancient reader (or commentator) would investigate before embarking on the study of a work of any given author. Mansfeld isolates seven preliminary questions (schema isagogicum) that had to be (or were often)

²⁴⁴ Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Einleitung in die griechische Tragödie*, 140. See also Irigoin, *Histoire du texte de Pindare*, 42-43. See also Irigoin's discussion of editions prior to Zenodotus and Aristophanes (*Histoire du texte de Pindare*, 21-28).

²⁴⁵ Blum, *Kallimachos*, 199.

²⁴⁶ The following discussion is heavily indebted to Mansfeld, *Prolegomena*.

addressed before reading an author's work: 1) the scope or goal of the work; 2) the order in which it should be read; 3) its utility; 4) the reason for its title; 5) its authenticity; 6) the divisions of the book; 7) the part of philosophy to which it belongs.²⁴⁷ Some of these issues were central for an editor collecting and editing an edition of an author as well. We have already mentioned decisions regarding authenticity on both the verbal level (through correction of words and phrases) and the compositional level (through rejection from, or inclusion in, a corpus). The editor or collector of the corpus of an author had to make judgments on the words of the text, the texts in the corpus, the order of these texts in the corpus, and whether or not (and if so, how) to introduce this corpus. With respect to such arrangements, the corpora of Plato, Aristotle, and Plotinus are most illustrative.

We have mentioned in passing the early process of collecting and editing Plato's corpus by his followers and the problems associated with these early collections.

Diogenes Laertius reports that editions were published by Thrasyllus and by Aristophanes of Byzantium.²⁴⁸ There were also numerous attempts to offer arrangements for reading the Platonic corpus in middle and Neoplatonic circles.²⁴⁹ Much disagreement surrounds the date of the various ordering patterns—e.g. trilogic or tetralogic that collected the dialogues into groups of three or four respectively. Some date the tetralogic division to a time shortly after Plato or argue that it did not originate with Thrasyllus;

²⁴⁷ Mansfeld, *Prolegomena*, 10-11.

²⁴⁸ Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum*, 3.57-62 (LCL 184 326-332). Thrasyllus appears to have been quite active in this field, since Diogenes also reports that Thrasyllus wrote an introduction to the reading of Democritus's works (*Vitae Philosophorum*, 9.41 [LCL 185 450]).

²⁴⁹ See Solmsen, "The Academic and the Alexandrian Editions of Plato's Works"; Burkhard Reis, *Der Platoniker Albinos und sein sogenannter Prologos: Prolegomena, Überlieferungsgeschichte, kritische Edition und Übersetzung* (Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1999); Mansfeld, *Prolegomena*; Tarrant, *Thrasyllan Platonism.*; Michael Dunn, "The Organization of the Platonic Corpus between the First Century B.C. and the Second Century A.D" (Ph.D. Dissertation, Yale University, 1974); Hoffmann, "La fonction des prologues exégétiques dans le pensée pédagogique néoplatonicienne"; and A.-J. Festugière, "L'ordre de lecture des dialogues de Platon aux Ve/VIe siècles," *Museum Helveticum* 26, no. 4 (1969): 281-96.

others contend that grouping into sets of three was anterior to a tetralogic grouping.²⁵⁰

The origins and authors of the arrangements are less important for this discussion than the theoretical underpinnings on which they are established—i.e. the rationale for the various patterns.

Diogenes Laertius relates the following information about the tetralogic edition of the *Corpus Platonicum* that he attributed to Thrasyllus. Diogenes reports that Thrasyllus judged thirty-six dialogues to be authentic, arranged these works into nine tetralogies, and concluded his edition with thirteen epistles written by Plato.²⁵¹ Diogenes offers little commentary on the purpose of the tetralogic organizing principle; yet it was not a peculiar strategy of arrangement.²⁵² In fact, Mansfeld calls attention to the statement by Middle Platonist Albinos (ca. mid 2nd century C.E.) that this system was also favored by a certain Dercyllides.²⁵³ Whether this system originated with Thrasyllus, Dercyllides, or an earlier editor, its precise origin is less important than the principles underlying the arrangement that can be discerned. Central to these principles are the common *hypotheses* (κοινὴν ὑπόθεσιν), which according to Thrasyllus's interpretation, undergird each

²⁵⁰ For further discussion and bibliography, see Mansfeld, *Prolegomena*, 59-63.

²⁵¹ Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum*, 3.58-61 (LCL 184 328).

²⁵² According to Dionysius, Thrasyllus claims his use of tetralogies was chosen in imitation of the tragedies produced at the Dionysia, Lenaea, Panathenaea, and the festival of the Chytri (*Vitae Philosophorum*, 3.56 [LCL 184 326]).

²⁵³ Mansfeld, *Prolegomena*, 64-71. Mansfeld nevertheless maintains that the original author of this ordering pattern was neither of these two and, in fact, remains unknown (66). For a critical edition of Albinos's prologue and his reference to Dercyllides, see Reis, *Der Platoniker Albinos*, 314.12-13.

tetralogy. For example, the first tetralogy (comprised of the *Euthyphro*, *Apology*, *Crito*, and *Phaedo*) is dedicated to showing the life of the philosopher.²⁵⁴

As an aside, the reference to a common *hypothesis* for each tetralogy recalls our discussion of the limits of textual manipulation, where Galen argues that one can remove, add, or change words only insofar as the *hypothesis* of the work is not altered. The use of the word *hypothesis* also anticipates our discussion of prefatory writings (i.e. *hypotheses*, prologues, etc.) that play a role in focalizing the interpretation of a text. It is interesting that the development and use of *hypotheses* prefixed to dramatic texts is widely attributed to Aristophanes of Byzantium, the same person identified by Diogenes as issuing an edition of Plato's works in trilogies.²⁵⁵ Mansfeld even suggests that

[w]e may readily believe that Aristophanes justified his arrangement of fifteen Platonic dialogues as five trilogies by their *dramatic* relationship in a more literary sense, basing himself on internal cross-references and similar clues. From there it is a small step to the assumption that he wrote a kind of *hypothesis* for each individual dialogue, in which he also explained its relation to the other dialogues in the same trilogy.²⁵⁶

Mansfeld also sees in Thrasyllus's identification of a common *hypothesis* for each tetralogy an implicit rejection of Aristophanes' trilogic ordering pattern and the connections drawn between texts in his *hypotheses*.²⁵⁷ Instead, according to Mansfeld's interpretation of Thrasyllus's "common *hypothesis*," the tetralogic pattern was the more appropriate way to organize Plato's works.

²⁵⁴ Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum*, 3.57-58 (LCL 184 326-328). It is also noteworthy that Thrasyllus gives two titles for all the works: for example, *Euthyphro* is also called *On Holiness*. Mansfeld points out, however, that the double titles antedate Thrasyllus (*Prolegomena*, 71-4).

²⁵⁵ Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum*, 3.61 (LCL 184 330).

²⁵⁶ Mansfeld, *Prolegomena*, 69.

²⁵⁷ Mansfeld, *Prolegomena*, 69.

Whether or not the edition arranged in trilogies was issued by Aristophanes, the tension between the tetralogic and trilogic ordering patterns are apparent.²⁵⁸ This is clear from statements transmitted by Diogenes that “some...force the dialogues into trilogies”²⁵⁹ and that after these five ordered trilogies, “the rest are arranged individually and without order.”²⁶⁰ The use of “force” (ἔλκουσι) and “disordered” (ἀτάκτως) highlight an explicit rejection not only of the trilogic diataxis but also the underlying hermeneutical rationale. In this interpretation there is a proper teleology that should be embodied in the corpus itself, and this teleology is not found in an organization arranged according to trilogies.

The denigration of improper arrangement or lack of order casts into relief the patterns of arrangement found in collections made by Thrasyllus and others. Mansfeld has identified the role of the proper isagogic (εἰσαγωγή) initiation into an author’s body of work in Thrasyllus’s and Albinos’s *diataxis* of the *Corpus Platonicum*, as well as editions of Aristotle and Plotinus.²⁶¹ This pedagogical organization is designed primarily so that the novice may properly be led into the more abstruse or difficult ideas and tracts of an author only after he/she has mastered the necessary preparations.²⁶² For this reason the first tracts chosen were not the most difficult or abstract; instead, the *Euthyphro*,

²⁵⁸ For example, Pfeiffer rejects Diogenes’ claims that Aristophanes issued an edition of Plato (*Classical Scholarship*, 196).

²⁵⁹ “Ἐνιοὶ δέ, ὧν ἔστι καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης ὁ γραμματικός, εἰς τριλογίας ἔλκουσι τοὺς διαλόγους (Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum*, 3.61 [LCL 184 330]).

²⁶⁰ τὰ δ’ ἄλλα καθ’ ἕν καὶ ἀτάκτως (*Vitae Philosophorum*, 3.62 [LCL 184 330]). Note that some commentaries of Aristotle are described in similar terms, i.e. ἄτακτα; see discussion in Blum, *Kallimachos*, 62.

²⁶¹ Mansfeld, *Prolegomena*, passim.

²⁶² Mansfeld, *Prolegomena*, 161-169.

Apology, Crito, and Phaedo demonstrate to the novice the life of the philosopher.

Mansfeld identifies in this selection a concern for moral purification of the soul, without which further advancement in philosophy and philosophic life is impossible.²⁶³ In Thrasyllus's diataxis, only after the proper moral purification should the reader then turn to logical, ethical, and political treatises. Mansfeld argues that Thrasyllus's diataxis according to philosophical pedagogy is, however, inconsistent and reverts back to the chronology of the life of Socrates as seen through the literary relationship in the first tetralogy.²⁶⁴

Albinos criticizes Thrasyllus and Dercyllides for just this reason. In opposition to this tetralogical diataxis, Albinos contends that Plato's works should be understood and read in a circular manner. In his prologue, Albinos writes:

It seems to me that they [Thrasyllus and Dercyllides] wanted to make the order (*taxis*) according to the characters and the circumstances of their lives, which is surely useful for something else, but not at all, however, for what we want now. Rather we want to find the beginning principle and order (*diataxis*) of teaching according to wisdom. We maintain therefore that Plato's teaching does not have one set beginning; for it seems perfect like a perfect image of a circle. Then just as there is no set beginning of a circle; so there is no set beginning of his teaching.²⁶⁵

Albinos's conception of Plato's teaching offers an alternative reading of Plato's corpus, in which its circular and interconnected nature is fundamental. In Albinos's interpretation, what is important is not the starting point but rather the order and sequence of the dialogues—though he does maintain that there are better ways, philosophically

²⁶³ Mansfeld, *Prolegomena*, 68-71, 94-95, 164-169.

²⁶⁴ Mansfeld, *Prolegomena*, 70-71.

²⁶⁵ δοκοῦσι δέ μοι προσώποις καὶ βίων περιστάσεων ἠθεληκέναι τάξιν ἐπιθεῖναι· ὃ ἐστὶ μὲν ἴσως χρήσιμον πρὸς ἄλλο τι, οὐ μὴν πρὸς ὃ ἡμεῖς νῦν βουλόμεθα. βουλόμεθα δὲ ἀρχὴν καὶ διάταξιν διδασκαλίας τῆς κατὰ σοφίαν εὑρεῖν. φαμέν οὖν Πλάτωνος λόγου μὴ εἶναι μίαν καὶ ὀρισμένην ἀρχὴν· εἰκόμην γὰρ αὐτὸν τέλειον ὄντα τελείῳ σχήματι κύκλου· ὥσπερ οὖν κύκλου μία καὶ ὀρισμένη οὐκ ἐστὶν ἀρχή, οὕτως οὐδὲ τοῦ λόγου (Reis, *Der Platoniker Albinos*, 314.13-20).

speaking, to approach Plato's writings. Central to Albinos's understanding is a division into two types of dialogues: those for instruction and inquiry.²⁶⁶ For each one there are further subdivisions according to the role and part of philosophy with which the dialogue is concerned. Despite Albinos's assertion that Plato's thought constituted a perfect circle, he too offers a pedagogical reading of Plato that leads from the physical, ethical, political, and economical dialogues before culminating in theological ones.²⁶⁷

In this pattern we see the seeds of later Neoplatonic ordering patterns in which the ultimate goal was the illumination of the soul in order to purify and prepare it for encountering the divine realm of the forms. For later Neoplatonic writers (e.g. Ammonius ca. third century C.E. and Proclus ca. 412-485 C.E.) the end of reading Plato was not just theological dialogues, but the return of the soul to the divine.²⁶⁸ This diataxis is predicated on the idea that the goal of philosophy is for the fallen nous to reunite with the divine. The student is thus led through a series of stages seriatim, carefully designed to prepare for the following stage so as to reach the final goal of bringing the soul to God.²⁶⁹ For this reason instruction in Plato's works often ended with the *Timaeus* and *Parmenides*.²⁷⁰ Approaching the divine through reading was so central to this arrangement that the metaphor of processing into a temple was employed to describe this

²⁶⁶ Mansfeld, *Prolegomena*, 84-89.

²⁶⁷ Mansfeld, *Prolegomena*, 87.

²⁶⁸ Hoffmann, "La fonction des prologues."

²⁶⁹ Hoffmann, "La fonction des prologues," 212-13.

²⁷⁰ Sometimes this reading continued past the *Parmenides* and included Orphic works and the Chaldean oracles (Hoffmann, "La fonction des prologues," 213).

instruction: the reader qua initiate progressed from the propylaea (the *Greater Alcibiades*) into the adyton (the *Parmenides*).²⁷¹

Not everyone, however, agreed on how to begin reading the works of Plato. Diogenes mentions considerable dispute about which tract should begin the Platonic corpus. Diogenes offers numerous opening tracts: e.g. the *Greater Alcibiades*, *Theages*, *Euthyphro*, *Clitophon*, *Timaeus*, and *Apology*.²⁷² As mentioned, the opening trilogy of the order attributed to Aristophanes was the *Republic*, *Timaeus* and *Critias*. Finding the *Timaeus* here at the beginning of Plato's oeuvre is quite peculiar. Apparently, some did not find beginning with the abstruse theological and philosophical *Timaeus* to be a problem; for them the importance of this dialogue presumably warranted its place of primacy in the corpus and mitigated the difficulty it could cause. Placing the most important tract first was not, however, without parallel in ancient editions. Blum points out that for some authors the most significant or longest work was placed first.²⁷³ For example, the most famous writings occupied the first position in Aristotle's corpus, while the lesser known were alphabetically arranged after them.²⁷⁴

Aristotle's corpus was subject to numerous ordering patterns. It should first be noted that for some Neoplatonic readers the reading of Aristotle himself was required

²⁷¹ Hoffmann, "La fonction des prologues," 212.

²⁷² Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum*, 3.62 (LCL 184 330-332).

²⁷³ Blum, *Kallimachos*, 201. Placing the longest or most important writing first is significant with respect to our following discussions on the *Corpus Paulinum*. As we will discuss in later chapters, some scholars contend that an early edition of Paul's letters was arranged according to decreasing length: see Gamble's discussion and bibliography (*Books and Readers*, 49-66, 264-275). Placing the longest tract first would be the first step in such a diataxis. Furthermore, the concern for accurate measurement of the stichoi of author's works recorded in Callimachus's *Pinakes* would make such an organizational pattern relatively easy. It is, therefore, surprising that there is not more evidence for arrangements according to length in the corpora investigated here. Lack of parallels, of course, does not invalidate the hypothesis regarding Paul's corpus; though we would, perhaps, expect to see such an arrangement occasionally.

²⁷⁴ Blum, *Kallimachos*, 194-6.

before beginning Plato's corpus.²⁷⁵ According to Simplicius, the *Categories* were to be read first: since they occupied an important place in the progression of Aristotle's system of logic, without the *Categories*, the unity and fullness of their discourse would be lacking, like a body without a head.²⁷⁶ But the *diataxis* of Aristotle's corpus was important in its own right. Blum contends that the corpus of Aristotle's writings that have been transmitted down to us are probably descendents of the edition of Andronicus of Rhodes (*floruit* first century B.C.E.), who also arranged the works of Theophrastus.²⁷⁷ In addition to beginning this edition with Aristotle's more important works, Andronicus also apparently gave a defense of his edition and arrangement in five books.²⁷⁸ Andronicus's edition was taken over by a certain Ptolemy and occasionally can be discerned in Diogenes Laertius's lists of Aristotle's books: these arrangements show considerable concern for ordering some of his writings with an eye toward philosophical categories, audience, and isagogic introduction.²⁷⁹

The comparison of the corpus of an author's works to a properly proportioned living body was mentioned above in connection with Aristotle's praise of the perfection of the Homeric corpus. This theme was developed and extended by Porphyry in his arrangement of an edition of Plotinus's works, which Porphyry explained and justified in his *Life of Plotinus* prefaced to this very edition. It is significant that Porphyry entitled

²⁷⁵ Hoffmann, "La fonction des prologues," 214-217.

²⁷⁶ Hoffmann, "La fonction des prologues," 213-4.

²⁷⁷ Blum, *Kallimachos*, 194. See also Paul Moraux, *Der Aristotelismus bei den Griechen: von Andronikos bis Alexander von Aphrodisias, I: Die Renaissance des Aristotelismus im I Jh. v. Chr.* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1973), 45-96; and v.s. Andronicus in *OCD*.

²⁷⁸ Blum, *Kallimachos*, 194. For a full discussion, see Moraux, *Der Aristotelismus*, 70-78.

²⁷⁹ Blum, *Kallimachos*, 195.

this prefatory work *On the Life of Plotinus and the Order of his Books* (περὶ τοῦ Πλωτίνου βίου καὶ τῆς ταξέως τῶν βιβλίων αὐτοῦ).²⁸⁰ In this *bios*, Porphyry deals with all manner of issues relating to Plotinus's life.²⁸¹ With respect to his edition, Porphyry claims that Plotinus himself entrusted him with their arrangement (*diataxis*) and correction (*διόρθωσις*).²⁸²

Porphyry then proceeds to offer his rationale and models for his collection of Plotinus's works. First, he rejects a chronological arrangement, since this would leave the writings in a state of chaos.²⁸³ His rejection of a chronological arrangement is significant because it may contain a latent criticism of an earlier edition of Plotinus, arranged chronologically. Since Porphyry's edition has been the primary vehicle for transmission of Plotinus's writings, we have little evidence for other collections of Plotinus. Yet because of this and an analogous statement,²⁸⁴ testimony from Eusebius, and information in the scholia, some scholars maintain that Porphyry gives indirect testimony to an earlier chronologically arranged edition.²⁸⁵

²⁸⁰ For a critical edition, see Paul Henry and Hans-Rudolf Schwyzer, *Plotini Opera* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964). More readily available is the Loeb edition: Plotinus, *Enneads*. Translated by A. H. Armstrong. (LCL; 7 vols.; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1966).

²⁸¹ Some merely pertain to Plotinus's biography: e.g. his study with Ammonius in Alexandria (Porphyry, *Vita*, 3 [LCL 440 6-12]). Others relate to his corpus and problems associated with it: e.g. Plotinus's neglect of revision or correction and his complete disregard for proper spelling (Porphyry, *Vita*, 8.1-8 [LCL 440 28]).

²⁸² Ἐπεὶ δὲ αὐτὸς τὴν διάταξιν καὶ τὴν διόρθωσιν τῶν βιβλίων ποιεῖσθαι ἡμῖν ἐπέτρεψε (Porphyry, *Vita* 24 [LCL 440 72,2-3]).

²⁸³ Porphyry, *Vita* 24 (LCL 440 72,5-6).

²⁸⁴ κατὰ τὴν χρονικὴν ἔκδοσιν τῶν βιβλίων (Porphyry, *Vita*, 26 [LCL 440 84,34]).

²⁸⁵ Disputes concerning this chronological edition extend beyond its mere existence; there is also considerable debate about its creator. For a discussion of the evidence for the existence of a chronological edition and its origin, see Marie-Odile Goulet-Cazé's summary of Schwyzer's theory that it was produced by Eustochius (Luc Brisson et al., eds., *Porphyry: La vie de Plotin, I: Travaux préliminaires et index grec complet* [Paris: J. Vrin, 1982], 287-94); and Luc Brisson's argument that Amelius prepared it since

Porphyry, following Apollodorus of Athens and Andronicus of Rhodes, founded his *diataxis* on the principles of numerology and subject of the writings. Porphyry relates how Apollodorus issued the comedies of Epicharmus in ten volumes and Andronicus arranged Aristotle's and Theophrastus's writings by subject.²⁸⁶ On their precedent, Porphyry first arranges Plotinus's fifty-four works into six enneads, which he finds pleasing for their numerological perfection.²⁸⁷ Porphyry also utilizes a thematic and pedagogic schema by grouping similar writings together and placing the easier writings first.²⁸⁸ Not only does Porphyry mimic earlier editions of Plato by evincing a concern for preliminary questions, he even arranges Plotinus's *Enneads* according to their *hypotheses*, just as Thrasyllus maintained that Plato's tetralogies had common *hypotheses*.²⁸⁹

Porphyry's plan for the *Corpus Plotinicum* extended beyond the order of the tracts in an attempt to govern even the connections between the *Enneads*; he informs that certain *Enneads* have been arranged in order to be issued together.²⁹⁰ The six *Enneads* are to be further divided into properly arranged *somatia*. For example, about the first

Porphyry testifies to Amelius's role in correcting, transcribing, and circulating Plotinus's works (Luc Brisson et al., eds., *Porphyre: La vie de Plotin, II: Études d'introduction, texte grec et traduction française, commentaire, notes complémentaires, bibliographie* [Paris: J. Vrin, 1982], 165-9). See also Marie-Odile Goulet-Cazé's rejoinder ("Remarques sur l'édition d'Eustochius," in *ibid.*, 71-6).

²⁸⁶ Porphyry, *Vita* 24 (LCL 440 72,7-11).

²⁸⁷ Porphyry, *Vita* 24 (LCL 440 72,11-14).

²⁸⁸ Porphyry, *Vita* 24 (LCL 440 72,15-17).

²⁸⁹ For example, the first Ennead was primarily concerned with ethical subjects (i.e. ὑποθέσεις), while the second was physical (Porphyry, *Vita*, 24.36-39). For a full discussion, see Mansfeld, *Prolegomena*, ch. 3.

²⁹⁰ This parallels Cassiodorus's instructions for the publication of scripture in properly issued collections and editions in his *Institutiones divinarum et saecularium litterarum*. For critical edition see R. A. B. Mynors, ed., *Cassiodori Senatoris Institutiones* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937). A handy English translation of Cassiodorus's *Institutions* is available in James W. Halporn and Mark Vessey, eds., *Cassiodorus: Institutions of Divine and Secular Learning and On the Soul* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2004).

three *Enneads* concerned with ethical, natural, and physical *hypotheses* respectively, Porphyry writes that “we have prepared and arranged these three *Enneads* in one body (σωμάτιον).”²⁹¹ Porphyry does not explicate what he means by “sotation.” Usually this is taken to refer to a volume, as Armstrong translates it in the Loeb edition.²⁹² Michel Tardeiu has suggested another interpretation: each *sotation* refers to a codex in which Plotinus’s *Enneads* are to be published according to Porphyry’s editorial schema.²⁹³ The durability of Porphyry’s ordering pattern according to a numerological and thematic pattern highlights the role of the editor in presenting a corpus to the public, especially when a rationale for this arrangement is preserved as well.²⁹⁴ With respect to the role that numerological *diataxis* plays in the transmission of an author’s works, Mansfeld, in reference to Thrasyllus’s tetralogical pattern, argues that “catalogues of books are fragile in the sense that titles may be lost during transmission, or other materials inserted. But when the exact number of dialogues you want to include in an authoritative list of genuine works is established according to a very simple arithmetical calculation, your catalogue is safer.”²⁹⁵ Although Mansfeld is primarily discussing lists or catalogues of an author’s works, the physical production of the corpus would not be unaffected by these same issues. The technical limits of publication in rolls, however, would place restrictions on organizational patterns since maintaining a specific order would be nigh

²⁹¹ Ταύτας τὰς τρεῖς ἐννεάδας ἡμεῖς ἐν ἐνὶ σωματίῳ τάξαντες κατεσκευάσαμεν (Porphyry, *Vita* 25 [LCL 440 78,1-2]).

²⁹² Porphyry, *Vita*, 25 (Armstrong, LCL 440 79).

²⁹³ For discussion and relevant bibliography, see Mansfeld, *Prolegomena*, 115 note 201. The import and impact of publication in a codex on the *diataxis* of a corpus will be addressed presently.

²⁹⁴ Mansfeld draws obvious inferences about the numerological (perhaps Pythagorean) significance of Porphyry’s divisions according to the numbers three, six, and nine (*Prolegomena*, 114-115).

²⁹⁵ Mansfeld, *Prolegomena*, 62.

impossible for multi-volume corpora issued in this format. For this reason a specific ordering pattern laid out according to definite criteria would be advantageous.

The transition to the codex, however, offered new means and possibilities to control the order and interpretation of books. Although scholars are far from unanimous that Porphyry's reference to somation should be translated as codex,²⁹⁶ there is little disagreement that in general the shift from publication in rolls to codices greatly changed the perspective of unity and comprehensiveness for an author's corpus.²⁹⁷ With the advent of the codex greater permanence in the ordering patterns—even if not achieved on account of the permutations in codicological design and manufacture²⁹⁸—was at least theoretically possible. Where the roll limited the length of an author's work that could be maintained in one physical entity and imposed, somewhat arbitrarily, divisions on other works (e.g. Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*), the codex freed the author for composition and editor for collection.²⁹⁹

Although the rise of the codex is often discussed in relation to early Christian predilection for this format, I am concerned with the role of the codex for shaping the editorial practices. There is little doubt that the codex altered how, and in what

²⁹⁶ Mansfeld, *Prolegomena*, 115 note 201.

²⁹⁷ For the main works on the codex in general and its use by early Christians in particular, see the following: Eric G. Turner, *The Typology of the Early Codex* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1977); Colin H. Roberts and T. C. Skeat, *The Birth of the Codex* (London: Oxford University Press, 1983); James M. Robinson, "The Construction of the Nag Hammadi Codices," in *Essays on the Nag Hammadi Texts: In honour of Pahor Labib* (ed. Martin Krause; Leiden: Brill, 1975); James M. Robinson, "The Future of Papyrus Codicology," in *The Future of Coptic Studies* (ed. R. McL. Wilson; Leiden: Brill, 1978); James M. Robinson, "On the Codicology of the Nag Hammadi Codices," in *Les Textes de Nag Hammadi* (ed. Jacques-E. Menard; Leiden: Brill, 1975); and Gamble, *Books and Readers*, 49-81.

²⁹⁸ For a full discussion of the nascent forms of the codex, see Turner, *Typology*.

²⁹⁹ See, for example, the rather arbitrary divisions of the books of Homer and their possible origins as a result of the length of the scroll (Nagy, *Performance*, 138-55; West, *Ptolemaic Papyri*, 18-24; and Blum, *Kallimachos*, 157ff).

collections, books and corpora were transmitted. About the collection and transmission of Euripides, Zuntz says:

In the age of the roll, any collection and selection of plays was equally possible; but once one selection was committed to a codex, no change or addition was possible in it, and any such codex was liable to become the ancestor of others, with the same content. It would be wrong indeed to seek in a mere technical fact the origin of a development which actually resulted from the general cultural situation; in fact, the standardization was accomplished before the age of the codex, but it was bound to be consolidated by the new book type.³⁰⁰

Zuntz offers a judicious corrective to those who see the codex as the sine qua non of collection, consolidation, and canonization. Canons and editions are possible without codices. Yet the codex form can still perpetuate and stabilize editions. In the transition from the roll to the codex Jean Irigoin even sees a change in the conception of an author's corpus: "Les classements proposés succesivement pour les dialogues de Platon – par trilogies, par tétralogies – ou la détermination de l'ordre de la lecture des traits médicaux pour les debutants, trouvent une solution avec le passage du rouleau au codex. Ainsi apparaît sous une forme matérielle la notion de corpus, de collection."³⁰¹ Irigoin states the matter baldly, but there is no doubt that the codex offered new paradigms and opened new avenues for envisioning and creating an edition, heretofore unavailable in disconnected and disparate rolls. The comprehensiveness, stability, and unity of the codex allowed for a permanence (or at least a perception of permanence) of design for an edition embodied in this new format.

This change in the format for the transmission of an edition effectively highlights the interrelationship between ordering patterns (*diataxis*) and hermeneutics. Editors

³⁰⁰ Zuntz, *Inquiry*, 256.

³⁰¹ Jean Irigoin, "Les éditions de textes à l'époque hellénistique et romaine," in *La tradition des textes grecs: pour une critique historique* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2003), 161.

attempted to make connections between books, to lead the novice through an author's corpus, and to impose some order on the author's sometimes disparate writings. Even before the codex they were not unsuccessful in this endeavor; there is ample evidence for such editorial practices before the advent of the leaf-book. The most illustrative are those concerned with pedagogical introductions to Plato. Thrasyllus's inclusion of the previously unknown letters into the *Corpus Platonicum* enabled him to develop and justify Platonic esotericism—his ordering pattern was thoroughly intertwined with his hermeneutic.³⁰² Similarly, the goal or telos of reading Plato's works was contingent on the order they were read. According to Dunn, Thrasyllus's diataxis privileges the acquisition of political virtue as the last stage of Platonic instruction, in contrast to Iamblichus who, in line with later Neoplatonic readers, sees Plato's thought culminate in theological writings and ascension to the Good.³⁰³

In this section, we have demonstrated that rarely were corpora haphazardly collected and ordered. Even early attempts at collection, however rudimentary, were founded on some rationale (e.g. alphabetical or chronological). Furthermore, we have seen that many editors selected books as authentic and arranged these books in accordance with their own hermeneutical strategies, strategies which occasionally are even explained by the editor himself. The role of the editor in selecting and ordering an author's writings was no less significant for shaping the interpretation of the author than changing the text itself. Issues of authenticity and spuriousness are analogous, whether on

³⁰² See Tarrant, *Thrasyllan Platonism*, esp. chs. 4, 5, & 7.

³⁰³ See Michael Dunn, "Iamblichus, Thrasyllus, and the Reading Order of the Platonic Dialogues," in *The Significance of Neoplatonism* (ed. R. Baine Harris; Norfolk, Va.: International Society for Neoplatonic Studies distributed by State University of New York Press, 1976), 59-80; and his fuller discussion in "The Organization of the Platonic Corpus".

the level of text or tract. Judgments on these issues of authenticity will be informed by the editor's hermeneutic, which was also integral to the organization of the corpus. Ordering tracts to lead the neophyte pedagogically through an author's body of work starts with an understanding and interpretation of the author's life and thought. Because of the connection between the life and writings of an author, many isagogical patterns began with a *bios* of the author that served as a moral exemplum so as to demonstrate to the student how the philosopher embodied their philosophy in their life. These *bioi* and sundry other paratextual materials, which editors employed and sometimes composed for the aid of the reader, will be the focus of the third and final section of this chapter.

IV. Paratexts Ancillary to an Edition

The final mode of interaction between the editor and the edition investigated here is the deployment of paratexts to the actual text of an author's corpus. These paratexts also represent a place where the role of the editor may overshadow the actual books and text of the author being collected. Our investigation into ancillary materials added to editions illuminates the nexus between the content and the text of an edition as well as the interpretive stance of the editor, which occasionally is deliberately articulated.

Unfortunately, not every MS preserves, or even employed, carefully designed and prepared apparatuses for ancient readers. Early attempts at issuing editions were usually concerned with collecting the books themselves; subsequently, introductions, marginalia, *bioi* became more common as later editors would build on earlier work and occasionally add editorial material—a most notable example is Aristophanes of Byzantium's *hypotheses*. Yet even early attempts at collection give evidence of the editor's concern for

material secondary to the textual corpus itself. The products of these early attempts were lives of the authors, i.e. *bioi*.

A. *Bioi*

Before our foray into the use of *bioi* by early editors, a distinction needs to be drawn between the literary genre of *bioi* and *bioi* that came to preface corpora.³⁰⁴ Although there were attempts at biography that approached *bioi* earlier, the literary genre of *bios* came into its own around the third century B.C.E., developing out of rhetorical encomiastic practices and popular stories about men and women of renown. There has been much discussion concerning the various forms this genre could take: e.g. the identification of a Suetonian or Plutarchian *bios* genre arranged according to theme or chronology respectively.³⁰⁵ Yet what most marked this genre was its malleability, which allowed it to be adapted easily to different lives and authorial invention. This genre is primarily distinguished by its concern for entertainment, which, in addition to mundane historical and biographical data, often contained salacious and titillating apocryphal details concerning the author's life. In contrast, the life that usually came to accompany and preface the author's corpus was arid and scholarly. Despite the differences between the *bios* as a literary genre and the *bios* used to introduce a corpus, it has been argued that

³⁰⁴ On ancient biography, see Duane Reed Stuart, *Epochs of Greek and Roman biography* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1928); Arnaldo Momigliano, *The Development of Greek Biography* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1993); Thomas Alan Dorey, *Latin Biography* (London: Routledge, 1967); and Patricia Cox, *Biography in Late Antiquity: A Quest for the Holy Man* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983). For a cursory overview of ancient biography, v.s. biography in Hubert Cancik et al., eds., *Brill's New Pauly: Encyclopaedia of the Ancient World* (Leiden: Brill, 2002); and Richard A. Burrige, "Chapter 11: Biography," in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period, 330 B.C.-A.D. 400* (ed. Stanley E. Porter; Leiden: Brill, 1997). For a discussion of Greco-Roman *bioi* in relation to Christian writings, specifically the gospel genre, see Richard A. Burrige, *What are the Gospels?: A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2004).

³⁰⁵ For a discussion and assessment of this thesis first put forward by F. Leo in 1901, see Momigliano, *Greek Biography*, passim, esp.18-21.

they are nevertheless related. Duane Stuart suggests that the lives that came to preface editions of the author's works were probably fashioned from earlier literary *bioi*.³⁰⁶ Indirect evidence of this influence can be found, for example, in the life of Euripides (alternately called a γένος or γένος'Ευριπίδου καὶ βίος in other MSS), where information on Euripides is cited with the formula: "they say."³⁰⁷ Herwig Görgemanns even claims that these shorter introductory *bioi* were indebted to the Suetonian type of *bios* as sources.³⁰⁸ Whatever the sources for prefatory *bioi*, their origins are less important for our discussion than their development and function.

Our earliest evidence of *bioi* with a prefatory function is, not surprisingly, connected to the Homeric corpus. The ancient Greek rhapsodes (ca. sixth century B.C.E.) are reported to have investigated Homer's origin (γένος) and flourishing (ἀκμή).³⁰⁹ In this activity Pfeiffer sees a direct connection to the development and composition of Homer's *bios*.³¹⁰ An early date for a Homeric *bios* is corroborated by reports concerning Antimachus's edition of Homer, which may have been introduced by a life of Homer. Recall our discussion of Antimachus's ἔκδοσις in section one of this chapter, where we noted that Antimachus cast Homer as a descendent of the city of Colophon, just like Antimachus himself; conversely, alternate biographies cast Homer as an Athenian.

³⁰⁶ Stuart, *Greek and Roman Biography*, 170-71, 86-87.

³⁰⁷ Stuart, *Greek and Roman Biography*, 170 note 29. See e.g. "καὶ φασιν αὐτὸν ἸΑθήνησι νικῆσαι κτλ," (*Scholia in Euripidem: Volumen I, ΓΕΝΟΣ ΕΥΡΙΠΙΔΟΥ* 2 [Schwartz ed., 1,7-8]).

³⁰⁸ Herwig Görgemanns, "Biography," in *Brill's New Pauly: Encyclopaedia of the Ancient World*, v.2 *Ark-Cas* (eds. Hubert Cancik and et al; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 649.

³⁰⁹ Pfeiffer, *Classical Scholarship*, 11.

³¹⁰ Pfeiffer, *Classical Scholarship*, 11.

Zenodotus may have followed Antimachus in the arrangement of a *bios* at the head of his edition of Homer.³¹¹

Despite Homer's privileged place in the pantheon of Greek culture, the deployment of *bioi* was not limited to the corpus of "the poet." There is also evidence for *bioi* of the poets Sappho (b. seventh century B.C.E.) and Alcaeus (b. ca. 625 B.C.E.).³¹² Legendary stories about Hippocrates and his connection to the island of Cos also began to circulate and were eventually included into his corpus.³¹³ Even works by less ancient authors began to be published along with *bioi*. For example, a *bios* of Aratus (ca. 315-ca.240 B.C.E.) was appended to his *Phaenomena*.³¹⁴ Information on Callimachus's life found in the *Suidas* probably introduced an early collection of his works.³¹⁵ We also have a *bios* of Pindar, though because it contains a reference to a corpus edited by Aristophanes, it must have been written after his edition was published.³¹⁶ Thrasyllus's edition of Democritus apparently had a *bios*.³¹⁷ It has also been suggested that a life of Aristotle prefaced a list of his writings³¹⁸ or even Andronicus of Rhodes's edition of the *Corpus Aristotelicum*.³¹⁹ As already mentioned, Porphyry's *bios* of Plotinus also prefaced

³¹¹ Pfeiffer, *Classical Scholarship*, 117.

³¹² Pfeiffer, *Classical Scholarship*, 11 note 5.

³¹³ Smith, *The Hippocratic Tradition*, 215-22.

³¹⁴ Mansfeld, *Prolegomena*, 49.

³¹⁵ Pfeiffer, *Classical Scholarship*, 128.

³¹⁶ Irigoin, *Histoire du texte de Pindare*, 35-36.

³¹⁷ Blum, *Kallimachos*, 144.

³¹⁸ Anton-Hermann Chroust, "A Brief Account of the Traditional Vitae Aristotelis," *REG* 77 (1964): 50-69.

³¹⁹ Momigliano, *Greek Biography*, 87.

his *Corpus Plotinicum*.³²⁰ The link between the *bioi* of these authors and their works illustrate that they became very important for transmitting information about the author and for introducing an author's corpus. Blum even suggests that it became a matter of course to append *bioi* to corpora of important authors (poets, playwrights, philosophers, etc.) ca. 200 B.C.E..³²¹ Because these *bioi* reflect the same concerns and information that are found in the *Pinakes*, Blum thinks there is an obvious connection.³²²

Without a doubt, the development and use of *bioi* were undoubtedly indebted to scholarly research into authors' lives compiled in the *Pinakes*. While it is not necessary to review our previous discussion of the *Pinakes*, the pride of place accorded to the author's *bios* in the *Pinakes* should be highlighted. Biographical details were of fundamental importance not only for editions, but also for lists of an author's authentic works.³²³ In fact, the *bios* appended to the beginning of an edition eventually came to comprise not only the expected biographical details (name, physical and intellectual heritage, inter alia), it also included a list of authentic works.³²⁴ The *bios* and bibliographic list in a sense merged, resulting in an introduction to the corpus.

The question for this investigation is: do these *bioi* actually have any relationship to the interpretation of the works in the corpus collected by the editor? It could perhaps be suggested that *bioi* merely offer the reader historical information about authors, their background, and their works. This function should neither be denied nor downplayed.

³²⁰ See discussion above.

³²¹ Blum, *Kallimachos*, 190.

³²² Blum, *Kallimachos*, 190.

³²³ Blum, *Kallimachos*, 190.

³²⁴ Blum, *Kallimachos*, 190.

But there is overwhelming evidence that the contents of *bioi* did far more than inform readers and readings: they shaped them. Three main areas underscore the significance of *bioi* for shaping interpretation: 1) the pedagogical role of the *bios* of the author; 2) the relationship between the author reconstructed in the *bios* and judgments of style or authenticity; and 3) the interrelationship between the corpus and the *bios*. The reconstruction of the author in the *bios* dovetails with the interpretation of their works, both of which the editor brings to the corpus.

The pedagogical function of the *bios* recalls our investigation into patterns of arrangement of corpora. Seen in the light of pedagogical and isagogical concerns, the reasons for placing the *bios* of an author at the front of a corpus become evident. First and foremost, the *bios* of the author acts as an exemplum for the reader, especially the novice.³²⁵ At the start of his/her instruction into the author's corpus, the reader is shown how the author exemplified his/her teachings in his/her own life in order that the initiate may have an example to follow.³²⁶ In terms of instruction, the *bios* is also quite easy to comprehend, since it usually offers a simple historical narrative free from difficult concepts or teachings. Mansfeld convincingly argues that the importance of the *bios* as exemplum even underpinned Thrasyllus's first tetralogy (i.e. *Euthyphro*, *Apology*, *Crito*, and *Phaedo*).³²⁷ By placing these texts first, according to Mansfeld, Thrasyllus presented a *bios* of the main character of Plato's dialogues, Socrates. This *bios* then offers an exemplary life for the readers of this corpus to imitate. While Socrates is not the author of the Platonic corpus, the importance of the *bios* as a pedagogical icon especially designed

³²⁵ Mansfeld, *Prolegomena*, 67-71.

³²⁶ Mansfeld, *Prolegomena*, 67-71.

³²⁷ Mansfeld, *Prolegomena*, 67-71.

and deployed for initiation and imitation in philosophical corpora is no less evident. Not only did *bioi* serve as pedagogical introductions to an author's corpus, they were also sometimes prefixed to commentaries on these corpora as well.³²⁸ Galen himself, in his *The Order of my Own Books*, even maintains that those who understand the quality and nature of his life, soul, and actions ought to begin by reading his work *On Sects for Beginners*.³²⁹

Porphry's *Life of Plotinus* also functions pedagogically to introduce Plotinus's corpus. As R. Goulet asserts, Plotinus's life cannot be analyzed apart from the corpus of his writings that it accompanied.³³⁰ For this reason, the image of Plotinus as the holy man par excellence, who embodied his teachings and the life of the philosopher in his actions, presents an exemplum for the reader before he or she undergoes the arduous task of contemplating Plotinus's teachings, and if diligent, follows him in approaching the divine even while in this worldly body.³³¹ Plotinus's life then parallels the life of the reader as he or she pedagogically moves through his corpus from the simple earthly teachings concerned with ethics and morality to the advanced divine instruction culminating in treatises devoted to *The Good* or *The One*.³³² Through this process of instruction the soul is refined so as to become divine like Plotinus's. In this way, Porphyry's reconstruction

³²⁸ Mansfeld, *Prolegomena*, 52.

³²⁹ *De ordine librorum suorum* (*Scr. Min.* II Marquardt, Müller, Helmreich, eds., 83.7-84.4).

³³⁰ Brisson et al., eds., *Porphyre: La vie de Plotin*, II, 77.

³³¹ For a discussion of Porphyry's *bios* of Plotinus as that of a holy man, see Cox, *Biography*, 102-33 and Mansfeld, *Prolegomena*, 108-13.

³³² Porphyry, *Vita* 24; 26 (LCL 440 72,17-8; 84,26).

of Plotinus's *bios* goes hand in hand with his arrangement of his corpus, which it prefaces.³³³

The interrelationship between *bioi* and judgments on authenticity offers the second way in which *bioi* insinuated the hermeneutic of the editor into a corpus. As we observed in our discussion on the importance of authenticity (*γνήσιον*) for the scope of an author's corpus, the inclusion of a book (or books) can greatly alter how a reader interprets an author. The addition of a *bios* could also affect interpretation, since *bioi* often influenced judgments on authenticity and conveyed a specific construction of the author that, quite often, aligned with the editor's hermeneutic. This is borne out by the ways in which the reconstruction of the author, preserved in the *bios*, affected, caused, or resolved disputes of authenticity. For example, we have already seen that conceptions of Homeric authentic authorship and claims by specific locales underpinned political disputes.³³⁴ Likewise, shifts in the style of Homeric epic often signified interpolations into the poem, since baser poetry was at odds with the belief that Homer occupied the apex of poetics. Unseemly passages in the Hippocratic corpus were also removed from Hippocrates and attributed to his son or grandson.³³⁵ More directly related to the actual reconstruction of the *bios* are Galen's judgments of authenticity in accordance with his view of Hippocratic authorship. We have seen that Galen is quick to subordinate his conception of Hippocratic thought to the needs of his argument. Appeals to Hippocrates' life could also affect judgments on the text: in their editions of the *Corpus Hippocraticum*

³³³ See the discussion in Mansfeld, *Prolegomena*, 108-13.

³³⁴ Recall our previous discussion of Homer as an Athenian and disputes about the Athenian interpolations used to justify control of Salamis.

³³⁵ See discussion above.

Artemidorus and Dioscurides sometimes made textual decisions concerning authenticity on the basis of style or dialect.³³⁶ Such claims that Hippocrates' dialect was Attic, Ionic, or Coan were surely made on the basis of Hippocrates' *bios*, whether legendary or historical; in this way, allegations that Hippocrates hailed from Cos arguably played no small role in these assessments of dialect and, consequently, authenticity.³³⁷

The historical and chronological reconstruction of an author's life could also be instrumental in determining authenticity. Dionysius of Halicarnasus's investigations into the life and works of Deinarchus allowed him to offer justifications for separating spurious from authentic speeches.³³⁸ If all else failed, the editor could always fall back on information deduced from the *bios*, as Blum states: "If reliable authorities for the authenticity of a work were unavailable, the biography of an author sometimes supplied criteria on the grounds of which a work could be ascribed or denied to him."³³⁹ Verdicts on authenticity were often inextricably intertwined with the *bios* of the author.

The connection between the corpus and *bioi* was also evident in the very composition of the *bios*. The *bios* could, and often did, impinge upon the authenticity of writings that conflicted with an author's *bios*. Alternatively the corpus impinged on the *bios* as well. Since it was not uncommon for researchers and editors in antiquity to turn to an author's writings when fashioning his/her life, the *bios* was often reconstructed from the very corpus to which it was attached. No doubt such a reconstruction often devolved

³³⁶ Smith, *The Hippocratic Tradition*, 235.

³³⁷ For a discussion of the development of legends of Hippocrates' origin and their importance for legitimating Cos and Coan medicine, see Smith, *The Hippocratic Tradition*, 208-22.

³³⁸ Blum mentions that Dionysius's work on Deinarchus's was not unique; he made similar inquiries into Lysias and Demosthenes (*Kallimachos*, 196-97).

³³⁹ Blum, *Kallimachos*, 231.

into a circular logic, where the authenticity of a work was proved by its faithfulness to the authorial construct which was constructed from the author's authentic writings. Books that fell outside the acceptable deviation were not used to reconstruct the image of the author, and the image of the author did not confirm the authenticity of these works. This is not to suggest that there were no reliable sources of information that ancient scholars and editors had at their disposal. Yet Momigliano maintains that, especially for poets and writers from archaic times, it was not uncommon for the lives of these authors to be fashioned from the primary evidence for their life and work, i.e. their corpus.³⁴⁰ While not every *bios* was constructed by utilizing the author's works in this way, we are given enough evidence to conclude that this process was not completely anomalous either. Recall Dionysius's collection of Deinarchus; his judgments concerning authenticity, his arrangement of Deinarchus's corpus according to the authenticity of its contents, as well as his reconstruction of his life, were all indebted to Deinarchus's speeches.³⁴¹ Euripides' vita likewise appears to have been drawn from his corpus.³⁴² There was a similar interrelationship between the life and writings of Hippocrates: Smith contends that despite reservations about the historicity of legends about Hippocrates, those legends that were corroborated by the Hippocratic corpus were more likely to be accepted as true.³⁴³ Likewise, those stories that served to legitimate ancient interpretations of Hippocrates and medical practices were given more credence. This was also related to the authentication of the transmission of author's authority; because Hippocrates was so

³⁴⁰ Momigliano suggests that this was not as necessary for *bioi* of others who left either disciples (e.g. philosophers) or a historical legacy (e.g. kings) (*Greek Biography*, 88).

³⁴¹ Blum, *Kallimachos*, 196-9. See also discussion above.

³⁴² Momigliano, *Greek Biography*, 80-81.

³⁴³ Smith, *The Hippocratic Tradition*, 219.

important for justification and legitimation of a physician's medical authority, laying claim to Hippocrates, his legacy, and his corpus was crucial. In many ways, the circular relationship between the *bios* and the corpus parallels the exegetical principle, "to interpret Homer from Homer." That which was assumed to be authentic offered authenticity to that under question; the *bios* constructed from the authentic works authenticated, or deemed spurious, those works on the margins.

In sum, the prefatory *bios* was fundamental for establishing an image of the author and functioned in many ways. The *bios* interacted with the corpus in a symbiotic manner; it both influenced and was influenced by questions of authenticity within the corpus. With respect to this authenticity, the *bios* was not only subject to the interpretation of the editor, but also offered an image of the author based on that interpretation. Finally, the *bios* functioned pedagogically as an exemplary life showing how in life authors embodied the teachings found in their writings. The *bios* offered a brief and isagogical entry point for readers, especially novices, into the writer's corpus. For this reason, corpora were often prefaced by such *bioi*. Both the *bioi* and the corpora they introduced were indebted to the editorial hand that collected and arranged them.

B. *Hypotheses* and other introductory works

Introductions to texts or corpora illuminate the link between the editor's interpretation and his/her work. This fact is somewhat obvious, since introductions are one of the few places where editors make deliberate statements about their methods and rationale in creating the edition. While emendation of the text (unless accompanied by a commentary), selection, and arrangement of books for the corpus all entail a tacit

articulation of an editor's hermeneutics, this articulation and the grounds for editorial decisions can be made explicit in an introduction. For this reason, introductions are without peer for investigating the editor's interpretive stance.

Before embarking on this investigation into introductory materials some distinctions need to be drawn. In this discussion of prologues, prefaces, and sundry paratextual materials, I am only concerned with those written by a later writer or editor, not those by the author—although they are related. Prologues, prefaces, and *prooimia* were employed by authors so as to introduce their work to the audience or the reader. *Prooimia* developed primarily out of rhetorical theory and practice and were designed to delineate the scope of the argument, introduce the topic under discussion to the audience, and attempt to secure the audience's favor for the remainder of the oration.³⁴⁴ The *prooimion's* utility for addressing the audience allowed it to be easily transferred to literary works wherein the author could address the reader. Attaching *prooimia* (*prefatio* in Latin) to literary works represents the application of this rhetorical theory to a literary setting.³⁴⁵

In literary *prooimia* the author also sought to curry the reader's favor and sketch the arc of the work. This was a place where the author recounted debts incurred and offered an apology for the works shortcomings.³⁴⁶ The widespread use of prefaces is

³⁴⁴ See Aristotle *Rhet.* III 14 1415b 7-9. Prooimia also had connections to poetry, for an overview of this aspect, see Hans Armin Gartner, "Prooimion," in *Der Neue Pauly: Band 10 Pol-Sal* (eds. Hubert Cancik and Helmuth Schneider; Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 1996).

³⁴⁵ Tore Janson, *Latin Prose Prefaces: Studies in Literary Conventions* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1964), 14-26.

³⁴⁶ Janson, *Latin Prose Prefaces*, 113-58.

evidenced by the marked use of *topoi* in later Latin prefaces.³⁴⁷ Despite their formulaic character, prefaces were an extremely useful vehicle for authors to address their audience. Attaching spurious prefaces to another's work in an attempt at forgery highlights their usefulness. Galen's many complaints about the loss of control over his oeuvre by someone's attempt to co-opt some of his books by adding his/her own preface (*prooimion*) illustrates this point perfectly.³⁴⁸

Prologues, by contrast, developed out of the dramatic genre.³⁴⁹ Despite the occasional assertions (and proof) that prologues were added by later editors, these interpolations more appropriately fall under our discussion of the text, since they purport to offer the text of the author, rather than an introduction to the work.³⁵⁰ For this reason, dramatic prologues fall outside our purview in this discussion of introductory works.

Eventually prologues also came under the influence of rhetorical theory and were utilized for genres other than dramatic.³⁵¹ In particular, prologues served to introduce

³⁴⁷ In particular, Janson observes that the preface dedicated to a patron was integral and most appropriate for reproducing the vertical relationships of Roman society (*Latin Prose Prefaces*, 159).

³⁴⁸ ἀποθανόντος οὖν ἐν τῷ μεταξὺ τοῦ νεανίσκου τὰ βιβλία παρά τισιν ἦν, ὑπονοούμενα τῆς ἐμῆς ἕξεως εἶναι, καὶ τις ἠλέγχθη προοίμιόν τι τεθεικῶς αὐτοῖς εἶτ' ἀναγιγνώσκων ὡς ἴδια (*De libris propriis* [*Scr. Min.* II Marquardt, Müller, Helmreich, eds., 98.2-6]).

³⁴⁹ For a brief overview, see Bernhard Zimmermann, "Prolog," in *Der Neue Pauly: Band 10 Pol-Sal* (eds. Hubert Cancik and Helmuth Schneider; Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 1996). For a full discussion of Euripides' prologues, see Hartmut Erbse, *Studien zum Prolog der euripideischen Tragödie* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1984).

³⁵⁰ For example, Page mentions the possibility that prologues to dramatic works were added by actors (*Actors' Interpolations*, 17-18). He bases this observation on the *hypothesis* to Rhesus; for a discussion of this *hypothesis* and their role in attribution of authorship, see below.

³⁵¹ *Rhetoric ad Herennium* 1.4; Cicero, *De Inv.*, 1.14. For an overview of the different theoretical divisions of speech, see Heinrich Lausberg, *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Study* (eds. David E. Orton and R. Dean Anderson; trans. Matthew T. Bliss, et al.; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 120-33.

commentaries wherein preliminary questions (i.e. prolegomena) were addressed.³⁵² Yet these were also written by the author of the commentary. Since the prologue (and sometimes commentary) were read prior to, or in tandem with, the text itself, quite often the commentary's introductory prologue served as an introduction to the corpus.³⁵³ The use of such prologues as introductions typifies the deployment of prologues composed specifically to introduce corpora. In this respect, investigating such prologues to commentaries as introductions is to some extent warranted. It must be acknowledged, however, that for the earliest examples of such prologues (see e.g. Albinos's *Prologue*), these texts do not appear to occupy the physical space as introductions to editions. We will, however, see introductory texts functioning in just this way in the physical manuscripts of the *Corpus Paulinum*. In any case, whether physically prefaced to the corpus or not, these introductory texts were designed to be read before studying the corpus of an author. For this reason, the use of *prooimia* or prologues as introductory works is intimately related to prolegomenal issues, which we discussed in relation to ordering patterns.

With respect to interpretative issues, we have noted how Albinos's prologue was illustrative of the way introductory works shaped interpretation. Albinos distinguished his interpretation, which was intimately connected to his cyclical reading order of Plato's dialogues, from that of Thrasyllus and Dercyllides, who cast the *Corpus Platonikum* into tetralogies. Similarly, Porphyry's introduction justified his ordering pattern and

³⁵² See L. G. Westerink, "The Alexandrian Commentators and the Introductions to their Commentaries," in *Aristotle Transformed: The Ancient Commentators and their Influence* (ed. Richard Sorabji; Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1990); and Mansfeld, *Prolegomena*, 31-37.

³⁵³ Mansfeld, *Prolegomena*, 28-30.

interpretation of Plotinus. Andronicus also adduced prefatory material to his edition of Aristotle's corpus.

Central to any discussion of prefatory materials in antiquity are *hypotheses*. *Hypothesis* can signify anything from the foundation, presupposition, or subject of a text to an actual written summary of a text.³⁵⁴ With respect to the former, we have already drawn attention to Galen's statement that the *hypothesis* sets the boundary for revision: the words of a text can be changed only as long as the *hypothesis* remains the same. We also discussed the common *hypotheses* that undergird Porphyry's and Thrasyllus's organizational patterns. Mansfeld drew attention to the latter meaning of *hypothesis* by pointing out Thrasyllus's common *hypothesis* in his first tetralogy. While Thrasyllus was probably referring to the scope of the tetralogy, Mansfeld suggested that he may have been responding to *hypotheses* authored by Aristophanes for the purpose of introducing the books in his edition.³⁵⁵ The fact that Diogenes Laertius identified Aristophanes as an editor of Plato's corpus—and Mansfeld's suggestion that he also prefaced *hypotheses* to this corpus—underscores Aristophanes putative role in the creation of *hypotheses*.

The development of *hypotheses* which prefaced literary works, especially tragedies, has traditionally been attributed to Aristophanes of Byzantium. This is primarily due to his prominent role in transmitting and introducing corpora, a reputation

³⁵⁴ See discussion in Pfeiffer, *Classical Scholarship*, 193ff; and Mansfeld, *Prolegomena*, 19-21, 69-71. *Hypothesis* also has connections with theatrical works, see D. Holwerda, "Zur szenisch-technischen Bedeutung des Wortes 'ΥΠΟΘΕΣΙΣ'," in *Miscellanea tragica in honorem J.C. Kamerbeek* (eds. Jan Maarten Bremer, et al.; Amsterdam: A. Hakkert, 1976). For a brief overview of the various uses and designations of *hypothesis*, see Bernhard Zimmermann, "Hypothesis," in *Brill's New Pauly: Encyclopaedia of the Ancient World*, v.6 *Hat-Jus* (eds. Hubert Cancik and et al; Leiden: Brill, 2002).

³⁵⁵ Mansfeld, *Prolegomena*, 69.

already garnered in antiquity.³⁵⁶ This reputation has survived down to modern scholarship. Pfeiffer, Zuntz, and Blum all follow Wilamowitz in the attribution of some *hypotheses* to Aristophanes.³⁵⁷ They also propose that Aristophanes made use of Callimachus's *Pinakes*, among other sources.³⁵⁸ Slater, however, rejects the connection between Aristophanes, his purported use of Callimachus's *Pinakes*, and the wide attribution of introductory material to him; instead, he suggests that the variety of styles in the surviving *hypotheses* suggest multiple authors, rather than Aristophanes alone.³⁵⁹

Whether or not Aristophanes is responsible for the *hypotheses* that came to preface literary texts is not crucial for the argument tendered here. Rather, I am concerned with the ways in which *hypotheses* (irrespective of their origins or sources), by introducing the text, shape the reader's interpretation. While *hypotheses* had diverse functions and were utilized for many different purposes, they could insinuate the hermeneutic of their composer—even if only in some small measure. Pfeiffer isolated three main types of dramatic *hypotheses*: 1) those attributed to Aristophanes; 2) anonymous; and 3) extensive Byzantine *hypotheses*.³⁶⁰ The last type falls outside of our purview, but the first two are of fundamental importance. The following features are typically contained in those *hypotheses* attributed to Aristophanes: 1) the subject of the

³⁵⁶ For example, as we have noted above, Diogenes Laertius reports that Aristophanes edited the Platonic corpus. In addition, a *hypothesis* prefaced to Menander's *Dyskolos* from the Bodmer papyri (P.Bodm. IV) is also attributed to Aristophanes. The assignation of hypotheses to Aristophanes, as Slater notes, must go back at least to the date of this papyrus (*Aristophanis Byzantii Fragmenta*, 172).

³⁵⁷ Pfeiffer, *Classical Scholarship*, 192ff; Zuntz, *Inquiry*, 249ff; and Blum, *Kallimachos*, 26-9 & 137.

³⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

³⁵⁹ Slater, ed., *Aristophanis Byzantii Fragmenta*, 172.

³⁶⁰ Pfeiffer, *Classical Scholarship*, 193-96. For more on Aristophanes' hypotheses, see also the earlier work Th. O. H. Achelis, "De Aristophanis Byzantii argumentis fabularum I," *Philologus* 72 (1913): 414-41; *ibid.*, "De Aristophanis Byzantii argumentis fabularum II," *Philologus* 72 (1913): 518-45; and *ibid.*, "De Aristophanis Byzantii argumentis fabularum III," *Philologus* 73 (1913): 122-53.

play; 2) other authors who dealt with the same topic; 3) the scene; 4) the chorus; 5) the prologist; 6) *didaskalia* (including the date of the play, titles of the competing plays and their authors, and prizewinners); 7) the chronological place in the author's oeuvre; 8) a critical assessment of the play.

Where the first type of *hypotheses* contain detailed information on the performance and history of the play, the second anonymous type, in contrast, is distinguished by their lack of such information; instead, these simply offer a summary of the play usually in a straightforward style.³⁶¹ The differences between the first and second type are so pronounced that Pfeiffer thought the designation *hypothesis* was not even accurate for these anonymous summaries; the more accurate designation would be narratives (διήγησις).³⁶² Although these *hypotheses* have usually been understood as targeting an audience wider than the scholastic community, Pfeiffer points out that “even in books which were certainly destined for the general reader, we find traces of Alexandrian scholarship.”³⁶³ Although these *hypotheses* were often transmitted in collections of *hypotheses*, eventually they became separated and were attached to the beginning of the play which they summarized, alongside the more succinct and scholarly *hypotheses* attributed to Aristophanes.³⁶⁴

As a result of the instability of this introductory material, it is difficult to speak about *hypotheses* with absolute certainty. In some respects the texts seem to be transmitted more stably than the introductions prefaced to them. While this may raise

³⁶¹ Pfeiffer, *Classical Scholarship*, 194-5.

³⁶² Pfeiffer, *Classical Scholarship*, 195.

³⁶³ Pfeiffer, *Classical Scholarship*, 195.

³⁶⁴ Pfeiffer, *Classical Scholarship*, 195.

some problems when isolating the editorial hermeneutic, the very fact that they are deployed so broadly speaks to their importance for ancient readers—a fact attested to by papyrus finds of summary introductory material, which has been collected and analyzed by Monique van Rossum-Steenbeek.³⁶⁵ Rossum-Steenbeek’s investigation into what she terms “sub-literary” papyri shows that the practice of prefacing texts with ancillary material was quite important for ancient editors. Rossum-Steenbeek deals with two main types of ancillary materials found in the papyri that are relevant to our discussion: narrative and learned *hypotheses*. According to her analysis, the style and vocabulary of narrative *hypotheses* to tragedies (specifically Euripides’ and Sophocles’) reveal that they were composed and collected by one person.³⁶⁶ These were then separated out and prefaced to their respective plays, where they are found in medieval MSS.³⁶⁷ With respect to the learned *hypotheses*, Rossum-Steenbeek follows Budé’s description of their main features: mythopoeia, summary, observations on the title, prologue and *didaskalia* data.³⁶⁸ While Rossum-Steenbeek is confident that these *hypotheses* were intended for scholars and were dependent on the text to which they were prefaced, she is reticent to posit a clear function.³⁶⁹ The one second/third-century example of another type, the

³⁶⁵ Monique van Rossum-Steenbeek, *Greek Readers’ Digests?: Studies on a Selection of Subliterary Papyri* (Leiden: Brill, 1998).

³⁶⁶ Rossum-Steenbeek, *Greek Readers’ Digests*, 1-4.

³⁶⁷ Rossum-Steenbeek, *Greek Readers’ Digests*, 24-25. Rossum-Steenbeek cites Barnett, who suggests that this began to happen ca. 6th cent. C.E.; Rossum-Steenbeek notes, however, that the earliest MS evidence for the practice is 10-11th centuries C.E. (*ibid.*, 25 footnotes 54-6).

³⁶⁸ Rossum-Steenbeek, *Greek Readers’ Digests*, 32-34.

³⁶⁹ Rossum-Steenbeek, *Greek Readers’ Digests*, 36.

descriptive *hypothesis*, clearly prefaced the play and probably acted as an introduction.³⁷⁰ Concerning *hypotheses* to Menander, Rossum-Steenbeek isolates four features: 1) title, 2) a phrase such as οὐ ἀρχή followed by the incipit, 3) didaskalia information, and 4) a summary.³⁷¹ Whether or not composed for this reason, Rossum-Steenbeek notes that these *hypotheses* clearly functioned as introductions to their respective plays, as the fourth-century C.E. Bodmer papyri testify.³⁷² Among the five papyri of Callimachean narratives (*diegeses*) which Rossum-Steenbeek adduces is one clearly prefaced to a “sumptuous papyrus codex” of Callimachus’s poetry from between the fifth and seventh centuries C.E.³⁷³ According to Rossum-Steenbeek, this papyrus offers clear evidence of prefatory material transmitted along with and prefaced as an introduction to the text.³⁷⁴

Rossum-Steenbeek also investigates Homeric *hypotheses*, isolating various types and uses. Significantly, she found that the Homeric *hypotheses* are not found transmitted alongside the Homeric text in early MSS, in contrast to later medieval ones.³⁷⁵ Rossum-Steenbeek suggests that they were used primarily in a schoolroom setting and functioned to introduce and augment (not replace) the text of Homer before reading it.³⁷⁶ In addition, she deduces from the variety of the Homeric *hypotheses* that these are not the product of

³⁷⁰ Rossum-Steenbeek, *Greek Readers’ Digests*, 38-39. She points out, however, that the order of the transcription of the play and the *hypothesis* is peculiar. The *hypothesis* was prefaced to the text after the text was copied.

³⁷¹ Rossum-Steenbeek, *Greek Readers’ Digests*, 39-45.

³⁷² Rossum-Steenbeek, *Greek Readers’ Digests*, 44-45.

³⁷³ Rossum-Steenbeek, *Greek Readers’ Digests*, 79. Rossum-Steenbeek follows Pfeiffer in designating these summaries as *diegesis* on the basis of one papyrus (P.Mil.Vogl. 1,18), which explicitly refers to them in this way.

³⁷⁴ Rossum-Steenbeek, *Greek Readers’ Digests*, 81.

³⁷⁵ Rossum-Steenbeek, *Greek Readers’ Digests*, 66.

³⁷⁶ Rossum-Steenbeek, *Greek Readers’ Digests*, 67 & 73.

one author, but rather represent many attempts to summarize and introduce the Homeric poems.³⁷⁷ She does note, however, that there may be connections between some of these early *hypotheses* and those eventually found in medieval Homeric MSS.³⁷⁸ Irrespective of the lack of definitive proof of transmission of these *hypotheses* alongside the Homeric text, the variety of types of Homeric *hypotheses* testifies to their importance for augmenting and introducing the text for ancient readers.

Another important introduction to the Homeric corpus is the *Essay on the Life and Poetry of Homer* (perhaps dating to the second to third century C.E.) attributed to Plutarch.³⁷⁹ Although its attribution to Plutarch and complicated transmission down to the present fall outside our purview,³⁸⁰ this text offers an illuminating view of the way the text of the Homeric corpus should be approached by the ancient reader.³⁸¹ According to this interpreter Homer was the repository of all knowledge, philosophy, and learning. If read allegorically, Homer's poetry signified in riddles (αἰνίττομαι) everything anyone needed to know.³⁸² For our discussion of introductions three aspects of this *Essay* are important. First, we again see evidence of the presence of a *bios* utilized to introduce the reader to the author's work. Second, the *Essay* addresses the issue of authenticity of Homeric poetry and transmits information concerning their division into twenty-two

³⁷⁷ Rossum-Steenbeek, *Greek Readers' Digests*, 82-83.

³⁷⁸ Rossum-Steenbeek, *Greek Readers' Digests*, 83.

³⁷⁹ For an accessible critical edition and translation, see John J. Keaney and Robert Lamberton, eds., *[Plutarch]: Essay on the Life and Poetry of Homer* (Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1996).

³⁸⁰ For an overview, see Keaney and Lamberton, eds., *[Plutarch]*, 1-10.

³⁸¹ Keaney and Lamberton, eds., *[Plutarch]*, 7-29.

³⁸² Keaney and Lamberton, eds., *[Plutarch]*, 17ff.

books—a division he attributes to Aristarchus, rather than Homer himself.³⁸³ Third, the *Essay* also offers a very clear and distinct interpretation of Homer's poems in this introduction. For this author, Homer is unmistakably writing about the manliness of the body in the *Iliad* and in the *Odyssey* the excellence of the soul.³⁸⁴ While this essay does not seem to have been transmitted with the text of the Homeric corpus until the fifteenth century, its function as an introduction and exegetical guide to the Homeric corpus is certain. In this way, it is related to the Homeric *hypotheses* and prologues discussed previously.

We have looked at evidence for *hypotheses* or related materials for tragedy, comedy, epic, and Hellenistic poetry. The evidence for the utilization of *hypotheses* is, however, not limited to literary texts. We have noted the possibility that Aristophanes composed *hypotheses* to accompany his edition of the *Corpus Platonicum*. Irrespective of the veracity of this report and modern interpretations, what is certain is the use of other more extensive introductory materials: e.g. Andronicus's introductory works to his edition of Aristotle's corpus. Even medical texts were not immune from editorial influence: it has been suggested that Artemidorus Capiton and Dioscurides issued *hypotheses* prefaced to works in their *Corpus Hippocraticum*.³⁸⁵ Thus, the utilization of *hypotheses* as succinct introductions to works transcends genre.

We will conclude our discussion on the relationship between these short introductory texts and the interpretation of the editor by investigating two illustrative examples so as to elucidate their hermeneutical function. While the interpretive role of

³⁸³ [Plutarch], *On Homer*, 4.

³⁸⁴ [Plutarch], *On Homer*, 4.

³⁸⁵ Smith, *The Hippocratic Tradition*, 239.

the topics covered in the *hypotheses* may be subtle (as with the *bioi* and *diataxis* patterns), it is not absent. The following selection from the *hypothesis* to Euripides' *Medea* offers an illuminating example of the way in which the *hypotheses* can highlight interpretive issues bearing on the text of the play and its authenticity: "The play appears to have been altered through Neophron's revising (διασκευάσας), as Dicaearchus in the *Life of Greece* and Aristotle in commentaries [say]. They censure it for not maintaining the role of Medea, but for falling to tears, when she plotted against Jason and his wife."³⁸⁶ Here the *hypothesis* calls into question the authenticity of the *Medea* based on the development of its eponymous character. This opinion is also augmented by referring to earlier scholars who also questioned its authenticity. While such information may seem innocuous, reports that Euripides' *Medea* was a revision of Neophron's were not summarily dismissed; Diogenes Laertius mentioned in passing that some held this very opinion.³⁸⁷ Whether or not Diogenes was referring to either of the sources mentioned in this *hypothesis*, or whether he culled this information from just such a *hypothesis*, is impossible to determine. What is assured, however, is that once a text is impugned by its own introduction, its authenticity is severely challenged, irregardless of the veracity of such a charge.

³⁸⁶ τὸ δράμα δοκεῖ ὑποβαλέσθαι παρὰ Νεόφρονος διασκευάσας, ὡς Δικαίαρχος τοῦ τῆς Ἑλλάδος βίου καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν ὑπομνήμασιν. μέμφονται δὲ αὐτῷ τὸ μὴ πεφυλαχέναι τὴν ὑπόκρισιν τὴν Μήδειαν, ἀλλὰ προπεσεῖν εἰς δάκρυα, ὅτε ἐπεβούλευσεν Ἰάσονι καὶ τῇ γυναικί (*Scholia in Euripidem: Volumen II, ΥΠΟΘΕΣΙΣ ΜΗΔΕΙΑΣ* [Schwartz ed., 138,8-12]).

³⁸⁷ Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum*, 2.134 (LCL 184 264).

The *hypothesis* to Euripides' *Rhesus*, which opened this chapter, operates in a similar manner, addressing issues of style, revision, and manuscript evidence in order to draw attention to disputes about its authenticity.³⁸⁸ This *hypothesis* to *Rhesus* reads:

Some have suspected that this play is spurious (νόθον), that it is not Euripides'. Rather it evinces a Sophoclean character. In the *Didaskalia*, however, it is listed as authentic (γνήσιον). And moreover, the meddlesomeness in regards to the heavens in it testifies to Euripides. But there are two prologues. For this reason, Dichaearchus setting out the *hypothesis* for *Rhesus*, writes word for word as follows, "the beginning of the one prologue has thus 'now the chariot of fire is moonlit' and in some of the copies there is even another prologue, exceedingly pedestrian and not befitting Euripides. Perhaps some of the actors have revised (διεσκευακότες) it."³⁸⁹

This *hypothesis* sets forth reasons for disputing the play's authenticity. In addition to the multiple prologues, the reasons adduced are familiar from our previous discussion of authenticity: manuscript evidence and style unbecoming the authorial construct. The *hypothesis* essentially distills the main issues from our investigation on the assignation of authenticity and its relation to the image of the author. Since the style does not correspond to what one would expect of a great playwright like Euripides, these sections must have been interpolated or the play must be by someone else. This *hypothesis* also adds critical assessments of the play (though the "some" is ambiguous) and the reasons for these judgments. Reading such observations before reading the text itself cannot but influence the reading of the text. *Hypotheses* can also draw attention to problems latent in

³⁸⁸ For a full discussion of the *hypothesis* to *Rhesus* and its relation to the text, especially in later MSS, see Zuntz, *Inquiry*, 144-51.

³⁸⁹ τοῦτο τὸ δράμα ἔνιοι νόθον ὑπενόησαν, Εὐριπίδου δὲ μὴ εἶναι· τὸν γὰρ Σοφόκλειον μᾶλλον ὑποφαίνειν χαρακτῆρα. ἐν μέντοι ταῖς Διδασκαλίαις ὡς γνήσιον ἀναγράφεται. καὶ ἡ περὶ τὰ μετάρσια δὲ ἐν αὐτῷ πολυπραγμοσύνη τὸν Εὐριπίδην ὁμολογεῖ. πρόλογοι δὲ διττοὶ φέρονται. ὁ γοῦν Δικαίαρχος ἐκτιθεὶς τὴν ὑπόθεσιν τοῦ Ῥήσου γράφει κατὰ λέξιν οὕτως· <τοῦ ἐτέρου προλόγου ἢ ἀρχῆς ἔχει οὕτως> ἔνυν εὐσέληνον φέγγος ἢ διφρηλάτος' καὶ ... ἐν ἐνίοις δὲ τῶν ἀντιγράφων ἕτερός τις φέρεται πρόλογος, πεζὸς πάνυ καὶ οὐ πρέπων Εὐριπίδῃ· καὶ τάχα ἂν τινες τῶν ὑποκριτῶν διεσκευακότες εἶεν αὐτόν (*Scholia in Euripidem: Volumen II*, ΥΠΟΘΕΣΙΣ ΡΗΣΟΥ [Schwartz ed., 324,7-14]).

the text: for example, the *hypothesis* of Euripides' *Herakleidae* is at variance with the play preserved and draws attention to problems of transmission and interpolation.³⁹⁰

The *hypothesis* makes issues of authenticity explicit with the result that texts suspected of being spurious are sometimes questioned before they are even read; other times the summary in the *hypothesis* alerts the reader to discrepancies within the text. By contrast, the text judged authentic and legitimated by the *hypothesis* occupies a more secure position. The *hypotheses* and sundry introductory materials greatly impact interpretation, impinging on issues of authenticity, biography, aesthetic judgments, as well as what constitutes the *hypothesis* or *skopos* of the play. In so doing, the *hypothesis* serves to focalize the issues of interpretation and the hermeneutic of the editor who appends this material. In this respect, these introductory materials are similar to *kephalaia*, to which we now turn.

C. *Kephalaia* and related summaries

Kephalaia, whose role is closely related to the introductory works just discussed, comprise another feature occasionally found in editions. Their development and use are rooted in rhetorical practices which can be traced back to Aristotle, who advises that the *prooimion* should contain an outline of the main points (*kephalaia*) to be covered in speeches, especially judicial ones.³⁹¹ Marie-Odile Goulet-Cazé traces three main definitions of *kephalaion* subsequent to Aristotle's formulation: 1) a main point; 2) a

³⁹⁰ Page, *Actors' Interpolations*, 33.

³⁹¹ Aristotle, *Rhet.* III 14.

summary; 3) a section or short chapter.³⁹² Although I am primarily concerned with the use of *kephalaia* as chapter headings that are supplied to MS editions of a corpus, there is considerable overlap and interrelations between the various usages of *kephalaia*. For example, the main points culled from a text are often similar to a summary of the text; likewise the chapter headings often comprise the main points. Most relevant for our discussion is how the author arrives at the main point or summary, which then is presented to the reader. Surely, there would usually be widespread agreement by many editors (and readers) as to what constitutes an argument's main points. Nevertheless, interpretations will diverge, and the headings describing the corpus may follow suit.

Philippe Hoffmann has researched *kephalaia* in relation to prolegomena (the preliminary questions to be discussed upon reading an author, which we discussed earlier in relation to authenticity and arrangement).³⁹³ These seven questions, also called seven *kephalaia*, serve to orient the reader and pedagogically prepare them for the proper study of Aristotle and Plato. These *kephalaia*, found in introductions, act as main points to be addressed before reading an author and have an indisputable hermeneutical function. In Hoffman's own words:

[d]ans le cas du traité des *Catégories*, par exemple, l'étude de l'ensemble des «points capitaux» [*kephalaia*] permet de donner un premier enseignement, à la fois universel et résumé, de l'ensemble de la doctrine prêtée à Aristote, et intégrée à la philosophie néoplatonicienne à titre propédeutique. Les néoplatoniciens se situent résolument dans la tradition d'une méthode d'enseignement forgée dans les écoles de l'époque hellénistique: elle consistait à donner, avant tout exposé détaillé d'une doctrine, un résumé préalable sous forme d'«éléments» –

³⁹² Brisson et al., eds., *Porphyre: La vie de Plotin, I*, 316-19.

³⁹³ Hoffmann, "La fonction des prologues," 219-21. Mansfeld also points out the relationship between the use of the word *kephalaia* to describe these introductory questions; Mansfeld, *Prolegomena*, 10. See discussion above.

l'ensemble de la doctrine, avec ses détails, étant ainsi anticipé, sous une forme brève et accessible à des commençants (οἱ εἰσαγόμενοι).³⁹⁴

The hermeneutical function of *kephalaia* was intimately associated with their pedagogical role for studying an author—especially for neophytes. This can be seen where the *kephalaia* encourage an interpretation that stresses the harmony between Aristotle and Plato so as to guide students isagogically into philosophical thought. Their pedagogical fashioning offers a specific reading of Aristotle and Plato and incorporates their philosophies seamlessly together into Neoplatonic philosophic life. Again, Hoffmann makes this point most succinctly:

La dimension pédagogique est indissociable de la pratique exégétique, car dans la vie des écoles néoplatoniciennes l'explication des textes canoniques jalonnant le cursus est destinée à être communiquée à des âmes humaines encore imparfaites – celles des «commençants», des auditeurs, ou des lecteurs – dont il faut capter l'attention et stimuler l'ardeur studieuse afin, véritablement, d'agir sur elles: il ne s'agit pas seulement de leur transmettre intellectuellement un savoir – le fruit de l'exégèse –, ou de révéler à «ceux qui en sont dignes» le contenu d'une *époptie* dont le maître a fait l'expérience mystique, mais aussi de réaliser en ces destinataires la modification psychologique et spirituelle qui va les conduire sur les voies de la conversion.³⁹⁵

Neither the *kephalaia* nor the interpretation issuing from their reading are simply summaries of main points—though they often are that. The author of the *kephalaia* orients and directs the reader towards the proper interpretation of the corpus, irrespective of its author. Although Hoffmann is specifically concerned with *kephalaia* found in prologues for Neoplatonic study, his argument has broader implications.

These implications have a direct bearing on the use of *kephalaia* as a table of contents or summary of main points attached to actual MSS. The *Corpus Plotinicum* is particularly useful for such an investigation, since in his *bios* of Plotinus Porphyry

³⁹⁴ Hoffmann, "La fonction des prologues," 222.

³⁹⁵ Hoffmann, "La fonction des prologues," 223-4.

mentions the use of *kephalaia*. At the end of Porphyry's description of his arrangement of Plotinus's corpus, he informs the user of this edition that:

we have included commentaries on some of them, irregularly, because friends pressed us to write on points they wanted cleared up for them. We also composed headings (κεφάλαια) for all of them except *On Beauty*, because it was not available to us, following the chronological order in which the books were issued; and we have produced not only headings (κεφάλαια) for each book but also summaries of the arguments (ἐπιχειρήματα), which are numbered in the same way as the headings (κεφάλαια) (trans. Armstrong).³⁹⁶

There is some disagreement concerning the exact role and place of Porphyry's *kephalaia*, since, except for traces, they have been lost in the course of the transmission.³⁹⁷ Theories as to the purpose of Porphyry's *kephalaia* and epicheiremes range from identifying the *kephalaia* as mere titles to suggestions that the epicheiremes are summaries of arguments incorporated into the text itself.³⁹⁸ Goulet-Cazé contends that the evidence is too ambiguous to offer a definitive answer.³⁹⁹ Whatever their actual role, it is clear that they represent a deliberate attempt by Porphyry to aid readers and orient their interpretation.

Zuntz's reconstruction of how *kephalaia* eventually came to designate a list of main points prefaced to a book proves particularly useful for our investigation of the incorporation of *kephalaia* into editions as a table of contents.⁴⁰⁰ Zuntz adduces evidence

³⁹⁶ Porphyry, *Vita*, 26.30-38 (Armstrong, LCL 440 85-87).

³⁹⁷ The evidence of their existence is supported by the Pseudo-Theology of Aristotle which is indebted to Porphyry's edition of the *Enneads*, see Brisson et al., eds., *Porphyre: La vie de Plotin*, I, 307 & 23-25.

³⁹⁸ Brisson et al., eds., *Porphyre: La vie de Plotin*, I, 323-25. For a bibliography, see *ibid.*, 319 note 1.

³⁹⁹ Brisson et al., eds., *Porphyre: La vie de Plotin*, I, 325.

⁴⁰⁰ This paragraph is indebted to the discussion in Günther Zuntz, *The Ancestry of the Harklean New Testament* (London: Pub. for the British Academy by H. Milford Oxford University Press, 1945), 80-82; On *kephalaia*, see also Hermann Mutschmann, "Inhaltsangabe und Kapitelüberschrift im antiken Buch," *Hermes* 46 (1911): 91-107; Brisson et al., eds., *Porphyre: La vie de Plotin*, I, 315-27; Robertus Friderici, *De librorum antiquorum captium divisione atque summaris. Accedit de Catonis De agricultura libro disputatio* (Marburg: Noske, 1911); H. D. Saffrey and L. G. Westerink, eds., *Proclus: Théologie platonicienne, Livre I* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1968), 129-30; and Mansfeld, *Prolegomena*, 22 & 116.

from Pliny the Elder, Cato, Eusebius, medical collections, and papyri in order to trace the development of this deployment of *kephalaia*.⁴⁰¹ He points out that, by the second century C.E. at the latest, there is evidence that *kephalaia* were used as indices or tables of contents. Zuntz even draws attention to an edition of Epictetus issued by Arrian, which utilized *kephalaia* in this manner.⁴⁰² *Kephalaia* were usually designated by περί, πῶς, ὅτι, or simply a word. These *kephalaia* then corresponded to passages in the text itself and were utilized so as to facilitate the location of references. For this reason *kephalaia* were occasionally numbered so that the passages could be located by finding the corresponding number in the margin of the text itself. If the *kephalaia* were not numbered, then the reader simply had to locate the heading itself in the margin.

Although *kephalaia*, unlike prefatory *bioi* and introductory texts, may have less overt connections to the editor's hermeneutics, we have still managed to identify two primary interpretive functions. First, *kephalaia* served as isagogical questions that introduced neophytic reader to a corpus. In doing so, the interpretation of the author of the introduction was foregrounded. Second, they developed into pithy summaries or chapter headings that were utilized as a table of contents prefacing a book or edition. The primary function of this usage of *kephalaia* was to assist the reader in discerning the scope of the work and for locating passages. Yet, an argument can be made that these brief summaries, which guided the reader through the text, were also not removed from editorial influences and concerns, since the *kephalaia* highlighted interpretive issues the editor thought salient. In this respect, *kephalaia* were not different in kind from

⁴⁰¹ Zuntz, *Ancestry*, 80-81.

⁴⁰² Zuntz, *Ancestry*, 81.

hypotheses and represent another way in which the hermeneutics of the editor influenced the corpus produced.

D. Aids for the Reader

Before concluding this discussion of ancillary materials we must address aids supplied for the reader. The first and most important aid for the reader was the separation of the mass of text usually transmitted in *scriptio continua* into sense-lines (κατὰ κῶλα καὶ κόμματα, *per cola et commata*) for ease of reading. Although this was not a common practice, it may have originated quite early in editions of lyric issued by Aristophanes, who also utilized various marginalia denoting speakers and stanza breaks.⁴⁰³ With respect to the text, we have already mentioned the considerable usage of marginal notes to designate interpretive issues, other editions, or textual variants. In his commentaries on the Hippocratic corpus, Galen frequently refers to such marginal variants, though he does not indicate when they were added.⁴⁰⁴ Similarly, the margins were sometimes supplied with glosses of obscure words. For early Christian MSS, the margins were available for other aids: e.g. Eusebian canons, lectionary information, and concordances.⁴⁰⁵ Page numbers were also sometimes included, though their usefulness was limited, since pagination was not standardized.⁴⁰⁶ Finally, stichoi were occasionally inserted into MSS;

⁴⁰³ See Dionysius of Halicarnassus's report quoted in Pfeiffer, *Classical Scholarship*, 187.

⁴⁰⁴ See, for example, Ernst August Wenkebach and Franz Pfaff, eds., *Galen in Hippocratis Epidemiarum Librum VI Commentaria I-VIII, CMG V 10,2,2* (Berlin: Teubner, 1956), 464. Galen also uses his knowledge of the incorporation of marginal glosses into the MS tradition in order to distinguish between authentic and inauthentic Hippocratic writings, see Bröker, "Die Methoden Galens," 430.

⁴⁰⁵ For an overview and relevant bibliography, see Bruce Manning Metzger, *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible: An Introduction to Greek Palaeography* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981), 38-48.

⁴⁰⁶ E.g. P⁴⁶, one of the earliest more or less full MSS of Paul's letters, included page numbers.

they were also found in the *Pinakes* and probably served to guarantee the amount of text and its authenticity.⁴⁰⁷ With respect to their relationship to editor's hermeneutics, the deployment of marginal notes, adduction of variant readings, and separation of text into cola and commata, all convey an implicit interpretive stance.

To recapitulate, in this section I have argued that paratexts transmitted interpretive stances by offering judgments of authenticity, summarizing the attendant text, orienting the reader of the text, facilitating reading, and guiding pedagogically. These modes were not necessarily mutually exclusive and, quite often, influenced one another: e.g. the information on an author in the *bios* can affect judgments on authenticity. Similarly, the summary information found in a *hypothesis* can inform the life of the author and transmission of his/her works. While it would be difficult to make the argument that every paratext was solely designed and utilized in order to subject the reader to the interpretation of the editor, reviser, or corrector, I have argued and adduced evidence that (quite often), deliberate or not, these materials definitely functioned to transmit interpretation.

V. Conclusion

This chapter has covered a vast amount of material in order to isolate the role of the editor's hermeneutics in fashioning an author's corpus of writings. In concluding let me recapitulate and draw these seemingly disparate and wide-ranging threads together. In our discussions of the text, we noted many causes of textual corruption: solutions to Homeric *zetemata* and theological problems; alterations by actors resulting from

⁴⁰⁷ In addition to discussion and bibliography in chapter 4, see Gregor Damschen, "Stichometrie," in *Der Neue Pauly: Band 11 Sam-Tal* (eds. Hubert Cancik and Helmuth Schneider; Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 1996); Blum's discussion of the *Pinakes* (*Kallimachos*, 182-84, 226ff).

performance; dissenting interpretations in Platonic scholastic traditions; and authentication of Galen's medical theory in the Hippocratic corpus. But Galen also made clear that, while we was not averse to emendation, he preferred the old readings found in ancient manuscripts. Furthermore, Galen's observations call for a nuanced understanding of textual variation: his identification of the *hypothesis* as the threshold of revision reminds us that texts could not just be deliberately altered without justification. There were limits to textual manipulation. Nevertheless, the criteria that justified or prohibited such manipulations were open to interpretation and it is here where the editorial hermeneutics once again enters: what comprises the *hypothesis* of a work can be debated. As we saw in our discussion of the contents and the order of the works in a corpus, unity and harmony was lacking. The authorial image, the style of the author, and acceptable deviation therefrom all conspired to render judgments on a work's authenticity: whether a book was accorded a central place in the corpus or relegated to the margins. So too, patterns of arrangement contained implicit hermeneutical stances, especially in those concerned with anagogical instruction. Finally, the investigation of ancillary materials appended to the text revealed similar connections between interpretation and pedagogy. The *bios* prefaced to corpora acted as a preliminary introduction to the thought of the author as a mode of purification and preparation for further study. The *bios* also had a symbiotic relationship with the author's corpus: it influenced judgments of authenticity and was shaped by the authentic works. *Hypotheses* also conveyed issues of interpretation by summarizing the *skopos* of the play and transmitting prior research on the author's life and a work's authenticity. The function of summary material found in *kephalaia* bear a close resemblance to the *hypotheses*; yet, just as important, they

supplied aids to readers, much like other marginalia. But even in the case of marginalia, tacit interpretive issues were operative. In this survey I have argued that the interpretive stance influenced virtually every aspect of corpus production, from the selection of words and books, to their arrangements, and introductions.

As interesting as these conclusions may be in their own right, the goal of this chapter was not to present an exhaustive or authoritative survey of ancient editorial practices. This foray into the editorial practices employed to fashion corpora of Greco-Roman authors instead serves to illuminate collections of the *Corpus Paulinum* in the early Church. In transitioning to specific editions (and MSS) of Paul's letters, we must keep in mind the chaos of ancient book production (whether public or private) as a counterpoint to this reconstruction above: the loss of control of a text once published applies equally to the textual and paratextual work of an editor. In the following three chapters, I will investigate how have the practices isolated here may have affected Paul's letters: the role of interpretation in shaping (within limits) Paul's text; judgments regarding authenticity of Paul's letters; arrangement and rearrangement of these letters for theological or pedagogical reasons; and deployment of paratexts in these editions in order to introduce pedagogical or interpretive concerns. In keeping with the contention that the production of a MS to some extent transmitted interpretive concerns (since complete institutional or ecclesiastical control over a text once published was lacking), I will investigate two MSS as embodiments of editions of the *Corpus Paulinum*. But first I turn to Marcion's *Apostolikon*, for which such physical evidence is lacking.

CHAPTER 3

MARCIONITE (PRE)TEXTS AND THE *CORPUS PAULINUM*

I say mine is true: Marcion his. I assert that Marcion's is false: Marcion mine. Tertullian, *Marc.*, 4.4.1¹

For if they are heretics, pursuing that of their own choosing not having it from Christ, they are not able to be Christians and they deserve the name of heretics. Thus those non-Christians have no claim to Christian writings; and to them it must be rightly said: "Who are you? When and whence did you come? Since you are not mine, what do you pursue in me? Then by what right, Marcion, do you cut my forest? With what license, Valentinus, do you divert my springs? By what authority, Apelles, do you disturb my boundary markers? Is it my possession which you others sow and reap here by your own authority? This is my possession. For a long time now I have owned it; I owned it first. I have the true deeds from the authors themselves whose property it was. I am the heir of the apostles. Just as they guarded their covenant, just as they trusted in the faith, just as they swore allegiance, just so do I hold fast. Without doubt they always disinherited and disowned you as unrelated and hostile." But for what reason are the heretics unrelated and hostile except from the diversity of doctrine, which each, in opposition to the apostles, either invented or received. Tertullian, *Praes.*, 37²

I. Introduction

Tertullian's attempt to deny Marcion and other so-called "heretics" the name Christian and the writings that this name conferred goes to the heart of the dispute over accusations of corrupting the *Corpus Paulinum*. According to Tertullian, since Paul's

¹ Ego meum dico uerum, Marcion suum; ego Marcionis adfirmo adulteratum, Marcion meum (*Marc.* 4.4.1 [CCSL 1 549,23-24]).

² Si enim haeretici sunt, christiani esse non possunt, non a Christo habendo quod de sua electione sectati haeticorum nomine admittunt. Ita non christiani nullum ius capiunt christianarum litterarum ad quos merito dicendum est: 'Qui estis? quando et unde uenistis? quid in meo agitis, non mei? quo denique, Marcion, iure siluam meam caedis? qua licentia, Valentine, fontes meos transuertis? qua potestate, Apelles, limites meos commoues? [mea est possessio,] Quid hic, ceteri, ad uoluntatem uestram seminatis et pascitis? Mea est possessio, olim possideo, prior possideo, habeo origines firmas ab ipsis auctoribus quorum fuit res. Ego sum heres apostolorum. Sicut cauerunt testamento suo, sicut fidei commiserunt, sicut adiurauerunt, ita teneo. Vos certe exheredauerunt semper et abdicauerunt ut extraneos, ut inimicos.' Vnde autem extranei et inimici apostolis haeretici, nisi ex diuersitate doctrinae, quam unusquisque de suo arbitrio aduersus apostolos aut protulit aut recepit? (*Praescr.* 37. 2-7 [CCSL 1 217,6-218,24]).

letters (and other scriptures) are “Christian” documents and “heretics” are not Christian, Marcion and his ilk have no legitimate claim to them or their transmission. Tertullian’s rejection of the authenticity of Marcionite traditions and the authority that such authenticity affords underscores scripture’s significance and its control in the early church. Two fundamental questions undergird this struggle for scripture: what is authentic Pauline tradition and who controls this tradition?

In this chapter I will investigate the ways in which issues of authenticity and the control of this tradition through proper interpretation coalesce around Marcion’s editorial activities on the *Corpus Paulinum*: his utilization of ancient editorial techniques for correction, emendation, arrangement of, and introduction to Paul’s letters. Primarily this entails a discussion of the text of Paul’s letters issued in Marcion’s edition. Since recent and past investigations on Marcion’s text has made another full evaluation of his text and methods employed in his editorial activity somewhat unnecessary,³ in this chapter I will

³ The following are some of the more important treatments of Marcion in the nineteenth and first half of the twentieth century: Adolf Hilgenfeld, "Das Apostolikon Marcion's," *ZHT* 25 (1855): 426-84; Theodor Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen kanons: Erster Band: Das Neue Testament vor Origenes. Zweite Hälfte* (Erlangen: A. Deichert, 1888), 585-718; E. C. Blackman, *Marcion and his Influence* (London: S.P.C.K., 1948). By far the most important and full investigation of Marcion, his legacy, and his texts remains Adolf von Harnack’s *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1924). Harnack’s magnum opus remains the benchmark and primary study that all scholars of Marcion must still engage. In addition to sundry articles, recently Marcion has again received significant attention; see R. Joseph Hoffmann, *Marcion, on the Restitution of Christianity: An Essay on the Development of Radical Paulinist Theology in the Second Century* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1984); Robert M. Grant, "Marcion and the Critical Method," in *From Jesus to Paul: Studies in Honour of Francis Wright Beare* (eds. Peter Richardson and John C. Hurd; Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1984); John James Clabeaux, *A Lost Edition of the Letters of Paul: A Reassessment of the Text of the Pauline Corpus attested by Marcion* (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1989); Gerhard May, "Marcion in Contemporary Views: Results and Open Questions," *SecCent* 6, no. 3 (1987/88): 129-51; reprinted in Katharina Greschat and Martin Meiser, eds., *Gerhard May: Markion, Gesammelte Aufsätze* (Mainz: Von Zabern, 2005), 13-33; Han J. W. Drijvers, "Marcionism in Syria: Principles, Problems, Polemics," *SecCent* 6, no. 3 (1987/88): 153-72; R. Joseph Hoffmann, "How Then Know This Troubled Teacher: Further Reflections on Marcion and his Church," *SecCent* 6, no. 3 (1987/88): 173-91; Robert M. Grant, *Heresy and Criticism* (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993), ch.3; Ulrich Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos: Rekonstruktion und historische Einordnung der marcionitischen Paulusbriefausgabe* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995); Gerhard May, "Markions Genesisauslesung und die "Antithesen"," in *Die Weltlichkeit des Glaubens in der Alten Kirche: Festschrift für Ulrich Wickert zum siebzigsten Geburtstag*

focus on specific variants found in the text of Marcion's edition in order to elucidate how Marcion's text-critical activity relates to his larger actions in fashioning an edition of Paul's letters. While I am circumscribing the scope of this inquiry in terms of the text investigated, I am expanding my purview to encompass not only the text, but also the text's relationship to Marcionite hermeneutics deployed in paratexts. This relationship requires an explication of the editorial techniques employed by Marcion (the arrangement and utilization of prefatory materials) and their relationship with the text, through which the editor's interpretive stance may be transmitted, as we discussed in chapter 2.

II. Marcion's Paratexts

A. Marcion's *Antitheses*

The most logical place to begin a discussion of Marcion's prefatory materials and their relationship to textual and editorial practices is his treatise known as the *Antitheses*. Alongside his editions of the Gospel of Luke and Paul's letters, the *Antitheses* represent one of Marcion's few known writings;⁴ moreover, this work most clearly articulated his theology and understanding of Christianity. Unfortunately Marcion's tract has neither

(eds. Barbara Aland, et al.; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1997); and Gerhard May, Katharina Greschat, and Martin Meiser, *Marcion und seine kirchengeschichtliche Wirkung = Marcion and his Impact on Church History: Vorträge der Internationalen Fachkonferenz zu Marcion, gehalten vom 15.-18. August 2001 in Mainz* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002). Schmid's study, in particular, offers a judicious and comprehensive reconstruction of Marcion's text of Paul's letters that is not likely to be surpassed soon. Because Schmid's investigation is so thorough and sound, in this chapter it will not be necessary to reconstruct Marcion's text in full, which Schmid has already done admirably. Instead, I will utilize Schmid's work for my investigation of the interplay between Marcion's introductory materials and overall editorial hermeneutics, which guided the creation and production of Marcion's *Apostolikon* in accordance with prevailing editorial practice in antiquity; in framing Marcion's textual criticism against this backdrop, I am building on Grant's work on Marcion's editorial practices—although I do not imply or maintain (pace Grant) that Marcion was unique in this practice.

⁴ Tertullian also refers to a letter allegedly composed by Marcion; for more on this text, see discussion below.

survived the ravages of time nor auto-da-fé.⁵ Tertullian relates that this work was entitled the *Antitheses*, because in it Marcion juxtaposed what he viewed as antithetical statements from the Hebrew scriptures and his NT collection.⁶ According to Tertullian, these *Antitheses* often deliberately set these statements in contrast so as to demonstrate the incompatibility of the God of the Hebrew Bible and the God who sent the Christ: e.g. Marcion's purported rejection of the ius talionis by juxtaposing it with Jesus' injunction to "turn the other cheek."⁷ In Marcion's understanding, apparently, such statements were mutually exclusive and pointed to a conflict in laws, thus demonstrating Jesus' rejection of the law found in the Hebrew Bible.

⁵ For an overview of the destruction of "heretical" works, see Speyer, *Fälschung*, 90-93; and Metzger, *Canon*, 102. For a discussion of attempts to root out the Diatessaron, see William Lawrence Petersen, *Tatian's Diatessaron: Its Creation, Dissemination, Significance, and History in Scholarship* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994), 41-45.

⁶ The following are Tertullian's references to *Antitheses* or antithesis from his treatise *Adversus Marcionem*: *Marc.* 1.19:314,25; 2.28:374,25; 2.29:377,4; 2.29:375,28; 2.29:376,4,19,23,27; 4.23:497,23; 4.1:423,2,5; 4.1:425,17,23; 4.1:426,1; 4.2:426,3; 4.4:429,18,22; 4.6:432,15; 4.9:440,20; 4.23:497,23; 4.24:499,25; 4.24:500,22; 4.35:542,13; 4.36:547,3,4,11. V.s. *Antitheses* or antithesis in Gösta Claesson, *Index Tertullianus* (Paris: Études augustiniennes, 1974).

⁷ *Marc.* 4.16.1-2 (CCSL 1 581). Cf. *Marc.* 1.2 (CCSL 1 442-443). Fundamental for any study on Marcion is the extent to which our sources rooted in heresiological polemics can be trusted. On the one hand, we must rely on their testimony for any reconstruction of Marcion's texts and thought. On the other hand, the evidence must be read circumspectly against the grain of their blatant heresiological agenda. This raises the questions: why should we trust heresiological reports about Marcion on some scores but not on others? And can we legitimately use their evidence yet read it against the grain with the result that we both accept and reject it simultaneously? The key question in my opinion is: cui bono? Insofar as Tertullian, Epiphanius, and others achieve their objectives 1) to slander Marcion, his teachings, and his texts and 2) to wrest control of the scriptures from him, we must be highly suspicious of the veracity of their calumny. Conversely, when these heresiological writers concede arguments which make their defense more difficult or which they must go out of their way to refute, we are justified in judging that these are likely (or at least more likely) authentic. Additionally, independent testimony regarding Marcionite texts and doctrine will augment our confidence in their reports. With respect to reconstructing Marcion's text of the *Corpus Paulinum*, Schmid offers convincing evaluations; with the exception of Tertullian and Epiphanius, who seem to be the only ones to have used Marcion's own texts, the most secure and reliable readings for Marcion's text from other sources (i.e. Adamantius, Origen, and Jerome) ought to be multiply attested; ideally they should be corroborated by Tertullian and/or Epiphanius (*Marcion*, 33-34, 37-39, 196, 207-209, 236, 243-248).

Despite our knowledge of this work, the exact genre of Marcion's *Antitheses* remains problematic.⁸ Harnack noted similar works such as Apelles' Συλλογισμοί and Tatian's Προβλήματα and drew attention to Tertullian's enigmatic references to an epistle.⁹ More recently, David Dungan tried to identify the *Antitheses*' genre by situating this work alongside other similar antithetical lists, which Pagans, Jews, and Christians marshalled to ridicule their opponents' gods.¹⁰ Although Dungan does not precisely explicate how such lists of contradictions function as a genre, he does offer numerous parallels to Marcion's series of antithetical statements and demonstrates that such lists were standard weapons in ancient inter- and intra-religious polemical struggles for cultural hegemony.¹¹ These antithetical statements contrasted worldly (often disgraceful) stories about opponents' gods with proper attributes and actions of God—i.e. what was θεοπρεπής. Marcion's rejection of the God of the Hebrew Bible stemmed from his inability to accommodate those disgraceful or unseemly stories about this God—which supplied the negative counterpoints to his antithetical statements—with what he deemed θεοπρεπής: anthropomorphisms, descriptions of God's creation of evil, demonstrations of God's ignorance, signs of God's limitations, and similar actions either unbecoming or not

⁸ References to the contents of these *Antitheses* have been collected by Harnack in his exhaustive and seminal study (*Marcion*, 74-92; 256*-313*). J. Rendel Harris even suggested that a portion of the *Antitheses* should be identified in the *Dialogue of Adamantius*, where it copies the dialogue of Methodius with a certain Valentinian Drosierius ("Marcion's Book of Contradictions," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 6, no. 3 (1921): 289-309). This hypothetical suggestion, however, is not convincing and has not been accepted by scholars.

⁹ Harnack, *Marcion*, 74-76.

¹⁰ David L. Dungan, "Reactionary Trends in the Gospel Producing Activity of the Early Church," in *L'Évangile selon Marc* (ed. M. Sabbe; Louvain: Leuven University Press, 1974).

¹¹ Dungan, "Reactionary Trends," esp. pp.191-98. On struggles for cultural hegemony more broadly, see Arthur J. Droge, *Homer or Moses?: Early Christian Interpretations of the History of Culture* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1989).

in accordance with divine qualities.¹² In fact, Gerhard May has convincingly argued that philosophical conceptions of the divine informed Marcion's theology and interpretations of Genesis transmitted in his *Antitheses*.¹³ These Hebrew Bible stories that depicted God in ways disgraceful and anthropomorphic buttressed Marcion's conviction that this god was separate from the God who sent Christ and for this reason ought to be rejected.

Dungan compellingly suggests that this type of argumentation was less concerned with a carefully reasoned and executed argument than with the accumulation of examples designed to disparage other gods and stories about them.¹⁴ Despite Dungan's important observations about Marcion's malleable interpretive strategies, his attempt to identify the genre of the *Antitheses* remains somewhat unsatisfactory. The examples of similar denigrations of opponents' gods adduced by Dungan come from a wide range of literary types and are more representative of a widespread argumentative strategy than a genre. So the problem of the genre of Marcion's *Antitheses* persists.

The Genre of the *Antitheses*

¹² See e.g. Tertullian *Marc.* 1.2.2; 2.5.1-2; 2.16.4; 2.25.1-2 (CCSL 1 443; 479-480; 493; 503).

¹³ "Markions Genesisauslesung," 197-98. On Marcion's possible relationship to philosophical thought, also see Ugo Bianchi, "Marcion: Theologien biblique ou docteur gnostique?," *VC* 21, no. 3 (1967): 141-49; and John G. Gager, "Marcion and Philosophy," *VC* 26, no. 1 (1972): 53-59.

¹⁴ Dungan contends that Marcion's use of antithetical statements does not necessarily speak to his rejection of allegory as a means for ameliorating difficulties in the text, as is sometimes claimed; rather Marcion employed a literalistic reading of these passages which happened to suit him at any particular point in his theological argument ("Reactionary Trends," 198). Schmid follows this assessment of Marcion's employment of allegory (*Marcion*, 255-60). Close attention to the specific wording and meaning of a text when it suited his interpretation was, however, not peculiar to Marcion. Such interpretive moves were well known and used in arguments over legal issues in stasis theory and can be traced all the way back in some form to Aristotle. Thus, Marcion's employment of such strategies is not surprising.

In addition to Tertullian’s appellation of Marcion’s writings as “antitheses” or a “dos,”¹⁵ our other earliest descriptions of Marcion’s writings range from Irenaeus’s “scriptis,”¹⁶ to Epiphanius’s συντάγματα,¹⁷ and an anonymous early Syriac writer preserved in Armenian, who refers to Marcion’s work as a “proevangelium”¹⁸—a description that prompted Harnack to hypothesize that Marcion’s *Antitheses* could have been a type of introductory work read before (or perhaps prefaced to) the gospel.¹⁹

I contend that Marcion’s *Antitheses* was indeed an introductory tract, one that corresponded to the ancient isagogic genre. The early descriptions of the probable form and content of Marcion’s work offer a compelling solution to the problem of the genre and function of the *Antitheses*. Based on this evidence and connections to features of the isagogic genre, I will further make the case that the *Antitheses* functioned as an introductory work and was fashioned so as to guide readers—perhaps neophytes—into the proper reading of (and perhaps were prefaced to) Marcion’s edition of the *Gospel* and the *Apostle*. Ascertaining the genre of the *Antitheses* can yield important insights into

¹⁵ Et ut fidem instrueret, dotem quandam commentatus est illi, — opus ex contrarietatum oppositionibus ‘Antithesis’ cognominatum et ad separationem legis et euangelii coactum — qua duos deos diuidens, proinde diuersos ut alterum alterius instrumenti uel, quod magis usui est dicere, testamenti, exinde euangelio quoque secundum antithesis credendo patrocinaretur (*Marc.* 4.1.1 [*CCSL* 1 544,25-545,6]).

¹⁶ Seorsum contradicemus, ex eius scriptis arguentes eum (*Haer.*, 1.27.4 [*SC* 264 352,55-56]).

¹⁷ ἄλλα δὲ συντάγματα ἀφ’ ἑαυτοῦ συνέταξε τοῖς ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ πλανωμένοις (*Pan.*, 42,9,3 [*GCS* 31 105,7-8]).

¹⁸ “Markion schreibt in seinem Buche, das sie mit Namen Proevangelium nennen, was in unsere Sprache hier übersetzt heißt: “eher als das Evangelium” —und ich bin verwundert, wieso es eine Schrift der Markionisten gibt, die sie mit Namen Proevangelium nennen, da die Schüler jenes vertrauensvoll meinen, daß der Anfang der Gottheit, an die sie glauben, um jene Zeit offenbar wurde, [namlich] zur Zeit des Pilatus des Pontiers, in jener Zeit, in der das Evangelium geschrieben wurde” (Joseph Schäfers, *Eine altsyrische antimarkionitische Erklärung von Parabeln des Herrn und zwei andere altsyrische Abhandlungen zu Texten des Evangeliums. Mit Beiträgen zu Tatians Diatessaron und Markions Neuem Testament* [Münster: Aschendorffschen Buchhandlung, 1917], 3-4). Schäfers follows Preuschen’s hypothesis that the Armenian “Peron ew Engelson” here represented the Syriac ܡܪܘܢܘܨܘܢܝܘܬܐ.

¹⁹ Harnack, *Marcion*, 74-76.

Marcion's foundational work: by utilizing established conventions of isagogic texts in order to lay out and transmit his theological goals, Marcion implicitly conveyed his understanding of the *Antitheses*' purpose and how he imagined they would be received by those encountering them (most likely neophytes, catechumens, and fellow adherents to Marcion's interpretation of Christianity).

Isagoge as a Genre

As the designation *isagoge* (from εἰσαγωγή/εἰσάγειν, meaning “lead into”) indicates, isagogic texts primarily functioned to introduce readers to a field of knowledge by making them cognizant of its terminology, categories of organization, recurring problems, and occasionally previous solutions. By the second century of the Common Era when Marcion flourished, the isagogic genre had already been deployed for some time for the transmission of elementary instruction. Introductory texts have been traced back to early works written to introduce students to the proper definitions, divisions, and components of rhetoric and Greek grammar—for example, Anaxamines' Τέχνη (380-320 B.C.E.) and Dionysius Thrax's Τέχνη γραμματική (170-90 B.C.E.).²⁰ Similar introductory works were also composed in an effort to lead novices into the fundamentals of philosophical thought eschewing more abstruse and complex aspects. Notable examples are Epicurus's (341-271 B.C.E.) introductory letters to Herodotus, Pythocles, and

²⁰ See Anaximenes, *Ars rhetorica quae vulgo fertur Aristotelis ad Alexandrum* (ed. Manfred Fuhrmann; Lipsiae: Teubner, 1966); Gustav Uhlig, Adalbert Merx, and Alfred Hilgard, eds., *Dionysii Thracis Ars grammatica qualem exemplaria vetustissima exhibent* (Lipsiae: B. G. Teubneri, 1883). For discussions of these works in relation to the development of introductory works, see Manfred Fuhrmann, *Das systematische Lehrbuch: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Wissenschaften in der Antike* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960), chs.1-2.

Menoceus and his so-called *Kyriai Doxai*,²¹ and Chrysippus's (282-206 B.C.E.) isagogic texts categorized under logic by Diogenes Laertius (e.g., Περὶ τῶν στοιχείων τοῦ λόγου πρὸς Νικίαν α', Περὶ τῆς εἰς τὰς ἀμφιβολίας εἰσαγωγῆς ε' and Τέχνη λόγων καὶ τρόπων πρὸς Διοσκουρίδην ε').²² Somewhat later come Albinos's (*floruit* second century C.E.) *Prologue* (also entitled εἰσαγωγή in some MSS), which we discussed in relation to introductory texts in chapter 2, and Porphyry's *Isagoge*, written as an introduction to Aristotelian categorization.²³ Isagogic texts were also employed to introduce students to such diverse fields as theology, music, medicine, architecture, mathematics, and astronomy.²⁴

Authors employed isagogic texts so that neophytes might more easily and quickly gain mastery of a field's fundamental principles. Epicurus explicitly intended the summary of his teaching on celestial phenomena, condensed in his *Epistle to Pythocles*, to aid those only newly acquainted with his theory of nature.²⁵ This understanding of introductory texts still applied centuries later as Galen indicates in his prescription of works written specifically for those beginners (οἱ εἰσαγομένοι) embarking on a

²¹ Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum* 10.28-135, 138-154 (LCL 185 556-660, 662-676).

²² Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum* 7.193 (LCL 185 304). Chrysippus's use of περί literature for isagogic texts may have had even earlier and more practical antecedents in such handbook texts as Xenophon's περί ἱππικῆς; see K. Th. Schäfer, "Eisagoge," *RAC* 4 (1959): 862-904.

²³ A. Busse, ed., *Porphyrii Isagoge (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca IV 1)*; Berlin: G. Reimeri, 1882). For an English translation and commentary, see Jonathan Barnes, *Porphyry Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).

²⁴ Most of these are covered in Fuhrmann, *Lehrbuch*. In addition, see Schäfer, "Eisagoge." Those texts most useful for our discussion are Cleomedes' *Caelestia*, available in Robert B. Todd, ed., *Cleomedis Caelestia (Μετέωρα)* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1990) and Nicomachus's *Encheiridion*, readily accessible along with numerous other musical isagogic texts in Karl von Jan, ed., *Musici Scriptores Graeci* (Lipsiae: Teubner, 1895 [1995 repr.]). The *Caelestia* has now been translated into English along with commentary in Alan C. Bowen and Robert B. Todd, *Cleomedes' Lectures on Astronomy: A Translation of "The Heavens" with an Introduction and Commentary* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004).

²⁵ μάλιστα τοῖς νεωστὶ φυσιολογίας γνησίου γεγευμένοις κτλ (Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum* 10.85 [LCL 185 614]).

curriculum of medical studies (cf. e.g. the work entitled *περὶ ὁσπῶν τοῖς εἰσαγομένοις*).²⁶

The author now identified as Ps.-Soranus echoes this understanding by defining as isagogic a text specifically designed to introduce initiates (*εἰσαγομένοι*) to the fundamental principles of medicine.²⁷ The earliest Christian text explicitly described as isagogic, Eusebius's *Preparation for the Gospel*, articulates the very same understanding: the isagogic text is most suitable for those unfamiliar with the faith or for recent converts needing rudimentary catechetical instruction. Eusebius surprisingly adds, however, that the scope of his work extends beyond the initiate's purview so as to educate and train in a more rigorously exact orthodox education those who were already acquainted with such preliminary catechesis.²⁸

Eusebius's extension of the isagogic genre's intended audience to those who already had preliminary catechetical instruction was not peculiar to the fourth century Christian context. In his *Epistle to Herodotus* from the fourth/third century B.C.E., Epicurus not only anticipates a wider audience for isagogic texts, he even extols the

²⁶ ἀναγνώσεται τοιγαροῦν οὗτος ἀπάντων πρῶτα τὰ τοῖς εἰσαγομένοις γεγραμμένα, τό τε περὶ τῶν αἰρέσεων, ὃ δὴ καὶ κατὰ τήνδε τὴν λέξιν ἐπιγέγραπται 'περὶ αἰρέσεων τοῖς εἰσαγομένοις' καὶ τὸ περὶ τῶν σφυγμῶν, ὃ δὴ καὶ αὐτὸ παραπλησίως ἐπιγέγραπται 'περὶ σφυγμῶν τοῖς εἰσαγομένοις' καὶ τρίτον, ὃ 'περὶ ὁσπῶν τοῖς εἰσαγομένοις' ἐπιγέγραπται κτλ. (*De libris propriis*, [*Scripta Minora* II Marquard, Muller, Helmreich eds. 83.24-84.7]).

²⁷ qui introducuntur ad medicinam, quos Graeci εἰσαγομένους appellant (*Anecdota Graeca et Graeco-Latina* 2, Rose ed. 243); quid est isagoga? Isagoga est introductio doctrinae cum demonstratione primarum rationum ad medicinae artis conceptionem (*Anecdota Graeca et Graeco-Latina* 2, Rose ed. 251). The date of the materials categorized as Pseudo-Soranus remains problematic: while the sources used in the compilation of the work known as the *Isagoge* derive from as early as late antiquity, the compilation itself probably dates from Medieval times: for a brief overview, see D. R. Langslow, *Medical Latin in the Roman Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 73.

²⁸ ταύτη γάρ μοι δοκῶ τὸν λόγον ἐν τάξει χωρήσειν εἰς τὴν ἐντελεστέραν τῆς εὐαγγελικῆς ἀποδείξεως διδασκαλίαν εἰς τε τὴν τῶν βαθυτέρων δογμάτων κατανόησιν, εἰ τὰ τῆς προπαρασκευῆς ἡμῖν πρὸ ὁδοῦ γένοιτο, στοιχειώσεως καὶ εἰσαγωγῆς ἐπέχοντα τόπον καὶ τοῖς ἐξ ἔθνῶν ἄρτι προσιοῦσιν ἐφαρμόττοντα· τὰ δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα τοῖς ἐνθένδε διαβεβηκόσι καὶ τὴν ἔξιν ἤδη παρεσκευασμένοις εἰς τὴν τῶν κρειπτόνων παραδοχὴν τὴν ἀκριβῆ γνῶσιν παραδώσει τῶν συνεκτικωτάτων τῆς κατὰ τὸν σωτήρα καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ μυστικῆς οἰκονομίας (*Praeparatio Evangelica* I 1, 12 [*GCS* 43/1 Places ed. 8,6-14]).

pedagogical virtues of his introductory epistles for those already well versed in his teaching; in fact, the codification of his main points and rubrics under which philosophical knowledge should be organized, he argues, solidifies his system in the adept's mind and facilitates the recall of the all-important essentials even if the subtle nuances are forgotten.²⁹ In this letter Epicurus deliberately and pedagogically sets out the main headings of his philosophical worldview beginning with his semiology and its establishment in aesthesis.³⁰ The subsequent discussion offers simple distillations of his philosophical theory (e.g. κινουῦνταί τε συνεχῶς αἱ ἄτομοι) followed by demonstrations or proofs of the veracity of these statements.³¹

The content and argumentative strategies found in Epicurus's *Epistle to Herodotus* are typical of isagogic texts. The introduction to music in Cleonides' (ca. 2nd century C.E.) *Εἰσαγωγή ἁρμονική* sets out to explain harmonics by means of deliberate division and definition of its theoretical and practical knowledge. After a main term (e.g. φθόγγος) is introduced, it is defined (φθόγγος μὲν οὖν ἐστὶ κτλ) and then given a more full discussion (εἰσὶ δὲ οἱ μὲν ἐν διατόνῳ φθόγγοι οἷδε κτλ).³² The introduction of terms in one definition then leads to subsequent division and definition.³³ Baccheius Geron's (ca. 3rd/4th century C.E.) *Isagoge* takes a similar propaedeutic format, introducing terms briefly before offering a full definition. In contrast to Cleonides' *Εἰσαγωγή ἁρμονική*, however, this isagogic text transmits musical knowledge by means of a series of

²⁹ Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum* 10.35-37, 82 (LCL 185 564-566, 610-612).

³⁰ Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum* 10.37-38 (LCL 185 566-568).

³¹ Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum* 10.43-44 (LCL 185 572-574).

³² Cleonides, *Isagoge harmonica*, 1, 4 (Jan ed. 179,3-10; 182,4-187,2).

³³ E.g. Ἀρμονική ἐστὶν ἐπιστήμη θεωρητικὴ τε καὶ πρακτικὴ τῆς τοῦ ἡρμωσμένου φύσεως. ἡρμωσμένον δὲ κτλ (Cleonides, *Isagoge harmonica*, 1, 4 [Jan ed. 179,3-10; 182,4-187,2]).

questions and answers (*erotapokriseis*) that build on and propel the instruction seriatim.³⁴ Undoubtedly, this *erotapokrisis* format was utilized to mimic the student-teacher relationship, a format that would have worked in tandem with the repetitions in Bacchius's *Isagoge* to facilitate memorization by novices.³⁵ Another isagogic text, Nichomachus of Gerasa's (*floruit* ca. 100 C.E.) *Enchiridion*, introduces the novice to the elements (στοιχεῖα) of harmonics in commentary form (ὑπόμνημα), often by deliberately setting his discussion in relation to previous musical theorists.³⁶

In order to demonstrate the reliability of his preliminary instruction in his isagogic *Caelestia*, Cleomedes (ca. 4th century C.E.) also castigates prior teachers and teachings. This text buttresses its more in-depth discussion and refutation of previous philosophers with ad hominem slander, reductio ad absurdam arguments, and Homeric proof-texts in support of his position (against the errors of Aristotle and Epicurus for example). The length of argumentation and more elaborate demonstrations notwithstanding, Cleomedes still describes his work as an isagogic text.³⁷ The connection between *isagoge* and the student-teacher relationship also crops up in Cleomedes' reference to notes that have

³⁴ E.g. πόσοι οὖν εἰσι ῥυθμοί; — Δέκα. — Τίνες οὗτοι; (Bacchius, *Isagoge*, 100 [Jan ed. 314,20]). See also Bacchius's subsequent list and definitions (Bacchius, *Isagoge*, 100-101 [Jan ed. 314,21-316,7]).

³⁵ We will see that Markus Asper ("Zu Struktur und Funktion eisagogischer Texte," in *Gattungen wissenschaftlicher Literatur in der Antike* [eds. Wolfgang Kullmann, et al.; Tübingen: Narr, 1998], 315-18) and Bas ter Haar Romeny ("Question-and-Answer Collections in Syriac Literature," in *Erotapokriseis: Early Christian Question-and-Answer Literature in Context* [eds. Annelie Volgers and Claudio Zamagni; Leuven: Peeters, 2004], 145-54) also came to this conclusion about the question-and-answer format.

³⁶ The *kephalaia* (α. "Ὅτι τὸ βιβλίον ἐγχειρίδιον ἐστὶν ὑπόμνημα τῆς ἀρμονικῆς στοιχειώσεως and η. Ἐξήγησις τῶν ἐν Τιμαίῳ ἀρμονικῶς εἰρημένων) summarize this tract's content succinctly (Nicomachus, *Enchiridion*, 1; 8 [Jan ed. 237,5-6; 250,3]). Although this work is entitled a handbook (ἐγχειρίδιον), it is also described as εἰσαγωγή (ibid. 238,8).

³⁷ Cleomedes' work is specifically called an εἰσαγωγή (Cleomedes, *Caelestia*, 1.8.118 [Todd ed. 43,160-161]).

been selected from the writings of the Stoic Posidonius (ca. 135-51 B.C.E.) and included in this work for their introductory quality.³⁸

The diversity in terms of titles (e.g. εἰσαγωγή/εἰσαγωγή, τέχνη, ὅροι, στοιχεῖα, ἐγχειρίδιον),³⁹ argumentative content, form, and purpose of the isagogic texts adduced here underscores the malleability of this genre. Although this survey is far from exhaustive, we can infer some general characteristics from this diversity: the content in these isagogic texts ranges from simple definitions and statements categorizing established bodies of knowledge to full explications and discussions provided by means of carefully constructed definitions, syllogisms, and proofs, which are sometimes framed in opposition to previous thinkers. In terms of format, the most common are the simple straightforward definitions (ὅροι, ἀρχαί), lists of elements (στοιχεῖα), notes (σχολαί), questions and answers (*erotapokriseis*), or pedagogical epistles used to convey material in the simplest terms, often replicating the student-teacher relationship.

Despite the diversity of argumentative strategies and formats found in the texts just surveyed, one aspect defined the isagogic genre's function: the targeted audience. Isagogic texts were primarily designed for education, especially the indoctrination of novices or initiates—even though, as Epicurus's epistles reveal, adepts could also profit from such texts. The use of the *erotapokriseis* format (or for that matter the epistle) was dictated not by the genre, but by the fitness such a format would have for transmitting

³⁸ Cleomedes, *Caelestia*, 1.8.118; 2.7.228 (Todd ed. 43,157-162; 84,11-14).

³⁹ Other titles often affixed to isagogic texts are ἀρχαί, institutiones, sententiae, and regulae; see the discussions in Eduard Norden, "Die Composition und Litteraturgattung der horazischen Epistula ad Pisonem," *Hermes* 40 (1905): 481-528; K. Th. Schäfer, "Eisagoge;" and Manfred Fuhrmann, "Isagogische Literatur," in *KIPauly*.

knowledge to the intended audience.⁴⁰ The *Sitz im Leben* of the *erotapokriseis* format (i.e. the pedagogical student-teacher relationship) just happened to lend itself quite suitably to the isagogic genre.⁴¹ In his research into isagogic texts, Markus Asper also stressed the pedagogical *Sitz im Leben* of this genre, especially the sub-category that he designates the “scholische” *isagoge*.⁴² According to Asper’s investigation, the “scholische” *isagoge* (represented by those forementioned introductory works such as *Εἰσαγωγή Ἑρμοῦ* by Cleonides, *Ἑρμοῦ ἑγχειρίδιον* by Nicomachus, and Cleomedes’ *Caelestia*) was marked by thematic and pedagogical concerns.⁴³ Asper isolated this pedagogical aspect in the replication of the oral student-teacher relationship in Cleomedes’ *εἰσαγωγή*, the *Caelestia*. Here the first person opening exhortation, ὁ νῦν ἡμῶν λόγος ἐνεσθηκώς, characterizing the lecture setting, has been codified into a third person written statement with the closing words of this tract, εἰσὶ δὲ αἱ σχολαὶ αὐταὶ

⁴⁰ Even though this format of *erotapokriseis* was extremely conducive to transmitting isagogic concerns due to its effectiveness in relaying information in an established student-teacher relationship, the question-and-answer format could also transmit content without isagogic pretensions. Some of our first examples of *erotapokriseis* literature (e.g. προβλήματα οἱ ζητήματα καὶ λύσεις in Homer interpretation and the related ἀπορίαι καὶ λύσεις εἰς τὰς Ἀριστοτέλους κατηγορίας) show no overt isagogic concerns. For discussion of these Homeric precursors see Norden, “Die Composition und Litteraturgattung der horazischen Epistula ad Pisonem,” *Hermes* 40 (1905): 481-528; Gustav Bardy, “La littérature patristique des “Quaestiones et Responsiones” sur l’Ecriture Sainte,” *Revue Biblique* 41 (1932): 210-36, 341-69, 515-37; 42 (1933): 14-30, 211-229, 328-352; and Haar Romeny, “Question-and-Answer Collections.”

⁴¹ Haar Romeny, “Question-and-Answer Collections,” esp. 148-54.

⁴² Asper identified three main types of the genre *εἰσαγωγή*: dihaeretic, catechetical dialogue, and “scholische.” The dihaeretic type sought to give an answer to a specific problem and then went about giving a very distinct and circumscribed response to this problem. The dialogic type of *εἰσαγωγή* targeted the initiate and, as its name implies, was written in question and answer form as one question followed the previous answer which led to a further questions. This type, Asper suggests, also lent itself to easy memorization. See (“Zu Struktur und Funktion eisagogischer Texte,” 315-18).

⁴³ For basic introductory information, see Cleonides, Nicomachus (3), Cleomedes, and Baccheius Geron in *OCD*. Texts of Cleonides’ and Nicomachus’s introductory works can be found in Jan, ed., *Musici Scriptores Graeci*. For Cleomedes, see Todd, ed., *Cleomedis Caelestia (Μετέωρα)*.

κτλ, at the end of the work.⁴⁴ From the beginning to the end, according to Asper, there is a transition from a first person pedagogical situation of the lecture to the codification of this instruction in the written notes (σχολαί). These lecture notes now stand in place of the teacher by collecting and systematizing his instruction. Thus, those themes highlighted by the *scholai* transmit and focalize the teacher's interpretation of the subjects under consideration.

Asper's other conclusions regarding isagogic texts corroborate my own findings that such texts were rarely used to develop nuanced arguments through precisely organized and ordered argumentation.⁴⁵ Rather, it was more common for isagogic texts to deal with broad themes in a loose and somewhat unstructured way and present series of information based on these themes. The primary concern in these isagogic texts was to introduce the inexperienced student to a topic or field of study.

The isagogic text then stood in the place of, or at least supplemented, the author or teacher, sometimes directly in the first person.⁴⁶ Not only did the isagogic text introduce and ease the student into a topic or field by broaching broad themes in a non-technical and non-argumentative way, it also introduced the novice to themes that would be encountered later in the course of study. By supplying notes for guidance in the field, the isagogic text shaped the rubrics under which subsequent knowledge would be placed. Whether or not Asper's subdivision of the "scholische" *isagoge* is entirely apt, there is no

⁴⁴ Cleomedes, *Meteora*, II 7.11-14 (ed. Todd). Asper, "Zu Struktur und Funktion eisagogischer Texte," 320-22.

⁴⁵ Asper has isolated six main characteristics that distinguished this "scholische" or lecture-style εισαγωγή: 1) a loosely arranged thematic structure; 2) variations in style; 3) direct exhortations by the author; 4) guiding notes; 5) exhortations to the readers/hearers; and 6) an emphasis on the oral transmission of the introduction ("Zu Struktur und Funktion eisagogischer Texte," 323).

⁴⁶ For a discussion of the singular use of introductory materials without a guiding instructor, see Jaap Mansfeld, *Prolegomena Mathematica: From Apollonius of Perga to Late Neoplatonism: with an appendix on Pappus and the History of Platonism* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 5.

doubt that the primary function of isagogic texts was to guide the student or reader into the field and to prepare them for more advanced study. This could take many forms such as simple notes, question-and-answers, dialogues, letters, or others. Furthermore, the boundaries between different forms and contents could be blurred. Even Asper's attempt to isolate relatively distinct features for various isagogic texts was tempered by caveats against expecting pure types in the εἰσαγωγή genre. Quite often, isagogic texts mixed with one another resulting in hybrid introductions.⁴⁷ We need to keep in mind this malleability and permeability when we try to understand Marcion's *Antitheses* in light of this genre.

Marcion's *Antitheses* as an Isagogic Text

References to Marcion's *Antitheses* support the contention that this work corresponded to the isagogic genre (perhaps related to what Asper terms the "scholische" *isagoge*), marked by its simplicity and adapted for Marcion's particular purposes. Although identifying the genre of the *Antitheses* poses difficulties since it is no longer extant, references to the argumentative content, form, and targeted audience suggest that this work conformed to the isagogic genre.

Our knowledge of the *Antitheses'* content provides the most important evidence for its connection to the isagogic genre. As noted, this text was primarily comprised of antithetical statements illustrating Marcion's fundamental theological themes. Tertullian locates the primary focus of Marcion's theology in his disassociation of the God of the Hebrew Bible from the God of Jesus Christ and consequently the law from the gospel. Tertullian vehemently and consistently militates against this very tenet:

⁴⁷ Asper, "Zu Struktur und Funktion eisagogischer Texte," 326-35.

The separation of the law and the gospel is Marcion's principal work. His disciples are not able to deny this, which they have in the first document (in summo instrumento), through which in fact they are initiated and are made obstinate in this heresy. For these are the *Antitheses* of Marcion, that is contrary opposites, which endeavor to expose the discord of the gospel with the law, so that from the contrariety of statements of both documents they may also prove the contrariety of Gods.⁴⁸

We have already established, in contrast to the *Antitheses*, that what he supposes is the disassociation of the law and the gospel, accomplishes nothing through the principal point of Marcion, as even this is arranged by the creator, then preached in the promise of a new law and a new word and a new testament.⁴⁹

Marcion apparently tried to disassociate his scripture from the Hebrew Bible by arguing from contradictory laws or sayings from these documents: e.g. Marcion claimed the God of the Hebrew Bible was vengeful, in contrast to the merciful God proclaimed by Jesus (*Marc.* 1.27.1); the one was bellicose, the other pacifist (*Marc.* 1.6.1-2); one just, the other good (*Marc.* 1.6.1-2); one sullied with the creation of the material world, the other alien to this mutable world (*Iren. AH* 5.2.1); one petty and particularistic, the other magnanimous and universalistic (*Marc.* 4.6.3); one God of the law, another of the gospel (*Marc.* 4.6.3); one known, and the other unknown (*Marc.* 4.6.4). Such examples, which could be multiplied considerably, demonstrate Marcion's thoroughness in articulating this fundamental tenet through his *Antitheses* and cohere well with the ways in which isagogic texts often conveyed introductory content by means of simple straightforward definitions in order to inculcate and systematize the basic tenets of a specific doctrine.

⁴⁸ Separatio legis et euangelii proprium et principale opus est Marcionis, nec poterunt negare discipuli eius quod in summo instrumento habent, quo denique initiantur et indurantur in hanc haeresim. Nam haec sunt 'Antithesis' Marcionis, id est contrariae oppositiones, quae conantur discordiam euangelii cum lege committere, ut ex diuersitate sententiarum utriusque instrumenti diuersitatem quoque argumententur deorum (*Marc.* 1.19.4 [*CCSL* 1 460,22-2]).

⁴⁹ Praestruximus quidem aduersus antithesis nihil proficere proposito Marcionis quam putat diuersitatem legis et euangelii, ut et hanc a creatore dispositam, denique praedicatam in repromissione nouae legis et noui sermonis et noui testamenti (*Marc.* 4.9.3 [*CCSL* 1 558,20-24]).

According to Tertullian, Marcion's *Antitheses* did not consist in carefully reasoned arguments; rather, Marcion's refutation and rejection of Judaism and the Jewish God was grounded in the accumulation of discrete, yet interrelated, antithetical statements which elucidated his fundamental themes. Tertullian's attempt to offer alternative antitheses and interpretations reveals the succinct and straightforward quality of Marcion's statements. For example, Tertullian simply counters Marcion as follows: "these rather will be our antitheses which connect Christ [to], not separate [from, the Creator],"⁵⁰ and "but if the kingdom of God is in the commandment then set it against Moses, and according to our *Antitheses*, there is one sense."⁵¹ The discrete character of Marcion's *Antitheses* is also intimated in Tertullian's following statement: "I should otherwise have fallen one by one on Marcion's *Antitheses* themselves, if, from their toilsome destruction, a defense of the creator as good and judge had been lacking."⁵² Apparently Marcion was not particularly concerned with developing an elaborate or carefully nuanced argument; the statements themselves, juxtaposed with one another, compelled the interpretation Marcion endorsed. Although this style of argumentation and introductory demonstration grounded in simple antithetical statements coheres well with the transmission of notes in isagogic texts and Asper's reconstruction of the "scholische"

⁵⁰ Haec erunt nostrae potius antithesîs, quae comparant, non quae separant Christum (*Marc.* 4.24.4 [*CCSL* 1 608,22-23]).

⁵¹ Quodsi in praecepto est dei regnum, propone igitur contra, secundum nostras antithesîs, Moysen, et una sententia est (*Marc.* 4.35.13 [*CCSL* 1 642,13-14]).

⁵² Ceterum ipsas quoque antithesîs Marcionis cominus cecidissem, si operosiore destructione earum egeret defensio creatoris (*Marc.* 2.29.1 [*CCSL* 1 508,28-1]).

εἰσαγωγή, Tertullian's bias must be weighed circumspectly; we would expect him to portray the *Antitheses* as simple and unsupported by well-reasoned arguments.⁵³

Fortunately, other sources corroborate Tertullian's depiction of the *Antitheses'* form and argumentative strategies. An important one is Adamantius's *De recta in Deum fide*, a text not dependent on Tertullian.⁵⁴ Despite Adamantius's references to Marcion's own works in this dialogue, scholars are virtuously unanimous in thinking that Adamantius himself probably did not use Marcion's texts.⁵⁵ Rather, Adamantius likely made use of earlier heresiological works for his information on Marcion.⁵⁶ Such caveats

⁵³ In this regard we must draw attention to Gerhard May's convincing re-evaluation of Harnack's portrait of Marcion as a biblical philologist uninterested in more philosophically abstruse concerns. In fact, May has compellingly argued that the reality is quite the reverse: evidence indicates that Marcion was deeply engaged with the philosophical questions of his day and developed his theology (and, I would argue, his editorial practices) towards their solution ("Marcion in Contemporary Views," 143-48; and "Markions Genesisauslesung," 197-98).

⁵⁴ The *De recta in Deum fide*, once attributed to Origen, is now widely accepted as anonymous and usually dated to the first half of the fourth century. The question of dating revolves around the relationship between passages found in the *De recta in Deum fide* and in Methodius's *περὶ τοῦ ἀντεξουσίου* and *περὶ ἀναστάσεως*. Although Timothy Barnes argued that Methodius was dependent on the *De recta in Deum fide*, thus placing the latter in the middle of the third century ("Methodius, Maximus, and Valentinus," *JTS* N.S. 30, no. 1 Ap [1979]: 47-55), Schmid has reaffirmed the opinion of Zahn that Adamantius is dependent on Methodius (*Marcion*, 202-06). As a result he argues that the *De recta in Deum fide* probably was written after Methodius's death ca. 313 and before 358 when this work was first attributed to Origen in the Philocalia (ibid. 206). This work written in Greek also survives in Latin MSS of a translation undertaken by Rufinus around 400. For a discussion of the MSS and sources used by the author of this work, see the critical edition by W. H. van de Sande Bakhuyzen ed., *Der Dialog des Adamantius: ΠΕΡΙ ΤΗΣ ΕΙΣ ΘΕΟΝ ΟΡΘΗΣ ΠΙΣΤΕΩΣ* [Leipzig: Hinrich, 1901], xxvi-xxxvii, xv-xvi. For more recent evaluations of Adamantius, see Clabeaux, *Lost Edition*, 12-13; and Schmid, *Marcion*, 202-207.

⁵⁵ *De recta in Deum fide*, 806d-807b (*GCS* 4 10,20-32); *De recta in Deum fide*, 823e-824a (*GCS* 4 66,5-12); *De recta in Deum fide*, 864a-c (*GCS* 4 222,10-28). The dialogue even imputes this same rhetorical strategy to the Marcionite Megethius who is portrayed as trying to refute Adamantius with his own writings, i.e. his scriptures (*De recta in Deum fide*, 810a [*GCS* 4 18,7-9]). W. H. van de Sande Bakhuyzen (*Der Dialog des Adamantius*, xv-xvi), Harnack (*Marcion*, 56*-63*), and Schmid (*Marcion*, 207) all concur that this dialogue does not offer direct access to Marcion's writings but incorporated earlier anti-Marcionite texts.

⁵⁶ Harnack thinks that even though it does not appear that Adamantius used a copy of Marcion's works, since he wrote in the early 4th century, Adamantius would have been able to redeploy many anti-Marcionite sources for his refutation (*Marcion*, 59*-63*). While Schmid is less sanguine, he does not completely dismiss Adamantius's worth for reconstructing Marcion's texts (at least his text of the Pauline corpus) (*Marcion*, 207-09). As a caveat, however, he maintains that with respect to Marcion's text of Paul's letters,

notwithstanding, Gerhard May still goes so far as to hypothesize that the antithetical statements recorded in this work may have been original.⁵⁷ In sum, Adamantius offers valuable (possibly original) sources that contain information not only on the content of Marcion's *Antitheses*, but their argumentative form as well.

This dialogue's most noteworthy aspect is the repeated antithetical statements, which the Marcionite characters furnish to support arguments that the God of the Hebrew Bible was separate from that of the *Gospel* and the *Apostolikon*. For example, the Marcionite Megethius contrasts the bellicose God of the Hebrew Bible with the pacifist Jesus in this way:

The prophet of the God of creation, so that he might kill more when he was fighting, did not allow the sun to set until he finished killing those fighting against the people; but the Lord, since he is good, says, "do not allow the sun to set on your anger;"... The prophet of the God of creation, when war was stirred up against the people, climbing to the peak of the mountain stretched out his hands to God so that he might kill many in battle; but our Lord, since he is good, stretched out his hands not to kill men but to save them. What then is similar? Through stretching out his hands that one kills, but this one saves.⁵⁸

These simple antithetical statements cohere well with the content of the *Antitheses* as described by Tertullian. Although short interpretations or explications may have been appended to these antithetical statements, as seen in the second example, the *Antitheses* primarily consisted of contrasting statements from Marcion's texts and the Hebrew Bible.

since Adamantius did not have a copy in hand, his citations must be used carefully and corroborated, when possible, with Tertullian and Epiphanius (209).

⁵⁷ "Die ersten beiden Teile des Dialog enthalten eine Reihe markionitischer Antithesen, die ursprünglich sein können" ("Markions Genesisauslegung," 197).

⁵⁸ ΜΕΓ. 'Ο προφήτης τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς γενέσεως, ἵνα πολεμῶν πλείονας ἀνέλη, ἔστησε τὸν ἥλιον τοῦ μὴ δύσαι μέχρι συντελέσει ἀναιρῶν τοὺς πολεμοῦντας πρὸς τὸν λαόν· ὁ δὲ κύριος, ἀγαθὸς ὢν, λέγει· ὁ ἥλιος μὴ ἐπιδύετω ἐπὶ τῷ παροργισμῷ ὑμῶν (*De recta in Deum fide* 1 813a-b [*GCS* 4 28,21-23]); ΜΕΓ. 'Ο προφήτης τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς γενέσεως, πολέμου συστάντος πρὸς τὸν λαόν, ἀναβὰς ἐπὶ τὴν κορυφὴν τοῦ ὄρους, ἐξέτεινε τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὸν θεόν, ἵνα πολλοὺς τῷ πολεμῷ ἀνέλη· ὁ δὲ κύριος ἡμῶν, ἀγαθὸς ὢν, ἐξέτεινε τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ οὐχὶ τοῦ ἀνελεῖν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἀλλὰ τοῦ σῶσαι. τί οὖν ὅμοιον; ὁ μὲν διὰ τῆς ἐκτάσεως τῶν χειρῶν ἀναιρεῖ, ὁ δὲ σώζει (*De recta in Deum fide* 812b [*GCS* 4 24,24-29]).

In some cases, the content of statements attributed to the Marcionites in *De recta in Deum fide* are remarkably close to Tertullian's explicit references to the *Antitheses* in his *Adversus Marcionem*. For example, both Tertullian and Adamantius mention Marcion's emphasis on the opposite reactions to children in the Hebrew Bible and the gospel, the former explicitly linking these statements to Marcion's *Antitheses*.⁵⁹

Tertullian, *Marc.* 4.23.4

But behold Christ loves the little ones, teaching that those who want to be greater ought to be such as these.

But the creator let loose bears against boys, taking vengeance for the insults the prophet Elisha suffered from them.

Adamantius, *De recta* 15-16 814c

The prophet of the God of creation told a bear to rush from the wood and devour the children taunting him.

But the good Lord says "allow the children to come to me, for the kingdom of heaven is for such as these."

The content and form of these two sources are remarkably similar, only differing insignificantly in order and the statements attributed to Christ. If the *Antitheses* contained both sayings attributed to Christ alongside the story about Elisha and the she-bears, and if this difference is not due to the whims of Tertullian or Adamantius, we may have also caught a glimpse of Marcion structuring multiple statements from his collection of scripture alongside an antithesis from the Hebrew Bible.

⁵⁹ Sed 'ecce Christus diligit paruulos, tales docens esse debere qui semper maiores uelint esse, creator autem ursos pueris inmisit, ulciscens Heliseum propheten, conuicia ab eis passum.' Satis impudens antithesis, cum tam diuersa committit, paruulos et pueros, innocentem adhuc aetatem et iudicii iam capacem, quae conuiciari poterat, ne dicam blasphemare (*Marc.* 4.23.4 [*CCSL* 1 605,19-25]); ΑΔ. ...δέδεικται τοίνυν καὶ διὰ νόμου καὶ διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ὅτι ἕκαστος πρὸς ἃ πράττει πρὸς τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, τοῦτο κομιέται. ΜΕΓ. Ὁ προφήτης τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς γενέσεως ἐκ δρυμοῦ [Ἐλισσαῖος] ἄρκτω εἶπεν ἐξελεῖν καὶ καταφαγεῖν τοὺς ἀπαντήσαντας αὐτῷ παῖδας· ὁ δὲ ἀγαθὸς κύριος· ἄφετε, φησί, τὰ παιδία ἔρχεσθαι πρὸς με· τῶν γὰρ τοιούτων ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν (*De recta in Deum fide* 15-16 814c [*GCS* 4 32,22-27]).

Adamantius also corroborates Tertullian’s report that Marcion contrasted Christ’s injunction to travel without worldly possessions with the creator God’s command that the Israelites gird themselves for travel and spoil the Egyptians.⁶⁰

Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* 4.24.1

Now the creator leads the exodus of the sons of Israel from Egypt loaded with the spoils of gold and silver and utensils and clothes, together with weight of unleavened dough.

Adamantius, *De recta* 811a-b

The God of creation ordered Moses when he was heading out of Egypt saying, “make yourself ready by girding your loins, shodding your feet, taking staffs in your hands and your purses; and take gold and silver and all the rest from the Egyptians.”

But Christ enjoined on his disciples not even to take a staff for the journey.

But our good Lord, sending his disciples into the world, says “neither sandals on your feet, nor purse, nor two tunics, nor money in your belt.” See how the good one clearly opposes the teachings of that one.

While Tertullian has an abbreviated form compared to Adamantius, in terms of content and format, both he and Adamantius offer strikingly similar accounts despite their independence. The short exegetical note appended to the antithetical statements in *De recta in Deum fide* is also noteworthy since, if ultimately dependent on Marcion’s *Antitheses*, it reinforces the guiding antithetical principle of interpretation.

In another example, Tertullian mines the scriptures of the Hebrew Bible to prove that Jesus’ command to love your enemies is in keeping with the Hebrew Bible, not in

⁶⁰ Antithesîs plurimum causarum diuersitas fecit, non potestatum. Sed qui diuersitatem causarum non respexit, facile eam potestatum existimauit. ‘Profectionem filiorum Israhelis creator etiam illis spoliis aureorum et argenteorum uasculorum et uestium praeter oneribus consparsionum offarcinatam educit ex Aegypto, Christus autem nec uirgam discipulis in uiam ferre praescrisit’ (*Marc.* 4.24.1 [*CCSL* 1 607,25-1]); ΑΔ. Ποία ἀπόδειξις τοῦ μὴ εἶναι τὸν Χριστὸν υἱὸν τοῦ δημιουργοῦ; ΜΕΓ. Ὅτι ὁ Χριστὸς ἀνέτρεψε τὰ τοῦ δημιουργοῦ, καὶ δείκνυμι ὅτι ἀνέτρεψε. ΑΔ. Δείξον ὅτι ἀνέτρεψε. ΜΕΓ. Ὁ θεὸς τῆς γενέσεως ἐντέταται Μωσῆϊ ἐκβαίνοντι ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου λέγων· ἔτοιμοι γένεσθε, τὴν ὄσφυν ἐξωσμένοι, τοὺς πόδας ὑποδεδεμένοι, τὰς ῥάβδους ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν ὑμῶν, τὰς πήρας ἔχοντες ἐφ’ ἑαυτοῦς· χρυσὸν καὶ ἄργυρον καὶ τὰ ἄλλα πάντα ἀπενέγκασθε τῶν Αἰγυπτίων. ὁ δὲ κύριος ἡμῶν ὁ ἀγαθός, ἀποστέλλων τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν οἰκουμένην, λέγει· μὴτε ὑποδήματα ἐν τοῖς ποσὶν ὑμῶν, μὴτε πήραν, μὴτε δύο χιτῶνας, μὴτε χαλκὸν ἐν ταῖς ζώναις ὑμῶν. ἴδε πῶς τηλαυγὸς ὁ ἀγαθὸς τοῖς ἐκείνου ἐναντιοῦται δόγμασιν (*De recta in Deum fide* 811a-b [*GCS* 4 20,29-22,1-9]).

opposition as Marcion claimed.⁶¹ This contrast between loving and hating your enemies is also found in the short pithy antithesis in *De recta in Deum fide*: “The lord in the law says: ‘Love the one who loves you and hate your enemy.’ But our Lord, since he is good, says: ‘Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you.’”⁶² In Adamantius’s dialogue, Megethius merely offers these contrasting statements in order to show that the law and the gospel are dissonant. Although neither the Marcionite Megethius nor Marcus are given the scope to defend their positions in the *De recta in Deum fide*, the close similarities between Tertullian and Adamantius offer compelling evidence that the presentation of these statements (if not direct quotations from Marcion’s *Antitheses*) owes more to this tract’s argumentative strategy and format than to heresiological misrepresentation.

Tertullian and Epiphanius also comment on the rejection of the law with the advent of the gospel in their discussions of Marcion’s text of Gal 5:14, where Paul exhorts the Galatian community to love one’s neighbor as oneself. As we will see in our discussion of this verse, both Tertullian’s and Epiphanius’s interpretations of Gal 5:14 underscore Marcion’s annulment of the law as a result of the separation of the law from the gospel.⁶³ What is particularly interesting for our discussion here is the argumentative strategy used by Epiphanius to refute this interpretation. After citing the verse as a note (σχόλιον) from Marcion’s *Apostolikon*, Epiphanius offers a simple straightforward refutation (ἐλεγχος), wherein he often cites the Hebrew Bible or the NT and explains how

⁶¹ Tertullian, *Marc.* 2.18; 4.16 (CCSL 1 495-496; 581-585).

⁶² Ο ἐν τῷ νόμῳ κύριος λέγει· ἀγαπήσεις τὸν ἀγαπῶντά σε, καὶ μισήσεις τὸν ἐχθρόν σου· ὁ δὲ κύριος ἡμῶν, ἀγαθὸς ὢν, λέγει· ἀγαπάτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν καὶ εὐχέσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν διωκόντων ὑμᾶς (*De recta in Deum fide* 1 812d [GCS 4 26,18-21]).

⁶³ Tertullian, *Marc.* 5.4.12-13 (CCSL 1 674,6-14); Epiphanius *Pan.* 42.12.3 (GCS 31 157.9-16).

this verse does not separate but rather unites the law and the gospel.⁶⁴ This style of refutation, unique amongst the heresies treated in Epiphanius's *Panarion* and utilized extensively in his polemic against Marcion,⁶⁵ closely resembles the content and argumentative strategy of Tertullian's and Adamantius's discussions of Marcion's tenets and may perhaps be traced to the *Antitheses*.⁶⁶ Since Epiphanius claims that he had in hand and used Marcion's own writings, it would be completely logical for him to refute Marcion not only with his own text, but also with his own style of argumentation, i.e. simple statements from the NT subsequently refuted by comparable statements from the NT or OT.⁶⁷ For these scholia and refutations, Epiphanius apparently drew upon an earlier notebook that he wrote against Marcion, in which he excerpted material from

⁶⁴ Σχόλιον ε. »'Ο γὰρ πᾶς νόμος ὑμῶν πεπλήρωται· ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν.« Ἔλεγχος ε. τίς ἐστι χρεία τῷ ἀγίῳ ἀποστόλῳ νόμῳ χρῆσθαι, εἰ ἀπηλλοτριώτο ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη τῆς παλαιᾶς νομοθεσίας; ἀλλ' ἵνα δείξῃ ὅτι τοῦ ἑνὸς θεοῦ αἱ δύο διαθήκαι καὶ ἡ συμφωνία <κατὰ> τὸ πληρωτικὸν τοῦ νόμου διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ πλησίον ἰσορρόπως ἐν ταῖς δύο διαθήκαις γνωρίζεται, τὸ τέλε<ι>ον ἐργαζομένης τὸ ἀγαθόν, νόμου τελείωσιν εἶπεν εἶναι τὴν ἀγάπην (*Pan.* 42.12.3 [*GCS* 31 157.9-16]).

⁶⁵ Epiphanius's typical style of argumentation consists of a brief overview and discussion of the indicted "heretics," often followed by citations from their writings (or oral reports of their errors) and Epiphanius's refutation of their practices, beliefs, or interpretations. This refutation often refers back to the primary "heretical" sources Epiphanius adduced, but only in the case of Marcion does he employ such balanced antithetical scholia. For more on Epiphanius's *Panarion* and his method of refutation, see Frank Williams tr., *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis: Book 1 (Sects 1-46)*, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1987), xvi-xviii.

⁶⁶ Cf. e.g. Σχόλιον μγ. »'Ο νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται ἕως Ἰωάννου καὶ πᾶς εἰς αὐτὴν βιάζεται«. Ἔλεγχος μγ. Εἰ νόμον τάσσει καὶ προφήτας ἀποκαλεῖ καὶ οὐκ ἀνομίαν δηλοῖ τὸν νόμον οὐδὲ ψευδοπροφήτας φάσκει τοὺς προφήτας, σαφῶς ὁμολογεῖται μεμαρτυρηκέναι τὸν σωτήρα τοῖς προφήταις καὶ δέδεικται ὡς περὶ αὐτοῦ προεφήτευσαν (*Pan.* 42.12.11 [*GCS* 31 142.19-24]); ἡ καὶ λε σχόλιον. »'Ο γὰρ ἀγαπῶν τὸν πλησίον νόμον πεπλήρωκεν«. ἡ καὶ λε ἔλεγχος. Εἰ διὰ τοῦ ἀγαπῶν τὸν πλησίον νόμος πληροῦται, οὐκ ἀλλότριος Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ κυριοῦ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ ὁ νόμος, ὁ κελεύων ἀγαπᾶν τὸν πλησίον· κτλ (*Epiphanius Pan.* 42.12.3 [*GCS* 31 178.11-18]).

⁶⁷ Epiphanius's use of Marcion's own works have been subjected to serious scrutiny. Schmid has proven convincingly that Epiphanius did have Marcion's texts in hand (*Marcion*, 173) in contrast to Clabeaux who thought that Epiphanius did not have a copy of Marcion's texts but rather used previous anti-marcionite works (*Lost Edition*, 14). There seems to be no reason to discount Epiphanius's assertion that he used Marcion's *Gospel*, *Apostolikon*, and *Antitheses* (or the *Syntagma* as he designates the latter).

Marcion's works in the form of scholia and grouped under specific rubrics.⁶⁸ Epiphanius then incorporated these scholia into the *Panarion*, where he refuted them one by one. We have no definitive proof that, by grouping scriptural notes and refutations under broad rubrics, Epiphanius modeled his refutation on Marcion's *Antitheses* themselves; but since Epiphanius's argumentative strategy and structure offer parallels to our investigation into the *Antitheses*, such modeling would neither be inconceivable, nor surprising. At the very least, Epiphanius corroborates our findings culled from Tertullian and Adamantius.

The antithetical statements from Tertullian and Adamantius (which in some cases are deliberately cited as being taken from Marcion's *Antitheses*) and Epiphanius's notes and refutations (arguably modeled after Marcion's *Antitheses*) call to mind the following characteristics of the isagogic genre: simple straight-forward style and content, presentation of definitions, discussion of previous authorities, and rudimentary content designed for an initiate audience. These statements convey general themes and summarize Marcionite doctrine in a straight-forward antithetical format wherein the simple juxtaposition of these statements supplies the argumentative strategy. The definitions tendered in these statements are not like those found in Cleonides' *Εἰσαγωγή ἀρμονική* or Baccheius Geron's *Isagoge*, where one definition led to another, but rather apophatic. By contrasting the demiurge of the Hebrew Bible with Christ, Marcion defined negatively what true divinity was. In juxtaposing the baser attributes of the Hebrew Bible god with Christ's divine ones, Marcion defined God in accordance with contemporary

⁶⁸ Schmid (*Marcion*, 173) makes a thoroughly compelling argument that in this notebook (ἑδάφιόν τι) Epiphanius grouped the scholia under rubrics (παλαιὰ διαθήκη, ἐνσαρκὸς παρουσία, ῥαδιουργία, ὁμολογία, ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν) which Epiphanius himself identifies (*Pan.* 42.10.5-8 [*GCS* 31 106-107]); as Schmid points out, traces of one of the rubrics are still visible: e.g. $\overline{\iota\varsigma}$ καὶ $\overline{\kappa\delta}$ σχόλιον. Περὶ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν· »γνωρίζω δὲ ὑμῖν ἀδελφοί, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, ὃ εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν«. κτλ (*Pan.* 42.12.3 [*GCS* 31 171,14-15]). The use of this earlier notebook has also created difficulties in evaluating Marcion's text cited by Epiphanius (Schmid, *Marcion*, 150-75).

philosophical conceptions of God.⁶⁹ In so doing, Marcion's *Antitheses* also deliberately cast aspersions on the authority of the Hebrew Bible and Jewish perverters of the gospel kerygma.⁷⁰ Thus the *Antitheses* were able to weave together implicit polemics and definitions in simple antithetical statements, possibly grouped under broad rubrics.⁷¹

While the forementioned features of Marcion's *Antitheses* typify the isagogic genre, the *Antitheses*' primary focus on the intended initiate audience provides the linchpin for the argument that Marcion composed the *Antitheses* to function as an introductory text. Tertullian, our first and primary source for the *Antitheses*, explicitly indicates that he understood the *Antitheses* to function as an introductory work designed to instruct readers in Marcionite theology and interpretation: he identifies this work as the "summo instrumento" through which his disciples are "initiated and made obstinate in this

⁶⁹ On Marcion's awareness of philosophical currents, see Gerhard May, "Marcion in Contemporary Views," 143-48; and *ibid.*, "Markions Genesisauslesung," 197-98.

⁷⁰ Both Tertullian and Adamantius relate Marcion's indictment of early Jewish corruptions and interpolations to the Gospel. The former explicitly locates this accusation in the *Antitheses*: Si enim id euangelium, quod Lucae refertur penes nos, — uiderimus an et penes Marcionem — ipsum est, quod Marcion per Antithesis suas arguit ut interpolatum a protectoribus Iudaismi ad concorporationem legis et prophetarum, quo etiam Christum inde confingerent, utique non potuisset arguere nisi quod inuenerat (Tertullian, *Marc.* 4.4.4 [CCSL 1 550, 20-25]); Τοῦτο οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἐγραψαν, τὸ οὐκ ἦλθον καταλῦσαι τὸν νόμον ἀλλὰ πληρῶσαι· οὐχ οὕτως δὲ εἶπεν ὁ Χριστός, λέγει γάρ· οὐκ ἦλθον πληρῶσαι τὸν νόμον ἀλλὰ καταλῦσαι (Adamantius, *De recta in Deum fide* 2 830e [GCS 4 88,31-33]).

⁷¹ It is worth noting briefly the differences between Marcion's *Antitheses* and the *Syllogisms* of his one-time pupil Apelles. From what we can glean from the *Antitheses* and Apelles' *Syllogisms*, Marcion's pupil preferred an erotapokriseis format, where a question was followed by a more fully developed argument (syllogisms as the title suggests) rather than simple statements with minimal commentary. The slightly more advanced character of the *Syllogisms* casts in relief the isagogic simplicity of Marcion's *Antitheses*. Despite the fact that erotapokriseis could be used for introductory works, Apelles seems to have developed this format in ways parallel to its use in Homeric criticism and informed by philosophical discourse (Katharina Greschat, *Apelles und Hermogenes: Zwei theologische Lehrer des zweiten Jahrhunderts* [Leiden: Brill, 2000], 46-50). Yet in some respects, the usage of a question-and-answer style of presentation for the isolation of literary, philosophical, or theological problems (ζητήματα, προβλήματα, quaestiones, sententiae) that need solutions (λύσεις) is not far removed from Marcion's modus operandi in his *Antitheses*. The main difference is that, instead of rehabilitating the philosophically or theologically offensive passages from the Hebrew Bible in order to maintain the continuity between Judaism and Christianity, Marcion used these very problems to separate the Gospel from the Hebrew Bible, the law, and its demiurgical God. For a recent collection and full discussion of Apelles' authentic and spurious *Syllogisms* in relation to his theology, see Greschat, *Apelles und Hermogenes*, 45-72.

heresy.” The phrase “in summo instrumento” contains considerable ambiguity and could refer to the “main,” “head,” “most important,” “chief,” or “first document” depending on the preferred translation. If we are to understand the description of the *Antitheses* as a “first document,” this may supply evidence that it not only functioned as an introduction, but perhaps was an introduction prefaced to Marcion’s edition. Such a hypothesis may be corroborated by Tertullian’s descriptions of the *Antitheses*:

But now we advance another step onward challenging, as we claim and thus even are about to prove, that the very gospel of Marcion has been adulterated. For clearly he assembled everything that he labored on, even setting up beforehand (praestruendo) the *Antitheses*, for this [purpose]: that he might establish a difference between the Old and New Testament, in the same manner his Christ separated from the creator as of another God and alien to the Law and Prophets. Clearly, for that reason he erased whatever was contrary to his judgment, as though conspired with the creator [and] interwoven by his [i.e. the creator’s] defenders; but those agreeing with his judgment he retained.⁷²

While I have translated the word “praestruo” with the deliberately neutral “set up beforehand,” Ernest Evans’s translation “prefix” is apt and in accordance with the possible prefatory quality of Marcion’s *Antitheses* which I am tendering here.⁷³

Tertullian’s designation of the *Antitheses* as head document (summo instrumento), coupled with his use of “praestruo,” suggest that the *Antitheses* may have in fact physically introduced Marcion’s corpus. Furthermore, Tertullian’s indication that the *Antitheses* extend or display (praefero) Marcion’s theology supports the interpretation that this work functioned isagogically by establishing the terms of the interpretation for

⁷² Sed alium iam hinc inimus gradum, ipsum, ut professi sumus, euangelium Marcionis prouocantes, sic quoque probaturi adulteratum. Certe enim totum quod elaborauit, etiam antithesis praestruendo, in hoc cogit, ut ueteris et noui testamenti diuersitatem constituens constituat, proinde Christum suum a creatore separatum, ut dei alterius, ut alienum legis et prophetarum. Certe propterea contraria quaeque sententiae suae erasit, conspirantia cum creatore, quasi <ab> adsertoribus eius intexta, competentia autem sententiae suae reseruauit (*Marc.* 4.6.1 [*CCSL* 1 552,12-20]).

⁷³ Ernest Evans, ed., *Tertullian: Adversus Marcionem* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), 275.

the following texts as well as possibly introducing them physically.⁷⁴ That this introduction may have been prefaced to Marcion's gospel accords well with the forementioned anonymous Syriac source's description of Marcion's book as a "proevangelium." Although prefacing an isagogic text to an author's work may not have been common for the isagogic texts of Cleomedes, Cleonides, or Nicomachus, the *Antitheses'* role as an introductory work clearly parallels the isagogic genre. By thematically laying out and supporting Marcion's interpretation at the beginning of his corpus, the *Antitheses* effectively set the terms of the argument, transmitted Marcion's hermeneutic, and prepared the reader to approach the following texts of the *Gospel* and *Apostle* through a proper Marcionite reading. Even if we bracket the possibility that "summo instrumento" and "praestruo" refer to the *Antitheses* as a physical introduction to Marcion's canon, the preceding argument clearly shows that this work had an isagogic function.

At this point, we must briefly address Tertullian's references to a letter allegedly written by Marcion.⁷⁵ This letter is not to be confused with accusations that Marcion forged a letter to the Laodiceans or Alexandrians reported in the Muratorian Canon;⁷⁶

⁷⁴ *Marc.* 4.4.3-4 (CCSL 1 550,16-25). The definition of praefero "to bear before, carry in front" easily encompasses the meanings from "extend" to "introduce." V.s. praefero in *OLD*.

⁷⁵ For previous discussions of this letter, see Harnack, *Marcion*, 16*-23*; Ernest Evans, *Tertullian's Treatise on the Incarnation* (London: S.P.C.K., 1956), 95; Jürgen Regul, *Die antimarcionitischen Evangelienprologe* (Freiburg: Herder, 1969), 182-83; Jean-Pierre Mahé, "Tertullien et l'Epistula Marcionis," *RevScRel* 45, no. 4 (1971): 358-71.

⁷⁶ Canon Muratorianus lines 1-3 Fol. ii^a; Critical editions can be found in Samuel Prideaux Tregelles, *Canon Muratorianus; The Earliest Catalogue of the Books of the New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1867); and Hans Lietzmann and Lodovico Antonio Muratori, *Das Muratorische fragment und die Monarchianischen prologe zu den Evangelien* (Bonn: A. Marcus und E. Weber, 1902). H. J. Frede hypothesizes that Marcion's purported forged letter to the Alexandrians may actually have been a reference to Hebrews (*Epistulae ad Thessalonicenses, Timotheum, Titum, Philemonem, Hebraeos; Pars II* [VL 25; Freiburg: Herder, 1975-1991], 1056-57).

rather, Tertullian relates that this letter was composed by Marcion himself.⁷⁷ In his treatise *De carne Christi* Tertullian claims that a certain letter (epistulam) written by Marcion relates how he was once a Christian believer before apostasizing. Tertullian also adds that Marcion's own followers neither deny the authenticity of this letter, nor the veracity of Tertullian's allegation.⁷⁸ Tertullian's reference to this letter in book one of his *Adversus Marcionem* follows relatively the same lines, with the exception that in this passage Tertullian refers to a "littera" rather than an "epistula."⁷⁹ The reference to the letter in book four of the same work is particularly important since it relates that, while this letter's authenticity may be disputed by Marcion's followers, the *Antitheses* are acknowledged as authentic.⁸⁰ In order to prove that Marcion represents a heretical deviation from his allegiance to the original Christian message, Tertullian argues:

What now if, in contrast to his own letter (epistulam), the Marcionites deny his faith first belonged to us? What if they do not acknowledge the letter? They clearly acknowledge (fatentur) and even display (praeferunt) Marcion's *Antitheses*. My proof from these suffices. For if the gospel which is referred to as Luke is our repository – we will see whether it is Marcion's repository – is itself, that which Marcion denounced through his own *Antitheses* as interpolated by the defenders of Judaism to the bodily union of the law and the prophets, from which

⁷⁷ *Marc.* 1.1.4; 4.4.3-4 (CCSL 1 442; 550); *Carn. Chr.* 2.4 [CCSL 2 875,20-25].

⁷⁸ *Carn. Chr.* 2.4 (CCSL 2 875,20-25).

⁷⁹ Non negabunt discipuli eius primam illius fidem nobiscum fuisse, ipsius litteris testibus, ut hinc iam destinari possit haereticus qui deserto quod prius fuerat id postea sibi elegerit, quod retro non erat. In tantum enim haeresis deputabitur quod postea inducitur, in quantum ueritas habebitur quod retro et a primordio traditum est. His disciples will not deny that his faith was first with us, since his own writings testify that now he might be able to be appointed a heretic, who having deserted what he was formerly, afterwards chose for himself, what he was not before. For inasmuch as what is introduced afterwards will be esteemed heresy, so the truth will possess what was before and has been transmitted from the beginning (*Marc.* 1.1.6 [CCSL 1 442,28-6]). Although "littera" does not need to be restricted by the definition of "letter" or "epistle" (v.s. littera in Lewis-Short) and could theoretically refer to the *Antitheses* or other possible writings by Marcion, this is usually understood as a reference to the same writing designated "epistulam." Similarly while epistula could mean simply "written communication" (v.s. epistula, *ibid.*), it surely must be understood in the sense of "epistle."

⁸⁰ The centrality and acceptance of the *Antitheses* is, of course, not surprising.

thereupon they even fashioned Christ, by no means is it possible to denounce except that which he had found.⁸¹

Multiple problems beset scholars attempting to interpret Tertullian's reports concerning this letter: foremost among these, and oft discussed in scholarship, are this letter's content and possible authenticity as a Marcionite composition.⁸² This issue of authenticity is particularly problematic, since the alleged thesis of this letter coheres perfectly with Tertullian's argument to prove that Marcion and "heretics" are secondary and derivative of the original catholic message—an assertion that not only supplied a fundamental argument to Tertullian's treatise against Marcion but also his *De praescriptione haereticorum*.⁸³

⁸¹ Quid nunc, si negauerint Marcionitae primam apud nos fidem eius aduersus epistolam quoque ipsius? Quid, si nec epistolam agnouerint? Certe 'Antithesis' non modo fatentur Marcionis sed et praeferunt. Ex his mihi probatio sufficit. Si enim id euangelium, quod Lucae refertur penes nos, – uiderimus an et penes Marcionem – ipsum est, quod Marcion per Antithesis suas arguit ut interpolatum a protectoribus Iudaismi ad concorporationem legis et prophetarum, quo etiam Christum inde confingerent, utique non potuisset arguere nisi quod inuenerat (*Marc.* 4.4.3-4 [CCSL 1 550,16-25]).

⁸² Despite Tertullian's admission that some may object to the letter, its authenticity has largely achieved scholarly consensus (Regul, *Die antimarcionitischen Evangelienprologe*, 182-83; Mahé, "Tertullien et l'Epistula Marcionis," 358-71). While not disputing its authenticity, Evans maintains that its contents are unclear and that Marcionites may have denied its authenticity (*Tertullian's Treatise*, 95). To the extent that Tertullian can be trusted on this score, scholars typically envision this letter to contain references to Marcion's arrival in Rome, possibly his largess of 200,000 sesterces, and subsequent falling out with the community there. Mahé's reconstruction is representative of this interpretation ("Tertullien et l'Epistula Marcionis," 358-71). While this definitely represents a reasonable reconstruction, the coherence of this interpretation with Tertullian's argument that Marcion and other "heretics" were secondary and derivative should give us pause.

⁸³ This is related to Tertullian's attempt to dispossess Marcion and other "heretics" of scripture and impugn their scripture and faith as inauthentic by seeking to establish indisputable boundaries between the allegedly true, catholic faith and scripture and its heretical antitheses. Tertullian deploys numerous tactics that revolve around this basic premise. Most important, Tertullian tries to assert ownership of scripture, claiming to bear the legal title and the use such ownership avails, while at the same time denying Marcion and other "heretics" the same rights and privileges (*Praescr.*, 15. 1-4 [CCSL 1 119,1-10]; *Praescr.*, 37. 2-7 [CCSL 1 217,6-218,24]). Since alteration necessarily comes after the original and heretics allegedly alter scripture, it follows, Tertullian contends, that Marcion and his altered scripture are secondary (*Marc.*, 4.5-6 [CCSL 1 550-553]). In Tertullian's argument, while heretics oppose the original and authentic scripture in favor of their corrupt and inauthentic copies, which generate their corrupt faith, true Christians, transmit true scripture and true Christian traditions (*Praescr.*, 38 [CCSL 1 218-219]; cf. *Praescr.*, 17 [CCSL 1 200,1-12] and *Praescr.*, 19 [CCSL 1 201,1-11]).

More apropos for our investigation into the isagogic genre of the *Antitheses* is Tertullian's following offhand comment that "they clearly acknowledge (fatentur) and even display (praeferunt)" this text.⁸⁴ Interpretation of this passage hinges on the meaning of the word "praeferunt," translated neutrally above as "display." Alternatively, one could also translate "praeferunt" as "they offer" or "they place before" in order to capture the prefatory aspect of this verb more precisely.⁸⁵ Both of these translations support the argument that the *Antitheses* are best understood in light of the isagogic genre: the former aligns nicely with the catechetical aspects of the *Antitheses* designed to

⁸⁴ Mahé makes an intriguing suggestion that this letter served as propaganda for spreading the Marcionite faith by offering a brief preliminary overview of Marcion's life and teaching for catechumens ("Tertullien et l'Epistula Marcionis," 369-71). In addition to detailing Marcion's split with Rome over his reinterpretation of the Christian message, this letter, in Mahé's interpretation, contained carefully selected "ζητήματα" or "questiones" designed to convert hearers to the faith (ibid. 369). While Mahé does not explicitly categorize this letter among the isagogic genre, such connections between letters and isagogic texts did exist. In fact, despite the fact that neither Cleomedes, nor Nicomachus, nor Cleonides wrote their isagogic tract in the form of a letter, Asper identifies epistolary elements to Cleonides' Εισαγωγή Ἀρμονική: "Das Werk zerfällt in die briefartige Einleitungs- und ein entsprechende Schlusspassage, die elf thematisch in sich abgeschlossene κεφάλαια umfassen" ("Zu Struktur und Funktion eisagogischer Texte," 318). Moreover, epistolary features were not uncommon for isagogic texts as those adduced in our brief survey above indicate: cf. e.g. Epicurus's three Epistles (to Herodotus, Pythocles, and Menoeceus) and Albinos's *Prologue* designated an εἰσαγωγή in some MSS, which began with an epistolary-like address "to the one about to read the dialogues of Plato," (τῷ μέλλοντι ἐντεύξεσθαι τοῖς Πλάτωνος διαλόγοις, *Der Platoniker Albinos und sein sogenannter Prologos* [I Reis 310.3]). For more on the prevalence of the epistolary format for isagogic texts, see Norden, "Die Composition und Litteraturgattung;" and Schäfer, "Eisagoge." In addition, Marcion's possible use of an isagogic epistle is not unparalleled in early Christianity. Christoph Marksches has shown that in the second century, Ptolemy utilized the dihaeretic isagogic epistolary genre in his *Letter to Flora* in order to show the proper origins and divisions of the law ("New Research on Ptolemaeus Gnosticus," *ZAC* 4, no. 2 [2000]: 225-54). It is not possible to prove decisively that Ptolemy modeled his use of isagogic genre on an isagogic letter of Marcion or the isagogic aspects of his *Antitheses*, but it is curious that one of the positions about the law's origins that Ptolemy refutes in this isagogic letter may be Marcion's: the statement "ἕτεροι δὲ τούτοις τὴν ἐναντίαν ὁδὸν τραπέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀντικειμένου φθοροποιοῦ διαβολοῦ τεθείσθαι τοῦτον ἰσχυρίζονται, ὡς καὶ τὴν τοῦ κόσμου προσάπτουσιν αὐτῷ δημιουργίαν, πατέρα καὶ ποιητὴν τοῦτον λέγοντες εἶναι τοῦδε τοῦ παντός" (Ptolemy, *Flor.*, 3.2 [SC 24 46]) may well refer to a Marcionite position, although Ismo Dunderberg offers compelling reasons for rethinking this connection to Marcion ("Myth and Lifestyle for Beginners," in *Beyond Gnosticism: Myth, Lifestyle, and Society in the School of Valentinus* [New York: Columbia University Press, 2008], esp. 87-92). To return to Marcion's letter, while Mahé's hypothesis appears promising—perhaps probable given the epistolary connections with the isagogic genre—it is unlikely that, barring the discovery of the letter itself, any confirmation of this suggestion will be forthcoming due to the vagueness of Tertullian's descriptions (and possible misrepresentation) of this letter.

⁸⁵ V.s. praefero in Lewis-Short.

guide readers (neophytes or adepts) into the foundational texts of the faith by means of a proper Marcionite interpretation; the latter reinforces the possible prefatory aspect of the *Antitheses* suggested by multiple passages in the *Adversus Marcionem*.⁸⁶ In fact, when coupled with the description that Marcion “set up the *Antitheses* beforehand (praestrundo)”⁸⁷—it should be recalled here that Evans translated “praestrundo” as “prefix”—the use of “praefertur” strengthens the argument that this work served as an elementary work designed to introduce his canon.

While it is not necessary to insist that the *Antitheses* could only function isagogically if prefaced to Marcion’s *Gospel* and *Apostolikon*, this passage from book four of Tertullian’s *Adversus Marcionem* speaks to the importance of the *Antitheses* for transmitting Marcion’s foundational precepts. In this respect, we ought to situate Tertullian’s statement that Marcion’s followers “praefertur” the *Antitheses* alongside the report that Marcion composed this “first document (summo instrumento)” so that his followers might be “initiated (initiantur) and cemented (indurantur)” in the faith.⁸⁸ In addition to evidence for the *Antitheses*’ form, content, and targeted audience, which suggest this work’s connection with the isagogic genre, these descriptions further reveal that the *Antitheses* established a proper Marcionite hermeneutic for reading the faith and Marcion’s canonical texts. This pedagogical (or catechetical) aspect of the isagogic genre identified in the *Antitheses* would undoubtedly have been a great desideratum for spreading the faith through Marcion’s ambitious (and obviously highly successful) evangelic campaign.

⁸⁶ See *Marc.* 1.19.4; 4.4.3-4; 4.6.1 (CCSL 1 460,21-29; 550,16-25; 552,12-20).

⁸⁷ *Marc.* 4.6.1 (CCSL 1 552,15).

⁸⁸ *Marc.* 1.19.4 (CCSL 1 460,24-25).

Marcion's *Antitheses* and Prolegomena

Even though there are strong indications that Marcion's *Antitheses* may have physically introduced and isagogically functioned to lay the groundwork for future instruction into Marcion's theology and his NT collection, the *Antitheses* may have been somewhat deficient in certain aspects of those seven introductory questions often covered before beginning a course of study, which Mansfeld investigated.⁸⁹ There is no way to know precisely how Marcion may have covered these topics in his *Antitheses* or if he was even aware of systematic handling of all these issues in introductory works. There are, however, indications that at least the issues of scope, arrangement, and authenticity were of fundamental concern for his introductory works.

Marcion's understanding of the scope of the argument and the authenticity of his canonical texts frames virtually every aspect of his *Antitheses* discussed so far: the separation of the law from the gospel and the God of the Hebrew Bible from that of Jesus Christ supplied the scope or telos of Paul's letters and the gospel. These texts, according to Marcion's readings of them in his *Antitheses*, all pointed in this direction. Tertullian himself perspicaciously realized that the *Antitheses'* purpose and very title were designed to this end:

Even more they join those things which they place in these oppositions, which agree with God. Take away Marcion's title and intention as well as the main point of this work and nothing else remains except the demonstration of God, the best

⁸⁹ These are: 1) the scope of the argument (σκόπος); 2) the arrangement of the work (διάταξις); 3) the utility of the work (χρήσιμον); 4) the reason (διὰ τί) for title (ἐπιγραφή) of the work; 5) the authenticity of the work (γνήσιον); 6) the division of the work (διαίρεσις); and 7) from what branch of philosophy the work derives (ὑπὸ ποίου μέρους) (Mansfeld, *Prolegomena*, 10-11).

and judge, because these two align with God alone. For his very zeal in opposing Christ to the creator with these examples even more shows their unity.⁹⁰

Although Tertullian is speaking about the title of Marcion's *Antitheses* and not the texts that it introduced, his comments about the hermeneutical role of the title speak to his—and possibly Marcion's—knowledge of a title's importance. Furthermore, the intention or goal of this introduction is clear: to differentiate the lower god from the higher God. Even though Tertullian rejects the title and its corresponding interpretation in his attempt to prove the unity of these attributes of God, he locates the central thesis of this tract in its very title, without which, in Tertullian's opinion, Marcion's argument would disintegrate. With respect to the title, Marcion's introduction corresponds nicely with other ancient isagogical works in its demonstration of the scope of its attendant corpus.

The importance of this goal extended beyond merely articulating the overarching theme of the corpus to the physical arrangement of the corpus itself. Although we will address the issue of order (*διάταξις*) more fully in our discussion of the so-called “Marcionite prologues,” the importance of placing Galatians first in the ordering pattern employed by Marcion is inextricably linked with Marcion's primary issue of differentiating between Judaism and Christianity. Once again Tertullian draws attention to this fact, when he writes:

Therefore, for that reason, we have established previously so that we might now profess that we will accordingly prove no other god was compassed by the apostle, just as we proved neither by Christ, proving again from his own [i.e. Marcion's] letters of Paul, which now it ought to be anticipated, have been mutilated, even with respect to their number, after the manner of the heretic's gospel. We also concede what Galatians, the principal letter against Judaism, teaches. For we also embrace this very dissolution of the old law, as itself coming

⁹⁰ Magis enim eos coniungunt, quos in eis diuersitatibus ponunt, quae deo congruunt. Aufer titulum Marcionis et intentionem atque propositum operis ipsius, et nihil aliud praestare quam demonstrationem eiusdem dei, optimi et iudicis, quia haec duo in solum deum competunt. Nam et ipsum studium in eis exemplis opponendi Christum creatori ad unitatem magis spectat (*Marc.* 2.29.2 [CCSL 1 508,8-14]).

from the disposition of the creator, just as now we have often discussed in its proper order about the new preaching by the prophets of our God.⁹¹

Tertullian clearly understood that Galatians, opening Marcion's *Corpus Paulinum*, supplied a fundamental hermeneutical principle for the separation of the law and the gospel. In keeping with his reinterpretation of the evidence adduced by Marcion, however, Tertullian counters that this denigration of the law issued from the creator God of the Hebrew Bible and was not the product of a new God: "furthermore the entire intention of this epistle teaches nothing other than the coming separation of the law by the dispensation of the creator, just as we will show below."⁹² We have no way of knowing positively if Marcion's *Antitheses*' themselves articulated the importance of beginning his Pauline corpus with Galatians. But Tertullian's concession of a fundamental point which aligns so well with Marcion's own beliefs suggests that Tertullian did not invent this idea himself; it is more likely that he is forced to respond to it because of Marcion's own assertions about Galatians. His defense shows that the issue of organization and order of the tracts in a corpus were not separate from interpretive concerns and that Marcion probably discussed this issue in his *Antitheses*.

The primary theme of separation of the law and the gospel also undergirded Marcion's discussion of authenticity (*γνησιον*). Nowhere is this more apparent than in Marcion's castigation of "false apostles" as perverters of the gospel trying to turn believers back to Judaism—according to Tertullian, an issue explicitly addressed in the

⁹¹ Quod idcirco praestruximus, ut iam hinc profiteamur nos proinde probaturos nullam alium deum ab apostolo circumlatum, sicut probauimus nec a Christo, ex ipsis utique epistolis Pauli, quas proinde mutilatas etiam de numero forma iam haeretici euangelii praeiudicasse debbit. Principalem aduersus Iudaismum epistolam nos quoque confitemur quae Galatas docet. Amplectimur etenim omnem illam legis ueteris amolitionem, ut et ipsam de creatoris uenientem dispositione, sicut saepe iam in isto ordine tractauimus de praedicata nouatione a prophetis dei nostri (*Marc.* 5.1.9-5.2.1 [*CCSL* 1 665,5-15]).

⁹² Igitur tota intentio epistolae istius nihil aliud docet quam legis decessionem uenientem de creatoris dispositione, ut adhuc suggeremus (*Marc.* 5.2.4 [*CCSL* 1 666,11-13]).

Antitheses.⁹³ These “false apostles,” in Marcion’s mind, not only tried to corrupt the gospel preached to those in Corinth, Galatia, and elsewhere, they were also responsible for the corruption of the physical gospel—and Paul’s letters—transmitted in MSS down to Marcion’s day.⁹⁴ The purpose Marcion saw in the gospel and Paul’s letters was inextricably linked with the text-critical activities he undertook in order to remove what he saw as the detritus of Jewish religion and to reestablish the original purity of the gospel message. Marcion was not haphazardly or arbitrarily manipulating the text; in his mind, he was restoring its original condition in accordance with his interpretation of the telos of these texts, a telos blatantly articulated in the *Antitheses*. In fact, Tertullian himself concedes that “they assert that Marcion did not so much create the canon by separation of the law and the gospel as he restored it after having been adulterated.”⁹⁵ Marcion’s authorial construct, whether that of the author of the gospel or Paul, provided the starting point for his text-critical actions. In chapter 2, however, we observed an

⁹³ *Marc.* 4.4.3-4 (*CCSL* 1 550,16-25).

⁹⁴ See e.g. Nam et ipsum Petrum ceterosque, columnas apostolatus, a Paulo reprehensos opponit, quod non recto pede incederent ad euangelii ueritatem, ab illo certe Paulo, qui adhuc in gratia rudis, trepidans denique, ne in uacuum currisset aut curreret, tunc primum cum antecessoribus apostolis conferebat (*Marc.* 1.20.2 [*CCSL* 1 461,19-24]); Sed et si quosdam falsos fratres inrepsisse descripsit, qui uellent Galatas ad aliud euangelium transferre, ipse demonstrat adulterium illud euangelii non ad alterius dei et Christi fidem transferendam, sed ad disciplinam legis conseruandam habuisse intentionem. . . (*Marc.* 1.20.4 [*CCSL* 1 461,4-8]); Quodsi et creator omnia haec iam pridem recusauerat et apostolus ea iam recusanda pronuntiabat, ipsa sententia apostoli consentanea decretis creatoris probat non alium deum ab apostolo praedicatum quam cuius decreta cupiebat iam agnosci, falsos et apostolos et fratres notans in hac causa, qui euangelium Christi creatoris transferrent a nouitate praenuntiata a creatore ad uetustatem recusatam a creatore (*Marc.* 1.20.6 [*CCSL* 1 462,27-6]); Cum uero nec Titum dicit circumcisum, iam incipit ostendere solam circumcisionis quaestionem ex defensione adhuc legis concussam ab eis, quos propterea falsos et superinducticios fratres appellat, non aliud statuere pergentes quam perseuerantiam legis, ex fide sine dubio integra creatoris, atque ita peruertentes euangelium, non interpolatione scripturae, qua Christum creatoris effingerent, sed retentione ueteris disciplinae, ne legem creatoris excluderent (*Marc.* 5.3.2 [*CCSL* 1 668,16-23]); Si et pseudoapostolos dicit operarios dolosos transfiguratores sui, per hypocrisin scilicet, conuersationis, non praedicationis adulteratae reos taxat. Adeo de disciplina, non de diuinitate dissidebatur (*Marc.* 5.12.6 [*CCSL* 1 701,18-21]); Aut si haec pseudoapostoli nostri et Iudaeici euangelizatores de suo intulerint, edat plenitudinem dei sui Marcion, qui nihil condidit (*Marc.* 5.19.5 [*CCSL* 1 721,7-9]).

⁹⁵ Aiunt enim Marcionem non tam innouasse regulam separatione legis et euangelii quam retro adulteratam recurasse (*Marc.* 1.20.1 [*CCSL* 1 460,14-16]).

interrelationship between the conception of the author (whether found in a prefatory *bios* or not) and the interpretation of textual authenticity. The authorial construct Marcion employed allowed him to justify his correction of the gospel and Paul's letters. No doubt Marcion's judgments of authenticity were also based on his knowledge of the vicissitudes of textual transmission in the ancient world and the textual instability resulting therefrom. When this is combined with Marcion's interpretation of Paul's own testimony about the "false brothers," Marcion's text-critical activities follow naturally.

Central to our interpretation of Marcion's text-critical practices is the role of paratexts, these ancillary materials that articulate the arguments by which Marcion's textual corrections can be justified. Paratextual materials help to establish and justify principles of textual correction, a topic we broached in chapter 2 in our discussion of the principle of interpreting Homer from Homer ("Ὅμηρον ἐξ' Ὀμήρου σαφηνύζειν). Grant has already made a cursory investigation into this principle and Marcion's reconstruction of the *Corpus Paulinum*.⁹⁶ In the remainder of this chapter I intend to build on Grant's observation and show how it is interrelated with an overall editorial schema involving restructuring and opening Paul's corpus with Galatians and prefacing each letter with short *argumenta* or *hypotheses* that pick up themes set out in the *Antitheses* and refocus them before reading each letter. Although I contend that Marcion's text-critical actions were informed by his interpretive stance, I stop short of Harnack's interpretation of the evidence;⁹⁷ rather, despite my occasional dissent to Schmid's interpretation, I find his

⁹⁶ Grant, "Marcion and Critical Method," 211-212.

⁹⁷ In particular, Harnack's claim that Marcion's complete rejection of allegory necessitated his critical actions is unconvincing. For Harnack's reconstruction of Marcion's critical methods and the results of his investigation into his text, see *Marcion*, 35-74, 153*-169*.

analysis and reconstruction for the most part convincing.⁹⁸ Nevertheless, we should not underestimate the role such materials played in transmitting the editor's hermeneutic and shaping—even if subtly—the reader's reception of the subsequent texts. Thus the issues of authenticity (γνήσιον), *skopos*, and “false apostles” found in the *Antitheses* are crucial for understanding the role of Marcion's editorial hermeneutic in transmitting the text and utilizing the so-called Marcionite prologues.

B. The Marcionite “Prologues”

In many Latin MSS there exist short summaries prefaced to Paul's letters; these prefatory tracts, sometimes called “prologues,” more accurately correspond to the prefatory genre of the *hypothesis* (in Latin “*argumentum*”) discussed in chapter 2. As we demonstrated in our survey of *hypotheses* there, such ancillary texts dealt with many issues from the scope of the text, the occasion for writing it, earlier editions or research on the text, to possible interpolations and issues of authenticity. They were above all malleable and ideally suited for introducing a reader, novice or learned, to the text. There are many different types of *argumenta* or prologues prefaced to Latin MSS; we are interested in the most simple and probably the earliest of them.⁹⁹ These *argumenta* (with significant variants) found in many Latin MSS predate the earliest Vulgate MS Codex Fuldensis (the subject of chapter 5) copied in 546-7 C.E., where they are found alongside

⁹⁸ For Schmid's evaluation of previous studies of Marcion's *Apostolikon*, including Harnack's, see *Marcion*, 6-31. For a summary of Schmid's conclusions with respect to Marcion's alleged tendentious alterations and his hermeneutic, see *Marcion*, 248-260.

⁹⁹ For critical editions of *argumenta*, prologues, and sundry prefatory material for Paul's letters in Latin, see Wordsworth and White, eds., *Epistulae Paulinae*, esp. 1-42; and Hermann Josef Frede, ed., *Epistulae ad Thessalonicenses, Timotheum, Titum, Philemonem, Hebraeos* (VL 25; Freiburg: Herder, 1975-1991), 99-131.

numerous other paratexts.¹⁰⁰ In terms of content, these *argumenta* offer a brief summary or overview of the main points of Paul's letters, orient and prepare the reader in ways similar to more lengthy prefatory materials, such as the *Antitheses*. These *argumenta* are as follows:¹⁰¹

Marcionite Argumenta

Argumentum in epistulam ad Galatas

Galatae sunt Graeci. Hi uerbum ueritatis primum ab apostolo acceperunt, sed post discessum eius temptati sunt a falsis apostolis ut in legem et circumcisionem uerterentur. Hos apostolus reuocat ad fidem ueritatis, scribens eis ab Epheso.

The Galatians are Greeks. First they accepted the word of truth from the Apostle, but after his departure they were tempted by false apostles that they might turn back to the law and circumcision. The Apostle called them back to the true faith writing to them from Ephesus.

Argumentum in epistulam ad Corinthios primam

Corinthii sunt Achaei, et hi similiter ab apostolo audierunt uerbum ueritatis, et subuersi multifarie a falsis apostolis, quidam a philosophiae uerbosa eloquentia, alii a secta legis Iudaicae inducti; hos reuocat apostolus ad ueram et euangelicam sapientiam, scribens eis ab Epheso.

The Corinthians are Achaeans. They also heard the word of truth from the apostle and subverted in many ways by false apostles were misled; some by the verbose eloquence of philosophy, others by the sect of the Jewish law. The Apostle called them back to the true and evangelical wisdom, writing to them from Ephesus.

Argumentum in epistulam ad Romanos

Romani sunt in partibus Italiae. Hi praeuenti sunt a falsi apostolis, et sub nomine Domini nostri Iesu Christi in legem et prophetas erant inducti. Hos reuocat apostolus ad ueram euangelicam fidem, scribens eis a Corintho.

The Romans are in the environs of Italy. They were first reached by the false apostles and under the name of our Lord Jesus Christ were misled into the law and the prophets. The Apostle called them back to the true evangelical faith writing to them from Corinth.

Argumentum in epistulam ad Thessalonicenses primam

¹⁰⁰ Wordsworth and White list the following MSS that contain the *argumentum* to Romans ABCDFGKMORTWZc et c (*Epistulae Paulinae*, 41).

¹⁰¹ I cite the *argumenta* from the critical edition by Wordsworth and White (*Epistulae Paulinae*) where they are found prefaced to their respective letters.

Thessalonicenses sunt Macedones in Christo Iesu, qui accepto uerbo ueritatis perstiterunt in fide etiam in persecutione ciuium suorum, praeterea nec receperunt ea quae a falsis apostolis dicebantur. Hos conlaudat apostolus scribens eis ab Athenis.

The Thessalonians are Macedonians in Christ Jesus, who once the word of truth had been accepted, persisted in the faith even in the persecution of their fellow citizens. Moreover, they did not receive the things which were said by the false apostles. The Apostle praised them highly writing to them from Athens.

Argumentum in epistulam ad Laodicenses¹⁰²

[Laodicenses sunt Asiani. Hi praeuenti erant a falsis apostolis...Ad hos non accessit ipse apostolus...hos per epistulam recorrigit...]

[The Laodiceans are Asians. They were previously reached by the false apostles...the Apostle himself did not come to them... he corrected them through the letter...]

Argumentum in epistulam ad Colossenses

Colossenses et hi sicut Laodicenses sunt Asiani; et ipsi praeuenti erant a pseudoapostolis nec ad hos accessit ipse apostolus sed et hos per epistulam recorrigit. Audierant enim uerbum ab Archippo, qui et ministerium in eos accepit. Ergo apostolus iam ligatus scribit eis ab Epheso per Tychicum diaconum.

The Colossians are also Asians just like the Laodiceans. They themselves were also previously reached by the false apostles. The apostle himself did not come to them, but also corrected them through a letter. For they heard the word from Archippus, who also received the ministry for them. Therefore the Apostle now in chains wrote to them from Ephesus through the deacon Tychicus.

Argumentum in epistulam ad Philippenses

Philippenses sunt Macedones. Hi accepto uerbo ueritatis perstiterunt in fide, nec receperunt falsos apostolos. Hos apostolus conlaudat, scribens eis a Roma de carcere per Epafroditum.

The Philippians are Macedonians. Once the word of truth had been received they persisted in the faith and did not receive the false apostles. The Apostle praised them highly, writing to them from prison in Rome through Epaphroditus.

Secondary Argumenta

Argumentum in epistulam ad Philemon

Philemoni familiares litteras facit pro Onesimo seruo eius. Scribit autem ei a Roma de carcere per Onesimum acolitum.

¹⁰² The *argumentum* to Laodiceans has been reconstructed by de Bruyne from the evidence in Colossian's *argumentum*, which clearly presupposes and refers back to a previous one to the Laodiceans.

He composes this familiar letter to Philemon on behalf of his slave Onesimus. But he writes to him from prison in Rome through the acolyte Onesimus.

Argumentum in epistulam ad Ephesios

Ephesii sunt Asiani; hi accepto uerbo ueritatis perstiterunt in fide. Hos conlaudat apostolus, scribens eis a Roma de carcera per Thychicum diaconum (*v.l.* amen sciendum sane quia haec epistola quam nos ad Ephesios scriptam habemus heretici et maxime Marcion istae ad Laodicenses additulant).

The Ephesians are Asians. Once the word of truth had been received they persisted in the faith. The Apostle praised them highly writing to them from prison in Rome through the deacon Tychichus (*v.l.* truly it should be known however that this letter which we have as written to the Ephesians the heretics, of them especially Marcion, entitle to the Laodiceans).

Argumentum in epistulam ad Corinthios secundam

Post actam paenitentiam consolatorias scribit eis a troade et conlaudans eos hortatur ad meliora.

After a penitent act he writes consolations to them from Troas and praising them highly exhorts them to better things.

Argumentum in epistulam ad Thessalonicenses secundam

Ad Thessalonicenses secundam scribit et notum facit eis de temporibus nouissimis et de aduersarii detectione. Scribit hanc epistulam ab athenis.

He writes the second letter to the Thessalonians and instructs them about the end times and the detection of the adversary; he writes this letter from Athens.

Argumentum in epistulam ad Timotheum primam

Timotheum instruit et docet de ordinatione episcopatus et diaconii et omnis ecclesiasticae disciplinae scribens ei a macedonia.

He instructs Timothy and teaches him about the ordination of the bishop and deacon and every ecclesiastical discipline writing to him from Macedonia.

Argumentum in epistulam ad Timotheum secundam

Item Timotheo scribit de exhortatione martyrii et omnis regulae ueritatis et quid futurum sit temporibus nouissimis et de sua passione.

He writes again to Timothy about the exhortation of testimony and every rule of truth and what would come with the end times and about his own suffering.

Argumentum in epistulam ad Titum

Titum commonefacit et instruit de constitutione praesbyterii et de spiritali conuersatione et hereticis uitandis qui in scripturis iudaicis credunt.

He admonishes and instructs Titus about the constitution of the presbyters and spiritual way of life and the shunning of heretics who trust in the Jewish scriptures.

The arrangement of these *argumenta* above is based on the reconstruction of the earliest collection and edition for which these texts were prepared as identified by Donatien de Bruyne, who created a stir and set off a flurry of scholarship in the twentieth-century with his hypothesis that these *argumenta* can be traced back to a Marcionite edition of the *Corpus Paulinum*.¹⁰³ Shortly thereafter, Peter Corssen, in his research on the history of Romans, independently came to a similar conclusion regarding the Marcionite origin of these *argumenta*.¹⁰⁴ De Bruyne based his theory on the following evidence: 1) the consistent style of the primary *argumenta*; 2) Marcion's *Apostolikon* contained the same number of letters in the collection, for which these *argumenta* were originally composed; 3) the order of the letters in this collection evidenced by the *argumenta* corresponded to Marcion's; 4) letters deemed spurious by Marcion and his followers were lacking in this collection; 5) in this collection Ephesians was entitled Laodiceans, just as in Marcion's edition; and 6) prominence of Marcionite thought and theology in the *argumenta*.

Even a cursory glance at the *argumenta* listed above validates de Bruyne's identification of distinct styles employed for these summaries. Romans, 1 Corinthians, Galatians, 1 Thessalonians, Ephesians, Colossians, and Philippians all adhere to the following pattern: 1) geographical description; 2) statement on the church's reception of the evangelic message; 3) testimony to their adherence to or apostasy from the faith; 4) account of Paul's response to their faith; and 5) report of place from which Paul wrote the

¹⁰³ Donatien de Bruyne, "Prologues bibliques d'origin marcionite," *Revue Bénédictine* 24 (1907): 1-16.

¹⁰⁴ Peter Corssen, "Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte des Römerbriefes," *ZNW* 10 (1909): 1-45; 97-102.

letter.¹⁰⁵ Alongside these *argumenta* are additional ones prefaced to 2 Corinthians, 2 Thessalonians, and Philemon which depart significantly in formula and length, retaining only the reference to the place whence Paul sent the letters. The Pastoral letters comprise an additional third type of *argumentum* containing only a short précis and no reference to the place of the letter's origin. Hebrews is completely lacking in any *argumentum* of this short type.¹⁰⁶

Due to the collocation of the evidence, de Bruyne argued that the original series of *argumenta* were prefixed to Romans, 1 Corinthians, Galatians, 1 Thessalonians, Colossians, and Philippians.¹⁰⁷ Since the *argumenta* to 2 Corinthians and 2 Thessalonians were of a different type and obviously secondary, the *argumentum* to the first letters to these communities must have been intended to cover them both.¹⁰⁸ Even though the letter to the Ephesians shows some superficial similarities to the original type of *argumentum*, this is a result of dependence on the *argumentum* to Philippians. De Bruyne also demonstrated that the *argumentum* to Ephesians was secondary since the *argumentum* to Colossians clearly presupposes a previous *argumentum* to a letter to the Laodiceans in the phrase, "Colosenses et hi sicut Laodicensis sunt Asiani."¹⁰⁹

Similar references to the letters in the *argumenta* allowed de Bruyne to reconstruct the tract that began this corpus. The *argumentum* to 1 Corinthians reveals that Galatians, not Romans, began this edition of Paul's letters, for which these *argumenta*

¹⁰⁵ Bruyne, "Prologues bibliques," 7-8.

¹⁰⁶ For examples of longer and later *argumenta* to Hebrews, see Wordsworth and White, eds., *Epistulae Paulinae*, 679-81.

¹⁰⁷ Bruyne, "Prologues bibliques," 7-8.

¹⁰⁸ Bruyne, "Prologues bibliques," 7-8.

¹⁰⁹ Bruyne, "Prologues bibliques," 4-6.

were written; the statement, “et hi similiter ab apostolo audierunt uerbum ueritatis, et subuersi multifarie a falsis apostolis,” discloses that neither Romans, nor any other *argumentum*, except Galatians, could have preceded, since the explicit reference to the reception “ab apostolo,” in the *argumentum* to Galatians is picked up again in the words “hi similiter” in the *argumentum* to 1 Corinthians.¹¹⁰ Thus, according to de Bruyne’s reconstruction, this edition was ordered: Galatians, 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Romans, 1 Thessalonians, 2 Thessalonians, Laodiceans, Colossians, Philippians, Philemon. The *argumenta* were affixed to these letters with the *argumentum* to 1 Corinthians and 1 Thessalonians covering both epistles to these communities.

Based on the clear typology of these *argumenta*, de Bruyne also argued that the Pastoral epistles and Hebrews were missing from this edition.¹¹¹ In subsequent editions, however, these letters were included and prefaced with their own *argumenta*, but composed in a different style.¹¹² Multiple facts indicate secondary status of the *argumentum* to Ephesians: the repetition of phrases from Philippians; absence of references to the false apostles; and the implicit references to the Laodiceans and Paul’s correction in the following *argumentum* to Colossians (Colossenses et hi sicut Laodicenses sunt Asiani; et ipsi praeuenti erant a pseudoapostolis nec ad hos accessit ipse apostolus sed et hos per epistulam recorrigit).¹¹³ For these reasons, this edition contained Ephesians, except under the title Laodiceans (N.B. not the apocryphal letter), and omitted the Pastorals and Hebrews.

¹¹⁰ Bruyne, “Prologues bibliques,” 6-7.

¹¹¹ Bruyne, “Prologues bibliques,” 7-8.

¹¹² Bruyne, “Prologues bibliques,” 8-12.

¹¹³ Bruyne, “Prologues bibliques,” 4-6.

De Bruyne argued that the cumulative effect of this evidence indicated a Marcionite origin for these *argumenta*. He based this hypothesis on: 1) reports about Marcion's *Apostolikon* containing the exact ten letters evidenced by this edition; 2) the correspondence between this edition's arrangement and Marcion's; 3) Marcion's use of the title Laodiceans, instead of Ephesians; 4) the absence of Hebrews and the Pastorals from Marcion's *Corpus Paulinum*; and 5) secondary attempts to catholicize this corpus by means of other *argumenta* as exemplified by those prefixed to the Pastorals and Ephesians.¹¹⁴ Moreover, de Bruyne also demonstrated that the actual content of the *argumenta* corroborated this hypothesis since the primary issues addressed in the *argumenta* reflect precisely those issues central for Marcion's thought: adamant rejection of Judaism, the Jewish law, and Jewish practices of circumcision; claims that the gospel was perverted and turned back to Judaism by false apostles; Paul's opposition to this reversion to Jewish error occasioned by these false apostles and guidance back to the true faith of the gospel from such error.

De Bruyne's study occasioned extensive reaction by some scholars who championed and augmented his findings and by others who dissented and attempted to refute them. Harnack, Souter, and Vogels all accepted de Bruyne's argument and saw the Marcionite origin of these *argumenta* as further evidence of Marcion's role in the transmission and canonization of the NT.¹¹⁵ While de Bruyne had hesitated to attribute

¹¹⁴ Bruyne, "Prologues bibliques," 10-12.

¹¹⁵ Harnack, *Marcion*, 132*; *ibid.*, "Der apokryphe brief des Apostels Paulus an die Laodicener, eine marcionitische Fälschung aus der 2. hälfte des 2. jahrhunderts," *Sitzungsberichte Pruessische Akademie der Wissenschaften, der philosophisch-historischen Klasse* 27 (1923): 235-45; *ibid.*, "Die marcionitische Ursprung der ältesten Vulgata-Prologe zu den Paulusbriefen," *ZNW* 24 (1925): 204-18; Heinrich Vogels, "Der Einfluss Marcions und Tatians auf Text und Kanon des Neuen Testaments," in *Synoptische Studien Alfred Wikenhauser dargebracht* (Munich: K. Zink, 1953); and Alexander Souter, *The Text and Canon of the New Testament* (London: Duckworth, 1954), 188-91.

the *argumenta* to Marcion himself, Harris was even positive that they ought to be traced back to Marcion and suggested that they were probably composed in Greek.¹¹⁶ Harnack also argued that the author of the Muratorian Canon actually knew these *argumenta* and utilized the same structure found in them for describing Paul's letters: namely, the Muratorian Canon's description of the content of Paul's letters as, "quae, qua ex causa, a quo loco."¹¹⁷ In addition, the editors of the magnum opus *Nouum Testamentum Latine, Editio Maior* were convinced by de Bruyne's study and concluded that Marcion's *Corpus Paulinum* must have been transmitted in Latin.¹¹⁸ They also situated the *argumenta* attributed to Marcion alongside other types of early Christian ancillary materials that had been transmitted down in MSS.¹¹⁹ Even Hoffman, Metzger and Ehrman in their recent studies, remain convinced of the Marcionite origin of these *argumenta*.¹²⁰

Despite the cogency of the argument and suitability of the Marcionite hypothesis, this reconstruction had its detractors. Shortly after Corsen's and de Bruyne's articles, Mundle offered a dissenting opinion and attempted to refute the argument for a Marcionite origin of these prologues point by point, concluding that they were late

¹¹⁶ J. Rendel Harris, "Marcion and the Canon," *Expository Times* 7 (1906): 392-94.

¹¹⁷ Adolf von Harnack, "Die Marcionitischen Prologe zu den Paulusbriefen, eine Quelle des Muratorischen Fragments," *ZNW* 25 (1926): 160-63.

¹¹⁸ "Si haec vera sint, ut credimus, sequitur Maricionis 'Apostolicon' Latine etiam circumlatum fuisse et communi usu tritum. Exemplo etiam antiquissimo probant, quod alias abunde testatum est, Ecclesiam nonnihil etiam in Noui Testamenti corpore conformando hereticis debere. Monarchianorum prologi in Euangelia, Donatistarum capitulationes in Actus, Pelagii praefationes in Epistulas, Priscilliani in eisdem canones, ab omnibus doctis nunc agnoscuntur; quibus hodie adiungitur" (*Epistulae Paulinae*, 41).

¹¹⁹ Ibid.

¹²⁰ Hoffmann, *Marcion*, 25-26; Metzger, *Canon*, 94-97; Bruce Manning Metzger and Bart D. Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*, 4th ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 39.

and dependent on Ambrosiaster.¹²¹ Lagrange followed Mundle in rejecting a Marcionite origin for the *argumenta*.¹²² Frede also remained unconvinced by the Marcionite connection; instead, he backed Mundle's arguments and adduced evidence from the Monza MS which, Frede contended, showed that the evidence for the existence of the letter to the Laodiceans in this edition were unfounded.¹²³ His argument was based on an obviously secondary reading—as he himself admits—in the prologue to Colossians in this MS (Colosenses et hi sicut Laodicensis sunt Asiani] colosenses et laodicensis sunt asiani), which shows, he argued, that the reference to the Laodiceans (i.e. hi sicut Laodiceans) could have been coordinative rather than resumptive.¹²⁴ These conclusions were rebutted by Schäfer, who, while not convinced of every specific argument advanced by Corssen and de Bruyne, sided with them and reopened the debate.¹²⁵ To date the most thorough attempt to refute a Marcionite origin of these *argumenta* was delivered by Nils Dahl, whose claims have since proved convincing to numerous scholars.¹²⁶

¹²¹ Wilhelm Mundle, "Die Herkunft der "marcionitischen" Prologe zu den paulinischen Briefen," *ZNW* 24 (1925): 56-77.

¹²² Marie Joseph Lagrange, "Les prologues prétendus marcionites," *Revue Biblique* 35 (1926): 161-73.

¹²³ Hermann Josef Frede, *Atlteainische Paulus-Handschriften* (Freiburg: Herder, 1964). Dahl's portrayal of Fischer among the "number of skeptical voices" (235) regarding their Marcionite origin is slightly misleading, since Fischer merely describes the prologues as "weder marcionitisch noch antimarcionitisch;" ("Das Neue Testament in lateinischer Sprache," in *Die Alten Übersetzungen des Neuen Testaments, die Kirchenväterzitate und Lektionare* [ed. Kurt Aland; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1972], 26).

¹²⁴ Frede, *Atlteainische Paulus-Handschriften*, 169.

¹²⁵ Karl Theodor Schäfer, "Marcion and the ältesten Prologe zu den Paulusbriefen," in *Kyriakon: Festschrift Johannes Quasten* (eds. P. Granfield and J. A. Jungmann; Münster: Aschendorf, 1973); Karl Theodor Schäfer, "Marius Victorinus und die Marcionitischen Prologe zu den Paulusbriefen," *Revue Bénédictine* 80 (1970): 7-16.

¹²⁶ Nils Alstrup Dahl, "The Origin of the Earliest Prologues to the Pauline Letters," *Semeia* 12 (1978): 233-77; Harry Y. Gamble, "The New Testament Canon: Recent Research and the Status Quaestionis," in *The Canon Debate* (eds. Lee Martin McDonald and James A. Sanders; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 2002), 284.; Clabeaux, *Lost Collection*, 1; Schmid, *Marcion*, 286-9.

Nils Dahl's Argument Against a Marcionite Origin

Since Dahl's argument has been the most influential lately, it is necessary to unpack his arguments for the dismissal of the Marcionite origin of these *argumenta*. In the following, I will lay out Dahl's premises, assumptions, and conclusions, while offering my reasons for disagreeing with his interpretation of the evidence. I conclude that in the final analysis the most historically plausible and probable origin of these *argumenta* remains Marcion or his disciples.

After recounting the state of research, Dahl begins by discussing the attestation for the usage or production of these *argumenta*. He first notes that neither Tertullian nor Epiphanius gives any explicit indication that Marcion's *Apostolikon* contained them. The first evidence for their existence may be the Muratorian canon, which Dahl, following Hahneman's much disputed hypothesis, thinks comes from the east in the fourth century.¹²⁷ In addition, commentaries by Marius Victorinus, Ambrosiaster, and Pelagius attest to their existence.

In terms of MS evidence, Dahl demonstrates that they were probably an integral part of Old Latin (OL) editions of Paul's letters, despite their absence from Greek-Latin codices D, F, G, and hence their exemplars. By the time of the Vulgate revision in the late fourth/early fifth century, they were clearly an integral part of Latin MSS and were incorporated into Vulgate MSS; there they were retained alongside a new introductory text

¹²⁷ Like many scholars, I do not find arguments for its eastern provenance and later date convincing. For the arguments placing the Muratorian Canon late and in the east, see A. C. Sundberg Jr., "Canon Muratori: A Fourth Century List," *HTR* 66 (1973): 1-41; Geoffrey Mark Hahneman, *The Muratorian Fragment and the Development of the Canon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992). For critical reactions and rebuttals to these arguments, see Everette Ferguson, "Canon Muratori: Date and Provenance," *StPatr* 17/2 (1982): 677-83; Everette Ferguson, "Review of Geoffrey Mark Hahneman, *The Muratorian Fragment and the Development of the Canon*," *JTS* 44 (1993): 696; Philippe Henne, "La datation du *Canon* de Muratori," *Revue Biblique* 100 (1993): 54-75; and Charles Hill, "The Debate over the Muratorian Fragment and the Development of the Canon," *WTJ* 57 (1995): 437-52.

the *Primum Quaeritur*. Dahl lists the following principal witnesses to these *argumenta*: the ninth century Codex Sangermanensis (G); the fifth century revision of Paul and Proverbs by Peregrinus; Codex Amiatinus (A) copied ca. 716, wherein the OL *capitula* preface the *argumenta*; the eighth century MS R; the ninth century MS M; and most later Vulgate MSS—in addition to the earliest MS evidence for the Vulgate revision, Codex Fuldensis, (F) ca. 547 C.E.¹²⁸ Their presence in Codex Amiatinus, Fuldensis, R and M indicate that their exemplars must have contained the *argumenta* and point to their insertion into many branches of Vulgate textual tradition well before sixth century C.E. given the broad attestation in the Vulgate MS tradition. Dahl's acceptance of the disputed late date for the Muratorian Canon notwithstanding, he still convincingly shows that the *argumenta* were “an indispensable part of an edition of Paul in Italy around 400 A.D.”¹²⁹ In light of the evidence from patristic testimony and the Muratorian canon, their existence can probably be traced back well into the third century or earlier.

Dahl makes a few other noteworthy observations bearing on the edition to which these *argumenta* were prefixed. Firstly, Dahl demonstrates that, although the references to bearers of letters are probably secondary, phrases concerning the destination of the letters probably were not.¹³⁰ For this reason, the content of the *argumentum* to Romans suggests that it was drawn from and prefaced to a text lacking chapters 15-16, since the textual tradition alternately describes this letter being sent from Corinth (a Corintho) or

¹²⁸ For a full list of MSS, see Frede, ed., *Epistulae ad Thessalonicenses, Timotheum, Titum, Philemonem, Hebraeos*, 108-09.

¹²⁹ Dahl, "Earliest Prologues," 241.

¹³⁰ Dahl, "Earliest Prologues," 242-44.

Athens (ab Athenis).¹³¹ Secondly, the textual instability evidenced in the *argumenta* preceded their incorporation into Vulgate MSS, a point reinforced by a variant in the *argumentum* to Titus (presbyterii *v.l.* maiorum natu) which Dahl thinks was the original reading and which indicates the usage and development of the *argumenta* before clearly defined ecclesiastical offices in the Latin church.¹³² Dahl concludes that these *argumenta* must have been in Latin tradition long before Marius Victorinus; and this, he states, contradicts Frede's argument that they were first introduced into the Latin "I type" of text.¹³³

Dahl then addresses one of the cornerstones of a Marcionite origin: the correspondence of the order presupposed by the *argumenta* to the order of Marcion's edition. This is one piece of evidence upon which all researchers agree, even de Bruyne's and Corsen's detractors. Yet Dahl follows Frede and Zahn's earlier suggestion that this order may simply be the result of an early attempt to organize Paul's letters chronologically, an order that he claims Marcion has inherited and adopted.¹³⁴ Dahl postulates that the phrase "iam ligatus" in the *argumentum* to Colossians and the note that Philippians was written from Rome indicate that these two letters were the last written when organized chronologically; he sees verification of this hypothesis in the placement of these letters at the end of Marcion's order (Galatians, 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Romans, 1 Thessalonians, 2 Thessalonians, Laodiceans, Colossians, Philippians). In addition, in Dahl's mind, the origins of the rest of the correspondence apparently indicate

¹³¹ Dahl, "Earliest Prologues," 244.

¹³² Dahl, "Earliest Prologues," 245.

¹³³ Dahl, "Earliest Prologues," 245.

¹³⁴ Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen kanons I*, 623; Frede, *Altlateinische Paulus-Handschriften*, 176.

a chronological scheme written while in custody: Galatians and Corinthians written from Ephesus, Romans and Thessalonians from Athens.¹³⁵

Dahl also recognizes the three distinct styles within the *argumenta* and acknowledges the secondary status of the *argumenta* to 2 Corinthians, Philemon, 2 Thessalonians, and the Pastoral letters. He also concedes the argument that the *argumentum* to Ephesians is secondary and copied from that of Philippians, though without a reference to the false apostles. Furthermore, Marius Victorinus seems to have read something like what the *argumentum* to Colossians would lead us to anticipate. Furthermore, since in a chronological order the letter before Colossians would have been written from Ephesus like the subsequent letter to the Colossians, and since the letter to the Ephesians could not have been written from Ephesus, the *argumentum* must have referred to the letter to the Laodiceans.¹³⁶ Thus Dahl rejects Frede's suggestion that "sicut hi" had a coordinative function and admits that the original *argumentum* was attached to a letter to the Laodiceans, while that to the Ephesians was secondary.¹³⁷

So far Dahl's reconstruction then is basically the same as de Bruyne's. The order of the *Corpus Paulinum* for which these *argumenta* were produced was the following: Galatians, 1-2 Corinthians, Romans, 1-2 Thessalonians, Laodiceans, Colossians, Philippians. The *argumenta* to 2 Corinthians, 2 Thessalonians, and the Pastorals are clearly secondary and not the result of different subject matter in the letters as Frede claimed.¹³⁸ Dahl's reconstruction departs from de Bruyne in his acceptance of Frede's

¹³⁵ Dahl, "Earliest Prologues," 246.

¹³⁶ Dahl, "Earliest Prologues," 250-51.

¹³⁷ Dahl, "Earliest Prologues," 250; Frede, *Altlateinische Paulus-Handschriften*, 169.

¹³⁸ Dahl, "Earliest Prologues," 247-8; Frede, *Altlateinische Paulus-Handschriften*, 172-3.

suggestion that the *argumenta* are similar to Callimachus's *Pinakes* and other early prefatory prologues employed for Greco-Roman literature.¹³⁹ The *argumenta*, according to Dahl, were probably originally part of a long prefatory work to the entire corpus, rather than prefaced to individual letters.¹⁴⁰ With the addition of secondary prologues the focus shifted from introducing the entire corpus to each letter.¹⁴¹

Dahl then turns to discuss early editions of Paul in order to ascertain whether the ordering pattern of Marcion's corpus was created by him or inherited. Dahl suggests that there could have been two editions which would have been available by the third century and which contained these letters in the order presupposed by the *argumenta*: Marcion's and one similar to Marcion's but different. Dahl hypothetically asserts:

Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.* 5.17 and 22) took it for granted that Marcion had left out the letters to Timothy and Titus and changed the address of Ephesians. But it is equally possible that Marcion used an already existing edition and only, as he saw it, deleted interpolations and corrected corrupt passages. For this reason it is entirely possible that the original set of prologues presuppose an edition which was very similar to that of Marcion without being identical with it.¹⁴²

Although Dahl does not think that all copies of Paul's letter can be traced back to a single archetype, he does interpret "the whole complex evidence as due to alterations and confluences of two basic editions, one in which Paul's thirteen (or fourteen) letters and another in which his letters to seven churches were arranged according to the principle of

¹³⁹ Harnack offered a similar observation (*Marcion*, 131*).

¹⁴⁰ By way of evaluation, while this conclusion is possible, it is highly unlikely. Our investigations into ancillary materials in chapter 2 have shown that these prefatory *argumenta* would be more closely related to *hypotheses* than to prologues or Callimachus's *Pinakes*. In addition, the uniform style and content with the continual repetition of the same themes would make for an extremely redundant introduction. For this reason, the original *argumenta* would more likely have been prefaced to the letters to the seven churches than to the entire corpus Paulinum. This conclusion is in fact confirmed by the fact that the MSS transmit them under the generic rubric of *argumentum*, not prologus or praefatio; see Wordsworth and White, eds., *Epistulae Paulinae*.

¹⁴¹ Dahl, "Earliest Prologues," 251.

¹⁴² Dahl, "Earliest Prologues," 252.

decreasing length.”¹⁴³ Dahl also attempts to distance this order from a Marcionite origin by adducing Syriac evidence (a canon list and Ephrem’s commentary) which ordered the beginning of the corpus Galatians, Corinthians, Romans.¹⁴⁴

Evaluation of Dahl’s Argument

To turn to my critique, Dahl’s analysis is undercut by some fundamental problems: 1) an eagerness to gloss over problematic evidence with simplistic generalities; 2) the assumption that his hypothetical reconstruction has been proven, before addressing—thus employing a circular logic and prejudging—the crux of the matter (the Marcionite content of the *argumenta*); 3) his rejection of the simplest and most plausible explanation of the evidence (a Marcionite origin) available, in favor of a hypothetical and more complex one (an orthodox origin).

In terms of oversimplification, Dahl claims that “the order of the Pauline letters is almost constant in Greek manuscripts” except for the place of Hebrews.¹⁴⁵ This statement is far too simplistic and does not do justice to the variation in the order of Paul’s letters in actual MSS, as Aland’s subsequent study has shown.¹⁴⁶ Similarly, in his attempt to identify a different source for the title to the Laodiceans, Dahl, employing a circular logic, argues that an early edition could have included Ephesians under the name of

¹⁴³ Dahl, "Earliest Prologues," 253.

¹⁴⁴ Dahl, "Earliest Prologues," 253-54. We will demonstrate subsequently that, despite Dahl’s rejection of Marcion’s influence in Syria, considerable evidence implies a long-lasting Marcionite presence there.

¹⁴⁵ Dahl, "Earliest Prologues," 253.

¹⁴⁶ Kurt Aland, "Die Entstehung des Corpus Paulinum," in *Neutestamentliche Entwürfe* (ed. Kurt Aland; München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1979).

Laodiceans, since the prologues are not attributed to Marcion.¹⁴⁷ This is of course very problematic, since he is, in fact, trying to prove that these *argumenta* were not produced by Marcion. Moreover, Dahl's assertion that the Valentinians also rejected the Pastorals does not speak to the argument that Marcion or a disciple did not create this edition and these *argumenta*; this observation only proves that the Pastorals were not unanimously accepted as authentic in the early Church.¹⁴⁸ Finally, before actually dealing with the fundamental issue (as he himself concedes), namely the content of the *argumenta*, Dahl presupposes that his hypothetical reconstruction has been proven: that these *argumenta* were probably written in Greek by an "orthodox" Christian for a seven letter edition.¹⁴⁹ When 13 and 14 letter editions gained ascendancy, they were translated into Latin and new *argumenta* were manufactured. Afterwards they were incorporated into Latin MS traditions, primarily the Vulgate, whence they have been transmitted down to us.¹⁵⁰ Despite the fact that I do not find this conclusion compelling, my problem does not lie with this conclusion per se, but that this conclusion has been proffered and an "orthodox" origin has been identified before taking into account all the evidence—in fact, the most

¹⁴⁷ Dahl argues that it could be attributed to Marcion or not: "Ephesians as a letter to the Laodiceans does not prove a Marcionite origin" ("Earliest Prologues," 256). Dahl's claim that Laodiceans does not necessarily represent a Marcionite feature is possible; but then while anything is possible, all of our evidence (e.g. Tertullian, Epiphanius, and the prologue to Ephesians) identifies Marcion with entitling Ephesians as Laodiceans. Even if he merely received this title and did not create it, Marcion still remains our only evidence for entitling Ephesians as Laodiceans.

¹⁴⁸ Dahl, "Earliest Prologues," 254. Dahl also discusses the problems of an *argumentum* to Philemon and the absence of Rom 15-16 in Marcion's edition (254-5). Neither of these pieces of evidence prove or disprove a Marcionite origin. With respect to Rom 15-16, Dahl notes that it was probably lacking in "Western" traditions also. The evidence from Tertullian and Epiphanius suggest that Philemon was included and probably placed after Colossians where the *argumentum* to this letter served to introduce both. Whatever the case, neither its inclusion nor exclusion speaks to the problem of Marcionite origin, as Dahl himself concedes.

¹⁴⁹ Dahl, "Earliest Prologues," 257.

¹⁵⁰ Dahl, "Earliest Prologues," 257.

important evidence. In this way, the following discussion of an orthodox or Marcionite source has already been prejudiced against a Marcionite origin.

To be sure, Dahl's reconstruction of the early editions of Paul's letters, drawing on Frede, definitely offers a more compelling reconstruction than others, who focus more on internal evidence of the letters, to the exclusion of the external evidence of early MSS and canons.¹⁵¹ Yet even this integration and interpretation of the external evidence is not as persuasive as that put forward by Kurt Aland and championed by Eugene Lovering.¹⁵² Aland, after analyzing the textual character of the individual letters in Greek MSS of Paul's letters and the various orders represented in these MSS and early canons, tests the suggestions of Leitzmann, Schmithals, Frede, and Dahl; he concludes that the evidence militates against an early first century "Ur-Corpus."¹⁵³ The evidence suggests rather that Paul's letters were transmitted and collected, edited, and issued in numerous "Klein-

¹⁵¹ A comprehensive review and critique of the theories posited for the early collection of Paul's letters can be found in Eugene Harrison Lovering, "The Collection, Redaction, and Early Circulation of the Corpus Paulinum" (Ph.D. Dissertation, Southern Methodist University, 1988). Ultimately, Lovering concludes that a combination of Zuntz's river motif into which numerous textual streams of Pauline traditions flowed and Aland's argument for the gradual accumulation of smaller corpora into larger collections offer the most historically probable explanation, in contrast to other reconstructions ("Collection," ch. 8). See also Aland, "Die Entstehung," and Günther Zuntz, *The Text of the Epistles: A Disquisition upon the Corpus Paulinum* (London: Oxford University Press, 1953), ch. 11, esp. 280-83. Harry Gamble, convinced by Frede's and Dahl's outline contends that "collections of Paul's letters need to be distinguished from editions of Paul's letters. The former may well have arisen gradually and in various forms in different churches or regions, presumably mainly within the Pauline mission field. Yet it is hard to imagine that the attested early editions of the Pauline corpus arose through happenstance or merely by agglomeration. Their clear methodological features betray deliberate activity informed by particular motives, conceptions, and aims" ("The New Testament Canon," 286). Gamble's attempt to bridge the gap between early haphazard collections (ala Aland's "Klein" corpora) and preconceived editions (such as those envisioned by Frede and Dahl) does not to my mind do justice to the permeable, often imperceptible, differentiation between edition and correction as we demonstrated in chapter 2. Given the problematization of edition and correction outlined in chapter 2, maintaining a distinction between collections and editions in the highly unstable arena of ancient publication is problematic. Furthermore, without a doubt even earlier smaller collections were collected and edited for specific purposes and according to specific needs, whatever these may have been; for those doing the collecting and subsequent copying these collections were in some respects editions.

¹⁵² Aland, "Die Entstehung;" Lovering, "Collection" 327-48.

¹⁵³ Aland, "Die Entstehung," 334.

Corpora” in many different places.¹⁵⁴ Aland also rebuts the specific contention that Marcion’s edition was based on an early collection arranged chronologically;¹⁵⁵ in particular, Aland points out that the consistently erratic character of the orders adduced poses serious problems for Frede’s identification of this purported chronological ordering pattern.¹⁵⁶ Despite Dahl’s and Frede’s consistent assertion that the ordering pattern

¹⁵⁴ Aland, "Die Entstehung," 335-6, 347-50.

¹⁵⁵ “Daß Gal nicht aus “chronologischen” Gesichtspunkten an der Spitze des Corpus steht, sondern deshalb, weil der Brief die Grundlage für Marcions Theologie wie seine Sicht der Frühgeschichte der Kirche abgibt, scheint mir außerhalb jeden Zweifels” (“Die Entstehung,” 329). Additionally, “Die Chronologie war es jedenfalls nicht (Einleitungswissenschaft im modernen Sinne kannte die 1. Hälfte des 2. Jahrhunderts noch nicht), es sei denn, daß Marcion die “Gefangenschaftsbriefe” als geschlossen Block ans Ende stellte, weil ihm – wie in der Frühzeit überhaupt – eine längere Gefangenschaft des Paulus lediglich aus dessen Lebensausgang bekannt war (“Die Entstehung,” 329-330).

¹⁵⁶ Aland, "Die Entstehung," 333. Frede maintains that the chronological diataxis depends on the “Western” order (Cor, Rm, Eph, Th, Gal, Phil, Col, Tm, Tt, Phlm) (*Epistulae ad Philippenses et ad Colossenses*, [Freiburg: Herder, 1966], 292). Despite the fact that there would be precedents in antiquity for a chronological diataxis (as we discussed in chapter 2), Frede’s reasons for positing a chronological pattern are never clearly articulated. Frede identifies the following four orders as dependent on a chronological schema (292).

C 1)	Gal	Cor	Rm	Th	Eph	Col	Phil	Phlm	—	—	—
C 2)	Gal	Cor	Rm	Hbr	Col	Eph	Phil	Th	Tm	Tt	Phlm
C 3)	Gal	Cor	Rm	Hbr	Eph	Phil	Col	Th	Tm	Tt	—
C 4)	Cor	Eph	Phil	Col	Gal	Th	Rm	Phlm	Tt	Tm	—

Opening with Galatians followed by Corinthians and Romans is common to three of his four ordering patterns which he claims employ, or are based on, the purported chronological pattern. But besides this commonality considerable variation exists in the details with respect to the order of the following letters. Furthermore, the pattern of C 2) found in the Syriac Sinaiticus ms cod. Syr. 10 includes 3 Corinthians. This apocryphal letter was also apparently in Ephrem’s Pauline corpus, since he discussed it in his commentary on Paul’s letters—for more on 3 Corinthians’ place in the Syrian NT canon see Metzger, *Canon*, 219-33. Although the chronological ordering pattern is often invoked and in modern scholarship can be traced back at least to Zahn (*Geschichte des neutestamentlichen kanons I*, 623), the reasons for positing the chronological order are not fully explained. As we will see in our discussion of the Vulgate revision, its prologue, the *Primum quaeritur*, explicitly refers to and rejects a chronological ordering pattern, though the exact order that this prologue referenced is unfortunately not articulated, so there is no way to know what this order was except (as the prologist indicates) that it did not begin with Romans. For arguments for the chronological ordering principle and other ordering patterns of Paul’s letters more generally see W. Hadorn, "Die Abfassung der Thessalonicherbriefe auf der dritten Missionsreise und der Kanon des Marcions," *ZNW* 19 (1919-1920): 67-72; W. Hartke, *Die Sammlung und die ältesten Ausgaben der Paulusbriefe* (Bonn: Carl Georgi, 1917); Frede, *Epistulae ad Philippenses et ad Colossenses*, 290-303; and Harry Y. Gamble, *The Textual History of the Letter to the Romans: A Study in Textual and Literary Criticism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977), 100-14. Modern research on Pauline chronology underscores the difficulty of isolating the chronological order of Paul’s letters and the vast differences in opinions, whether reconstructed with or without recourse to Acts; for example, Rainer Riesner’s summary of recent attempts to reconstruct the chronological order of the Pauline letters offers four very different sequences: 2 Thess, 1 Thess, 1 Cor, 2 Cor 10-13, Phil, 2 Cor 1-9, Gal, Rom, Col/Phlm (Buck and Taylor); 1 Thess, 2 Thess, Col/Phlm?, Phil?, 1 Cor, 2 Cor, Rom, Gal (Knox); 1 Thess, 1 Cor, 2 Cor 1-9, 2 Cor 10-13, Gal, Rom (Lüdemann); 1 Thess, 2 Thess, Phil, Col/Phlm, Gal, 1 Cor, 2 Cor, Rom (Hyldahl) (*Paul’s Early Period*:

represented by the *argumenta* evidence an earlier edition arranged chronologically, I maintain that this order is more compellingly explained by Marcion's rearrangement for theological reasons as Tertullian intimated.¹⁵⁷

The conclusion that these *argumenta* were prefaced to an edition ordered by Marcion in accordance with his theological proclivities by opening with Galatians is supported by the content. Although our interpretations differ, Dahl also thinks the content of the *argumenta* holds the key to unlocking their origins; and integral to this content are the false apostles. In Dahl's opinion, however, the false apostles do not call to mind Marcion's castigation of a reversion to Jewish practices, they could simply be any

Chronology, Mission Strategy, Theology [Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans, 1998], 26). For more discussions of recent attempts at reconstructing Pauline chronology, see also Robert Jewett, *A Chronology of Paul's Life* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), esp. 75-87; and Gerd Lüdemann, *Paul, Apostle to the Gentiles: Studies in Chronology* (trans. F. Stanley Jones; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984). To be sure, those in antiquity neither had access to modern resources and methods for historical reconstruction, nor were they aware of partition theories; but even a cursory reading of Paul's letters would reveal the difficulty in discerning a definite chronological schema, especially without recourse to Acts. If we bracket Romans 15-16, which was lacking in Marcion's edition and probably his exemplar, discerning a precise chronology and the place of Galatians is even more difficult. Even though Romans 15 lends support to his conclusion, Lüdemann makes a strong case that Galatians was written after 1 Corinthians, not before. To return to the *argumenta*, Dahl apparently understands the references "iam ligatus" and "a Roma de carcere," in the *argumentum* to Colossians and Philippians respectively, as indications that they were the last ones written (246). Surely, the letter to the Philippians, if written from Rome, must have been supposed to be the last, or very nearly so; but it does not necessarily follow that the "iam" indicates that the letter to the Colossians from Ephesus preceded it chronologically or that no letters were written between them, since Paul's own acknowledgement of his frequent run-ins with the law and incarcerations (cf. e.g. 2 Cor 11:21-12:13) forces us to question such a simple reconstruction, even in antiquity. Furthermore, if Marcion's edition which began with Galatians was based on a seven letter edition to seven churches for its catholicity and arranged according to decreasing length (1-2 Cor, Rm, Eph, 1-2 Th, Gal, Phil, Col, Phlm) as Gamble has somewhat persuasively argued (*Books and Readers*, 59-61; "The New Testament Canon," 283-85), then why does the mere opening with Galatians and minor rearrangement of other letters evidence a chronological schema? Would we not expect a wholesale reordering? Were the letters more or less already arranged chronologically in an order which just happened to be close to decreasing length as well? Were 2 Cor and 2 Thess written immediately after the first letter to these communities? The assumption of a chronological schema to Marcion's order compels a positive answer to all these questions. I, however, maintain that a far more likely explanation is that already suggested in antiquity by Tertullian, namely Marcion placed Galatians at the front for theological reasons. Both in primary and secondary sources there is far too much variation amongst the various orders identified as chronological to maintain that Marcion's diataxis was also organized on this principle. Furthermore, as we have shown in our investigations into ancient ordering patterns, it was quite common to begin a corpus with what the editor thought was the author's most important work; so Marcion's doing so should not be surprising.

¹⁵⁷ *Marc.* 5.1.9-5.2.1 (CCSL 1 665,5-15); Epiphanius (*Pan.* 42.12.3) even differentiates between an Apostolic and Marcionite order. See discussion below.

purveyors of heresy. But before isolating the character of these false apostles, Dahl maintains that only the *argumenta* to 1 Corinthians and Romans can be adduced as evidence, since 1) references to the false apostles turning communities back to Judaism could be culled from Galatians itself and 2) the other *argumenta* discuss the false apostles too generally. Dahl's dismissal of these *argumenta* exposes a fundamental flaw in his evaluation of the evidence for a Marcionite origin. The very fact that these *argumenta* to Thessalonians, Laodiceans, Colossians, and Philippians speak about the false apostles in a general manner demonstrate the importance of this central theme for the author of the *argumenta* and should not be overlooked. Indeed, the *argumenta* show that every letter is read through the lens of the false apostles, whose attempts at seduction these communities either succumb to or resist. The refusal to admit the *argumentum* to Galatians also privileges the evidence against a Marcionite origin, since we have already seen that Marcion identified this epistle as underscoring one of his primary theological tenets.

Nevertheless, Dahl thinks that these *argumenta* should be bracketed and that opposition to false apostles in the *argumenta* to Corinthians and Romans should be located in orthodox rejections of heresy instead of Marcion's rejection of reversion to Judaism. Dahl disputed any reference to Marcion's contrast between Paul and the false apostles in the *argumentum* to Corinthians, since in this *argumentum* the author separated the "falsis apostolis" into "quidam a philosophiae uerbosa eloquentia, alii a secta legis Iudaicae inducti."¹⁵⁸ Yet even from our scant information, Marcion did not assert that all apostles were false or that they consisted in a united front, merely that Paul especially

¹⁵⁸ It is noteworthy that Harnack identified the rejection of philosophy and worldly wisdom as another key feature in Marcion's belief system (*Marcion*, 160).

opposed those false apostles, who reverting to Judaism perverted the faith, and called back to the true gospel communities led astray by them. Thus the statement in the Corinthian prologue does not necessarily speak against a Marcionite origin.

Even though de Bruyne's interpretation that the *argumentum* to Romans offers strong evidence for Paul's rejection of the law and the prophets and a Marcionite origin, Dahl still adamantly maintains that "the force of this argument can be weakened if not completely invalidated."¹⁵⁹ Dahl goes on to claim the phrase "praeuenti sunt" could have been used to describe "false apostles who came upon them, hindering or overtaking them" rather than "reached beforehand."¹⁶⁰ The force of this argument is unclear; whichever translation is proffered the result is virtually the same, that Paul calls back to the true faith a community led astray by false apostles. Furthermore, Dahl contends that since the text of Romans lacked of any specific reference to false teachers (except for Rom 16:17, which of course was not found in Marcion's text) we must seek a non-Marcionite origin. Yet this conclusion remains thoroughly unconvincing; in fact, the lack of any reference to false teachers in Romans coupled with their presence in its *argumentum* testifies to the importance of the false apostles for the author's interpretation and even more indicates a Marcionite origin. In these *argumenta* the false apostles offer a fundamental lens and overtly structure the hermeneutic through which these epistles are read, even in letters without explicit connection to this issue.

¹⁵⁹ Dahl, "Earliest Prologues," 259.

¹⁶⁰ Dahl, "Earliest Prologues," 259.

Despite Dahl's assertion that this points to "a staunch anti-Judaizer, but no Marcionite,"¹⁶¹ the most logical and convincing source for this overwhelming concern to cast Paul's letters against the backdrop of the false apostles remains Marcion or his disciples. He structured his text-critical activities and theology around: 1) the issue of false apostles; 2) Paul's incorruptible status; 3) and the distinction between the law and gospel. To be sure, one can interpret this *argumentum* to Romans—and the rest of the *argumenta*—in a non-Marcionite way, as Dahl suggests. Moreover, no one would claim that anti-Judaism was the sole prerogative of Marcion or his disciples.¹⁶² Nevertheless, to disregard the most obvious and well-known candidate (i.e. Marcion) for an unknown and hypothetical one (i.e. some anti-Judaizer) runs counter to the evidence, and does not offer a better historical reconstruction of this evidence.

Although Dahl's argument offers a model of careful and thorough scholarship, his conclusions remain unconvincing. A fundamental flaw in his argument lies in the argumentative strategy employed in order to prove that these *argumenta* could possibly be connected to other sources and therefore could not have been produced by Marcion. Dahl, like de Bruyne's and Corssen's previous detractors, disassembles the components of this argument and attempts to cast doubt on every discrete piece of evidence that compels a Marcionite origin so that in the end he can claim that they do not point to a Marcionite origin. The arguments for a Marcionite origin, however, are not piecemeal or

¹⁶¹ Dahl, "Earliest Prologues," 260.

¹⁶² See for example the vast array of anti-Jewish writers from the inception of Christianity to the fourth century from Paul to Justin, Melito, and Chrysostom. For more on early Christian anti-Judaism see the following studies: Stephen G. Wilson, ed., *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity: v. 2 Separation and Polemic* (Waterloo, Ont., Canada: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1986); Judith Lieu, *Image and Reality: The Jews in the World of the Christians in the Second Century* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996); Marcel Simon, *Verus Israel: A Study of the Relations between Christians and Jews in the Roman Empire, 135-425* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986); and Robert Louis Wilken, *John Chrysostom and the Jews: Rhetoric and Reality in the Late Fourth Century* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983).

disparate; they cumulatively and cohesively point to Marcion or his followers as the most likely candidates for production of these prefatory materials. The only edition of the *Corpus Paulinum* that transmits this order with Galatians at the front, contains a letter to Laodiceans, lacks the Pastoral epistles, lacks Hebrews, and stresses the distinction between Paul and the false apostles, the gospel truth and Jewish error, is Marcion's. The spectral and far too hypothetical alternatives proffered do not warrant the dismissal of the concrete evidence pointing to a Marcionite origin.

One possible factor in Dahl's summary dismissal is his attempt to maintain a clear demarcation between Marcionite Christianity and "orthodoxy." Despite the fact that Dahl concedes "[t]he border lines between orthodoxy and heresy are fluid, especially in the fields of Bible editions and biblical studies,"¹⁶³ he still maintains that "traces in other, mainly Syriac and Latin, sources make it likely that in the second century these features were not Marcionite peculiarities."¹⁶⁴ Apparently the underlying assumption is that a Marcionite NT could not have influenced "orthodox" transmissions of the text or prefatory materials. Yet when we weigh the evidence at our disposal, Marcion or his disciples remain the most viable option. Tertullian, Epiphanius, and later variants in the secondary prologue to Ephesians relate that Marcion's version of this letter was entitled

¹⁶³ Dahl, "Earliest Prologues," 262.

¹⁶⁴ Dahl, "Earliest Prologues," 233. Although Dahl tries to prove that these *argumenta* could not have been produced by Marcion, since they could not have been included in Catholic MSS in the second century when Marcion was a major threat nor in the fourth century when Marcion is no longer a concern (this would be too late to explain vast distribution in the traditions), his conviction that Marcion and Christian (or at least Catholic) are mutually exclusive categories undergirds his contention that "it is much more difficult to explain the history of transmission on the assumption that the Prologues are Marcionite than on the assumption that they are not" ("Earliest Prologues," 256).

Laodiceans;¹⁶⁵ the Muratorian Canon also reports that Marcion used a letter of this title.¹⁶⁶ Although traces of Marcion's diataxis exist in Syriac sources, this does not prove that Marcion could not have created and transmitted this order into Syriac sources. Despite attempts to downplay Marcion's role in the transmission of Syriac textual transmission of Paul, Marcion's longstanding presence in the Syriac church does not allow for a quick dismissal of a Marcionite origin.¹⁶⁷

Furthermore, Tertullian's and Epiphanius's testimony that Marcion began his *Corpus Paulinum* with Galatians suggests that Marcion did not merely inherit this order.¹⁶⁸ Rather Galatians was deliberately placed in the first position so as to establish from the beginning of Paul's letters the key themes that Marcion saw throughout Paul's writings and ministry. Recall Tertullian's acknowledgement that Galatians represented Paul's "principal letter against Judaism" adduced earlier; Tertullian was likely responding to Marcion's claim that Galatians provided the cornerstone for his rejection of Judaism and the Hebrew Bible. Epiphanius's blatant distinction between Marcion's order and the "Apostolic" corpus also underscores not only his attempt to indict Marcion's edition as a result of its spurious character but also his recognition of the underlying theological

¹⁶⁵ Ecclesiae quidem ueritate epistolam istam ad Ephesios habemus emissam, non ad Laodiceos; sed Marcion et titulum aliquando interpolare gestit (Tertullian, *Marc.*, 5.17.1 [CCSL 1 712,9-11]);, ἔχει δὲ καὶ τῆς πρὸς Λαοδικέας λεγομένης μέρη (Epiphanius, *Pan.*, 42.9.4 [GCS 31 105.13-14]); cf. *Pan.* 42.11.9-42.11.12 (GCS 31 123.18-124.7); amen sciendum sane quia haec epistola quam nos ad Ephesios scriptam habemus heretici et maxime Marcion istae ad Laodiceos adtitulant (*Argumentum ad Ephesios*).

¹⁶⁶ *Muratorian Canon*, 63-66.

¹⁶⁷ See below for discussion of Marcion's widespread church network throughout the Mediterranean and its longstanding presence in the east. For brief discussion and further bibliography on Marcion's influence on the transmission of the NT, see footnote 219.

¹⁶⁸ Cf. e.g. *Marc.* 5.1.9-5.2.1 (CCSL 1 665,5-15).

reasons for Marcion's arrangement.¹⁶⁹ If Marcion's contents and order were simply a convenient pattern inherited and transmitted by him, there would be little reason for Tertullian's and Epiphanius's vehement indictment of Marcion for his rejection of some of Paul's letters and ordering them as he did.¹⁷⁰

Furthermore, Marcion was not alone in conceptualizing the importance of the order of tracts in a corpus, especially the importance of the first book read; we have already seen how editors of Greco-Roman corpora paid close attention to the issue of order and endeavored to employ *diataxis* schemas in accordance with their hermeneutical principles. Other early Christians besides Marcion remarked on the importance of ordering patterns: Origen claims that Ephesians occupies the middle position in Paul's corpus as the heart lies in the middle of the body, a place which reflects the significance of the letter's contents;¹⁷¹ Gregory of Nyssa states that Genesis, a cosmogonic writing,

¹⁶⁹ Epiphanius explicitly distinguishes between "Catholic" and Marcionite orders and throughout his discussion of the Pauline epistles draws attention to each letter's place in their respective canonical orders. See e.g. ἡμεῖς δὲ τὴν ἀναλογίην τότε ἐποιήσαμεθα οὐχ ὡς παρ' αὐτῷ <κεῖται> ἀλλὰ ὡς ἔχει τὸ ἀποστολικόν, τὴν πρὸς Ῥωμαίους τάξαντες πρώτην. (*Pan.*, 42.12.3 [*GCS* 31 155.26-27]); and τῆς πρὸς Κορινθίους β· αὕτη δὲ τρίτη κείται παρὰ τῷ Μαρκίῳ μετηλλαγμένως δὲ διὰ τὸ πρώτην παρ' αὐτῷ τετάχθαι τὴν πρὸς Γαλάτας (*Pan.*, 42.12.3 (*GCS* 31 173.8-10)).

¹⁷⁰ *Miror tamen, cum ad unum hominem litteras factas receperit, quod ad Timotheum duas et unam ad Titum de ecclesiastico statu compositas recusauerit. Adfectauit, opinor, etiam numerum epistolarum interpolare* (*Marc.* 5.21.1 [*CCSL* 1 725,19-22]); Αὕτη ἡ νενοθευμένη τοῦ Μαρκίῳ συντάξις, ἔχουσα μὲν χαρακτήρα καὶ τύπον τοῦ κατὰ Λουκᾶν εὐαγγελίου, καὶ Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου οὐχ ὅλον, οὐ πασῶν τῶν αὐτοῦ ἐπιστολῶν, ἀλλὰ μόνον τῆς πρὸς Ῥωμαίους καὶ τῆς πρὸς Ἐφεσίους καὶ <τῆς> πρὸς Κολασσαεῖς καὶ τῆς πρὸς Λαοδικεῖς καὶ [ἀπὸ] τῆς πρὸς Γαλάτας καὶ τῆς πρὸς Κορινθίους πρώτης καὶ δευτέρας καὶ τῆς πρὸς Θεσσαλονικεῖς πρώτης καὶ δευτέρας καὶ τῆς πρὸς Φιλήμονα καὶ <τῆς> πρὸς Φιλιππησίους· καὶ τῆς πρὸς Τιμόθεον πρώτης καὶ δευτέρας καὶ <τῆς> πρὸς Τίτον καὶ τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους * τῶν ἐμφορομένων παρ' αὐτῷ, ὡς οὐ πληρεστάτων οὐσῶν, ἀλλὰ ὡς ἐν παραχαράξει. πανταχόθεν δὲ τὴν αὐτὴν σύνταξιν * ἔρραδιουργημένην καὶ ἔν τισι λέξεσιν ἐπιποιήτως προσθήκην ἔχουσαν, οὐκ εἰς ὠφέλειαν, ἀλλὰ εἰς ἤσσονας καὶ ἐπιβλαβεῖς ξενολεξίας κατὰ τῆς ὑγιοῦς πίστεως ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐμβεβροντημένου νοῦ βοσκήματος (*Pan.* 42.11.9-42.11.12 [*GCS* 31 123.18-124.7]).

¹⁷¹ *Et quia iam ad Galatas, orantibus vobis, ante paucos dies quid nobis videretur, expressimus: nunc ad Ephesios transeundum est, mediam Apostoli epistolam, ut ordine ita et sensibus. Mediam autem dico, non quo primas sequens, extremis maior sit; sed quomodo cor animalis in medio est: ut ex hoc intelligatis quantis difficultatibus, et quam profundis quaestionibus involuta sit* (Jerome, *Comm. Eph.* 539-40 [*PL* 26 441A]). In his recent edition, Ronald Heine lays out his reasons for thinking that Jerome is expressly

acts as an introduction (εἰσαγωγή) for those embarking on the knowledge of God.¹⁷²

Clearly the order and especially the opening tract of a corpus was neither an unimportant pedantic concern, nor was it peculiar to Marcion; it was addressed by numerous ancient authors and directly related to the proper way to read and understand an author.

Thus placing the letter of Galatians at the front of his *Corpus Paulinum* would reinforce the hermeneutical principles guiding Marcion's editorial practices, which encompassed issues of order and authenticity, from the macro-level of which books to include or reject to the micro-level concerning the wording of the text of Paul's letters. These hermeneutical principles also undergirded the *argumenta*, which prefaced and served to introduce Paul's corpus, just as the *Antitheses*. These introductory tracts transmitted the fundamental theological issues of Marcion's Christianity: the separation of the law and the gospel and the removal of extraneous spurious material interpolated by "false apostles" corrupting Paul's letters. The full explication of these issues in the *Antitheses* designed to be read before Marcion's NT were then briefly taken up and focalized in the *argumenta* prefaced to Paul's letters. In this position they were perfectly placed to transmit Marcion's interpretation and guide the reader into the following texts in accordance with this interpretation, a feature which Dahl also perceived: "the Prologues exemplify the degree to which an editor may influence the way in which a literary text is read, especially if the editor has written the preface."¹⁷³ Even more important, these introductory texts also to some extent serve to authorize the editorial

drawing from Origen here (*The Commentaries of Origen and Jerome on St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002] 32-35).

¹⁷² ἡ δὲ γραφή τῆς κοσμογενείας εἰσαγωγή πως εἰς θεογνωσίαν τοῖς ἀρχομένοις ἐστὶ, διὰ τῶν ἐτοιμοτέρων εἰς κατανόησιν τὴν ἰσχὺν τῆς θείας παριστώσα φύσεως, προχειρότερον δὲ εἰς γνῶσιν τῶν νοουμένων ἢ διὰ τῆς αἰσθήσεως κατάληψις γίνεται (*Contra Eunomium*, 2.228 [Jaeger ed. 292,10-14]).

¹⁷³ Dahl, "Earliest Prologues," 265.

practices on the text since they articulate the *hypothesis* and issues of authenticity according to which the text is corrected. The editorial hermeneutics of Marcion's ancillary materials were intimately connected with the justification of his text-critical practices, the final subject of this chapter.

III. Marcion and the Text of the *Corpus Paulinum*

References to Marcion's text-critical activities in early Christian literature are manifold; they are not, however, unbiased. Our knowledge of Marcion's text of Paul's letters and his editorial practices thereon derive from heresiological polemic and accusations of corruption of the text in accordance with Marcion's alleged willful misinterpretation of Paul and the Christian faith. Heresiologists, foremost among them Tertullian and Epiphanius, indict Marcion for tampering with the texts of Paul's letters and Luke's gospel. Even though Tertullian acknowledges that Marcion claims to have restored the scriptures and that his alone were true, he nevertheless levels accusations of corruption against Marcion and consistently frames Marcion's textual criticism as corrupting the authentic, apostolic tradition. Tertullian and other early Christian writers vilified Marcion for the following activities: erasing;¹⁷⁴ hacking or cutting;¹⁷⁵ corrupting;¹⁷⁶ removing or deleting single prepositions or entire pages;¹⁷⁷

¹⁷⁴ Spongia (*Marc.* 5.4.2 [*CCSL* 1 671-672]); litura (*Marc.* 5.16.2 [*CCSL* 1 710-711]).

¹⁷⁵ Intercisae scripturae (*Marc.* 5.14.6 [*CCSL* 1 706]); Πάλιν παρέκοψε (Epiphanius, *Pan.* 42.11.6 schol. 58 [*GCS* 31 115,14]).

¹⁷⁶ Vitiatio (*Marc.* 4.4.1; 5.3.3 [*CCSL* 1 549; 668]).

¹⁷⁷ Sed flammam et ignem delendo haereticus extinxit (*Marc.* 5.16.1 [*CCSL* 1 710]); Haec Marcion delet, dum sensui salua sint (*Marc.* 4.21.1 [*CCSL* 1 597]); Abstulit haereticus (*Marc.* 5.17.14, 16 [*CCSL* 1 716,1; 22]); De mania haeretici praecidendi (*v.l.* de manibus haeretici praecidentis) non miror, <miror> si syllabas

interpolating;¹⁷⁸ misinterpreting through improper punctuation or accentuation of words;¹⁷⁹ rejecting entire letters of Paul's corpus;¹⁸⁰ and blatantly altering the text to suit his own theological proclivities.¹⁸¹

To be sure, these accusations should be attributed to heresiological slander leveled at Marcion in order to denounce his disregard for Christian traditions and condemn him as a heretic.¹⁸² Indeed, as the quotations opening this chapter illustrate, laying claim to the possession of authentic, unadulterated Christian scriptures reinforced declarations of authentic Christianity. In Tertullian's mind, Marcion's purported misappropriation of scripture blatantly disqualifies him from claims to either. Scholars have evaluated these accusations leveled against Marcion quite diversely. Harnack's agreement with this portrait of Marcion's text-critical activities represents the more accepting position.¹⁸³ More recent scholarship by Schmid, Clabeaux, and Williams has demonstrated that Marcion's textual activity primarily involved transmission and omission, rather than

subtrahit, cum paginas totas plerumque subducit (*Marc.* 5.18.1 [*CCSL* 1 717,5-6]); Rapuit haeticus In praepositionem (*Marc.* 5.18.1 [*CCSL* 1 717,9]). Cf. also *Marc.* 4.3.4; 4.43.7 (*CCSL* 1 549; 662).

¹⁷⁸ Interpolare (*Marc.* 4.3.4; 4.4.4; 5.17.1; 5.21.1 [*CCSL* 1 549; 550; 712; 725]).

¹⁷⁹ de sono pronuntiationis aut de modo distinctionem, cum duplicitas earum intercedit (*Marc.* 5.11.9 [*CCSL* 1 697,27-28]); positum in ambiguitate distinctionis (*Marc.* 5.11.10 [*CCSL* 1 698,15]).

¹⁸⁰ Miror tamen, cum ad unum hominem litteras factas receperit, quod ad Timotheum duas et unam ad Titum de ecclesiastico statu compositas recusauerit. Adfectauit, opinor, etiam numerum epistolarum interpolare (*Marc.* 5.21.1 [*CCSL* 1 725,19-22]).

¹⁸¹ Sciendum quoque in Marcionis Apostolo non esse scriptum, *et per Deum Patrem*, volentis exponere Christum non a Deo Patre, sed per semetipsum suscitatum (Jerome, *Comm. Gal.* 375 [*PL* 26 313A]).

¹⁸² On the slander of textual corruption as polemical trope against one's opponents, see August Bludau, *Die Schriftfälschungen der Häretiker: ein Beitrag zur textkritik der Bibel* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1925); and Bart D. Ehrman, "The Theodotians as Corruptors of Scripture," *StPatr* 25 (1993): 46-51.

¹⁸³ Harnack, *Marcion*, 61-71.

addition.¹⁸⁴ Although my study does not depart radically from these more skeptical evaluations of Marcion's freedom with the text, I want to recast Marcion's textual practices in light of ancient textual criticism outlined in chapter 2 and their relationship to larger issues of editorial hermeneutics, encompassing Marcion's paratextual apparatus as well. In the following study of select variants from Marcion's text of the *Corpus Paulinum*, I will investigate the interrelationship between Marcion's text-critical practices and his ancillary materials so as to demonstrate how issues of authenticity and interpretation found in the *Antitheses* and the *argumenta* affected the transmission of the text.¹⁸⁵

¹⁸⁴ David S. Williams, "Reconsidering Marcion's Gospel," *JBL* 108 (1989): 477-96; Clabeaux, *Lost Edition*, 121, 127-29; Schmid, *Marcion*, 154-5.

¹⁸⁵ The methodology utilized represents a fundamental problem when attempting ascertain and evaluate Marcion's texts. While Clabeaux's and Schmid's works on Marcion's text of the *Corpus Paulinum* represent critical methodological developments, certain aspects of these studies remain problematic. Two fundamental problems are: 1) ascertaining the text Marcion transmitted, and 2) trying to gauge the extent of Marcion's impact on the larger tradition of transmission of Paul's letters. With respect to the former, scholars have no other recourse than to citations of Marcion's text by his opponents. On this question I judge Schmid's methodology to be most rigorous and sound. He maintains that among the witnesses to the Marcionite *Corpus Paulinum*, Tertullian and Epiphanius are the most trustworthy, since they appear to have used copies of this text. The testimony of Adamantius, Origen, and Jerome, however, should be corroborated by Tertullian and Epiphanius, or at least multiply attested (see *Marcion*, 33-34, 37-39, 196, 207-209, 236, 243-248). With respect to the second problem (Marcion's possible influence on other streams of textual transmission), I have more fundamental problems with recent analyses of Marcion's text. Clabeaux sees no connection between Marcion's text and the larger textual tradition. Any agreements are instead evidence of a common *Vorlage* for Marcion and these other texts (*Lost Edition*, 2-6). Despite the agreements Marcion's text shares with other NT MSS, Schmid also judges Marcion's impact on other NT textual streams to be slight (*Marcion*, 253-4). While Schmid's critique of labeling texts "Marcionite" and "catholic" is laudable (*Marcion*, 14-15), he still tends to see agreements between Marcion's text and other NT MSS as evidence of the influence of a common *Vorlage* rather than Marcion's text (see e.g. *Marcion*, 160-81). In principle, I agree with Schmid's attempt to identify the text Marcion used by isolating those readings found in common with other traditions of transmission of the *Corpus Paulinum*. In practice, however, I hesitate to dismiss such agreements in readings, since such readings are the only evidence for the possible influence of Marcion's text on other textual traditions and to assume *a priori* that such agreements represent the text Marcion used, rather than the text Marcion transmitted into other textual streams is to prejudice Marcion's role in the transmission of the *Corpus Paulinum*. For this reason, I think this methodology needs some slight modification. Those readings attributed to Marcion alone ought not to be dismissed simply as a product of a common *Vorlage*, if found conflated with other textual streams (cf. e.g. Gal 5:14). These are to be distinguished from those texts with such broad distribution so as to be certain that Marcion did not create it (cf. e.g. Gal 2:5). Identifying the text Marcion altered is a much more difficult question. Ideally, the text should be singular (or sub-singular), multiply attested, and in alignment with Marcion's theological hermeneutic and understanding of Pauline authenticity. In the end, A. E. Housman's injunction that textual criticism "is not susceptible of hard-and-fast rules" ("The Application of

Galatians 1:1

The best place to begin our discussion of Marcion's textual criticism on the *Corpus Paulinum* is the first verse of Galatians, the first tract in his corpus. This reading is not transmitted by Epiphanius or Adamantius, rather our knowledge of this verse stems primarily from Jerome's testimony in his commentary on the Galatians, with possible corroboration by Tertullian.¹⁸⁶ Jerome reports that at the beginning of his *Apostolikon*, Marcion omitted the phrase καὶ θεοῦ πατρὸς so as to demonstrate that Christ was not raised by the Father, but rather by himself. According to Jerome, Marcion's copy of Galatians began "Paul, apostle not from men, nor through a man but through Jesus Christ who raised him(self) from the dead." For the sake of completeness I must also note that the first part of this reading up to "through Jesus Christ" is also attested by Tertullian and the apocryphal Epistle to the Laodiceans—although their witness tells us little about the rest of this verse under consideration here. These are the three readings transmitted for Gal 1:1:

Παῦλος ἀπόστολος οὐκ ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων οὐδὲ δι' ἀνθρώπου ἀλλὰ

1. διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν *tell.*
2. διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν *Marcion^{Jerome}*
3. διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ *Marcion^{Tertullian?}*, Epistle to the Laodiceans

Thought to Textual Criticism," *Proceedings of the Classical Association, August, 1921*, 18 [London, 1922]: 68) should be heeded and each reading judged on its own merits. At any rate, while methodological problems in identifying the text Marcion received, transmitted, or altered will continue to persist, we can investigate how Marcion's text was perceived as altered as it was read in conjunction with Marcion's paratexts (the *Antitheses* and *argumenta*).

¹⁸⁶ Sciendum quoque in Marcionis Apostolo non esse scriptum, *et per Deum Patrum*, volentis exponere Christum non a Deo Patre, sed per semetipsum suscitatum (*Comm. Gal.* 375 [PL 26 313A]); cf. *Marc.* 5.1.3 9-11; 5.1.6; 5.2.1 (CCSL 1 664,9-11; 664,10; 665-666).

In the second reading, Harnack saw evidence of Marcion's modalism, which equated Christ with the unknown God, but differentiated him from God the Father.¹⁸⁷ Harnack grounded his understanding of Marcion's modalistic theology in sayings attributed to the Marcionites: e.g. "Deus noster, etsi non ab initio, etsi non conditionem, sed per semetipsum reuelatus est in Christo Jesu"¹⁸⁸ and Συνεπάθησεν ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἀλλοτρίοις ὡς ἁμαρτωλοῖς οὔτε ὡς κακῶν ἐπεθύμησεν αὐτῶν, ἀλλὰ σπλαγχνισθεὶς ἠλέησεν.¹⁸⁹ Blackman agreed with Harnack that this reading in Gal 1:1 separated Christ from any contamination of the creator.¹⁹⁰ Jerome's testimony, if reliable, definitely conveys modalistic overtones and suggests that such an omission in Gal 1:1 would perhaps be in keeping with Marcion's purported theology.

Tjitze Baarda has carefully and judiciously evaluated Harnack's arguments concluding that "the result of this examination of Marcion's text of Gal 1:1 is a *non liquet*."¹⁹¹ Baarda's investigation first notes the problem of testimony adduced by Harnack for Marcion's reading: Jerome, Tertullian, and the apocryphal letter to the Laodiceans. Baarda discusses Hilgenfeld's earlier suggestion that prefatory materials (i.e. the *Antitheses*) could have convinced Jerome that Marcion deliberately omitted this phrase from his text.¹⁹² Jerome's knowledge of this reading as well as the interpretation

¹⁸⁷ Harnack, *Marcion*, 121-23, 67*-68*.

¹⁸⁸ *Marc.* 1.19.1 (*CCSL* 1 459,1-3).

¹⁸⁹ Harnack reconstructs this statement from the question-and-answer dialogue format (Adamantius, *De recta in Deum fide*, 1.3 [GCS 4 6,6-31]).

¹⁹⁰ Blackman, *Marcion*, 44.

¹⁹¹ Tjitze Baarda, "Marcion's Text of Gal 1:1: Concerning the Reconstruction of the First Verse of the Marcionite Corpus Paulinum," *VC* 42, no. 3 (1988): 236-56, esp. 251.

¹⁹² Baarda, "Marcion's Text of Gal 1:1," 240-242. Hilgenfeld thinks that Jerome utilized a Marcionite source, probably the *Apostolikon*, for his comments on Marcion's text. He is not sure, however, if this represented Marcion's or a later edition ("Das Apostolikon Marcion's," 438).

offered, Baarda convincingly argues, is not independent, but most likely can be traced back to a commentary on Galatians by Origen.¹⁹³ While we can trace the attestation to Origen, we are unable, according to Baarda, to ascertain whether Origen saw this text in Marcion's text or in the *Antitheses*.¹⁹⁴

Tertullian's testimony is slightly more straightforward, but also problematic.¹⁹⁵ Rather than discussing this passage at the beginning of his treatment of Marcion's *Apostolikon* at *Marc.* 5.2.1, Tertullian cites this reading at *Marc.* 5.1.3 9-11 ("ipse se" inquit, "apostolum est professus, et quidem non ab hominibus nec per hominem, sed per Iesum Christum") and picks it up again at *Marc.* 5.1.6 10 (non ab hominibus neque per hominem). The fact that Tertullian does not address this variant reading when he discusses the actual text of Galatians, Baarda argues, also suggests the possibility that Tertullian's discussion is not based on Marcion's text itself, but on a prefatory work that highlighted Paul's apostolic authority grounded in revelation apart from other human transmission.¹⁹⁶ Tertullian, however, claims that he did not discuss this passage of Marcion's text, because it is similar in all of Paul's letters.¹⁹⁷ Baarda questions the accuracy of this statement and observes that Tertullian's silence on this passage is striking, since, if it was in fact lacking in Marcion's text, it would be a noteworthy

¹⁹³ Baarda concludes that while the subsequent citations from John in the passage are much less polemical than what we would expect from Jerome, they are more in keeping with Origen's style of argumentation ("Marcion's Text of Gal 1:1," 241).

¹⁹⁴ Baarda, "Marcion's Text of Gal 1:1," 242.

¹⁹⁵ Harnack simply accepts Tertullian's testimony as proof that this reading was in fact transmitted by Marcion (*Marcion*, 67*-68*).

¹⁹⁶ Baarda, "Marcion's Text of Gal 1:1," 238.

¹⁹⁷ Praestructio superioris epistolae ita duxit, ut de titulo eius non retractauerim, certus et alibi retractarium posse, communem scilicet et eundem in epistulis omnibus (*Marc.* 5.5.1 [*CCSL* 1 675,10-12]).

omission on Marcion's part and one with possible theological overtones that Tertullian would be likely to mention.¹⁹⁸ Because Tertullian passes over this reading in silence, Baarda's caution is justified and we should exercise great care before assuming its presence in Marcion's text. If we could attribute this reading to Marcion, it would be in keeping with Marcion's rejection of the God of the Hebrew Bible. Nevertheless, even though this reading does have some connotations of modalism, it is clearly in a nascent undeveloped form; there is also the problem of accommodating Marcion's docetism with a form of monarchianism that could approach patripassianism.¹⁹⁹

Harnack's final proof for Marcion's deliberate excision of this phrase is the apocryphal epistle to the Laodiceans, which he argued was forged by someone of the

¹⁹⁸ Baarda, "Marcion's Text of Gal 1:1," 238-40.

¹⁹⁹ The categories of patripassianism and monarchianism are vexed and complicated both in the ancient sources and scholarly reconstructions. The following discussion is indebted to Rebecca Lyman's brief, yet cogent, overview of monarchianism in ancient and modern discourse ("Modalism," "Monarchianism," *EEC*, 763-4). Strictly speaking, monarchianism is the belief in a theology that stresses one "ἄρχη" or power (identified as the Father) in contrast to more complex theologies articulated to accommodate Jesus as the "Son" of the Father and the "Holy Spirit." While a strict monotheism provided the theological underpinning to monarchianism, combining this premise with a high Christology led some early Christians (e.g. Noetus ca. 200, Sabellius ca. 3rd century, and Praxeas ca. 200) to insist that, since there could be no division of the godhead, the Father himself must have suffered—hence giving rise to the "heresy" labeled Patripassianism or Sabellianism after one of its purported proponents. Harnack dubbed this belief Modalist Monarchianism. For those Christians adhering to a lower Christology the strict monotheism of monarchian thought easily accommodated forms of adoptionist thought such as that espoused by Theodotus the cobbler (ca. late 2nd century) that God "adopted" Jesus and filled him with divine power at his baptism, though he remained fully human. Since Jesus was empowered by God's power (*dynamis*), Harnack dubbed this position Dynamic Monarchianism. Although we should not blithely equate monarchianism with Patripassianism, one can definitely see how they could be related since both insist on the unitary integrity of the godhead. Docetic thought could be related to the former in its concern to maintain the prime articles of monotheism attributed to the godhead: unity, impassibility, etc. Docetism would not, of course, harmonize with patripassianism: claims that the father suffered would clash with the fundamental presuppositions undergirding docetism. Although we should be wary of assuming that the Marcion could not have adhered to a theology which to us seems to occupy two mutually exclusive positions, monarchianism and docetism are not necessarily mutually exclusive—though a monarchianism that tends toward patripassianism may well conflict with docetism—since both are predicated on maintaining God's divine attributes: impassibility, immovability, indivisible monadical integrity, etc. For a critical evaluation of the spread patripassianism, its use in heresiological libel, and the longstanding presuppositions leading to modalism, see M. Slusser, "The Scope of Patripassianism," in *StPatr* 17 (1982): 169-75.

Marcionite faith.²⁰⁰ Harnack posited that in forging this letter the author drew on the opening of Galatians for the prescript, since Laodiceans begins, “Paulus Apostolus non ab hominibus neque per hominem sed per Ihesum Christum, fratribus qui sunt Laodiciae.”²⁰¹ Although the similarity to Marcion’s purported opening of Galatians is unmistakable, Harnack’s argument is problematic. First, there is little beyond this opening which could prove that Marcion or a disciple forged this letter. In fact, both Tertullian and Epiphanius identify Marcion’s letter to the Laodiceans as the same as the letter to the Ephesians, except with a different title—so too the interpolation found in its *argumentum*.²⁰² Second, as Baarda notes, although this opening in Laodiceans omits reference to God the Father, the original text of Laodiceans also lacked any reference to raising himself, the foundation of claims for Marcion’s modalistic correction.²⁰³ Moreover, the author was under no compulsion to cite accurately or *in extenso* in the first place. In the end, the testimony of Laodiceans is too slim to prove the expunction of καὶ θεοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ from Marcion’s text.

²⁰⁰ Adolf von Harnack, "Der apokryphe brief," 235-45. Harnack contended that the apocryphal epistle to the Laodiceans was forged ca. 160-190 not by Marcion (since he did not use an apocryphal letter to the Laodiceans, but entitled Ephesians as Laodiceans) but by someone of the Marcionite school based on the following observations: 1) this forgery began with the same words as Galatians, which served as a foundation for Marcion’s theology and anti-catholicism; 2) the substitution of “christo” in v. 3 of Laodiceans for “deo meo,” found in Phil 1:3, reinforced Marcion’s modalism; 3) in vv. 4-5 this epistle to the Laodiceans highlights the distinction between the truth of the gospel in opposition to false teachers—a prominent aspect of Marcionite thought and integral to the Marcionite prologues; 4) the modification of Phil 2:12; 5) Marcion’s opposition to the OT and the importance of eternal life, the latter of which especially finds prominence in vv. 5 and 10. Harnack incorporated this article virtually verbatim into the second edition of his monograph on Marcion (*Marcion*, 134*-49*).

²⁰¹ Joseph Barber Lightfoot, *Saint Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon. A Revised Text with Introductions, Notes, and Dissertations* (London: Macmillan, 1879), 287.

²⁰² See the discussion above.

²⁰³ Baarda points out that the words “et deum patrem omnipotentem qui suscitavit eum a mortuis” are found in some MSS, but are clearly interpolations (“Marcion’s Text of Gal 1:1,” 243).

Baarda makes a strong argument that Paul's original address was reading 1 (διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ ἐγγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν) since it best explains the origin of both 2 and 3.²⁰⁴ With respect to Marcion's actual text, however, he remains skeptical that either reading 2 or 3 were found therein, and if either was, it could easily be explained through mechanical error.²⁰⁵ Schmid agrees with Baarda in departing from Harnack's assessment and rejecting the purported intentionality of this reading, concluding that, if the phrase was lacking in Marcion's text, the most probable reason for its omission is mechanical.²⁰⁶ This is an altogether possible and plausible explanation: the homoeoteleuton of ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ and ΤΟΥ (ΔΙΔ ΙΗΣΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΘΕΟΥ ΠΑΤΡΟΣ ΤΟΥ ΕΓΓΕΙΡΑΝΤΟΣ) could have occasioned parablepsis and resulted in the accidental omission of καὶ θεοῦ πατρὸς. It is peculiar though, that at the very beginning of this *Corpus Paulinum*—the very first sentence even—that such a mistake was made, if this reading was in fact transmitted in Marcion's text. It is even more peculiar that this error is found in no other MSS, if it did in fact predate Marcion's corpus.

Baarda levels another strong critique against Harnack's hypothesis: if Marcion omitted the reference to God the Father as raising Christ in order to prove the modalistic unity of God and Christ, it is difficult to explain why this was not changed in other passages, e.g. Rom 8:11, 1 Cor 6:14, and Eph 1:20.²⁰⁷ Although this appears compelling on the surface, we should caution against expectations of consistency in applying editorial principles. We have already seen in chapter 2 that, even in Alexandria, editorial

²⁰⁴ Baarda, "Marcion's Text of Gal 1:1," 251.

²⁰⁵ Baarda, "Marcion's Text of Gal 1:1," 251.

²⁰⁶ Schmid, *Marcion*, 240-41.

²⁰⁷ Baarda, "Marcion's Text of Gal 1:1," 244-252. It should be pointed out, however, that only Gal 1:1 refers to God as πατήρ.

practices were not applied consistently in work on the Homeric corpus.²⁰⁸ A lack of consistency in altering the text is also evident in early Christian MSS.²⁰⁹ Even Schmid has argued that, despite Marcion's documented proclivity for changing the text, he does not seem to have engaged in this endeavor in a thoroughgoing manner.²¹⁰ A lack of consistency does not prove that Marcion did not alter the text; rather it indicates that his alterations were much more localized and restricted than previously thought—as other recent arguments about the circumspect nature of Marcion's textual criticism have demonstrated.²¹¹ Furthermore, we could easily imagine that at the beginning of his collection of Paul's letters Marcion pursued his theological restorations with a diligence that may have waned subsequently.

In principle, I concur with Baarda's and Schmid's cogent and sound arguments: the evidence is too scant to maintain definitively that Marcion's text of Gal 1:1 contained either of the secondary readings. We can, however, examine how the evidence that we do have at our disposal can illuminate Marcion's editorial practices and their subsequent influence. What we know is that Tertullian and Jerome (possibly through Origen's commentary) testify to a shortened version of Gal 1:1. The testimony of Tertullian and

²⁰⁸ See above.

²⁰⁹ See Ehrman's conclusions regarding the lack of consistency in orthodox attempts to ameliorate the text (*Orthodox Corruption*, 277-8).

²¹⁰ Schmid, *Marcion*, 248-55.

²¹¹ Clabeaux concludes that "our understanding of the role of Marcion is in need of correction. The evidence indicates that he is to be seen more as a traditor of a poorly controlled text than as the heavy handed editor or fabricator of a totally new one" (*Lost Edition*, 129). Schmid also concludes that Marcion's editorial activity was quite circumscribed and far less anomalous in comparison to other early Christian reworkings of the text transmitted in the MS tradition (*Marcion*, 254-55). In passing we should also note that there is the possibility that the shorter reading may be the product of an error in transcription as well as a deliberate reading by Marcion through the correction of the text against an exemplar. Marcion could preserve a reading from another MS, but still reinforce a Marcionite tendency. Thus the mistake could have originated accidentally, but have been deliberately chosen by Marcion for inclusion in accordance with his theological proclivities. This possibility would also speak to the role of the *Antitheses* for setting the groundwork for his later text-critical activities.

Jerome also suggest that this shortened form of Gal 1:1, whether or not it was found in the actual text, was excerpted in some prefatory work, probably the *Antitheses*. This verse, as Baarda astutely points out, served to legitimate Paul as well as Marcion's conception of Paul as an apostle who stood outside the false apostolic trajectory.²¹² In addition, according to Origen—or at least Jerome—Marcion's purported excision of a phrase from this verse also justified a fundamental theological tenet about the unitary modalistic integrity of the godhead.

The confluence of evidence reveals the fundamental importance of Marcion's prefatory work, i.e. the *Antitheses*, for transmitting the editor's hermeneutic and justifying textual correction. If Marcion's text transmitted the shortened reading perhaps revised in light of a modalistic Christology, then Tertullian's and especially Jerome's testimony testify to the focalizing role of ancillary materials utilized so as to highlight key themes and passages in the subsequent texts; furthermore, this testimony also speaks to the role of prefatory materials in justifying later textual correction or emendation. Yet even if the longer reading was present in Marcion's text, the assumption—based on the testimony of the prefatory text—that the shorter text was present also shows that the *Antitheses* served to shape perceptions of the following text of Gal 1:1. For if the longer reading was found in Marcion's text, then highlighting a shortened portion of this reading in the *Antitheses* was so instrumental as to convince readers (whether Origen or Jerome) not only that this reading was in the text (even though it was not), but also that this verse was corrected by expunging three words in accordance with Marcion's predilection for a modalistic theology, which was probably articulated in the *Antitheses*. Thus, whichever reading Marcion transmitted in his text of Gal 1:1 this reading and its interpretation

²¹² Baarda, "Marcion's Text of Gal 1:1," 237-38.

dovetailed with and was reinforced by the *Antitheses*, which served to introduce this *Corpus Paulinum* and Marcion's gospel.

Galatians 2:5

The first few verses of chapter two of Galatians have been notoriously difficult for modern commentators, exegetes, and textual critics, as well as ancient interpreters unsettled by the fractious animosity between the apostles.²¹³ In particular, Paul's opposition to the false brothers in Gal 2:5 supplied a fundamental component to Marcion's theology: the castigation of the false apostles who tried to pervert the gospel and turn believers back to the God of the Hebrew Bible. Marcion's text of Gal 2:5 is especially relevant because this verse not only figured prominently in the development of Marcion's theology, but also, according to Tertullian, justified his editorial work on the text of the *Corpus Paulinum*. An examination of this verse further reveals how Marcion's paratexts were integral for transmitting his interpretation and editorial hermeneutic.

In this letter Paul locates the crux of the dispute in the Galatians' reversion to Jewish dietary and social practices, which threatened to undo their freedom and salvation in Christ (Gal 2:4-5). The identification of the so-called false brothers (ψευδαδέλφους) as the instigators in this affair apparently provided Marcion with further evidence for his

²¹³ See the thorough discussions in Joseph Barber Lightfoot, *The Epistle of Saint Paul to the Galatians* (Lynn, Mass.: Hendrickson [reprint], 1981), 102-20; Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979). The problem of discord among the apostles was unsurprisingly a major problem for early interpreters. From the earliest interpreters there were attempts to elide, downplay, or explain the dispute in contrast to those (such as Marcion) who identified it as indicative of a major rift among the early apostles. For a full discussion of the range of exegetes and interpretive tactics applied to the text in the ancient church, see Lightfoot, *The Epistle of Saint Paul to the Galatians*, 128-32. One solution advocated by Clement, which Lightfoot mentions, for explaining the discord between Paul and Peter was to differentiate Peter from Cephas (129-130). The distinction between Cephas and Peter has been debated even down to recent scholarship; see Bart D. Ehrman, "Cephas and Peter," *JBL* 109 (1990): 463-74; Dale C. Allison, Jr., "Peter and Cephas: One and the Same," *JBL* 111 (1992): 489-95.

contention that at least some early apostles were loathe to embrace this new gospel revelation, reverting instead to the law of the creator. This nexus of false apostleship and struggles for establishing genuine Christianity and the authentic text of Paul’s letters frame our investigation of the variants of this verse where Paul writes:

διὰ δὲ τοὺς παρεισάκτους ψευδαδέλφους, οἵτινες παρεισήλθον
κατασκοπήσαι τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἡμῶν ἣν ἔχομεν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ἵνα
(*add.* μὴ F G) ἡμᾶς καταδουλώσουσιν...

“Because of the false brothers led in secretly, who came in to spy on our freedom which we have in Christ Jesus so that they might enslave us.”

Aside from the addition of μὴ in MSS F and G, all witnesses agree up to this point; in what follows, however, the issue of Paul’s subordination to these false brothers takes center stage. These are the readings after the clause ἵνα ἡμᾶς καταδουλώσουσιν:

1. οὐδὲ πρὸς ὥραν εἴξαμεν τῇ ὑποταγῇ Marcion^{Tertullian} syr^P Ambrosiaster^{MSS}
2. πρὸς ὥραν εἴξαμεν τῇ ὑποταγῇ D* b Irenaeus^{lat} Tertullian, Ambrosiaster, Marius Victorinus, Jerome
3. οἷς οὐδὲ πρὸς ὥραν εἴξαμεν τῇ ὑποταγῇ *rell.*
4. οἷς οὐδὲ πρὸς ὥραν εἴξαμεν Ϝ⁴⁶

The various readings revolve around whether or not Paul was subordinate to these false brothers. Reading 1 attributed to Marcion by Tertullian declares “we were not subject for a moment so that the truth of the gospel might abide with you.” Reading 3 (“to whom we were not subject for a moment”) chosen by NA²⁷ also portrays Paul as uncontaminated by these false brothers. In this case, however, it is more specific by employing the relative pronoun οἷς. The singular reading in Ϝ⁴⁶ (“to whom we did not yield for a moment”) also employs a relative pronoun, but omits the following τῇ ὑποταγῇ. Reading 2 found in the original transcription of Codex Claromontanus and attested in Latin versions by Tertullian, Ambrosiaster, Marius Victorinus, and Jerome

departs from all of the readings in omitting the relative pronoun and the negative altogether, thus reading “we were subject for a moment.”

An assessment of the evidence favors reading 3. In terms of external evidence, it is obviously the best attested, in contrast to the singular readings in 1 and 4, and the sparse testimony for reading number 2. The internal evidence also leans in favor of reading 3. While reading 2 (πρὸς ὧραν εἴξαμεν τῇ ὑποταγῇ) may be more difficult in terms of transcriptional probability, on the basis of intrinsic probability the omission of the negative appears secondary; for the claim in reading 2 that Paul was subject to these false brothers contradicts Paul’s own prior declaration that he was subject to no one but Christ through revelation (1:1-12). The singular reading in \mathfrak{P}^{46} may not be difficult like reading 2, but the omission of τῇ ὑποταγῇ does render the relative clause less precise. Furthermore, the fact that this MS has a shorter reading does not recommend it as more likely original since James Royse has shown that one of the chief scribal habits in \mathfrak{P}^{46} is a tendency to omit.²¹⁴ While both readings 3 and 4 could be explained by conflation of readings 1 and 2, the strong, virtually unanimous, attestation for reading 3 in the MS tradition coupled with the geographical isolation of reading 2 and singularity of readings 1 and 4 offers convincing evidence for the originality of reading 3. Furthermore, as Clabeaux notes, in terms of transcriptional probability a scribe would be more likely to remove οἷς to ameliorate the sentence grammatically than to impair it by addition.²¹⁵

Since reading 1 has been judged to be secondary, numerous questions arise for our study of Marcion’s textual editorial practices. First, what purpose would this omission of οἷς serve? Second, did Marcion himself expunge οἷς? Third and finally,

²¹⁴ *Scribal Habits*, 357-58.

²¹⁵ *Lost Edition*, 85.

whether or not this reading originated with Marcion, did Marcion's paratexts shape its interpretation? We will see that while the answers to the first two questions remain ambiguous, the third occasions an unequivocal affirmative response.

For what reason would $\text{o}\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ be omitted? It is possible that this was simply an accidental omission. While there is no real compelling reason to posit a mechanical error in transcription, the loss of three letters is by no means exceptional in a chirographic culture. Yet in terms of external probability, the removal of the relative pronoun could be a deliberate expunction by an editor or scribe designed to ameliorate the grammar of the sentence and provide a main verb for the sentence. This accords with Metzger's assessment that "the omission of $\text{o}\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ in several witnesses ... was probably deliberate, in order to rectify the anacoluthon."²¹⁶ While the sentence with or without the relative pronoun expresses a similar sentiment, its removal (in addition to offering grammatical improvement) also slightly alters the meaning of Paul's words. The inclusion of the relative clause delimits subtly the rejection of subordination to these specific brothers, whereas its omission opens up the possibility of a broader spectrum of false brothers that Paul opposed. Where the inclusion of the relative pronoun in the original Pauline text localizes his independence by saying, "on account of the false brothers...to whom not for an hour were we subject," the reading Marcion is alleged to have produced read "on account of the false brothers... not for an hour were we subject so that the truth of the gospel might abide with you." This minor change highlights Paul's independence from everyone, because of the false brothers, rather than independence merely from these particular false brothers.

²¹⁶ *Textual Commentary*, 522.

Such a change, though admittedly subtle, would be in keeping with Marcion's conception of Paul and his polemic against false apostles transmitted in the *Antitheses* and *argumenta* prefaced to his letters. But did Marcion himself create this reading? Recent studies on Marcion's text have concluded that variant readings found in other textual traditions, which Marcionite influence could not have affected, must not have originated with Marcion—rather, Marcion simply received and transmitted them.²¹⁷ Warrant for this interpretation is often sought in the non-singularity of such readings. If other MSS transmit readings previously thought to be Marcionite, these readings cannot be Marcionite because Marcion could not have influenced these other lines of textual transmission. While there is no doubt that by the fourth or fifth century such claims have a certain validity, in the highly unstable second century, when the reading that Marcion transmits would have emerged, maintaining such strict boundaries between “catholic” and heterodox MSS is problematic. Research on the second-century text has shown that, with respect to the transmission of the text of the NT, there were no strict philological or ecclesiastical controls to effect such enforcement of orthodoxy.²¹⁸ In fact, the very assumption that there were in the second century “orthodox” and “heretical” MSS of the NT is too indebted to the boundaries that heresiologists were trying to erect. As the quotation from Tertullian that opened this chapter indicates, heresiologists were attempting to deprive “heretics” of “authentic” scriptures on the grounds that they were not “authentic” Christians. While I am not intent on proving that Marcion had a positive effect on the textual transmission of Paul's letters or the Gospel of Luke, I do maintain

²¹⁷ Clabeaux, *Lost Edition*, 2, 84-5, 106-7. Schmid does not directly address the issue of Marcion's reception or creation of this reading in his discussion of Gal 2:5 (cf. *Marcion*, 105-106), but he does offer further discussion of the isolation of the pre-Marcionite text (*Marcion*, 260-81).

²¹⁸ See Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians of Letters*, esp. chs. 4-5; and Aland and Aland, *The Text of the New Testament* 2nd ed., 48-70.

that the quick dismissal of any influence because Marcion was deemed an arch-heretic by his detractors is too indebted to heresiological polemics.²¹⁹

With respect to this specific reading where the Syriac and Latin traditions also omit the relative pronoun *oŭs*, Clabeaux concludes that the witnesses to the removal of *oŭs*

²¹⁹ Indeed, some have seen proof of, and occasionally even argued for, Marcionite influence on NT textual transmission, a point for which we will offer some evidence insofar as it relates to our larger theses in this chapter. The possibility that Marcion influenced the larger texture of the NT textual tradition has been answered both negatively and affirmatively. For example, both Zahn (*Grundrisse der Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons* [Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1932], 50-51) and Vogels (*Handbuch der Textkritik der Neuen Testament* [Bonn: P. Hanstein, 1955], 143-44) thought that Marcion influenced the Syriac tradition of Paul's letters. Although Zahn saw Marcionite influence on the Syriac tradition, in his earlier work he did not think it possible for Marcion's text to have affected ecclesiastical (*kirchlichen*) texts due to the church's hostility towards him (*Geschichte des neutestamentlichen kanons I*, 638). Harnack on the other hand thought that while Marcion did have an impact, though slight, on the transmission of Paul's letters, the Latin translation was not dependent on a Marcionite *Vorlage* (*Marcion*, 153*-55*, 60*-67*). With respect to the Syriac text of Paul, Kerschensteiner disputes Zahn and Vogel's interpretation, instead favoring the influence of Greek texts sharing readings with Marcion on the Syriac tradition (*Der altsyrische Paulustext* [Louvain: Secrétariat du Corpus SCO, 1970], 180-82). Similarly, Clabeaux rejects out of hand any connection between Marcion's text and Catholic MSS, since in his argument these serve as the window to a common *Vorlage* influencing both Marcion and other texts (*Lost Edition*, 2-6). Although Schmid acknowledges numerous agreements between Marcion's text and other NT MSS, he also concludes that Marcion did not have an impact on the transmission of NT MSS (*Marcion*, 253-4). Schmid's assessment is, on the whole, well-reasoned, cogently argued, and seeks to avoid the simplification of easily identifiable "Marcionite" versus "catholic" texts (14-15); yet he still seems to revert back to the earlier understandings of Marcionite texts when he sees, for example, the conflation of the singular reading at Gal 5:14 and "Western" texts as evidence of the influence of the text Marcion used on these "Western" MSS rather than Marcion's text itself (cf. 281). As I see it, the problem lies in scholarly acceptance of heresiological distinctions between Marcion's texts of the *Gospel* and *Apostolikon* and those "catholic" MSS with the result that Marcionite influence is almost summarily rejected outright or quickly explained away. To be sure, there were differences between the text of Marcion's and other NT MSS; but were these differences more pronounced than the differences between the texts of Acts in D and B? For problems regarding the texts of Acts, see Frederic G. Kenyon, "The Western Text in the Gospels and Acts," *Proceedings of the British Academy* 24, no. 1939 (1939): 287-315; W. A. Strange, *The Problem of the Text of Acts* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1992); Josep Rius-Camps and Jenny Read-Heimerdinger, *The Message of Acts in Codex Bezae: A Comparison with the Alexandrian Tradition* (London: T & T Clark, 2004). Furthermore, as our investigation into Codex Fuldensis will show in chapter 5, even as late as the 6th century it was not inconceivable for a text attributed to a heretic or a non-canonical writing to be knowingly included in a MS of the NT: in this MS we find a gospel harmony attributed to Tatian and the apocryphal Epistle to the Laodiceans. In order to maintain this clear-cut distinction between Marcionite and "catholic" we need to assume that the only people transmitting early Christian texts—in this case Paul's letters—knew and were invested in highly nuanced and polemical heresiological arguments; and furthermore, for this reason they were vigilant to reject and excise anything remotely smacking of Marcionism. To my mind this position is untenable. This is not to say that Hoffman's theory of the Marcionite origin of the *Corpus Paulinum* is a better or more compelling reconstruction (*Marcion*, 241-80), only that a summary dismissal of Marcionite origin, based on the fact that Marcion could not have influenced such diverse texts displays a circular logic and too acceptingly accepts the very boundaries early heresiologists were trying to construct.

could “preserve a very early emendation.”²²⁰ Although Clabeaux concedes that “the addition of οἷς could have been motivated by a scribe who wished to maintain the opposition of Paul to the “false apostles” but who did not want to rule out any yielding to the Jerusalem apostles,”²²¹ the converse (namely the possible deletion of οἷς by Marcion so as to extricate Paul from any and all “false apostles” whether from Jerusalem or elsewhere) does not hold, apparently because Marcion’s text could have no impact on MSS other than Marcionite ones.

A dismissal of Marcionite influence on the larger NT textual tradition remains methodologically problematic, since it is well known that Marcion created and maintained a vast network of churches throughout and beyond the Mediterranean basin, which survived and thrived for centuries. Tertullian concedes that Marcion spread his faith throughout the world, building churches like bees build honeycombs.²²² In the fourth century Cyril of Jerusalem (died ca. 386) still warned his congregation against accidentally entering a Marcionite church.²²³ Even though they may not have been threatening to convert the empire, in his *Edict against Heretics* the emperor Constantine still saw fit to confiscate Marcionite places of worship for the Catholic church and forbade their assemblies.²²⁴ Theodoret of Cyrrus (ca. 423-457), emboldened by imperial authority, tirelessly attempted to purge all traces of Marcionite Christianity from his region, converting eight communities and more than one-thousand people to the “true”

²²⁰ Clabeaux, *Lost Edition*, 107.

²²¹ Clabeaux, *Lost Edition*, 85.

²²² *Marc.* 4.5.3 (CCSL 1 672).

²²³ *Lecture* 18.26.

²²⁴ Eusebius, *Vit. Const.* 3.64.

faith.²²⁵ In the second to third century in Syria, Bardaisan composed dialogues against Marcion's disciples, the same target of some of Ephrem's (ca. 306-373) *Hymnen contra haereses* written generations later.²²⁶ Ephrem also complains that heretics libel Catholics with the moniker "Palutians," a point which Bauer argues signifies their secondary status to an original Marcionite Christianity in Syria.²²⁷ In fact, Bauer makes a strong case that "[h]ere [in Edessa] it was by no means orthodoxy, but rather heresy, that was present at the beginning. Christianity was first established in the form of Marcionism, probably imported from the West and certainly not much later than the year 150."²²⁸ The vehement opposition Marcion fomented coupled with Celsus's knowledge of only two types of Christianity, one of which was Marcionite, led Stephen Wilson to conclude "that during its heyday in the second century the Marcionite church was one of the dominant forms of Christianity. In some places and some times it was probably the main form of Christianity known to the inhabitants."²²⁹ Han Drijvers also sees a widespread Marcionite presence in the early Syrian church.²³⁰ The Armenian bishop Eznik of Kolb (ca. fourth-

²²⁵ *Hist. eccl.* 5.31; *Ep.* 81, 113, 145.

²²⁶ See also Walter Bauer's overwhelmingly convincing arguments that Marcion's brand of Christianity represented one of the earliest and most widespread forms in Syria (*Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity* [ed. Robert A. Kraft; trans. Philadelphia Seminar on Christian Origins; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971], 1-43).

²²⁷ Ephrem, *Contra Haereses*, 22,5-6. A critical edition and German translation can be found in Edmund Beck, ed., *Des Heiligen Ephraem des Syrers Hymnen contra haereses* (CCSO; 2 vols.; Louvain: L. Durbecq, 1957). See also discussion in Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy*, 20-29.

²²⁸ Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy*, 29.

²²⁹ Stephen G. Wilson, "Marcion and the Jews," in *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity: v. 2 Separation and Polemic* (ed. Stephen G. Wilson; Waterloo, Ont., Canada: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1986), 45.

²³⁰ Han J. W. Drijvers, "Marcionism in Syria: Principles, Problems, Polemics," *SecCent* 6, no. 3 (1987/88): 153-72.

fifth century) gives evidence for Marcionite communities still thriving in his day.²³¹ Even down to the tenth century, eight centuries after Marcion's *floruit*, we have evidence of Marcionite churches preserved in Arabic sources.²³² If in the fourth century, long after the ascendancy of the proto-orthodox, one could enter a church and, as Cyril of Jerusalem fears, not identify it as a "heretical" Marcionite space of worship, there are good grounds for thinking that in the second century, in Syria or elsewhere, a Marcionite text could have easily affected the transmission of the *Corpus Paulinum*. Marcion's activity throughout the church from Asia Minor, to Rome, to North Africa, to Syria in its developmental and formative period of the second century provides a perfectly plausible scenario for his influence on the text of the *Corpus Paulinum*, in Latin and Syriac traditions, not to mention Greek.

While such evidence presents problems for the methodology used to isolate the text Marcion received, because Marcion's reading is not singular, not found in an obvious conflate reading,²³³ and not multiply attested, attributing this text's origin to Marcion nevertheless remains untenable. Yet even if the omission of the relative οἷς preceded Marcion and we cannot prove he created or transmitted it to these Latin or Syriac witnesses, that does not mean that he merely received and transmitted the reading. If Marcion engaged in any sort of collation or comparison of MSS, he could possibly have found it in another MS and selected it for his text for the reasons suggested above. Such a

²³¹ Eznik, *De sectis*, 4.

²³² Marco Frenchkowski, "Marcion in arabischen Quellen," in *Marcion und seine kirchengeschichtliche Wirkung – Marcion and His Impact on Church History* (eds. Gerhard May and Katharina Greschat; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2002).

²³³ Had reading 3 been judged secondary on account of its seemingly conflate character—like reading 4 in Ⲫ⁴⁶ it contains both οἷς and οὐδὲ—our assessment would be different. But the overwhelming external evidence for reading 3 proves decisive.

scenario would still be in keeping with Marcion's editorial practices informed by his image of Pauline authenticity.

Whether or not Marcion engaged in such textual comparison must remain at the level of conjecture, since it is impossible to know with certainty whether Marcion transmitted, chose, or created this reading. But by reframing the question from this variant's origins to its interpretive deployment, we can further observe the relationship between Marcion's text and paratexts. For what is certain is that Tertullian accuses Marcion of falsifying the text in accordance with his allegation that the gospel was perverted by false apostles.²³⁴ Tertullian's indictment, however, does not focus on the omission of οἷς, but rather on what he deems exceptional with respect to his own text, namely the presence of οὐδέ, which he thinks Marcion justified corrupting by appealing to previous interpolations by false apostles. In an attempt to vitiate Marcion's text and his resulting interpretation, Tertullian exhorts, "indeed, let us pay attention to the plain sense and its occasion, and the corruption (uitiatio) of scripture will become apparent."²³⁵ While Tertullian's appeal to the "plain sense" (sensui ipsi) and "purpose" (causae) forms the basis of his argument against Marcion, the crux for this discussion is his claim that Marcion's "corruption of scripture will become apparent." Tertullian uses "uitiatio" to describe Marcion's "corruption," a word which elsewhere serves as a keystone for the argument that Marcion's scripture is derivative, late, and therefore false.²³⁶

²³⁴ *Marc.* 5.3.2-4 (CCSL 1 668).

²³⁵ Intendamus enim et sensui ipsi et causae eius, et apparebit uitiatio scripturae (*Marc.* 5.3.3 [CCSL 1 668,2-3]).

²³⁶ Cf. *Marc.* 4.4.1 (CCSL 1 549).

Even though Tertullian charged Marcion with corruption, in actuality both Marcion's and Tertullian's texts were corrupt; and ironically, Tertullian's shows clearer indications of corruption for theological ends. As the list of variants above makes evident, Tertullian utilized a copy of Gal 2:5 that contained reading 2:²³⁷ in Tertullian's text, which apparently omitted the οἷς οὐδέ, Paul did yield for a short time. Consequently, Tertullian counters Marcion's text and indicts his alleged corruption (uitiatio) by claiming that Paul and his associates did acquiesce, as the harmony between Acts and Paul's own statements indicate.²³⁸ Tertullian's interpretation lends credence to Metzger's supposition that the "[o]mission of οὐδέ...seems to have occurred when certain scribes thought it necessary – in view of the apostle's principle of accommodation (1 Cor 9.20-23) – to find here an analogue to the circumcision of Timothy (Ac 16.3)."²³⁹ Despite the fact that Tertullian himself was likely using a text corrupted to show that Paul did submit, Tertullian assumes that Marcion's text had been corrupted under the pretext that the gospel had been adulterated by the "false brothers" to show that Paul did not submit.²⁴⁰

As in the discussion of Gal 1:1 previously, Tertullian's interpretation and denunciation of Marcion's text illuminates the importance of Marcion's paratexts. Whether or not Marcion created, chose, or simply transmitted the reading οὐδὲ πρὸς ὥραν εἴξαμεν τῇ ὑποταγῇ, Tertullian was convinced that Marcion engaged in corruption because of Marcion's contention that false apostles had previously corrupted the gospel.

²³⁷ Tertullian, apparently reading ("ad horam cessimus") in contrast to Marcion's ("nec ad horam"), opposes Marcion's text by maintaining that Paul out of necessity did yield for a time: "Necessario igitur cessit ad tempus" (*Marc.* 5.3.5 [*CCSL* 1 669,19]).

²³⁸ *Marc.* 5.3.4-8 (*CCSL* 1 668-670).

²³⁹ *Textual Commentary*, 522.

²⁴⁰ *Marc.* 5.3.1-5 (*CCSL* 1 668-669).

While it is certainly possible that Tertullian himself noticed the difference between his and Marcion's text, it seems exceedingly unlikely that the simple addition or omission of $\alpha\iota\varsigma$ (or the addition of $\alpha\upsilon\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ as Tertullian imagined), would lead him to conclude that Marcion altered the text as a result of his conviction that the gospel had been interpolated by false apostles. Tertullian was undoubtedly led to this conclusion by Marcion's paratexts. Marcion paratextually adduced this fundamental tenet (and possibly this verse)²⁴¹ as proof of his views on the transmission of the gospel: most likely it was found in the *Antitheses*; we have already seen that it was undoubtedly in the *argumenta*.

Marcion's paratexts thus shaped Tertullian's reading of the text. So even though there is evidence that Marcion may have only received, rather than created, this reading, because Marcion's paratexts highlighted this principle (and perhaps this verse) as justification for it, Tertullian read the text accordingly—as though Marcion himself had corrupted it. Because of the variance between Tertullian's and Marcion's text, Tertullian read Marcion's text in light of his editorial principle that false apostles had interpolated the gospel, a principle that was, at least in part, predicated on Paul's opposition to the false apostles and their attempts to turn believers from the gospel back to Judaism in Galatians. Paul's conflicts with, and triumph over, these false apostles were conveyed paratextually (most probably in the *Antitheses*, quite clearly in the *argumenta*) where they were ideally situated not only for the justification of Marcion's hermeneutic and editorial practices shaped by his image of Pauline authenticity, but also for fashioning interpretations, like Tertullian's.

Galatians 5:14

²⁴¹ *Marc.* 5.3.2-3 (CCSL 1 668). See also *Marc.* 4.3 (CCSL 1 548-549).

In chapter 5 of Galatians Paul sets forth his final arguments against turning to circumcision and by association the law. Paul contrasts the slavery of the law and the freedom of Christ and exhorts the Galatians to be enslaved to one another through love, rather than to the law. In 5:14 Paul roots this exhortation to serve one another through love by equating the law with the exhortation to love one's neighbor as oneself. The multiple variants in this verse coalesce around the issue of past or present fulfillment of this love command and for whom the commandment may have been fulfilled. In this verse the readings below precede ἐν τῷ ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτὸν and follow ὁ γὰρ πᾶς νόμος ἐν...

1. ἐνὶ λόγῳ πεπλήρωται \mathfrak{P}^{46} \aleph A B C 062^{vid}. 0254. 0278. 33. 81. 104. 326. 1175. 1241^s. 1739 *pc* *co*
2. ὑμῶν πεπλήρωται²⁴² Marcion^{Tertullian, Epiphanius}
3. ἐνὶ λόγῳ πληροῦται Ψ 0122. 1881 \mathfrak{M} *Iatt*
4. ὑμῶν ἐν ἐνὶ λόγῳ πεπλήρωται a b *Ambst*
5. ὑμῶν ἐν ἐνὶ λόγῳ πληροῦται D F G
6. ὀλιγῶ πεπλήρωται 1505 *sy*^h
7. ἐνὶ λόγῳ ἀνακεφαλαιοῦται 365 *pc*

The external evidence clearly favors reading 1, which is attested by our earliest and best MSS and across text-types, found in Byzantine as well as primary and secondary Alexandrian witnesses. The external evidence does not incline toward Marcion's singular in reading 2 attested diachronically by Tertullian and Epiphanius. With the exception of reading 3, found in the Majority text and sundry other witnesses, the rest of the readings (4, 5, 6, and 7) are all poorly represented in the external evidence and are weak candidates for the original text.

²⁴² Tota enim, inquit, lex in uobis adimpleta est: diliges proximum tuum tamquam te (*Marc.* 5.4.12 [*CCSL* 1 674,6-8]). Ὁ γὰρ πᾶς νόμος ὑμῶν πεπλήρωται· ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτὸν (*Epiphanius Pan.* 42.12.3 [*GCS* 31 157,9-10]).

The primacy of reading 1 is corroborated by transcriptional probabilities. Every reading can be most easily explained as in some way dependent on this reading: reading 2 substitutes ὑμῶν for ἐνὶ λόγῳ. Reading 3 merely changes the verb from a perfect to a present. Readings 4 and 5 are both conflation, the former of readings of 1 and 2, and the latter of readings 2 and 3, all of which are arguably dependent on 1. Reading 6 also testifies to the originality of the first reading, since ἐν ὀλιγῷ arguably represents an aural error in transcription for ἐν ἐνὶ λόγῳ from which ἐν has been accidentally elided and ἐνὶ λόγῳ has metathesized to ἐν ὀλιγῷ. Reading 7 merely offers a substitution of ἀνακεφαλαιοῦται for πεπλήρωται, likely a scribal harmonization to ἀνακεφαλαιοῦται in Rom 13:9, where also we find another statement by Paul about the fulfillment of the law in the command to love each other.

After establishing that reading 1 represents Paul's original description of the law, our primary interest is to investigate the origin, cause, and transmission of the reading attributed to Marcion. Tertullian's attempt to use this verse to prove a connection between the creator and Christ intimates that Marcion and his disciples may have read this verse in the opposite way:²⁴³ i.e. as a blatant articulation of the end of the law resulting from the separation of Christ from the creator. Marcion's interpretation was not particularly unique among early Christian interpreters on this score. For example, Augustine, even though he did not reject the OT, interpreted this verse alongside Matthew 5:17 and Romans 13:10 as evidence that the old sacrificial law had been superseded and was worthless for salvation.²⁴⁴ Similarly, the substitution of the present for the perfect tense may also have functioned to emphasize the continual importance,

²⁴³ *Marc.* 5.4.13 (CCSL 1 674,8-20).

²⁴⁴ *Expositio ad Galatas* 44.1-45.4 (CSEL 84 118,1-119,21).

rather than past relevance, of the law summed up in this saying. Epiphanius, our other witness to Marcion's reading ὑμῖν πεπλήρωται, interprets Paul's entire purpose in this statement as the demonstration of the concord of the NT with the giving of the law in the Hebrew Bible:

Why is it necessary for the holy Apostle to make use of the law, if the New Testament has been alienated from the old giving of the law? But so that he might show that the two Testaments are of one God and their harmony might be known through the fulfillment of the law through love of the neighbor equally balanced in the two testaments, he said that the perfection of doing good for the fulfillment of the law is love.²⁴⁵

Epiphanius and Tertullian both oppose the interpretation that this verse indicated the end of the law and its complete separation from the gospel as interpreted by Marcion; as they represent Marcion's interpretation, the law's fulfillment does not signify its summing up, but rather its abrogation and destruction.

Tertullian and Epiphanius intimate that Marcion read this verse as proof of the separation of the creator God from the God of Christ and the law from faith, since the law has been "fulfilled" in the sense of "annulled," not "fulfilled" in the sense of "perfected," as Tertullian and Epiphanius interpreted. This distinction between the creator and Christ is, of course, the primary thesis of Marcion's *Antitheses* and his *argumenta*. The question for this investigation is whether or not the reading found in Marcion's text was created by him or his disciples. And if so, did it serve the purpose intimated by Tertullian and Epiphanius? Harnack thinks this reading may have been a tendentious correction designed to show that the law was now fulfilled among the Galatians (ὑμῖν) and by

²⁴⁵ Σχόλιον ε. Ὁ γὰρ πᾶς νόμος ὑμῖν πεπλήρωται· ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν. Ἐλεγχος ε. τίς ἐστὶ χρεία τῷ ἁγίῳ ἀποστόλῳ νόμῳ χρῆσθαι, εἰ ἀπηλλοτριώτο ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη τῆς παλαιᾶς νομοθεσίας; ἀλλ' ἵνα δείξῃ ὅτι τοῦ ἑνὸς θεοῦ αἱ δύο διαθήκαι καὶ ἡ συμφωνία <κατὰ> τὸ πληρωτικὸν τοῦ νόμου διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ πλησίον ἰσορρόπως ἐν ταῖς δύο διαθήκαις γνωρίζεται, τὸ τέλει<ι>ον ἐργαζομένης [τὸ] ἀγαθὸν νόμου τελείωσιν εἶπεν εἶναι τὴν ἀγάπην (Epiphanius *Pan.* 42.12.3 [GCS 31 157.9-16])

metonymy Christians rather than among the Jews.²⁴⁶ Schmid remains doubtful of Harnack's explanation on the grounds that Marcion was not consistent in reworking Rom 13:8-9 and that ὑμῶν may be a mechanical transcriptional error for ἐν ἐνί.²⁴⁷ Harnack's hypothesis remains unconvincing, but not only for the reason that Schmid offers. First, there is no explicit reference to Christians as possessors of the law instead of the Jews. Second, Marcion does not appear to have argued that the law has been transferred; rather it has been fulfilled, i.e. completed (and thus abrogated) by the love commandment. A more likely explanation for Marcion's interpretation (whether or not he altered it) is that the alteration of ἐνὶ λόγῳ to ὑμῶν highlights the supersession of the law for Christians by the command to love one's neighbor, irrespective of what Marcion may have thought it meant for Jews.

Evidence for tracing this variant to Marcion may be found in Marcionite ethics, where the command to "love your neighbor as yourself" figured prominently. Despite the fact that Tertullian tried to prove the irrationality of Marcion's God from Marcion's emphasis on this injunction, he nevertheless conceded the importance of the love of others, which followers of Marcion praised above all other commands as exemplifying Christ's selfless act of love for an estranged and alien humanity.²⁴⁸ In fact, the reading ὑμῶν πεπλήρωται attributed to Marcion by Tertullian and Epiphanius may well reinforce this doctrine, which surely figured prominently in Marcionite catechetical instruction (and perhaps in the *Antitheses* as well). In connection with my argument that Marcion's

²⁴⁶ Harnack, *Marcion*, 47, 78*, 153*.

²⁴⁷ Schmid, *Marcion*, 130-31. In my mind Schmid's suggestion that ὑμῶν represents a mechanical error in transcription of ἐν ἐνί is not particularly convincing, especially since no reading of ὑμῶν λόγῳ has been transmitted.

²⁴⁸ *Marc.* 1.23.1-9 (CCSL 1 465-466).

Antitheses shaped readings of Marcion's text and introduced readers into a proper Marcionite interpretation, it is noteworthy that in their discussions of this passage Tertullian and Epiphanius focus on how the law has been fulfilled (i.e. abrogated and superseded)—thus reinforcing the separation of the God of the Hebrew Bible from the God who sent Jesus Christ. Yet the focus of Marcion's text (whatever its origin) may have been more ethical than theological: the substitution of ὁμῶν (the only part of reading 2 that may have originated with Marcion) appears to stress the individual embodiment of the love command more than any theological separation of Gods.

Although Christian hostility or ambivalence towards the law was not unique to Marcion (as our reference to Augustine demonstrates) and one could imagine this reading arising from many early Christian communities, a dismissal of the reading as Marcionite conflicts with the actual evidence. First of all, Marcion's reading ὁμῶν is a singular reading. Furthermore, Schmid's reasons for disputing a Marcionite origin are not convincing in view of the fact that the reading attributed to Marcion is not only singular, but also multiply attested by Tertullian and Epiphanius—a point that corroborates the argument that it was found in Marcion's text;²⁴⁹ this fact coupled with this reading's singular status strengthens the possibility that it may have originated with him.

The singular reading appears to be a witness to a tradition that later became embodied in the transmission of the text conflated with reading 1 and transmitted in “Western” or Latin witnesses in readings 4 and 5. Although we cannot definitively prove that Marcion was the source for the conflated text, he is nevertheless the earliest and only

²⁴⁹ Schmid questions a Marcionite origin on the basis of inconsistency of Marcion's text-critical actions and the alignment of witnesses for Marcion's reading (*Marcion*, 130-31).

source for the reading ὑμῶν alone.²⁵⁰ Furthermore, Marcion's text is multiply attested from the early third to the fifth century. For these reasons, Marcion is the most likely creator of this reading, if we reject *a priori* arguments that he could not have affected "orthodox" or "catholic" MSS. The fact that later non-Marcionite MSS transmit ὑμῶν apparently conflated with readings 1 or 3 (thus giving rise to readings 4 and 5) merely attests to the conservatism of the NT textual tradition, which incorporated many different texts, either before communal boundaries were fixed, or in places where the earliest Christianities were heterodox.

Marcion's doctrine concerning the abrogation of the law and his ethic of selfless love in imitation of Christ accords perfectly with the reading attributed to him here in Gal 5:14. In this reading attributed to Marcion the text exhorts the readers and auditors that the entire law has been fulfilled not "in one word" but "for/in you," thus laying the stress not on the following command to love one's neighbor as oneself, but on its fulfillment in their own lives. Although the abrogation of the law was far from unique to Marcion or his disciples, the attempt to maintain the nominal relevance of the law on Christian terms became the norm. We have shown, however, that considerable evidence advises against

²⁵⁰ If the conflate readings that incorporate ὑμῶν were not indebted to this reading that is singularly attested in Marcion's text, then it must represent an accidental agreement, which just so happens to resemble a conflation with Marcion's text. While such a scenario is possible, in terms of transcriptional probability it does not seem particularly likely. It must be noted, however, that the using conflate readings to establish genealogy is extremely problematic. According to Westcott and Hort, conflate readings offer the most clear evidence of their derivative status—and more importantly, dependency—and comprised one of the cornerstones in their argument for dismantling the authority of the Textus Receptus, about which Hort wrote: "The clearest evidence for tracing the antecedent factors of mixture in texts is afforded by readings which are themselves mixed or, as they are sometimes called, 'conflate', that is, not simple substitutions of the reading of one document for that of another, but combinations of the readings of both documents into a composite whole, sometimes by mere addition with or without a conjunction, sometimes with more or less of fusion" (*The New Testament in the Original Greek: Vol. 2 Introduction* [Cambridge: Macmillan and Co., 1881] 49). Even if the broader conclusions about the secondary status of the Textus Receptus have been accepted, Westcott and Hort's use of conflation as evidence for the secondary status of the majority text is flawed; for a critique, see Ernest Cadman Colwell, "Genealogical Method: Its Achievements and Limitations," *JBL* 66, no. 2 (1947): 109-33.

dismissing a Marcionite origin: 1) the prominence of the command to love your neighbor in Marcionite ethics; 2) obvious connections to issues addressed in Marcion's introductory *argumenta* and *Antitheses*; and 3) most importantly the singular nature of the reading attributed to Marcion. The existence of this reading in subsequent conflate readings may also suggest Marcion's possible influence on the later transmission of the *Corpus Paulinum*. Even more important for our theses, the substitution of ὑμῶν not only highlights Marcion's ethics but also the central tenet of his theology, found in his *Antitheses*, *argumenta*, and editorial practice elsewhere: the contrast between the law and the gospel.²⁵¹

1 Corinthians 15:3

In 1 Corinthians Paul recapitulates his teaching about the resurrection in order to remind the Corinthians that Christ did indeed rise from the dead and so too would the faithful (1 Cor 15:1-19). In 1 Cor 15:3 Paul also acknowledges that this message was passed on to him. Even though he does not identify the source of this tradition, this admission of dependency chanced to stand at odds with Marcion's conception of Paul's independence from other apostles. Unsurprisingly, it is around this issue that the next variant revolves. Our evidence for Marcion's reading in this variant is in partial agreement. Adamantius and Rufinus's translation of his *De recta in Deum fide* both relate that after παρέδωκα γὰρ ὑμῶν ἐν πρώτοις Marcion's text lacked the relative clause ὁ καὶ παρέλαβον. The testimony of Tertullian on this reading is ambivalent: although Tertullian cites a form of 1 Cor 15:3 lacking this relative clause earlier in his refutation of Marcion's docetism (*Marc.* 3.8.5), he passes over this verse without comment in his

²⁵¹ *Marc.* 1.19.4 (CCSL 1 460,21-29).

actual discussion of the text of 1 Cor 15 Marcion's *Corpus Paulinum* (*Marc.* 5.9-10).²⁵²

Adamantius and Rufinus, however, disagree as to the end of this verse in Marcion's text: according to Adamantius (and possibly Tertullian), Marcion omitted the reference to the scriptures, an omission often interpreted in accordance with his denigration of the Hebrew Bible; in Rufinus's translation, however, this phrase is included. The following are the readings and witnesses for this variant found at the beginning of this verse about which we are primarily concerned:

παρέδωκα γὰρ ὑμῖν ἐν πρώτοις

1. ὁ καὶ παρέλαβον ὅτι Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς *tell*.
2. ὅτι Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν *Marcion*^{Adamantius, Tertullian (?)}
3. ὅτι Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς *Marcion*^{Rufinus} *b Ir*^{lat} *Ambst Ambr Hil*

As with most of the variants discussed so far, the reading not attributed to Marcion is the best represented in the external evidence. Readings 2 and 3 have very poor attestation.

Reading 2 is attributed only to Marcion; reading 3 has just slightly more support localized in Latin witnesses.²⁵³

If there was any doubt that reading 1 represents the original text, it is dispelled by the internal evidence. Paul makes frequent use of the verb παραλαμβάνω to describe the

²⁵² Since Tertullian does not cite 1 Cor 15:3 in *Marc.* 5 (the place where he goes through Marcion's text of the *Apostolikon* epistle by epistle), Schmid accepts only the testimony of Adamantius for the omission of the relative clause and the prepositional phrase κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς (*Marcion*, 228 note 127), even though Tertullian does seem to cite it at *Marc.* 3.8.5. Tertullian's reticence to take Marcion to task for the inclusion of this phrase and a lack of consistency in his text-critical manipulations suggests that Marcion's text available to Tertullian probably lacked κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς, despite the fact that he passes over it in silence in *Marc.* 5. Schmid's rigorous method for evaluation of Tertullian's citations of Marcion's text is commendable, but in this case there are good reasons for suspecting that Tertullian did cite this version and offers another witness to Marcion's corrected text. If Marcion had κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς in his text, Tertullian would likely have seized on it and lambasted Marcion for its inclusion.

²⁵³ Cf. e.g. *Marc.* 4.9.15; 5.4.2 (*CCSL* 1 561; 671-672).

oral—and sometimes revelatory—transmission of the gospel kerygma.²⁵⁴ In addition to Paul’s general tendency to cast his own preaching with this term, in this particular passage his subsequent introduction of apostolic testimony proving Christ’s resurrection also follows from this relative clause; its proleptic intimation of Paul’s argument, however, does not render it superfluous.²⁵⁵ Furthermore accidental haplography due to the omicron of the relative pronoun ὃ and ὅτι, while undoubtedly possible, does not offer a particularly compelling explanation for the omission of this phrase from Marcion’s text—especially when this reading perfectly reinforced Marcion’s contention concerning the uniqueness and incorruptibility of Paul’s gospel.

Schmid counters that παραλαμβάνω could simply mean “to receive” and thus would not necessarily raise Marcionite objections, since Paul could have received the gospel through revelation.²⁵⁶ This suggestion is not impossible and there are cases where Paul does use this verb to describe his revelation (1 Cor 11:23). Nevertheless, more often Paul uses παραλαμβάνω to describe gospel preached by himself to the Corinthians and other communities (1 Cor 15:1, Gal 1:9, Phil 4:9) or other human preaching (Gal 1:12). Furthermore, Paul immediately goes on to describe those who saw Christ before him, implying that he is indebted, if not to them, then to others before him for reports about Jesus’ resurrection (1 Cor 15:5-8) rather than to his own revelation.

²⁵⁴ In addition to 1 Cor 15:3 see also 1 Cor 11:23, 15:1, Gal 1:9, Gal 1:12, and Phil 4:9.

²⁵⁵ Clabeaux, however, thinks that this superfluity offers a compelling explanation for its expunction (*Lost Edition*, 120).

²⁵⁶ Schmid, *Marcion*, 229.

Another possible reason for omission, proposed by Clabeaux, lies in attempts to bring this verse in line with Gal 1:1, 1:17, and 2:6.²⁵⁷ Although this would cohere surprisingly well with a Marcionite tendency, Clabeaux thinks that this tendentious alteration does not necessarily warrant such an assumption. Many early Christians in Clabeaux's reconstruction, could have been eager to harmonize this verse with Paul's assertions of independence in Galatians. For this reason, Clabeaux thinks that a Marcionite origin for this omission is not required.

Although in theory Clabeaux's assertion that this alteration could be attributed to many different early Christian communities is entirely possible, it founders on the fact that his attempt to find an alternative to a Marcionite source offers no real compelling options. Of all the early collectors, editors, and correctors of the *Corpus Paulinum* that we know of, the one most concerned with distinguishing Paul from other apostles, employing text-critical practices, and deploying Galatians for this task, is Marcion. We have already seen that Paul's independence from false apostles lay at the heart of Marcion's conception of Pauline authenticity and played a prominent role in his *Antitheses, argumenta*, and other variants. For this reason Marcion remains the most probable source for this tendentious correction, just as Harnack argued, since this expunction aligns with Marcion's theological and textual proclivities.²⁵⁸ Marcion's well-documented rejection of the false apostles and his text-critical activities specifically designed to cleanse the text from their influence offer the best explanation for this omission, which is also multiply attested as Marcion's text of 1 Cor 15:3. Furthermore, this omission also coheres perfectly with one of his fundamental theological tenets and

²⁵⁷ Clabeaux, *Lost Edition*, 120.

²⁵⁸ Harnack, *Marcion*, 47, 91*.

Marcion's text-critical proclivities consistently articulated in the prefatory *Antitheses* and *argumenta*: the rejection of the false apostles and Paul's independence from any and all outside influence.

The final issue to address before moving onto the next variant is Marcion's impact on the transmission of the NT text through this reading. The other witnesses to Marcion's reading in 15:3 presented Harnack with clear evidence of his influence on Latin sources.²⁵⁹ We have already investigated other variants that transmit a Marcionite reading, which corroborate the possibility that Marcion may have influenced the transmission of the NT beyond his own communities and MSS. While Marcion's text is singular in the Greek tradition, Latin sources agree in the omission of the relative clause ὁ καὶ παρέλαβον. Yet this scant support of other witnesses does not warrant rejecting a Marcionite origin, which so perfectly embodies one of his fundamental preoccupations—the separation of Paul, the apostle par excellence, from other apostles. At the very least, this variant offers further substantiation for the influence of paratextual materials on the transmission of Marcion's text and possibly Marcion's influence on the larger tradition of the *Corpus Paulinum*.

1 Corinthians 15:45 & 15:47

The reasons for the creation of other variants attributed to Marcion are more difficult to ascertain. Two such variants present themselves in Paul's arguments for the future resurrection of the dead in 1 Cor 15, where Adam and Christ are contrasted. Tertullian and Adamantius report that in verses 45 and 47 Marcion's text transmitted ὁ

²⁵⁹ *Marcion*, 91*.

κύριος in place of Ἄδὰμ and ἄνθρωπος respectively. The following are the variants and witnesses for these readings:²⁶⁰

1 Cor 15:45 Οὕτως καὶ γέγραπται· ἐγένετο ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος Ἄδὰμ εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν,

1. ὁ ἔσχατος εἰς πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν \mathfrak{P}^{46} 1780²⁶¹
2. ὁ ἔσχατος Ἄδὰμ εἰς πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν rell.
3. ὁ ἔσχατος ὁ κύριος εἰς πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν Marcion^{Tertullian, Adamantius}

1 Cor 15:47 ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος ἐκ γῆς χοϊκός,

1. ὁ δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ \mathfrak{N}^* B C D* 0243. 6. 33. 1175. 1739* *pc bo*
2. ὁ δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος πνευματικός ἐξ οὐρανοῦ \mathfrak{P}^{46}
3. ὁ δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, ὁ οὐράνιος F G latt
4. ὁ δεύτερος ὁ κύριος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ 630. 1912. 2200 Marcion^{Tertullian, Adamantius}
5. ὁ δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ὁ κύριος 2400
6. ὁ δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος ὁ κύριος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ \mathfrak{N}^2 A D¹ Ψ 075. 1739^{mg}. 1881. \mathfrak{M} sy

As with the previous variants, in these verses we are less concerned with the original reading than we are with the secondary character of Marcion's reading. With respect to 1 Cor 15:45, the singular nature of Marcion's text lends much weight to its non-original status. Coupled with the sub-singular character of the reading found in \mathfrak{P}^{46} and the almost complete external support for reading 2, the derivative status of reading 3 (and 1) is virtually assured. The possibility that both readings 2 and 3 represent later glosses on reading 1 can be dismissed due to the virtually unanimous support for reading 2.

Although verse 47 offers many more variant readings, the evidence for Marcion's text is almost as scant as the singular reading in verse 45. In addition to Tertullian's and

²⁶⁰ The following are Tertullian's and Adamantius' citations of Marcion's text: factus primus homo Adam in animam uiuam, nouissimus Adam in spiritum uiuificantem, licet stultissimus haereticus noluerit ita esse; 'dominum' enim posuit nouissimum pro nouissimo 'Adam,' ueritas scilicet ne, si et [dominum] nouissimum haberet 'Adam', et eiusdem Christum defenderemus in Adam nouissimo, cuius et primum (*Marc. 5.10.7* [*CCSL* 1 693,11-17]); Primus, inquit, homo de humo terrenus, secundus dominus de caelo (*Marc. 5.10.9* [*CCSL* 1 693,25-26]); ταῦτα μὲν ἤκουσας τοῦ ἀποστόλου, ἐκεῖνα δὲ οὐκ ἤκουσας λέγοντος· ἐγένετο ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος, Ἄδὰμ, εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν, ὁ ἔσχατος, ὁ κύριος, εἰς πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν· ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος ἐκ γῆς χοϊκός, ὁ δεύτερος ὁ κύριος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ (*De recta in Deum fide*, 2.19 [*GCS* 4 100.3-6]).

²⁶¹ Darrell Hannah notes that Adam may have been omitted by the corrector of Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus (C) as well, but the editor of this MS was unsure of this reading (*The Text of I Corinthians in the Writings of Origen* [Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997] 164).

Adamantius's testimony for Marcion's text, this reading is only found in three minuscule MSS: 1912 from the tenth and 630 and 2200 from the fourteenth centuries.²⁶² The two best candidates in terms of external evidence are readings 1 and 6. The possible conflation of readings 1 and 4 in reading 6 and the fact that reading one is the shorter reading tips the scale in favor of reading 1. In addition, reading 1 also best explains the origin of the other readings, since it is the common denominator of all the variants. Although Paul's usage of κύριος is somewhat ambiguous,²⁶³ the external evidence for both 15:45 and 15:47 offer almost irrefutable proof for the absence of κύριος in these verses.

Our conclusions regarding the original reading based on external criteria are corroborated by additional transcriptional probabilities. The substitution of ὁ κύριος in 15:47 most likely represents an attempt to exalt the divinity of Christ in a manner similar to the interpolations of πνευματικός and ὁ οὐράνιος as exegetical glosses on the "second man." Arguably the more difficult reading—Christologically speaking—for scribes would have been reading 2 in 15:45 and reading 1 in 15:47. The more difficult readings would surely not be the readings attributed to Marcion: both number 3 in 15:45 (ὁ ἕσχατος ὁ κύριος) and number 4 in 15:47 (ὁ δεύτερος ὁ κύριος) fall in line with a general tendency to heighten Christ's divinity through the assignation of more august Christological titles.²⁶⁴

²⁶² For a brief description, see Aland and Aland, *The Text of the New Testament* 2nd ed., 133, 36-7.

²⁶³ Paul uses this epithet extensively not only in reference to Jesus but also God; in 1 Corinthians alone Paul uses κύριος 68 times.

²⁶⁴ This tendency has been well documented; see e.g. Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*; and Metzger and Ehrman, *Text*.

In fact, heresiological testimony about the origin and purpose of Marcion's reading bears this out explicitly. In *Adversus Marcionem*, Tertullian openly accuses Marcion of deliberately corrupting 15:45 in order to remove the contamination of humanity and especially the creator God.²⁶⁵ He levels a similar critique against Marcion's text of 15:47, which again evidences the desire to remove Christ from associations with humanity.²⁶⁶ Tertullian adduces both of these verses in his *De Resurrectione* in order to prove Christ's advent in the same human flesh and concomitant physical resurrection, which exemplified perfect paradigms for the believer.²⁶⁷ Thus, Tertullian contests Marcion's readings in these verses on Christological grounds, insinuating that κύριος in Marcion's text of 1 Cor 15:45 and 47 raises the divinity so much as to deny the possibility of Christ's fleshly humanity: an accusation in keeping with Marcion's alleged docetism.

This multiple and independent attestation offers strong evidence that Marcion's text referred to the "last Adam" and "second man" as κύριος. The questions for our investigation are: why was ὁ κύριος substituted in these verses? And was Marcion the source of these corruptions? Schmid thinks that these substitutions represent and should be numbered among twelve glosses on Paul's letters in Marcion's text.²⁶⁸ Since these glosses are often found in "Western" and Syriac witnesses, Schmid thinks they offer evidence of a very early pre-Marcionite text of Paul's letters that has been incorporated

²⁶⁵ *Marc.* 5.10.7-8 (CCSL 1 693).

²⁶⁶ *Marc.* 5.10.9-10 (CCSL 1 693-94).

²⁶⁷ *Res.* 49.2 (CCSL 2 990).

²⁶⁸ Schmid, *Marcion*, 278-9.

into all three textual streams.²⁶⁹ In theory Schmid offers a completely plausible reconstruction; without a doubt the text that Marcion used could well have influenced other textual traditions. Yet there are some problems with this reconstruction. First, there is little consistent testimony among these glosses to warrant a pre-Marcionite text, which influenced all three traditions. There are recurrent witnesses but they do not align so as to provide any discernable pattern—unlike the “Western” witnesses in Ephesians Schmid discusses elsewhere.²⁷⁰ Second and consequently, because such patterns are lacking, each variant ought to be dealt with on its own merits, rather than in concert with other glosses. Third, since singular readings are by far the most secure way of identifying textual tendencies, the singular and virtually singular character of Marcion’s text in vv. 45 and 47 suggest a Marcionite origin.²⁷¹

While Schmid’s description of the interpolations as glosses is apt, what purpose do these glosses serve? The substitution of κύριος for Adam in verse 45 does subtly remove Christ from a direct connection to the creator and creation, as Tertullian suggested. The retention of the citation formula γέγραπται, however, militates against this explanation. The addition of κύριος in both verses undoubtedly heightens the Christology. Although this would align with Marcion’s docetism, Schmid argues that a docetic Christology was neither unique to Marcion nor a necessary result of this corruption.²⁷² While Schmid does offer viable alternatives for early Christian docetic

²⁶⁹ Schmid, *Marcion*, 280-81.

²⁷⁰ Schmid, *Marcion*, 262-70.

²⁷¹ On singular readings, see Eldon Jay Epp, "Toward the Classification of the Term "Textual Variant"," in *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1993).

²⁷² Schmid, *Marcion*, 252, cf. 108.

thought, the prevalence of docetism does not refute the possibility that Marcion himself corrected the text for this reason; it only proves that it could have arisen in other circles as well. Yet Marcion's docetic Christology remains the most plausible source for this reading. Tertullian's constant attempts to refute this position and the attention this belief likely received in the *Antitheses* support a Marcionite origin for the additions of κύριος. There is little doubt that Marcion subscribed to some form of docetic Christology; Tertullian devotes considerable time and effort to prove that Jesus came and was raised in the flesh in order to refute Marcion's claim that Jesus' body was an illusion or phantasm.²⁷³

Marcion likely articulated the importance of docetism for his theology paratextually: while the issue of docetism is not directly discussed in the *argumenta*,²⁷⁴ there is evidence that this issue was set forth in Marcion's *Antitheses*. Tertullian's declaration at the end of book 2 that he has refuted Marcion's *Antitheses* indicates that the previous discussion has been primarily aimed at their claims;²⁷⁵ he devotes an entire book to Marcion's assertions about Jesus and among the positions treated in book 1 is Marcion's allegation that Jesus was not truly flesh and blood.²⁷⁶ In particular, and

²⁷³ A brief overview is given in *Marc.* 1.24.4-7; his full refutation of Marcion's claims about Jesus comprise book 3 of his *Adversus Marcionem*.

²⁷⁴ Its absence is not particularly surprising, however, given Paul's primary concern: to rebuke or exhort his communities rather than discuss Jesus.

²⁷⁵ *Marc.* 2.28-29 (CCSL 1 507-509). Specifically, note Tertullian's following statement concerning his direct engagement with the *Antitheses*: Ceterum ipsas quoque antithesis Marcionis cominus cecidisse, si operosiore destructione earum egeret defensor creatoris, tam boni quam et iudicis secundum utriusque partis exempla congruentia deo, ut ostendimus. Quodsi utraque pars, bonitatis atque iustitiae, dignam plenitudinem diuinitatis efficiunt omnia potentis, compendio, interim possum antithesis retudisse, gestientes ex qualitatibus ingeniorum siue legum siue uirtutum discernere atque ita alienare Christum a creatore, ut optimum a iudice et mitem a fero et salutarem ab exitioso (*Marc.* 2.29.1 [CCSL 1 508,28-8]).

²⁷⁶ See e.g. *Marc.* 1.22.1; 1.24.4-7 (CCSL 1 463; 467-468).

directly apropos to these variants and the *Antitheses*, Tertullian takes great pains to connect Christ not just to the flesh, but to the creation of humans in Genesis.²⁷⁷ Tertullian also offers the interesting observation that Marcion paid close attention to divine appellations, which should reflect God’s status and rank.²⁷⁸

We should also recall that the *argumentum* to Romans actually castigates those perverters of the faith, the false apostles, by whom the Romans “under the name of our Lord Jesus Christ were misled into the law and the prophets.”²⁷⁹ Although the *argumentum* to Romans is unique in applying this epithet to Christ,²⁸⁰ such an explicit reference to the name of the Lord, a direct translation of κύριος, would align nicely with Marcion’s attention to divine appellations and a Marcionite origin for these glosses. Marcion’s docetism and this Christological exaltation do not explicitly corroborate Tertullian’s accusations concerning the specific reasons Marcion substituted κύριος for Ἰησοῦς and ἄνθρωπος. They do indicate, however, that such corruptions are in keeping with Marcion’s concerns. In sum, both the reference to the designation “dominus” in his *argumentum* to Romans (perhaps reflecting his concern for proper divine appellation) and Tertullian’s discussion of Marcion’s docetism at the beginning of his *Adversus Marcionem*, where he intimates its prominence in Marcion’s *Antitheses*, once again

²⁷⁷ *Marc.* 1.24.5 (*CCSL* 1 467-468).

²⁷⁸ *Marc.* 1.7.1-7 (*CCSL* 1 447-448). Although the specific point of contention in this variant is the use of the word “deus,” this close attention to the names proper to God—or the God appropriately named thus—is not unrelated to the issue in this 1 Cor 15:45 and 15:47.

²⁷⁹ Romani sunt in partibus Italiae. Hi praeuerti sunt a falsi apostolis, et sub nomine Domini nostri Iesu Christi in legem et prophetas erant inducti. Hos reuocat apostolus ad ueram euangelicam fidem, scribens eis a Corintho.

²⁸⁰ One MS, which contains the *argumentum* to 1 Corinthians whence these readings are drawn, does, however, transmit a variant reading with reference to Christ as Lord: after “scribens eis ab Epheso” D adds “per thomothem cohortans eos et corripuens ut salui fiant in christo iesu domino nostro” (*Epistulae Paulinae*, 153).

underscore the interplay between text-critical manipulations and paratextual hermeneutics.

Colossians 1:22 & Ephesians 2:14

The issue of Christ's body and possible docetic readings in Marcion's text also concern the omissions from the next variants under consideration.²⁸¹ Their similarity with respect to Christ's flesh—or lack thereof—warrant their being dealt with in concert.²⁸² In both Eph 2:14 and Col 1:22, deuterio-Paul describes how Christ has rectified the problem of estrangement. In Eph 2:13ff this estrangement is remedied by means of Christ's expiatory sacrifice, which reconciles gentiles to Jews and humans to God. Specifically this reconciliation has been accomplished through the participation in Christ—or in this verse, in his flesh:

αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν, ὁ ποιήσας τὰ ἀμφοτέρα ἐν καὶ τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ λύσας, τὴν ἔχθραν ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ (Marcion omits αὐτοῦ) τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασιν καταργήσας, ἵνα τοὺς δύο κτίση ἐν αὐτῷ εἰς ἓνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον...

“For he is our peace, the one who made the two one and dissolved the barrier of the separation, the enmity in his (*v.l.* the) flesh having abolished the law of the commandments with teachings so that he might make the two into one new man.

²⁸¹ Itaque ipse est, inquit, pax nostra, qui fecit duo unum – Iudaicum scilicet et gentile, quod prope et quod longe – soluto medio pariete inimicitiae in carne sua. Sed Marcion abstulit ‘sua,’ ut inimicitiae daret ‘carne’ quasi carnali uitio [non] Christo aemulae (*Marc.* 5.17.14 [*CCSL* 1 715,24-716,1]); Sicubi autem et ecclesiam corpus Christi dicit esse – ut hic ait adimplere se reliqua pressurarum Christi in carne pro corpore eius, quod est ecclesia –, non propterea et in totum mentionem corporis transferens a substantia carnis. Nam et supra reconciliari nos ait in corpore eius per mortem, utique in eo corpore, in quo mori potuit, per carnem mortuus et non per ecclesiam, plane propter ecclesiam corpus commutando pro corpore, carnale pro spiritali (*Marc.* 5.19.6 [*CCSL* 1 722,18-3]).

²⁸² These examples have simply been chosen to elucidate another theological aspect of Marcion's text-critical work intersecting with his theology in ancillary materials; they are not, however, the only variants which have a possible connection to Marcion's purported docetism. For other examples related to docetism, other possible tendencies, and a discussion more broadly, see Harnack, *Marcion* 35-73.

Similarly, Col 1:22 insists that Christ’s sacrifice brings redemption and repairs the rift between humanity and God as a result of human mortality:

νυνὶ δὲ ἀποκατήλλαξεν ἐν τῷ σώματι τῆς σαρκὸς (Marcion omits τῆς σαρκὸς) αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου παραστήσαι ὑμᾶς ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους καὶ ἀνεγκλήτους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ...

Now he reconciled in the body of his flesh (*v.l.* his body) through his death so as to offer you holy, unblemished, and blameless before him.

The following are the variant readings and their witnesses:

Eph 2:14 τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ λύσας τὴν ἔχθραν

1. ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ *rell.*
2. ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ²⁸³ Marcion^{Tertullian}

Col 1:22 νυνὶ δὲ ἀποκατήλλαξεν ἐν τῷ σώματι

1. τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ *rell.*
2. αὐτοῦ Marcion^{Tertullian}

The overwhelming external evidence for both readings not attributed to Marcion indicate clearly that Marcion’s text is derivative and secondary. At issue for our investigation is once again the reason for Marcion’s readings. With respect to Eph 2:14, Clabeaux asserts that there is “nothing specifically Marcionite about this [reading].”²⁸⁴ He favors an accidental origin because of other witnesses for this omission that he adduces.²⁸⁵ Schmid questions Clabeaux’s evidence for Marcion’s text and admits that the omission of αὐτοῦ in Eph 2:14 could be understood as a Marcionite revision of the text—though he notes that other readings ascribed to Marcion undercut the assumption of a thorough-going and

²⁸³ Although Clabeaux lists the following four additional witnesses for this variant “OL:I (Ambrose, Jerome 3x, Quodvultdeus)” (*Lost Edition*, 120), I follow Schmid’s assessment, who demurs: “[f]ür diese Auslassung gibt es meines Wissens keine weiteren Belege,” (*Marcion*, 112).

²⁸⁴ Clabeaux, *Lost Edition*, 120.

²⁸⁵ Clabeaux, *Lost Edition*, 121.

consistent Marcionite tendency.²⁸⁶ Harnack and Blackman came to similar conclusions. Harnack specifically thought that Marcion's reading was tendentious and related to the additional excision of ἐν before δόγμασιν, which highlighted the destruction of the law and the contrast between Christian δόγμασιν and Jewish ἐντολαί.²⁸⁷ Blackman concurred with Harnack regarding the omission of αὐτοῦ.²⁸⁸ With respect to Col 1:22 Harnack also thought that τῆς σαρκός was expunged by Marcion because "Christus hat kein Fleisch."²⁸⁹ As with Eph 2:14, Schmid thought that the reading in Col 1:22 could align with a Marcion tendency, though in terms of a consistent Marcionite revision the evidence is inconclusive.²⁹⁰

To be sure, a Marcionite revision offers only one of many possible reasons for the creation of these variants. Although the loss of one or two words is far from being noteworthy and these omissions could be attributed to mechanical errors, neither parablepsis-occasioned homoeoteleuton nor homoeoarcton offer a particularly compelling explanation for their omission. Furthermore, Clabeaux's claim that the variant in Eph 2:14 does not evince anything particularly Marcionite directly contradicts our earliest evidence in Tertullian, who asserts that "Marcion expunged "sua" so that he might give "carne" to enmity, as though [it was] a fleshly imperfection not related to

²⁸⁶ Schmid, *Marcion*, 255.

²⁸⁷ Harnack, *Marcion*, 50.

²⁸⁸ Blackman, *Marcion*, 45.

²⁸⁹ Harnack, *Marcion*, 51.

²⁹⁰ Schmid, *Marcion*, 251-54.

Christ.”²⁹¹ Tertullian intimates that Marcion’s reading tries to disengage Christ from any connection with the flesh; instead “the enmity” is linked with the previous participle λύσας in order to illustrate Christ’s docetic nature and the hostile barrier of the flesh. Tertullian’s testimony has, of course, to be weighed circumspectly. Yet even though Tertullian was quick to slander Marcion with textual corruption, he was not prone to light upon passages not useful for this purpose. Furthermore, although he often lambastes Marcion and his text-critical practices, he does not completely misrepresent Marcion or his positions. In fact, as we have seen on some occasions, Tertullian even admits that Marcionites would dispute his allegations.²⁹²

Finally, if these readings were accidentally created prior to Marcion’s edition of the *Corpus Paulinum*, we would probably expect to see them more often in other witnesses. Instead, Tertullian’s references to these readings in Marcion’s text comprise virtually our only testimony. In fact, once again we have virtually singular readings attributed to Marcion standing against the entire textual tradition. Other possible explanations for these variants notwithstanding, the nearly singular character of these variants coupled with their perfect alignment with Marcion’s Christology require a more plausible reconstruction. While other possibilities do exist, the more probable explanation is that Marcion himself expunged these words so as to remove what he would have seen as spurious (νόθα) interpolations into Paul’s letters, interpolations which directly conflicted with his understanding of the *skopos* or telos of the Apostle, which he had articulated in his *Antitheses* and *argumenta*.

²⁹¹ Sed Marcion abstulit ‘sua,’ ut inimicitiae daret ‘carne’ quasi carnali uitio [non] Christo aemulae (*Marc.* 5.17.14 [CCSL 1 716,27-1]).

²⁹² See e.g. *Marc.* 1.19.1; 1.20.2; 1.23.3 (CCSL 1 459; 461; 465).

Ephesians 3:9

Our final variant illustrates the impact of an extremely minor change on the meaning of a text. In chapter 3 of Ephesians deuterio-Paul recounts the mystery that had been revealed to him, a mystery which had now been disclosed and had opened up possibilities for gentiles to gain access to God through the gospel. According to Tertullian, where Paul says that grace had empowered him to preach to the gentiles and “to illuminate what is the plan of the mystery hidden after the aeons in the God who made the universe,”²⁹³ Marcion removed the ἐν between τῶν αἰώνων and τῷ θεῷ. This alteration completely changes the meaning of Paul’s sentence from “the mystery hidden in the creator,” to “the mystery hidden from the creator.” In fact, Tertullian once again even accuses Marcion of deliberately altering the text so as to separate the god who created the material world from the true unknown God of Christ.²⁹⁴ Three variant readings, including Marcion’s, have been transmitted in the textual tradition.

Eph 3:9 ἐμοὶ τῷ ἐλαχιστοτέρῳ πάντων ἁγίων ἐδόθη ἡ χάρις αὕτη τοῖς ἔθνεσιν εὐαγγελίσασθαι τὸ ἀνεξιχνίαστον πλοῦτος τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ φωτίσαι τίς ἢ οἰκονομία τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ ἀποκεκρυμμένου ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων

1. ἐν τῷ θεῷ τῷ τὰ πάντα κτίσαντι *rell.*
2. ἐν τῷ θεῷ τῷ τὰ πάντα κτίσαντι διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ *D² 1881 ℳ sy^{h**}*
3. τῷ θεῷ τῷ τὰ πάντα κτίσαντι *Marcion^{Tertullian} ⚭* 614. 2412*

The external evidence leaves little doubt that the original is found in reading 1. Not only is it the best represented in the external evidence, it also best explains the origins of the other two variants transcriptionally. In the two secondary variant readings we see two

²⁹³ φωτίσαι πάντας τίς ἢ οἰκονομία τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ ἀποκεκρυμμένου ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων ἐν τῷ θεῷ τῷ τὰ πάντα κτίσαντι (Eph 3:9).

²⁹⁴ *Marc.* 5.18.1-4 (CCSL 1 717,5-718,13).

counter tendencies. On the one hand, reading 2 clearly attempts to identify Christ as the instrument through which the world was created by God; on the other hand, reading 3, as Tertullian indicates, can be read as a denigration of creation and a separation of the hidden mystery from this creator God.

Schmid has concluded that the omission of ἐν from this verse should be attributed to an accident in transcription rather than a deliberate removal.²⁹⁵ The original transcription and subsequent correction in Ⲙ certainly indicates that this represents a valid possibility. Yet even if this reading was accidentally produced in the original transcription of Codex Sinaiticus, this does not mean that it could not have been deliberately produced by Marcion—of course it does not prove that it was either. Although the loss of two letters would not be at all surprising, deleting the ἐν after ἀποκρύπτω completely changes the meaning of the sentence by supplying a dative to this verb, which, with this dative, would then mean “hide” or “conceal from.”²⁹⁶ Its absence, as Tertullian intimates, makes the text align so well with one of Marcion’s fundamental theological premises that we are compelled to consider seriously the possible deliberate excision of ἐν by Marcion. The reading produced by the absence of ἐν also coheres perfectly with the primary themes articulated in the *Antitheses* and *argumenta*. Although it is certainly possible that upon reading this verse in Eph 3:9 without the ἐν that Tertullian assumed Marcion had altered it in order to draw a distinction between the creator god and unknown God, the alignment of this text with evidence from Marcion’s prefatory materials suggests the possibility that this assumption may have been based on Marcion’s own interpretation articulated in the *Antitheses*. Moreover, after reading about

²⁹⁵ Schmid, *Marcion*, 113.

²⁹⁶ V.S. ἀποκρύπτω in *LSJ*.

the separation of the creator god from the God of Christ in the *Antitheses*, Tertullian's interpretation would have been completely understandable and in this respect the interpretive role of Marcion's paratexts is evident whether or not Marcion deliberately excised εἰς. This reading thus offers us further evidence of the possible interplay between the text and the Marcion's hermeneutic articulated in paratextual materials.

IV. Conclusion

The variants discussed in this chapter do not exhaust the possible interaction between Marcion's text-critical practices and their relation to his larger editorial concerns, in particular his ancillary materials. For example, Marcion's numerous alterations of the text where Paul offers positive evaluations of Abraham and Israel may without a doubt, as Schmid concedes, be related to Marcion's theological proclivities rooted in the rejection of the Hebrew Bible and the God therein (cf. Gal 3:6-9, 14a, 15-18, 29; Rom 4:1ff, 9:1ff, 10:5ff and 11:1-32).²⁹⁷ Yet not every peculiarity in Marcion's text represents a redaction occasioned by Marcion's hermeneutic (cf. e.g. Rom 15-16); in fact, many variants were merely early readings transmitted by Marcion that also found their way into other textual traditions.²⁹⁸ But the evidence for rejecting Marcion's influence on these traditions (e.g. Syriac and Latin witnesses) has been called into

²⁹⁷ Schmid, *Marcion*, 248-50, 54-55.

²⁹⁸ This conclusion represents a fundamental contribution of the studies by Clabeaux (*Lost Edition*, esp. 129-48) and Schmid (*Marcion*, esp. 280-81). For discussion of the textual history of the ending of Romans, see Gamble, *Textual History*.

question as being too ambivalent or indebted to heresiological misrepresentation to warrant their summary dismissal.²⁹⁹

Those variants adduced here, however, suffice to demonstrate that Marcion's editorial practices were intimately related to issues of authenticity (*γνήσιον*) and spuriousness (*νόθον*). Whether Marcion envisioned his editorial work on the text as a correction (*διόρθωσις*), edition (*ἔκδοσις*), or revision (*διασκευή*), such textual manipulation conformed to his understanding of what constituted authentic Pauline teaching and text. The fundamental presuppositions (the text's *hypothesis* perhaps) concerning God, Christ, and Paul's opposition to the false apostles that Marcion identified in Paul's thought oriented his text-critical manipulations and arrangement of the corpus. Marcion's text-critical practices also speak to an understanding of the issues of authenticity and spuriousness in relation to the problems of ancient textual instability. With respect to the conservative character of Marcion's text-critical manipulations on the *Corpus Paulinum*, our conclusions corroborate recent studies on Marcion's text-critical practice.³⁰⁰

Evidence indicates that Marcion did not rewrite the text completely; rather his corrections

²⁹⁹ E.g. Dahl's identification of the "orthodox" origins of the Marcionite *argumenta* provided Clabeaux the chief impetus for rejecting a possible Marcionite influence on the transmission of the *Corpus Paulinum*. In fact, his very first sentence states: "The starting point for this study is the demonstration by Nils Dahl and Hermann Josef Frede that the "Marcionite Prologues" were not the work of Marcion or the Marcionites at all" (*Lost Edition*, 1). Furthermore, most citations were adduced by Marcion's detractors because they were aberrant and notable, surely more correspondences with other texts and text-types would be found if the entire text was available. Similarly, if only Marcionite readings identified as tendentious are admissible for reconstructing Marcion's text and his role in fashioning his edition of Paul's letters, this presumes that Marcion never faithfully transmitted his received text, a point which studies highlighting Marcion's fidelity in textual transmission have shown not to be the case. Finally, if only singular readings with a possible Marcionite tendency can offer evidence of Marcion's reworking of the text and singular readings are by definition not found in other witnesses, then Marcion's role in transmitting the text of the *Corpus Paulinum* is dismissed before any verdict can be reached. For if any reading that is found in other MSS is immediately seen as indicative of a pre-Marcionite text, then no influence could ever be proven, because the evidence for this influence has been requisitioned to prove the text Marcion received rather than the text Marcion edited and produced.

³⁰⁰ See footnote 184 above.

usually entailed the omission of text. Yet these omissions (Gal 1:1, 2:5; 1 Cor 15:3; Eph 2:14, 3:9; and Col 1:22) and substitutions (Gal 5:14; 1 Cor 15:45, 15:47) investigated here are intimately related and should be interpreted in light of Marcion's paratextual apparatus, which in some measure even offered justification for his editorial practices.

The *Antitheses* and the *argumenta*, integral for Marcion's edition of the *Corpus Paulinum*, set out the fundamental rubrics and themes under and through which Marcion interpreted Paul. These prefatory materials were not merely pedantic introductory texts. As paratexts read alongside or pre-texts read before (and perhaps even prefixed to) Marcion's edition, they also supplied the pretext for his alterations. The text was not, however, simply rewritten in accordance with Marcion's alleged "arbitrary" hermeneutic, as heresiologists claim. Marcion did not envision his work on the *Apostolikon* as corrupting. Rather, as Tertullian himself even admits, Marcion sought to reestablish what he thought was the original purity of the text in accordance with his interpretation of Paul's writings, which he codified in his ancillary materials. Central to this interpretation was Marcion's rejection of the Hebrew Bible and the God in it, founded on the concern for what was θεοπραπίης in accordance with philosophical conceptions of God as May astutely recognized.³⁰¹ Just as Zenodotus and Alexandrian text critics struggled to ameliorate unseemly references to the behavior of the gods in Homeric epic, sometimes by altering (or correcting) the text, Marcion rejected the Hebrew Bible and sometimes

³⁰¹ "Marcion in Contemporary Views," 144-48; May writes that "Marcion made a distinction between the two Gods because he could not reconcile the anthropomorphic traits of the Old Testament God with the philosophical concept of an essentially good God" (145). May also connects this philosophical foundation to Marcion's rejection of allegory as a mode of interpretation: "[s]ince the Old Testament is not sufficient for his theological demands, he traces it back to a God of low rank. The rejection of allegorical interpretation is the consequence, not the presupposition, of criticism" (147). In the same issue of *Second Century* Drijvers also presents a compelling argument that Marcion's theology and thus his rejection of the Hebrew Bible ought to be framed against the backdrop of philosophical conceptions of God and cosmology in the second century of the Common Era ("Marcionism in Syria," 158-72).

sought to purge positive references to this creator God from the text of Paul's epistles. Marcion himself, according to Origen, even professed (most likely in his *Antitheses*) to utilize the same type of text-critical practices (ἀθετέω) often used for Alexandrian textual alteration.³⁰²

Finally, whether or not Marcion engaged in textual manipulation guided by his hermeneutical presuppositions and whether or not evidence of such textual manipulation has influenced other streams of the textual tradition, Marcion's paratextual manipulation clearly achieved its desired results: to justify and transmit his hermeneutic. Indeed, Tertullian, one of the few ancient readers of Marcion's texts and paratexts whose opinion has been preserved until today, consistently interpreted Marcion's text as though he did in fact engage in textual manipulation in accordance with his theological proclivities transmitted in the *Antitheses*. Thus for this reader—a textual opponent—the paratexts directly affected the interpretation of the accompanying text. These paratextual materials not only offered justification for his text-critical actions, they also introduced the reader to Paul's letters in accordance with Marcion's interpretation of the *Corpus Paulinum* so as to guide the reader's interpretation in accordance with Marcion's understanding of Pauline authenticity and theology.

³⁰² ὁ Μαρκίων...φάσκων μὴ δεῖν ἀλληγορεῖν τὴν γραφὴν, καὶ τοὺς τόπους τούτους ἠθέτησεν ὡς οὐχ ὑπὸ τοῦ σωτῆρος εἰρημένους κτλ (Comm. Matt. 19.2 [GCS 40 356,27-31]).

CHAPTER 4

THE EUTHALIAN EDITION OF THE *CORPUS PAULINUM*

I copied and published this volume of the Apostle Paul in lines on account of its value for transcription and ease of comprehension for reading. I ask for forgiveness of all the brothers present among us for my boldness, returning with prayer your indulgence on my behalf. This book was collated against a copy in Caesarea from the library of the holy Pamphilus and copied by his hand.

Dedication

I am coronis, teacher of divine ordinances. If you lend me to anyone, take a book in return. For those who give away are bad.

Response

I am a treasure with spiritual goods for you and for all people, having been desirably adorned with harmonious and beautiful words, indeed the truth. I will not give you to anyone rashly; furthermore, I will not sell you for profit. But I will lend you to friends, only taking a book in return as security.

Colophon to the *Corpus Paulinum* in Codex Coislinianus (H^P).¹

I. Introduction

So ends the sixth-century C.E. MS of Paul's letters known as Codex Coislinianus (H^P, 015). Preceding this colophon is a text arranged in rough sense-lines and encompassed by a series of paratexts, or remnants thereof, that associate this MS with an edition of the *Corpus Paulinum* fashioned by a certain Euthalius. Although the figure of

¹ ἔγραψα καὶ ἐξεθέμην κατὰ δύναμιν στειχηρὸν· τόδε τὸ τεύχος παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου· πρὸς ἐγγραμμὸν καὶ εὐκατάλημ· πτον ἀνάγνωσιν· τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς ἀδελφῶν παρ' ὧν ἀπάντων τόλμης· συγνώμην αἰτῶ· εὐχὴ τῇ ὑπὲρ ἐμῶν· τὴν συνπεριφορὰν κομιζόμενος· ἀντεβλήθη δὲ ἡ βίβλος· πρὸς τὸ ἐν καισαρία ἀντίγραφον· τῆς βιβλιοθήκης· τοῦ ἁγίου Παμφίλου· χειρὶ γεγραμμένον· προσφώνησις· Κορωνίς ἐμὴ δογμάτων θείων διδάσκαλος· ἂν τίμη με χρήσης· ἀντί βιβλὸν λαμβάνε οἱ γάρ· ἀπόδοται κακοί· ἀντίφρασις· Θεσαυρὸν ἔχω σε πνευματικῶν ἀγαθῶν· καὶ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ποθητὸν· ἁρμονίαις τε καὶ ποικίλαις γραμμαῖς κεκοσμημένον· νῆ τὴν ἀλήθειαν· οὐ δώσω σε προχείρως· οὐδ' αὖ φθονέσω τῆς ὀφελείας· χρήσω δὲ τοῖς φίλοις ἀξιοπίστον ἀντίβιβλον λαμβάνων (Henri Auguste Omont, *Notice sur un très ancien manuscrit grec en onciales des Épîtres de saint Paul, conservé à la Bibliothèque nationale* [Paris: 1889], 53). Note that the colophon to H breaks off after οὐδ' αὖ φθονέσω τῆς; it has been reconstructed from MS 88, which also transmits this colophon. For the text and discussion of notes and variants, see Louis Charles Willard, "A Critical Study of the Euthalian Apparatus," (Ph.D. Dissertation, Yale, 1970) 113-26.

Euthalius remains somewhat obscure and the scope of his work fraught with difficulties, in terms of its paratextual apparatus his edition represents one of the most thorough and enduring attempts to refashion Paul's letters.²

In this chapter, after briefly reviewing the state of the question regarding Euthalius and the edition attributed to him, I will investigate numerous paratexts associated with the Euthalian edition in relation to issues of prolegomena. Subsequently, I will turn to Codex Coislinianus as a repository of the Euthalian edition of the *Corpus Paulinum*, focusing on the interaction between the text and paratexts transmitted in this MS. Specifically, I argue that the editor of the Euthalian edition (whether or not named Euthalius) designed both the text organized colometrically and the paratexts situated around the text for the catechetical instruction and the general edification of the community, whether through private study or public reading. Furthermore, I contend that underlying this programmatic revision of the *Corpus Paulinum* was an attempt to refashion a new Christian polity through the creation of an intertextual web of text and paratexts in the production of the physical MS. Thus, through this revision for education,

² The identity of this Euthalius, the date of his *floruit*, the scope of his revision of the *Corpus Paulinum*, and the relationship of this colophon to this revision have been subject of numerous investigations; for relevant discussion and bibliography, see below. This edition enjoyed tremendous circulation from late antiquity onward and was transmitted, in full or in part, into numerous versions such as Syriac, Armenian, Georgian, Gothic, and Latin: see Eduard Riggenbach, "Die Kapitalverzeichnisse zum Römer- und zum Hebräerbrief im Codex Fuldensis der Vulgata," *Neue Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie* 3 (1894): 350-63; J. Armitage Robinson, *Euthaliana; Studies of Euthalius, Codex H of the Pauline Epistles, and the Armenian Version* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1895); E. von Dobschütz, "Euthaliusstudien," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 19 (1899): 107-34; Günther Zuntz, "Die Subscription der Syra Harclensis," *Zeitschrift der deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft* N. F. 26 (1951): 174-96; James Woodrow Marchand, "The Gothic Evidence for 'Euthalian Matter'," *HTR* 49 (1956): 159-67; J. Neville Birdsall, "The Euthalian Material and its Georgian Versions," *Oriens Christianus* 68 (1984): 170-95; and Sebastian Brock, "The Syriac Euthalian Material and the Philoxenian Version of the NT," *ZNW* 70 (1979): 120-30. The incorporation of Euthalian traditions in the 16th century publications of the Complutensian Polyglott and Erasmus's edition, highlighted by Nils Dahl ("The 'Euthalian Apparatus' and the Affiliated 'Argumenta'" in *Studies in Ephesians: Introductory Questions, Text- & Edition-Critical Issues, Interpretation of Texts and Themes* [eds. David Hellholm, et al.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000]), offers vivid proof of the longevity of the Euthalian edition.

the physical MS of Paul's letters became an instrument for transmitting Christian moral instruction to initiates and the faithful.

II. The Euthalian Edition of the *Corpus Paulinum: Status Quaestionis*

The fundamental questions that continue to shape investigations of the Euthalian apparatus revolve around issues of authorship, antecedents, and the intended scope of this edition of the *Corpus Paulinum*. The following represent examples (though not comprehensive) of the various materials commonly found in Euthalian MSS of Paul's letters: 1) a prologue to Paul's letters; 2) *hypotheses* to each of the letters; 3) chapter headings or *kephalaia* to the letters; 4) a list of citations in the letters; 5) an account of Paul's martyrdom; and 6) a description of Paul's travels.³ The scope and contents of the Euthalian edition are extensive. Yet already at the inception of Euthalian studies, Lorenzo Zacagni, the editor of the editio princeps of the Euthaliana published in the late seventeenth century, recognized that not all the materials associated with the Euthalian edition were authentic.⁴ Such problems regarding the scope, extent, and authorship of the original form of this edition have not yet abated.

Zacagni was the first to attribute the Euthaliana to Euthalius as a result of parts of the MS tradition, which attributed the prologue to the *Corpus Paulinum* (and sundry other apparatuses) to a certain Euthalius alternatively identified as a deacon or as a bishop of Sulca, who, Zacagni maintained, composed his edition in the latter half of the fifth

³ For an overview of all the various materials associated with the Euthaliana and review of scholarship, see Willard, "Critical Study."

⁴ Lorenzo Alessandro Zacagni, *Collectanea monumentorum veterum Ecclesiae graecae ac latinae quae hactenus in Vaticana bibliotheca delituerunt. Tomus primus* (Roma: Sacrae congregationis de propaganda fide, 1698). In the following study, I will refer to the more readily available *Patrologia Graeca* edition published by J. P. Migne (Euthalius Diaconus, *Opera*, 627-790 [PG 85]), which reprints Zacagni's edition.

century.⁵ Several pieces of evidence led Zacagni to this conclusion: the attribution of the apparatus to Euthalius in the MS tradition; the reference to Athanasius in the prologue to Acts; and a late fifth-century date suggested both by Euthalius's sources and the *Martyrium* transmitted among the Euthaliana. In attempting to identify the Euthalius in the MS traditions, Zacagni adduced a certain deacon named Euthalius mentioned in the proceedings of the Council of Chalcedon (ca. 451).⁶ If this identification is accurate, the bishop Athanasius of Alexandria referred to in the prologue cannot be the famous Athanasius from the fourth century; it must instead be the Athanasius known as Celetes, who ascended to the episcopacy in 490.⁷ The composition of the editions of Acts and Catholic epistles, Zacagni thought, must come from after this time period.⁸ Furthermore, the *Martyrium*, a recounting of Paul's martyrdom circulated with the Euthaliana, offered two firm dates for this piece's production (i.e. 396 and 458): in Zacagni's mind, the former date (396) represented the original composition of the *Martyrium* prior to its incorporation into and publication with the Euthaliana, while the later date (458) put the creation of the Euthalian edition in the late fifth-century and also accorded with the rest of the evidence.⁹ Zacagni offered the following reconstruction: while still a deacon, Euthalius edited the *Corpus Paulinum*; later in the fifth century, after becoming the bishop of Pselcha (since the only known Sulca is in Sardinia, Zacagni thought this must

⁵ Zacagni, *Collectanea*, lviii-lxvi: Εὐθαλίου ἐπισκόπου Σούλκης πρόλογος προτασσόμενος τῶν δεκατεσσάρων ἐπιστολῶν Παύλου τοῦ ἁγίου Ἀποστόλου (Euthalius, *Prologus*, 693-94 [PG 85]).

⁶ Zacagni, *Collectanea*, lxii.

⁷ Zacagni, *Collectanea*, lxiv.

⁸ Zacagni, *Collectanea*, lxv-lxvi.

⁹ Zacagni, *Collectanea*, lviii-lix.

have been a corruption of Pselcha in Egypt), he turned his attention to the Catholic epistles and Acts.¹⁰

Other scholars have been far less optimistic about this interpretation and have questioned this identification primarily on the grounds of the inconsistency of attribution to Euthalius. For example, the MS tradition of the Pauline prologue alone is hardly unanimous in attribution. It is attributed to: Euthalius a deacon; Euthalius the bishop of Sulca;¹¹ and no one in the Armenian tradition.¹² The prologue to Acts also transmits the prologue anonymously and is attributed to a Euthalius bishop of Sulca, who sent his work to Athanasius bishop of Alexandria.¹³

Since the ascription of the edition of the *Corpus Paulinum* to Euthalius, as well as the subsequent editions of Acts and Catholic epistles, is far from unanimous in the extant witnesses to the so-called Euthaliana, numerous alternatives have been suggested in the ensuing years since Zacagni's identification of Euthalius as the author of this apparatus. Already in the late nineteenth century Albert Ehrhard questioned Euthalius's authorship.¹⁴ After highlighting the instability of the name and ecclesiastical rank of Euthalius in the Euthalian MS traditions and demonstrating on the basis of another MS and a lacuna in H that the name Evagrius was in H's colophon, Ehrhard mounted the

¹⁰ Zacagni, *Collectanea*, lxiv-lxvi.

¹¹ Euthalius, *Prologus*, 693-94 (PG 85).

¹² P. Aristaces Vardanian, "Euthaliana," *Handes amsorya; monatschrift für armenische Philologie* 38 (1925): 1-26, esp. 3-4.

¹³ Willard, "Critical Study" 149.

¹⁴ Albert Ehrhard, "Der Codex H ad epistulas Pauli und 'Euthalius diaconos'," *Centralblatt für Bibliothekwesen* 8, no. 9 (1891): 385-411.

argument that Evagrius Ponticus was the creator of this edition.¹⁵ Ernst von Dobschütz stressed both that some MSS called Euthalius a deacon (while some bore no name at all) and that the MS tradition of the edition of Acts and Catholic epistles also shows variation, even mentioning that this edition was sent to Athanasius bishop of Alexandria.¹⁶ Von Soden also highlighted the instability of ascriptions in the MSS and sought to date the edition much later as a result of the fortuitous discovery of a confession attributed to a bishop of Sulca also named Euthalius. The theology of this confession, which reflected later ecclesiastical councils and especially the work of Maximus Confessor (ca. 580-662 C.E.), von Soden argued, compelled a date after 662 C.E.; therefore this Euthalius, bishop of Sulca, identified in the MS tradition must have created this edition in the latter part of the seventh century.¹⁷ J. Rendel Harris offered another proposal; while he maintained that the prologue to Paul's letters were composed by Euthalius, he claimed that his editions were not dedicated to Athanasius but to a Meletius. Harris tried to substantiate this thesis by pointing to wordplays on the name of Meletius and the word "study" (μελέτη).¹⁸ Since the author was prone to such plays on words and names, Harris thought that the use of numerous cognates for Euthalius's own name (e.g. εὐθαλεστάτην, εὐθαλοῦς, εὐθαλή) proved that Euthalius was indeed the author.¹⁹ Because "there never was a Meletius, worth mentioning, who was not a schismatic," Harris claimed that this name of the

¹⁵ Ehrhard, "Der Codex H," 409-411.

¹⁶ E. von Dobschütz, "Ein Beitrag zur Euthaliusfrage," *Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen* 10, no. 2 (1893): 49-70, esp. 61. Εὐθαλίου ἐπισκόπου Σούλκης ἔκθεσις κεφαλαίων τῶν πράξεων σταλείσα πρὸς Ἀθανάσιον Ἐπίσκοπον Ἀλεξανδρείας (Euthalius, *Elenchus capitum libri Actuum*, 627-28 [PG 85]).

¹⁷ Hermann Freiherr von Soden, *Die Schriften des neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt hergestellt auf Grund ihrer Textgeschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1902 [1911 reprint]), 637-44.

¹⁸ J. Rendel Harris, *Stichometry* (London: C.J. Clay and Sons, 1893), 80-85.

¹⁹ Harris, *Stichometry*, 82-3.

dedicatee was suppressed and replaced by the unimpeachable Athanasius.²⁰ Taking a different approach, Zuntz claimed that the author himself deliberately suppressed his own name, substituting the pen name of Euthalius for himself and that of Athanasius for the dedicatee;²¹ Euthalius and Athanasius then, in Zuntz's reconstruction, are ciphers for Euzoius (376-379) and Acacius (341-365), bishops of Caesarea, deployed for fear of Euzoius's and his predecessor's associations with the Caesarean tradition of Origen.

Despite the problems associated with the identification of Euthalius, none of these alternative hypotheses has gained traction. The dependence of the Syriac Philoxenian revision (undertaken ca. 507/8 C.E.) on the Euthalian edition (not to mention the existence of Euthaliana in H dated to the sixth century) invalidated von Soden's suggestion that the Euthalian revision ought to be located in the seventh century.²² Harris's and Zuntz's proposals of Meletius and Euzoius respectively may have fared somewhat better, but only because the hypothetical nature of their reconstructions does not admit easy refutation or confirmation.²³ While the arguments for other options have not challenged the scholarly consensus, scholars are still loath to embrace the identification of Euthalius, since the evidence is far from conclusive and, apart from this connection to these editions, he is not well known. Yet, as previous investigations into the Euthaliana have emphasized, the very obscurity of Euthalius to some extent argues for his authorship, since attributing an edition to an unknown entity runs counter to the more usual practice of attributing works

²⁰ Harris, *Stichometry*, 83.

²¹ Günther Zuntz, "Euthalius = Euzoius?," *VC* 7, no. 1 (1953): 16-22.

²² J. B. Conybeare, "The Date of Euthalius," *ZNW* 5 (1904): 39-52; and Zuntz, "Euthalius = Euzoius?," 18-19. Willard nicely summarizes their arguments ("Critical Study," 158-61). For more on the relationship of the Philoxenian Syriac and Euthaliana, see Brock, "Syriac Euthalian Material"; and discussion below.

²³ Willard, "Critical Study," 175-6.

to someone illustrious.²⁴ Conybeare even makes a compelling argument that the less well known Euthalius, i.e. the author of the Euthaliana, was later after the seventh century identified with Euthalius bishop of Sulca after the publication of his confession.²⁵ After his exhaustive survey Willard judiciously concluded that while the date of the edition can likely be situated in the latter fourth century, probably between 380 and 396, (the reasons for which will be enumerated presently), the question of the author remains unresolved.²⁶ I find Willard's assessment and reconstruction the most compelling; thus in this chapter, I will continue using the name Euthalius for the author of much of the apparatus that bears his name (i.e. the Euthaliana) for the sake of convenience, even though the identification of Euthalius remains problematic.

This brief survey makes evident that the problem of authorship of the Euthaliana does not afford simple solutions and in the absence of new evidence is unlikely to be resolved more compellingly in the future. Since the various hypotheses explaining the origination of the Euthaliana have reached an impasse, continued focus on this aspect of the Euthaliana impedes further research on this edition. For this reason, I will bracket further discussion of origins and authorship of the Euthaliana except insofar as such discussions enable us to locate this edition chronologically.

Euthalian Sources and Witnesses

²⁴ Zuntz, "Euthalius = Euzoios?," 19.

²⁵ Conybeare, "The Date of Euthalius."

²⁶ Willard, "Critical Study," 175-76. In his recent study, Dahl concurred with this assessment ("The 'Euthalian Apparatus'", 233-34).

Since the Euthaliana's authorship remains unresolved, in order to situate this edition chronologically scholars have been forced to utilize evidence of this edition's sources and subsequent testimony in order to date it. The sources and testimony for the Euthaliana and their importance for the date of composition are inextricably intertwined with the problem of authorship. We are fortunate that among the testimony for the Euthaliana come descriptions from Euthalius himself. In the prologues to his edition of the *Corpus Paulinum*, as well as well as the Catholic Epistles and Acts—which he also edited and published with paratextual apparatuses similar to his edition of Paul—Euthalius sets out the aims and scope of his work.²⁷

It is in the prologues to these other editions that Euthalius informs us about the scope and purpose of his editorial work on the text of Paul's letters. The most extensive comments come from his prologue to Acts; just after the opening of this prologue we find following description:

Then, after I first read and wrote the book of the Apostle in lines (στοιχηδόν), I recently sent this book produced metrically (μετρίως) to one of our Fathers in Christ, having been ordered as some young horse unable to walk or an ignorant youth to go down a desolate and untravelled path. Hitherto I was aware of nobody anywhere of all those who have devoted themselves to the divine word with this form (τὸ σχῆμα) of delineation made for ease [of reading] (εἰς σπουδῆν). For thus neither an audacious nor daring man, I myself was unable to insult harshly those other works done well, as though they had been done poorly, by separation in metrical sections for our rudimentary reading (μετρίαις ταῖς τῆς ὀλιγομαθοῦς ἡμῶν ἀναγνώσεως τομαῖς). Just now then, as I said, after I had reworked the book of Paul, and straightaway in fact after working on the book of the Acts of the Apostles along with the seven Catholic epistles, I sent them to you first, requesting your most generous indulgence for both along with my temerity and recklessness, and to entreat earnestly all the brothers and fathers to read them with

²⁷ See Euthalius, *Prologus in quatuordecim Sancti Pauli Apostoli Epistolas* 708 A 31-37; *Prologus Actuum apostolorum*, 629 A 10-21; *Prologus Epistolarum catholicarum*, 668 B 20-22 (PG 85).

love, and to pass over both my sins and failings due to ignorance. But rather to correct each of them for me with indulgence in a brotherly way.²⁸

Euthalius's statements inform us about the form and purpose of his edition's text of Paul's letters (as well as Acts and the Catholic epistles).²⁹ We are told that Euthalius first completed work on Paul's corpus before embarking on Acts and the Catholic epistles afterwards. With respect to the actual text of the *Corpus Paulinum*, Euthalius says that he published the book στοιχιδὸν and μετρίως. Although I have translated these words as "in lines" and "metrically," the actual meaning of these words (especially στοιχιδόν) is a vexed and complicated issue. We will address the problems of interpreting this passage when we turn to fuller discussions of the text and paratexts below; we should point out in passing that Euthalius imagines himself as inaugurating a new format (τὸ σχῆμα) for Paul's letters. We should also note that, in the various prologues attributed to him, Euthalius explicitly describes the following components of his edition of Paul's letters: a prologue, divine testimonies (a list of quotations in Paul's letters), *kephalaia* (chapter headings), lections, and the text arranged for ease of reading. To anticipate briefly the forthcoming discussion, this edition—in the format of its text and deployment of paratexts—bears the hallmarks of pedagogical and catechetical concerns.

²⁸ Πρῶτον δὴ οὖν ἔγωγε τὴν Ἀποστολικὴν βίβλον στοιχιδὸν ἀναγνούς τε καὶ γράψας, πρώτην διεπεμψάμην πρὸς τινὰ τῶν ἐν Χριστῷ πατέρων ἡμῶν, μετρίως πεποιημένην ἔμοι, οἷα τις πῶλος ἀβαδῆς, ἢ νέος ἀμαθῆς ἐρήμην ὁδὸν καὶ ἀτριβῆ ἰέναι προστεταγμένος· οὐδένα γὰρ που τῶν, ὅσοι τὸν θεῖον ἐπρεσβεύσαντο λόγον, εἰς δεῦρο διέγνων περὶ τοῦτο τῆς γραφῆς ταύτης εἰς σπουδὴν πεποιημένον τὸ σχῆμα. Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀνὴρ ἀθάδης οὕτως οὐδὲ τολμηρὸς ἦν, ὡς τοὺς ἑτέρους εὖ μάλα πεποιημένους πόνους αὐτὸς ἀφειδῶς καθυβρίζειν μετρίαις ταῖς τῆς ὀλιγομαθοῦς ἡμῶν ἀναγνώσεως τομαῖς. Ἐναγχος τοίνυν, ὡς ἔφην, τὴν Παύλου βίβλον ἀνεγνωκῶς, αὐτίκα δὴτα καὶ τὴνδε τὴν τῶν ἀποστολικῶν Πράξεων, ἅμα τῇ τῶν καθολικῶν Ἐπιστολῶν ἑβδομάδι, πονήσας, ἀρτίως σοι πέπομφα, συγγνώμην γε πλείστην αἰτῶν ἐπ' ἀμφοῖν, τόλμης ὁμοῦ καὶ προπετείας τῆς ἐμῆς, ἅπαντάς τε εἰκότως κοινῇ καθικετεύων ἀδελφοῦς τε καὶ πατέρας, μετ' ἀγάπης αὐταῖς ἐντυγχάνειν, τῶν τε ἐμῶν ἁμαρτημάτων τε καὶ σφαλμάτων, τῶν ἐξ ἀπειρίας, ἀμνημονεύειν· διορθοῦσθαι δέ μοι μᾶλλον ἀδελφικῶς κατὰ συμπεριφορὰν τούτων τὰ ἕκαστα (*Prologus Actuum apostolorum*, 629 A 10-22 [PG 85]).

²⁹ Note that Euthalius's entreaty for others to receive his work generously and to correct his failings represents a common trope of prefatory works; see Janson, *Latin Prose Prefaces*, 124-144. For further discussion on Euthalius's utilization of stock commonplaces of prefatory works, see below.

In these editorial works Euthalius had predecessors. Euthalius explicitly informs us that he did not compose the *kephalaia*, but rather redeployed the work of an earlier “Christ-loving Father.”³⁰ This “father” has usually been identified as Pamphilus, due to Euthalius’s link to Caesarea, Pamphilus’s role in biblical production, and the attribution of *kephalaia* to Pamphilus in some MSS of the Euthalian edition of Acts.³¹ The prominence of Pamphilus in the colophon opening this chapter is often cited as corroboration of his influence on the Euthalian edition.³²

The colophon not only offers evidence for Pamphilus’s active role in the dissemination of scripture (possibly influencing Euthalius), but also the dissemination of Euthalius’s edition. The presence of H’s colophon (also found in other Euthalian MSS) in Syriac and Armenian versions (albeit in various forms) combined with other evidence has enabled scholars to trace influence of the Euthalian edition back at least to the Philoxenian Syriac edition ca. 507/8 C.E.³³ Whether or not this colophon was original to the Euthalian edition, however, is another matter, which will be addressed at the commencement of the section on the Euthalian text. We should also note that Euthalian

³⁰ *Prologus*, 708 A 32-33 (PG 85).

³¹ For overviews, see Willard, "Critical Study," 74-77. On the attribution to Pamphilus, see Zuntz, *Ancestry*, 87. Although he has been largely rejected, Theodore of Mopsuestia was also suggested as a possibility: see discussions in Ehrhard, "Der Codex H"; and Robinson, *Euthaliana*. Ernst von Dobschütz also suggested Theodore of Mopsuestia as the author of the prologue to Acts ("A Hitherto Unpublished Prologue to the Acts of the Apostles," *American Journal of Theology* 2 [1898]: 358-87, esp. 386).

³² See discussion of colophon below.

³³ For relationship of the Euthalian edition to the Syriac version(s) see Dobschütz, "Euthaliusstudien;" Zuntz, *Ancestry*; and Brock, "Syriac Euthalian Material."

traditions have influenced scholia on Paul's letters attributed to Oecumenicus (ca. sixth century).³⁴

These sources and witnesses give a broad time frame in which this edition must have been produced. Two other crucial pieces of evidence allow us to triangulate more precisely: 1) references both to the works of Eusebius of Caesarea and to the *Apostolic Constitutions*; and 2) the so-called *Martyrium Pauli* transmitted among the Euthaliana. Euthalius's citations of Eusebius's *Chronicle* (ca. 303-325 C.E.) and *Ecclesiastical History* (after 323 C.E.) quite simply and conveniently supply a *terminus post quem* for this work; this edition could have been composed no earlier than the first half of the fourth century.³⁵ Additionally, in the twenty-ninth Divine Testimony in Acts, the identification of the *Apostolic Constitutions* as the source of "it is better to give than receive" pushes the date up to ca. 380, when this work was compiled.³⁶

The *Martyrium Pauli* is somewhat more complicated. This work, sometimes transmitted among the Euthaliana, shows considerable similarities to Euthalian thought, expression, and vocabulary.³⁷ Yet at the same time, the *Martyrium* differs from the Euthalian prologue in its description of Paul's martyrdom, a fact which is difficult to

³⁴ Willard, "Critical Study," 9 footnote 5. Von Dobschütz also notes a connection with Theodore of Mopsuestia's use of *skopos* in his commentary on Paul's letters ("Ein Beitrag," 57-58). This, however, was hardly unique to Theodore or Euthalius as our survey in chapter 2 demonstrates. For a full discussion of *skopos* in introductory works or commentaries, see Mansfeld, *Prolegomena*, passim.

³⁵ For a brief and convenient discussion of the dates of Eusebius's works, see Kirsopp Lake, ed., *Eusebius: The Ecclesiastical History, vol. 1* (LCL; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926 [1992 reprint]), ix-xxvii. Harris argues that Euthalius's dependency on Eusebius extended far beyond mere citations and that "Euthalius is for the most of his time a plagiarist, as well as sometimes a blunderer" ("Euthalius and Eusebius," in *Hermas in Arcadia and Other Essays* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1896] 68).

³⁶ Euthalius, *Prologus Actuum apostolorum* 644 D (PG 85). For dating the *Apostolic Constitutions* see Marcel Metzger, *Les constitutions apostoliques* (3 vols.; Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1985), 57-62.

³⁷ The connections between the *Martyrium* and the Euthalian prologue was first observed by Robinson who argued for the *Martyrium*'s dependence on the Euthaliana (*Euthaliana*, 28-30, 45-47). Robinson also provides a synopsis of the passages (*ibid.*, 29).

explain without positing another author.³⁸ The redundancy of including an account of Paul's martyrdom alongside a prologue, which, as we will see, had already narrated this event, lends credence to the conclusion that this was not composed by Euthalius himself. The discrepancy of the dates of Paul's martyrdom and lack of reference to this *Martyrium* in his description of his edition support this judgment. Yet the overlap of vocabulary and expression suggests that one likely served as the source for the other. The relationship of this work to Euthalius's edition is crucial, since at the end of the *Martyrium* we find references to the years 396 C.E. and 458 C.E.—thus giving firm dates for the *Martyrium*'s production. If Euthalius was dependent on this work as a source, the *Martyrium* would provide a new and later *terminus post quem*; alternatively if the *Martyrium* used the Euthaliana as a source we would have a *terminus ante quem*. Although scholars variously interpret the evidence for Euthalius's dependency on the *Martyrium* or vice versa, Robinson has demonstrated to the satisfaction of most scholars that the *Martyrium* was dependent on Euthalius.³⁹ Thus we can locate the production of Euthalius's edition in the middle to late fourth century.

³⁸ The *Martyrium* describes Paul's martyrdom according to two separate calendrical systems (i.e. Roman and Syro-Macedonian) as thirty-six years from Jesus' death (in the Roman) or alternatively sixty-nine years from his birth (in the Syro-Macedonian), specifically dating his martyrdom to June 29 (*Martyrium Pauli* 713 B-716 A [PG 85]); the prologue, on the other hand, indicates that the June 29 was when Paul's martyrdom was celebrated in Rome (*Prologus* 700 C-701 A, 709 D-712 A [PG 85]). Robinson pointed out that, while mistaking the feast day for the actual day of martyrdom (as in the *Martyrium*) was quite common, this mistake was not perpetrated by the author of the prologue (*Euthaliana*, 30). For a full discussion of the issues of the dates and literary dependency, see Willard "Critical Study," 79-91.

³⁹ Robinson, *Euthaliana*, 28-30, 45-47. Typical of those responses to Robinson's argument are Conybeare ("The Date of Euthalius," 41), Zuntz (*Ancestry*, 79 note 2), and Willard ("Critical Study," 91). Once again Willard offers a judicious and comprehensive overview of the arguments for, and against, dependency on the Euthalian prologue or vice versa (Willard, "Critical Study," 79-91). Primarily the problem revolves around the depiction of Euthalius as a slavish epitomizer and plagiarist or an original, yet dependent, author, who was himself slavishly imitated. Harris ("Euthalius and Eusebius") continued to find the former to be the most compelling explanation of the evidence, whereas Robinson (*Euthaliana*, 28-30, 45-47) and Willard ("Critical Study," 91, 174) are typical of those more persuaded by the latter reconstruction. Although Zuntz agrees with Robinson's assessment that the *Martyrium* is dependent on Euthalius's prologue, he also does not rank Euthalius's "uninspired pen" very highly (*Ancestry*, 85 note 1). In Willard's

The point of locating this edition chronologically is not merely historical; rather it is to gain some purchase on the intellectual, social, and cultural context in which this edition was originally published. The Euthalian paratexts, to which we turn next, provide ample opportunity for fleshing out the ways in which the publication of this edition interacted with and responded to the historical currents of the latter fourth century, especially the emerging social and political dominance of Christianity.

III. Euthalian Paratexts

A. Introduction

Even though many problems continue to beset those researching the Euthaliana (particularly the attribution of authorship), these do not prohibit us from investigating those writings circulating under the name of Euthalius in order to ascertain his goals in creating this edition of the *Corpus Paulinum*. In view of the manifold difficulties associated with the Euthaliana, we are extremely fortunate that Euthalius left extensive statements on this score. Euthalius's comments come primarily from a description of his work in the prologue to his edition of the *Corpus Paulinum*, as well as the prologue to Acts and the Catholic epistles composed later. In the following discussion, I will focus on Euthalius's edition as described through his own paratexts, while setting this discussion against the backdrop of ancient prolegomena and related editorial concerns set out in chapter 2. I will demonstrate that the red-thread running through Euthalius's edition and

case, the absence of any mention of the *Martyrium* in the prologue factors heavily in the assessment that the *Martyrium* was not original to the Euthalian edition ("Critical Study," 174). Willard also notes similarities between the accretions to the colophon and the *Martyrium*: "[i]t would appear that the colophon, in the expanded form found in 015 and 88, exhibits characteristics of eclectic production similar to the *Martyrium*. It would be natural, then, to link them to the same period of activity, whether simultaneous with or following the production of the prologues" (ibid. 175).

guiding his goals in the creation of this edition is instruction of the faithful: this instruction, which encompasses not only rudimentary catechetical preparation but also continual growth of the ever-maturing believer, shaped Euthalius's edition on multiple levels—from the order of the texts in the corpus, the insertion of a *bios* of Paul as an exemplar for the Christian life, the highlighting of vices and virtues for isagogic instruction and paraenesis in the *kephalaia*, to the rough colometric organization of the following text. On virtually every level, Euthalius, by drawing on traditions of ancient prolegomena and earlier Christian editions and scholarship, constructed an edition for the edification of the faithful envisioned as a new Christian polity.

B. Euthalius's Prologue to the *Corpus Paulinum*

As we demonstrated in chapter 2, the prologue served as an important vehicle for outlining the editor's role and goals in fashioning an edition in antiquity. Euthalius composed his prologue to introduce his edition by employing typical aspects of ancient prolegomena and translating them to the specific needs of an edition of Paul and the early Christian context. Our discussion of this prologue will focus on three main aspects of Euthalius's labor: 1) his adaptation of the tropes of introductory works; 2) his innovation of features peculiar to his prologue; and 3) the relationship of this prologue to his larger paratextual apparatus and editorial goals.

Euthalius and Introductory Tropes

Commonplaces

It was not uncommon for introductory works to begin with a plea for the reader's leniency in view of the author's inadequacy for carrying out the task at hand. Euthalius employs this motif at the very beginning of the prologue and continues to develop it over the course of subsequent paragraphs:

Admiring the love of learning and zeal of your love, most honored father, and yielding to respect and persuasion, I plunged myself in through a somewhat narrow strait and passage of history to write this prologue to the works of Paul; and I undertake this work out of fear of disobedience much more than through our own volition.⁴⁰

In these opening words of his prologue Euthalius situates himself squarely in the traditions of literary prologues. Both the statement of inadequacy and his dedication are typical literary devices of such works, as was the metaphor comparing his work to a skiff being tossed by the sea.⁴¹

Euthalius's dedication of this work to a patron or friend in his opening words also had innumerable precedents in antiquity.⁴² Most likely Euthalius's dedicatee in this prologue is the same as that mentioned in his prologue to Acts, where he is named Athanasius. We noted above that, since the beginning of Euthalian scholarship, scholars have wrestled with the identity of this Athanasius in an effort to date Euthalius and his

⁴⁰ Τὸ φιλομαθὲς καὶ σπουδαῖον ἀγάμενος τῆς σῆς ἀγάπης, Πάτερ τιμώτατε, αἰδοῖ τε καὶ πειθοῖ εἴκων, στενωπῷ τινι καὶ παρεισδύσει τῆς ἱστορίας ἑμαυτὸν ἐπαφήκα, τόνδε τὸν πρόλογον τῆς Παύλου πραγματείας συγγράψαι· καὶ πολὺ μείζον ἢ καθ' ἡμᾶς ἔργον ἀνεδεξάμην, δέει τῆς παρακοῆς (*Prologus* 693 A [PG 85]).

⁴¹ Janson, *Latin Prose Prefaces*, 146-47. Harris, however, saw a connection with two histories written in Armenian; this similarity led him to posit some literary relationship between Euthalius and these Armenian works, concluding that it was most likely that neither were drawing upon the other, but that they were both independently indebted to an earlier work beginning with such an opening ("Euthalius and Eusebius," 69-71). A cursory investigation into the common modes of expression in literary prologues, however, renders any search for a relationship or source unnecessary. Janson has shown that not only are there numerous examples of the storm-tossed ship as representative of navigating difficult literary straits, but the affectation of inadequacy for the task at hand was a rhetorical commonplace (*Latin Prose Prefaces*, 124-40).

⁴² Janson, *Latin Prose Prefaces*, 116-23.

edition more precisely.⁴³ Whoever this dedicatee was, Euthalius, continuing his metaphor of his work as a wave and wind-tossed vessel, beseeches him for intercessory prayers and benevolence to bring his undertaking safely into harbor.⁴⁴

Euthalius's Introductory *Bios* of Paul

Once Euthalius finishes his dedicatory supplication, he turns to the first and most important part of the prologue: a *bios* of Paul.⁴⁵ Although this *bios* gives only the bare outline of Paul's life, it nevertheless lays the groundwork for one of Euthalius's overarching editorial goals. This goal consists in the persistent edification of the faithful by means of catechetical instruction and exhortation established through the devotion to scripture—in this case, Paul's letters.

The importance of the *bios* in this schema may not readily present itself. Yet despite its seeming lack of utility for this purpose, Euthalius's development of this pedagogical goal is nowhere more evident than in this *bios* of Paul. In this recounting of Paul's life, Euthalius has presented the reader with an example of an ideal conversion to a life of faith in Christ. In this *bios* Euthalius recounts Paul's former life as an educated Jewish Pharisee persecuting the church, until he comes to believe in Christ and is baptized after the vision on the road to Damascus (696 A-697 C [PG 85]). Paul then begins his life as an apostle and meets amicably with Peter to divide the world (697 C [PG 85]). In the course of his apostleship, Paul endures much hardship culminating in his

⁴³ See discussion above.

⁴⁴ *Prologus* 693 A-696 A (PG 85).

⁴⁵ *Prologus* 696 A-701 A (PG 85).

final arrest, trial, and deportation to Rome, where, although he suffered martyrdom, he won the crown of Christ and is still celebrated (700 A-701 A [PG 85]).

From this brief synopsis, Euthalius's *bios* may seem rather straightforward, but underlying this simplicity is a narrative structured by repentance, conversion, and salvation. Just such a narrative would be edifying to those newly encountering Paul's corpus or beginning instruction in the Christian faith. In effect, before even reaching Paul's letters, or even summaries of them in the prologue itself, Euthalius has tacitly inaugurated his catechetical curriculum. In fact, not only would this summary of Paul's life present the initiate with an exemplary model of Christian conversion—even for those who already believed in Christ—it would also offer a paradigm par excellence of the virtuous Christian life as exemplified by one of the foremost of the apostles.

We should recall here our discussion in chapter 2 that the ancient *bios* played an important role in the development of ancient collections of an author's oeuvre. Two main aspects ought to be highlighted with respect to Euthalius's *bios* of Paul: the use of the *bios* for constructing an image of the author and the importance of this image as a moral exemplar for the reader. With respect to the former we saw how the image of an author prefaced in a *bios* was interrelated with questions of authenticity of works attributed to him or her—a point we will return to shortly with respect to Euthalius's edition. This image in the *bios*, furthermore, acted as the first step in the moral purification of the neophytic reader encountering the corpus. Here the novice would learn how the philosopher embodied his teachings through a life of virtue: to give but one specific example, we observed how the *bios* of Plotinus prefaced before the *Corpus Plotinicum* exemplified how, through philosophical contemplation, the reader might advance toward

the divine while still in the body. This initiation into a philosophical way of life then continued pedagogically throughout Plotinus's works culminating in his most advanced works on *The Good* and *The One*. In his translation of this fundamental feature of ancient corpora to Paul's works, Euthalius displays a keen awareness of the pedagogical possibilities of prefacing an edition with an introductory *bios*.

Euthalius's reconstruction of Paul's life and works corresponds to other prefatory *bioi* in another important way. In antiquity the corpus itself usually provided the material for reconstructing an author's life, although traditions, related works, or previous research were also sometimes employed. Euthalius's main resource for his *bios* was likewise Paul's own writings; for Euthalius these include only those fourteen letters widely attributed to Paul. These were also supplemented by Acts and other traditions that were incorporated in Eusebius's research, on which Euthalius explicitly and tacitly drew.⁴⁶

Even though Euthalius's *bios* of Paul may not represent an innovation either in terms of function or utilization of primary texts for its construction, his translation of this common feature of ancient editions of Greco-Roman pagan authors to Christian contexts represents a watershed moment for ancient editions of Paul and one which seems to have no Christian precedent. To be sure, Marcion's *Antitheses* apparently dealt in passing with Paul's life (especially in relation to the false apostles castigated therein); but there is no indication that this isagogic text contained a full biography. The author of the *Primum Quaeritur* prologue composed for the Vulgate revision of the *Corpus Paulinum*, which we will discuss in the following chapter, also fails to utilize the possibilities for instruction through Paul's life, even though exempla for Christian living figured

⁴⁶ *Prologus* 708 A-713 A (PG 85). See also Harris, "Euthalius and Eusebius."

prominently in his agenda. With pagan editors of philosophical texts as his lodestar, Euthalius steered the *Corpus Paulinum* into uncharted, yet pedagogically rich, waters.

Euthalius's Goals

Euthalius's own words immediately following the end of his *bios* make evident that he envisioned this *bios* embedded in the prologue to function pedagogically. He admonishes his readers and auditors that:

The blessed apostle Paul effected much exhortation (πολλὰς παραινήσεις) for life and virtue already before this [i.e. his martyrdom] and also offered much preliminary instruction (πολλὰ...εἰσαγήσατο) to people about what must be done. Furthermore, altogether through the web (ὕφης) of these fourteen epistles he circumscribed for people the entire way of life (πολιτείαν).⁴⁷

This passage, which bridges the *bios* and following epitomes of Paul's letters, articulates three main aspects of Euthalius's catechetical program as realized through this edition: catechetical instruction, continual exhortation, and the fundamental role of Paul's corpus in this curriculum.

A few key words highlight Euthalius's editorial goals. The first indication of this pedagogical *skopos* is Euthalius's focus on exhortation (παραινήσεις). We will come back to the importance of paraenesis in our discussion of the *kephalaia*'s relationship to Euthalius's text of Paul (especially in relation to Codex Coislinianus). At this point I want to stress that this paraenesis contains no direct relationship to the actual paraenetic passages of his letters; rather it is Paul's life which had just been recounted that supplies the closest antecedent to this "exhortation for life and virtue." Just like those *bioi* of

⁴⁷ Πολλὰς δὲ καὶ πρὸ τούτου ἤδη παραινήσεις ὑπὲρ τε βίου καὶ ἀρετῆς ὁ μακάριος ἐποίησατο, καὶ πολλὰ περὶ τῶν πρακτέων τοῖς ἀνθρώποις εἰσαγήσατο Παῦλος ὁ ἀπόστολος. Ἐπι δὲ καὶ ὅλως διὰ τῆς ὕφης τῶν δεκατεσσάρων ἐπιστολῶν τούτων, τὴν ὅλην ἀνθρώποις διέγραψε πολιτείαν (*Prologus* 701 A77-79 [PG 85]).

philosophers prefaced to editions of their work, Paul's life itself serves as a model for Christian behavior by offering an exemplum for mimesis. Secondly, Euthalius continues this focus by describing Paul's attention to preliminary instruction (καὶ πολλὰ περὶ τῶν πρακτέων τοῖς ἀνθρώποις εἰσαγήσατο). While this phrase proleptically intimates Euthalius's shift to a discussion of Paul's letters themselves, the focus remains with the previous clause as the anaphora (Πολλὰς...πολλὰ) indicates. The employment of the verb εἰσαγήσατο also underscores Euthalius's catechetical program and recalls our discussion of the isagogic genre (εἰσαγωγή) of Marcion's *Antitheses* in chapter 3. Although there are similarities between the Marcion's and Euthalius's prefatory works, Euthalius's prologue represents a more literary prologue rather than a simple handbook for beginners. Yet no literary pretence on the part of Euthalius should overshadow the pedagogical aspects of this prologue.

Despite differences between Marcion's and Euthalius's introductory works, both function to transmit hermeneutical viewpoints. This is seen most clearly by contrasting the construction of Paul's image found in each. In our discussion of Marcion's image of Paul culled from the Marcionite prologues and the *Antitheses*, Paul was "the Apostle" who reinstated the true belief in Christ by rejecting the God of the Hebrew Bible, opposing the false apostles, and calling back those apostatizing to Judaism. Marcion constructed this image on the basis of the ten letter corpus that he edited and used, an edition lacking the Pastorals and Hebrews; the Paul of Acts and the concord among the apostles found therein also played no part in Marcion's Pauline construct. Had Marcion employed the Pastorals and Acts, his image of Paul would have been markedly different. Such an image is found in Euthalius, however, where both Acts and Paul's letters

(including 2 Timothy from the Pastorals) are explicitly cited.⁴⁸ My point in stressing the use of the Pastorals and Acts in Euthalius's reconstruction of Paul's life is not to suggest that Euthalius was in any way anomalous in his day and age. By this point in time the Pastorals were widely viewed as authentic and Acts was without question used to augment information on Paul's life.⁴⁹ Yet the inclusion of inauthentic epistles such as the Pastorals will create a very different image of Paul, both theologically and socially. Furthermore, we must remember that the margins of the Pauline corpus were still occasionally contested even in the late fourth/early fifth century: for, as we will see in the next chapter, the *Primum Quaeritur* prologue to the Vulgate revision makes a specific point to defend Hebrews as an authentically Pauline letter against its detractors.

Euthalius was also able to utilize extracanonical traditions of apostolic authorship and authenticity by drawing on other sources. The attribution of Acts and the third gospel to Paul's traveling companion, Luke (an attribution that Euthalius specifically attributed to Eusebius) allowed Euthalius to connect the *bios* of Paul in Acts to that from his own letters.⁵⁰ While neither Eusebius nor Euthalius was unique in this attribution, we should not discount the role of such extra-canonical traditions in shaping readings of Paul. The sources used to reconstruct Paul's life are deemed authentic and their use for this purpose in turn authenticates them as sources for readers of this edition. In a related manner, these extra-canonical traditions supply a proto-orthodox metanarrative legitimating its own claims of apostolicity and orthodoxy. The inclusion of such traditions in paratexts

⁴⁸ Cf. e.g. Euthalius, *Prologus* 696 B21-22; 700 C73-701 A74 (PG 85).

⁴⁹ See e.g. Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.* 2.22.1-8.

⁵⁰ Eusebius, of course, was not the originator of this tradition, but he was the source explicitly cited by Euthalius (*Prologus* 709 A-713 A [PG 85]).

(prologues, subscriptions, etc.) ensures their transmission as part of the very scripture they seek to authenticate; for example, the tradition that Titus was the first bishop of the Cretian church, which happens to be found in the subscription to this letter in Codex Coislinianus, received transmission through the Majority text even down to the King James Version.⁵¹

Euthalius's Introductory Epitome of Paul's Letters

After lauding the exemplary value of Paul's *bios* for the Christian life, Euthalius summarizes Paul's letters themselves. In this summary, by further translating issues frequently found in ancient prolegomena to the *Corpus Paulinum*, Euthalius continues his focus on education and edification. The following is Euthalius's epitome of Paul's letters:

The letter to the Romans comprises catechesis (κατήχησιν) into Christ, especially through the demonstration of natural arguments (διὰ τῆς ἐκ φυσικῶν λογισμῶν ἀποδείξεως); for this reason it is arranged in first position, since indeed it has been written for those beginning in reverence for God.

Second after this is that to the Corinthians, who, although they had already come to believe, were not living properly according to the faith, on account of which he especially rebukes them. And for their chastisement (πρὸς τὴν ἐπίπληξιν) he immediately sends another [epistle] indicating the same to those changing their minds, [an epistle] through which he strengthened them for correction (πρὸς ἐπανόρθωσιν), informing and threatening them of his own coming.

After these that to the Galatians is arranged fourth written against those inclining toward Judaism, for whom after demonstration as he sets apart saying, "Finally let no one cause trouble for me; for I bear the marks of Jesus in my body."

In the fifth position lies that [written] to the Ephesians, faithful and steadfast people. In this letter the mystery is displayed in public notice similar to that to the Romans, to both acquaintances by hearsay. And in contrast to the rest these are the first principles for catechumens (αὐταὶ πρὸς ἀντιδιαστολὴν ἀρχαὶ κατηχομένων) and the introductory texts for the faithful (πιστῶν εἰσαγωγαί).

⁵¹ *Holy Bible King James Version: Standard Text Bible* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1611 [1995 reprint]), 1188.

That to the Philippians is arranged sixth after additional growth (μετὰ προσαύξησιν) for the faithful and those already bearing fruit; for these he also testifies that he has known their best when present and he urges them to bestow even more when absent. This letter is differentiated from those to the Corinthians. For to those he said, “become my imitators (Μιμηταί μου γίνεσθε).” But to the Philippians, “Become my fellow-imitators (Συμμιμηταί μου γίνεσθε).” But he also names them his crown and joy. Just so these differ from the Corinthians.

Next is that written to the Colossians, to those not discerning according to the flesh, but faithful and steadfast, whom he also commands to guard against the deceits of philosophy and [he commands] not to cleave to Judaic observances and not to be clean with respect to religious observance, but with respect to discipline of the body. He orders them to discern the powers of letters. He writes to Archippus to pass on their support to them.

After these things were said, the two letters to the Thessalonians were likely written, of which the one comprises praise for their obedience as a result of their edification (ἐκ προσαυξήσεως) even up to testing by persecution. These ones he also compares to the believers in Judea, saying that they [the Thessalonians] in the same way as them [the Judeans] have suffered at the hands of their own country-people. These ones he also calls his crown of boasting and joy and especially exhorts them in their sufferings.

And after this one he writes another to the same [Thessalonians], which comprises testimony of their edification (προσαυξήσεως μαρτυρίαν) and their endurance, which they have in the face of persecution. [He writes] concerning the teaching of the fulfillment of the age and concerning an awareness of the delay.

That to Hebrews, after these about which he previously said that they are imitators (μιμητὰς τοὺς προειρημένους). This one concerns both the Judaic mysteries and the transfer from them to Christ announced beforehand by the prophets. These letters then encompass the individual edification in relation to the people (τὴν κατὰ τὸν λαὸν ἰδιωτικὴν αὐξήσιν).

After these are arranged two letters to Timothy, of which the first concerns discernment of teachers and order of the Church and how it is necessary to lead and to be arranged.

And the second written to him comprises praise for the ancestral faith in him through continual edification (κατὰ προσαύξησιν), a faith just as came to him from his grandmother and mother. In this [letter] he then also criticizes his disciples in Asia, judging them to be of little faith, and testifies to the great zeal of Onesiphorus alone. And he advises Timothy himself to withdraw from worldly affairs and he reminds and testifies about the gift of the kerygma. After praising beforehand what is proper and speaking about the resurrection of heresies and that it is not necessary to receive them, he afterwards also sends his detailed final thoughts about himself. When he had set out the way for many, he told him to come to him as quickly as possible and to see his fulfillment before the end, which he indicated by saying, “I have already been poured out, and the time for my departure stands at hand.”

[In] that to Titus, he describes similar things concerning the clergy and the order of the Church.

The epistle to Philemon is written concerning the faith of the slave Onesimus, who, although at first useless, was transformed and became worthy of freedom by the intervention of the Apostle. Indeed, he became a martyr of Christ in the city of Rome under Tertullus, who was at that time holding the office of prefect, enduring in the breaking of his legs the lot of martyrdom.

Thus the entire book encompasses every type of life for edification (παντοῖον εἶδος πολιτειῶν κατὰ προσαύξησιν). And let our epitome of them be said for such a purpose; we will concisely arrange before each letter in sequence the presentation (ἐκθεσιν) of kephalaia, the hard work achieved by one of our wisest and Christ-loving Fathers. We set up as headings both the most accurate section for readings, and also by systematizing the finding of the divine testimonies for ease of reference, after going through the reading of the textual web (ὕφης). We then straightaway will set this out after this prologue.⁵²

⁵² Περιέχει οὖν ἡ πρὸς Ῥωμαίους Ἐπιστολή κατήχησιν εἰς Χριστὸν, καὶ μάλιστα διὰ τῆς ἐκ φυσικῶν λογισμῶν ἀποδείξεως, διὸ πρώτη τέτακται, οἷα δὴ πρὸς ἀρχὴν ἔχοντας εἰς θεοσέβειαν γραφεῖσα. Δευτέρα δὲ ταύτης ἡ πρὸς Κορινθίους ἐστίν· ἀνθρώπους πιστεύσαντας μὲν ἤδη, τῆς δὲ πίστεως ἀναστρέφοντας οὐκ ἀξίως· ἐφ' ᾧ καὶ μάλιστα τούτοις ἐπιμέμφεται· καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἐπίπληξιν μεταβαλλομένους αὐτῆς ἑτέραν ἐπιστέλλει τοῦτο αὐτὸ σημαίνουσας, δι' ἧς ἐπιστηρίζει τούτους πρὸς ἐπανόρθωσιν, τὴν ἰδίαν αὐτοῦ παρουσίαν ἐπαγγελλόμενος, καὶ ἀπειλῶν. Ἐπὶ ταύταις ἡ πρὸς Γαλάτας τετάρτη τέτακται, κατὰ τῶν εἰς Ἰουδαϊσμόν ἀποκλινάντων γραφεῖσα· οἷς μετὰ ἀπόδειξιν ὥσπερ ἀποτάσσεται, λέγων· Τοῦ λοιποῦ κόπους μοι μηδεὶς παρεχέτω· ἐγὼ γὰρ τὰ στίγματα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ σώματί μου βαστάζω. Πέμπτη ἡ πρὸς Ἐφεσίους κεῖται, πιστοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ παραμένοντας, ἧς ἐν τῇ προγραφῇ τὸ μυστήριον ἐκτίθεται, παραπλησίως τῇ πρὸς Ῥωμαίους· ἀμφοτέροις δὲ ἐξ ἀκοῆς γνωρίμοις. Καὶ εἰσὶν αὐταὶ πρὸς ἀντιδιαστολήν ἀρχαὶ κατηχουμένων, καὶ πιστῶν εἰσαγωγαί. Ἔκτη τέτακται ἡ πρὸς Φιλιππησίους μετὰ προσαύξησιν πιστοῖς ὁμοῦ καὶ καρποφόροις, οἷς καὶ μαρτυρῶν τὰ κάλλιστα παρὼν ἐγνωκένας, προτρέπεται καὶ ἀπόντος μάλιστα προσθεῖνας. Ἀντιδιαστέλλεται δὲ ἡ ἐπιστολή αὕτη τοῖς Κορινθίοις· τοῖς μὲν γὰρ ἔλεγε· Μιμηταὶ μου γίνεσθε. Τοῖς δὲ Φιλιππησίοις· Συμμιμηταὶ μου γίνεσθε· Ἀλλὰ καὶ στέφανον αὐτοὺς καὶ χαρὰν ὀνομάζει· τοσοῦτον οὗτοι διαλλάττουσι Κορινθίων. Ἐξῆς δὲ ἐστὶν ἡ πρὸς Κολασσαεῖς γραφεῖσα, πρὸς οὐκ ἐγνωσμένους κατὰ σάρκα, πιστοὺς δὲ καὶ βεβαίους· οὓς καὶ προκόπτοντας παρατηρεῖν κελεύει τὰς ἐκ φιλοσοφίας ἀπάτας, καὶ ταῖς Ἰουδαϊκαῖς παρατηρήσεσι μὴ προσέχειν· εἶναι γὰρ οὐ καθαρὰν θρησκείαν, ἀλλ' ἀφειδίαν σώματος· οὓς καὶ τὰς δυνάμεις τῶν ἐπιστολῶν κρινεῖν κελεύει. Γράφει δὲ καὶ Ἀρχίππῳ παραγγεῖλαι τούτων αὐτοῖς τὴν προσοχὴν. Μετὰ δὲ τὰς εἰρημένας αἱ πρὸς θεσσαλονικεῖς εἰκότως ἐγράφησαν ἐπιστολαὶ δύο, ὧν ἡ μὲν ἔπαινον περιέχει αὐτῶν εὐπειθείας ἐκ προσαυξήσεως, ἄχρι καὶ θλίψεων πείραν ἐσχηκότων. Οὓς καὶ παραβάλλει τοῖς ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ πεπιστευκόσι, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ὑπὸ τῶν ἰδίων συμφυλετῶν πεπονθέναι λέγων, καθάπερ κάκεινους. Τούτους δὲ καὶ στέφανον τῆς αὐτοῦ καυχήσεως καὶ χαρὰν ὀνομάζει, καὶ μάλιστα ἐπὶ τοῖς πάθεσι παρακαλεῖ. Καὶ μετὰ ταύτην ἑτέραν πρὸς τοὺς αὐτοὺς γράφει, ἣ περιέχει τῆς τούτων προσαυξήσεως μαρτυρίαν, καὶ τῆς ὑπομονῆς, ἧς ἔχουσι περὶ τὰς θλίψεις· καὶ περὶ τῆς συντελείας τοῦδε τοῦ αἰῶνος διδασκαλίαν, καὶ περὶ προσοχῆς εἰς ἀναστροφήν. Ἡ δὲ πρὸς Ἐβραίους μετὰ ταύτας, ὧν ἔφησεν εἶναι μιμητὰς τοὺς προειρημένους. Ἡ περιέχει περὶ τε Ἰουδαϊκῶν μυστηρίων, καὶ τὴν ἐκ τούτων μετάθεσιν εἰς Χριστὸν, προκατηγγελημένην ὑπὸ τῶν προφητῶν. Ἐναυθα περικλείουσι τὴν κατὰ τὸν λαὸν ἰδιωτικὴν αὐξήσιν αἱ ἐπιστολαί. Μετὰ ταύτας αἱ πρὸς Τιμόθεον ἐτάχθησαν ἐπιστολαὶ δύο. Ὡν ἡ μὲν πρώτη περιέχει διδασκάλων προσοχὴν, καὶ Ἐκκλησίας τάξιν, καὶ ὃν χρὴ τρόπον ἄρχειν τε καὶ διατάσσεσθαι. Καὶ ἡ δευτέρα δὲ ἡ πρὸς τὸν αὐτὸν γραφεῖσα, περιέχει κατὰ προσαύξησιν ἔπαινον τῆς ἐν αὐτῷ πίστεως προγονικῆς, ὥσπερ ἐκ μάμης καὶ μητρὸς εἰς αὐτὸν ἐλθούσης· ἐν ταυτῷ δὲ ἐξῆς καὶ τῶν συνόντων αὐτῷ ἐν Ἀσίᾳ κατηγορεῖ, διακρίνων ὥσπερ τοὺς ὀλιγοπίστους, μόνῳ τε Ὀνησιφόρῳ σπουδὴν πλείστην μαρτυρεῖ. Αὐτὸν τε Τιμόθεον προτρέπεται τῶν βιωτικῶν πραγμάτων ἑαυτὸν ἄλλοτριον, καὶ ὑπομνησκει δὲ, καὶ μαρτύρεται, τοῦ κηρύγματος χάριν· προεπαινέσας δὲ τὰ δέοντα, ὕστερον καὶ περὶ τοῦ καθ' ἑαυτὸν διεξοδικοῦ τέλους ἐπιστέλλει, προειπὼν περὶ τῆς τῶν αἰρεσιωτῶν ἐπαναστάσεως, καὶ ὡς οὐ δεῖ ξενίζεσθαι. Πολλῶν δὲ τὸν τρόπον ἐκθέμενος, πρὸς αὐτὸν ἦκειν κελεύει τάχα δι' ἂν δύναιτο τοῦτον, καὶ πρὸς τὸ τέλος ὄραν τῆς αὐτοῦ συμπληρώσεως, ὅπερ ἔδειξεν εἰπὼν· Σπένδομαι ἤδη, καὶ ὁ καιρὸς τῆς ἀναλύσεώς μου ἐφέστηκεν. Ἡ δὲ πρὸς Τίτον, ὁποῖους τινὰς εἶναι κληρικοὺς διαγράφει, καὶ διάταξιν Ἐκκλησίας. Ἡ δὲ πρὸς Φιλίμονα Ἐπιστολή γέγραπται περὶ πιστοῦ

Euthalius's summary of Paul's epistles found in this prologue offers much material for analysis. I will organize my discussion around three interrelated rubrics: 1) the relationship between Euthalius's prologue and ancient prolegomena; 2) the further development of the theme of edification through careful introduction and mimesis; and 3) the interrelation of these themes in the prologue with Euthalius's larger edition.

Euthalius and Prolegomena

As we summarized in chapter 2, Mansfeld identified seven main headings, which addressed preliminary questions before a person began reading a text or a corpus of an author in antiquity.⁵³ These dealt with the following issues: 1) the scope of a work, 2) the order in which it should be read, 3) the utility of the work, 4) the reason for its title, 5) whether or not the work was authentic, 6) the divisions of the work, and 7) to what part of philosophy it belonged.

It is clear from this prologue that Euthalius had more than just a passing acquaintance with such typical features of ancient prolegomena. Nowhere is this more evident than in his short description of Romans. Despite the brevity of this epitome, Euthalius manages to address four of the seven issues typically associated with introductory questions: scope, order, utility, and part of philosophy. All four of these

οϊκέτου Ὀνησίμου, ὃς τὸ πρῶτον ἀχρεῖος ὢν, μεταβαλ[λ]όμενός τε, ἐλευθερίας ἀξιοῦται πρεσβεύσαντος τοῦ Ἀποστόλου· ἀλλὰ δὴ καὶ μάρτυς Χριστοῦ γεγένηται ἐν τῇ Ῥωμαίων πόλει ἐπὶ Τερτύλλου τὸ τηρικαῦτα τὴν ἔπαρχον ἐξουσίαν διέποντος, τῇ τῶν σκελῶν κλάσει τὴν ψῆφον ὑπομείνας τοῦ μαρτυρίου. Οὕτως ἢ πᾶσα βίβλος περιέχει παντοῖον εἶδος πολιτειῶν κατὰ προσαύξησιν· καὶ τὰ μὲν κατ' ἐπιτομὴν παρ' ἡμῶν εἰρήσθω περὶ αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον· καθ' ἑκάστην δὲ συντόμως ἐπιστολὴν ἐν τοῖς ἐξῆς προτάξομεν τὴν τῶν κεφαλαίων ἐκθεσιν, ἐνὶ τῶν σοφωτάτων τινὶ καὶ φιλοχρίστῳ Πατέρων ἡμῶν πεπονημένῃν. Οὐ μὲν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν τῶν ἀναγνώσεων ἀκριβεστάτην τομὴν, τὴν τε τῶν θείων μαρτυριῶν εὐαπόδεκτον εὔρεσιν ἡμεῖς τεχνολογήσαντες ἀνεκεφαλαιωσάμεθα, ἐπιπορευόμενοι τῇ τῆς ὑφῆς ἀναγνώσει· ἐκθησόμεθα δὲ οὖν ταύτην εὐθὺς μετὰ τόνδε τὸν πρόλογον (*Prologus* 701 A80-708 A37 [PG 85]).

⁵³ Mansfeld, *Prolegomena*, 10-11 et passim.

themes are interrelated and convey the overarching interpretive framework for Euthalius's edition.

We see this interrelationship most clearly in Euthalius's discussion of the placement of Romans at the head of the corpus. In contrast to Marcion, who, we argued in chapter 3 above, began his collection with Galatians because of its fundamental role in the rejection of Judaism in his thought, the reason for placing Romans first relates directly to Euthalius's concern for pedagogical introduction. Romans is not placed first because it represents the *summa theologicae* of Pauline thought, but because it employs natural arguments for catechesis (κατήχησις) in Christ. The mention of natural arguments (ἐκ φυσικῶν λογισμῶν) could be references to Paul's arguments about pagan culpability for ignoring God's revelation through nature; yet at the same time, focusing on natural arguments further underscores Euthalius's debt to editorial practices and arrangements of philosophical corpora, especially the category of philosophy to which a work belonged. In fact, among Middle and Neoplatonic organizations of the *Corpus Platonicum*, those Platonic dialogues that dealt with physical aspects of philosophy were placed first for readers being led into Platonic thought.⁵⁴

The ultimate goal in such instructional ordering patterns was to become more godlike through progressively advanced instruction by reading Plato's dialogues in the proper isagogic order. But since one could not comprehend such advanced instruction as a novice, the course of instruction began with more tangible and demonstrable subjects such as natural arguments, before proceeding to more difficult and abstract topics. The concern for advancing from introductory to advanced works corresponds nicely with Euthalius's claim that Romans was arranged (τέτακται) in first place for catechesis, since

⁵⁴ Mansfeld, *Prolegomena*, 84-89.

it was written for those just beginning in the faith and offers demonstrations through natural arguments.

The instructional foundation of Euthalius's ordering pattern also figures prominently in the discussions of most of the remaining epistles. Paul's dispute with the Corinthian church, for example, supplied Euthalius with a warrant for placing these letters in the second and third position; for, even though they had already come to believe in Christ, they needed to be corrected by Paul. Ephesians occupies fifth place as result of this community's unshaken faith. Euthalius compares this letter to Romans and draws out its instructional character when he writes that "in contrast to the rest these [epistles] are the first principles for catechumens (αὐταὶ πρὸς ἀντιδιαστολήν ἀρχαὶ κατηχουμένων) and the introductory texts for the faithful (πιστῶν εἰσαγωγαί)."

It is important to point out that, in his summary of Ephesians, Euthalius distinguishes between readers and relates this distinction to his pattern of arrangement of the letters in his corpus. For both the catechumens and the faithful, Euthalius prescribes this letter alongside that to the Romans, indicating their utility for the former, since they deal with first principles (ἀρχαὶ κατηχουμένων), and for the latter, isagogic issues (εἰσαγωγαί).⁵⁵ In keeping with Euthalius's focus on preliminary instruction in the letters found at the beginning (especially from Romans to Ephesians), he stresses catechesis (κατήχησις) and correction (ἐπανόρθωσις). Yet even if Euthalius's ordering pattern privileges isagogic concerns, the letters can still serve more than one purpose, as his descriptions of Romans and Ephesians indicate.

⁵⁵ We should note here that linking isagogic concerns with introductory or catechetical instruction resonates with our argument that Marcion's *Antitheses* functioned in just this way to teach and preserve the faith.

The subtle movement to letters more appropriate for those already acquainted with preliminary instruction continues with the community letters from Philippians to Hebrews. In these we see an increasing focus on the continual spiritual development, especially growth (προσαύξησης/αὔξησης), as opposed to correction (ἐπανόρθωσις) or catechesis (κατήχησις) found in the earlier letters. Whereas the early letters were marked by their utility for rudimentary instruction, Euthalius consistently targets continual development for believers in the later ones. Philippians occupies the sixth position due to its instructional suitability for the continual edification (προσαύξησης) of those believers already bearing fruit, just like its eponymous community. Both the Colossians and the Thessalonians receive praise for their faith and spiritual growth; Euthalius even highlights Paul's praise of the latter for their endurance in the face of persecution.

In order to highlight his isagogic arrangement of Paul's letters, Euthalius has to stress less commendable aspects of the opening letters and the more laudatory features of those towards the end. For example, the theological difficulty of Romans is passed over in favor of the pedagogical benefits of its natural arguments, while arguments for the abrogation of Judaism and the law in Hebrews are highlighted, instead of the very reason for these arguments: i.e. the threat of returning to such beliefs. We will see virtually the same tactic employed by the author of the Vulgate prologue in the following chapter.

In both instances we see the results of trying to justify a traditionally received order through editorial practices founded on instruction. With respect to Euthalius's prologue in particular, despite the fact that he tries to cast his edition of Paul's corpus against the backdrop of other ancient editorial practices, he is hampered by previous editions of the *Corpus Paulinum* itself. So for example, while Euthalius begins with

Romans because of natural arguments, this most difficult and advanced of Paul's letters clearly does not square well with his arrangement.⁵⁶ Furthermore, despite the fact that Ephesians, alongside Romans, has been assigned to introductory instruction it is poorly placed closer to the center of the corpus. Euthalius tries to explain his edition in terms of isagogic instruction, but is apparently loathe to completely rearrange it in light of this very issue. Instead, he undoubtedly works with an order that has come down to him, but still tries to reframe and refocus it through the lenses of preliminary instruction and continual edification of the faithful.

While we have taken pains to elucidate Euthalius's redeployment of typical features of ancient prolegomena in this prologue, at least one aspect warrants discussion for its omission. Completely lacking in Euthalius's prologue is any mention of the problems of authenticity (*γνήσιον*) in Paul's corpus. In light of the fact that this very problem was addressed in a work from the very corpus being edited (cf. 2 Thess 2:1-2) and was still discussed at the dawn of the fifth century, the absence of any acknowledgement of problems of authenticity is peculiar, especially since such discussions were common in introductory works.⁵⁷ Apparently, such concerns did not factor into Euthalius's overarching goal in disseminating his *Corpus Paulinum* for instruction. For Euthalius not only refrains from discussing passages with overt theological significance that could impinge on authenticity, he also frames his instruction

⁵⁶ I should note here that we will see a slightly different explanation proffered by the author of the *Primum Quaeritur* prologue to the Vulgate revision in the following chapter, where Romans is placed in first position because of the ignorance of the Roman congregation regarding their salvation through faith. Both prologues underscore the difficulties editors faced in explaining the received order of Paul's letters in terms of ancient prolegomena.

⁵⁷ See e.g. the *Primum Quaeritur* prologue discussed in the following chapter and the Cappadocian Amphilochus's (ca. 340-394) statement that some dispute the authenticity of Hebrews in Metzger, *Canon*, 212-13; 313-14. For discussion of authenticity in paratextual materials more broadly, see chapter 2.

in the most general hortatory and paraenetic terms without reference to specific beliefs or practices that could be deemed aberrant. Nevertheless, the inclusion of the Pastorals, for example, would still result in the incorporation of a tacit rejection of certain beliefs and behaviors as the reader interpreted the corpus qua corpus rather than each individual letter.⁵⁸

The issue of authenticity also impinges upon the Euthalian *bios* as it relates to other *bioi* in antiquity. With respect to the incorporation of disputed works into an author's corpus, we saw in chapter 2 that such action can have a tremendous effect on the image of the author constructed therefrom. In particular, the reconstruction of the author's *bios* and corpus hinged on the interpretation of the editor, who sometimes was the same person as the author of the *bios*. Porphyry's *bios* of Plotinus, for example, opened his edition of the *Corpus Plotinicum* as an exemplum of the philosophical life. In effect, the hermeneutic of the editor informed the works deemed authentic and available for reconstruction of the author's *bios*; in turn this *bios*—it too an editorial or authorial construct—informed their own and later judgments of authenticity.

Euthalius and the Inculcation of Christian Mimesis

Like his *bios*, Euthalius's prologue also stresses the importance of Paul's life and teachings as exemplars for Christian edification and virtue in two other important ways. The first can be found in citation practices. Although Euthalius does not cite extensively in his summary, when he does offer quotations from Paul, they underline his concern for

⁵⁸ E.g. beliefs in realized eschatology or women's roles in the church. For more on the latter issue with respect to paratextual materials, see the discussion of the *capitula* in Codex Fuldensis in the following chapter.

Christian behavior through imitation.⁵⁹ For example, Euthalius marshals Galatians 6:17 in order to demonstrate that Paul (the exemplum for the reader) himself exemplifies the image of Christ to the point of bearing his marks on his own body. Similarly the citation from 2 Timothy 4:6, recounting Paul's recognition of his imminent end displays prominently his endurance and resolve in sacrificing for the faith. The call to virtuous Christian behavior through mimesis also exhorts the reader in a passage from Euthalius's summary of Philippians: here Euthalius cites Paul's encouragement to this congregation to "become my fellow imitators" (συμμιμηταί μου γίνεσθε) from 3:17 and contrasts this passage with the less laudatory "become my imitators" (μιμηταί μου γίνεσθε) in 1 Corinthians 11:1. Euthalius also takes the opportunity to stress such imitation again, when, in his summary of Hebrews, he refers to the Thessalonians as their imitators (μιμητάς). Euthalius's few citations from Paul's letters consistently draw attention to exempla for imitation, whether Paul's or another's.

In addition to specific references to Paul as an exemplum, the isolation and focalization on other paragons of faith in the epitome of his letters supplies a second way for Euthalius to highlight edification through virtuous exempla. When Euthalius focuses on these exempla, he often testifies to their endurance up to the point of persecution or martyrdom. In keeping with Euthalius's catechetical ordering pattern, such examples are far more common in the later letters; in contrast, the earlier letters focus on correction and rebuke. The simplest example comes from the summary of Ephesians, where the eponymous congregation are called faithful and steadfast (πιστοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ παραμένοντας). Similarly, Euthalius highlights the generosity of the Philippians. The

⁵⁹ We could also place the brief allusions to the Thessalonians and Philippians as Paul's "joy and crown" under a similar rubric.

Thessalonians receive extensive praise for their spiritual growth and endurance in the face of persecution.

Euthalius even takes the opportunity to single out individuals so that the reader may not want for other models besides Paul. For example, both Onesiphorus and Timothy are praised in the summary of 2 Timothy. Among the individuals specifically mentioned in the prologue, Onesimus receives the highest praise in Euthalius's epitome of Philemon; for this, the shortest of Paul's epistles, Euthalius composed a summary longer than that to Romans, Paul's longest letter, so that he might narrate Onesimus's transformation from slavery to freedom in Christ. Euthalius once again even transgresses the bounds of scripture to inform the reader of Onesimus's glorious endurance resulting in martyrdom. Notice also that, according to Euthalius, Paul effects this transformation of Onesimus much like the Paul of Euthalius's *Corpus Paulinum* would ideally effect a similar transformation on the reader. This epitome of Philemon illustrates perfectly the ways in which Euthalius frames his summaries around the concern for Christian mimesis. Here the letter placed at the end of his ordering pattern relates the culmination of his goals in creating this edition: Paul's facilitation of Onesimus's transformation from slavery to his belief in Christ culminating in martyrdom.

We have already touched on the utility of Paul's letters in Euthalius's employment of typical features of prolegomena. The utility of Paul's letters lies in their importance for education and edification and underscores Euthalius's interpretation of the scope of Paul's writings. For Euthalius, the scope and utility of Paul's works go hand in hand and further relate to his understanding of the corpus as a whole. We get an indication of his interpretation of the scope at the end of his summary of Paul's letters,

when Euthalius writes that “the entire book encompasses every type of life for edification” (ἡ πᾶσα βίβλος περιέχει παντοῖον εἶδος πολιτειῶν κατὰ προσαύξησιν). This statement isolates and develops three fundamental aspects from his prologue. First, his edition consistently functions to reinforce proper Christian beliefs and behaviors through continual development (προσαύξησιν). By offering Paul’s *bios* as an exemplum, by explaining the arrangement of the letters as facilitating instruction and edification, and by summarizing these letters in order to exhort believers in fortifying the faith, Euthalius fashions his edition toward this edificatory telos. Second, in this endeavor he redeploys standard features of ancient prolegomena. The reference to “every type of life” sums up the telos of Paul’s corpus as a whole. This statement also harks back to Euthalius’s attempt to identify and circumscribe the ends of each discrete letter, while subsuming the entire corpus under the larger rubric of a completely new way of life.⁶⁰ Thus Euthalius’s conception of the telos or scope also connects to the third key aspect of the prologue: the inauguration a new Christian polity.

Euthalius’s understanding of *politeia* represents a fundamental rubric structuring his interpretation of Paul’s letters and the goals his edition of the *Corpus Paulinum*.⁶¹ According to Euthalius, Paul’s letters offer people a completely new polity and the means to maintain it. By referring to “an entire way of life” at the beginning and “every type of life” at the ending of his overview of Paul’s epistles, Euthalius explicitly frames his discussion of the pedagogical and edificatory utility of Paul’s letters with this conception of polity. In doing so, Euthalius incorporates his conception of this way of life into the

⁶⁰ Ἐτι δὲ καὶ ὅλως διὰ τῆς ὑφῆς τῶν δεκατεσσάρων ἐπιστολῶν τούτων, τὴν ὅλην ἀνθρώπου διέγραψε πολιτείαν (*Prologus* 701 A78-79 [PG 85]).

⁶¹ We will also draw out the significance of this idea in subsequent discussions of other paratexts associated with the Euthaliana as well as the text of Paul’s letters in H.

very fabric of his *Corpus Paulinum* by facilitating instruction and fostering growth through mimesis so as to cultivate a new Christian way of life.

C. Euthalius's Divine Testimonies

As we have seen, Euthalius did not content himself with merely composing a prologue to his edition of the *Corpus Paulinum*. He also manufactured or redeployed other paratextual materials to orient the reader navigating Paul's letters. Among these was a listing of citations found in Paul that Euthalius termed divine testimonies.

The divine testimonies were quite simply lists of the number and order of citations found in each of Paul's letters. These lists of citations from all manner of authors in antiquity (from Jewish scripture to pagan literature) were then designed to be situated in his corpus. We are fortunate that Euthalius once again describes the layout of his edition. After enumerating the lections, Euthalius informs us: "I went through the readings and arranged in stichoi (ἑστίχιστα) the entire book of the Apostle exactly according to fifty stichoi; and I placed alongside the headings (τὰ κεφάλαια) of each reading and the testimonies (μαρτυρίας) conveyed in each, and besides, of as many stichoi the reading has."⁶² He then continues describing the manner in which he will guide the reader through these numbers in the margin:

The number in black alone indicates the quantity of the testimonies of each book. The number in red where it is in order, and it measures likewise with the number

⁶² Διείλον τὰς ἀναγνώσεις καὶ ἑστίχιστα πᾶσαν τὴν ἀποστολικὴν βίβλον ἀκριβῶς κατὰ πεντήκοντα στίχους· καὶ τὰ κεφάλαια ἐκάστης ἀναγνώσεως παρέθηκα, καὶ τὰς ἐν αὐτῇ φερομένας μαρτυρίας· ἔτι δὲ καὶ ὄσων στίχων ἢ ἀνάγνωσις τυγχάνει (*Elenchus Lectionum* 720 B [PG 85]). Although this passage refers to components of Euthalius's edition which are widely accepted as authentic, its authenticity as an original Euthalian composition has been called into question by Robinson (*Euthaliana*, 16) and Zuntz (*Ancestry*, 105), who instead thought that it was rather taken over by Euthalius. Willard concurred with Zuntz's theory but stressed that they were nonetheless part of Euthalius's original edition of the *Corpus Paulinum* ("Critical Study," 35-37).

previously lying before with these contained in the volume of the Apostle. But each of them leaves off and then begins again in each letter.⁶³

In these passages Euthalius explains the placement, coordination, and identification of the *martyria* in his edition. Along with the *kephalaia* and lections, they are set up after the prologue and before the text.⁶⁴ Apparently the order of his edition was the following: prologue, *kephalaia*, lections, *martyria*, and text. These lists of *martyria* were also deployed according to the lections in which they were found. In Euthalius's marginal network of cross-references, these paratexts were further distinguished from others by a system of rubrication, through which they were numerically catalogued with respect to each individual letter and the entire corpus: the number in black ink indicated the total number of *martyria* for that letter, the rubricated number its placement within that series.

From this description we can deduce that Euthalius's primary goal in supplying *martyria* to his edition was to aid the reader in locating citations in Paul's letters. So it should come as no surprise that Euthalius's brief comments on the purpose of the *martyria* convey this sentiment. This paratextual apparatus consisting of a catalogue of citations and their signification through marginal numbers "systematiz[ed] the finding of the divine testimonies for ease of reference."⁶⁵ By means of these cross-references then, Euthalius fashioned a paratextual network in order to facilitate the reader's discovery of

⁶³ Ὁ διὰ τοῦ μέλανος ἀριθμὸς ποσότητα μόνον δηλοῖ τῶν ἐφ' ἐκάστης βίβλου μαρτυριῶν· ὁ δὲ διὰ τοῦ κινναβάρεως τάξιν ὁμοῦ, καὶ κανονίζεται τῷ πάλιν ἔνδον ὁμοίως παρακειμένῳ ἀριθμῷ αὐτοῖς τοῖς ῥητοῖς τοῦ ἀποστολικοῦ τεύχους· ἀπολήγει δὲ ἐκάτερος αὐτῶν, καὶ πάλιν ἄρχεται κατ' ἐπιστολήν· (*Programma* 720 11B-C [PG 85]).

⁶⁴ Many suggestions concerning the actual purpose of the lections have been proposed: from their possible use for public reading in worship (Zacagni, *Collectanea*, lxxiv), readings for commentaries (Robinson, *Euthaliana*, 15), to passages read for catechetical instruction (Zuntz, *Ancestry*, 105). For an overview of the purpose and authenticity of the lections, see Willard, "Critical Study," 28-37.

⁶⁵ τὴν τε τῶν θείων μαρτυριῶν εὐαπόδεκτον εὔρεσιν ἡμεῖς τεχνολογήσαντες κτλ (*Prologus* 708 A [PG 85]).

intertexts within the text of Paul. The utility of the divine testimonies, according to Euthalius, consists in facilitating the detection of quotations. Such a reference tool would arguably be most useful for instruction, scholarship, and theological debate.

The Utility and Function of Euthalius's Divine Testimonies

While Euthalius's stated purpose for the deployment of the divine *martyria* is relatively straightforward, he fails to offer answers to two further questions. The first is rather basic: how do these paratexts actually function? The second question takes us beyond Euthalius's stated purpose in creating this technology for his edition, to the more fundamental impetus for this endeavor: beyond its utility, how does this paratext relate to Euthalius's larger editorial goals?

The best way to understand the first question is to analyze two examples of *martyria* themselves: the first list of divine testimonies from Hebrews is noteworthy since it is also transmitted in Codex Coislinianus; the second from 1 Corinthians offers important insights into the scope and function of Euthalius's work. The following excerpt from Euthalius's enumeration of citations to Hebrews from the books of Genesis, Exodus, Deuteronomy, 2 Kings and the Psalms illustrates the function of the *martyria*:

In [the epistle] to the Hebrews, 30.
3 from Genesis: #13, #15, #23.
3 from Exodus: #16, #18, #26.
3 from Deuteronomy: #3, #20, #21, #25, #28, #29.
1 from 2 Kings: #2.
1 from Psalm 2: #1.
1 from Psalm 8: #8.
1 from Psalm 24: #9.
1 from Psalm 39: #19.
1 from Psalm 44: #5.
1 from Psalm 101: #6.
1 from Psalm 103: #4.

2 from Psalm 109: #7, 14.
etc.⁶⁶

I have displayed Euthalius's enumeration graphically in this format to make the information conveyed more easily recognizable: the *martyria* list the number of citations from each book found in Hebrews and locate them in sequence. So, if you want to find the citation from Psalm 24 in Hebrews, you simply look for the marginal number corresponding to this testimony alongside the text of this letter. This is exactly what we find in the margin of Codex Coislinianus, where, for example, there is a theta with a supralinear stroke followed by the identification of Psalm 24.⁶⁷

With respect to our second question concerning this work's function beyond its utility for facilitating references, let us turn to the divine testimonies from 1 Corinthians.

The full list of citations from this letter are the following:

In the first letter to the Corinthians, 17.

2 from Genesis: #8, #16.

1 from Exodus: #10.

2 from Deuteronomy: #7, #9.

1 from 1 Kings and the same from the prophet Jeremiah: #2.

1 from Psalm 23: #11.

1 from Psalm 93: #6.

1 from Job: #5.

1 from Hosea the prophet: #17.

3 from Isaiah the prophet: #1, #4, #13.

1 from the gospel of Matthew: #12.

1 from the apocryphon of Elijah: #3.

1 maxim of Menander: #15.

1 Laconian proverb of Demades: # 14.⁶⁸

⁶⁶ Ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολῇ λ'. Γενέσεως III· ιγ', ιε', κγ'. Ἐξόδου III· ις', ιη', κς'. Δευτερονομίου III· γ', κ', κα', κη', κθ'. Βασιλειῶν δευτέρας I· β'. Ψαλμοῦ β', I· α'. Ψαλμοῦ η', I· η'. Ψαλμοῦ κδ', I· θ'. Ψαλμοῦ λθ', I· ιθ'. Ψαλμοῦ μδ', I· ε'. Ψαλμοῦ ρα', I· ς'. Ψαλμοῦ ργ', I· δ'. Ψαλμοῦ ρθ', II· ζ', ιδ'. κτλ (*Elenchus divinatorum testimoniorum X*, 721 C-D [PG 85]).

⁶⁷ Coislin. 202, fol. 6^r; Omont, *Épîtres*, 35.

⁶⁸ Ἐν τῇ πρὸς Κορινθίους πρώτη ἐπιστολῇ ιζ'. Γενέσεως II· η', ις'. Ἐξόδου I· ι'. Δευτερονομίου II· ζ', θ'. Βασιλειῶν πρώτης καὶ Ἱερεμίου προφήτου ἢ αὐτῆ I· β'. Ψαλμοῦ κγ', I· ια'. Ψαλμοῦ ργ', I· ς'. Ἰωβ I· ε'. Ὡσηὲ προφήτου ιζ'. Ἡσαΐου προφήτου III· α', δ', ιγ'. Ἐκ τοῦ κατὰ Ματθαῖον Εὐαγγελίου I· ιβ'.

This series starts off like that to Hebrews with the numeration of quotations from the Hebrew Bible. After the prophets, however, Euthalius begins to identify other sources. The first is relatively unremarkable, where Paul's version of the Lord's Supper (1 Cor 11:23-26) is cited as coming from Matthew. Euthalius then indicates that Paul's citation in 1 Corinthians 2:9 came from an apocryphon of Elijah, by which he must have meant the *Apocalypse of Elijah*. In the attribution of this citation to this apocryphon, Euthalius was not the unique, since Origen had already attributed it to this source.⁶⁹ Finally, the list concludes with two even more unexpected sources, namely Menander and Demades.

Non-canonical Testimonies and the Triumph of Christianity

It is not the appearance of these apocryphal and pagan sources that is surprising. For, at least in the cases of Menander and the *Apocalypse of Elijah*, Euthalius does correctly locate the source of these sayings. It must be said in passing, however, that the identification of the Laconian Demades for the proverb "let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we will die" is unexpected, since this is also found in Isaiah 22:13. Without a doubt, Isaiah represents a far more likely source; and we would probably have expected Euthalius to attribute this citation to this book rather than Demades. But what is even more surprising about the inclusion of sources attributed to Demades, Menander, or the apocryphon of Elijah is their classification alongside canonical sources as "divine testimony." The dissonance between this title and the contents of some testimonies

⁶⁹ Ἡλία ἀποκρύφου Ι· γ'. Μενάδρου γνώμη Ι· ιε'. Δημάδου λακωνικὴ παροιμία Ι· ιδ' (*Elenchus divinatorum testimoniorum II*, 721 A [PG 85]).

⁶⁹ See Jean-Marc Rosenstiehl, *L'apocalypse d'elie: introduction, traduction et notes* (Paris: Geunther, 1972) 16.

contents has vexed scholars. H. H. Oliver explains the dissonance by maintaining that “from such a diverse listing it can be inferred that the term, ‘Divine Citations’ had come to have a simple conventionalized meaning.”⁷⁰ Zahn maintained that the references to such sources were not original to Euthalius’s edition but interpolated later.⁷¹ What Oliver imagines by a “conventionalized meaning” is unclear; but in response to Zahn’s attempt to dismiss such non-canonical citations, it is arguably more likely that the quotation was originally attributed to a Laconian sage instead of Isaiah as part of the original editorial plan, than for it to be interpolated afterward, thus displacing Isaiah, since it would be more difficult to explain a scribe replacing a reference to Isaiah with a Laconian proverb of Demades than a reference to Laconian proverb of Demades with one to Isaiah.

In answering the question about the underlying function of the divine testimonies, I want to step back from how Euthalius may have envisioned their utility. Rather I want to redirect our line of inquiry so as to conceptualize the function of Euthalius’s work in relation to his larger editorial concerns. By doing so the reason for entitling them the divine testimonies comes into focus. In fact, the purpose of the role of the divine testimonies aligns nicely with Euthalius’s pedagogical goals. In particular, the inculcation of the truth claims in catechetical instruction would likely be fostered by the identification of proof-texts available in a rough and ready, yet quickly accessible, system; so by employing the paratextual divine testimonies, Euthalius’s claims that Hebrews narrated the “the transfer [of the Judaic mysteries] to Christ announced beforehand by the prophets,” which we read in the prologue to this edition, could be

⁷⁰ Harold H. Oliver, "'Helps for Readers' in Greek New Testament Manuscripts" (Th.M., Princeton, 1955) 134, cited in Willard, "Critical Study," 60.

⁷¹ Theodor von Zahn, "Neues und Altes über den Isagogiker Euthalius," *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift* 15 (1904): 305-30, 75-90; esp. 380.

quickly supported by proof-texts about the fulfillment of the prophecies of the OT in the NT and the supersession of Judaism by Christianity.

Since the identification of pagan or apocryphal works would be less amenable to such purposes, other reasons for their incorporation in a list of “divine testimonies” must be sought. To be sure, comprehensiveness represents one obvious explanation, but this does not explain why these non-scriptural sources are designated “divine testimony.” The application of this title to profane texts, I would argue, should also be understood in light of Euthalius’s editorial *skopos*. While this prefatory and marginal list of citations identifies Paul’s sources and orients the reader to them, in doing so, Euthalius shifts the focus to these intertexts’s contextualization in Paul, where their identification as “Divine Testimonies” and interpretation is contingent on their deployment in Paul’s text. In this way, the relationship between Paul and his citations have been reversed: where Paul tried to legitimize his arguments by means of these sources, these sources are now legitimized as “Divine Testimonies” in Paul and his authority visually on the page. These sources, once cited by Paul to support his own argument, are now important insofar as they support Paul’s interpretation of them as envisioned by Euthalius through the lens of Christ and Christianity. Again let me emphasize that Euthalius is not unique in asserting Christianity’s superiority over Judaism and paganism; already in Justin’s apologetic works we find similar attempts to elevate Christianity over Judaism and paganism by making all those exercising rational thought (οἱ μετὰ Λόγου βιώσαντες) dependent on Christ, the seminal Logos (σπερματικός λόγος), which imbues all humans.⁷² Where Euthalius is unique, however, is in his fashioning and deploying new paratexts in order to

⁷² Justin Martyr, *1 Apol.* 46,4; *2 Apol.* 8 & 10 (Marcovich ed. 97,13-14; 149; 151-52). This became a trope of apologetic literature: on Christians in relation to Jews and Pagans in general, see Droge, *Homer or Moses?*; Marcel Simon, *Verus Israel*; and Judith Lieu, *Image and Reality*.

indoctrinate and reinforce these ideas pedagogically through the publication of his edition of the *Corpus Paulinum*.

Euthalius's extraction and highlighting of these sources function to create a network of texts, paratexts, and intertexts systematized so as to rehabilitate and exert power (whether cultural, intellectual, theological, social, or political) over the traditions represented by these other texts. From our perspective then, this paratextual and intertextual network of sources fashioned by Euthalius circumscribes scripture within a Christian hermeneutical hegemony. By decontextualizing and incorporating them into a new system, by reducing them and their attendant traditions to divine testimony to Christian legitimacy, by subsuming them under a new divine authority founded on these very truth claims of Christianity, Euthalius presents tangible evidence for the supersession of Judaism and, emerging in the fourth century, the Roman empire under the aegis of a new Christian polity.

D. Euthalian *Kephalaia*

Alongside Euthalius's prologue and divine testimonies, MSS of the Euthaliana transmit a series of detailed *kephalaia*. The *kephalaia* function analogously to the divine testimonies: whereas the divine testimonies identify specific quotations in the text, *kephalaia* orient the reader to specific passages of the text. Specifically, the *kephalaia* comprise summaries of a work's contents listed in a numbered series that correspond to numbers found in the margins of the following text. Just like the divine testimonies, by locating the number in the margin the reader is able to find the passage corresponding to the summary in each *kephalaion*. As we outlined in chapter 2, *kephalaia* likely originated

as a sort of table of contents prefaced to a work. This table of contents summarized and listed the topics under main headings, i.e. *kephalaia* (*capitula* in Latin). Eventually the numbers for the *kephalaia* (and sometimes the *kephalaia* themselves) were written in the margins corresponding to the heading so as to facilitate the finding of that particular passage in the text.

In our discussion of *kephalaia* in chapter 2, we also demonstrated that *kephalaia* were more than mere helps for the reader; they also were integral in communicating the editor's hermeneutic. Because the *kephalaia* isolated salient passages and presented the reader with a succinct interpretation of these passages, they represented the vanguard in conveying an interpretive framework. Although this interpretation could often be relatively straightforward, it was sometimes philosophically or theologically significant.⁷³ Thus, as part of the editor's hermeneutical arsenal, the *kephalaia* wielded extraordinary power to focus readers on specific passages and guide them in the proper interpretation of these passages.

Authenticity and Redeployment of the Euthalian *Kephalaia*

Before turning to our analysis of the *kephalaia* themselves, we must first address the issue of the authenticity of the Euthalian *kephalaia*. The widespread presence of the *kephalaia* in the transmission of the Euthaliana indicate that these headings were likely part of Euthalius's original edition. Euthalius himself corroborates this at the end of his summary of Paul's letters quoted above: there he explains that "we concisely arranged

⁷³ They were also significant for their understanding of ancient literary genres. For more on this topic see discussion below and David Hellholm and Vemund Blomkvist, "Parainesis as an Ancient Genre-Designation: The Case of the 'Euthalian Apparatus' and the 'Affiliated Argumenta'," in *Early Christian Paraenesis in Context* (eds. Troels Engberg-Pedersen and James M. Starr; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004).

before each letter in sequence the presentation of *kephalaia* (ἐκθεσιν κεφαλαίων).⁷⁴ Despite the fact that these *kephalaia* were originally a part of Euthalius's paratextual apparatus, they were not his own composition; for he also informs us that they were "the hard work achieved by one of our wisest and Christ-loving Fathers."⁷⁵ Although this father remains unidentified, the scholarly consensus is that this figure ought to be identified as Pamphilus.⁷⁶ The identification of Pamphilus is supported by his alleged prominence in producing scripture, his role in fostering Caesarean scholarship (to which Euthalius is often connected), and his possible connection to the Euthalian tradition in the colophon. Apparently Euthalius's contribution was to place numbers in the margins to facilitate the location of passages referred to in the *kephalaia*.⁷⁷

Kephalaia and Euthalius's Editorial Goals

Let us turn then to the Euthalian *kephalaia*. Explicating the role of the *kephalaia* in Euthalius's edition entails a recapitulation of numerous themes encountered in the previous discussion of prolegomena; for in the *kephalaia* we observe further development of Euthalius's pedagogical goal of general Christian instruction and exhortation, although

⁷⁴ καθ' ἐκάστην δὲ συντόμως ἐπιστολὴν ἐν τοῖς ἐξῆς προτάξομεν τὴν τῶν κεφαλαίων ἐκθεσιν (*Prologus*, 708 A32 [PG 85]).

⁷⁵ ἐνὶ τῶν σοφωτάτων τινὶ καὶ φιλοχρίστῳ Πατέρων ἡμῶν πεπονημένην (*Prologus*, 708 A32-33 [PG 85]).

⁷⁶ As noted above, Theodore of Mopsuestia has also been suggested as a possibility, but this has not proved persuasive. For further arguments concerning the authorship of the *kephalaia*, see discussion above and footnote 31.

⁷⁷ For discussion of the scope of Euthalius's work on the *kephalaia*, see Willard, "Critical Study," 64-77. One additional problem revolves around the interpretation of Euthalius's description of his work as ἐκθεσις; on *ekthesis* and Euthalius's redeployment of *kephalaia*, see Zuntz's discussion (*Ancestry*, 78-88). *Ekthesis* was also used to describe the protrusion (and often enlargement) of letters into the margin of a page in order to designate chapter breaks, see Marjo C. A. Korpel, "Introduction to the Series Pericope," in *Delimitation Criticism: A New Tool in Biblical Scholarship* (eds. Marjo C. A. Korpel and Josef M. Oesch; Assen, The Netherlands: Van Gorcum, 2000), 13; and Colin H. Roberts, *Manuscript, Society, and Belief in Early Christian Egypt* (London: Oxford University Press, 1979), 16-18.

issues of interpretation and theology are not completely neglected. At the end of this discussion, we will transition to an investigation of the text of Paul's letters in relation to the *kephalaia*. There we will see how the focalizing role of the *kephalaia* and the colometric presentation of the text interrelate and reinforce Euthalius's catechetical and pedagogical agenda fashioned through his edition of the *Corpus Paulinum*.

Any discussion of the Euthalian *kephalaia* must contend with Euthalius's own statements concerning his purpose in deploying them for this edition. Although we have mentioned Euthalius's statements on their origin, a full citation and discussion of this important passage (previously discussed in relation to the prologue) is necessary. At the end of his summary of Paul's letters and before his recounting of the dates of Paul's activity expressly taken from Eusebius's *Chronicle*, Euthalius writes:

Thus the entire book encompasses every type of life for edification (παντοῦτον εἶδος πολιτειῶν κατὰ προσαύξησιν). And let our epitome of them be said for such a purpose (καὶ τὰ μὲν κατ' ἐπιτομὴν παρ' ἡμῶν εἰρήσθω περὶ αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον); we concisely arranged before each letter in sequence the presentation of *kephalaia* (τὴν τῶν κεφαλαίων ἔκθεσιν), the hard work achieved by one of our wisest and Christ-loving Fathers.⁷⁸

We have already addressed the relationship of this passage to Euthalius's pedagogical and edificatory program through the publication of this edition set out in his prologue; this goal applies equally to Euthalius's *kephalaia*. Throughout these paratexts, Euthalius's *kephalaia* highlight themes of instruction and exhortation founded on enduring Christian virtue so as to reach for the perfection modeled by Christ and other Christian exemplars.

By isolating Pauline passages integral for their pedagogical or hortatory nature and by prefacing paraenetic or catechetical interpretations of other passages, the

⁷⁸ *Prologus*, 708 A31-37 (PG 85).

kephalaia reinforce Euthalius’s fundamental goal in publishing this edition. In fact, the very first *kephalaion* to Romans, the opening epistle in Euthalius’s edition, stresses the importance of instruction and casts it against the backdrop of a key theme of the prologue, i.e. the inauguration of a new “way of life” (πολιτεία). This *kephalaion* summarizes the opening of Romans as follows: “Evangelic teaching about both those outside and those in the grace of Christ and about hope and a spiritual way of life (πολιτείας πνευματικῆς). Therefore, first, after the opening, [he writes] about the judgment against the gentiles who do not regard the natural world.”⁷⁹ Its brevity notwithstanding, this *kephalaion* still manages to convey some of Euthalius’s key pedagogical principles. Contrasting the judgment of unbelievers with a new spiritual way of life founded on Christ’s grace corresponds well with Euthalius’s configuration of preliminary instruction offered in Romans. Furthermore, highlighting antithetical paths available to people (i.e. salvation or judgment) would arguably be effective for targeting those newly embarking on this course of faith. Even more important, we should not overlook the way this *kephalaion* frames Paul’s letter as “evangelic teaching” and associates this with a new “way of life” (πολιτεία). The linking of evangelic teaching inaugurating a new polity accords perfectly with Euthalius’s description of Romans as a letter ideally suited for catechesis. In fact, David Hellholm and Vemund Blomkvist have put forward an interesting proposal that this designation “evangelic teaching” encompassed the entire first section of Romans from chapters one to eleven, which was

⁷⁹ Εὐαγγελικὴ διδασκαλία περὶ τε τῶν ἔξω χάριτος Χριστοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐν χάριτι καὶ περὶ ἐλπίδος, καὶ πολιτείας πνευματικῆς. Πρῶτον μὲν οὖν μετὰ τὸ προοίμιον, περὶ κρίσεως τῆς κατὰ ἐθνῶν τῶν οὐ φυλασσόντων τὰ φυσικά (*Capitulum I ad Romanos*, 749 C-D [PG 85]).

followed by a section of paraenesis from chapter twelve to the end.⁸⁰ Finally, the highlighting of the natural world (τὰ φυσικά) echoes the description of Paul's use of natural arguments (ἐκ φυσικῶν λογισμῶν) for catechesis in Euthalius's epitome of Romans in the prologue. Although this *kephalaion* does not explicitly frame this catechesis in relation to natural philosophy or themes related to prolegomena in the same way that Euthalius does in his prologue, the resonances are more than coincidental. Moreover, this *kephalaion* locates the result of Pauline instruction in a "spiritual polity," echoing the same telos as Euthalius's prologue.

The close similarity between the *kephalaia* and Euthalius's prologue dispels any objections to using the *kephalaia* as evidence of Euthalius's own interpretive viewpoint. Although Euthalius explicitly tells us that he adopted the *kephalaia* of another, he evidently not only endorsed their hermeneutic, but was fundamentally influenced by it in conceiving his own editorial endeavor. If he had not endorsed the interpretations in the *kephalaia*, he would not have deployed them and taken over their fundamental principles for his edition. For this reason, we are justified in interpreting them as though Euthalius did write them.⁸¹ Yet they also can be utilized as embodiments of previous traditions of

⁸⁰ Hellholm and Blomkvist, "Parainesis," 476-78.

⁸¹ I should point out here that I do not in every instance maintain that the mere incorporation of extraneous paratextual material necessitates an acceptance and endorsement of the interpretation of that being incorporated. For, in the case of the multiple traditions incorporated into Codex Fuldensis investigated in the next chapter, I find the dissonance created by the juxtaposition of paratexts from disparate sources and hermeneutics far too disjunctive to imply any hermeneutical homogeneity—though it does appear to indicate a degree of inattentiveness on the part of the final compiler of the MS. The difference in my approach in these two chapters lies in three main factors that are peculiar to each chapter. First, Euthalius deliberately articulates that he employed an earlier work by someone he revered in contrast to the juxtaposition of paratexts to the *Corpus Paulinum* in Codex Fuldensis. Second, Euthalius's own work does not stand at odds with, but complements and develops, the interpretive framework in the *kephalaia*. Third, in the case of Euthalius we see one single editor who has redeployed an earlier paratext; whereas in the case of Codex Fuldensis we see multiple editorial traditions codified in this MS. Moreover, the last editor of this MS, i.e. Victor of Capua, showed little concern for a consistent hermeneutical viewpoint as evidenced by his incorporation of a Latin gospel harmony that he actually attributed to Tatian, whom he describes as a

work on Paul's letters, which Euthalius purports to stand in line with and extend. In the following discussion, we will see ample evidence where Euthalius develops this tradition of instruction identified by the *kephalaia* to Paul's letters by seizing specifically on the inculcation of a new Christian polity.

Kephalaia and Paraenesis

Throughout Paul's corpus the *kephalaia* draw attention to themes of edification. By describing passages of Pauline exhortation with the term paraenesis (παραίνεσις), the Euthalian *kephalaia* focus on the paraenetic aspect of Paul's letters so as to redirect the reader's attention to issues of moral exhortation. In addition, Hellholm and Blomkvist have argued that quite often Euthalius indicated far more than simple moral exhortation, rather he drew attention to the generic category of paraenesis as described by ancient epistolary theorists, especially when the passage indicated begins with παρακαλέω or corresponds to paraenetic sections identified through scholarly form-critical analysis.⁸² Whether or not the average reader was aware of the generic nuances Euthalius may have highlighted in his *kephalaia*, the importance of paraenesis for Christian virtue in the Euthalian *kephalaia*, like in the prologue, would have been evident. As the following examples demonstrate, the paraenesis in the *kephalaia* emphasized proper Christian behavior somewhat generally, not unlike Paul's own letters.⁸³ The third *kephalaion* to

heretic. Instead he implicitly subsumed these disparate paratexts under his own hermeneutic founded on an ecumenical inclusivity. For extensive discussion, see chapter 5 below.

⁸² Hellholm and Blomkvist, "Parainesis."

⁸³ For discussions of paraenesis in Paul, see Anders Klostergaard Petersen, "Paraenesis in Pauline Scholarship and in Paul—An Intricate Relationship," pages 267-96 in *Early Christian Paraenesis in Context* (eds. Troels Engberg-Pedersen and James M. Starr; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004); Hieronymus

Titus summarizes 2:2-9 as “exhortations (παραινέσεις) that it is necessary to encourage each according to stature.”⁸⁴ In its abridgement of Colossians 3:5-17, the ninth *kephalaion* to this letter places a similar stress on Christian virtue, calling for “exhortation (παραίνεσις) for purification, holiness, benevolence, love of God, love of learning, the singing of psalms, the pious thankfulness of life dedicated to God.”⁸⁵ *Kephalaion* six to Philippians 4:1-9 distinguishes between Paul’s individual admonitions to Syntyche and Eudocia and those to the community describing “exhortations (παραινέσεις) specific to some and common to all.”⁸⁶ Whether or not such references to paraenesis indicate generic classifications—as, for instance, Hellholm and Blomkvist interpret the paraenesis in the ninth *kephalaion* to Colossians—these *kephalaia* orient the reader to paraenetic passages concerned with general Christian morality and behavior.

The theme of concord or unity also figures prominently in the Euthalian *kephalaia* devoted to paraenesis. In *kephalaion* three to Philippians, Paul’s appeal to this community is summed up by “exhortation for concord in God, and the life full of God.”⁸⁷ *Kephalaion* six to Ephesians 4:1-16 comparably offers “exhortation for a unifying love, even if the gifts are divided for the common good.”⁸⁸ Although on the surface these *kephalaia* offer little beyond moral platitudes, we must remember that such exhortation

Cruz, *Christological Motives and Motivated Actions in Pauline Paraenesis* (Frankfurt am Main: P. Lang, 1990); and David G. Bradley, "The Topos as a Form of Pauline Paraenesis," *JBL* 72, no. 4 (1953): 238-46.

⁸⁴ Παραινέσεις, ὡς δεῖ παραινεῖν καθ’ ἡλικίαν ἐκάστοις (*Capitulum III ad Titum*, 788 B [PG 85]).

⁸⁵ Παραίνεσις καθάρσεως, ἀγιασμοῦ, φιλανθρωπίας, φιλοθεότητος, φιλομαθίας ψαλμωδίας, εὐφήμου εἰς θεὸν διαγωγῆς εὐχαριστίας (*Capitulum IX ad Colossenses*, 768 C-D [PG 85]).

⁸⁶ Παραινέσεις ἰδιαί τινων, καὶ κοιναὶ πάντων (*Capitulum VI ad Philippenses*, 765 C [PG 85]).

⁸⁷ Παραίνεσις τῆς κατὰ Θεὸν ὁμοιότητος, καὶ τῆς ἐνθέου ζωῆς (*Capitulum III ad Philippenses*, 765 B [PG 85]).

⁸⁸ Παραίνεσις περὶ ἀγάπης ἐνωτικῆς, εἰ καὶ τὰ χαρίσματα διήρηται πρὸς ὠφέλειαν κοινὴν (*Capitulum VI ad Ephesios*, 764 B-C [PG 85]).

was not only integral for Euthalius's editorial telos, it could also be instrumental in enforcing specific beliefs and practices as normative and traditional in theological disputes.⁸⁹ Irrespective of the general nature of this paraenesis, since this edition of Paul's letters was designed for neophytic indoctrination and continual spiritual development of the laity, such exhortation would have aided this goal significantly.

Kephalaia and Preliminary Instruction

References to isagogic or catechetical instruction also figure prominently in the *kephalaia* just as in Euthalius's prologue. Unsurprisingly, the *kephalaia* for those letters designated for beginners in the prologue (i.e. Romans and Ephesians) often highlight catechetical instruction. The *kephalaia* to Ephesians illustrate this most clearly, where the first *kephalaion* from this letter explicitly underscores isagogic instruction: "Concerning our election and instruction (εἰσαγωγῆς) and perfection in Christ."⁹⁰ The subsequent *kephalaion* also highlights the importance of seeking Christ's guidance in such education in the following description of Ephesians 1:15-24: "prayer for knowledge of the good things initiated in Christ (τῶν ἐν Χριστῷ εἰσαχθέντων ἀγαθῶν) for us."⁹¹ Just as Euthalius identified a dual audience (i.e. beginners and believers) for Ephesians in his prologue, the *kephalaia* combine isagogic themes and moral exhortation. As noted above, Hellholm and Blomkvist even make a strong case that Euthalius divided the letter of Romans into

⁸⁹ See Lloyd Pietersen, *The Polemic of the Pastorals: A Sociological Examination of the Development of Pauline Christianity* (London: T&T Clark, 2004); L. G. Perdue, "The Social Character of Paraenesis and Paraenetic Literature," *Semeia* 50 (1990): 5-39.

⁹⁰ Περὶ τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ ἐκλογῆς ἡμῶν, καὶ εἰσαγωγῆς, καὶ τελειώσεως (*Capitulum I ad Ephesios*, 764 B [PG 85]).

⁹¹ Εὐχὴ περὶ γνώσεως τῶν ἐν Χριστῷ εἰσαχθέντων ἀγαθῶν εἰς ἡμᾶς (*Capitulum II ad Ephesios*, 764 B [PG 85]).

two parts (evangelic teaching and paraenesis), the latter of which governed the entire series of *kephalaia* from Romans 12 until the end.⁹² A similar phenomenon was identified in the *kephalaia* to Ephesians, where Euthalius, according to Hellholm and Blomkvist, subordinates the *kephalaia* from chapter four unto the end under the heading of paraenesis.⁹³ While they identify paraenetic language and concerns throughout the Euthalian *kephalaia* to Paul's letters, it is significant that, with the exception of the ninth *kephalaion* to Colossians—which, despite inconsistencies between the content of the *kephalaion* and the description of the placement of the lections to Colossians, designates in their opinion the genre paraenesis—only those letters identified by Euthalius as integral for catechesis (Romans and Ephesians) are explicitly categorized under the genre paraenesis.⁹⁴ Irrespective of their argument for the genre paraenesis in the *kephalaia* to Colossians, if Hellholm and Blomkvist have correctly identified that, in some *kephalaia*, Euthalius classified paraenesis as a genre to cover multiple *kephalaia* in entire sections of Paul's letters, we have further confirmation of the importance of paraenesis for Euthalius's pedagogical and edificatory agenda.

The focus on isagogic instruction, however, is not limited to epistles that Euthalius assigns for catechesis such as Ephesians or Romans. The seventh *kephalaion* from Hebrews, a letter towards the end of the arrangement of this corpus, also focuses on this issue; it paraphrases Hebrews 5:11-6:9 thus: “punishment as for those still needing preliminary instruction (εἰσαγωγῆς). In which [he gives] exhortation for growth since

⁹² Hellholm and Blomkvist, "Parainesis," 476-81.

⁹³ Hellholm and Blomkvist, "Parainesis," 478-81.

⁹⁴ Hellholm and Blomkvist, "Parainesis," 484-86.

there is no second beginning. Exhortation with praise.”⁹⁵ Even though Euthalius did not expressly designate Hebrews for isagogic instruction in the prologue, here in the *kephalaia* this work does not actually target novices. Rather this *kephalaion* is framed from the perspective of one, who, although a believer, has not yet matured enough and still needs preliminary instruction. This focus also aligns nicely with the purpose of Hebrews itself (cf. e.g. Heb 6). References to isagogic instruction in this *kephalaion* notwithstanding, the focus remains on the spiritual growth of believers.

Kephalaia and Mimesis

In addition to taking over the *kephalaia*, Euthalius has redirected and developed their focus on educational aspects of Paul’s letters into a consistent editorial schema in his edition—particularly with respect to mimesis. Instruction through mimetic exempla, which implicitly framed Euthalius’s *bios* of Paul and epitome of his letters, also figures in the *kephalaia*. In stressing imitation as a fundamental element in Christian education, the *kephalaia* dovetailed perfectly with Euthalius’s editorial enterprise. Most often in the *kephalaia*, references to mimesis direct the reader to the perfect exemplar of Christ. *Kephalaion* eighteen to Romans explicitly places Paul’s exhortation for his readers to live in harmony and patience with one another under the rubric of imitation. To this end, Romans 15:1ff is summed up: “concerning the imitation of Christ’s patience.”⁹⁶ Not only do the *kephalaia* hold up Jesus’ life as a model for believers, but his death also offers a paradigm for spiritual excellence: *kephalaion* five to Philippians explicitly equates the

⁹⁵ Ἐπιτίμησις ὡς ἔτι δεομένοις εἰσαγωγῆς. Ἐν ᾧ προτροπὴ εἰς ἐπίδοσιν, ὡς οὐκ οὕσης ἀρχῆς δευτέρας. παράκλησις σὺν ἐπαίνῳ (*Capitulum VII ad Hebraeos*, 777 C [PG 85]).

⁹⁶ Περὶ μιμήσεως τῆς Χριστοῦ ἀνεξικακίας (*Capitulum XVIII ad Romanos*, 752 C [PG 85])

spiritual life through deprivation of the flesh with the imitation of Jesus' death, by summarizing Philippians 3:1-21 as "concerning the spiritual life which is not in the flesh, which is the imitation of Christ's death."⁹⁷ Just as Euthalius's prologue isolated Paul's exhortation to "become my fellow imitators" from this passage in the epitome of Philippians in order to underscore the importance of the mimetic underpinnings of Christian virtue, this *kephalaion* isolated mimesis in order to encourage believers to pursue the spiritual, not fleshly, life. In this way, Paul's passing reference to mimesis in Philippians was consistently prefaced for its role in cultivating Christian virtue.

Sometimes the *kephalaia* merely have to illuminate a passage already redolent with mimetic connotations. The case of *kephalaion* six to Hebrews offers such an example. This distillation reads: "The fear of judgment of the Word, who is above all, and the utility of the sacerdotal grace from the one who suffered humanly like us."⁹⁸ In this summary of Hebrews 4:11ff, the *kephalaion* simply focuses the reader on Christ's human suffering in order to underscore his consanguinity. Implicit in this *kephalaion* is the possibility for humans to model Christ's virtue, because of his subjection to the human condition. This *kephalaion* draws on aspects of the theology of Hebrews, whereby Christ pioneers a new relationship with God and embodies the perfect paradigm for imitation (cf. Heb 2:8-18; 4:14-16; 12:1-24).

But it is not only Christ who serves as a model in the *kephalaia* to Hebrews. The admonition to respect leaders and imitate their faith in Hebrews 13:7 received focus also. This twentieth *kephalaion*, however, alters the object of imitation from leaders

⁹⁷ Περὶ πνευματικοῦ βίου τοῦ μὴ ἐν σαρκί, ὅς ἐστι μίμησις θανάτου τοῦ Χριστοῦ (*Capitulum V ad Philippenses*, 765 C [PG 85]).

⁹⁸ Τὸ φοβερὸν τῆς κρίσεως παρὰ τῷ Λόγῳ, τῷ διὰ πάντων, καὶ τὸ χρηστὸν τῆς ἱερατικῆς παρὰ τῷ ὁμοιοπαθήσαντι ἡμῖν ἀνθρωπίνως (*Capitulum VI ad Hebraeos*, 777 B [PG 85]).

(ἡγουμένων) as follows: “Concerning the imitation of fathers.”⁹⁹ The substitution of “fathers” for “leaders” not only refashions the text, it also extends the mimetic exempla to include such as OT luminaries or Christian forefathers. In addition to this exhibition of models other than Christ, the ninth *kephalaion* to Hebrews demonstrates that Christ also has a model in Melchizedek. In this example, the *kephalaion* distills Hebrews 7:1-3 down to the following: “Concerning Melchizedek the model of Christ in his name, city, life, and priesthood.”¹⁰⁰ Strictly speaking, this *kephalaion* does not portray Christ as modeling Melchizedek through mimesis, but rather Melchizedek serves as a type (τύπος) of Christ. Nevertheless, Hebrews description of Melchizedek as the forerunner allows this *kephalaion* to turn the focus once again on imitation or models of virtuous behavior.

This discussion of virtue modeled on the example of Christ in the *kephalaia* raises important questions: do the *kephalaia* highlight specific types of behavior for the reader to model? If so, what do they entail? As in the prologue, the virtues highlighted in the *kephalaia* comprise general moral exhortation. These *kephalaia* from Hebrews offer typical examples: “Concerning brotherly love and hospitality. In which [he speaks] about temperance. Concerning contentment.”¹⁰¹ Equally common are invocations to maintain the proper social order in the church as evinced in these *kephalaia* from 1 Timothy: “Concerning the age and character and administration of widows. Concerning the honor of presbyters. Concerning the obedience of slaves. Against the greedy and false

⁹⁹ Περὶ μιμήσεως πατρῶν (*Capitulum XX. III ad Hebraeos*, 779 C [PG 85]).

¹⁰⁰ Περὶ Μελχισεδέκ τοῦ εἰς Χριστὸν τύπου κατὰ τὸ ὄνομα, καὶ τὴν πόλιν, καὶ ζωὴν, καὶ τὴν ἱερωσύνην (*Capitulum IX ad Hebraeos*, 777 C [PG 85]).

¹⁰¹ Περὶ φιλαδελφίας καὶ φιλοξενίας. Ἐν ᾧ περὶ σωφροσύνης. Περὶ αὐταρκείας (*Capitulum XX. I-II ad Hebraeos*, 780 C [PG 85]).

teachers.”¹⁰² On the one hand, such platitudinous exhortation is unremarkable; yet, on the other hand, they point to an attempt to indoctrinate and redefine such commonplaces as distinctly Christian virtues.

This process of self-definition through instruction can be seen clearly in *kephalaia* that contrast laudable “Christian” spiritual virtue with condemnable “Jewish” fleshly vice. Hebrews 13:9-20 proved useful for such comparisons, where “Paul,” according to *kephalaion* twenty-one, wrote “concerning not living according to the law bodily but spiritually according to Christ in virtue.”¹⁰³ In the case of *kephalaion* eight to Colossians this denigration of Judaism even serves as a negative example for spiritual living. Here Paul is said to have written, “that the models of the fleshly law are useful for the fleshly, and not for the spiritual, who live by the power of Christ.”¹⁰⁴ In contrast to Jewish beliefs and practices to be shunned, the *kephalaia* direct the reader to Christian virtue and to passages where Paul expounds such behavior, as at the end of Hebrews, which *kephalaion* twenty-two describes as a “prayer to God concerning the instruction in virtue and concerning the divine plan.”¹⁰⁵

The end result of isagogic instruction was perfection modeled on Christ and other luminaries of Christian virtue. As the first *kephalaion* to Ephesians succinctly articulated

¹⁰² Περὶ χηρῶν ἡλικίας, καὶ τρόπου καὶ διοικήσεως. Περὶ πρεσβυτέρων τιμῆς. Περὶ δούλων ὑπακοῆς. Κατὰ τῶν φιλοκερδῶν καὶ ψευδοδιδασκάλων (*Capitula XI, XII, XV, XVI ad I Timotheum*, 784 A [PG 85]).

¹⁰³ Περὶ τοῦ μὴ σωματικῶς ζῆν κατὰ νόμον, ἀλλὰ πνευματικῶς κατὰ Χριστὸν ἐν ἀρετῇ (*Capitulum XXI ad Hebraeos*, 780 C [PG 85]).

¹⁰⁴ “Ὅτι οἱ τοῦ σαρκικοῦ νόμου τύποι, τοῖς σαρκικοῖς χρήσιμοι, καὶ οὐ πνευματικοῖς, τοῖς ἐν δυνάμει Χριστοῦ ζῶσιν (*Capitulum VIII ad Colossenses*, 768 D [PG 85]).

¹⁰⁵ Εὐχὴ πρὸς Θεὸν περὶ τῆς εἰς ἀρετὴν ἀγωγῆς καὶ οἰκονομίας (*Capitulum XXII ad Hebraeos*, 780 C [PG 85]).

above, perfection directly followed election and instruction.¹⁰⁶ By utilizing these *kephalaia*, which preface the importance of mimesis of Christ and Christ's role as a model of Christian behavior, Euthalius reinforced his emphasis on virtue established through imitation in Paul's *bios* and epitome of his letters. All of these paratexts worked in concert to bring Euthalius's vision to fruition.

A direct corollary of this focus on imitation was the necessity to convey Christological themes through the *kephalaia* as well. For if one is instructed to imitate Christ, Christ must be properly defined. Many *kephalaia* to Hebrews convey Christological themes prominently; the first three *kephalaia* to this letter confronts this issue directly:

Theology of Christ in the glory of the Father and power over all, after the cleansing of those on the earth from which he ascended to his heavenly glory. That the glory of Christ is not ministerial but divine and creative, wherefore it is not for the present age in which they [i.e. the angels] are ministers, but for the world to come. That he was incarnated in accordance with the arrangement, sympathy, and kindness on our behalf for the salvation of humans, the salvation from death in exchange for dwelling with him.¹⁰⁷

Such formulations are not unique to the *kephalaia* to Hebrews. *Kephalaion* seven to 1 Timothy 3:16 agrees with this description of Christ's coming in the flesh, contending that Paul wrote this passage "concerning divine incarnation."¹⁰⁸ Christ's role as a creator is

¹⁰⁶ Περὶ τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ ἐκλογῆς ἡμῶν, καὶ εἰσαγωγῆς, καὶ τελειώσεως (*Capitulum I ad Ephesios*, 764 B [PG 85]).

¹⁰⁷ Θεολογία Χριστοῦ ἐν δόξῃ Πατρὸς καὶ ἐξουσία τῶν πάντων, μετὰ τῆς καθάρσεως τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς, ἀφ' ἧς ἀνέβη εἰς τὴν ἐπουράνιον δόξαν. Ὅτι οὐ λειτουργικὴ ἡ δόξα Χριστοῦ ἀλλὰ θεϊκὴ καὶ ποιητικὴ· διὸ οὐκ ἐπὶ τοῦ παρόντος αἰῶνος ἐν ᾧ οἱ λειτουργοὶ, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τῆς μελλούσης οἰκουμένης. Ὅτι ἐσαρκώθη κατὰ διάθεσιν, καὶ συμπάθειαν, καὶ οἰκειότητα, τὴν πρὸς ἡμᾶς, ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ ἀνθρώπων, τῇ ἐκ θανάτου, ἐπὶ τῆς πρὸς αὐτὸν οἰκειώσεως (*Capitula I-III ad Hebraeos*, 777 A-B [PG 85]). Hellholm and Blomkvist think that the designation θεολογία applies to the entire tract of Hebrews ("Parainesis," 500).

¹⁰⁸ Περὶ θείας σαρκώσεως (*Capitulum VII ad I Timotheum*, 781 D [PG 85]).

also found in the third *kephalaion* to Colossians described as “concerning the creation in Christ and the recreation through God’s union.”¹⁰⁹

From the perspective of proto-orthodoxy, such Christological formulations are unremarkable. Yet this should not overshadow that these *kephalaia* preface an implicit hermeneutic in keeping with this proto-orthodox Christology. These *kephalaia* do not, however, reflect the theological precision of the ecumenical councils in the fourth century and afterwards, around the time the Euthalian edition was likely published. Rather, the views of Christ prefaced here are more typical of those emerging out of the late second and early third century struggles with docetic traditions such as Valentinians, Marcionites or adoptionist positions as held by the Ebionites; the articulation of Jesus’ nature as both human and divine in these *kephalaia* navigates a middle course between these options. The concern with past Christological controversies coupled with a lack of awareness of later Christological precision, would be quite understandable and expected, if, as has been suggested, Pamphilus (ca. 240-309 C.E) was the author of these *kephalaia*.

IV. The Euthalian Text

A. Introduction

So far in this chapter I have investigated the role of certain Euthalian paratexts (the prologue, *bios*, divine testimonies, and *kephalaia*) in the creation of this edition of Paul’s letters. An equally if not more important component of this edition was the actual text of Paul’s letters, which these paratexts introduced. As we turn to this aspect of Euthalius’s edition, our investigation will revolve around a number of problems. First and

¹⁰⁹ Περὶ τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ κτίσεως, καὶ ἀνακτίσεως τῆς κατὰ συνάφειαν Θεοῦ (*Capitulum III ad Colossenses*, 768 C [PG 85]).

foremost among them is: how did Euthalius prepare his text for publication? A corollary to this question is: what type of text did Euthalius utilize for his ἔκδοσις? Even more fundamental, is there even any necessary connection between the edition of Euthalian paratexts and the text transmitted in later Euthalian MSS? Many of these questions extend far beyond the purview of this chapter; a full investigation of the Euthalian text would require extensive collation and investigation of the host of MSS that transmit the Euthaliana.¹¹⁰ Only after investigating the text in these MSS can we begin to speak about the textual character of the Euthalian edition. My focus in this chapter, however, is far more circumscribed. After isolating the scope of Euthalius's work on the text of the *Corpus Paulinum* from his own statements in the prologues to Paul, Acts, and the Catholic epistles, I investigate the text of Codex Coislinianus H^P, the earliest extant MS associated with the Euthalian edition, in order to illuminate the relationship between his paratexts, text, and pedagogical goals.

B. Euthalius's *Corpus Paulinum*

As forementioned, Euthalius did not content himself with the publication of the *Corpus Paulinum*; he also published editions of Acts and the Catholic Epistles, wherein he described the goals and purpose of his work on Paul's letters. We intimated that Euthalius's description of his publication of the text of the *Corpus Paulinum* in lines, while somewhat unclear, was undoubtedly designed to facilitate reading and comprehension of the text—as Euthalius himself acknowledged. This chrestomathic format utilized for ease of reading, I argue, proved central to Euthalius's editorial goals in inculcating the Christian faith through catechetical instruction and moral exhortation.

¹¹⁰ For a list of these MSS and their contents, see Willard, "Critical Study," 209-19.

Euthalius's Textual Format and Pedagogy

After Euthalius recounts his earlier work on his edition of Paul (in that passage from the prologue to Acts discussed previously), he offers further clarification of the goal of his work on the *Corpus Paulinum*. Here Euthalius compares the psychagogic benefits for the reader of his editions to an artisan's continual refinement of his handiwork:

Just as some wise craftsman finding the best design would straightaway from it busy himself with this more refined one thereafter and he himself fine tuning and always returning with myriad contrivances in his own mind would seek for an even more perfect one, indeed, in the same way the chrestomathic work of reading (ἡ τῆς ἀναγνώσεως...χρηστομαθῆς πραγματεία) daily happens both to train and lift up the soul little by little for contemplation of the knowledge of the good. [...] just now then when I had resolved to publish the book of Acts and the Catholic epistles with attention to prosodic features (κατὰ προσωδίαν) and how to summarize them and how to draw the mind through each of them with close attention to detail, most beloved brother Athanasius, and when I had done this diligently and zealously and also arranged their text in lines (στοιχηδόν) according to my measurement (συμμετρίαν) for clearly understandable reading (πρὸς εὐσημιον ἀνάγνωσιν), I quickly conveyed each to you for review and after I had set them out in regular succession after the few readings, prefacing first the things about which Luke the evangelist composed.¹¹¹

¹¹¹ Καθάπερ γὰρ ἂν τις ἀγχίνους χειροτέχνης τὸ κάλλιστον τῆς τέχνης εὐρόμενος, τὸ λεπτότερον δ' αὐτῆς ἐξ αὐτῆς περιεργάζεται, λοιπὸν, καὶ ζητῆ, μυρίαὶ αἰεὶ μηχαναῖς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ αὐτὸς ἔννοιαν πρὸς τὸ τελειότερον συνεκτίνων τε καὶ ἀρμοζόμενος· τὸν αὐτὸν δὴ τρόπον ἡμῖν καὶ ἡ τῆς ἀναγνώσεως τυγχάνει χρηστομαθῆς πραγματεία, ὁσημέραι πρὸς θεωρίαν τῆς τῶν καλῶν γνώσεως κατὰ μικρὸν τὴν ψυχὴν ἐξασκοῦσά τε καὶ ἀναβιβάζουσα. ...ἐναγχος ἐμοί γε τὴν τε τῶν Πράξεων βίβλον ἅμα, καὶ καθολικῶν Ἐπιστολῶν ἀναγνῶνά τε κατὰ προσωδίαν, καὶ πῶς ἀνακεφαλαίωσασθαι, καὶ διελεῖν τούτων ἐκάστης τὸν νοῦν λεπτομερῶς, προσέταξας, ἀδελφεῖ Ἀθανάσιε προσφιλέστατε, καὶ τοῦτο ἀόκνως ἐγὼ, καὶ προθύμως πεποικῶς, στοιχηδόν τε συνθεῖς τούτων τὸ ὕφος, κατὰ τὴν ἑμαυτοῦ συμμετρίαν πρὸς εὐσημιον ἀνάγνωσιν, διεπεμφάμην ἐν βραχεῖ τὰ ἕκαστά σοι, καὶ κατ' ἀκολουθίαν ἐκθέμενος ὀλιγοστήν ἀνακεφαλαίωσιν, πρῶτον περὶ ὧν Λουκᾶς ὁ εὐαγγελιστὴς συνέταξε, προοιμιασάμενος (*Prologus Actuum apostolorum*, 633 A56-C65 [PG 85]). Nota bene: in this translation and in discussion below I have followed Alan Kemp's rendering of κατὰ προσωδίαν (i.e. "according to prosodic features") as found in his translation of Dionysius Thrax's *Tekhnē Grammatikē* ("The *Technē Grammatikē* of Dionysius Thrax: English Translation with Introduction and Notes," in *The History of Linguistics in the Classical Period* [ed. Daniel J. Taylor; Amsterdam: J. Benjamins Pub. Co., 1987]). This phrase has a wide range of meanings and, according to Kemp, encompasses "accentuation, the rough and smooth breathings, vowel and syllable length, and phonetic features relating to word boundaries" (ibid. 186).

On the whole, this passage corresponds rather closely to what Euthalius articulated previously.¹¹² Euthalius again draws the reader's attention to the textual format in lines, although in this instance he describes this feature with the term *στοιχηδόν* instead of *στοηχιδόν*. He once again locates the purpose of his measured delineation of the text in the facilitation of reading. In addition, Euthalius indicates that he utilized this format so that he might publish his editions *κατὰ προσωδίαν*. The overarching purpose of Euthalius's work on the text, however, was the psychagogic role of leading the soul to the divine through constant study of scripture by facilitating its reading.

While the overall goal of Euthalius's text remains relatively clear, what he actually means by his descriptions of the text is not. The first problem relates to the use of the terms *στοιχηδόν* and *στοηχιδόν*. In his description of his publication of the Catholic epistles Euthalius designates his format by another term; here he writes: "I will publish the Catholic epistles in order for you in lines (*στιχηδόν*) at the same time after setting out the syllabus (*ἔκθεσιν*) of the *kephalaia* and then the divine testimonies in lines."¹¹³

Exactly what Euthalius meant to convey by these terms remains somewhat obscure; the adverbs *στοιχηδόν* and *στιχηδόν* literally mean "in a row, in order, or one after another" and "by rows or lines, in verses" respectively.¹¹⁴ The description in the colophon transmitted in H and numerous other Euthalian MSS cited at the beginning of this chapter introduces further complications to the discussion: here the scribe, corrector, or editor of

¹¹² Though not related to Euthalius's work on the text of Paul, we should also note that, immediately after this section, Euthalius prominently highlights the introductory aspect of his edition and its importance for prefacing information about Luke.

¹¹³ Ἐγὼ δέ τοι στιχηδόν τὰς καθολικὰς καθ' ἑξῆς ἐπιστολάς ἀναγνώσομαι, τὴν τῶν κεφαλαίων ἔκθεσιν ἅμα, καὶ θείων μαρτυριῶν μετρίως ἐνθένδε ποιούμενος (*Prologus Epistolarum catholicarum*, 668 B 20-22 [PG 85]).

¹¹⁴ V.s. *στοιχηδόν* in *LSJ*.

Codex Coislinianus or an exemplar employed phrase κατὰ δύναμιν στιχηρὸν to describe the textual format.¹¹⁵

Scholars have tried to reconcile the edition produced by Euthalius with his words in the following ways. Robinson concluded that Euthalius's work on the text was limited to facilitating "an intelligent reading of the sacred text by distributing it into short sentences."¹¹⁶ Against those who saw in Euthalius the founder of stichometry in the NT, J. Rendel Harris, distinguished Euthalius's format from this textual arrangement.¹¹⁷ Stichometry was the arrangement of a text in lines corresponding to a sixteen syllable, thirty-six letter ideal line;¹¹⁸ Euthalius's work corresponded to colometry, i.e. the arrangement of the text in sense-lines κατὰ κῶλα καὶ κόμματα (per cola et commata).¹¹⁹ The measurement of the text and paratexts in Euthalius's edition corresponded to stichometry;¹²⁰ his arrangement of the text, colometry. Whereas the former was utilized for payment of the scribe according to the amount of line transcribed or in order to guard against major losses or interpolations of text;¹²¹ the primary utility of the latter lay in its presentation of the text on the page so as to aid reading in contrast to the presentation in

¹¹⁵ See footnote 1 above.

¹¹⁶ Robinson, *Euthaliana*, 13. He adamantly maintains that Euthalius took no action on the text itself (ibid. 12).

¹¹⁷ Harris, *Stichometry*, 34-48. For further discussions of stichometry in general, see Friedrich Blass, "Zur Frage über Stichometrie der Alten," *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 24 (1869): 524-32; Charles Graux, "Nouvelles recherches sur la stichométrie," *Revue de Philologie de Littérature et d'Histoire Anciennes* N. S. 2 (1878): 97-143; Friedrich Blass, "Stichometrie und Kolometrie," *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 34 (1879): 214-36; and Roland Schütz, "Die Bedeutung der Kolometrie für das Neue Testament," *ZNW* 21 (1922): 161-84. For recent discussions of stichometry in early Christian MSS see Kim Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians of Letters*, 87-88.

¹¹⁸ Harris, *Stichometry*.

¹¹⁹ Robinson, *Euthaliana*, 17; and Zuntz, *Ancestry*, 94-104.

¹²⁰ Harris, *Stichometry*, 39-54.

¹²¹ Schütz, "Kolometrie," 64ff.

scriptio continua format.¹²² Zuntz followed a similar line of argument, but saw Euthalius's work as that of a grammarian intent on ensuring the proper vocalization of the text.¹²³

Central to Zuntz's argument was Euthalius's statement that he published in this format κατὰ προσφδίαν.¹²⁴ This reflects the concern, in Zuntz's interpretation, of the grammarian intent on rendering the text for accurate comprehension and pronunciation aloud.¹²⁵ What exactly did preparing the text κατὰ προσφδίαν entail? Zuntz defers to the ancient grammatical handbook *Technē Grammatikē* of Dionysius Thrax, who defines κατὰ προσφδίαν as the first-order ability to read proficiently that precedes exegesis.¹²⁶ Dionysus further distinguishes reading κατὰ προσφδίαν from reading καθ' ὑπόκρισιν and κατὰ διαστολήν; the latter two are concerned with the virtue (ἀρετήν) and the thought (νοῦν) respectively, whereas reading κατὰ προσφδίαν reveals the artistry (τέχνην).¹²⁷

Zuntz thinks that Euthalius's separation of the text κατὰ κῶλα καὶ κόμματα in order to

¹²² Willard, "Critical Study," 187.

¹²³ Zuntz, *Ancestry*, 89-94.

¹²⁴ For further discussion of the phrase κατὰ προσφδίαν, see William G. Rutherford, *A Chapter in the History of Annotation being Scholia Aristophanica*, vol. III (London: Macmillan, 1905 [1987 Garland Publishing reprint]), 157-67.

¹²⁵ Zuntz, *Ancestry*, 89-94.

¹²⁶ Gustav Uhlig, ed., *Dionysii Thracis Ars Grammatica* (Lipsiae: B. G. Teubner, 1883), 5,2-5. For further discussions of Dionysius Thrax, see Jean Lallot, "Grammatici certant: vers une typologie de l'argumentation *pro et contra* dans le question de l'authenticité de la *Technē*," in *Dionysius Thrax and the Technē Grammatikē* (eds. Vivien Law and Ineke Sluiter; Münster: Nodus Publikationen, 1995); Vivien Law, "The *Technē* and Grammar in the Roman World," in *ibid.*; Theresa Morgan, "Dionysius Thrax and the Educational Uses of Grammar," in *ibid.*; and Robert H. Robins, "The Authenticity of the *Technē*: The *status quaestionis*," in *ibid.* For ancient grammar and grammarians more generally, see Robert A. Kaster, "Islands in the Stream: The Grammarians of Late Antiquity," in *The History of Linguistics in the Classical Period* (ed. Daniel J. Taylor; Amsterdam: J. Benjamins Pub. Co., 1987); *ibid.*, *Guardians of Language: The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988); and Pierre Swiggers and Alfons Wouters, eds., *Ancient Grammar: Content and Context* (Leuven: Peeters, 1996).

¹²⁷ ἐκ δὲ τῆς προσφδίαν τὴν τέχνην...ὀρώμεν (*Ars Grammatica*, [Uhlig ed. 6,15-16]).

aid the proper discernment of letters into words for reading underscores a concern for controlling the reading of the text.¹²⁸

Although the term στιχηδὸν semantically relates to the verbs στιχίζω/στείχω, as forementioned Robinson and Zuntz have rejected the interpretation that this aspect of Euthalius's work on the text of his edition related to stichometry.¹²⁹ Yet Harris demonstrates that Euthalius did engage in accurate stichometric measurement.¹³⁰ So more precisely, while Euthalius did reckon the *stichoi* of Paul's letters, this action was separate from his colometric organization. About the designation στιχηδὸν in particular, Zuntz contends that "no ordinary grammarian would have used it [i.e. στιχηδόν] in this sense, for στιχηδόν means simply 'in lines.'"¹³¹ Rather, Zuntz maintains, the widespread designation of the poetical books of the OT as στιχηρά or στιχήρεις βίβλοι and written κατὰ κῶλα καὶ κόμματα led Euthalius to employ στιχηδόν incorrectly in reference to the division of the text in sense-lines rather than simply in lines.¹³² About Euthalius's use of terminology to describe his textual format, Robert Devreesse likewise concluded that "l'écriture στιχηδὸν ou στιχηρὸν est identique à l'écriture *per cola et commata*."¹³³

Although Euthalius claimed that he was aware of no precedent for the utilization of this format for scripture, there were in fact antecedents in pagan and Christian

¹²⁸ Zuntz, *Ancestry*, 90-94.

¹²⁹ Robinson, *Euthaliana*, 12-13; Zuntz, *Ancestry*, 99-101.

¹³⁰ Harris, *Stichometry*, 34-54.

¹³¹ Zuntz, *Ancestry*, 99.

¹³² Zuntz, *Ancestry*, 99.

¹³³ Robert Devreesse, *Introduction à l'étude des manuscrits grecs* (Paris: Impr. nationale, Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1954), 63; like Zuntz, Devreesse is also dependent on Jerome's explanation (see below) and links this format with the Cicero and Demosthenes as well as the prophetic and poetical books of the NT.

literature. We have evidence for the division of bilingual Greek-Latin Christian scriptural texts into sense-lines perhaps by beginning of the third century.¹³⁴ We have also observed above that lyric poetry was reported to have been organized in such format already by Aristophanes of Byzantium (ca. 257-180 B.C.E.).¹³⁵ In his preface to his revision of Isaiah, Jerome corroborates the early use of this format in editions of pagan authors, when he informs his readers he will issue this work “per cola...et commata” after the example of Demosthenes and Cicero so as to aid the reader.¹³⁶ Hesychius of Jerusalem’s (died after 451) introduction to his edition of the twelve prophets echoes the utility of this arrangement, which he actually models on a book of the Apostle—likely an early fifth-century reference to the Euthalian edition.¹³⁷

The purpose of a text’s arrangement in rough sense-lines so as to aid the reader accords perfectly with Euthalius’s own understanding of this format. About this aspect of his edition, Euthalius is much less ambiguous: this delineation allowed for ease of reading (πρὸς εὐσημον ἀνάγνωσιν). This ease of reading followed directly from the format by drawing the reader’s attention to issues of prosody (κατὰ προσωδίαν).

Undoubtedly, while this format would benefit all readers, it would be most useful for

¹³⁴ Hermann Josef Frede offers evidence that the archetype (designated Z) of the Greek-Latin bilingual MSS G^P and D^P, likely a bilingual MS was published in colometric format in the mid fourth-century (*Altlateinische Paulus-Handschriften*, 51-2, 94-95). David Parker argues that a bilingual archetype of gospels later codified in Codex Bezae was produced in sense-lines perhaps as early as the beginning of the third century (*Codex Bezae*, 73-96, 281).

¹³⁵ See chapter 2.

¹³⁶ sed quod in Demosthene et Tullio solet fieri, ut per cola scribantur et commata, qui utique prosa et non versibus conscripserunt, nos quoque utilitati legentium providentes interpretationem novam novo scribendi genere distinximus (*Prologus in Isaia propheta [Biblia Sacra Vulgata*, ed. Gryson 1096,3-6]).

¹³⁷ ἔστι μὲν ἀρχαῖον τοῦτο τοῖς θεοφόροις τὸ σπούδασμα στιχηδὸν ὡς τὰ πολλὰ πρὸς τὴν τῶν μελετωμένων σαφήνειαν τὰς προφητείας ἐκτίθεσθαι...πλὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν ἀποστολικὴν βίβλον οὕτω τιμὴ συγγραφεῖσαν εὐρῶν, οὐ μάλιστα ἐν ταῖς δωδέκα βίβλοις τῶν προφητῶν καὶ αὐτὸς ἠκολούθησα (Adriani *Isagoge*, Critici Sacri VI, 10); cited in Robinson, *Euthaliana*, 36.

those less familiar with reading the text; this is, in fact, exactly how Cassiodorus views Jerome's colometric arrangement of the prophets.¹³⁸ An ancillary utility would be the controlling of interpretation by properly dividing the text.¹³⁹ Yet even more important was this format's relation to Euthalius's ultimate goal: Euthalius intended this textual layout to have a chrestomathic effect on the reader so that through their daily meditation on scripture their souls might ascend step by step to contemplation of the divine.

The Problem of the "Euthalian" Colophon

Despite the difficulties resulting from Euthalius's imprecision, it is relatively clear that, according to Euthalius, what distinguished this text was its layout. Euthalius's text was arranged in sense-lines for ease of reading. The text delineated in this format remains another matter. Euthalius fails to mention any correction or collation of the actual text, which his publication would likely have entailed.¹⁴⁰ The colophon in the Euthalian edition of Codex Coislinianus that began this chapter, however, records a tradition of correction against a copy in the library of Caesarea copied by Pamphilus himself.

¹³⁸ Cassiodorus explicitly links this format to instructing those with only a rudimentary education (*Institutiones, Praefatio* 9 [Mynors ed., 8,12]).

¹³⁹ Such division of the text could factor heavily into interpretive debates: for example, Bludau notes that "Gnostics" and their detractors were accused of using of divergent punctuation in order to validate their interpretations (*Die Schriftfälschungen*, 29ff); on this point see also Pagels (*Gnostic Paul*, 21) who concludes that disputes over punctuation were at the bottom of Origen's dispute with Valentinian exegetes regarding the judgment of the psychics. Such issues were not limited to early theological disputes, Nigel Wilson relates that Photius similarly drew attention to the importance of a properly divided and punctuated text in order to avoid an improper Manichean interpretation of 2 Cor 2:2 (*Scholars of Byzantium* [Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983], 117-19).

¹⁴⁰ Contrast Jerome's explicit discussion of textual problems that he faced in his revision of the gospels (which we will discuss in the following chapter) articulated in his *Epistula ad Damasum*. This letter is conveniently found in Roger Gryson, ed., *Biblia Sacra: iuxta Vulgatam versionem, 4 ed.* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994), 1515-16.

The possibility that this colophon transmitted in H (and other Euthalian MSS and traditions) could be used both to reconstruct Euthalius's editorial practices and to link this edition to Caesarean scholarship generated intense debate in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century.¹⁴¹ Because of the presence of this colophon, or a related version, in other Greek MSS as well as in Armenian and Syrian traditions, some scholars have identified it not only as being integral to H, but also that the correction of the text against a Caesarean exemplar referred to in the colophon must have been central to Euthalius's process of editing and publishing his *Corpus Paulinum*.¹⁴² Ehrhard argued that this colophon was composed by the creator of the Euthalian edition due to overlaps in vocabulary between the colophon and the prologues.¹⁴³ He also contended that the editor of this revision was an Evagrius (quite probably Evagrius Ponticus), since the name of Evagrius is found in some versions of this colophon and may also be reconstructed in the lacuna of H.¹⁴⁴ Conybeare, although not endorsing every aspect of Ehrhard's argument, adduced Armenian evidence and even more extensive Euthalian parallels to the argument for Euthalius's authorship.¹⁴⁵ Von Dobschütz rejected the purported similarity between the colophon and the prologues, concluding rather that this Evagrius was not the editor of

¹⁴¹ For a full survey of the relevant literature, see Willard, "Critical Study," 113-26.

¹⁴² Zuntz's reconstruction represented the most comprehensive and inclusive of these attempts, even though he linked the majority of this work to Pamphilus rather than Euthalius (*Ancestry*, passim, esp. 13-37, 77-78). See discussion below.

¹⁴³ Ehrhard, "Der Codex H."

¹⁴⁴ Ehrhard, "Der Codex H." Bertrand Hemmerdinger ("Euthaliana," *JTS* N. S. 11 [1960]: 349-55) followed him in this evaluation, though he thinks the Evagrius that authored the Euthaliana was Evagrius of Antioch.

¹⁴⁵ F. C. Conybeare, "On the Codex Pamphili and the Date of Euthalius," *The Journal of Philology* 23, no. 46 (1895): 241-59.

the Euthalian edition, but a scribe who transmitted it.¹⁴⁶ J. Armitage Robinson, concurring with Dobschütz's argument, adduced further evidence for disassociating the colophon from the edition.¹⁴⁷ Robinson does not, however, completely dismiss the hypothesis that Evagrius Ponticus was in some way associated with the Euthaliana; but, whoever this Evagrius was, he maintained that he was not the editor of this *Corpus Paulinum*, though perhaps the creator of "an editio minor of the work of Euthalius on these epistles."¹⁴⁸

By triangulating from the colophon found in the Armenian tradition and that from MSS H and 88, Zuntz hypothesized that the colophon to the Euthalian edition that served as the exemplar of the Syriac Philoxenian ought to be reconstructed thus:

Ἐντεβλήθη πρὸς τὸ ἀντίγραφον τὸ ἐν Καισαρείᾳ τῆς Παλαιστίνης· τῆς βιβλιοθήκης τοῦ ἁγίου Παμφίλου· χειρὶ γεγραμμένον αὐτοῦ· <quae erant> (= ὅπερ ἦσαν?) ἐπιστολαὶ δεκατέσσαρες· ὧν εἰσὶν πάντων ὁμοῦ· ἀναγνώσεις λα΄· κεφάλαια ριζ΄· μαρτυρίαι ρκζ΄· στίχοι τετρακισχίλιοι ᾤλς΄.¹⁴⁹

This composite reconstruction, split at the hypothetical restoration ὅπερ ἦσαν based on Syriac evidence,¹⁵⁰ comes from two sources, which, according to Zuntz, were at some point dismembered: the first half is transmitted in H, 88, and the Armenian version; the latter half is found embedded in the Euthalian paratexts.¹⁵¹ Zuntz hypothesized that the author of the Euthalian edition composed his colophon by referencing an edition created

¹⁴⁶ Dobschütz, "Ein Beitrag," 50, 65-66.

¹⁴⁷ Robinson, *Euthaliana*, 70-71. E.g. the use of στιχηρον vs. στιχηδον, the first person singular of the colophon, and the alternative descriptions of this work in the colophon and the prologues (70-71).

¹⁴⁸ Robinson, *Euthaliana*, 71.

¹⁴⁹ Zuntz, *Ancestry*, 77.

¹⁵⁰ Zuntz, *Ancestry*, 13-16.

¹⁵¹ Zuntz, however, fails to explain adequately how this colophon was separated and transmitted into its various witnesses.

by Pamphilus (the first half) and reproducing this edition's conclusion (the second half).¹⁵² In fact, Zuntz claims that Pamphilus himself was the creator of much of the Euthalian apparatus, which was taken over by Euthalius.¹⁵³ More apropos to the question of a possible Euthalian textual revision, Zuntz saw in this colophon evidence of Euthalius's dependence on Caesarean scholarship in correcting and transmitting a Caesarean text.¹⁵⁴ Of all those hypotheses advanced to solve the problem of the relationship of the colophon to the Euthalian edition, Willard deems Zuntz's overall approach to be the most persuasive—though he avers that Zuntz overplays the coherence of his theory.¹⁵⁵ In fact, the colophon's *prospheesis* and *antiphesis* found in both H and 88 after the statement concerning collation introduces further complications, since von Dobschütz revealed that they are also found in MS 773 of the gospels.¹⁵⁶ According to Willard, the most likely explanation is that the colophon represents a later addition to Euthalius's work, interpolated relatively shortly after the initial publication at about the same time as the *Martyrium* discussed above.¹⁵⁷ In sum, although this colophon has indisputable connections to the Euthalian edition, the exact nature of this relationship has yet to be fully resolved.

¹⁵² Zuntz, *Ancestry*, 77-88.

¹⁵³ Zuntz, *Ancestry*, 77-88.

¹⁵⁴ Zuntz, *Ancestry*, 87-8.

¹⁵⁵ Willard, "Critical Study," 124-26. Willard rightly notes that Zuntz's claim that the colophon was found in the exact same form in H, 88, and Armenian is not accurate. While they are similar, the second half of the colophon, which is key to Zuntz's argument, is only found in Syriac Philoxenian evidence, not in the others (*ibid.* 124-5).

¹⁵⁶ E. von Dobschütz, "The Notices Prefixed to Codex 773 of the Gospels," *HTR* 18 (1925): 280-84.

¹⁵⁷ Willard, "Critical Study," 174-75.

Putting aside the problem of the origin of the colophon, these discussions offer little in the way of commentary on our primary concern: the connections between the colophon and the text itself. Despite this colophon's claim that this MS was corrected against a MS transcribed by Pamphilus himself, as early as the late nineteenth century Robinson expressed reservations concerning Euthalius's preparation of the text, since nowhere in the apparatus affiliated with the Euthaliana does Euthalius mention any work on the actual text.¹⁵⁸ With respect to the actual text and its purported correction, Harold Murphy advanced the discussion immensely in two important articles, wherein he demonstrated: 1) that no textual affinity exists between MSS H and 93, which transmit the same colophon;¹⁵⁹ and 2) that, based on Murphy's reconstruction of Pamphilus's text, MS 93 has not been corrected to it.¹⁶⁰ Murphy left open the possibility that H itself, or either an exemplar of H or 93 had been so corrected; though clearly, since they transmit different texts, both could not have been so corrected as their colophons claimed.¹⁶¹ Murphy's findings corroborated Corssen's conclusions that among eighth to eleventh century Euthalian MSS textual consanguinity was lacking.¹⁶² From these conclusions it is obvious that, as a result of the chaotic nature of ancient book production and lack of institutional control, on occasion there are no necessary connections between the transmission of a text and its ancillary paratexts (in this case the colophon) after its initial

¹⁵⁸ Robinson, *Euthaliana*, 12, 69-70.

¹⁵⁹ Harold S. Murphy, "On the Text of Codices H and 93," *JBL* 78 (1959): 228-37.

¹⁶⁰ Harold S. Murphy, "The Text of Romans and 1 Corinthians in Minuscule 93 and the Text of Pamphilus," *HTR* 52, no. 2 (1959): 119-31.

¹⁶¹ Murphy, "Text of Codices H and 93," 236-7.

¹⁶² Murphy, "Text of Romans and 1 Corinthians," 130-31; Peter Corssen, "Review of Eduard von der Goltz, *Eine textkritische Arbeit des zehnten bzw. sechsten Jahrhunderts*," *Göttingische gelehrte Jahrbuch* 161 (1899): 665-80.

publication—though the ease of disassociation of text and paratext does not mean that the original interpretive purposes of paratexts are nullified or that we cannot track such purposes in later redeployments, possibly alongside other texts. At any rate, with respect to Euthalius’s text, our ability to draw firm conclusions about either its form as utilized by Euthalius or its preparation for his edition is limited.

Editorial Goals Unpursued by Euthalius

Another way to ascertain Euthalius’s goals is to articulate what he did not endeavor to do in crafting this edition of the *Corpus Paulinum*. We saw in our survey of ancient editorial practices in chapter 2 that editions were fashioned for many reasons; these ranged from scholarly to isagogic, not to mention specific editions with specific goals. Although some features were common to various editions, certain components lent themselves more suitably to some editions than others. By entertaining possible editorial goals Euthalius could have pursued, we are able to see more clearly how he fashioned his edition of the *Corpus Paulinum* for catechetical instruction and general edification. Two specific issues do not enter the purview of Euthalius’s editorial enterprise: theological and scholastic.

Despite the occasional reference to theological issues in Euthalius’s paratexts, Euthalius remains relatively unconcerned with matters of theology. In fact, the most notable places of theological discussion are found in the *kephalaia*, which Euthalius incorporated into his edition. We saw that, since these have been redeployed from an earlier source (likely Pamphilus), those theological issues found here reflect third century concerns rather than the late fourth century when Euthalius produced this edition.

Although Euthalius's acknowledged redeployment of the *kephalaia* indicate that he did not dissent from the theological views presented there, he declines to engage with those theological problems most pressing in the fourth century.

The fact that Euthalius's edition is not crafted with an eye toward proper theological indoctrination but rather general catechetical and edificatory instruction is somewhat surprising since he produced his edition at a time of intense theological controversy. With the advent of Constantine's imperial sponsorship in the fourth century, ecclesiastical authorities increasingly came under pressure to establish clearly what constituted Christian doctrine so as to unify the church. The fourth and fifth centuries saw a series of ecumenical councils—at Nicaea (325 C.E.), Constantinople (381 C.E.), Ephesus (431 C.E.), the "Robber Council" at Ephesus (449 C.E.), and Chalcedon (451 C.E.)—where ecclesiastical and imperial authorities wrangled over and sorted out the rank and position of the Son, Spirit, and Father in the Trinity.¹⁶³ This is aside from those theological disputes that were resolved without recourse to large-scale ecumenical proceedings such as the Pelagian controversy at the beginning of the fifth century, which we will discuss in the following chapter.

¹⁶³ On early ecumenical councils, synods, and relationship to imperial authority, see Eduard Schwartz, *Kaiser Constantin und die christliche Kirche* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1936); Hans Jochen Margull, ed., *The Councils of the Church; History and Analysis* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966); W. H. C. Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement; Chapters in the History of the Church in the Fifth and Sixth Centuries* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972); Timothy David Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1981), esp. 208-244; Frances M. Young, *From Nicaea to Chalcedon: a Guide to the Literature and its Background* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983); Leo Donald Davis, *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils (325-787): Their History and Theology* (Wilmington, Del.: M. Glazier, 1987); and Mark Edwards, "Synods and Councils," in *Cambridge History of Christianity*, v. 2: *Constantine to c. 600* (eds. Augustine Casiday and Frederick W. Norris; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007). A convenient selection of primary texts relating to early theological controversies can be found in James Stevenson ed., *Creeds, Councils, and Controversies; Documents Illustrative of the History of the Church A.D. 337-461* (London: SPCK, 1989). See also Timothy Barnes's reservations concerning the role of imperial authority in ecumenical councils ("Constantine, Athanasius and the Christian Church," in *Constantine: History, Historiography, and Legend* (ed. Samuel N. C. Lieu and Dominic Montserrat; London: Routledge, 1998).

With respect to the creation of an edition, theological concerns frequently played an instrumental role. We have already investigated the role that theological issues played in the fashioning of Marcion's edition of the *Corpus Paulinum*. This edition offers a clear precedent for the ways in which editions of Paul's letters could be fashioned in light of theological concerns. Marcion's fashioning not only encompassed alteration and correction of the text, but also preparation and introduction of paratexts. In the following chapter we will also see that, according to Jerome, one of the specific goals of the Latin revision that became known as the Vulgate was to foster theological unity, since the diversity of Latin MSS could imply a diversity of faith.¹⁶⁴ In terms of ancillary materials, Latin MSS were supplied with numerous paratexts in response to the theological issues related to Pelagian thought.¹⁶⁵ Similarly, later theological controversies occasioned the Philoxenian and Harklean revisions, both of which represent attempts to modify the Syriac Peshitta accordingly.¹⁶⁶ These examples indicate that, both before and after Euthalius, theological issues often played a central role in the construction of NT editions.

Despite the prevalence of theological concerns driving the publication of early Christian editions, Euthalius's edition evinces no blatant concern for such issues either in the text transmitted or in the paratextual interpretation prefaced. However much Euthalius himself may have been concerned with these issues, they did not represent issues he

¹⁶⁴ *Epistula ad Damasum* Roger Gryson, ed., *Biblia Sacra: iuxta Vulgatam versionem, 4 ed.* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994), 1515 12-16.

¹⁶⁵ See discussion of the *Primum Quaeritur* prologue and anti-Pelagian *capitula* in the following chapter.

¹⁶⁶ See Bruce Manning Metzger, *The Early Versions of the New Testament: Their Origin, Transmission, and Limitations* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977), 63-74; and Sebastian P. Brock, "The Use of the Syriac Fathers for New Testament Textual Criticism," in *Text of the New Testament* (eds. Ehrman and Holmes), 224-225.

deemed necessary to address in his edition of the *Corpus Paulinum*. It was not theological goals as defined by the ecumenical councils prevalent in his time that Euthalius's pursued, but rather those simple catechetical goals for indoctrination—goals arguably not dissimilar from those that impelled Constantine to request copies of scripture for the “instruction of the church.”¹⁶⁷ This well-known letter is usually adduced for its description of the codices Eusebius produced and the possibility that extant MSS may have been among them.¹⁶⁸ More relevant for our discussion is the fact that Constantine's requisitioned scriptures for the furnishment and instruction of churches that he founded through his imperial munificence in the new capital Constantinople—an act that in some measure offers a precedent for Euthalius's goal to inculcate a new Christian polity through the production of MSS.

While theological issues may not have figured prominently in the creation of those editions surveyed in chapter 2, editions specifically designed for scholars and scholastic endeavors were exceedingly common. In fact, those editions of the Homeric corpus that helped to establish Alexandrian methods of textual scholarship primarily evince scholastic concerns. The following represent typical features of such scholarly editions: evidence of systematic collation and correction; the addition of marginal notations and sometimes variant readings; and the transmission of commentary in the form of marginal notes or a companion volume.

Systematic correction and collation represent essential aspects of scholarly editions. While such textual comparison need not be restricted to scholarly editions

¹⁶⁷ Eusebius, *Vita Constantini*, 4.36.1-2 (GCS 7 Winkelman ed., 134,1-11).

¹⁶⁸ See Kirsopp Lake, "The Sinaitic and Vatican Manuscripts and the Copies Sent by Eusebius to Constantinople," *HTR* 11, no. 1 (1918): 32-35; and T. C. Skeat, *Proceedings of the British Academy* "The Use of Dictation in Ancient Book-Production," 42 (1956): 179-208.

(personal copies and editions designed for other purposes could be and often were corrected), for an edition to be serviceable for scholars it should at least be corrected and ideally collated against other copies. As we discussed in chapter 2, this practice represented the first-order of scholarship in those editions of the Homeric corpus published in Alexandria. Furthermore, both Aristophanes and Aristarchus took into consideration Zenodotus's edition and other copies in the publication of their own editions. The importance of correction and collation should not lead us to think that every MS (whether of Paul's letters or otherwise) that bears marks of correction represents a scholarly edition; rather, such correction and collation were prerequisite for producing such an edition, though not determinative. While there is evidence for correction and collation of MSS from early on in the development of Christianity,¹⁶⁹ Euthalius himself made no mention of such activity, despite the fact that a later interpolated colophon did. Euthalius's disinclination to articulate whether or not he engaged in collation and correction does not lend support to scholastic aims for his edition.

From the beginning of Homeric studies in Alexandria, marginal notation was employed to denote textual problems and resolutions. Zenodotus's rudimentary obelus used to mark suspect passages eventually developed into an elaborate system of marginal notations, by which Aristarchus noted spurious lines, repeated or interchangeable lines, and his own disagreements with previous editions. As we noted, systems of marginal notation were subsequently employed in numerous other editions such as Plato's oeuvre,

¹⁶⁹ About the two corrections in 1 Cor 6:14 in \mathfrak{P}^{46} , for example, Günther Zuntz concludes "[i]t is unlikely that the corrector found these variants, all three, in the manuscript from which \mathfrak{P}^{46} was copied. We seem to be granted a glimpse into a scriptorium where some authoritative manuscripts were used by the correctors in an endeavor to bring the productions of the scribes up to a definite standard" (*The Text of the Epistles: A Disquisition upon the Corpus Paulinum* (London: Published for the British Academy by Oxford University Press, 1953], 20).

lyric poetry, and the Hippocratic corpus. While some early Christian MSS transmit marginal notation in the form of corrections (see e.g. the use of marginal corrections in \mathfrak{P}^{46} and in \mathfrak{P}^{66}),¹⁷⁰ even more apposite is Origen's development of textual notations for his research tool the Hexapla.¹⁷¹ Not only were there clear precedents for the use of marginalia in Christian scholarly editions, about a couple centuries after Euthalius likely published his edition, the Harklean edition (ca. 616) was published with marginal signs and even occasional variant readings.¹⁷² While Euthalius did employ marginalia to orient the reader to his various paratextual apparatuses, this use merely exhibits a utilitarian purpose, rather than scholastic.

The presence of marginal variant readings in the Harklean Syriac version had precedents in Alexandrian Homeric editorial practice. Irrespective of the ongoing debate about the actual format by which these variant readings to the Homeric text were transmitted (whether through marginal signs, notation, or accompanying commentary), what is important for this discussion is that these scholarly editions communicated textual problems, solutions, and sometimes variant readings to the reader. Despite the fact that it has often been presumed that commentaries were transmitted in a companion volume, a text of Callimachus interlarded with notes in the same third century B.C.E. MS has called

¹⁷⁰ Cf. e.g. fol. 35r of \mathfrak{P}^{46} (Frederic G. Kenyon, ed., *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri; Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible: Fasciculus III Supplement: Pauline Epistles, Plates* [London: E. Walker, 1936]) and page 14 of \mathfrak{P}^{66} (Victor Martin, *Papyrus Bodmer II: Evangile de Jean* [Cologne-Genève: Bibliothèque Bodmeriana, 1956]).

¹⁷¹ For a recent discussion of and bibliography for the Hexapla, see chapter 2, "Origen's Hexapla: Scholarship, Culture, and Power" in Anthony Grafton and Megan Hale Williams, *Christianity and the Transformation of the Book: Origen, Eusebius, and the Library of Caesarea* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006).

¹⁷² Metzger, *Early Versions*, 70.

into question this assumption.¹⁷³ The origin of MSS of scholia is equally uncertain. Reynolds and Wilson hesitantly identify the fourth/fifth century in Gaza as the time and place of their creation;¹⁷⁴ they leave open, however, the possibility that the development of the compilation of scholia into one commentary may be indebted to early Christian catena commentaries.¹⁷⁵ While these running commentaries of patristic comments on the NT text are attributed to Procopius of Gaza ca. 460-530 C.E.,¹⁷⁶ there is evidence for analogous antecedents. The exemplar of the tenth century MS 1739 contained marginal comments on the text of the *Apostolikon* (i.e. Acts and both the Pauline and Catholic Epistles) selected from the writings of numerous patristic authors: Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius, and Basil.¹⁷⁷ Since Basil (ca. 330-379) is the latest father included in the marginal notes, this exemplar is usually dated to sometime near the end of the fourth century¹⁷⁸—contemporaneous with the production of the Euthalian edition. Such examples illustrate that not only would Euthalius have had precedents for furnishing editions with variant readings or comments (whether marginal or interlinear), but also

¹⁷³ Reynolds and Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars*, 10-11, 245-46. For fuller discussion, see also Nigel Guy Wilson, "The Relation of Text and Commentary in Greek Books," in *Il libro e Il testo: Atti del Convegno internazionale, Urbino 20-23 settembre 1982* (ed. Cesare Questa and Renato Raffaelli; Urbino: Università degli studi di Urbino, 1984), 103-110.

¹⁷⁴ Reynolds and Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars*, 52-53.

¹⁷⁵ Reynolds and Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars*, 53.

¹⁷⁶ Reynolds and Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars*, 53.

¹⁷⁷ Eduard Freiherrn von der Goltz, *Eine textkritische Arbeit des zehnten bzw. sechsten Jahrhunderts herausgegeben nach einem Kodex des Athosklosters Lawra* (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1899).

¹⁷⁸ Metzger and Ehrman, *Text*, 91. J. Neville Birdsall, however, dates this archetype to the fifth or sixth century ("The Text and Scholia of the Codex von der Goltz and its Allies, and their Bearing upon the Texts of the Works of Origen, Especially the Commentary on Romans," in *Origeniana: Premier colloque international des études origéniennes (Montserrat, 18-21 septembre 1973)* [ed. Henri Crouzel, Gennaro Lomiento, Josep Ruis-Camps, 1975], 215-216).

that others were developing such scholarly aids at roughly the same time or shortly thereafter.

The alternative goals in these examples of Greco-Roman and early Christian editorial practice serve to differentiate those pursued by Euthalius. Euthalius's edition transmits none of these specific features of scholarly editions. Although the colophon associated with the Euthaliana and affixed to Codex Coislinianus discusses collation and correction, we have seen that evidence indicates that this colophon most likely represents a later interpolation to Euthalius's edition not long after its publication. In contrast to a scholarly audience, the use of colometric sense-lines were deliberately employed by Euthalius in order to assist initiates or the unlearned—a utility which we have seen was echoed by other pagan and Christian writers. This is not to suggest that scholars could not have used or profited from the text or paratexts of Euthalius's edition. The stichometric calculations, "Divine Testimonies," and *kephalaia* could all be employed profitably by scholars; even the colometric lineation of the text, while designed for novices or initiates, could aid a scholar in translation. Such wide-spread utility should not obscure, however, that Euthalius himself identifies a catechetical purpose for his edition. While we would imagine that such catechesis would, of course, have theological content, Euthalius's concerns also do not reflect the theological questions pressing at the time in which he issued his edition. Moreover, those features typical of scholarly or theologically oriented editions were lacking in Euthalius's edition and such lack highlights Euthalius's aim in creating a different type of edition founded on different editorial goals that primarily consisted in general catechetical instruction and moral exhortation.

C. Codex Coislinianus and the Euthaliana

Early on scholars noticed that the sixth century MS Codex Coislinianus transmitted numerous features in common with the Euthalian edition of Paul's letters.¹⁷⁹ Along with the transmission of a text arranged in Euthalian fashion, i.e. roughly κατὰ κῶλα καὶ κόμματα, H preserves the Euthalian *kephalaia*, a colophon associated with the Euthaliana, and remnants of the Euthalian divine testimonies. Since Codex Coislinianus represents our earliest physical evidence for the Euthalian edition of the *Corpus Paulinum*, there is arguably no better candidate for investigating the relationship between the Euthalian text and paratexts.

The text of H, transcribed on good quality parchment, shows evidence of multiple hands.¹⁸⁰ The original transcription and correction in the sixth century was at some point retraced with a corrosive ink, which, according to Henri Omont, marred the "purity and elegance" of the original.¹⁸¹ This later reinking hand, which shows tendencies toward minuscule script (and thus ought to be dated to ca. 8th/9th century), added breathing marks, accents, and punctuation.¹⁸² The MS also contains ligatures, abbreviations, suspensions, stichoi, corrections marked with various signs, and the typical nomina

¹⁷⁹ Omont, *Épîtres*, 7. Despite the importance of Codex Coislinianus, no definitive edition containing the entire text exists. Rather, as a result of its dispersal throughout the world, this MS has been published in piecemeal fashion. After L. Duchesne's publication ("Fragments des Épîtres de Saint Paul," *Archives des Missions scientifiques et littéraires* 3 [1876]: 420-9), Omont (*Épîtres*) issued a full edition with two plates. Robinson (*Euthaliana*, 48-69) corrected some readings of Omont's edition and supplemented it by reading text from traces of ink left on opposing pages; Kirsopp Lake (*Facsimiles of the Athos Fragments of Codex H of the Pauline Epistles* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905]) presented still more of H's text from leaves discovered at the Athos monastery.

¹⁸⁰ Omont, *Épîtres*, 10.

¹⁸¹ Omont, *Épîtres*, 10.

¹⁸² Omont, *Épîtres*, 10. On minuscule features in the reinking hand, see Robinson, *Euthaliana*, 66. Since this later hand evinces minuscule characteristics, it must be dated at least after the end of the 8th/beginning of the 9th century, when this script arose; for discussion of the date of the rise of minuscule, see T. W. Allen, "The Origin of the Greek Minuscule Hand." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 40 (1920): 1-12.

sacra.¹⁸³ Although the subsequent history of this MS would surely offer much worth investigating, in this study, we are concerned with its original transcription and correction.

Omont notes that the majority of the variants in the MS are orthographic.¹⁸⁴ Variants due to itacism in particular are extremely common, as even a quick overview confirms.¹⁸⁵ In contrast to our previous chapter on Marcion's edition, comparable textual variation linked to theological or dogmatic issues can not be readily discerned in H.

We have already broached the problems associated with the purported correction of Codex Coislinianus in relation to its colophon. In that discussion we saw that, although Murphy did not rule out that H may have been corrected towards this MS of Pamphilus, he demonstrated that there was no necessary connection between the colophon and the Euthalian text. Murphy also lamented H's lacunose state, which limits our conclusions about its possible connection to Pamphilus's text referred to in this colophon.¹⁸⁶ With respect to its textual character, H is sometimes situated in the Alexandrian text-type.¹⁸⁷ According to the collation and analysis of *Teststellen* by the *Institut für neutestamentliche Textforschung*, this MS stands in category III, showing occasional agreements with

¹⁸³ Omont, *Épîtres*, 11-12.

¹⁸⁴ Omont, *Épîtres*, 12.

¹⁸⁵ Omont, *Épîtres*, 12. Particularly common is the substitution of $-\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ or $-\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ for the second person plural $-\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$ or $-\epsilon\tau\epsilon$; see e.g. 1 Cor 10:27, 10:28; 2 Cor 11:1 (twice), 11:4 (four times), 11:15, 11:19, 11:20; Gal 1:6, 1:9, 5:1, 5:2, 5:4 (twice) et al.

¹⁸⁶ Murphy, "Text of Romans and 1 Corinthians," 124. Murphy also gives an overview of previous attempts to reconstruct Pamphilus's text (ibid. 120-24).

¹⁸⁷ Metzger and Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament* 4th ed., 76, 313.

Byzantine and “Western” readings alongside the majority of agreements with the Alexandrian tradition.¹⁸⁸

Such discussions of the textual character of H, however, have limited, if any, utility for understanding the Euthalian edition for three reasons. First, as we have noted, Euthalius made no mention of undertaking a programmatic revision of the text; his work on the text extended merely to its layout *κατὰ κῶλα καὶ κόμματα*. Second, even if Euthalius did rework the text, we have seen that there is no necessary relation between the text and the Euthalian paratexts, since the paratexts could have been prefaced to another text. Third, as mentioned above, in order to investigate the text of the Euthaliana properly, a full collation of Euthalian MSS, or at least a collation of a representative sample, must be made. For this reason, in this study Codex Coislinianus merely serves as an early iteration of the Euthaliana, whose text may or may not be representative of this edition; for this reason, the issue of the Euthalian text-type will be bracketed.

Rather, I will focus on the text’s relation to what we do know about the goals of Euthalius’s edition. With respect to the text, most fundamental is the catechetical role of reading. For this reason Euthalius’s text was arranged to facilitate comprehension, whether by novices or students, adepts or lectors. While all would profit from Euthalius’s layout of the text, those standing to benefit the most were the former. These goals in crafting this edition of the text reinforced that goal of Euthalius’s paratexts: to promote

¹⁸⁸ Aland and Aland, *The Text of the New Testament* 2nd ed., 110. The summary of the findings show that in the test-stellen H agrees seven times with the majority text, twelve times with what is designated the ancient text, and never with those readings where the ancient and majority agree; three times H transmits a “special reading” (ibid. 10, 332-337). See also Kurt Aland and et al, eds., *Text und Textwert der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments: II. Die Paulinischen Briefe* (4 vols.; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1991), 34. For detailed collation of H in these test-stellen, see *Die Paulinische Briefe* II.2, 262-67, 685-90, 693-700; *Die Paulinische Briefe* II.3, 120-23, 128-36, 161-69; and *Die Paulinische Briefe* II.4, 111-15, 478-483, 507-9, 750-52, 799-803, 815-17. Although Codex Coislinianus aligned most closely to the Alexandrian tradition, it was not uncommon for H to be corrected toward the Byzantine text; see, for example, the corrections 1 Cor 10:28, 1 Tim 1:17, 2 Tim 2:3, Heb 1:3.

catechetical and edificatory instruction of believers and converts. The following discussions of the text of Codex Coislinianus have been selected merely for their utility in elucidating and explicating this and other illuminating facets of Euthalius's goals as embodied in this MS. We turn now to explore just how Euthalius endeavored to do this by arranging the text and furnishing it with paratexts.

Colossians 3:4-8

Codex Coislinianus's text of Colossians presents a unique view of the pedagogical potential of Euthalius's edition of the *Corpus Paulinum*. From the focalizing paratext to deliberate organization of the text, we see how the multiple components of this editorial system interact harmoniously for the cultivation of Christian virtue. At first glance Colossians 3:3-8 in Codex Coislinianus may seem a poor candidate for extensive discussion. There are no major theological, Christological, or dogmatic variants readily visible. Yet this should not surprise us, since we have seen that, at least with respect to the goal of his edition of Paul's letters, Euthalius's purpose lay elsewhere. His objective was catechetical and hortatory, and this is exactly where the focus is drawn in Codex Coislinianus.

Colossians 3 focuses on the extirpation of desire and exhortation to virtue through the emulation of Christ.¹⁸⁹ These themes interrelate and mutually reinforce one another, as the following statements indicate:

For you died and your life has been hidden with Christ in God. Whenever Christ, your life, is manifest, then you also will be made manifest with him in glory.

¹⁸⁹ Eduard Lohse, in particular, sees the lists of virtues and vices as integral to "putting on of the new man" now that believers have died with Christ (*Colossians and Philemon; A Commentary on the Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon* [trans. William R. Poehlmann and Robert J. Karris; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971], 136-37).

Therefore kill your earthly members, sexual immorality, impurity, passion, evil desire, and avarice, which is idolatry, on account of which the wrath of God comes upon the sons of unbelief; these in which you walked then, when you lived in them. But now you have put them all aside: wrath, rage, evil, blasphemy, obscenities from your mouth (Col 3:3-8).

In these verses deuterio-Paul continues to exhort the Colossians to put aside the inimical things of the flesh, since they have united and have been resurrected with Christ (cf. 1:21-23; 2:12). Such actions are no longer tolerable or admissible now that they have been made alive in the faith through baptism (2:11-14).

Not only does this does the text focus attention on the paraenetic and implicit mimetic aspects of this passage, the *kephalaia* and textual format of the passage do also. Immediately after verse four, at the beginning of deuterio-Paul's imperative to kill the passions, we see a marginal theta in Codex Coislinianus. This signifies *kephalaion* nine to Colossians and orients the reader to a passage replete with what it describes as "exhortation for purification, holiness, benevolence, love of God, love of learning, the singing of psalms, the pious thankfulness of life dedicated to God."¹⁹⁰ We adduced this *kephalaion* above in our discussion of the Euthalian paratexts as evidence for the ways in which these ancillary materials incorporated into his edition functioned to preface Euthalius's catechetical and paraenetic goals. While the primary purpose of this *kephalaion* was to divide the text in accordance with the list of *kephalaia* transcribed earlier, the deployment of this *kephalaion* in the physical MS also functioned to orient the reader to this specific passage noteworthy for its edificatory content.

The presence of this *kephalaion* in Codex Coislinianus presents concrete evidence for the way in which such orientation interacted with other pedagogical components of

¹⁹⁰ Παραίνεσις καθάρσεως, ἁγιασμοῦ, φιλανθρωπίας, φιλοθεότητος, φιλομαθίας ψαλμωδίας, εὐφήμου εἰς θεὸν διαγωγῆς εὐχαριστίας (*Capitulum IX ad Colossenses*, 768 C-D [PG 85]).

his edition. The hortatory focus of *kephalaion* nine, which exhorted the reader to pursue Christian virtue, was further illuminated by admonition against vice in the layout of the text itself. In Codex Coislinianus the subsequent vice list signaled by the *kephalaion* occupies an extravagant amount of parchment, visually illustrating the prominence of the vices to be avoided. Let me be clear, I am not claiming that excessive use of physical space on the MS page occasioned by the colometric arrangement of the text in H was altogether anomalous; any MS that had a text arranged in sense-lines rather than *scriptio continua* would transmit a similar layout. Yet the precise division into sense-lines can vary, and it is in this variable that Euthalius's focus on vice becomes evident; as we will see, this is especially the case when this format in sense-lines is compared with other MSS that employ similar formats. The text of H is arranged in the following manner with the marginal *kephalaion* as follows:¹⁹¹

ἀπεθάνετε γὰρ
καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν κέ-
κρυπται σὺν τῷ Χριστῷ
ἐν τῷ θεῷ·

ἀδελφοὶ. ὅταν ὁ Χριστὸς φανερωθῆ,
ἡ ζωὴ ἡμῶν,
τότε καὶ ὑμεῖς σὺν αὐτῷ
φανερωθήσεσθε
ἐν δόξῃ.

Θ Νεκρώσατε οὖν τὰ μέλη
ὑμῶν τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς,
πορνείαν·
ἀκαθαρσίαν·
πάθος·
ἐπιθυμίαν κακῆν·
καὶ τὴν πλεονεξίαν·
ἥτις ἐστὶν εἰδωλολατρία·
δι' ἧ ἔρχεται ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ

¹⁹¹ Paris, Suppl. 1074 fol. 4 v. line 10-St. Petersburg XIV fol. 3 v. line 7. See Omont, *Épîtres*, 29,10-30,7. In transcribing this and other passages from Codex Coislinianus, for convenience and ease of reading I have followed the text of the NA²⁷ in orthography, accentuations, and spacing between words and, while retaining the layout of H, have introduced hyphens for word-breaks at the end of lines.

ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς
 ἀπειθείας.
 ἐν οἷς καὶ ὑμεῖς περιε-
 πατήσατέ ποτε,
 ὅτε ἐζήτε ἐν τούτοις·
 νυνὶ δὲ ἀπόθεσθε·
 καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ πάντα·
 ὀργήν·
 θυμόν·
 κακίαν·
 βλασφημίαν·
 αἰσχρολογίαν· ἐκ τοῦ στό-
 ματος ὑμῶν·

This format is obviously most useful for assisting reading. Although there are words that extend from one line to the next in this passage (e.g. κέκρυπται, περιεπατήσατε, στόματος), these are rare. Instead, the careful delineation of each vice (πορνείαν· ἀκαθαρσίαν· πάθος· ἐπιθυμίαν κακὴν· καὶ τὴν πλεονεξίαν· ἥτις ἐστὶν εἰδωλολατρία... ὀργήν, θυμόν, κακίαν, βλασφημίαν, αἰσχρολογίαν) often on its own line (or shared with a modifier) grants the reader access to the text unimpeded by *scriptio continua*. In addition to assisting the reader's comprehension of the text, this textual format makes a visual argument about where the text's center of gravity lies. A comparison of exhortation in Colossians 3:9-11 illustrates by contrast the importance of the vice list in verses five through eight. While the text is painstakingly laid out with great attention to each vice in verses five through eight, the following exhortation to put off the old man and put on the new receives little attention by comparison:

μὴ ψεύδεσθε εἰς ἀλλήλους,
 ἀπ' ἐκδυσάμενοι τὸν πα-
 λαιὸν ἄνθρωπον σὺν ταῖς
 πράξεσιν αὐτοῦ
 καὶ ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν νέ-
 ον κτλ.

In this layout in H, where even a word as short as νέον is cut, the hypothetical exhortation in 3:9 is downplayed, whereas those concrete actions to be avoided in the previous vice list are highlighted. By contrast, the arrangement of the MS Ɔ⁴⁶, casts in relief the way the text in Codex Coislinianus has been focused on behavior to avoid; the *scriptio continua* of this earlier MS (displayed here with spaces and accents) merely transmits the text without privileging any part of its content as follows:¹⁹²

...ἀπεθάνετε γὰρ καὶ ἡ
ζωὴ ὑμῶν κέκρυπται σὺν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐν τῷ
θεῷ· ὅταν ὁ Χριστὸς φανερωθῇ, ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν,
τότε καὶ ὑμεῖς σὺν αὐτῷ φανερωθήσεσθε
ἐν δόξῃ. Νεκρώσατε οὖν τὰ μέλη τὰ ἐπὶ
τῆς γῆς, πορνείαν, ἀκαθαρσίαν, πάθος,
ἐπιθυμίαν κακῆν, καὶ τὴν πλεονεξίαν, ἥτις ἐστὶν
εἰδωλολατρία, διὰ ταῦτα γὰρ ἔρχεται ἡ ὀργὴ
τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν οἷς καὶ ὑμεῖς περιεπατήσατέ
ποτε, ὅτε ἐζήτε ἐν τούτοις· νυνὶ δὲ ἀπό-
θεσθε καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ πάντα, ὀργὴν, θυμόν,
κακίαν, βλασφημίαν, αἰσχρολογίαν ἐκ τοῦ
στόματος ὑμῶν· κτλ.

Compare also the Greek text of the same passage from the sixth-century Greek-Latin bilingual MS, Codex Claromontanus, which does not as blatantly delineate this vice list, even though it too is arranged in sense-lines as this excerpt shows:

ἀπεθάνετε γὰρ
καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν
κέκρυπται σὺν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐν τῷ θεῷ·
ὅταν ὁ Χριστὸς φανερωθῇ,
ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν,
τότε καὶ ὑμεῖς σὺν αὐτῷ
φανερωθήσεσθε ἐν δόξῃ.
Νεκρώσατε οὖν τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν
τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς,
πορνείαν, καὶ ἀκαθαρσίαν,
πάθος, ἐπιθυμίαν

¹⁹² Since it does not pertain to the present argument, I have omitted the beginning of line 6 fol. 92 v where Colossians 3:3 begins. Note also that I have transcribed the text of Ɔ⁴⁶ with its variants, with the exception of nomina sacra.

κακήν,
καὶ τὴν πλεονεξίαν,
ἣτις ἐστὶν εἰδωλολατρία,
διὸ ἔρχεται ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς
ἀπειθείας

ἐν οἷς καὶ ὑμεῖς
περιεπατήσατέ ποτε,
ὅτε ἐζήτε ἐν τούτοις·
Νυνὶ δὲ ἀπόθεσθε
καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ πάντα,
ὀργήν, θυμόν, κακίαν,
βλασφημίαν, αἰσχρολογίαν
ἐκ τοῦ στόματος ὑμῶν μὴ ψεύδεσθε¹⁹³

Although Codex Claromontanus's layout provides the reader with more guidance than the *scriptio continua* in \mathfrak{P}^{46} , its delineation—only κακήν has been transcribed alone on one line—in sense-lines still does not impart the same weight to this vice list as Codex Coislinianus.¹⁹⁴

As a final comparison consider the textual layout of Codex Sinaiticus, a fourth century MS which at times transmits a text with attention to sense-lines. Yet even though the text of this MS is arranged in a roughly colometric fashion, when it is set alongside Codex Coislinianus the visual prominence of vices in the latter become even more conspicuous, as the following synoptic comparison makes evident.

Codex Sinaiticus¹⁹⁵

ἀπεθανετε γαρ και
η ζωη ὑμων κε-
κρυπται συν τω Χριστω

Codex Coislinianus

ἀπεθάνατε γὰρ
καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν κέ-
κρυπται σὺν τῷ Χριστῷ

¹⁹³ I have followed the text of Codex Claromontanus as recorded by Constantin von Tischendorf (*Codex Claromontanus* [Lipsiae: F. A. Brockhaus, 1852], 342-43); the nomina sacra have been written out here in full.

¹⁹⁴ Tischendorf suggested a possible relationship between the textual division in H^p and Codex Claromontanus (*Codex Claromontanus*, xiii-xiv). Simon Crisp, however, has serious reservations about such a relationship, since he thinks that Codex Claromontanus does not utilize lines to designate sense divisions in the same way as H ("Scribal Marks and Logical Paragraphs: Discourse Segmentation Criteria in Manuscripts of the Pauline Corpus," *UBS Bulletin 198/199* [2005]: 77-87, esp. 81).

¹⁹⁵ Constantin von Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Sinaiticum* (Lipsiae: F. A. Brockhaus, 1863), 86. In transcribing this text I have written out the nomina sacra in full.

εν τω θεω οταν ο
 Χριστος φανερωθη η
 ζωη υμων τοτε
 και υμις συν αυτω
 φανερωθησεσθε
 εν δοξη.
 Νεκρωσατε ουν τα
 μελη τα επι της γης
 πορνιαν· ακαθαρ-
 σιαν παθος επιθυ-
 μιαν κακην και
 την πλεονεξειαν
 ητις εστιν ειδωλο-
 λατρια δι α ερχεται
 η οργη του θεου επι
 τους υιους της απι-
 θιας
 εν οις και υμις περι-
 επατησατε ποτε
 οτε εξητε εν του-
 τοις
 νυνι δε αποθεσθε
 τα παντα οργην
 θυμον· κακιαν·
 βλασφημιαν· αι-
 σχρολογιαν· εκ του
 στοματος υμων

ἐν τῷ θεῷ·
 ὅταν ὁ Χριστὸς φανερωθῆ,
 ἡ ζωὴ ἡμῶν,
 τότε καὶ ὑμεῖς σὺν αὐτῷ
 φανερωθήσεσθε
 ἐν δόξῃ.
 Νεκρώσατε οὖν τὰ μέλη
 ὑμῶν τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς,
 πορνείαν·
 ἀκαθαρσίαν·
 πάθος·
 ἐπιθυμίαν κακὴν·
 καὶ τὴν πλεονεξίαν·
 ἣτις ἐστὶν εἰδωλολατρία·
 δι' ἧς ἔρχεται ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ
 ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς
 ἀπειθείας.
 ἐν οἷς καὶ ὑμεῖς περιε-
 πατήσατέ ποτε,
 ὅτε ἐξῆτε ἐν τούτοις·
 νυνὶ δὲ ἀπόθεσθε·
 καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ πάντα·
 ὀργὴν·
 θυμόν·
 κακίαν·
 βλασφημίαν·
 αἰσχρολογίαν· ἐκ τοῦ στό-
 ματος ὑμῶν

Since this MS offers a text in a roughly colometric format, it is perhaps unsurprising that in places the layout of **Σ** corresponds somewhat closely to H. In fact, some phrases have exactly the same lineation; others differ only slightly.¹⁹⁶ Yet **Σ** differs most significantly from H where deuterio-Paul lists vices to avoid and the latter MS transmits them carefully delineated on the page. As already noted, H presents each vice almost exclusively on a single line or with modifiers; they also are never divided at the end of a line. By contrast, in Codex Sinaiticus these vices are frequently cut at the end of a line and transcribed on

¹⁹⁶ See, for example, απεθανετε γαρ και η ζωη υμων κε-κρυπται συν τω Χριστω, φανερωθησεσθε εν δοξη, Νεκρωσατε ουν τα μελη τα επι της γης, εν οις και υμις περι-επατησατε ποτε.

the same line as other vices. While such a colometric organization does not make the text difficult to read (though the format in H would arguably better facilitate comprehension), it does not draw attention to the vice list in the same manner as presented in H.

The comparison of \mathfrak{P}^{46} , Codex Claromontanus, and Codex Sinaiticus gives visual confirmation of the way in which the textual layout of H reinforces moral instruction by highlighting vice. Thus, the reader of Codex Coislinianus receives visual exhortation and admonition of the dangers of the flesh. It should also be noted that Colossians 3 is in no way unique in utilizing this format for disgraceful behavior: e.g. the list of those wrongdoers, for whom the law has been meted out in 1 Timothy 1:8-11, receives a similar layout in Codex Coislinianus.¹⁹⁷

By prominently displaying the vices in this way in Colossians 3:4-8, the text warns the reader of the dangers of the fleshly passions in contrast to the union with Christ described previously. Christ's glorious manifestation and the participation promised to the Colossians (and by extension the readers/auditors of H) is contingent on conquering the passions in imitation of Christ. The focus on instruction through mimesis supported by an easy to read textual layout highlighting vice (and by contrast Christian virtue) reflects Euthalius's editorial goals and shows how this MS of Paul's letters transmitted this pedagogical legacy.

Titus 2:1-5

The conclusions to our analysis of Colossians 2:4-8 find corroboration in Codex Coislinianus's text of Titus 2:1-5. Although H transmits some interesting variants here,

¹⁹⁷ Paris, Suppl. 1074 fol. 7 r; Omont, *Épîtres*, 43.

πρεπεῖς,
μὴ διαβόλους
μὴ οἴνω πολλῷ δεδου-
λωμένας,
καλοδιδασκάλους,
ἵνα σωφρονίζουσιν
τὰς νέας
φιλάνδρους εἶναι,
φιλοτέκνους
σώφρονας
ἀγνάς
οἰκουροὺς
ἀγαθάς

Just as this MS transmitted the text of Colossians 3:4-8 and 1 Timothy 1:8-11 in a physical format that admonished readers about vices to avoid, the same tactics of textual arrangement were deployed to inculcate the Christian virtues found in Titus 2:1-5. We should also point out that this theme is not alien to the actual content of chapter two of Titus, where, even in the passage above, sound teaching leads to sound action (cf. e.g. 2:1, 2:3, 2:7, 2:10).

The textual format in this MS emphasizes edification delineated for its reinforcement and advancement of proper social roles. The author of Titus prescribes virtues for elders (e.g. temperance, honor, prudence) and young women (e.g. familial piety, domesticity, chastity), which are inscribed so that the reader may make no mistake in comprehending them. Although H is missing some pages at this point and does not transmit the remainder of this paraenesis, it seems reasonable to assume that in verses five through ten the text would continue highlighting the virtues of Christian values and social cohesion: i.e. women ought to be subordinate to their husbands, youths ought to be a model of self-control and slaves ought to submit to their masters. This emphasis on teaching each to know their place and act in accordance with it aligns perfectly with

kephalaion three, which was transcribed a few pages before and directed the reader interested in paraenesis to this passage in this MS.

Again a comparison with other MSS makes the paraenetic focus of H evident. As we have already seen both Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Claromontanus offer a text arranged in sense-lines; but despite the prominence of this format in these MSS, neither are arranged with the same attentiveness to the virtue exhorted in this passage from Titus as transmitted by H. The differences in sense-line format can best be observed by comparing the texts synoptically as in the following table.

Codex Sinaiticus²⁰⁰

συ δε α λαλει α πρε-
πι τη υγαινουση
διδασκαλια
πρεσβυτας νηφαλι-
ους ειναι σεμνους
σωφρονας υγαι-
νοντας τη πιστι
τη αγαπη τη υπο-
μονη
πρεσβυτιδας ωσαυ-
τως εν καταστη-
ματι ιεροπρεπισ
μη διαβολουσ μη
δε οινω πολλω δε-
δουλωμενας κα-
λοδιδασκαλουσ ινα
σωφρονιζουσι τασ
νεασ· φιλανδρουσ
ειναι φιλοτεκνουσ
σωφρονασ· αγνασ
οικουργουσ αγαθασ

Codex Coislinianus

σὺ δὲ λάλει ἃ πρέπει τῇ ὑγι-
αινούσῃ διδασκαλίᾳ.
πρεσβύτας νηφαλίουσ
εἶναι,
σεμνοῦσ,
σώφρονασ,
ὑγαιίνοντασ τῇ πίστει,
τῇ ἀγάπῃ,
τῇ ὑπομονῇ·
πρεσβύτιδασ ὡσαύτωσ
ἐν καταστήματι ἱερο-
πρεπεῖσ,
μὴ διαβόλουσ
μὴ οἴνω πολλῷ δεδου-
λωμένασ,
καλοδιδασκάλουσ,
ἵνα σωφρονίζουσιν
τὰσ νεάσ
φιλάνδρουσ εἶναι,
φιλοτέκνουσ
σώφρονασ
ἀγνάσ
οἰκουροῦσ
ἀγαθάσ

Codex Claromontanus

συ δε λαλει α πρεπει
τη υγαινουση διδασκαλια
πρεσβυτας νηφαλιουσ ειναι
σεμνους σωφρονασ
υγαινοντασ τη πιστει
τη αγαπη τη υπομονη
Πρεσβυτιδασ ωσαυτωσ
εν καταστηματι
ιεροπρεπεισ
μη διαβολουσ
μη οινω πολλω
δεδουλωμενασ
καλοδιδασκαλουσ
ινα σωφρονιζωσιν
τασ νεασ φιλανδρουσ ειναι
φιλοτεκνουσ
σωφρονασ αγνασ
οικουργουσ αγαθασ

Where H repeatedly arranges a single word per line (or sometimes simply accompanied by its article),²⁰¹ only διδασκαλια in Codex Sinaiticus is transcribed alone and this most

²⁰⁰ Note that I have followed Tischendorf's transcription of Codex Sinaiticus and Claromontanus in the omission of accents and breathing marks and orthography. I have, however, included hyphens to make more easily recognizable where words have been broken in these MSS.

likely resulted from a lack of space to copy it on the previous line with its modifiers (τη υγιαίνουση). The closest that **Σ** approaches H is in the transcription of ειναι φιλοτεκνους—though H offers a more syntactically appropriate lineation by putting ειναι with the first predicate adjective (φιλάνδρους) rather than the second (φιλοτέκνους). Although the textual organization of **Σ** is more useful for reading than a text written in *scriptio continua*, the frequent word breaks²⁰² and disregard for smaller units of syntax,²⁰³ while not making the text difficult to comprehend, do render it somewhat less useful for public reading or catechetical instruction than H. This is even more evident in the paraenetic sections where H delineates the virtues more or less individually, but **Σ** transmits a text often with more than one virtue (or unrelated modifier) on the same line. In connection with our argument that the Euthalian edition was organized with a view to catechetical ends rather than scholastic, such lineation would be superfluous (though certainly not useless) for learned or advanced readers—whereas its utility for neophytes is both self-evident and consonant with Euthalius’s stated objectives. These conclusions are consistent with those reached earlier in our comparison of these MSS in Col 3:4-8.

In contrast to Codex Sinaiticus, the Greek text of the Greek-Latin bilingual Codex Claromontanus more closely approximates Codex Coislinianus’s colometric arrangement of paraenetic matter in Titus 2:1-5. Even though D is not delineated so that each virtue receives its own line as consistently as in H (καλοδιδασκαλους and φιλοτεκνους are the

²⁰¹ See e.g. σεμνούς, σώφρονας, τῆ ἀγάπη, τῆ ὑπομονῆ, καλοδιδασκάλους, τὰς νέας, φιλοτέκνους, σώφρονας, ἀγνάς, οἰκουροὺς, ἀγαθὰς.

²⁰² E.g. πρε-πι, νηφαλι-ους, ὑγιαι-νοντας, ὑπο-μονη, ωσαυ-τως, καταστη-ματι, δε-δουλωμενας, and καλοδιδασκαλους.

²⁰³ The negative μη is copied on the line prior to its accompanying phrase, δε οινω κτλ. Similarly, ινα and τας are separated from σωφρονιζουσι and νεας respectively.

only words occupying one line), sometimes the text is divided just as in Codex Coislinianus.²⁰⁴ Yet even though the colometric format in D^P occasionally agrees with H, this has less to do with the highlighting of virtue and vice than it does with accommodating the accompanying Latin translation. For example, single words or short phrases in the Greek text become longer participial phrases or other verbal constructions when rendered into Latin.²⁰⁵ Similarly, entire subordinate clauses or phrases are listed on one line just as the corresponding Latin translation.²⁰⁶ These observations echo Parker's assessment of the use of sense-lines in bilingual MSS, which are not designed to aid interpretation by novices as described by Jerome but "to facilitate comparison, whether in lectionary use or study."²⁰⁷ As both Codex Sinaiticus and Claromontanus help to elucidate, one of the significances of Codex Coislinianus's lineation consists in highlighting virtue and vice.

In addition to comparing this same passage in H and other MSS, it may be worthwhile to compare different passages in H itself. In contrast to such delineation of vices in this passage from Codex Coislinianus, the texts both at the beginning of this letter and Galatians, for example, do not receive the same treatment in this MS—even

²⁰⁴ For example, the following occupy one line in both MSS: μη διαβολους, καλοδιδασκαλους, ινα σωφρονιζωσιν, φιλοτεκνους.

²⁰⁵ For example, φιλοτεκνους was rendered "filios diligent;" καλοδιδασκαλους, "bene docentes;" οικουργους αγαθας, "domum custodientes benignae sunt;" and μη διαβολους, "non detrahentes."

²⁰⁶ The phrases μη οινω πολλω δεδουλωμενας became "non vino multo servientes;" ινα σωφρονιζουσι, "ut prudentiam doceant;" τας νεας φιλανδρους ειναι, the object of σωφρονιζουσι, "adulscntulas ut ament viros suos."

²⁰⁷ Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 75

though they are still arranged colometrically to facilitate reading.²⁰⁸ The beginning of Titus is rendered thus:

Παῦλος δοῦλος θεοῦ,
ἀπόστολος δέ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ
κατὰ πίστιν ἐκλεκτῶν
θεοῦ. Καὶ ἐπίγνωσιν
ἀληθείας τῆς κατ' εὐ-
σέβειαν
ἐν ἐλπίδι ζωῆς αἰω-
νίου· ἣν ἐπηγγείλατο
ὁ ἀψευδὴς θεὸς πρὸ
χρόνων αἰωνίων·
ἐφάνερωσεν δὲ καιροῖς
ἰδιοῖς τὸν λόγον αὐ-
τοῦ· ἐν κηρύγματι.
ὁ ἐπιστεύθη ἐγὼ κα-
τ' ἐπιταγὴν τοῦ σωτη-

The stress conferred on the virtue and vice through the colometric structure in Titus 2:1-5 is eschewed here. Not a single word occupies its own line and multiple words (i.e. εὐσέβειαν, αἰωνίου, αὐτοῦ, κατ', and σωτηρος) are cut at the end of lines in the transcription of Titus 1:1-3 in Codex Coislinianus; notice that even the tau from the elided preposition κατ' is written on the following line. Despite such word-breaks, this format still coincides nicely with Euthalius's stated objectives to arrange the text πρὸς εὐσημον ἀνάγνωσιν. It does not, however, delineate with the same precision as in those passages devoted to paraenesis. This delineation of non-paraenetic passages in H is not anomalous. At the beginning of Galatians (vv. 1-6) the colometric organization in this codex again facilitates reading, while stopping short of arranging the text in the same manner as in those passages such as Col 3:4-8 and Titus 2:1-5 concerned with paraenesis.

Παῦλος ἀπόστολος

²⁰⁸ As mentioned earlier in transcribing this passage from Codex Coislinianus, I have introduced hyphens at the end of lines and spaces between words. In orthography and accentuation I follow the NA²⁷. I have also written out nomina sacra in full.

οὐκ ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων
 ουδέ δι' ἀνθρώπου·
 ἀλλὰ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ
 καὶ θεοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ ἐγεί-
 ραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ
 νεκρῶν·
 καὶ οἱ σὺν ἐμοὶ πάντες
 ἀδελφοὶ·
 ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς
 Γαλατίας·
 χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη
 ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ κυρίου
 ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ
 τοῦ δόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑ-
 πὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν
 ἡμῶν
 ὅπως ἐξέληται ἡμᾶς
 ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος
 αἰῶνος πονηροῦ·
 κατὰ θέλησιν τοῦ θεοῦ
 καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν·
 ᾧ ἐστὶν ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς
 αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώ-
 νων, ἀμήν.
 θαυμάζω, ὅτι οὕτω τα-
 χέως μετατίθεσ-
 θε ἀπὸ τοῦ καλέσαν-
 τος ὑμᾶς ἐν χάριτι Χριστοῦ
 εἰς ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον

In contrast to the previous salutation of the epistle to Titus, in this passage there are some words that occupy only one line. But while four words (νεκρῶν, ἀδελφοὶ, Γαλατίας, and ἡμῶν) are transcribed on one line, no pattern is readily discernable to explain why these words have been delineated thus—except that the previous line was most likely unable to accommodate the entire thought resulting in the enjambment of the words that ended the phrase (e.g. ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν, καὶ οἱ σὺν ἐμοὶ πάντες ἀδελφοὶ, ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Γαλατίας, ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν). Once again we observe multiple words divided at the end of lines (ἐγείραντος, ὑπὲρ, αἰώνων, ταχέως, μετατίθεσθε, and

καλέσαντος)—though as in the previous example this does not completely exclude this colometric arrangement’s use for ease of reading.

Since the passages from Col 3 and Titus 2 discussed above were adduced to elucidate the interaction between the text’s colometric organization and paraenetic issues prefaced in the *kephalaia*, the *kephalaia* to these sections should be investigated briefly to test the viability of our argument regarding such interplay of colometry and paraenesis in H. In contrast to the passages from Col 3:4-8 and Titus 2:1-5 characterized as paraenetic in the Euthalian *kephalaia*, the opening of Galatians was only noted for its prooimion and “an account of his conversion from Judaism through revelation.”²⁰⁹ The *kephalaia* for Titus commence at 1:5, hence no *kephalaion* has been composed for 1:1-4 of this epistle. The lack of a similar type of textual layout repeatedly highlighting specific words as seen in the passages identified for paraenesis in the *kephalaia* should perhaps come as no surprise since the *kephalaia* identify no paraenetic material. The textual formats of the salutations and opening words of Galatians and Titus thus contrast with those sections in Col 3:4-8 and Titus 2:1-5, where the colometric organization of the text highlights specific passages allocated for paraenesis in the *kephalaia*.

Thus, in addition to slowing down the eyes and the breath for reading (possibly aloud) just as Euthalius intended (cf. κατὰ προσωδίαν and πρὸς εὐσημον ἀνάγνωσιν), this textual layout of Titus 2:1-5 in H also draws attention to proper Christian behavior. This consists in bringing male and female presbyters (and doubtlessly youths and slaves as well) into conformity with traditional and hierarchical values of the Greco-Roman world

²⁰⁹ Μετὰ τὸ προοίμιον, διήγησις τῆς ἑαυτοῦ μεταστάσεως ἀπὸ Ἰουδαϊσμοῦ κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν (*Capitulum I ad Galatas*, 760 D-761 A [PG 85]).

reconfigured as Christian values.²¹⁰ In this case Codex Coislinianus codifies an attempt to promote such behavior.

Hebrews 4:14-15

Our next pericope from Heb 4:14-15 offers further evidence for the interplay between the text and paratextual *kephalaia*. Since this passage is not arranged with the same attention to detail as seen in Col 3:4-8, Titus 2:1-5, and others in this MS, it does not require extensive investigation. Rather, I will briefly discuss its relevance for elucidating the focalizing and pedagogical role of the *kephalaia* in H.

In chapter 4 of Hebrews the author portrays Jesus as the perfect high priest, who alone is able to give rest to believers. By recapitulating the consanguinity of believers and Christ, due to the latter's incarnation (2:14-18), a consanguinity that leads to the possibility of salvation, the author stresses Christ's powers of intercession: "now then, since we have a great high-priest, who has come through the heavens, Jesus Christ the son of God, let us hold fast to our confession. For we do not have a high-priest unable to sympathize with our weaknesses, but one, who, although having been tested likewise in all respects, was apart from sin" (4:14-15). These powers are efficacious because Christ himself has been subject to the same weaknesses but, unlike all others, has not been found wanting.²¹¹ Since Christ has lived in the flesh apart from sin, he may approach

²¹⁰ For the reinforcement of traditional Greco-Roman mores in early Christianity, see e.g. Margaret Y. MacDonald, *The Pauline Churches: A Socio-historical Study of Institutionalization in the Pauline and Deutero-Pauline Writings* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988); and Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her*.

²¹¹ Harold Attridge specifically links Hebrews's exhortation to "the likeness of the suffering human Jesus to the addressees" (*The Epistle to the Hebrews* [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1989], 141).

God's throne as an intercessor (4:16) and serve as exemplar for virtue (cf. also 2:8-18; 12:1-24).

In our discussion of the Euthalian *kephalaia* above, we noted Christ's role as an exemplar for the reader of Hebrews. In fact, one of the *kephalaia* discussed in relation to this issue summarized this very passage; recall *kephalaion* six to Hebrews, which said that in Hebrews 4:11-5:10, "Paul" wrote about "the fear of judgment of the Word, who is above all, and the utility of the sacerdotal grace from the one who suffered humanly like us."²¹² This *kephalaion* was integral to our argument that the Euthalian *kephalaia* prefaced and interpreted passages in keeping with the focus on the mimesis of exemplars of virtuous Christian living, just as the *bios* of Paul and epitome of his letters in Euthalius's prologue.

Euthalius's utilization of *kephalaia* provide a paratextual corollary to the content of the text itself. In its deployment in the margin of this MS, this paratextual *kephalaion*, even though originally designed to divide the text and orient the reader to the corresponding section, also functioned to signal this passage for the edification of readers and to provide them with exempla. The Euthalian *kephalaion* oriented readers to this passage in Hebrews where Christ's kinship offered a new perfect high-priest and paradigm, and in doing so instantiated Euthalius's editorial and pedagogical goal in the MS.²¹³ Thus, in addition to dividing the text for readers intent on locating this passage, by focusing on Christ's status as high-priest and his shared humanity to the reader or auditor

²¹² Τὸ φοβερὸν τῆς κρίσεως παρὰ τῷ Λόγῳ, τῷ διὰ πάντων, καὶ τὸ χρηστὸν τῆς ἱερατικῆς παρὰ τῷ ὁμοιοπαθήσαντι ἡμῖν ἀνθρωπίνως (*Capitulum VI ad Hebraeos*, 777 B [PG 85]).

²¹³ Unfortunately, H does not preserve this *kephalaion*, since it is lacunose where this would be found. Nevertheless, as our previous discussion of the extant third *kephalaion* to Colossians indicates, we are justified in assuming that it was transmitted here as well.

of Hebrews, the fundamental pedagogical principle of Euthalius’s editorial praxis was inscribed on the physical parchment of this MS.

1 Timothy 3:16

Another passage useful for investigating the interplay between Euthalius’s text and paratexts is 1 Timothy 3:16, which paradoxically is not found in this MS.

Nevertheless, I intend to show that, if the reading that had been transmitted in the text was among those found in the textual tradition, the corresponding *kephalaion* in H attempted to highlight its “proper” interpretation.

In 1 Timothy 3:16 after offering guidance for proper Christian behavior and the selection of church leaders, the author reflects on the mystery of the faith. The text proceeds: ὁμολογουμένως μέγα ἐστὶν τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον·

1. ὁ ἐφανερῶθη ἐν σαρκί D* lat
2. ὃς ἐφανερῶθη ἐν σαρκί **ℵ*** A* C* F G 33. 365 *pc*
3. θεὸς ἐφανερῶθη ἐν σαρκί **ℵ^C** A^C C² D² Ψ 1739. 1881 **ℳ** *pc* vg^{ms} sa
4. ὁ θεὸς ἐφανερῶθη ἐν σαρκί 88 *pc*

The readings in this variant relate to the relationship between this mystery and the expressed or suppressed antecedent of the relative pronoun beginning this hymnic section.²¹⁴ The issue revolves around the question: what exactly has been made manifest in the flesh?

²¹⁴ On the hymnic qualities of 1 Tim 3:16, see Reinhard Deichgräber, *Gotteshymnus und Christushymnus in der frühen Christenheit: Untersuchungen zur Form, Sprache und Stil der frühchristlichen Hymnen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967); Martin Dibelius and Hans Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972), 61-63; Jack T. Sanders, *The New Testament Christological Hymns* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971); and Wolfgang Metzger, *Der Christushymnus 1. Timotheus 3, 16: Fragment einer Homologie der paulinischen Gemeinden* (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1979).

In terms of distribution, reading 3, with θεός as the subject, is the best attested across text types in the primary and secondary Alexandrian witnesses and Sahidic and Latin versions. Closely rivaling this is reading 2, transmitted as the original transcription in some of the same MSS (the “Western” witnesses F and G, and others) that transmit reading 3. The textual tradition provides few witnesses for readings 1 and 4. Readings 1, 2, and 3 are attested at least by the fourth to fifth century. Although our MS evidence for reading 3, the interpolation of θεός as the subject of ἐφανέρωθη, only goes back to the fourth century, as Ehrman notes, the widespread distribution of the reading indicates that it likely goes back at least to the third century²¹⁵—a conclusion that applies equally to reading 2.

The transcriptional probabilities overwhelmingly support the originality of reading 2. Grammatically the masculine relative pronoun for a neuter antecedent in this reading represents the lectio difficilior and most easily explains the creation of the other readings. Although one could perhaps mount arguments for the originality of reading 1,²¹⁶ objections to this reading are supplied by its isolation in “Western” witnesses and its amelioration of the grammar by providing the most grammatically appropriate relative pronoun for the neuter singular antecedent μυστήριον. As Metzger relates, these are the reasons that led the UBS committee to prefer reading 2 and to assign it the highest rating of A.²¹⁷

²¹⁵ Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*, 78.

²¹⁶ Such arguments would likely incline toward intrinsic probabilities on the assumption that the grammatical coherence of the passage outweighs the external evidence.

²¹⁷ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 573-74.

For our discussion far more important than the original reading is the possible reasons for the creation of the others. Metzger is no doubt correct that the interpolation of θεός could have been accidental, resulting from misreading OC written in majuscules for the nomen sacrum Θ̄C̄.²¹⁸ Metzger also granted that this may have a deliberate attempt to supply a subject for the following verbs or, somewhat less likely in Metzger's opinion, "to provide greater dogmatic precision."²¹⁹

Ehrman, however, has argued convincingly that this intrusion of θεός most likely was the result of dogmatic concerns and not accidental. Since the primary witnesses to this reading are in the form of corrections, its origin ought to be sought in anti-adoptionistic corruptions of Paul's text, functioning in this case to raise the Christology of this creedal formula.²²⁰ I would further add that this passage also functions in an opposite way: i.e. by relating that God was actually made manifest in the flesh, this phrase also functions to oppose a docetic Christology. In sum, readings 3 and 4 manage to chart a middle course between what the proto-orthodox viewed as two equally rejectable options.

This brings us to the crux of our investigation of this variant. I want to draw attention to how the Euthalian paratextual *kephalaion* that summarized and prefaced this passage likely interacted with this text. Although H does not transmit the text of 1 Timothy 3:16, if the text transmitted was one of these four variant readings, we can still conjecture that the *kephalaion* to this passage attempted to highlight an interpretation aligning with the proto-orthodox position above. Recall our previous discussion of

²¹⁸ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 574.

²¹⁹ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 574.

²²⁰ Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*, 77-8.

kephalaion seven to 1 Timothy 3:16, which relates that in this passage Paul wrote, “concerning the divine incarnation.”²²¹ If H had transmitted reading 1, the *kephalaion* would have attempted to refocus the reader from the ambiguous relative pronoun ὃ to the referent of that mystery manifested in the flesh: the divine Christ incarnated. If H had transmitted reading 2, the *kephalaion* would have attempted to clarify any ambiguity concerning the antecedent of ὃς: the divine Christ incarnated. If H had transmitted readings 3 or 4, the *kephalaion* would have attempted to reinforce the interpretation of the mystery already found in the text: God made manifest in the flesh. Thus, whichever reading Codex Coislinianus may have transmitted at 1 Timothy 3:16, the deployment of the Euthalian *kephalaia* in the text attempted to shape its interpretation before it was even encountered. In this interaction between this Euthalian *kephalaion* and the texts of 1 Timothy 3:16, we see a specific example of the way in which paratexts tried to guide the reader and focus his/her interpretation and instruct the reader in proper Christian doctrine.

V. Conclusion

Euthalius predicated his edition of the *Corpus Paulinum* on education, both preliminary and advanced. This pedagogical goal was articulated in and developed by means of the paratextual components of his edition. Foremost among the instructional aspects of these paratexts was Euthalius’s emphasis on exemplarity and mimesis, prominently displayed in the prologue’s epitomes of Paul’s letters and his *bios*. While this utilization of front-matter for orienting the reader toward such editorial and pedagogical goals was not atypical (we have seen it extensively in corpora from Greco-

²²¹ Περὶ θείας σαρκώσεως (*Capitulum VII ad I Timotheum*, 781 D [PG 85]). See Coislin. 202, fol. 10 r; Omont, *Épîtres*, 42,11.

Roman pagan authors), these actions did not exhaust Euthalius's paratextual deployment. Alongside the more mundane utility of the Euthalian *kephalaia* and divine testimonies for locating passages or citations in the MS, Euthalius also developed these paratexts so as to further his pedagogical goals; this is especially evident in Euthalius's continual stress on instruction and exhortation in the *kephalaia*. Euthalius's pedagogical goals have been further elucidated by our discussion of those that he chose not to pursue in his edition of the *Corpus Paulinum*, such as scholarly or theological. Undoubtedly, scholars could profitably use Euthalius's edition; but this fact should not obscure that Euthalius himself did not pursue this editorial goal. Although we may have expected Euthalius's pedagogical telos to have a theological corollary by deploying paratextual apparatuses for guiding the reader into a theologically proper interpretive framework and establishing theological hegemony over Paul, as we saw in Marcion's *Antitheses* and *argumenta*, Euthalius likewise did not pursue this editorial goal. While theological issues are not completely absent from Euthalius's paratexts (especially the importance of a proto-orthodox definition of Christ for mimesis as in 1 Tim 3:16), Euthalius remains far more concerned with basic issues of ethics and morality, especially insofar as they impinged on his pedagogical and catechetical development of a new Christian polity.

The deployment of paratexts to inculcate a new Christian polity worked in tandem with Euthalius's arrangement of the text for facilitating reading and comprehension. In order to guide reading and interpretation—whether for private catechetical study or public liturgical worship—Euthalius organized the text in a roughly colometric format. In Codex Coislinianus specifically, the oldest extant representative of Euthalius's editorial work, the text additionally delineated those types of virtues to cultivate and vices to avoid

so as to embody this Christian way of life exhibited by those exemplars for mimesis. The text thus reinforced Euthalius's pedagogical goal and was embedded within the paratexts in an editorial network; Euthalius's divine testimonies, *kephalaia*, and prologue quite literally circumscribed the text within his pedagogical hermeneutic. This network of text and paratexts, I argue, conspired not only to promote catechetical and paraenetic instruction in the service of a new Christian polity, but also to exert an interpretive hegemony over scripture at a crucial time in the emergence of Christian imperial dominance.²²² His redeployment of editorial practices into Christian contexts and deployment of new paratexts demonstrates how, with the Euthalian edition, the MS itself had become a vehicle for conveying moral instruction and for exerting Christian hermeneutical hegemony.

²²² Writing specifically about the ways in which Egeria's travel writing in the later fourth century served to remap the holy land as distinctly Christian, Andrew Jacobs contends that "[a]s Christians traveled through a reunified and securely orthodox empire at the end of the fourth century, the holy land emerged as a nexus for this ideally homogenous orthodox imperium" (*Remains of the Jews: The Holy Land and Christian Empire in Late Antiquity* [Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2004] 122). Jacobs further argues that "All 'otherness' is absorbed and thus erased within a robust and totalizing Christian identity. In Egeria's travel diary it is the unifying force of Scripture, subsuming all otherness into wholly Christian text that accomplishes this absorption and erasure" (122). The importance of scripture for such "absorption and erasure" is equally evident in the very pages of Euthalius's edition of Pauline scripture, which reveals the very paratextual means by which this process could be codified in the physical MS: not only through the deployment of the "divine testimonies" to recast pagan and Jewish literature as "testimony" to Christian truth claims, but also the use of the prologue, *kephalaia*, and colometric organization to inculcate a new Christian polity. For further discussion of the role of books and scholarship in relation to the emergence of imperial Christianity, see chapters 3-4 in Grafton and Williams, *Transformation of the Book*.

CHAPTER 5

CODEX FULDENSIS AND THE *CORPUS PAULINUM*

I, Victor, servant of Christ and by his grace bishop of Capua, read [this MS] in the Basilica Constantiniana on April 19, 546; I read [it] again on April 12, 547.¹

I. Introduction

With these words Victor of Capua signaled the completed production of the MS now known as Codex Fuldensis (F).² This MS copied and corrected at Victor's behest not

¹ Victor famulus xri et eius gratia episcapuae legi apud basilicam constan...ianam d· XIII· kal maias ind· nona q·n p c basili u c cos Iterato legi ind· X· die prid· iduum april (Ernestus Ranke, ed., *Codex Fuldensis: Novum Testamentum Latine interprete Hieronymo ex manuscripto Victoris Capuani* [Marburg: Sumtibus N. G. Elwert, 1868], 462). Basic overviews and discussions of Codex Fuldensis can be found in Elias Avery Lowe, ed., *Codices Latini Antiquiores; A Palaeographical Guide to Latin Manuscripts Prior to the Ninth Century* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1934-1966), 1196; and Bonifatius Fischer, *Lateinische Bibelhandschriften im frühen Mittelalter* (Freiburg: Herder, 1985). I follow Fischer's dating and reconstruction (*Lateinische Bibelhandschriften*, 58-9): the gospel text and its ancillary materials were copied first, followed by the *Corpus Paulinum* and then the rest of the NT. After the initial copying was completed on April 19, 546, when Victor himself penned his first note after the transcription of the Apocalypse of John, a small quire containing a prologue and *capitula* to Acts was inserted. At this time Victor added a second note at the end of Acts on May 2 546: "Victor famulus xri et eius gratia episcapuae legi VI non· mai· d· ind· nona quinq· pc basili uc cs" (Ranke, ed., *Codex Fuldensis*, 398). The MS was then given a final read-through almost an entire year later on April 12, 547 when Victor appended another note to the Apocalypse of John. Victor also appended the notes "legi" and "legi meum" indicating his read-through and correction at the end of 2 Peter and James respectively (Ranke, ed., *Codex Fuldensis*, 407, 420). Ernst von Dobschutz thought that Victor's inscription "I read" ought to be taken as a evidence for the liturgical use of this MS in Capua on this day ("Wann las Victor von Capua sein Neues Testament?," *ZNW* 10 [1909]: 90-96). Peter Corsen, however, pointed out that "legi" in this context refers to the read-through of a MS for correction, similar to *correx*i, *contuli*, *emendavi*, et al ("Die Subskriptionen des Bischofs Victor in dem Codex Fuldensis," *ZNW* 10 [1909]: 175-77). For a list of the consuls in the later Roman empire for dating this MS, see Roger S Bagnall et al., eds., *Consuls of the Later Roman Empire* (Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1987).

² For general overviews on Capua and bibliography from Roman to Norman times, see Stefano De Caro and Valeria Sampaolo, *Guide of Ancient Capua* (Napoli: Museo archeologico dell'antica Capua, 2000); Gennaro D'Isanto, *Capua romana: ricerche di prosopografia e storia sociale* (Roma: Edizioni Quasar, 1993); Jürgen von Ungern-Sternberg, *Capua im zweiten punischen Krieg: Untersuchungen zur römischen Annalistik*. (München: Beck, 1975); G. A. Loud, *Church and Society in the Norman Principality of Capua, 1058-1197* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985). For a discussion of Constantine's munificence to Capua for this basilica as part of his larger building program, see A. H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire 284-602:*

only preserves one of the earliest datable texts of the Vulgate revision,³ but also offers insight into the embodiment of earlier editorial traditions in a physical MS. For example, to name just a few of the more noteworthy features, in Codex Fuldensis we find: a gospel harmony produced from Jerome's Vulgate revision of the gospels;⁴ Victor's own preface discussing this gospel harmony;⁵ the gospel canon table of Eusebius/Ammonius;⁶ *capitula* to accompany this table;⁷ lectionary readings;⁸ a prologue written for the Vulgate revision of the *Corpus Paulinum*;⁹ the so-called Marcionite prologues;¹⁰ *capitula* for the Pauline epistles drawn from diverse sources;¹¹ a concordance to the Pauline

A Social, Economic, and Administrative Survey, vol. I (2 vols.; Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986), 90. A brief overview of the baptistry of the Basilica Constantiana can be found in De Caro and Sampaolo, *Guide of Ancient Capua*, 59-60.

³ This Vulgate revision found in F is, however, mixed with OL readings as our summary below relates.

⁴ For discussions on the edition of the Diatessaron found in F, see Petersen, *Tatian's Diatessaron*, 45-51, 85-6; Ulrich Schmid, *Unum ex quattuor: eine Geschichte der lateinischen Tatianüberlieferung* (Freiburg: Herder, 2005); and Franco Bolgiani, *Vittore di Capua e il «Diatessaron»* (Torino: Accademia delle Scienze, 1962).

⁵ Ranke, ed., *Codex Fuldensis*, 1-3. See discussion below and in Petersen, *Tatian's Diatessaron*, 45-51.

⁶ For a full discussion, see Patrick McGurk, "Canon Tables in the Book of Lindisfarne and in the Codex Fuldensis of St Victor of Capua," *JTS* N.S. 6 (1955): 192-98.

⁷ Collected in Donatien de Bruyne, *Sommaires, divisions et rubriques de la Bible latine* (Namur: Auguste Godenne, 1914), 314-68.

⁸ For more on the lectionary readings and their connection to the *capitula* to Hebrews and the *Vorlage* of both F and R, see Fischer, *Lateinische Bibelhandschriften*, 64.

⁹ See discussion below.

¹⁰ For a detailed exposition of the Marcionite prologues (or rather *argumenta*), see chapter 3 above.

¹¹ See discussion below in addition to the synoptic presentation of Latin *capitula* to the *Corpus Paulinum* in Bruyne, *Sommaires*, 314-68. See also Donatien de Bruyne, "Sommaires antipélagiens inédits des lettres de Saint Paul," *RBén* 38 (1926): 45-55; Hermann Josef Frede, ed., *Epistulae ad Thessalonicenses, Timotheum, Titum, Philemonem, Hebraeos (VL 25)*; Freiburg: Herder, 1975-1991), 120-31; and the study of F's *capitula* to Rom and Heb in Eduard Riggensbach, "Die Kapitalverzeichnisse zum Römer- und zum Hebräerbrief im Codex Fuldensis der Vulgata," *Neue Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie* 3 (1894): 350-63.

epistles often attributed to Pelagian circles;¹² the apocryphal epistle to the Laodiceans;¹³ and even further marginal notes by later readers such as St. Boniface (ca. eighth century).¹⁴

The remarkable diversity of materials codified in Codex Fuldensis would seem to call into question my claims regarding the role of paratexts in the transmission of editorial interpretation. Such diversity, however, does not negate the hermeneutical function of paratexts that I have demonstrated thus far. In fact, here too a paratext shaped interpretation by subsuming this MS's collection of materials drawn from earlier and disparate editorial endeavors under an overarching hermeneutic. These multiple interpretive layers of editorial production codified in this sixth-century MS have been subjected to Victor's own hermeneutic. These paratexts initially composed in light of specific (often doctrinal) concerns and deployed with the publication of Marcion's edition, Old Latin (OL) versions, the Vulgate revision, or other pro- or anti-Pelagian revisions/editions have now been redeployed under a new hermeneutical aegis governed by Victor's ecumenical inclusiveness. Victor's broad ecumenism supplied a new lens for reading these once hermeneutically disparate, and sometimes contradictory, paratexts. Victor's own preface, wherein he discussed the problems related to the gospel harmony

¹² Donatien de Bruyne, "Une concordance biblique d'origine pélagienne," *RBén* 5 (1908): 75-83. For a recent overview of this *Concordia Epistularum*, see Frede, ed., *Epistulae ad Thessalonicenses*, 106.

¹³ See Joseph Barber Lightfoot, *Saint Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon: A Revised Text with Introductions, Notes, and Dissertations* (London: Macmillan, 1882), 274-300; and Frede, ed., *Epistulae ad Thessalonicenses*, 121.

¹⁴ The editor of the critical edition of Codex Fuldensis, Ernestus Ranke, identified at least eight hands in the MS: three (perhaps four) come from the time of its initial transcription and correction; the remaining four are later medieval correctors or scholiasts. Of the early hands, Ranke identifies one scribe and one corrector, whom he designated S and C respectively. Victor's notations and instructions for correction are indicated by V and one hand similar to Victor's but which Ranke cannot precisely identify as the bishop's as V^S. The later medieval correctors are identified by Ranke merely as M¹, M², M³, or M⁴; the scholiast is designated by Z (*Codex Fuldensis*, 465). Boniface came into possession of the MS and gave it to the monastery at Fulda in 745: see Metzger, *Early Versions*, 335.

that he found and transmitted in Codex Fuldensis, makes clear his guiding principles of interpretation, irrespective of the possible hermeneutics of the texts he redeployed. Since this preface articulates Victor's method of authentication and his justification for incorporating a text likely created by someone he deemed a "heretic," it deserves extensive quotation.

When by chance a gospel harmony prepared from the four fell into my hands and, since it was without title, I did not find the name of the author, after diligently inquiring who with no small labor of study rearranged the words and deeds of our Lord and savior separated for gospel reading in the order in which they appear to have followed, I discovered a certain Alexandrian, Ammonius, who is also called the author of the canons of the gospel joined with the gospel of Matthew excerpts from the remaining three and in this way wove together a gospel in one sequence just as Bishop Eusebius, writing to a certain Carpianus in the preface of his edition, in which he set out canons with the renowned gospels, [and] portraying the zeal of that man mentioned above, reported thus "a certain Alexandrian, Ammonius, devoting himself greatly, as I testify, to labor and zeal left behind for us the one from four gospel." I also learned from his [i.e. Eusebius's] history that Tatian, a most learned and renowned orator of that time put together a gospel harmony from the four, for which he composed the title Diapente. This one [i.e. Tatian] was a disciple of the blessed philosopher and martyr Justin while he was living, but when departing to the Lord with the crown of martyrdom, after deserting the sacred instruction of his teacher and becoming puffed up with arrogance and cleaving to the error of the lapsed heresy of Marcion, the Encratites, rather than to the truth of the philosopher of Christ, Justin, this baleful man perfected his ruinous life, asserting among other things that marriage and defilement are to be made equal [and] liable to judgment; but he [i.e. Tatian] is even said to have introduced to the apostolic writings the hand of profane emendation or, as I say, more accurately corruption. But because the glory of the truth working by the power of Christ, our God, often triumphs through confession or deeds even of faithless men (for even demons used to confess Christ and in the Acts of the Apostles the sons of Sceva put demons to flight in the name of Jesus, whom Paul preached) Tatian also, even if implicated in profane error, nevertheless is not useless, by producing an example for the learned, as it seems to me, he set in order this gospel with expert arrangement. And perhaps he developed this work while cleaving to side of the blessed Justin on account of the latter's erudition. For I think for this reason that it is this one's [Tatian's] not Ammonius's edition of the celebrated volume, since Ammonius appears to have joined the words separated from the narrative of the remaining evangelists to Matthew's narrative; but this one adopts the beginning of Saint Luke. Although for the most part he joins the words of the remaining [gospels] to the gospel of Saint Matthew, with the result that it is rightfully possible to be

uncertain whether this invention of the same work ought to be reckoned Ammonius's or Tatian's, nevertheless, now even if the author of this edition appears to be Tatian the heresiarch, I willingly embrace the version, since I examine and recognize the words of my Lord, [but] if they had been his [Tatian's] own, I would have thrown it away.¹⁵

Victor of Capua's preface has usually been mined for its invaluable testimony about the transmission of the Diatessaron. What is important for our discussion is that Victor's preface illuminates the hermeneutic guiding this collection and codification of materials in this codex. Upon finding a text without title, Victor actively engaged in research only to discover that the text before him most likely had heretical connections; in fact, according to Victor's research, Tatian, the likely creator of this gospel harmony, was a heresiarch and associate of Marcion. Yet surprisingly, such heretical associations did not compel Victor to dismiss this text. Instead, its utility outweighed any heretical contamination. In a display of unexpected ecumenism, after verifying the authenticity of

¹⁵ Cum fortuito in manus meas incideret unum ex quattuor euangelium conpositum et absente titulo non inuenirem nomen auctoris· diligenter inquirens quis gesta uel dicta domini et saluatoris nostril euangelica lectione discreta in ordinem quo se consequi uidebantur· non minimo studii labore redegerit· repperi ammonium quemdam alexandrinum· qui canonum quoque euangelii fertur inuentor· matthei euangelio reliquorum trium excerpta iunxisse· ac sic in unam seriem euangelium nexsuisse· sicut eusebius episcopus carpiano cuidam scribens in praefatione editionis suae· qua canones memorati euangelii edidit supra dicti uiri imitatus stadium refert· in hunc modum· ammonius quidam alexandrinus multum ut arbitror laboris et studii impendens unum ex quattuor nobis abreliquit euangelium ex historia quoque eius comperi· quod tatianus vir eruditissimus et orator illius temporis clarus· unum ex quattuor conpaginauerit euangelium cui titulum diapente conposuit· hic beati iustini philosophi et martyris· dum adiuueret discipulus fuit· quo migrante ad dominum cum palma martyrii· magistri sanctam deserens disciplinam et doctrinae supercilio elatus in lapsum encratitarum heresim marcionis potius amplexus errorem quam iustini· christi philosophi ueritatem· suae uitae perniciosus excoluit· asserens inter alia nuptias et stupra pari crimini subiacere· sed et dictis apostolicis· manus profanae emendationis· uel ut dicam uerius corruptionis dicitur intulisse· sed quia et hominum perfidorum christi dei nostri operante potentia confessione uel opere saepe triumphat gloria ueritatis· nam et daemones christum fatebantur· et filii sceuae in actibus apostolorum· in nomine ihesu quem praedicaret paulus demonia fugabant· tatianus quoque licet profanis implicatus erroribus non inutile tamen exhibens studiosis exemplum hoc euangelium ut mihi uidetur sollerti conpaginatione disposuit· et fortisan adhuc beati iustini adherens lateri illius eruditionis merito hoc opus explicuit· arbitror enim propterea non ammonii sed huius esse editionem memorati uoluminis quod ammonius matthei fertur relationi euangelistarum reliquorum relatione discretos adnexuisse sermones hic uero sancti lucae principia sunt adsumpta

Licet ex maxima parte euangelio sancti matthei reliquorum trium dicta coniunxerit· ut iure ambigi possit· ammonii an tatiani inuentio eiusdem operas debeat extimari·

Uerumtamen uel si iam heresiarches huius editionis auctor exstitit tatianus uerba domini mei cognoscens libenter amplector interpretationem si fuisset eius propria procul abicerem· (Ranke, *Codex Fuldensis*, 1-2).

the words of scripture, Victor chose to subordinate this text's heretical association to its overriding utility. Despite incriminating evidence against this text and its creator, Victor justified its transmission by appealing to God's omnipotence to turn heretics and their texts to divine ends.

The codification of the heretically tainted Diatessaron did not exhaust Victor's theological inclusivity: among the many other paratextual materials in this MS, Victor and his compilers collected Marcionite *argumenta*, the Vulgate prologue from the pen of an author sympathetic to Pelagian teachings, and *capitula* from OL editions alongside anti-Pelagian *capitula*. Victor's conservation and seemingly haphazard compilation of previous editorial work in these diverse paratexts (and the juxtaposition of their equally diverse hermeneutical perspectives) could lead to the conclusion that the interpretive stances were either not discerned by or did not concern Victor of Capua and the compilers of this MS. Such seemingly haphazard collection of previous editorial work in this MS also chances to stand at odds with Victor's self-presentation as a bishop keen on identifying the author of an untitled text. Yet his self-avowed ecumenism forces us to entertain whether such disparate hermeneutics would have concerned Victor, if he had recognized them. Since he did not directly address the issue of diverse hermeneutical viewpoints transmitted along with his edition of the *Corpus Paulinum*, we cannot know with certainty how he interpreted these paratexts. But it is not unreasonable to infer that if Victor authorized the transcription of the "words of my Lord" despite possible heretical contamination, then paratexts to Paul's letters would have been of little concern to him irrespective of their disparate, contradictory, or possibly even heretical hermeneutics—

recognized or not. These previous editorial hermeneutics were thus effectively circumscribed by and subsumed under Victor's.

While Codex Fuldensis itself represents a product of Victor's editorial hermeneutic as related in his preface, it also transmits texts and paratexts from previous editorial work. For this reason, I have taken pains to draw out the inclusivity undergirding Victor's hermeneutic in this edition so as to distinguish clearly his editorial hermeneutic in this MS from that of the editions Victor has incorporated. Not all of those diverse texts and paratexts redeployed by Victor in this MS will be investigated here—in fact, not even all those appended to the *Corpus Paulinum*. In this chapter, after surveying the *status quaestionis* of the origin of the Vulgate revision of the *Corpus Paulinum*, I investigate editorial strata in the following paratexts incorporated in Codex Fuldensis: Marcionite *argumenta*; *capitula* from OL editions; a prologue composed for the Vulgate revision that displays nascent Pelagian concerns; and *capitula* for Romans with an anti-Pelagian stance. My primary focus in this section will be the pro- or anti-Pelagian concerns in the prologue and *capitula*; my investigation of the Marcionite *argumenta* and other *capitula* serve to cast in relief the hermeneutic of these pro- or anti-Pelagian paratexts in order to investigate the incorporation of these conflicting editorial products in this MS. While Victor's codification of these multiple layers of editorial practice in Codex Fuldensis has subsumed these previous editions under a new ecumenical inclusiveness, their original interpretive stances taken in response to earlier doctrinal controversies remain intact. Because these paratexts were taken over wholesale into this later MS, a discordant juxtaposition of interpretive lenses results. Yet neither Victor's ecumenism nor their juxtaposition resulting from his codification can remove their earlier interpretive aims.

This interpretive role can be seen most clearly by comparing previous editorial interpretations prefaced by other paratextual materials in this MS—e.g. the Marcionite *argumenta* and select *capitula*. In this study of the Vulgate prologue, *capitula*, and Marcionite *argumenta*, I argue that paratexts transmitted interpretation, whether or not those redeploying these materials in the production of this MS (or other MSS) perceived their particular hermeneutical lenses. In the specific case of Codex Fuldensis, where the paratextual products of earlier editorial perspectives were rendered subordinate to that set out in Victor's preface, we see the codification and compilation of numerous editorial interpretive viewpoints.

As a corollary to the increasing deployment of paratextual materials as a mode of shaping interpretation, I will also examine select variants from this MS's text to see if those text-critical methods utilized by Marcion in the preparation of his edition were utilized in the production of this one: do the paratexts prepared for the Vulgate revision or Victor's edition interact with the preparation or transmission of their respective texts in the same manner as Marcion's *Antitheses* and *argumenta*? In chapter 3 we saw evidence that Marcion's paratexts not only shaped readings of the text of his *Corpus Paulinum*, but also articulated the foundations and provided justification for altering the text itself.

While the latter function was not necessary for the hermeneutical impact of the former, in Marcion's edition they went hand in hand. Along with prefacing interpretation, Marcion's paratextual introduction reinforced his textual manipulation (both perceived and real). We will see that despite the alteration of texts for theological ends in the work of Marcion and numerous anonymous scribes,¹⁶ Codex Fuldensis evinces no comparable tendency for corrupting the text for such reasons. Nor do the interpretations articulated in

¹⁶ See Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*.

paratexts to these earlier editions shape the transmission of the text, despite clear evidence that they do shape its interpretation. Yet paratexts can shape interpretations of a text without necessarily affecting its transmission or corruption. This shift from fashioning interpretation by means of textual corruption to paratextual introduction coincides with contemporary reverence for the faithful transmission of the text best exemplified by Cassiodorus's (ca. 485-585) rules for proper transcription, correction, and study of scripture in his *Institutiones divinarum litterarum*.¹⁷

This veneration for the text and corresponding rejection of corruption as a strategy for shaping interpretation should not lead us to discount paratexts, which I argue are more subtle strategies, but no less effective. I should stress here I am less concerned with the impact of this strategy of deploying paratexts on those later editors or collectors who redeployed these paratexts than I am with the editorial strategies deployed to articulate hermeneutical investments themselves. While my focus does not lie in tracing the effectiveness of this strategy, we do, however, have ample evidence of the impact of paratexts on interpretation. Both Marius Victorinus and Ambrosiaster drew on the Marcionite *argumenta* in the composition of their commentaries;¹⁸ in the opinion of Stephen Cooper, who recently issued an English translation of Marius Victorinus's commentary, the Marcionite *argumenta* likely even shaped interpretation.¹⁹ In addition, Pelagius incorporated the entire *Primum Quaeritur* Vulgate prologue at the beginning of

¹⁷ See especially Cassiodorus, *Institutiones* 15, 30 (Mynors ed., 41-51, 75-78).

¹⁸ DeBruyn, *Pelagius's Commentary*, 9. See also Stephen Cooper, *Marius Victorinus' Commentary on Galatians: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), esp. 352-3; and Karl Theodor Schäfer, "Marius Victorinus und die Marcionitischen Prologe zu den Paulusbriefen," *RBén* 80 (1970): 7-16.

¹⁹ *Marius Victorinus' Commentary*, 352-3.

his commentary on Paul's letters.²⁰ But whether or not later readers or compilers discerned the interpretive stances conveyed in paratextual materials, these ancillary texts liminally positioned between reader and text provided editors a unique medium to transmit interpretation without altering the text itself.

II. The Vulgate Revision of the *Corpus Paulinum: Status Quaestionis*

The Vulgate revision undertaken at the end of the fourth century represents one of many, though doubtless the most important, reworkings of the Latin text of the NT. This revision was neither the first nor the last in a long line of Latin textual ameliorations: the OL versions show multiple attempts at revision before the issuance of this subsequent textual revision later known as the Vulgate;²¹ after the edition of the Vulgate the

²⁰ The *PQ* prologue was taken over by Pelagius in his *Expositiones XIII Epistularum Pauli*; see Alexander Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions of Thirteen Epistles of St. Paul: II. Text and Apparatus Criticus* (ed. J.A. Robinson; Cambridge: The University Press, 1926), 3-5. Although Souter maintained that the prologue ought to be attributed to Pelagius (*Pelagius's Expositions: I*, 115), Frede has proved convincingly that it belongs to the Vulgate revision (*Epistulae ad Thessalonicenses*, 99-101). A discussion of other sources used by Pelagius in his commentary can be found in Alfred J. Smith, "The Latin Sources of the Commentary of Pelagius on the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans," *JTS* 19 (1918): 162-230; 20 (1919) 55-177.

²¹ When assessing the Vulgate revision and its place among the Latin translations in the early church we are extremely fortunate to be able to draw on the extensive research of the Beuron Institute and the *Vetus Latina* project, which have delineated the lineaments of the OL, attempts to revise these versions, and the persistence of the OL in later revisions. The differences in the Latin textual types are primarily attributable to variation in vocabulary. According to the current state of research all the OL versions (and thus the Vulgate as well) go back to a common translation which had been constantly revised in different places. The early texts-types are identified by Latin patristic citations: disregarding Tertullian whose testimony is much debated, Cyprian offers the first clear evidence of an identifiable Latin text-type in North Africa, designated K. There are two main constellations of European texts: the I text-type represents the broadly distributed and textually diverse European text, while D is the more localized and associated with Italy. Among these main types there is of course considerable variation and mixture. For general discussions, see Bonifatius Fischer, "Das Neue Testament in lateinischer Sprache," in *Die Alten Übersetzungen des Neuen Testaments, die Kirchenväterzitate und Lektionare* (ed. Kurt Aland; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1972); Metzger, *Early Versions*, 285-93; J. K. Elliot, "The Translation of the New Testament into Latin: The Old Latin and the Vulgate," in *ANRW* (eds. H. Temporini and W. Haase; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1992); Jacobus H Petzer, "The Latin Version of the New Testament," in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis* (eds. Bart D. Ehrman and Michael William Holmes; Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans, 1995). For more detailed discussions of the OL revisions of the Pauline epistles see Hermann Josef Frede, *Allateinische Paulus-Handschriften* (Freiburg: Herder, 1964); *ibid.*, ed., *Epistula ad*

persistent influx of OL texts into Vulgate MSS necessitated continual revisions in attempts to reacquire the original Vulgate text.²² The persistence of the admixture of OL texts in Vulgate MSS notwithstanding, this revision eventually achieved prominence and exerted vast influence over a western Christendom.²³

In his well-known letter to Pope Damasus, Jerome revealed the reasons for the Vulgate revision of the Gospels commissioned by the Pope himself:

For if the faith must be summoned from Latin copies, then to this they will respond: it is almost as diverse as the codices. But if truth ought to be sought from multiplicity, why do we not, by reverting back to the original Greek, correct them which either were edited poorly by bad translators or more perversely emended by those inexperienced impudents or interpolated or changed by sleeping copyists?²⁴

The Latin MSS of the NT in circulation were marred by idiosyncratic and diverse readings betraying many hands that had attempted to translate these texts into this vernacular; with this sentiment Augustine concurs: “They are able to be enumerated who have translated the scriptures from Hebrew into Greek; but not at all the Latin translators. For in the beginning of the faith whenever a Greek codex found its way into the hands of anyone

Ephesios (VL 24/1; Freiburg: Herder, 1962-64); *ibid.*, ed., *Epistulae ad Philippenses et ad Colossenses* (VL 24/2 Freiburg: Herder, 1966-1971); *ibid.*, ed., *Epistulae ad Thessalonicenses*; and Uwe Fröhlich, ed., *Epistula ad Corinthios I* (VL 22; Freiburg: Herder, 1995), 168-226.

²² Among the more notable of the later revisions of Vulgate that attempted to purify the Vulgate text of OL influence are those undertaken by Peregrinus, Theodulf, and Alcuin. Peregrinus revised the Vulgate (especially the text of Paul) in the 5th century in Spain thus giving rise to a so-called Spanish Vulgate. Although Alcuin and Theodulf both operated in the 8th century, they employed much different text-critical principles; whereas Theodulf tried to create a scholastic text, Alcuin aimed more for usability. For discussion and bibliography, see Samuel Berger, *Histoire de la Vulgate pendant les premiers siècles du Moyen Age* (New York: B. Franklin, 1893), 145-225; Metzger, *Early Versions*, 334-48; and Fischer, *Lateinische Bibelhandschriften*, 47-53, 205-403.

²³ Metzger contends that “whether one considers the Vulgate from a purely secular point of view, with its pervasive influence on the development of Latin into the Romance languages, or whether one has in view only the specifically religious influence, the extent of penetration into all areas of Western culture is well-nigh beyond calculation” (*Early Versions*, 285).

²⁴ Si enim latinis exemplaribus fides est adhibenda, respondeant, quibus; tot sunt paene quot codices. Sin autem veritas est quaerenda de pluribus, cur non ad Graecam originem revertentes ea quae vel a vitiosis interpretibus male edita, vel a praesumptoribus imperitis emendata perversius vel a librariis dormitantibus aut addita sunt aut mutata corrigimus? (*Epistula ad Damasum* Roger Gryson, ed., *Biblia Sacra: iuxta Vulgatam versionem*, 4 ed. [Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994], 1515 12-16).

and he seemed to have some faculty of his own tongue and the other, he ventured to translate it.”²⁵ Such diversity, as Jerome intimated, threatened to undermine the unity of the faith predicated on these writings with the result that in the face of theological disputes insistence on unanimous church doctrine could be seriously compromised by their multiplicity. Thus the revision of the OL texts at the end of the fourth century, which eventually became known as the Vulgate,²⁶ was more than a scholastic enterprise undertaken to improve the Latin text, although it did do that: it was also an attempt to impose unity on the diversity of Latin MSS and bring them into harmony with the Greek tradition. One of the aims of this effort was to foster theological unity.

Tradition ascribed the Vulgate to Jerome; according to this tradition his revision not only comprised the Gospels, as discussed in his letter to Damasus, and the Hebrew Bible, to which Jerome also wrote prefaces, but the rest of the NT as well. Jerome’s own statements in his *De viris inlustribus* in some respects corroborate this tradition, where he relates: “I revised the New Testament accurately from the Greek; the Old Testament I translated according to the Hebrew.”²⁷ Despite Jerome’s claims to the revision of the entire NT, serious doubts have been cast on Jerome’s role in revising the NT outside the

²⁵ Qui enim scripturas ex hebrea in graecam uerterunt, numerari possunt, latini autem interpretes nullo modo. Vt enim cuique primis fidei temporibus in manus uenit codex graecus et aliquantum facultatis sibi utriusque linguae habere uidebatur, ausus est interpretari (*Doctr. chr.* 2.11.16 [CCSL 32 42,21-26]).

²⁶ Not until the 16th century was this late 4th century revision accorded the name Vulgate, which had previously been used for the OL versions; see E. T. Sutcliffe, "The Name Vulgate," *Bib* 29 (1948): 345-52; and A. Allgeier, "*Haec vetus et vulgata editio*. Neue wort und begriffgeschichtliche Beitrage auf dem Tridentum," *Bib* 29 (1948): 353-90.

²⁷ Novum Testamentum Graece fidei reddidi, Vetus iuxta Hebraicum transtuli (*De viris inlustribus* 135 [Richardson ed. 56.4-6]). Jerome’s castigation of those who took offense at his revision of the Gospels in Ep. 27 corroborates a possible role in the revision of the Pauline epistles as well; see especially 27.1 and 27.3. In the latter passage Jerome contrasts readings of his opponents with his own at Rom 12: “illi legant: spe gaudentes, tempori seruientes, nos legamus: spe gaudentes, domino seruientes,” (*Epistula* 27 [CSEL 54 225,16-18]).

Gospels.²⁸ With respect to the revision of the Pauline epistles in particular, scholars have become increasingly skeptical that Jerome was its reviser.²⁹ Quite often Jerome not only fails to cite the Vulgate, he even castigates codices that transmit certain Vulgate readings (cf. e.g. Rom 12:3; 1 Cor 13:3; Gal 5:9; Eph 2:16, et al);³⁰ this is quite inexplicable if he himself was the originator of this revision. In addition, as Frede has pointed out, the prologue composed to introduce the Vulgate edition of the *Corpus Paulinum* conflicts with Jerome's statements on the status of Hebrews.³¹

Besides Jerome many luminaries of the early Latin church have been suggested as the creator of the Vulgate edition of Paul's letters: at different times de Bruyne offered that Augustine or Pelagius had a hand in its production.³² While de Bruyne's hypothesis regarding Augustine garnered little support, the identification of Pelagius commended itself due to the close relationship between the Vulgate and Pelagius's text of Paul's letters.³³ Yet Pelagius's association with the Vulgate revision was also called into

²⁸ Along with the *Corpus Paulinum* recent scholarship has identified Rufinus of Syria as the reviser of the Catholic Epistles, see Walter Theile, "Probleme der Versio Latina in den Katholischen Briefen," in *Die alten Übersetzungen* (ed. Kurt Aland; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1972), 117. Gryson hesitates to actually name Rufinus of Syria as the reviser of the Apocalypse of John, but he does acknowledge that the Vulgate revision of the New Testament, save for the Gospels, was carried out by one person (*Apocalypsis Johannis* (Freiburg: Herder, 2000), 90). For a recent assessment of Jerome's translation activity on the Gospels, see Philip Burton, *The Old Latin Gospels: A Study of their Texts and Language* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 192-99.

²⁹ For a full discussion of debates over the revision of the Vulgate, see Metzger, *Early Versions*, 352-62.

³⁰ Donatien de Bruyne, "Études sur les origines de notre texte latin de saint Paul," *RB* NS 24 (1915): 358-92, esp. 363-64. Jerome's castigations are also recorded in Wordsworth and White, eds., *Epistulae Paulinae*, 127, 248, 395, 428.

³¹ Frede, ed., *Epistulae ad Thessalonicenses*, 99-101. See also Fischer, "Neue Testament," 73.

³² For Pelagius's role, see de Bruyne, "Études sur les origines de notre texte latin de saint Paul;" for Augustine, *ibid.*, *Les fragments de Freising* (Rome: Bibliothèque vaticane, 1921); *ibid.*, "Saint Augustin reviseur de la Bible," in *Miscellanea Agonistiana II* (Rome: Tipografia poliglotta vaticana, 1931).

³³ Alexander Souter, "The commentary of Pelagius on the Epistles of Paul: The Problem of its Restoration," *Proceedings of the British Academy* (1905-6): 409-39; *ibid.*, "The Character and History of Pelagius's

question shortly after it was put forward. Among the early dissenters to a Pelagian origin were Buonaiuti, Souter, Chapman, and Lagrange.³⁴ While Chapman and Lagrange argued for the traditional association of the Vulgate with Jerome, Buonaiuti and Souter merely maintained that the reviser could not have been Pelagius. The hypothesis that Pelagius was the author of the Vulgate version of Paul's letters is now widely dismissed, since Souter pointed to OL readings found in Pelagius's text which in his opinion indicated that Pelagius did not use as pure a Vulgate text as thought.³⁵ Frede conceded that Pelagius's text was marred by mixture; yet he argued that the OL mixture in Pelagius's text of Paul's letters does not indicate one more earlier revision of the OL text on the way to the Vulgate revision, but rather that the Vulgate revision had already been subject to OL influences by the time Pelagius used it.³⁶

Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul," *Proceedings of the British Academy* (1915-16): 261-96. Although Souter's statements regarding the similarity of the Vulgate and Pelagius's text occasioned de Bruyne's argument for Pelagius's authorship of the Vulgate revision of the *Corpus Paulinum*, Souter eventually retracted his earlier view on the closeness of this version to Pelagius's citations. Instead Souter maintained that Pelagius did not use the Vulgate, but an OL text closer to the Vulgate (*Pelagius's Expositions of Thirteen Epistles of St. Paul: I. Introduction* [ed. J.A. Robinson; vol. 9 no.I-III; Cambridge: The University Press, 1922], 116-158 esp. 155-158).

³⁴ E. Buonaiuti, "Pelagius and the Pauline Vulgate," *ExpTim* 27 (1915-16): 425-7; John Chapman, "Pelage et le texte de S. Paul," *RHE* 18 (1922): 469-81; 19 (1923) 25-42; J. Chapman, "St. Jerome and the Vulgate New Testament," *JTS* 24 (1923): 33-51, 113-25, 283-99; Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions: I*, 116-158 esp. 155-158; M.-J. Lagrange, "La Vulgate latine de l'Épître aux Romains et la texte grec," *RB* N.S. 13 (1916): 225-35; M.-J. Lagrange, "La Vulgate latine de l'Épître aux Galates et la texte grec," *RB* N.S. 14 (1917): 424-50; M.-J. Lagrange, "La révision de la Vulgate par S. Jérôme," *RB* 15 (1918): 254-7. Ferdinand Cavallera acknowledged that de Bruyne's argument for Pelagius was untenable, but upheld and extended de Bruyne's argument that Jerome had no role in the Vulgate revision of Acts and the Apocalypse in addition to Paul's letters ("Saint Jérôme et la Vulgate des Actes des Épîtres et de l'Apocalypse," *BLE* [1920]: 269-92).

³⁵ Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions: I*, 116-58 esp. 55-58.

³⁶ Frede, ed., *Epistulae ad Philippenses*, 42.

The regnant scholarly opinion attributes the authorship of the Vulgate revision of the *Corpus Paulinum* to Rufinus of Syria.³⁷ Our knowledge of Rufinus is altogether incommensurate with his influence on the development of Christianity in light of his alleged role in this Vulgate revision. Although likely born in the east, i.e. in Syria as his name suggests,³⁸ Rufinus moved in the upper echelons of society in Rome among the social, intellectual, and ecclesiastical elite at the end of the fourth century, where he would have been ideally positioned for undertaking the task of revising portions of the Latin NT. Apparently associated with Jerome's monastery in Bethlehem,³⁹ Rufinus of Syria appears to be the same Rufinus sent as an envoy to Milan by way of Rome where he was to greet Rufinus of Aquila before the Origenist controversy reached fever pitch.⁴⁰ It is probably at this time or somewhat later when, according to Augustine, Rufinus dwelt

³⁷ In his recent *Vetus Latina* edition of 1 Cor Uwe Fröhlich still concurs with this assessment (*Epistula ad Corinthios I*, 220-22). For discussions of Rufinus, see Flavio G. Novolone and Aimé Solignac, "Pélage et Pélagianisme," in *Dictionnaire de spiritualité ascétique et mystique doctrine et histoire* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1986); Eugene TeSelle, "Rufinus the Syrian, Caelestius, Pelagius: Explorations in the Pre-history of the Pelagian Controversy," *AugStud* 3 (1972): 61-95; Elizabeth A. Clark, *The Origenist Controversy: The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1992), 202-7; Theodore S. de Bruyne, *Pelagius's Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 18-24.

³⁸ Marius Mercator calls him "Rufinus quondam natione Syrus" (*Commonitorium, prologus* 3, 1 [ACO I, 5: 5]).

³⁹ See Jerome's translation of Epiphanius's letter to John of Jerusalem (Jerome, *Ep.* 51, 2 [CSEL 54, 399]) and Novolone and Solignac, "Pélage et Pélagianisme," 2890.

⁴⁰ Jerome, *Ep.* 81, 2 (CSEL 55, 107). There is no complete scholarly consensus on the identity of Rufinus sent by Jerome and whether or not he ought to be equated with Rufinus the Syrian. Henri Marrou ("Les Attachés Orientales du Pelagianisme," *Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-lettres, Compte Rendus* [1968]: 459-92) is disinclined to accept that Jerome's envoy Rufinus is the same Rufinus whom Caelestius implicates in his defense at the council of Carthage; Mary Miller (*Rufini Presbyteri Liber de Fide: A Critical Text and Translation with Introduction and Commentary* [Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1964]), Gerald Bonner ("Rufinus of Syrian and African Pelagianism," *AugStud* 1 [1970]: 30-47), TeSelle ("Rufinus the Syrian"), Fröhlich (*Epistula ad Corinthios I*, 220-22), and Clark (*Origenist Controversy*) on the other hand incline toward the acceptance that Rufinus the Syrian was the author of the *Liber de fide*, Jerome's envoy, and to some extent the forerunner of Pelagius and Caelestius.

with Pammachius in Rome.⁴¹ Augustine (and later Marius Mercator ca. fifth century) also records allegations associating Rufinus with the germination of Pelagian thought (specifically the non-transmission of sin from Adam) derived from the Acts of the Council of Carthage where Caelestius was interrogated;⁴² according to Augustine, during the investigation into Caelestius's theology at the Council of Carthage, the defendant admitted that "the holy presbyter Rufinus of Rome who lived with holy Pammachius, I heard him say that there is no transmission of sin."⁴³ Marius Mercator not only tars Rufinus with the brush of Pelagianism, he even charges him with disseminating this heresy to its eponymous figure-head Pelagius himself while at Rome under the pontificate of Anastasius (ca. 399-401 C.E.).⁴⁴ This association with Pelagian positions—albeit in nascent forms—finds corroboration in Rufinus's own work, the *Liber de Fide*, where Rufinus himself refutes the physical transmission of sin in association with his polemic against Origenist and Arian theologies.⁴⁵ With the exception of his work related to the Vulgate revision, Rufinus left few other writings.⁴⁶ Part of his work on the Vulgate text was the composition of a prologue, the so-called *Primum Quaeritur*, written to

⁴¹ *De gratia Christi*, II, 3, 3 (CSEL 42, 168).

⁴² *De gratia Christi*, II, 3, 3 (CSEL 42, 168).

⁴³ Caelestius dixit: sanctus presbyter Rufinus Romae qui mansit cum sancto Pammachio; ego audiui illum dicentem, quia tradux peccati non sit (*De gratia Christi*, II, 3, 3 [CSEL 42, 168,12-15]).

⁴⁴ Marius Mercator, *Commonitorium*, prologus 3, 1 (ACO I, 5: 5).

⁴⁵ For a thorough discussion of Rufinus's role in the Origenist controversy, see Clark, *Origenist Controversy*, 202-07.

⁴⁶ According to Nuvolone a short *Libellus de Fide* should also attributed to Rufinus ("Pélage et Pélagianisme," 2890); for the text, see Rufinus, *Libellus de fide* 3, 1 (ACO I, 5: 4-5).

preface his edition of the *Corpus Paulinum*,⁴⁷ which we will discuss in relation to Rufinus's theology in greater detail shortly.

Rufinus of Syria's emergence as the likely candidate for the Vulgate revision of Paul's letters (and other parts of the Vulgate NT) has much to commend itself.⁴⁸ First of all, Rufinus is closely associated with Jerome, who as noted was first commissioned by Pope Damasus to revise the Latin text of the Gospels. Pelagius's close connection to the Vulgate also makes sense if the reviser was Rufinus, since it would be easy to explain: 1) why Pelagius, a possible pupil of Rufinus, would be one of our first witnesses to this revision; and 2) why Pelagius is not the author, since in the short intervening time between Rufinus's revision and Pelagius's usage OL readings had already crept into the text.⁴⁹ That Rufinus authored the Vulgate revision also accounts for the close connection between Rufinus and the Vulgate text cited in his *Liber de Fide*.⁵⁰

Rufinus left no statement concerning his guidelines for revision comparable to Jerome's on the Gospels. In fact, the prologue *Primum Quaeritur* issued alongside this revision remains completely silent on this issue. In spite of the absence of deliberate

⁴⁷ Frede argues convincingly that the prologue was composed specifically for the Vulgate revision by its reviser (*Epistulae ad Philippenses*, 42-3).

⁴⁸ See Frede, ed., *Epistulae ad Philippenses*, 282; Fischer, "Neue Testament," 73; Bruyne, *Pelagius's Commentary*; Fröhlich, ed., *Epistula ad Corinthios I*, 220-22. For Rufinus's role in revising the Catholic epistles, see Walter Theile, ed., *Epistulae Catholicae (VL 26/1)*; Freiburg: Herder, 1956-1969), 117.

⁴⁹ For more on the rapid corruption of the Vulgate text, see Frede, ed., *Epistulae ad Philippenses*, 40-43 and the discussion below.

⁵⁰ See the discussion of Rufinus's textual citations and collation of the Vulgate with the citations of the Pauline corpus in Rufinus's *Liber de Fide* found in the introduction and commentary of Miller's edition (*Liber de Fide*, 14-15, 146-93). In his recent study of the Latin OL tradition of 1 Cor, Fröhlich concluded that the slight variations between Rufinus's citations and the Vulgate text were not sufficient to disprove the argument that Rufinus revised the Pauline epistles (*Epistula ad Corinthios I*, 220-21). This collocation of evidence for Rufinus (i.e. proximity to Jerome, Pelagius, and the Pelagian use of the Vulgate text) also compelled Theile to reach a similar conclusion regarding the suitability of Rufinus as the reviser of the Catholic epistles ("Probleme der Versio Latina in den Katholischen Briefen," in *Die alten Übersetzungen* [ed. Kurt Aland; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1972], 117).

enunciation of the principles of revision, detailed investigation of the Vulgate text has revealed the *modus operandi* for its creation: primarily this revision is marked by its adherence to Greek readings—more specifically it eschews “Western” readings in favor of Alexandrian.⁵¹ This adherence to the Greek readings in the Vulgate revision even occasionally extends to the point of slavish repetition of word-order often at the expense of felicitous Latin.⁵² Additionally, Frede has noted that this revision also stands against OL readings.⁵³ Thus Frede has isolated two main principles for distinguishing the Vulgate revision from other Latin versions: 1) the correspondence to Greek (especially Alexandrian) readings, and 2) those that reject the OL forms when readings are divided.⁵⁴

The close relationship between the Greek witnesses and the Vulgate revision, even down to the replication of very word order, underscores a deep reverence for the text of scripture. In connection with this reverence Jerome’s comments on translation practices are illuminating, even though this revision of the *Corpus Paulinum* is not attributed to him: in his letter to Pammachius on the best method of translation, Jerome explicitly differentiates translation of the scriptures from profane literature: “For I not only acknowledge, but even do so openly with free voice that I express sense from sense, not word by word in interpretation from the Greek, apart from the holy scriptures where

⁵¹ Frede, ed., *Epistulae ad Philippenses*, 32-35. Frede does note, however, that the Vulgate also occasionally transmits Byzantine readings (*ibid.*).

⁵² Frede, ed., *Epistulae ad Philippenses*, 32-33.

⁵³ Frede, ed., *Epistulae ad Philippenses*, 31.

⁵⁴ Frede, ed., *Epistulae ad Philippenses*, 31.

even the order of the words is a mystery.”⁵⁵ According to Jerome, in contrast to the proper method of translation (sense by sense), scripture requires special reverence, where translation proceeds word by word even replicating, inasmuch as possible, the actual order of the text so as to preserve its holy nature. While such an acknowledgment from Rufinus himself may be lacking, his actual work of revision reveals a similar veneration for the text. The author of the Vulgate revision did, however, address other editorial concerns in the prologue composed to accompany his new edition, to which we now turn.

III. Paratexts and Editorial Hermeneutics in Codex Fuldensis

A. *Primum Quaeritur*

The transmission of the introductory prologue *Primum quaeritur* (PQ), known from its opening words, in virtually every Vulgate tradition offers virtually irrefutable evidence that this prologue was written to accompany the Vulgate revision.⁵⁶ Although this prologue is actually attributed to Pelagius in sundry MSS,⁵⁷ Frede and Fischer have proven convincingly that this prologue arose together with the Vulgate revision, which should rather be attributed to Pelagius’s predecessor Rufinus of Syria, the putative author

⁵⁵ Ego enim non solum fateor, sed libera uoce profiteor me in interpretatione Graecorum absque scripturis sanctis, ubi et uerborum ordo mysterium est, non uerbum e uerbo, sed sensum exprimere de sensu (*Ep. 57 Ad Pammachium de optimo genere interpretandi*, 5.2 [CSEL 54,1 508,9-13]).

⁵⁶ Almost all Vulgate MSS (F among them) have either the original *Primum quaeritur* or a prologue dependent on it. For a list of MSS and their prologues, see Frede, ed., *Epistulae ad Thessalonicenses*, 100-101.

⁵⁷ Because this prologue was attributed to Pelagius in some MSS, a fact which would be difficult to explain if he was not the actual author, de Bruyne saw it as the product of Pelagius along with the Vulgate textual revision ("Études"). Souter conceded that the *Concordia Epistularum* probably came from Pelagius or one of his followers, but was less sanguine on the multiple editions of the Vulgate posited by de Bruyne ("Character and History," 266-270).

of this revision.⁵⁸ This is corroborated by the incorporation of *PQ* by Pelagius into his commentary on the Pauline epistles composed ca.406-409.⁵⁹ As noted above, further evidence that this prologue was not composed by Jerome can be seen in the divergent evaluations of the authenticity of Hebrews in *De viris illustribus* and the *PQ*, since, although the *PQ* appears to have been dependent upon Jerome's *De viris illustribus* 5, the prologue departs from Jerome's judgment on this letter's inauthenticity.⁶⁰

Foremost for our investigation of *PQ* in Codex Fuldensis are three interrelated issues: 1) the role of *PQ* in transmitting the hermeneutic of the reviser of the Vulgate; 2) possible interactions between the prologue and other ancillary texts found in Fuldensis; 3) and the analysis of *PQ* in light of prevailing editorial practice with respect to introductory and other paratextual materials. As I discuss *PQ*'s relationship to issues of prolegomena I will investigate the ways in which the editor's interpretation has framed this prologue and its corpus. The following is my translation of *PQ*, to which I will refer in my analysis:

First, it is to be asked why after the Gospels which are the fulfillment of the law and in which examples and precepts for living are most plentifully arranged for us, the Apostle wanted to send these letters to individual churches. It would seem certainly to be done for this reason that he might protect the first-fruits of the church's infancy from newly appearing questions and that he might curtail present and rising vices and afterwards prevent future disputes. [He did this] by the example of the prophets who, after the issuance of the law of Moses, in which all the mandates of God were spoken, nevertheless still transmitted their

⁵⁸ Frede, ed., *Epistulae ad Philippenses*, 42-43; Fischer, "Neue Testament," 73; Frede, ed., *Epistulae ad Thessalonicenses*, 99-101. Souter, however, saw the *Primum Quaeritur* as the work of Pelagius himself (*Pelagius's Expositions: I*, 115); Georges de Plinval ("Précisions sur l'authenticité d'un prologue de Pélage: *Primum quaeritur*," *REAug* 12 [1966]: 247-53) followed him in attributing it to Pelagius.

⁵⁹ Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions*, 3-5. For dating of the commentary, see Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions: I*, 4-5; and Bruyne, *Pelagius's Commentary*, 11. The terminus post quem is Pelagius's use of Rufinus's translation of Origen's commentary on Rom ca. 405; the terminus ante quem are Augustine's references in *De Peccatorum Meritis et Remissione*. De Bruyne (*Pelagius's Commentary*, 11) follows Frede (*Epistulae ad Thessalonicenses, Timotheum, Titum, Philemonem, Hebraeos; Pars II* [VL 25; Freiburg: Herder, 1975-1991], 1019) in the hypothesis that Pelagius's full commentary on the Pauline epistles including Hebrews was cut short by the sack of Rome by Alaric in 410.

⁶⁰ Frede, ed., *Epistulae ad Thessalonicenses*, 99.

teaching, continually renewing [the law] for people to arrest sin and for the sake of an example [they transmitted] books down to posterity for us too. Then it is to be asked why he wrote no more than ten letters to churches. For with the one which is called to the Hebrews, there are ten, for the remaining four were specifically sent forth to disciples. So that he might demonstrate that the New is not at odds with the Old Testament and that he himself did not act against the law of Moses, he set his letters to the number of the primary commandments of the Decalogue. By just as many precepts as that man [Moses] instructed those freed from Pharaoh, by the same number of letters this man [Paul] led those who were won from the Devil and the servitude of idolatry. For the most erudite men conveyed that even the two stone tablets had the figure of the two testaments.

Some men, however, contend that the letter, which is written to the Hebrews, is not Paul's, for the reason that it is not entitled with his name, and due to the discrepancy of word and style, but that it is either Barnabas's according to Tertullian, or Luke's according to some others, or surely Clement's, a disciple of the apostles and bishop of the Roman Church, who was ordained after the apostles. To these it is necessary to respond: if therefore it is not Paul's because it does not have his name, it is not anybody's because it is entitled with no name. But if this is absurd, that which shines with such eloquence of his own doctrine, ought all the more to be believed to be his. But since among the assemblies of the Hebrews by false suspicion he was thought of as a destroyer of the law, he wished to narrate the relationship of the example of the law and the truth of Christ without mentioning his name, lest the hatred of his name displayed in front exclude the utility of the reading. It is certainly not surprising, if he seems more eloquent in his own [language], i.e. Hebrew, than in a foreign one, i.e. Greek, the language in which the other letters are written.

And furthermore it disturbs some why the epistle to the Romans is put in the first place, when reason shows that it was not written first. For he testifies that he wrote it when he was going to Jerusalem, since he had already exhorted the Corinthians and others with letters that they might collect the [money for the] ministry, which he would carry with him. Whence some want all the letters to be gathered [and] arranged in this way that the one which was sent later may be placed first so that he may come by steps through each individual letter to the more perfect.

For in fact, the majority of the Romans were so ignorant that they did not know that they were saved by the grace of God and not their own merits. And about this two peoples were fighting amongst themselves. For that reason, he declared that they needed to be reinforced, reminding them of their prior vices as gentiles. Now to the Corinthians, however, he says that the gift of knowledge has departed. And he rebukes not so much everyone as he censures why have they not reprimanded the sinners? Thus he says, "fornication is reported among you," and again, "come together with my spirit to hand such a one over to Satan." In the second they are truly praised and they are admonished so that they might advance more and more. Now the Galatians are accused of no crime except that they had trusted the most shrewd false apostles. The Ephesians are truly worthy of no blame, but much praise because they had served the apostolic faith. The

Philippians, who did not even wish to listen to false apostles, are lauded even more. The Colossians, however, were such that although they were not seen corporeally by the Apostle, they were worthy of this praise, “even if I am absent in body, in spirit I am with you rejoicing and watching your condition.” With every praise, he distinguishes the Thessalonians just as much in two letters, for the reason that not only had they served the unshaken faith of truth, but they were found constant even in the face of persecution of their fellow citizens. Concerning the Hebrews, truly, what ought to be said? About them the Thessalonians, who were praised the most, are said to have become imitators, just as he himself said, “And you brothers have become imitators of the churches of God which are in Judea. For you have suffered the same things from your kinsmen which they suffer from the Jews” Among the Hebrews too he relates the same thing saying, “For you both had compassion for those in fetters and submitted to the seizure of your goods with joy, knowing that you have the better and abiding wealth.”⁶¹

⁶¹ Primum quaeritur quare post euangelia, quae supplementum legis sunt et in quibus nobis exempla et praecepta uiuendi plenissime digesta sunt, uoluerit apostolus has epistulas ad singulas ecclesias destinare. Hac autem causa factum uidetur, ut scilicet initia nascentis ecclesiae nouis causis existentibus praemuniret, ut et praesentia atque orientia resecauit uitia, et post futuras excluderet quaestiones, exemplo prophetarum, qui post editam legem Mosi, in qua omnia Dei mandata legebantur, nihilominus tamen doctrina sua rediuita semper populi compressere peccata, et propter exemplum liberos ad nostram etiam memoriam transmiserunt. Deinde quaeritur cur non amplius quam decem epistulas ad ecclesias scripserit; decem sunt enim cum illa quae dicitur ad Hebraeos, nam reliquae quattuor ad discipulos specialiter sunt porrectae. Ut ostenderet nouum non discrepare a ueteri testamento et se contra legem non facere Mosi, ad numerum primorum decalogi mandatorum suas epistulas ordinauit, et quot ille praeceptis a Pharaone instituit liberatos, totidem hic epistulis a diaboli et idolatriae seruitute edocet aduersos. Nam et duas tabulas lapideas duorum testamentorum figuram habuisse uiri eruditissimi tradiderunt. Epistolam sane quae ad Hebraeos scribitur quidam Pauli non esse contendunt, eo quod non sit eius nomine titulata, et propter sermonis stilique distantiam, sed aut Barnabae iuxta Tertullianum aut Lucae iuxta quosdam uel certe Clementis discipuli apostolorum et episcopi Romanae ecclesiae post apostolos ordinati. Quibus respondendum est: si propterea Pauli non erit quia eius non habet nomen, ergo nec alicuius erit quia nullius nomine titulatur; quod si absurdum est, ipsius magis esse credenda est quae tanto doctrinae suae fulget eloquio. Sed quoniam apud Hebraeorum ecclesias quasi destructor legis falsa suspitione habebatur, uoluit tacito nomine de figuris legis et ueritate Christi reddere rationem, ne odium nominis fronte praelati utilitatem excluderet lectionis. Non est sane mirum si eloquentior uideatur in proprio id est hebraeo quam in peregrino id est graeco, quo ceterae epistolae sunt scriptae sermone. Mouet etiam quosdam quare Romanorum epistula in primo sit posita, cum eam non primam scriptam ratio manifestet. Nam hanc se proficentem Hierosolymam scripsisse testatur, cum Corinthios et alios ante iam, ut ministerium quod secum portaturus erat colligerent, litteris adhortatus sit. Unde intellegi quidam uolunt ita omnes epistulas ordinatas ut prima poneretur quae posterior fuerat destinata, ut per singulas epistulas gradibus ad perfectiora ueniretur. Romanarum namque plerique tam rudes erant ut non intellegerent dei se gratia et non suis meritis esse saluatos, et ob hoc duo inter se populi conflictarent. Idcirco illos indigere adserit confirmari, uitia gentilitatis priora commemorans. Corinthiis autem iam dicit scientiae gratiam esse concessam, et non tam omnes increpat quam cur peccantes non increpauerint reprehendit, sicut ait Audite inter uos fornicatio; et iterum Congregatis uobis cum meo spiritu tradere huiusmodi Satanae. In secunda uero laudantur et ut magis ac magis proficiant admonentur. Galatae iam nullius criminis arguuntur, nisi hoc tantum quod callidissimis pseudoapostolis crediderunt. Ephesii sane nulla reprehensione sed multa laude sunt digni, quia fidem apostolicam seruauerunt. Philippenses etiam multo magis conlaudantur, qui nec audire quidem falsos apostolos uoluerunt. Colossenses autem tales erant ut cum ab apostolo uisi corporaliter non fuissent hac laude digni haberentur. Etsi corpore absens sum, sed spiritu uobiscum sum gaudens et uidens ordinem uestram. Thessalonicenses nihilominus in duabus epistulis omni laude prosequitur eo quod non solum fidem inconcussam seruauerint ueritatis, sed etiam in persecutione ciuium fuerint constantes inuenti. De Hebraeis uero quid dicendum est? quorum Thessalonicenses qui plurimum

With respect to its role as an introduction to the *Corpus Paulinum*, which it precedes in Codex Fuldensis and most Vulgate MSS, the *PQ* displays a broad familiarity with features of ancient prolegomena. Issues of utility (χρήσιμον), scope (σκοπός), order (διάταξις), and authenticity (γνήσιον) all figure prominently in this prologue.⁶² The most important issue for the author of the *PQ* is Paul's purpose in writing the letters: why would Paul write these letters when such laudable examples are proffered in the gospels? In order to answer this question the author appeals to the OT where the writings of the prophets, although in many ways superfluous in view of the perfection of the law given by Moses, are still issued so as to put an end to sin. Although Paul is here aligned with the Prophets and Moses with the evangelists, subsequently Paul's ten letters are equated to the Ten Commandments of Moses. This fact, according to Rufinus, testifies to the harmony between the OT and NT and the essential unanimity of the law and Paul's gospel. This deliberate linkage of the OT and the NT, we will see, echoes the high valuation of the OT in the thought of Rufinus and his disciples, where OT exempla offer Christians a pedagogical pattern and proof of God's justice.

Rufinus's attempt to equate the Decalogue with Paul's letters illustrates perfectly the malleability of judgments regarding authenticity in the ancient world and early Christianity, in this case the *PQ*.⁶³ The inclusion of Hebrews in the Vulgate edition of

laudati sunt imitatores facti esse dicuntur, sicut ipse ait Et uos fratres imitatores facti estis ecclesiarum dei quae sunt in Iudaea; eadem enim passi estis et uos a contribulibus uestris quae et illi a Iudaeis. Apud ipsos quoque Hebraeos eadem commemorat dicens Nam et uinctis compassi estis, et rapinam bonorum uestrorum cum gaudio suscepistis, cognoscentes uos habere meliorem et manentem substantiam (Wordsworth and White, eds., *Epistulae Paulinae*, 1-5).

⁶² See my discussion of ancient prolegomena features in chapter 2.

⁶³ This malleability is also especially evident in Eusebius's contention that heretical works are exposed by their departure from orthodoxy in style and thought (*Hist. Eccl.*, 3.25). The deliberate linking of the

Corpus Paulinum as an authentic letter of Paul makes this evident. Since Hebrews occupied a marginal status in the canon of the western church,⁶⁴ Rufinus tries to rehabilitate it and incorporate it into Paul's corpus in order to complete the number of Paul's community letters at ten and link the OT and NT.

One unspoken yet obvious reason for so deliberately articulating this connection between the OT and NT is the rejection of Marcion's doctrine separating the Hebrew Bible from the NT. To be sure, Marcionite Christianity and Marcion's followers—even if still around—were no longer a pressing concern in the late fourth century.⁶⁵ This particular aspect of Marcion's thought, however, had been taken up and was still actively propounded by Manichaean devotees.⁶⁶ We cannot prove that the *PQ* specifically targeted Marcionite or Manichaean thought, though some products of earlier Marcionite editorial work (i.e. the Marcionite *argumenta*) were not only still around, but had even made their way into later MS traditions (even Codex Fuldensis) where they were situated

Decalogue and Paul's letters to the communities also betrays the continual problem of the particularity in Paul's letters; for more on this issue, see Nils Alstrup Dahl, "The Particularity of the Pauline Epistle as a Problem in the Ancient Church," in *Neotestamentica et Patristica; Eine Freundesgabe, Herrn Professor Dr. Oscar Cullmann zu seinem 60 Geburtstag übereicht* (Leiden: Brill, 1962).

⁶⁴ Hilary of Poitiers (d. 368) represents one of the first to designate Hebrews as clearly canonical in the west; but even after him Jerome indicated that Hebrews was not unanimously accepted in the west, in contrast to the east; see Metzger, *Canon*, 159-62, 232-36. For a full discussion on problems regarding Hebrews' authenticity, canonical status, etc., in the west, see Frede, ed., *Epistulae ad Thessalonicenses; Pars II*, 1051-62.

⁶⁵ See my discussion in chapter 3.

⁶⁶ A good overview of the western (as well as eastern) spread of Manichaeism can be found in Geo Widengren, *Mani and Manichaeism* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1961); and Samuel N. C. Lieu, *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire and Medieval China* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1985). Lieu also discusses Mani's debt to Marcion's thought and the latter's rejection of the Jewish scriptures (37-41, 64-65); on Manichaean relationship to the Jewish scriptures, see also François Decret, *Aspects du manichéisme dans l'Afrique romaine: Les controverses de Fortunatus, Faustus, et Felix avec saint Augustin* (Paris: Études augustiniennes, 1970), esp. 123-49. On the role of Manichaean thought in Augustine's debate Julian of Eclanum at the end of the Pelagian controversy, see Elizabeth A. Clark, "Vitiated Seeds and Holy Vessels: Augustine's Manichean Past," in *Images of the Feminine in Gnosticism* (ed. Karen King; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988); and Robert Austin Markus, "Augustine's Confessions and the Controversy with Julian of Eclanum: Manichaeism Revisited," in *Collectanea Augustiniana: Mélanges T.J. van Bavel* (eds. B. Bruning, et al.; Leuven: Peeters, 1990).

alongside other editorial traditions. We will have more to say on the juxtaposition of the Marcionite *argumenta* and the *PQ* prologue; it should be noted here that this prologue rejects the fundamental tenets articulated in these *argumenta*.

The mutability of the category of authenticity (γνήσιον) in this introduction to Paul's letters is directly analogous to Galen's opinions regarding the status of spurious works attributed to Hippocrates. Those works that contradicted or called into question Galen's interpretation of Hippocratic medicine were deemed inauthentic (νόθα); those spurious books that supported his interpretation were championed as authentic. The determining criterion was not dispassionate weighing of evidence for or against. Rather how well any given work corresponded to Galen's interpretation of Hippocrates was paramount. Similarly, Rufinus resorts to the criterion of utility based on his conception of Pauline authorship. Because numerous stylistic and vocabulary reasons could be adduced to prove that Hebrews was not written by Paul, as Origen himself noted some time earlier,⁶⁷ what proves the authenticity of Hebrews is its effulgence and coherence with Pauline teaching: "quae tanto doctrinae suae fulget eloquio." Rufinus's *argumentum ad absurdum* that Hebrews was written by no one, since it has no author attached to it, underscores the difficulty of proving Pauline authorship. In order to preserve the utility of this letter Paul deliberately declined to attach his name lest, according to *PQ*, it prohibit some from reading it. This evaluation of Hebrews articulated in *PQ* demonstrates that making judgments on authenticity was not separate from a work's utility.

⁶⁷ Origen is aware that the style of Hebrews differs markedly from that of Paul's other letters, but similar to the *PQ*, notes that the thought in the letter is in keeping with Paul. As to its author, however, he concedes that only God knows (Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.* 6.25 11-14 [LCL 265 76-78]). See also Clement of Alexandria's thoughts also recorded by Eusebius whence the *PQ* draws the tradition that Paul originally wrote in Hebrew but deigned to affix his name and was translated into Greek by Luke (*Eccl. Hist.* 6.14 2-4 [LCL 265 46]).

The defense of the authenticity of Hebrews highlights the way that isagogic material can either rehabilitate or reinforce negative judgments of a given text. In fact, the inclusion of Hebrews in the Vulgate revision of the *Corpus Paulinum* helped to secure its place in the canon and liturgy of the western church.⁶⁸ In order to achieve this inclusion and rehabilitate the status of Hebrews as an authentic Pauline letter as in the east, Rufinus turned to an introductory paratext, wherein he directly addressed and rebutted problems regarding its authenticity. This prologue and the attendant corpus that included Hebrews at the end effectively achieved its desired results. This is not to imply that without the Vulgate revision and its prologue Hebrews would not have eventually been accorded this status in the west: it is merely to say that the prologue and the physical collection it prefaced were the sites where editorial decisions could meet readers and shape their readings. Although Hebrews was likely on its way to canonization in the west, the *PQ* would have been well placed to hasten this process.

The stigma of illegitimacy of Hebrews could, however, not be shunted aside completely. An investigation into the arrangement (διάταξις) of *PQ*'s corpus discloses the lingering marginal status of this work. Unlike the arrangement in \mathfrak{P}^{46} or other MSS that physically locate Hebrews within the Pauline corpus, the *PQ* places this letter at the end.⁶⁹ Although the narrative for this order provides an exalted (yet clearly quite

⁶⁸ By the time of the Council of Carthage in 419 Hebrews was firmly ensconced in the western canon as one of Paul's 14 letters, even though MSS of Paul's letters copied thereafter still sometimes omitted this letter; e.g. 9th cent. Codex Boernerianus (G) omits Hebrews (Metzger, *Canon*, 237-8). For more on G see Frede, *Altlateinische Paulus-Handschriften*, 50-79.

⁶⁹ The placement of Hebrews in the second position immediately after Romans and before 1 Corinthians in \mathfrak{P}^{46} is quite noteworthy. Already in the editio princeps, Frederic Kenyon observed that "the position given to Hebrews immediately after Romans is almost unique" (*The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri; Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible: Fasciculus III Supplement: Pauline Epistles, Text* [London: E. Walker, 1936], xi). In addition to \mathfrak{P}^{46} , Hatch notes six minuscules and a Syrian canon ca. 400 C.E. which also place Hebrews after Romans ("The Position of Hebrews in the Canon of the

contrived) justification for this station, the final position in MSS was often the place where dubious or suspect tracts were placed.⁷⁰ Rather than being the culmination of Pauline thought as *PQ* claims, ending the corpus with Hebrews likely betrays prior suspicions over its authenticity.

Yet Rufinus recasts the marginal position of Hebrews by utilizing a pattern of organization wherein this letter marks the culmination of Pauline thought. According to the *PQ*, Paul's community letters have been arranged so as to demonstrate the movement from neophytic initiation in Romans to the perfection of the faith found in the last tract, Hebrews. The method and rationale for this ordering of the *Corpus Paulinum* enunciated in this prologue displays a remarkable similarity to ordering patterns of corpora outlined in chapter 2. The pattern advocated here represents isagogic concerns, particularly intent on narrating a move toward perfection step by step in each letter. In particular, this achievement of a higher perfection through the properly ordered reading of Paul displays an appreciation for the pedagogical or psychagogical import of ordering patterns not dissimilar to Neoplatonic organizations of Plato's corpus designed to raise the soul to the contemplation of the divine.

New Testament," *HTR* 29 [1936]: 133-51). It should also be noted that H. F. D. Sparks identified the same pattern in the *Corpus Paulinum* used by the Egyptian ascetic Hieracas ("The Order of the Epistles in the Chester Beatty Papyrus P46," *JTS* 42 [1941]: 180-81). Hatch reports that Hebrews was most commonly placed after Philemon (at the end of the Pauline corpus) or between 2 Thessalonians and 1 Timothy (between the community and personal letters); it is also found though "very rarely after Galatians, Ephesians, Colossians, and Titus," ("Position of Hebrews," 133). These placements likely correspond to disputes over the status of Hebrews as authentically Pauline. Locating Hebrews at the end of the corpus resonates with our observation in chapter 2 that editors or compilers often segregated spurious works there. In contrast, placing Hebrews in the second position in \mathfrak{P}^{46} undoubtedly reveals that the producers of this codex (and perhaps its exemplar) thought Hebrews was an authentic Pauline writing—conclusions that Kenyon (*Pauline Epistles, Text*, xi-xii) and Eldon Epp ("Issues in the Interrelation of New Testament Textual Criticism and Canon," in *The Canon Debate* [eds. Lee Martin McDonald and James A. Sanders; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 2002], 504) come to as well. Thus, the issue of authenticity also touches on the arrangement of the epistles actually included in MSS.

⁷⁰ See our discussion in chapter 2.

This pattern's rationale is, however, clearly secondary to earlier arrangements as evidenced by the incongruity of the letters' contents and Rufinus's summary of them. In order to realize this pattern in the Pauline corpus the *PQ* must frame all the letters so that they do in fact lead step by step to the more perfect. The actual order, however, blatantly contradicts this endeavor, creating in some cases rather strained summaries of the contents of the letters. For example, Romans is not placed first because it offers the closest approximation to Paul's theological summa, but rather because of the Roman audience's ignorance about salvation through grace rather than merits and their former gentile life, both of which exemplify their neophytic status. In passing it should be noted that although the high estimation of "grace" in opposition to "merits" could be read as an statement countering a "Pelagian" position (at least as depicted by opponents), the importance of God's grace and minimization of one's merits actually coheres perfectly with Pelagius's own soteriology as interpreted by Torgny Bohlin.⁷¹ Thus the Romans are cast in a very disparaging and unflattering light highlighting this letter's place as preliminary instruction into the faith. Fischer has suggested that this disparagement of the Roman church in the *PQ* should be related to Rufinus's displeasure with the community in Rome when he spent time there.⁷² To be sure, Rufinus's possible disaffection with the Christian community in Rome would in some respects harmonize with Pelagius's later more rigorous demands on the faithful, though this is not completely necessary to explain the denigration of Romans. With respect to the rationale for ordering Paul's letters, it is

⁷¹ Torgny Bohlin, *Die Theologie des Pelagius und ihre Genesis* (Uppsala: Lundequistska bokhandeln, 1957), 38.

⁷² Fischer, "Neue Testament," 73. N.B. this also offers further evidence, in Fischer's opinion, for the association of Rufinus with the revision of the Vulgate.

more likely, I think, that he is forced to downplay their maturity in the faith so as to maintain his pedagogical and catechetical pattern of arrangement.

While certain aspects of Paul's letters are emphasized in order to accommodate this ordering pattern, in other letters problems and confrontations are deemphasized for the same reason. About Galatians Rufinus claims that they "are accused of no crime except that they had trusted the most shrewd false apostles." Although this does not misrepresent Paul's letter to the Galatians, completely absent is Paul's apoplectic disbelief that the Galatians would even entertain the thought of being circumcised (3:1-6; 5:1-12). Furthermore, nowhere is this selective interpretation more apparent than the final letter to the Hebrews. Despite the prominence of the author's fears that his audience may apostasize to Jewish practices in Hebrews (cf. 3:12-15; 10:32-34; 12:25-13:16), according to this prologue, this letter marks the endpoint and culmination of indoctrination into the faith through Paul's letters—even though the fear of apostasizing and returning to Jewish practices could argue for its place at the beginning of a corpus arranged in such a catechetical pattern. Rufinus even claims to be at a loss for words to describe their perfection before comparing them to the Thessalonians. Thus in Rufinus's rationale for his arrangement each letter exemplifies a further step in the reader's inculcation in the true and proper faith as they are catechetically led from the most rudimentary instruction to the sublimity of the faith in the epistle to the Hebrews.⁷³

Not only does this ordering pattern strike a dissonant chord in comparison with the contents of the letters; once this revision was finished there was still no necessary

⁷³ The importance of ordering systems was not, of course, confined to the *Corpus Paulinum*; e.g. a prologue to the Catholic epistles deliberately draws attention to the fact that there were alternative ordering patterns in Greek MSS; this prologue is also known from its opening words "Non ita ordo." See Fischer, *Lateinische Bibelhandschriften*, 41.

connection to the actual arrangement of the letters in the corpus to which it was prefaced. In fact, Codex Fuldensis departs from this pattern significantly. The order advocated in the Vulgate prologue (Romans, 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, 1 Thessalonians, 2 Thessalonians, Hebrews) is not replicated by the order found in Fuldensis (Romans, 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, 1 Thessalonians, 2 Thessalonians, Colossians, Laodiceans, 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus, Philemon, Hebrews). Note that F even incorporates the apocryphal letter to the Laodiceans in this corpus. This dissonance between introductory materials and the actual contents they precede in physical MSS underscores the weight of tradition burdening later attempts to establish new editions, which by the sixth century were cobbled onto the foundations of countless earlier endeavors.

In discussing the interpretive stance of *PQ* it is necessary to address its relationship to Rufinus's thought in general and his contribution to the development of Pelagianism in particular.⁷⁴ I should stress here that there was no unified Pelagian

⁷⁴ For overviews of Pelagianism, see Novolone and Solognac, "Pélage et Pélagianisme;" Georges de Plinval, *Pélage, ses écrits, sa vie et sa réforme; étude d'histoire littéraire et religieuse* (Lausanne: Payot, 1943); Robert F. Evans, *Pelagius: Inquiries and Reappraisals* (New York: Seabury Press, 1968); John Ferguson, *Pelagius* (Cambridge: W. Heffer and Sons, 1956); B. R. Rees, *Pelagius: Life and Letters* (Rochester, N.Y.: Boydell Press, 1998). The primary texts for reconstructing the Pelagian controversy are extensive and in the case of Pelagius and his circle quite often fraught with disputes over authenticity. For our purposes Rufinus's *Liber de Fide* and Pelagius's *Expositiones XIII Epistularum Pauli*, and *Epistula ad Demetriadem* are most important and widely accepted as authentic. Berthold Altaner was the first to argue for the *Liber de Fide* as a work of Rufinus ("Der Liber de fide: ein Werk des Pelagianers Rufinus des 'Syrers'," *TQ* 130 [1950]: 432-49). His dating of this work after 412, which was followed in Miller's edition, has been seriously questioned by François Refoulé, "Datation du premier concile de Carthage contre les Pélagians et du *Libellus fidei* de Rufin," *REAug* 9 (1963): 41-49; in contrast to Altaner, Refoulé thinks that Augustine was responding to Rufinus rather than Rufinus responding to Augustine (47-49). For this reason, he puts the *Liber de Fide's* composition ca. 400 in Rome. See also J. H. Koopmans, "Augustine's First Contact with Pelagius and the Dating of the Condemnation of Caelestius at Carthage," *VC* 8, no. 3 (1954): 149-53. For critical editions, see Pelagius, *Ad Demetriadem*. (*PL* 30: 15-45); Rufinus, *Liber de Fide* (Miller, ed.); Souter, *Pelagius's Expositiones: II*. For further discussion of the works of Pelagius and his circle see John Morris, "Pelagian Literature," *JTS* N.S. 16 (1965): 26-60. Although some "Pelagian" materials have been preserved as a result of their circulation under the name of "orthodox" writers (see Nuvolone, "Pélage et Pélagianisme," 2918-2923), the anti-Pelagian materials have been, unsurprisingly, far better preserved and are quite vast. Foremost are Jerome's *Dialogus adversus Pelagianos* and Augustine's *De perfectione*

position; not all of those (e.g. Rufinus, Caelestius, Pelagius himself, and Julian of Eclanum) lumped together under the umbrella of Pelagianism and would necessarily have agreed with one another on every theological nicety.⁷⁵ With regard to views of sexuality for instance, Michael Rackett demonstrated that those early Christians identified as “Pelagian” (namely, Pelagius, “the Anonymous Sicilian,” and Julian of Eclanum) occupied quite diverse positions;⁷⁶ what united these different approaches, however, was the underlying concern to maintain the possibility of human sinlessness.⁷⁷ In sum, there did exist some common presuppositions and concerns underlying their theologies and for this reason we are in some sense justified in seeing Pelagius as the theological heir of those ideas set forth by Rufinus. Primarily these presuppositions and concerns revolved around human nature and God’s justice.

These issues found particular focus in the furor that erupted over infant baptism and raged throughout the Pelagian controversy. At stake was far more than the simple

iustitiae hominis, De gestis Pelagii, De gratia Christi et de peccato originali, De nuptiis et concupiscentia ad Valerium comitem, De peccatorum meritis et remissione et de baptismo parvulorum ad Marcellinum, De spiritu et littera, De natura et gratia, De natura et origine animae, Contra duas epistulas Pelagianorum, Contra Iulianum (Opus Imperfectum). A still useful collection of the more important passages for the Pelagian controversy can be found in Albert Bruckner, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Pelagianischen Streites* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1906).

⁷⁵ Scholars have increasingly stressed the diversity of the views of those associated with Pelagianism; see Gerald Bonner, *Augustine and Modern Research on Pelagianism* (Wetteren, Belgium: Villanova University Press, 1972), 3, 45; *ibid.*, "How Pelagian was Pelagius?: An Examination of the Contentions of Torgny Bohlin," *StPatr* 9 (1966): 350-58. Peter Brown notes that in reality our understanding of Pelagianism is indebted to an Augustinian construct (*Augustine of Hippo: A Biography* [Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967], 343, 58).

⁷⁶ Michael Reynolds Rackett, "Sexuality and Sinlessness: The Diversity among Pelagian Theologies of Marriage and Virginity" (Ph.D. Dissertation, Duke University, 2002). Rackett’s study constitutes a significant contribution to this trend to move away from the simplistic reconstructions (indebted to Augustine’s construction of the “Pelagian” movement) to more nuanced readings of “Pelagian” sources in more recent scholarship, by demonstrating the range of perspectives on sexuality among those numbered among “Pelagians”—from the Anonymous Sicilian’s denigration of marriage to Pelagius’s tempered defense of asceticism and Julian of Eclanum’s defense of marriage—united by the undergirding concern for the possibility of sinlessness.

⁷⁷ Rackett, "Sexuality and Sinlessness," 1.

ritual of baptizing babies: the very definitions of human nature and God's grace hung in the balance. The issues undergirding Rufinus's thought that eventually became articulated more fully in the Pelagian controversy coalesced primarily around God's justice and human accountability:⁷⁸ how did human sinfulness and righteousness before and after the advent of Christ square with God's demands for proper action? Pelagius's treatment of this problem in his *Epistula ad Demetriadem* in 413 C.E. did nothing to quell an increasingly vociferous debate about sin, grace, and human accountability.⁷⁹ Although Augustine and Jerome differ significantly on these issues, they both offer strident rejoinders which corroborate the contours of Pelagius's theses concerning human nature, the origin of sin, and possibility of human perfection.⁸⁰

Since Rufinus's positions are most fully developed in Pelagius's thought, I will begin this overview by discussing the development of this trajectory in the latter. Pelagius's *Epistle to Demetrias* presents an unequivocal statement on human possibilities and God's justice. In this letter Pelagius affirms that humans were created good with respect to their nature, since they, supplied with intellect and free will, have been made in

⁷⁸ I agree with Elizabeth Clark that the issues undergirding the debates had less to do with anthropology than with theology—in particular God's justice (*Origenist Controversy*, 206). This is not to dismiss the importance of human accountability and possibility in Pelagian thought, rather that these issues were subordinate to, and dependent on, God's impartiality.

⁷⁹ For a full overview and discussion of the controversy with respect to the primary players in the debate, see Brown, *Augustine of Hippo*, 340-97; J. N. D. Kelly, *Jerome: His Life, Writings, and Controversies* (London: Duckworth, 1975), 309-32; and B. R. Rees, *Pelagius: A Reluctant Heretic* (Wolfeboro, N.H.: Boydell Press, 1988).

⁸⁰ See especially Augustine's *De gestis Pelagii, De gratia Christi et de peccato originali, De peccatorum meritis et remissione, De spiritu et littera, De natura et gratia, De natura et origine animae, Contra duas epistulas Pelagianorum, Contra Iulianum (Opus Imperfectum)* and Jerome's *Dialogus adversus Pelagianos*. We will have opportunity to discuss their rejoinders to Pelagianism in our discussion of the *capitula* in Codex Fuldensis.

God's own image.⁸¹ The inner law, about which Paul writes in Rom 1-2, offers proof that all have access to righteousness and are held accountable for their own actions.

According to Pelagius, this inner law allowed the luminaries from the Hebrew Bible from Adam to Moses to live righteous lives before both the law and Christ's incarnation.⁸²

These examples demonstrate human capacity for virtue.⁸³ Job is even adduced as the model of gospel virtue despite the fact that he lived long before Christ's advent and the gospel itself.⁸⁴ Pelagius argues that, since many were righteous before the law and before Christ, sin comes from habit and following the example of Adam and his first sin, not human nature; but the law and then the perfect example of Christ teach us how to achieve virtue and live a virtuous life. So even though Pelagius concedes that achieving righteousness is more possible after Christ's advent, he still maintains that righteousness was possible before the law and before Christ.⁸⁵

In his treatise *Liber de fide* Rufinus anticipated many positions developed more fully by Pelagius. Particularly noteworthy for our discussion and the development of Pelagian thought are Rufinus's teachings on the origin of sin, the possibilities of human sinlessness before the advent of Christ, and the repercussions of Adam and Eve's disobedience. In his *Liber de fide* Rufinus adamantly maintains that sin is not passed down from Adam and Eve, for this would render God unjust;⁸⁶ rather as Pelagius argued

⁸¹ Pelagius, *Ad Demetriadem* 2 (PL 30 17).

⁸² Pelagius, *Ad Demetriadem* 4-6 (PL 30 19-22).

⁸³ Pelagius, *Ad Demetriadem* 4 (PL 30 19).

⁸⁴ Pelagius, *Ad Demetriadem* 6 (PL 30 22).

⁸⁵ Pelagius, *Ad Demetriadem* 8 (PL 30 22-23).

⁸⁶ Rufinus the Syrian, *Liber de fide* 38-39 (Miller ed., 110, 112, 114).

after him, human nature is good.⁸⁷ Articulating a “creationist” position Rufinus maintains that, since souls do not come from Adam and Eve, sin could not be transmitted through them.⁸⁸ In the act of procreation God creates the soul and humans supply matter; these two are then invigorated in the womb by God.⁸⁹ Rufinus does not explicitly articulate where sin does come from; but he does maintain that human souls have the same substance as Jesus’ soul, who serves as exemplar for living without sin—a point of resonance with Pelagius’s articulation of the transmission of sin by following the example of Adam and Eve.⁹⁰ Furthermore, Rufinus also explicitly states that, since infants do not have sin, the purpose of infant baptism is not to wash away sin, but to enter them into the kingdom of heaven.⁹¹ Instead, sin is passed down through the example of Adam and Eve’s disobedience, not from their nature; since each individual soul is created by God it could not be stained with sin. In fact, Rufinus even stresses that humans share consubstantiality with Jesus’ rational soul.⁹² For this reason Jesus’ triumph over the passions and life of virtue exemplify for all how to defeat vice, live virtuously, and resist the snares of the devil while in the fleshly body.⁹³

The possibility for human righteousness has far-reaching implications. Since human nature is good and humans are capable of righteousness even before the advent of

⁸⁷ Rufinus the Syrian, *Liber de fide* 39 (Miller ed., 112, 114).

⁸⁸ Rufinus the Syrian, *Liber de fide* 28 (Miller ed., 90, 92, 94).

⁸⁹ Rufinus the Syrian, *Liber de fide* 28 (Miller ed., 90, 92, 94).

⁹⁰ Rufinus the Syrian, *Liber de fide* 40-43 (Miller ed., 114, 116, 118, 120). (cf. e.g. Pelagius, *Ad Demetriadem* 8, 13, 27 [PL 30 22-23, 27-28, 41-42]).

⁹¹ Rufinus the Syrian, *Liber de fide* 40 (Miller ed., 114, 116).

⁹² Rufinus the Syrian, *Liber de fide* 43 (Miller ed., 120).

⁹³ Rufinus the Syrian, *Liber de fide* 49 (Miller ed., 126).

Jesus, just like Pelagius after him Rufinus maintains that scripture teaches that many in the Hebrew Bible led righteous lives; among them were Adam and Eve who lived exemplary lives after their disobedience. This positive evaluation of the righteous men and women from the Hebrew Bible on the one hand testifies to human nature. These examples also explain the prominent place of the law and exemplars from the Old Testament in the preface to the *Liber de fide* where it is set on par with the New.⁹⁴

Many fundamental themes and issues from the writings of Rufinus and his theological heir Pelagius find prominence in this prologue to the Vulgate revision.⁹⁵ Although the issue of infant baptism or God's justice and human accountability are not explicitly addressed, the *PQ* still subtly articulates central aspects of Rufinus's thought. Foremost among Rufinus's (and subsequently Pelagius's) theology is the role that example and habit play in fostering sinful or alternatively virtuous behavior. This central tenet introduces the rationale for Paul's letters and structures their order. In the very first sentence Rufinus questions why Paul would trouble to write these letters when so many examples (*exempla*) for living are proffered in the gospels. Similarly, the concern to arrange Paul's letters pedagogically so as to lead the reader to a more perfect faith evokes Rufinus's belief in human progress toward Jesus' perfect exemplar. The prominent features of *exempla* and striving towards perfection are not unique to Rufinus's prologue: we have seen similar ordering patterns deployed for pedagogical principles and utilized

⁹⁴ Rufinus the Syrian, *Liber de fide* preface (Miller ed., 52).

⁹⁵ Gisbert Greshake comes to a similar conclusion regarding the *PQ* prologue as it was taken over into Pelagius's commentary—though he focuses on its relation to Pelagius's thought rather than Rufinus's (*Gnade als konkrete Freiheit: eine Untersuchung zur Gnadenlehre des Pelagius* [Mainz: Matthias-Grünewald, 1972], 52-3).

for promoting a virtuous life in other Greco-Roman corpora by imitation of exempla.⁹⁶

What is important, nevertheless, is that the *PQ* stresses pursuing virtue and curtailing sin in this prologue in accordance with central tenets as articulated by Rufinus.

The direct equation of the Decalogue with Paul's ten letter corpus also communicates the central preoccupation with righteousness even before Christ's arrival in Pelagian thought. With respect to Rufinus's thought in particular, this prologue goes much further than reaffirming the Hebrew Bible as the Old Testament: the law is fulfilled (or at least supplemented) by the gospels (*supplementum legis*); the numerous examples for living (*exempla uiuendi*) offered in the gospels hark back to the perfect mandates of God later supplemented by the prophets. Furthermore, Paul's teaching does not contradict the law or the Old Testament; in fact, according to the *PQ*, by writing only ten letters Paul deliberately indicated that he did not oppose Moses. This teaching aligns perfectly with Rufinus's *Liber de Fide* wherein the Old Testament is cited as the source of the faith and a font of exemplary sinless lives⁹⁷—a point even more fully developed and articulated in Pelagian thought.⁹⁸ The identification of these Pelagian themes in the *Corpus Paulinum* illustrates nicely the ways in which the prologue *PQ* subtly transmitted interpretation. This is not to imply that the sentiments expressed in this prologue were strictly Pelagian or had to be read through such a lens. Rather Pelagian thought, especially as articulated by the Vulgate reviser Rufinus, structure this prologue in terms

⁹⁶ See our discussion in chapter 2.

⁹⁷ Rufinus the Syrian, *Liber de fide* preface, 8, 35, 36, 37, 39 (Miller ed., 52, 60, 104, 106, 108, 110, 112, 114).

⁹⁸ Pelagius, *Ad Demetriadem* 4-8 (*PL* 30 19-23).

of the scope, purpose, and arrangement of Paul's letters; and an introductory prologue was ideally suited and situated for such utilization.

B. *Primum Quaeritur* and *Argumenta* in Codex Fuldensis

The juxtaposition of this prologue alongside the primary and secondary Marcionite *argumenta* creates some stark inconcinnities. In chapter 3 we observed that the original Marcionite prologues were only appended to the following letters in this order (i.e. Galatians, 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Romans, 1 Thessalonians, 2 Thessalonians, Laodiceans [i.e. Ephesians], Colossians, Philippians, Philemon) with the *argumenta* to 1 Corinthians, 1 Thessalonians and Philippians covering the subsequent letters of 2 Corinthians, 2 Thessalonians, and Philemon. The consistent style and content of the *argumenta* to these letters (Galatians, 1 Corinthians, Romans, 1 Thessalonians, Laodiceans [i.e. Ephesians], Colossians, Philippians) clearly differentiated these original *argumenta* from later ones. Subsequently, *argumenta* to the remaining letters (2 Corinthians, 2 Thessalonians, Philemon, 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus) were composed. These *argumenta* to 2 Corinthians, 2 Thessalonians, Philemon and the Pastorals are not only much more succinct, they also highlight fidelity to the ecclesiastical hierarchy and the proto-orthodox faith.⁹⁹

⁹⁹ The secondary catholicization in opposition to Marcion is even more evident in a scribal addition to the *argumentum* to Ephesians in the 9th century MS Codex Colmariensis (N). This interpolation reads:
truly it should be known however that this letter which we have written to the Ephesians the heretics, of them especially Marcion, entitle to the Laodiceans.
amen sciendum sane quia haec epistola quam nos ad Ephesios scriptam habemus heretici et maxime Marcion istae ad Laodicenses adtitulant;" (Wordsworth and White, eds., *Epistulae Paulinae*, 406).

This interpolation into an already secondary *argumentum*, which replaced the *argumentum* to Laodiceans from Marcion's corpus and which was based on the *argumentum* to Philippians, put even more distance between itself and its Marcionite origins. This secondary addition quite probably originated long before the 9th century when Marcion was clearly no longer a threat. Nonetheless, its existence demonstrates that the

Given the marginal status of Hebrews discussed above, it is no surprise that its *argumentum* stands outside these early lines of transmission. The multiple *argumenta* and obvious departure from the style of both primary and secondary *argumenta* testify to disputes over its authenticity and canonicity.¹⁰⁰ In fact, Codex Fuldensis does not even contain an *argumentum* to Hebrews. This fact allows us to infer that the exemplar from which F was copied also lacked an *argumentum* to Hebrews. F does, however, transmit *capitula* to Hebrews which were imported from a MS related to the seventh century Codex Reginensis (R).¹⁰¹ Minor variations notwithstanding, these *capitula* to Hebrews in Fuldensis align with R and are independent from the other *capitula* to Hebrews; R is also the only MS to transmit this particular *argumentum* to Hebrews. From the collocation of this evidence we are able to conclude that an ancestor of F and R, from which the *capitula* to Hebrews were drawn, lacked an *argumentum*.¹⁰² As we will see when we turn our attention to the *capitula* proper, this by no means exhausts the complexities of transmission of paratextual materials in Fuldensis. But at this point we can conclude that the exemplar of Fuldensis probably contained *argumenta* to the entire Pauline corpus save Hebrews. The inclusion of one *argumentum* to Hebrews in many Vulgate MSS

argumentum was in this instance ideally situated to denounce as heretical an alternative edition of the *Corpus Paulinum*.

¹⁰⁰ For the text of the *argumenta* to Hebrews, see Wordsworth and White, eds., *Epistulae Paulinae*, 679-81. Discussions can be found in Donatien de Bruyne, "Prologues bibliques d'origin marcionite," *RBén* 24 (1907): 1-16; Peter Corssen, "Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte des Römerbriefes," *ZNW* 10 (1909): 1-45; 97-102; and Frede, ed., *Epistulae ad Thessalonicenses*, 117-19.

¹⁰¹ Frede, ed., *Epistulae ad Thessalonicenses*, 130-31.

¹⁰² While it is possible that F omitted the *argumentum* which was retained by R, there are no obvious reasons for doing so, since the *argumentum* found in R seems to be clearly dependent on the Marcionite *argumenta* and evinces no clear reasons for omission. For the text of this *argumentum*, see Wordsworth and White, eds., *Epistulae Paulinae*, 681. Fischer argues that this *Vorlage* likely came from Campania, Rome, or further north and also contained liturgical readings and the Versus Damasi which were taken over into F and R (*Lateinische Bibelhandschriften*, 63-4).

(ABDKNOPSVWZ et al) and another *argumentum* in a couple MSS (CT), which elsewhere transmit the same prefatory material as F,¹⁰³ offers further evidence for Fischer's argument that while ancillary materials allow us to infer the existence of early editions, their independent transmission in the early middle ages makes determining the origin and spread of these editions difficult.¹⁰⁴

The juxtaposition of the Marcionite *argumenta* alongside the *PQ* casts into relief the role paratextual materials could play in prefacing interpretations of the subsequent texts. Nowhere is this more evident than a comparison of Rufinus's view of the Hebrew Bible (whether articulated in opposition to Manichaean or Marcionite theology) with that found in the Marcionite *argumenta*. Where the Marcionite *argumenta* give free reign to an overt polemic against Judaism, Jewish practice, and the Hebrew Bible in their summaries of Paul's letters (especially in Galatians, 1 Corinthians, and Romans), the Vulgate prologue lauds the law so much as to put it on equal footing with the gospels and Paul. Not only does Rufinus explicitly equate Paul's ten letters with the Decalogue and consistently downplay the anti-Jewish rhetoric found in the *Corpus Paulinum* itself, he even begins this prologue by framing the gospel as the fulfillment of the law. In fact, the description of "euangelia, quae supplementum legis sunt" and the statement "ut ostenderet nouum non discrepare a ueteri testamento et se contra legem non facere Mosis" could scarcely be further from the Marcionite *argumentum* which lambasted the Galatians: "hi uerbum ueritatis primum ab apostolo acceperunt, sed post discessum eius

¹⁰³ E.g. Even though F departs from all of these MSS in omitting an *argumentum* to Hebrews, it aligns with ABCKMO in transmitting *PQ* along with the Marcionite *argumentum* to Rom, 1 Cor, 2 Cor, Gal, Eph, Phil, Col, 1 Thess, 2 Thess, 1 Tim, 2 Tim, Titus, and Phlm (Wordsworth and White, eds., *Epistulae Paulinae*, 1, 41, 153, 279, 355, 407, 455, 491, 523, 555, 573, 615, 647, 669, 679).

¹⁰⁴ Fischer, *Lateinische Bibelhandschriften*, 39-42.

temptati sunt a falsis apostolis ut in legem et circumcisionem uerterentur.” From the contrast between the Marcionite *argumenta* and *PQ*, we begin to see how Codex Fuldensis represents a site of competing interpretations, where its paratextual materials of diverse background and perspective codify earlier struggles to establish an interpretative hegemony over the attendant *Corpus Paulinum*. This MS also elucidates how these editorial products composed with their own specific interpretive lenses for their own specific editions, can be incorporated, however uneasily, into a later MS alongside one another under Victor’s overarching editorial hermeneutic.

In sum, the *PQ* emphasizes some fundamental themes found in Rufinus’s thought and developed further by Pelagius; these themes structure and inform the summary of Paul’s letters in the *PQ* and thus transmit an interpretive framework to the reader of the subsequent Vulgate revision. In order to convey this hermeneutic Rufinus draws on prolegomena traditions, adapts them to his own purpose, and refracts them through his hermeneutical lens. This has been seen most clearly with the discussion of the scope and purpose of Paul’s letters, where they are explicitly linked with the OT and the Mosaic law. This positive evaluation of the Hebrew Bible found in the *PQ* is in many ways not at all surprising given the author’s role in the development of Pelagianism. Furthermore, Rufinus’s belief in the inherent goodness of humanity and possibility of achieving perfection through the extirpation of sin by emulation of Christ and the patriarchs arguably lies at the root of his ordering pattern (διάταξις/*ordo*) designed so as to lead one to imitate a life of virtue. We have observed, however, that this pattern has been superimposed on previous editions resulting in jarring incongruities when comparing the contents of the letters and their description in Rufinus’s ordering pattern. Finally, *PQ*’s

introduction and interpretation stands in stark contrast with that found in the Marcionite *argumenta* found alongside it in Codex Fuldensis (and numerous other MSS). This contrast shows unequivocally that these prologues and *argumenta* were far more than mere theologically neutral introductions to Paul's letters; they also prefaced and transmitted an interpretation of the attendant corpus. Their later codification in subsequent editorial products resulted in the imbrication of multiple interpretive layers, despite their originally distinctive hermeneutic provided to circumscribe their specific edition.

C. *Capitula* in Codex Fuldensis

Another prominent paratextual feature in this MS are the *capitula*: headings supplied to the biblical text which orient the reader to specific passages in the codex.¹⁰⁵ These *capitula* function in the same way as the *kephalaia* set out in chapters 1 and 4, for which they are the Latin equivalent. The *capitula* to the *Corpus Paulinum* in Codex Fuldensis consist of a numbered list of the main headings (i.e. *capitula*) prefaced to each letter, usually found between the *argumentum* (whether Marcionite or secondary) and the letter itself.¹⁰⁶ The number corresponding to each *capitulum* then directs the reader to a specific passage in the text identified by the number in the margin. Thus our conclusions in chapter 2 that the numbered *kephalaia* were primarily designed and functioned to

¹⁰⁵ With the exception of Hebrews whose *capitula* seem dependent on a Greek edition of the *kephalaia*, the *capitula* in Fuldensis are actually designated by the term "brevis." A list of many *capitula* to Latin biblical MSS can be found in Bruyne, *Sommaires*. For a more recent overview of the various *capitula* to the Pauline corpus, see Frede, ed., *Epistulae ad Thessalonicenses*, 120-31.

¹⁰⁶ This pattern is not adhered to in Rom where the *capitula* to this letter follow the *Condordia Epistularum* attributed to Pelagian sources and precedes the Marcionite *argumentum*. Additionally, an *argumentum* to Hebrews is lacking, and the apocryphal letter to Laodiceans has no *capitula* between its *argumentum* and the epistle. Furthermore, the *argumentum* to Laodiceans is almost exactly the same as that for 1 Tim

orient the reader's interpretation and facilitate the location of passages in the MS aligns perfectly with the *capitula* in Codex Fuldensis.

The *capitula* exhibit quite distinct types formally, which indicate their diverse origins.¹⁰⁷ The *capitula* to all the letters (1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, 1 Thessalonians, 2 Thessalonians, Colossians, 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus, Philemon) except Romans and Hebrews adhere to the style which begin with “de” and then describe briefly the topic of the passage.¹⁰⁸ For example, *capitulum* XXVII to 1 Cor in Codex Fuldensis summarizes this passage as follows: “concerning the unjust (de iniustis), that they will not possess the kingdom of God and that all sins are washed by the grace of baptism.”¹⁰⁹ This type of *capitula* is very closely aligned with our discussion of *kephalaia* in chapter 2, where we observed that the introduction of the *kephalaia* often began with the designation περί (alongside πῶς, ὅτι, or simply a word), since the use of “de” in Latin *capitula* directly corresponds to περί in Greek *kephalaia*.

The contents of the *capitula* vary. Usually they consist simply of a short description (sometimes only a few words) of the topic Paul addresses in a given passage, which the author of the *capitula* has singled out for specific emphasis. Additionally, some *capitula* of this “de” type, which Donatien de Bruyne designated M,¹¹⁰ not only offer a

¹⁰⁷ For an overview of the *capitula* transmitted in Latin MSS, see Frede, ed., *Epistulae ad Thessalonicenses*, 98-131. For a discussion of Latin MS prefatory materials more generally, see Fischer, *Lateinische Bibelhandschriften*, 39-42.

¹⁰⁸ Codex Fuldensis does not transmit any *capitula* to the apocryphal letter to Laodiceans despite having numbers in the text which surely correspond to a *capitula* numbering system (Ranke, ed., *Codex Fuldensis*, 291-92). For more on the transmission of *capitula* to Laodiceans, see Frede, ed., *Epistulae ad Thessalonicenses*, 121.

¹⁰⁹ de iniustis quod regnum dei non possidebunt · et quod omnia peccata baptismi gratia diluantur (Ranke, ed., *Codex Fuldensis*, 205).

¹¹⁰ Donatien de Bruyne, *Prefaces de la Bible latine* (Namur: Auguste Godenne, 1920), 314-19. De Bruyne chose this designation (M) for them because the type of text of Rom for which these *capitula* were

brief summary of the contents of the passage but also occasionally give short citations or paraphrases of the text: e.g. *capitulum* XVIII to Galatians summarizes, “concerning the Jews who, although they believed, were constrained by slavery under the elements of the world until ‘the Lord made from a woman and under the law’ was sent by the father into the world.”¹¹¹ Despite the minor differences between these type M *capitula*, they are all roughly of the same style and give evidence for their common origin, which can be traced back to at least the fourth century.¹¹² The presence of OL vocabulary and of “Western” readings in these *capitula* indicates that they were originally composed for an OL edition of Paul’s letters, which also lacked Hebrews.¹¹³ Some Latin MSS of Hebrews also have M type *capitula*, although they are clearly secondary and show considerable variation.¹¹⁴

The *capitula* to Romans and Hebrews in F also present complications. As noted, the *capitula* found in F do not follow this type with which they usually align; rather this MS aligns with R alone in transmitting ten (or in R twelve) *capitula* to Hebrews beginning with numerous keywords (e.g. *quoniam*, *quia*, *de*, *et al*). As Riggerbach intimated and a

composed was very similar to that of Marcion’s in that it lacked chapter 16 but included the doxology; see Donatien de Bruyne, "Les deux derniers chapitres de la lettre aux Romains," *RBén* 25 (1908): 423-30; *ibid.*, "La finale marcionite de la lettre aux Romains retrouvée," *RBén* 28 (1911): 133-42. For more recent discussions, see Frede, ed., *Epistulae ad Thessalonicenses*, 120-1; and Gamble, *Textual History*.

¹¹¹ *de iudaeis credentibus sub aelementis mundi seruitio constrictis donec dominus factus ex femina adque sub lege a patre in saeculum mitteretur* (Ranke, ed., *Codex Fuldensis*, 248).

¹¹² Frede, ed., *Epistulae ad Thessalonicenses*, 120.

¹¹³ Frede, ed., *Epistulae ad Thessalonicenses*, 120-21. See the discussion of their relation to the OL in Riggerbach, "Die Kapitalverzeichnisse."

¹¹⁴ There are type M series found in ABKOSZ and a shorter and related alternative style found in N; see Wordsworth and White, eds., *Epistulae Paulinae*, 682-88. For a discussion and overview, see Frede, ed., *Epistulae ad Thessalonicenses*, 122.

synoptic comparison makes evident (see Appendix I), rather than transmitting the M type they offer a Latin translation of the Euthalian *kephalaia* discussed in chapter 4.¹¹⁵

The *capitula* to Romans in F also evince significant irregularity.¹¹⁶ Many of the *capitula* to Romans in F do not adhere to type M, even though, with the exception of Hebrews, this MS usually transmits these *capitula*. Alongside the type M *capitula* beginning with “de” is a series beginning with other keywords (e.g. “quod,” “quo,” or “in”). These *capitula*, however, only correspond to heading numbers I-XXIII in Romans.¹¹⁷ After number XXIII the *capitula* to Romans in Codex Fuldensis are in complete agreement with type M,¹¹⁸ while in *capitula* I-XXIII, F deviates from the summaries in the M type. Furthermore, an inspection of the MS itself reveals that the summaries of the contents found in *capitula* I-XXIII in F do not correspond to the placement of the *capitula* numbers in the margins of the actual text; in fact the *capitula* in I-XXIII summarize chapters 1-14 but are placed in the margins up to chapter 9. The *capitula* numbers in the margins alongside the text in Codex Fuldensis instead correspond to the placement of the type M *capitula*. This data arranged in tabular form (see appendix II) discloses that *capitula* I-XXIII undoubtedly represent the later incorporation of another series of *capitula* into a preexisting framework provided by F’s exemplar, which must have transmitted the M style.

Despite the fact that this type of *capitula* is only found in *capitula* I-XXIII to Romans in F, they are part of a larger series that are dependent on type M, with which

¹¹⁵ Riggenbach, "Die Kapitalverzeichnisse."

¹¹⁶ The following arguments are based on Riggenbach, "Die Kapitalverzeichnisse;" Wordsworth and White, eds., *Epistulae Paulinae*, 43-45; and my own investigations of a microfilm copy of the MS itself.

¹¹⁷ See *capitula* II, XIII, XVIII in Wordsworth and White, eds., *Epistulae Paulinae*, 45, 49, 51.

¹¹⁸ This is, of course, with the exception of minor variations.

always found together in some form or other.¹¹⁹ Although they are composed for the entire *Corpus Paulinum* from Romans to Hebrews, they do not closely summarize every section to every letter.¹²⁰ Most important for our investigation, de Bruyne discerned an anti-Pelagian and possibly anti-Nestorian perspective in this *capitula* series.¹²¹ On account of its dependence on the M type, Augustinian theology, and opposition to Pelagianism this series has been dated to the mid-fifth century and attributed variously to Pope Leo the Great (d. 461) or Prosper of Aquitaine (ca. 390-455).¹²²

The incorporation of the so-called anti-Pelagian *capitula* into a type M structure in F and alongside the type M *capitula* suggests to my mind the following scenario:¹²³ the front matter where the M type *capitula* were listed in F's exemplar must have been lost up to *capitula* XXIII. Their absence must have been filled by another exemplar, perhaps

¹¹⁹ Frede, ed., *Epistulae ad Thessalonicenses*, 122.

¹²⁰ For this reason Frede points out that the lack of summary of chapter 16 of Romans does not indicate that this series was composed for a version of the text lacking this chapter like the M type (*Epistulae ad Thessalonicenses*, 122).

¹²¹ Bruyne, "Sommaires antipélagiens." Frede, however, thinks that a pro-Augustinian stance is somewhat more accurate (*Epistulae ad Thessalonicenses*, 122).

¹²² De Bruyne who first argued for Leo's authorship of this *capitula* series offered extensive correspondences between Leo's writings and the *capitula* themselves ("Sommaires antipélagiens," 53-55). Frede, however, favored Prosper as the author (*Epistulae ad Thessalonicenses*, 122). It is worth noting here that John Chisolm also identifies Prosper as the author of the *Pseudo-Augustinian Hypomnesticon* (*The Pseudo-Augustinian Hypomnesticon against the Pelagians and Celestians: Volume 1, Introduction* [Fribourg: University Press, 1967], 77-129).

¹²³ De Bruyne also recorded that Theodor Zahn favored a similar explanation, while H. J. White thought that the scribe began copying a MS with the anti-Pelagian type but changed to type M and followed this until the end of Romans ("Sommaires antipélagiens," 55). De Bruyne himself suggested that the scribe found both capitulation series in his exemplar, along with the text divided into fifty-one sections; he copied the anti-Pelagian series first and then continued to the second series in order to complete the remaining twenty-eight of the fifty-one *capitula* (ibid.). F. J. A. Hort was less certain of the reason for the scribe's conflation of the two capitulation styles ("On the End of the Epistle to the Romans," *The Journal of Philology* 3, no. 5 (1870): 51-80).

merely corresponding to the numbers I-XXIII already found in the text.¹²⁴ When the text was copied, the *capitula* alongside the text of the exemplar were incorporated into F despite the fact that the summaries in *capitula* I-XXIII did not match their placement in the MS. The remainder of the type M *capitula* from the exemplar (XXIII-LI) were retaken up at *capitulum* XXIII and correctly employed to the end of Romans.¹²⁵

The results of our investigation into the *capitula* to Hebrews and Romans has important repercussions for our investigation into the paratextual materials transmitted in F: first, the diverse origins of the *capitula* in F illustrate the ease of disassociation of text and paratext resulting in the (sometimes dissonant) imbrication of hermeneutical layers in the latter; second and related to this disassociation, we get a glimpse into the scriptorium where earlier editorial labors, however diverse, could be recombined and recodified as need dictated for the production of a MS; third and most important, the importation of *capitula* I-XXIII in Romans demonstrates the interpretive role of simple headings. To explicate briefly, since the original and primary function of the *capitula*—namely to orient the reader to passages in the text—is completely absent in *capitula* I-XXIII, their role in offering a summary and interpretation of a passage is magnified. Our following study of F's *capitula* I-XXIII (especially *capitulum* X) in Romans will demonstrate that this role is especially prominent.

¹²⁴ Even if we had no other evidence for these *capitula*, since the summaries in I-XXIII are so at odds with their actual placement of the *capitula* in the MS itself, it would be unthinkable that the *capitula* could have been composed for F.

¹²⁵ Despite the fact that *capitula* I-XXIII in F evince an anti-Pelagian tendency, as intimated above, other paratextual materials in F have been attributed to Pelagian sources, namely the *Concordia Epistularum*. In passing it should be noted here that this type M series of *capitula* is linked to the OL and is often transmitted alongside this Pelagian *Concordia Epistularum*; this fact has compelled Fischer to hypothesize about the possible existence of a Pelagian edition of the *Corpus Paulinum* at the beginning of the 5th century (*Lateinische Bibelhandschriften*, 39-42). For more on the possible Pelagian origin of the *Concordia Epistularum* see Bruyne, "Une concordance;" Souter, "Character and History;" and Frede, ed., *Epistulae ad Thessalonicenses*, 106.

Before turning to these obvious examples I will show that this hermeneutical role is also latent in *capitula* that accurately orient the reader to passages in a MS. To be sure, quite often *capitula* merely appear to relate an innocuous summary describing a passage's content with no blatant hermeneutical intention; in these cases the *capitula* may simply facilitate the location of passages—their primary function. But even in these instances what the *capitula* single out for highlighting surely represents concerns deemed important. The very fact that specific passages are worthy of focalization in the *capitula* underscores the role of *capitula* in shaping interpretation by targeting those passages most amenable to the theological proclivities undergirding the *capitula*. To illustrate by way of contrast, we do not usually find proof-texts for heretical doctrine highlighted here: for example, although the *capitula* do not completely gloss over issues that Marcion stressed to prove the disassociation of the law and the gospel (e.g. the false brothers and destruction of the law), they are tempered by other *capitula* which Marcion would surely reject (e.g. positive evaluations of law).¹²⁶ Thus more than mere helps to orient the reader to specific passages, the *capitula* function to focalize the reader's attention to those theologically salient; in doing so they transmit interpretive concerns from the subtle to the overt.

Among examples less theologically overt, but no less socially significant are references to women in the *capitula*. In these cases the *capitula* often preface selections from the Pauline corpus used to subjugate women. This is evident, for example, in *capitula* to 1 Corinthians, Ephesians, and Colossians where the subjugation of women or

¹²⁶ Marcion would probably concur with the summaries in Galatians' *capitula* VI (de falsis fratribus) and VIII (de apostolo legem ueteris testamini per crucem et passionem domini destruyente); *capitulum* XXVIII to Galatians (de impletione legis in proximi dilectione etc.) and *capitulum* XXXII to Romans (de iustitia legis et iustitia fidei), however, would probably not be amenable to Marcion's theology (Wordsworth and White, eds., *Epistulae Paulinae*, 55-362).

their silence in the church is stressed.¹²⁷ While this represents a fairly accurate summary of the contents in these passages, the emphasis placed on the subordination of women in the *capitula* gives disproportionate prominence to these themes in the undisputed Pauline letters. The isolation and magnification of this theme demonstrate the possible roles played by the *capitula* in constructing an image of Paul and relaying implicit judgments on authenticity. We have already had opportunity to mention the absence of the Pastorals from Marcion's edition in chapter 3, which may reflect an implicit judgment on their authenticity. These *capitula* swing opinion to the other side and attempt to align positions in the Pastorals with similar ones found in Paul's undisputed letters. They even go so far as to highlight 1 Cor 14:34-5, verses that some modern scholars think may be glosses interpolated into the Pauline text.¹²⁸ By prefacing this passage from 1 Cor 14:34-5 which aligns with comparable misogyny in the Pastorals, the *capitula* (and even more blatantly the *Concordia Epistularum*) found in Codex Fuldensis make an implicit statement on the authenticity of these verses (1 Cor 14:34-5) and these books (1-2 Tim and Titus). Just as the *PQ* justified the authenticity of Hebrews, so too the *capitula* demonstrate their ability to justify the authenticity of the Pastorals and their subjugation of women by placing these pseudonymous and somewhat marginal Pauline statements alongside similar yet

¹²⁷ de silentio mulierum in ecclesiam (1 Cor LXVIII); de subiectione mulierum ad maritos (Eph XXVIII, Col XVI) (Ranke, ed., *Codex Fuldensis*, 207, 258, 285).

¹²⁸ For a recent argument for the inauthenticity of 1 Cor 14:34-35 and bibliography, see Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans, 1987), 699-713. Fee's position has been taken up by Philip Payne in a series of articles: "Fuldensis, Sigla for Variants in Vaticanus, and 1 Cor 14:34-5," *NTS* 41 (1995): 240-62; *ibid.*, "Ms 88 as Evidence for a Text without 1 Cor 14:34-35," *NTS* 44 (1998): 152-58; *ibid.*, "The Text-Critical Function of the Umlauts in Vaticanus, with Special Attention to 1 Corinthians 14:34-35: A response to J. Edward Miller," *JSNT* 27, no. 1 (2004): 105-12. Antoinette Wire offers strong and cogent objections to Fee's interpolation theory (*The Corinthian Women Prophets: A Reconstruction through Paul's Rhetoric* [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990], 149-52). For serious critiques of Payne's argument, see Curt Niccum, "The Voice of the Manuscripts on the Silence of Women: The External Evidence for 1 Cor 14:34-35," *NTS* 43 (1997): 242-55; and J. Edward Miller, "Some Observations on the Text-Critical Function of the Umlauts in Vaticanus, with Special Attention to 1 Corinthians 14:34-35," *JSNT* 26, no. 2 (2003): 217-36.

passing comments in 1 Corinthians.¹²⁹ While the summary of those passages from the Pauline corpus that subordinate women may not be tendentious, targeting them for isolation in the *capitula* for easy reference and portraying these sentiments in complete concord with Pauline thought definitely shows how paratexts attempt to shape the text's reception and to deploy it for the subjugation of women.¹³⁰

One of the frequent refrains found in the *capitula* are exaltations of Jesus' divinity, where the *capitula* serve to heighten the Christology found in Paul's letters; the *capitula* also consistently accentuate aspects of Christology so as to portray Jesus alternately as both human and divine. *Capitulum* XVIII to Galatians 4:3-4 even transmits a reading at variance with the Vulgate text transmitted in F. This *capitulum* describes this section of Galatians as follows: "concerning the Jews who, although they believed, were constrained by slavery under the elements of the world until 'the Lord made from a woman and under the law' was sent by the father into the world."¹³¹ In this *capitulum* Jesus is described as "*dominus factus ex femina adque sub lege,*" whereas the text of F in

¹²⁹ It is worthwhile to recall our discussion of the hypotheses to Euripides' plays in chapter 2, where we showed how the hypotheses cast doubt on the authenticity of some plays as a result of style, character development, or earlier "scholarly" opinion. In the case of the Pauline paratextual material from Codex Fuldensis the exact opposite move is made: those passages that align with the Pastorals are deliberately highlighted so as to prove the unanimity of his thought and corpus.

¹³⁰ The effects of such judgments regarding the authenticity of the Pastorals and their role in the subordination of women are most clearly seen in the legal realm, where pseudo-Paul's statements in 1 Tim 5:9 are used to justify laws curbing women's roles in the church (*Codex Theodosianus* 16.2.27 [Mommsen ed.]); translation available in Clyde Pharr, *The Theodosian Code and Novels, and the Sirmondian Constitutions* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1952). For discussions of Paul's subordination of women or the use of the Pauline corpus for such activity in the early church, see Wire, *The Corinthian Women Prophets*, Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins* (New York: Crossroad, 1983); Ross Shepard Kraemer, *Her Share of the Blessings: Women's Religions among Pagans, Jews and Christians in the Greco-Roman World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992); Dennis Ronald MacDonald, *The Legend and the Apostle: the Battle for Paul in Story and Canon* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1983); Frances M. Young, *The Theology of the Pastoral Letters* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

¹³¹ de iudaeis credentibus sub aelementis mundi seruitio constrictis donec dominus factus ex femina adque sub lege a patre in saeculum mitteretur (Ranke, ed., *Codex Fuldensis*, 248).

Galatians transmits how God sent “*filium suum natum ex muliere factum sub lege.*” In this case the text transmitted by F departs from the Vulgate MS tradition (along with DLNTVZ) and its own *capitulum* in transmitting “natum” instead of “factus.”

The disconnect between the *capitulum* and the text betrays two mutually exclusive moves that result in presenting a refined view of Christ’s divinity. On the one hand, the *capitulum*’s substitution of “dominus” for “filium suum” subtly functions to raise the Christology by citing “dominus,” even though the actual text retains “filium suum.”¹³² On the other hand, the substitution of “natum” in place of “factum” in the text serves to lower Christ’s divinity by stressing his human birth. Although both “natum” and “factum” are reasonable translations of the Greek underlying this translation (γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός, γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον), “natum” definitely highlights his actual birth. Tischendorf relates the variants γεννόμενον and γεννώμενον, participles from γεννάω, which could be the source of these divergent translations.¹³³ Although both γεννάω and γίγνομαι have a very similar semantic range,¹³⁴ γεννάω, a causal form of γίγνομαι, definitely emphasizes Christ’s birth from a woman.

In his *De carne Christi* Tertullian exploits the distinction between “natum” and “factum” and the emphasis on Jesus’ birth evident in the translation “natum” in contrast to “factum”:

But even Paul imposes silence with his grammar saying: ‘God sent his son made (factum) from a woman.’ Is there any ‘through a woman’ or ‘in a woman?’ This is

¹³² For a thorough study on the role of Christological disputes in the corruption of text of the NT, see Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*. Although the text is not altered in F the substitution of “dominus” for “suum filium” functions in much the same way as those corruptions studied by Ehrman that stress Jesus’ divinity, in particular those with anti-adoptionistic leanings (ibid. 47-118).

¹³³ Constantin von Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece* (Lipsiae: Giesecke & Devrient, 1872), 644.

¹³⁴ F. F. Bruce maintains that γίγνομαι and γεννάω would mean virtually the same thing in this context (*The Epistle to the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* [Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1982], 195).

in fact more emphasized because he says ‘made’ (factum) rather than ‘born’ (natum). For quite easily he could have said ‘born’ (natum). But by saying ‘made’ (factum) he both signified the ‘word made (factum) flesh’ and affirmed the truth of the flesh made (factae) from a virgin.¹³⁵

In Tertullian’s interpretation the use of “factum” stands as a deliberate intertextual reference to the Gospel of John, a reference indicative of Christ’s divine yet fleshly status. Whereas Tertullian favors “factum” for its elevated Christology, arguably the reading “natum” stresses Jesus’ humanity and physical birth.

Undoubtedly the disjunction between “natum” in the text of Gal 4:4 in F and “factum” in its *capitulum* indicates a divergence of translation for which the *capitula* were prepared. Here without any concern for the dissonance between the text and its *capitulum* the Vulgate text transmitting “factum” has been prefaced with the M series *capitulum* prepared for an OL text. Likely related to the Christological issues just discussed, the persistence of “natum” in the M type *capitulum* and (at least in one MS) indicates liturgical influence of the OL text on the Vulgate.¹³⁶

The *capitula* furnish numerous other examples of exalting Christology in their summaries. In *capitulum* I to Romans, F moves beyond the mere recapitulation of Paul’s description of Jesus’ incarnation found in the M type *capitula* and in MS *Mus. Br. Reg. I. E. VIII* which almost all transmit “de natiuitate domini secundum carnem.”¹³⁷ *Capitulum* I in F further qualifies this human incarnation by referring to Christ’s preexistence

¹³⁵ Sed et Paulus grammaticis istis silentium imponit dicens: Misit deus filium suum factum ex muliere. Numquid per mulierem, aut in muliere? Hoc quidem impressius, quod factum dicit quam natum; simplicius enim enuntiasset natum. Factum autem dicendo et uerbum caro factum consignauit et carnis veritatem ex uirginis factae adseuerauit (*Carn. Chr.* 20.2-3 [CCSL 2 909,13-19]).

¹³⁶ In addition to MSS DFLNTVZ containing “natum” Wordsworth and White also record that the 13th century witness designated *Correctorium vaticanum* transmits the following note concerning this reading “antiqui, et ita legitur in ecclesia et similiter in responsorio;” (*Epistulae Paulinae*, 386).

¹³⁷ In the latter MS (*Mus. Br. Reg. I. E. VIII*) there is also the minor substitution of christi for domini (Wordsworth and White, eds., *Epistulae Paulinae*, 44).

implied by his preordination (de incarnatione domini ihesu christi ante omnem eum praeordinata).¹³⁸ Such exaltation of Christ’s divinity was not anomalous as *capitulum* I to Hebrews in F (drawn from the Euthalian *kephalaia*) demonstrates; here too F transmits a much more developed *capitulum* in comparison with other MSS. This *capitulum* summarizes the beginning of Hebrews with “story of the divinity of Christ in the glory of the Father and power of all, who after the cleansing of those who are upon the earth ascended into the heavenly glory because the glory of Christ is not angelic but divine.”¹³⁹ This blatant articulation of Christ’s deification and equality with God contrasts sharply with the corresponding *capitula* from CHÖTU (“that in recent days the Father has spoken in the Son, who, the splendor and figure of his substance, sits at the right hand having been made greater than the angels”)¹⁴⁰ and the even more pedestrian one found in ABKOSV (“concerning Christ namely God was among the Jews encouraging in many ways”)¹⁴¹ and the related N (“concerning Christ namely God was among the Jews”).¹⁴² As we have already observed, the *capitula* to Hebrews found in F can be traced back to the *kephalaia* from the Euthalian edition of the *Corpus Paulinum* discussed in chapter 4. Their presence here not only illustrates the malleability of prefatory materials (a point seen repeatedly) but also the persistent attractiveness of the exalted portrait of Christ therein.

¹³⁸ Wordsworth and White, eds., *Epistulae Paulinae*, 45.

¹³⁹ Narratio deitatis christi in gloria patris et potestatis omnium cum purificatione eorum qui super terra sunt postquam ascendit in caelestam gloriam quoniam gloria christi non est angelica se deitatis (Wordsworth and White, eds., *Epistulae Paulinae*, 683).

¹⁴⁰ Quia in nouissimus diebus Pater sit locutus in Filio. qui splendor et figura substantiae sedit ad dexteram melior angelis effectus (Wordsworth and White, eds., *Epistulae Paulinae*, 683).

¹⁴¹ De christo quod deus sit circa iudaeos exhortatio multiformis (Wordsworth and White, eds., *Epistulae Paulinae*, 682).

¹⁴² De christo quod deus sit circa iudaeos (Wordsworth and White, eds., *Epistulae Paulinae*, 682).

Although these examples clearly demonstrate the *capitula*'s role in focalizing key passages and tacitly shaping their interpretation, one could object that they are sometimes subtle and represent little more than routine demonstrations of Christian piety transferred to early Christian MSS. While even this admission would prove the basic underlying thesis that in their initial deployment *capitula* and other paratextual materials attempted to convey and delimit early Christian interpretations of Paul, the so-called anti-Pelagian *capitula* in F transmit far more deliberate attempts to shape the interpretation of Paul's letters in light of theological battles fought over the issue of Pelagianism. In contrast to the mere summary of the content found in many *capitula*, these *capitula* blatantly attempt to shape the reading and interpretation of the text. The deliberate efforts to counter Pelagian theology in *capitula* I-XXIII in F reveal that the marginal place occupied by *capitula* and other paratexts ideally positioned them in the vanguard of theological battles where they adroitly contested interpretations by prefacing counter readings before the actual proof-texts from the *Corpus Paulinum* were encountered.

Our examination of the impact of Rufinus's nascent Pelagianism on the *PQ* Vulgate prologue traced this conflict to quarrels over the origin of human sin and possibilities of human virtue. These issues also figure prominently in the *capitula* to Romans, where these paratexts transmit positions directly countering Pelagian theology. This observation was not lost on Hort, Riggenbach, and de Bruyne, who, as we noted above, intimated the anti-Pelagian character of Fuldensis's *capitula* to Romans.¹⁴³ De Bruyne makes the strongest case for the anti-Pelagian stance of the *capitula* by highlighting original sin, the need for grace, and resonances with Augustinian thought

¹⁴³ Hort, "On the End of the Epistle to the Romans;" Riggenbach, "Die Kapitalverzeichnisse;" and Bruyne, "Sommaires antipélagiens."

filtered through Pope Leo the Great.¹⁴⁴ In the discussion here I will build on their preliminary observations and situate the anti-Pelagian features of these *capitula* against the backdrop of this theological struggle and our investigation into the paratextual transmission of interpretation.

The issue of baptism so fundamental in the Pelagian controversy is occasionally prefaced in F's *capitula*. For example, *capitulum* XI describes the content of Rom 6:3ff as "concerning the sacrament of baptism in which we die to sin so that we might live to God."¹⁴⁵ According to this *capitulum* the efficacy and purpose of baptism lies in its ability to purify the believer of sin. Such a conception aligns closely with anti-Pelagian sentiments expressed by Augustine and differs from those which Augustine attributes to Pelagians—specifically the claim that infant baptism merely enrolls the child into the kingdom of God and does not remove original sin.¹⁴⁶ Foregrounding baptism as an ablution for sin would scarcely endear itself to Pelagian interpretations as an investigation into Pelagius's interpretations of Romans exposes. In his commentary on this letter Pelagius repeatedly outlines his theory of the transmission of sin by example.¹⁴⁷ Pelagius conceives of baptism, according to Bohlin, as the reconciliation of God and humanity by regiving the God-given ability (*posse*) to pursue righteousness imparted through God's

¹⁴⁴ Bruyne, "Sommaires antipélagiens."

¹⁴⁵ De sacramento baptismi in quo morimur peccato ut uiuamus deo (Ranke, ed., *Codex Fuldensis*, 177).

¹⁴⁶ See e.g. Augustine, *De peccatorum meritis et remissione* I 18,23-19,24 (CSEL 60 22-24). For the development of Augustine's thought on original sin over time and the role that Pelagius played as a catalyst in this development, see Athanase Sage, "Le péché originel dans la pensée de saint Augustin, de 412 à 430," *REAug* 15, no. 1-2 (1969): 75-112.

¹⁴⁷ See e.g. Pelagius, *In Romanos* 5:12-6:21 (Souter ed., 45-53).

grace at creation, which had been overshadowed by the custom (*consuetudo*) of sin.¹⁴⁸ In Pelagius's opinion baptism does not wash away sin, but rather, by entering into the body of Christ and the kingdom of God, enables the initiate to imitate the new man, Jesus, and to refrain from sin by actualizing the original God-given potential.¹⁴⁹

In contrast, *capitulum* XXVII to 1 Cor drawn from the M type *capitulum* offers a much more ambiguous interpretation of Paul's understanding of baptism. This *capitulum* summarizes 1 Cor 6:9ff as follows: "concerning the unjust, that they will not possess the kingdom of God and that all sins are washed by the grace of baptism."¹⁵⁰ Notice that this *capitulum*'s summary actually aligns rather closely with a Pelagian understanding that baptism enrolls the initiate in the kingdom of God. Yet this interpretation conducive to Pelagian understandings is juxtaposed alongside one aligning more with an Augustinian position on baptism, where baptism offers remission of original sin—even though, according to Augustine, concupiscence remains afterwards in the nature of the flesh.¹⁵¹ The contrast between these *capitula* is significant: the M type *capitulum* XXVII from 1 Cor could support either Pelagian or Augustinian interpretations; *capitulum* XI to Rom 6:3ff from the anti-Pelagian series takes a decisive stance against a Pelagian interpretation. Although these *capitula* represent contrasting understandings of baptism, the interpretations provided are subtle and only that from Romans demonstrates what we

¹⁴⁸ Bohlin, *Theologie*, 29-32.

¹⁴⁹ Pelagius, *In Romanos* 6:1-6:7 (Souter ed., 48-50).

¹⁵⁰ De iniustus quod regnum dei non possidebunt et quod omnia peccata baptismi gratia diluantur (Ranke, ed., *Codex Fuldensis*, 205).

¹⁵¹ Augustine, *De peccatorum meritis et remissione et remissione et de baptismo paruulorum ad Marcellinum* I, 28,45-46 (CSEL 60 116,1-117,21).

could identify as an anti-Pelagian stance. The fact that they are subtle, however, does not diminish their interpretive goals or effects.

While these references to baptism remain slightly ambiguous and open to more than one interpretation, *capitulum* X from Romans dispels any doubt that Pelagian thought has been marked for denunciation in the anti-Pelagian series. This is evident despite the fact that Pelagius and his followers remain unnamed. This *capitulum* offers the following abridgment of Paul's thoughts from Rom 5:

concerning the sin of Adam which he transmitted into all humans without any exception, neither is it cancelled except in Christ Jesus who alone in this way received nature from a human so that the contagions of ancient origin might not hold him and just as through the sin of one the death of all entered, so through the righteousness of one, the life of all might be restored.¹⁵²

At virtually every opportunity this economical recapitulation counters Pelagian theology on the origins of sin and possibility of human righteousness. This becomes evident by comparing this *capitulum* synoptically with some of the charges against Pelagius at the synods in Jerusalem and Diospolis in 415 as recorded in Augustine's *De gestis Pelagii*.¹⁵³

<i>Capitulum</i> X in F	<i>De gestis Pelagii</i> 11
De peccato Adae quod in omnes homines sine cuiusquam exceptione transibit	Adam mortalem factum, qui siue peccaret, siue non peccaret, moriturus esset. quoniam peccatum Adae ipsum solum laeserit, et non genus humanum.

¹⁵² De peccato Adae quod in omnes homines sine cuiusquam exceptione transibit nec euacuatur nisi in christo ihesu qui solus sic humana naturam recepit ut eum contagia ueteris originis non tenerent · et sicut per unius peccatum fuerit ingressa mors omnium · Ita per unius iustitia repararetur uita cunctorum (Ranke, ed., *Codex Fuldensis*, 177).

¹⁵³ Adam mortalem factum, qui siue peccaret, siue non peccaret, moriturus esset. quoniam peccatum Adae ipsum solum laeserit, et non genus humanum. quoniam lex sic mittit ad regnum, quemadmodum euangelium. quoniam ante aduentum Christi fuerunt homines sine peccato. quoniam infantes nuper nati in illo statu sint, in quo Adam fuit ante praeuaricationem. quoniam neque per mortem uel praeuaricationem Adae omne genus hominum moriatur neque per resurrectionem Christi omne genus hominum resurgat (*De gestis Pelagii* 11 [CSEL 42 76,16-25]). Augustine also explicitly tries to link Pelagius to Caelestius, who in 412 had been condemned by the council of Carthage for holding similar views (*De gestis Pelagii* 11 [CSEL 42 76,15-16]).

quod [i.e. peccatum] in omnes homines
sine cuiusquam exceptione transibit nec
euacuatur nisi in christo ihesu qui solus sic
humana naturam recepit ut eum contagia
ueteris originis non tenerent

quoniam lex sic mittit ad regnum,
quemadmodum euangelium.

quoniam ante aduentum Christi fuerunt
homines sine peccato.

quoniam infantes nuper nati in illo statu
sint, in quo Adam fuit ante
praeuaricationem.

et sicut per unius peccatum fuerit ingressa
mors omnium · Ita per unius iustitia
repararetur uita cunctorum

quoniam neque per mortem uel
praeuaricationem Adae omne genus
hominum moriatur neque per
resurrectionem Christi omne genus
hominum resurgat.

The following comparisons between Pelagian theology and the summary of Romans prefaced in this *capitulum* underscore clearly their incompatibility: first of all, if sin is transmitted by Adam to everyone, then it cannot be explained as the result of example as Pelagius claimed;¹⁵⁴ secondly, the fact that all humans bar none are stained with the sin of Adam rules out any exception for infants without rational thought or luminaries from the OT;¹⁵⁵ similarly, the explicit assertion that Christ alone saves one from sin directly militates against the positive valuation of the law in Pelagius's or Rufinus's thought, since according to this *capitulum*'s summary of Paul, no one can be righteous except through Christ;¹⁵⁶ the argument that Adam was created mortal and would have died irrespective of his fall into sin (a tenet explicitly advocated by Rufinus)

¹⁵⁴ Pelagius, *In Romanos* 5:12-6:21 (Souter ed., 45-53).

¹⁵⁵ Pelagius, *Ad Demetriadem* 4-6 (PL 30 19-23); cf. Rufinus the Syrian, *Liber de fide* preface, 8, 35, 36, 37, 39 (Miller ed., 52, 60, 104, 106, 108, 110, 112, 114).

¹⁵⁶ Pelagius, *Ad Demetriadem* 4-6 (PL 30 19-23); cf. Rufinus the Syrian, *Liber de fide* preface, 8, 35, 36, 37, 39 (Miller ed., 52, 60, 104, 106, 108, 110, 112, 114).

finds opposition here too, where Adam is linked to the death of all;¹⁵⁷ the Pelagian insistence on human capacity for righteousness is also rejected in favor of a virtuous life and righteousness available through Christ alone.¹⁵⁸ The laconic and economical format of this *capitulum* did not prevent it from being deployed against the central tenets of Pelagian theology.

The extensive parallels between Pelagian theology and counter-themes in this *capitulum* unmistakably demonstrate this *capitulum*'s preoccupation with refuting these positions. This observation is even more evident upon comparison of this *capitulum* with Pelagius's own interpretation of this passage in his commentary on Romans, where his exegesis of this passage underscores his understanding of human nature and the transmission of sin. In contrast to this *capitulum*, Pelagius did not think that sin entered and was transmitted naturally through Adam. Adam's transmission of sin was by example and habit, not flesh and nature.¹⁵⁹ Pelagius's further comments on this verse underscore his belief in the fundamental goodness of human nature which enables the pursuit of righteousness;¹⁶⁰ for Pelagius the recapitulation of Adam in Christ merely re-illuminated the possibilities of human action.¹⁶¹ Although the original sinner, Adam, introduced the paradigm for subsequent generations to imitate, Christ exemplified a new paradigm for righteousness and virtue.¹⁶² Pelagius's subtle qualification that this

¹⁵⁷ Rufinus the Syrian, *Liber de fide* 29-30 (Miller ed., 94, 96, 98).

¹⁵⁸ Pelagius, *Ad Demetriadem* 2 (PL 30 17); cf. Rufinus the Syrian, *Liber de fide* 39 (Miller ed., 112, 114).

¹⁵⁹ Pelagius, *In Romanos* 5:12 (Souter ed., 45).

¹⁶⁰ Pelagius, *In Romanos* 5:21 (Souter ed., 48).

¹⁶¹ Pelagius, *In Romanos* 5:14 (Souter ed., 46).

¹⁶² Pelagius, *In Romanos* 5:16 (Souter ed., 47).

“righteousness remained in *almost* nobody,” however, leaves open the possibility that humans still had the capacity (*possibilitas*) for willing (*volitio*) righteous action (*actio*), whether or not anyone actually succeeded in attaining this state of perfection.¹⁶³ While this possibility remained, after the righteous from the OT few were able to actualize their potential as rational, righteous humans, since humanity had become so mired in the habit of sin.¹⁶⁴ Human weakness and the successive devolution into moral turpitude as a result of bad examples notwithstanding, these three cornerstones of human nature (*possibilitas*, *volitio*, and *actio*) and the concomitant possibilities for righteous action remained. Their presence in every human was in no way affected by Adam’s sin, even if actualization was. *Capitulum X* to Rom 5:12ff in F rejects these Pelagian positions on human nature, the origin and transmission of sin, and possibility of human righteousness before Christ’s advent. Not surprisingly Rom 5, which this *capitulum* explicitly prefaced and oriented against Pelagian theology, represented a key passage wherein Pelagius rooted this teaching.

This *capitulum* also echoes Augustine’s strident ridicule of Pelagian theology. Against Pelagius, his predecessors, and followers, Augustine insists that sin is transmitted from Adam to all humans even infants.¹⁶⁵ Both *capitulum X* and Augustine reject the claim that Adam would have died whether or not he had sinned as a result of the transmission of sin. Moreover, this transmission is not merely by example, but by the

¹⁶³ cum paene aput nullam iustitia remansisset, per Christum est reuocata (Pelagius, *In Romanos* 5:12 [Souter ed., 52,13-14]). For a discussion of “*possibilitas*,” “*volitio*,” and “*actio*,” see Augustine, *De gratia Christi* III,4 (CSEL 42 127). Pelagius also uses “*posse*,” “*velle*,” and “*esse*” to describe these three fundamental modes of human existence (*Ad Demetriadem* 3 [PL 30 17-18]).

¹⁶⁴ Pelagius, *In Romanos* 5:12-13 (Souter ed., 45-46). The use of “*paene*” (45,13 and 46,3) to qualify the extirpation of righteousness clearly indicates that Pelagius did not think such righteousness was beyond human capability.

¹⁶⁵ *De peccato originali*, I XIII,15-XVI,17 (CSEL 42 176-179).

corrupt nature of humanity suffering the punishment of Adam's sin.¹⁶⁶ Even though Christ's advent opened up new possibilities for each individual, this situation persisted, according to Augustine, from Adam in perpetuity.¹⁶⁷ In this way Augustine also tacitly rejects the claims that the OT law could save or that the righteous from the OT could have been righteous apart from Christ. All without exception—whether infants, patriarchs or prophets—are tainted with original sin.¹⁶⁸ Even the advent of Christ, though signifying a change in sacraments, afforded no necessary or essential change in the human condition steeped in original sin.¹⁶⁹ Life is possible not by free will, but only through Christ's intercession through God's grace.¹⁷⁰ While Pelagius insisted on the goodness of human nature and the non-transmission of sin (both of which allowed for some in the OT to achieve righteousness before Christ), Augustine thought such teaching rendered Christ and his grace unnecessary;¹⁷¹ only Adam's nature at creation before the fall was free from sin.¹⁷² For this reason Augustine declared Pelagius a heretic¹⁷³ and "hostile to God's grace."¹⁷⁴ For it is only through Christ's grace, according to Augustine, that

¹⁶⁶ *De peccato originali*, I XVI,17 (CSEL 42 178-179).

¹⁶⁷ *De peccato originali*, I XXXII,37 (CSEL 42 195-196).

¹⁶⁸ Among humans, however, Christ alone was without sin (*De peccato originali*, I XXXII,37 [CSEL 42 196]).

¹⁶⁹ *De peccato originali*, I XXXII,37 (CSEL 42 195-196).

¹⁷⁰ *De peccato originali*, I XXII,24-XXVI,27 (CSEL 42 143-148). See also *De gratia Christi*, XXXV,38 (CSEL 42 154).

¹⁷¹ *De peccato originali*, I XXIX,34 (CSEL 42 193,13-17).

¹⁷² *De natura et gratia*, III,3 (CSEL 60 235,8-22).

¹⁷³ *De peccato originali*, I XXII,25 (CSEL 42 183-184).

¹⁷⁴ *De peccato originali*, I XXIX,34 (CSEL 42 193-194, esp. 193,17).

humanity can be released from sin and death, which, in Augustine's reading of the Latin version of Rom 5:12, entered the world in the wake of Adam's fall.¹⁷⁵

The anti-Pelagian tendency in these *capitula* to Romans in F is further supported by a comparison with other series of *capitula* to Romans which reject this interpretation of Adam's original sin, its transmission, and its removal through Christ's grace.

Capitulum X from MS B delivers the general summary "concerning Adam's sin and death and that through one man, Jesus Christ, righteousness will abound."¹⁷⁶ Similarly

capitulum VI in MSS CHOTU summarizes this section of Romans, "therefore they are justified by faith. And Christ at the proper time died for the ungodly. And death was through one man and reigned from Adam. And where transgression flourished, that we might no longer serve sin."¹⁷⁷ The laconic *capitula* VIII and X in MS Mus. Br. Reg. I. E.

VIII eschew extensive comment altogether, offering merely "concerning death which reigned from Adam to Moses" and "concerning the baptized that they are baptized into the death of the Lord."¹⁷⁸ The M type *capitula* XII through XIII transmitted in MSS

AKMOVZ, which usually align with F, summarize this section of Rom 5 as follows:

concerning the passion of the Lord for us, the ungodly, and the transgression of the human sinner, Adam;¹⁷⁹ concerning death which reigned from Adam to Moses even unto those who did not sin in the likeness of the transgression of

¹⁷⁵ *De peccato originali*, I XXIX,34 (CSEL 42 193,18-194,4).

¹⁷⁶ De adae peccatum et mortis et quod per unum iesum christum iustitia abundabit (Wordsworth and White, eds., *Epistulae Paulinae*, 48).

¹⁷⁷ Iustificati igitur ex fide. et christus secundum tempus pro impiis mortuus est . et per hunum hominem mors . et regnavit mors ab adam . et hubi abundavit delictum . et hut ultra non seruiamus peccato (Wordsworth and White, eds., *Epistulae Paulinae*, 49).

¹⁷⁸ *Capitulum* VIII: De morte regnante ab adam usque ad moysen; *Capitulum* X: De baptizatis quod in mortem domini sint baptizati (Wordsworth and White, eds., *Epistulae Paulinae*, 48).

¹⁷⁹ De passione domini pro impiis nobis et praeuaricatione hominis peccatoris adae (Wordsworth and White, eds., *Epistulae Paulinae*, 48).

Adam;¹⁸⁰ concerning the difference of magnitude of the sin of Adam at the same time, resigning the human race to death with himself, and the grace of the Lord, in whose presence all who believe in him are raised up to eternal life and glory.¹⁸¹

The divergence of F from the type M *capitula* to Romans is especially interesting, since, as noted, outside of Romans these MSS usually transmit the same *capitula*. Although there is nothing explicitly Pelagian about these type M *capitula*, they definitely fall short of the anti-Pelagian sentiments expressed in F.

In addition to brief summaries, these *capitula* also excerpt short phrases from the actual text of Paul's letters. These verses, however, were subject to rival interpretations, as our subsequent investigation into the Latin texts of Rom 5:12, 5:14, 5:16 and 5:21 will show. In fact, Paul's statement highlighted in *capitulum* XIII of the M type that death "reigned from Adam to Moses even over those who did not sin in the likeness of the transgression of Adam" (Rom 5:14) was interpreted by Pelagius as support for his theology.¹⁸² This is not to imply that the prefacing this verse supported a Pelagian stance (for we shall see Augustine laying claim to its "proper" interpretation as well), but merely that highlighting the text in *capitulum* XIII did little to discourage a Pelagian reading. I am not claiming that codification of various paratexts in Codex Fuldensis was necessarily connected with supporting or opposing Pelagianism. Nor am I suggesting that these M type *capitula* are necessarily sympathetic to Pelagianism or that they ought to be attributed to a Pelagian source, only that the hermeneutic composed for their original

¹⁸⁰ De morte regnante ab adam usque ad moysen et in eos qui non peccauerunt in similitudine praeuaricationis adae (Wordsworth and White, eds., *Epistulae Paulinae*, 48).

¹⁸¹ De differentia magnitudinis peccati adae humanum genus secum pariter deponentis ad mortem et gratiae domini apud se credentes omnes in se releuentes ad uitam et gloriam sempiternam (Wordsworth and White, eds., *Epistulae Paulinae*, 48).

¹⁸² See discussion of Rom 5:14 below.

deployment contrasts sharply with the anti-Pelagian tendencies found in numbers X and XI in F.

The codification of theologically diverse paratexts from the Marcionite *argumenta* to the *PQ* and the anti-Pelagian *capitula* suggest that the compilers of this MS either did not know the origin of these materials and their contradictory hermeneutics or did not find them to be problematic, just as the heretically tainted gospel harmony. We have already discussed the importance of Victor's ecumenical inclusivity. With respect to the possible carelessness in incorporating various materials into Codex Fuldensis other features warrant mention. I have already noted above the haphazard incorporation of *capitula* I-XXIII to Romans and the disregard for *PQ*'s proper arrangement of Paul's letters. This MS also incorporates the apocryphal letter to the Laodiceans, even though the *PQ* explicitly says Paul wrote only ten letters to communities and does not mention Laodiceans among them. The inclusion of this letter sets this edition of the *Corpus Paulinum* at odds with a fundamental assertion of the *PQ*, namely that Paul's community letters and the Decalogue are in complete agreement. F also transmits *capitula* numbers alongside the text of this apocryphal letter even though the corresponding *capitula* at the beginning of the letter are missing.¹⁸³ While multiple introductory texts are supplied to Romans, Hebrews completely lacks any *argumentum*.¹⁸⁴ As noted above, no care was taken to collate the OL text found in the M type *capitula* with the Vulgate text of the letters themselves. Finally, Fischer has shown that the lection readings incorporated into F do not even correspond to the festivals for the environs of Capua where this MS was

¹⁸³ Ranke, ed., *Codex Fuldensis*, 291-292.

¹⁸⁴ Ranke, ed., *Codex Fuldensis*, 169-172, 179, 311-312.

copied.¹⁸⁵ All of these examples suggest possible inattention in the collection and codification of the earlier editorial traditions and their corresponding hermeneutics that made up the *Corpus Paulinum* in this MS. Whether or not this collection resulted from such inattention or simply represent the materials at the manufacturers disposal, we also need to question the assumption that opposing theological viewpoints would have been a concern to Victor even if he had been fully aware of them, since he did not hesitate to incorporate a gospel harmony into Codex Fuldensis that he even acknowledged may have been attributable to Tatian, whom he calls a “heretic” and associate of Marcion, claiming that God can turn even heretical works to divine ends.¹⁸⁶

Although it does not appear that any pro- or anti-Pelagian focus was paramount for Victor or his scriptorium in Capua, this fact does not negate the initial hermeneutical goals of such paratexts. Whatever their role subsumed in Victor’s later editorial product, in their original deployment these paratexts communicated interpretive concerns. As mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, the influence that paratexts could have on interpretation is nowhere more evident than their close relationship with biblical commentaries. Both the *PQ* and the Marcionite *argumenta* were incorporated into Latin commentaries on Paul: both Marius Victorinus and Ambrosiaster drew on the Marcionite *argumenta* for their commentaries on Paul;¹⁸⁷ unsurprisingly Pelagius found the content of the *PQ* so amenable as to import it wholesale into his commentary.¹⁸⁸ The longer *argumentum* (i.e. *Romani ex Iudaeis*) to Romans in F and other MSS was also

¹⁸⁵ Fischer, *Lateinische Bibelhandschriften*, 64.

¹⁸⁶ Ranke, ed., *Codex Fuldensis*, 1,14-2,20.

¹⁸⁷ DeBruyn, *Pelagius’s Commentary*, 9; Stephen Cooper, *Marius Victorinus’ Commentary*, 352-3; Schäfer, “Marius Victorinus und die Marcionitischen Prologe,” 7-16.

¹⁸⁸ Souter, *Pelagius’s Expositions: II*, 3-5.

incorporated by Pelagius into his commentary.¹⁸⁹ The importance of paratextual influence on commentaries cannot be overstressed. Cassiodorus envisioned commentaries as integral components in his curriculum for ascending to a higher understanding of the divine.¹⁹⁰ The transference of biblical paratexts into commentaries shows that some readers saw these ancillary materials as integral for shaping readings of the biblical text and blatantly redeployed them for this end.

While the discontinuity in F's *capitula* to Romans indicates that *capitula* I-XXIII were not deliberately omitted and reinscribed so as to replace the wealth of proof-texts open to Pelagian interpretations from its original type M series, those anti-Pelagian *capitula* that were incorporated effectively achieved the same result: the elimination of passages amenable to Pelagian interpretations and the explicit rejection of these interpretations through counter readings. In contrast, the M type *capitula* to this section of Romans cohere well with various *capitula* series adduced from other MSS in omitting any overt anti-Pelagian sentiments. They strike a dissonant chord, however, with the anti-Pelagian *capitula* from F where Pelagian tenets in *capitulum* X are obviated at virtually every turn. The complete absence of a deliberate stance on the Pelagian controversy in other series of *capitula* underscores the anti-Pelagian focus of *capitula* I-XXIII (especially X), which blatantly furnish the reader with anti-Pelagian interpretations to those very proof-texts fundamental for this controversy. While the compilers of Codex Fuldensis may not have been aware of the results of this action, following previous

¹⁸⁹ Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions: II*, 6-7. In addition to the authenticity of the *PQ*, Souter maintained that all the *argumenta* and prologues, *Romani ex Iudaeis* included, were Pelagian compositions (*Pelagius's Expositions: I*, 115). Frede, however, disagreed with Souter's assessment (*Epistulae ad Thessalonicenses*, 101).

¹⁹⁰ Cassiodorus, *Institutiones*, *prefatio* 2 (Mynors ed., 4,6-14).

scholars I maintain that at their original composition these *capitula* were composed to oppose Pelagian and/or support Augustinian thought.

The paratexts investigated here conspicuously transmit interpretations of the attendant text of the *Corpus Paulinum*. The Vulgate prologue *PQ* recasts Paul and his letters through the lens of Rufinus's nascent Pelagianism. Our comparison of the *PQ* with the Marcionite *argumenta* and the *capitula*, especially the anti-Pelagian series I-XXIII in Romans, further underscores the interpretive role such ancillary materials could play. Moreover, the *capitula* themselves attempted to shape interpretation by focalizing and offering readings of the text in keeping with their diverse origins and attendant hermeneutics. That prefatory materials were instrumental in shaping interpretation is further evident by the inclusion of the Marcionite *argumenta* and the *PQ* Vulgate prologue in Latin commentaries on Paul's letters.

IV. The Vulgate Text, Codex Fuldensis, and Editorial Hermeneutics

While our investigation into Codex Fuldensis has so far focused primarily on the relationship between diverse paratextual materials, we have noted the occasional and passing interaction between paratextual interpretations and the text itself. At this point a more detailed look at the transmission of the Vulgate text and its relationship to this paratextual material in F is warranted. As we discussed in our brief overview of the *status quaestionis* of the Vulgate revision of the *Corpus Paulinum*, this text prepared by Rufinus of Syria adhered to the following principles: 1) adherence to the Greek, in particular the Alexandrian text-type; and 2) avoidance of "Western" Greek and distinctively OL readings.

Even though Codex Fuldensis represents one of the earliest extant MSS of the Vulgate text of Paul's letters, it is not free from OL influence. Analysis of the Vulgate text of the *Corpus Paulinum* transmitted in Fuldensis has revealed that this text also aligns closely with the Italian OL text (I).¹⁹¹ In particular Codex Fuldensis has a close relationship with the MS S transcribed ca. 780, arguably stemming from a common predecessor.¹⁹² The corrections undertaken in F, however, align more closely with the text of MS R from the eighth century, a fact that allows Frede to conclude that Victor of Capua used a text for correction similar to that which was later codified in MS R.¹⁹³

Utilizing Frede's and Corssen's work on the text of Codex Fuldensis, Fischer has reconstructed the transcription of the Pauline epistles from two Vorlagen as follows:¹⁹⁴ first from Galatians to the end Victor added textual notes to a Vulgate text strongly mixed with OL readings; this was then copied by the scribe thus giving a strongly mixed text; subsequently Victor made additional corrections to this newly created and mixed text by further collating it to a better Vulgate text similar to MS Reg. lat. 9; in this way F's text was brought even more closely in line with the Vulgate, while still retaining its mixed character.¹⁹⁵

¹⁹¹ Frede, ed., *Epistulae ad Philippenses*, 30.

¹⁹² Frede, ed., *Epistulae ad Philippenses*, 30.

¹⁹³ Frede, ed., *Epistulae ad Philippenses*, 30. This connection with R is particularly intriguing in light of the connections between F and R in the transmission of *capitula* for the epistle to Hebrews discussed above. We noted there that F and R transmit the same *capitula* for this letter, but that R transmits an *argumentum* to Hebrews which is wholly lacking in F. This close relationship between the exemplar against which F was corrected and R both in terms of text and in terms of some paratextual materials illustrates the complexity of relationships between MSS both in terms of text and paratext.

¹⁹⁴ Fischer, *Lateinische Bibelhandschriften*, 63-4; Peter Corssen, *Epistula ad Galatas ad fidem optimorum codicum Vulgatae* (Berlin: Apus Weidmannos, 1885); Frede, ed., *Epistulae ad Philippenses*.

¹⁹⁵ Fischer, *Lateinische Bibelhandschriften*, 63. Fischer is of course quick to stress that a pure Vulgate text does not really exist in any MS of the *Corpus Paulinum*.

While the text in Codex Fuldensis has been corrected at Victor's directives according to an exemplar with a text similar to that in R, the pages of Codex Fuldensis contain numerous other corrections to the text of Paul's letters from those attributed to the scribe down to those attributed to medieval readers who also sought to ameliorate the text.¹⁹⁶ Ranke summarizes the corrections as follows:¹⁹⁷ during the transcription of the MS some errors were caught by the scribe himself; after Victor's read-through other corrections were made by the scribe or corrector at the behest of Victor who added marginal notes for the correction of the MS; finally, Victor himself occasionally made some corrections to Codex Fuldensis. Victor's role in correcting F was characterized primarily by simple correction of errors in spelling or transcription (omission, haplography, dittography, etc.).¹⁹⁸ Since the corrections of simple, yet inevitable, errors in transcription of any handwritten product (e.g. the confusion of the letters b and v, known as betacism) are the most common found in Fuldensis, these need not detain us here.¹⁹⁹ The few corrections occupying our attention date to the time of the MS's initial production under the aegis of Bishop Victor.

¹⁹⁶ See footnote 14 above.

¹⁹⁷ Ranke, ed., *Codex Fuldensis*, 465-6.

¹⁹⁸ Fischer, *Lateinische Bibelhandschriften*, 59.

¹⁹⁹ E.g. Rom 7:18-20 was added later, although clearly omitted by haplography occasioned by parablepsis as a result of the repetition of the entire phrase "non ego operor illud sed quod habitat in me peccatum" at the end of verses 17 and 20—though Ranke is unsure if this correction should be attributed to the scribe or the corrector (*Codex Fuldensis*, 479). With respect to betacism, in Fuldensis at Rom 2:16, 2:27, and 3:6 the scribe copied *iudicauit* before correcting it to *iudicabit*. Although there are Greek variant readings of the future *κρίνει* in 2:16 and the present *κρίνει* in 3:6, these variations do not correspond to the Latin perfect "iudicauit" in place of the future "iudicabit." Rather these errors in transcription of 2:16 and 3:6, just like the transcription and correction of Rom 2:27 in Fuldensis are to be attributed to betacism—a common error in Fuldensis and Latin MSS more generally. Occasionally, however, such readings are neither insignificant nor completely attributable to betacism. Consider the readings found in 1 Cor 6:14, which in contrast show no signs of correction in F. The reading transcribed into Fuldensis departs (along with numerous other Latin MSS ACH^oRSLMNO*RTZ*Λ) from other Vulgate witnesses in reading the perfect "suscitauit" in place of the future "suscitabit" (KO^oPUVWZ^c). Were it not for the Greek MS evidence these divergent

The question before us now is whether or not there are any textual variations worthy of note for our larger concerns in this study: namely, does F transmit any corrections, alterations to the text, or singular readings with possible theological import? Fischer informs us that by and large Victor refrained from the introduction of new readings into the text, except for the *Corpus Paulinum*.²⁰⁰ Given the overt anti-Pelagian stance in the *capitula* added to Romans in Codex Fuldensis, we would perhaps expect similar tendencies to emerge in the transcription or correction of the text itself; or alternatively, the identification of a Pelagian forbear, Rufinus, as the author of the Vulgate revision and the Pelagian affinities in the *Primum Quaeritur* also found in this MS²⁰¹ would perhaps suggest the possibility of Pelagian interests influencing, if not Codex Fuldensis, then a Vulgate exemplar used in its production. Considering the importance of Pelagian thought (whether sympathetic or hostile towards) for the traditions codified in this MS, I deem it warranted to focus on those passages from the *Corpus Paulinum* that were particular points of contention between Pelagian and anti-Pelagian interpreters in order to investigate if the original revision or later transcription and correction of any specific verses in F show any relation to interpretive concerns. For this reason I will isolate variants from Rom 5-6 and one from 1 Cor 15 that show particular relevance for investigating any relationship to Pelagianism as we saw in the

readings could also easily be explained by betacism. Yet the evidence indicates that these readings along with the present “suscitat” (d e) represent translations of different texts found in the original Greek. What is significant in this variant in Fuldensis is its divergence from the text that corresponds to the original and arguably the Vulgate reading (ἐξεγερεῖ/suscitabit), which the major Vulgate editions favor over the perfect “suscitavit” (Wordsworth and White, eds., *Epistulae Paulinae*, 202; and Gryson, ed., *Biblia Sacra*, 1775). On betacism and its influence on orthography, see William Edward Plater and H. J. White, *A Grammar of the Vulgate, being an Introduction to the Study of the Latinity of the Vulgate Bible* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926), 43.

²⁰⁰ Fischer, *Lateinische Bibelhandschriften*, 59.

²⁰¹ Although we have not dealt with them in full, the *Concordia epistularum* found in F are also usually attributed to a Pelagian source, see footnote 12 above.

paratextual material.²⁰² To anticipate my conclusions, despite the prominence of Pelagianism in the paratextual materials in this MS, the textual strata investigated here show no clear evidence for or against similar tendencies. Rufinus's hermeneutic as articulated in the *PQ* did not evidently affect the original Vulgate revision (at least as transmitted in Codex Fuldensis); similarly, neither Rufinus's nascent Pelagianism in the *PQ* nor the *capitula* (whether anti-Pelagian, OL, or Euthalian) occasioned manipulation of the text of this MS (containing both OL and Vulgate readings). While their initial composition did not translate into justifying manipulation of the text, these paratexts still attempted to lead the reader (both literally and hermeneutically) into the text. Despite the fact that these two modes of shaping interpretation coincided in Marcion's edition, paratexts could be deployed for interpretive concerns without occasioning the alteration of the text. In fact, these ancillary materials offered a way to shape readings while maintaining the integrity of the text. We thus see a shift in modes of constraining interpretations of Paul from textual corruption to paratextual introduction.

Romans 5:16

Let us begin with a correction from Rom 5, one of the most important chapters in this letter and the Pauline corpus for staking out claims in the Pelagian controversy. At Rom 5:16 the text of F has been corrected by Victor. In this case, where the text transmits "et non sicut per unius delictum" Victor added a dotted obelus (·/·) in the margin along

²⁰² For the importance of Romans and in particular Romans 5 for the Pelagian controversy see J. Patout Burns, "The Interpretation of Romans in the Pelagian Controversy," *AugStud* 10 (1979): 43-54; William S. Babcock, "Augustine's Interpretation of Romans (A.D. 394-396)," *AugStud* 10 (1979): 55-74; Theodore S. de Bruyne, "Pelagius's Interpretation of Rom 5:12-21: Exegesis within the Limits of Polemic," *TJT* 4 (1988): 30-43; and Bruce Harbert, "Romans 5,12: Old Latin and Vulgate in the Pelagian Controversy," *StPatr* 22 (1989): 261-64.

with the reading “peccantem” to be inserted in place of delictum where ·/· has been inserted interlinearly.²⁰³ The Latin MSS transmit the following variants along with those readings found in F:

1. per unius delictum F*
2. per unius peccantem F^c
3. per unum peccantem ACGH c d³ e
4. per unum peccatum BKM*VWZ^c d* f g
5. per unum delictum L
6. delictum per unum peccantem D

The instability in the Latin translations of Rom 5:16 arises primarily from the Greek, which also exhibits variation in this verse: καὶ οὐχ ὡς δι’ ἑνὸς ἁμαρτήσαντος (*v.l.* ἁμαρτήματος) τὸ δῶρημα· τὸ μὲν γὰρ κρίμα ἐξ ἑνὸς εἰς κατάκριμα, τὸ δὲ χάρισμα ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων εἰς δικαίωμα. For the reading ἁμαρτήματος NA²⁷ lists the witnesses DFG m sy^p. Since the Greek MS evidence, save for the “Western” witnesses, favors the reading ἁμαρτήσαντος translated as “peccantem” over ἁμαρτήματος,²⁰⁴ the reading “per unum peccantem” arguably represents the revised Vulgate reading; for it is aligned with the Greek Alexandrian tradition and eschews the “Western” external evidence. Recent editions of the Vulgate concur with the judgment that “per unum peccantem” was the revised Vulgate reading.²⁰⁵

The origins of the other readings are not particularly difficult to ascertain, since they all appear to represent slightly alternative translations of the Greek. While the

²⁰³ For a discussion of the dotted obelus as an indicator of correction, a possible link to commentaries and its development out of Alexandrian text-critical activities, see Kathleen McNamee, *Sigla and Select Marginalia in Greek Literary Papyri* (Bruxelles: Fondation Égyptologique Reine Élisabeth, 1992), esp. 17-19.

²⁰⁴ C. E. B. Cranfield thinks that ἁμαρτήσαντος is the lectio difficilior (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* [Edinburgh: Clark, 1975], 286 note 3), an evaluation with which Joseph Fitzmyer agrees in his assessment of ἁμαρτήματος as an “obvious correction” (*Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* [New York: Doubleday, 1993], 419).

²⁰⁵ Gryson, ed., *Biblia Sacra*, 1755; and Wordsworth and White, eds., *Epistulae Paulinae*, 87.

present participle “peccantem” offers a translation of the aorist participle ἀμαρτήσαντος, “peccatum” or “delictum” can both be explained by alternative translations of ἀμαρτήματος. Since ἐνός represents the same form for the genitive singular of the masculine and neuter, both “unius” and “unum” can be explained along similar lines: “unius” could represent ἐνός as a substantive genitive of possession, while “unum” could translate ἐνός as an adjective into the accusative governed by the preposition “per” along with “delictum,” “peccatum,” or “peccantem.”

Whatever the rationale for the various translations, they are not particularly affected by exegetical issues. Although the reading in Fuldensis is corrected from “as by the transgression of one” to “as the transgression by the sinning of one”—thus emphasizing a subtle shift to Adam’s transgression through sinning rather than merely the sin/fault or the sinning itself—none of the readings offers incontestable proof-texts for Pelagian or anti-Pelagian interpretations: Pelagius reads “per unum peccantem” and links it to the Paul’s subsequent statements to prove the perpetuation and removal of sin by the examples of Adam and Christ respectively;²⁰⁶ Augustine on the other hand, also cites this same reading (per unum hominem peccantem), albeit with slight amplification, in his treatise *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* as proof that Paul spoke of original sin physically transmitted to all humans.²⁰⁷ While the presence of “delictum” in verse 16 could endear

²⁰⁶ Pelagius, *In Romanos* 5:16 (Souter ed., 47). The actual reading listed in Souter’s edition is “per unum delictum,” though the readings “peccantem” and “peccatum” are found in some MSS. De Bruyn’s selection and translation of “peccantem” as Pelagius’s reading is compelling, since Pelagius appears to take up this word in his following comment “[e]x uno peccante etc.” (Pelagius, *In Romanos* 5:16 [Souter ed., 47,15]); see Bruyne, *Pelagius’s Commentary*, 94.

²⁰⁷ *De nuptiis et concupiscentia*, II 46 (CSEL 42 300,18-301,2).

itself somewhat to Augustine’s interpretation,²⁰⁸ it is not necessary in this case to explain these variants by appealing to corruptions or alternative translations of the text in light of theological battles. Along the same lines, neither does the correction of F need to be attributed to such concerns despite the overt anti-Pelagian stance in the *capitula*.

1 Corinthians 15:38

For an investigation of the possible relationship between interpretive concerns and the text transmitted 1 Cor 15:38 offers intriguing possibilities. In chapter fifteen of 1 Corinthians Paul stressed the types of bodies and seeds which God gives to each creature in order to set up and buttress his claim that Jesus had in fact been raised from the dead in a spiritual body (vv. 12-20); so too the resurrection will be a bodily resurrection in the future (vv. 50-55). Paul directly connected this distinction between different types of bodies to the resurrection of the body apart from any corruption (vv. 42-50). Thus Paul’s assertion that “God gives to it a body just as he wished and to each of the seeds its own body” supports his argument that there will be a bodily resurrection of the dead.

Despite the lack of variation in the Greek witnesses (they all read ὁ δὲ θεὸς δίδωσιν αὐτῷ σῶμα καθὼς ἠθέλησεν, καὶ ἐκάστῳ τῶν σπερμάτων ἴδιον σῶμα) Latin MSS offer the following divergent translations of the verb ἠθέλησεν:

Deus autem dat illi corpus sicut

1. uoluit ADGHΘKMOPRSUVZ d e f g
2. uult BCFLNTW c m
3. uoluerit r Augustine

²⁰⁸ For example, Augustine isolates the use of delictum subsequently in Rom 5 to prove that this transgression must have been original sin which is then transmitted down from Adam; “let them explain,” Augustine writes, “how from one fault (ex uno delicto) [leads] to condemnation, except that one original sin, which transferred into all humans, yields to condemnation” (*De nuptiis et concupiscentia*, II 46 [CSEL 42 300,23-301,2]).

While F and other MSS (BCLNTW c m) and some patristic witnesses testify to the present “uult,” the vast majority of Latin MSS (ADGHΘKMOPRSUVZ d e f g) read the perfect “uoluit.”²⁰⁹ In addition, Augustine even cites a reading of the perfect subjunctive “uoluerit,”²¹⁰ which is also attested in the MS r. The significant variation in the Latin codices is surprising, since the readings transmitted in Greek MSS show no variation. The unanimity of the Greek testimony leaves little doubt that the reading of Rufinus’s Vulgate revision was the perfect “uoluit,” since we have noted his adherence to the Greek and this reading arguably most accurately renders the Greek. The origin of the other readings is far less intelligible as translations of the unanimous Greek reading ἠθέλησεν—though some possible explanations exist. One possibility is that the reading “uult” represents a conative present translation of an ingressive aorist ἠθέλησεν;²¹¹ the perfect subjunctive “uoluerit” could also represent a possible translation of the aorist ἠθέλησεν with an attempt to attenuate the conditional nature of God’s will with respect to the giving of bodies. The nuance in translation may reflect the thought that, while there is no doubt that God gives the body (“dat” in the indicative), the purposes and reasons for how this is willed are more open to speculation, since God’s mind and providence are ultimately beyond human ken (“uoluerit” in the perfect subjunctive).²¹² Although possible

²⁰⁹ Until the publication of the *Vetus Latina* edition of 1 Cor by Fröhlich is completed (*Epistula ad Corinthios I*), for a list of witnesses, see Wordsworth and White, eds., *Epistulae Paulinae*, 267.

²¹⁰ It should be noted that “voluerit” is also the same form of the 3rd person singular of the future perfect indicative for “volo.” The perfect subjunctive, however, appears to be the more appropriate understanding; because the future perfect “denotes an action completed in the future” (*Allen and Greenough’s New Latin Grammar* [New Rochelle, NY: Aristide D. Caratzas, 1931 (1998 reprint)], 300 §478) it is unlikely that it represents a translation of the aorist ἠθέλησεν.

²¹¹ See Greenough et al., eds., *Allen and Greenough’s New Latin Grammar*, 295 § 467 and *Greek Grammar*, § 1924.

²¹² This translation tempers the retention of the past tense from the aorist into the perfect by shifting the indicative into the subjunctive. For more on the contrast between the subjunctive and indicative in Christian

explanations can be found for all three alternative translations, the perfect indicative “uoluit” still offers the best representation of the Greek aorist indicative.

Another equally plausible explanation for these divergent Latin translations can be found in debates over the body at conception and resurrection. Citations by early Latin fathers in debates over this issue supply context for the use of these alternative readings, if not for their creation. The issue of resurrection was particularly pressing for Tertullian, who saw in 1 Cor 15:38 evidence not just for the resurrection of the body, but for the resurrection of the flesh.²¹³ In his treatise on the resurrection Tertullian cites the present indicative “uult” in support of his argument for this future fleshly resurrection.²¹⁴

Disputes over the origin of the soul, traducianism, and issues that flared up into the Pelagian controversy also come to the fore in the translation of this verse, where Rufinus of Syria, the author of the Vulgate revision, claimed it spoke directly to the creation of the infant body in its mother. He elaborates how the resurrection of the flesh mirrors its creation:

Again we furthermore are taught that the dead will rise in the same flesh in which they also were formed in the mother’s womb, as well as in body and form, just as the blessed Paul writing to the Corinthians says: ‘But someone will say: how do the dead rise? In what sort of body do they come? Fool, that which you sow does not live unless it first dies. And what you sow, you sow not the body to come, but a naked grain, as perhaps of wheat or of something else. But God gives to it a body just as he willed.’ When the apostle said this, that ‘God gives to it a body,’ not ‘as he wills’ but ‘as he willed’ he declared that just as a human was created from the beginning so too he will rise in the resurrection neither changed in

Latin, see Albert Blaise, *A Handbook of Christian Latin: Style, Morphology, and Syntax* (Washington, D.C.: Brepols; Georgetown University Press, 1994), 86-88 esp. §239.

²¹³ *De res.* 52 (CCSL 2 995-998).

²¹⁴ *De res.* 52.5-7 (CCSL 2 996,15-24).

appearance nor body, just as our Lord Jesus Christ after he rose from the dead did not change at all neither with respect to body nor form.²¹⁵

In opposition to Origenist incarnation (and reincarnation) of fallen nouses on the one hand and traducianism on the other, Rufinus adheres adamantly to a creationist theology insisting that God “willed” rather than “wills” a body to each underscoring his belief in God’s creation of the soul from nothing and the body from the material substrate supplied by the parents.²¹⁶ The use of the perfect indicates for Rufinus that just as God “willed” the creation of each individually, body and soul, in the past, so too he has already “willed” the resurrection body; he “willed” not their souls’ creation before bodies (à la Origenism); nor—“willed” apart from God—are the body and soul passed down merely from the parents (à la traducianism). The perfect tense reveals, in Rufinus’s mind, God’s dual responsibility for the creation of the embryonic and resurrection body.

Augustine on the other hand cites the perfect subjunctive (uoluerit) in his anti-Pelagian writings²¹⁷ and in particular in his response to Julian of Eclanum, who criticizes Augustine for damning God’s own creations by attributing original sin to the human seed in the womb.²¹⁸ Julian seizes upon 1 Cor 15:38, especially the clause “and to each of the

²¹⁵ Rursus etiam docemur quod resurgant mortui in eadem carne in qua etiam in utero matris formati sunt, in corpore pariter ac figura sicut beatus Paulus, ad Corinthios scribens, dicit: “Sed dicit aliquis: Quomodo resurgent mortui? Quali autem corpore venient? Insiapiens, tu quod seminas non vivificatur nisi prius moriatur. Et quod seminas, non corpus quod futurum est seminas, sed nudum granum, ut puta tritici aut alicuius ceterorum. Deus autem dat illi corpus sicut voluit.” Hoc cum apostolus dixisset, quod “Deus dat illi corpus,” non “sicut vult,” sed “sicut voluit,” ostendit quod, sicut a principio creatus est homo, sic etiam in resurrectione resurget, neque habitu neque corpore permutato, sicut Dominus noster Iesus Christus, postquam resurrexit a mortuis, nec corpus nec figuram penitus immutavit (*Liber de fide* 51 [Miller ed., 128,23-130,5]).

²¹⁶ Rufinus the Syrian, *Liber de fide* 25-28 (Miller ed., 86, 88, 90, 92, 94). For bibliography and discussion of creationism, traducianism, and Origen’s theory on the origin of the soul and body as they relate to Pelagianism, see Clark, *Origenist Controversy*, ch. 5.

²¹⁷ *De natura et origine animae*, 1.14.17 (CSEL 60 317,26-318).

²¹⁸ *Contra Iulianum (Opus Imperfectum)* 5.13 (CSEL 85/2 184,1-14).

seeds its own body,” for proof that God gives the body not just to grains but to humans; moreover this body, since it is given by God, is good by nature.²¹⁹ It should be pointed out here that Julian cites the present “uult,” the very reading which his theological forebear Rufinus rejects. According to Julian, since God gives a body to each seed, neither stain of sin nor desire which in contrast are made by the Devil can be imparted.²²⁰ Paul’s declaration that God gives the appropriate body to each seed serves well Julian’s argument that the seed implanted in the womb by God does not transmit sin.²²¹

Augustine responds by claiming that Julian has not only misrepresented his position, but also misunderstood Paul.²²² If Julian’s interpretation is correct, Augustine lampoons, then humans would have been planted and harvested in the same manner as grain.²²³ Rather, Paul’s agriculture analogy applies only to the body after death which dies to be made alive again and for this reason cannot be applied to the origin of bodies in conception, and hence their transmission of sin. While Augustine pays close attention to the context of Paul’s teaching on the bodies given to seeds, he glosses over Julian’s use of “uult” in his interpretation that this applies not to the giving of the body in the resurrection, but rather in conception.

Augustine’s silence with respect to the far better attested “uult” and “uoluit” is peculiar. In view of his knowledge of the text of the NT and its variation in Greek and

²¹⁹ *Contra Iulianum (Opus Imperfectum)* 5.13 (CSEL 85/2 186,8-20).

²²⁰ Libido nihil attinet, inquit, ad semina, quia facta est a diabolo; huic autem libidini serviunt coniuges, semina autem et parvulos de seminibus facit deus (*Contra Iulianum (Opus Imperfectum)* 5.13 [CSEL 85/2 184,1-3]).

²²¹ *Contra Iulianum (Opus Imperfectum)* 5.14 (CSEL 85/2 186,8-13).

²²² *Contra Iulianum (Opus Imperfectum)* 5.13 (CSEL 85/2 184,15-185,36).

²²³ *Contra Iulianum (Opus Imperfectum)* 5.14 (CSEL 85/2 187,37-188,62).

Latin codices,²²⁴ his consistent citation or misquotation of a key proof-text that speaks against his understanding of human generation is surely not an accident. It is impossible that he knew only the perfect subjunctive reading (uoluerit), which does not represent the most accurate translation of the Greek and has been transmitted in only one MS (r); in fact his reproduction of “uult” from Julian’s citation of 1 Cor 15:38 leaves no doubt that he also knew this Latin variant. Nevertheless, despite this knowledge, Augustine continues to cite the perfect subjunctive “uoluerit.” Augustine’s reasons for preferring the perfect subjunctive remain unstated. Despite his consistent citation of this version, he does not draw specific conclusions from it that would allow us to discern the reasons for his preference. We may perhaps conjecture that he prefers and cites the perfect subjunctive for reasons similar to those stated above: the subjunctive subtly qualified human perception and understanding in the face of the divine economy.²²⁵

For our purposes here we are interested in whether or not the Latin variants for this verse can help us understand the reading “uult” transcribed in F. Does one reading align more closely with certain anti-Pelagian features in this MS? From the evidence adduced above it is manifest that the different translations of ἠθέλησεν played a role in debates over the nature of the body at resurrection and creation. Especially in the case of Rufinus, who created the revision of the Vulgate, the preference for “uoluit” over “uult” indicated God’s hand in the body’s creation and presumably its alignment with Greek witnesses. Rufinus’s belief in the innate goodness of human nature was also stressed by

²²⁴ See e.g. our previous discussion of OL variation and his comments on variant readings in *De peccatorum meritis et remissione* I 11,13 discussed in relation to Rom 5:14 below.

²²⁵ For the use of the subjunctive and the indicative in independent correlative clauses, see Blaise, *Handbook of Christian Latin*, 87 §239. On Augustine’s pessimism concerning human discernment of the divine will, see Brown, *Augustine of Hippo*, 391-397.

Julian of Eclanum against Augustine’s doctrine that humans were tainted with original sin passed down from Adam. Yet in Julian’s arguments he consistently cites the present indicative “uult.” The fact that Julian quotes the very reading that Rufinus rejects compels two conclusions: 1) in this verse there is no necessary connection between the text transmitted in F and any anti-Pelagian tendencies; and 2) none of the readings found in the Latin MSS necessarily constrain these exegetes’ interpretations. Furthermore, even if we could prove that the creation of “uult” or “uoluit” was related to specific theological issues—which the evidence clearly militates against—the reading transcribed in F is not singular and thus is a product of an earlier exemplar rather than unique to this MS. The conclusion reached here does, however, illuminate a shift in the propensity to corrupt the text when compared to our investigations of Marcion’s *Apostolikon*; the text appears unaffected by the Pelagian concerns prominently displayed in the paratexts transmitted by this MS. We will see whether or not this reticence to corrupt the text in F is corroborated by subsequent variants under discussion.

Romans 5:12

We have already seen that Rom 5 represented a battleground of strategic importance for countering Pelagian interpretations by means of *capitula* in F. In particular, Rom 5:12, where Paul recounts the entry of sin and, through sin, death into the world through Adam’s disobedience, represented an especially crucial passage both for Pelagian doctrine on the transmission of sin by imitation and Augustinian arguments for the transmission of sin and death by reproduction.²²⁶ This verse was so central to this

²²⁶ The debate primarily centered around the meaning of the phrase “ἐφ’ ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον;” was ἐφ’ ᾧ to be understood as a conjunction or a relative clause. If it was a relative clause what was the antecedent? This

issue that Augustine placed it as the keystone of the Christian faith in his refutation of Julian: “for there is one catholic faith of all, who believe with one heart, confess with one mouth, that ‘through one human, sin entered into the world, in which all have sinned’ and who subvert with catholic antiquity your novel opinions.”²²⁷ With so much at stake for both sides in the debate it is perhaps not surprising that the text of this verse exhibits variation.

This variation found in the Latin texts of Rom 5:12 arises from instability in the Greek tradition. The “Western” bilinguals DFG, the OL tradition and Greek MS 1505 all omit ὁ θάνατος (or the Latin translation “mors”) from Paul’s phrase, καὶ οὕτως εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους ὁ θάνατος διήλθεν, ἐφ’ ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον. The lemma for Ambrosiaster’s commentary on Romans similarly omits “mors;” yet this occasions no special emphasis on Ambrosiaster’s part, who, like Augustine afterwards, understands Paul to be speaking about the transmission of original sin.²²⁸ In keeping with its fidelity to Alexandrian text-type and avoidance of “Western” and OL readings, the Vulgate revision renders the Greek as “et ita in omnes homines mors pertransiit, in quo omnes peccauerunt.”

problem was confounded by the OL and Vulgate translation “in quo,” which we will see supported Augustine’s conception of original sin. For full discussions and summary of previous interpretations of this phrase, see Cranfield, *Commentary*, 274-82; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (New York: Doubleday, 1993), 413-17; *ibid.*, “The Consecutive Meaning of ΕΦ’ Ω in Romans 5.12,” *NTS* 39 (1993): 321-39; and Robert Jewett, *Romans: A Commentary* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 375. Buonaiuti (“Pelagius and the Pauline Vulgate”) even argues that the retention of the poor OL translation “in quo” in the Vulgate revision proves that Pelagius could not have authored the Vulgate; otherwise he would have offered a more appropriate translation so as to deny his opponents access to arguments for original sin through this verse.

²²⁷ Una est enim omnium catholica fides, qui per unum hominem peccatum intrasse in mundum, in quo omnes peccaverunt, uno corde credunt, ore uno fatentur, et vestras novitias praesumptiones catholica antiquitate subvertunt (*Contra Iulianum* 1.3.8 [PL 44 645]).

²²⁸ Ambrosiaster, *Commentarius In Epistulam ad Romanos*, 5,12,1-4 (CSEL 81 162-165).

Bruce Harbert has shown that while the omission of “mors” from the OL text was crucial for Augustine’s argument for the physical transmission of original sin, Pelagius and Julian appealed to the Vulgate text containing “mors” as evidence that death, not sin, was transmitted.²²⁹ In contrast to the OL used by Ambrosiaster and subsequently by Augustine, Pelagius saw in the Vulgate text of Rom 5:12 evidence that sin was transmitted by example, rather than by nature. Paul’s statements on the introduction of death through sin demonstrate death’s hold on humans through the repetition and pattern of Adam’s disobedience; by perpetuating sin, humans also perpetuate death.²³⁰ Central to Pelagius’s interpretation is the causal interpretation of Paul’s assertion that death not sin entered into all humans because all have sinned (ἐφ’ ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον, translated into the ambiguous Latin “in quo omnes peccauerunt”).²³¹ For Pelagius and his circle the presence of ὁ θάνατος/mors in the previous clause clarified Paul’s words and supported their contention that sin was not physically imparted to all of humanity from Adam, though death was.

Augustine of course disagrees with this position on original sin and stresses that it is not death which is the primary focus of transmission in Rom 5:12, but rather sin. For this reason, Rom 5:12 figures prominently in Augustine’s refutation of Pelagian teachings on the transmission of sin by example rather than by nature; in numerous writings

²²⁹ Harbert, "Romans 5,12."

²³⁰ De Bruyn notes that Pelagius surely understands this death to be spiritual not physical (*Pelagius’s Commentary*, 92-3).

²³¹ De Bruyne astutely points out that Pelagius reads “in quo” conditionally rather than as a relative clause like Augustine with the “unum hominem” (i.e. Adam) or “peccatum” as the antecedent (*Pelagius’s Commentary*, 92 notes 22-23). Due to the agreement in gender with the relative pronoun, if read as a relative clause ἐφ’ ᾧ in Greek could refer to death (θάνατος) or human (ἄνθρωπος) but not sin (ἁμαρτία), since the former are masculine while the latter is feminine. In Latin, however, “in quo” could refer to sin (peccatum) and human (hominem) but not death (mors), since the former are masculine or neuter while the latter is feminine.

Augustine isolates Rom 5:12 as a locus of Pelagian misinterpretation.²³² Yet as Harbert points out, Augustine's charges of misinterpretation or distortion of Paul's words are somewhat disingenuous; rather Augustine's interpretive difficulties can be traced to Pelagian use of the Vulgate. Whereas the ambiguity of the OL reading allowed Augustine to supply "peccatum" as the subject of "pertransiit," the inclusion of "mors" denied him the same exegetical license to locate the transmission of original sin in this verse.²³³ In addition, Augustine's realization that sin in Greek (ἁμαρτία) is feminine forces to him to relinquish his interpretation that "in quo" refers to sin, since ἐφ' ᾧ, if introducing a relative clause, could not take ἁμαρτία as an antecedent but it could take the masculine ὁ θάνατος.²³⁴ For this reason in some cases Augustine has to shift the focus to other passages from Paul's corpus (e.g. Rom 7:23 and 1 Cor 15:56) in order to maintain his interpretation of original sin through exegesis of Rom 5:12.²³⁵ For while Augustine was prepared to concede that Paul said death also entered along with sin, he was not prepared to allow that death alone entered.²³⁶ Paul's statements in this passage unambiguously testify, Augustine claims, to the transmission of original sin into all humans, not the death

²³² *De peccatorum meritis et remissione* I 9, 10 (CSEL 60 11,21-12,8); *Contra Iulianum (Opus Imperfectum)* 2,49-50 (CSEL 85/1 198,1-199,15). See also *Contra Iulianum* 1.3.8 (PL 44 645) quoted above. On a related note Augustine also begins his treatise against Julian with an indictment of Pelagian teaching on Adam's mortality irrespective of his transgression (*Contra Iulianum (Opus Imperfectum)* praefatio [CSEL 85/1 3,1-10]).

²³³ Harbert, "Romans 5,12."

²³⁴ Augustine, *Contra duas epistulas Pelagianorum* IV 4,7 (CSEL 60 527,17-19). For further discussion, see Gerald Bonner, "Augustine on Romans 5,12," *SE* 5 (1968): 242-7; and Fitzmyer, "Consecutive Meaning," 322-23.

²³⁵ Harbert, "Romans 5,12." See also *Contra duas epistulas Pelagianorum* IV 4,7 (CSEL 60 527,27-528,4).

²³⁶ Harbert, "Romans 5,12."

of the soul through sin.²³⁷ Furthermore, Augustine argues that this transmission is not effected by imitation but propagation: in fact, the Pelagians deliberately distort and obfuscate Paul in their attempt to prove this transmission of sin by imitation where Paul himself without ambiguity says that original sin was physically transmitted to all humans.²³⁸ It is impossible to tell if Augustine was completely oblivious to the fact that the debate hinged on the use of different texts or if he was just undeterred by the more faithful rendition in the Vulgate cited by the Pelagians. Since Augustine clearly knows that his opponents are citing another text, it is more likely that he knows what is at issue but nevertheless refuses to give quarter and instead impugns his opponents' exegesis.

Augustine's rejection of Pelagius's interpretation of "mors" as the subject of "pertransiit" compelled the editors of the Oxford Editio Maior to conjecture that Augustine saw mors as a Pelagian gloss.²³⁹ Augustine's own words, however, fall short of accusing Pelagius of corruption of this verse; he simply accuses Pelagius, by laying stress on death, rather than sin, of distorting this verse's meaning in order to reject what he saw as Paul's clear articulation of the transmission of original sin.

But for this reason they say these things, while they wish to pervert the words of the apostle to their own understanding. For where the apostle says 'through one man sin entered into the world and through sin death and thus transmitted into all men,' there they want to understand not that sin was transmitted, but death. But what about that which follows: 'in which all have sinned?' For either the apostle says that all have sinned 'in this one human' about which he has said, 'through one man sin entered into the world,' or 'in this sin,' or certainly 'in this death.'²⁴⁰

²³⁷ *De peccatorum meritis et remissione* I 9, 9 (CSEL 60 10-11).

²³⁸ *De peccatorum meritis et remissione* I 9, 9 (CSEL 60 10-11).

²³⁹ "[E]tiam Aug. putat mors glossam esse Pelagianum" (*Epistulae Paulinae*, 85).

²⁴⁰ Sed haec ideo dicunt isti, dum uolunt ex uerbis apostoli in suum sensum homines detorquere. ubi enim ait apostolus: per unum hominem peccatum intrauit in mundum, et per peccatum mors et ita in omnes homines pertransiit, ibi uolunt intelligi non peccatum pertransisse, sed mortem. quid est ergo quod sequitur: in quo omnes peccauerunt? aut enim in illo uno homine peccasse omnes dicit apostolus, de quo dixerat: per

Augustine then continues to explain his interpretation by rooting his understanding in previous patristic authority.

For just so even the blessed Hilary understood what is written: ‘in quo omnes peccauerunt.’ For he says, ‘in whom, that is in Adam, all have sinned.’ Then he added, ‘it is clear that all have sinned in Adam just as in a mass; for he himself having been corrupted through sin begat all who were born under sin.’ Hilary writing these things drove home without ambiguity how ‘in whom all have sinned’ ought to be interpreted.²⁴¹

The twin pillars of scripture and precedent supplied the infrastructure upon which Augustine built his doctrine of original sin.²⁴² Although the commentary cited by Augustine was occasionally attributed to Hilary of Poitiers in Africa and in Ireland, it actually is an anonymous work composed in the latter half of the fourth century (ca. 365-380) and now classified under the name of Ambrosiaster, since it was subsequently attributed to Ambrose in later MSS.²⁴³ In addition to Ambrosiaster, Tertullian and Cyprian were enlisted among the ranks of previous Latin exegetes, who, according to Augustine, prefigured his doctrine. While this tactic of appealing to previous patristic authority was deliberately employed by Augustine against Pelagius after his publication of *De natura*

unum hominem peccatum intravit in mundum, aut in illo peccato, aut certe in morte (*Contra duas epistulas Pelagianorum* IV 4,7 [CSEL 60 527,8-17]).

²⁴¹ nam sic et sanctus Hilarius intellexit quod scriptum est: in quo omnes peccauerunt; ait enim: in quo, id est in Adam, omnes peccauerunt. deinde addidit: manifestum in Adam omnes peccasse quasi in massa; ipse enim per peccatum corruptus, omnes quos genuit, nati sunt sub peccato. haec scribens Hilarius sine ambiguitate commonuit, quomodo intelligendum esset ‘in quo omnes peccauerunt’ (*Contra duas epistulas Pelagianorum* IV 4,7 [CSEL 60 528,9-16]).

²⁴² Robert Evans notes that the increasing appeal to earlier Latin fathers coincided with Pelagius’s own appeals to their authority (including Jerome and Augustine himself) in his *De Natura*, wherein attempted to claim authentic apostolic authority for his understanding of theology and anthropology (*Pelagius: Inquiries and Reappraisals*, 85-89).

²⁴³ Souter, "Character and History;" and *ibid.*, *A Study of Ambrosiaster* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1905), esp.161-94.

wherein Pelagius cited Jerome and Augustine himself,²⁴⁴ the later anti-Pelagian author of the *Pseudo-Augustinian Hypomnesticon* (perhaps Prosper of Aquitaine) would eventually abandon the tactic of rooting his interpretation in previous patristic authority and appeal more centrally to scripture after the Pelagian cause was taken up by Julian of Eclanum.²⁴⁵ Far more important was controlling the interpretation of those contested proof-texts from scripture, of which Rom 5 was of the utmost strategic importance. Thus deserting the battle for Rom 5:12 was not an option.

Augustine explicitly marshals this verse against Pelagian doctrine regarding the possibility of living without sin; in Augustine's interpretation no one has achieved this apart from Christ's grace.²⁴⁶ That Rom 5:12 was a major focal point for divergent interpretations concerning the entry of sin, or alternatively death, is evident by the fact that Augustine concluded his treatise *De gratia Christi*, composed against Pelagian teachings on grace and sin, with a citation and interpretation of this verse.²⁴⁷ His slight amplification of Paul's words (*etiam de peccato, quod per unum hominem cum morte intravit in mundum atque ita in omnes homines pertransiit*) so as to link unambiguously the transmission of sin "with death" further underscores the interpretive problems posed by Rom 5:12,²⁴⁸ where the presence of "mors" in the phrase "in omnes homines mors pertransiit" excluded "peccatum" as the subject understood by brachylogy. In

²⁴⁴ Evans, *Pelagius: Inquiries and Reappraisals*, 85-89.

²⁴⁵ Chisholm, *Pseudo-Augustinian Hypomnesticon: Vol. 1*, 188-90, 212.

²⁴⁶ *De peccato originali*, I 29,34 (CSEL 42 193,24-194,4).

²⁴⁷ *De gratia Christi*, L 55 (CSEL 42 165,14-166,5). Augustine also draws on the precedent of Ambrose's interpretation.

²⁴⁸ *De gratia Christi*, L 55 (CSEL 42 166,1-3).

Augustine's mind the primary consequence of Adam's transgression was the physical transmission of sin to all humans through the corruption of human nature.²⁴⁹

We have seen that neither Pelagius nor Rufinus of Syria disagreed about Adam's blame for the first transgression. Their dispute was how this sin was transmitted: in their theology it was not transmitted naturally or physically as Augustine maintained; but rather it was transmitted by example. Rufinus, and subsequently Pelagius, rejected the insistence on the transmission of death through sin and the contention that death and mortality followed the initial transgression. As long as humans remained mired in sin, death would reign; but if humans were able to free themselves completely from sin, death would have no power over them. Rufinus of Syria even argued that, although Adam and Eve were created mortal with respect to the flesh, they would not have died, had it not been for sin.²⁵⁰ Rufinus maintained that eating of the tree of knowledge did not make Adam and Eve subject to death for they were already mortal; they would not have died, however, for immortality would have eventually been granted to Adam and Eve through the tree of life.²⁵¹ Thus this transgression estranged them from the promise of immortality. Yet for Rufinus death was far from a punishment; it was a good given by God to free humans from the grip of sin.²⁵² Even though sin perpetuated death, death in effect put an end to sin by removing humans from enslavement to sin. Although Pelagius does not describe death in such positive terms, he does understand Rom 5:12 to describe the perpetuation of death through the perpetuation of sin, whereas the cessation of sin

²⁴⁹ *De gratia Christi*, L 55 (CSEL 42 165,22-26).

²⁵⁰ Rufinus the Syrian, *Liber de fide* 29-30 (Miller ed., 94, 96, 98).

²⁵¹ Rufinus the Syrian, *Liber de fide* 30 (Miller ed., 96, 98).

²⁵² Rufinus the Syrian, *Liber de fide* 32-34 (Miller ed., 100, 102, 104).

avails humans of life.²⁵³ Additionally, Rom 5:12 offered critical support for Pelagius's contention that death, not original sin, was transmitted from Adam to all humans.²⁵⁴

Irrespective of its possible Pelagian origin, the suggestion that "mors" in the phrase "et ita in omnes homines mors pertransiit" was an interpolation is not completely outside the realm of possibility in view of the external evidence. As mentioned above the Greek MSS DFG 1505, the OL versions, and the Vulgate MS F omit θάνατος/"mors." The absence of θάνατος/"mors" from these witnesses, however, does not supply enough evidence to prove this word was a Pelagian gloss. Apart from the omission of θάνατος/"mors" isolated in the textually "Western" MSS and geographically western Latin version, the rest of the NT textual tradition is united in the inclusion of θάνατος. Thus this reading was in circulation long before the Pelagian controversy and is clearly not a Pelagian gloss.

In fact, rather than being a Pelagian gloss, the alignment of the external evidence leans toward the conclusion that Paul himself explicitly referenced θάνατος as the subject of διήλθεν in Rom 5:12. This conclusion is corroborated by the internal evidence. Paul devotes extensive discussion to death's entry into and spread throughout the world and its relationship to sin.²⁵⁵ Whether or not Paul's understanding of Adam's sin prefigured Augustine's or Pelagius's, there is no doubt that Paul saw death's entry into the world and transmission to all humans through sin as a source of alienation from God (cf. Rom 5). Death, however, no longer exercises dominion over humans, according to Paul, now

²⁵³ Pelagius, *In Romanos* 5:12 (Souter ed., 45).

²⁵⁴ Pelagius, *In Romanos* 5:12 (Souter ed., 45).

²⁵⁵ The primary chapters for Paul's discussions of death are found in Rom 5-8 and 1 Cor 15; see also Rom 1:32; 1 Cor 3:22; 11:26; 2 Cor 1:9, 10; 2:16; 3:7; 4:11, 12; 7:10; 11:23.

that Christ has been resurrected (Rom 6:9). Nothing in his statements regarding death necessitates rejecting ὁ θάνατος as the subject of this clause.

In terms of transcriptional probabilities, omission occasioned by the homoeoteleuton of ἀνθρώπους and θάνατος offers one possible explanation for the loss of ὁ θάνατος; yet the mere similarity of one sigma does not seem sufficient to warrant such an explanation. Alternatively, the possible ambiguity of the subject (ἡ ἁμαρτία or ὁ θάνατος) of διῆλθεν may have occasioned a gloss of θάνατος for clarification. Yet even without the preceding θάνατος a gloss is not necessary to conclude that death is the subject of this verb—though its presence without question clarifies any ambiguity. Nor, on the other hand, does the omission of θάνατος, while removing any redundancy from the repetition of ὁ θάνατος, compel reading ἡ ἁμαρτία as the subject—though it does make reading ἡ ἁμαρτία as the subject more possible. So the issue of transcriptional probability leans in favor of the scribal omission of ὁ θάνατος, whether due to accidental or intentional reasons, rather than its insertion.

The combination of internal evidence, transcriptional probabilities, and patristic testimony regarding the importance of Rom 5:12 for anti-Pelagian interpretation suggests that “mors” would more likely have been expunged to counter Pelagian interpretations than added as Pelagian gloss.²⁵⁶ Yet even this is untenable since there is evidence for its omission well before this controversy.²⁵⁷ It is curious, however, that the omission of ὁ θάνατος is virtually isolated in the “Western” Greek-Latin MSS (D F G) and the Latin

²⁵⁶ Questions of motive are, of course, impossible to discern precisely.

²⁵⁷ See e.g. Ambrosiaster, *Commentarius in Epistulas Paulinas* 5,12 (CSEL 81 162-65) and Origen, *Explanationum in Epistulam ad Romanos* 5.12 (Bammel, ed. 358-360). Caroline B. Hammond Bammel notes that, while Rufinus’s translation gives a lemma that includes mors, Origen’s comments indicate that his text of Rom 5:12 lacked this word (*Der Römerbrieftext des Rufin und seine Origenes-Übersetzung* [Freiburg: Herder, 1985], 332-34).

tradition.²⁵⁸ If this reading was useful for anti-Pelagian arguments, the prevalence of this reading in Latin MSS would in many respects not be at all surprising considering the contrast between Pelagius's exculpation by Synods in the east and Augustine's indictment of Pelagian teachings in the west.²⁵⁹

To return to the MS of primary concern for this chapter, Codex Fuldensis also omits "mors" from this phrase. This omission from F is interesting for numerous reasons. In the first place the omission of "mors" represents a departure from the reading transmitted in most other Vulgate MSS. Although F offers a strongly mixed Vulgate text, such a departure in a text central for the Pelagian controversy is nevertheless important in its blatant rejection of the fundamental tendencies of the Vulgate revision; here F aligns with those "Western" witnesses usually shunned and shunted by this revision.²⁶⁰ This alignment with a reading more conducive to Augustinian theology and opposed to Pelagian interpretations is all the more curious in light of the anti-Pelagian rhetoric in the *capitula* to this very passage of Romans. Yet the original omission of θάνατος/"mors" had nothing to do with the Pelagian controversy and, even though Augustine employed it against Pelagian positions, it is impossible to prove definitively that "mors" was omitted from F as a result of anti-Pelagian motives. Even with the excision of this word we are not compelled to read "peccatum" rather than "mors" as the subject of "pertransiit;" nor does an Augustinian interpretation necessarily follow. While the omission of "mors" does run counter to all the tendencies for the revision of the Vulgate as well as the

²⁵⁸ This is, of course, with the exception of MS 1505.

²⁵⁹ See Augustine *De gestis Pelagii* (CSEL 42).

²⁶⁰ See especially Frede, ed., *Epistulae ad Philippenses*, 30-1; and the summary provided by Fischer, "Neue Testament," 67-69.

transmission and correction of Codex Fuldensis, the reading evinces no necessary anti-Pelagian tendency, despite its possible alignment with the anti-Pelagian rhetoric found in the *capitula*. Here the text of Rom 5:12 merely transmits an ambiguous OL reading, surely from its exemplar, whereas the paratextual *capitulum* to this verse prefaces unambiguous anti-Pelagian rhetoric.

Romans 6:16

The nexus of sin and death also provide the primary focus for the next variant under discussion. In Rom 6:16 Paul exhorts his readers to be enslaved to God rather than to sin. In most Greek MSS Paul explicitly contrasts this enslavement to obedience that leads to righteousness with enslavement to sin that leads to death (δοῦλοί ἐστε ᾧ ὑπακούετε, ἤτοι ἁμαρτίας εἰς θάνατον ἢ ὑπακοῆς εἰς δικαιοσύνην); some Greek and versional witnesses (D 1739* r sy^p sa), however, omit εἰς θάνατον. The internal considerations supply no warrant for rejecting εἰς θάνατον as un-Pauline; Paul links the entrance of death into the world through sin quite explicitly as we have already seen in our discussion of Rom 5:12. In addition the conclusion that εἰς θάνατον was secondarily omitted based on internal evidence corroborates the overwhelming external evidence for the inclusion of εἰς θάνατον.

Ambrosiaster's text of Rom 6:16 also lacks a Latin translation of εἰς θάνατον and reveals that this reading without this phrase was current in Latin MSS by the fourth century. From the dates of the external evidence this omission of εἰς θάνατον should be traced back even earlier, since in addition to the Latin it is also widely attested in versions

as diverse as the Sahidic and Syriac Peshitta.²⁶¹ Its presence in the tenth century MS 1739, which according to a colophon was based on a fourth/fifth century copy of Origen's Alexandrian text,²⁶² and the sixth century "Western" MS D indicates that its origin was well before the fourth century. This is confirmed by Origen's citation of Rom 6:16 without this phrase, thus testifying to its existence by the third century at the latest. Such an early date clearly demonstrates that the omission of this prepositional phrase was completely unrelated to the theological issues underlying the Pelagian controversy. But this does not rule out the possibility that its interpretations and possibly Latin translations were informed by this debate.

Our primary interest in this investigation are the Latin readings and the possibility that this verse may offer evidence of translation or editorial practices, particularly affected by theological issues related to sin and death in Pelagian thought from Rufinus the Syrian onward. The numerous readings in Latin MSS and patristic testimony reveal the difficulty of handling this phrase. The Latin translations of εἰς θάνατον are:

- serui estis eius cui oboeditis siue peccati ... siue oboeditionis ad iustitiam
1. in morte MRUZA
 2. in mortem DFHΘL
 3. ad mortem BCKOTVWΦ
 4. omit GAK

Both the Wordsworth-White and Stuttgart editions follow Codices Amiatinus (A), Sangermanensis (G), and K in judging that the Vulgate revision lacked any translation of

²⁶¹For a general discussion of the 5th century date of Peshitta, see Brock, "The Use of the Syriac Fathers,"; for the Sahidic origin around the 4th/5th centuries, see Frederik Wisse, "The Coptic Versions of the New Testament," in *Text of the New Testament* (eds. Ehrman and Holmes).

²⁶² Metzger and Ehrman, *Text* 4th ed., 91.

εἰς θάνατον. Although Amiatinus transmits a relatively pure Vulgate text,²⁶³ it is significant that the reading in it as well as MSS G and K run counter to the general principles for Rufinus's revision outlined by Frede: fidelity to the Greek, especially Alexandrian, MS traditions.

In contrast to the omission, the locution εἰς θάνατον presented some minor problems for rendering in Latin. This prepositional phrase could be understood as expressing temporality or intentionality.²⁶⁴ Presumably the translation “serui...peccati ad mortem” was construed to mean “slaves...of sin to death,” while “serui...peccati in morte” as “slaves...of sin in death.” The differences between these translations are subtle, for both lay the stress on death (whether literal or spiritual) attendant upon the servitude to sin. The Latin reading in F and sundry other witnesses could also render “serui...peccati in mortem” with a degree of intentionality as “slaves...of sin unto death;” or in contrast the translation “serui...peccati in mortem” could convey notions of temporality: “in” plus the accusative “mortem” could be understood as “slaves...of sin until death.”²⁶⁵ This translation is particularly interesting since such a rendering would be in keeping with Rufinus's conviction discussed above in connection to Rom 5:12 that death was a good that freed one from eternal enslavement to sin.²⁶⁶

²⁶³ Although the *Vorlagen* of Amiatinus are of diverse textual character for different parts of the Bible (see Fischer, *Lateinische Bibelhandschriften*, 9-34, esp. 34) for the Pauline epistles they transmit a relatively pure Vulgate text (Frede, ed., *Epistulae ad Philippenses*, 30).

²⁶⁴ *Greek Grammar*, § 1686.

²⁶⁵ Greenough et al., eds., *Allen and Greenough's New Latin Grammar*, §221.12.1.b. For more on the employment of the preposition “in” for the Vulgate translation, see William Edward Plater and H. J. White, *A Grammar of the Vulgate*, 89, 101.

²⁶⁶ Rufinus the Syrian, *Liber de fide* 32-34 (Miller ed., 100, 102, 104).

Although we do find some discussion of Rom 6:16 in patristic sources, the possible reasons for alternative translations of εἰς θάνατον do not enter into their exegetical purview. Quite often this results from the fact that the text cited does not contain any translation of εἰς θάνατον: for example, since Ambrosiaster comments on a lemma lacking εἰς θάνατον, his discussion offers nothing relevant for our discussion.²⁶⁷ Both Pelagius and Julian of Eclanum also cite a text of Rom 6:16 lacking this phrase.²⁶⁸ Although Julian does argue from Rom 6:16 that humans are not enslaved to sin by nature through birth, his and Pelagius's comments mention nothing related to the beneficial aspects of death. Augustine does not even respond directly to Julian's use of Rom 6:16, rather he marshals scripture concerning slavery from 2 Peter 2:19 instead.²⁶⁹ Even the author of the Vulgate revision, Rufinus of Syria, is silent on a possible relationship between his understanding of death and this verse; in fact, he does not even cite Rom 6:16 in his discussion of this topic.

We should mention here a correction in F at Rom 5:21 that also relates to sin and death, even resulting in the same reading "in mortem." Here the original transcription in F "ut sicut regnauit peccatum in morte" was corrected to "ut sicut regnauit peccatum in mortem" by adding a supralinear stroke for the "m" above the "e" in "morte." Both the transcription and the correction attested in F are widely represented in other Latin MSS: ACLMO^cRT read "in morte;" BDGHΘKO*UVWZ, "in mortem." In contrast to the variant at Rom 6:16, the Greek version of Rom 5:21 (ἵνα ὡσπερ ἐβασίλευσεν ἡ ἁμαρτία

²⁶⁷ Ambrosiaster, *Commentarius in Epistulas Paulinas, Ad Romanos*, α β 6,16 (CSEL 81 204,1-12).

²⁶⁸ Augustine, *Contra Iulianum (Opus Imperfectum)* 1.107 (CSEL 85/1 126,15-23); Pelagius, *In Romanos* 6:16 (Souter ed., 52).

²⁶⁹ *Contra Iulianum (Opus Imperfectum)* 1.107 (CSEL 85/1 126,24-32).

ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ) underlying these translations transmits no variation in this case. Although the Greek text is stable, once again the multiple cases (the ablative or the accusative) governed by the preposition “in” has introduced variation in the Latin. The translation “in morte” with the ablative appears to be the most appropriate in terms of fidelity to the Greek meaning and is the reading favored by the major critical editions of the Vulgate.²⁷⁰

Just as in Rom 6:16, the corrected phrase in F at Rom 5:21 (*sicut regnavit peccatum in mortem*) could be construed to support Rufinus’s exaltation of death as freedom from sin: “just as sin reigned until death.” Despite the passing comments in patristic sources that refer to “in mortem” from Rom 5:21 in relation to the Pelagian controversy and original sin, we do not find such interpretations of “in mortem” discussed explicitly.²⁷¹ Although he does not anticipate Rufinus of Syria’s thoughts on the benefits of death, Ambrosiaster does lend credence to the possible temporal interpretation of “in mortem” when he relates that “sin ruled for a time but grace unto eternity.”²⁷² According to Augustine, in Rom 5:21 Paul communicates how through their own volition each individual adds sin to that transmitted originally from Adam;²⁷³ elsewhere Augustine similarly maintains that the abundance of sin entering through the

²⁷⁰ Gryson, ed., *Biblia Sacra*, 1756; and Wordsworth and White, eds., *Epistulae Paulinae*, 88.

²⁷¹ Tertullian reads “*regnauit in morte delictum*” and the remainder of verse 21 as evidence for the future resurrection of the flesh; *De Res.* 47, 12 (*CCSL* 2 986,42-53). One MS (T) of Tertullian’s *De Resurrectione Mortuorum*, however, transmits “*mortem*” rather than “*morte*.”

²⁷² *Superabundat ergo gratia, quia peccatum ad tempus regnavit, gratia autem in aeternum* (Ambrosiaster, *Commentarius in Epistulas Paulinas; Ad Romanos*, α β, 5, 21 [*CSEL* 81 188,16-17]). It should be noted, however, that Ambrosiaster employed the preposition “*ad*” to designate the duration of sin’s rule in contrast to his citation of the second half of Rom 5:21 where grace’s eternal rule is described with “*in*” plus the accusative.

²⁷³ Augustine, *De peccatorum meritis et remissione*, I 15, 20 (*CSEL* 60 20,3-19).

law more clearly demonstrated humanity's need for Christ and his healing grace in order to be freed from the clutches of sin.²⁷⁴

After investigating these two examples of “in mortem” from the Vulgate text of F, we are now in a position to draw some conclusions regarding their possible relationship to issues of Pelagianism. There are some fundamental differences between these two translations “in mortem” transmitted in F: “in mortem” found at 5:21 is a correction and based on no variation in the Greek MSS; multiple variants are evident in the Greek evidence for the reading “in mortem” at Rom 6:16, the original transcription in F. While no connection to issues of Pelagianism was evident in Rom 6:16, Rom 5:21 did occasion comments on original sin by Augustine. The fact that Ambrosiaster apparently understood “in mortem” in a temporal fashion indicates that the Greek prepositional phrase underlying the Latin translations found in Rom 5:21 (i.e. εἰς θάνατον) offers the more likely prospect for understanding “in mortem” temporally. This use of “in” plus the accusative case was quite common in the Latin versions not just to indicate motion towards but many other idiomatic Greek expressions, including intentionality or temporality expressed with the preposition εἰς.²⁷⁵

²⁷⁴ Augustine, *De spiritu et littera*, 6, 9 (CSEL 60 160,21-161,24).

²⁷⁵ Without a doubt some of these go back to OL translations. At any rate, in the Vulgate version of Romans alone there are over 90 examples of “in” plus the accusative. For some of the more noteworthy ones, see e.g. at Rom 1:16, 10:1 εἰς σωτηρίον is translated “in salutem”; at Rom 1:25, 9:5, 11:36, 16:27 εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας is translated “in saecula”; “in similitudinem” renders ἐν ὁμοιώματι at Rom 1:23, 8:3 (the OL cited by Tertullian in his *De Res.* here is “in simulacro”; see Wordsworth and White, eds., *Epistulae Paulinae*, 98-9); at 5:14 ἐπὶ ὁμοιώματι, with the exception of B 1505 and a few other MSS that read ἐν, is also rendered by the words “in similitudinem.” For an overview of the preposition “in” and the various cases it governed, see Greenough et al., eds., *Allen and Greenough's New Latin Grammar*, §221.12.1.b and Plater and White, *A Grammar of the Vulgate*, 89, 101. For the development of Latin under Christian influence more generally, see Blaise, *Handbook of Christian Latin*; and Einar Löfstedt, *Late Latin* (Oslo: Aschehoug, 1959).

Yet irrespective of the possible temporal interpretation of “in mortem,” found in the Latin witnesses for Rom 5:21 or 6:16, neither Rufinus nor any other patristic author overtly relates this verse to the possible benefits of death. Just as neither appear to be interpreted specifically for or against a Pelagian perspective, so too neither can the origins of the variants or translations be linked to Pelagianism. Finally given their non-singular status, neither evince any specific interpretive tendency for the MS F, nor for the Vulgate revision. In sum, our investigations of F’s translation “in mortem” at Rom 5:21 and 6:16 have again revealed no obvious tendentious characteristics.

Romans 5:14

We conclude our investigation of F’s text with Rom 5:14. Paul’s claim that death reigned from Adam to Moses builds on his arguments that sin and death entered into the world as a result of Adam’s transgression. The law given by God through Moses in some measure checked the power of sin, although the fallout from this reception of the law was in Paul’s mind a greater knowledge of, and enslavement to, sin (7:7-20). Our discussion revolves around the question: over whom did sin and specifically death (v. 14) reign during this time from Adam to Moses?

The majority of Greek and versional witnesses read: ἀλλὰ ἐβασίλευσεν ὁ θάνατος ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ μέχρι Μωϋσέως καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς μὴ ἀμαρτήσαντας ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοιώματι τῆς παραβάσεως Ἀδὰμ ὅς ἐστιν τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος. A few MSS (614. 1739*. 2495*), however, omit μὴ from this sentence. The brevity of this omission in terms of the number of letters belies its significance, since its absence drastically changes the meaning of Paul’s thought. Rather than using καὶ adverbially to intensify and describe how death

ruled “even over those who did not sin in the likeness of Adam’s transgression,” the omission of $\mu\eta$ shifts the emphasis of $\kappa\alpha\iota$ in the clause to an exegetical limitation of death’s dominion, “namely over those who sinned in the likeness of Adam’s transgression.”²⁷⁶ The contrast between these two statements is marked: in the former death dominates all irregardless of their actions with respect to Adam’s transgression; whereas in the latter death exercises dominion only over those who sin in the likeness of Adam’s transgression.

The transcriptional probabilities cohere with the conclusion based on the overwhelming external evidence in favor of the originality of the reading $\epsilon\pi\iota$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ $\mu\eta$ $\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\rho\tau\eta\sigma\alpha\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma$. While it is possible to imagine the addition of $\mu\eta$ by a scribe or editor intent on stressing the totality of death’s rule, it is far more likely that $\mu\eta$ would have been excised so as not to show death exacting the wages of sin even over those who had not in fact sinned like Adam. Or as Cranfield suggests, the omission of $\mu\eta$, although “a very understandable improvement,” shows that the whoever corrupted the text did not understand that Paul was describing death’s dominion over all irrespective of how their sin related to Adam’s, rather than maintaining that all sins are similar to Adam’s and Israel’s disobedience of God’s commands before and after the law.²⁷⁷ The law of which all are guilty of transgressing in the interim between Adam and Moses is arguably the natural law to which all are subject (Rom 1).

²⁷⁶ *Greek Grammar*, § 2869a.

²⁷⁷ Cranfield, *Commentary*, 283.

The external evidence for the Latin versions transmits two main readings corresponding to those found in the Greek.²⁷⁸ The scarcity of the reading “qui peccauerunt” extant in only two MSS (d* and m [PS-AU spe], from the fifth/sixth and fifth centuries respectively) reflects the paucity of Greek MSS upon which it was based. In contrast, the translation “qui non peccauerunt” rendering ἐπὶ τοὺς μὴ ἁμαρτήσαντας represents the overwhelmingly predominant reading. Although the MS evidence for “qui peccauerunt” is somewhat late, this omission cannot be associated with the Pelagian controversy where we might expect it since Origen informs us that he knew of both readings.²⁷⁹ In addition, Ambrosiaster’s citation proves that it was also known in the west before the Pelagian controversy. Moreover, despite the fact that Pelagius himself read the Latin version “qui non peccauerunt” based on ἐπὶ τοὺς μὴ ἁμαρτήσαντας, he was not forced to abandon his belief in God’s justice and human accountability. In Pelagius’s interpretation Paul’s statement could be construed in two ways: 1) humans suffered death for transgressions unlike those of Adam (perhaps transgressions of natural law); or 2) death was thought to rule before the gift of the law could allow for the discernment of righteous from unrighteous action.²⁸⁰

While Pelagius gives no indication of any awareness of multiple readings for this verse, other commentators discuss their presence in both Latin and Greek MSS.

Ambrosiaster rejects the reading “qui non peccauerunt” even though he knows that it existed in the Greek MSS; for, Ambrosiaster claims, even Greek MSS have suffered

²⁷⁸ Wordsworth and White also list the translation “in non peccantes” in f which appears to have been conflated with “qui non peccauerunt” thus giving the reading “in non peccantes uel in eos qui non peccauerunt” found in g (*Epistulae Paulinae*, 86).

²⁷⁹ Origen, *Commentary on Romans*, 5,1 549-574 (Hammond Bammel ed., 386-387).

²⁸⁰ Pelagius, *In Romanos* 5:14 (Souter ed., 46).

corruption at the hand of heretics and their ilk when they were not able to interpret them.²⁸¹ For this reason Ambrosiaster links what he considers to be the true reading to the apostolic authority of the Latin fathers Tertullian, Victor, and Cyprian.²⁸² By pointing out that the law was not given until Moses, Ambrosiaster explains Paul's statement that death reigned from Adam to Moses over those who sinned in the likeness of Adam because sin was yet to be manifested through the law.²⁸³ Even earlier Origen, although showing a clear preference for the reading translated as "in quo peccaverunt," interprets the other variant rendered "in quo non peccaverunt" to refer to death's rule even over those, who had not sinned in the likeness of Adam and until Christ's harrowing were held infernally by death rather than sin.²⁸⁴ Far more interesting are Origen's comments that presage the rift between Pelagian and Augustinian interpretations, where Origen contemplates the transmission of sin through those born of Adam as opposed to those who act like him.²⁸⁵

Augustine, as we have seen, casts his interpretive lot with the former, i.e. the procreative transmission of original sin. Of the numerous passages he adduces from Rom 5, verse 14 in particular underscores his belief in the transmission of original sin, in contrast to Pelagian conceptions of transmission through imitation.²⁸⁶ Augustine argues that the reading "qui non peccauerunt" supports his contention that even those, who had

²⁸¹ Ambrosiaster, *Commentarius In Epistulam ad Romanos*, γ 5,14,4e-5 (CSEL 81 177,10-22).

²⁸² Ambrosiaster, *Commentarius In Epistulam ad Romanos*, γ 5,14,5a (CSEL 81 177,23-26).

²⁸³ Ambrosiaster, *Commentarius In Epistulam ad Romanos*, γ 5,14,4b (CSEL 81 175,16-22).

²⁸⁴ Origen, *Commentary on Romans*, 5,1 549-574 (Hammond Bammel ed., 386-387).

²⁸⁵ Origen, *Commentary on Romans*, 5,1 514-530 (Hammond Bammel ed., 384-385).

²⁸⁶ Augustine, *De peccatorum meritis et remissione et remissione et de baptismo paruulorum ad Marcellinum I*, 10,11 (CSEL 60 13,5-8).

not sinned of their own will, were still under the reign of death through the contamination of Adam's original sin.²⁸⁷ According to Augustine, only the grace of Christ can remove the guilt of sin (*reatus peccati*) that allows death to hinder all from attaining eternal life.²⁸⁸ Without a doubt, Augustine's clear preference for the reading "qui non peccauerunt" can be traced to his belief in the natural transmission of original sin. Yet this predilection does not prohibit him from drawing the same conclusions about the reading "qui peccauerunt," which he acknowledges is found in some Latin and Greek copies;²⁸⁹ in Augustine's mind this alternative reading proves that, since all have sinned in the likeness of Adam, "qui peccauerunt" must also refer to the natural transmission of original sin from Adam.²⁹⁰

The lineaments of interpretation discerned by Origen—whether sin was transmitted through procreation or imitation—eventually took root in the Pelagian controversy. But just as Origen came to both of these interpretations from the reading τοὺς ἁμαρτήσαντας (in Latin "qui peccauerunt"), both Pelagius and Augustine cited the other reading (*qui non peccauerunt*) to support their opposing arguments concerning the transmission of sin. The interpretive dexterity displayed in patristic readings of Rom 5:14—especially in relation to the Pelagian controversy—testifies to the superfluity of

²⁸⁷ Augustine, *De peccatorum meritis et remissione* I, 11,13 (CSEL 60 13,22-14,16).

²⁸⁸ Augustine, *De peccatorum meritis et remissione* I, 11,13 (CSEL 60 13,25-14,2).

²⁸⁹ Augustine, *De peccatorum meritis et remissione* I, 11,13 (CSEL 60 14,19-23).

²⁹⁰ Augustine, *De peccatorum meritis et remissione* I, 11,13 (CSEL 60 14,16-25).

corrupting the text, since whatever reading is proffered, it was interpreted in accordance with their hermeneutic.²⁹¹

The interpretive polyvalency of both readings militates against any possible relationship between theological tendencies and the text transmitted in F. In addition, the reading transmitted in Fuldensis (*qui non peccauerunt*) is not singular and for this reason alone prohibits us from making any sweeping claims about this particular MS's tendencies. We have also seen that neither reading has a necessary connection to Pelagian or Augustinian interpretations. Although Augustine prefers "*qui non peccaverunt*," Pelagius also reads and interprets this same reading in support of his position.

In this connection it must be mentioned that the type M *capitula* actually preface the reading "*qui non peccauerunt*" favored by Augustine. While this reading in this *capitulum* may have been amenable to anti-Pelagian interpretations similar to Augustine's, Codex Fuldensis neither prefaces this *capitulum* nor this reading. Yet while this reading may have fostered anti-Pelagian positions, it pales in comparison to that found in the anti-Pelagian series. For, as we have already seen, the readings for Rom 5:14 did not fall along well-defined lines of interpretation, since Pelagius could interpret the reading "*qui non peccauerunt*" in support of the transmission of sin by imitation, and Augustine in support of the physical transmission of original sin. Furthermore, while the prefacing of "*qui non peccauerunt*" could have been somewhat useful for an anti-Pelagian position, the *capitula* in F evince a far more deliberate stance against Pelagianism by prefacing an interpretation rather than merely the bare text without any directive

²⁹¹ Such interpretive dexterity was, of course, not unique to this verse; for an illuminating study of such diverse interpretations of Romans by Origen, Chrysostom, and Augustine, see Peter Gorday, *Principles of Patristic Exegesis: Romans 9-11 in Origen, John Chrysostom, and Augustine* (New York: Edwin Mellen Press, 1983).

commentary. *Capitula* X and XI found in F and discussed above preface an interpretation of the text, rather than the text itself. The contrast between the blatant anti-Pelagianism of these *capitula* in F and the mere prefacing of the hermeneutically ambiguous reading “qui non peccauerunt” in *capitulum* XIII of the M type casts into stark relief the role of the paratext. Although the text transmitted in Codex Fuldensis at 5:14 evinces neither overt hermeneutical tendency nor corruption of the text, the paratexts—i.e. the anti-Pelagian *capitula*—blatantly function to counter any possible Pelagian interpretation in Rom 5, whether or not Victor or his scriptorium deliberately deployed them to this end.

With the return to the paratext we have come full circle. Our investigation of the variation of Rom 5:14 has shown that despite possible resonances with debates surrounding the Pelagian controversy, the Greek and Latin readings for this variation emerged well before the fourth/fifth century. But latent in Paul’s thought were fundamental problems of God’s justice and the transmission of sin intimated by Origen and debated by Pelagius, Augustine, and their respective circles. Whether these fundamental issues were in any way connected to the corruption of Rom 5:14 is impossible to tell—if they were they were ahead of their time. What is clear is that the variants apparently occasioned neither Augustine nor Pelagius to reevaluate their arguments. We also find that the text in F evinces no marked tendency for or against Pelagian thought or interpretation.

Although this theological debate did not affect F’s text, the paratextual *capitula* on the other hand reveal that these interpretive issues had been transferred to the margins. Yet the prefacing of the text “qui non peccaverunt” in the M type *capitula* would have done little to disabuse either interpretation. In contrast, the interpretation prefaced in

Codex Fuldensis's anti-Pelagian *capitula* blatantly supported an Augustinian reading and countered a Pelagian one. While we cannot maintain that this fact contributed to the departure of F from M type *capitula* in favor of the codification of a stronger anti-Pelagian set of *capitula*, the *capitulum* in F functions to do just this in contrast to the text itself or the prefacing of the text in the M type *capitula*. In this respect, it supports my argument that in this MS textual manipulation is eschewed in favor of the paratextual.

As we suspected, these variant readings drawn from those highly contested parts of the Pauline corpus (especially Rom 5-6) show numerous contacts to the Pelagian controversy. Yet the Pelagian controversy left no discernable traces on the text of Codex Fuldensis investigated here. In four of the six readings investigated (i.e. Rom 5:12, 5:14, 5:16, 6:16) the variation is a result of instability in the Greek tradition. Of these readings, Rom 5:12 and 5:14 were fundamental proof-texts for disputes over the transmission of original sin. While the Vulgate revision of these verses could have been influenced by Rufinus of Syria's belief in the fundamental goodness of humanity, the reading of the Latin Vulgate revision is far more likely due to its alignment with the Greek testimony. Although the text found in this MS occasionally aligns with the OL against the Vulgate (1 Cor 15:38 and Rom 5:12) or with a reading favored by Augustine in opposition to Pelagian interpretations (e.g. Rom 5:12 and 5:14), there is no clear discernable stance for or against Pelagianism in Codex Fuldensis. In fact, the patristic authors from both sides of the debate often cited the same text and sometimes multiple variations were employed to argue for the same interpretation. Although corruption of the text was one possible avenue for both "heterodox" and "orthodox" Christians to control interpretation, by the time of the Vulgate revision, the Pelagian controversy, and the later transcription of

Codex Fuldensis, the ossification of the text made such modes a less viable option. Neither “heretical” Pelagians nor “orthodox” followers of Augustine appear to have engaged in overt alterations of the text—though Augustine at least deliberately cited OL texts that supported his position. Debates over the issues of original sin and Pelagianism were not resolved by corruption but interpretation. In order to facilitate the proper exegesis of the text, the editors and compilers of early Christian MSS did, however, turn to a more subtle, but no less hermeneutically significant, method for shaping interpretation: they employed paratexts in the form of prologues, *argumenta*, and *capitula* that not only highlighted theologically salient texts, but their proper interpretation as well.

V. Conclusion

The final MS transcribed under Victor’s watch drew on and incorporated the products of many diverse editorial endeavors. From the textual to paratextual materials of the *Corpus Paulinum* embodied in Codex Fuldensis, we catch a glimpse of how one editor, Victor of Capua, collected, codified, and ultimately subsumed under his own editorial hermeneutic earlier editorial work and their accompanying interpretive paratexts. In terms of the text, Victor drew on the scholastic and ecclesiastical Vulgate revision of the Latin in accordance with the Greek initially commissioned by Damasus and carried out by Rufinus of Syria. Victor was also indebted to those anonymous scribes and translators of the OL versions so castigated by Jerome and Augustine. In terms of paratextual materials, the traditions codified in F are just as varied: the Marcionite *argumenta*, Vulgate *Primum quaeritur* prologue, and *capitula* (M-type, anti-Pelagian, and Euthalian) were drawn from vastly diverse ecclesiastical and scholastic sources.

Although Victor does not indicate whether or not he recognized their disparate hermeneutical stances, his statements on the probable heretical links of the gospel harmony that he redeployed offer strong indications that previous editorial products from heretics' pens or contradictory hermeneutics were harmless, since "the glory of the truth working by the power of Christ, our God, often triumphs through confession or deeds even of faithless men." We see in this MS the imbrication of multiple earlier hermeneutical layers fashioned for their earlier editions, but subsequently juxtaposed with one another. This juxtaposition did not, however, erase these earlier interpretive concerns; in this MS they were instead subordinated to a new ecumenical inclusivity evidenced by Victor's own paratextual hermeneutic in his preface.

Those editorial products associated with Pelagianism (whether for or against) represented the central problem in this chapter's investigation of the ways in which editorial practices shaped interpretation of Paul, whether textually or paratextually. Among the multiple editorial products in the form of paratexts composed in light of Pelagian concerns were the *Primum quaeritur* prologue and the anti-Pelagian *capitula*. Their interpretive stances were especially evident when they were situated both alongside one another and other earlier paratextual materials with their own hermeneutical positions as in the OL *capitula* or Marcionite *argumenta*. Yet in terms of the text, neither the scribe of Codex Fuldensis nor the corrector, Victor himself, engaged in any alteration undertaken in light of the Pelagian concerns in F's paratextual materials; nor did the nascent Pelagianism of the reviser Rufinus appear to influence his Vulgate revision. As stated at the beginning of this chapter, paratexts did not necessarily have to influence the transmission of the text to influence its interpretation, even though in the case of

Marcion's text and paratexts these two modes were completely interrelated. These diverse paratexts collected by Victor into Codex Fuldensis illuminate the hermeneutical issues undergirding their original composition and deployment before being redeployed in a new editorial context and under a new ecumenical inclusivity. While we should not assume that Marcion lacked comparable reverence for the faithful transmission of Paul's text, we see nevertheless a shift between his edition discussed earlier and the products of those later editions that were subsequently incorporated in this MS. Primarily it is a shift from the predilection for corruption (though surely understood by Marcion as "correction") to introduction as a mode of constraining the text. The original composition and deployment of these paratexts served to guide textual interpretation; their increasing deployment also coincidentally accompanied a shift away from corruption of the text for the same end.

Building on earlier editorial foundations created problems for later editors and compilers because the interpretive concerns and objectives tendered by these earlier editions did not necessarily align with subsequent ones—a problem that Marcion, while not creating his edition *ex nihilo*, did not have to face in the second century to the same extent as Victor in the sixth. Such theologically diverse paratexts could pose problems for later editors of early Christian scriptures, who had to contend with multiple earlier editorial voices competing to be heard in what was imagined to be a univocal text. Short of issuing a completely new and independent edition, if a later editor or compiler took over any textual or paratextual components of previous editions, they were bound to take over any implicit or explicit hermeneutic as well. The incorporation of paratexts in Codex Fuldensis (*capitula*, *argumenta*, and the *Primum quaeritur* prologue), loosed from their

original editions and juxtaposed with later editorial products founded on alternative hermeneutical presuppositions, resulted in interpretive tensions despite the fact that Victor had brought them under his hermeneutical aegis. Even though juxtaposed, reframed, and subsumed by alternative interpretive concerns, their original interpretive stances remain and in them we see how such ancillary texts attempted to exert hermeneutical hegemony over scriptural interpretation at the one place where this power was most localized: the physical MS privately used and studied by church leaders and liturgically exhibited before the faithful.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

From the exploration of the many facets of ancient editorial practice in the second chapter to the specific case-studies in the subsequent chapters, in this dissertation I have endeavored to investigate the ways in which editors may have shaped editions of the *Corpus Paulinum*. In doing so, I was not merely concerned with how the text of Paul's letters was edited, but the myriad ways in which the editor attempted to frame the text and its interpretation through paratextual materials such as prologues, *hypotheses*, and *kephalaia*.

I have argued that, while corrupting or "correcting" the text represented the first order of "interpretation," there were limits to such emendations. These strictures on textual manipulation depended on the editor's conception of the author and what constituted an authentic text of his or her thought—in the context of this investigation, authentic Pauline doctrine. There was an implicit relationship between an editor's conception of authenticity and the corruption or "correction" of the text. According to Galen, such emendations of the text had to remain within the boundaries of the *hypothesis* of the text—i.e. a work's foundation or presupposition. But since interpreters may and do often disagree about the meaning of a text, disagreements over "corrections" of the text follow. What Paul teaches about the law in Galatians was interpreted quite differently by Marcionite and proto-orthodox Christians. Paul's views on resurrection

were variously interpreted by his own community established in Corinth and the author of the Pastorals writing in his name. To emend or to correct Paul's words on the basis of Paul's teaching then hinged on how the editor, corrector, or scribe interpreted that teaching within the scope of his writings.

In chapter 3, in particular, we saw how these issues manifested themselves in Marcion's edition of the *Corpus Paulinum* which was marked by textual revision. Although Marcion was castigated for corrupting the text by heresiologists like Tertullian and Epiphanius, Marcion's editorial work was neither arbitrary nor capricious. He saw his work as reestablishing the text of Paul's letters that had been corrupted by false apostles—a point even conceded by Tertullian. Just as important, I argued that Marcion's paratextual materials to his edition of Paul's letters, his *Antitheses* and *argumenta*, played an essential role in articulating Marcion's interpretation of Pauline thought. On the one hand, this prefatory hermeneutic reinforced and to some extent justified Marcion's textual practices: these ancillary materials displayed Marcion's image of Paul and Pauline authenticity, with which Marcion's image of an authentic Pauline text conformed. On the other hand, because Marcion's *Antitheses* and *argumenta* were so successful in transmitting Marcion's interpretation, when Marcion's text exhibited variance that could have been interpreted in accordance with his theology, ancient heresiologists simply assumed that Marcion had so altered the text. Whether Marcion did or did not emend or correct the text of Paul in any given instance, his prefatory materials isagogically laid out his theology and convinced his readers that he did—thus illustrating the interpretive role of Marcion's ancillary materials.

The issue of authenticity applied not only to the words of the text, but also represented an important criterion for the rejection of some works as spurious. Assignations of authenticity or, conversely, spuriousness will have a tremendous effect not only on the reconstruction of the author's image but his/her corpus as well: since the simple omission or inclusion of works reflect an implicit judgment regarding their authenticity, such actions will also affect the reconstruction of an author's thought. The reconstruction of an author's thought will in turn affect the judgment of what works are authentic and for this reason ought to be included or omitted. Furthermore, the issue of authenticity also impinged on the arrangement of texts in a corpus, where works of questionable authenticity were often segregated from the rest of the corpus at the end.

In addition to implicitly rendering epistles inauthentic by omission, the order of Paul's letters in an edition may also submit a disputed letter as authentic or convey pedagogical concerns. The former was especially evident in the case of Hebrews, where its marginal position in the western church required extensive apology in the *Primum quaeritur* prologue to the Vulgate revision. This prologue also relates that Romans was placed first because it allowed the reader to be led by the example of the Romans's ignorance to a more perfect faith in the following letters. Such isagogic concerns also explicitly undergirded Euthalius's arrangement of Paul's letters, which, along with the network of text and paratexts, were designed to inculcate and foster a new Christian polity. Marcion's ordering pattern also related to his overarching editorial goals: by opening his edition with Galatians Marcion highlighted that epistle which most explicitly reinforced one of his fundamental tenets articulated in his *Antitheses* and *argumenta*—i.e. Paul's separation of the gospel from the law.

Neither issuing judgments (whether implicit or explicit) on the authenticity of individual words or entire letters nor rearranging these letters exhausted the means by which the editor could transmit interpretive concerns. The deployment of paratextual materials (e.g. prologues, *argumenta*, and *kephalaia*) also offered an avenue for editors to communicate hermeneutic issues. Marcion's *Antitheses* and *argumenta* to Paul's letters represent our earliest, though somewhat rudimentary, examples of such deployment. The provisional nature of Marcion's paratexts notwithstanding, the *Antitheses* and *argumenta* managed to convey isagogically the fundamental principles of Marcionite theology so as to foster preliminary catechesis and fortify advanced instruction. Utilizing paratextual elements in the service of indoctrination attained full realization in Euthalius's *Corpus Paulinum*. In this edition, numerous paratexts (the *kephalaia*, divine testimonies, and prologue containing Paul's *bios* and epitomes of his letters) operated in tandem with a text arranged colometrically for ease of reading to instruct neophytes and initiates on proper Christian behavior and to provide exemplars for mimesis. These paratextual goals were also reinforced by the arrangement of the letters themselves. Although the paratextual transmission of interpretive issues was no less evident in Codex Fuldensis, this MS did not transmit a consistent hermeneutical viewpoint; rather, it served as a repository of diverse and conflicting paratextual interpretations situated alongside one another under the umbrella of Victor of Capua's ecumenical inclusivity: e.g. the Marcionite *argumenta*, various types of *capitula* (the OL M-type, Euthalian, and anti-Pelagian), and the *Primum quaeritur* prologue to the Vulgate revision (which prefaced perspectives in keeping with the nascent Pelagianism of its author, Rufinus of Syria). In this MS, where we saw no evidence of deliberate textual corruption for theological

reasons, the juxtaposition of multiple, often dissonant, marginal voices illuminates the developing role of alternative paratextual manipulations for the same theological ends.

The role of these paratextual materials in editions of the *Corpus Paulinum* investigated here were no less instrumental in shaping interpretations of the text than altering the wording of the text itself. Altering the text, prefacing the text, and rearranging the corpus merely represented a few of the many ways that the editor, collector, or scribe was able to transmit interpretive perspectives. We have seen that in the later MSS investigated in this study—i.e. Codex Coislinianus and Codex Fuldensis—there is a marked move away from textual manipulation as a means to control the text; conversely, paratextual manipulation increasingly gains prominence. This finding accords well with the argument that the greatest instability in a textual tradition occurs within the first century of transmission.¹ The ossification of the text and decreasing freedom to manipulate it by the fourth century and afterwards necessitated different modes of constraining interpretation, when simply rewriting or “correcting” the text was no longer a viable option—though the conservative nature of the textual tradition has fortunately preserved these early attempts at asserting interpretive control over the text down through the centuries. Hence, the practice of utilizing paratexts to mediate Paul’s text and Pauline traditions first inaugurated by Marcion was brought to fruition in later MSS, of which Codex Coislinianus and Codex Fuldensis stand as an exemplary specimens.

The discipline of NT textual criticism has traditionally focused on the text alone as the locus of textual manipulation. While such a focus is not misplaced, this reverence

¹ Helmut Koester, "The Text of the Synoptic Gospels in the Second Century," in *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century: Origins, Recensions, Text, and Transmission* (ed. William L. Petersen; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989), 19. Zuntz’s assessment of the Byzantine method of “selection rather than conjecture” also corresponds well with this move away from textual manipulation (*Text*, 55).

for the text overlooks those spaces before, after, and around the text of ancient MSS. In this study I have argued that alongside such textual manipulation was a paratextual manipulation that with equal effectiveness editors employed to constrain the text by utilizing prologues, *argumenta*, *kephalaia/capitula*, and testimonies. In these paratexts we find all manner of interpretations and concerns (justifications for arrangements of letters, questions regarding authenticity, disputes over theology, and exhortation for Christian living) as the margins of MSS were being filled with diverse paratexts of equally diverse voices claiming to speak for a univocal text. Whether by textual or paratextual manipulation, the editions of Paul's letters investigated here demonstrate the profound effect of the editor, corrector, or scribe could have on the Pauline traditions and, as a result, their interpretations. These editions not only preceded and were necessary for interpretation, they themselves represented interpretations of Paul and authentic Pauline doctrine—interpretations inscribed on those contested sites of authority, the physical MSS of the *Corpus Paulinum*.

Appendix I:

Comparison of *Capitula* in F with Euthalian *Kephalaiia*¹

<i>Capitula</i> #	Summary in Vulgate MSS F & R	Euthalian <i>Kephalaiia</i>
I	Narratio deitatis christi in gloria patris et potestatis omnium cum purificatione eorum qui super terra sunt postquam ascendit in caelestam gloriam quoniam gloria Christi non est angelica sed deitatis.	Θεολόγια Χριστοῦ ἐν δόξῃ Πατρὸς καὶ ἐξουσία τῶν πάντων, μετὰ τῆς καθάρσεως τῶν ἐπὶ νῆς, ἀφ' ἧς ἀνέβη εἰς τὴν ἐπουράνιον δόξαν. Ὅτι οὐ λειτουργικὴ ἡ δόξα Χριστοῦ, ἀλλὰ θεϊκὴ.
II	Et opifex proper quod non in praesenti saeculo in quo sunt ministri sed futura dispensatione.	καὶ ποιητικὴ· διὸ οὐκ ἐπὶ τοῦ παρόντος αἰῶνος ἐν ᾧ οἱ λειτουργοὶ, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τῆς μελλούσης οἰκουμένης.
III	Quoniam incorporatus est secundum adiunctionem quae ad nos est ad salutem hominum propter quod ei adiungimur.	Ὅτι ἐσαρκώθη κατὰ διάθεσιν, καὶ συμπάθειαν, καὶ οἰκειότητα, τὴν πρὸς ἡμᾶς, ἐπὶ σωτηρία ἀνθρώπων, τῇ ἐκ θανάτου, ἐπὶ τῆς πρὸς αὐτὸν οἰκειώσεως.
IIII	Quoniam credendum est christo sicut et mosi crediderunt. Sublimiorem tamen quasi deum et hominem sciendum esse et timendam antiquorum defluxinem.	Ὅτι οὐ πιστευτέον Χριστῷ, ὡς Μωυσῆ ἐπίστευσαν· καθ' ὑπεροχὴν δὲ, τὴν θεοῦ πρὸς ἄνθρωπον. Ἐν ᾧ ὅτι φοβητέον τῶν πάλαι τὴν ἔκπτωσιν.
V	Exhortatio destinationis ad manifestissimam requiem.	Προτροπὴ σπουδάσαι εἰς τὴν προδηλουμένην κατάπαυσιν.
VI	De terribili iudicio ac uerbo futuro per omnibus et de suavitate gratiae sacerdotialis ab eo qui similiter pro nobis passus est ut homo.	Τὸ φοβερὸν τῆς κρίσεως παρὰ τῷ Λογῷ, τῷ διὰ πάντων, καὶ τὸ χρηστὸν τῆς χάριτος τῆς ἱερατικῆς παρὰ τῷ ὁμοιοπαθήσαντι ἡμῖν ἀνθρωπίνως.
VII	Obiurgatio quasi adhuc egeant introductionem et exhortatio ad perfectionem et obsecratio in laudem.	Ἐπιτίμησις ὡς ἔτι δεομένοις εἰσαγωγῆς. Ἐν ᾧ προτροπὴ εἰς ἐπίδοσιν, ὡς οὐκ οὔσης ἀρχῆς δευτέρας. παράκλησις σὺν ἐπαίνῳ.
VIII	Quia firma est dei repromissio et hoc cum dei sacramento.	Ὅτι βεβαία ἡ ἐπαγγελία τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ταῦτα σὺν ὄρκῳ.
VIII	De melchisedech qui forma est christi secundum nomen et	Περὶ Μελχισεδέκ τοῦ εἰς Χριστὸν τύπου κατὰ τὸ ὄνομα,

¹ The texts for the following table are compiled from Wordsworth and White, eds., *Epistulae Paulinae*, 683, 685, 687 and Euthalius, *Opera*, 777, 780 (Migne ed., PG 85).

X

ciuitatem et uitam et
sacerdotium et quia
praeconstratus est abrahae.
Quoniam cessauit sacerdotium
aaron quod super terram et stabit
uerbum caeleste quod est christi
ex alio genere non secundum
carnem nec secundum legem
carnalem. (XI R) Eminentia
secundi testamenti ad prioris in
propitiationem et
sanctificationem. (XII R) De
sanguine christi in quo nouum
est testamentum quia in ipso est
certissima purificatio in
perpetuo. Non ea quae in
sanguine animalium quae in
terra offerunt.

καὶ τὴν πόλιν, καὶ τὴν ζωὴν,
καὶ τὴν ἱεροσύνην. Ἐν ᾧ ὅτι καὶ
τοῦ Ἀβραάμ προετιμήθη.
Ὅτι παύεται ἡ τοῦ Ἀαρὼν
ἱεροσύνη, ἢ ἐπὶ γῆς οὐσα·
ἴσταται δὲ ἡ οὐράνιος ἢ
Χριστοῦ, ἐξ ἑτέρου γένους, οὐ
κατὰ σάρκα, οὐδὲ διὰ νόμου
σαρκίνου. Ὑπεροχὴ τῆς δευτέρας
διαθήκης παρὰ τὴν προτέραν ἐν
ἰλασμῷ. Περὶ τοῦ αἵματος
Χριστοῦ, ἐν ᾧ ἡ νέα διαθήκη,
ὅτι τοῦτο ἀληθὲς καθάρισον εἰς
αἰὲν, οὐ τὰ ἐν αἵμασι ζώων τοῖς
πολλάκις προσαγομένοις.

Appendix II:

Comparison of Summary and Placement of *Capitula* in F with *Capitula* Found in Latin
MSS AKMOVZ

<i>Capitula</i> #	Passage summarized in <i>capitula</i> in MS F	Location of <i>capitula</i> in MS F	Passage in MSS of type M <i>capitula</i>
I	<i>Romans 1:1</i>	—	Romans 1:1
II	<i>Romans 1:8</i>	Romans 1:8	Romans 1:8
III	<i>Romans 1:18</i>	Romans 1:13	Romans 1:13
IIII	<i>Romans 2:1</i>	Romans 1:18	Romans 1:18
V	<i>Romans 2:14</i>	Romans 1:26	Romans 1:26
VI	<i>Romans 2:28</i>	Romans 2:1	Romans 2:1
VII	<i>Romans 3:21</i>	Romans 3:1	Romans 3:1
VIII	<i>Romans 4:1</i>	Romans 3:5	Romans 3:5
VIIII	<i>Romans 5:1</i>	Romans 3:9	Romans 3:9
X	<i>Romans 5:12</i>	Romans 3:27	Romans 3:27
XI	<i>Romans 6:3</i>	Romans 5:1	Romans 5:1
XII	<i>Romans 6:23</i>	Romans 5:6	Romans 5:6
XIII	<i>Romans 7:7</i>	Romans 5:14	Romans 5:14
XIIII	<i>Romans 8:6</i>	Romans 5:15	Romans 5:17
XV	<i>Romans 8:18</i>	Romans 6:3	Romans 6:3
XVI	<i>Romans 8:26</i>	Romans 6:12	Romans 6:12
XVII	<i>Romans 9:1</i>	Romans 7:1	Romans 7:1
XVIII	<i>Romans 10:5</i>	Romans 7:14	Romans 7:14
XVIIII	<i>Romans 11:13</i>	Romans 8:6	Romans 8:6
XX	<i>Romans 11:25</i>	Romans 8:15	Romans 8:15
XXI	<i>Romans 12:1</i>	Romans 8:24	Romans 8:24
XXII	<i>Romans 13:1</i>	Romans 8:30	Romans 8:30
XXIII	<i>Romans 14:1</i>	Romans 8:33	Romans 8:33
XXIIII	Romans 9:1	Romans 9:1	Romans 9:1
XXV	Romans 9:6	Romans 9:6	Romans 9:6
XXVI	Romans 9:14	Romans 9:14	Romans 9:14
XXVII	Romans 9:18	Romans 9:18	Romans 9:18
XXVIII	Romans 9:22	Romans 9:22	Romans 9:22
XXVIIII	Romans 9:26	Romans 9:27	Romans 9:26
XXX	Romans 9:30	Romans 9:30	Romans 9:30
XXXI	Romans 10:1	Romans 10:1	Romans 10:1
XXXII	Romans 10:5	Romans 10:5	Romans 10:5
XXXIII	Romans 10:14	Romans 10:14	Romans 10:14
XXXIIII	Romans 11:1	Romans 11:1	Romans 11:1
XXXV	Romans 11:7	Romans 11:7	Romans 11:7
XXXVI	Romans 11:11	Romans 11:11	Romans 11:11
XXXVII	Romans 11:13	Romans 11:13	Romans 11:13
XXXVIII	Romans 11:25	Romans 11:25	Romans 11:25
XXXVIIII	Romans 11:33	Romans 11:33	Romans 11:33

XL	Romans 12:1	Romans 12:1	Romans 12:1
XLI	Romans 12:3	Romans 12:3	Romans 12:3
XLII	Romans 12:4	Romans 12:4	Romans 12:4
XLIII	Romans 13:1	Romans 13:1	Romans 13:1
XLIII	Romans 13:7	Romans 13:7	Romans 13:7
XLV	Romans 13:11	Romans 13:11	Romans 13:11
XLVI	Romans 13:14b	Romans 13:14b	Romans 13:14b
XLVII	Romans 14:7	Romans 14:7	Romans 14:7
XLVIII	Romans 14:9	Romans 14:9	Romans 14:9
XLVIII	Romans 14:14	Romans 14:14	Romans 14:14
L	Romans 14:15	Romans 14:15	Romans 14:14ff
LI	Romans 15:4	Romans 15:4	Romans 15:4

REFERENCES

Primary Sources

Adler, Ada, ed. *Svidae Lexicon*. Lipsiae: Teubner, 1928.

Adamantius. *ΠΕΡΙ ΤΗΣ ΕΙΣ ΘΕΟΝ ΟΡΘΗΣ ΠΙΣΤΕΩΣ*. *De recta in Deum fide*. (1) Ed. W. H. van de Sande Bakhuyzen. *GCS* 4, 1901. (2) Ed. Vinzenz Buchheit. *Tyrannii Rufini Librorum Adamantii Origenis Adversus Haereticos Interpretatio: Eingeleitet, herausgegeben und kritisch kommentiert*. *Studia et Testimonia Antiqua* 1. Munchen: William Fink Verlag, 1966.

Ambrose. *De spiritu sancto*. Ed. O. Faller. *CSEL* 79, 1964.

Ambrosiaster. *Commentarius in epistulas Paulinas*. Ed. H. J. Vogels. *CSEL* 81/1-3, 1966, 1968, 1969.

Anaximenes. *Ars rhetorica quae vulgo fertur Aristotelis ad Alexandrum*. Edited by Manfred Fuhrmann. Lipsiae: Teubner, 1966.

Augustine. *Contra duas epistulas Pelagianorum*. Eds. C. F. Vrba and J. Zycha. *CSEL* 60: 421-570, 1913.

Augustine. *Contra secundam Iuliani responsionem (Opus Imperfectum)*. Ed. Zelzer. *CSEL* 85/1 85/2, 1974, 2004.

Augustine. *De doctrina Christiana*. Eds. K.-D. Daur and J. Martin. *CCSL* 32, 1962.

Augustine. *De gestis Pelagii*. Eds. C. F. Vrba and J. Zycha. *CSEL* 42: 49-122, 1902.

Augustine. *De gratia Christi et de peccato originali*. Eds. C. F. Vrba and J. Zycha. *CSEL* 42: 123-206, 1902.

Augustine. *De natura et gratia*. Eds. C. F. Vrba and J. Zycha. *CSEL* 60: 231-299, 1913.

Augustine. *De natura et originae animae*. Eds. C. F. Vrba and J. Zycha. *CSEL* 60: 301-419, 1913.

Augustine. *De nuptiis et concupiscentia*. Eds. C. F. Vrba and J. Zycha. *CSEL* 42: 207-319, 1902.

Augustine. *De peccatorum meritis et remissione et de baptismo paruulorum ad Marcellinum*. Eds. C. F. Vrba and J. Zycha. *CSEL* 60: 3-151, 1913.

Augustine. *De spiritu et littera*. Eds. C. F. Vrba and J. Zycha. *CSEL* 60:153-229, 1913.

- Augustine. *De Trinitate*. Eds. W. J. Mountain and F. Glorie. *CCSL* 50 50A, 1968.
- Augustine. *Expositio ad Galatas*. Ed. I. Divjak. *CSEL* 84, 1971.
- Basil of Caesarea. *De Spiritu*. Eds. Monachorum ordinis sancti Benedicti e Congregatione Sancti Mauri. Bibliotheca patrum graecorum dogmatica 3/1, 1839.
- Basil of Caesarea. *Basili Regula a Rufino latine versa*. Ed. K. Zelzer. *CSEL* 86, 1986.
- Bruckner, Albert. *Quellen zur Geschichte des Pelagianischen Streites*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1906.
- Busse, A., ed. *Porphyrii Isagoge*. Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca IV 1. Berlin: G. Reimeri, 1882.
- Cassiodorus. *Institutiones*. Ed. R. A. B. Mynors. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1937.
- Cicero, Marcus Tullius. *De oratore*. Eds. tr. E. W. Sutton and H. Rackham. LCL Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1942.
- Clement of Alexandria. *Excerpta ex Theodoto*. Ed. François Sagnard. SC 23, 1948.
- Clement of Alexandria. *Stromata I-VI*, 4th ed. Eds. O. Stählin, L. Früchtel, and U. Treu. GCS 52, 1985.
- Codex Theodosianus*. Ed. T. Mommsen. *Theodosiani libri xvi cum constituionibus sirmondianis*. Berlin: Weidmann, 1905. English translation: *The Theodosian Code and Novels, and the Sirmondian Constitutions*. Tr. Clyde Pharr. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1952.
- Cramer, J. A., ed. *Catena in Sancti Pauli Epistolas ad Corinthios ad Fidem codd. mss.* Vol. V of *Catena Graecorum Patrum in Novum Testamentum*. Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1967.
- Diels, Hermann, Wilhelm Schubart, and Johan Ludvig Heiberg. *Anonymer kommentar zu Platons Theaetet*. Berlin: Weidmann, 1905.
- Dindorfius, Gulielmus ed., *Scholia in Homeri Odysseam ex Codicibus Aucta et Emendata: Tomus I*. Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1962.
- Diogenes Laertius. *Vitae philosophorum*. Translated by Robert Drew Hicks. 2 vols. LCL. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1925.
- De Lacy, Phillip ed. *Galen: On the doctrines of Hippocrates and Plato, I-II: Edition, Translation, III: Commentary and Indices, CMG V 4,1,2*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1978-84.

- Dörrie, Heinrich and Matthias Baltes. *Der hellenistische Rahmen des kaiserzeitlichen Platonismus: Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar*. Stuttgart Bad-Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog, 1990.
- Ephraem. *Hymnen contra haereses*. Ed. tr. Edmund Beck. *CSCO 169 170 CSCO Scripti Syriaci 76 77*. Louvain: L. Durbecq, 1957.
- Epiphanius. *Panarion*. *GCS 25 31² 37²*, 1915, 1980, 1985.
- Erbse, Hartmut ed. *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem (Scholia Vetera): Volumen I-VII*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1969-1988.
- Euripides. *Hippolytos: Edited with Introduction and Commentary by W. S. Barrett*. Oxford,: Clarendon Press, 1964.
- Eusebius. *Ecclesiastical History*. Translated by Kirsopp Lake. Loeb Classical Library 153 265. Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1926 (1992 reprint).
- Eusebius. *Praeparatio Evangelica*. Eds. K. Mras and E. des Places. *GCS 43/1-2*, 1982, 1983.
- Euthalius. *Opera*. *PG 85: 627-790*, 1864.
- Fortenbaugh, William W. and Eckart Schütrumpf. *Demetrius of Phalerum: Text, Translation and Discussion*. Vol. 9, Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities. New Brunswick N.J.: Transaction Publishers, 2000.
- Frede, Hermann Josef, ed. *Epistula ad Ephesios*. *VL 24/1*. Freiburg: Herder, 1962-64.
- Frede, Hermann Josef, ed. *Epistulae ad Philippenses et ad Colossenses*. *VL 24/2* Freiburg: Herder, 1966-1971.
- Frede, Hermann Josef, ed. *Epistulae ad Thessalonicenses, Timotheum, Titum, Philemonem, Hebraeos*. *VL 25*. Freiburg: Herder, 1975-1991.
- Frede, Hermann Josef, ed. *Epistulae ad Thessalonicenses, Timotheum, Titum, Philemonem, Hebraeos; Pars II*. *VL 25*. Freiburg: Herder, 1975-1991.
- Fröhlich, Uwe, ed. *Epistula ad Corinthios I*. *VL 22*. Freiburg: Herder, 1995.
- Galen. *Selected Works*. Translated by P. N. Singer. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Gregory of Nyssa, *Contra Eunomium*. Ed. W. Jaeger. *Gregorii Nysseni Opera*, 1960.

- Gryson, Roger, ed. *Apocalypsis Johannis*. Freiburg: Herder, 2000.
- Gryson, Roger, ed. *Biblia Sacra: iuxta Vulgatam versionem, 4 ed.* Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994.
- Hippolytus. *Refutatio omnium haeresium*. Ed. M. Marcovich. PTS 25, 1986.
- Irenaeus. *Adversus haereses*. Eds. A. Rousseau et L. Doutreleau. SC 100/1-2 152 153 210 211 263 264 293 294, 1969-1982.
- Jan, Karl von, ed. *Musici Scriptores Graeci*. Lipsiae: Teubner, 1895 (1995 repr.).
- Jerome. *Commentarii in epistulas Pauli*. PL 26, 1845.
- Jerome. *De viris inlustribus*. Ed. E. C. Richardson. TU 14, 1, 1896.
- Jerome. *Epistulae*. Ed. I. Hilberg and M. Kamptner. CSEL 54 55 56/1, 1910/1918, 1996.
- Justin Martyr. *Apologiae pro Christianis*. Ed. M. Marcovich. PTS 38, 1994.
- Keaney, John J. and Robert Lamberton, eds. *[Plutarch]: Essay on the Life and Poetry of Homer*. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1996.
- Lake, Kirsopp. *Facsimiles of the Athos Fragments of Codex H of the Pauline Epistles*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905.
- Lietzmann, Hans and Lodovico Antonio Muratori. *Das Muratorische fragment und die Monarchianischen prologe zu den Evangelien*, Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen ; 1. Bonn: A. Marcus und E. Weber, 1902.
- Lowe, Elias Avery, ed. *Codices Latini Antiquiores; A Palaeographical Guide to Latin Manuscripts Prior to the Ninth Century*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1934-1966.
- Ludwich, Arthur I. *Aristarchs homerische textkritik nach den fragmenten des Didymos dargestellt und beurtheilt:Erster Theil*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1884.
- Ludwich, Arthur I. *Aristarchs homerische textkritik nach den fragmenten des Didymos dargestellt und beurtheilt:Zweiter Theil*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1884.
- Marquardt, Johann, Iwan von Müller, and Georg Helmreich, eds. *Claudii Galeni Pergameni Scripta Minora v. II*. Lipsiae: B.G. Teubneri, 1884.
- Metzger, Marcel ed. *Les constitutions apostoliques*. SC 320 329 336, 1985.

- Origen. *Commentarius in Canticum*. Eds. Luc Brésard, Henri Crouzel, Marcel Borret. SC 375 376, 1903.
- Origen. *Commentarius in Epistolam ad Romanos*. (1) PG 14:833-1292. (2) Ed. Caroline Hammond Bammel. *Der Römerbriefkommentar des Origenes; kritische Ausgabe der Übersetzung Rufins, Buch 1-3*. Vetus Latina: Aus der Geschichte der Lateinische Bible 16. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1990.
- Origen. *Commentarii in evangelium Johannem*. Eds. E. Preuschen and C. Blanc SC 120 157 222 290 385, 1966-1992.
- Origen. *Commentarius in Matthaeum I*. Ed. E. Klostermann. GCS 40, 1935.
- Origen. *De principiis*. Ed. P. Koetschau GCS 22, 1913.
- Origen. *Homiliae in Genesim*. Ed. tr. H. de Lubac and L. Doutreleau. SC 7, 1976.
- Marius Mercator. *Commonitorium*. Ed. Eduard Schwartz. ACO I, 5:5-23, 1924-1926.
- Pelagius. *Ad Demetriadem*. PL 30: 15-45.
- Pelagius. *Expositiones XIII Epistularum Pauli*. Ed. Alexander Souter. (1) *Pelagius's Expositions of Thirteen Epistles of St. Paul*. Texts and Studies IX. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1926.
- Plotinus. *Opera*. (1) Eds. Henry, Paul and Hans-Rudolf Schwyzer. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964. (2) *Plotinus*. Translated by A. H. Armstrong. Loeb Classical Library. 440-445, 468. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1966-1988
- Ptolemy. *Epistula ad Floram*. Ed. G. Quispel. SC 24, 1949.
- Ranke, Ernestus, ed. *Codex Fuldensis: Novum Testamentum Latine interprete Hieronymo ex manuscripto Victoris Capuani*. Marburg: Sumtibus N. G. Elwert, 1868.
- Reis, Burkhard. *Der Platoniker Albinos und sein sogenannter Prologos: Prolegomena, Überlieferungsgeschichte, kritische Edition und Übersetzung, Serta Graeca; 7*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1999.
- Robinson, James R. *The Coptic Gnostic Library: A Complete Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2000.
- Rose, Valentin, ed. *Anecdota Graeca et Graecolatina: Mitteilungen aus Handschriften zur Geschichte der griechischen Wissenschaft*. 2 vols. Berlin: F. Duemmler, 1864-1870.

- Rosenstiehl, Jean-Marc. *L'apocalypse d'elie: introduction, traduction et notes*. Paris: Geunther, 1972.
- Rufinus the Syrian. *Liber de Fide*. Ed. tr. Mary William Miller. Catholic University of America Patristic Studies 96. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1964.
- Sanders, Henry A. *A Third-century Papyrus Codex of the Epistles of Paul*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1935.
- Schäefers, Joseph. *Eine altsyrische antimarkionitische Erklärung von Parabeln des Herrn und zwei andere altsyrische Abhandlungen zu Texten des Evangeliums. Mit Beiträgen zu Tatians Diatessaron und Markions Neuem Testament*. Münster: Aschendorffschen Buchhandlung, 1917.
- Schwartz, Eduard, ed. *Scholia in Euripidem: Volumen I*. Berolini: G. Reimer, 1887.
- Schwartz, Eduard, ed. *Scholia in Euripidem: Volumen II*. Berolini: G. Reimer, 1887.
- Slater, William J., ed. *Aristophanis Byzantii Fragmenta*. Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker; Bd. 6. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1986.
- Tertullian. *Ad Marcionem*. (1) Ed. A. Kroymann. *CCSL* 1, 1954. (2) Ed. tr. Ernest Evans. *Tertullian: Adversus Marcionem*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.
- Tertullian. *Ad Valentinianos*. Ed. A. Kroymann. *CCSL* 2, 1954.
- Tertullian. *De carne Christi*. Ed. A. Kroymann. *CCSL* 2, 1954.
- Tertullian. *De praescriptione haereticorum*. Ed. R. F. Refoule. *CCSL* 1, 1954.
- Tertullian. *De resurrectione mortuorum*. Ed. J. G. Ph. Borleffs. *CCSL* 2, 1954.
- Theile, Walter, ed. *Epistulae Catholicae*. VL 26/1. Freiburg: Herder, 1956-1969.
- Tischendorf, Constantin von. *Codex Claromontanus*. Lipsiae: F. A. Brockhaus, 1852.
- Tischendorf, Constantin von. *Novum Testamentum Sinaiticum*. Lipsiae: F. A. Brockhaus, 1863.
- Todd, Robert B., ed. *Cleomedis Caelestia (Μετέωρα)*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1990.
- Tregelles, Samuel Prideaux. *Canon Muratorianus; The Earliest Catalogue of the Books of the New Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1867.

Uhlig, Gustav, Adalbert Merx, and Alfred Hilgard, eds. *Dionysii Thracis Ars grammatica qualem exemplaria*. Lipsiae: B. G. Teubneri, 1883.

Völker, Walther. *Quellen zur Geschichte der christlichen Gnosis*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1932.

Wenkebach, Ernst August, ed. *Galenii In Hippocratis Epidemiarum librum iii, CMG V 10,2,1* Leipzig: Teubner, 1934.

Wenkebach, Ernst August and Franz Pfaff, eds. *Galenii in Hippocratis Epidemiarum Librum VI Commentaria I-VIII, CMG V 10,2,2*. Berlin: Teubner, 1956.

Wordsworth, John and H. J. White, eds. *Nouum Testamentum Latine, Editio Maior: Pars Secunda—Epistulae Paulinae*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1913-1941.

Zacagni, Lorenzo Alessandro. *Collectanea monumentorum veterum Ecclesiae graecae ac latinae quae hactenus in Vaticana bibliotheca delituerunt. Tomus primus*. Roma: Sacrae congregationis de propaganda fide, 1698.

Secondary Sources

Achelis, Th. O. H. "De Aristophanis Byzantii argumentis fabularum I." *Philologus* 72 (1913): 414-41.

Achelis, Th. O. H. "De Aristophanis Byzantii argumentis fabularum II." *Philologus* 72 (1913): 518-45.

Achelis, Th. O. H. "De Aristophanis Byzantii argumentis fabularum III." *Philologus* 73 (1913): 122-53.

Adorno, Francesco and et al, eds. *Corpus dei papiri filosofici greci e latini (CPF): testi e lessico nei papiri di cultura greci e latina*. Firenze: L. S. Olschki, 1989.

Aland, Kurt. "Die Entstehung des Corpus Paulinum." Pages 302-50 in *Neutestamentliche Entwürfe*. Edited by Kurt Aland. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1979.

Aland, Kurt and Barbara. *The Text of the New Testament*. Translated by Erroll F. Rhodes. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.

Aland, Kurt and et al, eds. *Text und Textwert der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments: II. Die Paulinischen Briefe*. 4 vols. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1991.

Allgeier, A. "Haec vetus et vulgata editio. Neue wort und begriffsgeschichtliche Beiträge auf dem Tridentum." *Biblica* 29 (1948): 353-90.

- Allen, T. W. "The Origin of the Greek Minuscule Hand." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 40 (1920): 1-12.
- Allen, Thomas W. *Homer: The Origins and the Transmission*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924.
- Alline, Henri. *Histoire du texte de Platon*. Paris: E. Champoin, 1915.
- Allison, Dale C., Jr. "Peter and Cephas: One and the Same." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 111 (1992): 489-95.
- Altaner, Berthold. "Der Liber de fide: ein Werk des Pelagianers Rufinus des 'Syrers'." *Theologische Quartalschrift* 130 (1950): 432-49.
- Anderson, Amy S. *The Textual Tradition of the Gospels: Family 1 in Matthew*. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Anderson Jr., R. Dean. *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul*. Kampen: Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1996.
- Apthorp, M. J. *The Manuscript Evidence for Interpolation in Homer*. Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1980.
- Arndt, William, Frederick W. Danker, and Walter Bauer, eds. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Arns, Paulo Evaristo. *La technique du livre d'après saint Jérôme*. Paris: E. de Boccard, 1953.
- Asper, Markus. "Zu Struktur und Funktion eisagogischer Texte." Pages 309-40 in *Gattungen wissenschaftlicher Literatur in der Antike*. Edited by Wolfgang Kullmann, Jochen Althoff, and Markus Asper. Tübingen: Narr, 1998.
- Attridge, Harold W. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1989.
- Baarda, Tjitze. "Marcion's Text of Gal 1:1: Concerning the Reconstruction of the First Verse of the Marcionite Corpus Paulinum." *VC* 42, no. 3 (1988): 236-56.
- Babcock, William S. "Augustine's Interpretation of Romans (A.D. 394-396)." *Augustinian Studies* 10 (1979): 55-74.
- Bagnall, Roger S, Alan Cameron, Seth R. Schwartz, and Klaus A. Worp, eds. *Consuls of the Later Roman Empire*. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1987.

- Bammel, Caroline Hammond. *Der Römerbrieftext des Rufin und seine Origenes-Übersetzung*. Freiburg: Herder, 1985.
- Bardy, Gustav. "La littérature patristique des "Quaestiones et Responsiones" sur l'Écriture Sainte." *Revue Biblique* 41 (1932): 210-36, 341-69, 515-37; 42 (1933): 14-30, 211-229, 328-352.
- Barnes, Jonathan. *Porphyry Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Barnes, Timothy. *Constantine and Eusebius*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1981.
- Barnes, Timothy. "Constantine, Athanasius and the Christian Church." Pages 7-20 in *Constantine: History, Historiography, and Legend*. Edited by Samuel N. C. Lieu and Dominic Montserrat. London: Routledge, 1998.
- Barnes, Timothy David. "Methodius, Maximus, and Valentinus." *Journal of Theological Studies* N.S. 30, no. 1 Ap (1979): 47-55.
- Barth, Carola. *Die Interpretation des Neuen Testaments in der valentinianischen Gnosis, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur; Bd. 37, pt. 3*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1911.
- Bauer, Walter. *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*. Edited by Robert A. Kraft. Translated by Philadelphia Seminar on Christian Origins. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971 (1996 Sigler Press reprint).
- Beard, Mary and et al, eds. *Literacy in the Roman World*. Ann Arbor: Journal of Roman Archaeology, 1991.
- Berger, Samuel. *Histoire de la Vulgate pendant les premiers siècles du Moyen Age*. New York: B. Franklin, 1893.
- Betegh, Gábor. *The Derveni Papyrus: Cosmology, Theology and Interpretation*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Betz, Hans Dieter. *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.
- Bianchi, Ugo. "Marcion: Theologien biblique ou docteur gnostique?" *VC* 21, no. 3 (1967): 141-49.
- Birdsall, J. Neville. "The Text and Scholia of the Codex von der Goltz and its Allies, and their Bearing upon the Texts of the Works of Origen, Especially the Commentary on Romans." Pages 215-22 in *Origeniana: Premier colloque international des*

- études origéniennes (Montserrat, 18-21 septembre 1973)*. Edited by Henri Crouzel, Gennaro Lomiento, Josep Ruis-Camps, 1975.
- Birdsall, J. Neville. "The Euthalian Material and its Georgian Versions." *Oriens Christianus* 68 (1984): 170-95.
- Blackman, E. C. *Marcion and his Influence*. London: S.P.C.K., 1948.
- Blaise, Albert. *A Handbook of Christian Latin: Style, Morphology, and Syntax*. Washington, D.C.: Brepols; Georgetown University Press, 1994.
- Blass, Friedrich. "Stichometrie und Kolometrie." *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 34 (1879): 214-36.
- Blass, Friedrich. "Zur Frage über Stichometrie der Alten." *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 24 (1869): 524-32.
- Bludau, August. *Die Schriftfälschungen der Häretiker: ein Beitrag zur textkritik der Bibel*. Münster: Aschendorff, 1925.
- Blum, Rudolf. *Kallimachos: The Alexandrian Library and the Origins of Bibliography*. Translated by Hans H. Wellisch. Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991.
- Bohlin, Torgny. *Die Theologie des Pelagius und ihre Genesis*. Uppsala: Lundequistska bokhandeln, 1957.
- Bolgiani, Franco. *Vittore di Capua e il «Diatessaron»*. Torino: Accademia delle Scienze, 1962.
- Bonner, Gerald. "Augustine on Romans 5,12." *Studia Evangelica* 5 (1968): 242-7.
- Bonner, Gerald. *Augustine and Modern Research on Pelagianism*. Wetteren, Belgium: Villanova University Press, 1972.
- Bonner, Gerald. "How Pelagian was Pelagius?: An examination of the contentions of Torgny Bohlin." *Studia patristica* 9 (1966): 350-58.
- Bonner, Gerald. "Rufinus of Syria and African Pelagianism." *Augustinian Studies* 1 (1970): 30-47.
- Bowen, Alan C. and Robert B. Todd. *Cleomedes' Lectures on Astronomy: A Translation of "The Heavens" with an Introduction and Commentary*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004.

- Bradley, David G. "The Topos as a Form of Pauline Paraenesis." *JBL* 72, no. 4 (1953): 238-46.
- Brisson, Luc, Marie-Odile Goulet-Cazé, Richard Goulet, and Denis O'Brien, eds. *Porphyre: La vie de Plotin, I: Travaux préliminaires et index grec complet*. Histoire des doctrines de l'Antiquité classique 6. Paris: J. Vrin, 1982.
- Brisson, Luc, Marie-Odile Goulet-Cazé, Richard Goulet, and Denis O'Brien, eds. *Porphyre: La vie de Plotin, II: Études d'introduction, texte grec et traduction française, commentaire, notes complémentaires, bibliographie*. Histoire des doctrines de l'Antiquité classique 16. Paris: J. Vrin, 1982.
- Brock, Sebastian. "The Syriac Euthalian Material and the Philoxenian Version of the NT." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 70 (1979): 120-30.
- Brock, Sebastian. "The Use of the Syriac Fathers for New Testament Textual Criticism." Pages 224-36 in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*. Edited by Bart D. Ehrman and Michael William Holmes. Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans, 1995.
- Bröker, L. O. "Die Methoden Galens in der literarischen Kritik." *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 40 (1885): 415-38.
- Brown, Peter. *Augustine of Hippo: A Biography*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967.
- Brown, Peter. *The Body and Society: Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1988.
- Bruce, F. F. *The Epistle to the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1982.
- Bruyne, Donatien de. "Études sur les origines de notre texte latin de saint Paul." *Revue Biblique* NS 24 (1915): 358-92.
- Bruyne, Donatien de. "La finale marcionite de la lettre aux Romains retrouvé." *Revue Bénédictine* 28 (1911): 133-42.
- Bruyne, Donatien de. "Les deux derniers chapitres de la lettre aux Romains." *Revue Bénédictine* 25 (1908): 423-30.
- Bruyne, Donatien de. *Les fragments de Freising*. Rome: Bibliothèque vaticane, 1921.
- Bruyne, Donatien de. *Prefaces de la Bible latine*. Namur: Auguste Godenne, 1920.

- Bruyne, Donatien de. "Prologues bibliques d'origin marcionite." *Revue Bénédictine* 24 (1907): 1-16.
- Bruyne, Donatien de. "Saint Augustin reviseur de la Bible." Pages 521-606 in *Miscellanea Agonistiana II*. Rome: Tipografia poliglotta vaticana, 1931.
- Bruyne, Donatien de. "Sommaires antipélagiens inédits des lettres de Saint Paul." *Revue Bénédictine* 38 (1926): 45-55.
- Bruyne, Donatien de. *Sommaires, divisions et rubriques de la Bible latine*. Namur: Auguste Godenne, 1914.
- Bruyne, Donatien de. "Une concordance biblique d'origine pélagienne." *Revue Bénédictine* 5 (1908): 75-83.
- Bruyne, Theodore S. de. *Pelagius's Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Bruyne, Theodore S. de. "Pelagius's Interpretation of Rom. 5:12-21: Exegesis within the Limits of Polemic." *Toronto Journal of Theology* 4 (1988): 30-43.
- Buonaiuti, E. "Pelagius and the Pauline Vulgate." *Expository Times* 27 (1915-16): 425-7.
- Burns, J. Patout. "The Interpretation of Romans in the Pelagian Controversy." *Augustinian Studies* 10 (1979): 43-54.
- Burr, V. "Editionstechnik." *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* 4 (1959): 597-610.
- Burridge, Richard A. *What are the Gospels?: A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 2004.
- Burridge, Richard A. "Chapter 11: Biography." Pages 371-93 in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period, 330 B.C.-A.D. 400*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Burton, Philip. *The Old Latin Gospels: A Study of their Texts and Language*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Campanhausen, Hans von. *Ecclesiastical Authority and Spiritual Power in the Church of the First Three Centuries*. Translated by J. A. Baker. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1969.
- Cancik, Hubert, Helmuth Schneider, Christine F. Salazar, and David E. Orton, eds. *Brill's New Pauly: Encyclopaedia of the Ancient World*. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

- Cassio, Albio Cesare. "Early Editions of the Greek Epics and Homeric Textual Criticism." Pages 105-36 in *Omera tremila anni dopo*. Edited by Franco Montanari and Paola Ascheri. Roma: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 2002.
- Cavallera, Ferdinand. "Saint Jérôme et la Vulgate des Actes des Épitres et de l'Apocalypse." *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique* (1920): 269-92.
- Cerquiglini, Bernard. *In Praise of the Variant: A Critical History of Philology*. Translated by Betsy Wing. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999.
- Chapman, J. "St. Jerome and the Vulgate New Testament." *JTS* 24 (1923): 33-51, 113-25, 283-99.
- Chapman, John. "Pelage et le texte de S. Paul." *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 18 (1922): 469-81; 19 (1923) 25-42.
- Chisholm, John Edward. *The Pseudo-Augustinian Hypomnesticon against the Pelagians and Celestians: Volume I, Introduction*. Fribourg: University Press, 1967.
- Chroust, Anton-Hermann. "A Brief Account of the Traditional Vitae Aristotelis." *REG* 77 (1964): 50-69.
- Citti, Vittorio. "Le edizioni omeriche 'delle città'." *Vichiana* 3 (1966): 3-43.
- Clabeaux, John James. *A Lost Edition of the Letters of Paul: A Reassessment of the Text of the Pauline Corpus attested by Marcion*. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1989.
- Claesson, Gösta. *Index Tertullianus*. Paris: Études augustiniennes, 1974.
- Clark, Elizabeth A. *The Origenist Controversy: The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- Clark, Elizabeth A. "Vitiated Seeds and Holy Vessels: Augustine's Manichean Past." Pages 367-401 in *Images of the Feminine in Gnosticism*. Edited by Karen King. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988.
- Colwell, Ernest Cadman. "Genealogical Method: Its Achievements and Limitations." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 66, no. 2 (1947): 109-33.
- Colwell, Ernest Cadman. "Method in Establishing the Nature of Text-types." Pages 45-55 in *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1969.
- Conybeare, F. C. "On the Codex Pamphili and the Date of Euthalius." *The Journal of Philology* 23, no. 46 (1895): 241-59.

- Conybeare, J. B. "The Date of Euthalius." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 5 (1904): 39-52.
- Conzelmann, Hans. *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Translated by James W. Leitch, Hermeniaia: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.
- Cooper, Stephen Andrew. *Marius Victorinus' Commentary on Galatians: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Corssen, Peter. "Review of Eduard von der Goltz, *Eine textkritische Arbeit des zehnten bzw. sechsten Jahrhunderts*." *Göttingische gelehrte Jahrbuch* 161 (1899): 665-80.
- Corssen, Peter. "Die Subskriptionen des Bischofs Victor in dem Codex Fuldensis." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 10 (1909): 175-77.
- Corssen, Peter. *Epistula ad Galatas ad fidem optimorum codicum Vulgatae*. Berlin: Apus Weidmannos, 1885.
- Corssen, Peter. "Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte des Römerbriefes." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 10 (1909): 1-45; 97-102.
- Cox, Patricia. *Biography in Late Antiquity: A Quest for the Holy Man*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983.
- Cranfield, C. E. B. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. Edinburgh: Clark, 1975.
- Crisp, Simon. "Scribal Marks and Logical Paragraphs: Discourse Segmentation Criteria in Manuscripts of the Pauline Corpus." *UBS Bulletin* 198/199 (2005): 77-87.
- Cruz, Hieronymus. *Christological Motives and Motivated Actions in Pauline Paraenesis*. Frankfurt am Main: P. Lang, 1990.
- Cuvigny, Marcel and Guy Lachenaud, eds. *Plutarque: Œuvres Morales: Tome XII-1: Il ne faut pas s'endetter; Vies des dix orateurs*. Paris: Belles Lettres, 1981.
- D'Isanto, Gennaro. *Capua romana: ricerche di prosopografia e storia sociale*, Vetera ; 9. Roma: Edizioni Quasar, 1993.
- Dahl, Nils Alstrup. "The 'Euthalian Apparatus' and the Affiliated 'Argumenta'" Pages 231-75 in *Studies in Ephesians: Introductory Questions, Text- & Edition-Critical Issues, Interpretation of Texts and Themes*. Edited by David Hellholm, Vemund Blomkvist, and Tord Fornberg. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.

- Dahl, Nils Alstrup. "The Origin of the Earliest Prologues to the Pauline Letters." *Semeia* 12 (1978): 233-77.
- Dahl, Nils Alstrup. "The Particularity of the Pauline Epistle as a Problem in the Ancient Church." Pages 261-71 in *Neotestamentica et Patristica; Eine Freundesgabe, Herrn Professor Dr. Oscar Cullmann zu seinem 60 Geburtstag übereicht*. Leiden: Brill, 1962.
- Damschen, Gregor. "Stichometrie." Page 990 in *Der Neue Pauly: Band 11 Sam-Tal*. Edited by Hubert Cancik and Helmuth Schneider. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 1996.
- Davis, Leo Donald. *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils (325-787): their History and Theology*. Wilmington, Del.: M. Glazier, 1987.
- Davison, J. A. "Peisistratus and Homer." *TAPA* 86 (1955): 1-21.
- Decret, François. *Aspects du manichéisme dans l'Afrique romaine: Les controverses de Fortunatus, Faustus, et Felix avec saint Augustin*. Paris: Études augustiniennes, 1970.
- De Caro, Stefano and Valeria Sampaolo. *Guide of Ancient Capua*. Santa Maria Capua Vetere (Napoli): Museo archeologico dell'antica Capua, 2000.
- Deichgräber, Reinhard. *Gotteshymnus und Christushymnus in der frühen Christenheit: Untersuchungen zur Form, Sprache und Stil der frühchristlichen Hymnen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967.
- Devreesse, Robert. *Introduction à l'étude des manuscrits grecs*. Paris: Impr. nationale, Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1954.
- Dibelius, Martin and Hans Conzelmann. *The Pastoral Epistles*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972.
- Dillon, John M. "Tampering with the Timaeus: Ideological Emendations in Plato." Pages 50-72 in *The Golden Chain: Studies in the Development of Platonism and Christianity*. Hampshire, Great Britain: Variorum, 1990.
- Dorey, Thomas Alan. *Latin Biography*. London: Routledge, 1967.
- Dover, Kenneth James. *Lysias and the Corpus Lysiacum*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968.
- Dobschütz, Ernst von. "Ein Beitrag zur Euthaliusfrage." *Centralblatt für Bibliothekwesen* 10, no. 2 (1893): 49-70.

- Dobschütz, Ernst von. "Euthaliusstudien." *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 19 (1899): 107-34.
- Dobschütz, Ernst von. "A Hitherto Unpublished Prologue to the Acts of the Apostles." *American Journal of Theology* 2 (1898): 358-87.
- Dobschütz, Ernst von. "The Notices Prefixed to Codex 773 of the Gospels." *Harvard Theological Review* 18 (1925): 280-84.
- Dobschütz, Ernst von. "Wann las Victor von Capua sein Neues Testament?" *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 10 (1909): 90-96.
- Drijvers, Han J. W. "Marcionism in Syria: Principles, Problems, Polemics." *SecCent* 6, no. 3 (1987/88): 153-72.
- Droge, Arthur J. *Homer or Moses?: Early Christian Interpretations of the History of Culture*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1989.
- Duchesne, L. "Fragments des Épîtres de Saint Paul." *Archives des Missions scientifiques et littéraires* 3 (1876): 420-9.
- Dungan, David L. "Reactionary Trends in the Gospel Producing Activity of the Early Church." Pages 179-202 in *L'Évangile selon Marc*. Edited by M. Sabbe. Louvain: Leuven University Press, 1974.
- Dunn, Michael. "The Organization of the Platonic Corpus between the First Century B.C. and the Second Century A.D." Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1974.
- Dunn, Michael. "Iamblichus, Thrasyllus, and the Reading order of the Platonic Dialogues." Pages 59-80 in *The Significance of Neoplatonism*. Edited by R. Baine Harris. Norfolk, Va.: International Society for Neoplatonic Studies distributed by State University of New York Press, 1976.
- Edwards, Mark. "Synods and Councils." Pages 367-85 in *Cambridge History of Christianity, v. 2: Constantine to c. 600*. Edited by Augustine Casiday and Frederick W. Norris. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Ehrhard, Albert. "Der Codex H ad epistulas Pauli und 'Euthalius diaconos'." *Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen* 8, no. 9 (1891): 385-411.
- Ehrman, Bart D. "Cephas and Peter." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 109 (1990): 463-74.
- Ehrman, Bart D. "Heracleon and the "Western" Textual Tradition." *New Testament Studies* 40 (1994): 161-79.

- Ehrman, Bart D. "Heracleon, Origen, and the Text of the Fourth Gospel." *VC* 47 (1993): 105-18.
- Ehrman, Bart D. *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Ehrman, Bart D. "The Theodotians as Corruptors of Scripture." *Studia patristica* 25 (1993): 46-51.
- Elliott, J. K. *A Bibliography of Greek New Testament Manuscripts*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Elliot, J. K. "The Translation of the New Testament into Latin: The Old Latin and the Vulgate." Pages 198-245 in *ANRW* 2.26.1. Edited by H. Temporini and W. Haase. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1992.
- Emonds, Hilarius. *Zweite Auflage im Altertum: kulturgeschichtliche Studien zur Überlieferung der antiken Literatur*. Leipzig: O. Harrassowitz, 1941.
- Epp, Eldon Jay. "Issues in the Interrelation of New Testament Textual Criticism and Canon." Pages 485-515 in *The Canon Debate*. Edited by Lee Martin McDonald and James A. Sanders. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 2002.
- Epp, Eldon Jay. "The Oxyrhynchus New Testament Papyri: "Not Without Honor Except in Their Hometown"?" *JBL* 123, no. 1 (2004): 5-55.
- Epp, Eldon Jay. "The Significance of the Papyri for Determining the Nature of the New Testament Text in the Second Century: A Dynamic View of Textual Transmission." Pages 274-97 in *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1993.
- Epp, Eldon Jay. *The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966.
- Epp, Eldon Jay. "Toward the Classification of the Term "Textual Variant"." Pages 47-61 in *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1993.
- Erbse, Hartmut. *Studien zum Prolog der euripideischen Tragödie*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1984.
- Erbse, Hartmut. "Über Aristarchs Iliasausgaben." *Hermes* 87 (1959): 275-303.
- Erbse, Hartmut. "Überlieferungsgeschichte der griechischen klassischen und hellenistischen literatur: Band I." Pages 207-83 in *Geschichte der*

- Textüberlieferung der antiken und mittelalterlichen Literatur*. Edited by Herbert Hunger. Zürich: Atlantis Verlag, 1961.
- Evans, Ernest. *Tertullian's Treatise on the Incarnation*. London: S.P.C.K., 1956.
- Evans, Robert F. *Pelagius: Inquiries and Reappraisals*. New York: Seabury Press, 1968.
- Fee, Gordon D. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans, 1987.
- Fee, Gordon D. "P⁷⁵, P⁶⁶, and Origen: The Myth of Early Textual Recension in Alexandria." Pages 247-73 in *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism*. Edited by Eldon Jay Epp and Gordon D. Fee. Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans, 1993.
- Ferguson, Everette. "Canon Muratori: Date and Provenance." *SP* 17/2 (1982): 677-83.
- Ferguson, Everette. "Review of Geoffrey Mark Hahneman, *The Muratorian Fragment and the Development of the Canon*." *JTS* 44 (1993): 696.
- Ferguson, John. *Pelagius*. Cambridge: W. Heffer and Sons, 1956.
- Festugière, A.-J. "L'ordre de lecture des dialogues de Platon aux Ve/VIe siècles." *Museum Helveticum* 26, no. 4 (1969): 281-96.
- Fischer, Bonifatius. *Lateinische Bibelhandschriften im frühen Mittelalter*. Freiburg: Herder, 1985.
- Fischer, Bonifatius. "Das Neue Testament in lateinischer Sprache." Pages 1-92 in *Die Alten Übersetzungen des Neuen Testaments, die Kirchenväterzitate und Lektionare*. Edited by Kurt Aland. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1972.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "The Consecutive Meaning of EΦ' Ω in Romans 5.12." *New Testament Studies* 39 (1993): 321-39.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. New York: Doubleday, 1993.
- Frede, Hermann Josef. *Altlateinische Paulus-Handschriften*. Freiburg: Herder, 1964.
- Frenchkowski, Marco. "Marcion in arabischen Quellen." Pages 39-63 in *Marcion und seine kirchengeschichtliche Wirkung – Marcion and His Impact on Church History* Edited by Gerhard May and Katharina Greschat. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2002.

- Frend, W. H. C. *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement; Chapters in the History of the Church in the Fifth and Sixth Centuries*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972.
- Fuhrmann, Manfred. *Das systematische Lehrbuch: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Wissenschaften in der Antike*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960.
- Fuhrmann, Manfred. "Isagogische Literatur." Pages 1453-56 in *Der Kleine Pauly*. Edited by Konrat Ziegler and Walther Sontheimer. Stuttgart: Alfred Druckenmüller, 1967.
- Friderici, Robertus. *De librorum antiquorum captium divisione atque summaris. Accedit de Catonis De agricultura libro disputatio*. Marburg: Noske, 1911.
- Gager, John G. "Marcion and Philosophy." *VC* 26, no. 1 (1972): 53-59.
- Gamble, Harry Y. *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.
- Gamble, Harry Y. *The Textual History of the Letter to the Romans: A Study in Textual and Literary Criticism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977.
- Gamble, Harry Y. "The New Testament Canon: Recent Research and the Status Quaestionis." Pages 267-94 in *The Canon Debate*. Edited by Lee Martin McDonald and James A. Sanders. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 2002.
- Gartner, Hans Armin. "Prooimion." Pages 409-12 in *Der Neue Pauly: Band 10 Pol-Sal*. Edited by Hubert Cancik and Helmuth Schneider. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 1996.
- Glare, P. G. W. *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.
- Gorday, Peter. *Principles of Patristic Exegesis: Romans 9-11 in Origen, John Chrysostom, and Augustine*. New York: Edwin Mellen Press, 1983.
- Görgemanns, Herwig. "Biography." Pages 648-53 in *Brill's New Pauly: Encyclopaedia of the Ancient World, v.2 Ark-Cas*. Edited by Hubert Cancik and et al. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Grafton, Anthony, Glenn W. Most, and James E. G. Zetzel, eds. *F. A. Wolf: Prolegomena to Homer, 1795*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1985.
- Grafton, Anthony and Megan Hale Williams. *Christianity and the Transformation of the Book: Origen, Eusebius, and the Library of Caesarea*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006.

- Grant, Robert M. *Heresy and Criticism*. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993.
- Grant, Robert M. "Marcion and the Critical Method." Pages 207-15 in *From Jesus to Paul: Studies in Honour of Francis Wright Beare*. Edited by Peter Richardson and John C. Hurd. Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1984.
- Graux, Charles. "Nouvelles recherches sur la stichométrie." *Revue de Philologie de Littérature et d'Histoire Anciennes* N. S. 2 (1878): 97-143.
- Greenough, J. B., George Lyman Kittredge, Albert Andrew Howard, and Benjamin L. D'Ooge, eds. *Allen and Greenough's New Latin Grammar*. New Rochelle, NY: Aristide D. Caratzas, 1931 (1998 reprint).
- Greschat, Katharina. *Apelles und Hermogenes: Zwei theologische Lehrer des zweiten Jahrhunderts*. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Greschat, Katharina and Martin Meiser, eds. *Gerhard May: Markion, Gesammelte Aufsätze*. Mainz: Von Zabern, 2005.
- Greshake, Gisbert. *Gnade als konkrete Freiheit: eine Untersuchung zur Gnadenlehre des Pelagius*. Mainz: Matthias-Grünwald, 1972.
- Haar Romeny, Bas ter. "Question-and-Answer Collections in Syriac Literature." Pages 145-63 in *Erotapokriseis: Early Christian Question-and-Answer Literature in Context*. Edited by Annelie Volgers and Claudio Zamagni. Leuven: Peeters, 2004.
- Hadorn, W. "Die Abfassung der Thessalonicherbriefe auf der dritten Missionsreise und der Kanon des Marcions." *ZNW* 19 (1919-1920): 67-72.
- Hahneman, Geoffrey Mark. *The Muratorian Fragment and the Development of the Canon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.
- Haines-Eitzen, Kim. *Guardians of Letters: Literacy, Power, and the Transmitters of Early Christian Literature*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Halporn, James W. and Mark Vessey, eds. *Cassiodorus: Institutions of Divine and Secular Learning and On the Soul*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2004.
- Hannah, Darrell D. *The Text of I Corinthians in the Writings of Origen*. Edited by Bart D. Ehrman. Vol. 4, The New Testament in the Greek Fathers, *Texts and Analyses*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.
- Hanson, Ann E. "Galen: Author and Critic." Pages 22-53 in *Editing Texts = Texte edieren*. Edited by Glenn W. Most. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998.

- Harbert, Bruce. "Romans 5,12: Old Latin and Vulgate in the Pelagian Controversy." *Studia patristica* 22 (1989): 261-64.
- Harnack, Adolf von. "Der apokryphe brief des Apostels Paulus an die Laodicener, eine marcionitische Fälschung aus der 2. hälfte des 2. jahrhunderts." *Sitzungsberichte Pruessische Akademie der Wissenschaften, der philosophisch-historischen Klasse* 27 (1923): 235-45.
- Harnack, Adolf von. "Die Marcionitischen Prologe zu den Paulusbriefen, eine Quelle des Muratorischen Fragments." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 25 (1926): 160-63.
- Harnack, Adolf von. "Die marcionitische Ursprung der ältesten Vulgata-Prologe zu den Paulusbriefen." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 24 (1925): 204-18.
- Harnack, Adolf von. *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott*. Zweite verbesserte und vermehrte ed. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1924.
- Harris, J. Rendel. *Codex Bezae: A Study of the So-called Western Text of the New Testament*. Edited by J. Armitage Robinson. Vol. 2, Texts and Studies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1891.
- Harris, J. Rendel. "Euthalius and Eusebius." Pages 60-83 in *Hermas in Arcadia and Other Essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1896.
- Harris, J. Rendel. "Marcion and the Canon." *Expository Times* 7 (1906): 392-94.
- Harris, J. Rendel. "Marcion's Book of Contradictions." *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 6, no. 3 (1921): 289-309.
- Harris, J. Rendel. *Stichometry*. London: C.J. Clay and Sons, 1893.
- Harris, William V. *Ancient Literacy*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1989.
- Hartke, W. *Die Sammlung und die ältesten Ausgaben der Paulusbriefe*. Bonn: Carl Georgi, 1917.
- Hatch, William Henry Paine. "On the Relationship of Codex Augiensis and Codex Boernerianus of the Pauline Epistles." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 60 (1951): 187-99.
- Hatch, William Henry Paine. "The Position of Hebrews in the Canon of the New Testament." *The Harvard Theological Review* 29 (1936): 133-51.

- Heath, Malcolm. *Hermogenes On Issues: Strategies of Argument in Later Greek Rhetoric*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.
- Heine, Ronald E. *The Commentaries of Origen and Jerome on St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Henne, Philippe. "La datation du *Canon* de Muratori." *Revue Biblique* 100 (1993): 54-75.
- Hilgenfeld, Adolf. "Das Apostolikon Marcion's." *ZHT* 25 (1855): 426-84.
- Hill, Charles. "The Debate over the Muratorian Fragment and the Development of the Canon." *WTJ* 57 (1995): 437-52.
- Hoffmann, Philippe. "La fonction des prologues exégétiques dans le pensée pédagogique néoplatonicienne." Pages 209-46 in *Entrer en matière*. Edited by Jean-Daniel Dubois and Bernard Roussel. Paris: Les éditions du Cerf, 1998.
- Hoffmann, R. Joseph. "How Then Know This Troubled Teacher: Further Reflections on Marcion and his Church." *SecCent* 6, no. 3 (1987/88): 173-91.
- Hoffmann, R. Joseph. *Marcion, on the Restitution of Christianity: An Essay on the Development of Radical Paulinist Theology in the Second Century*. Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1984.
- Holmes, Michael W. "Early Editorial Activity and the Text of Codex Bezae in Matthew." Ph.D. Dissertation, Princeton, 1984.
- Holmes, Michael W. "Codex Bezae as a Recension of the Gospels." Pages 123-60 in *Codex Bezae: Studies from the Lunel Colloquium, June 1994*. Edited by D. C. Parker and Christian-Bernard Amphoux. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996.
- Holwerda, D. "Zur szenisch-technischen Bedeutung des Wortes 'ΥΠΟΘΕΣΙΣ'." Pages 173-98 in *Miscellanea tragica in honorem J.C. Kamerbeek*. Edited by Jan Maarten Bremer, S. L. Radt, and C. J. Ruijgh. Amsterdam: A. Hakkert, 1976.
- Hort, Fenton John Anthony. "On the End of the Epistle to the Romans." *The Journal of Philology* 3, no. 5 (1870): 51-80.
- Housman, A. E. "The Application of Thought to Textual Criticism." *Proceedings of the Classical Association, August, 1921* 18 (1922): 67-84.
- Hurtado, Larry W. *The Earliest Christian Artifacts: Manuscripts and Christian Origins*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2006.
- Hellholm, David and Vemund Blomkvist. "Parainesis as an Ancient Genre-Designation: The Case of the 'Euthalian Apparatus' and the 'Affiliated Argumenta'." Pages 467-

- 519 in *Early Christian Paraenesis in Context*. Edited by Troels Engberg-Pedersen and James M. Starr. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004.
- Hemmerdinger, Bertrand. "Euthaliana." *Journal of Theological Studies* N.S. 11 (1960): 349-55.
- Ilberg, Johannes. "Die Hippokratesausgaben des Artemidorus Kapiton und Dioscurides." *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 45 (1890): 111-37.
- Irigoin, Jean. *Histoire du texte de Pindare*. Paris: C. Klincksieck, 1952.
- Irigoin, Jean. "Les éditions de textes à l'époque hellénistique et romaine." Pages 133-74 in *La tradition des textes grecs: pour une critique historique*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2003.
- Jacobs, Andrew S. *Remains of the Jews: The Holy Land and Christian Empire in Late Antiquity*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2004.
- Jacoby, F. "Patrios Nomos: State Burial in Athens and the Public Cemetery in the Kerameikos." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 64 (1944): 37-66.
- Janson, Tore. *Latin Prose Prefaces: Studies in Literary Conventions*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1964.
- Jewett, Robert. *A Chronology of Paul's Life*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.
- Johnson, William A. *Bookrolls and Scribes in Oxyrhynchus*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004.
- Jones, A. H. M. *The Later Roman Empire 284-602: A Social, Economic, and Administrative Survey*. 2 vols. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986.
- Jongkind, Dirk. *Scribal Habits of Codex Sinaiticus*. Piscataway, N.J.: Gorgias Press, 2007.
- Kannaday, Wayne Campbell. *Apologetic Discourse and the Scribal Tradition: Evidence of the Influence of Apologetic Interests on the Text of the Canonical Gospels*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004.
- Kaster, Robert A. *Guardians of Language: The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- Kaster, Robert A. "Islands in the Stream: The Grammarians of Late Antiquity." Pages 149-68 in *The History of Linguistics in the Classical Period*. Edited by Daniel J. Taylor. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins Pub. Co., 1987.

- Kelly, J. N. D. *Early Christian Creeds*. 3rd ed. London: Longman, 1972.
- Kelly, J. N. D. *Early Christian Doctrines*. London: A. & C. Black, 1958.
- Kelly, J. N. D. *Jerome: His Life, Writings, and Controversies*. London: Duckworth, 1975.
- Kemp, Alan. "The *Technē Grammatikē* of Dionysius Thrax: English Translation with Introduction and Notes." Pages 169-90 in *The History of Linguistics in the Classical Period*. Edited by Daniel J. Taylor. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins Pub. Co., 1987.
- Kenyon, Frederic G., ed. *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri; Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible: Fasciculus III Supplement: Pauline Epistles, Plates*. London: E. Walker, 1936.
- Kenyon, Frederic G., ed. *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri; Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible: Fasciculus III Supplement: Pauline Epistles, Text*. London: E. Walker, 1936.
- Kenyon, Frederic G. "The Western Text in the Gospels and Acts." *Proceedings of the British Academy* 24, no. 1939 (1939): 287-315.
- Kerschensteiner, Josef. *Der altsyrische Paulustext*, CSCO 315. Subsidia, t. 37. Louvain: Secrétariat du Corpus SCO, 1970.
- Koester, Helmut. "The Text of the Synoptic Gospels in the Second Century." Pages 19-37 in *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century: Origins, Recensions, Text, and Transmission*. Edited by William L. Petersen. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989.
- Koopmans, J. H. "Augustine's First Contact with Pelagius and the Dating of the Condemnation of Caelestius at Carthage." *VC* 8, no. 3 (1954): 149-53.
- Korpel, Marjo C. A. "Introduction to the Series Pericope." Pages 1-50 in *Delimitation Criticism: A New Tool in Biblical Scholarship*. Edited by Marjo C. A. Korpel and Josef M. Oesch. Assen, The Netherlands: Van Gorcum, 2000.
- Kraemer, Ross Shepard. *Her Share of the Blessings: Women's Religions among Pagans, Jews and Christians in the Greco-Roman World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Kraft, Robert A. "Para-mania: Beside, Before and Beyond Bible Studies." *JBL* 126, no. 1 (2007): 5-27.

- Kraus, Thomas J. *Ad fontes: Original Manuscripts and their Significance for Studying Early Christianity; Selected Essays*. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Kraus, Thomas J. and Tobias Nicklas. *New Testament Manuscripts: their Texts and their World*. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Lagrange, Marie Joseph. "Les prologues prétendus marcionites." *Revue Biblique* 35 (1926): 161-73.
- Lagrange, M.-J. "La révision de la Vulgate par S. Jérôme." *Revue Biblique* 15 (1918): 254-7.
- Lagrange, M.-J. "La Vulgate latine de l'Épître aux Galates et la texte grec." *Revue Biblique* N.S. 14 (1917): 424-50.
- Lagrange, M.-J. "La Vulgate latine de l'Épître aux Romains et la texte grec." *Revue Biblique* N.S. 13 (1916): 225-35.
- Lake, Kirsopp. "The Sinaitic and Vatican Manuscripts and the Copies Sent by Eusebius to Constantinople." *HTR* 11, no. 1 (1918): 32-35.
- Laks, André and Glenn W. Most, eds. *Studies on the Derveni Papyrus*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.
- Lallot, Jean. "Grammatici certant: vers une typologie de l'argumentation *pro et contra* dans le question de l'authenticité de la *Technè*." Pages 27-40 in *Dionysius Thrax and the Technè Grammatikè*. Edited by Vivien Law and Ineke Sluiter. Münster: Nodus Publikationen, 1995.
- Lamberton, Robert. *Homer the Theologian: Neoplatonist Allegorical Reading and the Growth of the Epic Tradition*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986.
- Lamberton, Robert and John J. Keaney, eds. *Homer's Ancient Readers: The Hermeneutics of Greek Epic's Earliest Exegetes*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- Lampe, G. W. H. *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1961.
- Langslow, D. R. *Medical Latin in the Roman Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Lausberg, Heinrich. *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Study*. Edited by David E. Orton and R. Dean Anderson. Translated by Matthew T. Bliss, Annemiek Jansen, and David E. Orton. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

- Law, Vivien. "The *Technē* and Grammar in the Roman World." Pages 111-20 in *Dionysius Thrax and the Technē Grammatikē*. Edited by Vivien Law and Ineke Sluiter. Münster: Nodus Publikationen, 1995.
- Lehrs, Karl. *De Aristarchi studiis homericis*. 3rd ed. Lipsiae: Apud S. Hirzelium, 1882.
- Leisegang, Hans. *Der heilige Geist*. Stuttgart: Teubner, 1967.
- Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott, Henry Stuart Jones, and Roderick McKenzie. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Rev. ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- Lieu, Judith. *Image and Reality: The Jews in the World of the Christians in the Second Century*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996.
- Lieu, Samuel N. C. *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire and Medieval China*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1985.
- Löfstedt, Einar. *Late Latin*. Oslo: Aschehoug, 1959.
- Lightfoot, Joseph Barber. *The Epistle of Saint Paul to the Galatians*. Lynn, Mass.: Hendrickson (reprint), 1981.
- Lightfoot, Joseph Barber. *Saint Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon. A Revised Text with Introductions, Notes, and Dissertations*. 6th ed. London: Macmillan, 1879.
- Lohse, Eduard. *Colossians and Philemon; A Commentary on the Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon*. Translated by William R. Poehlmann and Robert J. Karris. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971.
- Lonie, I. M. "The Cnidian Treatises of the Corpus Hippocraticum." *The Classical Quarterly* 15, no. 1 (1965): 1-30.
- Lord, Albert Bates. *Epic Singers and Oral Tradition*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991.
- Lord, Albert Bates. *The Singer of Tales*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960.
- Loud, G. A. *Church and Society in the Norman Principality of Capua, 1058-1197*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.
- Lovering, Eugene Harrison. "The Collection, Redaction, and Early Circulation of the Corpus Paulinum." Ph.D. Dissertation, Southern Methodist University, 1988.
- Lüdemann, Gerd. *Paul, Apostle to the Gentiles: Studies in Chronology*. Translated by F. Stanley Jones. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.

- Lyman, Rebecca. "Modalism," "Monarchianism." Pages 763-64 in *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*, 2nd ed. Edited by Everette Ferguson. New York: Garland Publishing, 1998.
- MacDonald, Dennis Ronald. *The Legend and the Apostle: the Battle for Paul in Story and Canon*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1983.
- MacDonald, Margaret Y. *The Pauline Churches: A Socio-historical Study of Institutionalization in the Pauline and Deutero-Pauline Writings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Mahé, Jean-Pierre. "Tertullien et l'Epistula Marcionis." *RevScRel* 45, no. 4 (1971): 358-71.
- Mansfeld, Jaap. *Prolegomena: Questions to be Settled before the Study of an Author, or a Text*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994.
- Mansfeld, Jaap. *Prolegomena Mathematica: From Apollonius of Perga to Late Neoplatonism: with an appendix on Pappus and the History of Platonism*. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Marchand, James Woodrow. "The Gothic Evidence for 'Euthalian Matter'." *HTR* 49 (1956): 159-67.
- Margull, Hans Jochen, ed. *The Councils of the Church; History and Analysis*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966.
- Markus, Robert Austin. "Augustine's Confessions and the Controversy with Julian of Eclanum: Manichaeism Revisited." Pages 913-25 in *Collectanea Augustiniana: Mélanges T.J. van Bavel*. Edited by B. Bruning, M. Lamberigts, and J. van Houtem. Leuven: Peeters, 1990.
- Marrou, Henri. "Les Attaches Orientales du Pelagianisme." *Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-lettres, Compte Rendus* (1968): 459-92.
- Marjanen, Antti and Petri Luomanen. *A Companion to Second-century Christian "Heretics"*. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Marschies, Christoph. "New Research on Ptolemaeus Gnosticus." *Zeitschrift für antikes Christentum* 4, no. 2 (2000): 225-54.
- Marrou, H. I. "La technique de l'édition à l'époque patristique." *VC* 3 (1949): 208-24.
- Martin, Victor. *Papyrus Bodmer II: Evangile de Jean*. Cologny-Genève: Bibliothèque Bodmeriana, 1956.

- May, Gerhard. "Marcion in Contemporary Views: Results and Open Questions." *SecCent* 6, no. 3 (1987/88): 129-51.
- May, Gerhard. "Markions Genesisauslesung und die "Antithesen"." Pages 189-98 in *Die Weltlichkeit des Glaubens in der Alten Kirche: Festschrift für Ulrich Wickert zum siebzigsten Geburtstag*. Edited by Barbara Aland, Christoph Schäublin, and Dietmar Wyrwa. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1997.
- May, Gerhard, Katharina Greschat, and Martin Meiser. *Marcion und seine kirchengeschichtliche Wirkung = Marcion and his impact on church history : Vorträge der Internationalen Fachkonferenz zu Marcion, gehalten vom 15.-18. August 2001 in Mainz*. Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 2002.
- Metzger, Bruce Manning. *The Canon of the New Testament: Its Origin, Development, and Significance*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.
- Metzger, Bruce Manning. *The Early Versions of the New Testament: Their Origin, Transmission, and Limitations*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977.
- Metzger, Bruce Manning. *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible: An Introduction to Greek Palaeography*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1981.
- Metzger, Bruce Manning and Bart D. Ehrman. *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*. 4th ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: Biblia-Druck, 1994.
- Metzger, Wolfgang. *Der Christushymnus I. Timotheus 3, 16: Fragment einer Homologie der paulinischen Gemeinden*. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1979.
- Mewaldt, Johannes. "Galenos über echte und unechte Hippocratica." *Hermes* 44 (1909): 111-34.
- McGurk, Patrick. "Canon Tables in the Book of Lindisfarne and in the Codex Fuldensis of St Victor of Capua." *Journal of Theological Studies* N.S. 6 (1955): 192-98.
- Miller, J. Edward. "Some Observations on the Text-Critical Function of the Umlauts in Vaticanus, with Special Attention to 1 Corinthians 14.34-35." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 26, no. 2 (2003): 217-36.
- McNamee, Kathleen. *Sigla and Select Marginalia in Greek Literary Papyri*. Bruxelles: Fondation Égyptologique Reine Élisabeth, 1992.

- McNamee, Kathleen. *Annotations in Greek and Latin texts from Egypt*. New Haven, Conn.: American Society of Papyrologists, 2007.
- Momigliano, Arnaldo. *The Development of Greek Biography*. Expanded ed. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1993.
- Montanari, Franco. "Zenodotus, Aristarchus and the Ekdosis of Homer." Pages 1-21 in *Editing Texts = Texte edieren*. Edited by Glenn W. Most. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998.
- Moraux, Paul. *Der Aristotelismus bei den Griechen: von Andronikos bis Alexander von Aphrodisias, I: Die Renaissance des Aristotelismus im I Jh. v. Chr.* Berlin: De Gruyter, 1973.
- Morgan, Theresa. "Dionysius Thrax and the Educational Uses of Grammar." Pages 73-94 in *Dionysius Thrax and the Technē Grammatikē*. Edited by Vivien Law and Ineke Sluiter. Münster: Nodus Publikationen, 1995.
- Morris, John "Pelagian Literature." *Journal of Theological Studies* N.S. 16 (1965): 26-60.
- Mundle, Wilhelm. "Die Herkunft der "marcionitischen" Prologe zu den paulinischen Briefen." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 24 (1925): 56-77.
- Murphy, Harold S. "On the Text of Codices H and 93." *JBL* 78 (1959): 228-37.
- Murphy, Harold S. "The Text of Romans and 1 Corinthians in Minuscule 93 and the Text of Pamphilus." *Harvard Theological Review* 52, no. 2 (1959): 119-31.
- Mutschmann, Hermann. "Inhaltsangabe und Kapitelüberschrift im antiken Buch." *Hermes* 46 (1911): 91-107.
- Myres, John Linton. *Homer and his Critics*. London: Routledge & Paul, 1958.
- Nagy, Gregory. *Homeric Questions*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1996.
- Nagy, Gregory. *Poetry as Performance: Homer and Beyond*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Niccum, Curt. "The Voice of the Manuscripts on the Silence of Women: The External Evidence for 1 Cor 14:34-35." *New Testament Studies* 43 (1997): 242-55.
- Nickau, Klaus. *Untersuchungen zur textkritischen Methode des Zenodotos von Ephesos*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1977.

- Nickau, Klaus. "Zenodotos." Pages 19-49 in *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumwissenschaft: Zweite Reihe*. Edited by Konrat Ziegler. München: Druckenmüller, 1972.
- Norden, Eduard. *Die antike Kunstprosa vom VI Jahrhundert V. Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance*. Zwieter abdruck ed. Vol. 1. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1909.
- Norden, Eduard. "Die Composition und Litteraturgattung der horazischen Epistula ad Pisones." *Hermes* 40 (1905): 481-528.
- Novolone, Flavio G. and Aimé Solignac. "Pélage et Pélagianisme." Pages 2889-942 in *Dictionnaire de spiritualité ascétique et mystique doctrine et histoire*. Paris: Beauchesne, 1986.
- Oliver, Harold H. "'Helps for Readers' in Greek New Testament Manuscripts." Th.M., Princeton, 1955.
- Omont, Henri Auguste. *Notice sur un très ancien manuscrit grec en onciales des Épîtres de saint Paul, conservé à la Bibliothèque nationale*, Imprimerie Nationale. Paris, 1889.
- Pack, Roger A. *The Greek and Latin Literary Texts from Greco-Roman Egypt*. 2d rev. and enl. ed. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1965.
- Page, Denys Lionel. *Actors' Interpolations in Greek Tragedy*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1934.
- Pagels, Elaine. *The Gnostic Paul: Gnostic Exegesis of the Pauline Letters*. Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1975.
- Parker, D. C. *Codex Bezae: An Early Christian Manuscript and its Text*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Parker, D. C. *The Living Text of the Gospels*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Parker, D. C. "Review of David Trobisch, *The First Edition of the New Testament*." *JTS* N.S. 53, no. 1 (2002): 298-305.
- Payne, Philip B. "Fuldensis, Sigla for Variants in Vaticanus, and 1 Cor 14.34-5." *New Testament Studies* 41 (1995): 240-62.
- Payne, Philip B. "Ms 88 as Evidence for a Text without 1 Cor 14:34-35." *New Testament Studies* 44 (1998): 152-58.

- Payne, Philip B. "The Text-Critical Function of the Umlauts in Vaticanus, with Special Attention to 1 Corinthians 14.34-35: A response to J. Edward Miller." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 27, no. 1 (2004): 105-12.
- Perdue, L. G. "The Social Character of Paraenesis and Paraenetic Literature." *Semeia* 50 (1990): 5-39.
- Petersen, Anders Klostergaard. "Paraenesis in Pauline Scholarship and in Paul--An Intricate Relationship." Pages 267-96 in *Early Christian Paraenesis in Context*. Edited by Troels Engberg-Pedersen and James M. Starr. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004.
- Petersen, William Lawrence. *Tatian's Diatessaron: Its Creation, Dissemination, Significance, and History in Scholarship*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994.
- Petzer, Jacobus H. "The Latin Version of the New Testament." Pages 113-30 in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*. Edited by Bart D. Ehrman and Michael William Holmes. Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans, 1995.
- Pfeiffer, Rudolf. *History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.
- Pietersen, Lloyd. *The Polemic of the Pastorals: A Sociological Examination of the Development of Pauline Christianity*. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Plater, William Edward and H. J. White. *A Grammar of the Vulgate, being an Introduction to the Study of the Latinity of the Vulgate Bible*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926.
- Plinval, Georges de. *Pélage, ses écrits, sa vie et sa réforme; étude d'histoire littéraire et religieuse*. Lausanne: Payot, 1943.
- Plinval, Georges de. "Précisions sur l'authenticité d'un prologue de Pélage: *Primum quaeritur*." *Revue des Études Augustiniennes* 12 (1966): 247-53.
- Porter, Calvin L. "Papyrus Bodmer XV (P75) and the text of Codex Vaticanus." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 81 (1962): 363-76.
- Rackett, Michael Reynolds. "Sexuality and Sinlessness: The Diversity among Pelagian Theologies of Marriage and Virginity." Ph.D. Dissertation, Duke University, 2002.
- Rees, B. R. *Pelagius: A Reluctant Heretic*. Wolfeboro, N.H.: Boydell Press, 1988.
- Rees, B. R. *Pelagius: Life and Letters*. Rochester, N.Y.: Boydell Press, 1998.

- Reeve, Michael D. "Interpolation in Greek Tragedy, I." *GRBS* 13, no. 3 (1972): 247-66.
- Reeve, Michael D. "Interpolation in Greek Tragedy, II." *GRBS* 13, no. 4 (1972): 451-73.
- Reeve, Michael D. "Interpolation in Greek Tragedy, III." *GRBS* 14, no. 2 (1973): 145-71.
- Re foulé, François. "Datation du premier concile de Carthage contre les Pélagians et du *Libellus fidei* de Rufin." *Revue des Etudes Augustiniennes* 9 (1963): 41-49.
- Regenbogen, O. "Πίναξ." *Pauly-Wissowa* 20 (1950): 1409-82.
- Regul, Jürgen. *Die antimarcionitischen Evangelienprologe*. Freiburg: Herder, 1969.
- Reynolds, L. D. and Nigel Guy Wilson. *Scribes and Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.
- Riesner, Rainer. *Paul's Early Period: Chronology, Mission Strategy, Theology*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans, 1998.
- Riggenbach, Eduard. "Die Kapitalverzeichnisse zum Römer- und zum Hebräerbrief im Codex Fuldensis der Vulgata." *Neue Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie* 3 (1894): 350-63.
- Rius-Camps, Josep and Jenny Read-Heimerdinger. *The Message of Acts in Codex Bezae: A Comparison with the Alexandrian Tradition*. London: T & T Clark, 2004.
- Roberts, Colin H. *Manuscript, Society, and Belief in Early Christian Egypt*. London: Oxford University Press, 1979.
- Roberts, Colin H. and T. C. Skeat. *The Birth of the Codex*. London: Oxford University Press, 1983.
- Robinson, James M. "The Construction of the Nag Hammadi Codices." Pages 170-90 in *Essays on the Nag Hammadi Texts: In Honour of Pahor Labib*. Edited by Martin Krause. Leiden: Brill, 1975.
- Robinson, James M. "On the Codicology of the Nag Hammadi Codices." Pages 15-31 in *Les Textes de Nag Hammadi*. Edited by Jacques-E. Menard. Leiden: Brill, 1975.
- Robinson, James M. "The Future of Papyrus Codicology." Pages 23-70 in *The Future of Coptic Studies*. Edited by R. McL. Wilson. Leiden: Brill, 1978.
- Rossum-Steenbeek, Monique van. *Greek Readers' Digests?: Studies on a Selection of Subliterary Papyri*. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

- Royse, James Ronald. *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri*. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Robins, Robert H. "The Authenticity of the *Technē*: The *status quaestionis*." Pages 13-26 in *Dionysius Thrax and the Technē Grammatikē*. Edited by Vivien Law and Ineke Sluiter. Münster: Nodus Publikationen, 1995.
- Robinson, J. Armitage. *Euthaliana; Studies of Euthalius, Codex H of the Pauline Epistles, and the Armenian Version*, Texts and Studies; v. 3, no. 3. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1895.
- Rutherford, William G. *A Chapter in the History of Annotation being Scholia Aristophanica, vol. III*. London: Macmillan, 1905 (1987 Garland Publishing reprint).
- Sage, Athanase. "Le péché originel dans la pensée de saint Augustin, de 412 à 430." *Revue des Études Augustiniennes* 15, no. 1-2 (1969): 75-112.
- Saffrey, H. D. and L. G. Westerink, eds. *Proclus: Théologie platonicienne, Livre I*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1968.
- Sanders, Jack T. *The New Testament Christological Hymns*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971.
- Schäfer, K. Th. "Eisagoge." *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* 4 (1959): 862-904.
- Schäfer, Karl Theodor. "Marius Victorinus und die Marcionitischen Prologe zu den Paulusbriefen." *Revue Bénédictine* 80 (1970): 7-16.
- Schäfer, Karl Theodor. "Marcion and the ältesten Prologe zu den Paulusbriefen." Pages 135-50 in *Kyriakon: Festschrift Johannes Quasten*. Edited by P. Granfield and J. A. Jungmann. Münster: Aschendorf, 1973.
- Schäublin, Christoph. "Homerum ex Homero." *Museum Helveticum* 34 (1977): 221-27.
- Schmid, Ulrich. *Unum ex quattuor: eine Geschichte der lateinischen Tatianüberlieferung*. Freiburg: Herder, 2005.
- Schmid, Ulrich. *Marcion und sein Apostolos: Rekonstruktion und historische Einordnung der marcionitischen Paulusbriefausgabe*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995.
- Schüssler Fiorenza, Elisabeth. *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins*. New York: Crossroad, 1983.

- Schütz, Roland. "Die Bedeutung der Kolometrie für das Neue Testament." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 21 (1922): 161-84.
- Schwartz, Eduard. *Kaiser Constantin und die christliche Kirche*. 2nd ed. Leipzig: Teubner, 1936.
- Simon, Marcel. *Verus Israel: A Study of the Relations between Christians and Jews in the Roman Empire, 135-425*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Skeat, T. C. "The Use of Dictation in Ancient Book-Production." *Proceedings of the British Academy* 42 (1956): 179-208.
- Slusser, M. "The Scope of Patripassianism." Pages 169-75 in *Studia patristica vol. XVII, part one*. Edited by Elizabeth A. Livingstone. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1982.
- Smith, Alfred J. "The Latin Sources of the Commentary of Pelagius on the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans." *Journal of Theological Studies* 19 (1918): 162-230; 20 (1919) 55-177.
- Smith, Wesley D. *The Hippocratic Tradition*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1979.
- Soden, Hermann Freiherr von. *Die Schriften des neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren textgestalt hergestellt auf Grund ihrer Textgeschichte*. Second ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1902 (1911 reprint).
- Solmsen, Friedrich. "The Academic and the Alexandrian Editions of Plato's Works." *Illinois Classical Studies* 6, no. 1 (1981): 102-11.
- Solmsen, Friedrich. "Republic III, 389b-d6: Plato's Draft and the Editor's Mistake." *Philologus* 109 (1965): 182-85.
- Souter, Alexander. "The Character and History of Pelagius's Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul." *Proceedings of the British Academy* (1915-16): 261-96.
- Souter, Alexander. "The Commentary of Pelagius on the Epistles of Paul: the Problem of its Restoration." *Proceedings of the British Academy* (1905-6): 409-39.
- Souter, Alexander. *A Study of Ambrosiaster*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1905.
- Souter, Alexander. *Pelagius's Expositions of Thirteen Epistles of St. Paul: I. Introduction*. Edited by J.A. Robinson. Vol. 9 no.I-III, Texts and studies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1922.

- Souter, Alexander. *The Text and Canon of the New Testament*. London: Duckworth, 1954.
- Sparks, H. F. D. "The Order of the Epistles in the Chester Beatty Papyrus P46." *Journal of Theological Studies* 42 (1941): 180-81.
- Speyer, Wolfgang. *Die literarische Fälschung im heidnischen und christlichen Altertum: eine Versuch ihrer Deutung*. Munich: C. H. Beck'sche, 1971.
- Starr, R. J. "The Circulation of Literary Texts in the Roman World." *Classical Quarterly* 37 (1987): 213-23.
- Starr, R. J. "The Used-book Trade in the Roman World." *Phoenix* 44 (1990): 148-57.
- Stemplinger, Eduard. *Das Plagiat in der griechischen Literatur*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1912 (1990 G. Olms reprint).
- Stevenson, James ed. *Creeds, Councils, and Controversies; Documents Illustrative of the History of the Church A.D. 337-461*. Revised with additional documents by W. H. C. Frend. London: SPCK, 1989.
- Strange, W. A. *The Problem of the Text of Acts*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Stuart, Duane Reed. *Epochs of Greek and Roman Biography*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1928.
- Sundberg Jr., A. C. "Canon Muratori: A Fourth Century List." *Harvard Theological Review* 66 (1973): 1-41.
- Sutcliffe, E. T. "The Name Vulgate." *Biblica* 29 (1948): 345-52.
- Swiggers, Pierre and Alfons Wouters, eds. *Ancient Grammar: Content and Context*. Leuven: Peeters, 1996.
- Tarrant, Harold. *Thrasylan Platonism*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1993.
- TeSelle, Eugene. "Rufinus the Syrian, Caelestius, Pelagius: Explorations in the Pre-history of the Pelagian Controversy." *Augustinian Studies* 3 (1972): 61-95.
- Theile, Walter. "Zum lateinischen Paulustext. Textkritik und Überlieferungsgeschichte." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 60 (1969): 264-73.
- Theile, Walter. "Probleme der Versio Latina in den Katholischen Briefen." Pages 93-119 in *Die Alten Übersetzungen des Neuen Testaments, die Kirchenväterzitate und Lektionare*. Edited by Kurt Aland. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1972.

- Thiel, H. van. "Zenodot, Aristarch und Andere." *ZPE* 90 (1992): 1-32.
- Tischendorf, Constantin von. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. Vol. 2. Lipsiae: Giesecke & Devrient, 1872.
- Trobisch, David. *The First Edition of the New Testament*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Turner, Eric G. *The Typology of the Early Codex*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1977.
- Turner, Nigel. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*. Vol. III. Syntax. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963.
- Ungern-Sternberg, Jürgen von. *Capua im Zweiten Punischen Krieg: Untersuchungen zur römischen Annalistik*. München: Beck, 1975.
- Valk, H. L. M. van der. "On the Edition of Books in Antiquity." *VC* 11 (1957): 1-10.
- Valk, Marchinus van der. *Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad: Part Two*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963.
- Vallee, Gerard *A Study in Anti-Gnostic Polemics*. Edited by J. Ouellette, Studies in Christianity and Judaism. Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1981.
- van Gronigen, B. A. "ΕΚΔΟΣΙΣ." *Mnemosyne* 16 (1963): 1-17.
- Vardanian, P. Aristaces. "Euthaliana." *Handes amsoya; monatschrift für armenische Philologie* 38 (1925): 1-26.
- Vogels, Heinrich. "Der Einfluss Marcions und Tatians auf Text und Kanon des Neuen Testaments." Pages 278-89 in *Synoptische Studien Alfred Wikenhauser dargebracht*. Munich: K. Zink, 1953.
- Vogels, Heinrich. *Handbuch der Textkritik der Neuen Testament*. Bonn: P. Hanstein, 1955.
- von der Goltz, Eduard Freiherrn. *Eine textkritische Arbeit des zehnten bzw. sechsten Jahrhunderts herausgegeben nach einem Kodex des Athosklosters Lawra*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1899.
- Wagner, Sister M. Monica tr. *Saint Basil, Ascetical Works*. FC, v. 9. Washington D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1950.

- West, Stephanie. *The Ptolemaic Papyri of Homer*. Köln: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1967.
- Westcott, B. F. and F. J. A. Hort. *The New Testament in the Original Greek: Vol. 2 Introduction*. Cambridge: Macmillan and Co., 1881.
- Westerink, L. G. "The Alexandrian Commentators and the Introductions to their Commentaries." Pages 325-49 in *Aristotle Transformed: The Ancient Commentators and their Influence*. Edited by Richard Sorabji. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1990.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Ulrich von. *Einleitung in die griechische Tragödie*. Zweiter unveränderter Abdruck aus der ersten Auflage von Euripides Herakles I Kapitel I-IV ed. Berlin: Weidmann, 1921.
- Widengren, Geo. *Mani and Manichaeism*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1961.
- Wilken, Robert Louis. *John Chrysostom and the Jews: Rhetoric and Reality in the Late Fourth Century*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983.
- Willard, Louis Charles. "A Critical Study of the Euthalian Apparatus." Ph.D. Dissertation, Yale, 1970.
- Williams, David S. "Reconsidering Marcion's Gospel." *JBL* 108 (1989): 477-96.
- Williams, Frank. *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis: Book I (Sects 1-46)*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1987.
- Wilson, Nigel Guy. "The Relation of Text and Commentary in Greek Books." Pages 105-10 in *Il libro e Il testo: Atti del Convegno internazionale, Urbino 20-23 settembre 1982*. Edited by Cesare Questa and Renato Raffaelli. Urbino: Università degli studi di Urbino, 1984.
- Wilson, Nigel Guy. *Scholars of Byzantium*. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983.
- Wilson, Stephen G. "Marcion and the Jews." Pages 45-58 in *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity: v. 2 Separation and Polemic*. Edited by Stephen G. Wilson. Waterloo, Ont., Canada: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1986.
- Wilson, Stephen G., ed. *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity: v. 2 Separation and Polemic*. Waterloo, Ont., Canada: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1986.
- Wire, Antoinette Clark. *The Corinthian Women Prophets: A Reconstruction through Paul's Rhetoric*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.

- Wisse, Frederik. "The Coptic Versions of the New Testament." Pages 131-41 in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*. Edited by Bart D. Ehrman and Michael William Holmes. Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans, 1995.
- Wyrick, Jed. *The Ascension of Authorship: Attribution and Canon Formation in Jewish, Hellenistic, and Christian Traditions*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2004.
- Young, Frances M. *From Nicaea to Chalcedon: A Guide to the Literature and its Background*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983.
- Young, Frances M. *The Theology of the Pastoral Letters*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Zahn, Theodor von. "Neues und Altes über den Isagogiker Euthalius." *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift* 15 (1904): 305-30, 75-90.
- Zahn, Theodor von. *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen kanons: Erster Band: Das Neue Testament vor Origenes. Zweite Hälfte*. Erlangen: A. Deichert, 1888.
- Zahn, Theodor von. *Grundrisse der Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*. Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1932 (2nd Auflage).
- Zetzel, James E. G. *Latin Textual Criticism in Antiquity*. New York: Arno Press, 1981.
- Zimmermann, Bernhard. "Hypothesis." Pages 647-48 in *Brill's New Pauly: Encyclopaedia of the Ancient World, v.6 Hat-Jus*. Edited by Hubert Cancik and et al. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Zimmermann, Bernhard. "Prolog." Pages 398-400 in *Der Neue Pauly: Band 10 Pol-Sal*. Edited by Hubert Cancik and Helmuth Schneider. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 1996.
- Zuntz, Günther. *The Ancestry of the Harklean New Testament*, The British Academy, Suppl. Papers 7. London: Oxford University Press, 1945.
- Zuntz, Günther. "Euthalius = Euzoius?" *VC* 7, no. 1 (1953): 16-22.
- Zuntz, Günther. *An Inquiry into the Transmission of the Plays of Euripides*. Cambridge: University Press, 1965.
- Zuntz, Günther. "Die Subscription der Syra Harclensis." *Zeitschrift der deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft* N. F. 26 (1951): 174-96.
- Zuntz, Günther. *The Text of the Epistles: A Disquisition upon the Corpus Paulinum*. London: Oxford University Press, 1953.