

Vemund Blomkvist
Euthalian Traditions

Texte und Untersuchungen
zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur

Archiv für die Ausgabe der Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller
der ersten Jahrhunderte

(TU)

Begründet von
O. von Gebhardt und A. von Harnack

Herausgegeben im Auftrag der
Berlin-Brandenburgischen Akademie der Wissenschaften
von Christoph Markschies

Band 170

De Gruyter

Vemund Blomkvist

Euthalian Traditions

Text, Translation and Commentary

Including the Appendix

Parainesis as an Ancient Genre-Designation

by

David Hellholm and Vemund Blomkvist

De Gruyter

Dieser Band wurde im Rahmen der gemeinsamen Forschungsförderung
im Akademienprogramm mit Mitteln des Bundesministeriums für Forschung
und der Senatsverwaltung für Wirtschaft, Technologie und Forschung
des Landes Berlin erarbeitet.



Gutachter dieses Bandes:
Hans-Gebhard Bethge und Christoph Marksches

Vemund Blomkvist. Born 1967. Dr. Philos. Senior Lecturer in Greek and
New Testament Isagogics at the Faculty of Theology, University of Oslo.

This publication has been supported by the Research Council of Norway.

ISBN 978-3-11-029179-7
e-ISBN 978-3-11-029196-4
ISSN 0082-3589

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A CIP catalog record for this book has been applied for at the Library of Congress.

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen
Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet
über <http://dnb.dnb.de> abrufbar.

© 2012 Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/Boston

Layout and typesetting: Progressus Consultant AB in Karlstad, Sweden

Druck: Hubert & Co. GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen

∞ Gedruckt auf säurefreiem Papier

Printed in Germany

www.degruyter.com

Contents

Preface.....	xi
--------------	----

PART ONE

Introductory Issues

I. Introductory Issues.....	3
1. Introduction.....	3
1.1. What is the ‘Euthalian Apparatus’?.....	3
1.2. Manuscript Evidence and Editions.....	5
2. History of Research.....	8
2.1. Survey.....	8
2.2. Conclusions.....	31
3. Aim and Structure of the Study.....	33
3.1. The Euthalian Apparatus and the Biblical Text.....	33
3.2. The Sequence and Style of the Present Commentary.....	34
3.3. Themes of the Commentary.....	36
3.3.1. The Pre-text.....	36
3.3.2. The Meta-terminology of the Apparatus.....	36
3.3.3. The Apparatus as Paraphrase.....	40
3.3.4. Parallel Materials.....	42

PART TWO

Text and Translation

II. The Euthalian Κεφάλαια, Ὑποθέσεις and Πρόλογοι.....	45
---	----

Κεφάλαια.....	45
Ύποθέσεις.....	73
Πρόλογοι.....	99

PART THREE
Commentary

III. Commentary.....	121
1. Commentary on the κεφάλαια-τίτλοι.....	121
1.1. The Genre κεφάλαιον-τίτλος.....	121
1.2. The Structure of the Euthalian κεφάλαια-τίτλοι.....	123
1.3. The κεφάλαια-τίτλοι and the Division of the Pre-text.....	124
1.4. The meta-terminology of the Euthalian κεφάλαια-τίτλοι.....	125
1.4.1. ΠΑΡΑΙΝΕΣΙΣ.....	125
1.4.2. ΠΑΡΑΚΛΗΣΙΣ.....	129
1.4.3. ΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΙΑ.....	130
1.4.4. ΕΥΧΗ.....	134
1.4.5. ΕΠΑΝΑΛΗΨΙΣ.....	136
1.5. The meta-terminology of the κεφάλαια-τίτλοι: Concluding Remarks.....	138
1.6. Transformations and Additions to the Pre-text.....	139
1.7. The ‘Paulusbild’ of the κεφάλαια-τίτλοι.....	140
2. Commentary on the ύποθέσεις.....	142
2.1. The Genre Ύποθεσις.....	142
2.2. The Hypotheses of the Pauline Letters.....	147
2.2.1. Authorship.....	147
2.2.2. Structure.....	147

2.2.3. Διὰ τί: An Ancient Introduction to the Ὑποθέσεις of the Pauline Letters	147
2.2.4. Hypothesis of Romans	148
2.2.5. Hypothesis of 1 Corinthians	154
2.2.6. Hypothesis of 2 Corinthians	157
2.2.7. Hypothesis of Galatians	160
2.2.8. Hypothesis of Ephesians	161
2.2.10. Hypothesis of Colossians.....	165
2.2.11. Hypothesis of 1 Thessalonians.....	167
2.2.12. Hypothesis of 2 Thessalonians.....	168
2.2.13. Hypothesis of Hebrews	170
2.2.14. Hypothesis 1 Timothy.....	171
2.2.15. Hypothesis of 2 Timothy	172
2.2.16. Hypothesis of Titus	172
2.2.17. Hypothesis of Philemon	173
2.2.18. The Hypotheses of the Pauline Letters: Summary	174
2.3. The Hypotheses of the Catholic Letters	176
2.3.1. Authorship.....	176
2.3.2. Structure	176
2.3.3. Hypothesis of James	178
2.3.4. Hypothesis of 1 Peter	179
2.3.5. Hypothesis of 2 Peter	182
2.3.6. Hypothesis of 1 John	183
2.3.7. Hypothesis of 2 John	185
2.3.8. Hypothesis of 3 John	186
2.3.9. Hypothesis of Jude.....	186
2.3.10. The Hypotheses of the Catholic Letters: Summary.....	188

2.5. The List of Apostles and Deacons.....	192
2.6. The List of Wonders.....	192
2.7. The Hypotheses: Summary.....	193
3. Commentary on the Prologues.....	194
3.1. The Genre ‘Prologue’.....	194
3.2. Commentary on the <i>Prologue to the Letters of Paul</i>	196
3.2.1. Structure of the <i>Prologue to the Letters of Paul</i>	196
3.2.2. The Heading to the <i>Prologue to the Letters of Paul</i>	197
3.2.3. Prologus praeter rem.....	197
3.2.3.1. The Genre ‘Prooemium’.....	197
3.2.3.2. Comments on the ‘Prooemium’.....	198
3.2.4. Prologus ante rem.....	200
3.2.4.1. The ‘Life of Paul’.....	200
3.2.4.2. The ‘Epitome of the Pauline Letters’.....	206
3.2.4.3. The ‘Editorial Notice’.....	211
3.2.4.4. The ‘Chronicle of the Preaching of Paul’.....	213
3.2.5. <i>Prologue to the Letters of Paul</i> : Summary.....	216
3.3. Commentary on the <i>Prologue to the Catholic Letters</i>	218
3.3.1. Structure of the <i>Prologue to the Catholic Letters</i>	218
3.3.2. The Heading to the <i>Prologue to the Catholic Letters</i>	218
3.3.3. Prologus praeter rem.....	218
3.3.3.1. Comments on the ‘Prooemium’.....	218
3.3.4. Prologus ante rem.....	219
3.3.4.1. Comments on the ‘Editorial Notice’.....	219
3.3.5. The Prologue to the Catholic letters: Summary.....	220
3.4. Commentary on the <i>Prologue to Acts</i>	220

3.4.1. Structure of the <i>Prologue to Acts</i>	220
3.4.2. The Heading to the <i>Prologue to Acts</i>	221
3.4.3. Prologus praeter rem	221
3.4.3.1. Comments on the 'Prooemium'	221
3.4.3.2. The 'Encomium of Melete'	223
3.4.4. Prologus ante rem	224
3.4.4.1. Comments on the 'Editorial Notice'	224
3.4.4.2. Comments on the 'Epitome of Acts'	225
3.4.5. Prologue to Acts: Summary	226
3.5. The Prologues: Summary	226

PART FOUR

Résumé

IV. Résumé	231
1. Introduction	231
2. Aim of the Present Commentary	232
3. The Meta-terminology of the Euthalian Apparatus	233
4. The 'Paulusbild'	235
5. The Catholic Letters in the Euthalian Apparatus	240
6. Acts in the Euthalian Apparatus	241
7. The Composition of the Euthalian Editions	242
8. The Ancient and Medieval Parallel Materials in Relation to the Euthalian apparatus	244
9. Comparison of the Parallel Materials	246

PART FIVE
 Appendices

V. Appendix I	253
1. ‘Marcionite’ Prologues	253
2. Edition of Priscillian	255
3. Theodoret’s Arguments	269
4. Theophylact’s Arguments	286
VI. Appendix II	299
1. What is a Genre-Designation?	299
2. <i>Parainesis</i> — <i>paraineo</i> — <i>parainetikos</i> as Genre-Designation	302
2.1. A short History of <i>parainesis</i> as Genre-Designation	302
2.2. The Evidence from Euthalius	304
2.2.1. Evidence from the Chapter-Lists (CAP)	305
2.2.2. Evidence from the Affiliated Argumenta	336
2.3. Evidence From Ps-Libanios or Ps-Proclos	340
3. Conclusion	343
Bibliography	345
Index of Modern Authors	377
Index of Passages	383

Preface

Many people have contributed to this study. First, I am deeply grateful for the countless hours Professor David Hellholm has guided me with exceptional knowledge and strong support during my work on this dissertation. Berit Hellholm, Prof. David Hellholm's wife, has generously supported my work and served some memorable dinners. Christer Hellholm, their son, has done excellent work with typesetting and editing. I would also like to thank Cristina Hellholm, Christer Hellholm's wife for her hospitality.

Björg Tosterud gave me valuable advice on the translation. Andrey Sand, David Jordan, and Dr. Stephen Kidd helped me improve the English style. Dr. Simon Crisp inspired me with his enthusiasm, and Dr. Louis Charles Willard generously gave me access to his notes. I also had the pleasure to discuss the Euthalian matter with the late Professor Neville Birdsall when I was a guest at the meeting of Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas in Pretoria, South Africa in 1999. I also want to express my gratitude to the late Professor Nils Alstrup Dahl, who introduced me to the Euthalian apparatus in 1994. The University of Oslo and the Faculty of Theology gave me the opportunity to work on this dissertation.

I want to thank Professor emeritus Jerker Blomqvist and Professor Dieter Sänger for accepting the task of being opponents at the defence of my thesis. Their criticism was very valuable. Professor Øyvind Norderval was the administrator of the committee, and I want to thank him for helpful advice and support. Finally, I wish to extend my gratitude to Professor Christoph Marksches, editor of *Texte und Untersuchungen*, who accepted this study for publication in this renowned series.

I am, of course, responsible for all errors in this work.

The essay by David Hellholm and Vemund Blomkvist, "Parainesis as an Ancient Genre-Designation. The Case of the 'Euthalian Apparatus' and the 'Affiliated Argumenta'" first published in J. Starr and T. Engberg-Pedersen (eds.), *Early Christian Paraenesis in Context* (BZNTW 125), Berlin • New York: Walter de Gruyter 2004, 467–519 has in slightly revised and supplemented form been reprinted in this volume as VI. Appendix II.

Part One

Introductory Issues

I. Introductory Issues

1. Introduction

1.1. What is the ‘Euthalian Apparatus’?

The Acts, the Pauline letters, and the Catholic letters are epitomized in a corpus that is known as the ‘Euthalian apparatus,’ (hereafter called the ‘apparatus.’) The apparatus has been transmitted without a title in the majority of manuscripts, but its common designation derives from ‘Euthalius,’ a person about whom very little is known. Some writers believe he was an Egyptian cleric who lived in the 4th or 5th century,¹ while others place him much later, describing him as a deacon from the East who became bishop of Sulci in Sardinia in the 7th century.² The name ‘Euthalius,’ however, is not the only one which appears in the manuscripts, but also ‘Evagrius,’ who has been identified both with Evagrius Ponticus³ and Evagrius of Antioch,⁴ both of the 4th century.

The apparatus originally appeared in two volumes:

1. The first volume contained the fourteen letters of Paul, with Heb placed after 2 Thess.⁵
2. The second volume contained Acts together with the seven Catholic letters.

These two volumes are described in the so-called Euthalian prologues—although the term ‘prologue’ is in a sense unfortunate, since the ‘prologues’ were probably something closer in form to dedicatory letters.⁶ These letters once accompanied the Euthalian volumes, which should be considered model codices for the Euthalian editions, although these codices themselves are no longer extant. The first volume was thus an edition of the Pauline letters and the second volume an edition of Acts and the Catholic letters. Although it may be objected that the use of the term ‘edition’ applied to manuscripts is anachronistic, the terminology adopted in the present work will reflect the stance repre-

1 L. ZACAGNI (1698: lxii–lxv) and J. WETTSTEIN (1752: 73) place him in the 5th century, while F. C. CONYBEARE (1904: 45–52) places him in the 4th century.

2 This identification was first suggested by HERM. VON SODEN (1902: 648–649) and later supported by W. BOUSSET (1903: 328–330).

3 See A. EHRHARD 1891.

4 See J. N. BIRDSALL 1970.

5 See the heading to the *Prologue to the Pauline Letters*: Πρόλογος Εὐθαλίου διακόνου προτασσόμενος τῆς βίβλου τῶν ἐπιστολῶν Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου. ‘Prologue by the Deacon Euthalius prefixed to the Book of the Letters of Paul the Apostle.’ This is called ‘The Apostolic Book’ in the Prooemium of the *Prologue to Acts*.

6 See J. R. HARRIS 1893: 82; G. ZUNTZ 1953: 19.

sented by Elizabeth Eisenstein, who notes that biblical scholars often refer to ‘editions of the Bible’ made before the age of printing.⁷

Each of the prologues contains an editorial notice where the volumes are described. It should however be remembered that no two identical manuscripts exist, and from the very moment a copy is made, the ‘first edition’ is subject to change. Apart from changes in the text, entire sections that were added as help for readers may be omitted, and new material added. The great variety found in Euthalian manuscripts shows that this has occurred.⁸ For this reason, it is important to emphasize that the Euthalian editions did not survive in their original form since both the arrangement of the biblical text and the introductory material have been subject to change. Regarding the arrangement of the biblical text, it is commonly assumed that the Euthalian editions were written in sense-lines,⁹ even though this is not the case with the great majority of extant manuscripts. The justification for referring to editions is therefore not a uniformity found in the textual tradition, but a hypothetical starting point behind that tradition.

The editions were probably not planned as a two-volume work, since the first volume does not announce any sequel. In the prologue to the second volume there are, however, references to the first. Thus we may speak of two Euthalian editions that later were combined into one.¹⁰ All scholars have presupposed that the two volumes were the work of one author, who incorporated earlier material into his editions. The voice of this author is presumably heard in the prologues. However, the possibility exists that the second volume was calqued onto the first, and that the author of the second consciously wrote the prologues to Acts and the Catholic letters in the style of his predecessor. If this is the case, the question of authorship is even more complex than scholars often have assumed. To this question we will return in the commentary below.

The original editions with the Euthalian prologues were not the starting point for the entire tradition of auxiliary material that exists in Greek manuscripts of the NT. Much of this material existed prior to the apparatus, and has also been transmitted through other channels. Thus we find the same texts transmitted together with the prologues and without them. This was emphasized by Albert Ehrhard, and also by Nils Alstrup Dahl.¹¹

To begin, it is necessary to offer some preliminary comments on the most important elements of the apparatus:

1. Κεφάλαια-τίτλοι (chapter titles).¹² The biblical text was early divided into chapters, each with its own title. Κεφάλαια-τίτλοι are often prefixed to each biblical book, and the titles may be repeated in the biblical text.

7 See E. EISENSTEIN 1979/2005: 11.

8 See the great variety of constellations in L. CH. WILLARD (1970: 209–219/2009: 158–169).

9 See ZACAGNI 1698: lix; WETTSTEIN 1752: 73; ZUNTZ 1945: 94–104 and WILLARD 1970: 182–191/2009: 137–143.

10 This is the case eg in minuscule 181, which contains Acts, the Catholic and the Pauline letters and the Apocalypse.

11 See EHRHARD 1891: 397; N. A. DAHL 2000d: 256–257.

12 This term is not ancient, but was invented by von Soden. The manuscripts use the term κεφάλαια. In the present study von Soden’s term is adopted, as it has a more precise reference. See VON SODEN 1902: 405.

2. Ὑποθέσεις (argumenta). The ὑποθέσεις are separate summaries for each biblical book.
3. Πρόλογοι (prologues). There are three prologues (to the Pauline letters, to Acts, and to the Catholic letters). The prologues explain that the author has been asked to edit the biblical books, and they provide introductory material of interest to the reader, such as biographies of the biblical authors and short summaries of their work.

1.2. Manuscript Evidence and Editions

Elements belonging to the apparatus are found in hundreds of Greek biblical manuscripts. A survey of the Greek manuscripts and the elements of the apparatus they contain was made by Louis Charles Willard.¹³ His survey shows that only a limited number of manuscripts have been used in the printed editions of the apparatus. The first printed edition of the entire apparatus is that of Lorenzo Zacagni, published in Rome in 1698, in the first (and only) volume of his *Collectanea monumentorum veterum ecclesiae Graecae ac Latinae*. Zacagni used nine manuscripts, his most important witness being minuscule 181.¹⁴ This eleventh-century manuscript contains Acts, the Catholic letters, the Pauline letters, and the Apocalypse, in that order (since the Apocalypse is not transmitted with the Euthalian apparatus, it will not be considered here). The text of the original manuscript ends at Tit 2:3, and the Apocalypse was supplemented later.¹⁵ Minuscule 181 contains the three Euthalian prologues, with the ὑποθέσεις and κεφάλαια-τίτλοι prefixed to each biblical book, as well as lists of biblical quotations and other auxiliary material. Through the edition of Zacagni, this manuscript has had a great influence on later scholarship. Therefore, the name ‘Euthalius,’ which occurs in this manuscript, was established as the name of the author, despite the fact that the apparatus in the majority of manuscripts is anonymous. The edition of Zacagni forms the basis of the editions of Andreas Galland (1774), Jacques Paul Migne (1864), and Hermann von Soden (1902).

The earliest witness that contains Euthalian material is Codex H 015 of the Pauline letters (6th cent.).¹⁶ This fragmentary manuscript is written in sense-lines. The sense-lines are quite short, some of them consisting only of a single word. This manuscript contains several elements of the apparatus, (even though it does not have any prologue), including (1) Lists with numbered κεφάλαια; (2) numerals in the margin which indicates where a chapter begins;¹⁷ (3) a numbering of the OT quotations in the margin with indication of the source of the quotation;¹⁸ and (4) a colophon with phrases that are very close to mate-

13 See the manuscript survey in WILLARD (1970: 209–219/2009: 158–169).

14 Zacagni refers to this as the ‘Codex Regio-Alexandrinus Vaticanus,’ as it was donated by Queen Christina to Pope Alexander VIII, see ZACAGNI 1698: liv.

15 See VON SODEN 1902: 219.

16 See the edition of Codex H by H. OMONT (1890) and the material reproduced by J. A. ROBINSON (1895: 50–71).

17 These can only be seen in a few instances, see EHRHARD 1891: 394.

18 On the OT testimonies in Codex H, see ROBINSON 1895: 18–20.

rial found in the apparatus. This colophon is reproduced in the following section dealing with the history of research.

Although the history of the apparatus is primarily linked to the history and reception of the Greek New Testament, some other versions do exist. Euthalian material exists in Syriac, Armenian and Georgian, as well as traces of the apparatus in Gothic and Latin. The apparatus for the Pauline letters was translated into Syriac. The first scholar to offer a comprehensive treatment of the Syriac version was Ernst von Dobschütz (1899), who based his study on two NT manuscripts, L (8th cent.) and O (11th cent.).¹⁹ L contains the Peshitta version, while O represents the Harclean revision. The apparatus is used differently in these two manuscripts: in L, it was added as an independent tract to the NT, while in O the apparatus was inserted into the biblical text, as in the Greek tradition.²⁰ The two versions of the apparatus are not independent, but are evidence of a complex history of transmission.²¹

The apparatus for the Pauline letters, Acts and the Catholic letters was translated into Armenian. This material was introduced to European scholars by Frederick Cornwallis Conybeare in 1895, whose work on this material was carried further by James Armitage Robinson in his *Euthaliana*. These scholars studied the Armenian manuscripts with the apparatus from the 13th century²² although the Armenian translation of the apparatus itself is much older, (dating perhaps to the 5th century, as Conybeare argued).²³ In the 1920s, P. Aristaces Vardanian wrote a series of articles on the Armenian version of the apparatus which were later published together in one volume.²⁴ Vardanian argues that parts of the apparatus were translated into Armenian at an early date (5th cent.), but that the ὑποθέσεις were translated later, since these texts represent a later form of Armenian, indicating that they were not included in the original Greek apparatus. However, since Vardanian wrote in Armenian, his work has a limited readership. Luckily, Willard has provided an English summary and discussion of his work.²⁵

The apparatus also exists in different recensions in Georgian. This material was first referred to by Theodor Kluge in 1911, which he returned to in a later study.²⁶ Neville

19 L = British Library, Add 7157. O = Oxford, New College 333. See E. VON DOBSCHÜTZ 1899: 116–117 and 128.

20 See VON DOBSCHÜTZ 1899: 129.

21 A chart of the process of transmission is given in VON DOBSCHÜTZ (1899: 144–145). This is reproduced in WILLARD (1970: 139/2009: 103). The work of von Dobschütz has been carried further by S. BROCK (1979), who adds the manuscript Mingana syr. 343 (~1350 AD), see BROCK 1979: 121.

22 B. M. Add. 19,730 (~1270 AD) and the Venice Bible at San Lazzaro (1220 AD). In addition, they refer to the Bible of Lord Zouche, which according to Conybeare was copied from a 13th century manuscript, see CONYBEARE 1895: 244–245 and ROBINSON 1895: 8–10.

23 See CONYBEARE 1895: 249–250 and 259.

24 See P. A. VARDANIAN 1930.

25 See WILLARD 1970: 133–136/2009: 98–101. This summary was based on Willard's transcripts of Miss V. Semerjian's oral translation.

26 See TH. KLUGE 1911 and 1956. The first article contains only a reference to the material, which is not identified explicitly as Euthalian. The second article brings a German translation of parts of the Prologue to the Letters of Paul, the Martyrdom as well as lists of chapters and lections.

Birdsall presented in 1984 a survey of the Georgian evidence and found that it survived in two forms—a shorter form of the apparatus to the Pauline letters that may have originated in the 5th century and an expanded form in the 7th century. According to Birdsall, the apparatus to Acts and the Catholic letters belongs only to the later recensions of these writings (11th cent.).²⁷

In 1956, James W. Marchand suggested that traces of the apparatus are also found in Gothic manuscripts. In the Codices Ambrosiani A and B (6th cent.) there are divisions of the text which often correspond to Euthalian divisions, and they also have an affinity to the Euthalian edition as they indicate sense-lines. Marchand conjectures that this practice goes back to Wulfila (d. ca. 383) himself, who in turn adopted it from a Euthalian edition.²⁸

Some ancient fragments of the apparatus in Latin are also known.²⁹ Nils. A. Dahl found that a part of the *Prologue to the Letters of Paul* is found in four medieval manuscripts from Monte Cassino. Here the Euthalian material is fused with excerpts from the *Muratorian Fragment*. This discovery was never published.³⁰

The Euthalian apparatus also exists in an Old Church Slavonic version. This material was edited in 2003 by Johannes G. van der Tak.³¹

One may conclude this survey of the different versions of the apparatus by saying that the apparatus is found mainly in Eastern churches. von Dobschütz suggested that it also may have been translated into Coptic and Ethiopic.³² To my knowledge, however, no such version has yet been found. The vast majority of manuscripts are Greek, and apart from a few witnesses, the apparatus was apparently never in wide circulation in the West. It is also important to note that the *editio princeps* of Zacagni does not incorporate readings from the various non-Greek versions, since they were unknown to him.

The work on a new edition of the Greek text has been initiated by David Parker and Simon Crisp. For this reason, the present study does not focus on the textual transmission of the apparatus and its translation of the apparatus has been made from the text of von Soden (1902), which is strongly dependent on the text of Zacagni. The degree of dependence varies, however, in different parts of the apparatus: von Soden reproduced Zacagni's text of the prologues with some few but important alterations, leaving out, for example, Zacagni's textual conjectures. In reproducing the κεφάλαια-τίτλοι and the

27 See N. BIRDSALL 1984/2006: 233 and 236. He lists four manuscripts with the apparatus to the Pauline letters from the 10th and 11th centuries. The apparatus for Acts and the Catholic letters has been edited from five manuscripts. For the list of manuscripts, see BIRDSALL 1984/2006: 217–18 (Letters of Paul) and 237 (Acts and the Catholic letters).

28 See J. W. MARCHAND 1956: 160–162 and 166–167; WILLARD 1970: 143–145/2009: 106–107.

29 Euthalian κεφάλαια-τίτλοι of Hebrews are found in some Latin manuscripts, see VON DOBSCHÜTZ (1899: 111).

30 It was included in one of the drafts the present author made for DAHL 2000d, but it was left out in the printed version. For the text of the Monte Cassino manuscripts, see A. HARNACK 1898: 131–132. Harnack did not identify the material as Euthalian, since the study is mainly concerned with the text of the Muratorian Fragment.

31 See J. G. VAN DER TAK 2003 and WILLARD 2009: VII.

32 See VON DOBSCHÜTZ 1899: 154.

ὑποθέσεις, von Soden acted with greater independence, offering an eclectic text based on Zacagni and early printed editions of the NT. Although his eclectic method may be criticized from a purely theoretical point of view, it is difficult to reject von Soden's text so long as no new critical edition has appeared. In the present work, von Soden's text is used, mainly because of its clear separation of different elements of the apparatus.

2. History of Research

2.1. Survey

In his 1516 edition of the Greek and Latin NT, Erasmus printed the Euthalian ὑποθέσεις of the Pauline letters. The Euthalian ὑποθέσεις belonged to the Greek NT which had been rediscovered by scholars in the West. Erasmus followed the ancient practice of prefixing the ὑπόθεσις to each biblical book—a practice which is found in the manuscripts of many ancient authors. Thus the plays of Euripides are often found in medieval manuscripts with a prefixed ὑπόθεσις, and a similar practice was actually continued in some early translations of the NT into modern European languages. The important change was that the reformers often wrote their own introductions in the style of the ancient ὑποθέσεις, for example, Luther's *Vorreden*. This genre was a useful vehicle for the reformers who wanted to promote a new interpretation of Scripture in a form that was easy to understand. For this reason, the ancient ὑποθέσεις were soon forgotten. Also abandoned was the Euthalian system of chapter divisions in favor of the chapter divisions of Stephen Langton (12/13th cent), which are still in use today. It was thus natural that the apparatus was left out from Bible editions in modern European languages, and no longer considered useful for readers of the Bible, becoming instead a curious subject for scholars.³³

In this scholarship, there have been historically four important themes (the first three of which were treated by Zacagni, and all of which returned to by later scholars): (1) The question of authorship, including the question of the identity of the dedicatee, and that of the unknown father who made the κεφάλαια-τίτλοι for the Pauline letters; (2) the question of which elements of the apparatus that are genuine, i.e. that belonged to the edition of Euthalius; (3) the question of how the biblical text was arranged by Euthalius; (4) the question of how the apparatus has applied rhetorical methods to the biblical texts.

The edition of Zacagni included the Greek text with Latin translation. The apparatus contains in his edition the following elements:

1. *Acts*

- a) Prologue (Πρόλογος).
- b) Lection list (Ἀνακεφαλαίωσις τῶν ἀναγνώσεων), which statistically records the number of lections, chapters, quotations and verses.

³³ The apparatus is given little attention in modern introductions to the New Testament. One notable exception is the work of Adolf Jülicher, see JÜLICHER/FASCHER 1931: 573–577.

- c) Introduction (Πρόγραμμα) to the short quotation list.
- d) Short quotation list (Ἀνακεφαλαίωσις θείων μαρτυριῶν), which does not reproduce the quotations, but merely points to them by means of numbers.
- e) Long quotation list (Ἀνακεφαλαίωσις θείων μαρτυριῶν), which gives the full text of the biblical quotations.
- f) Argument (Υπόθεσις).
- g) *The Travels of Paul* (Ἀποδημίαι Παύλου).
- h) Chapter list (Κεφάλαια-τίτλοι), which contains forty chapters with subdivisions, all having titles.
- i) A division of Acts into thirty-six chapters, without titles, but marked by quotation of each chapter's opening words.

2. *The Catholic letters*

- a) Prologue (Πρόλογος).
- b) Lection list (Ἀνακεφαλαίωσις τῶν ἀναγνώσεων).
- c) Introduction (Πρόγραμμα) to the short quotation list.
- d) Short quotation list (Ἀνακεφαλαίωσις θείων μαρτυριῶν).
- e) Introduction (Πρόγραμμα) to the long quotation list.
- f) Long quotation list (Ἀνακεφαλαίωσις θείων μαρτυριῶν).
- g) Argumenta (Υποθέσεις) and chapter lists (Κεφάλαια-τίτλοι) for each letter.
- h) Stichometric note.
- i) Colophon, which records that the manuscript was compared with books at the library of Caesarea, the text resembling the colophon of Codex H.
- j) *The Inscription on the Altar in Athens* (Ἐπίγραμμα τοῦ ἐν Ἀθήναις βωμοῦ), which is a short gloss giving the full text on the altar that Paul saw in Athens.
- k) *The Voyage of Paul the Apostle to Rome* (Πλοῦς Παύλου ἀποστόλου ἐπὶ Ῥώμην). This piece is often referred to as the 'Navigatio Pauli' recounting the itinerary of Paul's voyage to Rome.

N.B. The two last pieces belong to Acts rather than the Catholic letters—although since Acts and the Catholic letters originally formed a single volume, the two notes are not entirely misplaced.

3. *The Pauline letters*

- a) Prologue (Πρόλογος)

- b) *The Martyrdom of Paul the Apostle* (Μαρτύριον Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου)
- c) Lection list (Ἀνακεφαλαίωσις τῶν ἀναγνώσεων)
- d) Introduction (Πρόγραμμα) to the short quotation list
- e) Short quotation list (Ἀνακεφαλαίωσις θείων μαρτυριῶν)
- f) A list of the cities where Paul wrote his letters.
- g) A list of the Pauline letters that records the letters he wrote alone and the letters he wrote with various co-workers.
- h) Introduction (Πρόγραμμα) to the long quotation list
- i) Long quotation list (Ἀνακεφαλαίωσις θείων μαρτυριῶν)
- j) List of the Pauline letters, which begins with the words *Τάδε ἔνεστιν Παύλου Ἐπιστολαί*.
- k) A note on why the book is called ‘The Fourteen Letters of Paul’, beginning with the question *Διὰ τί Παύλου Ἐπιστολαὶ δεκατέσσαρες λέγονται*, followed by an answer to that question. The piece is often referred to in the secondary literature as ‘*Διὰ τί*’.
- l) *Argumenta* (Υποθέσεις) and chapter lists (Κεφάλαια-τίτλοι) for each letter.

Prefixed to the material is a long introduction by Zacagni that remains one of the most important works on Euthalius. The main points of Euthalius’ work as summarized by Zacagni are the following: Euthalius was asked by a father, whose name he does not mention, to write a prologue on the deeds of Paul. Euthalius obeyed and produced not only a prologue, but also divided the text of the letters into lections and verses. The list of lections provided scribes with a check-list of the letter’s statistics (including a *στιχομετρία*—the total number of lines of each lection), while the division into verses aimed at a more elegant way of reciting the biblical text. He also collected the testimonies (quotations) from the Old Testament in Paul, and added *κεφάλαια-τίτλοι* that he had borrowed from an unknown Greek father living in Syria (pp. lix–lx).

That this father lived in Syria, was not stated in the work of Euthalius, but was an inference that Zacagni made on the basis of the *Martyrdom of Paul the Apostle*. This text was transmitted together with the apparatus, and has been much discussed from Zacagni onwards. Since it has been considered the key to the questions of the date and locality of Euthalius, it is worth quoting in full:

Μαρτύριον Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου [Text: Robinson 1895: 29 and 47]	The Martyrdom of Paul the Apostle My translation
<p>Ἐπὶ Νέρωνος τοῦ Καίσαρος Ῥωμαίων ἐμαρτύρησεν αὐτόθι Παῦλος ὁ ἀπόστολος, ξίφει τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποτηθεὶς ἐν τῷ τριακοστῷ καὶ ἕκτῳ ἔτει τοῦ σωτηρίου πάθους, τὸν καλὸν ἀγῶνα ἀγωνισάμενος ἐν Ῥώμῃ, πέμπτη ἡμέρα Πανέμου μηνός, ἥτις λέγοιτο ἂν παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις ἢ πρὸ τριῶν καλανδῶν Ἰουλίω, καθ' ἣν ἐτελειώθη ὁ ἅγιος ἀπόστολος τῷ κατ' αὐτὸν μαρτυρίῳ, ἕξηκοστῷ καὶ ἐννάτῳ ἔτει τῆς τοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ παρουσίας. Ἔστιν οὖν ὁ πᾶς χρόνος ἐξ οὗ ἐμαρτύρησε τριακόσια τριάκοντα ἔτη μέχρι τῆς παρουσίας ταύτης ὑπατείας, τετάρτης μὲν Ἀρκαδίου τρίτης δὲ Ὀνωρίου τῶν δύο ἀδελφῶν αὐτοκρατόρων Αὐγουστῶν, ἐνάτης ἰνδικτιῶνος τῆς πεντεκαίδεκαετηρικῆς περιόδου, μηνός Ἰουνίου εἰκοστῇ ἐνάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ. Ἐσημειωσάμην ἀκριβῶς τὸν χρόνον τοῦ μαρτυρίου Παύλου ἀποστόλου.</p> <p>[Egyptian paragraph:] καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ὑπατίας τετάρτης μὲν Ἀρκαδίου τρίτης δὲ Ὀνωρίου, μέχρι τῆς παρουσίας ταύτης ὑπατίας, πρώτης Λέοντος Αὐγούστου, ἰνδικτιῶνος δωδεκάτης, Ἐπιφί ε', Διοκλετιανοῦ ροδ', ἔτη ξγ'. ὡς εἶναι τὰ πάντα ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ Σωτήρος ἡμῶν παρουσίας μέχρι τοῦ προκειμένου ἔτους ἔτη τετρακόσια ἕξηκόντα δύο.</p>	<p>There, under Nero, emperor of the Romans, Paul the Apostle suffered martyrdom, by having his head cut off with the sword, having fought the good fight in Rome in the thirty-sixth year after the passion of the Savior, on the fifth day of the month Panemos, which is called by the Romans the third day before the calends of July. On that day the holy Apostle reached perfection with the martyrdom at his [Nero's] time, in the sixty-ninth year after the coming of our Savior Jesus Christ. So the whole period – from the martyrdom to the present consulship, the fourth of Arcadius and the third of Honorius, the two brothers ruling Augusti, the ninth indiction in the cycle of fifteen years, on the twenty-ninth day of the month of June – is three hundred and thirty years. I have indicated precisely the date of the martyrdom of Paul the Apostle.</p> <p>[Egyptian paragraph:] And from the fourth consulship of Arcadius and the third of Honorius to the present consulship, the first of Leo Augustus, the twelfth indiction, the fifth of Epiphi, the hundred and seventy-fourth year of Diocletian, there are sixty-three years. So all the years from the coming of our Savior until the present year are four hundred and sixty-two.</p>

There are two textual problems that should be noted: 1. The Egyptian paragraph is not in the majority of manuscripts,³⁴ and 2. In some manuscripts, the reference to the Egyptian month Epiphi also occurs in the first section of the text. This insertion is attested in two readings:

- (a) It is inserted into the Roman date: πέμπτη ἡμέρα Πανέμου μηνός, ἥτις λέγοιτ' ἂν παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις, κατ' Αἰγυπτίους Ἐπιφί ε', ἢ πρὸ τριῶν καλανδῶν Ἰουλίω.
- (b) It is inserted before the Roman date: πέμπτη ἡμέρα κατὰ Συρομακεδόνας Πανέμου μηνός, ἥτις λέγοιτο ἂν παρ' Αἰγυπτίους Ἐπιφί, παρὰ δὲ Ῥωμαίοις ἢ πρὸ τριῶν καλανδῶν Ἰουλίω.

Robinson argues that the first reading contains a gloss (κατ' Αἰγυπτίους Ἐπιφί ε') that has crept into the text. Its insertion is awkward since it breaks up the sentence, separating the reference to the Romans and their calendar. The second reading is a correction of

34 See WILLARD 1970: 209–219/2009: 158–169.

the first, with the gloss being worked into the text with greater care, and the phrase κατὰ Συρομακεδόνας clarifying the provenance of the different calendars.³⁵

Another problem is that the *Martyrdom* refers to two different years as the ‘present consulship.’ This clearly reflects two stages in the development of the text. Zacagni found that 29 June in the fourth consulship of Arcadius and the third of Honorius corresponds to 29 June, 396, while 5 Epiphi in the first consulship of Leo Augustus corresponds to 29 June, 458. He thus noted the discrepancy between the chronology of Euthalius and the Dionysian chronology current today.³⁶ According to the chronology of the *Martyrdom*, Christ died at the age of thirty-three in the year which corresponds to our 29 (pp. lxi–lxii). While this problem was easily solved, the use of different methods of dating was a more demanding puzzle. In the first paragraph, the anonymous author says that Paul suffered martyrdom on the third day before the calends of July (29 June) which he equates with 5 Panemos. Zacagni considered this equation particularly important and based his argument on the dissertations of cardinal Enrico Noris on the Syro-Macedonian calendar.³⁷ In his work, Noris had quoted a passage from the *Martyrdom*, which he knew from Oecumenius’ commentary on Acts. In Oecumenius, the text form explicitly referred to Panemos as a Syro-Macedonian month.³⁸ According to Noris, 5 Panemos would be the correct date only in cities of Palestine such as Raphia, Ascalon and Gaza. In this area the Syro-Macedonian month Panemos corresponded exactly to the Egyptian month Epiphi, both beginning on 25 June.³⁹ Zacagni thus assumed that the *Martyrdom* was first dated in Palestine in 396 by the anonymous predecessor of Euthalius, who used the version of the Syro-Macedonian calendar prevalent in areas of Syria under Egyptian influence.

This Syrian-based Greek father was also responsible for the κεφάλαια-τίτλοι (pp. lviii–lix). He conjectured that the second year given in the *Martyrdom* (458) was the year when

35 For a list of the manuscripts and a discussion of these readings see ROBINSON 1895: 45–46.

36 The *Martyrdom* reckons years from the birth of Christ by moving the date four years backward on the calendar according to our time-reckoning. The system of dating from the birth of Christ became common much later, cf. H. LIETZMANN (1934/1984: 5): ‘Die christliche Ära (nach Christi Geburt) ist die in der modernen Kulturwelt allgemein gültige. Sie ist von dem römischen Mönch Dionysios Exiguus erfunden und in seiner Ostertafel vom Jahre 532 zuerst angewendet worden. Seinem Beispiel folgen anfangs nur gelehrte in chronographischen Werken, aber im 8. Jahrhundert finden wir Datierungen nach Christi Geburt schon vereinzelt auf Urkunden, privaten und königlichen; im 9. Jh. begegnen wir sie öfter, und seit dem 10. Jh. erscheint diese Datierungsweise auch auf päpstlichen Urkunden. Schliesslich wird sie im hohen Mittelalter allgemein üblich.’ VON SODEN (1902: 374) thinks that the original text of the *Martyrdom* (the ‘Urstück’ without the Egyptian paragraph) did not include the reckoning from the birth of Christ. The recalculation was, according to von Soden, added to the ‘Urstück’ at an early stage. In the Egyptian paragraph (458 AD), on the other hand, this system of dating is used. Even this is earlier than Dionysius. Most scholars believe that the dates in the *Martyrdom* that refer to its composition can be trusted. Thus, the *Martyrdom* – at least in its expanded form – is early evidence for the use of the new system. Dieter Sänger brought this feature of the *Martyrdom* to my attention.

37 *De annis et epochis Syromacedonum* (first printed in Florence, 1691). I have not had access to this edition, but use an edition printed in Leipzig in 1696 (NORIS 1696).

38 E. NORIS (1696: 22) offers the following translation: quinta die, juxta Syromacedones, mensis Panemi, qui apud Ægyptios dici potest Epiphi; apud Romanos vero III Kalendas Julias, vicesimo nono mensis Junii. Cf. the text as printed by ROBINSON (1895: 46): πέμπτη ἡμέρα κατὰ Συρομακεδόνας Πανέμου μηνός, ἥτις λέγοιτο ἂν παρ’ Αἰγυπτίους Ἐπιφί, παρὰ δὲ Ῥωμαίους ἡ πρὸ τριῶν καλανδῶν Ἰουλίων.

39 See NORIS 1696: 22–23 and 479–480.

Euthalius published his volume on Paul. Euthalius had expanded the *Martyrdom* and included a reference to the Era of Diocletian and the Egyptian month Epiphi, which indicates that Egypt was his home.⁴⁰ Zacagni also found his hypothesis confirmed in the *Acts of Chalcedon*, which mentioned a deacon of the Alexandrian church who was named Euthalius (p. lxii). Zacagni also tried to place the name ‘Sulci’ into this Egyptian setting, assuming ‘Sulci’ to be a corruption of ‘Pselcha,’ the name of an Egyptian town (p. lxiii–lxiv).

The second volume of Euthalius, containing the Acts and the Catholic letters, was dedicated to Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria. Euthalius, in his preparation of the volume, visited the library of Caesarea in Palestine in order to compare his text with biblical manuscripts in that library.⁴¹ In this volume, Euthalius had made the κεφάλαια-τίτλοι himself, using the work of the Syrian father on the Pauline letters as a model (p. lxvi). Zacagni identified the dedicatee of the edition of Acts as Athanasius Celetes, archbishop of Alexandria from 490 (pp. lxiv), but this identification created a new problem. Euthalius had been present at Chalcedon in 451 and had made his volume on Paul in 458, as this was the year mentioned in the second paragraph of the *Martyrdom*. Since he was referred to as the ‘Deacon Euthalius’ in the title to the *Prologue to the Letters of Paul* he must have been at least twenty-five in 458, Zacagni reckoned, as younger men could not be ordained. Since Zacagni assumes that archbishop Athanasius Celetes was the dedicatee, it could only be after 490 that Euthalius made his volume on Acts and the Catholic letters. But, if so, how could he, in the introductory paragraph to the κεφάλαια-τίτλοι of Acts, have referred to himself as ‘young in years and in learning’? Zacagni assumed that these words of Euthalius should be understood as an allegory, referring to the ‘recent times’ in which he lived, and that his learning is considered insignificant compared to the great learning of the ancient fathers of the Church (p. lxiii).

Regarding the question of the genuine Euthalian elements, Zacagni doubted that the ὑποθέσεις were included in the original editions of Euthalius. His main reason was that they are never referred to in the prologues. There were also some contradictions between the ὑποθέσεις and the list of cities where Paul wrote his letters, a list which he considered genuine. He discussed the possibility that the ὑποθέσεις were written by the unknown Syrian father who also had made the κεφάλαια-τίτλοι, but concluded that they most probably belonged to a later period. The ὑποθέσεις, then, were composed by ‘some pious and learned man,’ and scribes had added them to the apparatus (p. lx).

Zacagni also observed that Euthalius had arranged the text so that the reading aloud of the text would be more elegant. This he did by dividing the text into verses, ‘somewhat similar to song’ *ad quandam cantus similitudinem* (pp. lix–lx). This view he based on the Euthalian *Prologue to Acts*, where Euthalius said that he had read the text κατὰ

40 See ZACAGNI 1698: lxi. Zacagni noted that the reference to the twelfth indiction is problematic, as he would expect the 29th of June to fall in the year of the eleventh indiction. He suggests that Euthalius used a different system. On reckoning by indiction, see E. J. BICKERMAN 1968: 78–79.

41 See ZACAGNI 1698: lxxv. The basis of this is the end of a stichometrical note at the end of the edition of Acts and the Catholic letters: Ἀντεβλήθη δὲ τῶν Πράξεων καὶ καθολικῶν Ἐπιστολῶν τὸ βιβλίον πρὸς τὰ ἀκριβῆ ἀντίγραφα τῆς ἐν Καισαρείᾳ βιβλιοθήκης Εὐσεβίου τοῦ Παμφίλου. ‘The book of the Acts and the Catholic letters was compared with the exact copies of the Caesarean Library of Eusebius son of Pamphilus.’ The note is found in Zacagni’s edition on p. 513 and in PG 85: 692AB.

προσωδίαν. The theory, however, is probably based on a misunderstanding, since the Greek word προσωδία may refer to accents or other reading signs.⁴²

In the prolegomena to his 1707 edition of the New Testament, John Mill suggested that the Syrian father who had written the κεφάλαια-τίτλοι of the Pauline letters was Theodore of Mopsuestia. Mill gives the following reasons for this conjecture: (1) Theodore was a Syrian, a presbyter in Antioch and that before 396, the first year mentioned in the *Martyrdom*, he became bishop of Mopsuestia in Cilicia. (2) He was known as a learned man, who had also written a commentary on the Pauline letters. (3) The fact that Euthalius does not mention his name actually supports his hypothesis. Theodore was despised and later condemned as a heretic at the Second Council of Constantinople, so it was not advisable to name him explicitly.⁴³ The theory of Mill has had some influence on other scholars, such as Harris (see below).

Jacob Wettstein included an entry on Euthalius in the prolegomena to his edition of the NT. The article is largely dependent on Zacagni's work, but contains some new ideas. Wettstein believed, like Zacagni, that Euthalius lived in 5th century Egypt, basing this belief on the Egyptian paragraph of the *Martyrdom*.⁴⁴ The most important difference from Zacagni lies in his view on what Euthalius had done with the biblical text since he emphasized the influence of Origen on Euthalius. This influence was not so much from Origen the theologian as the philologist. Wettstein believed that Euthalius had furnished the text with accents and breathing marks, possibly in imitation of the Origen's *Hexapla*. He argued that Origen had supplied accents to his Greek transliteration of the Hebrew in order to avoid incorrect pronunciation, and that Origen's treatment of the poetical books of the OT corresponded to the writing the text in sense-lines.⁴⁵ Wettstein also rejected Zacagni's view that the dedicatee to the edition of Acts was the bishop Athanasius Celetes. Instead he identified the dedicatee as the presbyter Athanasius, a nephew of the patriarch Cyrillos. To this Athanasius he ascribed the *Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae*, a collection of ὑποθέσεις of all biblical books.⁴⁶ The ὑποθέσεις of the Euthalian editions are also found in the *Synopsis*, and Wettstein believed that Athanasius had borrowed the work of Euthalius.⁴⁷

In 1883, James Rendel Harris published his study on stichometry. The first part of the study is devoted to the practice of stichometry in antiquity, while the second part discusses the stichometry of the NT writings and the work done by Euthalius in this respect. Harris first notes that the term στίχος early came to denote a standard hexameter line of sixteen syllables⁴⁸ and was also used to measure prose texts. It was on a per-στίχος basis that scribes received their payment.⁴⁹ Harris also noted a change in the meaning of the

42 See ZUNTZ 1945: 90.

43 See J. MILL 1707: lxxxvii.

44 See WETTSTEIN 1752: 75–76.

45 See WETTSTEIN 1752: 73–74.

46 The work is treated by ROBINSON (1895: 106–108).

47 See WETTSTEIN 1752: 76.

48 The number 16 may have been picked because of its symmetrical character, or because the first line of the Iliad contains this number. See HARRIS 1883: 139.

49 See HARRIS 1883: 154.

term *στίχος* under the influence of the ‘sense-line’, and found that the word may also designate a ‘sentence.’ This use of the term may reflect the fact that a hexameter line very often corresponds to a sentence unit.⁵⁰ In the second part of the study, Harris examines the stichometry of the NT and finds that the figures in the Euthalian lection lists reflect a measuring of the text in units of sixteen syllables.⁵¹ This study of stichometry is one aspect of the broader work of Harris, which really may be considered a development of Wettstein’s ideas; also a Wettstein development is Harris’ suggestion that the greater part of Euthalius’ work originated in the time and school of Origen.⁵²

In 1890, Codex H was edited by Henri Omont. Although this manuscript had been connected to Euthalius also by earlier scholars,⁵³ the edition of Omont instigated more intensive research on its relation to the Euthalian apparatus. Ehrhard published in 1891 a study of codex H and Euthalius,⁵⁴ using a manuscript which has been important for study of the apparatus not only because it is written in sense-lines and contains *κεφάλαια-τίτλοι* and marginal notes on testimonies, but especially because it contains a colophon placed after Tit. which resembles the prologues of the apparatus. The opening line of the colophon has been damaged, and cannot be read with certainty. The second part of the colophon is a dialogue between the personified *coronis*—the flourish of the pen at the end of the text—and the owner of the book. The end of the text, however, is not preserved in Codex H. Just like the *Martyrdom*, this short text has been very important for scholars and should therefore be reproduced here:

50 See HARRIS 1883: 151.

51 See HARRIS 1883: 317. Harris presupposes that the text of Euthalius used abbreviated forms of the words *θεός, κύριος, Ἰησοῦς* and *Χριστός*.

52 HARRIS 1883: 331.

53 WETTSTEIN (1752: 74) considered this manuscript an early representative of the Euthalian edition.

54 See EHRHARD 1891.

Colophon of Codex H 015 (after Omont 1890: 189) ^a	My translation
<p>ἔγραψα καὶ ἐξεθέμην στειχηρὸν κατὰ δύναμιν τόδε τὸ τεῦχος Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου πρὸς ἔγγραμμὸν καὶ εὐκαταληπτὸν ἀνάγνωσιν· τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς ἀδελφῶν παρ' ὧν ἀπάντων τολμῆς· συνγνωμῆν αἰτῶ· εὐχῆ τῇ ὑπὲρ ἐμῶν· τὴν συνπεριφορὰν κομιζόμενος·</p> <p>Ἀντεβλήθη δὲ ἡ βίβλος· πρὸς τὸ ἐν Καισαρίᾳ ἀντίγραφον· τῆς βιβλιοθήκης τοῦ ἁγίου Παμφίλου· χειρὶ γεγραμμένον.</p> <p>προσφώνησις Κορωνίς εἰμι δογματῶν θεῶν διδάσκαλος· ἂν τινὶ με χρήσης· ἀντιβιβλον λάμβανε· οἱ γὰρ· ἀποδοταὶ κακοί·</p> <p>ἀντίφρασις· Θησαυρὸν ἔχω σε πνευματικῶν ἀγαθῶν καὶ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ποθητῶν· ἁρμονίαις τε καὶ ποικίλαις γραμμαῖς κεκοσμημένον· νῆ τὴν ἀλήθειαν· οὐ δώσω σε προχείρως τινὶ· οὐδ' αὐ φθονέσω τῆς [...]</p>	<p>I wrote and edited this volume of Paul the Apostle, arranging it in verses according to my abilities, so that the text of our brothers may be clearly written^b and easy to understand, and I ask all of them for forgiveness for my audacity, that I may receive acceptance through prayer for my [work (?)].</p> <p>The book was compared with a copy in the li- brary of Caesarea, written with the hand of the holy Pamphilus.</p> <p>Address I am the Coronis, teacher of the divine doc- trine. If you lend me to anyone, you should get a receipt, because borrowers are evil.</p> <p>Answer I keep you as a treasure of spiritual blessings, one which is longed for by all men, combined from many parts and adorned with writing in various colors. In truth, I will not rashly give you to anyone, nor again will I grudge the [...]</p>
<p>a Since my aim is simply to give an idea of the content of the piece, I reproduce the texts in minuscule letters with added word divisions and without the line breaks of the original. For a full discussion of the textual variants of the colophon, see WILLARD 1970: 113–126/2009: 83–92.</p> <p>b The word 'ἔγγραμμὸν' does not make any sense in this context, and the translation presupposes that the word represents 'εὐγγραμμὸν'.</p>	

Ehrhard compared codex H with minuscule 88 which contains the same colophon.⁵⁵ Minuscule 88 is a 12th century manuscript containing Acts, the Catholic and Pauline letters with the Euthalian apparatus and also the Apocalypse. The most important textual variant is that the colophon in min. 88 begins with the words Εὐάγριος ἔγραψα. It is possible that this reading is supported in Ehrhard's examination of a codex H facsimile, where the letters EY.....IOC exist. At the request of Ehrhard, H. Omont examined the line and arrived at the conclusion that the name Εὐάγριος apparently could be discerned.⁵⁶ The presence of the name 'Evagrius' in the earliest Euthalian manuscript led him to assume that it was Evagrius who was the author of the apparatus. Ehrhard identified him with the Egyptian monk Evagrius Ponticus (4th cent.), although he acknowledged that Evagrius was a common name, and that there were likely many Egyptian monks with that name. Ehrhard noted that the name 'Euthalius' was found in very few manuscripts and that other names, such as Athanasius, Pamphilus and Ecthalios also occur. Moreover, there

55 The dialogue beginning with The 'Address' is however separated from the first part of the colophon by The Voyage of Paul the Apostle to Rome. See EHRHARD 1891: 388–389. The text of the colophon continues in min. 88 with ὠφελείας, χρήσω δὲ τοῖς φίλοις, ἀξιόπιστον ἀντιβιβλον λαμβάνων. ROBINSON (1895: 9) gives the following translation of the end of the colophon (based on the Armenian version): 'Nor again will I grudge the benefit of any, but when I lend thee to my friends, I will take a goodly copy in exchange.'

56 See EHRHARD 1891: 397.

was little historical evidence about ‘Euthalius.’⁵⁷ These problems were solved by assuming that ‘Euthalius’ had never existed, and that this name was substituted for ‘Evagrius’ after Evagrius had been condemned as an Origenist. This would also explain why someone would try to erase the name in Codex H. That is, the tradition had adopted the work of Evagrius, but did not want to mention the name of the heretic.⁵⁸ The introduction of the name ‘Evagrius’ was a new turn in the history of research. A related hypothesis was later proposed by Birdsall, who suggested that it was Evagrius of Antioch, not Evagrius Ponticus, who was the author of the apparatus.⁵⁹

The hypothesis of Ehrhard was criticized by von Dobschütz, who in 1893 published an article where he argued that Codex H represents a late form of the Euthalian edition, and that the colophon is dependent on the Euthalian prologues.⁶⁰ Some of his arguments based on the phraseology of the colophon were also used by Robinson (see below).

In 1893, Harris published a new edition of his study of stichometry. In this treatise, he also included a lecture on the origin of the codices Sinaiticus and Vaticanus. The work of Euthalius is quite important for this argument on origins. Harris connects Euthalius to Caesarea and its library on the basis of the following evidence: (1) The colophon at the end of the Euthalian edition of Acts and the Catholic letters mentions Caesarea explicitly. (2) The colophon of Codex H is a Euthalian text that is very close to the archetype.⁶¹ This also refers to Caesarea. (3) In Codex Coislinianus 25, the Euthalian κεφάλαια-τίτλοι of Acts has the heading ἔκθεσις κεφαλαίων τῶν πράξεων τοῦ Παμφίλου. Regarding this third argument, Harris argues that even if this does not prove that Pamphilus was the author of the list, the heading does show that the Euthalian κεφάλαια-τίτλοι were once ascribed to Pamphilus.⁶² Harris found that the Caesarean origin of the apparatus also had some explanatory value: the list of thirty-six chapters that is found at the end of the apparatus to Acts corresponds to the original chapter divisions of Acts in Codex Vaticanus. A system of division used at the library of Caesarea is supposed to lie behind this.⁶³ Harris also has his original views regarding the circle of Euthalius.⁶⁴ His starting point is the long *Encomium of Melete* in the *Prologue to Acts*, where Melete is the personification of scriptural studies or meditation upon the scriptures. In this section, Harris finds that Euthalius is playing with the word Melete: ‘[H]e has personified her and made her into a fair bride for the good father to whom he writes. But why should he say of her that she is his foster sister, ay! and his namesake?’⁶⁵ Harris gives the following answer: The name of

57 See EHRHARD 1891: 398–400.

58 See EHRHARD 1891: 405–406.

59 See BIRDSALL 1970.

60 See VON DOBSCHÜTZ 1893.

61 Harris does not refer to the work of Ehrhard or to the name ‘Ευάγριος.’

62 See HARRIS 1893: 88. Harris had earlier argued that there were connections between Codex Sinaiticus and Caesarean manuscripts that were used to correct it. Thus both Vaticanus and Sinaiticus were somehow related to the library of Caesarea. See HARRIS 1893: 75. See the translation of these κεφάλαια-τίτλοι to Acts in S. D. SALMOND 1886.

63 See HARRIS 1893: 74–75.

64 His theory regarding the origin of the apparatus is found in HARRIS 1893: 79–86.

65 HARRIS 1893: 81.

the dedicatee was not Athanasius, but Meletius, and the name Meletius was often associated with heresy. 'Athanasius' is not an historical person, but only the orthodox substitute for the name of the heretic. The correct heading of the prologue is thus Εὐθαλίου ... πρὸς Μελέτιον. Harris finds three possible candidates, but considers Meletius of Mopsuestia, the pupil of Theodore, the most plausible. The reason for this choice is that Harris connects Euthalius to the second edition of the *Martyrdom* in 458, as Zacagni also had done. Harris differs, however, from Zacagni with regard to the date of the edition of Acts and the Catholic letters, arguing that the editions of the Pauline letters and that of the Acts and the Catholic letters were not separated by thirty years, but were produced almost at the same time.⁶⁶ When Harris had suggested Meletius of Mopsuestia as the dedicatee of the edition of Acts and the Catholic letters, he was delighted to find that this idea was indirectly supported by Mill, who had conjectured that Theodore of Mopsuestia was the unnamed Syrian father who wrote the κεφάλαια-τίτλοι of the Pauline letters. Harris also recorded some correspondences between the Euthalian material and the commentary on the Pauline letters by Theodore.⁶⁷ The third conjecture of Harris concerns the dedicatee of the edition of Paul. Harris suspects that this was no other than Nestorius. Thus, he has drawn the Euthalian apparatus into the sphere of the heretics Theodore, Nestorius, and Meletius. This is supposed to explain why the text of the apparatus is so vague about its origin.

In 1895, F. C. Conybeare introduced Armenian evidence into the discussion. His most important witness was an Armenian manuscript in the British Museum (B. M. Add. 19,730), which he dates to the late 13th century. It contains the apostolic books in the following order: 1. Apocalypse 2. The Pauline letters with Heb placed after 2 Thessalonians. 3. Acts 4. The Catholic letters. This order is significant, as it is also found in other ancient Armenian manuscripts and has points of contact with Codex Sinaiticus.⁶⁸ The manuscript also contains the Euthalian prologues. Among other Euthalian materials we find *The Voyage of Paul the Apostle to Rome* prefixed to Acts. An important element for the argument of Conybeare is the colophon found after Philemon, which he identified as the colophon of Codex H. This piece he also found in the Venice Bible (1220 AD) and in the Zouche Bible. Conybeare gives the following translation:⁶⁹

I wrote out and arranged as far as possible verse by verse (= κατὰ δύναμιν στιχηρόν) the writings of Paul the Apostle, disposing (them) also in easily understood (or 'grasped') readings (ἀναγνώσεις) for (or of) our brethren. Of all of whom I crave indulgence for my boldness; in order that by means of the prayers, to be offered in our behalf, I may receive your condescension towards me. This book was copied according to (or 'from') an exemplar of Caesarea, which lies there in the chest of books, and which was written with his own hand by the holy Pamphilus.

66 Harris can place also the edition of Acts and the Catholic letters in that year or immediately after because he no longer needs to bring Athanasius Celetes on the scene, see HARRIS 1893: 83.

67 He mentions the ὑποθέσεις to Eph and Col, which both state that Paul at the time had not met the recipients but heard about them. The third κεφάλαιον to Eph is also very close to Theodore's interpretation, see HARRIS 1893: 86.

68 In the Codex Sinaiticus the Pauline letters are placed before Acts. Within the Paulines, Heb follows 2 Thessalonians. See CONYBEARE 1895: 245.

69 CONYBEARE 1895: 243–244.

Advice

I am master and teacher of the divine religion.⁷⁰ If thou lend me to anyone, thou shalt take a goodly copy in my stead, for those who (?+have to) restore (i.e. books) are evil.

Reply

I keep thee a treasure of spiritual blessings, adorned with embellishments (or ‘arrangements’) desired of all men and with all sorts of ornaments. Yea, I speak truly. I will not vainly lend thee to anyone. Nor another time will I be jealous of (or? for) the weal of anyone. But when I shall lend thee to my friends, I will take a goodly copy (or *exemplar*) in exchange for thee.

Conybeare assumed that the colophon is the work of Euthalius, and that the sense-lines of Codex H are those of Euthalius himself. The Armenian text of the *Martyrdom* also indicated that the Armenian represented an early version of the apparatus. He found that the text of the *Martyrdom* in the Zouche Bible did not contain the Egyptian paragraph or the inserted reference to Epiphi in the first paragraph.⁷¹ In addition to his discussion of Euthalian texts, Conybeare also discussed external evidence on Euthalius from the Armenian ‘Book of the Caesars’. He discusses four short notices, the first is the following:⁷²

Arcadius and Honorius, sons of Theodosius the Great, ruled 24 years. In his (sic) third year there was Euthalius, a blessed (father), an Alexandrine, who in admirable copies arranged (or ‘drew up’ *lit.* ‘ordered’) the preface and the particulars (or sections), and the lections of the Holy Apostles and of the seven Catholic Epistles, on account of the heresies then existing, of Kalabros and Karpokrates, of Katharos and Eklaros (sic), who said that Christ was a mere man, and rejected the Old Testament and despised its testimony concerning Christ.

The third notice contains the remarkable information that Euthalius had made the edition of the Pauline letters at the request of ‘the great father’ Theophilus, while the edition of Acts and the Catholic letters was made at the request of the ‘royal ecclesiastic’ Athanasius. Although Conybeare cannot tell what significance ‘royal’ has in this context, he identifies Theophilus as the bishop of Alexandria from 385 AD. The value of the evidence is debated. von Dobschütz points out that the notices to a large extent are derived from the prologues and the *Martyrdom*. What goes beyond this, he is willing to ascribe to the free imagination of an Armenian heresiologist.⁷³

The work of these critics were used by Robinson in his *Euthaliana*.⁷⁴ Robinson had recovered the text of several leaves of codex H. As in the work of Ehrhard and Conybeare, the colophon is very important for his views on Euthalius. Robinson does not consider the

70 The Armenian translation of ‘κορωνίς’ as ‘master’ seems to BIRDSALL (1984/2006: 221) like a wild guess. It is however possible that the translator has confused ‘κορωνίς’ with ‘κοίρανος’.

71 See CONYBEARE 1895: 248–250.

72 The texts are reproduced in CONYBEARE 1895: 251–252.

73 See VON DOBSCHÜTZ 1899: 113.

74 CONYBEARE 1895 and ROBINSON 1895.

colophon Euthalian, but believes that it is based on the Euthalian prologues.⁷⁵ His main arguments are the following:⁷⁶

- (1) In the colophon, the author refers to himself as ‘I’ not as ‘we’, as in the parallel material in the Euthalian *Prologue to Acts*.
- (2) The colophon uses ἐξεθέμην for the whole edition of the Pauline letters, while Euthalius uses this verb for the exposition or list of chapters.⁷⁷
- (3) The colophon uses the word στειρηρόν to describe the arrangement of the text in lines. This term is apparently a contamination of the terms στιχηρώς and στιχηδόν that are found in Euthalius.
- (4) The phrase εὐχῆ τῆ ὑπὲρ ἐμῶν τὴν συνπεριφορὰν κοιμιζόμενος in the colophon seems to be an unhappy reworking of the introduction to the κεφάλαια-τίτλοι of Acts: εὐχῆ τῆ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν τὴν συνπεριφορὰν κοιμιζόμενοι. The word ἐμῶν has apparently replaced ἡμῶν, but the meaning of the phrase in the colophon is unclear.⁷⁸ It is thus evidence of a careless rewriting of the text in the singular. The epitomizer should have replaced ἡμῶν with ἐμοῦ. Robinson suggests that the difficult ἐμῶν may not be the work of the epitomizer, but of a later scribe who was trying to improve the text.

In his discussion of Robinson’s work, Willard points out that the source-critical method that Robinson applied to the colophon led him to treat the *Martyrdom* similarly. Not only the colophon but also the *Martyrdom* could be the work of a later editor, and Robinson sought to demonstrate that the *Martyrdom* was a later addition, dependent on the *Prologue to the Letters of Paul*.⁷⁹ His main reasons for assuming literary dependence were the following observations.⁸⁰

- (1) The *Martyrdom* first refers to the date of Paul’s death with the Roman designation ‘the third day before the calends of July.’ Close to the end of the first paragraph (see text above) it uses the more modern designation ‘on the twenty-ninth day of the month of June.’ This last form may represent the idiom of the author of the *Martyrdom*, while the use of the Roman calendar seems to be derived from *Prologue to the Letters of Paul*.⁸¹
- (2) The relative clause καθ’ ἣν ἐτελειώθη ὁ ἅγιος ἀπόστολος τῷ κατ’ αὐτὸν μαρτυρίῳ is difficult to understand. One should expect that the words κατ’ αὐτὸν referred

75 See ROBINSON 1895: 48–71.

76 See ROBINSON 1895: 70–71.

77 This argument was also used by VON DOBSCHÜTZ (1893: 50): ‘Die Phrase ἔγραψα καὶ ἐξεθέμην ist aus Euthalius überhaupt nicht zu belegen.’

78 This was pointed out also by VON DOBSCHÜTZ (1893: 50), who could not make any sense out of ὑπὲρ ἐμῶν.

79 See ROBINSON 1895: 28–30.

80 See WILLARD 1970: 82–83/2009: 61–62.

81 Ῥωμαῖοι δὲ περικαλλέσιν οἴκοις καὶ βασιλείοις τούτου λείψανα καθείρξαντες, ἐπέτειον αὐτῷ μνήμης ἡμέραν πανηγυρίζουσι, τῆ πρὸ τριῶν καλανδῶν Ἰουλίῳν, πέμπτη Πανέμου μηνός, τούτου τὸ μαρτύριον ἑορτάζοντες. In the present volume, see section “[The Celebration of his Martyrdom]” on page 104.

to Nero in whose reign Paul died as a martyr. The problem with this interpretation is that Nero has not been mentioned since the opening line of the *Martyrdom*. Robinson found that the corresponding passage in the *Prologue to the Letters of Paul* provided the solution to this puzzle. There we read *καὶ ἐρρύσθην ἐκ στόματος λέοντος· τοῦτον τὸν Νέρωνα εἶναι λέγων· περὶ δὲ τῆς δευτέρας, ἐν ἧ καὶ τελειοῦται τῷ κατ' αὐτὸν μαρτυρίῳ, φησὶν· τὴν καλὴν διακονίαν σου πληροφόρησον*.⁸² There is no difficulty with the syntax, and αὐτόν clearly refers to Nero. Thus, the problem in the text of the *Martyrdom* is apparently caused by a mechanical copying of this passage, and the epitomizer has ignored the previous circumstances; in doing so the reference to Nero became obscure.

- (3) The author of the *Martyrdom* says that Paul died a martyr on 29 June. This is however not the date of Paul's death, but the date of the *depositio* of his remains that happened almost two centuries later. Robinson stated that although this error is common in later times, it was not found in the *Prologue to the Letters of Paul*.

In addition to these main points, Robinson also argued on a more general basis that Euthalius would not have imitated his own language in this slavish manner. The wealth of expression that is found in the Euthalian prologues suggested to him a more original author. He also rejected the possibility that the *Martyrdom* was a source-text for *Prologue to the Letters of Paul*, arguing that it was, in fact, the opposite. After all, the three main arguments referred to above, as well as the great intervals between the parallel passages in the prologue, made it improbable that the *Martyrdom* could have been a source-text.⁸³ Robinson thus was convinced that the *Martyrdom* was the work of a later hand. A new dating was necessary: he had to place the Euthalian edition of the Letters of Paul some time before 396, the earliest year that was mentioned in the *Martyrdom*. The *Prologue to the Letters of Paul* refers to Eusebius, and thus Euthalius could be placed somewhere in the 4th century. Thus it was possible to consider the great Athanasius (d. 372) the dedicatee of the volume of the Acts and the Catholic letters.⁸⁴

Another feature of the study of Robinson is the connection he made between the *Martyrdom* and the colophon. Both texts were derived from the Euthalian prologues, and he assumed that they both belonged to a later *editio minor* of the apparatus. Since the name 'Evagrius' occurred in some copies of the colophon, Robinson was inclined to believe that Evagrius Ponticus was responsible for this abridged edition.⁸⁵ Regarding the question of the genuine Euthalian elements, Robinson is one of the most radical critics, since he used the text of the prologues as a criterion of authenticity. That is, only the items that Euthalius explicitly referred to in the prologues should be considered original. Thus only three items could be considered genuine: The prologues, the κεφάλαια-τίτλοι and the collections of testimonies.⁸⁶

82 In the present volume, the section "[Chronological summary]" on page 108.

83 See ROBINSON 1895: 29.

84 See ROBINSON 1895: 100–101. Even if the Athanasius of Alexandria was a possible dedicatee, Robinson hesitated to draw any conclusion regarding the locality of Euthalius.

85 See ROBINSON 1895: 71.

86 See ROBINSON 1895: 11–27, with his conclusion on the last page.

In 1896, Harris published an essay focusing on the relations between Euthalius and Eusebius.⁸⁷ Harris argued that Euthalius was not an original writer with ‘so great a wealth of expression’ as Robinson believed.⁸⁸ Harris first observed that Euthalius himself had pointed to Eusebius as one of his sources, and he proceeded to examine this literary relationship in greater detail. He found that large portions of the Euthalian prologues were derived from the *The History of the Church* and *Chronicon* of Eusebius, and thus that Euthalius was a ‘systematic plagiarist.’⁸⁹ This dependence on Eusebius was used by Harris to restore the *Martyrdom* as belonging to the original apparatus. While Robinson had argued that the *Martyrdom* was based on the *Prologue to the Letters of Paul*, Harris now suggested that both texts were derived from Eusebius. In order to show this, Harris criticizes the three arguments of Robinson on the *Martyrdom*:⁹⁰

- (1) Harris finds it natural that the author of the *Martyrdom*, in a passage that brings the dates down to his own day, refers to 25 June. The calendrical dating of Paul’s martyrdom to 5 Panemos is older than both Eusebius and Euthalius. It is therefore not necessarily derived from the *Prologue to the Letters of Paul*. Eusebius does not use the Syro-Macedonian calendar, but refers to dates by Roman months with Syro-Macedonian names.
- (2) The clause with the difficult phrase κατ’ αὐτὸν is not derived from the *Prologue to the Letters of Paul*, but from Eusebius (*H. E.* ii, 22): δεύτερον δ’ ἐπιβάντα τῇ αὐτῇ πόλει, τῷ κατ’ αὐτὸν τελειωθῆναι μαρτυρίῳ. Harris finds that there is a similar obscurity in the use of κατ’ αὐτὸν here, and concludes that the *Martyrdom* here actually is closer to Eusebius.
- (3) Regarding the error concerning the date of the Paul’s martyrdom, Harris interprets the evidence of the *Prologue to the Letters of Paul* differently. Again, he builds his argument on the text of Eusebius. In *H. E.* iii, 31, Eusebius refers to his earlier treatment of the deaths of Paul and Peter and their *depositio* in the Vatican and on the Ostian way in *H. E.* ii, 25 respectively. Harris finds that even Eusebius is unclear at this point, and argues that the error in the *Martyrdom* does not necessarily represent a misunderstanding of the text of Eusebius or the *Prologue to the Letters of Paul*.

A further consequence of these three criticisms, is that Robinson’s theory of a second epitomizer, working after Euthalius, is unnecessary, and Harris suggests that Euthalius had written the *Martyrdom* himself.⁹¹ Harris did not confine himself to source-criticism, but was also conscious of the influence of generic convention upon the prologues. The prologues could be read in a wider context, as texts belonging to a literary culture with certain expectations as to what a prologue should contain. Thus he described the opening

87 See HARRIS 1896.

88 HARRIS 1896: 64, cf. ROBINSON 1895: 29.

89 HARRIS 1896: 69. His evidence for this verdict is presented on pp. 64–69.

90 The discussion of these three arguments is found in HARRIS 1896: 80–82.

91 See HARRIS 1896: 82–83.

of the *Prologue to the Letters of Paul* as 'a conventional opening to a new book.'⁹² However, the reading of Euthalius in the light of literary conventions is not so much a concern for Harris, as it is to show the individual borrowings from the Eusebius' text.

The study of von Dobschütz on the Syriac version of Euthalius, referred to above, is to a large extent concerned with the history of the Syriac NT, but is, nevertheless, clearly of importance also for general research on Euthalius. Regarding the date of Euthalius, von Dobschütz noted that the versions of the *Martyrdom* in L and O refer to the 819th year of Alexander the Great, which corresponds to our 508 AD. This is also the year in which the Philoxenian revision of the Peshitta was produced. The manuscript O brings some additions to the text of the *Martyrdom*, as it looks back to that year (508 AD) as the year when a previous translation of this writing from Greek into Syriac was made.⁹³ This edition led von Dobschütz to associate the text of the *Martyrdom* in O with the Harclean version from 616 AD. The implication is that not only the *Martyrdom*, but also a form of the Euthalian apparatus was present already in the Philoxenian version.⁹⁴ Regarding the question of the genuine Euthalian elements, it is worth noting, however, that the Syriac manuscripts von Dobschütz examined did not contain the ὑποθέσεις.

In the first volume of von Soden's *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments* (1902) a large amount of auxiliary material to the NT writings was included. Among this material we find the complete Euthalian apparatus, albeit in separated elements. von Soden also reconstructs a biography of Euthalius, employing a method that is basically a close reading of the prologues and some related texts as sources for the life and times of Euthalius.⁹⁵ Unfortunately, von Soden did not refer to the work of Harris from 1896 where the influence of generic conventions was acknowledged. von Soden tends to take the rhetoric of Euthalius seriously as a personal testimony of the author. He noted a marked difference both in style and content between the *Prologue to the Letters of Paul* and the *Prologue to Acts*, considering the former a respectable piece of work, while the latter is full of self-deprecating phrases that stress the incompetence and audacity of the author, containing almost nothing of interest to the reader of Acts. von Soden thought that this Euthalius is a transformed person, different from the deacon who wrote the first prologue. Between the two works, Euthalius seemed to have broken his back. What had happened? The solution, according to von Soden, was found in a document discovered by Wobbermin, one of his co-workers. Wobbermin had come across the *Confession* of Euthalius in an 11th cent. manuscript in Athos. The full title of the document is Εὐθαλίου ἐπισκόπου Σούλης ὁμολογία περὶ τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως.⁹⁶ von Soden declared triumphantly that this dis-

92 HARRIS 1896: 69. For an introduction to the conventions of the genre in late antiquity and medieval times, see H. BRINKMANN 1964.

93 This probably refers to a translation of the Pauline letters from Greek into Syriac.

94 See VON DOBSCHÜTZ 1899: 133–137. The question of the relationship between the versions is also treated in BROCK 1979.

95 The reconstructed biography of Euthalius with the documents used for the reconstruction is found in VON SODEN 1902: 637–649.

96 The text is found in Athos Lawra 149, fol. 1–4. The full text of the Confession is printed in VON SODEN 1902: 638–641.

covery had put an end to the *Penelopearbeit* of earlier research.⁹⁷ The piece purports to be a retraction of heretical views in the form of a confession. After a personal introduction, where Euthalius presents himself as ‘a humble man and a sinner, bishop of the most Holy Church of Sulci,’ he confesses his belief in the main trinitarian and Christological dogmas. He condemns monotheletism in particular, and regrets that he had been led by a certain John to sign an earlier heretical confession. This document also contains references to the first five ecumenical councils:

From the <i>Confession</i> of Euthalius. Text in von Soden 1902: 640–641.	My translation
<p>Οὓς δὲ ἀπεβάλλετο καὶ ἀποβάλλεται ὁ ἀποστολικὸς καὶ πρωτόθρονος τοῦ ἁγίου Πέτρου τοῦ ἀποστόλου ἡγουν ἢ ἅγια τοῦ θεοῦ καθολικὴ καὶ ἀποστολικὴ μεγάλη ἐκκλησία Ῥώμης κατέκρινεν ἢ κατακρίνει, ἀποβαλλόμεθα καὶ κατακρίνομεν· καὶ οὓς προσεδέξατο καὶ προσδέχεται, ἀσφαλῶς καὶ ἀνεκδυστάτως προσδεχόμεθα καὶ ὁμοπίστους ἡμῶν γινώσκομεν ἄνευ οἰάσων ἀμφιβολίας, καὶ τοῖς μὴ οὕτως ὁμολογοῦσιν ἢ πιστεύουσιν ἢ κηρύττουσιν ἀνάθεμα ἔστω ἐκ τῆς ἀχράντου καὶ ζωοποιοῦ τριάδος τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας καθολικῆς τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἀποστολικῆς ὀρθοδόξου ἐκκλησίας· ἀποδέχομαι δὲ καὶ περιπτύσσομαι τὰς ἁγίας καὶ οἰκουμενικὰς τέσσαρας συνόδους, τὴν ἐν Νικαίᾳ, τὴν ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει, τὴν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ τὸ πρότερον καὶ τὴν ἐν Χαλκηδόνι, πρὸς αὐταῖς καὶ τὴν ἐκ δευτέρου ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει γενομένην ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐν εὐσεβεῖ τῇ λήξει Ἰουστινιανοῦ τοῦ βασιλέως· προσδέχομαι δὲ μετὰ καὶ τούτων ἀπάντων καὶ τὴν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐν ἀποστολικῇ τῇ μνήμῃ ἁγιωτάτου πάπα Μαρτίνου συναθροίσθησαν ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἁγίαν σύνοδον ἐπὶ βεβαιώσει τῶν ὀρθοδόξων καὶ ἀποστολικῶν δογμάτων τῆς ἀμωμήτου ἡμῶν τῶν Χριστιανῶν πίστεως καὶ εἰς κατάκρισιν τῆς νέας θρασυτήτος.</p>	<p>We reject and condemn all those whom the apostolic First Chair of the Holy Apostle Peter rejected and rejects, and all those whom the holy, catholic and apostolic Great Church of God condemned and condemns. And we accept firmly and without hesitation all those whom it accepted and accepts. We know them as our fellow-believers, without any doubt, and those who do not confess or believe or proclaim likewise, let them be anathematized from the pure and life-giving Trinity of the Father, of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and from the holy, catholic and apostolic orthodox Church of God. I praise and accept the four holy ecumenical councils, the one in Nicaea, in Constantinople, the first in Ephesus, and in Chalcedon, in addition to these also the second council that took place in Constantinople under Justinian, who died as a pious man. I accept in addition to all these also the holy council that was assembled in Rome under Pope Martin, the most holy man in apostolic memory, a council assembled in order to confirm the orthodox and apostolic teachings of our, the Christians, blameless faith, and in order to condemn the recent rashness.</p>

von Soden is convinced that the document is genuine because the name ‘Euthalius’ is unimportant in the dogmatic controversies of the period. If this argument is accepted, it is also possible to date the document with some accuracy. The council in Rome under Pope Martin was held in 648. Pope Martin himself died after a controversy in 655, so von Soden believed that the piece was written some time after this, in the late 7th century. As to the location of the document, certain linguistic details led him to identify the Sulci of Euthalius. The final paragraph of the *Confession* refers to the person who had seduced

⁹⁷ See VON SODEN 1902: 638.

Euthalius into signing the earlier confessional document: an otherwise unknown John, who is referred to as ‘exceptor of the duchy’ (Ἰωάννης ὁ ἐκσκέπτωρ τῆς δουκτικῆς ἀρχῆς)—a duchy being a subdivision of the Byzantine exarchies, and *exceptores* being members of the duchy’s administration. Thus, since this John was an *exceptor*, and “Sulci” (on Sardinia) a city within a Byzantine exarchy, von Soden felt certain that he had found the Sulci of Euthalius on Sardinia.⁹⁸ von Soden was not impressed by the contents of the *Confession*, saying that ‘what we have dug out is a monument made by a weak soul.’⁹⁹ The signing of the heretical confession, and its later retraction were the painful events that had destroyed him.

The discovery of the *Confession* was not the only new material that von Soden could offer. He also found the solution to an old problem in Euthalian scholarship: In minuscule 181, the main witness used by Zacagni in his edition, Zacagni had found in the end of a stichometrical list the mysterious phrase Καὶ τὸ πρὸς ἑμαυτὸν στίχοι κζ’. The text this phrase referred to, however, was not found in the manuscript. The problem was solved when another of von Soden’s co-workers, von der Goltz, found the following text on the island of Chalki:

98 See VON SODEN 1902: 643. This possibility had been considered already by ZACAGNI (1698: lxii–lxiv), who rejected it because Euthalius wrote in Greek and rather seemed to be connected to the Church of Alexandria.

99 ‘Es ist das Denkmal eines schwachen Geistes, das wir hier ausgegraben haben.’ VON SODEN 1902: 644.

The Πρὸς ἑμαυτόν of Euthalius. Text in von Soden 1902: 646–647.	My translation
<p>Πρὸς ἑμαυτόν Τὰ πάντα πάντη καιρὸν ἔχει· ἀκμάζει γὰρ τὰ ἕκαστα καὶ λήγει παλιν. ἐν πᾶσιν δὲ ἀπάθεια μόνη νικᾶν ἔχει. ὑπεροπτικὸς τοίνυν μὴ γίνου, θυμέ, ταῖς εὐδοξίαις μηδὲ ταπεινὸς ταῖς δυστυχίαις. οὕτω γὰρ ἂν δίκαιος ἔση τοῦ βίου ζυγοστάτης. οὐχ ἀπλαῖς οὐδ' ἀσυνθέτοις συσκευαῖς ἐμπεπτώκαμεν ἀλλὰ δὴ πλεισταῖς καὶ πικραῖς καὶ διαφόροις. τούτων ἡμῖν οὐδεὶς ἦν ὁ παρήγορος· πάντων γὰρ ἄρδην τῶν αγαθῶν ἡμεῖς ἐστηρήμεθα, πατρίδος ὁμοῦ καὶ δόξης καὶ περιουσίας, μόνην δ' ἄρωγὸν εὖρον τῶν κακῶν τὴν ἀναισθησίαν. πολλαῖσιν οὖν μοι συμφοραῖς προσομιλήσασα ψυχῇ, μὴ δὴ κάμη ἐμοί, ἀλλ' ὑπόμεινον, φίλη. ὥσπερ γὰρ ἀρίστη ταῦτα εἰλονιζομένη καρτερήσεις, ὅτι οὐχ' ὁ θέλει τις καὶ βούλεται δρᾶ, ἀλλ' ὁ μὴ ζητεῖ καὶ φεύγεται. ὁ γὰρ θεῖος ὅρος τῶν πάντων κρατεῖν ἐμελέτησεν· εἶπεν δέ τις, εἶπεν ἡμῖν ὧδε ποιητικὸς στίχος· ἐλπίδες ἐν ζωοῖσιν, ἀνέλπιστοι δὲ θανόντες. οὐκοῦν τοὺς πάθους τλῆναι χρὴ καὶ γενναίως φέρειν; οὐδεὶς γὰρ οὐδὲν ἐστὶ τῶν ἐν βίῳ βροτῶν καὶ οὐδὲν ἐν ταυτῷ γένηι τῶν ἀνθρώπων. ὡς ἐν τροχῷ δὲ πάντα στρέφεται καὶ τρέχει ἄλλων· ταῦτ' ἐγὼ πρὸς ἑμαυτόν πάντα γράφω νῦν καὶ πρὸς ἐστίαν πατρὸς ἐμοῦ τὴν τρισαθλίαν Εὐθάλιος, οἴμοι τὴν μεταβολὴν ἐννοῶν, τῶν ἀνθρώπων δὲ πάντα ὡς ἀνθρώπος βλέπων μίαν ἔλιπον ἐμαυτῷ εὐπίστον ἐλπίδα, τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ μόνην μοι φιλανθρωπίαν. στίχων κζ'.</p>	<p>To Myself Everywhere, there is a time for every thing. For each thing will bloom and then disappear. In all, only indifference can prevail. Soul, do not be haughty in your happiness, and do not be abased in adversities. For thus you will with justice guard the equilibrium of life. I was not the victim of simple and straightforward schemes, no, of many different ones, cruel ones, and there was no one who helped me out of them. We were completely bereft of all benefits: homeland, honor and possessions, the only helper I found was indifference. My soul, you who have experienced so many misfortunes, do not grow weary, but, my friend, endure.^a As the bravest you will endure if you keep this in your mind, because a man does not do what he wants and wishes for, but he does what he does not seek and what he tries to avoid. For the divine law has power over everything. And so goes a poetic line: 'Hope is among the living, but the dead do not possess it.'^b Should we not endure and carry our sufferings with dignity? For he who takes part in the life of mortals and belongs to mankind, is nothing. But as in a wheel, everything revolves and moves on. All this I, Euthalius, now write to myself and to the thrice-stricken house of my father. Woe is me, as I consider the change! Seeing the affairs of humans as a human being, I left for myself one hope in good faith, the one love of God for mankind. Twenty-seven lines.</p>
<p>a This translation was suggested to me by Jerker Blomqvist. b The line is Theocritus Idylls 4.42, see VON DOBSCHÜTZ 1899: 114.</p>	

It turned out that this piece corresponded to the *Prayer of Euthalius* which was known from Armenian manuscripts. The German translation of the Armenian printed by von Dobschütz is slightly different, and some of the personal elements of the Greek text are left out. This explains how the piece could appear as a kind of epilogue in the printed editions of the Armenian NT.¹⁰⁰ von Soden used the Greek original of *To Myself*, the *Confession*, the *Martyrdom*, and the Euthalian prologues as if they were pieces in a puzzle. He considered the *Martyrdom* in its form without the Egyptian paragraph a part of the original edition of Euthalius.¹⁰¹ Moreover, since the use of the Syro-Macedonian calendar

100 On the Armenian version, see VON DOBSCHÜTZ (1899: 113–115, with translation) and CONYBEARE (1904: 47).

101 For his view on the textual history of the *Martyrdom*, see VON SODEN 1902: 369–374.

in the *Martyrdom* connected Euthalius with the East, von Soden was able to reconstruct a biography of Euthalius with the following main points:¹⁰² Euthalius was a deacon in the East, possibly in Syrian Antioch, when he edited his volume of the Pauline letters, dedicated to an unknown father. After a controversy, Euthalius was forced to move to Sardinia. Here he signed an unorthodox confession. When he later made a retraction, in the form of the orthodox *Confession* that has come down to us, he was made bishop of Sulci on Sardinia as a reward. Only at that point, in order to rehabilitate himself completely, did he produce the volume of Acts and the Catholic letters. *To Myself* is a late, autobiographical product, which gives us intimate knowledge of the inner life of Euthalius after his many struggles. von Soden also had original views concerning the elements of the apparatus: While Zacagni and others had excluded the ὑποθέσεις using internal criteria, stressing the fact that they were not mentioned in the prologues, von Soden argued that the ὑποθέσεις with absolute certainty belonged to the original edition, as they occur in all the manuscripts. For similar reasons, he was willing to accept most of the material, including the *Martyrdom*, as genuine.¹⁰³ Another aspect of von Soden's work concerned the writing of the biblical text. von Soden believed that Euthalius divided the Acts and the Letters into sense-units simply by adding points in the text. In this view, he differs from earlier scholars.¹⁰⁴ The edition of von Soden also departs from that of Zacagni in its order of presentation, since the ὑποθέσεις, the κεφάλαια-τίτλοι, and the prologues are treated separately. von Soden did not adopt the juxtaposition of ὑποθέσεις and κεφάλαια-τίτλοι, so common in the manuscripts, being convinced (like Zacagni) that separate traditions had been fused in the apparatus, and letting this insight determine the order of presentation. Thus the different genres of apparatus (κεφάλαια-τίτλοι, ὑποθέσεις, prologues) were separated in his edition.

Conybeare soon raised objections against von Soden.¹⁰⁵ While admitting that the discovery of the *Confession* represented a problem, he blamed von Soden for neglecting the work of Robinson. He argues that Robinson had shown that the *Martyrdom* is dependent on the *Prologue to the Letters of Paul*, and this made von Soden's view untenable.¹⁰⁶ Conybeare drew attention to the fact that the apparatus in the majority of manuscripts is anonymous, and that only a few identify the author as Euthalius bishop of Sulci. He also assumes that the apparatus was translated into Armenian in the middle of the 5th century. One reason for this assumption is the Armenian date given in the *Martyrdom*, where an Armenian translator has added the name of the Armenian month Margotz as a gloss on 'June.' According to Conybeare, 1 June fell on 1 Margotz in the year 448 AD, since only in that year were the months in exact alignment. Of course, the two months would partly cover each other in the period 388–508 (enough for an author to have given an estimate

102 See VON SODEN 1902: 648–649.

103 See VON SODEN 1902: 657. The *Martyrdom* is considered genuine in the sense that it was included in the edition of Euthalius. Since it originated in 4th century, it belongs to the material that Euthalius inherited.

104 See VON SODEN 1902: 666.

105 See CONYBEARE 1904.

106 See CONYBEARE 1904: 39–41. Unfortunately, Conybeare does not here discuss the objections of Harris against the work of Robinson.

date), but Conybeare believes that the ‘middle date’ 448 is the most plausible.¹⁰⁷ He also used Armenian sources in order to prove that Robinson’s dating of the Greek Euthalian material was correct. Some of this material had already been introduced in his previous work on Euthalius (see above). The earliest of the Armenian texts used by Conybeare is a 10th century manuscript containing a chronicle he ascribes to Ananias of Shirak (7th cent.).¹⁰⁸ In this manuscript Euthalius is said to have published his volume of the Pauline letters in 396. Conybeare admits that this date evidently is based on the *Martyrdom*, and thus has no value as an independent source, but he wants to draw attention to the fact that the chronicle does record traditions about Euthalius at such an early date. Conybeare also introduced a rather late source, a commentary on Acts by the Armenian presbyter Matthew (1411).¹⁰⁹ Here Euthalius is said to have produced the volume of the Pauline letters for Alexander, patriarch of Alexandria, who died shortly after the first Ecumenical Council of Nicaea. According to Conybeare, Matthew’s commentary was compiled from many sources including John Chrysostomos, Ephrem, and Michael the Syrian. He was, at that point, inclined to place confidence in this account, especially since Matthew seems to have information that is not found elsewhere. He gives an early date for Euthalius, and resists the assumption that Athanasius was the great Athanasius of Alexandria. The main point of Conybeare is that the Armenian traditions, though contradictory, prove that an early date for Euthalius is more accurate.¹¹⁰

In the same year, Theodor Zahn published an article on Euthalius where he criticized von Soden’s views.¹¹¹ The essence of his criticism is similar to that of Conybeare: Zahn finds that the identification of Euthalius with the 7th century bishop has a weak foundation. He is willing to accept that a Greek from Syria may have become bishop of the mainly Latin-speaking church of Sulci on Sardinia in the second half of the 7th century. He finds it, however, unthinkable that this bishop could have failed to mention that his work on the biblical texts was made primarily for the benefit of the Greek churches in the East and not for his own community. In addition, Zahn could also draw attention to the fact that the *Confession of Euthalius* was known in the West even before von Soden published it: The Dominican friar Bonacursius of Bologna (13th cent.), who had lived 45 years in the Greek East, had quoted parts of this confession (in the original Greek and with Latin translation) in his *Thesaurus veritatis fidei* (c. 1275). Here, the *Confession* served as Greek evidence supporting the doctrine of the primacy of Rome.¹¹² Zahn thinks that the ‘To Myself’ is much closer to the Euthalian prologues. Here, he finds the same kind of rhythmic prose and a similar use of pagan authors.¹¹³ The most important texts are, according to Zahn, not the *Confession* or the ‘To Myself’ but the Euthalian prologues and the *Martyrdom*. To him, the 4th cent. *Martyrdom* proves that the 7th century *Confession* was not

107 See CONYBEARE 1904: 50. The method of dating implies that this is an approximation only.

108 See CONYBEARE 1904: 45–46.

109 See CONYBEARE 1904: 47–49.

110 See CONYBEARE 1904: 45–49 and WILLARD 1970: 128–133/2009: 95–98.

111 ZAHN 1904.

112 See ZAHN 1904: 305–306.

113 See ZAHN 1904: 316.

the work of the author of the apparatus. The Euthalian edition was made, according to Zahn, somewhere in Syria between 330 and 390 AD.

The works of Conybeare and Zahn may be said to mark the end of the discussion that had followed after the publication on Codex H by Omont in 1890. After this period of intensive research came to an end, there have been relatively few studies on Euthalius. The Armenian work of Vardanian published in the 1920s was probably read by very few scholars in Europe. For this work, most scholars are dependent on the summary that Willard had acquired. Vardanian basically agrees with Conybeare regarding the date of the Armenian translation, which he places in the middle of the 5th century. His method of discerning between genuine and secondary elements of the apparatus is linguistic: only elements written in the classical language are considered genuine. On the basis of this criterion, he accepts the *Martyrdom*, but not the *ὑποθέσεις*. He also considers the Armenian colophon, *The Voyage of Paul the Apostle to Rome*, and *The Travels of Paul* as genuine writings.¹¹⁴

An important work of the subsequent period is Günther Zuntz' *The Ancestry of the Harklean New Testament* which appeared in 1945. The focus of this study is not the apparatus, but the history of the Syriac NT. Zuntz' main concern is to demonstrate close connections between the NT text of Pamphilus on the one hand, and the Philoxenian (508) and Harklean (616) versions on the other. He argues that the Euthalian elements were not a part of the Peshitta, but were introduced in the Philoxenian version. He reconstructs the Greek text of a colophon in the Philoxenian version, and finds that the first half of this colophon is identical with that of Codex H and min. 88 (without the dialogue), while its second half is identical with the summary of the Euthalian lection list of the Letters of Paul.¹¹⁵ He finds that this indicates that these manuscripts are interdependent, and, further, that this interdependence is related to the library of Caesarea where the colophon was originally a guarantee of authenticity of copies issued from the Caesarean scriptorium.¹¹⁶ The apparatus was thus a Caesarean product, and Pamphilus was the originator of the work. 'Euthalius' is only a pseudonym of an author who was not particularly creative, since only the prologues were his own. Besides, 'Euthalius' had distributed the *κεφάλαια-τίτλοι* in his copy, so that they appear before the text of each letter.¹¹⁷ Other aspects of Zuntz' work should be mentioned: He placed the apparatus within the larger context of Greco-Roman literary culture, introducing parallels to the *κεφάλαια-τίτλοι* and the *ὑποθέσεις*.¹¹⁸ He also discussed the arrangement of the biblical text against the background of ancient scribal practices.¹¹⁹

114 For a detailed summary of the work of Vardanian, see WILLARD 1970: 133–137/2009: 98–101.

115 For the reconstructed text of this colophon, see ZUNTZ 1945: 77.

116 See ZUNTZ 1945: 87.

117 See ZUNTZ 1945: 83. In a later study, Zuntz has conjectured that 'Euthalius' is a pseudonym for Euzoios, and that the name of the dedicatee Athanasius also is a pseudonym. Behind 'Athanasius' stands Acacios. Both are associated with the Library of Caesarea in the 4th century. For this conjecture, see ZUNTZ 1953.

118 See ZUNTZ 1945: 80–82.

119 See ZUNTZ 1945: 89–104. This aspect of Zuntz' work may be considered a development of Harris' work on stichometry (HARRIS 1883).