CHRISTOPH MARKSCHIES
translated by WAYNE COPPINS

CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY *and* ITS INSTITUTIONS *in the* EARLY ROMAN EMPIRE

PROLEGOMENA *to a* HISTORY *of* EARLY CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY

Christian Theology and Its Institutions in the Early Roman Empire

BMSEC

BAYLOR–MOHR SIEBECK

Studies in Early Christianity

ALSO AVAILABLE

From Jesus to the New Testament
Early Christian Theology and the Origin of the New Testament Canon
by Jens Schröter (2013)

Israel, Church, and the Gentiles in the Gospel of Matthew
by Matthias Konradt (2014)

Christian Theology and Its Institutions in the Early Roman Empire

Prolegomena to a History of Early Christian Theology

Christoph Markschies

Translated by Wayne Coppins

BAYLOR UNIVERSITY PRESS

Mohr Siebeck

Cover Design by Natalya Balnova

Originally published in German as *Kaiserzeitliche christliche Theologie und ihre Institutionen: Prolegomena zu einer Geschichte der antiken christlichen Theologie* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007, student edition 2009), with the ISBN 978-3-16-149957-9.

This English edition is published in Germany by Mohr Siebeck with the ISBN 978-3-16-154143-8.

Distributors
For all other countries
Baylor University Press
One Bear Place #97363
Waco, Texas 76798
USA

For Europe and the UK
Mohr Siebeck
Wilhelmstr. 18, Postfach 20 40
D-72010 Tübingen
Germany

978-1-4813-0403-0 (Web PDF)

This ebook was converted from the original source file. Readers who encounter any issues with formatting, text, linking, or readability are encouraged to notify the publisher at BUP_Production@baylor.edu. Some font characters may not display on all ereaders.

To inquire about permission to use selections from this text, please contact Baylor University Press, One Bear Place, #97363, Waco, Texas 76798.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Markschies, Christoph.

[Kaiserzeitliche christliche Theologie und ihre Institutionen. English]
Christian theology and its institutions in the early Roman Empire : prolegomena to a history of early Christian theology / Christoph Markschies ; translated by Wayne Coppins.
pages cm. — (Baylor-Mohr Siebeck studies in early Christianity)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-1-4813-0401-6 (hardback : alk. paper)

1. Theology—History—Early church, ca. 30-600. 2. Church history—Primitive and early church, ca. 30-600. I. Title.

BT25.M3713 2015
230.09'015—dc23 2015002032

Printed in the United States of America on acid-free paper with a minimum of 30% post-consumer-waste recycled content.

Contents

This page intentionally left blank

Editors' Introduction

The Baylor–Mohr Siebeck Studies in Early Christianity series aims to facilitate increased dialogue between German and Anglophone scholarship by making recent German research available in English translation. In this way, we hope to play a role in the advancement of our common field of study. The target audience for the series is primarily scholars and graduate students, though some volumes may also be accessible to advanced undergraduates. In selecting books for the series, we will especially seek out works by leading German scholars that represent outstanding contributions in their own right and also serve as windows into the wider world of German-language scholarship.

Christoph Markschies is one of the most prominent scholars of early Christianity in the world today. He holds the chair of Ancient Christianity (Patristics) at the Humboldt University of Berlin, where he also served as president from 2006 to 2010. Since 2012, he has served as vice president of the Berlin-Brandenburgischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. In addition to the information about his research and publications provided at his university webpage, a list of his English-language publications can be found at Wayne Coppins' blog *German for Neutestamentler*.

The present volume, *Kaiserzeitliche christliche Theologie und ihre Institutionen: Prolegomena zu einer Geschichte der antiken christlichen Theologie* (*Christian Theology and Its Institutions in the Early Roman Empire: Prolegomena to a History of Early Christian Theology*), both represents an important contribution in its own right and points forward to Markschies' hope to compile a history of early Christian theology in the future. A major strength of the volume resides in its terminological precision and methodological sophistication. For example, Markschies' incisive critique of teleological approaches to the history of early Christianity and his careful analysis of the terms "theology" and "institution" provide a compelling rationale for his subsequent focus on three *different* institutional contexts—namely, the free teachers and Christian schools, the

Montanist prophets and their circle, and the Christian worship service and its prayers. Similarly, his critical appropriation of the terms "identity" and "plurality" helps him develop an attractive alternative to competing models such as Walter Bauer's cultural Protestant model of "orthodoxy" and "heresy" or the Jesuit model of the "inculturation" of Christianity. Another great strength of the volume is found in its wide-ranging engagement with primary sources and secondary literature. For example, investigations of Plato's Academy, pagan oracle sanctuaries, and early Christian libraries illuminate Origen's private Christian university, the phenomenon of Montanism, and the canon of the Christian Bible. Then again, he draws upon modern, multidisciplinary research on institutions to critique influential notions, such as "early Catholicism," and to highlight the *particula veri* of rejected perspectives, such as "the great man theory."

With regard to the translator's divided allegiance to the source and target languages, Wayne Coppins has generally attempted to adhere closely to the German wording, while allowing for some adjustments for the sake of clarity and readability in English. One particularly difficult point of translation may be mentioned here—namely, the translation of the terms *Normierung(en)*, *Normierungsprozesse*, *normieren*, and *normiert*. With a view to English speech conventions, I considered using the language of "standardization(s), standardization processes, standardize, and standardized" for this set of terms. Since, however, Markschies' word choice places the emphasis on the setting of a norm in general, with the result that the language of "standardization" is likely to convey an overly limited impression of what is in view, I decided instead to render these terms in a more wooden fashion as "norming(s) or norm-setting(s), norming processes, norm, and normed." As a rule, I have provided my own translations of Markschies' translations of primary texts, quoting from existing translations only in cases in which he has quoted from an existing German translation. Similarly, I have generally provided my own translations of German works quoted in the volume, while providing a reference to existing English translations when possible.

The translator, Wayne Coppins, would like to thank Simeon Zahl, Timothy Michael Law, and David Lincicum for providing him with valuable comments on his translation of major sections of the monograph; Simon Gathercole for carefully working through the entire translation; and Elisabeth Wolfe for significantly improving the readability and accuracy of the translation at many points. For repeated assistance with difficult German sentences and formulations, I am especially grateful to Christoph Heilig, Scott Caulley, and Christoph Markschies. Great thanks are likewise due to Emmanouela Grypeou and Mitchell Esswein for typing out and sending me the Coptic and Syriac texts. I also wish to thank my department head, Sandy Martin, and the University of Georgia as an institution for the strong support that has been given to this project. Finally, I am thankful to my wife Ingie Hovland and my daughters Sophia and Simone for creating space in our life for my translation work.

Both editors wish to express their thanks to Henning Ziebritzki at Mohr Siebeck and Carey Newman at Baylor University Press for their exceptional support and guidance in the continued development of this series. Likewise, we are thankful to the many people at Baylor University Press who have given us concrete assistance and guidance along the way, especially Jenny Hunt, Diane Smith, Jordan Rowan Fannin, and David Aycock, and grateful to Scribe Inc. for their editing and production services.

Wayne Coppins and Simon Gathercole
Athens, Georgia, and Cambridge, England,
September 2014

This page intentionally left blank

Introduction to the English Edition

In the introduction to the German edition (below), I provide information about the motives that moved me to write a book on the institutional contexts of theology in the imperial period and about the biographical and institutional contexts of the emergence of this book. For this reason, I can actually register only two points here. In my first attempt to build upon the program for a new history of theology developed here—namely, in my book on the history of ancient Christian (as well as Jewish and pagan) conceptions of the body of God[1]—I found no reason to fundamentally revise this program of understanding the history of Christian theology on the basis of the respective institutional contexts. Ekkehard Mühlenberg's objection that this concept of theology is taken from religious studies and implies no ontological statement about the truth of the claims contained in it accurately captures my intention:[2] historical analysis and theological value judgment must be distinguished as clearly as possible. A "*mixophilologia-theologia*" that excessively mixes historical analysis and theological interpretation may correspond to the tradition of the discipline and perhaps also to the work style of my esteemed Göttingen colleague, but after the methodological clarifications in the scholarship of history and theology in the twentieth century, it appears to me only anachronistic.[3] If I were to write my book again today, then I would perhaps make much more explicit how much I have been influenced by the Cambridge school of the political history of ideas in my attempts to write the history of Christian theology (the history of theology in the first place being nothing more than

[1] Markschies 2015; an English translation is expected to appear in 2016.

[2] Mühlenberg 2010, 232–33.

[3] It is a sign of such an anachronism that Mühlenberg regards it as a problem when a certain expression (such as "religious power") leads an author "a bit too much into the circle (*Umkreis*) of Peter Brown" (Mühlenberg 2010, 239 n. 5). I feel extremely comfortable in this circle and hope that my book reveals a number of impulses that I received in this circle and from Peter Brown himself.

a certain case of a history of ideas)[4] and correspondingly perhaps treat the political and social presuppositions of the institutions in the history of Christianity in somewhat greater detail than occurs here.[5] In a proper revision, I would also have to refer to the content of new publications and interpretations that have appeared since the completion of the manuscript. This has not taken place in the present English translation; only silent corrections of various errors and mistakes in the German edition have been made thanks to the great care of the translator Wayne Coppins. As compensation, I can refer only in some cases to works of my own in which the literature published since 2006 has been worked through as fully as possible, such as my work on the "new prophecy," the so-called Montanism.[6] For the history of the canonization of the Christian Bible, I can refer to my detailed main introduction to this topic in the new edition of the most extensive German introduction to and translation of the literature that became apocryphal.[7] But I cannot (yet) point to more recent texts of my own in relation to two complexes in which the discussion has clearly progressed. My interpretation of the so-called Gnosis, which is presupposed in the corresponding sections of my book, would actually have to be updated with a view to the most important new publications of recent years and the objections presented in them,[8] even if thus far I have not yet found a reason to fundamentally revise my views. I also readily acknowledge that my pointed attempt to interpret Marcion as a philologist turned out to be too brief and thesis-like in view of the many other interpretations.[9] In both cases, however, I did not want to anticipate upcoming publications: Markus Vinzent is working (together with others such as Matthias Klinghardt) on a new image of Marcion in the tradition of certain approaches of the nineteenth century;[10] but so long as the new text edition of the "gospel" of Marcion announced by Vinzent has not yet been published, it would probably be premature to recompose the corresponding section and lay it out in greater detail. Here one would naturally also have to evaluate very thoroughly the great treatise of Tertullian against Marcion. By contrast, as my next project, I want to put together a collection of my studies on the history of Valentinian Gnosis,[11] in which I can also bring the presupposed

[4] Skinner 1969 (cf. Markschies 2008b).
[5] On this, see briefly Markschies 1999a; 2001b.
[6] Markschies 2012b.
[7] Markschies 2012a; an English translation is in the works.
[8] I mention above all Brakke 2010.
[9] Mühlenberg 2010, 243–44.
[10] Vinzent 2014; Klinghardt 2008.
[11] It will be published by Mohr Siebeck in the series "Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament."

overall picture of the phenomena into discussion with other approaches once again.

If I were to write the book again today, then it would turn out to be even more comprehensive. For if alongside the "explicit theology" the sphere of the "implicit theology" is to be taken into view with relative completeness, then it lacks, as I must self-critically concede, a chapter on magical texts and interpretations of healings. Here too we are naturally dealing with institutions that have generated a quite specific form of theology. But the high standards that, for example, my Leipzig colleague Franziska Naether has set in her treatment of the *Sortes Astrampsychi* (which also exists in a Christian version)[12] have kept me from composing such a chapter in an overly hasty fashion and attaching it to the English translation of the German monograph. I have at least worked on a particular sort of healings that were offered in the Christian communities—namely, the incubations.[13] Moreover, my colleague Candida R. Moss has impressively demonstrated once again that the institution of martyrdom has also produced certain theologies that shape the face of certain manifestations of Christianity, in part up to the present day.[14] With such additional chapters, it would be possible to avoid more energetically the impression that when one wishes to present the history of Christian theology in antiquity, one writes only the prehistory of the theological faculties, as these have existed since the Middle Ages in European universities and then also in universities outside of Europe—a suspicion that is always suggested for a professor at such an institution who is an author. But such simple forms of teleology are actually prohibited, and their traces are hopefully not to be found in this book.

But before one ruminates over whether a book could have been improved, it must of course exist in the first place. And thus I wish above all to thank Wayne Coppins for the fact that the book now exists in English. I would also like to thank him for attending to the translation of my book in such an extremely careful manner. He has not shied away from transforming complex German sentences into concise English and thus made a very German book with infinitely long footnotes readable in another language. The absurd contradictions of a globalized world include the fact that information is more easily accessible but linguistic proficiency has diminished so much that many people can scarcely take notice of foreign literature. With this, the problem of the already somewhat idiosyncratic scholarly national style is intensified even further. One often complains that one is

[12] Naether 2010.
[13] Markschies 2008a, 62–99.
[14] Moss 2013 (cf. already Moss 2010).

not read by others, but in truth, such accusations naturally always apply in the first instance to one's own address. If a new interest in European publications could be discerned in the English-speaking world (and I think it can be), then it is certainly also due to initiatives such as the Baylor–Mohr Siebeck Studies in Early Christianity series, into whose service Wayne Coppins has placed himself so unselfishly. I thank him, Carey Newman at Baylor University Press, and those who look after me at Mohr Siebeck, and above all Georg Siebeck and Henning Ziebritzki, once again for their initiative and their labor. One of my academic teachers, the Tübingen New Testament scholar Martin Hengel (1926–2009),[15] represented an internationality and interdisciplinarity that was very unusual for his time; if my book were to reveal a little of his corresponding impulses, then it would bring me great joy. Now, however, I wish that the book in this new form it also finds new friends.

Christoph Markschies
Berlin, September 2014

[15] Frey 2010.

Introduction to the German Edition

When I first had to give public academic lectures as a church historian at the Friedrich Schiller University of Jena, I considered for quite some time before the announcement whether I should offer the two cycles of my subject—namely, "church history" and "history of dogma or theology"—separately according to the traditional praxis of German Protestant faculties or whether I should combine them instead. There are good reasons for both approaches. The traditional separation is supported by the massive amount of material, which can be more easily managed in this way and by the very different goals of the two cycles. The church history cycle presents the history of Christianity in the context of its respective environments and thus relativizes the apparent immediacy of historical manifestations of Christianity. The history of dogma cycle, which should actually be referred to more precisely as the history of theology cycle,[16] is much more strongly related to the neighboring subject area of systematic theology, is even offered in part by systematic theologians, and often focuses on the outcome of Christian reflection through the centuries, which is ordered according to modern loci. In this way, the evaluative component in this lecture cycle is also naturally much greater than in a purely historical review of the history of Christianity. Especially in the last century, the disadvantages of a separate treatment of the two thematic fields have been pointed out time and again from very different quarters.[17] A treatment of the history of theology that brackets out the historical contingencies of the formation

[16] For the terminological distinction between a "history of dogma" and a "history of theology," see Köpf 1988. The first footnote of this book also simultaneously documents the fact that I received the first impulses for investigating the connection between institutions and theologies in the Tübingen advanced seminar of Ulrich Köpf.

[17] In order to ground this demand, the metaphor of a fence that has been torn down has often been used from the nineteenth century onward, a phenomenon that would be worthy of an investigation of its own. For example, in the context of his inaugural lecture before the Prussian academy of scholarly studies, Adolf (von) Harnack declared that "the fence that previously separated the field of church history from the field of general history has been torn down" (Harnack 1890, 791; 1980a, 3; 1930a, 212).

of theological doctrine would needlessly repeat one-sided emphases of a classic history-of-ideas approach to reality that have long been recognized, and many developments would remain incomprehensible “theologian squabbles” and difficult to comprehend as meaningful processes. An organic connection between church history and the history of theology could also be supported by the fact that in this way the long-neglected history of piety and liturgy could take up the hinge function that actually belongs to it, between the reconstruction of historical processes and the presentation of theological reflection.

Although more arguments would actually support a combination of the traditional two cycles, I decided in the summer of 1994 to follow the old Jena tradition and read the two cycles in succession—first a church history cycle with strong history-of-theology portions and then the second cycle with strong historical portions. Perhaps it was a result of this long approach to the actual history of theology that I became more and more conscious of a considerable deficiency in our conventional practice of presenting the history of Christian theology. When we make explicit the historical presuppositions of ancient Christian theology, we usually mean the event-historical framework in which ancient theologians thought and specifically the tableau that is outlined with well-known key phrases—namely, persecution of Christians, mission and gradual spread of Christianity, Constantinian turning point, and ascent to state religion. But one scarcely reflects on the fact that—certainly since the methodological shifts in the study of history during the last century—“historical presuppositions” must be developed much more concretely. In which institutional contexts was theology carried out? Who had the time and the economic possibilities to occupy himself or herself in greater detail with reflection on his or her Christian religion? For whom were such different forms of theology intended? Who was at all interested in the reception of ancient Christian theology? Conventional and standard histories of theology from the nineteenth and twentieth century have always offered and continue to offer only a presentation of systems of Christian theology that are oriented to the classic structure of a modern Christian dogmatic—and this is also completely understandable in view of the close relationship that exists between the history of Christian theology and systematic theology in the education of German theologians. But in preparing my own lectures, I found all the aforementioned questions unanswered and decided to work on them in greater detail and above all to undertake a thorough investigation of the *institutional contexts* within which Christian theology was carried out in the imperial period. In this monograph, I present the provisional result of that work.

By paying attention to the institutional contexts, I aim to avoid having only isolated segments of ancient Christianity come into view in this book, for example, by considering only a type of theology (e.g., the type that refers to the frames of reference of Platonic philosophy and shapes western Christian theology to some extent up to the present) or only a single region (Rome or precisely not Rome, depending on the confessional form) or only a certain social milieu (e.g., the social standing of those supported by communities and Christian teachers working in their educational institutions).[18] For this reason, in the first main section of this book, I have especially directed my attention to the *different* institutional contexts in which Christian theologies were developed in the second and third centuries CE. I have investigated the development and change of such institutions and given consideration to public situations of communication—namely, pagan and Christian school contexts—but also, for example, the conditions at the great imperial and private estates. The differences and commonalities between Christian and pagan institutions are also dealt with, at least in the form of an overview. I am, of course, aware that the first answers given to questions that have scarcely been asked usually have a very provisional character and that the difficult and meager source material already makes a truly comprehensive presentation of the institutional contexts scarcely possible anymore. For this reason, I have decided to work in a consciously paradigmatic way: thus, in chapter 2, "Three Institutional Contexts," the Montanists (section 2.2) stand as an example for all forms of theology that are not oriented to the model of the contemporary philosophical forms of instruction, and in section 2.3, on the Christian worship service and its prayers, a select number of anaphoras stand as paradigmatic for applied forms of theological reflection in the worship service. But since the following investigation, despite such concentration on characteristic examples, aims to describe the institutional contexts of the emergence and development of Christian theological reflection in the imperial period, it can also be read as a prolegomena to a history of Christian theology in the second and third centuries.[19]

The first two chapters, which provide more of a history of institutions, are followed by chapter 3, "Institution and Norm," which provides an equally paradigmatic investigation of the *norms* around which pagan and Christian theology oriented themselves in the imperial period. I am thoroughly aware that my monograph is limited to a single norm of the three norms (office,

[18] One could say—simultaneously very self-critically and certainly also in a somewhat exaggerated manner—that many histories of theology (and certainly not only those of German theologians) run dead straight, in a not unproblematic manner, to the position of the theology professor as the "crown" of the history-of-theology development.

[19] I have focused my investigation, not only for reasons of space, on these two centuries, even if it occasionally reaches forward into the following century, above all in the sections on the free teachers and Christian schools (section 2.1) and on the New Testament canon and the libraries (section 3.1). With the so-called Constantinian turn in the fourth century, the institutional contexts of Christian theology underwent a quite fundamental change once again.

confession, and canon of Holy Scriptures) that are traditionally mentioned in this connection—namely, to the *biblical canon*—although it is certainly the case that additional norms and norming processes were determinative for ancient Christianity, such as in the sphere of the worship service. To address them would already have caused the "prolegomena to a history of theology" to grow into a history of theology. For this reason, I have also forgone a short section on office and confession that I originally planned to include.[20] While working on this book, I have been more interested in the connection between institution and norm, between institutionalization and norm-setting. Since exciting contributions on the topic of "canon" are also currently being presented from a cultural studies perspective, I have concentrated especially on this norm. Here too my concern is not to submit a comprehensive presentation but rather to make visible this norm's connection to the respective institutions for which it was in force and within which it emerged: Are the initial differences in the norming of a canon of Holy Scriptures also connected to specific conditions in communities—for example, to different contents of libraries? Did theologians in different institutional contexts perhaps also use a different canon of Holy Scriptures? The question that is thus touched on and that has been much discussed in the twentieth century because of Walter Bauer's 1934 monograph *Rechtsgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum* (*Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*)[21]—namely, the question of the *identity of ancient Christianity in the plurality of its different forms*—is answered in the form of a sketch in the fourth and final chapter, "The Identity and Plurality of Ancient Christianity." In this way, the results of viewing norm and institution jointly are also brought together at the same time.[22]

A basic thesis of this book is that a consideration of the different institutional contexts of Christian theology makes it possible to provide a description of commonalities and differences in ancient Christianity in the second and third centuries that is both more precise and more able to achieve a consensus than usually happens today in connection with Bauer and in opposition to him. The key concepts "identity," "plurality," and "pluralism" that are repeatedly used in the final chapter signal my special interest in how, alongside the plurality of ancient Christianity that has been

[20] Engagement with the two themes is, of course, older. For the topic of confession and rule of faith, compare, for example, Markschies 1999b.

[21] Bauer 1964, 288–306 ("The reception of the book"). For an account of the subsequent discussion, compare section 4.2.

[22] The subtitle "Prolegomena to a History of Early Christian Theology" signals that in the future I hope to be able to present a more in-depth answer to the question in a history of theology that represents a new type, namely in its institutional focus and its emphasis on both explicit and implicit theology. A second volume of this history will be published in German in 2015 (Markschies 2015), and it will probably appear in English in 2016.

attentively documented in the most recent research, it can also be observed that the different conceptions are related to a basis that is common to all.

This book attempts to approach the colorful world of ancient Christian theology with a precise set of methodological instruments. This approach implies that a detailed account will be given of the ancient and modern terms that are employed. For this reason, the monograph begins with a chapter on the key terms “theology” and “institution” (sections 1.1 and 1.2). Remarks on the understanding of the term “norm” that I presuppose can be found at the end of the first chapter, and the key terms “identity,” “plurality,” and “pluralism” will be treated at length in the final chapter (section 4.3). All these terms, as well as the periodization term *Kaiserzeit* used in the title (translated there as “in the early Roman Empire” and elsewhere as “in the imperial period”), do not come from the traditional continental European history of theology but from more recent discussion in history and classics. At the same time, it thus becomes clear that while this presentation has not been written from a supposedly neutral “religious studies” standpoint, its author is nevertheless very conscious of the sometimes not unproblematic implications of the rather traditional terminology that theologians normally employ.[23] This especially applies to the terms used for periodization—for example, the highly problematic designation “early Catholicism.”[24] There has, however, been a growing sensitivity on this point in recent years: thus, for example, individual authors have come to completely avoid the familiar concept of “primitive Christianity” (*Urchristentum*) in their historical analyses because of its normative connotations. According to François Vouga, it implies “not only the equation of beginning and nature and the falling apart of truth and history,” but it “also contains the idea of a degeneration of an original unity into groupings and heresies that are independent of one another,” which can no longer be advocated after Walter Bauer. The term “early Christianities” with its plural form is said to be better suited for expressing “the different reception of the Jesus event in the individual circles that equally confessed themselves to be Christians.”[25] In the final section, I will ask—as indicated above—whether one actually provides an accurate account of the findings of the imperial period with the use of the plural “Christianities.”

[23] Markschies 1998b, 345–46.

[24] On this point, compare n. 69 in chapter 4, which references A. M. Ritter 2000, 203 n. 5; Vouga 1994, 235–44; Nagler 1994, 7–182.

[25] Vouga 1994, 13. The ideological implications of the term (e.g., in the form of a theory of decline) are carefully traced by Alkier 1993, 5–254. Alkier argues for the abandonment of the term, which belongs to the “genius-aesthetic” (261) and for its replacement with the already familiar term “*Frühchristentum*/early Christianity” (261–66). In a research report, Lüdemann 2000, 128–30, in turn, opposes this viewpoint.

This book has a rather long prehistory, which will be briefly recounted here, since the different contexts of emergence for its parts may also be able to signal the limits of this investigation. The work on the book basically began when I was invited in March 1989, as a Tübingen assistant, to speak on the topic of the canonization of the New Testament before the *Martin-Luther-Bund* (Martin Luther Association) in Erlangen and realized, at first with great amazement and yet soon also with muted resentment, that since the publication of the great monographs on this topic at the end of the nineteenth century, scarcely any new material had been taken into consideration, and therefore the investigations essentially followed traditional paradigms or repeated long-known points of view. The core of the section on the New Testament canon and the libraries emerged at that time. The text was presented multiple times in Tübingen in 1989/1990, including before the assembly of the New Testament assistants of the faculty in June 1990. An opportune occasion for completely reworking the manuscript first arose when the occupant of the Martin Buber Professor for comparative religious studies at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Guy G. Stroumsa, invited me to Jerusalem in the winter semester of 1999/2000 to join a working group on the topic "Mechanisms of Canon-Making in Ancient Societies" at the Institute for Advanced Studies of Hebrew University. It was not only chapter 3 that exceptionally profited from the shared time and lively discussions with my cofellows Margalit Finkelberg, Moshe Greenberg, Moshe Halbertal, Robert Lamberton, Andrew Plaks, Hagith Sivan, David Stern, and Guy Stroumsa. The revised ideas could then be presented to the convocation of the *Association pour l'étude de la littérature apocryphe chrétienne* (AELAC) at their annual conference in Dole in June 2000, to the Göttingen theological faculty in June 2001 as the "Gerhard Ulhorn Lecture," and then once more during the same summer in Geneva as part of a conference on the canonization of the Bible. Chapter 3 was also greatly modified by discussions with the members of the *Berliner Arbeitskreises für koptisch-gnostische Schriften* (Berlin Work Group on Coptic-Gnostic Scriptures); since 1999, Hans-Gebhard Bethge and the late Hans-Martin Schenke, who died in 2002, have invited me to this work group on multiple occasions and gifted me with fascinating discussions.

Nevertheless, I did not expand this investigation into a book of its own on the canonization of the New Testament; instead, I have attempted to treat this topic within the horizon of institutions and the question of the *identity of ancient Christianity in the plurality of its different manifestations*. The specification of the relationship between identity and plurality that is treated at length in chapter 4 has basically occupied me since my Tübingen dissertation on the urban Roman theologian Valentinus.[26] Here,

[26] Markschies 1992.

however, it was not so much lecture presentations as it was a great number of discussions with colleagues and students that sharpened my own reflections on this subject area: I will mention only a long conversation in 1992 with the New Testament scholar Dieter Georgi (1929–2005) at the *Evangelisch-Theologische Fakultätentag* (Meeting of the Protestant Theological Faculties) in Leipzig; multiple sessions of the Patristic doctoral colloquium that I have organized together with Hanns Christof Brennecke and Wolfgang Wischmeyer since the winter of 1994 in the form of regular meetings in Erlangen, Jena, and Vienna; and finally a 1997 course at the *Theologische Studienjahr* (Theological Academic Year) of the Dormition Abbey B.M.V. in Jerusalem titled "Identity and Plurality in Ancient Christianity," which was held at the invitation of the founder of this organization, Dr. Laurentius Klein OSB, who died in 2002.[27] The idea of taking up this question anew and yet treating it, in contrast to the previous literature, in relation to ancient Christian institutions goes back to the 1997 course in Jerusalem. In subsequent years, I have then attempted to consider such individual institutions in greater detail: section 2.1, on the free teachers and Christian schools, goes back to a lecture in the framework of a thematic series of lectures of the Bochum graduate research center on "commentary literature," which was given on June 2, 1998, at the invitation of my Catholic colleague Wilhelm Geerlin. With these reflections, I originally attempted to supplement investigations published elsewhere on the educational sociological structure of Valentinian Gnosis[28] and to place it in a broader framework. This manuscript also expanded when I presented it multiple times in very different contexts in 1998 and 1999.[29] The origins of section 2.2, on the institutions of Montanist theology, are also more recent. It goes back originally to a 1998 lecture that I gave in early spring at a conference that took place at the initiative of the Erfurt religious studies scholar Andreas Bendlin in Brasenose College, Oxford, devoted to the theme of "imperial religion and provincial religion." The text was also presented again in greatly altered form at the beginning of 2001 at the universities of Turin and Pisa. During an all-too-short research semester in early summer 2003 in the Beuron Archabbey, I drafted an extensive section on the Christian worship service and its prayers (section 2.3). The basic lines of this section, which emerged at a location that contemporaneously cultivates a classic Benedictine liturgy of the hours and also

[27] I recall with special fondness the inspiring time with the students in Jerusalem and hope to have taken into account as many of their stimulating suggestions and questions as possible in the revision of the lecture text that was presented at that time.

[28] Markschies 1997, 401–38.

[29] It was presented on October 23, 1998, in the humanities category of the "Akademie gemeinnütziger Wissenschaften" (Academy of Researches Useful for the Common Good).

possesses a magnificently furnished library, were discussed with the participants in my first advanced seminar in Berlin, which was organized together with Professor Katharina Bracht in 2004, and in the two following semesters; the section was supplemented accordingly. However, an academic leave from the distinguished Berlin chair of ancient church history and a renewed invitation to the Institute for Advanced Studies in Jerusalem from September to December 2005 first gave me the opportunity to complete the manuscript after many years of work. The group led by Galit Hasan-Rokem, Ilana Pardes, and Carola Hilfrich also included Alon Confino, Arkady Kovelman, Ronit Matalon, and Amy Shuman. In this circle of ethnologists, historians, and scholars of literature, we discussed questions of the identity of individuals and groups in a way that led once again to a far-reaching revision of the final chapter. The group completed its work in Jerusalem at the end of the winter semester on February 26, 2006, by giving me the opportunity to present and discuss the concept of the book again for the last time on the final evening of our time together.

Without the help of present-day institutions, such a monograph on the institutional contexts of ancient Christian theology certainly would not have emerged and been wrested from everyday academic life. During a wonderful year at the *Wissenschaftskolleg zu Berlin* (Institute of Advanced Study in Berlin) from October to July 1999, I could, free from all external concerns and cares of daily university life, begin writing the manuscript and at the same time divert myself from it occasionally through intellectually rich conversations and other stimulating activities. The librarians, under the direction of Gesine Bottomley, obtained a great abundance of literature for me with great energy. Ancient history colleagues in Berlin and Potsdam, first and foremost Wilfried Nippel and Jörg Rüpke, invited me to stimulating discussions of my theses in their faculties, and historians and sociologists from my fellowship year sharpened my view of institutions; I mention above all Franz-Xaver Kaufmann from Bielefeld and Paul Nolte from Berlin. From September 1999 to February 2000, I was able to press ahead with the manuscript at the Institute for Advanced Studies at Hebrew University in Jerusalem.[30] The move to Heidelberg in fall 2000 delayed the completion of the book in a certain respect, but it was also good for it because my predecessor Adolf Martin Ritter was friendly enough to discuss the final chapter in detail in a joint advanced seminar in the 2000/2001 winter semester and to patiently put up with the divergent ideas of his

[30] It is more than a formality when I thank the leadership of the Friedrich Schiller University of Jena at that time, especially its chancellor Dr. Klaus Kübel and my faculty colleagues, for making possible this more extended absence of their church historian from the everyday life of the university.

young colleague. The writing of the manuscript could then be continued in the aforementioned research semester in early summer 2003. Here I especially thank the Benedictines of the Archabbey St. Martin in Beuron for the friendly way that they granted me hospitality in their monastery and made possible an undisturbed research phase in a wonderful environment. It is a special joy to me that a book so closely tied to Jerusalem could largely be completed during a renewed stay at the Institute for Advanced Studies in this city, right next to the masterfully stocked Hebrew National Library, and that the last corrections could be made while staying on Mount Zion during the academic year of the Benedictine abbey in the spring of 2006.

I also wish to give explicit thanks—alongside the people who have already been mentioned—to a number of colleagues who have, at various times, given me important pointers and impulses for the subject matter addressed in this book: Luise Abramowski (Tübingen), Barbara Aland (Münster), Jan Assmann (Heidelberg), Hans Dieter Betz (Chicago), Katharina Bracht (Berlin), Martin Hengel (Tübingen), Eilert Herms (Tübingen), Ulrich Köpf (Tübingen), Wolf Lepenies (Berlin), Eva Markschies (Berlin), Christoph Schubert (Erlangen), and Michael Welker (Heidelberg). The Jena, Heidelberg, and Berlin chairs supported their directr in manifold ways and thus this list must be supplemented with the names of the secretaries Barbara Sarouji, Waltraud Anzinger, and Inge Ith, as well as the assistants Andreas Heiser, Henrik Hildebrandt, Ulrike Kugler, Bernhard Mutschler, Oliver Weidermann, and the various student assistants. Together with the student assistants, the aforementioned colleagues have given the book a unified form, checked its references, and compiled a bibliography.[31] Georg Siebeck as well as Henning Ziebritzki and their colleagues in Tübingen accepted the manuscript and first made it into a real book.

At the end of a comparably long period of completion, I look back with deep thankfulness to the many different institutional contexts that have given me the opportunity to reflect upon the connections developed here: τί δὲ ἔχεις ὅ οὐκ ἔλαβες;

Christoph Markschies
Berlin and Jerusalem, Spring 2006

[31] For this reason, the German version only provides the full citation of a work when it first appears in the manuscript and afterward cites works by their abbreviated titles, which are then unpacked in the bibliography. In this English version, by contrast, primary sources and secondary literature are cited by author/editor, date, and page throughout (e.g., Markschies 2006, 9), with the exception of a small number of abbreviations, which are unpacked at the beginning of the bibliography. When necessary, a letter of the alphabet has been added to distinguish between works published in the same year (e.g., Markschies 2000a). Previous publication dates for works have often been provided in square brackets in the bibliography (e.g., Harnack 1996 [^{2}1924]), but these have not been included in the footnotes.

1

Theology and Institution

Terminological Clarifications

Every contemporary account of the history of the ideas and institutions of ancient Christianity is deeply influenced by the fact that it takes place against the background of a history of the religion that reaches into the present. Over the course of the nearly two-thousand-year history of theoretical reflection on Christianity, the meanings of many terms we use have often changed drastically. Indeed, we might fear that modern terminology's ability to describe the reality of ancient conditions is very inadequate. This quickly becomes evident in the area of general history when it is observed that the terms usually used for the political institutions of the early Roman Empire tend to be ones that are actually inseparably linked with nineteenth-century notions: there is an "empire" and an "emperor," and one must suspect that characterizations of the first three centuries are at least affected by images from more modern empires and their emperors, if not fundamentally overprinted by them. For this reason, we begin our investigation of Christian theology and its institutions in the early Roman Empire with a set of terminological clarifications, which serve simultaneously to introduce the topic. The natural starting point for such clarifications is the terms used in the title of this study—namely, "theology" and "institution."

1.1 "Theology"

Many classical and present-day portrayals of the history of Christian theology[1] describe its path as a kind of *one-way street*—more precisely as a dead straight one-way street in the form of a small lane that leads, according to one's confessional mind-set, either steeply upward or just as steeply

[1] In light of following sketch, which is simplified to such an extent that it borders on caricature, I wish to note that this also applies to my own presentations during my first years as a lecturer!

downward.[2] I wish to designate this hermeneutical model as a "one-way street" model because it basically takes its starting point implicitly from the present organizational form of scholarly theological reflection at universities and reconstructs the development of the history of theology from this endpoint as teleology. From this viewpoint, the actual goal of the development of Christian theology in antiquity was that moment when Christian theologians adopted the educational model of an ancient philosophical school and oriented their theology—at first more defectively than effectively—toward the paradigm of contemporary Platonic philosophy. This means further that for this view, the actual goal of the Middle Ages was the establishment of theological faculties and scholastic university theology and the actual goal of the history of modern theology has been the "reshaping of Christian thinking" in reaction to the European Enlightenment. Such a teleology that—as indicated—starts implicitly from the present structure of theological reflection, which is oriented toward philosophical standards of rationality as its norm, must almost inevitably marginalize other forms of theological reflection as unimportant byways or even as unfruitful dead ends. It is then left to general ecclesial or even societal trends to discover the relevance of these alleged byways and dead ends. I will give just two examples. When Jewish-Christian dialogue became increasingly important after World War II, Jewish Christianity, a form of Christianity that was certainly not oriented toward the paradigm of contemporary Platonic philosophy, was discovered. Likewise, it is precisely when mysticism is in fashion that a few mystical theologians begin to be rescued from oblivion, and in recent years, female mystics have often been rescued as well.

One could pointedly say that the traditional model of a history of ancient Christianity with its apparently inevitable sequence is a direct consequence of this one-way-street hermeneutic: in truth there only *appears* to be a direct path from the Aramaic-speaking primitive community oriented toward the Jerusalem temple in Palestine to the first timid attempts to form an urban community outside the context of the synagogue in the ancient metropolises and further to the large Greek-speaking Hellenistic communities with a developed hierarchy and educational institutions oriented toward contemporary institutions of learning. The more one has distanced oneself from this traditional model for the reconstruction of the history of ancient Christianity, the clearer it becomes that, in truth, seemingly archaic stages of ancient Christianity such as Jewish

[2] Compare especially Andresen 1971; Beyschlag 1988; 1991; Bienert 1997; Harnack 1990a; 1990b; 1991c; Loofs 1967, 79–233; A. M. Ritter 1999. In addition to characteristic portrayals of the past, this selection also includes some more recent presentations.

Christianity[3] lived on happily in innovative and vital ways and were by no means replaced by the respective "higher" level—in this case, hellenized Gentile Christianity.[4] As a rule, the comparably simple model for the history of Christianity just described was also then combined with a relatively simple model of either progress or decadence. Examples for positive evaluations are found especially among Catholic historians of dogma of a neoscholastic stripe; perhaps the most prominent example of a negative evaluation of the development toward a theology oriented to the Platonic paradigm, viewed as a one-way street, is Adolf von Harnack's monumental three-volume *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte* (*History of Dogma*), which appeared in its first edition in 1887 and remains an absolutely brilliant achievement, even in its errors.[5]

The inappropriateness of the classical one-way-street model can be demonstrated with the help of what appear to be two extremely simple questions: First, what is theology really? And second, what exactly did the Greek word θεολογία designate in the second and third century?

We begin with the first question: what is theology really? While theology was viewed as a prerogative of Christianity for a long time and regarded without question as an umbrella term for the rational-argumentative account given by Christians concerning their faith, today a religious studies consensus has developed regarding a definition that does not limit the subject area to Christianity. In the words of Heinrich von Stietencrons, "Theology is argumentative, didactically developed speech about the divine."[6] Admittedly, this definition still calls directly to mind the familiar Western form of university theology; I prefer therefore—with Jan Assmann—a more open definition. Distinguishing between "explicit" and "implicit" theology, Assmann formulates the matter as follows: "The concept of 'implicit' theology relates to that of religion as grammar does

[3] By "Jewish Christianity," I mean Christian groups who strongly oriented their implicit and explicit theology toward Judaism, who endeavored to keep the Torah and the dietary laws, and who remained obligated to the Jewish "*Messiasdogmatiken*" (Messiah teachings) in the development of Christology. The distinction presupposed here between a history of Christianity "that occupies itself only with mutations that shaped the later self-understanding of the Christian faith and the subsequent history of Christianity" and one that "describes and interprets . . . the various stages of the evolution of individual mutations" irrespective of whether or not "these were guiding for subsequent developments of Christianity" is also found in Vouga 1994, 13–19, and it is likewise explicated there in relation to Jewish Christianity (p. 19).

[4] Thus Dieter Lührmann already stated in 1972 that both of the aforementioned spheres of tradition stood "alongside each other and not temporally after each other" and that "the boundary between the two spheres was not rigid but must be conceived as much more permeable than has generally been the case up to now" (Lührmann 1972, 459).

[5] Harnack 1990a; 1990b; 1991c.

[6] Assmann 1992, 25, with reference to Stietencron 1986.

to language. A religion without 'implicit theology' is absolutely unthinkable."[7] Explicit theology—for example, as distinct from the implicit theological guiding assumptions of a cult hymn[8]—is, in turn, the discursively developed speech about the divine and the religious actions and experiences that human beings have with what they perceive to be divine. It is developed through discourse—that is, people relate both to a common subject matter and also to one another.[9] Another point is also important in Assmann's open concept of theology: "implicit" and "explicit" theology do not relate to each other in the way that the colors black and white do but rather are "poles of a graded scale on which one must reckon with different levels of explication of theology."[10] When we focus on the development of Christian theology in the second and third centuries, we cannot (formulating the matter negatively) look only for classical representatives of the type of "explicit theology" whose discursiveness satisfies our criteria of rational argumentation, but we can (applying it positively) observe the exciting process of an increasing explication of "implicit theology." Indeed, the key term "discourse" also points, in the first instance, less to argumentation than to processes of communication and—if one follows Foucault—to the "working out and handing down of knowledge within the framework of institutions."[11] For this reason, our focus in the following chapters will be especially concerned with the institutions within which a certain form of "explicit theology" was carried out or, more precisely, a theology that was on the way from an "implicit" to an "explicit" theology.

But first we must answer the question of what one understood by θεολογία in the second and third centuries and who was called θεολόγος, theologian.

[7] Assmann 1992, 25 (developed further in Assmann 1991, 21–23).

[8] In contrast to the situation of the ancient Egyptians as described by Assmann 1991, 22, the *themes* of implicit and explicit theology in ancient Christianity do not initially differ from one another but are only arranged differently: one the one hand, *Urzeit* (original time) and *Endzeit* (end time), or creation and redemption (cosmological dimension), together with guilt and forgiveness (anthropological dimension), and on the other hand, the question, which lies between the two dimensions, of the emergence and meaning of the categories of "good" and "evil."

[9] Assmann 1991, 192. With Bühler, Assmann distinguishes between empractic speech (i.e., speech embedded in actions) and the intertextuality of language, which "has sufficiently detached itself from its 'empractic' embedding so as to obtain a form of its own, usually fixed in writing, 'as text'" (cf. also Assmann 1986, 46–49, esp. 49n8).

[10] Assmann 1986, 49.

[11] Assmann 1986, 52n24: "I have adopted the term 'discourse' from Michael Foucault. By this I thus mean the dissemination and handing down of knowledge in the framework of institutions." An intellectually rich application of this notion to late antiquity is also found in Veyne 1992, 28–33 (= Veyne 1978).

1.1.1 The Term ΘΕΟΛΟΓΙΑ in the Second and Third Centuries[12]

At the beginning of the history of Christianity stood, as one can say with Adolf von Harnack, the overwhelming personality[13] of a Jew or (in the terminology of ancient Christian theology) the revelation of the Jewish God in a person[14] who awakened faith and created community among non-Jews as well.[15] Not only was this faith known in fixed formulas and systematized in free formulations, but it was also already reflected on as "theology" among the first witnesses, and in an astonishingly short time, theolog*ies* emerged. From the abundance of these theologies certain theological topoi were normed at an equally early stage, whereas others were excluded as "heresies" from the second century onward. At the end of this development, from the fourth century on, stands the "dogmatization" of certain *theologoumena* in the empire-wide councils of late antiquity.[16]

Admittedly, these developmental connections were not at first designated with terms that were mostly used thereafter only for the demarcated sphere of a certain group of religions ("theology" and "dogma") but with terms such as φιλοσοφία and κανών or *regula*, which were precisely not assigned to a specific religious conceptual world.[17] Thus the emergence and professionalization of the giving of a rational account of the Christian faith in the imperial period are not only commonly presented with terms that were not used for this purpose in antiquity, but in this way a very specific ordering of Christian "theology" to societal reality is also suggested and continuities are insinuated that did not exist as such. Thus if, on the one hand, one asks what meaning the term "theology" as we use it today had in the early Roman Empire and, on the other hand, one collects together the terms with which ancient Christianity designated the giving of a rational account of its faith, then one obtains important initial insights into the institutional and intellectual position of Christian reflection in ancient society. The gradual appropriation of the pagan terms θεολογία, θεολόγος, and θεολογεῖν on the one hand and the term δόγμα on the

[12] Foundational: Ebeling 1962 and Kattenbusch 1930, 161–205 (= Kattenbusch 1962b); compare also Bader 1996, 15–21; Ziehen 1934; Stiglmayr 1919; Whaling 1981, 289–93. I am happy to note that alongside my own investigations, I benefited greatly from the attestations collected by Erik Peterson in his files that are now preserved in Turin. Great credit is also due to Henrik Hildebrandt for tracking down the texts, which were sometimes quite inaccessible.

[13] Harnack 1991c, 48–49.

[14] Compare Frenschkowski 1995, 314–47.

[15] On the distinctive features (including linguistic ones) of this faith, see Lührmann 1981b, 64–122; 1976, esp. 85–99.

[16] Markschies 2000f, 99–195.

[17] Henrichs 1968, 441–49.

other hand, which can be observed in the course of the first five centuries (and is traced hereinafter), already represents an interesting process of inculturation of Christian "theology" in the imperial period.

For an educated person in antiquity, the etymology of a word was important. Hearing a particular term, one simultaneously heard its connotations. According to its etymology, the word θεολογία first simply means "speech about God," but then also "account about God," as a Latin reproduction of the Greek word in Augustine makes clear: the bishop from late antiquity translates θεολογία with *de divinitate ratio sive sermo*; *ratio* is rational account; *sermo*, however, can also mean "ordinary speech" or "common language."[18]

From this perspective, the high-medieval custom of designating Christian account-giving about God in its entirety as *theologia* and the designation of people who carried it out institutionally as *theologi* appears to follow naturally. It was, of course, the result of a longer process: in pre-Constantinian antiquity, Christians who did "theology" in the sense of our contemporary, scholastically informed concept—namely, free teachers, teachers organized in the communities, and teaching bishops—were precisely not called "theologians," and the forms of their reflection and teaching were not called "theology," either. Rather, in the imperial period, composers of myths like Orpheus, Homer, and Hesiod,[19] as well as certain cultic functionaries, were referred to as θεολόγοι, thus as

[18] Thus Augustine, *De civitate dei* VIII 1 (Dombart/Kalb 1928/1929, I: 321.1–2).

[19] For the pagan usage, compare, for example, Aristotle, *Metaphysica* B 4 1000 a 9–11 οἱ μὲν οὖν περὶ Ἡσίοδον καὶ πάντες ὅσοι θεολόγοι μόνον ἐφρόντισαν τοῦ πιθανοῦ τοῦ πρὸς αὑτούς, ἡμῶν δ' ὠλιγώρησαν; Sextus Empiricus, *Adversus Mathematicos* IX 193 (Mutschmann 1914, 255.1–3, which follows fragment B 11 in Diels/Kranz 2004) . . . παρὰ τοῖς θεολόγοις καὶ ποιηταῖς μυθοποιήσεως· πάσης γὰρ ἀσεβείας ἐστὶ πλήρης. ἔνθεν καὶ ὁ Ξενοφάνης διελέγχων τοὺς περὶ Ὅμηρον καὶ Ἡσίοδόν φησι; Philodemus, *De Pietate* 42, lines 1204–5 [θεολ]όγων καὶ φιλοσόφων (Obbink 1996, 188); Philodemus, *De Pietate* 86, lines 2481–82 θεολόγων [καὶ π]οιητῶν (Obbink 1996, 277 and 494–95); Cicero, *De Natura Deorum* III 21.53 (*ii qui theologi nominantur*); Lucian, *Alexander* 19 (Macleod 1974, 340.26–27 . . . ὑπὸ κήρυκι καὶ θεολόγῳ; cf. Victor 1997, 146 and 96–97 [text and translation]); Philostratus, *Vita Apollonii* IV 21.8 ᾤετο, ἐπεὶ δὲ ἤκουσεν, ὅτι αὐλοῦ ὑποσημήναντος λυγισμοὺς ὀρξοῦνται καὶ μεταξὺ τῆς Ὀρφέως ἐποποιίας τε καὶ θεολογίας τὰ μὲν ὡς Ὧραι . . . (Mumprecht 1983, 392.17–20 = Kern 1963, *Testimonium* 256a [p. 355]). This terminological usage is naturally taken up by Christians as well: compare, for example, Clement of Alexandria, *Protrepticus* II 26.6 (Stählin/Treu 1972, 19.31) (θεοί), ὧν καὶ θεογονίαν Ἡσίοδος ᾄδει τὴν αὑτοῦ, καὶ ὅσα θεολογεῖ Ὅμηρος; Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* V 74.4 Ὀρφεὺς . . . ὁ θεολόγος (Stählin/Früchtel/Treu 1985, 378.4); or Pseudo-Justin, *Cohortatio ad Graecos* 3.1 (Marcovich 1990, 27.10–11). Additional attestations for the Ὀρφεὺς θεολόγος can be found in Bader 1996, 24–25, with notes 51–52.

people who had composed θεολογία—that is, speech about the gods in hymnic form—or who recited hymns about the gods composed by others.[20] Here, the concern was less with a special literary form fixed in language than with the ὑμνεῖν, the singing (the praises) of,[21] as the Greek orator Menander of Laodicea on the Lycus (late third century) makes clear.[22] In the so-called *Great Magical Papyrus of Paris* (Bibl. Nat. suppl. Gr. 574), a papyrus book from late antiquity with magical instructions for all manner of life situations, the word θεολογία designates the concise call to god, εἴσελθε, φάνηθί μοι, κύριε ("come in, appear to me, lord!").[23] With this frequently repeated call, the user of the papyrus adjures (ὁρκίζειν) the "god of gods" to come to his side to help him and, for this purpose, names an abundance of magical names of this god. A Berlin magical papyrus from the former collection of Anastasi (P. 5025 A/B) even calls the whole magical process "persuasion with god-taught words" (. . . λόγοις θεολογουμένοις πείσαντες).[24] A (lost) Orphic work is said to have had the title Θεολογία.[25]

In a corresponding manner, the person who recited θεολογία in cultic or magical contexts was a θεολόγος: for the second and third centuries, relevant titles are attested for cultic functionaries from the imperial cult

[20] Poland 1967, 38–39, 46–48, 50–51, 268, 349. Most of the other authors are dependent on this fundamental investigation; compare, for example, Reitzenstein 1916, 135, with n. 3 (= Diadochus of Photiki, *De Perfectione Spirituali Capita Centum* 7 [Weis-Liebersdorf 1912, 8.22 = Des Places 1998, 87.10–12] Ὁ πνευματικὸς λόγος τὴν νοερὰν αἴσθησιν πληροφορεῖ· ἐνεργείᾳ γὰρ ἀγάπης ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ φέρεται, διόπερ καὶ ἀβασάνιστος ἡμῶν ὁ νοῦς διαμένει ἐν τοῖς τῆς θεολογίας κινήμασιν).

[21] Thus rightly Thraede 1994, 916–17 and 923: "linguistically or rhythmically stylized prayers"; compare also Nilsson 1945, 65–67.

[22] Menander Rhetor (Walz 1836, 321.12–13 = Russell/Wilson 1981, 208.14): ὡς ὁ τῶν θεολογούντων (individual manuscripts: θεολόγων) λόγος.

[23] *Papyri Graecae Magicae* IV 1037 τοῦτον ὕστερον τῆς θεολογίας (Preisendanz 1928, 108); the quoted call appears in the immediate context of, among others, *Papyri Graecae Magicae* IV 1000, 1001, 1006, 1016, 1020, 1025, and 1034.

[24] *Papyri Graecae Magicae* I 50–51 (Preisendanz 1928, 4).

[25] Attested in Damascius, *Dubitationes et Solutiones de primis principiis* 124 (Ruelle 1966, I: 319 = Westerink/Cobès 1986–1991 III: 162.19–21 = Kern 1963, fr. 28, p. 97); compare Aristotle, *Metaphysica* A 3 983 b 28. Above all, the *Dubitationes et Solutiones* of Damascius offer a rich abundance of attestations for the orphic connotation of the word field: 53 (Ruelle 1966, I: 107.13–14) ὁ θεολόγος ἀνυμνεῖ; 98 (I: 252.2–3): ὥς φησιν ὁ θεολόγος; 123 (I: 317.6–7): τὴν ἐν ταῖς ῥαψῳδίαις θεολογίαν; compare also 247 (II: 118.4–5): συνανεφέρετο καὶ αὐτο (sc. το ὄν) τῇ θεολογίᾳ. Damascius often speaks of theologians in the plural: 50 (I: 100.15); 85 (I: 196.4); 89 (I: 219.25); 90 (I: 221.23); additional attestations can be found in the index of Ruelle 1966, II: s.v. (360).

of the cities of Ephesus,[26] Pergamum,[27] and Smyrna[28] in Asia Minor and from the oracle sanctuary of Apollo at Delphi.[29] The ὑμνῳδοί in the imperial cult could also evidently be designated as θεολόγοι, but they were also sometimes distinguished from these.[30] Such θεολόγοι praise the emperors in the imperial cult through the recitation of prose hymns.[31] The θεολογία in the Athens association of the Iobakchoi, which assigns this task to the priest in its detailed "association statutes," may be imagined to be closely analogous—namely, as a hymnic calling upon the gods.[32] Women who

[26] The honorary decree of the Dionysiac Artists for T. Aelius Alcibiades of Nysa mentions that a P. Aelius Pompeianus Paeon, who was the θεολόγου ναῶν τῶν ἐν Π[εράμῳ], requested the honoring (Wankel 1979, nr. 22.4, p. 135; the editor, Wankel, translates, "festival speaker of the temple in Pergamon").

[27] . . . Πολιάδος Ἀθηνᾶς, θυγατέρα Κλ(αυδίου) Ἀλεξάνδρου θεολόγου (Dittenberger 1986, II, nr. 513.6–7, p. 158 = Fränkel 1895, nr. 525, p. 341; an inscription from the beginning of the third century); compare also Fränkel 1895, 264–65, on nr. 374 A, line 30; Deissmann 1897, 58–59.

[28] Compare notes 30 and 33 in this chapter. On the famous Athens inscription, see Dittenberger 1873–1897, III, 770 = Kaibel 1965, 882 = Kirchner 1935, nr. 3816[5]; see now Zuntz 2005, 46–48 and 57, for a summarizing discussion on inscriptions.

[29] Plutarch, *De defectu oraculorum* 15 (= *Moralia* 26.15 [Patton/Pohlenz/Sieveking 1972, 77.14–15]) and Ziehen 1934, 2032. Compare also the mention of a herald and a theologian in the sanctuary of Abonuteichos: Lucian, *Alexander* 19 (as n. 19 above). A report about the mythical figure of the wonder worker Abaris, preserved in Apollonius, *Historiae Mirabiles* 4, is probably older. It is said that the wandering magician and prophet was simultaneously an oracle priest: Ἄβαρις δὲ ἐξ Ὑπερβορέων ἦν μὲν καὶ αὐτὸς τῶν θεολόγων, ἔγραψε . . . (Keller 1877, 45.7–8 = Giannini 1965, 122.47–48).

[30] Compare a founding inscription from the theatre of Ephesus (104 CE) τοῖς θεολόγοις καὶ ὑμνῳδοῖς (Wankel 1979, nr. 27.146, p. 178 [= Newton 1890, 481, lines 191–92]), an honor for Tiberius Claudius Moschas by the συνέδριον [τ]ῶν ὑμνῳδῶν [κ]αὶ θεολόγων [κ]αὶ θεσμῳδῶν of Artemis (Engelmann/Knibbe/Merkelbach 1980, nr. 645.4–7, p. 41) and a foundation inscription from the time shortly after 124 CE from Smyrna (Petzl 1987, nr. 697.38–39, [191–97] 192 = CIG II, nr. 3148.38–39, p. 712 = IGRomIV, nr. 1431.33–34) . . . θεολόγους, ὑμνῳδούς . . . The passage deals with foundations of Hadrian and the granting of a second neocoria to the city by a resolution of the Senate, which is treated in detail in a second inscription from 124 CE: Nr. 594 (Petzl 1987, 74–75). According to this inscription, twenty-four hymnodists were bound up with the new temple (cf. J. Keil 1908; additional literature in Petzl 1987, 76 [on nr. 594]). Another inscription CIG II, nr. 3803.5–6, p. 980, which was found in the broader environs of Hadrianopolis, attests a θεο[λόγο]ν τ[ῶ]ν τῆδ[ε] μυ[σ]τηρίων; compare also from Ephesus FiE III, nr. 15.2 pp. 105–6: θεο[λ]ό[γος], nr. 74.2, p. 158 θεολόγος, and from Smyrna CIG II, nr. 3199.3, p. 735 τὰς θεολόγους; CIG II, nr. 3200.3, p. 735 τὰς θεολόγους; CIG II, nr. 3348.2, p. 779 ὑμνῳδοῦ καὶ θεολόγου.

[31] For hymnodists and theologians in the imperial cult, compare also Heberdey 1912, 194; Robert 1943, 184–86; 1949, 210; Pleket 1965, 337–38, 346; Sokolowski 1969, 101; Price 1984a, 90.

[32] According to the famous Iobakchoi inscription (before 178 CE), the priest was responsible for the θεολογία, which means a "festival sermon" according to Ziehen 1934, 2032 (cf. the literature in Pleket 1965, 338 n. 29). The inscription was first published by

acted in a corresponding manner were likewise called θεολόγοι (e.g., in the mysteries of Demeter).[33]

This original meaning of the word field was evidently not suppressed by the increasing Christianization of language and society: in the first half of the seventh century, the alchemist Stephan of Alexandria still used θεολογεῖν in the classical sense for the praise of God through hymns.[34] It also led to the fact that Christians could also use this word with negative connotations: in a Christian (pseudo-Chrysostom) sermon Εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πάσχα from the imperial period, which was influenced by Hippolytus' tractate of the same name (CPG II: 4611), the author notes in his exposition of the biblical formulation "the gods of the Egyptians" (Exodus 12.12)—repeating a well-known and topical polemic—that the Egyptians would make cows, fish, birds, other animals, and all sorts of creatures into gods and sing hymns to them (θεοποιούμενα καὶ θεολογούμενα).[35]

Alongside the teaching about gods in hymns, mythological teaching about gods could also be called θεολογία. This was by no means always presented in the form of hymns. It also appeared in various institutional and literary contexts: in a papyrus fragment (a speech?) about the goddess

---

Wide 1894, p. 268, lines 111–16 (= Dittenberger 1960, nr. 737 pp. 267–75, quotation on p. 272). Other literature can also be found in Dittenberger 1960; he explains the term as "*orationem sollennem, qua per ferias die laudes praedicantur et exornantur. Quem morem, sine dubio ex antiquiore hymnos cantandi usu natum, ne ipsum quidem nimis recentem esse et inferiore certe aetate latissime patuisse multis et scriptorum et titulorum testimoniis allatis docuit M., ideoque in mysticis sodalitatibus nonnunquam inter alia officia etiam* θεολόγου *mentionem fieri*"; compare also Poland 1967, 268: θεολογία "is the festival sermon for the honoring of the god."

[33] Thus in an inscription from Smyrna from the first/second century CE, Ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος καὶ ἡ σύνοδος τῶν τῆς θεᾶς μυστῶν ἐτείμησαν Κλαυδίας Ἀντωνίας Σαβεῖναν Προκλιανὴν καὶ Ἰουλιανὴν ἀδελφάς, τὰς θεολόγους / "Council and people and assembly of the mystics of the goddess have honored the sisters Claudia Antonia Sabina Prokliane and Claudia Antonia Iouliane, the theologoi" (Petzl 1987, nr. 653.1–3 [p. 140 = CIG 3199.3, p. 735], line 51.3–4). Compare also nr. 654.3 (p. 141 = CIG 3200.3, p. 735), where two sisters likewise exercise the function of theologians in the cult of Demeter (cf. the important corrections by Petzl 1987, 141, of Nilsson 1988, 357, and Ziehen 1934, 2032–33). Compare also an inscription from Lydia (Thyateira) in P. Hermann 1981–1989, V 2, nr. 962: ὑμνωδοὶ καὶ θεολόγοι τῆς Μητρὸς τῶν θεῶν and from Nysa . . . μελοποιοῦ καὶ ῥαψ[ωδοῦ | Θε]οῦ Ἁδριανοῦ, θεολόγου ναῶν τῶν ἐν Π[εργάμῳ (Clerc 1895, 125, lines 3–4, which can also be found in Blümel forthcoming).

[34] Stephanus Alchemista, *De magna et sacra arte I* (= Στεφάνου Ἀλεξανδρέως οἰκουμενικοῦ φιλοσόφου καὶ διδασκάλου τῆς μεγάλης καὶ ἱερᾶς τέχνης. Περὶ χρυσοιίας πρᾶξις σὺν θεῷ πρώτη), thus far only edited in Ideler 1963; on the author, see Taylor 1937/1938. At the end of the text, it reads, . . . ἵνα τοσούτον ἐρᾷν ἀξιωθῆτε μεθ' ὑμνωδίας θεολογεῖν τὴν ὑπεράγαγον τοῦ θεοῦ ἀγαθότητα (Ideler 1963, 202.18–19).

[35] Pseudo-Hippolytus (= Pseudo-Chrysostomus), *Homilia in Sanctum Pascha* [VI] 12 (Nautin 1950, 141.2).

Athena-Isis, we read that no real judgment about the nature of the origin of this goddess or the gods is possible (lines 6–8), because corresponding material is indicated neither by the poets who, in the oldest times, composed θεολογία, myths of the gods (lines 9–10), nor by the holy books (διὰ τῶν ἱερῶν συνταγμάτων; lines 10–11). No god had seen her origin, and no human being knows it either. From that point of view, one could not make even the simplest statement about the nature (ὕλη or φύσις) of this goddess (lines 27–28) within the framework of speeches of praise. The ἱερὸς λόγος about her is said to be inferred and written down from the κοσμικαὶ θεωρίαι established by Hermes.[36] In the handbook on the "traditions of Greek theology" by the Stoic philosopher L. Annaeus Cornutus of the imperial period, titled Ἐπιδρομὴ τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ἑλληνικὴν θεολογίαν[37] παραδεδομένων, the phrase παλαιὰ θεολογία is, correspondingly, also understood to mean the material that is listed in the genealogies of Hesiod or developed in the Heracles myth.[38]

In the second and third centuries, the word field was also used much less frequently in philosophical contexts.[39] In Diodorus Siculus, we read that the Romans had brought γράμματα δὲ καὶ φυσιολογίαν καὶ θεολογίαν, "studies and teachings about nature and the gods," to greater perfection than the peoples from whom they adopted them.[40] According to Strabo, every theology (πᾶς ὁ περὶ τῶν θεῶν λόγος) must test old views and myths of the gods, because the forefathers spoke both enigmatically and mythologically.[41] Alexander of Aphrodisias, a contemporary of Clement of Alexandria and Origen, reported the convention of referring to Homer and Hesiod as

[36] I follow the edition and interpretation of the so-called Arkesilaos-Papyrus in Adler 1930.

[37] The manuscripts, however, read θεωρίαν; compare the apparatus on the title, p. 1, in Lang's edition of Cornutus (C. Lang 1881) and the remarks of Nock 1931, 998. On the author, compare Most 1989.

[38] Cornutus, *De natura deorum* 17 and 31 (C. Lang 1881, 31.12–17 or 63.12–19) as well as 35 (C. Lang 1881, 75.18–76.16).

[39] Philodemus, *De pietate* 72, but compare Claudius Aelianus, *De natura animalium* XII 5 (Scholfield 1958/1959 III: 16; a description of the temple of Apollo Smintheus in Lydia and the mice contained therein) ἡ μὲν οὖν τῶν μυῶν μνήμη προήγαγεν ἡμᾶς ἐς θεολογίαν τινά, ξείρους δὲ αὐτῶν οὐ γεγόναμεν καὶ τοιαῦτα προσακούσαντες.

[40] Diodorus Siculus, *Bibliotheca historica* V 40.2 (Bekker/Dindorf/Vogel 1985, 59.6–7).

[41] Strabo, *Geographica* X 3.23 (H. L. Jones 1967–1970, V: 118) πᾶς δὲ ὁ περὶ τῶν θεῶν λόγος ἀρχαίας ἐξετάζει δόξας καὶ μύθους, αἰνιττομένων τῶν παλαιῶν ἃς εἶχον ἐννοίας φυσικὰς περὶ τῶν πραγμάτων καὶ προστιθέντων ἀεὶ τοῖς λόγοις τὸν μῦθον / "And theology as a whole must examine early opinions and myths, since the ancients expressed enigmatically the physical notions which they entertained concerning the facts and always added the mythical element to their accounts" (trans. H. L. Jones 1967–1970, V: 118; cf. Forbiger 1858, 141).

theologians and to philosophical reflection about the first causes as theology: the πρώτη φιλοσοφία were already called θεολογική in Aristotle, and it is also said to be actually the most valuable scholarly discipline because it deals with the most valuable object.[42] It was the particular combination of piety and Platonic philosophy in Neoplatonism that led to the more frequent use of the words θεολόγος or θεολογία there: in his treatise *De abstinentia* from 268 CE, the Neoplatonist Porphyry, born in 234 CE in Tyre, applied this expression in the singular to Pythagoras,[43] whereas he applied the plural θεολόγοι to the *Oracula Chaldaica* and their first commentators.[44] Iamblichus often uses the word field in his treatise *De mysteriis*.[45] In this way, the word θεολογία, which occurs for the first time in Plato[46] and was probably coined by him,[47] recurred with new force in philosophy of a Platonic character. There was, of course, always an awareness of the fact that Plato carried out θεολογία in his dialogues. Thus an unknown Christian apologist

[42] Alexander Aphrodisiensis, *In Aristotelis metaphysica commentaria* III *proem*. (Hayduck 1891) and *In Aristotelis metaphysica commentaria* V 1–2 (Bekker 1837, 1026 a 16.33 = Hayduck 1891, 18.9–11) ἡ θεολογικὴ τῶν ἄλλων ἔστὶ τιμιωτάτη ἐπιστημῶν, περὶ τὸ θεῖον γένος ἔσται, ἡ τιμιωτάτη περὶ τὸ τιμιώτατον. Compare also Alexander Aphrodisiensis, *In Aristotelis metaphysica commentaria* I 2 (Bekker 1837, 982 b 11 = Hayduck 1891, 18.9–11) ὁ δὲ θεὸς ἀρχὴ πρώτη καὶ αἰτία τῶν ἄλλων. διὰ τοῦτων δὲ ἔδειξεν ὅτι καὶ εὐλόγως ἥδε ἡ πραγματεία θεολογικὴ καλεῖται or *In Aristotelis metaphysica commentaria* I 2 (Bekker 1837, 983 b 6 = Hayduck 1891, 25.9–10) λέγοι δ' ἄν περὶ Ὁμήρου τε καὶ Ἡσιόδου ὡς πρώτων θεολόγων as well as Alexander Aphrodisiensis, *In Aristotelis meteorologicorum libros commentaria* II 1 (Bekker 1837, 353 a 32 = Hayduck 1899, 66.13–15) θεολόγους δὲ λέγει τοὺς περὶ θεῶν ἐπαγγελομένους λέγειν, ὧν ἦν Ὅμηρος καὶ Ὀρφεὺς καὶ Ἡσίοδος, ὅς καὶ θεογονίαν συνέγραψε.

[43] Compare Porphyry, *De abstinentia ab esu animalium* II 36.3 ἅ τέ φησιν ὁ θεολόγος (Bouffartigue/Patillon 1979, 102) or a mythological figure by the name of Σέλευκος ὁ θεολόγος (*De abstinentia ab esu animalium* II 55.1 [117]).

[44] Porphyrius, *De abstinentia ab esu animalium* II 43.4–5 (110) and elsewhere; compare the remarks of Jean Bouffartigue in the introductory “notice” of his new edition (Bouffartigue/Patillon 1979, 11 and 41–46).

[45] Iamblichus, *De mysteriis liber* 1.1 (Parthy 1965, 2.5–6) σὺ τε καλῶς ποιεῖς, τινὰ εἰς γνῶσιν τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν, ὡς φιλοῦσι, περὶ θεολογίας προτείνων ἐρωτήματα / “Thus you do well when you place certain questions about the teaching of the nature of the divine before priests as friends for evaluation.”

[46] Plato, *Respublica* II 379 a: The myth, understood as (hi)story of the gods, may not be narrated freely, but “guidelines for the teaching on the gods” must be set up, οἱ τύποι περὶ θεολογίας (379 a 5–6). What proper θεολογία should be is said immediately thereafter: οἷος τυγχάνει ὁ θεὸς ὤν, ἀεὶ δήπου ἀποδοτέον (a 7–8); “as god is, so must one always represent him.”

[47] Thus in a sensitive interpretation of the passage Jaeger 1964, 12–13, Ebeling 1962, 754, objects without sufficient grounds, followed by Bader 1996, 17 n. 34. Kattenbusch 1930, 4–5 n. 2, is uncertain; compare also Kattenbusch 1908, esp. 901–4. Compare also Goldschmidt 1950, 29–30. For a critical view of the interpretation in Jaeger, see Zuntz 2005, 49.

from late antiquity, who can perhaps be identified with Marcellus of Ancyra, writes of the dialogue *Timaeus*: ἐν ᾧ καὶ θεολογεῖν ἐπιχείρει (sc. Plato).[48]

Until the end of late antiquity, a corresponding use of terminology was widespread in the philosophical literature. In his tractate on first principles, the last great pagan Neoplatonist, Damascius, once called Orpheus ὁ θεολόγος[49] without further explanation. He sees his own specific form of the Neoplatonic theory of principles attested in virtually all philosophers and in a large number of theologians.[50] With the plural "theologies," he designates above all the theologies of the Chaldean oracles and Orphic hymns but then also those of the Egyptians and Phoenicians.[51]

Plato not only discovered the word that came to designate Christian "theology" from the high middle ages; his philosophy also in a sense first made possible the elaborate Christian "theology" of the imperial period and thereby basically paved the way for the close association between Platonic philosophy and Christian "theology" that characterized Christian antiquity (admittedly with varying degrees of intensity). Even if the word θεολογία was initially not used in this way in antiquity itself, the relatively quick development of "theology" in ancient Christianity presupposes a good bit of that bold metaphysical certainty with which Plato, in precisely that passage in which the word θεολογία first appears, also asserted the possibility of "theology" as an "appropriate representation" of God. No Christian "theology" could have been developed in antiquity on the basis

[48] Pseudo-Justin, *Cohortatio ad Graecos* 22.1 (Marcovich 1990, 53.6). In the writing there is, of course, as we saw above, a reference of the word to Homer and Hesiod: § 3,1 (Marcovich 1990, 27.10–11).

[49] Damascius, *Dubitationes et Solutiones de primis principiis* 67 (Ruelle 1966, I: 146 = Westerink/Cobès 1986–1991, II: 92.11) λέγει γοῦν ὁ θεολόγος· (followed by the Orphic fragment nr. 129 Kern 1963); compare *Dubitationes et Solutiones de primis principiis* 53 (I: 107 = II: 34.9) ὁ θεολόγος ἀνυμνεῖ . . . (followed by nr. 85 Kern 1963).

[50] Damascius, *Dubitationes et Solutiones de primis principiis* 50 (Ruelle 1966, I: 100 = Westerink/Cobès 1986–1991, II: 24.2–3); compare also *Dubitationes et Solutiones de primis principiis* 50 (I: 100 = II: 24.11), *Dubitationes et Solutiones de primis principiis* 85 (I: 196 = II: 174.5), the commentary of the French edition (Westerink/Cobès 1986–1991, II: 228), and the reference to *Dubitationes et Solutiones de primis principiis* 122–25 (Ruelle 1966, I: 316–24 = Westerink/Cobès 1986–1991 III: 158–67).

[51] Damascius, *Dubitationes et Solutiones de primis principiis* 89 (Ruelle 1966, I: 219 = Westerink/Cobès 1986–1991, II: 212.14–16); compare also Proclus, *In Platonis Timaeum commentaria* 25 B (Diehl 1903/1904/1906, I: 185.3 = Kern 1963, fr. 175, p. 210); Proclus, *In Platonis Timaeum commentaria* 39 B-D (Diehl 1903/1904/1906 III: 88.18 = Kern 1963, fr. 99, p. 165); Proclus, *In Platonis rem publicam commentarii* (Kroll 1899/1901, II: 338.10 = Kern 1963, fr. 224); Proclus, *Theologia Platonica* IV 16 (Saffrey/Westerink 1968–1997, IV: 48.21–22 = Kern 1963, fragment 159, p. 358), and Hermias of Alexandria, *In Platonis Phaedrum Scholia* 247 D (Couvreur 1971, 154.14).

of a skeptical approach,[52] like the viewpoint favored by the Platonic Academy for many years after the metaphysical certainty of Plato was broken in skepticism beginning in the second century BCE.[53] Rather, the simplifying standardization as well as the popularizing "theologization" of the various antiskeptical philosophical directions in the early Roman Empire, which followed as a reaction to skepticism, were an important presupposition for the emergence of Christian "theology."[54]

The new use of the terminology in philosophical contexts from the late third century presumably constituted the presupposition for the fact that Christian "theologians" could now also use for their own activity a word field that was closely bound up with pagan religiosity, even if the exact terminological history can no longer be illuminated reliably. The evangelist John—probably especially because of the hymn that introduces his gospel—was designated as ὁ θεολόγος,[55] though prior to the fourth century, we have no clear examples for this use of terminology.[56] The title is first used as a matter of course in the early Byzantine period, as is documented by a somewhat enigmatic inscription that may have been meant to settle a struggle for rank between Ephesus and Smyrna and probably comes from the Justinian period: there it states that John (received) from the Lord "those (unspeakable) words with which he (showed) to us his divinely inspired and indescribable nature and on account of which he

[52] This can be seen, on the one hand, in the strong polemic against Epicureanism (Markschies 2000b), and on the other hand, in the fact that in the relevant "philosophical biographies" of Christians in antiquity, skepticism is only a way station (cf. only Augustine, *Confessiones* V 14.25 [Skutella/Jürgens/Schaub 1981, 97.21–27, with the commentary of O'Donnell 1992a, 327–28]).

[53] Compare the excellent introduction of Erler 1997, 547–62.

[54] Jaeger 1961, 42–46; 1963, 31–33.

[55] In the Byzantine Majority Text, the *inscriptio* of the last book of the Bible reads ἀποκάλυψις Ἰωάννου τοῦ θεολόγου (cf. Bousset 1966, 180–81); for the linguistic usage of late antiquity, compare, for example, a pseudo-Chrysostom homily on John the theologian (CPG II: 4645 = BHG 927), which speaks about τὸν θεολόγον καὶ θεοκήρυκα (PG 61: 720), Diadochus of Photiki, *De perfectione spirituali capita centum* 80 (Des Places 1998, 138.10–11: τούτου χάριν τοιούτῳ ὁ θεολόγος ἐχρήσατο ῥήματι . . .), or the acts of the apostle (student) Timothy (CANT 295 = BHG 1847; Usener 1877, 7–13): ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦ ἐνδόξου θεολόγου Ἰωάννου . . . αὐτόπτης τε καὶ αὐτήκοος γεγένηται (Usener 1877, 9.22–24).

[56] Origen, *Commentarii in evangelium Joannis* Fragment 1 (Preuschen 1903b, 483.14) is admittedly often mentioned as a first example, but the concern is with a catena fragment that is handed down anonymously in the majority of its witnesses. (Heine 1986 is critical of its value.) Likewise, the attestation of Eusebius, *Quaestiones evangelicae ad Marinum* 2 (from the Corderius-Catena; PG 22: 1009 A = Merkel 1978, 88.5 . . . τὸν θεολογικώτατον Ἰωάννην . . .) comes from catena material, though here authenticity is probable. By contrast, the suggestion of Schwartz 1963, 53–54, that Papias already applied to title to John is again problematic.

was rightly called 'theo(logian)' and 'son of thunder.'"[57] Hippolytus places the "divinely inspired prophets and theologians" together and evidently means by this the prophets and psalmists of the old covenant.[58] Eusebius refers to Moses as an awe-inspiring "theologian and lawgiver" who through his own writings (i.e., the Pentateuch) established "for the people of the Jews a πολιτεῖα in correspondence with proper εὐσέβεια."[59] In fragments from his Psalms commentary (CPG II: 2551), Didymus the Blind emphatically calls Paul ὁ θεολόγος[60] twice, and Isaiah is subsequently called ὁ μέγας θεολόγος[61] once. However, traces of the meaning of θεολογία related to hymns about the gods are also found in early manuscript traditions of Eucharistic prayers where the expression originally referred to the *Sanctus* but was subsequently replaced by the word δοξολογία.[62]

At the same time, starting in the third century, θεολογία was usually understood to mean "Trinitarian theology" in the specific sense, after the word had been used in this way by Clement of Alexandria occasionally and by Origen quite frequently.[63] In a disputed fragment of a treatise against

[57] Edition and translation in Wankel 1979, nr. 45, pp. 281–84 (citation A, lines 4–7; p. 282) . . . καὶ ἀνεκδιήγητον θεο[λόγος τε κ]αὶ βροντῆς υἱὸς εἰκότως ἐκλήθη (supplements by J. Keil). For the inscription, compare the detailed essay of J. Keil 1924, esp. 370–71 (text and commentary).

[58] Hippolytus, *De universo* (cited from Holl 1899, 143, 31: ἀλλὰ τοῖς θεοπνεύστοις προφήταις καὶ θεολόγοις ἐξηγηταῖς ἐγχειρήσαντες τὰς ἀκοὰς θεῷ πιστεύσητε . . .).

[59] Eusebius, *Praeparatio evangelica* VII 9,1 (Mras/Des Places 1982, 378.15–17).

[60] Didymus, *Commentarii in Psalmos* 71.1 (PG 39, 1465 B): περὶ οὗ γέγραφεν ὁ θεολόγος (a citation from 1 Ephesians 2.14 follows) and 135.4 (PG 39, 1593 A): περὶ ἧς ὁ θεολόγος φησί· (a citation from Corinthians 1.24 follows). Compare also Didymus, *Commentarii in Zachariam* 4.7 I 312 (Doutreleau 1962, I: 358.27; a citation from Ephesians 2.8 follows). Once he mentions . . . τὸν θεολόγον Πέτρον, τὸν ἀπόστολον Χριστοῦ (Didymus, *Commentarii in Zachariam* 3.3–5[a] I 214 [Doutreleau 1962, I: 304.8]) and writes ὡς ἔγραψεν ὁ θεολόγος Ἰάκωβος (*Commentarii in Zechariam* 14.4[b]–5[a] V 54 [Doutreleau 1962, III: 998.16–17]), additional attestations for the psalmist in the index of Doutreleau 1962, III, s. v. (1154); compare also Mühlenberg 1977, 97.9 and 319.6.

[61] Anonymous, *Tropea divinae . . . dialogis* IV (Τῆς θείας καὶ ἀνικήτου θεοῦ ἐκκλησίας καὶ ἀληθείας πεπραγμένα τρόπαια κατὰ Ἰουδαίων ἐν Δαμάσκῳ, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Codex Coislinianus 299, fol. 140[r] b = Bardy 1973, 228.2).

[62] Hänggi/Pahl 1998, 10 (Liturgy of Mark) ἀσιγήτοις θεολογίαις τὸν ἐπινίκιον καὶ τρισάγιον ὕμνον ᾄδοντα; 208 (Jerusalem Liturgy according to Cyril of Jerusalem), 232 (Liturgy of Basil), and 246 (Liturgy of James); compare Bader 1996, 21 n. 45.

[63] Origen admittedly uses also the traditional pagan terminology: ἀρχαῖοι θεολόγοι Ἑλλήνων (*Contra Celsum* I 25 [Koetschau 1899b, 76.2]); . . . δῆλον ὅτι καὶ Σωκράτους καὶ Πλάτωνος καὶ Πυθαγόρου καὶ Φερεκύδου καὶ ὧν πρὸ βραχέος ὕμνησε θεολόγοι θεοφιλέστερά ἐστι ταῦτα τὰ ζῷα (*Contra Celsum* IV 97 [Koetschau 1899b, 369.25–370.1]) and (Pseudo-[?]) Origen, *Commentarii in Psalmos* 64.2 οἱ ἔξω τῆς ἐκκλησίας θεολογεῖν ἢ καὶ ὑμνεῖν (Pitra 1883, 73) or *Commentarii in Psalmos* 117.27 δοξολογῶν καὶ θεολόγῶν σε (Pitra 1883, 245). But of John it is said (*Contra Celsum* II 71 [Koetschau 1899b, 193.16–17]), Ἐκεῖνος θεολογῶν ἀπήγγειλε τὰ περὶ θεοῦ τοῖς γνησίοις αὐτοῦ

Artemon, which may have been written by Hippolytus (CPG I, 1915; perhaps to be identified with the "Little Labyrinth"), θεολογεῖν is distinguished from ὑμνεῖν and refers to the explication of the divinity of Jesus Christ: the author refers to Justin, Miltiades, Tatian, Clement of Alexandria, and many other writings "in all of which Christ is taught as God" (ἐν οἷς ἅπασιν θεολογεῖται ὁ Χριστός), but he also adds ψαλμοὶ . . . καὶ ᾠδαί that are written by "believing brothers" (thus Christians) and "sing to Christ, the Word of God and praise his divinity" (. . . τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν Χριστὸν ὑμνοῦσιν θεολογοῦντες).[64] Didymus the Blind, in his commentary on the prophet Zechariah (CPG II: 2549), used the word θεολογεῖν to designate biblical revelations about the nature of the Father.[65] From that point of view, the actual θεολογούμενος is God himself.[66] θεολογία is used for the divine nature and in this respect is set over against the λόγος περὶ ἐνανθρωπήσεως.[67] The Cappadocian theologian Gregory of Nazianzus' Trinitarian theological discourses are first called "theological discourses" in the Byzantine period, but their author is already called ὁ θεολόγος at the council of Chalcedon (451 CE).[68] Whether the designation of Trinitarian theology as θεολογία caused the fourth evangelist to be given the title θεολόγος or whether, conversely, this title for the fourth evangelist prepared the ground for this designation for Trinitarian theology can no longer be clearly discerned today due to a lack of sources.

μαθηταῖς. Compare also Origen, *Commentarii in evangelium Joannis* II 34.205 (Preuschen 1903b, 92.15–17), ἀλλὰ πολλὴν θεολογίαν σχέσιν τε πατρὸς πρὸς υἱὸν καὶ υἱοῦ πρὸς πατέρα ἔστι μαθεῖν οὐκ ἔλλαττον ἀπὸ τῶν προφητῶν, δι' ὧν ἀπαγγέλλουσι τὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ; *Homilae in Jeremiam* XVIII 6 in 18.1–16 (Klostermann/Nautin 1983, 158.9–11), οὐκοῦν ὅταν μὲν αἱ γραφαὶ θεολογῶσι τὸν θεὸν καθ' αὑτὸν καὶ μὴ ἐπιπλέκωσιν αὐτοῦ τὴν οἰκονομίαν τοῖς ἀνθρωπίνοις πράγμασι, λέγουσιν αὐτὸν εἶναι οὐχ ὡς ἄνθρωπος; as well as *Commentarium in evangelium Matthaei* XII 38 (Klostermann/Benz 1935, 155.3), τὴν περὶ Ἰησοῦ θεολογίαν, and XI 2 [36.4–5], καὶ ἀποδεξάμενος ἣν ἐδύναντο ἐκ μέρους ἀπαγγεῖλαι αὐτῷ περὶ τοῦ πατρὸς θεολογίαν.

64 Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* V 28.4 or 5 (Schwartz 1999, II/1: 500.22, 26).

65 Thus Didymus, *Commentarii in Zachariam* 8.16–17 III 15 (Doutreleau 1962, II: 622.16–17); compare Didymus, *Commentarii in Zachariam* 7.12[b]-14 II 199 (Doutreleau 1962, II: 518.16–17): . . . ὁ προφήτης θεολογῶν φάσκει· (a quotation of Isa 31.2 follows).

66 Thus Didymus, *Commentarii in Zachariam* 2.12–13 I 145 (Doutreleau 1962, I: 270.15); compare 2.14–16 I 154 (I: 274.17) and 6.12–15 II 60 (II: 456.6).

67 Thus Didymus, *Commentarii in Zachariam* 1.8 I 22 (Doutreleau 1962, I: 202.24); compare 3.5[b]-7 I 224 (I: 308.11–12), 8.4–5 II 276 (II: 558.5), and 10.1–3 III 251 (II: 740.16).

68 Loofs, 1899, 139; compare from the documents of the council: dyophysite florilegium nr. 3 (ACO II/1/3: 114.14), from the writing of Emperor Julian against Origen (ACO III: 193.2, 26 and 205.37), and on the title of Gregory Nazianzus' *Orationes* 27–31, see the remarks of the editor P. Gallay in his preliminary edition of the work (Gallay/Jourjon 1978, 8). A fine example of the fact that θεολογία was connected with Gregory due to this epithet is found in a short medieval excerpt collection from the Bible and church fathers in cod. Monac. 276, fol. 11r (edited in Boll 1908, 100.12: ὁ πολὺς ἐν θεολογιᾳ Γρηγόριος).

Alongside the specific meaning, the word θεολογία was also of course used in the technical sense to refer to the giving of a rational account of God by Christians: the learned bishop Eusebius of Caesarea/Palestine, a grandstudent of Origen, was the first Christian author to distinguish between θεολογία (as ecclesial speech about God) and οἰκονομία (as speech about the incarnation, life, and salvific death of Jesus), between divine being in eternity and divine activity in time.[69] With this development, Christian theology joined itself to a linguistic convention, popularized by the Stoics, of designating a subdiscipline of philosophy as θεολογία.[70] Two ancient authors who were frequently read in the Middle Ages were especially responsible for further developments into the High Middle Ages and for the scholastic expansion of the meaning of the term. In the Latin sphere, Augustine was influential in this direction from the start because he took up[71] the distinction—which probably originally came from the Stoa—between three *theologiae* (the mythical theology of the poets, θεολογία μυθική; the physical theology of the philosophers, θεολογία φυσική; and the political theology of the lawgiver, θεολογία πολιτική)[72] and made it at home in Christian theology, when it had previously only been mentioned by Tertullian and Eusebius.[73] Additionally,

[69] Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* I 1.7 Καὶ ἄρξεταί γέ μοι ὁ λόγος, ὡς ἔφην, ἀπὸ τῆς κατὰ τὸν Χριστὸν ἐπινοουμένης ὑψηλοτέρας καὶ κρείττονος ἢ κατὰ ἄνθρωπον οἰκονομίας τε καὶ θεολογίας (Schwartz 1999, II/1: 8.25–27). The bishop Athenodoros of Amasea/Pontus, brother of Gregory Thaumaturgus and fellow student of Origen (Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* VII 14 [Schwartz 1999, II/2: 668.4–5]), states in his (authentic?) writing Περὶ ἑβραισμοῦ (cited from Holl 1899, nr. 411, p. 161.1-5): ἄλλη μὲν τοῖς ἐκκεκαθαρμένοις παντελῶς τὴν διάνοιαν ἁρμόζει θεολογία, ἡ μάλιστα ἀληθής, ἄλλη δὲ τοῖς πολλοῖς, ἡ δυναμένη τὴν διάνοιαν αὐτῶν εἰς εὐσέβειαν ἐκκαλεῖσθαι καὶ δικαιοπραγίαν ἐν τῇ πρὸς ἀλλήλους κοινωνίᾳ, ἀπαλλάττουσα τοῦ θηριώδους βίου.

[70] Aristotle distinguishes, in Metaphysica VI 1 1026 a 18–19, τρεῖς . . . φιλοσοφίαι θεωρητικαί, μαθηματική, φυσική, θεολογική; Cleanthes († 250 BCE) is said to have divided philosophy into six subareas of dialectic, rhetoric, ethics, politics, physics, and theology (Diogenes Laertius VII 41 in SVT I, nr. 482, p. 108.10–13: ὁ δὲ Κλεάνθης ἓξ μέρη φησί [scil. τοῦ κατὰ φιλοσοφίαν λόγου] διαλεκτικόν, ῥητορικόν, ἠθικόν, πολιτικόν, φυσικόν, θεολογικόν; cf. also Kattenbusch 1930, 8–9); as a subdiscipline of physics, theology established the connection to popular piety, to εὐσέβεια. However, the stoics titled the corresponding works not περὶ θεολογίας or the like but, for example, *De natura deorum*.

[71] Augustine not only received it, but through the momentous translation of the term φυσικὴ θεολογία with *theologia naturalis*, he introduced the key term “natural theology,” which is still used today: compare *De civitate dei* VI 5 (Dombart/Kalb 1928/1929, I: 252.17–25).

[72] This distinction arose probably in the second century, without it being possible to assign it to a certain school (so Dihle 1996, 184–87; Lieberg 1973; 1982).

[73] Tertullian, *Ad nationes* II 10 (Borleffs 1954, 41.16–20), *Triplici enim genere deorum censum distinxit: unum esse physi<cum>, quod philosophi retractant, aliud mythicum,*

the Greek theology of an unknown Syrian monk from the fifth century who composed the so-called *Corpus Dionysiacum*, in which the word θεολογία was used seventy times and understood to mean "'God's word' itself," also had an influence, via translations, in the West.[74]

1.1.2 Christian "Theology" in the Second and Third Centuries

It is, of course, astonishing that in ancient Christianity, the word "theology," which originally belonged in the context of pagan religiosity, gained such significance—after all, the word field θεολογία, θεολογεῖν, and θεολόγος were not used at all in the New Testament—but it is also surprising that the giving of a rational account of the faith became so important that in the High Middle Ages this word and this subject matter could eventually be exclusively associated with each other terminologically. For in the first century, most Christians made it through life—to put it anachronistically—with a relatively small "theology" that consisted of a few concise formulas (e.g., κύριος Ἰησοῦς or Ἰησοῦς ἠγέρθη). It is true that the attempt was made to draw systematic lines between the word, work, and fate of Jesus of Nazareth and the Greek (Jewish) Bible and that contemporary methods of scriptural interpretation were used (or appropriated) for this purpose.[75] However, the systematic problems that emerged here were not yet even comparable with those posed by the philosophical interpretation of myths. Early Christian judgments against philosophy—that is, against the discipline that deals with the giving of a rational account of the connections between God and the world—are formulated in a correspondingly critical manner.[76] The first two generations of the

---

quod inter po<etas> uolutatur, tertium gentile, quod populi sibi quique adoptaue<runt>, and Eusebius, *Praeparatio evangelica* IV 1.2–4 (Mras/Des Places 1982, 161.9–162.16), ἐπειδὴ γὰρ τὸ πᾶν τῆς θεολογίας αὐτῶν εἶδος εἰς τρία γενικώτερον διαροῦσιν, εἴς τε τὸ μυθικὸν ὑπὸ τῶν ποητῶν τετραγῳδημένον καὶ εἰς τὸ φυσικὸν τὸ δὴ πρὸς τῶν φιλοσόφων ἐφευρημένον εἴς τε τὸ πρὸς τῶν νόμων διεκδικούμενον ἐν ἑκάστῃ πόλει καὶ χώρᾳ πεφυλαγμένον, τούτων δὲ μέρη δύο ἤδη πρότερον διὰ τῶν πρὸ τούτου συγγραμμάτων ἡμῖν ἐξήπλωται, τό τε ἱστορικόν, ὅ δὴ μυθικὸν ἀποκαλοῦσιν . . . (161.9–14).

[74] A. M. Ritter 1994, 62; "In other words, 'theology' normally means the Holy Scriptures in the sense of the 'tidings' that goes back to God himself" (A. M. Ritter 1994, 63).

[75] The significance of the biblical theologies and especially the Greek Bible was correspondingly great; compare the introductory remarks in Rösel 1998, 49–53.

[76] Compare Colossians 2.8 βλέπετε μή τις ὑμᾶς ἔσται ὁ συλαγωγῶν διὰ τῆς φιλοσοφίας καὶ κενῆς ἀπάτης κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, κατὰ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου καὶ οὐ κατὰ Χριστόν· ("Beware that no one capture you through philosophy and empty deceit, founded on the teaching of human beings and on the powers of the world and not on Christ").

Christian community mostly wanted only to hand down a παράδοσις that had already been handed down to them (cf. 1 Corinthians 15.1-3). With regard to terminology, there was scarcely an awareness of the fact that this παράδοσις was occasionally already reflected on in the process.

A sign of the changing attitude toward reflection on the Christian faith within the Christian communities in the second century is the designation of Christianity as the "true philosophy." This is first attested thematically in the urban Roman apologist Justin Martyr in the middle of the second century and terminologically in Clement of Alexandria at the end of the second century.[77] Justin is probably also the first Christian "theologian" with whom the verb θεολογεῖν occurs.[78] A generation later, Clement of Alexandria then distinguished between the mere μυθολογία (of Dionysus) among the Greeks and the true θεολογία of the Logos.[79] However, he still understood the word in a fully traditional manner when he located the Old Testament prophets who taught θεολογία within a sequence that included Orpheus, Homer, and Hesiod.[80] The Palestinian bishop and scholar Eusebius of Caesarea especially paved the way for the reception of the philosophical meaning of the word θεολογία (teaching about God) within Christian "theology" from the fifth century onward. In the fourth century, Eusebius wrote περὶ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς θεολογίας[81] against his fellow bishop Marcellus of Ancyra and spoke of the κενοφωνία of this ξένος θεολόγος.[82] Thus from the fourth century on, the key word

[77] Justin, *Dialogus cum Tryphone* 8.1 διαλογιζόμενός τε πρὸς ἐαυτον τοὺς λόγους αὐτοῦ ταύτην μόνην εὕρισκον φιλοσοφίαν ἀσφαλῆ τε καὶ σύμφορον (Marcovich 1997, 84.4–6); *Apologia i* 26.6 Χριστιανοὶ καλοῦνται, τρόπον καὶ οἱ οὐ κοινωνοῦντες τῶν αὐτῶν δογμάτων τοῖς φιλοσόφοις τὸ ἐπικατηγορούμενον ὄνομα τῆς φιλοσοφίας κοινὸν ἔχουσιν (Marcovich 1994, 71.26–29); Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* I 90.1 τὴν ἀληθῆ φιλοσοφίαν δι' υἱοῦ παραδιδομένην (Stählin/Früchtel/Treu 1985, 58.2); compare also Bardy 1949; Bartelink 1960; Görgemanns 1989, 616–23 (lit); J. Leclercq 1952; Malingrey 1961, 119–20, 137–38, 148–49, and 212 (on the term "true philosophy").

[78] Justin, *Dialogus cum Tryphone* 113.2 (Marcovich 1997, 263.7–8) ἀλλὰ διά τι ἓν ἄλφα πρώτῳ προσετέθη τῷ Ἀβραὰμ ὀνόματι θεολογεῖς; since the biblical figures are also θεολόγοι, in this passage θεολογεῖν can mean interpreting an Old Testament story allegorically (cf. also Kattenbusch 1930, 38–39 = 198–99).

[79] Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* I 57.6 οὕτως οὖν ἥ τε βάρβαρος ἥ Ἑλληνικὴ φιλοσοφία τὴν ἀίδιον ἀλήθειαν σπαραγμόν τινα, οὐ τῆς Διονύσου μυθολογίας, τῆς δὲ τοῦ λόγου τοῦ ὄντος ἀεὶ θεολογίας πεποίηται (Stählin/Früchtel/Treu 1985, 36.29–31).

[80] Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* V 24.1 (Stählin/Früchtel/Treu 1985, 340.25–28).

[81] CPG II: 3478; for the title compare Eusebius, *De ecclesiastica theologia* II (Klostermann/Hansen 1972, 98.13–14).

[82] Eusebius, *Contra Marcellum* I 1.6 (Klostermann/Hansen 1972, 2.25).

θεολογία has possessed an antiheretical character and has been used for theology that has been normed by synods or councils (thus for "dogmas").

Why did a "theology" arise in the second century? Gerhard Ebeling maintained that "the (sc. Christian) faith pressed forth from itself towards understanding."[83] But this viewpoint does not yet grasp the problem in all its sharpness. For in the first place, it must be made clear that it was by no means a given for a religion in antiquity to develop a "theology." Adolf von Harnack suggested in 1926 that the giving of such a theological account was a specific feature of the *Christian* religion in the Roman Empire. He claims that "theology," in the sense of the giving of a responsible account of the faith, was lacking in other ancient "religions" such as the Mithras cult, the Magna Mater religion, and the religion of the sun and that the Neoplatonic synthesis of religion and "theology" did not last long. According to Harnack, these cults lacked the ability to develop a theology and dogmas.[84] But the decisive reason for these findings, which would have to be differentiated once more,[85] was presumably less a lack of ability and more the absence of opportunity. A text like 1 Peter 3.15 shows that the emergence of "theology" in Christianity was connected with the mission situation (ἕτοιμοι ἀεὶ πρὸς ἀπολογίαν παντὶ τῷ αἰτοῦντι

[83] Ebeling 1962, 760.

[84] In his Bonn lectures, Harnack 1927 states, "There was probably never a theology of the Mithras religion, the Magna Mater religion, the sun religion etc., as there was a theology of the Christian religion, and the same applies for dogma, concept fantasies, and cult wisdom, there was also a spiritualistic but no rational dogmas. All these religions, including the Egyptian religion, concerning which one can more appropriately speak of the study of religion, were simple cults and remained so until the time of Neoplatonism" (3). "It was only in the Christian religion that it came to a scholarly theology and a system of dogma that have asserted themselves up to the present" (4).

[85] Thus Harnack 1927, 3, held that "also the Jewish religion . . . possessed no theology and no dogma in the sense of a scholarly dogmatic." One wonders whether Judaism is treated correctly in this opposition; Harnack must downplay the theological conceptions of Hellenistic Judaism and especially Philo, a contemporary of Paul (with the only firm date the embassy to Caligula in 39/40 CE when he was perhaps sixty), to a type of failed episode ("But not only did the Jewish religion experience through the Alexanderism a transformation that reached to the foundation of its nature, but the whole undertaking already fully collapsed in the second century CE" [4]). Alone if one thinks of the Babylonian scholar and philosopher of religion Maimonides (1135–204), who developed a Jewish philosophy of religion on the basis of the Talmud or of the rise of Islam, which naturally knows a theology (Harnack evidently no longer assigned these events to antiquity), then one must consequently suspect that the thesis that a theology only existed in Christianity is false as a phenomenological thesis and probably must be understood instead as "theological"—that is, as a thesis formulated from a certain Christian viewpoint. Naturally, Harnack's thesis would also have to be scrutinized again with regard to the pagan cult (cf. e.g., the theology of the Orphics) and also with regard to the ancient philosophical systems whose religious background is now seen more clearly (P. Hadot 1991, 15–37 [= P. Hadot 1987]).

ὑμᾶς λόγον περὶ τῆς ἐν ὑμῖν ἐλπίδος; "be prepared at all times to give a defense before everyone who requires an account from you concerning the hope that is in you"), and from this perspective, we might ask whether the absence of "theology" in the pagan cults cannot be explained by the fact that mission was not pursued there. The emergence of a "theology" would then be the direct consequence of the Christian claim to absoluteness, which through the universalizing of Jewish monotheism was advocated in the communities at the latest after the death of Jesus. This distinguished the new religion from the remaining cults in the environment, which did not present these sorts of requirements for exclusivity and therefore did not have to give reasons for such requirements either.

Thus one must say in summary that the concept of a "history of Christian theology," which is normally used as a matter of course, already suggests a connection between various phenomena *ex post* (after the fact), whereas in truth, Christians worked out different issues in very disparate ways. Nevertheless, for systematic reasons, Christianity already tended from the beginning toward that form of rational account-giving that was later called "theology." We have now analyzed the systematic reasons in the classical theological terminology for this and have made reference to the claim to absoluteness and the missionary situation. In a second section, these reasons will be analyzed against the background of social-scientific model constructions. For this purpose, I turn now to the second principal term of this monograph—namely, the term "institution."

1.2 "Institution"

Only at first glance is the idea of developing the history of ancient Christian "theology" with a view to its institutions a new notion. For this reason, it is worth considering the relevant history of research before we reflect on the understanding of the term "institution."

1.2.1 Observations on the History of Research

The historians at the turn of the century who have remained prominent up to the present, whether secular historians such as Theodor Mommsen or church historians such as Adolf von Harnack, were largely in agreement that as historians we must study the *institutions*, for these alone were regarded as "certainly recognizable," being viewed as "the skeleton of history" (so Harnack[86]). Mommsen once wrote to his son-in-law Wilamowitz,

[86] Thus Harnack in the fifth thesis of his Oslo lecture "Wie soll man Geschichte studieren, insbesondere Religionsgeschichte?" (How should one study history, especially

"We can grasp the institutions to a certain extent; antiquity already did not know the process of becoming and we will not guess it."[87] One would actually like to assume that this suggestion of the friends Harnack and Mommsen was eagerly taken up by all who subsequently occupied themselves with the history of ancient Christianity—after all, there is so much that remains dark, hypothetical, and unexplainable in the "process of becoming" of the history of the church and the theology of the second and third centuries. Precisely because so many important sources from this time have been lost and so much remains in the darkness, the need for certain fixed points in the sea of ignorance is so great: 85 percent of the texts from the second century whose existence we know about has been lost—and this quantity presumably forms only a rather small percentage of the sources that once existed in their entirety.

But has the history of the church or of Christianity in antiquity really taken the institutions increasingly into consideration since the beginning of this century, as one would like to expect? If one reviews the standard comprehensive accounts of our day in relation to this point, then this may be questioned with complete justification. Such works naturally deal with institutions: thus we find, for example, "constitution and worship service," "penance and forgiveness," and "canon, rule of faith, and office" in the widely circulated Protestant presentation of Carl Andresen and Adolf Martin Ritter;[88] similarly, we find "the constitution of the church" and institutions of the "Christian life" such as baptism, worship service, penance, and holy days and times in the recent Catholic textbook of Karl Suso Frank.[89] Even Ernst Dassmann, whose students Georg Schöllgen and Clemens Scholten have made important contributions on institutions in pre-Constantine Christianity,[90] mentions only the familiar and long-known institutions in his textbook, perhaps with somewhat greater emphasis than his colleagues on the institutions of "love of neighbor and caritas."[91]

These few examples are sufficient for our purpose. One does not at all receive the impression that dedicated actions have followed the call

---

history of religion?), cited from the edition of Markschies 1995b, 154; compare also Jantsch 1990, 44–45.

[87] T. Mommsen in a letter to U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, cited in Ehrenberg 1960, 95; Wilamowitz answered on October 11, 1984: "You raise the question, whether you would not do better to let the matter rest and make the public law, and motivate this with the fact that history can portray the institutions but not the becoming" (Mommsen/Wilamowitz-Moellendrorff 1935, Nr. 179, 192; cf. also Calder 2004).

[88] Andresen/Ritter 1993, 12–13, 26–31.

[89] Frank/Grünbeck 1996, 100–131.

[90] Schöllgen 1982 (= 1990a); 1990b; Scholten 1995.

[91] Dassmann 1991, 239–50.

from the beginning of the twentieth century to carry out a history of institutions. For the sphere of ancient Christianity, there are not even counterparts to Theodor Mommsen's great and unsurpassed works on the history of institutions—namely, his works on Roman criminal law and public law[92]—and almost all the monumental presentations on the classic institutions of the history of Christianity (worship service or office, rule of faith, and canon) come from the beginning of the century,[93] if one wishes to overlook for a moment characteristic exceptions such as the presentations of Freiherr Hans von Campenhausen[94] and Josef Andreas Jungmann.[95] But even for all these valuable investigations, it remains true that they constantly deal with only a small segment of the institutions that would actually be relevant for a history of ancient Christianity. Time and again, we see the foursome "worship service, office, rule of faith, and canon," which is occasionally somewhat tiring already. In view of this finding, it would be urgently necessary here (as well as elsewhere[96]) to open up further segments of a history of ancient Christian institutions.

1.2.2 Observations on the Understanding of the Term

But in order to open up further segments of a history of ancient Christian institutions, it is advisable that one establish a more open concept of institutions as a basis for such investigations than Harnack and Mommsen did in their day. While they tied the concept of institutions to the legal norming of societal forms of order,[97] I wish to take the definition—which stands in the tradition of Arnold Gehlen—of the Collaborative Research Center *Institutionalität und Geschichtlichkeit* (Institutionality and Historicity) in Dresden as a basis for the following chapters of this monograph: *institutions* are defined there as "social arrangements that outwardly and inwardly effectively suggest and bring into force stability and duration" and in which especially "the action-guiding and communication-directing foundations of an order are also always symbolically brought to

[92] Mommsen 1955; 1963.

[93] What follows is a selection: Harnack 1990c; Kattenbusch 1962a; Leipoldt 1907/1908; Zahn 1975.

[94] Campenhausen 1953; 2003; 1972.

[95] Jungmann 1958. In a way, one would also already have to mention Lietzmann 1926.

[96] In my inaugural Jena lecture on November 1, 1995, I therefore spoke also of a necessary "broadening" of the basis of investigation for the question of the upheavals in the fourth century: Markschies 1997d, 184–87.

[97] Compare Lipp 1987; Hoffmann 1987; Schülein 1987; Gimmler 1996, 7–23. For our connection, it is not necessary to present the differentiation between "individualistic" and "collectivistic" approaches in the theory of institution and to justify our choice; the selected concept of institution has merely heuristic functions.

expression."[98] In my view, such a concept of institutions is shown, despite all its problems, to be considerably more practicable for the portrayal of an emerging religion than the legally colored definition from the beginning of the twentieth century. The most important problem that is bound up with a more open concept is certainly the colloquial speech convention, which immediately associates "institution" with a legally normed form of order. When, for example, we repeatedly speak of Christian "educational institutions" hereafter, one may not, of course, imagine the organizational stability and legal norming of a modern school or university.

A more open concept of institutions such as this one has already been implicitly in use for some time: thus, in the history of ancient Christianity, one speaks of the papacy, a monastery, or the imperial councils as "institutions" and does not mean by this legal contexts so much as organized social structures that show the same enduring characteristics as governing bodies—namely, explicit norm structures, regular membership, transpersonal goals of action, and corporate power. Admittedly, the range of combinations of these formal criteria is not fixed[99] and naturally also varies with regard to the Christian institutions. We understand "institution" in this sense as an anthropological basic category and as an inevitable ordering and reference pattern of every social action. By contrast, we understand "institutionalization" as the emergence of an organizational framework (and not merely the consolidation of formally regulated interactions into the form, for example, of a decision-making body that exists over time). Although in-depth, systematic analyses of "institutions" as instances for regulating social interaction have, in the meantime, become available in anthropological, legal, and sociological discussions,[100] thus far in the investigation of ancient Christianity, it has scarcely been considered that a careful reception of the results of such investigations on "institutions" also opens up new perspectives of inquiry for the development of theology and church in the second and early third centuries. This also applies in a similar way to other fields of contemporary social sciences.

Thus one can learn from the *discipline of sociology* that new ideas require the *social basis* of an institution in order to establish themselves, and therefore people who want to establish a new idea in a society must create such a social basis.[101] In ancient Christianity, the new idea—or more

[98] Melville/Moos 1998, V; for such an empirical–action-oriented understanding of institution, compare also Siedschlag 2000, 28–30.

[99] According to Melville 1992a, 2. Douglas 1987, 69, aptly says, "Institutions create shadowed places in which nothing can be seen and no questions asked."

[100] Eisenstadt 1968; Dubiel 1976; Hoffmann/Hubig/Lipp 1987; Schelsky 1970; and the contributions in Melville 1992b, esp. Acham 1992.

[101] Weingart 1974, 26.

precisely, the ensemble of new ideas grouped around the central guiding idea of the special significance of the word, work, and person of Jesus of Nazareth—was always bound up with certain normative patterns of behavior that sometimes differed considerably and did not even have to be new at all (but rather integrated various ethical traditions into an "inclusive ethos"[102] as, for example, in the communities determined theologically by Paul). From this perspective, one must always investigate the ancient Christian institutions to determine whether they are not only the social basis for the spread of this ensemble of new ideas but also a social objectification of special normative structures of behavior. An institution can also develop "on the basis of a common set of normative structures of behavior" and then have above all the task of "preserving this set of behaviors or making precise and ensuring its continual implementation in the life praxis."[103] In the case of ancient Christian institutions, the ensemble of new ideas and the privileged pattern of behavior are more closely connected insofar as they were already theoretically related to each other in the New Testament and have also been repeatedly related to one another in subsequent "theological" reflection. The ensemble of new ideas was implemented time and again in "central ideas" of common action that led to the pragmatics of normative patterns of behavior.[104] Part of the evidently great attractiveness of Christianity in antiquity probably consisted in the fact that with the notions of meaning bound up with the new ideas, Christian institutions fulfilled human "basic needs,"[105] and these notions of meaning were realized "through durable, regulated forms of social action."[106]

In the framework of this monograph we are interested first in the *formation* of institutions and thus in the process of institutionalization, which takes place, as we have said, in order to secure the social basis for the spread of new ideas. For this purpose, the people involved usually leave their original reference group, initially establish new contacts, and then establish a new institution through the recruitment of comrades-in-arms. The opposition that they experience is one of the reasons why a group consciousness emerges and stabilizes (the so-called in group–out group consciousness). In the framework of this process of institutionalization and stabilization of group consciousness, the new ideas that were originally argued for only in a weak manner are grasped with ever greater precision; to this extent, they are brought into a system (whereas originally

[102] On the relation of exclusive identity and inclusive ethos in the Pauline communities, compare above all Wolter 1997.

[103] Melville 1992a, 12.

[104] Melville 1992a, 11.

[105] Malinowski 1944, 91–131.

[106] Melville 1992a, 11.

they often burst open an existing system) and are thereby dogmatized. Finally, the new group demarcates itself outwardly by sanctioning (i.e., penalizing) deviations.[107] Thus successful new ideas lead—to formulate the matter pointedly—with a certain inevitability to new institutions and new dogmas. Such an institutionalizing *dynamic*, which is more or less automatically bound up with the aim of establishing a new idea, must be distinguished again from the individual institutionalizing *strategy* of a certain group—namely, the specific nature and way in which it founds and consolidates a social basis for its new ideas. As a rule, one can see this specific strategy in publications and other public expressions (including symbolic ones). But argumentative promotion of a new idea is automatically also simultaneously bound up with practical institutionalization, and this connection is not only a characteristic of a *specific* strategy.[108] The guiding opposition—which is employed again and again in the writing of church history and also for most histories of Christianity—between hierarchically organized mainstream church or institutional church, on the one hand, and charismatically shaped minority groups that are critical of hierarchy, on the other hand, ignores the dynamic of institutionalization that is *common* to both forms, which is independent of their respective concrete strategies. To put the matter differently, viewed from a sociological perspective, mechanisms of norm-setting, canonization, dogmatization, and hierarchicalization are not so much spontaneous reactions to crisis phenomena as they are developments that more or less automatically accompany the establishment of a new idea. Thus the model of a crisis-initiated phase of norm-setting—namely, the norming of the biblical canon, dogmatics, and hierarchy that allegedly reacted against the so-called Gnostic crisis of the second century[109]—must already be critically scrutinized for sociological reasons to see whether it really describes the historical findings adequately. However, the question of the identity of ancient Christianity in the plurality of its different manifestations, which has been much discussed in the twentieth century, cannot be answered simply with reference to sociological models: whether unity or difference or whether uniformity or plurality stood at the beginning of ancient Christianity cannot be clarified through an analysis of general laws of institutionalization but only through a precise description of the Christian processes of institutionalization in the early and high imperial period. For while a group that forms

[107] For more detail on the steps of the process, see Weingart 1974 and T. N. Clark 1974.

[108] Weingart 1974, 33.

[109] On the model of a "Gnostic crisis" in the development of ancient Christianity, compare section 3.15 and section 4.1.

the social basis for the establishment of an idea usually does possess an original, natural geographic center, it also tends to disperse and settle in various centers with its success in establishing itself. It is just as possible, however, that on the basis of a new idea, multiple groups emerge independently of one another locally and their common conceptual orientation does not imply a common social organization but first presses toward one and creates an artificial geographical center only secondarily.[110]

Thus, when the term "institution" is used to consider not only the hierarchically structured majority church but first and foremost all social structures that establish stability and duration, then the focus on the "great men"—which characterizes the traditional writing of church history and is so problematic from an epistemic methodological perspective—obtains a good sense as well: institutionalization can only succeed when, in addition to a new idea, there are also "talented individuals" who endeavor to obtain a social basis for its establishment.[111] Whether we know all these individuals and whether they were only male is naturally a completely different question that is also difficult to answer for the second and third centuries. A further difficulty for our investigation emerges through the fact that—as we have seen—institutions also always express the action-guiding and communication-directing foundations of their order symbolically, whereas for the early and high imperial period, we are dealing almost exclusively with some of the remains of *written* traditions. For the most part, archaeological remains do not exist. For this reason, the entire additional sphere of symbolic communication of the foundations of ancient Christian institutions (e.g., through the "logic of gestures" and other forms of behavior or through clothing) can scarcely be illuminated: what are the "identifying signs" and what are the "meaning-bearing symbols" of certain Christian institutions in which theology was carried out during the high imperial period? Here we are dependent on isolated reports (cf., above all, sections 2.1 and 2.2). This is especially regrettable since we know—from the study of rhetoric, for example—how strongly oral speech was supported by hand gestures[112] and how natural nonverbal communication was as a support for verbal communication.

[110] Weingart 1974, 28.

[111] T. N. Clark 1974, 105–7.

[112] An instructive series of drawings on the gestures with which numbers were expressed is found in Quacquarelli 1974, 76–84; an interpretation of the central passage Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria* XI 3.65–135 (Rahn 1972/1975, II: 3.632–58 = Radermacher/Buchheit 1972, II: 339.22–354.24) is found in Maier-Eichhorn 1989; in general, see Hurschmann 1998.

Naturally, no ancient Christian lived exclusively in the context of Christian institutions (since "we are always already in institutions"[113]). In the end, the juxtaposition of very different pagan and Christian institutional forms was also impossible to remove in antiquity, and the ancient institutions also existed in their cultural system with restricted authority. However, the different institutional orders as suborders of a system were not autonomous and were more or less stringently bound up with one another. This original stringency only broke up in the late imperial period (independently of the growing significance of Christianity). It was replaced by a much more modest complementarity of the suborders and by direct competition in places. One can effectively make this clear with reference to the increasing dissemination of the oriental religions in the empire.[114] Just as all institutions strove to perfect themselves and to form monopolies under these conditions, individual Christian institutions as well as the hierarchically structured majority church also attempted, from the middle of the second century at the latest, to adjust their factually limited authority to the theoretically claimed removal of limitations and the claim to totality. Normally, one pays attention only to the fact that this process of monopolization was especially directed against pagan institutions of a political and religious nature. But Christian institutions also competed, of course, with one another in antiquity due to this kind of general developmental dynamic of institutions. When one merely looks, as is usually done, at the conflicts between an "orthodoxy" that was establishing itself and a "heresy" that was demarcated from it (see in detail sections 4.1 and 4.2), then one considers only a small portion of this conflict of institutions: for naturally there were also conflicts between free teachers and established schools and between sedentary apocalyptic groups and itinerant teachers.

Sociologically meaningful in every respect is the process of the gradual *diffusion* of a new idea, which simultaneously implies the diffusion of its social basis and thus of the institution that propagates it. Although, as we have seen, a stronger process of norming and sanctioning is introduced (or at least there is an attempt to introduce it), in parallel to the process of diffusion, the group boundaries can initially open up in the interest of diffusion. The pluralization of institutions that are devoted to the dissemination of the same new idea also opens up the originally narrow boundaries of the talented individuals who participate in this dissemination and their immediate environment. It is likewise difficult to say exactly how opening up and demarcation in the ancient Christian institutions relate to each other. Up to now, in works on the history of ancient Christianity, we lack a

[113] Karl Acham (quoted in Melville 1992a, 17).
[114] Compare only Cumont 1989.

precise categorization of the very general category of “membership” in the different institutional contexts.[115] Only in Gnosis research has there been repeated reflection and debate on the question of how far membership in certain Gnostic circles (thus in institutions) overlapped or even stood in tension with the membership of the relevant person in the hierarchically structured majority church (thus in another institution). Perhaps one can explain the problem of such “double memberships” through the gradation in the intensity of membership: alongside the active participation in the dissemination of the new idea, a weaker form of membership is indeed also possible; a general or at least partial “acceptance of the underlying structures of behavior and a formal integration into a social role in relation to the whole and in relation to other members” is required.[116]

Alongside the initial process of the formation of institutions for the dissemination of a new idea in ancient Christianity, we are also interested within the framework of this monograph in the *consolidation* of such institutions in the late second and third centuries. We can learn from the social sciences that within the framework of such developments, actions are formalized, structures of norms are further specified, and controllable (and controlled) interactions such as sanctions are solidified. An institution that is consolidated in this way is distinguished by *formality* (a series of explicitly formulated goals, rules, and practices that regulate the behavior of the members that is regarded as adequate), *hierarchy* (a pyramidal power and authority structure with demarcated spheres of authority), *duration* (existence beyond the death of leader figures and members), and a *material substratum* (specific physical possessions in order to make its own goals concrete). If one brings to mind this developmental dynamic that is inherent in institutions, then one has to ask, for example, whether one can understand the clear changes that the prophetic movement of the Montanists experienced after the death of their founding figure better as a process of consolidation that was more or less inevitable and determined by the institutionalizing dynamic than as a falling away from the original ideals. However, one must, of course, be careful not to simplify the complex historical reality to an overly simple developmental dynamic: alongside stabilization, the ancient Christian institutions naturally also experienced destabilization and consolidated themselves once more through restabilizations.[117]

Our preceding explication of the concept of “institutions” also leads to a definition of the expression “norm,” which we will use primarily in

[115] Luhmann 1976, 39–53 (“membership as role”) and 89–108 (“motivation of members”).

[116] Melville 1992a, 13.

[117] Compare Melville 1992a, 20–24.

chapters 3 and 4. Like the Dresden Collaborative Research Center, we use this term to mean “the action-guiding and communication-directing foundations of an order” or of an institution. Norms ground, justify, and legitimate individual and collective behavior. In light of this understanding of “norm,” the question naturally immediately arises of whether norms are not themselves “institutions” and whether normative structures of behavior should not even be interpreted as “institutions in the narrow sense” (so Melville).[118] Since we introduced the organized social structure as an important characteristic of institutions, norms can admittedly guide institutions, but they are not themselves institutions in the actual sense. The exact differentiation between norm and institution is probably best specified through a functional description: norms press, as new ideas do, toward the social basis of institutions in order to be disseminated; institutions consolidate their new ideas as norms. Even if norms (like institutions) are means for overcoming crises,[119] however, the emergence of norms cannot be explained by crises alone.

After these terminological clarifications, chapters 2 and 3 will explore three different institutions in ancient Christianity (sections 2.1–2.3) and the exact relation between institution and norm (sections 3.1 and 3.2).

[118] Melville 1992a, 7–8.
[119] Kaufmann 1987.

This page intentionally left blank

2

Three Institutional Contexts

In this first main part of our investigation, we will deal with three characteristic examples of institutional contexts of explicit and implicit Christian theology in the second and third centuries—namely, first the free teachers and Christian schools (section 2.1), then “Montanism” as a paradigm for an explicit theology that is not oriented toward the contemporary form of philosophical instruction (section 2.2), and finally the early history of the Eucharistic worship service and its prayers as an example of a form of implicit theology that is oriented toward application (section 2.3). The modern concept of “theology” is naturally taken as a basis in this categorization.

2.1 The Free Teachers and Christian Schools

If one wishes to study in greater detail the two institutions that immediately come to mind when one thinks of Christian “theology” in antiquity—namely, the free teachers in the style of the urban Roman theologian Justin and the Christian school as it was organized through the Alexandrian theologian Origen in Caesarea/Palestine—then one must first deal in somewhat greater detail with the ancient system of education. It is only in comparison with other, non-Christian free teachers and in comparison with schools in general that the specific features of Christian institutions and the “theology”[1] carried out within them can be precisely taken into account. In addition, the various ancient educational institutions that one could designate with the triad “teachers, students, schools” are of absolutely central importance for the development of ancient Christianity, a Christian theology, and a church. There are, of course, already studies in this area—several monographs may be mentioned here.[2] For this reason, it is not necessary to discuss all the Christian teachers of the second and third centuries in sequence and likewise

[1] The quotation marks around “theology” aim to keep in view that the previous chapter showed the application of this term to the rationally responsible account-giving of the Christian faith in antiquity is first attested very late.

[2] Neymeyr 1989 and A. E. Zimmermann 1988. Quacquarelli 1974 provides a pass through the material. Hascall 1984 and the relevant sections in Snyder 2000, 189–214, are not very fruitful. Greschat 2000, 222, is above all doxographically oriented, but compare pp. 38–44: “The school as the historical locus of Appelian theology.”

superfluous to present all the institutions of Christian education in succession. Instead, we can focus on examples in the following section.[3]

Naturally, New Testament scholarship has occupied itself time and again particularly with the Johannine and Pauline schools, especially with the relationship between the theology of the respective teachers and that of their students;[4] we will not, however, address these connections here. Alexander Böhlig already stated in 1975 that the person who "wants to rightly analyze the Gnostic literature" cannot do this "without drawing on the influence of the Greek school from the elementary education to the philosophical school" and presented an extensive list of topoi from the literature of Nag Hammadi that presuppose the school education of authors and intended readers.[5]

Despite these publications, however, the phenomenon "teachers, students, schools" has thus far been vallued at most in a rudimentary form, and it has not yet been described with sufficient differentiation, either. Naturally, we cannot fill both gaps here. In the framework of our interest in the institutional contexts of Christian theology in the second and third centuries, we can deal with only three dimensions of the topic that simultaneously provide the headings for the three main sections of this chapter. First we will examine the question of whether the elementary instruction already presented a religious provocation for Christian teachers and students because of its markedly pagan character (and then, of course, the pagan character of the subsequent educational stages as well) and how this provocation was dealt with (section 2.1.1). Second, we will present the significance of the ancient pagan educational canon for Christians (section 2.1.2). Third, we will then explicate the consequences of the adoption of such and other conventions and institutions of pagan education for the development of a Christian theology (section 2.1.3).

But before we deal with the Christians and their relation to the ancient educational establishments, we should recall, at least in the form of a short excursus, an important dimension (which is not always given sufficient attention) of the topic "teachers, students, schools" that will

[3] For a foundational presentation of all teachers in the period, especially Clement of Alexandria, compare Neymeyr 1989 (on Clement, see pp. 45–95). For the history of the Christian catechetical teaching, compare Kretschmar 2000, 1–5 (with literature).

[4] However, I do not know of much literature that is devoted specifically to the phenomenon "school"; but compare P. Müller 1988, 325: "The [Paul] school is precisely not an organized, localizable school institution but a tradition phenomenon and actualization phenomenon in the succession of Paul." The contributions in Scholtissek 2000a now address in greater detail the key phrase "Paul school" that was introduced by Heinrich Julius Holtzmann and Otto Pfleiderer. Scholtissek 2000b is especially relevant for our connections.

[5] Böhlig 1975, 15.

repeatedly become significant for our theme—namely, the differentiation of various educational institutions and their different educational levels. One can already see from such a generally circulated presentation such as that of Henri Irénée Marrou on the "history of education in classical antiquity"[6] that three stages of instruction are to be distinguished for the imperial period (admittedly not as mechanically and strictly as Marrou still thought[7]): the elementary instruction for the urban upper stratum; the higher instruction; and the education via orators, philosophers, and lawyers called "collegiate instruction" by Marrou, perhaps not so appropriately.[8] In any case, I wish, following the investigation of Johannes Hahn,[9] to add to these the free instruction that philosophers gave at very different levels.

We generally concentrate on the last two levels of instruction: we ask whether, in addition to higher education, Christian theologians also enjoyed rhetorical or philosophical specialized training, and we ask about the level of their education. But we scarcely inquire about the first two levels of education and their institutions. At most, we still know the memorable statements of Augustine concerning this section of his individual and singularly well-documented educational history:[10] "Thus I was brought to school so that I might learn to read and write, concerning which I, poor man, did not see what use that should be—and received my strikes, however, if I was slovenly in learning."[11] But such statements about school days that, from today's perspective, took a disagreeable course only make clear what we already knew from other sources: one of the most frequently handed down verses from the ancient school reads, "Work diligently, my dear child, lest your skin be taken off,"[12] and that naturally casts a revealing light on the teaching style of the elementary education. But with such anecdotes concerning a supposed pedagogy by the stick, scarcely anything is yet obtained for the history of

[6] Marrou 1977 (= Marrou 1976); compare also Marquardt 1975, 92–114; Rauschen 1901; Cole 1909; Haarhoff 1920; A. Müller 1910, 292–317; Jullien 1885; Gwynn 1926. Recent more detailed studies include Clarke 1971; S. F. Bonner 1977; Cribiore 1996.

[7] See above all Kaster 1983a, 323–46, and now also Vössing 1997, 2–22.

[8] Marrou 1977, 490–533; a contemporary attestation is Apuleius, *Florida* 20.1–2 (Helm 1977, 208.28–210.1).

[9] Hahn 1987.

[10] Compare the commentaries in O'Donnell 1992, 60–63, and Marrou 1981, 9–23 (= Marrou 1958).

[11] Augustine, *Confessiones* I 9.14: *Inde in scholam datus sum, ut discerem litteras, in quibus quid utilitatis esset ingnorabam miser: Et tamen, si segnis in discendo essem, vapulabam* (Skutella/Jürgens/Schaub 1981, 11.13–16); compare now Vössing 1992, 881–900.

[12] Φιλοπόνει, ὦ παῖ, μὴ δαρῇς; this precept of the teacher was repeated four times by students on a Berlin wood tablet (ÄM 13234; Ziebarth 1913, 12 nr. 12; cf. Ziebarth 1909, 109).

ancient Christianity.[13] Thus we will initially consider the first level of formal education and ask how a second- or third-century Christian from the upper class might have experienced it. In the next two sections, we will then deal with the other educational institutions and the necessary differentiation of the educational levels. With this, however, only a small percentage of the Christians of that time comes into view. If one follows more recent investigations, which estimate the total of the *literati* population in the cities of Italy and in the hellenized regions at 15–20 percent at the highest (and in the western provinces at 5–10 percent), then one will certainly not be permitted to postulate a significantly higher number of people who successfully completed the elementary instruction for the Christians:[14] Most people were, as Origen once said, “rustic and unable to read or write.”[15]

2.1.1 The Pagan-Religious Character of the Various Educational Institutions and the Christian Reaction to It

Under this heading, we will deal first with the pagan-religious character of the instruction of elementary schools (section 2.1.1.1), then with the attempts of Christians to modify this very instruction in a Christian manner (section 2.1.1.2), and finally with the question of how Christians could work as elementary teachers under these circumstances (section 2.1.1.3).

2.1.1.1 The Pagan-Religious Character of Elementary and Grammar Instruction

Even if one only superficially examines the remains of ostraca and papyri that remain preserved from this first level of instruction,[16] one is struck by the provocation that the instruction must actually have already posed for Christians through its references to pagan piety and mythology, which took place as a matter of course: the simple word lists that one had to

[13] Gaiser 1979, 1–96.

[14] Harris 1989, 129–41 (on the situation in Hellenism), 231–48 (on the times of the Emperors), 259–67 (on Pompeii); compare also the discussion in section 2.1.1.4 with n. 106. The statistical assumptions of Harris and their cultural historical consequences have been critically discussed recently; compare W. A. Löhr 2005, 209–11, and with stimulating examples, Seeliger 2003, 297–312.

[15] Origen, *Contra Celsum* I 27 (Koetschau 1899b, 79.5–6): πολλαπλασίους οἱ ἰδιῶται καὶ ἀγροικώτεροι τῶν ἐν λόγοις γεγυμνασμένων.

[16] In our context, it is sufficient to name a selection of relevant publications: Wessely 1965, XLII–LVIII; Jouguet/Perdrizet 1906, 148–61; Clarysse/Wouters 1970, 201–35; Harrauer/Sijpesteijn 1985 (which admittedly contains above all texts from the post-Constantinian and early Byzantine periods); Minnen 1992, 209–11; Cribiore 1997, 53–60. Sedley 1998 discusses an interesting declination exercise of the (not quite correct) expression ὁ Πυθαγόρας φιλόσοφος in P. British Library Add. Ms. 37516/1.

complete at the dictation of the γραμματιστής, the *primus magister* or *magister ludi*[17] (that is, after one had learned to write the letters and syllable combinations), already contained as a given the names of gods and heroes: Ὀρφ(ε)ύς stands there alongside Ξέρξης.[18] The letters themselves were already bound up with religious and cosmic contexts (e.g., the seven vowels were coordinated with the seven angels that presided over the seven planets[19]), and all the remaining levels of education were teeming with pagan gods, as is also shown by the preserved school notebooks. The British Museum preserves a small schoolbook composed of eight wooden tablets[20] that contains texts from the grammar instruction on the parts of speech, and as an example of an epithet (παρώνυμον ὄνομα) one can read in this book, θέων φίλων ᾿Ερμαῖος ῾Ηρακλείδης, Hermes and Heracles bear the epithet "friend of the gods" (lines 304–5).

In the subsequent part of the education, the teaching of the alphabet and the elementary grammar instruction, it is well known that above all Homer or Virgil were read. In order for students to adequately understand the Greek text that was already complicated by the range of vocabulary, there were evidently preparations—as there are today—that explained the unknown vocabulary and difficult grammatical passages.[21] In view of these and other efforts to make or keep present a text that was only partially comprehensible to contemporaries, it becomes clear once again what importance the author Homer had in the ancient school. One would like to know what a Christian would have thought when someone dictated to him on his wax tablet what we still find today on a wax tablet of the Bodleian collection: Θεὸς οὐδ᾿ ἄνθρωπος Ὅμηρος, "Homer was not a human being but

[17] Compare the documentation in Marrou 1977, 491 n. 9–11; on the topic, see Kaster 1983a; 1988; 1983b. On the terms, see Cribiore 1996, 13–14 with appendix 1 (List of Teachers) and Cribiore 2005, 50–59.

[18] Ostracon in British Museum G. 20, cited by Milne 1908, 122–32 (nr. 2) = Ziebarth 1913, 6 nr. 8.

[19] Böhlig 1975, 15–16; Marrou 1977, 222; Pseudo-Sabas, *Mysteria litterarum* (Hebbelynk 1900/1901. The concern is with a text that probably comes from Palestinian circles of monks of the fifth/sixth century; cf. Hebbelynk 1900, 8–9; cf. now also Bandt 2007).

[20] British Library Add. Ms. 37533; edited by Kenyon 1909, 32–38, or Ziebarth 1913, 24–28, nr. 47; discussed by Brinkmann 1910. On the bibliography of the various collections of school texts, see now also Cribiore 1996, 27–33. Cribiore 1996, 31, distinguishes (1) letters of the alphabet; (2) alphabets; (3) syllabaries; (4) lists of words; (5) writing exercises; (6) short passages (maxims, sayings, and limited amount of verses); (7) longer passages (copies or dictations); (8) *Scholia Minora*; (9) compositions, paraphrases, summaries; (10) grammatical exercises; and (11) notebooks.

[21] Poethke 1967. Poethke edits and comments on P. Berol. 11634 (second century CE): "The preparation explains epic, antiquated words and forms from Iliad Θ 361 to I 64 in simple juxtaposition" (Poethke 1967, 106, with references to parallels).

a god."[22] The classical educational canon of ancient literature[23] for the elementary instruction alongside Homer was a rich provocation for Christians as well: it contained the whole mythology of the gods together with their stories of murder and adultery.

How strongly the entire instruction was shaped by pagan mythology at all levels of ancient education and how strongly the identification of the teacher with the contents of the instruction was demanded is made clear not least by Emperor Julian in a letter that he wrote in connection with his school law from June 17, 362. The emperor points out the discrepancy between what a pedagogue thinks and says: if this involved little things, then the discrepancy would be just barely tolerable; "but if someone teaches in the most essential questions the opposite of what he thinks, then is this not the manner in which hucksters act?"[24] The emperor formulates very clearly: "For Homer and Hesiod and Demosthenes and Herodotus and Thucydides and Isocrates and Lysias the gods were guides to every education. . . . It is therefore absurd in my opinion that the interpreters of their works refuse honor to the gods honored by them."[25] And his friend Libanius explained more than twenty years later: οἰκεῖα γάρ, οἶμαι, καὶ συγγενῆ ταῦτα ἀμφότερα, ἱερὰ καὶ λόγοι.[26]

Not only the instructional material but also the entire institution of elementary education were deeply shaped by pagan religiosity: on certain religious festival days, it was common to give gifts to one's teachers, as Tertullian[27] and Jerome[28] attest. At the festival of Flora (from April 28 to

[22] Wax tablets from the Bodleian Library, Oxford gr. inscr. 4; cited by Hesseling 1893, 296; Ziebarth 1913, 12 nr. 26.

[23] Treu 1986.

[24] Julian, *Epistulae* 61 c/55 (Bidez/Cumont 1922, 422 B = B. K. Weis 1973, 176): Καὶ εἰ μὲν ἐπὶ σμικροῖς εἴη τὸ διάφορον τῆς γνώμης πρὸς τὴν γλῶτταν, κακὸν μέν, οἱστὸν δὲ ἁμωσγέπως γίνεται· εἰ δὲ ἐν τοῖς μεγίστοις ἄλλα μὲν φρονοίη τις, ἐπ' ἐναντίον δὲ ὧν φρονεῖ διδάσκοι, πῶς οὐ τοῦτο ἐκεῖνο καπήλων ἐστίν, οὔτι χρηστῶν, ἀλλὰ παμπονήρων βίος ἀνθρώπων.

[25] Julian, *Epistulae* 61c/55 (Bidez/Cumont 1922, 423 A = B. K. Weis 1973, 178): Ὁμήρῳ μέντοι καὶ Ἡσιόδῳ καὶ Δημοσθένει καὶ Ἡροδότῳ καὶ Θουκυδίδῃ καὶ Ἰσοκράτει καὶ Λυσίᾳ θεοὶ πάσης ἡγοῦνται παιδείας· (. . .) Ἄτοπον μὲν οἶμαι τοὺς ἐξηγουμένους τὰ τούτων ἀτιμάζειν τοὺς ὑπ' αὐτῶν τιμηθέντας θεούς.

[26] Libanius, *Orationes* 72.8 (Foerster/Richsteig 1903–1927, IV: 350.14); compare Dörrie 1974a.

[27] Tertullian, *De idololatria* 10.2 *Quis ludimagister sine tabula VII idolorum Quinquatria tamen frequentabit? Ipsam primam noui discipuli stipem Minervae et honori et nomini consecrat, ut, etsi non profanatus alicui idolo verbotenus de idolothyto esse dicatur, pro idololatra vitetur. Quid? Minus est inquinamenti? Eoque praestat quaestus et nominibus et honoribus idolo nuncupatus?* (Reifferscheid/Wissowa 1954, 1109.28–32 = Waszink/Winden 1987, 38.6–10, with the commentary on pp. 185–90); for an in-depth commentary with references to the epigraphic material as well, see Vössing 1997, 331 n. 1125.

[28] Jerome, *Commentarii in epistulam Pauli ad Ephesios* III 6 (on Ephesians 6.4) *et quod in corbanam pro peccato virgo vel vidua vel totam substantiam suam effundens quilibet*

May 3), the students wore crowns.[29] In addition, "there was no school on the days of the first ceremonious offering of the *flaminicae*, the priestesses of the cult of the living empress and the *divae*, and on the days of the Aediles of the city, as well as at the temple dedication of the Roman Minerva, i.e. the *Quinquartus*, in Carthage."[30]

In light of the deeply religious character of the instructional material and institution, one naturally asks immediately and automatically whether the ancient Christians did not make energetic attempts to reshape the elementary instruction or, if this was not possible, to withdraw from it.

2.1.1.2 Christian Alternatives

In view of these characteristics of the elementary education, one can understand why some Christians evidently refused this instruction and—as attested by Augustine—learned their Latin on the basis of the Bible.[31] We have some examples, even if they are late, of elementary education being carried out on the basis of biblical texts among such earnest Christians. The late and legendary *Martyrium of Babylas of Nicomedia* (BHG 2053), of which we will speak again, reports that instead of τὰ Ἑλληνικὰ παιδεύματα, the διδάσκαλος taught his students Christian hymns and psalms,[32] a not insignificant divergence from the curriculum, for which he paid with his death (at least according to the legend). The Papyrus collection of the Austrian National Library in Vienna preserves a school notebook from the fourth century that was discovered in Faiyum in which some verses from the thirty-third Psalm are noted in "what is clearly the handwriting of

---

pauper obtulerant, hoc kalendariam strenam et Saturnaliciam sportulam et Minervale munus grammaticus et orator, aut in sumptus domesticos, aut in templi stipes, aut in sordida scorta convertit (PL 26: 574 A); compare the commentary in Marquardt 1975, 94–95 n. 6.

[29] Tertullian, *De idololatria* 10.3 (Waszink/Winden 1987, 38.10–15); compare the reference to an epigram of the *Anthologia Latina* 96 (Riese et al. 1869–1926, 103) / 85 (Shackleton Bailey 1982, 81) in Vössing 1997, 313 n. 1133, as well as text, translation, and commentary on pp. 368–69, esp. lines 2 and 5: *Sed cum discipulos nullo terrore coercet* / . . . *proiectis pueri tabulis Floralia ludunt* / "But since he (sc. the uneducated elementary teacher) does not frighten the students, the boys throw their tablets away and celebrate the Floralia Festival with play."

[30] Vössing 1997, 313–14.

[31] Chadwick 1998, 41; Harnack 1912, 85–90; compare Augustine, *De doctrina christiana* II 9.14 (Martin/Daur 1962, 41.3–4; Green 1963, 42.2–3: *etsi nondum ad intellectum, legendo tamen vel mandare memoriae*), and Marrou 1958, 356–57.

[32] Passio § 1 (Halkin 1963, 331.25–29): καὶ τοῦτο δὲ ποιεῖ ὁ μιαρὸς ἐκεῖνος καὶ κακοήθης γέρων ἀντὶ τῶν ἑλληνικῶν παιδευμάτων, οἷς οἱ τῶν παιδίων διδάσκαλοι κέχρηνται, μύθους τινὰς ἐκδιδάσκων τοὺς παῖδας· οὕσπερ μύθους ᾠδὰς ἁγίας καὶ ψαλμοὺς οἱ ὑπ᾽ αὐτοῦ πλανώμενοι λέγουσιν; compare Delehaye 1900; Halkin 1963, 329–30; Kaster 1988, 387 (nr. 192).

a student" and in which there are also attempts by another hand to practice the Greek alphabet (P. Gr. Vind. 29274).[33] Another Egyptian school notebook from the fourth century begins every page with a carefully drawn sign of the cross and the first page with the additional invocation "praise be to God," in order to then place Zeus, the father of the gods and human beings, via the collocation of the Greek terms αἴξ, βοῦς, γύψ, δρῦς, ἐΰς, Ζεῦς, in the unflattering company of goat, cattle, vulture, and tree. His wife Hera, Hephaestus, and Helios fare no differently on the following pages.[34] In a writing exercise on a wooden tablet that can be found today in Würzburg, the saying of Menander ζή]σῃ βίον κράτ[ιστον | ἐὰ]ν θυμοῦ κρα[τῇς is concluded with a Chi-Rho symbol.[35] Finally, a recent list with papyri that could be interpreted as writing exercises of biblical texts contains five examples for the third and fourth centuries,[36] including an interesting fragment, preserved today in Heidelberg, of an *Onomasticon Sacrum* on which theophoric Hebrew words such as ΙΩΒΑΒ, for example, were translated in Greek transliteration (in this case with Ἰὼ πατήρ).[37] In the Syriac *Didascalia*, a church order that may come from the third century, there was even a warning against reading any pagan literature. We will deal with the relevant passage again in the next section.

But in spite of such refusals of the classical educational heritage, it is conspicuous that members of Christian communities seem to have hardly complained about the massive pagan-religious character of the elementary education[38]—nor apparently did they make any more of an

[33] Thus the description of the papyrus in Sanz 1946, nr. 24 (pp. 42–47); compare also Haelst 1976, nr. 136; Harrauer/Sijpesteijn 1985, 25–26. See now Henner 1999, 52 nr. 42.

[34] Papyrus Bouriant 1, fol. 1, p. 1, col. 1, or p. 2, col. 2 Ἥρα, fol. 3 col. 2 Ἥφαιστος, Ἥλιος (in Ziebarth 1913, nr. 46, pp. 21–22). Compare Jouguet/Perdrizet 1906, 148–49; Ziebarth 1909. Compare also the alphabet with symbols of the cross on the Staßbourg ostracon inv. Gr. 958 (sixth/seventh century) in Cribiore 1996, nr. 64, and the image on plate V.

[35] Würzburg K 1020 in Brashear 1986, 8–9, with table 6; Menander, *Sententiae* 269 (Jaekel 1964) is quoted. In Brashear 1986, there is another example of a writing exercise that is recognizable as a text from a Christian text solely by the Chi-Rho symbol: Würzburg K 1027 (pp. 14–16); compare also Würzburg K 1025 (p. 12).

[36] Horsley 1982, 138: Paris Vouvre in. MND 552 E, F (= Haelst 1976, nr. 205) with Psalm 92 (cf. Boyaval 1975); ind. MND 552 H,–L (Haelst 1976, nr. 239; Boyaval 1975, 225) with Psalm 146; possibly also P.Oxy II, 209 (= K. Aland 1994, p[12] = Haelst 1976, nr. 490) with Romans 1.1-7 and P.Amh. I, 3b (= K. Aland 1994, p[12] = Haelst 1976 nr. 536) with Hebrews 1.1; for the Heidelberg Onomastikon, compare the following note.

[37] P. Heid. I, 5 (= Haelst 1976, nr. 1136); quotation in line 6; the text is conveniently accessible in Wessely 1946, 202–5 nr. 27; compare also Deissmann 1905, 86–93.

[38] Thus, for example, also Ellspermann 1949; but compare Rubenson 2000. Henner 1999, 51–52 n. 31, points out that only 4 percent of the preserved school texts use Christian literature for the instruction.

attempt to implement a distinct form of elementary education that was Christian in character. On the contrary, in his *Divinae Institutiones*, which was composed between 304 and 317, Lactantius required that one must pay attention to the elementary teacher so that one learns the right way to speak, and for this end, many years are said to be necessary.[39] Christians behaved in a corresponding manner, as a scene from the fourth century that the Apollinarian bishop Timothy of Berytus reports in his church history attests: sometime in the thirties of this century, the well-known Sophist Epiphanius[40] presented a hymn of Dionysus, probably in Syrian Laodicea, within the framework of his teaching and exhorted, as was customary, the uninitiated and unholy pagans to leave the room. But none of the Christians present, neither clerics nor lay people, left the room.[41]

Here the question naturally arises of whether the reported findings must not be interpreted to the effect that we have markedly overestimated the religious dimension of the instruction and the instructional materials in our reflections thus far. Had the religious connotation of the elementary instruction, which we presented as "markedly religious in character," faded away long ago? Or was it no longer clear to all or never present at all due to the specific character of ancient pagan religiosity? The well-known key phrase of a purely "cultic religion" apparently intends to convey that people scarcely had individual piety at that time. If this were the case, then it would naturally hardly be surprising either if religious themes outside of a cultic context were not identified as *religious* themes or if the portions of the ancient elementary instruction that appear remarkably religious to us today were not at all perceived as such. But in my view, it is not particularly sensible to underestimate the factor of individual piety in the reconstruction of religion in the early imperial period and play it off against concepts such as cult or ritual. One could even ask whether it does not represent an implicit Christian prejudice when one denies the element of piety to a religion that is replaced by Christianity and thus unconsciously constructs a towering superiority of one's own religion. In any case, such a constriction of religiosity in the imperial period has been increasingly avoided in recent years; I need only refer to a recent essay by John Scheid.[42]

[39] Lactantius, *Divinae Institutiones* III 25.10 *grammaticis quoque non parum operae dandum est, ut rectam loquendi rationem scias; id multos annos auferat necesse est* (Brandt/Laubmann 1890, 258.8–10).

[40] Probably the sophist Epipanius of Petra mentioned in Eunapius, *Vitae sophistarum* pp. 493–94 (Giangrande 1956, 79–80), who later taught in Athens; compare W. Schmid 1907, 195–96.

[41] Sozomen, *Historia ecclesiastica* VI 25.10 (Bidez/Hansen 1960, 271.21–24); on Timothy, see Cavalcanti 1983.

[42] Scheid 1998; compare also Champeaux 1989.

For this reason, I wish to interpret these findings differently—namely, as indications of the limited intensity of the Christianization of members of the Christian communities (noting that we are usually inclined to overestimate this intensity). As we have seen, one may not take the scattered references and reports of an alternative Christian elementary instruction as an occasion to postulate an energetic resistance of Christians against the markedly pagan-religious character of the elementary instruction as the normal case. Such a stance probably represented more the exception than the rule, and it was probably possible only for very specific social strata anyway: a reorganization of the instructional material could be more easily established in the country or in the framework of the private instruction of upper strata stamped by Christianity than in the educational institutions of the city that were accessible to all.[43] Otherwise, a predominantly pagan elementary education in the public framework and the private Christian upbringing of children probably stood largely unconnected alongside each other.[44] In my view, this suggests, alongside various other observations, that the Christianization of the members and sympathizers of Christian communities was not as far-reaching as we usually assume.

Thus most Christians attended the pagan elementary instruction, probably without great hesitation. For this reason, as we have seen, there are scarcely any passages in ancient Christian literature in which these connections are addressed, let alone called into question. It is another question, of course, whether it was similarly accepted as a given in the pre-Constantine period for Christians to be active as teachers in these educational institutions.

2.1.1.3 Christians as Elementary Teachers

At the beginning of the third century, the Carthaginian church father Tertullian appears to speak for a differentiation in this point (i.e., for a distinction between the possibility of attending elementary instruction and the impossibility of giving it): in a characteristically sharp manner, he polemicizes against elementary teachers[45] as idolaters and against the religious connotations of the educational institution[46] but then allows Christians to attend the instruction. According to Tertullian, as an excuse, the student

[43] Compare for this Pack 1989 and Klein 1990.

[44] A. J. Clark 1968; Gärtner 1985.

[45] On the question of whether only elementary teachers are in view here or also other teachers of the higher instruction, compare Bayer 1983 and Vössing 1997, 307–8. On the elementary teacher (γραμματιστής or γραμματοδιδάσκαλος), compare Wolf 1952.

[46] Tertullian, *De idololatria* 10.1 *Quaerendum autem est etiam de ludimagistris, sed et ceteris professoribus litterarum. Immo non dubitandum affines illos esse multimodae*

could point to the necessity of not being able to learn something in any other way.[47] This excuse cannot, of course, be applied to the teacher. On the contrary, it is especially the material that he has to teach that calls into question the entire occupation for a serious Christian. Tertullian regards the text of the instruction in which pagan gods are praised to be especially problematic—here, through the presentation in the framework of the instruction, the teacher bears witness to these very gods.[48] As a good Christian, one may indeed participate in the elementary instruction, but one may not give it. The teaching occupation is—irrespective of the level of ancient education—irreconcilable with the Christian confession.[49]

Can one thus observe, at least in the prohibition against Christians working as elementary school teachers expressed here, the stance of resistance that we missed in the attitude toward attending the elementary instruction? Probably not! For one can show that Tertullian represents here—as elsewhere[50]—an ethical maximum position that corresponds neither to reality[51] nor to the theological consensus of the Christian community in his time but is probably instead a characteristic feature of the North African form of Montanism that this theologian turned to in the course of his life.[52]

The provisional impression that Tertullian represented a clear minority position in ancient Christianity with his attack on elementary teachers is confirmed by additional sources—namely, church orders on the one hand and inscriptions on the other hand. While a church order that is presently known by the reconstructed title *Traditio Apostolica*, often attributed to Hippolytus though it is probably an anonymous third-century church order,[53] does introduce the elementary teacher in the less than flattering company of brothel owners, idol makers, actors, cart drivers, gladiators, and pagan priests, who must first give up their occupation before they

idololatriae (Reifferscheid/Wissowa 1954, 1109.22–24 = Waszink/Winden 1987, 38.1–3); Schöllgen 1985 and Ellspermann 1949, 34–37.

[47] Tertullian, *De idololatria* 10.7 *Huic necessitas ad excusationem deputatur, quia aliter discere non potest* (Reifferscheid/Wissowa 1954, 1110.3–4 = Waszink/Winden 1987, 40.33).

[48] Tertullian, *De idololatria* 10.5 *Si fidelis litteras doceat, insertas idolorum praedicationes sine dubio, dum docet, commendat, dum tradit, affirmat, dum commemorat, testimonium dicit* (Reifferscheid/Wissowa 1954, 1110.19–22 = Waszink/Winden 1987, 40.24–26).

[49] Thus the interpretation of Vössing 1997, 309–10, which is on target in my view.

[50] Brennecke 1997, 82–84.

[51] Becker 1954, 350: “This means that the . . . picture that is sketched of Christian perfection does not correspond to the reality”; similarly Vössing 1997, 309–10.

[52] Thus I follow the dating of *De idololatria* to ca. 211/212 (cf. R. Braun 1977, 574–75) and not the early dating to before 197 (so, for example, Becker 1954, 349–50).

[53] Compare Markschies 1999b.

may attend the baptismal instruction, it is then surprisingly conciliatory when it specifies concerning the teachers, "if he teaches the small children, then it is better if he ceases to do so, but if he does not have any other work, then it is forgiven him."[54] The *Constitutiones Apostolicae* from the fourth century, which is dependent on the *Traditio Apostolica*, then lists almost all the other occupations from the quoted list and a few from the magical sphere, but it no longer lists the occupation of the teacher.[55] And the so-called *Canon of Hippolytus* from the later fourth century,[56] which is preserved only in Arabic, finally specifies that Christian grammarians should confess before their students that "the gods of the Gentiles are only demons" but has otherwise evidently come to an arrangement with the instruction of Christians: "It is good to teach the poets; when, however, he (sc. the teacher, γραμματικός) can mediate the treasure of faith to his students his accomplishment is so much the greater."[57]

The conclusion that one obtains from the church orders corresponds to the inscriptional findings. A series of tomb inscriptions attests that there must already have been all sorts of Christians among the elementary teachers in the pre-Constantinian period (or, put differently, all sorts of Christians worked as elementary school teachers despite the pagan-religious character of the instruction).[58] For example, in the Roman catacombs of S. Callisto, an elementary teacher named Gorgon(i)us is remembered on a loculus plate, and the portrayal of a scroll alludes to his occupation without any trace of reservation.[59] Ernst Diehl's collection of Latin Christian inscriptions

[54] *Traditio Apostolica* § 16 (= *Canones Ecclesiastici* § 41): ⲉϣϫⲉ ⲉϥⲧⲥⲁⲃⲟ ⲛ̄ⲛ̄ⲕⲟⲩⲓ ⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩⲥ ⲙⲉⲛ ⲉⲧⲣⲉϥⲗⲟ ⲉϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲙⲉⲛⲧⲁϥ ⲧⲉⲭⲛⲏ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ ⲉⲓⲉ ⲙⲁⲣⲟⲩⲕⲱ ⲛⲁϥ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ (Till/Leipoldt 1954, 10). Compare Schölgen/Geerlings 1991, 247; similarly in the Ethiopian version (Duensing 1946) and in the Syriac *Testamentum Domini Nostri Jesu Christi* from the fifth century (II 2 [Rahmani 1968, 114]), ܠܡܗܝܡܢܐ. ܢܫܡܥ ܡܢ ܗܘ. ܘܡܢ̈ ܒܒܡܠܟܐ ܡܗܝܡܢ ܘܡܒܢ̈ ܢܬܩܒܠ ܘܢܫܬܘܬܦ. ܘܐܢ ܠܐ ܦܐܫ: ܢܫܬܠܐ܀ ܐܢ ܝܕܥ ܐܢܫ ܐܘܡܢܘܬܐ ܗܝ ܕܡܗܝܡܢܐ

[55] *Constitutiones Apostolicae* VIII 32.8–10 (M. Metzger 1987, 236.24–238.32); compare also the epitome VIII [3] 22[32].8–10 (F. X. Funk 1905, II: 86.3–10).

[56] Markschies 1999b, 63–69.

[57] *Canones Hippolyti* 12 (PO 31/2, 366 = Coquin 1966, 98); compare the (unsatisfactory) translations of Achelis/Flemming 1891, 80–81; Riedel 1968, 206; Marrou 1977, 591: "A grammar teacher should teach the small children if he otherwise has no livelihood. He may teach education if he always purifies his students and confesses that those who the Gentiles call gods [cf. Psalm 95.5 LXX] are Satans [literally: 'demons,' C.M.]. Every day he should say of them that there is no God other than the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. If he is able to teach all his students many poets, good; but if he is even more able to teach them the true faith, then he thereby obtains a reward."

[58] Bigelmair 1902, 308, 312; Bardy 1932, 1–28, esp. 6–11, 19–25; Bardy 1934–1935; Berardino 1972; Quacquarelli 1974.

[59] ILCV nr. 720 (Diehl 1970, I: 135) = ICUR.NS nr. 9894 (Silvagni/Ferrura 1964, 82): *Ianuara coiugi bene / merenti Gorgono / magistro primo*; compare also Wischmeyer 1982,

alone names six additional elementary teachers[60] and two grammarians.[61] In Phrygia, an epitaph of the late third century refers to an Aurelius Trophimus as σοφίης διδάσκαλος.[62] In North Africa, a tomb attests a Domitus Rufinus for the fourth century,[63] and in Panopolis/Akhmîm, a Theodosius γραμματικός.[64] According to legend, Saint Vitus fled as a seven-year-old, with his nurse Crescentia and her husband, the pedagogue Modestus, from his not-yet-converted family to Sicily.[65] Beyond this, a whole series of names has been handed down to us of pedagogues who were or became Christians, of known or unknown names. These include the North African grammarian Flavius (or Fabius) at the turn of the third to the fourth century, whom Jerome probably[66] designated as a Christian, as our Flauium,[67] but also, of course, Marius Victorinus; the Athenian orator Prohaeresius;[68] and Nebridius, whom Augustine portrays in the context of his Milan conversion

nr. 17, p. 45. According to Kaster 1988, 410 (nr. 224), the word *primo* has been added by a later hand, which must not, of course, speak against the historical correctness of this information; one recognizes this already on the image in Rossi 1966, 257, 310, and Table XLV n. 43.

60 ILCV nrr. 717–23 (Diehl 1970, 135–36).

61 ILCV nrr. 725/726 (Diehl 1970, 136).

62 SEG VI nr. 137.4–5, compare 28–29 (from Altintas/Kurtköy in Phrygia); compare Buckler/Calder/Cox 1927, 53–56; Kaster 1988, 371 (nr. 158).

63 ILS nr. 7762 (Dessau 1974, 823): *Domitio Rufino, magistro liberalium litterarum, homini bono, v(ixit) a(nnis) LXXV*. The inscription comes from Iomnium/Tigzirt and is introduced with the Chi-Rho symbol; compare the commentary in Kaster 1988, 367 (nr. 153) and PLRE I: s. v. Rufinus 16, p. 777.

64 Crum 1902a, nr. 8361, p. 84 = Lefebvre 1907, 325 (cf. XXVII); Kaster 1988, 367 (nr. 153) and PLRE I: s. v. Theodosius 2, p. 902.

65 Compare *Passio Viti, Modesti et Crescentiae* (BHL 8711) in *Acta sanctorum*, Jun. II (1021–1026) 1021.

66 Kaster 1988, 285–86 (nr. 61) is more cautious. Admittedly, Flavius (or according to other manuscripts Flabus/Flavus/Fabus/Fabius) in the author index: *Firmianus, qui et Lactantius, Arnobii discipulus, Diocletiano principe accitus cum Flavio grammatico, cuius "De medicinalibus" versu compositi extant libri, Nicomediae rhetoricam docuit ac penuria discipulorum ob Graecam vindelicet civitatem ad scribendum se contulit* (Jerome, *De viris illustribus* 80.1 [Ceresa-Gastaldo 1988, 186]).

67 Jerome, *Adversus Iovinianum* II 6 (PL 23: 306 B): *legat qui uult Aristotelem et Theophrastum prosa, Marcellum Sidetem, et nostrum Flauium hexametris uersibus disserentes: Plinium quoque secundum, et Dioscoridem, et caeteros tam physicos quam medicos, qui nullam herbam, nullum lapidem, nullum animal tam reptile, quam uolatile, et natatile, non ad suae artis utilitatem referunt*. Kaster 1988, 286, considers whether the *noster* does not perhaps refer to Greek authors and points out that Jerome consciously sets off Flavius as a Latin author from Greek authors. In my view, the uncommented mention in the author index speaks against this view.

68 Eunapius, *Vitae sophistarum* (Boissonade 1849, 493 = Wright 1989, 512): Ἰουλιανοῦ δὲ βασιλεύοντος, τόπου τοῦ παιδεύειν ἐξειργόμενος (ἐδόκει γὰρ εἶναι Χριστιανός) συνορῶν . . . ; compare Bidez 1947, 63–64 (= Bidez 1930) and Ennslin 1957.

as an assistant teacher and with whom he exchanged letters,[69] as well as another Christian assistant teacher in Milan whom Augustine mentions once.[70] When asked about his occupation, the Christian grammarian Victor from North African Cirta, who was interrogated on December 13, 320,[71] in connection with the Donatist schism by the *consularis Numidiae*, Zenophilus, answered, *professor sum Romanarum litterarum, grammaticus Latinus*.[72] Finally, a whole series of former elementary or grammar teachers, orators, and professors became prominent theologians.[73] Anatolius, who held a chair for Aristotelian philosophy in Alexandria, held office as bishop between 270 and 280 in Syrian Laodicea.[74] Malchion was active at about the same time as a Christian clergyman and leader of an Antioch school of rhetoric.[75] And one can mention further Amphilochius of Iconium,[76] Apolinarius of Laodicea,[77] Arnobius,[78] Asterius the Sophist,[79] Cyprian of

[69] Augustine, *Confessiones* VIII 6.13 (Skutella/Jürgens/Skaub 1981, 164.3; *subdoceret* with the commentary in O'Donnell 1992b, 37); for Nebridius, compare also Kaster 1988, 314–15 (nr. 104), and Ensslin 1940; PLRE I: s.v. Nebridius 4, p. 640, and Mandouze 1982, s.v., pp. 744–76.

[70] Compare Augustine, *Sermones* 178.7–8 (PL 38: 964: *plane Christianus*; Kaster 1988, 315, objects with cogent arguments against an identification of this anonymous pedagogue with Nebridius).

[71] J.-L. Maier 1987, 211–14.

[72] *Gesta apud Zenophilum* § 1 (J.-L. Maier 1987, 215.15–16); compare Ensslin 1958, 2058; PLRE I: s. v. 1, p. 957; Kaster 1988, 372.

[73] Compare also Arnobius, *Adversus nationes* II 5 (. . .) *quod tam magnis ingeniis praediti oratores grammatici rhetores consulti iuris ac medici, philosophiae etiam secreta rimantes magisteria exeptunt spretis quibus paulo ante fidebant* (Marchesi 1953, 69.23–70.1).

[74] Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* VII 32.6 (Schwartz 1999, II/2: 718.13–21) and Jerome, *De viris illustribus* 73.1–2 (Ceresa-Gastaldo 1988, 180); compare the fragments in CPG I: 199–200, nr. 1620–24; Harnack 1957c, 75–79; Strobel 1977, 134–37. His ten volumes *ἀριθμητικαὶ εἰσαγωγαί* mentioned in Eusebius were perhaps an introductory book for philosophy students.

[75] Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* VII 29.2 Μαλχίων, ἀνὴρ τά τε ἄλλα λόγιος καὶ σοφιστοῦ τῶν ἐπ' Ἀντιοχείας Ἑλληνικῶν παιδευτηρίων διατριβῆς προεστώς (Schwartz 1999, II/2: 704.11–13) or Jerome, Jerome, *De viris illustribus* 71.1 (Ceresa-Gastaldo 1988, 178).

[76] Holl 1969, 7–9, 17.

[77] Socrates, *Historia ecclesiastica* II 46.2 on father and son Apolinarius: ἀμφότεροι δὲ ἦσαν Ἑλληνικῶν λόγων διδάσκαλοι, καὶ γραμματικῶν μὲν ὁ πατήρ, ῥητορικῶν δὲ ὁ υἱός (Hansen 1995a, 185.5–6); Kaster 1988, 242–43 (nr. 14).

[78] Jerome, *De viris illustribus* 79 *Arnobius sub Diocletiano principe Siccae apud Africam florentissime rhetoricam docuit* (Ceresa-Gastaldo 1988, 186); compare Wlosok 1989, 366.

[79] Socrates, *Historia ecclesiastica* I 36.2 (Hansen 1995a, 86.4–5); it is uncertain whether Asterius gave up his occupation after his conversion (one could understand Socrates in this way) or continued to practice it (one could interpret Athanasius, *De synodis* 20.1

Carthage,[80] Gregory of Nyssa,[81] Optimus of Agdamia/Phrygia,[82] and of course, Augustine.[83] For later times, one can point, for example, to Ausonius and John Philoponus.[84] The young goldsmith Aetius taught and lived with a Christian elementary teacher in Anazarbus.[85] Last of all, as indirect evidence for Christian teachers, one must, of course, also refer to the aforementioned school law of Emperor Julian from 362 (*Codex Theodosianus* XIII 3.5[86]), the vehement counterreaction against these measures by Christian authors such as Gregory of Nazianzus,[87] and finally the Tertullian passages referenced above. The latter were only sensible and not spoken into the wind if there were in fact Christian teachers in Carthage and elsewhere. We are basically dealing with a natural consequence of the rapid spread of Christianity "among the noble and rich, educated and officials."[88] In addition, one must not forget that the various forms of pedagogical occupations in the imperial period were privileged in terms of taxation, sometimes substantially, and for this reason, it is already improbable that all freshly converted Christians immediately left corresponding occupations.[89]

At the end of this section on Christian elementary teachers, we must now ask whether Augustine himself should not present a good example for the immense difficulties of Christians with the occupation of a teacher

---

[Opitz 1935a, 247.3–4] in this way). Kinzig 1988, 31 with n. 12–15, and Vinzent 1993, 21 n. 6, gather the more recent literature on the question, but both leave the question open.

[80] Cyprian was an educated (*Vita Cypriani* 2.1 [Hartel 1971, XCI.19–20]) teacher of rhetoric (Jerome, *De viris illustribus* 67.1 [Ceresa-Gastaldo 1988, 170–72]); compare Bévenot 1993, 246; Kaster 1988, 73.

[81] Compare Dörrie 1983, 866.

[82] PLRE I: s.v., p. 650; Libanius, *Epistulae* 1544 (Foerster/Richsteig 1903–1927, XI: 561.19–562.20) and Socrates, *Historia ecclesiastica* VII 36.20 (Hansen 1995a, 386.6–7); compare Sievers 1969 [1868], 291.

[83] Compare the information in the prosopographic catalogue in Kaster 1988, 246–47 (nr. 20) and naturally Marrou 1981, esp. 49–73. In his history of mission, Harnack 1981 mentions in addition the "author of the song *Laudes Domini*," thus the author of the oldest datable Christian-Latin poem (CPL 1386; cf. Herzog 1989), and suggests that he was presumably a rhetorician.

[84] Compare the discussion in Kaster 1988, 334–38 (nr. 118).

[85] Philostorgius, *Historia ecclesiastica* III 15 (Bidez/Winkelmann 1972, 45.15–17): Γραμματικοῦ δέ τινος τὴν φύσιν αὐτοῦ ἀγαμένου καὶ μεταδοῦναι τῆς τέχνης ὡρμημένου, ὁ Ἀέτιος παρ᾽ αὐτὸν εἰσοικισθεὶς ἐθήτευεν, τὰς οἰκετικὰς αὐτῷ τελῶν λειτουργίας; compare also Kaster 1988, 5–6, and his prosopographic catalogue 376 (nr. 167).

[86] Compare the discussion in section 2.1.1.1; Marrou 1981, 589–91; Hardy 1968; 1978; Schlange-Schönigen 1995, 140–45.

[87] Compare, for example, Gregory of Nazianzus, *Orationes* 4.100–108 (Bernardi 1984, 248.1–262.19).

[88] Harnack 1981, 559–68.

[89] Details in Harris 1989, 235–36.

and warn us against prematurely leveling out the oppositions (especially when the example does not concern the elementary instruction). As is well known, after Augustine had experienced his conversion in August of 386, he first gave up[90] his position of municipal professor of rhetoric in Milan at the beginning of the vacation that followed three weeks later, and he feared criticism in relation to this delay: "Perhaps many . . . of my brothers will say I acted in a sinful way in that I, having already attached myself to your service from the heart, allowed myself to sit for even one hour on the chair of lies and deception."[91] But this fear concerns, as the tense of the Latin text makes clear, the readers of the confessions, who take note of how Bishop Augustine once behaved more than ten years after the described events. During the Milan days, the municipal rhetorician appears to have been more afraid, as he himself reported shortly before, that one could think such an immediate notice "so shortly before the beginning of the vacation" took place only "in order to make me appear important."[92] The Christian ethic did not require immediate resignation from Augustine but rather patience. In addition, one can ask whether he gave up his office because of the conversion alone or whether he instead gave it up because of the ascetic form of Christianity to which he was converted. Moreover, Augustine corresponded shortly after his conversion with the aforementioned assistant teacher Nebridius—as was fitting for a teacher of grammar—not only about theological problems but also over a grammatical problem of detail.[93] One could naturally also point to the fact that father and son Apolinarius were disciplined (but probably not excommunicated) prior to 335 by their local bishop Theodotus or his successor George before the assembled community because they had heard, in the framework of their instruction by the Sophist Epiphanius[94] there, his aforementioned recitation of a Dionysus hymn.[95] But Hans Lietzmann

[90] Augustine, *Confessiones* IX 2.3 (Skutella/Jürgens/Schaub 1981, 181.21–182.3); for the chronology, compare A. Schindler 1993a, 650: his conversion "took place ca. August 1, 386 (three weeks before the Fall vacation according to IX 2.4; its duration was from August 23 to October 15 according to *Codex Theodosianus* II 8.19)."

[91] Augustine, *Confessiones* IX 2.4 *pecasse me in hoc quisquam servorum tuorum, fratrum meorum, dixerit, quod iam pleno corde militia tua passus me fuerim vel una hora sedere in cathedra mendacii* (182.21–25).

[92] Augustine, *Confessiones* IX 2.3 (. . .) *quam vicinum vindemialium diem praevenire voluerim, multa dicerent, quod quasi appetissem magnus videri* (181.28–182.1).

[93] Augustine, *Epistulae* 3.5 (Goldbacher 1895, 9.7): "You may decide whether it reads *cupi* or *cupiri* here."

[94] Compare section 2.1.1.2 with n. 40.

[95] Socrates, *Historia ecclesiastica* II 46.2–6 (Hansen 1995a, 185.5–15; Socrates mentions criticism by Theodotus and his excommunication by George: ἄμφω ἀκοινωνησίᾳ ἐζημίωσεν [p. 185.15]), and Sozomen, *Historia ecclesiastica* VI 25.10–12 (Bidez/Hansen

already succinctly located the true reason for this disciplinary action not in the problem of the specific pagan instructional material: “[t]his disciplinary action, however, scarcely arose solely from the episcopal concern for the salvation of the community that was endangered by Epiphanius, but it was basically directed against the church-political position of the condemned.”[96]

Let me conclude this first section on the relationship of the Christians to the instructional material and institutions of the elementary education with a concise summary.

2.1.1.4 Christians and Elementary Education in Antiquity

Thus an abundance of reports from various different genres shows us that many Christians regarded neither the attendance of the elementary instruction and the levels of instruction that were built upon it nor the activity of their fellow Christians in corresponding pedagogical occupations as problematic. When Henri Irénée Marrou writes, “Christianity tolerated the classical school,”[97] this is formulated at least a bit more strictly than the ancient Christians saw things. It admittedly remains striking that a missionary religion such as Christianity, according to all that we know, did not at all use the institutional possibilities of the elementary education for the passing down of a new idea (although there were certainly examples in Judaism for such a form of elementary education on the basis of the Holy Scriptures) and apparently accepted with relative calm the

1960, 271.20–272.7; Sozomen portrays the presentation of the hymn by Epiphanius, the reaction of the hearers, the excommunication by Theodotus, the readmittance after public church penance, and the renewed excommunication by George, admittedly for other reasons); on the interpretation, compare Mühlenberg 1993, 362; Lietzmann 1970, 1–2; Speck 1997, 362–69. According to Lietzmann 1970, 1–2, both Socrates and Sozomen go back in these points to the life description that the Apolinarius student Timothy of Berytus devoted to his teacher.

[96] Lietzmann 1970, 2. One could, of course, ask whether Lietzmann does not somewhat downplay the historical value of the narrative at this point; after all, it would not have been possible to detect the connections hypothesized by Lietzmann from the narrative of Timothy itself with its friendly stance toward Apolinarius; in fact, Sozomen hands down as well that the reason for the alleged excommunication by George was Apolonarius’ relations to Athanasius: ἡ πρὸς Ἀθανάσιον συνουσία (Sozomen, *Historia ecclesiastica* VI 25.12 [Bidez/Hansen 1960, 272.4]).

[97] Marrou 1977, 585. For a more adequate statement, compare Fontaine 1982, 17: “It cannot be stressed enough that there was only one school from the early to the late imperial period. The short break caused by Julian was only a passing exception that proves the rule. A Christian school first crops up in the sixth century and then it was indeed Christian as an institution but less so in the teaching program.”

pagan-religious characteristics of the instruction, which stood in strict opposition to a propagation of the Christian message.

But how are these findings, which we have made clear with reference to an abundance of examples, to be explained? At first, one could naturally ask again whether the pagan-religious character of the elementary education was actually perceived as intensively by Christians and non-Christians as we have tacitly presupposed here or whether the instructional material and texts, irrespective of all religious connotations, were not experienced instead as faded mythical narratives.[98] In such a case, it would not, of course, be surprising that Christians not only experienced it as their pagan environment did but also did not stumble over the religious contents of the instruction, let alone feel a need to replace them. To be sure, this possibility cannot be completely excluded, since almost all sources for such statements about the "mental housekeeping" of teachers and students in antiquity are lacking. In my view, however, this explanatory attempt falls short of the mark. First, as we have seen, it follows, at least implicitly, an older concept that emphasizes the ritual and formal characteristics of religion in the imperial period at the expense of lived piety.[99] Second, it ignores the fact that the names of gods that often turn up in the instruction were also frequently used by pagan students and teachers outside of the instruction to designate wielders of religious power. For me, at least, it seems very difficult to imagine that in school contexts, these people completely abstracted from the experiences of religious power that were otherwise connected with the corresponding names. But in this case, it must be explained why Christians put up so little resistance against the defining pagan-religious character of the elementary education.

But presumably the expectation, which we presuppose time and again, that Christians would have had to meet the pagan character of the elementary instruction with proper resistance presupposes too high of a degree of Christianization among the adherents of the new religion. If one brings to mind, for example, the extremely conspicuous observation of how Christians in pre-Constantinian times bore the names of pagan gods and how seldom they were called by the names of biblical figures or famous Christian martyrs but instead were given names such as Apollonius, Dionysus, Hippolytus, Serapion, or Origen,[100] then irrespective of all the problems of

[98] It was above all this question that was asked when this text was discussed in Bochum and Erfurt in early summer or late autumn 1998; I use here formulations of Angelika Geyer, my colleague from Jena.

[99] Kaufmann-Bühler 1966, 987–99, 1003–4.

[100] Markschies 2001b, 69–70 (cf. 1999a, 55–56).

such an observation,[101] it quickly becomes clear that one should probably harbor no illusions about the individual degree of Christianization of Christians even in pre-Constantinian times. Under these circumstances, one will have to imagine only the smallest number of elementary students as passionate religious fanatics, and one must not only say with Harnack that "the martyrs died because they refused to offer sacrifice to the gods whose names they bore"[102] but also say that they died because they refused to offer sacrifice to the gods whose names they had written hundreds of times on their tablets in the school. We only very rarely hear of a religiously motivated conflict in a school. Thus it is reported for the first time by Prudentius at the beginning of the fifth century that the students of the Christian *magister litterarum* Cassianus from *Forum Cornelii* / Imola killed him with their styluses, presumably in connection with the Diocletian persecution of Christians[103] (and when one attempts to imagine this death, one doubts the historicity of the report). As we have already said,[104] the report that an elementary teacher named Babylas was also killed in Nicomedia at about the same time along with eighty-four of his ninety-two students comes from a late legend (BHG 2053) whose historical core can scarcely still be reconstructed beyond doubt.

Alongside the reference to the degree of Christianization of "normal" Christians in pre-Constantinian times, which was certainly rather slight in part, one can perhaps also draw on a general consideration about language and language formation to explain the findings about the stance of these very Christians toward elementary education described above: as is well known, the ancient elementary education especially consisted of language instruction. Since, however, a language cannot be exchanged in a moment, one may assume that Christians unconsciously used a whole

[101] In view of today's praxis in which non-Christians choose Christian names and, conversely, Christians choose non-Christian names, one can, for example, ask whether the choice of certain pagan names actually allows more far-reaching conclusions about the degree of Christianization of an ancient person.

[102] Harnack 1981, 437.

[103] Compare Prudentius, *Peristephanon liber* 9.13–16 (= BHL 1625) *Innumeri circum pueri (miserabile uisu) / confossa paruis membra figebant stilis / unde pugillares soliti percurrere ceras / scholare murmur adnotantes scripserant* and 9.21–24 *Praefuerat studiis puerilibus et grege multo / saeptus magister litterarum sederat, / uerba notis breuibus comprendere cuncta peritus / raptimque punctis dicta praepetibus sequi* (Lavarenne 1951, 112–13); compare the commentary in Lavarenne 1951, 109–11; Kaster 1988, 252–53 (nr. 26); Palmer 1989, 242–43. In the *Legenda Aurea*, the same fate is assigned to a *Felix in pincis* (Benz 1969, 119–21; Kaster 1988, 406 [nr. 216]). Palmer 1989, 242, refers to a possible pagan model in Livy, *Ab urbe condita* V 27, which is exemplary at least stylistically (cf. also Lanzoni 1925).

[104] Compare section 2.1.1.2 with n. 32.

series of figures of speech stamped in a pagan-religious manner and did not react in an especially sensitive manner to their use by others, either. Perhaps it was already for this reason that they did not take greater offence from the corresponding figures of speech of the elementary instruction.

As a final point, we have spoken of the naturalness with which Christians gave and visited the elementary instruction even in the pre-Constantinian period. Here, of course, one also must not overstress anything and stylize the Christian church as a kind of ancient *Volkshochschulbewegung* (adult education movement) whose members all had or believed they had a higher level of education. This did not apply even to the upper echelons of the hierarchy: the apostolic church orders and the aforementioned Syriac *Didascalia apostolorum* still reckon in the third century[105] with the fact that bishops could be illiterate, which is also perhaps not a completely surprising assumption in view of an illiteracy rate of about 60 to 80 percent of the population of the empire.[106] Time and again, we find examples that suggest that the hypothesis that even many bishops had not attended an elementary school was accurate far into the post-Constantinian period: the bishop of Gadara in East Jordan, a city with such prominent sons as the second-century Cynic Oenomaus[107] and where one could certainly receive every form of elementary instruction, visited the great councils in the middle of the fifth century and could not even write his name in the list of signatures.[108] And Gregory of Nyssa reported in a letter that once fullers, stable boys, and goat herders were chosen to be bishops and leaders of communities.[109] Education was a question

[105] Thus at least Marrou 1977, 600, and Schubert 1923, 95–99.

[106] Brown 1993, 26–27; 1992, 37 (= 1995, 53); Duncan-Jones 1977; Seeliger 2003; and the literature mentioned in n. 14.

[107] Hammerstaedt 1988, 11–19.

[108] The archdeacon Aitherius signed the acts of the council of Ephesus (431 CE) for the bishop Theodoros (ACO I 1.7, p. 117 n. 184): Θεόδωρος ἐπίσκοπος Γαδάρων ὑπέγραψα χερὶ Αἰθερίου ἀρχιδιακόνου γραμμάτου ὄντος; similarly, ACO I 2, p. 74 n. 181, in Latin *Theodorus episcopus Gadaron subscripsi manu Aetherii archidiaconi*. But in the entire subscription list ACO I 1.7, this formula only crops up additionally in one (!) signature: p. 114 n. 94; but compare also ACO I 1.2, p. 63 n. 190: Θεόδωρος ἐπίσκοπος Γαδάρων ὑπέγραψα καὶ συναπεφηνάμην τῆι ἁγίαι συνόδωι. Αἰθέριος ἀρχιδιάκονος ὑπέγραψα ἐπιτραπεὶς παρ’ αὐτοῦ (for the other attestations in the prosopographic index, see ACO IV 2, s.v., p. 458). One could sharpen the observation further: also twenty years later, in Chalcedon, the bishop had still not learned to sign for himself: *Theodorus episcopus Gadarensis per alterius manum, id est Etherii archidiaconi subscripsi* (Actio I, ACO II 3.1, p. 234 n. 184). In light of the famous examples of the educational level of the city (attestations in Hengel/Markschies 1989, 20 with n. 101–9 on pp. 75–76—though often of persons who never saw Gadara and were only born there!), we are dealing with a quite notable constant in a turbulent time. For an in-depth presentation of the educational level of the city and additional attestations, see Markschies 2001b, 182 with n. 466 (cf. 1999a, 159).

[109] Gregory of Nyssa, *Epistulae* 17.11–16 (Pasquali 1959, 54.1–55.10).

not only of individual prestige but also of position and power; it was open only to a minority of the empire's population. Therefore, one may not simply regard this educated minority in the empire as identical with the higher Christian hierarchy.[110] In his Aachen dissertation on the Roman school education in North Africa, the ancient historian Konrad Vössing could show for the second century that while every *puer honestus* was obligated to attend a public school in North Africa, one hears "nothing of private instruction or of teachers on the *uillae suburbanae*."[111] Gymnasia existed only in cities;[112] the reception into the status of ephebes was properly celebrated, of course.[113] Accordingly, most of the preserved reports and witnesses concern urban and not rural education. Against this background, one will probably have to interpret the famous instructional scene on the so-called *Schulreliefpfeiler* (school relief pillar) of Neumagen (in the Bernkastel-Wittlich district; second century CE at the latest), which is kept in the Rheinland Museum in Trier,[114] as a snapshot from a city. It shows a grammar teacher,[115] who can be recognized as a Greek by his well-shaped beard, sitting between two Roman disciples, who look at their teacher in a not very enthusiastic manner.

Thus, as we have especially seen in the example of the elementary instruction, many Christians, though far from all, not only attended ancient educational institutions but also worked in them. But what "educational canon" did they encounter in these institutions, and how did they deal with it? We will devote section 2.1.2 to this question.

2.1.2 The Significance of the Pagan Educational Canon for Christians and Their Educational Institutions

We will now expand the perspective and ask about the "higher" educational institutions that followed the elementary education. But not least for reasons of space, we will change the point of view and now ask less about individual institutions and the participation of Christians in their programs of education and focus more on the programs of education themselves

[110] For other important differences between city and land with Palestine serving as an example, see Markschies 1997.

[111] Vössing 1997, 104.

[112] Krüger 1990, 158–61; Bagnall 1993, 100–102; Ort 1983.

[113] Compare, for example, P.Oxy. 926 (VI, 291–92; text on p. 292): καλεῖ σε Ἡραθέων| δειπνῆσαι εἰς τὴν ἐπί|κρισιν αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ οἰ|κίᾳ αὐτ[ο]ῦ αὔριον ἥτις| ἐστὶν ε ἀπὸ ὥρ(ας) [θ.] / "Heratheon invites you to dine on the occasion of the celebration of his examination in his house, tomorrow, the fifth, from the ninth hour."

[114] Inventory number 9921 (NM 180): R. Schindler 1970, 49 with image 141; Binsfeld in Cüppers 1983, 264–65. Additional archaeological discoveries in Vössing 1997, 49–55.

[115] Christes 1979.

(section 2.1.2.1) and the creative interaction of the Christians with the ancient educational canon (section 2.1.2.2).

2.1.2.1 The Pagan Educational Canon

Today it does not create much difficulty to indicate what the educational canon of an educational institution consists of and what texts and learning goals it contains—as a rule, something like this is laid down precisely and normed in teaching plans. As is well known, however, this is much more difficult for imperial antiquity. Whether and how school education, *artes liberales*, and ἐγκύκλιος παιδεία hang together has been controversial ever since the investigations of Ilsetraut Hadot.[116] Hadot showed that the "encyclical education," ἐγκύκλιος παιδεία,[117] did not represent the basis or the content of the general instruction of young people but rather a canon, formed in certain philosophical schools, of scholarly studies based on rational reflection and methods. It is certain that the Jewish-Hellenistic intellectual Philo of Alexandria in the first century CE already considered the canon of such a comprehensive encyclical education to include "grammar, geometry, astronomy, rhetoric, music, and all the remaining branches of rational knowledge," whose symbol is Hagar, the maidservant of Sarah, in the framework of his allegorical interpretation of Genesis.[118] But encyclical education leads to Ἀρετή.[119] Philo's view can be compared with that of his contemporary Seneca and represents a position in a contemporary debate about the educational canon of a society.[120] In what follows, Philo resolves the problem of the pagan character of this same education in a rather elegant manner by interpreting the stories of the gods—even though in a cautious manner—as deterring examples: "The grammar explains the presentations of the poets and prose writers, sharpens insight and rich

[116] I. Hadot 1984, esp. 263–93; 1989. The position is summarized more concisely in I. Hadot 1997.

[117] But compare Seneca, *Epistulae* 88.23 *artes, quas* ἐγκυκλίους *Graeci, nostri autem liberales vocant* (Préchac/Rosenbach 1969–1989, IV: 310); see Fuchs 1962, 365; Marrou 1981, 183–97 (with tables of the diverse lists of *artes liberales* on pp. 188–89); Flaig 2002, 126–28.

[118] Philo, *De congressu eruditionis gratia* 11: εἰκότως οὖν οὐ βραχέσι χρήσεται προοιμίοις, ἀλλὰ γραμματικῇ, γεωμετρίᾳ, ἀστρονομιᾳ, ῥητορικῇ, μουσικῇ, τῇ ἄλλῃ λογικῇ θεωρίᾳ πάσῃ, ὧν ἐστι σύμβολον ἡ Σάρας θεραπαινὶς Ἄγαρ, ὡς ἐπιδείξομεν (Cohn/Wendland 1962 III: 74.11–14); compare Fuchs 1962, 389–90.

[119] Philo, *De congressu eruditionis gratia* 10: (. . .) οὕτως καὶ ἀρετῆς πρόκειται τὰ ἐγκύκλια· ταῦτα γὰρ ὁδὸς ἐστιν ἐπ' ἐκείνην φέρουσα (Cohn/Wendland 1962 III: 74.6–8).

[120] Seneca, *Epistulae* 88.32 (Préchac/Rosenbach 1969–1989, IV: 316) and Vössing 1997, 39 n. 100. For Seneca, the encyclical education is admittedly a *possible* preliminary stage for philosophy, and only philosophy leads to virtue.

knowledge, and on the basis of the evil deeds that are reported concerning the heroes and demigods sung about there, teaches contempt for everything that deludes the noble thoughts."[121] The statements of Philo show that the Christian stance toward pagan education naturally has a Jewish prehistory (or a Jewish counterpart), but we cannot present that here.[122]

Alongside the comprehensive encyclical education stood, according to Hadot, the much smaller educational program of the instruction—namely, grammar and rhetoric and, for a minority of those who enjoyed such an education, the study of philosophy as well.[123] Admittedly, Konrad Vössing, in his aforementioned investigation on the Roman school education in North Africa, already showed a number of years ago that the notion of a radical separation between a simple school education program and a complete canon of encyclical education is suggested somewhat too rigidly in Hadot: "The idea of a coherent and, so to speak, self-sufficient education program that could be fixed in various disciplines developed—immediately after its emergence and despite its origin from a single philosophical school of thought—a great, general power of attraction, even in the definition of a school program that was obligatory for all."[124] Vössing shows that in the imperial period, school instruction and education became increasingly identical in more than terminology alone, and thus a portion of the distinctive impact of education in relation to social climbers fell away.[125]

Naturally, one can immediately ask in our context whether the popularization of the philosophical educational canon over the school educational canon did not lead to the fact that Christians—a group that was not originally oriented toward the standards of contemporary philosophy—offered hardly any resistance to this educational canon but, rather, as we have seen, taught and learned the philosophical educational canon relatively as a matter of course because most of them had long since accepted the school educational canon as a given.

[121] Philo, *De congressu eruditionis gratia* 15: γραμματικὴ μὲν γὰρ ἱστορίαν τὴν παρὰ ποηταῖς καὶ συγγραφεῦσιν ἀναδιδάξασα νόησιν καὶ πολυμάθειαν ἐργάσεται καὶ καταφρονητικῶς ἔχειν ἀναδιδάξει τῶν ὅσα αἱ κεναὶ δόξαι τυφοπλαστοῦσι, διὰ τὰς κακοπραγίας, αἷς τοὺς ᾀδομένους παρ' αὐτοῖς ἥρωάς τε καὶ ἡμιθέους λόγος ἔχει χρήσασθαι (Cohn/Wendland 1962 III: 75.4–8).

[122] Compare Bousset 1975, esp. 72–73, 83–93, and 98–110; Droge 1989; Siegert 1992, 64–75.

[123] Compare the references in Malherbe 1979, 194–221 (for the New Testament authors); Veyne 1989, 31–32 (= Veyne 1985); Vössing 1997, 574–85; Vogt 1973; 1983, 17–27; the characterization of the teaching as "upper-strata phenomenon" is not meant to call into question the occasional witnesses for the visiting of elementary education by slaves or members of the lower strata.

[124] Vössing 1997, 32. Compare now also Cribiore 1996.

[125] Vössing 1997, 40–42; for attestations from church fathers' texts, see p. 42 n. 107/108.

It is generally known and need be mentioned only briefly in our context that Homer constituted the center of the pagan school educational canon and thus the center of instruction,[126] although with this—at least in the opinion of Pliny the Younger—"the most difficult" stood "at the beginning."[127] In the Latin sphere, the Latin Odyssey of Livius Andronicus, Terence, Horace, and a few other authors were also read; in the Greek sphere, Menander was read alongside Homer.[128] At this point, one could present in detail the effects of this school educational canon on Christians and especially Christian authors. It is not, of course, directly in our interest to present new insights on the old topic of "the attitude of the early Christian authors toward pagan literature."[129] Moreover, a renewed survey under the heading "the early Christians and the Greek education"[130] is likewise unnecessary for our line of questioning. Finally, we do not need to recompile statements that critically engage with the value of the pagan education here, either.[131] In our context, it is much more interesting that—regardless of all critical statements—this school educational canon connected the educated Christians rather closely with their non-Christian fellow citizens: while they did not attend the same cult, they had gone to the same school.[132] Naturally, the Christian confession separated Christians from their pagan environment in the pre-Constantine period, but one must make clear at the same time that the παιδεία and the school educational canon bound up with it simultaneously distanced Christians *and* pagans from their uneducated contemporaries and equalized them within a certain leading stratum.[133]

[126] Marquardt 1975, 105.

[127] Pliny the Younger, *Epistulae* II 14.2 (Kasten 1982, 102): *in foro pueros a centumviralibus causis auspicari, ut ab Homero in scholis, nam hic quoque ut illic primum coepit esse, quod maximum est*.

[128] Attestations in Marquardt 1975, 106 n. 3–7; compare also Vössing 1997, 367–75 with n. 1268–77 on pp. 368–71; Freund 2000, 14–19 (cf. esp. the reference to a small board, found in the military base Vindolanda/Scotland, with Virgil, *Aeneid* IX 473 as a writing exercise on p. 16 n. 3); Marrou 1981, 15 n. 67 and 96 n. 27.

[129] Ellspermann 1949; Fuchs 1954, 353–59; Krause 1958; Chadwick 1990; Marrou 1981, 93–109.

[130] Jaeger 1963; 1961; Ruhbach 1974; Wifstrand 1967. For older literature, see Fuchs 1954, 359–62.

[131] Marrou 1977, 583–85; 1981, 330–33; Stockmeier 1967, 447; Fuchs 1962, 391.

[132] Siegert 1993, 170, says somewhat exaggeratedly that "the most polemical stance of early Christian authors to Hellenistic culture" hides the fact "that there was a century-long ecumenism of religious dialogue and exchange; one of the most important '*Sitze im Leben*' (settings in life) was the completely super-confessional literature instruction." Conversely, in his foundational article "Homer," Bartelink 1994, 145, speaks too nonspecifically of a "neutral ancient educational stock."

[133] Brown 1992, 38–40 (= 1995, 54–56); Kaster 1988, 23–30.

For this reason, individual Christian apologists also made use of this store of commonalities between Christians and non-Christians in their arguments for Christianity. Some time ago, Barbara Aland convincingly showed that in the citations and allusions in his *Octavius*, Minucius Felix "restricted himself to certain authors, although others could also have been suggested with a view to the subject matter"—namely, to the school authors.[134] Thus one may designate his work as an attempt to interpret the school educational canon that was common to pagans and Christians in a very specific way that was not initially able to gain a consensus but that he attempted to portray as capable of doing so. It seems to me that one could also make these observations in relation to a whole series of other apologists.

Here too the question arises of whether the Christians, in the same way as they used and cocarried the pagan elementary education as a matter of course, actually took over the pagan educational canon as well, both in the form of the abbreviated school educational canon and in the simplified philosophical educational canon.

2.1.2.2 The Christian Educational Canon

There were attempts by Christians to establish their *own* educational canon and to have it appear as a supplement or as competition to the pagan educational canon.[135] Such attempts at establishing an education canon *of their own* took place on very different levels: the Syriac *Didascalia*, a church order that perhaps comes from the third century, warns against the reading of any pagan literature and establishes, in this connection, its own Christian educational canon with tight lines: "If you want to read accounts of history, then you have the book of Kings, but if wise men and philosophers, then you have the Prophets. . . . If you desire hymns, then you have the Psalms of David, and if something about the emergence of the world, then you have the great Moses' Genesis, and if laws and regulations, then you have the outstanding law[136] of the Lord."[137] Thus it was

[134] B. Aland 1983, 18 n. 45; compare also Ellspermann 1949, 14–22.

[135] These attempts must be distinguished once again from what Albert Wifstrand discussed in his five Uppsala lectures from 1951 under the heading of "Christian Influence on Pagan Education" (Wifstrand 1967, 88–105).

[136] Thus the Latin fragment, *aut si leges et praecepta, habes gloriosam domini legem* (Connolly 1929, 13.11–12); the Syriac text is different: "Thus you have the law, the book of the †exodus of God the Lord" (Achelis/Flemming 1904, 5).

[137] *Didascalia* 2, translation according to the Syriac text (cf. Achelis/Flemming 1904, 5.25–33). In the Latin text of the Veronese fragments, it reads, *Si uis storias †legere, discurre, et †habes Regnorum; si autem sofistica et poetica, habes Profetas (. . .). Si uero canticorum desideras, habes Psalmos; si autem initium Generationis mundi, habes Genesim; aut si leges et praecepta, habes gloriosam domini legem* (Connolly 1929, 13.5–12).

regarded as inappropriate in these circles not only for a Christian to teach pagan literature but also for him to read it. In Western church orders, there are corresponding prohibitions, at least for the bishops.[138] To this extent, it appears consistent and long anticipated—and not only a consequence of the school law of Emperor Julian, which I have already mentioned several times now—that Apolinarius of Laodicea, an evidently well-educated grammarian in the fourth century, made available (or at least tried to make available) the relevant texts for such a new Christian educational canon: the history of Israel up to Saul retold in twenty-four books according to the Homeric model; comedies written in the style of Menander; tragedies according to the model of Euripides; and lyric poetry in the style of Pindar, the contents of which were completely taken from the Bible.[139] It was certainly not a matter here of a "bizarre and tasteless experiment" (so Clarke[140]); rather, Apolinarius followed a tendency to make Christian education autonomous, which was more widespread and ancient among Christian educators than the vehemently contested legal action of the apostate emperor. Such a viewpoint is supported by the fact that his father, Apolinarius the Elder, who initially worked as a grammarian in Berytus and then in Syrian Laodicea as well, is said to have composed a "Christian grammar"—and there is no reason not to assume with H. Lietzmann that here the examples were exclusively taken from Christian authors.[141]

[138] *Statuta ecclesiae antiqua* 5 (= 16; Munier 1963, 167.12–13: *Vt episcopus gentilium libros non legat, haereticorum autem pro necessitate et tempore*); Marrou 1977, 584–85; Kaster 1988, 73.

[139] Thus at least Sozomen, *Historia ecclesiastica* V 18.3–4 (Bidez/Hansen 1960, 222.10–17); diverging in details Socrates, *Historia ecclesiastica* III 16.1–5 (Hansen 1995a, 210.5–19); compare Lietzmann 1970, 150–51; Speck 1997, 365; 1986. Speck points out that it is reported only in Socrates that the younger Apolinarius brought the New Testament into dialogue form as well (16.5 [210.16–19]), whereas in Sozomen, who writes slightly later, this information is lacking, and the reworkings of the Old Testament material that Socrates ascribes to the father is ascribed here to the son. Since the father of Socrates is designated as γραμματικός but the son as σοφιστής (16.2 [210.8–9]; Speck 1997, 365), in essence already a program of education is said to be represented by this small family. Whether one should then conclude from such and other observations that the information about the works of the Apolinarii are legends as well (at least the information about the work of the son) is another discussion in and of itself. Speck concludes, "That these works ever existed is more doubtful than ever" (369). I would, however, not go so far in my judgment; rather, it scarcely appears surprising to me that no writings of the "heretic" Apolinarius and his father were accessible to the two authors Socrates and Sozomen in the forties of the fifth century, and therefore, when they took over information about their works from source writings, they proceeded in a not very precise and contradictory manner in relation to each other. The passage has been recently discussed by Nesselrath 1999, 84–88.

[140] "To us this may seem a bizarre and tasteless experiment" (M. L Clarke 1971).

[141] Socrates, *Historia ecclesiastica* III 16.3: γραμματικὴν Χριστιανικῷ τύπῳ συνέταττε (Hansen 1995a, 210.11); compare Lietzmann 1970, 150.

In principle, one must also mention the Christian reworkings of profane Greek texts, which admittedly first took place from the fourth century onward. Consider, for example, two reworkings of the Ἐγχειρίδιον of the teachings of Epictetus from monastic circles: In the handbook of Pseudo-Nilus (CPG III: 6075 = PG 79: 1285–1312), which is difficult to date, the gods are "traced back to the singular; Socrates is soon left out, and soon replaced by 'the philosophers' or St. Paul."[142] The Ἐγχειρίδιον is "Christianized" much more resolutely by a work that is often designated as a "Christian paraphrase." This happens, for example, through the insertion of texts from the Bible and by replacing the philosopher with an anchorite. "The entire monastic life simmers through this reshaping."[143] And in the *Ars Grammatica* of Flavius Sosipater Charisius, which can be dated to the middle of the fourth century,[144] there suddenly appears, in the midst of all sorts of pagan examples for which terms draw certain *casus* to themselves, the lemmata *Adam* and *Abraham*, which are said to be *monoptoton*—that is, nouns that only have one case form. Adam is additionally identified with the Greek word ὁ πρωτόπλαστος.[145] According to the index, these are the only names of Jewish-Christian tradition in the whole work.

Another attempt to establish an *independent* Christian educational canon was undertaken in the thirties of the third century by Origen, who was educated in Alexandria, through the establishment of a "school" in Palestinian Caesarea Maritima.[146] At a later point, we will deal more fully with the institutional form and history of the first Christian "private university" (see section 2.1.32). The *teaching program* of this institution is described by two roughly contemporaneous authors—namely, *o*n the one hand, Gregory Thaumaturgus, a personal student of Origen in his *Address of Thanksgiving to Origen* (*Oratio panegyrica*), and, on the other hand, the learned Palestinian bishop Eusebius of Caesarea in the sixth book of his *Ecclesiastical History* (*Historia ecclesiastica*), which is dedicated to Origen. We do not need to deal here with the controversial questions of whether Eusebius is completely dependent on Gregory and whether Gregory is actually the author of the tractate that is usually ascribed to him.[147]

[142] Spanneut 1962, 664.

[143] Compare *Enchiridion* 22 with the paraphrase § 29.1 (Schweighäuser 1977, 44): Εἰ φιλοσοφίας ἐπιθυμεῖς . . . or Εἰ τῆς ἐναρέτου πολιτείας ἐπιθυμεῖς . . . and Spanneut 1962, 666.

[144] Goetz 1899 or Gatti 1997.

[145] *Ars Grammatica* I 17 (Barwick/Kühnert 1964, 151.15–17): *Adam* ὁ πρωτόπλαστος *monoptoton est, proin Latinae ut et Graece. Abraham adaeque monoptoton esse censeto*.

[146] Crouzel 1979; Knauber 1968; Thümmel 1984.

[147] Nautin 1979, 81–86, argues against this view, and Crouzel 1983, 782–85, has, in turn, attempted to refute the position of Nautin. Richard Klein has supported Crouzel's

Instead, we are interested in the program of education that is described by both authors, which most likely describes the content of the instruction of Origen at the Christian private university in the provincial capital of Caesarea/Palestina.[148] According to Gregory, this program of education (7.93–15.183) encompassed dialectic (7.93–7.108), arithmetic, geometry, astronomy (8.109–8.114), ethics (9.115–12.149), and theology (13.150–15.183); according to Eusebius, Origen introduced people whom he regarded as gifted "into the philosophical subjects by giving them instruction in geometry, arithmetic, and the other foundational scholarships, and by making them familiar with the various systems of the philosophers, whose writings he explained, commented on and criticized in specifics."[149] It was already demonstrated some time ago that this program of education follows the Stoic division of philosophy into logic, ethics, and physics, to which Philo is already indebted.[150] In his letter to Gregory, Origen boldly designates these objects of knowledge as "general knowledge" or as "preparatory instruction for Christian teaching" and thereby already documents the Christian usurpation of the pagan educational canon in his terminology: from the ἐγκύκλιος παιδεία, the general knowledge, arises the ἐγκύκλια μαθήματα ἢ προπαιδεύματα εἰς Χριστιανισμόν.[151]

At this point, what was already intimated now becomes entirely clear: the attempt by educated Christians such as Origen and Apolinarius to develop a Christian educational canon of their own also leads back, at the core, to the adoption of the pagan educational canon that can also be observed among the remaining Christians who are less well known. With all his grammatical education and rhetorical art, Apolinarius writes

argumentation in his in-depth introduction to the edition of the *Oratio panegyrica* in the "Fontes Christiani" (Guyot/Klein 1996), which also summarizes the discussion between Nautin and Crouzel and responds to the attempt to support Nautin's view argumentatively by Simonettis 1988. See also Trigg 2001.

[148] In this point, I follow Nautin 1979, 51–53; Eusebius assigns his report to the preceding activity of Origen in Alexandria.

[149] Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* VI 18.3: εἰσῆγέν τε γὰρ ὅσους εὐφυῶς ἔχοντας ἑώρα, καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ φιλόσοφα (a number of manuscripts have: φιλόλογα) μαθήματα, γεωμετρίαν καὶ ἀριθμητικὴν καὶ τἄλλα προπαιδεύματα παραδιδοὺς εἴς τε τὰς αἱρέσεις τὰς παρὰ τοῖς φιλοσόφοις προάγων καὶ τὰ παρὰ τούτοις συγγράμματα διηγούμενος ὑπομνηματιζόμενός τε καὶ θεωρῶν εἰς ἕκαστα (Schwartz 1999, II/2: 556.17–20). According to Nautin 1979, 51, this passage is based on Origen, *Epistula ad Gregorium Thaumaturgum* 1 (cited in n. 151 below), but he can refer only to parallel vocabulary that are suggested in any case in these connections.

[150] Brinkmann 1901; Habets 1983, 58–66 and 102–8; Klein 1996, 85–87.

[151] Origen, *Epistula ad Gregorium Thaumaturgum* 1 (= Origen, *Philocalia* 13): ποιητικῶς δὲ διὰ τοῦτ' ἂν ηὐξάμην παραλαβεῖν σε καὶ φιλοσοφίας Ἑλληνῶν τὰ οἱονεὶ εἰς Χριστιανισμὸν δυνάμενα γενέσθαι ἐγκύκλια μαθήματα ἢ προπαιδεύματα (Crouzel 1969, 186.10–188.13 = Guyot/Klein 1996, 214.10–12).

a biblical history in the style of Homer, and Origen makes philosophy a "handmaiden of theology" in exactly the same way as the Greek philosophy of the Classical epoch usurped an already existing school canon of the *artes liberales* for its own model of an encyclical education and thus transformed the *artes liberales* into a "handmaiden of philosophy."[152] With this, however, the intellectual and institutional Christianization of the παιδεία in the post-Constantinian period and its use as a matter of course by the great bishops of the fourth century[153] was already prepared for intellectually and practically. Both the participation of Christians in pagan education as a matter of course and their attempt to replace the pagan educational canon with their own conception of binding educational values belong to the direct presuppositions of the new imperial church stance toward παιδεία: from the late fourth century onward, this was correspondingly also regarded "as a necessary preliminary stage in the life of a Christian dignitary." With this, it was transformed into a "preparatory school of Christian character."[154]

In a final section, it remains for us to provide at least a sketch, on the basis of several characteristic examples, of the consequences for the development of Christian "theology" of the adoption of the pagan educational canon and the taken-for-granted attendance of pagan educational institutions by Christians.

2.1.3 The Consequences of the Adoption of Pagan Educational Institutions for the Development of Christian "Theology"

It is, of course, common knowledge that the emergence of Christianity and especially the emergence of Christian theology are connected in a special way with the subject area "teachers, students, schools": Jesus of Nazareth could, and still can, be perceived as a teacher, as διδάσκαλος,[155] and his disciples as the students of this teacher, as the μαθηταὶ τοῦ κυρίου.[156]

[152] Thus Origen himself in his letter: (. . .) ἵν', ὅπερ φασὶ φιλοσόφων παῖδες περὶ γεωμετρίας καὶ μουσικῆς γραμματικῆς τε καὶ ῥητορικῆς καὶ ἀστρονομίας, ὡς συνερίθων φιλοσοφίᾳ, τοῦθ' ἡμεῖς εἴπωμεν καὶ περὶ αὐτῆς φιλοσοφίας πρὸς Χριστιανισμόν (Crouzel 1969, 188.15–18 = Guyot/Klein 1996, 214.14–18); compare also Dihle 1986, and for a comparable adoption and reinterpretation of pagan image motifs, see Markschies 2005b.

[153] Brown 1992, 118–26 (= 1995, 153–63); Markschies 1998c.

[154] Brown 1992, 123 (= 1995, 159). But one will not be able to say (with Brown) that it previously was generally valid "as the all-embracing and supreme ideal of a gentleman's life" but must point to the fact that this represented a minority position and it was viewed by the most varied "professions" as an indispensable preparation for higher goals.

[155] Riesner 1984; Normann 1966.

[156] Compare now Kany 1999, 286–99.

For this reason, it is already not surprising when the discipleship of Christ also realized itself especially in the teaching, and the ones who followed the Χριστὸς διδάσκαλος became active as teachers. It also causes little surprise that since the second century at the latest, the teacher-student relationship between Jesus and his disciples was imagined to be analogous to other ancient teacher-student relationships and the charismatic personality of a Jew in lower Galilee no longer remained in view. This is already shown by a glance at the relevant portrayals of Christian craftwork or the sarcophagi[157] or by the debate about whether the famous scene from the *Via Latina* catacomb is a portrayal of a doctor explaining something on a corpse, Empedocles raising a long-dead young woman, or Christ raising a dead person:[158] the Χριστὸς διδάσκαλος had been assimilated to the contemporary philosophical teacher, at least iconographically.

Comprehensive monographs and detailed articles have been written about primitive and early Christian teachers and the differences between the two groups.[159] We are only interested here in the question of what consequences the adoption of pagan educational institutions had for the formation of a certain form of Christian theology, a form that lay claim to *Wissenschaftlichkeit* (scientific status or scholarliness), according to ancient standards.[160] The comparison does not, of course, consider

[157] Admittedly, direct teaching scenes on pagan sarcophagi appear to be not so frequent: "Men who are characterized as 'wise' by a scroll or other attributes are found frequently on muse sarcophagi, namely from the middle Antonian period to the Tetrarchic period on the sides, and from about 220 CE standing or sitting also on the fronts was well. . . . In addition to this extremely varied material there are only very few chests on which the wise are more strongly emphasized" (G. Koch 1993, 84; cf. Koch/Sichtermann 1982, 203–6; Wegner 1966). This impression appears to be confirmed in Lange 1996, 68, which lists only one attestation for a "teaching scene" (Repertorium Nr. 527 = Wilpert 1929–1936, nr. 225/2), but it is a given that one must also add the traditio-legis portrayals and similar material, so that we are dealing with an iconographic focal point (cf. also Dinkler 1980, 22–23, and above all extensively Zanker 1995, 272–80). For a concise overview with literature, see Kany 1999, 343–45.

[158] Chamber I in arcosolium f-g-h; compare the overview of the previous attempts at interpretation in Kötzsche-Breitenbruch 1976, 45 n. 267 (Judas before Christ and apostles, creation of the human being, Aristotle, Socrates, raising of Lazarus, or Hippocrates) and the proposed interpretation of Gaiser 1980, 18–20 (a portrayal of the Platonic Academy).

[159] Neymeyr 1989; A. E. Zimmermann 1988; Harnack 1981, 365–77; Rengstorf 1935, 160–62; Bardy 1932b; 1937; 1942; Campenhausen 1953, 210–33; Gryson 1982; Coyle 1984 (criticized in Neymeyr 1989, 5–7). In lectures before the Collège de France, Guy G. Stroumsa has drawn attention to the shifting of the "sagesse païenne à spiritualité chrétienne," which is shown as well in a transformed ideal of the philosopher (cf. Stroumsa 2005b; 2005a).

[160] I am very aware of the problems of introducing a modern term (cf. Sütterlin 1960; 1984) but think that it can scarcely be contested that there were already general standards for rational (i.e., scholarly) argumentation and research and that in some circumstances

primarily the lower levels of education such as elementary instruction but rather the higher and highest levels (i.e., the aforementioned philosophical instruction).[161] Here, of course, we must first pay exact attention, as mentioned at the outset, to differences between different institutions and levels (section 2.1.3.1) in order to then make these differentiations fruitful for an analysis of ancient Christian theology (section 2.1.3.2).

2.1.3.1 The Ancient Philosophical Instruction

Too little attention has been given in the relevant research to the fact that with the key phrase "philosophical instruction," one should not imagine a monolithic block of identical institutions at a single level. In his aforementioned Heidelberg dissertation on the *Berufsbild* (occupational profile) of philosophers in antiquity,[162] the Münster ancient historian Johannes Hahn not only documented the abundance of relevant instructional offerings (e.g., for Rome, the ἐπιτομὴ τῆς οἰκουμένης,[163] he counts fifty philosophical teachers from Greece in the second century alone)[164] but also suggested an insightful differentiation of institutions and educational levels. Leaving aside, for the moment, the occasional "guest lecture" of philosophers from elsewhere,[165] Hahn distinguishes between "house philosophers," who belong to an urban *familia*,[166] "salon philosophers" or "popular philosophers," and "professional philosophers"

---

one can designate this connection with a word that has been used only since the eighteenth century. (Translator's note: I have usually translated the words *Wissenschaft* and *wissenschaftlich* with "scholarship" and "scholarly" in this monograph. For further discussion of this difficult point of translation, see my blog *German for Neutestamentler*.)

[161] Arnim 1898 (cf. esp. the introductory chapter "Sophistik, Rhetorik und Philosophie in ihrem Kampfe um die Jugendbildung" [Sophistic, Rhetoric, and Philosophy in Their Battle for the Education of the Youth]); André 1987; Friedländer/Wissowa 1920, 243–97; Fowden 1977; Goulet 1981; Markschies 1997c, 403–11.

[162] See section 2.1 with n. 9.

[163] Athenaeus Naucratites, *Deipnosophistae* I 36.3; Galen, *De humero iis modis prolapso quos Hippocrates non vidit* (Kühn 1965, XVIII/1: 347.16).

[164] Hahn 1987, 150; compare also the documentation on p. 149 n. 7–12. If one brings to mind that (according to *Scriptores Historiae Augustae Antoninus Pius* 11.3 [Hohl 1971, I: 44.26–27 = Dörrie/Baltes 1993, p. 2 nr. C. 73.2]) Antoninus Pius honored rhetoricians and philosophers "in all provinces" with "honors and annual salaries" (cf. also the in-depth commentary on this passage in Dörrie/Baltes 1993, 130–35), then this high number is less surprising.

[165] The term "salon philosopher" is found in Hahn 1987, 97; the remaining terms are mine; compare Millar 1992, 494–98, 501–3.

[166] Structurally these basically also include the philosophers in the circle of the Roman emperor; compare Rawson 1997.

in the strict sense.[167] The observation that in Rome an abundance of philosophical instructional offerings at very different levels was available has scarcely been made useful for the comparison with the Christian teachers of the second and third centuries, though it is extraordinarily important. Hahn's observations on the philosophical instruction must also be extended further.

One can naturally show that regardless of all differences, the various forms of philosophical instruction at different levels had a whole series of characteristic features in common. Thus an overview of the terminology of the conceptual fields "schools" and "students"[168] would show that the phenomenon of a "school education," for example, can be observed not only for professional philosophers who followed the model of the older academy of Plato but also for the two other groups—namely, the house philosophers and the salon philosophers or popular philosophers. The different forms and levels of philosophical instruction scarcely differ in the structure of the daily school activity, as the schools in Rome, for example, show: the relatively similar life in the popular philosophical circles that gathered around stoics such as Musonius Rufus[169] or Epictetus and the activities in the schools of professional philosophers such as the Platonist Calvenus Taurus[170] can be quite clearly traced from lecture notes or reports from students. For the philosophical instruction, there was a kind of fixed basic pattern of school activity, which also applied, mutatis mutandis, to the philosophical διατριβή: the teacher first gave set (but also occasionally improvised) regular instructional lectures; the students took notes, gave speeches, learned together the most important passages of central texts by heart, discussed their form and content with guidance,[171] and also took time for questions that were not directly related to the material.[172] An

[167] Also at least one woman philosopher: CIL VI 33898 = ILS II/2, 7783 (Dessau 1974, 827): *Euphrosyne pia, docta novem musis, philosopha v(ixit) a(nnos) XX.*

[168] Markschies 1997c, 404–5; see now also Kany 1999, 267–76, on "philosopher students" (μαθηταί and synonyms).

[169] Hense 1990, XIV–XXVI; Geytenbeek 1973; Laurenti 1989; Kany 1999, 273.

[170] Dörrie 1973; 1976; Neymeyr 1989, 218–20 (pp. 224–26 on Calvenus Taurus) and 310–23. According to an honorary decree (Dittenberger 1960, nr. 868 = Dörrie/Baltes 1993, C. 2 75 a, p. 14), Calvenus Taurus, who originally came from Berytus, held in Delphi "citizenship, office and dignity of a proxenos, the right to preferential treatment in court, the right to obtain land and house and all other honorary rights" (cf. the commentary of Dörrie/Baltes 1993, 144–47).

[171] Cancik 1984, 177, and (with documentation) Markschies 1997c, 406–7 n. 21/22. On the written character of the διαλέξεις, compare the controversy of the authors H. Hobein and W. Kroll in Hobein/Kroll 1930, 2559. In the third writing of the *Moralia* with the title *De recta ratione audiendi,* Plutarch gave a few rules of behavior for the attendance of lectures.

[172] Aulus Gellius, *Noctes Atticae* XVII 20,1–9 (Marshall 1991, 528.28–53.8).

artistic implementation of such teaching activity may be present in the "philosophers mosaic of Naples"; this is the case at any rate if one follows the late Tübingen classicist Konrad Gaiser and interprets this piece of art from the first century CE, which was discovered in 1897 during the excavation of a rural house in Torre Annunziata near Pompeii, as a depiction of the Platonic Academy.[173]

Problems of general life conduct played a not insignificant role in the instruction. One can recognize therein that most of the popular and professional philosophical circles bore the character of a "study community" and "life community" (thus, above all, Pierre Hadot[174]). For a comparison with Christian teachers, a second observation of Pierre Hadot also seems to me to be of special interest—namely, his constant reference to the religious dimension of the instruction, which could certainly shape its institutional character as well: in his *Life of Apollonius of Tyana* (*Vita Apollonii*), Philostratus reports that the otherwise unknown popular philosopher Euthydemus gave his instruction in the Asclepius sanctuary of Aegae/Cilicia and that Apollonius visited him when he was about forty, together with "adherents of Plato, Chrysippus (the Stoic), and peripatetics."[175]

Thus the difference between the two types of philosophical teaching probably consisted above all in the professional level and in the limited stress on a formal logical education among the popular philosophers. Naturally, there were also corresponding differences in the makeup of the circles of hearers: some philosophers, so states Musonius' student Dio Chrysostom, "do not mix with the common folk for any price . . . but others strain their voices in so-called lecture halls, whereby they have hearers before them who are bound to them and accustomed to them."[176] Exact statements about details are admittedly difficult here: thus generalizing observations on the instructional content among house philosophers, whose life is caricatured with the usual sharpness by Lucian in *De mercede conductis* and about whom we have some inscriptional and literary evidence from Rome,[177] are already prohibited because their

[173] Gaiser 1980, 30–106.

[174] P. Hadot 1991 (= 1987); compare also I. Hadot 2003. A similar thesis is advocated by Stroumsa 2005a; 2005b, 195–99.

[175] Philostratus, *Vita Apollonii* I 7 (Mumprecht 1983, 22.12–21); text, translation, and commentary can also be found in Dörrie/Baltes 1993, C. 73.5, pp. 6–9 and 139–40.

[176] Dio Chrysostom, *Orationes* 32.8: οἱ μὲν γὰρ αὐτῶν ὅλως εἰς πλῆθος οὐκ ἴασιν οὐδὲ θέλουσι διακινδυνεύειν, ἀπεγνωκότες ἴσως τὸ βελτίους ἂν ποιῆσαι τοὺς πολλούς· οἱ δ' ἐν τοῖς καλουμένοις ἀκροατηρίοις φωνασκοῦσιν, ἐνσπόνδους λαβόντες ἀκροατὰς καὶ χειροήθεις ἑαυτοῖς (Dindorf/Budé 1916–1919, 342.22–343.1).

[177] Lucia, *De mercede conductis* 1–42 (Macleod 1974, 212–36); Hahn 1987, 151–53; in § 17, the designation διδάσκαλος is introduced as a title.

activity was naturally determined to a special degree by the interests of the respective *pater familias*. By contrast, we are somewhat better oriented in relation to the instructional material among popular philosophers and salon philosophers, since alongside the fragments of Musonius and the *Diatribai* of his student Epictetus, the speeches of Maximus of Tyre give us 140 lectures of a salon philosopher who was probably active in Rome in the second half of the second century (thus at the same time as the Christian teachers Justin, Ptolemy, and Valentinus).[178] The giving of these lectures probably lasted just under a half hour in each case. The texts are aimed at urban strata who possessed a certain measure of philosophical and literary education and textual knowledge but were simultaneously also interested in an engaging presentation of the material.[179] Alongside the old great philosophical topics (What is philosophy? What is God? Where does evil come from? How should one live?), all sorts of "smaller" problems (e.g., on dealing with wrong suffered; *Orationes* 12), questions of individual life conduct (e.g., on the freedom from worries; *Orationes* 28), and even problems of the Platonic doxography were addressed. A hundred years before Maximus, Persius, a student of the Roman Stoic Annaeus Cornutus, already reflected these themes in satire: "Learn, poor people, and investigate the nature of things: What are we? For what occupation were we born? In what order were we placed? . . . What is the measure of our earnings and for what may one pray? For what is money useful? . . . For what has a god called you? Where is your place in the works of the world, the society of human beings?"[180]

Between the different forms of philosophical instruction, of course, there were clear differences not only with respect to the professional level and the social and intellectual makeup of the respective circles of hearers but also with regard to the institutional character. One can make this clear relatively quickly for the "house philosophers," who were integrated into a *familia* and were thus sedentary and thereby distinguished from the free teachers who traveled around or remained in a fixed location. By contrast, the institutional character of ancient philosophical schools is extremely difficult to determine precisely. Not all people who designated

[178] Trapp 1994 has produced once more a critical edition of Maximus' διαλέξεις; for Maximus, compare also Hobein/Kroll 1930; Puigalli 1983; Szarmach 1985.

[179] Hobein/Kroll 1930, 2558 or 2561–62; compare also Mutschmann 1917, 188–92, and on the "philosophical program," Hahn 1987, 54–60.

[180] Persius, *Satirae* III 66–72 (cf. Wilken 1979, 171): *Discite, o miseri, et causas cognoscite rerum:/ Quid sumus, et quidnam victuri gignimur; ordo/ Quis datus, aut metae quam mollis flexus et unde;/ Quis modus argento, quid fas optare, quid asper/ Utile nummus habet; patriae carisque propinquis/ Quantum elargiri deceat, quem te deus esse/ Iussit, et humana qua parte locates es in re.*

themselves συμβιωταί lived together in a long-term and stable building; rather they could certainly also meet in free, changeable associations at public locations such as market places or bath grounds and spend a part of the day with one another in philosophical conversation. Moreover, the Greek word αἵρεσις, which is often used for philosophical schools, does not at all designate a legally normed type of institutional association but a *school of thought*.[181]

Philosophical schools that offered their instruction at a professional philosophical level in an established form existed in the imperial period primarily in two legal contexts: either they ranked among the institutions that are designated in German as *Vereine*—that is, "societies" (in English they are usually designated with the more open term "voluntary associations"[182])—or they were organized as *Stiftungen* (foundations). We will now occupy ourselves in somewhat greater detail with these two legal forms—namely, societies (or voluntary associations) and foundations.

First we will consider "societies" (*collegia*): The relatively imprecise terminological classification of the legal context of philosophical schools as "societies" or "voluntary associations" already shows what an uncertain area one moves in when one attempts to paint a precise picture. Such uncertainties become more extensive, for example, if one inquires into the exact difference between pure "cult societies" and philosophical schools constituted as societies. The older work of Franz Poland on the *Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens* (history of Greek societies)[183] already broke with a schematic ordering of the material according to "the purposes of societies," inter alia because the detachment of a specific group of "cult societies" did not prove to be feasible. All "societies" are "cult societies" in a certain sense (nonreligious *collegia* were not even permitted), and one can merely ask whether the cultic purpose formed the only focal point of the work of the society; whether familial, economic, and occupational purposes were added;[184] or whether the purpose of philosophical conversation and instruction dominated the "life of the society." Thus even

[181] Compare Brox 1986, 257–58, and Desjardins 1991. Naturally a "school of thought" is also an institution, admittedly often deinstitutionalized in an institutionalized manner (thus Siedschlag 2000, 45). Here we cannot carry out the interesting comparison with the social support system of Palestinian rabbis in the high imperial period (see Levine 1989, 55–59).

[182] Compare Kloppenburg/Wilson 1996 and Schmeller 1995, 24–53. A concise summary of the state of scholarship can also be found in Kany 1999, 270–71, and at greater length in Sirks 2006, 21–40.

[183] F. Poland 1909.

[184] F. Poland 1909, 5; compare also Waltzing 1968; Sohm/Mitteis/Weger 1923, 203–9; San Nicolo 1972 (with the review of Hands 1974); Ausbüttel 1982; Brashear 1993.

societies whose life was characterized by educational activities must be dealt with as “cult societies”: this applies both to gymnasium societies, in which men united and took part in the exercises in an urban gymnasium,[185] and to the Alexandrian Museion, a sort of college of arts and sciences that bore the title σύνοδος.[186] In Pergamum, the συνσχολασταί were apparently organized in such an institution,[187] and in Ephesus, this was the case for eleven μαθηταί[188]—and these examples show again that a strict distinction between philosophy and “cult” is scarcely possible in the second and third centuries.[189]

I note only in passing that the old question of whether the Christians also organized themselves in an analogy to societies should be dealt with once again. Certainly the adherents of an illegal *superstitio* could scarcely—especially in light of the religious character of all societies—register as a society. On the other hand, a pagan passerby who read the famous (today unfortunately lost) inscription συναγωγὴ Μαρκιωνιστῶν in the Syrian backcountry, for example, must naturally have thought of analogous society designations such as the συναγωγὴ τῶν κωποπωλῶν, which is attested in the region of Perinthos.[190] And the care for the burial of Christians will also have called to mind the burial societies of many of their contemporaries.[191]

Now we turn our attention to “foundations”: philosophical schools could also have the institutional framework of a foundation.[192] Unfortunately, we do not possess any *Stiftungsurkunden* (foundation charters) or other relevant regulations for philosophical schools. In order to be able to portray this institutional framework with somewhat greater precision in spite of this fact, we will first consider briefly the foundation of an extremely well-to-do Roman administrative official from Ephesus by the name of C. Vibius Salutaris.[193] It dates from the year 104 CE and is documented by an inscription on white marble at the north end of the south wall of the south analemma of the theater of Ephesus. The main portion of the fragments was discovered in the

[185] Documentation in F. Poland 1909, 103–5.

[186] Thus F. Poland 1909, 161, with an appeal to Strabo, *Geographica* XVII 1.8 ἔστι δὲ τῇ συνόδῳ ταύτῃ καὶ χρήματα κοινὰ καὶ ἱερεὺς ὁ ἐπὶ τῷ Μουσείῳ τεταγμένως.

[187] Fränkel 1890, nr. 463, line 13; compare F. Poland 1909, 105.

[188] Newton 1890, nr. 548 (Hicks), line 2; compare F. Poland 1909, 105.

[189] Thus S. G. Wilson 1996, 6–7, also with reference to Nock 1933. The excursus, “the legal position of the philosophical schools,” in Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1965 is materially obsolete.

[190] Compare dedication inscription nr. 59 in Sayar 1998, 239–40; the concern is with an altar for the “guild of the sellers of petty wares” (συναγω[γ]ῇ [ῥ]ωπο|πωλῶν, lines 3–4); F. Poland 1909, 155; compare also IG IX/2 25 . . . τῆς τῶν νέων συναγωγῆς and Kolb 1995.

[191] A. Müller 1905.

[192] Weiler 2001; Eck 1997.

[193] Compare Hanslik 1958, 1982–83.

nineteenth century and is found today in the British Museum in London. The multipart inscription quotes both the actual “foundation letter” (B) and a municipal resolution about it (A) and the confirmation of the foundation by the proconsul (C). Concerning the purpose of the foundation, one learns from the resolution of the public assembly only that the interest of the foundation capital is to be paid out each year on the birthday of the goddess Artemis by the founder and his heirs (A, lines 62–73). The foundation letter then specifies more exactly that on the “birthday of the great goddess Artemis” (B, line 224), members of various municipal bodies (such as the council), who are personally present in the sanctuary and position holders in the cult of Artemis, are to pay certain sums, whereby in the case of larger groups it is decided partly by lot who can be given the designated sum (at most 2 denarii and 13.5 asses and as a rule 1 denarius; B, line 237). A portion of the money is naturally designated for specific religious purposes as well. And alongside the aforementioned payment of money, the foundation of C. Vibius Salutaris also comprised a great number of golden and silver statues and statuettes of the goddess Artemis; of other members of the pantheon; of personifications such as the “emperor-loyal demos of the Ephesians” (B: line 179); and of emperors, politicians, and other notable figures. Fluctuating interest earnings and equally unstable exchange rates are explicitly taken into account. For our purposes, the inscription is especially of interest due to the fact that a relatively precise fixation for the extent of the interest earnings from the foundation capital is recorded in the resolution of the council and the public assembly:[194]

> (He himself promised . . . to invest the money) donated (by him to the council and the gerousia of the Ephesians) and the citizens (and) ephebes (and the paides) and to pay 9 percent interest, which was to be distributed (every) year according to his endowment (on the birthday) of the goddess, the sixth of Thargelion; he was thus in agreement that (either) he or (his) heirs would pay out the donated money when it was needed, whereby the presider should receive it for the respective legal person (for which it was intended).[195]

[194] Edition and translation in Wankel 1979, 167–222, nr. 27, which also provides documentation of the complicated edition history; see more recently Rogers 1991, 136–51.

[195] Inscription nr. 27, lines 62–73 (Wankel 1979, 174–75): τῶν δὲ χρημάτων τῶν καθιε]ρωμένω[ν ὑπ’ αὐ]τ[οῦ Ἐφεσίων τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῇ γερουσιᾷ] καὶ πολ[είταις καὶ ἐ]φή[βοις καὶ παισὶν ὑπέσχετο αὐτὸς] ἐπὶ τοῦ σ[ἐκδαντιστὴς γενέσθαι] καὶ [τε]λεῖν τόκ[ον δραχμιαῖνον] ἀσσαριαῖον [δι]αιρεθ[η]σόμενον κ[αθ’ ἕκαστον ἐ]νιαυτὸν κα[τὰ τ[ὴν διάταξιν αὐτοῦ τ[ῇ γεν]εσ[ίῳ τῆ]ς θεοῦ ἡ[μέρᾳ,] [ἥτι]ς ἐστὶν τοῦ Θαργηλιῶ[ν]ος μηνὸς ἕκ[τ]η ἱσταμέ[νου] [ὁ]μολογήσας ἀποδώσε[ι]ν τὰ χρήματ[α ἢ] ἑαυτὸν τὰ [καθι]ερωμένα, ὅταν βουλη[θ]ῇ, ἢ τοὺς κληρονό[μους αὐτο]ῦ τῇ πόλει, κομιζομένων τῶν ἑκά[σ]του προ[σώπου π]ροισταμένων.

From the inscription, one can deduce not only that the city could expect a yearly return of 9 percent from the foundation capital of 20,000 denarii for the named tasks but also that this sum of interest earnings had to be provided even if the inheritance of Salutaris, to which the foundation belonged, were to be sold by the heirs. The buyer would also have to invest the capital in such a way that it produced 9 percent interest; that is to say, the resolution of the council and the public assembly assumed that the foundation was to be "unchangeably, indissolubly, and incontrovertibly" valid for all time (A, lines 105–6 in the reconstruction of Hermann Wankel). Thus one can approximately work out how high the foundation capital would have needed to be for a foundation that wanted to provide tolerable support for a philosophical school that was relatively stable organizationally.

How little we know about the legal and institutional framework of philosophical schools in the imperial period, beyond such general findings about the nature of Greco-Roman societies and foundations, is shown with particular clarity through a consideration of the most famous example of a philosophical school—namely, the Academy of Plato. Relevant information about the legal and economic status of the Academy of Plato in the foundational phase and Hellenistic period is found, in effect, only in Philodemus' book about the Academy, which Konrad Gaiser, following others, has reconstructed from two Herculaneum papyri (P. Herc. 1021 and 164).[196] From this source, we derive the limited information that follows: Plato followed the polemic of his teacher Socrates against the paid philosophical instruction of the Sophists, "freed the students from dues (school fees) and thus showed philanthropy to all."[197] The public philosophical teaching took place in the Academy gymnasium. By contrast, in Plato's garden, where there was a sanctuary to the Muses, research was undertaken and discussed in esoteric seclusion. We only know of this spatial and institutional separation because Plato's successor in the leadership of the Academy had to restrict himself to the teaching in the inner circle for health reasons.[198] Plato was able to acquire the garden near the Academy because of a gift of money from a student named Dion, and

[196] Gaiser 1988; for his *Academica*, which probably represents a part of his "Syntaxis of the Philosophers" (Gaiser 1988, 24–25), Philodemus excerpted older sources from the second and third generation of the Academy. Due to the famous eruption of Vesuvius in 79 CE, the work copy of the philosopher, who died between 40 and 35 BCE, was evidently buried and remained preserved in an extremely fragmented form.

[197] P. Herc. 1021, col. 2 (Naples), 1–3 [ὁ δὲ] ἀτ[έλειαν ἐποίει φιλ]ανθ[ρ]ωπίαν [πᾶσι δ]ούς (Gaiser 1988, 157, an account of papyrological details of the edition will not be included; cf. also the commentary on pp. 364–65, which includes additional documentation).

[198] P. Herc. 1021, col. T (Oxford), 12–14 (Gaiser 1988, 188), and col. 6 (Oxford), 29/29a (Gaiser 1988, 190), in the interpretation of Gaiser 1988, 458.

one may assume that the rest of the teaching operation was also financed by donations from rich benefactors and students.[199] This sponsoring could also occasionally be carried out from the political side. Philodemus characterizes the philosophical schools in Asia Minor that briefly blossomed through the influx of a number of Plato's students after his death in 349/348 BCE and declined due to the departure of Aristotle and Theophrastus to Mytilene on Lesbos[200] as philosophical schools in which students had joined together "into one fellowship institution";[201] it was apparently supported by the ruler of the city who had studied with Plato.[202] The leadership of the Athens Academy lay in the hands of a scholarch, who—as we know from Speusippus' successor Xenocrates—was chosen by the majority decision of the "young school members."[203] But the Academy (as probably the majority of the other philosophical schools as well) was not organized as a cult society for the muses, as a θίασος, and possessed neither a special legal status nor a special religious one, if one disregards for a moment the one endowment.[204] The sparse information about the institutional framework of the Academy in Hellenism and in the early imperial period can fortunately be supplemented by a noteworthy witness from late antiquity.[205] The Neoplatonic philosopher Damascius, the last school head of the Academy before its closing in 529 CE, wrote in his history of philosophy: "The philosopher Plato was poor and possessed only the garden in the Academy; this was the smallest part of the inherited possession. For the garden brought a yield of approximately three gold coins; the entire earnings had increased in more recent times because pious people inclined to philosophical research, who died in succession, by virtue of

[199] Gaiser 1988, 364, 417, 421, and Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum* III 9 (Long 1964, I: 124.15–23); thus also Krämer 1983, 4–5. In his 1979 Heidelberg Academy lecture, Konrad Gaiser attempted to interpret the famous philosopher mosaic of Torre Annunziata near Pompeii from the first century CE as a representation of the Platonic Academy; Gaiser 1980.

[200] Details in Gaiser 1988, 387–88.

[201] P. Herc. 1021, col. 5 (Oxford), 9–11 ἐκεῖνοί τε δια[τρίβο]ντες ἐφιλοσόφουν εἰς ἕνα [περί]πατον συνιόντες (Gaiser 1988, 162).

[202] Gaiser 1988, 385–86.

[203] P. Herc. 1021, col. 6.41–44 οἱ δ[ὲ] νεανίσκοι ψηφ[ο]φορήσαντες ὅστις αὐτῶν ἡγήσετα[ι], Ξενοκράτην εἵλοντο τὸν [Κα]λχηδόνιον (Gaiser 1988, 193). Gaiser wishes to reconstruct from a marginal note col 7.12* even on top of that the number of votes (Gaiser 1988, 466: 25 votes).

[204] So also Krämer 1983, 4 (with references to recent literature), and Lynch 1972, 102, 106–27 (corrections to Willamowitz-Moellendorff 1965, 263–91 ["The legal position of the philosophical schools"]).

[205] At this time, however, the original building of the Academy was already destroyed and thus the library too was destroyed (cf. the commenting observations in Dörrie 1987, 544–49).

the testament for those pursuing philosophy, left the material foundation for the undisturbed leisure of their philosophical way of life."[206]

Even if Damascius falsely claims that the school founder Plato was poor, one nevertheless discerns from his report important details about the institutional and financial framework of the Academy in late antiquity. Apparently, the garden plot that was once used for the esoteric functions of the Academy had been leased, and only a moderate profit had been made from this action. According to Damascius, the financial basis of the Academy in late antiquity was represented by the assets that accrued to the Academy as a legacy through testamentary donations.[207] The respective head of the school as διάδοχος of his predecessor in the office was probably entitled to dispose of the possessions of the Academy as the director of the foundation and obligated to invest the corresponding assets of the foundation in a financially profitable way. Irrespective of all modifications of their philosophical leading assumptions in the period after Plato's death, the Academy must have already had a vital interest in organizational continuity for this reason—namely, because only the unbroken διαδοχή of their scholarchs guaranteed the financing of their instructional institution.

The curriculum of such institutionally organized philosophical schools can be reconstructed only for the especially significant ones, as Ilsetraut Hadot has recently shown once again: we can no longer determine whether, for example, mathematical studies were taught at smaller schools as preparatory instruction for the actual philosophical disciplines.[208] It is certain only that in the instruction, students first read authoritative literature together and the teacher commented afterward on the section (συνανάγνωσις).[209]

[206] Πλάτων ὁ φιλόσοφος πένης ἦν καὶ μόνον τὸν Ἀκαδημίᾳ ἐκέκτητο κῆπον, ὅς μέρος ἐλάχιστον ἦν τῶν διαδοχικῶν· ὁ μὲν γὰρ κῆπος ἐγγύς τι χρυσῶν τριῶν νομισμάτων ἀπεδίδου, ἡ δὲ ὅλη πρόσοδος ὕστερον χιλίων ἢ καὶ πλειόνων ὀλίγον. ηὐξήθη δὲ αὕτη κατὰ τοὺς νεωτέρους χρόνους ἀνθρώπων ἱερῶν τε καὶ φιλολόγων ἄλλοτε ἄλλων ἀποθνησκόντων καὶ διαθήκας ἀπολειπόντων τοῖς φιλοσοφοῦσιν ἀφορμὴν τῆς ἐπὶ τῷ φιλοσόφῳ βίῳ σχολῆς καὶ γαλήνης (The *Suda* s.v. Πλάτων = Damascius, *Vita Isidori* E 158/F 265 [Zintzen 1967, 213.8–14]) or *Historia philosophica* 102 (Athanassiadi 1999, 246 = Dörrie 1987, 266).

[207] So also Dörrie 1987, 551; compare also Photius, *Bibliothecae codices* 242 p. 346 a 32–37 (Henry 1971, 38) = Damascius, *Vita Isidori* (Zintzen 1967, 212.1–5) or *Historia philosophica* 102 (Athanassiadi 1999, 246) = Dörrie 1987, 264: ἡ τῶν διαδόχων οὐσία οὐχ ὡς οἱ πολλοὶ νομίζουσι Πλάτωνος ἦν τὸ ἀνέκαθεν (in each case with small textual divergences).

[208] I. Hadot 2003, 60–61.

[209] Alexander Aphrodisiensis, *In Aristotelis topicorum libros octo commentaria* p. 101 a 26 (Wallies 1891, 27.12–16): ἦν δὲ σύνηθες τὸ τοιοῦτον εἶδος τῶν λόγων τοῖς ἀρχαίοις (namely, the discussion of theses), καὶ τὰς συνουσίας τὰς πλείστας τοῦτον ἐποιοῦντο τὸν τρόπον, οὐκ ἐπὶ βιβλίων ὥσπερ νῦν (οὐ γὰρ ἦν πω τότε τοιαῦτα βιβλία), ἀλλὰ

If one now brings back to mind these very different institutional framing conditions of philosophical instruction by house philosophers, popular philosophers, and professional philosophers in open or organized school contexts, then a new light falls once again on the aforementioned differences with regard to the professional level and the circle of hearers. A philosopher traveling through the land such as Maximus of Tyre, who relied on support from the greatest possible circle of hearers, had to speak differently from and at a different level than those of his colleagues who were active at an institution that was supported by a substantial foundation endowment and was not dependent on the current reception of a paying crowd.

What consequences does it have for the portrayal of the history of Christian theology in the high imperial period when we ask whether we can also observe comparable institutional and sociology-of-education differentiations there?

2.1.3.2 Philosophical Instruction among Christians

It seems to me, as I have already frequently intimated, that such a differentiation of the various institutions and educational levels of the higher instruction also has great significance for the history of Christian theology in the second and third centuries. This is the case because for these two centuries, we know of both Christian teachers who taught more at the level of a salon philosopher or a popular philosopher with only moderate knowledge of the contemporary professional philosophy and highly educated theologians whose philosophical educational level certainly invites comparison with professional philosophers. As an example of a philosophical instruction that probably corresponds more to that of the salon or popular philosophers, I wish to name at this point the Roman apologist *Justin* and, as an example of an educational level that corresponds more to that of a professional philosopher, *Origen*. Finally, one could, in addition, envisage Valentinian Gnosis as a movement that oscillates in a very peculiar way between these two levels: some of its representatives, such as the Roman teacher *Ptolemy*, oriented themselves at a professional philosophical level, whereas many followers are located only at the level of a salon philosopher or even lower. However, I have developed this view of Valentinian Gnosis as a philosophical school in greater detail elsewhere[210] and can therefore leave it at that with this reference.

θέσεώς τινος τεθείσης εἰς ταύτην γυμνάζοντες τε καὶ ἀνασκευάζοντες δι’ ἐνδόξων τὸ κείμενον; on the interpretation of the passage, compare I. Hadot 2003, 62–63.

[210] Markschies 1997c, 425–38; 2000d.

For our connections, the two other aforementioned theologians—namely, Justin and Origen—are of greater interest.

According to the witness of the *Acta Justini* (BHG 972z), Justin taught for a time in Rome "above the bath of Myrtinus" and gathered his students there.[211] As the horizon of his teaching activity, this text formulates Justin's wish "to get to know all the philosophical schools of thought."[212] He wore the pallium[213] like Tertullian[214] and the later Alexandrian bishop Heraclas[215] and wanted to mediate "knowledge of the mystery of salvation"; he viewed himself as a philosopher and gnostic (*Gnostiker*) but not as a "theologian."[216] In his *Dialogue with Trypho* (*Dialogus cum Tryphone*), the philosopher explains that bad men also "want to give an answer . . . to every objection and every argument. In the same way, I too proceed with all human beings, wherever they might be from, if they want to discuss it with me or question me about it."[217] It fits with this that even with regard to pagan philosophical instruction, "it is often reported that outsiders come to instruction or to the circle of students of the relevant philosopher either as chance visitors and relatives or as those seeking counsel,"

[211] *Acta Justini* 3 according to the short version of Paris. Graec. 1470 Ἐγὼ ἐπάνω μένω τοῦ μυρτίνου βαλανείου παρὰ πάντα τόν χρόνον (Knopf/Krüger/Ruhbach 1965,125.24 [= Franchi de' Cavalieri]) or in the longer version of Cantabr. Add. 4489 Ἐγὼ ἐπάνω μένω *τινὸς Μαρτίνου* τοῦ *Τιμωτίνου* βαλανείου παρὰ πάντα τὸν χρόνον (Knopf/Krüger/Ruhbach 1965, 16.12–13). For an introduction to both versions, compare, for example, Neymeyr 1989, 21–22; the oldest and shortest version of Paris. Graec. 1470 is presented by Knopf/Krüger/Ruhbach 1965 following Lazatti. For the place information in the manuscripts, see Freudenberger 1968, 26; the information about the bath of Timothy on the Viminal Mount is certainly a secondary reading since the location of the Myrtinus bath was no longer known.

[212] *Acta Justini* 2 πάντας λόγους ἐπειράθην μαθεῖν (125.7 or 15.27); Neymeyr connects this information with the well-known report about Justin's philosophical educational journey from the *proomium* of the dialogue (Justin, *Dialogus cum Tryphone* 2.3–6 [Marcovich 1997, 72.15–73.43]) and comes to a more optimistic judgment concerning its historicity than Hyldahl 1966, 148–59.

[213] Compare above all Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* IV 11.8 . . . Ἰουστῖνος, ἐν φιλοσόφου σχήματι . . . (Schwartz 1999, II/1: 324.10–11).

[214] Tertullian, *De pallio*, passim.

[215] Origen, *Epistula* apud Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* VI 19.14 . . . δι' ὅν καὶ πρότερον κοινῇ ἐσθῆτι χρώμενος ἀποδυσάμενος καὶ φιλόσοφον ἀναλαβὼν σχῆμα . . . (Schwartz 1999, II/2: 562.18–20); compare Vinzent 1996, 186.

[216] Justin, *Dialogus cum Tryphone* 74.3: τὸ σωτήριον τοῦτο μυστήριον (Marcovich 1997, 197.16); compare also Vinzent 1996, 178.

[217] Justin, *Dialogus cum Tryphone* 64.2 Διὸ κἂν ὑμεῖς πονηρεύησθε, προσμενῶ πρὸς ότιοῦν προβαλεῖσθε καὶ ἀντιλέξετε ἀποκρινόμενος· καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ καὶ πρὸς πάντας ἁπλῶς τοὺς ἐκ παντὸς γένους ἀνθρώπων, συζητεῖν ἢ πυνθάνεσθαί μου περὶ τούτων βουλομένους, πράττω (Marcovich 1997, 180.11–14).

indeed even as people who were passing through.[218] Even if the question of whether Justin gathered a school around himself in his residence above the bath or whether he only sporadically taught individual guests there is difficult to decide due to the lack of more detailed information and may also only present an ahistorical alternative,[219] it is clear that he did not teach at an institution equipped with an extensive endowment that was comparable to the great philosophical schools in antiquity. But since one of his hearers, according to the witness of the *Acta*, declared that he enjoyed hearing lectures at Justin's residence, one also may not imagine his teaching activity as sporadic living room lectures for occasional guests and good friends.[220] Justin's level of education can be determined with relative precision: eleven of the thirty-six writings of Plato are cited, admittedly mainly those passages that belong to a core stock that was cited time and again in antiquity, and in addition, a series of fashionable or professional philosophical terms.[221] Some time ago, the late Bonn classicist Wolfgang Schmid compared this level of Justin's knowledge of Plato with that of Maximus of Tyre, an author whom we introduced as a paradigm example of a salon or popular philosopher.[222] This seems to me to be materially more accurate than the various attempts to stylize Justin as a highly educated school philosopher or conversely as an uneducated copyist.[223] Here we can, of course, only indicate in thesis form the significance that the instructional activity of Justin and other early Christian teachers held from a methodological and institutional perspective for the formation of a theology that attempted to satisfy the scholarly standards of that time and probably also could do so

[218] Thus Hahn 1987, 70; compare also Neymeyr 1989, 215–29.

[219] Neymeyr 1989, 29–30, remains critical toward the notion of a "school of Justin." Contrast P. Lampe 1989, 238–40 (cf. 2003, 276–79): a list of seven hearers of Justin can be found on p. 239 (cf. p. 278). In addition to the aforementioned fact that philosophical schools stood open also for chance visitors, one could likewise point to the fact that occasionally in other passages too the boundaries between a philosophical school in the strict sense (namely, in a continuous institutionalized teaching context) and individual people "who teach on their own authority in the city in which they settled" (Marrou 1977, 391) become blurred. As an example, Marrou mentions Epictetus; compare now also Neymeyr 1989, 220–24.

[220] Admittedly there are differences here between the various versions of the *Acta Justini* A 4.7: Εὐέλπιστος εἶπεν· Ἰουστίνου μὲν ἡδέως ἤκουον τὸν λό*γον* (Musurillo 2000, 44.24) or B τῶν λό*γων* (50.18). Compare Pouderon 1998, 240.

[221] P. Lampe 1989, 224–27 (cf. 2003, 262–65) with appendix II ("Justin—Educational Elements") on pp. 353–61 (cf. 2003, 417–25). Compare recently Edwards 1991, who produces important arguments for the originality and philosophical seriousness of Justin.

[222] W. Schmid 1952, 178. Compare also Wartelle 1998; Harnack 1906; Döring 1979, 143–61; Fédou 1998, 51–66.

[223] Compare among others Andresen 1952/53; 1981; Dörrie 1955; 1957; 1976, 263–74; Waszink 1965; 1979, 371–75.

to a good extent: Justin used the Socratic maieutic in order to demonstrate the inaccessibility of Platonic philosophy; argued in response to questions and against objections; and drew on authorities for the demonstration of his arguments, on which he commented in detail.

Justin's most prominent student was probably the Assyrian *Tatian*.[224] In his *Ecclesiastical History*, Eusebius reports that Tatian originally gave instruction with no little success "in the pagan studies" (ἐν τοῖς Ἑλλήνων μαθήμασι) of the canonical encyclical education and also published on these topics. Unfortunately, no traces of such publications are preserved, so that one remains dependent on hypotheses.[225] Eusebius reports further that Tatian gained students (μαθηταί) in Rome, from which one can infer that he founded his own "school" there.[226] But Eusebius also says very explicitly that after Justin's martyrdom (thus after 165 CE), Tatian "established his own school puffed up from the self-darkness of a teacher" (ἴδιον χαρακτῆρα διδασκαλείου συνεστήσατο).[227] From the *Chronicle* (*Chronicon*) of Eusebius and the antiheretical work of Epiphanius, one can gather that around 172 CE, after a quarrel with the Roman community and his exclusion from it, Tatian left and again established his own school (διδασκαλεῖον) "in the land between the two rivers" (Seleucia-Ctesiphon).[228] Even if these pieces of information come from a relatively later time, they are not untrustworthy; they show that Justin "set/established a precedent/school" in the truest sense of the word.

If one now compares the views attributed to Tatian in Irenaeus, Eusebius, and Epiphanius with those of his teacher, whom he once designated as "most awe-inspiring Justin,"[229] then it is conspicuous that a sharp opposition is present between Tatian and his teacher Justin in a whole series of

[224] Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* V 29.1 (Schwartz 1999, II/1: 390.3): μαθητὴν αὐτὸν (sc. Tatian) ἱστοροῦντες τοῦ μάρτυρος (sc. Justin). Neymeyr 1989, 193–94, points to the fact that Irenaus calls Tatian only a "hearer" of Justin (*Adversus haereses* I 28.1 [Rousseau/Doutreleau 1979, II: 356.9 or 357.18]), which he regards, due to the teaching differences between the two, as more accurate than Eusebius' characterization of him as μαθητής.

[225] Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* IV 16.7 (Schwartz 1999, II/1: 358.2–3). Petersen 2001; Neymeyr 1989, 182–95; Preuschen 1907; Whittaker 1976.

[226] Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* V 13.1 and 8 (Schwartz 1999, II/1: 454.15 and 458.6; on Rhodo); compare also P. Lampe 1989, 245; Neymeyr 1989, 35–36; Pouderon 1998, 241–42.

[227] Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* IV 29.3 (Schwartz 1999, II/1: 390.16).

[228] Eusebius/Jerome, *Chronicon ad annum Abraham* 2188 (Helm/Treu 1984, 206.13–14), and Epiphanius, *Panarion seu adversus Lxxx haereses* 46.1.6 (Holl/Dummer 1980, 204.5–6).

[229] Tatian, *Oratio ad Graecos* 18.6 ὁ θαυμασιώτατος Ἰουστῖνος (Marcovich 1995a, 38.21).

details and yet also in basic orientations: Irenaeus of Lyons mentions above all the encraticism of Tatian and his Valentinian doctrine of the aeons.[230] Such fundamental differences between teachers and students—which can also be observed, for example, in the so-called Valentinian school between Ptolemy and his students[231] but also between Marcion and Apelles and finally even in the relation of the authentic views of the Syrian teacher Bardaisan to those of his students[232]—can again be made comprehensible, in my view, as a consequence of the adoption of pagan educational institutions.[233] If Christian theology oriented itself to the methods and forms of pagan philosophical instruction, then it was inevitable that teaching differences between Christian teachers and students cropped up. For with its history, the Platonic Academy, which in many respects forms a model for subsequent antiquity, is precisely an example of the considerable discontinuity in spite of the personal continuity of the leaders in unbroken chains of succession. As is well known, worlds lie between the leader of the Athens Academy Carneades (129/128 BCE) and the aforementioned middle Platonist Calvenus Taurus (ἀκμή 145 CE). At any rate, an essential element of continuity between the dogmatizing older Academy, the aporetic middle Academy, and the probabilistic newer Academy consisted above all in the unbroken succession[234] of their scholarchs, even if the representatives of the skeptical direction attempted to show with their writings that there had been a "unity of the Academy from Plato onward."[235] Naturally, one should not exaggerate the breaks, either: no school head (προστάτης or ἄρχων) wanted, with controversial discussions such as those over the question of whether or not the world really came into existence,[236] to establish a conscious discontinuity as a principle of tradition.

[230] Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* I 28.1 (Rousseau/Doutreleau 1979, II: 354.8–356.26) = Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* IV 29.2–3 (Schwartz 1999, II/1: 390.6–20); compare also Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* III 92.1 (Stählin/Früchtel/Treu 1985, 238.22–23).

[231] Markschies 2000d, 250–54.

[232] To my knowledge, the dimension of the teacher-student relationship does not pop up in the debate over the authentic teaching of Bardaisan between H. J. W. Drijvers and B. Aland (cf. the literature in Drivers 1993, 211–12; Neymeyr 1989, 158–68; B. R. Voss 1970, 51–59).

[233] At any rate, for Tatian, this explanation appears to me more appropriate than Erwin Preuschen's explanation, based on Zahn, that Tatian's "intensive hate against everything Greek" reveals "racial oppositions" between Greeks and Semites "that are insurmountable" (Preuschen 1907, 388).

[234] Kienle 1961, 79–100.

[235] Compare the reference to Plutarch's writing Περὶ τοῦ τῶν μίαν εἶναι τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ Πλάτωνος Ἀκαδήμιαν (text and commentary in Dörrie/Baltes 1993, C 7 a 84.1, p. 62 and commentary on pp. 244–45).

[236] Compare Plato, *Timaeus* 28 B, with Baltes 1996.

One naturally made efforts to set the new in relation to the old and to justify new teachings through statements of the "older teachers."[237] But a strictly normed handing down of tradition and institutional exclusion of views, as the Christian church then intended them in the form of canon and *regula fidei*, lay far outside the philosophical schools' field of vision. Yet to the extent that Christian theologians in the second and third centuries oriented themselves toward these ancient educational institutions, Christian theology had to become pluralized. Or to put the matter differently, the conspicuous pluralism of the Christian theology of the second and third centuries, which has recently been especially emphasized once again, is also a consequence of the adoption of pagan educational institutions. The philosophical schools were shaped by the individual personalities of teachers who spoke "directly in their own name"; the διδάσκαλος "conveyed to his students the fruit of his own thinking and wisdom."[238]

Origen is undoubtedly an example for the fact that since the end of the second century, Christians could teach not only at the popular philosophical level but also at the professional philosophical level in institutional contexts that can be compared with the great ancient philosophical schools. This naturally applies especially to his aforementioned[239] rigorous program of education that takes up the encyclical education as ἐγκύκλια μαθήματα ἢ προπαιδεύματα εἰς Χριστιανισμόν and establishes the institution of a "private Christian university" for its independent mediation. During his life, Origen taught in two very different cities in extremely different contexts, and it is not so simple to reconstruct them exactly. Irrespective of all difficulties of reconstructing the more specific circumstances of his teaching activity from the reports in Pamphilus, Eusebius, Jerome, Rufinus, and Photius,[240] what follows is nevertheless relatively certain: soon after the execution of his father Leonides in 202 CE, Origen, who was then not yet seventeen years of age,[241] began to work as a γραμματικός in his native city of Alexandria. Thus he took over the students from the elementary teacher (γραμματιστής/γραμματοδιδάσκαλος) in order to

[237] Numenius, who undoubtedly advocated a new interpretation of Plato that was widely rejected by his philosophical contemporaries, explicitly and vehemently denied innovations (fragment 24 [Des Places 1973, 62.5–65.79]): the καινοτομηθέν is παρανόμημα and ἀσέβημα (fr. 24 [63.30–31]); on this problem, compare also Frede 1987, 1041–46; Dillon 1982.

[238] Thus Marrou 1977, 393–94, who insists on this "personal character of ancient upbringing" (394).

[239] See section 2.1.2.2.

[240] For the sources for his biography and the debate over its reconstruction, compare now R. Williams 1996, 397–98 (with extensive bibliographical references).

[241] Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* VI 2.12 (Schwartz 1999, II/2: 522.14–17).

lay the foundations for the rhetorical education through further linguistic and literary instruction (for the program of instruction, cf. section 2.1.2 above).[242] Unfortunately, we do not know whether he worked on his own or was employed at a gymnasium.[243] As a teacher he continued, according to contemporary practice, to study at the same time. A rich woman promoted his higher studies as a patroness and received him into her house.[244] If the chronology of Eusebius and Jerome is correct, after a solid year, the “worldly” grammar teacher Origen already adopted a function in the instruction of Christian catechumens.[245] Whether and how long he was simultaneously active in both teaching spheres remains unclear. At any rate, he was so successful as a grammar teacher that he could soon earn a living for himself and his six siblings.[246] Unfortunately, we can scarcely specify with precision the studies with which Origen occupied himself during this time as a teacher. In his treatise *Adversus Christianos* (*Against the Christians*), the Neoplatonist philosopher Porphyry hands down the information that an allegorical biblical interpreter by the name of Origen was a student of the philosopher Ammonius, named Σακκᾶς (the “sack wearer”).[247] In his biography of Origen in the *Ecclesiastical History*, Eusebius of Caesarea quotes this information and presupposes as a given that this Origen is his own revered theological model, which is also—regardless of all the problems that are presented by other pieces of information about a Neoplatonist named Origen—entirely probable.[248] It

[242] Marrou 1977, 235–57; Kaster 1988, passim; Quacquarelli 1974, 41–44.

[243] S. F. Bonner 1977, 146–62; Christes 1975, 401–2.

[244] Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* VI 2.13 (Schwartz 1999, II/2: 522.19–21): καὶ τυγχάνει δεξιώσεως ὁμοῦ καὶ ἀναπαύσεως παρά τινι πλουσιωτάτῃ μὲν τὸν βίον καὶ τὰ ἄλλα περιφανεστάτῃ γυναικί. Compare the interesting hypotheses on the sources of the Eusebian texts in Nautin 1979, 50–53.

[245] Jerome, *De viris illustribus* 54.2 (Ceresa-Gastaldo 1988, 152) *octavo decimo aetatis suae anno* κατηχήσεων *opus aggressus*; compare Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* VI 3.3 (Schwartz 1999, II/2: 524.14–15): ἔτος δ’ ἦγεν ὀκτωκαιδέκατον καθ’ ὅ τοῦ τῆς κατηχήσεως προέστη διδασκαλείου. Scholten 1995, 19 with n. 17, has argued again for the correctness of this chronology. It is not necessary for us to repeat the details of this convincing argumentation here.

[246] Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* VI 2.15 (Schwartz 1999, II/2: 524.5–6), characterizes the earnings of the grammar teacher Origen as δαψιλῶς (“ample”) in view of his age. If this should not be meant—as many other formulations from this section of the bibliography—as a topos and illustrate the extraordinary gifting of Origen, then it is an interesting piece of information. For this period in Origen’s life, compare also Neymeyr 1989, 96–102.

[247] The epithet is admittedly first attested in Theodoret; compare the information in n. 258 below.

[248] Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* VI 19.6 (Schwartz 1999, II/2: 558.26–560.1): ἀκροατὴς γὰρ οὗτος Ἀμμωνίου τοῦ πλείστην ἐν τοῖς καθ’ ἡμᾶς χρόνοις ἐπίδοσιν ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ ἐσχηκότος γεγονώς (= Porphyry, *Contra Christianos* Fragment 39 in

admittedly remains unclear when exactly Origen took up his study with Ammonius Saccas. For it is only chronologically certain that Plotinus lived as his student in Alexandria for eleven years until the death of the philosopher in 241/242, which means at least that Origen must have been a student of Ammonius before then, since Origen already lived in Caesarea during these years. Although Ammonius must have been an impressive personality and gave Plotinus the decisive impulse for the working out of a Neoplatonic system, Ammonius nevertheless stood, according to Heinrich Dörrie's interpretation of the relevant passages of the *Vita Plotini,* at the margins among the professional philosophers in Alexandria and was evidently a kind of *Geheimtip* (well-kept secret).[249] Since he did not publish any treatises himself and his students agreed not to publish the lecture transcripts posthumously, it is also very difficult to reconstruct what Ammonius taught and what distinguished his "school" in terms of organization and content. Since all the preserved reports about the doxography of Ammonius are directed to the theory of principles, to questions about the ἕν and the ἕνωσις—that is, to the relation between the one, being, and the things that are[250]—one can hardly imagine that he was the first and only philosophical teacher of Origen. In order to hear Ammonius with profit, one would need to have already carefully studied the texts of Plato and their history of interpretation at another point. We know nothing about the additional circumstances and organizational framework of Ammonius' teaching activity. One could at best infer from his outsider role that he did not teach at any of the established educational institutions. Origen presumably first received instruction from him during a later phase of his own higher studies, in which he was no longer active as a grammar teacher.[251]

Harnack 1916b, 65 = Harnack 1980b, 424); compare also Origen's own statement on his philosophical teacher, cited below in n. 251. On Origen as a student and the problem of the identity of the Christian theologian Origen and the Neo-Platonist Origen, compare (critically) Dörrie 1955; R. Klein in Guyot/Klein 1996, 111; Neymeyr 1989, 98; (affirming) Kettler 1972; recently Böhm 2002; Ziebritzki 1994, 30–42 (with additional literature).

[249] Dörrie 1978, 469; quite similarly already Fowden 1951, 477–81.

[250] Compare especially Nemesius of Emessa, *De natura hominis* 3 (Morani 1987, 38.16–20) = Porphyry, *Symmikta Zetemata* (Dörrie 1959, 56), and Origen the Platonist, fragment 7 (Weber 1962, 5–6) = Proclus, *Theologia Platonica* II 4 (Saffrey/Westerink 1968–1997, II: 31.4–22); Dörrie 1978, 466–68.

[251] Since R. Williams 2000, 398, suggests identifying the "teacher of philosophy" mentioned in the quotation of a letter of Origen in Eusebius (Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* VI 19.13 [Schwartz 1999, II/2: 562.15–16] = CPG I: 1496) with Ammonius, he dates his studies to the time after 210 CE. Origen says there that while he was with this teacher, he met the subsequent Alexandrian bishop Heraclas who had belonged to the teacher for five years already. Unfortunately we do not know when Heraclas began to study with Ammonius. Heraclas was in office from 232/233 to 247/248 as bishop, so that one can well imagine that he had already studied with Ammonius when Origen began his activity as a grammar teacher (Crouzel 1990,

In his biography of Origen, Eusebius introduces two very different reasons for the fact that Origen gave up his teaching as a grammar teacher: first, more and more students are said to have streamed into Origen's ecclesiastical instruction; second, Origen is said to have recognized then that "attending to the divine studies (ἡ πρὸς τὰ θεῖα παιδεύματα ἄσκησις) is not compatible with the teaching of grammar (ἡ τῶν γραμματικῶν διδασκαλία)."[252] Even if Eusebius gives the impression here that Origen felt a contradiction between the teaching of grammar and the "holy scholarship" due to his Christian faith,[253] the interest in concentrating on the higher studies could have been a motivation, in addition to simply being overworked, for giving up the occupation that he originally practiced. In the *Address of Thanksgiving* (*Oratio panegyrica*) of a student in Caesarea, which was already mentioned in 2.1.2.2, it is correspondingly recounted, as the view of the mature Origen, that the study of grammar is "an unimportant and unnecessary study" and that it does not depend on the linguistic form but on the material content of things.[254] Origen then secured his livelihood by selling his library and receiving a daily life annuity of four obols in return.[255] Eusebius describes in detail the strict ascetic inclinations and practices of Origen during this time, who walked barefoot and owned only one garment in accordance with the "gospel words of the Savior, which require one not to have two shirts and not to use any shoes either."[256] But interestingly, it is now reported about Plotinus that he likewise lived very ascetically and followed Pythagorean catharsis. Nothing speaks against tracing this life stance back, with Heinrich Dörrie, to his teacher Ammonius,[257] so that it is certainly easy to imagine that Origen discovered in the gospel the life form that he had learned from Ammonius (or, conversely, that he also found in Ammonius the life form that he knew

1302–3). Moreover, the information is in tension with Eusebius' statement that Heraclas was the first student of Origen (Historia ecclesiastica VI 3.2 [524.11-12], as Koch 1926 has rightly noted. One could infer from a statement in Theodoret (*Graecarum affectionum curatio* VI 60 [Raeder 1904, 169.11-13; Canivet 1958, 275.21-276.2) that Ammonius took up his teaching activity in Alexandria in 190 CE at the latest (so also Fowden 1977, 369).

[252] Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* VI 3.8 (Schwartz 1999, II/2: 526.15–17). For the terminology that is used, compare Plato, Timaeus 24 D παιδεύματα θεῶν.

[253] Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* VI 3.8 (Schwartz 1999, II/2: 526.17–18): . . . ἅτε ἀνωφελῆ καὶ τοῖς ἱεροῖς μαθήμασιν ἐναντίαν τὴν τῶν γραμματικῶν λόγων διατριβήν.

[254] Gregory Thaumaturgus, *Oratio panegyrica* 7.107: τὸ μικρὸν τοῦτο <τὸ> καὶ οὐκ ἀνωφελῆ καὶ τοῖς ἱεροῖς μαθήμασιν ἐναντίαν τὴν τῶν γραμματικῶν λόγων διατριβήν (Guyot/Klein 1996, 166.16–17).

[255] Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* VI 3.9 (Schwartz 1999, II/2: 526.22–23).

[256] Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* VI 3.10 (Schwartz 1999, II/2: 528.1–3), compare Matthew 10.10 and 6.34.

[257] Dörrie 1978, 469.

from the gospel) and as a result implemented it in his own life as well.[258] Such a viewpoint is also supported by the fact that Ammonius, according to his epithet, did not wear a simple philosopher's mantel (τρίβων) but a garment that called to mind a sack for the transporting of some kind of objects (σακκᾶς).

The precise institutional framework of Origen's intrachurch educational work during the first two decades of the third century in Alexandria[259] has been controversial in scholarship for some time. While for a long time his teaching was assigned as a matter of course to the instruction of catechumens and institutionally to a "catechetical school" (as a translation of τὸ τῆς κατηχήσεως διδασκαλεῖον) in the wake of Eusebius,[260] starting in the middle of the last century, it has been hypothesized that Eusebius inadmissibly retrojects fourth-century circumstances into the third century in his presentation. Instead, Origen is said to have been active as a free teacher, since there was not yet any established institution of a "catechetical school." But some time ago—in precisely the opposite direction—the reliability of the Eusebian tradition has been defended, and the teaching of Origen has been placed in the context of the establishment of a *Theologische Hochschule* (theological college) of the Alexandrian church. In the view of Clemens Scholten, who advocated this thesis in his inaugural Bonn lecture in 1995, this "college" was established because the church recognized "that penetrating into the educational world of the time and transforming it meant, at that time, a confrontation at the collegiate level, because the actual acquisition of knowledge and argumentative exchange took place here and not with the elementary teacher or grammar teacher."[261] The opening of such an institution is said to have been easy for the church because "the learned philosophizing of this time was nothing other than an exegesis that was increasingly being refined methodologically, from which something like a school dogmatic was derived

[258] The difficult question of whether Ammonius was originally once a Christian and fell away from the faith as Porphyry claims and Eusebius denies (*Historia ecclesiastica* VI 19.7 and 9 [Schwartz 1999, II/2: 560,4–7 and 25–26]) does not need to interest us here. Dörrie 1978, 467, has sharply opposed this assumption. Langerbeck 1967, [146–66] 150–52, has attempted to defend it with not uninteresting arguments, and he calls Ammonius a "secularized Christian philosopher" (p. 166).

[259] For the chronology compare now the balanced summary in R. Williams 2000, 398–400.

[260] In addition to the literature listed in n. 245 above, compare Bardy 1937; Knauber 1951; Hornschuh 1960; Bienert 1978, 81–87; Tuilier 1982; A. Le Boulluec 1987; Neymeyr 1989, 42–45 and 96–102.

[261] Scholten 1995, 37; for the traditional view, compare Wilken 1984.

and developed,”[262] and thus it was related methodologically to theology in which a dogmatic was also derived from exegesis. “The study of writings with the assistance of the preparatory studies of the quadrivium and philosophy”[263] are said to have stood at the center of the teaching plan of the college. Against a common view, the Alexandrian church is thus said to have developed another distinct form of educational institution alongside that of the catechumenate but not to have financed it, so that Origen remained in this sense a free teacher and dependent on other sources of income. As a result, the designation of this “theological college” as τὸ τῆς κατηχήσεως διδασκαλεῖον, which is attested in Eusebius, should be translated as “school of Christian instruction” or “Christian school.”[264]

In support of his thesis, Scholten could appeal to the fact that later generations understood the Eusebian expression τὸ τῆς κατηχήσεως διδασκαλεῖον to mean that a διδασκαλεῖον in the specific sense of an academic (collegiate) school had existed in Alexandria from the seventies of the second century onward and, in addition, presented a chain of succession (διαδοχή) of scholarchs analogous to the Platonic Academy. We possess an excerpt from Philip of Side’s Χριστιανικὴ ἱστορία / *Historia christiana* from the beginning of the fifth century (CPG III: 6026),[265] in which an unbroken chain of school heads leads to Origen as the fourth in the series after the apologists Athenagoras, Pantaenus, and Clement (or Clement and Pantaenus) and after Origen through Heraclas, Dionysius, and Pierius down to Didymus the Blind and a certain Rhodon.[266] Naturally,

[262] Scholten 1995, 25. Scholton refers to Dörrie 1974b and P. Hadot 1987. According to Albinus, The ordered study of Plato’s dialogues and “the engagement with the investigation of nature as well as the so-called theology and ordering of the universe” led to the students “seeing the sphere of the divine in full clarity” (κατοψόμεθα τὰ θεῖα ἐναργῶς): Albinus, *Introductio in Platonem* 5 (Hermann 1907,150.12 = Dörrie/Baltes 1990, nr. B., line 50, p. 100, with commentary on pp. 356–58).

[263] Scholten 1995, 37.

[264] Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* VI 3.3 (Schwartz 1999, II/2: 524.15); compare VI 26 (580.12) and Scholten 1995, 29–31.

[265] Oxford, Bodleian Library, Cod. Baroccianus gr. 142, fol. 216^{r}–216^{v}; edited in Hansen 1995b, 160; discussed in detail in Pouderon 1994: translation on p. 164, images of fol. 216$^{r/v}$ on pp. 165–66. A version of the article condensed to its theses was presented by Pouderon at the eleventh International Conference of Patristic Studies in Oxford in 1991 (Pouderon 1993).

[266] Philip, fragment: πλὴν εἴτε οὕτως εἴτε ἐκείνως τέταρτος προέστη τῆς Χριστιανικῆς διατριβῆς Ὠριγένης· (Hansen 1995b, 160.14–15). The fragment concludes with another concise list: οἱ διδάσκαλοι· Ἀθηναγόρας ά· Πάνταινος β´· Ὠριγένης γ´ . . . In contrast to Pouderon 1994, 220–21, I wish to regard this second list as a simple marginal gloss (this is supported already by the major error that Clement is counted as number 6: Κλήμης ζ´· [Hansen 1995b, 160.22–25] and the fragment concludes with this second list), which entered into the text at some point.

not only is the presupposed image of a διδασκαλεῖον that existed from the beginning and had a fixed organization problematic, but the concomitant reconstruction of the succession of the scholarchs is also afflicted with many historical problems. But the list, which perhaps comes from Alexandria,[267] demonstrates that the tradition descending from Origen of a theological education in Alexandria had at times solidified itself in such a way organizationally that one could effortlessly compare it—just two hundred years after the end of his activity in the metropolis—with a very famous philosophical educational institution organized as a school. As a sign for this, Athenagoras, who comes from Athens, is credited in the same fragment not only with founding the Alexandrian διδασκαλεῖον but also with the leadership of the Platonic Academy in Athens (τῆς Ἀκαδημαϊκῆς σχολῆς προιστάμενος) at the same time, so that the institution in Alexandria basically appears as a daughter of the great Athenian model.[268]

Scholton's thesis of a theological college as the institutional context of the teaching activity of Origen would explain better than the traditional model of an exclusively catechetical background why his biblical commentaries and other writings — the first five books of a John commentary (CPG I: 1453), three books of an largely lost commentary on Genesis (1410), commentaries on the Psalms (1425), two books on the resurrection that are preserved only in fragments (1478), and the first Christian dogmatic in the form of gathered treatises (namely, *On First Principles* περὶ ἀρχῶν / *De Principiis* [1482])—start at such a high level. If Origen simply gave instruction for educated baptismal candidates in the metropolis, then these texts would clearly have been over the heads of the presumed circle of listeners. Moreover, in comparison with the previous thesis of a "catechetical school," the assumption of the existence of a theological college in Alexandria would more easily allow one to perceive, alongside the thematic connections, the institutional connections between Jewish-Hellenistic teachers and Christian teachers in Alexandria, thus connections between figures such as Philo, Valentinus, Clement, and Origen. However, really clear source attestations for the existence of such a theological college are lacking in the early third century in Alexandria.

[267] Thus Pouderon 1994, 218–19. But it makes one skeptical toward this thesis that according to Philip, the last school head in the διαδοχή, Rhodon, transferred the διδασκαλεῖον to Side (thus to the city where Philip was born; Hansen 1995b, 160.19: μετήγαγε κατὰ Φίλιππον τὴν διατριβὴν ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ πόλει τῇ Σίδῃ κατὰ τοὺς χρόνους τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοδοσίου). Ensslin 1938, 2374, sets this straight by stating that Rhodon "as *former* [emphasis C. M.] leader of the Alexandrian catechetical school under Theodosius I moved to Side"; Opitz 1938 does not mention the connections at all.

[268] Philip, fragment: ἀνὴρ ἐν αὐτῷ χριστιανίσας τῷ τρίβωνι καὶ τῆς Ἀκαδημαϊκῆς σχολῆς προϊστάμενος (Hansen 1995b, 160.3–4) and Pouderon 1994, 192–93.

An institutionalized "private Christian university" can first be shown on the basis of the aforementioned reports of Gregory Thaumaturgus and Eusebius from the thirties of this century in Caesarea, and in contrast to a possible precursor establishment in Alexandria, its teaching program can be quite securely reconstructed (see section 2.1.2.2) as well. More hypothetical is the assumption that there was already such a college in Alexandria in the second century. In this time and place, only specific school connections are reasonably certain, but these, as we have seen in relation to the example of Justin, could definitely form around free teachers as well.[269] Thus Scholten's thesis remains a hypothesis that requires "both critical scrutiny and intensive discussion" (Wolfram Kinzig).[270]

Irrespective of all objections by modern scholars against the information about a "catechetical school" in Alexandria in Eusebius of Caesarea, it remains for the time being the most plausible hypothesis that Origen gave his instruction in the context of an institution, whatever its nature, for the education of catechumens in Alexandria. This would presuppose that for its own educational offerings, the Alexandrian church publicly decided during his lifetime not to work any longer with free teachers who earned their livelihood from other activities but rather to establish a fixed organizational form. This step, however and whenever it took place in detail, has a significance that can hardly be exaggerated for the history of the institutions in which explicit Christian theology was carried out in antiquity. For alongside the free teachers and Christian popular philosophers, there existed for the first time an institution that could have provided instruction at a professional philosophical level. This model of a fixed organizational

[269] For the older literature, compare Neymeyr 1989, 40–95, and now van den Broek 1995 (= 1996, 197–205). Van den Broeck thinks that "the whole idea of a Christian school with a διαδοχή of teachers handing down a fixed tradition of learning to their pupil successors is completely false" (1995, 41 = 1996, 199); contrast Runia 1993, 135–37, and van den Hoek 1997: Runia and van den Hoek are of the view (in my opinion with complete justification) that without a Christian school context, the works of Philo could not have been handed down in the completeness that is presupposed by the reception of Philo in Clement of Alexandria. For the theological concept of a "gnostic teacher" in Clement, compare now Kovacs 2001.

[270] Kinzig 1997, 927–28. Kinzig thinks above all that Scholten's notion of the church establishing such a theological collegiate school projects back conditions of the fourth century into the second. In addition, he fears that the expression "theological college" could be misunderstood to mean that here it was above all Christian clergy who were educated and regards the expression "Christian school" as more appropriate. However, in this way, it does not become as clear that an education at a university level took place here. For my part, I would put questions to Scholten at other points: How do we know that Origen sold his books only for material reasons (thus, however, Scholten 1995, 21)? Can one, with Eusebius, really presuppose for Alexandria the educational program that Gregory Thaumaturgus attests for Caesarea without any qualification (thus Scholten 1995, 24)?

form was so important to Origen that he took it with him from Alexandria and most probably exported it in highly altered form to Palestine when he had to leave the Egyptian metropolis because of his difficulties with the bishop there. In Caesarea, a catechetical school now became a private Christian university, a true theological college with an ambitious program of education. Origen probably did not get to know a comparably high educational institution via his most important philosophical teacher in Alexandria—for, as we have seen, the "sack-wearer" Ammonius was a charismatic outsider in relation to the philosophical guild at that time. One could, of course, get to know comparable institutions of collegiate education in the early third century at many other places in Alexandria. When he was still a grammar teacher, Origen presumably studied these institutions and their educational offerings very carefully before he opened his Christian private university in Caesarea.

Origen left Alexandria for good at the beginning of the thirties of the third century (probably 232 CE); moved to the worldly and ecclesiastical administrative metropolis of Caesarea in Palestine; and now did, in fact, establish a "(collegiate) school"[271] there, so that he was also active as a theological teacher in the second important section of his life. More precise information about this "school of Origen," the first clearly attested private Christian university, can be obtained above all from the aforementioned *Address of Thanksgiving* (λόγος χαριστήριος [cf. 3.31 and 4.40], later titled λόγος προσφωνητικός), which the later bishop Gregory Thaumaturgus addressed to his teacher after five years at this school, probably in 238 CE. From Jerome's catalogue of authors, one learns that this text was recited in a *Festgemeinschaft* (fellowship celebration), which consisted of the leader of the school, Origen, and Gregory's fellow students[272]—thus the situation very remotely resembles the graduation speech of someone who has passed their exams at a modern graduation celebration. At any rate, Gregory expressed his thanks on behalf of a certain number of students and before the revered teacher, as the linguistic observations on the alteration between "I" and "we" (2.14–15; 10.127 and 129) and the address ὦ φίλη κεφαλή (2.15 and 19.204) show.[273] The text was preserved in Caesarea and later included with the apology for Origen that his student Pamphilus composed. Since Gregory belonged to the first

[271] R. Williams 2000, 400–401; compare also the documentation in n. 262 above.

[272] Jerome, *De viris illustribus* 65.3 (Ceresa-Gastaldo 1988, 170).

[273] Plato, *Euthydemus* 293 E (φίλης κεφαλῆς); *Phaedrus* 264 A (φίλη κεφαλή); Proclus, *In Platonis Timaeum commentaria* 29 D/E (Diehl 1903/1904/1906, I: 358.3): τεῦκρε, φίλη κεφαλή (citation from Homer, Odyssea IX 281); likewise in Plutarch, *Quomodo adulator ab amico internoscatur* 11 = *Moralia* 4.11 (55 B = Paton/Wegehaupt/Pohlenz/Gärtner 1993, 110.14).

generation of Origen's students in Caesarea, as he himself also indicates (5.63), it is perhaps even the first festive end of school celebration whose graduation speech is preserved for us here. In the *Address of Thanksgiving*, we find interesting information about the teachers, the students, and the school itself. One learns first that the author, Gregory, had already completed the three levels of higher education—namely, elementary instruction, grammar instruction, and rhetorical instruction—in his home city of Neocaesarea in Pontus ("as was common for young men from distinguished family and good upbringing"[274]) and had already studied Roman law there for three years.[275] Thus the "school of Origen" imparted neither an elementary education nor the higher levels of encyclical education but presupposed them. Staying at the school for five years was apparently not felt to be an unusually long time of study. If one considers the extensive study program (see section 2.1.2.2; dialectic, arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, metaphysics, natural philosophy, ethics, and theology[276]), then it is an entirely understandable span of time. One lived in a close teaching, learning, and life fellowship, which Gregory depicts as ties of friendship with every sign of enthusiasm. Time and again the model of the Platonic Academy shines through. The *Address of Thanksgiving* itself is modeled at many points on the Platonic dialogues—thus Gregory's admiration for Origen recalls that of Alcibiades for Socrates in the *Symposium*,[277] and the image of Origen as a gardener who waters and digs around the soul (7.96) recalls the *Apology*.[278] One learns further that the task of the student consisted first of listening (probably in the lectures). Gregory uses a plural, indicating that a number of teachers who delivered such lectures in the school were apparently present at the celebration (1.3).[279] In addition, in order to attract students, there were, at least at the beginning, "conversations of every sort" (6.74) and later there were questions and tasks from the teacher for the students (7.95). The terminology of the *Address of Thanksgiving*, which is strongly influenced by contemporary philosophy, shows

[274] Gregory Thaumaturgus, *Oratio panegyrica* 5.56: οἷα παῖδας οὐκ ἀγενῶς δῆθεν καὶ φύντας καὶ τρεφομένους (Guyot/Klein 1996,144.2–3).

[275] Klein in Guyot/Klein 1996, 7–8.

[276] For the threefold division in εἶδος λογικόν, φυσικόν, and ἠθικόν. Compare also Origen, *Homiliae in Canticum* prologue (Baehrens 1925, 75–79) and Neuschäfer 1987, 77–84. Other passages in which Origen comments on the methods of his teaching are discussed by Knauber 1968, 183.

[277] Compare Plato, *Symposium* 219 D–221 D, and Klein in Guyot/Klein 1996, 24.

[278] Compare Plato, *Apologia* 29 E–31 C, and Klein in Guyot/Klein 1996, 37. For detailed documentation of this metaphor, which was "a popular commonplace of the contemporary philosophy," see Knauber 1968, 193.

[279] Gregory Thaumaturgus, *Oratio panegyrica* 1.3: . . . ὅτι μὴ τῶν θαυμασίων τούτων ἀνδρῶν, τῶν τὴν καλὴν φιλοσοφιαν ἀσπασαμένων (Guyot/Klein 1996, 120.13–14).

that the students were apparently strongly formed by the instruction.[280] In this school, the concern was with the true and beautiful φιλοσοφία (1.3) and with (συμ–)φιλοσοφεῖν; φιλοσοφία as scholarship περὶ τοῦ θείου is simply a part of this shared learning and life undertaking (13.150).[281]

From the life story of Gregory Thaumaturgus, it becomes clear that with his "school," Origen evidently did not wish to address primarily the Christians of Caesarea, let alone the Christian youth of Caesarea, who were keen on education,[282] but courted educated members of the upper stratum outside the region who were interested in a collegiate education within a Christian framework. Since it is a matter of education at a collegiate level and a long course of study, one should not speak of an "introductory course with a missional character for young Gentiles" if one wishes to describe the educational goal of the school.[283] And a "*Schulkatechumenat*"[284] (school catechumate) is certainly not in view when we are dealing with an education that lasted multiple years. The institution evidently attracted well-to-do educated people who sought a professional philosophical education that was Christian in character and motivated them to study for quite some time. From other sources, we know that Porphyry, who in his aforementioned passage on Origen in Eusebius admits, sort of in passing, that he "met" or "associated with" the Christian theologian "in his youth."[285] Thus he presumably stayed in Caesarea/Palestine, because according to the trustworthy testimony of the church historian Socrates, he was beaten by Christians there.[286] Since the Neoplatonist philosopher was born around 233 CE, the encounter must have happened sometime in the later forties of the third century, and it is at least not out of the question that it took place in the context of the "school of Origen." This would in any case explain why the church historian Socrates could designate Porphyry as an apostate from Christianity.

[280] Documentation in Knauber 1968, 187–91, and Klein in Guyot/Klein 1996, 30–44.

[281] Compare also Gregory Thaumaturgus, *Oratio panegyrica* 16.195: . . . καὶ ὑμνῳδοὺς καὶ θεολόγους (Guyot/Klein 1996, 206.1) on the Jerusalem temple singers and cult prophets who had to go into the Babylonian exile.

[282] Thus also Knauber 1968, 183.

[283] Klein in Guyot/Klein 1996, 44.

[284] With this term, Knauber 1968, 202, attempts to summarize the concern of his interpretation, whereby he is "very aware of the historical limits of such a manner of expression."

[285] Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* VI 19.3 (Schwartz 1999, II/2: 558.8): ὅν κατὰ τὴν νέαν ἡλικίαν ἐγνωκέναι φήσας. Eusebius refers to: . . . [ἀνήρ], ᾧ κἀγὼ κομιδῇ νέος ὢν ἔτι ἐντετύχηκα (*Historia ecclesiastica* VI 19.5 [558.22–23]). The word ἐντετύχηκα can describe both a short meeting and a longer period of study. Compare LSJ s.v. (578); PGL s.v. (484); Kettler 1972, 332 (admittedly on the reading συντετύχηκα).

[286] Socrates, *Historia ecclesiastica* III 23.38 (Hansen 1995a, 222.25–30 = fragment 9T: Smith/Wasserstein 1993, 14.1–10; cf. Kinzig 1998, 320–23 [also on parallel traditions]).

But what organizational form did the "school of Origen" have? According to the view of Adolf Knauber, it is self-evident that with the word "school" one may "not think of a formal institution"; what is meant is "instead a concrete circle of persons: the teacher-student fellowship that was formed around Origen in Caesarea."[287] Knauber appeals to formulations from the *Address of Thanksgiving* such as ἡ πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα τοῦτον κοινωνία and ἡ κοινωνία ἥδε (5.70). But this does not adequately describe the textual findings: Gregory or the author of the *Address of Thanksgiving* describes only that "the fellowship with this man" (i.e., Origen) belongs to the "invisible" reasons that he and his brother came to Origen and remained with him (5.70). But alongside the κοινωνία, the school, according to the passage, is also concerned with instruction in the studies that deal with the Logos and with benefits for the salvation of souls (5.70, ἡ διατριβὴ δι' αὐτοῦ περὶ τὰ τοῦ λογοῦ μαθήματα, καὶ τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν ὠφέλεια εἰς σωτηρίαν). In this passage, it is not at all said which "visible" organizational form of the instruction thereby showed itself. Thus one may not designate the personal fellowship between teacher and student, which belonged to the nature of contemporary philosophical education, as "the actual structure of the 'school'" and claim that in comparison "material—in order not to say: organizational—elements are of secondary significance."[288] Even if the author of the *Address of Thanksgiving* claims that it is a distinguishing difference in relation to the schools of other philosophers that his interest in the pagan philosophy can be traced back to the trustworthy life conduct of Origen (11.33), precisely this close connection between teaching and life conduct corresponds to the proprium of a contemporary philosophical school. When interpreting the matter of the "school of Origen," one may not impose modern alternatives on an ancient institution and ask whether the concern was more with "cultivating speculation and pure research" or with "missionizing and proclamation in the spiritual life sphere of the educational system of the time."[289] In this educational institution, results of pure research and speculation were taught in order to thus disseminate, with the help of the divine Logos, the "beautiful philosophy" (1.3) in the contemporary educational system. Naturally, we know nothing about the exact modalities of the financing of this instruction, but our knowledge is similarly slight, as we have seen, even for the most prominent philosophical school of antiquity—namely, the Platonic Academy. Whether

[287] Knauber 1968, 182.

[288] Knauber 1968, 182.

[289] Thus, however, Knauber 1968, 203. Pouderon 1998, 265, speaks more appropriately of a "université chrétienne."

Ambrosius, the patron and sponsor of Origen,[290] financed not only the famous opulent writing office[291] but also the costs of the school or whether the students had to pay tuition fees has not been handed down. It is certain at any rate that the relation between patron and client was not impeded by Origen's difficult move from Alexandria to Caesarea.[292] Unfortunately, neither do we know whether he received a proper ecclesial teaching commission in Caesarea; but in light of the good relation of Origen to the local bishop, one can certainly hypothesize that the bishop viewed the activities of the college with pleasure.

An especially fascinating question in the interpretation of Gregory's *Address of Thanksgiving* is why "virtually nothing of the actual theology and Christ spirituality of Origen" can be discovered in it[293] and scarcely any biblical quotations occur either; rather, the text remains in the sphere of the general propaedeutic of faith in God and a personally oriented speech about the divine οἰκονομία (5.55; but cf. 3.28). Correspondingly, the words Χριστός, ἐκκλησία, φωτισμός, πίστις, and ἀγάπη do not occur at all, and the terms βαπτίζειν and εὐχαριστία are not used in their specific Christian sense. Should one not have learned more about the theology of Origen and the significance of Holy Scripture for one's daily work in five years of study? Did the teaching of Origen remain in the philosophical prolegomena and not reach at all the actual theological central points, as they were already developed in Alexandria in the treatise on fundamentals Περὶ ἀρχῶν / *De principiis*? Or were the departing students not at all interested in such intra-Christian themes? All these interpretations of the findings have been mentioned.[294] But one should realize that we are dealing with a celebratory address as a farewell before the school community and not with an interview lecture in which the candidate has to show that he has understood what has been taught. Precisely if the whole school

[290] Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* VI 18.1 (Schwartz 1999, II/2: 556.9–10); compare also Jerome, *Epistulae* 43 (Hilberg 1910, 318–21); *De viris illustribus* 56 (Ceresa-Gastaldo 1988, 158); Epiphanius, *Panarion seu adversus Lxxx haereses* 64.3 (Holl/Dummer 1980, 405.13–407.3); and Origen, *Commentarii in evangelium Joannis* V 8 (Preuschen 1903b, 105.16–19).

[291] Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* VI 23.2 (Schwartz 1999, II/2: 568.25–570.7); on literary patronage, compare Gold 1987, passim.

[292] Compare the prologue to the fifth book of the John commentary, which was composed in Caesarea: Origen, *Philocalia* 5.5 (Harl/De Lange 1983, 292.1–294.31 / Preuschen 1903b, 100–105); Monaci Castagno 2003.

[293] Knauber 1968, 190; approvingly cited by Klein in Guyot/Klein 1996, 31. Compare also the expressions of other interpretations of the *Address of Thanksgiving* collected in Knauber 1968, 185–86.

[294] An overview of the interpretations is provided by Klein in Guyot/Klein 1996, 33–34; for a more extensive overview, see Crouzel 1969, 46–78.

was gathered, with students of very different educational levels sitting together in the auditorium, the speech could have only propaedeutic character. In addition, Gregory leaves no doubt that at the end of the education stood the allegorical interpretation of that "which is dark and riddling" (ὅ τί ποτε σκοτεινὸν καὶ αἰνιγματῶδες ἦν), as frequently occurs with the holy words (15.174),[295] thus the allegorical interpretation of the biblical texts by Origen and their interpretation against the background of the theology of the school head. Just as an exoteric and an esoteric teaching is distinguished among the Platonists, God has spoken in the Bible, according to Gregory, in riddles and "through this man" makes what is enigmatic a manifest subject of instruction in that school (15.177). Gregory himself shows that he was thoroughly aware of the dominant position of the divine Spirit in the hermeneutic of Origen when in one place in the speech he calls his teacher a ἑρμηνεὺς . . . τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγων (15.181). Correspondingly, the instruction in this school is "truly a paradise" (15.183). Moreover, it may also not be a purely rhetorical figure when the student confesses at the graduation celebration that as he departs, he can "not even bring all the inheritance that falls to us" and very openly appeals to the fact that he has still made no great advances in this last and highest discipline of his education (16.191).

Summarizing, one can argue that the "school of Origen," the first Christian university of antiquity that is really attested for us, offered in the sense of its founder and academic leader a comprehensive instruction in diverse contemporary studies that culminated in an explicit "theology," an interpretation of biblical texts with a view to their allegorical content. Origen presumably viewed this undertaking as his personal contribution to the great goal of leading people from a simple understanding of the Christian faith to a deepened, mature faith, in the manner in which he explains in the prologue of his commentary on the Song of Songs.[296] A good teacher, so it says further in this commentary that emerged in Caesarea and was presumably presented in the college, should make himself superfluous in this task in order that the Logos himself can take over the function of teacher.[297] The private Christian university was evidently also interested in being able to release its students again. This college was not a church institution in the actual sense, although Origen always wanted to serve the church with his scholarly and "theological" work. We find

[295] Gregory Thaumaturgus, *Oratio panegyrica* 15.174 (Guyot/Klein 1996, 196.4–5).

[296] Origen, *Commentarii in Canticum canticorum* prologue 1.4 (Brésard/Crouzel/Borrett 1991/1992, I: 82–84).

[297] Origen, *Origen, Commentarii in Canticum canticorum* I 1.1–8 on *Song of Songs* 1.2 (Brésard/Crouzel/Borrett 1991/1992, I: 176–82).

it difficult to say how long the "school of Origen" lived on in the actual sense after the death of its founder and leader. That Pamphilius and Eusebius really taught in the context of a living school with a fixed program of learning and a constant circle of lecturers and students is rather improbable; it is nowhere attested, at any rate. Despite this fact, a consideration of these two theologians in the tradition of Origen shows which effects of the school, which probably did not long survive the death of its charismatic first leader, went forth and influenced Christian "theology,"[298] if one thinks just of the exegetical, historical, and systematic works of Eusebius.

One could continue and expand these observations on the adoption of organizational forms of the pagan philosophical instruction and their consequences for Christian theology with reference to other great "schools" of ancient Christianity in Antioch, Edessa, and Nisibis,[299] though these differed considerably from the "school of Origen," at least with regard to their educational program. Moreover, the impact of ancient "schools" in the sense of a fixed organization naturally did not remain limited to the foundation of Christian (collegiate) schools, which were aligned more or less with the model of a philosophical school: the old topic of "lines of teachers and lines of bishops"[300] and the old question of the relation of the *successio apostolica* to the διαδοχαί would belong in this context, as would the return of some church fathers to Atticism.[301] Naturally, one could also deal with the adoption of pagan educational institutions with reference to the example of other Christian educational institutions, such as that of the catechetical instruction.[302] But such a comprehensive treatment of the topic would extend beyond the framework of this investigation.

We have seen with reference to the example of Justin, Ptolemy, Tatian, and Origen that only a small number of Christians since the late second century made use of the institutions and organizations of ancient *higher* education—namely, for the formation and mediation of an "explicit theology" of Christianity to contemporaries that were especially keen on education but not in order to actively promote the new religion among as many as possible of all those interested in education. The private Christian university in Caesarea Maritima, which is attested for the second, Palestinian period of Origen's life, represents an exception here, which can be explained primarily by the person of its leader and his extensive education. For a long time, the "school of Origen" found no successor, if only

298 Compare Markschies 2006, 246–48.
299 Drijvers 1995; H. Leclercq 1935; Macina 1982.
300 Campenhausen 1951.
301 Stiglmayr 1913; Fabricius 1967; Wifstrand 1967, 28–48.
302 Daniélou/Charlat 1968; Dujarier 1979; Kretschmar 2000.

because of its extraordinarily high educational level. At any rate, the really important ancient educational institution was at first *not* taken over by Christians and probably also could not be taken over by them: so it was quite some time before Christians could also occupy the few state teaching chairs[303] and the much more numerous state teaching offices,[304] thoroughly Christianize the colleges,[305] and thus penetrate to the top of the educational pyramid—namely, until well into the sixth century CE. By contrast, Christian teachers in the institutions of the elementary education were apparently more numerous from the beginning, but they only rarely attempted to exercise influence on the instructional content and reshape it. The relation of Christian "explicit theology" to the educational institutions, which were nevertheless its actual midwife, was and remained full of tension.

2.2 The Montanist Prophets and Their Circle

In section 2.1, we have seen, with reference to the examples of Justin, Ptolemy, Tatian, and Origen, how institutions—that is, the organization, form, and content of the contemporary instruction—influenced at every level the formation of an "explicit theology" of ancient Christianity in the modern sense of the word. But we could also observe that this specific interrelation between institution and theology, at least in the first centuries, did not represent the rule but rather an exception. In this new section, we want—again with reference to a characteristic example—to investigate a form of ancient Christian theology that is decidedly *not* oriented toward the contemporary philosophical instruction and inquire into possible pagan models. Due to the relatively great amounts of both authentic source materials and external reports, "Montanism" is better suited for this investigation than many other movements about which we know only a little or texts whose circles of tradents can scarcely be reconstructed or cannot be reconstructed at all. With this example, one can investigate how a group of prophets, female and male, carried out explicit "theology" through prophetic sayings and mediated it to a greater number of people.

303 Helm 1957; Liebeschuetz 1991, 891; Schlange-Schöningen 1995, 91–111.

304 According to the information of a letter of Emperor Antoninus Pius, which Modestin (in the first half of the third century) translates and comments on in *Digesta* XXVII 1.6.1–2 (Krueger/Mommsen 1877, 391a.7–10), in the first half of the second century in small cities, three sophists (rhetoricians) and two grammarians must have been privileged through immunities such as freedom from taxation; in middle-sized cities, four members of these occupations; and in larger cities (sc. the provincial capitals, the μητροπόλεις), five. Compare also Vössing 1997, 345–46.

305 Compare the tumultuous events in Alexandria: Liebeschuetz 1991, 887–88.

Despite the favorable nature of the sources, the view of “Montanism” is also shaped by ancient heresiology and in places even distorted by it. This begins with the term. The late ancient expression “Montanism” or “Montanists,”[306] coined by Christian heresiologists and really widespread only in modernity, refers to a prophetic movement in the ancient Christianity of the second century that gathered around several prophetesses and Montanus, from whom it has its name.[307] It emerged in the sixties of the second century. The original geographic center of this group was at first small villages in Phrygia.[308] Later it apparently spread through the entire empire. Antimontanist Christian theologians of the second and fourth centuries hand down fourteen (or twenty-four) prophetic logia.[309] These logia show that at the beginning of its empire-wide history of success, it announced, at first with prophetic authority alone, the near dawning of the end events in the Phrygian highland. With respect to these texts, it has become customary in scholarship to speak of “Montanist oracles,” although the problematic nature of this designation was also always clear: “Some seem not to be strictly ‘oracles’ at all.”[310] On the other side, however,

306 For οἱ Μοντανοί, compare, for example, Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catecheses* XVI 8.6 (Reischl/Rupp 1967, 214); for οἱ Μοντανισταί, compare, for example, (Pseudo-?) Didymus, *De Trinitate* III 18, 23 and 41 (PG 39: 881 B, 924 C, and 984 B); for *Montani sectator*, compare Jerome, *Epistulae* 41.1 (Hilberg 1910, 311.13) and *De viris illustribus* 59.1 (Ceresa-Gastaldo 1988, 160); for *Montani dogma*, compare Jerome, *Commentarii in Habacuc prophetam* prologue (Adriaen/Vallarsi 1970, 580.38) and *De viris illustribus* 53.4 (Ceresa-Gastaldo 1988, 150). For the designation “Montanists,” compare Labriolle 1913b, 275–76, and now (critically) Jensen 1992, 272–73. In her monograph, Trevett 1996, 2, 159–62, refrains from using the “anachronistic terminus” (“Priscillianism or Montanism: Who Founded and Led the New Prophecy?”).

307 Relevant literature (in selection): Bonwetsch 1881; Labriolle 1913a; K. Aland 1960; Campenhausen 1968, 257–82; 1972, 221–43; Klawitter 1975; Aune 1983, 313–16; Hirschmann 2005, esp. 41–53 (on the date of emergence and initiators).

308 On the Montanist heartland, compare Markschies 1994 with references to ancient texts and modern secondary literature. In the framework of a survey in the region, which has been carried out since summer 2000 by William Tabbernee (Tulsa, USA) and Peter Lampe (Heidelberg) in Phrygia, localities were identified again with Pepuza and Tymion: P. Lampe 2002; Tabbernee 2003. Not enough of the results of the survey have been published yet to check, let alone accept, the argumentation for the new identification. In my view, the inscriptional mention of *coloni* of the localities Tymion and Simoe (. . . *colonis Tymiorum et Simoen*|[*tium*], lines 10–11, in an inscription from the beginning of the third century from the museum of Uşak; cf. now P. Lampe 2004, 499) allows no clear localization of the place (contrast P. Lampe 2004, 508, “the ancient localities of Tymion and Simoe are . . . to be sought rather in the near vicinity of the place of the stone’s discovery if the inscription is to make sense”).

309 CPG I: 1325, compare Heine 1989, 2–9.

310 Trevett 1996, 3; compare now also McGinn 1997. Labriolle 1913a, 34–35, argues for the designation “oracles” with reference to a quotation from the *prooemium* of the *Controversiae* of Seneca the Elder (I praef. 9): *Quid enim est oraculum? Nempe voluntas divina hominis ore enuntiata* (Håkanson 1989, 3.7–8).

scholars also like to speak of "Montanist prophecy"[311] and in this way allude to the self-designation of the movement as ἡ νέα προφητεία.[312] For this reason, Harnack also thought that the collection of logia bore the title Ἡ τοῦ Μοντανοῦ προφητεία.[313]

We will attempt to describe the institutional status of this movement by first attempting to clarify more precisely the *literary* genre of their prophetic texts—namely, the logia that have been handed down. We therefore ask, What are the texts of this movement that have been handed down about? Do they stand in the tradition of biblical prophecy or in the tradition of pagan oracles? Or is the strict alternative between "prophecy" and "oracles" perhaps already problematic? In doing so, we will focus especially on a subquestion from this bundle of questions: what connects the Montanist texts with contemporary pagan oracles, and what separates the two? In this way, we constantly keep in view the institutional contexts and organizational background of the literary traditions that interest us. We will approach the answers to these questions in three steps: First, ancient descriptions and authentic texts of the Montanist movement will be investigated in relation to the terms with which "prophetic activity" is described (section 2.2.1). Second, we will compare the profile that we have obtained with relevant phenomena from the religious environment of Asia Minor (section 2.2.2). Finally, we will attempt a summarizing classification of the phenomenon "Montanism." The goal of the investigation is both to determine the institutional position of Montanism in the Phrygian "provincial religion" of the second century CE[314] and to study the different degrees of identity and pluralism in local Christianity.[315]

[311] Thus in Trevett 1996, passim: "The New Prophecy."

[312] Compare section 2.2.1 with n. 348. Kraft 1955, 249, hypothesizes that the self-designation was "prophecy" and the pejoratively interpreted qualification as "new" prophecy was a majority church reaction; contrast already Schepelern 1929, 10–11, and Klawitter 1975, 69.

[313] Harnack 1958a, 238. Labriolle 1913a, 35 with n. 4, considers whether the formulation ἐν τῷ κατὰ Ἀστέριον Ὀρβανόν of the so-called anti-Montanist Anonymous in Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* V 17 (Schwartz 1999, II/1: 466.18–19) means that (according to this view?) Asterius Urbanus edited the collection of the prophetic logia in the way that, for example, Mark edited the εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Μάρκον.

[314] I use the term in the sense of agreements reached at the conference "Reichsreligion and Provinzialreligion" (Imperial Religion and Provincial Religion) in September 1996 in the "Werner-Reimers-Stiftung" (Bad Homburg) but understand by it the totality of all the cults of a geographical sphere and choose here the starting point of a regional history of religion; compare Cancik/Rüpke 1997, III.

[315] In a series of articles in recent years, the "new prophecy" is incorporated into the context of the contemporary Christianity of Asia Minor as well: Trevett 1989; D. H. Williams 1989; Stewart-Sykes 1997, 421–28.

2.2.1 Ancient Descriptions of the "Montanist Prophecy"

First, if we are to explain such questions of the placement of historical phenomena and movements, then it is necessary to begin with the indisputably authentic texts of this movement.[316] In the Montanist witnesses themselves, there is a description of how the "new prophecy" "functions" (in order to choose this neutral expression for the time being). Here, three texts handed down in the late ancient bishop Epiphanius of Salamis on Cyprus are especially relevant. The first is introduced there as a text of Montanus:

> Εὐθὺς γὰρ ὁ Μοντανός φησιν· 'ἰδού, ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὡσεὶ λύρα κἀγὼ ἐφίπταμαι ὡσεὶ πλῆκτρον· ὁ ἄνθρωπος κοιμᾶται κἀγὼ γρηγορῶ. ἰδού, κύριός ἐστιν ὁ ἐξιστάνων καρδίας ἀνθρώπων καὶ διδοὺς καρδίαν ἀνθρώποις'.[317]

> For Montanus says, for example: "Look, the human being is like a lyre and I fly thereto like a plectrum (lyre-striker). The human being sleeps, and I am awake. Look, the Lord is the one who brings the hearts of human beings out of themselves (sets into ecstasy) and who gives human beings a (new) heart."

The second text is ascribed by Epiphanius to Maximilla, one of the three prophetesses who are known by name:

> Φάσκει δὲ πάλιν ἡ αὐτὴ Μαξίμιλλα, ἡ τῆς παρακολουθίας γνῶσις καὶ διδασκαλία,[318] ἵνα καὶ χλευαστικῶς εἴπω, ὅτι 'ἀπέστειλέ με κύριος τούτου τοῦ πόνου καὶ τῆς συνθήκης καὶ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας αἱρετιστὴν μηνυτὴν ἑρμηνευτήν, ἠναγκασμένον, θέλοντα καὶ μὴ θέλοντα, γνωθεῖν[319] γνῶσιν θεοῦ'.[320]

> But again this same Maximilla, the knowledge and teaching of her following, to speak in a ridiculous manner, says, "The Lord has sent me as adherent, proclaimer, interpreter of this toil and this covenant and this message, (as one) who is compelled, willingly or unwillingly, to know (to teach) the knowledge of God."

[316] I concentrate—with the exception of the so-called anti-Montanist Anonymous—on the prophetic logia; for the inscriptions, compare now Tabbernee 1997a.

[317] Nr. 3 (Labriolle 1913b, nr. 5 = Heine 1989, nr. 3 = K. Aland 1960, nr. 5) Epiphanius, *Panarion seu adversus Lxxx haereses* 48.4.1 (Holl/Dummer 1980, 224.22-225.2). Cf. also the extensive commentary in Labriolle 1913a, 46-50.

[318] Compare the variant in *Vaticanus Graecus* 502: παρακολουθίας καὶ διδασκαλίας γνῶσις.

[319] In *Vaticanus*, μαθεῖν.

[320] Nr. 8 (Labriolle 1913b, nr. 14 = Heine 1989 nr. 8 = K. Aland 1960, nr. 15) Epiphanius, *Panarion seu adversus Lxxx haereses* 48.13.1 (Holl/Dummer 1980, 237.9–13). Compare also the commentary in Labriolle 1913a, 73–76.

From the two texts, one can see that in the Montanist prophecy, the individuum of the prophet "sleeps," and in its place "the Lord" Christ uses the human organs and speaks. The graphic image of the lyre and the plectrum (lyre striker) is admittedly traditional, being used, for example, by Philo,[321] in the possibly contemporaneous *Odes of Solomon*,[322] and by early Christian apologists.[323] The mention of the new heart belongs in the context of Old Testament prophecy (cf., e.g., Ezekiel 11.19-20; 18.31; 36.26; and Jeremiah 31.31-33). If one compares these passages with the conceptions of Plutarch's Delphic priest of Apollo regarding the inspiration of the Pythia, which are about a hundred years older, then the greater restraint and simultaneously more precise description of the latter is conspicuous. "Voice, sound, expression, and meter" are assigned by Plutarch to the prophetess, and "images and conceptions" to god: "That one . . . kindles a light in her soul so that she can know the future."[324] While Plutarch designates the soul of the Pythia, in which the divine movement mixes with the movement of the soul, as god's instrument,[325] the human being receives a (new) heart according to Montanus.

[321] Philo, *Quis rerum divinarum heres sit* 259: ἐπεὶ καὶ μόνος ὄργανον θεοῦ ἐστιν ἠχεῖον, κρουόμενον καὶ πληττόμενον ἀοράτως ὑπ' αὐτοῦ (Cohn/Wendland 1962 III: 59.15–16); compare Burkhardt 1992, 158–59, 216–18; see further Groh 1985, 84–85. Much too general, by contrast, is McGinn 199, 129 n. 7: "As is widely known, this instrumental theory receives ample support in the Old Testament descriptions of prophetic experience, especially in the former prophets." By contrast, Strobel 1980, 279–82, links lyre and lyre-striker with Apollo's lyre and lyre-striker (Pseudo-Homeric hymn "To Pythian Apollo," lines 182 and 185).

[322] Compare *Odes of Solomon* 4.3c, "You gave your heart, Lord, to the believers," and *Odes of Solomon* 6.1–2, "As the wind goes through the lyre and the strings resound, so the Spirit of the Lord speaks in my members, and I speak in his love" (Lattke 1979, 80–83 and 90–91; cf. also Lattke 1995, 24–26).

[323] Pseudo-Justin, *Cohortatio ad Graecos* 8.2, . . . ἀλλὰ καθαροὺς ἑαυτοὺς τῇ τοῦ θείου πνεύματος παρασχεῖν ἐνεργείᾳ, ἵνα αὐτὸ τὸ θεῖον ἐξ οὐρανοῦ κατιὸν πλῆκτρον, ὥσπερ ὀργάνῳ κιθάρας τινὸς ἢ λύρας τοῖς δικαίοις ἀνδράσι χρώμενον, τὴν τῶν θείων ἡμῖν καὶ οὐρανίων ἀποκαλύψῃ γνῶσιν (Marcovich 1990, 33.12–15); Clement of Alexandria, *Paedagogus* II 41.4 (exposition of psalm 150.3–6), κιθάρα νοείσθω τὸ στόμα, οἱονεὶ πλήκτρῳ κρουόμενον τῷ πνεύματι (Stählin/Treu 1972, 182.22–23); and Hippolytus, *De antichristo* 2.1, Οὗτοι γὰρ πνεύματι προφητικῷ οἱ πάντες κατηρτισμένοι καὶ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ λόγου ἀξίως τετιμημένοι, ὀργάνων δίκην ἑαυτοῖς ἡνωμένοι ἔχοντες ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἀεὶ τὸν λόγον ὡς πλῆκτρον, δι' οὗ κινούμενοι ἀπήγελλον ταῦτα ἅπερ ἤθελεν ὁ θεός (Norelli 1987, 66 = Bonwetsch/Achelis 1897, 4.22–5.1). Compare now the ample commentary in Riedweg 1994, 277–79; concisely also Hirschmann 2005, 77–86.

[324] Plutarch, *De Pythiae oraculis* 7 = *Moralia* 25.7 (397 C = S. Schröder 1990, 86.6–8), οὐ γὰρ ἔστι θεοῦ ἡ γῆρυς οὐδ' ὁ φθόγγος οὐδ' ἡ λέξις οὐδὲ τὸ μέτρον ἀλλὰ τῆς γυναικός· ἐκεῖνος δὲ μόνας τὰς φαντασίας παρίστησι καὶ φῶς ἐν ψυχῇ ποιεῖ πρὸς τὸ μέλλον. Compare now S. Schröder 1990, 152–54, and in general Stroumsa 1999, 192–93.

[325] Plutarch, *De Pythiae oraculis* 21 = *Moralia* 25.21 (404 B = S. Schröder 1990, 97.22–24): ψυχὴ δ' ὄργανον θεοῦ γέγονεν; compare S. Schröder 1990, 36–43, 346–47;

In this respect, for him the prophet or the prophetess is not only “adherent” but also “proclaimer” and “interpreter”—indeed the Lord himself;[326] she is “compelled,”[327] whether she “is willing or unwilling” (cf. John 5.30 and 6.38), and brings in this way “knowledge of God.”

But the Montanist prophecy not only presupposes the “being outside of oneself” of the individuum, but it is also accompanied in a completely traditional manner by dreams and visions. This is shown by a tradition that Epiphanius connects with the names of the prophetess Quintilla or Prisca/Priscilla, which should presumably, despite more recent doubts, be judged as authentic:[328]

> Φάσὶ γὰρ οὗτοι οἱ Κυιντιλλιανοὶ[329] εἴτ’ οὖν Πρισκιλλιανοὶ ἐν τῇ Πεπούζῃ ἢ Κυίντιλλαν ἢ Πρίσκιλλαν (οὐκ ἔχω [γὰρ] ἀκριβῶς λέγειν), μίαν δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν ὡς προεῖπον ἐν τῇ Πεπούζῃ κεκαθευδηκέναι καὶ τὸν Χριστὸν πρὸς αὐτὴν ἐληλυθέναι συνυπνωκέναι τε αὐτῇ τούτῳ τῷ τρόπῳ, ὡς ἐκείνη ἀπατωμένη ἔλεγεν· ‘ἐν ἰδέᾳ’, φησὶ, ‘γυναικός, ἐσχηματισμένος, ἐν στολῇ λαμπρᾷ ἦλθε πρός με Χριστὸς καὶ ἐνέβαλεν ἐν ἐμοὶ τὴν σοφίαν καὶ ἀπεκάλυψέ μοι τουτονὶ τὸν τόπον εἶναι ἅγιον καὶ ὧδε τὴν Ἰερουσαλὴμ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατιέναι’.[330]
>
> For the Quintillians or Priscillians say that in Pepuza either Quintilla or Priscilla ([for] I cannot say exactly), at any rate one of them whom I previously named

Vernière 1990 and (critically) Holzhausen 1993, 74–76. Holzhausen documents the Platonic background of this theory of inspiration (pp. 86–91).

[326] Compare text nr. 2 (Labriolle 1913b nr. 2 = Heine 1989, nr. 2 = K. Aland 1960, nr. 4) Epiphanius, *Panarion seu adversus Lxxx haereses* 48.11.9 (Holl/Dummer 1980, 235.1–2): Εἶτα πάλιν φησὶ τὸ ἐλεεινὸν ἀνθρωπάριον Μοντανός, ὅτι ‘οὔτε ἄγγελος οὔτε πρέσβυς, ἀλλ’ ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ θεὸς πατὴρ ἦλθον’, a variant of Isaiah 63.9: οὐ πρέσβυς οὐδὲ ἄγγελος, ἀλλ’ αὐτὸς κύριος . . . . Compare also Groh 1985, 90–92, and Trevett 1996, 81–83: “The *Sitz im Leben* of this utterance probably lies in exposition of the promises and requirements of God to his people” (81–82).

[327] McGinn 1997, 129 n. 9, refers to Jeremiah 20.7-9 (Jeremiah 20.7: Ἠπάτησάς με, κύριε, καὶ ἠπατήθην, ἐκράτησας καὶ ἠδυνάσθης·). On the “Montanist prophecy,” compare also Weinel 1899, 91–96, 99.

[328] Compare the literature references and the argumentation in Markschies 1994, 16 n. 72.

[329] A conjecture of Holl without manuscript evidence; both manuscripts offer κατὰ φρύγα.

[330] Nr. 11 (Labriolle 1913b, nr. 17 = Heine 1989, nr. 11 = K. Aland 1960, nr. 12) Epiphanius, *Panarion seu adversus Lxxx haereses* 49.1.2 (Holl/Dummer 1980, 241.23–242.8); compare Acts 21.1: καὶ τὴν πόλιν τὴν ἁγίαν Ἰερουσαλὴμ καινὴν εἶδον καταβαίνουσαν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. The logion has recently received extensive commentary in Strobel 1980, 238–42; Jensen 1992, 319–23; Trevett 1996, 98, 167–70. The older commentaries are summarized by Labriolle 1913b, 87–94.

> fell asleep in Pepuza and Christ is said to have come to her and shared her sleep as she, being deceived, told: "in the form of a woman," she says, "adorned with shining clothing Christ came to me and placed wisdom in me and revealed to me that this place was holy and Jerusalem would come down from heaven here."

The situation is classic:[331] while sleeping (συνυπνωκέναι), the prophetess dreams and is inspired through the vision (ἐνέβαλεν ἐν ἐμοὶ τὴν σοφίαν). The woman figure, who appears to her as incarnate wisdom, is "adorned with shining clothing"[332] and confirms the holiness of the place at which the vision occurs; she connects the peripheral Phrygian countryside of the Montanists with the (lost) religious center in Palestine. One can possibly draw as well on the inscription of a certain Nanas from Akoluk in upper Tembris valley, who had, according to her tomb inscription, "angelic visitation" and "in great measure a voice" and "prayed night and day." The stone for this married or widowed woman was set up by people who mourned her (lines 20–22). The first word of the inscription, προφήτισα, was admittedly probably chiseled into the stone after the fact, but it reflects what the original inscription intended to say:[333] προφήτισα (line 1); εὐχομένη πανήρον (line 7); ἀνγελικὴν ἐπισκοπὴν | καὶ φωνὴν εἶχε μέγιστον (lines 10–11).[334] To be sure, it was disputed from the beginning whether the concern is with a Montanist Christian, a majority Christian, or even a Novatian prophetess (from a geographical perspective, all these groups come into question),[335] but the form of prophecy described here probably suggests an assignment to Montanism: the description of one who hears a voice "in great measure" and is visited by angels indicates the exact signs of ecstatic prophecy that are assigned to Montanist prophetesses and prophets elsewhere as well. The two parts of the sentence should possibly be related to each other: the visitation of the angels

[331] J. S. Hanson 1980, 1405–9.

[332] Also this characteristic of the vision is typical, as J. S. Hanson 1980, 1410 n. 64, shows with reference to a series of attestations: Suetonius, *Divus Julius* 32 (*eximia magnitudine et forma*); *Divus Claudius* 1.2 (*mulieris humana amplior*); Herodotus, *Historiae* V 56 (μέγαν καὶ εὐειδέα); Xenophon, *Cyropaedia* VIII 7.2 (κρείττων καί τις ἢ κατὰ ἄνθρωπον); Ennius apud Cicero, *De divinatione* I 20 (*homo pulcher*); Tacitus, Annales XI 21.1 (*species muliebris ultra modum humanum*); Plutarch, *De defectu oraculorum* 45 = *Moralia* 26.45 434 E (Paton/Pohlenz/Sieveking 1972, 114.5: καλόν); and Plato, *Critias* 44 A–B (καλὴ καὶ εὐειδής).

[333] Tabbernee 1997a, nr. 68, p. 419 and fig. 77; Strobel 1980, 100; Eisen 1996, 65–81; other editions and literature in Hirschmann 2004, 160 n. 1, and J. C. Poirier 2004, 151–52 n. 2–4.

[334] Merkelbach/Stauber 2001, 349–50 nr. 16/41/15, read ἀνγελικὴν ἐπισκοπὴν | καὶ φωνὴν εἶχε μεγίστων. The identity of these "highest" whose voices Nanas heard admittedly remains unclear.

[335] For the history of research, see now Hirchmann 2004, 161–62.

consists precisely in the fact that the divine voice can be heard.[336] Such an interpretation is also supported by the prophetess title, which was attached to the inscription in an emphasized manner.[337] Majority church theologians such as Origen regarded it as a characteristic feature of the primitive period that "the first human beings hear a divine voice and instruction and occasionally see angels of God who come to them."[338] In the end times (which the Montanists claimed was dawning), this primordial time is reestablished, at least for special prophetesses and prophets.

Thus the relevant Montanist texts make clear that certain religious functionaries of the movement understood themselves as "prophets" or "prophetesses" and designated themselves accordingly.[339] Such a designation was naturally used not only in "Montanism": Polycarp, the bishop of Smyrna, who was probably executed in 156/157 CE, was designated by his community as διδάσκαλος ἀποστολικὸς καὶ προφητικός.[340] But this formulation already had an at least implicit anti-Montanist accent—for the prophetic gift of the bishop lacks every element of ecstasy; he is gentle, quiet, humble, and modest.[341] Here, we can already discern[342]

336 J. C. Poirier 2004, 156–58. Hirschmann 2004, 167, interprets as follows: "the attribute ἀγγελικός may characterize the manner in which Nanas performs the office of bishop: in the 'manner of an angel.'" Unfortunately, there is not really any convincing evidence for this interpretation—which is also difficult philologically since a verb is lacking that supports this meaning of ἐπισκοπή (the only possibility is ἐπισκοπὴν . . . εἶχε . . .). Instead, Hirschmann claims that in the fourth century we must assume that the change of meaning to "office of bishop" has been completed.

337 Compare Tabbernee 1997, 424. Eisen 1996, 81; Lane Fox 1986, 406–7; Trevett 1999, 266, point out that such prophetesses would also be thinkable in majority Christianity and here we can decide nothing precisely due to lack of sources.

338 Origen, *Contra Celsum* IV 80 (Koetschau 1899b, 350.1–3): καὶ ὁ θεῖος δὲ κατὰ Μωυσέα λόγος εἰσήγαγε τοὺς πρώτους ἀκούοντας θειοτέρας φωνῆς καὶ χρησμῶν καὶ ὁρῶντας ἔσθ' ὅτε ἀγγέλων θεοῦ ἐπιδημίας γεγενημένας πρὸς αὐτούς. After quoting the Origen passage, J. C. Poirier 2004, 159, fittingly remarks, "Endzeit als Urzeit" (endtime as primordial time).

339 Compare nr. 6 (Labriolle 1913b, nr. 11 = Heine 1989, nr. 6 = K. Aland 1960, nr. 13) Epiphanius, *Panarion seu adversus Lxxx haereses* 48.2.4 (Holl/Dummer 1980, 221.25–222.2): Φάσκει γὰρ ἡ λεγομένη παρ' αὐτοῖς Μαξίμιλλα ἡ προφῆτις ὅτι, φησί, 'μετ' ἐμὲ (*Marcianus Graecus* 125: προφήτης; *Vaticanus Graecus* 503: προφῆτις—but cf. both manuscripts of 48.2.9 unaminously: εἰ γὰρ λέγει Μαξίμιλλα ὅτι προφήτης οὐκέτι ἔσται . . .) προφήτης οὐκέτι ἔσται, ἀλλὰ συντέλεια'. An extensive interpretation of the text is found in Trevett 1996, 163–70, and now in J. C. Poirier 1999.

340 *Martyrdom of Polycarp* 16.2 (the text synopsis of Dehandschutter 1979 and now also in Buschmann 1998, 17–36; for the date of Polycarp's death, see Buschmann 1998, 39–40).

341 Compare Buschmann 1998, 322.

342 Ash 1976; Bacht 1951, 254; Burghardt 1979, 344–56; Fascher 1927, 210–24; Weinel 1899, 95–101.

contours of a majority church anti-Montanist understanding of prophecy that do not stand in unbroken continuity with the primitive Christian understanding: Paul had said of himself that he speaks ecstatically more than any member of his Corinthian community (1 Corinthians 14.18: εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ, πάντων ὑμῶν μᾶλλον γλώσσαις λαλῶ·), while simultaneously indicating with considerable precision that prophecy was to take place in ordered forms and for "building up" (1 Corinthians 14.3: ὁ δὲ προφητεύων ἀνθρώποις λαλεῖ οἰκοδομὴν καὶ παράκλησιν καὶ παραμυθίαν; 14.26: πάντα πρὸς οἰκοδομὴν γινέσθω). But in that case, one can maintain that the Montanist prophecy emerged during a time in which prophecy was not as much of a given as it was in the first century. "The fact that their utterances . . . were collected already shows that this prophecy was perceived as something rare and obtained authoritative character."[343] However, this form of prophecy evidently impressed great numbers of people as well. The Christian communities in far-distant Lyons and Vienna confirm this in a letter to the communities in *Asia* and Phrygia at the end of the second century: "Deeds of divine grace strengthened in many the faith in the prophetic gifting of those people as well" (sc. of Montanus and others).[344]

The quotations of the "anti-Montanist Anonymous"[345] in Eusebius of Caesarea represents one of the earliest ancient sources about Montanism. This majority church author[346] attempted to obtain knowledge about Montanism in Galatia and attests even in the introduction of his work, which can be dated quite reliably to the early nineties of the second century,[347] that the group designated itself as ἡ νέα προφητεία, but it is said to be, in truth,

[343] Fascher 1927, 221.

[344] Epistula apud Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* V 3.4 (Schwartz 1999, II/1: 432.17–20): πλεῖσται γὰρ οὖν καὶ ἄλλαι παραδοξοποιίαι τοῦ θείου χαρίσματος εἰς ἔτι τότε κατὰ διαφόρους ἐκκλησίας ἐκτελούμεναι πίστιν παρὰ πολλοῖς τοῦ κἀκείνους προφητεύειν παρεῖχον. W. A. Löhr 1989, 139, has argued that one should regard the corresponding anti-Montanist passages cited by Eusebius not as an original component of the letter from Lyons: it is said to be "clear that the pieces . . . quoted by Eusebius are secondary additions"; accordingly, they allegedly should not be dated to 177/178 either. We cannot go into this argument here; compare also Kraft 1978.

[345] CPG I: 1327 (p. 121); for the identification of this author, compare Harnack 1958a, 240–41; 1958b, 364–69; Schwartz 1999, II/3: 81.

[346] The Syriac tradition on Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* V 16.2, and the translation of Rufin identify him as "Apollinaris" (cf. Nestle 1901, 195 [Apollinaris], and Mommsen 1999, II/1: 461.3). See Jerome, *De viris illustribus* 37.1 and 39.1 (Ceresa-Gastaldo 1988, 134/136); compare also Kühnert 1949; Campenhausen 2003, 269 n. 114; 1972, 231 n. 114. Both argue for Polycrates of Ephesus; by contrast, K. Aland 1960, 109–10, reserves judgment.

[347] Harnack 1958, 365–66: Winter 192/193.

ψευδοπροφητεία.[348] He describes how Montanus, "in the unbridled desire to be leader, granted access to the adversary and, possessed by spirits, suddenly fell into a frenzy and convulsions. He began to become ecstatic and emit sounds and speak strange things and to prophecy in a way that clearly contradicted the ancient church tradition and the traditional teaching."[349] The women too are said to have spoken "crazily, indecently, and strangely, just like the aforementioned Montanus."[350] It has long been seen that this description is based on heresiological strategies:[351] the zeal to assume the functions of leadership is a topos in such contexts as is the connection of "heretics" with unclean spirits or even the devil, and their apparent unmasking as "mad." But it has also already been observed that the description of the "new prophecy" follows pagan terminology. This includes the basic description with the verb πνευματοφορηθῆναι,[352] which is used negatively in early Christian literature, and the remaining vocabulary of "possession" (κατοχή, παρέκστασις,[353] ἐνθουσιᾶν, ξενοφονεῖ[354]), which likewise has exclusively negative associations in contemporary non-Montanist Christian

[348] Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* V 16.4: προσφάτως δὲ γενόμενος ἐν Ἀγκύρᾳ τῆς Γαλατίας καὶ καταλαβὼν τὴν κατὰ τόπον ἐκκλησίαν ὑπὸ τῆς νέας ταύτης, οὐχ, ὡς αὐτοί φασιν, προφητείας, πολὺ δὲ μᾶλλον, ὡς δειχθήσεται, ψευδοπροφητείας διατεθρυλημένην . . . (Schwartz 1999, II/1: 460.14–17); compare also V 16.18 (466.27).

[349] Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* V 16.7: ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ ψυχῆς ἀμέτρῳ φιλοπρωτείας δόντα πάροδον εἰς ἑαυτὸν τῷ ἀντικειμένῳ πνευματοφορηθῆναί τε καὶ αἰφνιδίως ἐν κατοχῇ τινι καὶ παρεκστάσει γενόμενον ἐνθουσιᾶν ἄρξασθαί τε λαλεῖν καὶ ξενοφωνεῖν, παρὰ τὸ κατὰ παράδοσιν καὶ κατὰ διαδοχὴν ἄνωθεν τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἔθος δῆθεν προφητεύοντα (Schwartz 1999, II/1: 462.10–15).

[350] Eusebius, Historia ecclesiastica V 16.9: ὡς καὶ ἑτέρας τινὰς δύο γυναῖκας ἐπεγεῖραι καὶ τοῦ νόθου πνεύματος πληρῶσαι, ὡς καὶ λαλεῖν ἐκφρόνως καὶ ἀκαίρως καὶ ἀλλοτριοτρόπως, ὁμοίως τῷ προειρημένῳ (Schwartz 1999, II/1: 462.28–464.3).

[351] "Further, it appears that Eusebius' source has intentionally modeled his depiction of Montanus' inaugural prophetic experience, as well as that of the two women . . . after Lucian's satire on the Prophet Alexander of Abonuteichos" (Aune 1983, 313; cf. also Bacht 1951, 260–62).

[352] The verb is used once in Jeremiah 2.23–24 LXX in order to describe the offenses of the people: ὀψὲ φωνὴ αὐτῆς ὠλόλυξεν, τὰς ὁδοὺς αὐτῆς ἐπλάτυνεν ἐφ' ὕδατα ἐρήμου, ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις ψυχῆς αὐτῆς ἐπνευματοφορεῖτο, παρεδόθη; otherwise only the adjective is attested: Hosea 9.7; Zephaniah 3.4 and in the *Shepherd of Hermas, Mandate(s)* XI 16 = 43.16 (Whittaker 1967, 42.2). All positive uses are much later (PGL s. v. [p. 1106]).

[353] According to Fascher 1927, 223, παρέκστασις means "Montanus' ἔκστασις came probably not spontaneously but was . . . prepared for and produced through a 'technique.'" Since the word in question is very rarely attested, this is admittedly a quite hypothetical interpretation. In Acts there is relatively uninhibited talk of the ecstasy of the apostles Peter and Paul (Acts 10.10-11, παρασκευαζόντων δὲ αὐτῶν ἐγένετο ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἔκστασις, καὶ θεωρεῖ τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνεῳγμένον, or 22.17, Ἐγένετο δέ μοι ὑποστρέψαντι εἰς Ἰερουσαλὴμ καὶ προσευχομένου μου ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ γενέσθαι με ἐν ἐκστάσει).

[354] But compare from the *Acts of Philip* § 124: καὶ ἐκεῖθέν μοι ξένα ῥήματα ὁμιλεῖ, καὶ διὰ πάσης νυκτὸς εὐχομένη ξενοφωνεῖται φωτὶ καταλαμπομένη, καὶ

texts. By contrast, Porphyry, in his letter to the Egyptian priest Anebon, describes with a thoroughly positive valuing how some of those who fell into ecstasy became inspired (ἐνθουσιῶσιν) "when they hear flutes or tambourines or timpani or a certain melody . . . with others (it happens) when they drink water, such as e.g., the priest of the (Apollo) Clarios in Colophon; others . . . when they are enveloped in the vapor of (certain) waters such as the prophetess of Branchidae (Didyma)."[355] The terms used by the "anti-Montanist Anonymous" to describe the "new prophecy" had positive associations in the pagan environment. With these terms, even the word choice gave readers the impression that in the case of the prophetic practices of Montanism, the concern was with pagan phenomena.

The observation that the anti-Montanist Anonymous uses heresiological clichés to unmask the pagan character of the "new prophecy" leads automatically to the question of the truthfulness of his description. More than twenty years ago, Karl Froehlich already advocated the thesis that the Montanist prophetesses and prophets precisely did not speak prophetically in ecstasy[356] but rather expressed themselves in a "discursive speech."[357] And even if ecstatic phenomena in the style described by the anti-Montanist Anonymous did belong to the Montanist prophecy, one would have to ask again whether "natural divination" or "technical divination" was present.[358] Even if Froehlich's position has developed in recent years to a sort of consensus within Montanist scholarship, the question of prophetic technique seems to me to be considerably more open than the scholarly consensus allows one to suspect. In the case of the undisputed authentic "Montanist oracles," of which there are only fourteen, overly confident conclusions about the nature, let alone the technique, of Montanist prophecy are actually prohibited. If a heresiological strategy has been "unmasked," then this does not yet bring with it, of course, a certain judgment about the truthfulness of heresiological topoi.

ἀναστενάζουσα λέγει· Ἦλθεν μοι τὸ ἀληθινὸν φῶς Ἰησοῦς (Lipsius/Bonnet 1959, II/1: 53.3–6).

[355] I quote the letter according to the reconstruction of Sodano 1958. A comparison was made with the older edition of Parthey 1965, XXIX–XLV, but compare Bidez 1980, 80–87 § 14/2.2: Ὡς τῶν ἐξισταμένων ἔνιοί τινες αὐλῶν ἀκούοντες ἢ κυμβάλων ἢ τυμπάνων ἢ τίνος μέλους ἐνθουσιῶσιν. ... ὡς ... οἱ δ' ὕδωρ πιόντες, καθάπερ ὁ ἐν Κολοφῶνι ἱερεὺς τοῦ Κλαρίου, ..., οἱ δ' ἐξ ὑδάτων ἀτμιζόμενοι, καθάπερ αἱ ἐν βραγχίδαις προφήτιδες (Sodano 1958, 9.10–10.3 = Parthey 1965, XXXIII.13XXXIV.2); for pagan Phrygian attestations cf. Schepelern 1929, 17–25, 146–49.

[356] Froehlich 1973; contrast Baumeister 1978.

[357] Thus the report of McGinn 1997, 133. But McGinn 1997, 133–34, then modifies the thesis: "It is more persuasive to see Montanist prophecy as discursive, but preceded or bracketed by ecstatic speech."

[358] So the distinction of Aune 1983, 23, which is inspired by Cicero, *De divinatione* I 12. Cicero speaks of *artificiosa divinatio* and *naturalis divinatio*.

It is completely clear that the ecstasy of the Montanist prophets formed a main topic of their opponents.[359] Tertullian wrote his own treatise *De ecstasi*, which is unfortunately lost, and in view of this fact, it would already be quite peculiar if there were no ecstatic phenomena within the "new prophecy."[360] Moreover, one cannot say that the anti-Montanist Anonymous' attempt to unmask the Montanist prophecy as pagan religiosity was a general tendency of anti-Montanist propaganda: the German expression "montanist Orakel" (Montanist oracle) suggests the comparison with pagan oracles; in antiquity, however (if I understand correctly), *termini technici* such as μαντεῖον and χρηστήριον were never used to describe the Montanist logia. This was possibly due to a general restraint; thus the contemporary apologists Athenagoras[361] and Theophilus of Antioch[362] never introduce their quotations from the Σιβυλλιακοὶ χρησμοί with a reference to this title either. Only Clement of Alexandria speaks once of the "oracle sayings ascribed to her (sc. the Sibyl),"[363] and he can also call the Old Testament proverbs οἱ χρησμοὶ οἱ θεῖοι.[364] The learned Eusebius of Caesarea's stance toward oracles is an exciting topic of its own that should be investigated one day.[365]

2.2.2 Montanism and Oracle Sites of Asia Minor

How does the "new prophecy" relate to the prophetic forms of its religious environment, to the oracle sites of Asia Minor? Following this line of questioning, themes are taken up anew that the Danish religious studies

[359] The anti-Montanist anonymous excerpts from a more extensive anti-Montanist writing in which the apologist Miltiades (Harnack 1991a, 278–82) shows "that a prophet may not speak in ecstasy" (περὶ τοῦ μὴ δεῖν προφήτην ἐν ἐκστάσει λαλεῖν: Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* V 17.1 [Schwartz 1999, II/1: 470.5–6]). Unfortunately, Eusebius did not take over these passages into his *Church History*; compare also Schepelern 1929, 20–25, and Trevett 1996, 87–89. Naturally later heresiologists likewise take up the point: Epiphanius, *Panarion seu adversus Lxxx haereses* 48.3.11–4.3 (Holl/Dummer 1980, 224.19–225.10; in the appendix, Holl lists a whole series of additional passages in which the problem of prophecy-ecstasy is treated); Didymus, *Fragmenta in Actus* 10.10–11 (PG 39: 1677 A); and Jerome, *Commentarii in epistulam Pauli ad Ephesios* II 3 (PL 26: 479 B/C).

[360] Thus already Bonwetsch 1881, 59–61.

[361] Athenagoras, *Legatio pro Christianis* 30.1 (Goodspeed 1984, 351).

[362] Theophilus, *Ad Autolycum* II 3.2 (Marcovich 1995b, 39.7); II 31.6 (82.23); II 36.1 (Σίβυλλα δέ, ἐν Ἕλλησιν καὶ ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς ἔθνεσιν γενομένη προφῆτις, ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς προφητείας αὐτῆς . . . p. 89.1–2); compare also II 9.2 (52.9) and II 38.3 (96.7).

[363] Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* I 108.1: καὶ περὶ τῶν χρησμῶν τῶν καταπεφημισμένων ἐκείνης (Stählen/Früchtel/Treu 1985, 69.18).

[364] Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* II 34.3 (Stählen/Früchtel/Treu 1985, 131.5).

[365] In his *Praeparatio evangelica*, Eusebius portrays wandering γόητες, μάντεις and προφῆται: Eusebius, *Praeparatio evangelica* IV 2.8–12 (Mras/Des Places 1982, 167.13–169.5); compare Fascher 1927, 220, and now extensively Kofsky 2000, 138–64.

scholar Wilhelm Schepelern—admittedly without even discussing one concrete example from the region of Asia Minor—dealt with more than seventy years ago in his monograph on "Montanism and the Phrygian cults."[366] This topic of discussion has frequently been taken up again since then.[367] One often hears, of course, very pessimistic judgments about the influence of local cults and thus about the significance for Montanism of the history of religion of the country of origin.[368] Admittedly, it has just recently been argued again with great energy that "traditional-pagan influences could find entrance into a Christian movement (sc. such as Montanism) only if the movement had been ready for such a thing from the beginning."[369]

Occasionally, the Montanist "oracles" have been compared with Apollo oracles from Asia Minor and the Montanist "prophets" with the so-called oracle prophets, and the fact that Montanus is designated as a (former) priest of Apollo[370] in a pseudo-Athanasian dialogue between a Montanist and an Orthodox[371] has been invoked to support this view. The well-known oracle sites of Claros[372] and Didyma[373] from Asia Minor are usually drawn upon for such comparisons, though unfortunately practically never the sanctuaries that lay much nearer to the geographical center of Phrygian Montanism—namely, the sanctuaries of *Apollo Archegetes (Pythoktonos)*, of *Apollo* in Phrygian Laodicea, and of *Apollo (Lairbenos)*, which is elevated on a striking hill above the Buyuk Menderes (Maeander) River about 2.18 miles (3.5 km) from the village Bahadınlar.[374] But at least with the

[366] Schepelern 1929 (esp. 130–59, "Montanism and the Phrygian Inspiration Manticism"). For Strobel 1980, 228, Montanism is "a movement that is basically deeply Christian . . . but which *from the beginning* was embedded not only in the Phrygian people but also in its religious background without completely slipping into it in a syncretistic manner"; for individual criticisms of Schlepelern, compare also K. Aland 1960, 134–39.

[367] Dounton-Fear 1982; Baumeister 1978a; 1978b.

[368] Compare, for example, Bonwetsch 1881, 149; Labriolle 1913b, 3; Kraft 1955a, 271 ("If we reflect on the role that the Revelation of John played among the Montanists, then it is completely unimaginable that Montanism was a mix of Christianity and Phrygian culture"); Aune 1983, 313 (The "deliberate attempt by Christian heresiologists to paganize Montanus has led many modern scholars to agree that Montanist prophecy was an intrusion of pagan revelatory ecstasy into Christianity. This view is completely false").

[369] Hirschmann 2005, 21.

[370] Μοντανὸς ὁ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ἱερεύς (Ficker 1905, 455.13–14 = Heine 1989, 122). The report is problematic insofar as he is elsewhere, as is well known, made into a former priest of Cybele: (Pseudo-?)Didymus, *De trinitate* III 41.3, γενόμενος ἱερεὺς (. . .) εἰδώλου (PG 39: 989 B = Heine 1989, 146), and Jerome, *Epistulae* 41.4, *abscisum et semiuirum habuisse Montanum* (Hilberg 1910, 314.18); compare Markschies 1994, 27 n. 123.

[371] According to Scorialensis X II 11, fol. 431r–433r (saec. XIII; cf. Opitz 1935b, 68–72).

[372] Buresch 1973, 29–47; Lane Fox 1986, 171–261.

[373] Fontenrose 1988, 77–105.

[374] I repeat a route description from Markschies 1994, 25 n. 10: "The sanctuary lies on a scenically unique position on a toe wall and must be reached via a field path. This path

temples in Hierapolis and Laodicea we are indeed dealing with oracle sanctuaries. We will now briefly consider in succession these cult sites that were in the immediate vicinity of the original geographical home of Montanism.

2.2.2.1 Hierapolis

Apollo was the "city god" of the Phyrgian *Hierapolis*,[375] and a corresponding building with a prostyle is both verified archaeologically[376] in its structural form from the third century CE and attested in a detailed description from the sixth century.[377] The site is characterized by local peculiarities: in the podium of the temple, above all on the northern side, there are approximately 3-cm-wide slits that are intentionally kept open through which a suffocative natural gas (primarily carbon dioxide), which is still flowing today, can escape from an underground cavern.[378] There is an entrance on the south long side of the temple that leads into the grotto. A whole series of ancient authors describe these vapors and the neighboring Charonion or Plutonium, a great cavern whose entrance probably lay near the theater (and thus in the immediate vicinity of the Apollo sanctuary).[379] For our line of questioning, the reference in Apuleius, which is roughly contemporary with Montanus, is especially interesting since it brings the vapors of the Apollo cult of Hierapolis into connection with those of Delphi.[380] Some

---

turns by the last house on the northern end of the village at the main street to the left. The distance between Ortaköy and the sanctuary is about 8 kilometers; from Bahaettinler, 3.5 kilometers must still be traversed."

[375] Weber 1910, 181; compare Wernicke 1895, 1–111 s.v. "Aktios" (42), "Archegetes" (44), and "Lairbenos" (58). On the Jewish population in Hierapolis, compare now also Herz 1988, 14–20.

[376] This temple was not yet discovered in the 1887 German campaign (Humann et al. 1898, 41–43; Ramsay 1895, 84–121) but in the Italian excavations after 1957 (see in general Parke 1985, 180–83). Discoveries of stones, wall remains, and coins in the third century temple suggest that a temple of Apollo was located here already in the second century (Carettoni 1963/1964, 411–33; Kekeç 1992, 43; cf. also Verzone 1971).

[377] Photius, *Bibliothecae codices* 242 (Damascius, *Vita Isidori* 131) p. 344 b 35–345 a 27 (= Henry 1971, 34–35, or Zintzen 1967, 176.4–178.11); compare Weber 1910, 184–89; Asmus 1911, 174.

[378] Carettoni 1963/1964, 430 with fig 40.

[379] Strabo, *Geographica* XIII 4.14 (Meineke 1866–1877, 880.6–881.6); Cicero, *De divinatione* I 79 (Schäublin 1991, 82); Cassius Dio, *Historiam Romanorum libri* 68.27.3 (Boissevain 1895–1931 III: 215.15–216.6); Iamblichus, *De mysteriis* 4.1 (Parthey 1965, 182.9–13); Damascius apud Photius, *Bibliothecae codices* 242 p. 345 a 14–24 (Henry 1971, 34–35 = Zintzen 1967, 178.5–10); Ramsay 1895, 86; Ruge 1899, 2184; Weber 1910, 233–36. Compare now also the translated texts in Ritti 1985, 7–12.

[380] Apuleius, *De mundo* 17: *vidi et ipse apud Hierapolim Phrygiae* (Beaujeu 1973, 137 = Moreschini 1991, 165.10–16). Right before Hierapolis Apuleius mentions the Apollo oracle of Delphi; for the cult aetiological comparison, see also Weber 1910, 188–89.

sort of connection between the vapors and the oracle prophecy must have existed in Hierapolis as well; admittedly, we know nothing exactly. Unfortunately, only very few oracle texts have remained preserved. The Apollo temple of the third century again used stones, on which such oracles were attached; they document that corresponding pieces of information could be received from the sanctuary, at least since the late Hellenistic period. Three answers to questions are preserved from the Hadrianic period.[381] The first is presumably directed to an oracle prophet:[382] "Take possession of the thigh (of the prisoner). Through the voice of the god who makes himself understood you speak divine things and you yourself hear divine commandments."[383] The second answer presumably advises a magistrate official to moderate his decisions. The third is directed to the city of Hierapolis itself, which had inquired because of water problems.[384] According to the view of Herbert William Parke, these texts differ from the other Apollo oracles: "In style they show some resemblances to each other and are distinctly different in tone from any of the replies preserved from Claros or Didyma. The god is more informal and inclined to talk round the subject of the question put to him. If so, we may suppose that there was a local tradition of divination at Hieropolis stretching down from pre-Hellenic times."[385]

2.2.2.2 Laodicea and the Sanctuary of Apollo Lairbenus

There was also an oracle sanctuary in (Phrygian) Laodicea at Lycus.[386] The existence of a whole series of local oracle prophets is also attested by name through inscriptions at other places; one sent one's own "prophets" and "priests of the children" as a delegation to Claros.[387] Admittedly, scarcely any archaeological work has yet been done in the place, so neither the exact location of the temple nor details about its cult are known. A continuation of the discontinued excavations in this important place would be

[381] Carratelli 1963/1964; Lloyd-Jones/West 1966; West 1967; Guarducci 1995, 100–106; Parke 1985, 181.

[382] Thus Parke 1985, 182.

[383] Carratelli 1963/1964, 365 nr. IIIa: ᾠδῆς ἐμπάσσοιο θεοῦ ὅτε σε πνύοντος [δ]ιαλέγεις αὕτως δὲ κλύεις ἱερῶν ἐνοπάων | [ἣ] γὰρ θέσμα γεγειοτέρων φύσεως; West 1967, 186: κ]ωλῆς ἐμπάσσοιο· θεοῦ ὅτι σὲ πνύοντος | [θε]ῖα λέγεις αὕτως δὲ κλύεις ἱερῶν ἐνοπάων | αὐτὰρ θέσμα γεγειοτέρων φύσεως.

[384] Parke 1985, 182–83; Carratelli 1963/1964, 353–57 and 360–65.

[385] Parke 1985, 183.

[386] Compare Livy, *Ab urbe candita* XXXVIII 13.1, 5 (Weissenborn/Müller 1981, 363); Lane Fox 1986, 235; Robert 1969, 295–305.

[387] Parke/Wormell 1956, 35–39, and Robert 1969, 304 n. 3: ἱερέως παίδων, θεσπιωδοῦντος (for additional inscriptions see Robert 1969, 299–301).

especially desirable in light of the prominent location of Laodicea on the great long-distance trade route in the Maeander valley.

One cannot say at present whether or not the sanctuary of *Apollo Lairbenus* (Λαιϱβενός), which was located even nearer to the Phrygian area where Pepuza and Tymion must be sought, was an oracle sanctuary; here too extensive archaeological investigations are lacking. The assessment reached by Hans Oppermann in 1931 still applies today, even after the publication of the relevant fourth volume of the "Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua":[388] "If in the cult of A[pollo] L[airbenos] individual characteristics, such as confession and manumission in the form of the transfer of ownership to God, emerge clearly while everything else remains visible only in unspecific outlines, then this is due to the nature of the material. Those customs are not peculiar to this sanctuary but fit into the general picture of the non-Greek sacral and legal customs of Asia Minor."[389] It is, however, precisely the so-called confession or atonement inscriptions that have repeatedly found the interest of a history-of-religion approach to Montanism as a point of comparison.[390] For our connections, however, we can largely bracket them out for the moment. An inscription from the first or second century CE mentions a μυστήϱιον,[391] which is probably a reference to a celebration of mysteries.

Thus it can be said that there were quite a number of small oracle sanctuaries in immediate proximity to the geographic center of Montanism in the Phrygian mountain country, whose existence did not, of course, prevent institutions and inhabitants of Laodicea and Hierapolis from sending embassies to the "great" oracles in Claros and Didyma. These concentrations of oracle sanctuaries are conspicuous. Moreover, the time of the reign of the Emperors Trajan and Hadrian can be designated as the "golden age" of the oracle of Didyma:[392] "In the century and a quarter between 100 and 225 CE we have more recorded responses of the Oracle, whether in literature or inscription, than for any previous period."[393] With this brief

[388] Buckler/Calder/Guthrie 1933, 97–102; compare the plan of the sanctuary, which requires revision, on p. 98 (also found in Strobel 1980, 209 image 12) and the concise but excellent observations in S. Mitchell 1993, 193–95.

[389] Oppermann 1931, 534.

[390] Last edited by Petzl 1994, 122–43 (nr. 106–24); compare above all Schepelern 1929, 92–105, and Strobel 1980, 208–18.

[391] In Petzl 1994, 126 (nr. 108.3–5) = Buckler/Calder/Guthrie 1933, 104–5 nr. 281: διὰ τὸ μ<ὴ> βούλεσθε . . . παϱεστάναι τῷ μυστηϱίῳ . . . ; compare Burkert 1987, 138 n. 55. In *Alexander* § 38/39 Lucian also attests a mystery cult for the oracle sanctuary of Asclepius Glycon, a son of Apollo, in Abonuteichos on the Paphlagonic coast of the Black Sea (Victor 1997, 110–13, 154–57).

[392] Lane Fox 1986, 235; compare his map "Client Cities of the Oracle at Claros, attested in the Greek East during the Imperial Period" (175).

[393] Parke 1985, 73–74; compare also Fontenrose 1988, 22–23.

consideration of the oracle sanctuaries of Hierapolis, Laodicea, and the cult site of Apollo Lairbenos, we have established an essential presupposition for a comparison between the pagan oracle prophecy of Asia Minor and the Christian Montanist prophecy. In order to obtain a somewhat more complete picture of the pagan oracle cult, however, we must still deal with the "great" oracle sites of Didyma and Claros, whose model was—as we have seen—also present in Phrygia. By contrast, we must refer only briefly to the ubiquity of oracles in the ancient world—and thus naturally also in Phrygia. These were available in the form of codices with texts such as the Sortes Astrampsychi or in the form of stone slabs whose preformulated sentences could be chosen with the help of a die, as it were in passing.[394]

2.2.2.3 The Oracle Sanctuaries and Montanism

For a comparison with the Montanist prophecy, only a few observations on cult personnel and workings of the Apollo Oracles of Asia Minor are necessary: first, it must be recalled that there were "prophets" in Didyma and Claros. In Didyma, the προφήτης was evidently nominated by the Milesian people from important families, chosen by lot, and remained in office for the course of a year.[395] The prophet Quintus Pomponius Pollio, who was active in the second century at the oracle of Didyma, was a physician and is introduced in an inscription as "called by god";[396] but Epicurean and Stoic philosophers are attested as well.[397] An inscription from 132 CE, which was found in the theater of Notion (province of Asia, now Giaur-Köi, located on the sea 1.25 miles [2 km] from Klaros[398]), mentions the prophet of the relevant year with the name Hermius Attalus.[399] The relatively great number

[394] "In almost every city of the south-west, through Lycia and Pisidia, a dice oracle stood in the civic centre to be used for routine consultation by men and women of all ranks and conditions" (S. Mitchell 1993, 13, with reference to a *corpus* planned by J. Nollé and the unpublished excavations of an Apollo oracle in Çavdarli in Phrygia, at the territory of Prymnessus); compare Nollé 1987 and, for the *Sortes Astrampsychi*, Markschies 2003, 108–10.

[395] Fascher 1927, 44–47; Fontenrose 1988, 46–47; for references to other oracle prophets in Asia Minor, see Fascher 1927, 38–39.

[396] I quote according to Rehm/Harder/Wiegand 1958, 155–203 (nr. 202–306); here nr. 280 A/B, p. 194: προφήτης Κ. Πομπώνιος Πωλλίων εὐσεβής, πανηγυρικός, ἰατρὸς κληθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ. It remains uncertain whether Pomponius Pollio was called by god as a physician or as a prophet (Fontenrose 1988, 55), but the latter seems more likely to me (Nutton 1969; Lane Fox 1986, 181–82).

[397] Rehm/Harder/Wiegand, nr. 285: προφήτης Φιλίδας Ἡρακλέωνος φιλόσοφος Ἐπικούρειος γένος ἀπ᾽ Αἴαντος (p. 196; it can scarcely be dated clearly); nr. 310.4–6 (p. 207: Aelius Aelianus).

[398] J. Keil 1936, 1075–77.

[399] Dittenberger 1986, II: 1905, nr. 530 (II: 193.1–2 and 10–11): προφητεύοντος Ἑρμίου Ἀττάλου; Fascher 1927, 47–48.

of prophet inscriptions from Didyma even makes it possible to comment on the familial connections of prophets.[400] The office, from whose occupant all sorts of sponsor activities were expected, could be held multiple times and at every age;[401] however, information about the exact function of the prophets is lacking there. A recently published inscription from Miletus permits the reconstruction of a twisted headband (*strophia*) with two loops that portrayed the *insignium* of the prophets.[402] Naturally, this does not describe the mass of cult personnel and the remaining offices that had to be occupied at the sanctuaries, but the observations are sufficient for our line of questioning.[403]

The function of the two oracles can be reconstructed somewhat more clearly. In the *Annals*, Tacitus describes how in Claros a priest was said to descend into a hole, drink water "from a mysterious spring," and "though mostly ignorant of writing or poetry, give answers in verse form about the things that everyone had in mind."[404] Iamblichus and the excavated structures of the sanctuary correct, confirm, and supplement this portrayal.[405] The visitors of the oracle probably had access to individual underground rooms, with the holy spring from which the prophet drank at the western end. The priest was responsible for the offering, and an oracle singer (θεσπιῳδός) formulated in verse for those waiting for what the office-holding prophet delivered.[406] There was also a holy spring in Didyma, but here the prophetess did not drink, and the visitors were probably not permitted to enter the adyton. Iamblichus testifies for the end of the third century that in Didyma, a γυνὴ χρησμῳδός in various forms of inspiration (including sitting on a ἄξων) "received the god."[407] This woman is

[400] This applies especially for the inscription nr. 284 from the first century CE, which Rehm/Harder/Wiegand, 195–96, describe as "a kind of memorial of a family . . . that provided an unusually high number of high officials in a certain period."

[401] Fontenrose 1988, 49–50.

[402] W. Günther 2003, 451, with image 1 on p. 457.

[403] Fontenrose 1988, 56–62.

[404] Tacitus, *Annales* II 54.3 (Heller 1982, 170): *Non femina illic, ut apud Delphos, sed certis e familiis et ferme Mileto accitus sacerdos numerum modo consultantium et nomina audit; tum in specum degressus, hausta fontis arcani aqua, ignarus plerumque litterarum et carminum edit responsa versibus compositis super rebus, quas quis mente concepit*; compare Lane Fox 1986, 172–78.

[405] Iamblichus, *De mysteriis* 3.11 (Parthey 1965, 124.9–126.3); Macrobius, *Saturnalia* I 18.1: *sed in hoc adyto vaticinaturi plurimo mero sumpto, uti apud Clarium aqua pota, effantur oracula* (Willis 1970, 101.2–4); compare also Fontenrose 1988, 219–24.

[406] Thus the description of functions according to Parke 1985, 220. According to Robert 1967, 305, the exact opposite is the case: the θεσπιῳδός drank the water and the προφήτης composed in verse.

[407] Iamblichus, *De mysteriis* 3.11: καὶ μὴν ἥν ἐν Βραγχίδαις γυνὴ χρησμῳδός, εἴτε ῥάβδον ἔχουσα τὴν πρώτως ὑπὸ θεοῦ τινὸς παραδοθεῖσαν πληροῦται τῆς

called "prophetess" in the other sources, and some office holders are now attested in inscriptions as well,[408] after the office itself was already known from references to it in Iamblichus, Porphyry, and Origen. Oracles were given in Didyma only on certain days and in Claros apparently on certain "holy nights."[409]

The preserved oracle answers show how frequently the sanctuary of Didyma was utilized for the needs of very concrete individuals at this time, all of whom for whatever reason found themselves in situations of upheaval or had fallen into crises and difficulties:[410] at the beginning of the second century, for example, the builders who were constructing the theater of Miletus asked whether they should begin with the arches and were informed that it would be favorable to proceed in this way,[411] and at about the same time, there was a request for help for a successful progression of competitions in Miletus.[412] The oracles of Claros, by contrast, are often somewhat dark and ambiguous, although there are exceptions, such as the (authentic?) answer to Aelius Aristides from the middle of the second century,[413] which directs the sick hero to Asclepius and to Pergamom, the very city in which he finally finds healing. Oracles were, in any case, given only in response to existing inquiries.

But what commonalities and differences exist then between the "prophets" of Claros and Didyma, the "prophetess" from Didyma, and the Montanist prophetesses and prophets? First, one must realize that such a question compares rather different forms of religion. The pagan examples come from a more *urban* context and represent a cult that has long

---

θείας αὐγῆς, εἴτε ἐπὶ ἄξονος καθημένη προλέγει τὸ μέλλον, εἴτε τοὺς πόδας ἢ κράσπεδόν τι τέγγουσα τῷ ὕδατι ἢ ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος ἀτμιζομένη δέχεται τὸν θεόν, ἐξ ἁπάντων τούτων ἐπιτηδεία παρασκευαζομένη πρὸς τὴν ὑποδοχὴν ἔξωθεν αὐτοῦ μεταλαμβάνει (Parthey 1965, 127.3–9); compare also Parke 1985, 211–14; Fontenrose 1988, 80–85; Lane Fox 1986, 183–84.

[408] Compare, for example, the mention of the granddaughter of a "prophetess Tryphosa" in an inscription discovered some time back (W. Günther in Tuchelt 1980, 170; edited and translated as nr. 17 in Fontenrose 1988, 192).

[409] Parke 1985, 215 and 220; cf. Iamblichus, *De mysteriis* 3.11: ἔν τισι δὲ τακταῖς νυξίν (Parthey 1965, 124.11–12); or Aelius Aristides, *Orationes* 49.12 (= *hieroi logoi* III 12 [B. Keil 1898, 416.10–18]).

[410] On the "topics" of the answers, compare Fontenrose 1988, 89–90.

[411] Text in Buckler 1923, 35; compare also L. Robert 1968, 581. An edition, translation, and commentary are found now also in T. L. Robinson 1986, nr. 41, and Fontenrose 1988, 193–94 nr. 19.

[412] Knackfuss/Rehm 1924, 301–2 nr. 205a = Rehm/Hermann 1997, 33–34 nr. 205a, p. 201, and table 15/2 = T. L. Robinson 1986, nr. 42 and Fontenrose 1988, 194–95 nr. 20.

[413] Aelius Aristides, *Orationes* 49.12 (= *hieroi logoi* III 12 [B. Keil 1898, II: 416.10–18]); compare also the translation and commentary of Behr 1986/1981, II: 310, and H. O. Schröder 1986, 67. Behr 1968, 62, dates the event to October 147 CE.

been institutionalized and professionalized: the oracle of Didyma stood in close connection with Miletus and the religious and political institutions of this city; the oracle of Claros was located in the vicinity of the metropolis of Ephesus with its important harbors; and Laodicea and Hierapolis were larger cities. By contrast, the Christian example comes more from a *village* context. Moreover, we do not know whether the Montanist community was already so institutionalized that it saw its prophetesses as holders of (community) offices; at any rate, it is clear that we are dealing here with a much more modest degree of organization.[414] The cult that framed the answers of the oracle differed considerably as well. In the Apollo oracles, there were bloody sacrifices, whereas these did not occur, of course, among the Montanists. The Apollo oracle was sought out by people who often enough consulted the cult personnel with quite concrete inquiries[415] and received an answer. We do not know whether inquiries preceded the Montanist prophetic sayings, but this is rather unlikely. If we may trust the somewhat meager nature of the sources, the Montanist texts deal with questions of prophetic inspiration and with problems of eschatology and ethics. It is in relation to this panorama of topics that one must understand Dennis Groh's somewhat pointed specification that the Montanist prophecy was "charismatic exegesis of the Holy Scriptures"[416] or Christine Trevett's statement that the texts bear witness to "the prophet's prerogative of creative use of Scripture."[417] Texts for concrete situations are not preserved from Montanus and his prophetesses, but we also cannot, of course, rule out the possibility that they existed. The preserved texts have recognizably been selected from a greater number for heresiological reasons. The Apollo oracles of Asia Minor were apparently handed down very often, though

[414] Hirschmann 2005, 123–38, attempts to reconstruct the organizational form of the "new prophecy" from the meager ancient reports and envisages an association structure with a patriarch at the top and "*koinonoi*" (κοινωνοί) as managing officials (so also already Strobel 1980, 268–74).

[415] Compare Plutarch, *De Pythiae oraculis* 28 = *Moralia* 25.28 408 C (S. Schröder 1990, 104.27–28): εἰ γαμητέον, εἰ πλευστέον, εἰ δανειστέον, and the examples in Aune 1983, 53–55, and Victor 1997, 28–31.

[416] Groh 1985, 76. Groh refers to the allusion to 1 Corinthians 2.4 (καὶ ὁ λόγος μου καὶ τὸ κήρυγμά μου οὐκ ἐν πειθοῖ[ς] σοφίας [λόγοις], ἀλλ' ἐν ἀποδείξει πνεύματος καὶ δυνάμεως) in text nr. 5, which is ascribed to Maximilla (Labriolle 1913b, nr. 12 = Heine 1989, nr. 5 = K. Aland 1960, nr. 16), in Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* V 16.17 (Schwartz 1999, II/1: 466.18–20): διώκομαι ὡς λύκος ἐκ προβάτων· οὐκ εἰμὶ λύκος, ῥῆμά εἰμι καὶ πνεῦμα καὶ δύναμις (Groh 1985, 78–79; Trevett 1996, 156).

[417] Trevett 1996, 85. To a certain extent, K. Aland 1960, 132, had already signaled this research direction when he designated the Gospel of John and Revelation as "the sources . . . from which this movement was fed."

by no means always, in meter,[418] whereas the Montanist oracles show no traces of artificial reworking. Rather, they follow the model of biblical prophetic sayings, as the emphatic ἰδού at the beginning of the Montanist text cited above shows,[419] which translates the Hebrew הנה.[420] Thus we basically have two quite different forms of oracle prophecy before us here. However, the two are then connected with each other again by an important commonality, because asceticism and sexual purity were required both in the context of the Apollo cult[421] and in the Montanist prophecy and ethic. Here, we can admittedly only mention this stimulating topic. Thus, in an inscription of the third century, it is recorded as a religious norm: "no one should enter unclean the (holy) precinct (of Apollo Lairbenos), swear a false oath, or engage in sexual intercourse."[422] And Origen bears witness to an oracle with a comparable content for the Montanists: "Do not come too near to me because I am clean; for I have taken no wife and my throat is not an open grave (Psalm 5.10/Romans 3.13), but I am a Nazarite of God, like them drinking no wine."[423] The exterior circumstances that accompany the prophecy are also comparable: the prophetess in Didyma found herself in a trance during her prophesying,[424] and the Montanist prophetesses and prophets, as we have already seen (section 2.2.1), were probably in ecstasy after all.[425] On each side, the view was held that in the oracle, one was dealing with divine words in human mouths. Thus, according to Lucian,

[418] But one should compare the discussion concerning the question of "why the Pythia no longer answers in verses" in Plutarch (*De Pythiae oraculis* 28 = *Moralia* 25.28; see now S. Schröder 1990, passim; Holzhausen 1993; Fontenrose 1978, 197–232).

[419] Compare Jeremiah 1.10 LXX: ἰδοὺ κατέστακά σε σήμερον ἐπὶ ἔθνη καὶ βασιλείας ἐκριζοῦν καὶ κατασκάπτειν καὶ ἀπολλύειν καὶ ἀνοικοδομεῖν καὶ καταφυτεύειν. Also compare Jeremiah 51.2 LXX: Οὕτως εἶπεν κύριος ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραῆλ, Ὑμεῖς ἑωράκατε πάντα τὰ κακά, ἃ ἐπήγαγον ἐπὶ Ἰερούσαλημ καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς πόλεις Ἰουδᾶ, καὶ ἰδού εἰσιν ἔρημοι ἀπὸ ἐνοίκων . . .

[420] Compare the great number of attestations in Hatch/Redpath 1954, 677–78. For form criticism perspectives on biblical prophecy, compare, for example, U. B. Müller 1975, 31–37, 47–56; Dautzenberg 1975, 15–42.

[421] This becomes especially clear in the so-called confession inscriptions from the sanctuary of Apollo Lairbenos; compare Petzl 1994, 122–43 nr. 106–24.

[422] Petzl 1994, 129 nr. 110.5–8 = MAMA IV, nr. 283 (Buckler/Calder/Guthrie 1993, 106) = SEG VI nr. 251: παραγέλων πᾶσι μηδὲ ἄναγον ἀναβῆτ' ἐπὶ τὸ χωρίον, ἐπροκήσι ἢ κήνσετε τὸν ὅρχις.

[423] Nr. 19 (Labriolle 1913b, nr. 19 = Heine 1989, nr. 19 = K. Aland 1960, nr. 19) Origen, *Commentarii in Epistulam ad Titum apud Pamphilum* (CPG I: 1464 p. 166: PG 14/1: 1306 A/B): *Requisierunt sane quidem, utrum haeresim an schisma oporteat vocari eos qui Cataphryges nominantur, obsecrantes falsos prophetas et dicentes: "Ne accedas ad me quoniam mundus sum: non enim accepi uxorem, nec est sepulcrum patens guttur meum, sed sum Nazareus Dei, non bibens vinum, sicut illi."*

[424] Parke 1985, 214.

[425] Pfister 1959; Speyer 1989, 358–61, 363–67.

the "lying prophet" Alexander of Abonoteichus as Glycon sent his clients to Claros: "Hurry to Claros, listen to Apollo, the voice of my father,"[426] and in Hierapolis, it was believed that the prophet spoke "divine things through the voice of the god who makes himself understood."[427] Finally, both the "Montanist" logia[428] and the pagan oracles[429] were collected.

2.2.3 Montanism as an Early Christian Prophetic Movement

It seems to me that the comparison of two so different phenomena, regardless of all differences, does lead to an important, previously overlooked basic feature of "Montanism" that is of fundamental significance for its great missionary success: with its ecstatic prophecy, "Montanism" demonstrated religious power in a rather clear manner. This dimension of religious power can also be felt precisely in the texts of the majority church opponents of Montanism. Thus the anti-Montanist Anonymous recounts that the attempt of the bishops Zoticus from the village Cumane and Julian from Apamea to refute the spirit of the prophetess Maximilla failed: their mouths are said to have been closed.[430] Montanism represented a power that was apparently not easy to overcome. And its power was much more tangible and directly capable of being experienced than the powerless power of Christ spoken about in Pauline theology or the attempts of the Christian theology emerging in the cities to compete with the popular and professional philosophy of their time. One can scarcely overestimate the educational sociological differences: Christian theologians who at least attempted to attain to the level of Platonic popular philosophers such as Maximus of Tyre taught in cities like Ephesus, whereas the apparently much less educated protagonists of the "new prophecy"[431] lived in the Phrygian countryside, which was mainly characterized by large, privately owned estates.[432] It was not the "modern"

[426] Lucian, *Alexander* 29: Ἐς Κλάρον ἴεσο νῦν, τοὐμοῦ πατρὸς ὡς ὄπ᾽ ἀκούσῃς (Victor 1997, 104.26).

[427] Compare section 2.2.2.1 with n. 383.

[428] Schepelern 1929, 13.

[429] Compare the reports about Cornelius Labeo's book *De oraculo Apollinis Clarii* (Macrobius, *Saturnalia* I 18.19–21 [Willis 1970, 105.11–106.7]; for this work see now Mastandrea 1979) and those of the Suda s.v. Nikandros: περὶ χρηστηρίων πάντων γʹ (Buresch 1973, 35; Aune 1983, 28–29) and in general Nilsson 1988, 478–85.

[430] Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* V 16.17 (Schwartz 1999, II/1: 466.22–25).

[431] S. Mitchell 1993, 158–97.

[432] If one analyses their names, then the number of Roman names is conspicuous: Prisca/Priscilla, Quintilla, and Maximilla. Only Montanus points to Phrygia (Strobel 1980, 233–35, provides a number of attestations). Strobel 1980, 236, also mentions two attestations for the names Maximilla and Priscilla in Phrygia. In spite of the remote geographical location, people apparently spoke not Phyrgian but Greek (S. Mitchell 1993, 174).

Christianity involved with the paradigm of the city and its culture that held the most tangible demonstration of power for its truth but rather a movement that had preserved the primitive Christian element of ecstatic prophecy and the deeds of power connected with it. There can be no doubt about this conservative characteristic of the movement: the gift of the Spirit and the prophetic speech based on it were already regarded in Judaism as signs of the dawning of the end times,[433] and primitive Christian literature took over these notions.[434] Even in the following period, the prophetic dimension did not die out in the Christianity of Asia Minor: the evangelist and deacon Philip of Caesarea Maritima/Palestina had four daughters who were prophetesses, and their tomb was shown in Phrygian Hierapolis.[435] In neighboring Philadelphia, there was a prophetess named Ammia,[436] about whom we admittedly know nothing. By contrast, it is doubtful to me whether one should therefore already immediately speak of a "Proto-Montanism" and thereby postulate a broader circle that is said to have become "alienated from some things in emerging catholic traditionalism."[437] Plus, the "emerging catholic traditionalism" was probably far too much a phenomenon of urban theology and the interest in prophecy a more widespread feature of Christian piety. Moreover, there were attempts to integrate the phenomenon of prophecy into the solidifying office structures of the church: a Christian text from the second century calls the σωματεῖον τῆς προφητικῆς τάξεως, the corporate body of the prophetic station, the ecclesiological concretion of the body of Christ.[438] Montanism belongs in this tradition.

[433] Compare Joel 3.1–2: Καὶ ἔσται μετὰ ταῦτα καὶ ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου ἐπὶ πᾶσαν σάρκα, καὶ προφητεύσουσιν οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν καὶ αἱ θυγατέρες ὑμῶν, καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ὑμῶν ἐνύπνια ἐνυπνιασθήσονται, καὶ οἱ νεανίσκοι ὑμῶν ὁράσεις ὄψονται· καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς δούλους καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς δούλας ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεῦματός μου.

[434] Acts 2.17-18: Καὶ ἔσται ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις, λέγει ὁ θεός, ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου ἐπὶ πᾶσαν σάρκα, καὶ προφητεύσουσιν οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν καὶ αἱ θυγατέρες ὑμῶν, καὶ οἱ νεανίσκοι ὑμῶν ὁράσεις ὄψονται, καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ὑμῶν ἐνυπνίοις ἐνυπνιασθήσονται· καί γε ἐπὶ τοὺς δούλους μου καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς δούλας μου ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου, καὶ προφητεύσουσιν.

[435] Acts 21.9: τούτῳ (sc. Philip) δὲ ἦσαν θυγατέρες τέσσαρες παρθένοι προφητεύουσαι; Proclus apud Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* III 31.4 (Schwartz 1999, II/1, 266.3–5): μετὰ τοῦτον προφήτιδες τέσσαρες αἱ Φιλίππου γεγένηνται ἐν Ἱεραπόλει τῇ κατὰ τὴν Ἀσιαν· ὁ τάφος αὐτῶν ἐστιν ἐκεῖ καὶ ὁ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῶν. Compare Corssen 1901 and now in detail Tabbernee 1997b, 207–12.

[436] Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* V 17.3 (Schwartz 1999, II/1: 470.15–16). Other attestations for prophetic activities in the Christianity of the time are discussed by Trevett 1996, 86–95.

[437] Trevett 1996, 40–42.

[438] Compare P.Oxy I, 5 lines 9–13: τὸ γὰρ προφητικὸν πν(εῦμ)α τὸ σωματεῖόν ἐστιν τῆς προφητικῆς τάξεως, ὅ ἔστιν τὸ σῶμα τῆς σαρκὸς Ἰ(ησο)ῦ Χρισ(το)ῦ

It also legitimates its own prophecy in the framework of prophetic chains of succession,[439] and it is no accident that it flourished in the environment of the Apollo oracles of Laodicea and Hierapolis, in a region in which it was natural to send embassies to Didyma and Claros. Religious power also played a special role in the non-Christian cults of this region.[440] It could also be very tangibly experienced in the oracle sanctuaries. On the other hand, the rise and quick spread of the "new prophecy"[441] presupposes a special, concrete, and actual charismatic experience among a series of people and cannot simply be derived from a number of environmental factors.

On the basis of these results, we can now attempt to give a provisional answer to a central question for the history of ancient Christian religion (and simultaneously for the history of Phrygian religion)—namely, the question of the classification and success of the Montanist movement. With the "Montanist prophecy," we are dealing both with an archaizing (or "conservative"[442]) phenomenon that goes back to the Palestinian primitive phase of Christianity and with a phenomenon of inculturation. By holding fast to primitive Christian prophecy, Montanists emphasized a feature of the local form of Christianity of Asia Minor, as this can also be observed, for example, in nearby Colossae.[443] In this city too, Christians apparently "boasted . . . with visions"—thus at any rate the reproach

---

(Grenfell/Hunt 1966, 8–9; Harnack 1898b = 1980a, 341–45; Paulsen 1979). Harnack considered assigning the text to Melito of Sardes and his lost writing περὶ προφητείας.

[439] Compare in the Pseudo-Athanasian dialogue between the orthodox and the Montanist: Ficker 1905, 456.26–27, 35.

[440] Compare the mention of δυνάμεις of gods in Lydian inscriptions: Hermann 1981, nr 317.3, p. 103 (114/115 CE; in Kollyda/Gölde/Incesu in Asia Minor: Μεγάλη Μήτηρ Ἀναεῖτις. Ἄξι| τα κατέχουσα καὶ Μεὶς Τιάμου | καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις αὐτῶν . . .); nr. 440.1–2, p. 140 (118/119 CE; Gölde: [Μεγάλη Μήτηρ Ἄτιμις] | [καὶ μέγας Μὴν Τιάμου τὴν . . .]| [. . . κώμην βασιλεύ]ων καὶ ἡ δύ|[ναμις αὐτῶν . . .] Ἀπολλώνιος); nr. 525.2–3, p. 171 (Μέγας Μὶς Ἀρτεμιδώρου Ἀξ[ι] | [ο]ττα κατέχων καὶ ἡ δύνα | [μ]ις αὐτοῦ); compare also nr. 318.33, p. 104 (156/157 CE; Kollyda, "Dedication to the Great Artemis Analitis and Meis [Men] Tiamu"). Lines 23-24 read, Μεγάλοι οὖν οἱ θε|οὶ οἱ ἐν Ἀξίττοις ἐπεξήτησαν. At the end of the inscription, in lines 32–34, it reads: ἀπὸ νοῖν εὐλογοῦ|μεν στηλλογραφήσαντες τὰς δυ|νάμις τῶν θεῶν). See also S. Mitchell 1993, 192.

[441] Compare Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* V 16.4 (Schwartz 1999, II/1: 460.15–16); Strobel 1980, 53–59; Fischer 1974 (revised in Fischer/Lumpe 1997, 22–59).

[442] So, for example, Paulsen 1978, 35–41; Frend 1988; Aune 1983, 313: "In general, Montanism should be viewed as a renewal movement within the second century church; more specifically it was a millenarian movement similar to the many millenarian movements in early Judaism including that of Jesus himself." I do not wish at this point to enter into the traditional debate over the relationship between "Jewish Christianity" and "Montanism" (cf. the history of research in Trevett 1996, 6–11) in the first instance because before doing so the definition of Jewish Christianity would have to be elucidated.

[443] Rowland 1983.

in the New Testament letter addressed to them.[444] And—our comments especially want to bring this point into view—holding fast to primitive Christian prophecy simultaneously connected this form of Christian community to a popular religious form in its immediate vicinity. Indeed, the apparent alternative between "primitive Christian prophecy" and "pagan oracle prophecy" was, at any rate, a given only in the viewpoint of ancient Christian heresiologists, who wanted to unmask an intra-Christian movement as "pagan." But one must stress here that this inculturation did not take place consciously as a reception of manners of thinking or cultic forms but rested on a *convergence* of religious forms. As elsewhere, causality and convergences must be strictly distinguished here; this has sometimes not taken place in the older literature and has discredited the whole direction of research. The evidently great missionary success of the Montanist movement was probably based not least on this unintentional inculturation—that is, on the convergences between "Montanist oracles" and "pagan oracles." In both cases, human beings could experience a tangible form of religious power that the Christianity shaped by the city with its intellectual discourses about the one God and his ethical demand quite obviously did not mediate to them. It is therefore no wonder that "Montanism" flourished in such a religious environment.

We can only mention a final point that would again merit a detailed comparison here at the conclusion: among educated Christians and Gentiles, there were people who sharply criticized the oracles both in their own religion and in foreign ones. In the second century,[445] the Cynic philosopher Oenomaus, who was from Gadara in East Jordan by birth, wrote a vehement polemic against oracles under the title Γοήτων θώρα (*Detection of Deceivers / Kata Chresterion*). At the turn from the second to the third century, the Alexandrian Christian theologian Clement of Alexandria claimed that the pagan oracles were defunct and that it was certainly no longer worthwhile then for people to turn to them: "Silent is the spring of Colophon"—that is, the spring of Claros.[446] The oracle sites of Apollo Clarios, Pythios, and Didymeus are said to be "worthless oracle sites":

[444] Colossians 2.18-19: μηδεὶς ὑμᾶς καταβραβευέτω θέλων ἐν ταπεινοφροσύνῃ καὶ θρησκείᾳ τῶν ἀγγέλων, ἃ ἑόρακεν ἐμβατεύων, εἰκῇ φυσιούμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ νοὸς τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ οὐ κρατῶν τὴν κεφαλήν, ἐξ οὗ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα διὰ τῶν ἁφῶν καὶ συνδέσμων ἐπιχορηγούμενον καὶ συμβιβαζόμενον αὔξει τὴν αὔξησιν τοῦ θεοῦ; compare Rowland 1983, 76–78.

[445] For the dating, compare Hammerstaedt 1988, 11–19; Parke 1985, 146–47, comes to similar conclusions.

[446] Clement of Alexandria, *Protrepticus* II 11.1: σεσίγηται γοῦν ἡ Κασταλίας πηγὴ καὶ Κολοφῶνος ἄλλη πηγή (Stählin/Treu 1972, 10.24–25); Hammerstaedt 1988, 19–24, convincingly demonstrates the literary dependence of Clement on Oenomaus.

ἄχρηστα χρηστήρια.[447] One should consider for a moment whether this decline of the classical oracle sites cannot be brought into connection with the diminishing significance of Montanism or with its change in character from a prophetic to an ascetic movement[448] at this same time: in light of the decline of the classical oracle sites, Christianity too no longer needed oracle prophecy in order to be successful in terms of mission.

2.3 The Christian Worship Service and Its Prayers

The institutional contexts of explicit "theology" in today's sense of the word, which we have discussed in the preceding sections, were probably only of direct significance for a small number of Christians in the imperial period. After all, free theological teachers who offered instruction like Justin (see above 2.1.3.2) existed only in the great metropolises of antiquity —in Alexandria, Antioch, and Rome—and possibly also in larger cities such as Ephesus or Carthage. Firmly organized Christian schools could not, of course, establish themselves in villages either. The place in which Origen founded his school was a rather important harbor city and headquarters of a provincial administration as well: Caesarea Maritima on the Palestinian Mediterranean coast. The Montanist movement, too, at least in its beginnings, was completely shaped by the specific religious-geographical profile of its Phrygian region of origin. In addition to these more geographical restrictions, which limited the potential circle of people interested in such forms of theological reflection to the inhabitants of a larger city and to the small percentage of people living in small cities or on country estates who were able to read and had the leisure to study the literary products of the Christian "theologians,"[449] there were naturally limitations on reception associated with educational sociological factors and (religious) mentality as well. Presumably, not everyone experienced the apocalyptic prophecy of the Montanists (section 2.2), the religious enthusiasm of their prophets, and their intensive eschatology and strict ethic to be a satisfying form of "theology." If one seeks a form of "theology" that was circulated very extensively and in a certain sense even "on a massive scale," then one must at least consider the various forms of the Christian worship service in antiquity.

2.3.1 Worship Service, Community, and Ritual

In contrast to the other institutions that have been addressed thus far, with the worship services, a form of "theology" comes into view that was familiar to very many if not most Christians. With Jan Assmann,

[447] Clement of Alexandria, *Protrepticus* II11.2 (Stählin/Treu 1972, 10.28).
[448] Powell 1975; Schöllgen 1984/1985; Trevett 1996, 69–76.
[449] Compare section 2.1 with n. 14 and the numbers in Harris 1989, 248–82.

we designated this form above (section 1.1) as "implicit theology,"[450] because the theological leading assumptions implicit in the liturgy (e.g., the leading assumptions of a hymn or the entire implied logic of an ordering of a worship service) are not unpacked discursively. Here, we may not, as we have likewise already seen, demarcate the explicit "philosophical theology" of an Origen or the Montanist "oracles" from the implicit theology of an ancient worship service form as strict opposites such as the colors black and white, but we must perceive them instead as "poles of a graduated scale . . . on which we must reckon with various levels of explication of theology."[451] A strict opposition is likewise ruled out when one looks at the "publicness" addressed in each case (understood here as general accessibility as distinct from the sphere of the private). Until the revolutionary changes of the fourth century, ancient Christian worship services were in the strict sense *not public*.[452] As Christian teachers, Justin and Origen did turn to a public that was both educated and interested, but they clearly did not teach in all openness at the market places of the metropolises. Their theology was neither generally public nor fundamentally nonpublic. Perhaps one can speak of a "reduced publicness." The strict nonpublic character of the worship services, which were accessible only to the Christian community and were organized in a correspondingly private framework, was secured through an ethos and increasingly through a policy of devout reserve in relation to passing on details about the worship service and sacraments to non-Christians. Still, one certainly cannot speak in the pre-Constantinian period about a proper obligation to secrecy that has been designated since the late seventeenth century with the term *disciplina arcani* (discipline of the arcane), which was originally charged in a theologically controversial way.[453]

With the worship service, the *community* that *celebrates* it comes into view. Thus (implicit) theology is analyzed here in the context of a ritual. By "ritual," one usually understands a formalized repetition of the same types of action through which a symbolic order is portrayed via means that are perceptible to the senses.[454] More recent ritual scholarship, however,

[450] Assmann 1992, 25.

[451] Assmann 1986, 49.

[452] This opposition applies, although the notion of a "public sphere" (*Öffentlichkeit*) is naturally modern: Hölscher 1978, 413–38.

[453] On the history of the term, see Powell 1979, 1, but compare *Constitutiones apostolicae* VII 25.6 (M. Metzger 1987, 54.19).

[454] Belliger/Krieger 2003. On the interesting interaction of ancient Christians with the Latin term *ritus*, see the concise but comprehensive treatment of Bader 1998, 270–71, as well as Koep 1962, 43–59. By *ritus* Cicero understands the recognized manner of presenting an offering (*De legibus* II 8.20 [Ziegler 1988, 264.26]).

has shown that the repetition that is structurally characteristic for the ritual (the schematization) does not have absolute uniformity as a consequence but includes a *ritual dynamic*: "Precisely because rituals are meant to develop effects, the identical repetition was not sought for its own sake in the execution, but always the adjustment to the relevant circumstances."[455] We admittedly know very little about these concrete circumstances—that is, about the individual communities and the corresponding regional modifications. An introductory overview of the sources will show that a section on "community and worship service" in the second and early third centuries must concentrate above all on the Eucharistic worship service and here especially on the *Eucharistic prayers* in order to obtain reasonably secure ground under our feet. It will then also become clear that the invention of new worship service rituals by Christians in antiquity is a sign of that very ritual dynamic to which we have already referred.

2.3.2 Christian, Jewish, and Pagan Worship Services

First, however, it is worthwhile, regardless of all the source problems that also exist here, to look briefly at the pagan cult, which is scarcely drawn upon for the purposes of comparison in the context of liturgical studies—in contrast to the great attention given to the worship service of the Jewish synagogue.[456] The rejection of "animal sacrifice, drink offerings, and incense offerings" as a common canon of Jewish and Christian cult criticism too clearly appears to be diametrically opposed to precisely this pagan worship service event.[457] In pagan cults there was, in fact, an offering at a central point, and the local priests and cult priests acted as mediators between the gods and the participants in the cult.[458] Through the killing of animals in the framework of the cult (θυσία)—and the cult personnel who killed the animals (*homo necans*)—the pagan ritual appears to be fundamentally separated from the Jewish and the Christian ones. And at first glance, the pagan cult naturally has a completely different function for the public as a whole πόλις than the Christian worship service, which was

[455] Weinfurter 2005, 9.

[456] For a critical evaluation of the traditional research position, see Schäfer 1973, 391–413. For one of the most important sources, compare Heinemann 1977, esp. 37–69; in general, see Levine 2000, 501–60 (chapter XVII: "Liturgy") and Reif 1993, 2–8 (history of research).

[457] Justin, *Apologia i* 13.1: . . . ἀνενδεῆ (ὁ δημιουργὸς τοῦδε τοῦ παντός) αἱμάτων καὶ σπονδῶν καὶ θυμιαμάτων (Goodspeed 1984, 33/Marcovich 1994, 50.2).

[458] Stengel 1920, 32–48, 95–98; on the differences between pagan ancient "priests" and modern Christian "priests," see the instructive discussion of Rüpke 1996, 252–55.

first held in private houses. If one studies any sacred legal inscription,[459] then these differences quickly become vivid. In the late Hellenistic period, an inscription was placed on a wall of the temple of Artemis Cindyas in Bargylia in Caria of Asia Minor (the southern coast of today's Turkey), in order to reorganize the festival of the goddess after the great political upheavals of the second century BCE. According to legend, there was a miracle-working statue of Artemis Cindyas in the temple.[460] From the aforementioned inscription in this temple, the significance of the animal offering quickly becomes clear—for detailed liturgical sequences are not conveyed in them, let alone texts that were recited.[461] Rather, a first text (SEG XLV [1995], number 1508A) gives a clear regulation that in the framework of the festival, the prepared cattle were brought in a procession to the temple, whereby the best cattle, together with those who had raised them, opened the procession (lines 6–9). In the run-up to the great festival day, the cattle were examined in the popular assembly and certified again by officials (lines 3 and 4). On the festival day itself, the animals were brought in the procession to the temple and sacrificed there and their flesh was divided: the gods received only the (inedible) innards; as gifts of honor, the shoulder and haunches went to the priests; and on the day after the celebratory offering, the rest of the flesh was distributed at the market place to citizens of the city who consumed it together (lines 9–13). The great meal of flesh was a sociable continuation of the cultic action that bound together the whole city. A heavy fine threatened those who neglected their appropriate duties (lines 28–30). If one considers that the ox was the most expensive animal and the consumption of flesh was only a rare exception in antiquity, then it becomes clear once again how strongly such festival days shaped and affected a whole city. The inscriptions show (SEG XLV [1995], number 1508B) that an effort was made to include additional groups of people such as the local noncitizens (the metics[462]) and to present the most successful cattle farmers to the public even more clearly in the public eye and not only in a procession.

[459] Parker 2004; Peirce 1993.

[460] In Polybius it says that no rain or snow may fall on the statue, although it stands in the open (*Histories* XVI 12.3); similarly in Strabo (*Geographica* XIV 2.20).

[461] SEG LXV (1995), nr. 1508A/B, pp. 408–11. For the first publication of the new fragment with translation, see Blümel 1995, 35–36; 1997, 154; 2000, 89–94; K. Zimmermann 2000, 451–85 (with corrections of SEG 45 on p. 485); for a German translation of the inscription, see Hotz 2005. The (lost) inscription that was published by Patton/Myres 1896, 218–19 (nr. 8), possibly belongs also in this connection. Observations can also be found in Lupu 2005, 100 (l. 9–13), 107.

[462] K. Zimmermann 2000, 469–72.

Comparable scenes could be set forth, for example, for the great Artemis sanctuary in Ephesus[463] but naturally for the contemporary imperial cult as well, which adopted many elements of traditional religious rituals such as procession, sacrifice, and feasts.[464] Unfortunately, here too we possess only normative texts (regulation of the cult) but scarcely any performative texts (hymns and prayers) or descriptive texts: the everyday practical implementation and individual perception of the imperial cult can scarcely be reconstructed any longer.[465] But regardless of all differences, what we know makes clear that the dynamic of the action schematized as a ritual consisted not least in its communicative function for certain groups: the inhabitants and visitors of a small city were informed through the festival of the goddess Artemis not only, for example, about this goddess and her veneration but also about the city, its piety, and its structures. One could certainly say that the cult, under the conditions of a population that was able to read only to a very limited degree, represented a theology that was made public. As Walter Burkert has shown,[466] precisely the bloody and drastic features of the sacrificial ritual that we find disconcerting today served this end as well. But we must realize that alongside the great, bloody, and special festivals, there was also a simpler daily piety in which incense and the lighting of lamps played a great role. Alongside offerings, ordinary people participated in the imperial cult simply and easily through prayers; they decorated the doors of their houses with laurel wreaths and clothed themselves in a festive manner.[467] The dimensions of the ritual were varied and mixed: for example, a society in Alexandria cared for the portrait of the emperor (εἰκόνες σεβαστῶν) and devoted itself to the cult of the Empress Faustina the younger (ca. 130–176 CE);[468] in Didyma and Stratoniceia, new, old, and ancient hymns were

[463] Bammer 1978; Bremmer 2000; Stengel 1920, 108–18.

[464] A comparable inscription would be a decree from Gytheum, the old main port of Sparta: SEG XI (1950), nr. 923, pp. 160–62 (honorary decree for Emperor Tiberius; cf. Rostovtzeff 1930; for an English translation, see Beard/North/Price 1998, 254–55); compare also Chaniotis 2003; Herz 2002; Price 1984b, 101–21 (significance of the cult for the life of the cities), 207–20 (sacrifice = Price 1980), and esp. pp. 210–11 on Gytheum.

[465] Chaniotis 2003, 19.

[466] Burkert 2003, 1–2.

[467] Nilsson 1945, 65–66; Price 1984b, 228–29; Clauss 1999, 322–23 (public provision of the expensive incense) and 328–34. Chaniotis 2003, 18–19, speaks of an “imperial period tendency toward an interiorization” and a “search for a personal contact between human beings and God.”

[468] From an inscription that was discovered in 1993 (possibly at the location of the *Caesareum* of Alexandria) on a (fragmented) column: . . . οἱ ἀπὸ συσσείτου Σεβαστῶν εἰκόνων καὶ Φαυστείνης Φαρίας Σωσιστόλου Νέας Σεβαστῆς. For the text of the inscription and commentary, see Bernand/Bernand 1998, 97–101, esp. 98 (text) and

sung in the cult by boy choirs;[469] and in some places, offerings were made in front of houses on provisional altars when the procession passed by.[470]

In distinction from the previously considered institutional contexts of Christian theology, the pagan cultic practices in the ritual sphere are suited in only a very limited manner for comparison with the corresponding Christian cultic actions. The private, nonbloody cultic action of the new religion was at most connected with the dramatic and bloody features that were characteristic of the pagan public cultic actions through the rumor that small children were sacrificed and eaten in Christian worship services. But that rumor of Thyestian meals (*Tragoedia Thyestae*),[471] which was widespread in antiquity and by no means applied only to Christians, exceeded the dramatic of actual contemporary cultic sacrifice in such an excess that in this way, a special position of the Christians in public life was again made clear.[472] From the second century onward, educated Christians publicly polemicized against the bloody sacrifice in the pagan cult[473] and certainly made recourse here to Jewish and pagan criticism of sacrifice.[474] Therefore, comparisons between the pagan cult, on the one hand, and Jewish and Christian cults, on the other hand, are possible at most where the sacrificial cult was spiritualized and nonbloody, spiritual

---

99–100 (commentary); compare also SEG XLVIII (1998), nr. 1960, p. 643, and Chaniotis 2003, 10–11.

[469] Thus an inscription from Didyma (Rehm/Harder/Wiegand 1958, nr. 217): Merkelbach/Stauber 1998, nr. 01/19/10, pp. 76–77 (lines 6–7). Apollo says, χαίρω δ’ ἐπὶ πάσῃ ἀοιδῇ | [κεἴ τε νέη τ]ελέθῃ· (lines 8–9).

[470] Clauss 1999, 332–33, with documentation.

[471] Thus Tertullian, *Ad nationes* I 7.27 (Borleffs 1954, 20.27).

[472] Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* V 1.14 (Schwartz 1999, II/1: 406.25); compare the Christian reaction to such accusations in Athenagoras, *Legatio pro Christianis* 3.1 (Goodspeed 1984, 318); Theophilus, *Ad Autolycum* III 15.1–3 (Marcovich 1995b, 115.1–10); Tertullian, *Apologeticum* 2.4 or 7.1 (Dekkers 1954a, 87.12–13 and 98.1–4); and Minucius Felix, *Octavius* 28.2 (Kytzler 1982, 27.6). Compare also Bickerman 1980, 225–55, esp. 231–33 (first published as Bickerman 1927); Dölger 1934; Freudenberger 1967; Speyer 1963; Schäfke 1979, 579–95 (with extensive citation of sources).

[473] *Odes of Solomon* 20.3 (the sacrifice of Christians is not “as the world”); Ptolemy, *Epistula ad Floram* apud Epiphanius, *Panarion seu adversus Lxxx haereses* 33.5.9 (Holl/Dummer 1980, 455.7–10): καὶ γὰρ προσφορὰς προσφέρειν προσέταξεν ἡμῖν ὁ σωτήρ, ἀλλ’ οὐχὶ τὰς δι’ ἀλόγων ζῴων ἢ τούτων τῶν θυμιαμάτων, ἀλλὰ διὰ πνευματικῶν αἴνων καὶ δοξῶν καὶ εὐχαριστίας καὶ διὰ τῆς εἰς τοὺς πλησίον κοινωνίας καὶ εὐποιίας; Aristides, *Apology* 1.2 (Pouderon/Pierre 2003, 256.12–13 [Greek]/186 [Syriac]); Athenagoras, *Legatio pro Christianis* 13.1–2; Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* IV 29.1–2 (Rousseau 1965, 764.1–770.44); Minucius Felix, *Octavius* 32.2–3 (Kytzler 1982, 30.29–31); and elsewhere. R. P. C. Hanson 1980, 913–14, refers to a Jewish prehistory in *Sibylline Oracles* III 591–92 and IV 162–70 and mentions other passages in pp. 915–17.

[474] Stroumsa 2005b, 108–44.

sacrifices (λογικαὶ θυσίαι)[475] replaced bloody material ones. We do not, of course, need to take up this much-treated topic again in detail here.

The relationship between Christian and Jewish worship services was already much closer because of the common rejection of pagan sacrifice. But this picture of a close relationship is also conditioned, of course, by the apparently good source findings for the form and course of the Jewish worship service of the word in the synagogues. If, by contrast, one were to draw on the Jerusalem temple cult for comparison, whose ritual regulations and liturgical texts were also handed down after its destruction in the first century, then one could not speak so easily of a comparison and a close relationship. We are much better informed about the Jerusalem sacrificial cult than we are about the pagan sacrificial cult. Thus we know, for example, some of the readings that accompanied the sacrificial ritual in the Jerusalem temple during the time before its destruction in the first century CE (*m. Tamid* 5.1),[476] but as we have seen, we know scarcely any liturgical texts from the pagan sacrificial cult in the imperial period. But the ability to compare the Christian worship service with the Jewish one is made difficult not least by the fact that strong regional differences predominated both in the Judaism of the imperial period and in Christianity, and many regulations that were long regarded as very old developed only gradually.

Even if much is currently in flux in the history of the Jewish and Christian liturgies of the early imperial period, one can still point (with Gerard Rouwhorst)[477] to some conspicuous parallels. First, the reading of biblical texts in the early Christian liturgy forms a clear parallel to the Jewish worship service, even if the position of the reading in the worship service or the emerging reading cycles are scarcely comparable.[478] Second, in the same breath as the reading, we must mention its interpretation in a sermon, which was evidently already connected with the reading at a very early point.[479] Another parallel is the emergence of the Christian Easter festival, which represents—however the details should be imagined—a transformation of

[475] Λογικαὶ θυσίαι *Corpus Hermeticum* I 31 (Nock/Festugière 1945ff, I: 19.1) and XIII 18–19 (Nock/Festugière 1945ff, II: 208.13, 16); compare Ferguson 1980; Young 1979; 1972.

[476] Compare, for example, Heinemann 1977, 122–38; for a treatment that is more extensive but obsolete in parts, see Elbogen 1995, 245–50.

[477] Rouwhorst 2004; compare also Rouwhorst 1997; Reif 1993, 53–87 (“The early liturgy of the synagogue”).

[478] On the reading of Scripture in the worship service in Christian antiquity in general, see Markschies 2004b (with additional literature there) and Rouwhorst 2002, 316–17; for the synagogue, compare, for example, Levine 2000, 135–43, 506–10; Schiffman 1999; Rouwhorst 1997, 77–78.

[479] Levine 2000, 145–47 (attestations primarily from the New Testament and from Philo) and 549–51 (from rabbinic literature).

the Jewish Passover festival. The same applies to the oldest theology of this festival in Melito of Sardis, Pseudo-Hippolytus, or Origen.[480] Finally, the celebration of the Eucharist and especially the Eucharistic prayer that is central to this celebration has clear Jewish parallels as well, irrespective of whether or not one should trace it back directly to the prayer of thanksgiving after the meal, the Birkat ha-Mazon (thus after Cuming above all Bradshaw).[481] Many of the aforementioned parallels can be traced back to the fact that Christian communities continued the liturgical customs of Judaism or adopted and modified them when they configured their own forms. But it has become increasingly clear in the most recent period that such reception processes may not be thought of as a one-way street: it is clear that there were Christian influences on the developing Jewish liturgy as well. Admittedly, this exciting field cannot be dealt with in detail here.[482] But it is absolutely necessary to mention that the Christian worship service apparently shared a leading basic principle with the Jewish one relatively quickly and had adopted it from there: one understood —as the *Sanctus* makes clear, which is first attested biblically in the mouth of heavenly beings[483]—all earthly liturgy as an imitation of the heavenly cult, which is presented to God without interruption through the various classes of angels. As Eusebius of Caesarea puts it, "Thus with the hosts in heaven he (sc. the Logos) also leads those on earth to the praise of the King of the all."[484] The significance of this heavenly grounding of all earthly liturgy has become even clearer since the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* from the Qumran findings were published (4QShirot 'Olat HaShabbat, 4Q400–402, 403–406, possibly 407 and 11QShirShab, 11Q17);[485] another fragment from the late Herodian period was found in Masada (Mas lk).[486] The writing on the leather fragments is dated partly to the late

[480] Details in Rouwhorst 2004, 81–82.

[481] Rouwhorst 2004, 82–86; Bradshaw 2004, 33, communicates an early Palestinian form of the Birkat ha-Mazon on the basis of Finkelstein 1928/1929, 211–26 (see pp. 215–17 for a juxtaposition with the relevant prayers of the *Didache* and pp. 236–62 for the critical edition of the variants). See also the presentation in Hänggi/Pahl 1998, nr. 122–25, pp. 9–12. Cuming 1989, 340, was already skeptical as well.

[482] A good introduction is provided in Leonhard 2004 (which is also a good introduction into the relevant studies of Daniel Boyarin and Israel Yuval).

[483] The investigations of Gabriele Winkler on the origin of the *Sanctus* in the Christian liturgy are summarized well in Bradshaw 2004, 127–28, and M. E. Johnson 2000; compare now Winkler 2002, 170–72.

[484] Eusebius, *Theophania* I 41 (Gressmann/Laminski 1992, 58*.31–32).

[485] Newsom 1998; 1985; Charlesworth/Newsom 1997, 138–89 ("composite text" of the thirteen hymns).

[486] Newsom/Yadin 1984, 77–88 (text is also, for example, in Newsom 1998, 239–52).

Hasmonean period and partly to the early Herodian period.[487] The texts are said not to come from the community of Qumran but from "priestly scribal circles."[488] The thirteen songs consist mostly of the description and quotation of the praise that the angels (אלוהים, מלאכים, קדושים, רוחות and diverse additional classes[489]) offer to God in his heavenly temple and thus legitimate the earthly cult.[490] In the heavenly cult, there are wonderful words, intelligible for those who have "knowledge of eternal things" (ובם לידועי עולמים),[491] but the very songs and formulas that distinguish the earthly worship service are also used.

Before we can analyze the Christian texts with a view to our line of thought, however, we must first discuss in somewhat greater detail the difficult source basis that can be drawn upon when the concern is with the history of the Christian worship service in the imperial period.

2.3.3 The Sources for the Early Christian Worship Service

The one who seeks to understand the development of the Christian worship service in antiquity as part of the history of Christian "theology" quickly encounters a *problem of sources*. The clearer it has become through the research of the last decades that the various liturgical actions in the pre-Constantinian period (the weekly celebration of the Lord's Supper, the worship service of the word, and other forms of prayers) did not develop from certain primitive forms of an "apostolic liturgy" but showed an extraordinary diversity in structure and content from the beginning,[492] the heavier the extensive absence of relevant texts from this time has weighed. Paul F. Bradshaw explains this development of the liturgy from manifold origins to more fixed forms, which was expressed some time ago in the memorable phrase "from freedom to formula,"[493] with the relatively small binding force of the liturgical regulations at the beginning: "liturgical texts fixed in writing were virtually unknown in the first three centuries; the worship service was consequently largely

[487] Newsom 1998, 173–74, 197, 221–22, 253–54, 293–94, 308, 395.

[488] Charlesworth/Newsom 1997, 5.

[489] Newsom 1985, 23–38.

[490] Newsom 1985, 72: "rather some sort of experimental validation of their claims."

[491] Song 6, line 45, in the reconstruction of Charlesworth/Newsom 1997, 158: Mas1k 2.26, 4Q403, fragment 1 1.11, 4Q405, fragment 3 2.1.

[492] For brief orientation on the state of research, see Bradshaw 1985; the classic research is represented by Klauser 1965, Jungmann 1967, and the more recent state of scholarship by Bradshaw 2002, 73–97; 2004, 24–138.

[493] Bouley 1981, esp. 89–158 and 217–53; Bradshaw 1993. Similarly, by the way, Levine 2000, 504: "Our sources indicate that liturgical practice was far from fixed."

improvised and was correspondingly flexible in its development."[494] We already read in Justin that the presider at the Eucharistic worship service formulates prayers and thanksgivings (freely) as well as he can (ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ),[495] and the so-called *Traditio Apostolica* (see section 2.3.4.4) prohibits the bishop from giving thanks as if he had learned it by heart "but each should pray as he can" (ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲕⲁⲧⲁ ⲧϭⲟⲙ ⲙ̄ⲡ̄ⲟⲩⲁ ⲡⲟⲩⲁ ⲉϥⲛⲁϣⲗⲏⲗ).[496] Naturally, one must also not exaggerate the notion, correct in itself, that the liturgy was improvised, since texts fixed in writing from the pre-Constantinian period do still exist. These certainly do not represent "*the* Roman," "*the* Antiochene," or "*the* Alexandrian" liturgy, but they were probably used and handed down in these regions by groups whose boundaries and influence we can no longer determine exactly. In contemporary Judaism, there were evidently written collections of prayers.[497] Moreover, the trend "from freedom to formula" led to fixed texts. Origen already says in his conversation with Heracleides and other bishops (middle of the third century), "When praying we want to remain with the fixed formulas," but with this statement he intends "to say something daring."[498]

Admittedly, the depths of the source problem are plumbed only in a rudimentary way with such observations. If for the understanding of rituals an analysis of their nonverbal aspects of presentation, which have been designated for some time as "performance," is also necessary, then reports on this aspect of the ancient Christian worship service are lacking—apart from very few exceptions that we will naturally take into consideration. This lies in the specific nature of liturgical texts from the beginning period

[494] Bradshaw 1985, 40. In the Eucharistic prayers, the bishop had the freedom of improvisation until the middle of the third century. In addition to the literature referenced in the preceding note, compare also R. P. C. Hanson 1961 and more recently A. Budde 2001a. For critical observations on the source basis of A. Budde's article, see now Winkler 2005, 28–29; for the Jewish findings, see Heinemann 1977, 42–45.

[495] Justin, *Apologia i* 67.5 (Goodspeed 1984, 75; Marcovich 1994, 129.15) = Hänggi/Pahl 1998, nr. 231, p. 70.

[496] *Traditio Apostolica* 9 [34] (Schölgen/Geerlings 1991, 238.20–21; Till/Leipoldt 1954, 6); compare now the commentary in Bradshaw/Johnson/Phillips 2002, 70.

[497] *Testament of Job* 50.3 (= 11.29): καὶ ὁ βουλόμενος λοιπὸν ἴχνος καταλαβεῖν τῆς πατρικῆς δόξης εὑρήσει ἀναγεγραμμένον ἐν ταῖς εὐχαῖς τῆς Ἀμαλθείας κέρας. Schaller 1979, 371, translates, "And whoever in the future wants to understand the trace of the day of the fatherly glory will find it written in the prayers of the horn of Amaltheia." On the "horn of the nymph Amaltheia," see Schaller 1979, 325, apparatus: Greek text according to Kohler 1972, 312. Kohler translates Ἀμαλθείας κέρας as "Horn of Plenty" and points to a variant reading Ἀμαλθείας Καρναφοῦχ (pp. 288–89). Both the textual findings and the interpretation require additional clarification.

[498] Origen, *Dialogus cum Heraclide* 4 (Scherer 1967, 62.27–64.1): Τολμηρὸν δόξω λέγειν, εὐχόμενοι ἐμμένειν ταῖς συνθήκαις· (cf. the elucidations in Scherer 1967, 64 n. 1).

of Christianity, which are called “script” in the terminology of ritual research.

Examples of such liturgical texts formulated in writing from the beginnings are found above all in “church orders,” thus in the *Didache*, the so-called *Traditio Apostolica*, and the liturgical material of the texts related to this church order.[499] To this can be added the traditions from the so-called apocryphal acts of apostles—thus the *Acts of John* (CANT 215.I = BHG 900–909) and the *Acts of Thomas* (CANT 245.I = BHO 1186–1204 or 245.II = BHG 1800–1831k; BHG[a] 1800–1831z).[500] The exact history-of-traditions background and historical context of these texts are admittedly controversial: for example, in 1883, Richard Adelbert Lipsius explained all the material from the *Acts of Thomas* against the background of the remaining traditions on Valentinian Gnosis as Gnostic,[501] while in recent years, the background in local Syrian majority Christianity has become clearer, not least through the investigations of Gabriele Winkler.[502] Now that the Gnostic interpretation of the passages from the *Acts of Thomas* by Lipsius can scarcely secure a consensus any longer today, many regard, by contrast, the four liturgical pieces found in the appendix of the so-called *Valentinian Exposition* (*Expositio Valentiniana*) of the ninth codex from the textual findings from Nag Hammadi (NHC XI,2 p. 40.1-44.37) as pieces of a Valentinian liturgy.[503] However, the two very fragmentary pieces on the Eucharist (NHC XI,2 d/e), which are interesting in our connection, show only a very superficial Gnostic character and scarcely a specifically Valentinian one. They begin—as in the majority church—with a thanksgiving and the assurance that an unknown group (presumably the praying Gnostics) will do God’s will “[through the] name of Jesus Christ . . .” and has thereby attained to perfection and purity: “perfected [in] every grace and [every] purity. Glory be to you through your firstborn

[499] Compare the overview in C. Vogel 1986, 31–34 (= 1981), and now Messner 2000, 35–52, on the sources and editions.

[500] Compare Plümacher 1978, 11–14, 34–43, and now Bradshaw 2004, 123–28, as well as Prieur 2004.

[501] Lipsius 1883, 311–21.

[502] Winkler 1994; 1996; in terms of its tendency, a similar view can also already be found in Lietzmann 1926, 240–47, although he reckons with an imitation of an old tradition “in a Gnostic atmosphere” (244).

[503] The pieces NHC XI,2 d/e could be assigned to the Eucharist because p. 43.20 begins, “[We] thank [to you, we say] thanks, O Father,” and the use of the Greek loanword εὐχαριστεῖν in this context points in the direction of a Eucharistic prayer. Thomassen 1989 discusses whether we are dealing with a “Mainstream” Valentinianism; compare in general J. D. Turner 1994.

Son, Jesus Christ, from now until eternity, Amen."[504] At most, this emphasis on the individual perfection of community members may have been characteristic for the Eucharist in Valentinian communities: in the Valentinian *Gospel of Philip* from Nag Hammadi (NHC II,3), we read that the Eucharistic cup from water and wine, a "symbol (τύπος) of the blood" (of Jesus Christ) over which thanks are given, lets one receive "the perfect human being."[505] The remaining reports about Eucharistic celebrations among Gnostics (for example, the Valentinian Marcus Magus,[506] or the so-called Ophites, Borborians, and Carpocratians[507]) are so heavily overlaid with polemic that a historical reconstruction can hardly succeed.

Finally, we must mention the frequently discussed brief statements of the Roman governor C. Plinius Caecilius Secundus in a letter to the Emperor Trajan, which admittedly attest only the regularity of morning celebrations with alternate singing directed to Christ (*carmenque Christo quasi deo dicere secum invicem*).[508] While a precise identification of such *carmina* as baptismal confession, psalms, or petitionary prayers has been attempted, this is scarcely possible due to the relatively broad spectrum of the meaning of the word *carmen* and the fact that here a non-Christian writes about impressions gained from an interrogation.[509] It is more probable that in the interrogations the Christians reported quite generally

[504] NHC XI, 2 p. 43.20–38; English translation of the German translation of W. P. Funk 2003, 761–62; similarly also the second prayer in which great weight is likewise placed on purity, p. 44.1–37: "You, O Lord, if you die in [pur]ity, then [you] will effect (?) purity—so that everyone who receives from him to eat [and drink, will live]. Glory be to you in eternity, Amen."

[505] *Gospel of Philip* 100 (NHC II,3 p. 75.15–24): ⲡⲡⲟⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ’ ⲙ̄ⲡϣⲗⲏⲗ ⲟⲩⲛ̄ⲧⲁϥ’ ⲏⲣⲡ’ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ ⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁϥ’ ⲙⲙⲟⲩ ⲉϥ’ ⲕⲏ ⲉϩⲣⲁï ⲉⲡⲧⲩⲡⲟⲥ: "The cup of prayer <, over which thanks is given (cf. 1 Cor 10.16),> contains both wine and water. It is established as a symbol of the blood {. . .} and is filled with the Holy Spirit" (English translation of the German translation of Schenke 2001, 206; cf. also his commentary, Schenke 1997, 456–57).

[506] N. Förster 1999, 64–91 (commentary on Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* I 13.2), and 400–402. Föster 1999, 65, shows "that Irenaeus himself formulated the more precise description of the course of the . . . rituals."

[507] Epiphanius, *Panarion seu adversus Lxxx haereses* 37.5.6–7 (Holl/Dummer 1980, 57.12–58.1); Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* III 10.1 (Stählin/Früchtel/Treu 1985, 200.5–15).

[508] Pliny the Younger, *Epistulae* X 96.7 (Kasten 1982, 642); for the interpretation, see now in detail H. Löhr 2003, 424–27, and previously already Lietzmann 1916b (= 1962, 43–47); Dölger 1925, 117–36; Salzmann 1989.

[509] Documentation in H. Löhr 2003, 425–26. Lietzmann 1916b, 36–37 (= 1962, 51) related the formulation to the alternating recitation of the baptismal confession—that is, to baptismal questions and answers. In view of the age of our earliest attestation for baptismal questions, this is very unlikely; compare also Lietzmann 1916a, 281–82 (= 1962, 54–55).

about songs, hymns, and chants that were directed to Christ and recited in alternate responses.[510]

In the relevant sources for our question the concern—leaving the *Didache* out of consideration for the moment—is with an extremely complex material of translations and revisions whose exact relation of dependence still cannot be explained precisely at present. The *Traditio Apostolica* stands as a paradigm example of this; but the situation of the apocryphal acts of apostles is comparable. It is virtually certain that the *Grundschrift* (basic writing) of this material, which has been designated *Traditio Apostolica* since the beginning of the twentieth century, already compiled material itself and comes from the third century. It can be said with a probability that approaches certainty that this *Grundschrift*, which can be reconstructed somewhat reliably from various translations and revisions,[511] was not composed by the urban theologian Hippolytus.[512] New discoveries of manuscripts in Ethiopia and India, which have not yet been published at present, have shown that we are dealing with an extremely fluid text that is, to a great extent, also freely movable in its content between the various languages of antiquity, so that all statements about early, let alone primitive, forms of the material are extremely difficult to make. In order to be able to reconstruct an early basic form of the Eucharistic liturgy from the recognizably late textual material—as is attempted, to some extent, by Paul F. Bradshaw[513]—extensive comparative investigations on the early traditions are necessary.

Beyond the material already mentioned, only a very small number of additional texts are available for the reconstruction of the Christian

[510] Only O. Casel 1921, 184, understands *invicem* as a strengthening of *secum* and interprets the expression correspondingly as "simply in relation to the common song" (H. Löhr 2003, 425 n. 369).

[511] As long as the Editio Critica Maior that was originally planned for the "Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller" (Greek Christian authors) has not been completed, one must consult the following works as practical synopses of the complicated findings: Botte 1984; Botte/Gerhards/Feldbecker 1989; Schöllgen/Geerlings 1991. For a synopsis with commentary in English, see Bradshaw/Johnson/Phillips 2002.

[512] I have attempted to ground this view of the text in a more extensive study: Markschies 1999b. Cerrato 2002, 98–100, and Bradshaw/Johnson/Phillips 2002, 98–100, concisely summarize the subsequent discussion. In view of the present state of my knowledge of the difficult stemma of the *Grundschrift* (basic writing), I must supplement my study above all with reference to the various revisions of the "Syriac Didascalia" and the exciting new discovery of an Ethiopian version (see now Bausi 2009) but do not need to revise any of the fundamental observations. According to the information of A. Bausi (Florence), the Ethiopian manuscript discovered by him contains a literal translation of the Greek *Grundschrift*, which is thus very near to the Latin version from Codex Veronensis and is fundamentally separated from the remaining late Ethiopian translations (see now Bausi 2009).

[513] Bradshaw 2004, 135–36.

worship service in the first three centuries: practically all the texts handed down on papyrus come from the post-Constantinian period.[514] Only Papyrus Würzburg 3 (Inv. Nr. 20 II 18; Haelst 1976, Nr. 1036[515]) from Hermopolis Magna is dated to the late third century.[516] It is evidently a private copy and not a text for liturgical use, possibly of a prayer of intercession with the concluding doxology διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς σου παιδὸς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ that can be assigned—at least if one follows the not completely undisputed supplements of Hans Lietzmann—to the so-called Antiochene Type, which together with the "Alexandrian" constitute the two main branches of the late ancient eastern liturgical families.[517]

However, the tradition contexts of a small number of fourth century papyri clearly show that the texts attested in them must be older. This applies above all to the liturgies of the city of Alexandria and the Egyptian province.[518] In our context of discussion, two complexes of tradition from this material are especially interesting, the so-called *Barcelona Anaphora* and the so-called *Euchologium of Serapion*. Although the "nontraditional forms" of pre-Constantinian Eucharistic prayers have received special attention in recent years and the *Anaphora of Addai and Mari*, for example, is sometimes dated very early,[519] we will restrict ourselves to the two aforementioned pieces in the interest of an example-oriented approach.

The so-called *Barcelona Anaphora* is handed down among fragments of a papyrus book in pocket-sized format, which is kept today in Montserrat (earlier Barcelona, "Fundacion 'San Lucas Evangelista'") and which now bears the signature Montserrat II/126–181 (= Leuven Database of Ancient Books 0552). These pages all belong to a single Greek-Latin mixed codex from the fourth century, from which larger and smaller parts have been published in Spanish or Catalan by their owner Ramon Roca-Puig over a period of forty years. The place of discovery is unknown, but much speaks for the view that the volume belongs to the codices that were

[514] An older collection that is, however, very rare in German libraries is Grande 1934. For helpful references on questions of the history of liturgy and energetic help in obtaining the literature, I thank Dr. Heinzgerd Brakmann in Bonn.

[515] Haelst 1976, 324 (nr. 1036).

[516] Compare Wilcken 1934, nr. 3, pp. 31–36 (with commentary by H. Lietzmann); Baulig 1984, 42–43; and the important pointers on the text and interpretation in Sijpesteijn/Treu 1988.

[517] Compare the clear diagram in Feulner 1997, 979–80; a material-rich overview can be found in Kretschmar 1977, 250–69. Here we can blend out the Jerusalem liturgies because the main source traditions first begin in the fourth century; compare, for example, Kretschmar 1956a.

[518] Compare Brakmann 1996; 1987; 1999a, 452–54; 2002, 323–76.

[519] Vogel 1980; for the Addai and Mari anaphora, compare the overview and literature in Bradshaw 2004, 128–31.

found at the beginning of the 1950s in the vicinity of Faw Qibli (Pabau), the main monastery of the Pachomians. Most of these codices are kept today in the Bibliotheca Bodmeriana (Cologny near Geneva) or the Chester Beatty Library (Dublin) and which are also often called the "Dishna papers."[520] To date, a critical edition of the entire material is lacking. For this reason, a complete overview of the preserved material is difficult[521] but also not absolutely necessary for our purposes.

The brown pages, which are greatly frayed in part, measure (to the extent that the images in Roca-Puig's work and his own remarks in the publications allow such conclusions) on average 12.5 cm by 10 cm, are written on relatively narrowly in a single column (up to twenty-two lines), and contain no numeration on the pages. The relatively clear writing allows the book to be dated to the early fourth century.[522] The volume originally contained texts of the most varied provenance, language, and genre (in the numeration I follow today's inventory numbers): A (if not *the* first) part is formed, with twenty-four folia (forty-seven pages), by the first two Catilinarian Orations of Cicero, the beginning of which is admittedly lost (a part); fol. 24^r contains the conclusion of the second oration (Pack 2294/ Mertens-Pack add. 2921.1: P. Montserrat II = P. Barc. inv. 126–149a).[523] This was followed by a heavily fragmented rhythmic hymn, likewise in Latin, on the birth and early youth of Christ, which is overwritten with the words *psalmus responsorius* (fol. 24^v–28^v; Haelst 1976, Nr. 1210: P. Montserrat II = P. Barc. inv. 149b–153). It consists of a *prooemium* and twelve completely handed down acrostic strophes as well as traces of three others. Here word accents are conspicuous (1.9: *progènies*; 5.11: *ád*; 7.5: *infántem herodès*; 7.13: *sìbi elégit*),[524] as are the rich biblical allusions in the *prooemium* and the first two strophes (Romans 8.17; Matthew 1.21 Acts 2.11;

520 Presumably discovered in 1952 in Abu Manu, 13.7 miles (22 kilometers) (north) east of Nag Hammadi; compare Wouters 1988, 12 with n. 22 and 15 with n. 34; Kasser 1988.

521 For a concise overview, see Römer 1997, 127–28.

522 A more detailed description of the pages is found in Roca-Puig 1965, 3–5 (papyrus, writing division), 19–43 (writing), and 47–52 (dating). The title of the publication is unfortunate, since the concern is not with a Mary hymn but with a Christ hymn that is directed to the Father: *pater, qui omnia regis,/peto Christi nos scias heredes./Christus, verbo natus,/ per quem populous est liberatus* (proomium, l. 1–4). Compare also Emmett 1975.

523 Compare the preliminary report of the editor, Roca-Puig 1973, as well as Roca-Puig 1971 and the edition of the passage—namely, Roca-Puig 1977.

524 The pagination provided corresponds to the first edition—namely, Roca-Puig 1965. The edition was given a detailed recension, which also contains some suggestions for improving the text (in addition *qui duodecim reges servire fecit* in line 8 of the Psalm should be retained; the same applies to line 79 *cum gratia* [cf. line 69] and line 100 *aquae* [the subject is Jesus]): C. H. Roberts 1967. According to Roberts, the whole fourth century is possible for the dating.

Matthew 11.13; Luke 1.36; and Hebrews 9.4). The aforementioned Eucharistic prayer of the so-called Alexandrian type (Haelst 1976, Nr. 863: P. Montserrat II = P. Barc. inv. 154b/155a) was also included in the mixed codex, as well as a prayer after the reception of communion, two prayers for the sick or the oil for the sick (Haelst 1976, Nr. 864: P. Montserrat II = P. Barc. inv. 155b/157a), plus diverse glosses and acclamations (Haelst 1976, Nr. 862: P. Montserrat II = P. Barc. inv. 154a[525]). The last part of the codex that has been identified and published to date consists of 124 Latin hexameters on the myth of Alcestis (Mertens-Pack add. 2998.1: P. Montserrat II = P. Barc. inv. 158–161).[526]

The aforementioned prayer for the sick from the tradition context of the so-called *Barcelona Anaphora* is also attested among the spectacular new discovery of texts from Manichean houses in the Egyptian oasis Kellis and was therefore probably used by Manicheans as well.[527] Unfortunately, the exact geographical origin of the bilingual book can no longer be illuminated,[528] and the original function also remains unclear. But it is probably a school context, as the glosses and marginal notes already suggest.

If, however, in the first decades of the fourth century, an anaphora already turns up in such a mixed codex and was most probably used in school contexts for the purpose of instruction, then it is highly probable that one may regard it as much older than its first literary attestation and date it to the third century. Since the so-called *Barcelona Anaphora* already shows signs of the “Alexandrian type,” something about the age of the whole text family simultaneously becomes clear.[529] The *Anaphora of Mark* itself is probably older as well[530]—for the witnesses of this Eucharistic tradition text stemming from the city of Alexandria, which are dated into the fourth century, come from provincial contexts of discovery and

[525] Roca-Puig 1970; a complete edition of the liturgical texts, Haelst 1976, 863/864, is found in Roca-Puig 1999 (for the preceding publications, compare also Treu 1989, 109; 1991, 96). The prayer for the laying on of hands in relation to the sick has been newly edited in Daniel/Römer/Worp 1997. The oil exorcism is the subject of a new edition by Merkelbach 1996; compare Luppe 1993, 70.

[526] Roca-Puig 1980 (preliminary report); 1982a (edition and commentary). On the text material, compare also Marcovich 1998.

[527] Papyrus Kellis I 88; compare Daniel/Römer/Worp 1997.

[528] However, in the hymn to Mary, we find the writing error naξarenum (1.11: Roca-Puig 1965, 19), which would probably only happen to a Greek, who thinks of Ναζαρηνός or Ναζωραῖος. In addition, some *nomina sacra* are written in Greek letters in Latin texts as well.

[529] Roca-Puig 1972.

[530] Compare the texts in Hammerstaedt 1999b, 24, 45, 109, and in Engberding 1956; Coquin 1969; Brakmann 1981, 239 n. 1 (with corresponding documentation); Cuming 1982.

thus, like the attestation of the *Barcelona Anaphora*, already presuppose a longer history of dissemination.[531]

By contrast, it is controversial and unclear how exactly the collection commonly titled *Euchologion of Serapion*, with thirty liturgical prayers for the Eucharist celebration, initiation, ordination, anointing of the sick, and liturgy for the dead (= CPG II: 2495), can be contextualized historically and with respect to the history of liturgy. This collection is handed down in the manuscript *Athos Lavra* 149 (eleventh century?). Its pieces were published in 1898 by Georg Wobbermin (1869–1943), who otherwise made more of a name for himself as a systematic theologian, after they were discovered in the context of work on Hans von Soden's edition of the New Testament on Mount Athos. Wobbermin not only edited the thirty pieces on fol. 7v–20v of the manuscript but also wrote a commentary on the collection. Since Εὐχὴ προσφόρου Σαραπίωνος ἐπισκόπου was written over the first of the pieces and the sentence πᾶσαι αὗται εὐχαὶ ἐπιτελοῦνται πρὸ τῆς εὐχῆς τοῦ προσφόρου stood after the last, Wobbermin assumed that it was a collection of material that belonged together and identified the bishop Serapion named in the title with the bishop of Thmuis mentioned in the heading of piece number 15 (Προσευχὴ Σαραπίωνος ἐπισκόπου Θμούεως). Wobbermin regarded him as the "author of the final redaction."[532] Since Serapion, a friend of Athanasius and Anthony, was bishop in Thmuis in Lower Egypt in 339 CE and died after 362 CE, a date was obtained in this way, at least for the redaction of the collection.

Two years later, the text collection was edited again by F. E. Brightman on the basis of new photographs of the manuscript.[533] Brightman criticized the designation of the collection as Εὐχολόγιον, which was introduced by Wobbermin and is widespread up to the present, and identified it as a (rudimentary) sacramentary—more precisely as a *libellus* of the celebrant, in which therefore the texts for the deacon and the other liturgists participating in the worship service were not recorded, either.[534] But Brightman was also convinced that the collection went back to Serapion. Since he read the heading for Nr. 15 as Προσευχαὶ Σαραπίωνος

[531] Brakmann 1999a, 452–54; for the Strasbourg Papyrus gr. 254 (Haelst 1976, nr. 998 = Häggi/Pahl 1998, 116/118; Hammerstaedt 1999b, 24) from the fourth/fifth century; compare the introductory observations and commentary in the edition of Grande 1934, 5–7, and Wegman 1981 (for the discussion of his thesis that the papyrus contains not a section but rather a complete Eucharistic prayer from the second/third century, cf. the literature in Brakmann 1988, 353). On the text, see now also Ray 1997; Bradshaw 2004, 131–33.

[532] Wobbermin 1898, 25, 31; compare now Bradshaw 2004, 133–35, and in detail M. E. Johnson 1995, 24–42.

[533] Brightman 1900.

[534] Brightman 1900, 89–90.

ἐπισκόπου Θμούεως, he even ascribed additional prayers to the Greco-Egyptian bishop.[535] After more extensive discussions, which do not interest us here, the last editor, Maxwell E. Johnson, proposed a division of the material into different groups and regarded a pre-Nicene origin as probable only for the first group of the pieces 1–11 (thus also for the first "prayer of offering") and pointed out interesting parallels to other early texts. He regarded the collection itself as a compilation of the fourth or fifth century.[536] By contrast, Wobbermin pointed out that the first piece directly ascribed to Serapion quoted the corresponding prayer of the *Didache* (9.4) word for word and therefore could well come from Serapion, since he was friends with Athanasius of Alexandria, who also knew, used, and reworked the *Didache*.[537] The question of the age of the prayer is already not without importance because here the words of institution are incorporated into a liturgical text.[538]

By contrast, the great collections of the relevant *Roman* texts emerged much later, as a consideration of the earliest example shows: it is admittedly extremely difficult to determine the age of the components of the *Libelli missarum* from the Veronese collection (Biblioteca capitolare 85 [*olim* 80]; earlier often also called the "Leonine Sacramentary")[539]—they are prayer texts for the mass from the archive of the Lateran that were collected, organized in *libelli* by formula groups according to the calendar year, and probably not intended for liturgical use—but for our contexts, the texts probably do not come into question: the manuscript itself comes from the seventh century and was written in North Italy, probably in Verona itself.[540] Today the collection is generally dated, with Hans Lietzmann, to the sixth century,[541] and its individual components

[535] Wobbermin 1898, 25.

[536] M. E. Johnson 1995, 276–77. On the parallels to the Strasbourg Papyrus, compare pp. 255–59, 272–76.

[537] Wobbermin 1898, 25–26.

[538] For a more extensive analysis, compare M. E. Johnson 1995, 233–53, and the concise summary in Bradshaw 2004, 134–35. Criticism of the attribution to Serapion had already previously been expressed by Botte 1964, 50–56 (it is said that the author is presumably an Arian and certainly a Pneumatomachian [55–56]); Cuming 1980b; Gamber 1967 (the original prayer consisted simply of a series of thanksgivings, followed by the intercessory prayer from *Didache* 9.4 and originally a prayer over the bread alone); Nock 1929. Unfortunately, I did not have access to Dufrasne 1981, which is not evaluated by M. E. Johnson either.

[539] Vogel 1986, 38–46.

[540] Thus the editor Leo Cunibert Mohlberg in his edition: Mohlberg 1956, 25–26. The character of the collection was first specified accurately by Stuiber 1950, 77–85; Mohlberg 1956, LIX–LXIII, takes up these results. Thus one cannot speak of a "sacramentary"; the collection is "at best a preliminary stage for this" (Stuiber 1950, 85).

[541] Lietzmann 1927, 30–35.

emerged at the earliest under Roman bishops of the fifth century.[542] We can therefore ignore it in our context.

It is more difficult to date and order the various prayer texts handed down on papyrus, of which we cannot, of course, provide a complete overview here.[543] In addition to purely private, or at least more private, prayers, we also find here pieces that were used in liturgies. Thus, for example, the Berlin papyrus 13415 contains a page from a lost papyrus book that was obtained at the old Hermopolis Magna and probably comes from the end of the fourth century (= Haelst 1976, Nr. 879),[544] a complete prayer for the Sabbath (σαββατικὴ εὐχή: P. Berol. 13415^{r}, line 10), and preceding this, perhaps a prayer for Friday.[545] That this collection of church prayers was originally intended for liturgical purposes is shown by structuring reading signs above the lines in the form of points. The community took up "the holy words of the divine law" in the worship service (μελε[τῶν] | [τας] τοὺς ἁγίους λόγους τοῦ θείο[υ] | [νόμου]: P. Berol. 13415^{v}, lines 5–7);[546] it walks, thanks to divine grace, upon the path of truth, is fortified in the truth (P. Berol. 13415^{r}, lines 17–18), and praises its Lord for this in prayer: δέσπο[τα· θ]εὲ [πάν] | σοφε πανεπίσκοπε μόν[αρχε ἅγιε] | ἀλη[θ]εινέ· (P. Berol. 13415^{r}, lines 12–14[547]). If one reads the whole prayer in context, then the pervasive grounding of the text with biblical vocabulary and the clusters of quotations from Scripture are conspicuous. One can almost speak of a "building block system," in which the building blocks of the text were evidently put together from proper quotations and allusions, which were connected by sentences inspired by biblical language. Most of the other texts are admittedly later and come from the Constantinian or post-Constantinian period.[548]

[542] For a convenient synopsis of attempts to date the collection at the time of 1956, see Mohlberg 1956, LXIV–LXXXV; for more recent information, see Palazzo 1998, 38–41 (= Palazzo 1983).

[543] Compare the collection in Goltz 1901, 328–53 (from church orders, the so-called Apostolic Fathers, apocryphal apostle acts, and other Patristic literature); compare Goltz 1905b.

[544] C. Schmidt 1914, 66–67; Schermann 1917. The text is also printed in Wessely 1946, 441–45, and Grande 1934, 13–14.

[545] Thus the appealing hypothesis of C. Schmidt 1914, 66.

[546] Compare, for example, Justin, *Dialogus cum Tryphone* 86.6 τὸν νόμον καὶ τὰ προστάγματα τοῦ θεοῦ λέγειν καὶ μελετᾶν ἐβούλοντο (Goodspeed 1984, 200; Marcovich 1997, 220.36–37).

[547] Compare 3 Maccabees 2.2: κύριε κύριε βασιλεῦ τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ δέσποτα πάσης κτίσεως ἅγιε ἐν ἁγίοις μόναρχε παντοκράτωρ . . .

[548] For the famous P. Vindob. G. 2326, which was published in 1887 under the heading, "The Oldest Liturgical Piece of Writing" (bibliography of the editions in Haelst 1976, nr. 1004, p. 318), compare now H. Förster 1997.

Finally, in addition to such prayer texts on papyrus, we also have as sources the writings of contemporary pre-Nicene theologians, which can be evaluated with a view to liturgical questions. Here, mention must be made especially of Justin,[549] Tertullian, Cyprian, and Origen, who have already often been investigated with a view to these connections.[550] In these texts, we find (admittedly scattered) an abundance of information about the liturgical daily routine and order as well as the "theology" of various forms of worship service. In what follows, we will in fact focus on the Eucharistic worship service (section 2.3.4), since the source situation for these liturgical forms is better, for example, than for baptism, ordination, and the daily liturgy or other types of daily prayer.[551] Our concern is not with a complete inventory of Christian worship service forms in the imperial period or with a comprehensive description of the prayer life of this time but rather with the specific form of "theology" that was alive in such liturgical performances—that is, institutionally.

2.3.4 Form and Theology of the Eucharistic Worship Service

If one desires to reconstruct the position and significance of the Eucharistic worship service for the Christian communities in the second and third centuries, then unfortunately, due to the late papyrus witnesses, one must primarily adhere again first (leaving aside the *Didache* for the moment) to the "great theologians," thus to people such as Justin or Origen, who were introduced in the preceding sections in their very specific institutional contexts (sections 2.1.3.1 and 2.1.3.2). This is regrettable to the extent that possible differences between the "theology" of educated strata and the *Gemeindeglauben* (community faith), to which Hermann Langerbeck pointed many years ago, can scarcely become evident. That such differences existed should not be doubted; such hypotheses are supported already by the different educational presuppositions between the teachers, whom we examined in greater detail above, and other people, for example, from the leadership of the Roman community, whom we know of from the second century. Langerbeck also insisted that we do not learn much about individual piety and the "theology" that was prevalent in the communities from public (or at least semipublic) arguments for Christianity.[552] Whether his reconstruction

[549] Jourjon 1976; Rordorf 1966 (= 1986, 59–71).

[550] Dekkers 1947; Saxer 1984.

[551] Bradshaw 1981, 47–71 ("The Second and Third Centuries"); additional literature in Messner 2001, 223 and 240.

[552] Langerbeck 1967. In a corresponding manner, the very careful interpretation of the relevant passages of Justin in Salzmann 1994, 235–57, begins with observations on the work's intended circle of readers (pp. 235–36).

of the conditions of the Roman community in the middle of the second century, which starts from a "radical Paulinism of the educated and a Catholic law-based Christianity of the naïve conservative community," is on target or whether it reflects only the theology of a classical philologist socialized in a Protestant manner does not have to be decided here.[553] His reference to the *Gemeindetheologie* (community theology) remains important, and one at least comes closer to this "community theology" when one looks at the liturgies, which for most community members presumably represented *the* institution in which they came into contact with "theology."

We will now go through the relevant witnesses chronologically, beginning with the *Didache* and Justin. By contrast, a discussion of special problems—such as the question of the place of the words of institution in the early liturgies, which is hotly debated at present, or the question of the various types of a Eucharistic liturgy in the first centuries—is not intended here.[554] If Paul Bradshaw is correct, then the concern cannot, in any case, be with reconstructing a line of development; rather, an inventory of "multiple prayer units" would have to be compiled.[555]

2.3.4.1 The Didache

The discussion about the concise sections of the *Didache* that are related to the Lord's Supper is extensive but does not need to be presented in detail for our purposes.[556] After a "two ways" teaching, the first preserved early Christian church order[557]—whose title Διδαχὴ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων is already presumably secondary because the theologoumenon of apostolicity plays no role in the work[558]—introduces regulations or texts for food,

[553] Langerbeck 1967, 175. Langerbeck, of course, rightly draws attention to the fact that after the "undoubtedly feverish life of the years between 135–165," we have no more reports about prominent urban Roman teachers, which could, at the very least, speak for the view that after the departure or death of the more prominent theologians (e.g., Marcion, Justin, and Ptolemy), the leadership of the community was carried out by people who had not enjoyed a comprehensive education at a high level.

[554] The whole first chapter is devoted to this problem in Bradshaw 2004, 1–23, esp. 15–23 (with literature on the topic); compare now also the (not unproblematic) view of Winkler 2004.

[555] Bradshaw 2004, 121.

[556] For a clear presentation of the literature see Niederwimmer 1989, 173–80; but compare also Klinghardt 1996, 380–86; Draper 2000; H. Löhr 2003, 421–24; Bradshaw 2002, 77–78; 2004, 24–42.

[557] Bradshaw 1989; Schöllgen/Geerlings 1991, 13–21; Schöllgen 1986.

[558] Without any discussion, *Didache* 11.4 introduces, alongside the prophet, a (likewise itinerant) ἀπόστολος (cf. Schöllgen 1990). For the discussion of the title of the work, compare the commentary in Schöllgen/Geerlings 1991, 25–26; Niederwimmer 1989.

baptism, and a *eucharistia*, using quite simple introductory categorizations (περὶ δὲ τῆς βρώσεως: *Didache* 6.3; περὶ δὲ τοῦ βαπτίσματος: 7.1; περὶ δὲ τῆς εὐχαριστίας: 9.1). What follows under this heading is certainly not an "order of service" (so, however, Niederwimmer) that contains all the texts, let alone liturgical stage directions, for a celebration of the Lord's Supper. Rather, three liturgical texts and a few regulations for dealing with the celebration are given. Where these texts stand in the course of a celebration is not indicated and does not at all lie within the interest of either the author or the redactor. Rather, under the heading περὶ δὲ τῆς εὐχαριστίας—the terminology oscillates between "concerning the thanksgiving" and "concerning the Eucharist"[559]—it provides a prayer of thanksgiving over the cup (9.2), another prayer over the broken bread (9.3, see below), and a prayer after the meal (μετὰ δὲ τὸ ἐμπλησθῆναι: 10.2–6). These prayers are noteworthy less because of their position in the liturgy of early celebrations of the Lord's Supper, which can scarcely be reconstructed beyond doubt any longer, but because of their appearance and their theological content. For they demonstrate by example how strongly the early Christian worship service life was shaped by Jewish prayers.[560] Irrespective of whether the concern was with the meal prayers of the agape meal that preceded the actual celebration of the Lord's Supper (thus, in my view with the greatest probability, Rordorff and Schölligen[561]), whether it was part of a special celebration of the Lord's Supper (most recently Kollmann), or whether it did not belong at all in such connections (thus most recently Klinghardt[562]), in the texts—if one considers the linguistic level alone—Jewish prayers and corresponding Jewish theologoumena are Christianized, as the texts from 9.1–3 and 10.1–6 show:[563]

> Περὶ δὲ τῆς εὐχαριστίας,
> οὕτως εὐχαριστήσατε·

[559] Compare the references in Bradshaw 2004, 35.

[560] Goltz 1901, 207–20; Dibelius 1956. In his commentary, Sandelin 1986, 186–28, attempts a reconstruction of the Hebrew *Vorlage* (Hebrew text on pp. 220–21).

[561] Rordorf 1986, 187–208; 1970; Schöllgen/Geerlings 1991, 50–54. Lietzmann 1926, 232–33, assumes that here the celebration of the Eucharist preceded the agape. His view stands in the context of a thesis about the double origin of ancient Christian meal celebrations and cannot be discussed in detail here. For the debate, see recently Bradshaw 2004, 26–32. Bradshaw argues ("an alternative paradigm"; 2004, 32) for an independent type of celebration in the midst of the plurality of other celebrations at other locations.

[562] Kollmann 1990, 79–101; compare also Klinghardt 1996, 373–492 (history of research on pp. 380–86); Schröter 2006, 68–71.

[563] Text in Hänggi/Pahl 1998, nr. 220, pp. 66–68.

πρῶτον περὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου·
Εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, πάτερ ἡμῶν,
ὑπὲρ τῆς ἁγίας ἀμπέλου Δαυὶδ τοῦ παιδός σου,
ἧς ἐγνώρισας ἡμῖν διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου·
σοὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

περὶ δὲ τοῦ ἄρτου·
Εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, πάτερ ἡμῶν,
ὑπὲρ τῆς ζωῆς καὶ γνώσεως
ἧς ἐγνώρισας ἡμῖν διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου·
σοὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.
(. . .)
Μετὰ δὲ τὸ ἐμπλησθῆναι,
οὕτως εὐχαριστήσατε·
Εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, πάτερ ἅγιε,
ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἁγίου ὀνόματός σου
οὗ κατεσκήνωσας ἐν ταῖς καρδίας ἡμῶν,
και ὑπὲρ τῆς γνώσεως καὶ πίστεως καὶ ἀθανασίας,
ἧς ἐγνώρισας ἡμῖν διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου·
σοὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.
σύ, δέσποτα παντοκράτορ,
ἔκτισας τὰ πάντα ἕνεκεν τοῦ ὀνόματός σου,
τροφήν τε καὶ ποτὸν ἔδωκας τοῖς ἀνθρώποις εἰς ἀπόλαυσιν,
ἵνα σοι εὐχαριστήσωσιν,
ἡμῖν δὲ ἐχαρίσω πνευματικὴν τροφὴν καὶ ποτὸν καὶ ζωὴν αἰώνιον διὰ <Ἰησοῦ> τοῦ παιδὸς σου.
πρὸ πάντων εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, ὅτι δυνατὸς εἶ·
σοὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.
μνήσθητι, κύριε, τῆς ἐκκλησίας σου τοῦ ῥύσασθαι αὐτὴν ἀπὸ παντὸς πονηροῦ
και τελειῶσαι αὐτὴν ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ σου,
καὶ σύναξον αὐτὴν ἀπὸ τεσσάρων ἀνέμων [. . .] εἰς τὴν σὴν βασιλείαν,
ἥν ἡτοίμασας αὐτῇ·
ὅτι σοῦ ἐστιν ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.
ἐλθέτω χάρις
καὶ παρελθέτω ὁ κόσμος οὗτος.
Ὡσαννὰ τῷ θεῷ Δαυίδ.
εἴ τις ἅγιός ἐστιν, ἐρχέσθω·
εἴ τις οὐκ ἔστι, μετανοείτω·
μαραναθά· ἀμήν.

It is Jesus (Christ) as παῖς θεοῦ who has made manifest “the holy vine of David, your servant” (9.2 = line 5; and not the people of Israel as God’s possession); it is Jesus as παῖς θεοῦ who has made manifest "the life and the knowledge" (9.3 = line 10); the church (and not the dispersed people of Israel) will be brought together from the ends of the earth in God's kingdom (9.4 = line 31). God—"the God of David" (10.6 = line 36)—is thanked for all this; for the basic motif, the third prayer also offers all sorts of parallels (10.5 = lines 29–33). Even the sequence—as is well known, the cup word (9.2 = line 3) comes first in the *Didache* and then the bread word or the piece word (9.3 = line 8[564])—corresponds to Jewish meals.[565] Jesus bears the same title as David: παῖς (sc. θεοῦ).[566] It remains difficult to decide in detail whether the two-way mediation between God and humanity through the servant Jesus as prophetic mediator was in mind (so Klinghardt), whether Jesus as the mediator of divine knowledge and gifts was in view (Hermann Löhr), or whether the soteriological background prefigured through Isaiah 53 was also intended. But the fact that the designation had a Jewish background should not be disputed.[567] This applies even to the introductory formulation Εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι . . . ὑπέρ . . . (lines 4, 9, 16), which can be paralleled with the Jewish introduction to prayer נדה לך ("We thank you . . .").[568]

But in the case of such references to the "Jewish character" of the prayer, which one often encounters in the secondary literature, one must differentiate. In his in-depth commentary on the Jewish background of the prayer, Karl Gustav Sandelin has shown that one cannot reckon with a simple translation of Jewish prayer formulas into Greek but rather that a Christian overall meaning was connected with the Jewish formulations:[569]

564 With Niederwimmer 1989, 185, I read περὶ τοῦ ἄρτου instead of κλάσματος.

565 Niederwimmer 1989, 181 (with documentation in n. 4); Dix 1938.

566 Klinghardt 1996, 442, n. 35, rightly draws attention to the fact that here (as elsewhere) we find not παῖς θεοῦ but διὰ (τοῦ ὀνόματος) Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδὸς σου . . . and infers from this that "παῖς is thus not a (christological) *title* but a *function designation*."

567 Compare Harnack 1926a, 212–38 (= 1980b, 730–56), esp. pp. 218–20 (= 736–38), on *Didache* 9/10, and p. 234 (= 752): "function designation." Jeremias 1954, 698–701, argues for a title. Klinghardt 1996, 442–48, deviates strongly from this view. In his Bonn habilitation thesis, H. Löhr 2003, 312–34, collected and interpreted in detail the attestations of the title in an excursus "Jesus Christ as God's παῖς in early Christian literature."

568 According to Heinemann 1977, 42, this formulation served as an alternative to the (more well-known) expression ברך אתה אדוני ("Blessed are you, Lord").

569 Contrast Klinghardt 1996, 407–27. Klinghardt reckons that the talk of Christ as mediator "expresses Jewish Christian self-understanding without consciously intending a demarcation (sc. from Judaism, C. M.)" (p. 410). In addition, he objects that "the prayer at the start of the meal *Didache* 9.2–4 . . . is not simply 'lightly Christianized Jewish benedictions at the start of a meal . . . but rather guidelines for prayers of thanksgiving that are to be spoken before the meal" (p. 417).

. . . ὑπὲρ τῆς ἁγίας ἀμπέλου Δαυὶδ τοῦ παιδός σου (9.2 = line 5) is not simply Jewish prayer language that was taken over into a Christian context, but it presupposes New Testament metaphors such as talk of Jesus as ἄμπελος (John 15.1) and as root of David (Revelation 5.5). When Christ is called the true vine and the Christian community forms his branches, then it makes sense to thank the father of Jesus Christ "for the holy vine of David"—thus probably for the Christian community that forms the vine of David (as the people Israel once did[570]), which Jesus Christ, who comes from the root of David, the true vine, has revealed as his branches. In view of the formulation in the cup word of the *Didache*, Sandelin even speaks of a "conflation of ideas";[571] it would probably be more appropriate to speak of a cluster of metaphors. One can hardly imagine that such a dense cluster of metaphors simply came into being through simply copying Jewish prayers. Martin Dibelius asked whether the clear linguistic differences from the known Jewish texts—ἡ ἁγία ἄμπελος Δαυίδ stands in place of פרי הגפן (*m. Berakot* 6.1)[572]—could not also be connected with the fact that in hellenized Judaism, metaphors such as "the fruit of the vine" were "spiritualized" into the "holy vine of David."[573] Naturally, there is no textual evidence for this thesis in the first place because of the small textual tradition from the worship service of the Greek-speaking synagogue, but with the "holy vine of David," the concern must have been with an established formula (so Martin Dibelius[574]), if one does not wish to assume that the text is incomprehensible in its present form and a late ancient or Byzantine reworking of the original (so Erik Peterson[575]). In any case, "in the enjoyment of the earthly gifts," the community thanks God for the revelation of God in Jesus Christ, which also assigns a place to it in God's plan of

[570] For the designation of the people Israel as "vine," compare Jeremiah 2.21 LXX, Psalm 79(80).9, 15, and 4 Ezra 5.23. Whether by the "vine of David" Christ is perhaps (also) nevertheless meant (so Origen, *Homiliae in Judices* 6.2 [Baehrens 1921, 500.6–7]) would need to be investigated once again. Considerations are found in Goltz 1901, 217 ("But the vine of David is . . . the Messiah, whom Jesus revealed himself to be"), and Harnack 1991b, 29. Lietzmann 1926, 233–34, refers merely to Harnack. Niederwimmer 1989, 184, understands the expression to mean "the eschatological salvation" (admittedly without providing justification). Kollmann 1990, 81 (with documentation) opts for the expression to mean the people Israel and Klinghardt 1996, 432, for "the community as chosen people."

[571] Sandelin 1986, 194. Sandelin 1986, 196, assumes that the statement was originally related to the wisdom that God made known.

[572] Niederwimmer 1989, 193, rightly points to the differences.

[573] Dibelius 1956, 119 and 122; in detail Mazza 1995, 16–30 (= Mazza 1992). Contrast Niederwimmer 1989, 184: "The entire pre-Didachian liturgy comes from the early Judaism of Palestine."

[574] Dibelius 1956, 120.

[575] Peterson 1982, 168–71.

salvation. The salvation promised to the chosen people is tied to Jesus, the servant of God, according to both knowledge and content. One hopes for the eschatological gathering of the Christ believers and a unified church in the kingdom of God. Finally, one gives thanks for the "holy name" of God "which you have caused to dwell in our hearts and for the knowledge and faith and immortality that you have made known to us through Jesus, your servant" (10.2 = lines 16–20). These too, of course, are traditional biblical and Jewish theologoumena that were Christianized: the theology of the name of God (שׁם יהוה) established in Deuteronomy, which vouches for the presence of God (Deuteronomy 12.11 and elsewhere) and is an expression of his power (Psalm 54.3), also belongs in the New Testament to the bedrock of the formation of Christian theology.[576] At the same time, with the reference to the indwelling of the name in the hearts (and with this to baptism[577]), it becomes clear again that in this εὐχαριστία, alongside the eschatological future of all believers and the salvation events of the past, the individual past of every single Christian is made present as well. The intensive linking of recollection of the salvific past, on the one hand, and request for eschatological salvific action in the future, on the other hand, comes from the Jewish prayer tradition and shapes not only the *Didache* but also fully developed Eucharistic prayers, as Achim Budde has recently emphasized.[578] We will return to this point below (see 2.3.5).

2.3.4.2 Justin Martyr

The first two in-depth descriptions of Christian worship services come from the Roman apologist Justin and are found at prominent places in his (*First*) *Apology*.[579] The concern here, as already in the *Didache*, is not, of course, with a description *ad usum delphini* derived from an order of service. Rather, in the context of an apologetic argument—namely, the argument that the demons in the pagan cults, such as the cults of Mithras and

[576] Compare the documentation in Bietenhard 1954, 254–58, 261–79; Mazza 1995, 20–25; Niederwimmer 1989, 186–90, and for the notion of the indwelling of the name, especially pp. 195–96. For the triad γνῶσις-πίστις-ἀθανασία, see Kollmann 1990, 85–86, who draws attention to Hellenistic and Hermetic parallels.

[577] Niederwimmer 1989, 195.

[578] "From the thankful mention of past events springs the prayer for what is future" (A. Budde 2000, 186); thus first Giraudo 1981, 303–6, 357–60 (see H. B. Meyer 1983; Gerhards 1983).

[579] Justin, *Apologia i* 61 and 65–67; for the context, compare Salzmann 1994, 235–37; Bradshaw 2002, 98–100; Alfonsi 1979, 74–76. The thesis, which is repeatedly presented in variant forms, that there were various types of primitive Christian and early Christian celebrations of the Lord's Supper (see recently Klinghardt 1996, 271–492, 500–509) will not be discussed in greater detail here; compare Rouwhorst 2002, 308–11.

Dionysus, imitated the Christian worship service—a short overview of the celebration of baptism and the Lord's Supper is provided. In his two sections, Justin does not offer a description of the complete course of the liturgy but emphasizes important elements of the worship services that were widespread in the city and the countryside (thus everywhere), which he strings together in a very catalogue-like manner (ἔπειτα, εἶτα, and καί). Thus attempts to answer history-of-liturgy questions of detail such as the position and significance of the words of institution in the worship service encounter considerable difficulties. Nevertheless, much can be inferred from the passages for the theology of the Christian worship service and especially for the theology of the celebration of the Lord's Supper.

The designation that the author chooses for the Sunday worship service is already interesting: in the framework of the second passage from the (*First*) *Apology*, which is usually dated shortly after the middle of the first century, he speaks simply of a "gathering" (συνέλευσις), which is a word that could be used for the most diverse meetings or associations and one that is also attested in liturgical texts from a later date.[580] The first passage that is important for us (*Apologia i* 61) describes a baptismal worship service; the second describes a Eucharist following the baptism (*Apologia i* 65–67). The baptism evidently took place in a smaller circle, perhaps because a gathering of thirty naked people in "living water" (thus, for example, at the Tiber or in a public fountain) was neither judicious nor seemly. Only then were the baptized handed over to a greater group of so-called brothers and the baptismal Eucharist followed. If they followed the form of the Sunday worship service, which is described after the baptism and the Eucharist (67.3–5a), then the Sunday worship service began with Old and New Testament readings, which were presented by one who read them aloud (ἀναγινώσκων),[581] after which the "presider" (προεστώς) gave an address in which he emphatically admonished them to imitate in life the beautiful teachings set forth in the reading.[582] Finally, in the Sunday worship service, after an (intercessory) prayer of the whole community, the

[580] Justin, *Apologia i* 67.3 (Goodspeed 1984, 75; Marcovich 1994, 129.7). For the term συνέλευσις, compare the documentation in LSJ s.v. (1707) from Vettius Valens' *Anthologiae* I 22.19, 24 or II 38.57, 71; IV 17.9; as well as Additamenta Antiqva 2 (περὶ συνελεύσεως) and Appendix 10.17, 20 (Pingree 1986, 45.11; 46.16; 113.28; 114.29; 180.11; 351.19; 409.33; and 410.26) and Origen, *De oratione* 31.7 (Koetschau 1899a, 400.20), as well as from the Liturgy of Mark (in Brightman 1967, 121.24).

[581] Not "reader" (ἀναγνώστης); compare Salzmann 1994, 246. On the term "Sunday morning," compare Bradshaw 2004, 68–69.

[582] Justin, *Apologia i* 67.4 προεστὼς διὰ λόγου τὴν νουθεσίαν καὶ πρόκλησιν τῆς τῶν καλῶν τούτων μιμήσεως ποιεῖται (Goodspeed 1984, 75; Marcovich 1994, 129.7–8); for the interpretation, see Salzmann 1994, 250–51. Here it is especially important that Salzmann can show that the description of the sermon by Justin takes place in such a way

Eucharist followed, for the reconstruction of which one can also use information from the first description of a baptismal worship service.[583] Here too the celebration is introduced again through a prayer, which was followed by the holy kiss.[584] "Afterward bread and a cup with water and wine mixed with water are brought to the presider of the brothers" (*Apologia i* 65.3). The triad of bread, water, and a cup with wine mixed with water (ὕδατος καὶ κράμματος[585]) that Justin mentions corresponds to what was also on the table otherwise; musings about an ascetic Lord's Supper celebration with bread and water, which were first made in 1891 by Adolf von Harnack and have been cautiously renewed again by Andrew McGowan, are unnecessary, especially as they presuppose a considerable intrusion into the text that has been handed down.[586] The presider speaks a prayer of thanksgiving; his assistants, the deacons, distribute bread, water, and (mixed) wine and also bring something from it to those absent. Important for the theological interpretation of the event is what Justin adds as a supplement: the believers receive what is handed to them not as ordinary bread and ordinary drink (οὐ γὰρ ὡς κοινὸν ἄρτον οὐδὲ κοινὸν πόμα) but—as they were taught (by the apostolic writings and thus the Lord himself)—as the body and blood of the incarnate Logos. Justin explains this connection with a construction that is not so simple grammatically: as through the Logos of God "the incarnate Jesus Christ, our redeemer . . . assumed for our salvation" flesh and blood, "so also the food 'thanked' through a word of prayer that comes from the Lord (δι' εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ)."[587] The reader has to add that

---

"that in the end it contains nothing other than his own theology" (252). This observation confirms our cautious observations at the beginning of this section.

[583] For justification, compare the detailed argumentation in Salzmann 1994, 238–39.

[584] Justin speaks simply of φίλημα, by which he means φίλημα ἅγιον or φίλημα εἰρήνης, which was understood within and outside the worship service as a realization of the fellowship of faith (thus Thraede 1972, 506). Accordingly, the kiss can later be referred to simply through the word εἰρήνη or *pax* (Tidner 1938, 255). In Justin, it still stands at the end of the worship service of the word; it is reckoned only later to the opening of the Eucharistic part (Jungmann 1958, II, 400; Thraede 1972, 512–13).

[585] καὶ κράμματος is lacking in the Ottobonianus gr. 274, a manuscript of the sixteenth century, which contains only chapters 65–67 of *Apologia i* (fol. 1r–2r). With Marcovich 1994, 7, one must first observe that the manuscript comes relatively far down in the stemma; from this perspective, far-reaching conclusions (such as the ones presented in Harnack 1891a, 115–44) are actually ruled out.

[586] Harnack 1891a, 115–44; reviewed by F. X. Funk 1897, 278–92; McGowan 1999, 151–55. For the discussion and on such celebrations, see now Bradshaw 2004, 76–77 and 51–60, and the overview in Klinghardt 1996, 504 n. 10 (lit).

[587] Justin, *Apologia i* 66.2 (Goodspeed 1984, 74; Marcovich 1994, 127.6–7). Compare Cuming 1980a; Gelston 1982. Because of *Apologia i* 13.1 and corresponding other attestations (32.4 and 44.9), Cuming 1980a, 80, searches for a translation that expresses both "through a word of prayer" and "prayer of the word" and proposes "the form of words which is from

so also the food used in the Eucharist, thus ordinary bread and ordinary drink, has assumed flesh and blood and has, through the μεταβολή of food into bodily substance that is characteristic for all food, "nourished our flesh and blood through transformation (μεταβολή)."[588] The sentence is not so easy to understand because it is largely identical in its structural form (διὰ λόγου θεοῦ σαρκοποιηθεὶς Ἰησους Χριστὸς ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμων is more or less parallel with δι᾽ εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν τροφήν) but is nevertheless concerned with variation (διὰ λόγου θεοῦ refers to the *Logos* of God that effected the incarnation of Jesus Christ; τὴν δι᾽ εὐχῆς λόγου refers to a *word* of prayer). The parallel construction is not completely carried through either; the second component—the Eucharistic food—is missing a complete sentence with a full verb. Admittedly, the exact reconstruction of the Eucharistic theology of Justin is not of central importance for our connections. More important is the question of what liturgical processes are alluded to with the statement that bread and wine in the Eucharist are "food 'thanked' through a word of prayer that comes from the Lord (δι᾽ εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ)."[589] Since the words of institution are cited immediately thereafter, it still seems most likely that "the word[590] that comes from the Lord" is these words of institution. Justin also brings them into a liturgical summary immediately after his cited sentence. It does not speak against this conclusion that they are referred to as εὐχή, as prayer; this corresponds to the subsequent practice of extensively incorporating the texts into the prayers linguistically and not demarcating or separating them formally from the Eucharistic prayer as "words of institution," as has been done since modern times. For a latter passage makes it quite clear that Justin is able to differentiate very well between the process of the "thanking" and the prayer.[591] The hypothetical assumption that the "word of prayer that comes from the Lord" refers to texts that are unknown

---

Jesus." Gelston 1982, 173, opposes this translation because it cannot be supported lexically and because an interpretation of the expression λόγος εὐχῆς in relation to the words of institution is not possible let alone attested. In his edition, Wartelle 1987, 191, translates "*par la prière empruntée aux paroles mêmes du Christ*." See recently Heintz 2003, 33–36; the concise summary of the discussion in Bradshaw 2004, 92–93; and now Schröter 2006, 82–84.

[588] Justin, *Apologia i* 66.2 (Goodspeed 1984, 74 / Marcovich 1994, 127.4–9).

[589] Justin, *Apologia i* 66.2 (Goodspeed 1984, 74 / Marcovich 1994, 127.6–7).

[590] Documentation for this meaning of διὰ λόγου can be found in Cuming 1980a, 80–81. For the interpretation of the controversial passage δι᾽ εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ, one must, as H. Löhr 2003, 429–30, shows, add Justin, *Apologia i* 13.1 λόγῳ εὐχῆς καὶ εὐχαριστίας (Goodspeed 1984, 33/Marcovich 1994, 50.3). H. Löhr 2003 provides a clear listing of the interpretive possibilities and then nevertheless interprets λόγου as the Christus-Logos so that a contradiction to 13.1 arises.

[591] Justin, *Apologia i* 67.5 (Goodspeed 1984, 75; Marcovich 1994, 127.6–7): καὶ ὁ προεστὼς εὐχὰς ὁμοίως καὶ εὐχαριστίας.

to us in the form of a prayer of thanksgiving (thus Anthony Gelston)[592] needs to postulate, at the very least, a whole series of improvised or lost fixed texts, whereas Justin cites the New Testament text immediately afterward. Moreover, the mixed form in which the words of institution are cited in the apologists already speaks for a somewhat longer tradition of their use. One recognizes the special holiness of the Eucharistic event—as, by the way, already in the Διδαχή—in the specifications about admittance and exclusion: only the baptized were permitted to take part in the Eucharist.

What does one learn from these—again, primarily apologetically motivated—passages on the theological interpretation of the Lord's Supper in the Roman communities around the middle of the second century? At first, naturally, only a little. The emphasis on the role of the Λόγος for the incarnation of Jesus Christ and the prayer *logos* for the Eucharistic food probably focuses more on a specific feature of Justin's theology than on an element of the (lost) Eucharistic prayer. Unfortunately, absolutely all the texts that could give us material information about the Lord's Supper theology of the Roman community in the middle of the second century are lost. Only formal observations remain. Especially interesting for our context is that at *two* places in the worship service, there is an opportunity for the presider to pass on results of his theological reflection to the community. First, the presider can set out theological reflection before the community in his address, which should, however, be related to the text of the reading—at least in Justin's view. Second, however, it is especially the various parts of the prayer that present an opportunity for the presider to practice "theology," at least in an implicit form—after all, he may formulate these texts freely. If one desires to speculate at all about the form of these improvisations that have not been preserved and wishes to orient oneself for comparison to the preserved sources from the third century that we have mentioned above, then these texts probably had, regardless of all improvisations, a high degree of similar formulas, if only because of the heavy use of biblical quotations and language shaped by the Bible. Put differently, one should in no way overestimate the individual portion in such improvised texts.

2.3.4.3 Tertullian, Cyprian, and Origen

Time and again, writings of the great theologians have been drawn upon for the illumination of the early history of the Christian worship service

[592] Gelston 1982, 175: "What Justin appears to mean is that consecration of the Eucharistic elements is effected through a prayer of thanksgiving offered in conformity to the pattern of Jesus' thanksgiving at the Last Supper." A different interpretation ("a reference to the agency of the divine λόγος") is advocated by Heintz 2003, 36.

and especially its Eucharistic form. We do this here only very briefly, since our concern is not with the explicit theology of educated "Christian philosophers" but with the implicit everyday theology of liturgical texts. The two North African theologians Tertullian and Cyprian, as well as the Alexandrian church teacher Origen, are drawn upon here in order only to deepen somewhat the conceptions of the form and theology of the Eucharistic worship service that can be read out of the texts.

For the Eucharistic worship service (and for many other daily operations), *Quintus Septimus Florens Tertullianus* offers vivid descriptions in his works. In his *Apologeticum*, he speaks of a "joint gathering" (*coetus et congregatio*) in which God is approached with prayer,[593] intercession is made for authorities and the preservation of the world and the deferment of the end, and the divine Scriptures are reflected upon for the building up of faith and the strengthening of Christian life conduct.[594] The description of the *triclinium christianorum* that follows in Tertullian, which is celebrated in a less luxurious manner and in a much more moral way than the pagan sacrificial meals, is possibly an indication that agape meal and Eucharist were probably still connected with each other at the beginning of the third century in Carthage—at any rate, the author says that the meal of the Christians already shows "its meaning through its name (sc. ἀγάπη)."[595] This is supported in any case by the reference to the prayers that precede the evening meal and to readings from the Holy Scripture and a freely given address together with closing prayers.[596] In another

[593] Tertullian, *Apologeticum* 39.2: *coimus in coetum et congregationem facimus, ut ad deum quasi manu facta precationibus ambiamus* (Dekkers 1954a, 150.5–6). For an excellent overview of the liturgical terminology of Tertullian, see Dekkers 1947, 49–50 n. 2; on this passage, compare F. X. Funk 1904; 1906; Salzmann 1994, 391–96 and 399–404, for Eucharistic worship services in general.

[594] Tertullian, *Apologeticum* 39.2–4: *Oramus etiam pro imperatoribus, pro ministeriis eorum ac potestatibus, pro statu saeculi, pro rerum quiete, pro mora finis. Coimus ad litterarum diuinarum commemorationem, si quid praesentium temporum qualitas aut praemonere cogit aut recognoscere. Certe fidem sanctis uocibus pascimus, spem erigimus, fiduciam figimus, disciplinam praeceptorum nihilominus inculcationibus densamus. Ibidem etiam exhortationes, castigationes et censura diuina* (Dekkers 1954a, 150.7–15).

[595] Tertullian, *Apologeticum* 39.16: *cena nostra de nomine rationem sui ostendit: id uocatur quod dilectio penes graecos* (Dekkers 1954a, 152.72). According to Salzmann 1994, 401–4, one can infer with certainty from *De corona militis* 3.3 (Kroymann 1954b, 1043.19–22) that in Tertullian's day the Eucharist was celebrated in the morning as well; compare esp. . . . *antelucanis coetibus* (p. 1043.21) and also Dekkers 1947, 36 and 111–13.

[596] Tertullian, *Apologeticum* 39.17–18: *Non prius discumbitur quam oratio ad deum praegustetur. . . . Post aquam manualem et lumina, ut quisque de scripturis diuinis uel de proprio ingenio potest, prouocatur in medium deo canere: hinc probatur quomodo*

passage, one learns that the Eucharist takes place in a church room at an altar—at that time, however, probably still a movable table.[597] About ten years after the composition of his *Apologeticum*, Tertullian states that Christians receive the *sacramentum eucharistiae* at early morning gatherings from the hand of the presider.[598] Other texts remain difficult to interpret, like a description of the activity of a Montanist prophetess in the worship service,[599] or are clearly overlaid by distinctive theological emphases of the North African, like his criticism of the custom that especially zealous Christians refuse the kiss of peace during the time of fasting.[600]

The reports in Caecilius Cyprianus are even more clearly related to specific contexts. In a controversy with Bishop Caecilius of Biltha (in 253 CE?) over the question of whether wine can be replaced with water in the Eucharist,[601] Cyprian mentions a number of details pertaining to the morning Eucharist celebration in passing and presents basic features of his own theology of the sacrament. In Carthage at least, the evening celebration—which was still combined with an agape meal, as Tertullian probably still presupposes—has evidently been replaced in the meantime by a morning worship service.[602] It is possible that Eucharists were even

---

biberit. Aeque oratio conuiuium dirimit (Dekkers 1954a, 152–153.81–98); compare also McGowan 2004; Bradshaw 2004, 97–103. The verb *cano* allows no precise translation: it can have to do with song, recitation in speech song, and spoken recitation (Lewis/Short 1958, s.v. [279–80]).

[597] Tertullian, *De oratione* 19.3 (Diercks 1954, 268.5): "to stand at the altar of God (*ad aram Dei*)"; compare Dekkers 1947, 49–67; Salzmann 1994, 407–8.

[598] Tertullian, *De corona militis* 3.3: *Eucharistiae sacramentum, et in tempore uictus et omnibus mandatum a domino, etiam antelucanis coetibus nec de aliorum manu quam praesidentium sumimus* (Kroymann 1954b, 1043.19–22); on the problem of the temporal difference between evening and morning, see Bradshaw 2004, 99–100.

[599] Tertullian, *De anima* 9.4: *Est hodie soror apud nos reuelationum charismata sortita, quas in ecclesia inter dominica sollemnia per ecstasin in spiritu patitur; conuersatur cum angelis, aliquando etiam cum domino, et uidet et audit sacramenta et quorundam corda dinoscit et medicinas desiderantibus sumit iamuero prout scripturae leguntur aut psalmi canuntur aut allocutiones proferuntur aut petitiones delegantur, ita inde materiae uisionibus subministrantur* (Waszink 1947, 792.24–31); compare Dölger 1940; Dekkers 1947, 47; H. Leclercq 1933, 587–89; Bradshaw 2004, 101–3.

[600] Tertullian, *De oratione* 18.4–5 (Diercks 1954, 267.7–9), with reference to Matthew 6.16-18; compare Thraede 1972, 514.

[601] See Salzmann 1994, 438–45; Saxer 1984, 190–91, 218–27, 245–46 (in general on the theology: 190–202); Harnack 1891a, 120–25; McGowan 1999, 151–55; Schröter 2006, 110–13. See also section 2.3.4.2 with n. 586.

[602] Cyprian, *Epistulae* 63.2.1 (Diercks 1996, 391.22–23), *Admonitos autem nos scias ut in calice offerendo dominica traditio seruetur*, as well as 63.16.2 (412.299–413.305), *Numquid ergo dominicum post cenam celebrare debemus, ut sic mixtum calicem frequentandis dominicis offeramus? Christum offerre oportebat circa uesperam diei, ut hora*

celebrated daily.[603] In the current case of a conflict over the configuration of the celebration at the worship service, it is more important to the bishop to press for the ordering of the Eucharist that is in conformity with the gospel, which for him directly included the wine. For this reason, he stresses the redeeming significance of the blood of Christ that shows itself in the cup.[604] Therefore, he repeatedly maintains that the Lord's Supper is offered *in commemoratione eius*, that it should imitate as far as possible what Christ did, and that the *dominica traditio* must be observed. Correspondingly, the priest (*sacerdos*) acts in the place of Christ and presents in the church a true and complete sacrifice (*sacrificium uerum et plenum*) to the Father.[605] The fact that Cyprian approaches, at least terminologically, the pagan practice of understanding the cult above all as sacrifice is equally conspicuous and noteworthy. Irrespective of all the biblical connections of the imagery that is used, a bit of Christianity's inculturation into its pagan environment can also be seen therein.

Finally, Origen is an important witness, even if his witness is likewise more indirect. His theological views about the Eucharist have already often been systematized and do not interest us here. Again, we will cast only a glance at the institutional context of the Eucharistic worship service, insofar as it can be discerned from Origen's texts, especially from his extensive homiletic oeuvre, which comes primarily from weekday worship services.[606]

---

ipsa sacrificii ostenderet occasum et uesperam mundi, sicut in Exodo scriptum est: "et occident illum omne uulgus synagogae filiorum Israel ad uesperam" (cf. Exodus 12.6). Compare Bradshaw 2004, 108–14 (or p. 18 for the words of institution in *Epistulae* 63.10.1) and Markschies 1998a, 17–18; for the connection between time of day and celebration, compare the pointers in Seeliger 1995, 204 with n. 53.

[603] Cyprian, *De dominica oratione* 18 or 31 (Simonetti/Moreschini 1976, 101.332–333, *et eucharistiam eius cotidie ad cibum salutis accipimus* or 109.571–588), and *Epistulae* 57.3.2, *ut sacerdotes qui sacrificia dei cotidie celebramus hostias deo et uictimas praeparemus* (Diercks 1994, 304.68–69). See Saxer 1984, 38, 46–50; Bradshaw 2004, 112–13.

[604] Cyprian, *Epistulae* 63.2.2 (Diercks 1996, 391.26–30): *Nec potest uideri sanguis eius, quo redempti et uiuificati sumus, esse in calice, quando uinum desit calici, quod Christi sanguis ostenditur, qui scripturarum omnium sacramento ac testimonio praedicetur*.

[605] Cyprian, *Epistulae* 63.2.1 (Diercks 1996, 391.22–25), *Admonitos autem nos scias ut in calice offerendo dominica traditio seruetur neque aliud fiat a nobis quam quod pro nobis dominus prior fecit, ut calix qui in commemoratione eius offertur mixtus uino offeratur*, and 63.14.4 (410.275–411.282), *Nam si Iesus Christus dominus et deus noster ipse est summus sacerdos dei patris et sacrificium patri se ipsum primus optulit et hoc fieri in sui commemoratione praecepit, utique ille sacerdos uice Christi uere fungitur qui id quod Christus fecit imitatur et sacrificium uerum et plenum tunc offert in ecclesia deo patri, si sic incipiat offerre secundum quod ipsum Christum uideat optulisse*; compare Laurance 1984.

[606] For the theology, compare Lies 1982, passim; Grimmelt 1942; Schütz 1984, esp. 155–72; Salzmann 1994, 430–38 (with criticism of Nautin 1979, 391–401); Monaci

Admittedly, there are only a very small number of concrete references to the form of the worship service in Origen's works, apparently because in his view the mysteries of the church should be disclosed only to the initiated and in this respect—like the central points of the Platonic philosophy—mediated only in the oral teaching for the advanced.[607] But one sees that, for Origen and his community, communion required the greatest reverence, spiritual preparation, and sexual abstinence.[608] The holy ones throughout the whole world and from all times, the hosts of angels, and the powers of the heavenly world stand around the community when it holds a worship service. In the worship service, heaven and earth are connected very specifically; angels stand invisible in the room.[609] With deep revulsion, Origen polemicizes against the fact that in the harbor city Caesarea (and presumably in the surrounding area as well), people, although they are Christians, celebrate *solemnitates gentium*. With anger, he observes that many Christians do not appear in the church in order to hear the word of God and can scarcely be seen at the church festivals or leave before the sermon.[610] There is a daily worship service there, but it has not yet been properly introduced and finds little interest among the community. The Eucharist is celebrated at least on Friday and Sunday—perhaps also on Wednesday.[611] The altar (*orationis indicium*), which

Castagno 1987, 50–59. Prof. Harald Buchinger was kind enough to make his lecture "Eucharistische Praxis und eucharistische Frömmigkeit bei Origines. Eine liturgiewissenschaftliche Relecture des Dossiers" (Eucharistic Praxis and Eucharistic Piety in Origen: A Liturgical Studies Relecture of the Dossier), which he delivered at the Origeniana Nona in Pecs (Hungary), available to me far in advance of its publication. Compare now Buchinger 2007; forthcoming.

[607] Origen, *In Jesu Nave homiliae* IV 1 (Baehrens 1921, 309.7–9): *Si vero etiam ad mysticum baptismi veneris fontem et consistente sacerdotali et Levitico ordine initiatus fueris venerandis illis magnificisque sacramentis, quae norunt illi, quos nosse fas est, tunc etiam sacerdotum ministeriis Iordane digresso terram repromissionis intrabis, in qua te post Moysen suscipit Iesus et ipse tibi efficitur novi itineris dux*. Compare *Homiliae in Numeros* V 3 (Baehrens 1921, 28.29–29.2): *Verum ne nimia haec operimentorum velamentorumque cautela desperationem quandam et maestitiam generet auditoribus, pauca aliqua, quae et nobis pandere tutum sit et vobis fas sit adspicere, quoniam quidem, ut prius diximus, "genus regale et sacerdotium, gens sancta et populus in acquisitionem" dicti sumus, aperire temptabimus* (cf. 1 Peter 2.9); compare also Salzmann 1994, 435–37.

[608] Origen, *Homiliae in Exodum* XIII 3 (Baehrens 1920, 274.7–13); *Commentarium in evangelium Matthaei* X 25 (Klostermann/Benz 1935, 34.13–20), and *Homiliae in Ezechielem fragmenta* in Ezekiel 7.22 (PG 13: 793 B).

[609] Origen, *Homiliae in Lucam* XXIII 8 (Rauer 1959, 146.15–20); Schütz 1984, 32–34.

[610] Origen, *In Jesu Nave homiliae* VII.4 (Baehrens 1921, 331.11); *Homiliae in Genesim* XI 3 (Baehrens 1920,105.24–106.17); *Homiliae in Exodum* XII 2 (Baehrens 1920, 264.1–5) as well as Schütz 1984, 31–32.

[611] Salzmann 1994, 430–31; Nautin 1979, 391–92 (documentation).

evidently already exists in a somewhat spacious church room at an elevated place, is adorned with ornamentation that believers have provided and is "sanctified by the costly blood of Christ."[612] Origen is much more interested in reflecting on his own activity as a preacher and in making himself understandable to the community through images and parables.[613] We especially learn about details regarding one's stance when praying, the outstretched hands in prayer, or the crossing of oneself before prayer and readings if they can be made understandable in the framework of a sermon or can be interpreted allegorically.[614]

The specific construction of texts about liturgical order and the specific character of theological argumentation with liturgical processes brings with it the fact that in many descriptions of the Eucharistic worship service of the early period, the community is absent, so to speak, or only very briefly present through the response texts assigned to it. There can be no doubt that the community was of great significance for the form of the worship service and for its theology. The community is already called λαός, "people," in Justin. This community not only joins in the prayers by shouting "amen," but it also participates very intensively and apparently perceptibly in the worship service through gestures. Unfortunately, we know only very little about the gestures in the Eucharistic worship service *prior to* the fourth century; but for such gestures, the writings of Tertullian and Origen are especially relevant:[615] the person who was praying lifted up his hands[616]

[612] Origen, *Homiliae in Numeros* X 3 (Baehrens 1921, 73.21–22): . . . *quoniam altare orationis indicium est*. Compare also *In Jesu Nave homiliae* X 3 (Baehrens 1921, 360.10–13), *Verumtamen sciendum est, quantum ex huiuscemodi figurarum adumbrationibus edocemur, quod, siqui tales sunt in nobis, quorum fides hoc tantummodo habet, ut ad ecclesiam veniant et inclinent caput suum sacerdotibus, officia exhibeant, servos Dei honorent, ad ornatum quoque altaris vel ecclesiae aliquid conferant, non tamen adhibeant studium, ut etiam mores suos excolant* . . . ; *In Jesu Nave homiliae* II 1 (Baehrens 1921, 296.20–21), *Cum vero videris introire gentes ad fidem, ecclesias extrui, altaria non cruore pecudum respergi, sed "pretioso" Christi "sanguine" consecrari* . . . (cf. 1 Peter 1.19). Compare also Harnack 1918, 65–88; 1919, 122–29.

[613] Compare Markschies 1997a, 39–68; Monaci Castagno 1987, 75–81.

[614] Schütz 1984, 136–42.

[615] For in-depth discussion, see Dekkers 1947, 82–105; Salzmann 1994, 408–15, 424–27; Saxer 1984, 207–11. For a more concise discussion, see Rordorf 1978 (= Rordorf 1986, 109–21). See also the summarizing treatment in Kötting 1978, 895–902 (lit), and Severus 1972, 1158–61 (gestures in pagan prayer) and 1219–34 (in Christian prayer).

[616] Tertullian, *De oratione* 14 (Diercks 1954, 6–8); *Apologeticum* 30.4 (Dekkers 1954a, 141.17–20): *Illuc sursum suscipientes Christiani manibus expansis, quia innocuis, capite nudato, quia non erubescimus, denique sine monitore, quia de pectore oramus, precantes semper pro omnibus imperatoribus*. Additional passages in Severus 1972, 1231–32.

and head (not of course proudly but modestly),[617] he struck himself on the chest[618] and crossed himself,[619] he stood or kneeled[620] (or avoided kneeling on Sunday and feast days, since it was viewed as a special sign of abasement[621]). It is not really certain that in the opening dialogue, the presider lifted up the hands for the posture of prayer and that the community followed him in doing this while standing.[622] We are admittedly completely in the dark about the extent to which the community really understood—acoustically and theologically—the Eucharistic texts that we discuss here. Through the ritual of approach canonized in the catechumenate and through the festive configuration, the majority probably understood that it was an especially holy matter, but whether subtleties such as the special presence of Christ in the meal and the elements or the sin-forgiving effect were clear to them all may be doubted. Admittedly, the general comprehensibility of a liturgy celebrated according to heavenly and time-of-salvation models was not at all intended, as we saw in our consideration of the angel liturgies (section 2.3.2) and the texts of Origen discussed in this section.

The nearest relevant text chronologically that has been drawn upon for the description of the order and "theology" of Eucharistic worship services in the high imperial period is the aforementioned reconstruction of a church order that is usually called *Apostolic Tradition*.

[617] But *cum modestia et humilitate . . . ne ipsis quidem manibus sublimius elatis, sed temperate ac probe elatis, ne uultu quidem in audaciam erecto*, Tertullian, *De oratione* 17.1 (Diercks 1954, 266.1–4); compare Severus 1972, 1230–31.

[618] Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem* III 18.6 (Kroymann 1954a, 532.16–18): . . . *genibus depositis et manibus caedentibus pectus et facie humi uolutante orationem commendare debuisset*; Severus 1972, 1160, provides only pagan attestations for this.

[619] Tertullian, *De corona militis* 3.4 (Kroymann 1954b, 1043.27–31): *Ad omnem progressum atque promotum, ad omnem aditum et exitum, ad uestitum, ad calciatum, ad lauacra, ad mensas, ad lumina, ad cubilia, ad sedilia, quacumque nos conuersatio exercet, frontem signaculo* (sc. *crucis*) *terimus*. Additional attestations in Severus 1972, 1217 and 1232–34 (making the sign of the cross over the forehead and eyes), and Dekkers 1947, 89–94.

[620] Tertullian, *De oratione* 23.1 (Diercks 1954, 271.1–4); Cyprian speaks, by contrast, of standing while praying and cites immediately thereafter the opening dialogue *Susum corda* (sic) . . . *Habemus ad Dominum*: Cyprian, *De dominica oratione* 31 (Simonetti/Moreschini 1976, 109.561, 567–68); detailed differentiations can be found in Severus 1972, 1216–17 (standing) and 1228 (kneeling).

[621] Compare Pseudo-Justin (Theodoret? Didorus of Tarsus?), *Quaestiones et responsiones ad orthodoxos* 115 = Irenaeus, fragment 7; Harvey 1965 (CPG I: 1315[2] = III, 6285): τὸ δὲ ἐν κυριακῇ μὴ κλίνειν γόνυ, σύμβολόν ἐστι τῆς ἀναστάσεως . . . ἐκ τῶν ἀποστολικῶν δὲ χρόνων ἡ τοιαύτη συνήθεια ἔλαβε τὴν ἀρχήν, καθώς φησιν ὁ μακάριος Εἰρηναῖος . . . ἐν τῷ περὶ τοῦ Πάσχα λόγῳ (Harvey 1965, II: 478–79). Compare also Tertullian, *De corona militis* 3.4 (Kroymann 1954b, 1043.23–24); *Odes of Solomon* 27.1; 35.7a; 37.1a and 42.1a; and Dölger 1936.

[622] Contrast Jungmann 1958, 85–89; Kohlschein 1992, 213 (reference H. Brakmann).

2.3.4.4 The So-Called *Apostolic Tradition*

In the various texts concerned with church order that have been traced back since the beginning of the twentieth century to a *Grundschrift* called *Apostolic Tradition* (*Traditio Apostolica*), we do not find a description—in contrast to what we find in Justin—of an ordinary Sunday Eucharistic worship service, but there are references to this celebration and individual elements of the liturgy communicated in words.[623] If one analyzes these pointers, then it becomes clear that the separation between a worship service of the word, which was equally open to the not-yet-baptized catechumens and to the baptized, and the actual Eucharistic part, to which the catechumens were no longer admitted, had already taken place.[624] We will, however, concentrate again on the Eucharistic worship service and especially on the anaphora preserved in the material. While it was ascribed to Hippolytus for a long time and its allegedly "archaic" elements—such as the talk of Jesus as the παῖς θεοῦ (*puerus tuus Iesus Christus* or παῖς σοῦ Ἰησοῦς Χριστός) and the mention of the "angel of his will" (*angelus uoluntatis tuae* or ἄγγελος τῆς βουλῆς or ἄγγελος βουλῆς σου) as a citation from Isaiah 9.5 (there ὁ μεγάλης βουλῆς ἄγγελος)—were interpreted as intentional archaizing by Hippolytus,[625] a view that reckons with a longer process of growth that reaches into the fourth century is now becoming more predominant.[626] Despite all the debates from the most recent period, however, it remains unclear when this liturgy arose, when the process of its literary growth was completed, and whether it reflects Roman or Egyptian conditions.[627]

[623] Salzmann 1994, 235; Jungmann 1967, 65–78; Lietzmann 1926, 181.

[624] Thus the appealing analysis of *Traditio Apostolica* 18 in Saltzmann 1994, 367–81, which is admittedly contained only in the Sahidic, Ethiopian, and Arabic texts (Schölgen/Geerlings 1991, 250.8–13 = Till/Leipoldt 1954, 12). Bradshaw/Johnson/Phillips 2002, 102, point out that all the other attestations of the ritually performed distinction between the two parts of the worship service stem from the fourth century but do not want to draw the conclusion that the passages of the *Traditio Apostolica* should therefore be dated to this time as well.

[625] Documentation in Bradshaw/Johnson/Phillips 2002, 37; compare esp. Connolly 1938, 350–69 (texts, retroversion into Greek, and commentary). In *Commentarium in Danielem* II 32/33, Hippolytus also identifies the "angel of the great counsel" mentioned by Isaiah with the υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ and the λόγος (Bonwetsch/Richard 2000, 120.7–8, 25–26 and 122.5). Justin and Irenaeus, however, already do so as well (documentation in Connolly 1938, 356).

[626] Already in 1950, Ratcliff had attempted to interpret the Latin version of the Eucharistic prayer more strongly as a compilation of the fourth century. The article concludes with a reconstruction of the theological topoi of the original version (Ratcliff 1950, 133–34).

[627] For Egypt, see Hanssens 1965, 506–11; Jungmann 1967, 73, refers, however, to six passages in the Eucharistic prayer "in which favorite ideas of Hippolytus come to expression, namely ideas that recur in his authentic writings." These references are indebted to Connolly 1938, 355–69. But can one really conclude anything from the fact that the formula ἄξιος καὶ δίκαιος, for example, occurs also in Hippolytus (Connolly 1938, 355: Hippolytus, *Commentarium in Danielem* III 4 [Bonwetsch/Richard 2000, 140.3–4])?

To address these questions, a careful linguistic comparison would first have to be carried out. Thus Connolly reports the observation of Armitage Robinson that the expression *corda habere,* which he himself retroverts into Greek according to the normal form as καρδίας ἔχειν, is "native Latin," and this conclusion would fit well with the observation that the formula is first attested in Rome and North Africa.[628] For our purposes, however, such an investigation is no more necessary than a renewed debate over the connection of individual theologoumena of the text with the urban Roman theologian Hippolytus: it can be quickly shown that many of the theological topoi expressed in the Eucharistic prayer are attested in a large number of authors of the time.[629]

The Eucharistic worship service is thematized above all at the beginning of the reconstructed church order in the context of the specifications relating to the bishops, their election, and their ordination, not in a passage of its own that one could designate from the context as an "order of worship" of a Eucharistic worship service of the third or fourth century. This addition of information into the context of a specific line of argumentation connects the material of the so-called *Apostolic Tradition* with the earlier texts, especially the *Didache* and the passages in Justin. If one follows the Latin version of the Veronese manuscripts of the *Apostolic Tradition*, then from the Eucharistic liturgy that the bishop leads, *cumque factus fuerit episcopus* ("after he has been made bishop"),[630] only the thanksgiving prayer (*gratias agere*/ εὐχαριστεῖν)[631] with a preceding opening dialogue is imparted. We quote it here in the version of the Veronese manuscript (fol. 61[r/v]) and, when necessary, supplement it with the other translations and revisions:[632]

[628] Connolly 1938, 355.

[629] Thus the view of Mazza 1995, 102–9 (with extensive documentation); affirmed by Bradshaw/Johnson/Phillips 2002, 45.

[630] *Traditio Apostolica* 4 (Schölgen/Geerlings 1991, 220.19–20 = Tidner 1963, 123.25); as emerges from *Traditio Apostolica* 18 (Schölgen/Geerlings 1991, 250.11–16 = Till/Leipoldt 1954, 12 = Duensing 1946, 48.17), the kiss of peace appears to belong in addition to the end of the worship service of the word (so also Bradshaw/Johnson/Phillips 2002, 99; by contrast, the kiss of peace mentioned in *Traditio Apostolica* 21 [Schölgen/Geerlings 1991, 264.28–29 = Tidner 1963, 132.3 = Till/Leipoldt 1954, 22 = Duensing 1946, 60.1–3] is probably a postbaptismal ritual [so Bradshaw/Johnson/Phillips 2002, 134; contrast Thraede 1972, 514]).

[631] *Traditio Apostolica* 4 (Schölgen/Geerlings 1991, 220.3 or 4–5 = Tidner 1963, 124.32 or 124.34; the prayer is lacking in the Sahidic and Arabic text). According to Jungmann 1967, 74, "the worship service of the word . . . after the consecration of the bishop is just as dispensable as in Justin after the administration of baptism." But it is, in fact, very improbable that in the order the complete form of the first worship service of the newly ordained bishop is imparted; at the end too all the concluding pieces of the worship service are lacking, without one being permitted to draw conclusions from this.

[632] In the Berlin edition of Tidner 1963, 124.30–126; a retroversion into Greek is found in Lietzmann 1926, 175. A synoptic presentation is found also in Hanssens 1965, 432–33; compare Hänggi/Pahl 1998, nr. 280, pp. 80–81.

Dominus vobiscum
Et omnes dicant:
Et cum spiritu tuo.
Sursum corda.
Habemus ad Dom<inum>.
Gratias agamus Domino
Dignum et iustum est.
Et sic iam prosequatur:
Gratias tibi referimus, Deus,
per dilectum puerum tuum Iesum Christum,
quem in ultimis temporibus misisti nobis salvatorem et redemptorem et angelum voluntatis tuae;
qui est verbum tuum inseparabilem, per quem omnia fecisti
et bene placitum tibi fuit; misisti de caelo in matricem virginis:
quiq<ue> in utero habitus incarnatus est
et filius tibi ostensus est ex spiritu sancto et virgine natus
qui voluntatem tuam conplens et populum sanctum tibi adquirens extendit manus cum pateretur, ut a passione liberaret eos, qui in te crediderunt;
qui cumque traderetur voluntariae passioni, ut mortem solvat et vincula diaboli dirumpat et infernum calcet et iustos inluminet et terminum figat et resurrectionem manifestet,
accipiens panem gratias tibi agens dixit: "Accipite, manducate: hoc est corpus meum, quod pro vobis confringetur." Similiter et calicem dicens: "Hic est sanguis meus qui pro vobis effunditur; quando hoc facitis, meam commemorationem facitis."
Memores igitur mortis et resurrectionis eius offerimus tibi panem et calicem gratias tibi agentes quia nos dignos habuisti adstare coram te et tibi ministrare.
Et petimus, ut mittas spiritum tuum sanctum in oblationem sanctae ecclesiae;
in unum congregans des omnibus qui percipiunt sanctis in repletionem spiritus sancti ad confirmationem fidei in veritate,[633]
ut te laudemus et glorificemus per puerum tuum Iesum Christum, per quem tibi gloria et honor, patri et filio cum sancto spiritu, in sancta ecclesia tua et nunc et in saecula saeculorum. Amen.

The prayer of thanksgiving consists of the opening dialogue *D*(*omi*) *n*(*u*)*s uobiscum* and the actual Eucharistic prayer, which is described

[633] Tidner 1963, *ad loc* (p. 126 apparatus), explains as follows: "*in unum congregans* (*sc. omnes sanctos*) *des omnibus, qui percipiunt sanctis, sc. ut oblationem* (*panem et calicem*) *percipiant in repletionem spiritus sancti*" (additional interpretations are also provided there).

in the Sahidic text with the Greek word προσφορά.[634] As its introduction already makes clear, the high prayer is a prayer of thanksgiving. Although it is made up of an anamnesis of the salvific significance of the life of Jesus Christ (lines 11–21), the words of institution (lines 22–25), and an epiclesis with a concluding great doxology (lines 26–33),[635] and it is sometimes claimed that the epiclesis has been added secondarily,[636] it nevertheless gives the impression of being a connected unity in its present version. The very emphasis on the idea of unity in the concluding epiclesis in which the petition for the Holy Spirit is connected with the confession that God gathers the church for unity (lines 28–29, *Et petimus, ut mittas spiritum tuum sanctum in oblatione sanctae ecclesiae: in unum congregans* or καὶ ἀξιοῦμέν σε, ὅπως καταπέμψῃς τὸ ἅγιόν σου πνεῦμα ἐπὶ τὴν θυσίαν τῆς [ἁγίας] ἐκκλησίας. <ἣν> ἑνώσας)[637] makes clear that the prayer is concerned with the incorporation of the current worship service community into a great connection. The person praying sees himself "placed in the immense multitude of those who simultaneously lift up the hands with him for praise, thanksgiving and petition, offer the Eucharistic sacrifice, or participate in its offering."[638] Here, the current event—again in the Jewish prayer tradition of binding together recollection, present, and future—is described and thus viewed in a completely parallel manner to the event at the last supper: as Jesus Christ took the bread and cup, so the bread and cup are taken in the Eucharistic worship service by the presider (line 22, *accipiens panem* [*et calicem*] *gratias tibi agens*) and the gifts are offered to God (line 26, *offerimus tibi panem et calicem*).[639] It includes thanksgiving for the fact that the liturgist (like the whole community, *nos* [line 27])

[634] *Traditio Apostolica* 4 (Schölgen/Geerlings 1991, 220.24–226.29 = Tidner 1963, 124.30 = Till/Leipoldt 1954, 2 = Duensing 1946, 20.3–4); a retroversion into Greek is found in Lietzmann 1926, 42, 174–86; the Latin version is also in Hänggi/Pahl 1998, nr. *280.80–81.

[635] *Traditio Apostolica* 4 (Schölgen/Geerlings 1991, 226.22–29 = Tidner 1963, 126.33–25 = Duensing 1946, 22.13–24.2); this doxology is oriented to Ephesians 3.21: αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ . . . εἰς πάσας τὰς γενεὰς τοῦ αἰῶνος τῶν αἰώνων, ἀμήν.

[636] The discussion and its arguments are summarized in Bradshaw/Johnson/Philips 2002, 42.

[637] *Traditio Apostolica* 4 (Schölgen/Geerlings 1991, 220.24–226.29 = Tidner 1963, 125.27–126.28 = Duensing 1946, 20.1–24.2; for the Greek version, see Lietzmann 1926, 175); Clerici 1966, 113–24. Ratcliff 1950, 34, argues, however, that the prayer for the descent of the Holy Spirit was first incorporated into the Eucharistic prayer in the fourth century.

[638] Baumstark 1971, 1; a similar view is held by Klauser 1965, 22, and (with the incorporation of the cultural anthropological background) Messner 2001, 160–70.

[639] A. Budde 2000, 189; on the elements that could be presented (in addition to wine and water), see Seeliger 1995, 204–7.

may stand before God and serve him (line 27, *adstare coram te et tibi ministrare*);[640] he stands in the framework of a text in which the community declares that through this prayer for these gifts, it hopes for this same sanctification that the prayer of Jesus over the gifts once effected. Recollection, offering, and prayer are even united in a single sentence: *memores . . . offerimus . . . et . . . petimus* (lines 26–28).[641] The παῖς or *puer* mediates the human prayer, praise, and thanksgiving toward God; there is a series of attestations from the contemporary literature for this meaning of this title.[642] In a noteworthy manner, the text characterizes this mediator not only as *salvator et redemptor* (line 11) but also as "angel of his will" (*et angelus voluntatis tuae*; line 11),[643] who is a Word inseparable from the Father (thus corresponding with the Stoic λόγος ἐνδιάθετος) through which the Father created everything and yet was sent by the Father into the womb of the virgin (and corresponds in this with the Stoic λόγος προφορικός). The following concise narration of salvation history encompasses the stations of the incarnation (lines 15); the gathering of a people (line 17); and the meritorious suffering that disbanded death, destroyed the chains of the devil and subdued the underworld, fixed a boundary, and made visible the resurrection (lines 19–21).[644] The conclusion of the prayer after the citation of the words of institution makes very clear once more that these "salvific facts" in the sense of the *commemoratio* (ἀνάμνησις) called for in the words of institution serve as *memoria mortis et resurrectionis* and are formulated at the same time as the community's gift in relation to its Lord (lines 26–27). This event is worked by the Spirit; it unifies the community, confirms their true faith, and gathers them in common praise of God—it thus makes clear that the goal of all earthly worship is for the community to join in with the unbroken praise of God of the choirs of angels in heaven.

[640] Botte 1976. With Dix 1968, LIV, Ratcliff 1950, 33, regards this passage in the Latin as problematically placed and linguistically corrupt.

[641] A. Budde 2000, 189.

[642] H. Löhr 2003, 327–28.

[643] Correspondingly in line 17 it then reads *qui voluntatem tuam conplens*.

[644] Compare the commentary in Bradshaw/Johnson/Phillips 2002, 47–48. The notoriously difficult formulation *et terminum figat* (for interpretations see Bradshaw/Johnson/Phillips 2002, 47–48) must be interpreted in the context in which it stands, thus in the context of underworld, death, and resurrection. From this perspective, the concern is in any case with the limitation of the powers of death and hell, which took place through Christ's passage into the realm of the dead and his resurrection.

2.3.5 The Theology of the Early Eucharistic Prayers

These observations on the form and theology of the Eucharistic worship service in the second and third century based on the early reports in the known authors should now be supplemented with paradigmatic analyses of liturgical texts from this context, whose basic forms can be traced back to the third century with good reasons. Since the Eucharistic prayer (ἡ ἀναφορά)[645] forms the heart of the Eucharistic worship service, we will focus on this part of the liturgy in our analysis and especially on texts that can probably be dated to the third century or at least preserve formulations from this time: the prayers of the *Acts of John* (*Acta Iohannis*) and the *Acts of Thomas* (*Acta Thomae*) from the context of the apocryphal acts of apostles, the Eucharistic prayer ascribed to the Egyptian bishop Serapion of Thmuis, the so-called Egyptian recension of the anaphora of Basil, and finally the anaphora from the aforementioned mixed codex of Barcelona or Montserrat. Here, one must naturally make clear again that the so-called pre-Constantinian anaphora—if we leave aside for the moment the prayers of the *Didache* that we have already discussed briefly—come from the apocryphal acts of apostles and therefore are difficult to situate with respect to their circle of tradents and their liturgical *Sitz im Leben* (setting in life).[646] For comparable reasons, we will draw on two other very well-known texts only for supplementation and commentary purposes: the previously discussed Eucharistic prayer that comes from the transmission material of the so-called *Traditio Apostolica* and has been handed down in the context of the consecration of the bishop as the first Eucharistic prayer of the newly elected bishop[647] is one of a kind, and its age is difficult to determine. The age of the Eucharistic prayers in the *Apostolic Constitutions* (*Constituiones apostolicae*) is also debated.[648] Since our concern here is not with the ancient Christian theology of the Lord's Supper or the sacrament of the Eucharist, we will also forgo discussion of the controversial questions about the placement and meaning of the words of institution and the tradition history of the *Sanctus*.[649]

[645] On the meanings of the Greek term compare Baumstark 1950, 418–27, especially for the designation of the εὐχὴ προσφόρου with this term (pp. 423–25); for the various dimensions, see also Messner 2001, 160–65. For the entire complex, see Gerhards 1992; Winkler 1997.

[646] But compare, for example, Vogel 1980; Rouwhorst 1980; 1990; Wegman 1991.

[647] Connolly 1938; Botte 1947; compare also Harden 1921/1922; Dalmais 1980.

[648] Cabié 1983; Fraigneau-Julien 1960; Mazza 1979; M. Metzger 1971.

[649] Orientation in relation to the present discussion is provided by Gerhards 1992, 81–85, and Winkler 2002, 256–64.

Although in the texts under consideration we are certainly not dealing, as we have said, with *the* liturgical norm of a whole region (such as, for example, Egypt), the Eucharistic prayers do have a certain representative character for the theological foundational ideas of a respective time and area. In order to understand this, one must briefly consider the praxis of the Eucharistic prayers in the third century. At that time, according to all that we know, the praxis changed "from freedom to formula" in this point as well. One did not, of course, change simply and radically from a free Eucharistic prayer, which the presider (as we have seen) probably improvised, to a formula that was fixed and absolutely binding in its wording, which he had to read from a liturgical book or learn. There was obviously an intermediate stage between these two forms of liturgical prayer in which the exact wording of the Eucharistic prayer was not yet fixed but a series of theological topoi were probably normed, which the presider prayed in freely chosen words.

The existence of such an intermediate stage can be shown with the help of a careful comparative analysis of various late ancient Eucharistic prayers on the basis of their conspicuous commonalities, as Achim Budde has recently shown with reference to the anamnetic passages of the "Egyptian" recension of the *Anaphora of Basil*, the *Anaphora of James*, and the *Anaphora of Nestorius*.[650] Even if these anamnetic passages, which are attributed together with the doxological and epicletic passages to the three original basic elements of the Eucharistic prayer (doxology, anamnesis, and epiclesis),[651] do not allow (that is according to their wording) any certain conclusions in relation to the theology of the Eucharistic worship service in the third century, the circles of themes that are contained in them and disseminated in various liturgical regions do allow an indirect conclusion about a very widely circulated form of Christian "theology" in antiquity.

Because we are concerned with "theologoumena," questions regarding liturgical studies in the narrower sense are of lesser importance. Thus in the following pages, we consider texts from two very different liturgical traditions, which modern liturgical studies (oriented on the model

[650] Compare the synopsis of the relevant passages in A. Budde 2001a, 130–31 (Greek/Syriac) and 132–37 (German translation and commentary). In the form of a letter, Prof. Gabriele Winkler was friendly enough to direct me to the fact that the findings would be changed again if one would base the synopsis on the respectively oldest versions in reliable editions. She has now presented such an analysis herself in the form of a commentary: Winkler 2005, 277–861.

[651] I follow the clear description in Messner 2001, 199–200. Gerhards 1992, 80–81 (literature), provides orientation in relation to the debate on whether it would be better to distinguish between only two parts (anamnesis/epiclesis) rather than three.

of a family tree) calls "branches"—namely, from the "Syrian-epicletic" branch on the one hand, which is represented for example by the prayers of the apocryphal acts of apostles stamped by epicleseis, and from the "Greek-strophic" branch on the other hand, in which the *Einsetzungsbericht* (account of the words and actions of Jesus at the Last Supper) is integrated into the text of the prayers (the *Anaphora of Basil* is an example of this type, as is the so-called *Barcelona Anaphora*). As is well known, these branches divide again into subbranches, such as the Antiochene or the Alexandrian, but these differentiations are likewise only of secondary importance for our line of questioning.[652] Rather, we are more concerned with the question of which institutional character of theological reflection these texts of various traditions reveal and which theologoumena characterize them.

The established *catalogue of themes* that limited and guided the free improvisation of the presider in the Eucharistic prayers consisted, according to the recent synoptic investigation of Achim Budde, of *two circles of themes*: Budde calls the *first circle of themes* "the human being before God." It consists of a retelling of salvation history from the creation of the human being in the image of God via paradise, the fall, and the education through the prophets down to the gift of salvation through Jesus Christ. This first circle of themes is supplemented through a *second circle of themes* that is devoted to "Christ's work of salvation": here the activity of Christ—his baptism, his giving of his life, his descent into the underworld, the resurrection, the ascension into heaven, and the leaving behind of "this great mystery of piety" (i.e., the Eucharistic sacrament[653])—is dealt with.

These two circles of themes are admittedly found above all in the anaphora, which were circulated widely in certain regions of ancient Christianity from the fourth century on and probably go back to the third century. In the early texts that are handed down (e.g., in the apocryphal acts of apostles of the late second and third centuries), whose significance for the history of ancient Christian liturgy is increasingly being discovered, the retelling of salvation history is, so to speak, preserved only in concise epicletic key words or doxological cries.

[652] The typology in this form can be found in Wegman 1991, 193–216; various corrections, especially of a terminological nature, are found, for example, in Winkler 1996, 179.

[653] Compare the text of the *Anaphora of Basil* (line 32) below (section 2.3.5.3): Κατέλιπεν δὲ ἡμῖν τοῦτο τὸ μέγα τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον.

2.3.5.1 The Eucharistic Prayers of the Apocryphal Acts of Apostles

In a pertinent Eucharistic prayer of thanksgiving from the apocryphal *Acts of John* (CANT 215.I = BHG 900–909), the retelling of salvation history is strongly focused on the concrete community and in this respect connects recollection of the past and hope for the future very closely with each other: "We praise your name, which has converted us from confusion and merciless beguilement."[654] And both of these perspectives are just as closely tied together in the second Eucharistic prayer of the *Acts of John*, a prayer of thanksgiving over the bread: "We praise you as the name of the Father, which was spoken by you. We praise you as the name of the Son, which was spoken by you.[655] We praise you as entrance, namely the door. We praise you as the resurrection, which was shown to us through you, we praise you as the way. We praise you as the seed, the word, the grace, the faith, the salt. . . ."[656] Here, salvation history is invoked in extremely concise form with single key words that recall biblical stories or theologoumena. How Jesus of Nazareth as God's Christ was a door for Jews and Gentiles during his life and thereafter is not explained but presupposed. The one who prays and the one who listens must know or at least should know how he is active as seed and what makes him salt. That the prayer of

[654] *Acts of John* 85: Δοξάζομέν σου τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ἐπιστρέφον ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῆς πλάνης καὶ ἀνηλεοῦς ἀπάτης (Hänggi/Pahl 1998, 74 = Junod/Kaestli 1983, I: 291.2–3); for the interpretation, see Vogel 1980, 404.

[655] Thus Junod/Kaestli 1983 with the Armenian and Syriac tradition. The Greek manuscript finding is difficult; the archetype γ of chapters 106–15 of the *Acts of John* (to which also the principal manuscripts of Lipsius/Bonnet, Parisinus Graecus 520, saec. X, and Vindobonensis hist. gr. 126, saec. XIV, must be added; cf. the introduction of Junod/Kaestli 1983, I: 38–39) offers a lightly divergent version: δοξάζομέν σου τὸ λεχθὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς ὄνομα. The translation also is controversial. Junod/Kaestli 1983, I: 300 *ad loc* report the translation of Lipsius/Bonnet: "We praise your name. . . ." Schäferdiek in Schneemelcher 1997, 187, is similar: "We praise your father name pronounced by you" (cf. Schäferdiek in Schneemelcher 1964, 255: "We glorify thy name that was spoken by the Father" with n. 1: "Or: 'We glorify thy name of "Father" that was spoken by <thee>.'").

[656] *Acts of John* 109 (Hänggi/Pahl 1998, nr. 241, p. 76 = Junod/Kaestli 1983, I: 301.3–8):

> δοξάζομέν σου τὸ λεχθὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς ὄνομα.
> δοξάζομέν σου τὸ λεχθὲν διὰ υἱοῦ ὄνομα.
> δοξάζομέν σου τὴν εἴσοδον τῆς θύρας.
> δοξάζομέν σου τὴν δειχθεῖσαν ἡμῖν διὰ σοῦ ἀνάστασιν.
> δοξάζομέν σου τὴν ὁδόν.
> δοξάζομέν σου τὸν σπόρον, τὸν λόγον, τὴν χάριν, τὴν πίστιν, τὸ ἅλας . . .

Junod/Kaestli 1983, I: 300, translate "*Nous te glorifions comme la porte qui donne l'accès*" and elucidate this on p. 300 n. 2; compare also Schröter 2006, 106–8.

thanksgiving was definitely formulated with a theological claim and that its abbreviated language is not a sign of theological inability is evident from a certain monarchic tendency in its first two predications. Later, after the conciliar rejection of Monarchianism in the fourth century, this tendency caused offense, as variants in the traditions show. Here is an example: "We praise you as the name, shown to us by the Father, of the Son, who is, however, truly God, the ruler of all."[657] It is, however, thoroughly questionable whether "Monarchianism" in the sense of a reflected theological position (as this was probably represented, for example, by Noetus of Smyrna[658]) stood in the background or whether there stood instead a completely traditional "oscillation" between the invocation of the name of Christ and the name of the Spirit, which Monarchianism first attempted to overcome theoretically.[659]

If one attempts to determine the specific direction of the theology that underlies the prayer of thanksgiving of the *Acts of John*, then a precise description proves very difficult. On the one hand, it is a theology grounded in the New Testament as allusions to New Testament stories and concepts show. On the other hand, it is also a theology influenced by Judaism, as the adoption of Jewish theologoumena (such as the central emphasis on the name) makes clear. Finally, a number of philosophical terms also crop up (such as "root of immortality"). Gnostic aeons—thus still Lipsius—are certainly not intended here,[660] and a specific Gnostic theology also scarcely stands in the background of the prayer of thanksgiving, although the Son is praised in the prayer of the *Acts of John* as "the unutterable pearl, the treasure, the plow, the net, the greatness, the diadem, the one called Son of Man for our sake, the truth, rest, knowledge, power, commandment, frankness, freedom, refuge in you"[661] and designated (more clearly reminiscent of Gnostic, especially Valentinian formulas and yet part of popular philosophical Koine) "root of immortality and fount of incorruption and foundation of the ages."[662] But the

[657] δοξάζομέν σου τὸ ὑπὸ πατρὸς δειχθὲν ὄνομα υἱοῦ δὲ ὄντος θεοῦ τοῦ παντοκράτορος (Junod/Kaestli 1983, I: 301 apparatus).

[658] Hübner 1999, 39–90.

[659] The term "oscillation" is found in Winkler 1994, 216–19, and 1996, 181.

[660] Lipsius 1883, 535; Corssen 1896, 121, read δοξάζομέν σου τὸ λεχθὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς ὄνομα and translated "the name named after the father."

[661] *Acts of John* 109 (Hänggi/Pahl 1998, 76 = Junod/Kaestli 1983, I: 301.9–303.12): τὸν ἄλεκτον μαργαρίτην, τὸν θησαυρόν, τὸ ἄροτρον, τὴν σαγήνην, τὸ μέγεθος, τὸ διάδημα, τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς λεχθέντα υἱὸν ἀνθρώπου, τὸν χαρισάμενον ἡμῖν τὴν ἀλήθειαν, τὴν ἀνάπαυσιν, τὴν γνῶσιν, τὴν δύναμιν, τὴν ἐντολήν, τὴν παρρησίαν, τὴν ἐλευθερίαν, τὴν εἰς σὲ καταφυγήν.

[662] *Acts of John* 109 (Hänggi/Pahl 1998, 76 = Junod/Kaestli 1983, I: 303.12–13): οὐ γὰρ εἶ μόνος, κύριε, ῥίζα τῆς ἀθανασίας καὶ ἡ πηγὴ τῆς ἀφθαρσίας καὶ ἡ ἕδρα

boundaries between various theological directions in the second and third centuries were obviously also more fluid than one would like to assume at first glance.

In the apocryphal *Acts of Thomas* (CANT 245.1 = BHO 1186–1204 or 245.II = BHG 1800–183k; BHG[a] 1800–1831z) that comes from Syria, many texts are handed down that are of interest for our context—above all, a Spirit epiclesis on the occasion of an anointing[663] and two epicletic prayers of the apostle over the Eucharistic bread. In the Spirit epiclesis, (in Jewish tradition) the "holy name of Christ, which is exalted over every name" (cf. Philippians 2.9) is again invoked, addressed as "power of the most high" (cf. Luke 1.35 and 24.49), "merciful mother," "fellowship with the male," "female revealer of the hidden mysteries," "mother of the seven houses," and "Holy Spirit." The more ancient version of the prayer is preserved by the Greek text (though from the perspective of textual criticism, this text is secondary):[664]

ἐλθὲ τὸ ἅγιον ὄνομα τοῦ Χριστοῦ τὸ ὑπὲρ πᾶν ὄνομα·
ἐλθὲ ἡ δύναμις τοῦ ὑψίστου καὶ ἡ εὐσπλαγχνία ἡ τελεία·
ἐλθὲ τὸ χάρισμα τὸ ὕψιστον·
ἐλθὲ ἡ μήτηρ ἡ εὔσπλαγχνος
ἐλθὲ ἡ κοινωνία τοῦ ἄρρενος·
ἐλθὲ ἡ τὰ μυστήρια ἀποκαλύπτουσα τὰ ἀπόκρυφα·
ἐλθὲ ἡ μήτηρ τῶν ἑπτα οἴκων, ἵνα ἡ ἀνάπαυσίς σου εἰς τὸν ὄγδοον οἶκον
γένηται.
ἐλθὲ ὁ πρεσβύτερος τῶν πέντε μελῶν, νοὸς ἐννοίας φρονήσεως
ἐνθυμήσεως λογισμοῦ,
κοινώνησον μετὰ τούτων τῶν νεωτέρων·
ἐλθὲ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα καὶ καθάρισον τοὺς νεφροὺς αὐτῶν καὶ
τὴν καρδίαν,
καὶ ἐπισφράγισον αὐτοὺς εἰς ὄνομα πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ καὶ
ἁγίου πνεύματος.

τῶν αἰώνων. Junod/Kaestli 1983 provide a series of parallel passages from Gnostic texts mainly of Valentinian provenance.

[663] Winkler 1978.

[664] *Acts of Thomas* 27 (Lipsius/Bonnet 1959, II/2: 142.13–143.2). The texts from the *Acts of Thomas* are carefully treated in Winkler 1996, 181–86. A summarizing treatment can also be found in Rouwhorst 1990; Messner 2000.

The Syriac version deviates, as a juxtaposition with a translation of the Greek text makes clear:[665]

Come, holy name of Christ, which is exalted over all names;	Come, holy Name of Christ,
come, power of the most high	come, power and grace that is from above,
and perfected mercy;	come, perfected mercy;
come, highest gift	come, exalted gift;
come, merciful mother;	—
come, fellowship with the male	come, fellowship with the blessing
come, female revealer of the hidden mysteries;	come, female revealer of the hidden mysteries;
come, mother of the seven houses that your rest may be in the eighth house.	come, mother of the seven houses, whose rest was in the eighth house.
	Come, female messenger of reconciliation,
Come, oldest of the five members: understanding, thought, insight, reflection, judgment,	
impart yourself to these young people	impart yourself to the thinking of the young people!
Come, Holy Spirit, purify their kidneys and their heart	Come, Holy Spirit, purify their kidneys and hearts.[666]
And seal them by the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit.[667]	

As one can clearly see, the Syriac text was corrected for theological reasons at two points in relation to the original version preserved in the Greek—namely, by leaving out the invocation “come, merciful mother” in line 4 or 6 and by the translation “fellowship with the blessing” for κοινωνία τοῦ

[665] The Syriac text can be found in W. Wright 1968, I: 193.9–19, and an English translation in II: 116–17.

[666] The translation follows Winkler 1990, 17; with light deviations also in Winkler 1994, 216, and Winkler 1996, 182.

[667] The translation follows that of H. J. Drijvers in Schneemelcher 1997, 314 (cf. G. Bornkamm in Schneemelcher 1964, 456–57).

ἄρρενος in line 5 or 7.[668] This change, of course, shatters the architecture of the text in which the expressions μήτηρ ἡ εὔσπλαγχος and μήτηρ τῶν ἑπτὰ οἴκων (lines 4 or 6 and 7 or 11) form a frame for the inner core of the prayer. The concluding phrase (line 13/22) is certainly an addition, since it offers a relatively classic Trinitarian formula.

Viewed from the perspective of the classic Greek and Latin tradition, the text contains a number of quite uncommon elements of theological reflection. In the first place, there is the emphasis on the *name*, already known from the *Didache*, the Valentinian Eucharistic prayer, and the *Acts of John*, for which other attestations from the literature of the late first and early second centuries can be found.[669] Above all, the conception of divine rest is evidently very important, for the text addresses the Holy Spirit as "mother of the seven houses" who is enthroned over the seven planets (cf. Proverbs 9.1) and, after the conclusion of the great seven-day world week, will find ἀνάπαυσις, eschatological rest, in the eighth house over the planets:[670] ἐλθὲ ἡ μήτηρ τῶν ἑπτὰ οἴκων, ἵνα ἡ ἀνάπαυσίς σου εἰς τὸν ὄγδοον οἶκον γένηται (lines 7/11–12). A kind of metaphor cluster is present: the eighth house over the planets calls to mind the eighth day, the world Sabbath, and here simultaneously a true day of the Lord. Surprising is also the talk of a "fellowship with the male" (κοινωνία τοῦ ἄρρενος), at least as long as one does not realize that with the epithet "mother," the Spirit should not be imagined as feminine in the sense of a gender. The expression κοινωνία τοῦ ἄρρενος could then be meant in such a way that the Spirit should be conceived both as mother and as "fellowship with the male," thus as a male-female gender-transcendent entity.[671] In distinction to the previously discussed prayer of the *Acts of John*, the theological claim is more modest, and the expectation of the biblical and theological knowledge of the praying community is much smaller.

[668] Compare also the commentary in Klijn 2003, 76–84.

[669] Acts 5.28; 3 John 7; *Shepherd of Hermas, Similitude(s)* IX 16.5 = 93.5 (Whittaker 1967, 90.8–9); and additional documentation in Klijn 2003, 79–80.

[670] For this notion of eschatological rest, compare Klijn 2003, 81–82 (with reference to Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* VII 57.1, 5 [Stählin/Früchtel/Treu 1970, 41.29–30 and 42.14]: . . . τῆς ἀναπαύσεως τόπον . . . or . . . διὰ τῆς ἁγίας ἑβδομάδος . . .) and Helderman 1984, 109–10 (Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* I 5.3), 213 (*Stromata* VII 57.1), and 285 (*Tripartite tractate* NHC I,5, p. 70.16–18 and 71.20–21: the rest of the highest aeon is found in the eighth *house*). But the notion of the house of wisdom, which stands on seven pillars, is at most of marginal influence for the image used here: Staerk 1936, 239.

[671] Compare the references in G. W. H. Lampe, PGL s.v. (p. 230a) and in the commentary of Klijn 2003, 81; Lampe and Klijn argue with Burkitt 1900, 289, for an original ܒܪܗ ܕ ܓܒܪܐ (this means ܕܐܢܫܐ ܒܪܗ). Then the original meaning of the passage would have been "Come, fellowship with the Son of the Man (= Son of the human being)" and would have brought to expression the close solidarity of Spirit and Son.

The extensive Eucharistic prayer of the apocryphal *Acts of Thomas* is very closely related in form and individual formulations to the Spirit epiclesis of the *Acts of Thomas* that we have just discussed: here too the Spirit is addressed again as mother; here too the distinction of the three persons of the Trinity is carried out only very loosely in the core text. The Eucharistic prayer reads in its Greek version:[672]

ἐλθὲ τὰ σπλάγχα τὰ τέλεια,
ἐλθὲ ἡ κοινωνία τοῦ ἄρρενος·
ἐλθὲ ἡ ἐπισταμένη τὰ μυστήρια τοῦ ἐπιλέκτου,
ἐλθὲ ἡ κοινωνοῦσα ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἄθλοις τοῦ γενναίου ἀθλητοῦ,
ἐλθὲ ἡ ἡσυχία ἡ ἀποκαλύπτουσα τὰ μεγαλεῖα τοῦ παντὸς μεγέθους,
ἐλθὲ ἡ τὰ ἀπόκρυφα ἐκφαίνουσα καὶ τὰ ἀπόρρητα φανερὰ καθιστῶσα,
ἡ ἱερὰ περιστερὰ ἡ τοὺς διδύμους νεοσσοὺς γεννῶσα,
ἐλθὲ ἡ ἀπόκρυφος μήτηρ,
ἐλθὲ ἡ φανερὰ ἐν ταῖς πράξεσιν αὐτῆς καὶ παρέχουσα χαρὰν
καὶ ἀνάπαυσιν τοῖς συνημμένοις αὐτῇ·
ἐλθὲ καὶ κοινώνησον ἡμῖν ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ εὐχαριστίᾳ
ἣν ποιοῦμεν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί σου,
καὶ τῇ ἀγάπῃ ᾗ συνήγμεθα ἐπὶ τῇ κλήσει σου.

The Syriac version deviates again from the Greek version in an interesting way, as a comparison with a translation of the Greek text makes clear:[673]

—	Come, gift of the most high;
Come, perfect mercy;	come, perfect mercy;
come, fellowship with the male;	—
—	come, Holy Spirit,
come, female knower of the mysteries of the elect ones;	come, female revealer of the mysteries of the elect ones among the prophets;
come, female participant in all battles of the noble athlete;	come, proclaimer through the apostles of the battles of the victorious athlete;
	come, treasure of glory;
	come, favorite of the mercy of the most high;

[672] *Acts of Thomas* 50 (47) (Lipsius/Bonnet 1959, II/2: 166.7–17).
[673] The Syriac text can be found in W. Wright 1968, I: 218.15–219.7, and an English translation in II: 189–90.

come, rest, you who reveal the great deeds of the whole greatness;	come, silence, revealer of the mysteries of the most high;
come, you who unveils what is hidden and makes known the mysteries;	come, you who unveil what is hidden and makes known the great deeds of our God;
holy dove, who gives birth to twin youths;	—
come, hidden mother;	—
—	come, giver of life in the secret and
come, you who are manifest through deeds and gives joy	manifest through deeds, come, giver of joy
and rest for all who are joined with you	and rest for all who are joined with you.
—	come, power of the Father and wisdom of the Son, you who are one in all.
come and participate with us in this Eucharist, which we celebrate in your name, and in your love meal, for which at your call we are gathered together.[675]	Come, join yourself with us.[674]

As before in the anointing prayer, the Syriac version has again taken offense at the presumably overly Gnostic sounding formulation κοινωνία τοῦ ἄρρενος and left it out entirely (line 2 or 4), has again completely removed the "hidden mother" (line 8 or 20), and has deleted the allusion to the dove that gives birth to twins (line 7 or 18–19). On the other hand, the Syriac text is more precise from a Trinitarian theological perspective in its attempt to differentiate the persons—for example, in the formulation "come, power of the Father and wisdom of the Son, you who are one in all" (lines 27–28). Thus it must again be approached as secondary in relation to the Greek version, which has preserved the original findings at this point. For this reason, there can thus be no doubt about the fact that the *Acts of Thomas* with the Syrian tradition addresses the Spirit as

[674] The translation follows that of Winkler 1990, 18; lightly deviating also in Winkler 1994, 217, and Winkler 1996, 185–86.

[675] The translation follows that of H. J. W. Drijvers in Schneemelcher 1997, 324 (cf. G. Bornkamm in Schneemelcher 1964, 470).

mother. This is also shown in the fact that at other points the text mentions "the name of the mother of the hidden mystery of the hidden powers and authorities" and places it alongside "the name of Jesus."[676] Nevertheless, an Irish palimpsest-sacramentary documents the fact that the Syrian epiclesis was certainly able to be taken up in a completely different liturgical tradition and theological situation.[677] As Sebastian Brock has shown, the call ἐλθέ, "come," is characteristic of the theology of these texts and yet also for an early Syriac tradition as a whole. Brock even sees here an identity-forming difference to the Greek and Latin tradition, which speaks of the "sending" of the Spirit and not of its "coming" (the מראנאתה probably stands in the background):[678] In the prayer from the *Acts of Thomas*—as in the rest of the Syriac tradition—one invokes the Spirit (here one observes no oscillation between the Son and the Spirit) and prays for its presence in the Eucharist, in order that what is hidden can be revealed and the eschatological rest (ἡσυχία) is given. The Spirit is said to participate with the community members in the Eucharist (according to the Syriac version it is even said to join itself with them). It is conspicuous that time and again the Spirit is envisaged and called down as revealer, as announcer of mysteries, and thus, so to speak, as the one who breaks the silence about God. One has the impression that there is no hiatus between a "proclamation part" and a "sacrament part" of the worship service, but the fact that God is revealed in the proclamation of the word and in the sacrament is central. Winkler and Messner emphasize that an original person epiclesis (calling down of the Spirit upon the participants in the meal) was only secondarily transformed into a gift epiclesis.[679]

2.3.5.2 The Eucharistic Prayer in the "Euchologium of Serapion"

The Greek tradition strongly deviates from these Syriac pieces, as a consideration of the well-known anaphora ascribed to the Egyptian bishop Serapion of Thmuis already shows. Here, this anaphora (without citing the

[676] *Acts of Thomas* 133 (Lipsius/Bonnet 1959, II/2: 240.10–12): ἐπιφημίζομέν σου ὀνόματί σου Ἰησοῦ. Here, the Syriac has likewise a classic Trinitarian structure ("we name the name of the father over you, we name the name of the Son over you, we name the name of the Spirit over you"; W. Wright 1968, 302); for the notion of Spirit as mother, compare Hirsch 1927, 40–64; on the *Acts of Thomas*, see esp. 47–48; Cramer 1979, 36–37.

[677] Text in Winkler 1996, 185; reference also in Klijn 2003, 125.

[678] Brock 1974, 213–14; likewise Messner 2000, 507.

[679] Messner 2000, 497.

New Testament words of institution in detail) is structured in stichoi (text 1 from the part of the manuscript ascribed to Serapion):[680]

Ἄξιον καὶ δίκαιόν ἐστιν
σὲ τὸν ἀγένητον πατέρα τοῦ μονογενοῦς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ
αἰνεῖν ὑμνεῖν
δοξολογεῖν.
αἰνοῦμεν σὲ ἀγένητε θεέ
ἀνεξιχνίαστε ἀνέκφραστε ἀκατανόητε πάσῃ γενητῇ
ὑποστάσει.
αἰνοῦμεν σὲ τὸν γιγνωσκόμενον ὑπὸ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ μονογενοῦς,
τὸν δι’ αὐτοῦ λαληθέντα καὶ ἑρμηνευθέντα καὶ
γνωσθέντα τῇ γενητῇ φύσει.
αἰνοῦμεν σὲ τὸν γιγνώσκοντα τὸν υἱὸν
καὶ ἀποκαλύπτοντα τοῖς ἁγίοις τὰς περὶ αὐτοῦ δόξας·
τὸν γιγνωσκόμενον ὑπὸ τοῦ γεγεννημένου σου λόγου
καὶ ὁρώμενον καὶ διερμηνευόμενον τοῖς ἁγίοις.
αἰνοῦμεν σὲ πάτερ ἀόρατε, χορηγὲ τῆς ἀθανασίας.

σὺ εἶ ἡ πηγὴ τῆς ζωῆς, ἡ πηγὴ τοῦ φωτός, ἡ πηγὴ πάσης
χάριτος καὶ πάσης
ἀληθείας,
φιλάνθρωπε καὶ φιλόπτωχε, ὁ πᾶσιν καταλλασσόμενος
καὶ πάντας πρὸς ἑαυτὸν διὰ τῆς ἐπιδημίας τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ
σου υἱοῦ ἕλκων.

δεόμεθα ποίησον ἡμᾶς ζῶντας ἀνθρώπους· δὸς ἡμῖν πνεῦμα
φωτός,
ἵνα γνῶμεν σὲ τὸν ἀληθινὸν καὶ ὅν ἀπέστειλας Ἰησοῦν
Χριστόν·
δὸς ἡμῖν πνεῦμα ἅγιον, ἵνα δυνηθῶμεν ἐξειπεῖν
καὶ διηγήσασθαι τὰ ἄρρητά σου μυστήρια.
λαλησάτο ἐν ἡμῖν ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα καὶ
ὑμνησάτω σὲ δι’ ἡμῶν.

[680] A synoptic comparison (in English language) with the corresponding texts from *Constitutiones apostolicae* VII 25–26 and (Ps-?) Athanasius, *De virginitate* 12–13 (Goltz 1905a, 46–47) in Bradshaw 2004, 116–21, esp. 118–19. I quote here the (not completely error free) edition of M. E. Johnson 1995, 46–48; compare also Hänggi/Pahl 1998, nr. 336, pp. 128–33.

Σὺ γὰρ ὁ ὑπεράνω πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας καὶ δυ<νά>μεως
καὶ κυριότητος
καὶ παντὸς ὀνόματος ὀνομαζομένου
οὐ μόνον ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι.
σοὶ παραστήκουσι χίλιαι χιλιάδες καὶ μύριαι μυριάδες
ἀγγέλων
ἀρχαγγέλων
θρόνων κυριοτήτων ἀρχῶν ἐξουσιῶν·
σοὶ παραστήκουσιν τὰ δύο τιμιώτατα σεραφεὶμ ἑξαπτέρυγα,
δυσὶν μὲν πτέρυξιν καλύπτοντα τὸ πρόσωπον,
δυσὶ δὲ τοὺς πόδας,
δυσὶ δὲ πετόμενα, καὶ ἁγιάζοντα·
μεθ' ὧν δέξαι καὶ τὸν ἡμέτερον ἁγιασμὸν λεγόντων
Ἅγιος ἅγιος ἅγιος κύριος σαβαώθ
πλήρης ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ τῆς δόξης σου.
πλήρης ἐστὶν ὁ οὐρανός,
πλήρης ἐστὶν καὶ ἡ γῆ τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς σου δόξης κύριε
τῶν δυνάμενων·
πλήρωσον καὶ τὴν θυσίαν ταύτην τῆς σῆς δυνάμεως καὶ τῆς
σῆς μεταλήψεως·
σοὶ γὰρ προσηνέγκαμεν ταύτην τὴν ζῶσαν θυσίαν τὴν
προσφορὰν τὴν
ἀναίμακτον.
Σοὶ προσηνέγκαμεν τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον,
τὸ ὁμοίωμα τοῦ σώματος τοῦ μονογενοῦς.
ὁ ἄρτος οὗτος τοῦ ἁγίου σώματός ἐστιν ὁμοίωμα,
ὅτι ὁ κύριος Ἰησους Χριστὸς ἐν ᾗ νυκτὶ παρεδίδοτο . . .
διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡμεῖς τὸ ὁμοίωμα τοῦ θανάτου ποιοῦντες τὸν
ἄρτον
προσηνέγκαμεν,
καὶ παρακαλοῦμεν διὰ τῆς θυσίας ταῦτης καταλλάγηθι
πᾶσιν ἡμιν
καὶ ἱλάσθητι, θεὲ τῆς ἀληθείας·
καὶ ὥσπερ ὁ ἄρτος οὗτος ἐσκορπισμένος ἦν ἐπάνω τῶν ὀρέων
καὶ συναχθεὶς ἐγένετο εἰς ἕν,
οὕτω καὶ τὴν ἁγίαν σου ἐκκλησίαν σύναξον ἐκ παντὸς ἔθνους
καὶ πάσης
χώρας
καὶ πάσης πόλεως καὶ κώμης καὶ οἴκου
καὶ ποίησον μίαν ζῶσαν καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν.

Προσηνέγκαμεν δὲ καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τὸ ὁμοίωμα τοῦ αἵματος,

ὅτι ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς λαβὼν ποτήριον μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι . . .
διὰ τοῦτο προσηνέγκαμεν καὶ ἡμεῖς τὸ ποτήριον ὁμοίωμα αἵματος
προσάγοντες.

Ἐπιδημησάτω θεὲ τῆς ἀληθείας ὁ ἅγιός σου λόγος ἐπὶ τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον,
ἵνα γένηται ὁ ἄρτος σῶμα τοῦ λόγου, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ ποτὴριον τοῦτο,
ἵνα γένηται τὸ ποτήριον αἷμα τῆς ἀληθείας.

καὶ ποίησον πάντας τοὺς κοινωνοῦντας φάρμακον ζωῆς λαβεῖν
εἰς θεραπείαν παντὸς νοσήματος καὶ εἰς ἐνδυνάμωσιν πάσης προκοπῆς καὶ
ἀρετῆς,
μὴ εἰς κατάκρισιν θεὲ τῆς ἀληθείας μηδὲ εἰς ἔλεγχον καὶ ὄνειδος.

Σὲ γάρ τὸν ἀγένητον ἐπεκαλεσάμεθα διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς ἐν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι·
ἐλεηθήτω ὁ λαὸς οὗτος, προκοπῆς ἀξιωθήτω,
ἀποσταλήτωσαν ἄγγελοι συμπαρόντες τῷ λαῷ εἰς κατάργησιν τοῦ πονηροῦ
καὶ εἰς βεβαίωσιν τῆς ἐκκλησίας.
Παρακαλοῦμεν δὲ καὶ ὑπὲρ πάντων τῶν κεκοιμημένων, ὧν ἐστιν καὶ ἡ
ἀνάμνησις.

The text of the anaphora handed down in the medieval manuscript must first be interpreted in its entirety before one can ask whether a literary growth can be observed in it and whether an original form can be reconstructed. Maxwell E. Johnson divides the text so that he first sets off the fourfold αἰνοῦμεν (lines 4, 6, 8, and 12) as a "preface" in which there is an alternation between a statement related to the Father and a statement related to the Son (lines 1–12).[681] Here, the Father is first described with the classic terms of Greek negative theology as unbegotten, unsearchable, inexpressible, and incomprehensible: ἀγένετος, ἀνεξιχνίαστος, ἀνέκφραστος, ἀκατανόητος

[681] M. E. Johnson 1995, 200–202.

(line 5). Then in a countermove, the Son is described as the one who knows him and brings knowledge (a paraphrase of Matthew 11.27, τὸν πατέρα τις ἐπιγνώσκει εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ ᾧ ἐὰν βούληται ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψαι). This dialectic of hiddenness and revelation also continues in the following statement introduced with αἰνοῦμεν. The concluding formulation not only calls the Father invisible (ἀόρατος) but also points in a very clear way to the heavenly cult: the Father is the "choir leader," the leader of immortality (line 12: χορηγὸς τῆς ἀθανασίας), because his son was resurrected as the first of mortals and leads and directs the circle dance of the immortals in heaven.[682] This passage appears to be highly reflected upon theologically and to presuppose a high degree of Trinitarian theological sensitivity: on the one hand, the distance between the transcendent Father and the revealed Son is stressed; on the other hand, both are closely connected, since the Father can be revealed only through the Son. Such formulations can scarcely be imagined prior to the second half of the fourth century, when a compromise was sought between the legitimate concerns of Subordinationism and Monarchianism in the eastern part of the empire.

This theologically well-composed introduction is followed by a concise, more salvation-historical section that addresses God as the fount of life (πηγὴ ζωῆς; lines 13–20),[683] the God who reconciles fallen human beings and draws them to himself through the incarnation of his beloved Son (διὰ τῆς ἐπιδημίας τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ . . . υἱοῦ; line 16). The theme of knowledge continues to remain determinative in the following prayer for the Holy Spirit—that is, the first epiclesis (lines 17–21). The Son and the Spirit should speak through the believers and help them to understand and pass on the ἄρρητα . . . μυστήρια (line 20) and to praise God. With the praise of God, the theme of the heavenly cult is addressed again at the same time, and its personnel are listed in traditional language in the *Pre-Sanctus* for the purpose of praising God in a description of the heavenly court: χίλιαι χιλιάδες καὶ μύριαι μυριάδες ἀγγέλων ἀρχαγγέλων, θρόνων κυριοτήτων ἀρχῶν ἐξουσιῶν (lines 25–27), and naturally the six-winged seraphim who start the *Sanctus*. However, it is not very likely that the singular πρόσωπον attested in the biblical text (Isa 6.2), the face covered by the seraphim wings, indicates *God's* face—an interpretation that Origen ascribes to his Jewish teacher but is scarcely attested in Jewish

[682] M. E. Johnson 1995, 216, refers for the expression to diverse parallels, likewise for the predications ἀγένητος, ἀνεξιχνίαστος, ἀνέκφραστος, ἀκατανόητος (216–18), which point to an emergence in the context of Trinitarian theological debates in the fourth century.

[683] In this way, a close connection with the preceding statement about God as leader of immortality.

sources. Rather, the seraphim cover *their* own faces in order not to have to see God.[684] The linking of the heavenly and earthly cults could not be closer here: like the seraphim and the whole heavenly court, the earthly community sings the Ἅγιος ἅγιος ἅγιος κύριος σαβαώθ πλήρης ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ τῆς δόξης σου. The *Sanctus* (lines 33–36) is followed by the extensively introduced words of institution (lines 40–57), which are divided by a quotation from the *Didache*; a formal anamnesis is lacking.[685]

In the *Pre-Sanctus* (i.e., the introduction of the *Sanctus*), the *Sanctus*, and the *Post-Sanctus* (from line 22, Σὺ γὰρ ὁ ὑπεράνω πάσης ἀρχῆς, to lines 38–39, σοὶ γάρ προσηνέγκαμεν ταύτην τὴν ζῶσαν θυσίαν τὴν προσφορὰν τὴν ἀναίμακτον), there are, regardless of all structural differences, such close parallels between these anaphora and versions of the *Anaphora of Mark* that from Wobbermin on, scholars have repeatedly assumed a common *Vorlage*.[686] On the other hand, since the "prayer of the offering of the bishop Serapion," as already mentioned, contains a quotation from the *Didache* (namely, lines 48–53, καὶ ὥσπερ ὁ ἄρτος οὗτος ἐσκορπισμένος ἦν ἐπάνω τῶν ὀρέων . . .), which is also found at a comparable point in other anaphora such as the *Apostolic Constitutions*, the hypothesis of a common source is also likely here.[687] Admittedly, not all parallels are convincing: the designation of the Eucharistic bread as τὸ ὁμοίωμα τοῦ σώματος τοῦ μονογενοῦς and as τὸ ὁμοίωμα τοῦ θανάτου (lines 44–44), which paraphrases Pauline theologoumena from Romans (cf. esp. Romans 6.5), has likewise been compared with a formulation of this anaphora, but it is differentiated already by the term that is used (ἀντίτυπος). As Johnson has shown, parallels to the understanding of the Eucharistic elements as ὁμοίωμα are sooner found in the Syriac sphere

[684] Origen, *De principiis* IV 3.14 (Görgemanns/Karpp 1992, 776–77 = Koetschau 1913, 346.11–17); Dix 1938, 274–75; Kretschmar 1956b, 164–68; M. E. Johnson 1995, 208–10; Halperin 1988, 162 (Targum Jonathan on Isaiah 6.2). In this respect, we must neither report nor comment on the different theses on the influence of Origen on the incorporation of the *Sanctus* here.

[685] Nock 1929, 385–88; see in detail M. E. Johnson 1995, 228–33; the key word admittedly occurs at the end of the text: Παρακαλοῦμεν δὲ καὶ ὑπὲρ πάντων τῶν κεκοιμημένων, ὧν ἐστιν καὶ ἡ ἀνάμνησις (lines 69–70).

[686] M. E. Johnson 1995, 206–7, provides a synoptic comparison of the versions of the passages ascribed to Serapion and the Greek and Coptic *Anaphora of Mark*.

[687] Wobbermin 1898, 26; M. E. Johnson 1995, 224–26 (with history of research and English text of *Constitutiones apostolicae* VII 25). Compare *Constitutiones apostolicae* VII 25.3: Σὺ δέσποτα παντοκράτορ, Θεὲ αἰώνιε, ὥσπερ ἦν τοῦτο διεσκορπισμένον καὶ συναχθὲν ἐγένετο εἷς ἄρτος, οὕτως συνάγαγέ σου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἀπὸ τῶν περάτων τῆς εἰς τὴν σὴν βασιλείαν (M. Metzger 1987, 54.9–12). Here the quotation from the *Didache* likewise stands before the thanksgiving for the "costly blood of Jesus Christ."

where there is talk of ܕܡܘܬܐ.[688] Accordingly, attempts to locate the origin of the anaphora ascribed to Serapion in Egypt or in Syria on the basis of such more or less convincing parallels[689] are not uncontroversial. For it is unclear whether the *Sanctus* already belonged to the basic material of the text or whether it was inserted into it later. If, however, it was inserted later, then one could still date a basic form of the anaphora to the third century because of the aforementioned parallels. But as long as one does not know when exactly the *Sanctus* was inserted into the Eucharistic worship service and whether this took place in Egypt or Syria, the tradition history of the Eucharistic prayer handed down in the so-called Euchologium cannot really be explained precisely. Johnson, who regards the *Sanctus* and the words of institution as secondary, argues (against Botte) for a date in the middle of the fourth century.[690] In support of this view, he points *first* to close parallels between the text ascribed to Serapion and the anaphora handed down in the Strasbourg Papyrus Gr. 254 in which the *Sanctus* and the words of institution are likewise absent: in both texts, it is said via an allusion to Paul's letter to the Romans (12.1) that in the framework of the Eucharistic celebration, a living or reasonable sacrifice (line 38, ζῶσαν θυσίαν or θυσίαν λογικήν) is offered.[691] Second, he draws attention to anti-Arian elements. Whether one can really infer, as Johnson does, from the combination of the Greek words γεννᾶν and λόγος in the formulation ὑπὸ τοῦ γεγεννημένου σου λόγου (line 10) and the expression ἀγένητος θεός (lines 4/65) that the high prayer has an anti-Arian thrust[692] or whether it is not more probable that these words were inserted because they had been used for a long time in the language of the liturgy is likewise difficult to decide. A direct opposition against a certain position in the Trinitarian theological controversy of the fourth century is not really recognizable.

[688] Though the term ὁμοίωμα does not occur here: Ἔτι εὐχαριστοῦμεν, πάτερ ἡμῶν, ὑπὲρ τοῦ αἵματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ ἐκχυθέντος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν καὶ τοῦ τιμίου σώματος, οὗ καὶ ἀντίτυπα ταῦτα ἐπιτελοῦμεν . . . 25.4 (M. Metzger 1987, 54.12–15); M. E. Johnson 1995, 227–30 refers for ܕܡܘܬܐ to the East Syrian anaphora from Brit. Libr. Add. 14669 in Hänggi/Pahl 1998, nr. 530, 397–404, esp. 402.

[689] Thus above all Dix 1938, 274–76; see M. E. Johnson 1995, 210–15.

[690] M. E. Johnson 1995, 199, 216–19. M. E. Johnson 1995, 202, calls the aorist προσηνέγκαμεν in lines 34 and 36 "a common Egyptian euchological characteristic."

[691] On Papyrus Gr. 254 (Haelst 1976, nr. 988 = Hänggi/Pahl 1998, 116/118); compare section 2.3.3.3 with n. 531 above. M. E. Johnson 1995, 258, mentions parallels to the following formulations: προσηνέγκαμεν ταύτην τὴν ζῶσαν θυσίαν τὴν προσφορὰν τὴν ἀναίμακτον (lines 38–39); παρακαλοῦμεν διὰ τῆς θυσίας ταύτης (l. 46); ποίησον μίαν ζῶσαν καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν (line 53); and Παρακαλοῦμεν δὲ καὶ ὑπερ πάντων τῶν κεκοιμημένων, ὧν ἐστιν καὶ ἡ ἀνάμνησις (line 69 and following).

[692] M. E. Johnson 1995, 201; compare also pp. 236–41.

In his monograph, Johnson reconstructs a primitive version of the anaphora in which the introductory prayer, the *Sanctus*, and the words of institution are lacking. The primitive version reconstructed by him reads as follows:[693]

δεόμεθα ποίησον ἡμᾶς ζῶντας ἀνθρώπους· δὸς ἡμῖν πνεῦμα φωτός,
ἵνα γνῶμεν σὲ τὸν ἀληθινὸν καὶ ὅν ἀπέστειλας Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν·
δὸς ἡμῖν πνεῦμα ἅγιον, ἵνα δυνηθῶμεν ἐξειπεῖν
καὶ διηγήσασθαι τὰ ἄρρητά σου μυστήρια.
λαλησάτο ἐν ἡμῖν ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα καὶ ὑμνησάτω σὲ δι’ ἡμῶν.

Σὲ γάρ τὸν ἀγένητον ἐπεκαλεσάμεθα διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς ἐν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι·
ἐλεηθήτω ὁ λαὸς οὗτος, προκοπῆς ἀξιωθήτω,
ἀποσταλήτωσαν ἄγγελοι συμπαρόντες τῷ λαῷ εἰς κατάργησιν τοῦ πονηροῦ
καὶ εἰς βεβαίωσιν τῆς ἐκκλησίας.
Παρακαλοῦμεν δὲ καὶ ὑπὲρ πάντων τῶν κεκοιμημένων, ὧν ἐστιν καὶ ἡ ἀνάμνησις.

μετὰ τὴν ὑποβολὴν τῶν ὀνομάτων·
ἁγίασον τὰς ψυχὰς ταύτης, σὺ γὰρ πάσας γιγνώσκεις·
ἁγίασον πάσας ἐν κυρίῳ κοιμηθείσας·
καὶ συγκαταρίθμησον πάσαις ταῖς ἁγίαις σου δυνάμεσιν
καὶ δὸς αὐτοῖς τόπον καὶ μονὴν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου.
δέξαι δὲ καὶ τὴν εὐχαριστίαν τοῦ λαοῦ
καὶ εὐλόγησον τοὺς προσενεγκόντας τὰ πρόσφορα καὶ τὰς εὐχαριστίας
καὶ χάρισαι ὑγείαν καὶ ὁλοκληρίαν καὶ εὐθυμίαν καὶ πᾶσαν προκοπὴν ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος ὅλῳ τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ.

διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς σου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι.
ὥσπερ ἦν καὶ ἐστιν καὶ ἔσται εἰς γενεὰς γενεῶν
καὶ εἰς τοὺς σύμπαντας αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.

[693] M. E. Johnson 1995, 253–54, with English translation.

Naturally, this reconstruction remains hypothetical, if only because—as we have seen—it presupposes assumptions about the age and origin of the *Sanctus* and the words of institution in the Eucharistic prayer that can scarcely be verified (at least within the framework of our investigation). It must likewise remain open whether or not one can take (as Hans Lietzmann did) the juxtaposition of the traditions from the apocryphal acts of the apostles discussed above, on the one hand, and such a Eucharistic prayer, on the other hand, as an argument for two (let alone multiple) different traditions of the celebration of the Lord's Supper in ancient Christianity.[694] For our context, this does not matter so much, because our concern first and foremost is only with a rudimentary inventory of the theologoumena that were used and the manner of their use in the present context of tradition. The conclusion of the prayer, the second epiclesis, is of special interest because here the strong dialectic of divine transcendence and the function of the Son as revealer of the transcendent Father is supplemented by an explicit Logos theology. The holy Logos of the Father should come down on the bread ἵνα γένηται ὁ ἄρτος σῶμα τοῦ λόγου (line 59). While this second epiclesis was already regarded very early on as a secondary addition,[695] subsequent to the investigations of Bernard Capelle, an increasing number of scholars have interpreted the passage as original or at least as a very old part of the Eucharistic prayer. They ground this view, alongside other arguments, with the fact that functions are ascribed here to the Logos that were consistently assigned to the Spirit after the theological debates and conciliar decisions of the late fourth century.[696] This, however, as it has been argued, agrees with the theology of Athanasius, who was supposedly connected with Serapion, and therefore it is believed to be quite conceivable as a theological innovation of the bishop from Thmuis in his own prayer for the worship service and thus as an insertion into the anaphora that could go back to Serapion himself. Cuming in particular has pointed to the close connection between Logos and Spirit in Athanasius' letters to Serapion. But a closer analysis of the passages shows that the bishop differentiates very carefully between Logos and Spirit.[697] Bernard Botte, by contrast, regards the formulation as an attempt

[694] Messner 2000, 494, with reference to Lietzmann 1926, 243–47; in detail also (with history of research) M. E. Johnson 1995, 220–23.

[695] History of research in M. E. Johnson 1995, 234–358; for example, in Lietzmann 1926, 76–80.

[696] Capelle 1946, 425–43 = Capelle 1962, (344–58) 355–58.

[697] Cuming 1980b, 573–74: Athanasius, *Epistulae ad Serapionem* I 23, 31 (PG 26: 585 A: εἰ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα χρίσμα καὶ σφραγίς ἐστιν, ἐν ᾧ χρίει καὶ σφραγίζει πάντα ὁ λόγος or 601 A); III 5–6 (632 B: ὁ γὰρ πατὴρ διὰ τοῦ λόγου ἐν τῷ πνεύματι κτίζει τὰ πάντα).

by Pneumatomachians “to place the Spirit in the shadows” and disputes any connection to Serapion of Thmuis.[698] We have, however, already seen in the discussion on the formulation δι’ εὐχῆς λόγου in Justin (see section 2.3.4.2) that—independent of the interpretation of the passage in Justin—the Logos epiclesis belongs to the very old part of the Eucharistic prayer and was formulated in the period in which the second and third person of the Trinity were not distinguished exactly from each other; moreover, nobody took offence at corresponding formulations—which were manifold, as Johnson shows.[699] Thus an exact date, let alone an ascription to an author, cannot succeed with the help of such formulations. Much more interesting for our contexts is the fact that through such formulations in the worship service in which this Eucharistic prayer was spoken, the Logos theology was made accessible to a larger group of community members in a very memorable manner—namely, by being mediated optically—and thus was spread much further than the writings of figures such as Justin, Eusebius, or Athanasius.

If one considers the anaphora as a whole, it is conspicuous that the text—whether in a later reworking or in its original version—does not merely string together formulas and biblical paraphrases as a cluster; multiple stringent theological ideas are developed in concise form and yet quite clearly betray backgrounds in the various Trinitarian theological controversies of the first centuries, without it being possible to assign these allusions in a conclusive manner. We find the Logos theology with which the early theology mediated the significance of the person of Jesus Christ to pagan and Jewish educated people but also the careful dialectic of the relation between transcendent Father and revealed Son that was set forth and increasingly refined from the third century onward. This impression of the close connection between liturgy and Trinitarian theological debates, which has been obtained via the anaphora from the so-called Euchologium of Serapion of Thmuis, finds confirmation when we now consider the Greek tradition of the *Anaphora of Basil*.

2.3.5.3 The *Anaphora of Basil*

In what follows, we turn to the so-called Egyptian recension of the *Anaphora of Basil*, thus to a quite old version of this Eucharistic prayer

[698] Botte 1964, 50–57, esp. 55; Mazza 1981, 520–23.

[699] Documentation in M. E. Johnson 1995, 245–46: Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* IV 18.5 (Rousseau 1969, II: 610.118–119); Clement of Alexandria, *Paedagogus* I 43.2 (Stählin/Treu 1972, 183.25–26) as well as Origen, *Commentarium in evangelium Matthaei* XI 14 (Kostermann/Benz 1935, 56.25–57.10). But compare also the formulation ὁ συνάναρχος λόγος τοῦ ἀνάρχου πατρός from the *Liturgy of Mark* (Brightman 1967, 148).

that has been used up to the present (which must be distinguished from the more well-known, longer, and later *Byzantine Anaphora of Basil*). For our contexts, the relation of dependence of the Cappadocian theologian Basil to the lost primitive form of this anaphora (Ur-BAS), which in addition to the so-called Egyptian (E-BAS) and Byzantine (Byz-BAS) has also been handed down in an Armenian basic form (Arm-BAS I), is of just as little importance as the disputed question of whether the so-called Egyptian recension, let alone the primitive form, actually originated from Egypt or whether they originated instead in Asia Minor.[700] We can also forgo an exact comparison between the various basic forms (E-BAS, Arm-BAS I, Byz-BAS, and Syr-BAS) together with their different versions, which have only recently been partially edited, because we are interested only in the theology of the two aforementioned complexes of themes in the anamnetic part and not concerned with their exact formulation or precise date. Moreover, such comparisons were also carried out very thoroughly by Gabriele Winkler in a recent comprehensive commentary and have shown that for the reconstruction of formulations of the lost primitive form (Ur-BAS), practically every basic form is a possibility, including the families and hyparchetypes reconstructed from the basic forms (Syr-BAS and Byz-BAS make up Ψ; this family together with Arm-BAS I makes up the hyparchetype Ω).[701]

In our analysis, we will concentrate on the part of the anaphora that is introduced with the *Sanctus* and follows after the opening dialogue and the so-called *Oratio ante Sanctus*. Here we will consider only the economy-of-salvation and christological pieces and not the words of institution and following anamnetic parts. Since this portion of text is attested

[700] The foundational study on the relationship of the Egyptian version of the *Anaphora of Basil* to the various Byzantine versions comes from Engberding 1931, LXXIII–LXXIX. In his investigation, Engberding 1931, XLLVII–XLLVIII, attempted to show that the Egyptian version "from the perspective of the general development . . . presents the older form" but must be scrutinized critically from case to case in relation to its age. Thus he regards the "head as a whole" (LXXXVIII) and thus the threefold repetition of the ἄξιον καὶ δίκαιον and the beginning of the main part Ὁ ὢν δέσποτα κύριε . . . as late and as a "product of Egyptian soil" (LXXVIII). The Bonner Catholic dissertation of A. Budde 2004, 135–97, contains, for the first time, a comparative edition of E-BAS. For the history of research, see now in detail Winkler 2005, 1–37 (pp. 9–21 on Engberding; 17–18 on the question of authorship; 136–275 the editions of Arm-BAS I and II); some observations can also be found in M. E. Johnson 1995, 271–75.

[701] Overviews of the state of the debate and a comparative overview of the versions can be found in A. Budde 2004, 9–29, and Winkler 2005, 21–37. For the debate over the "Egyptian character," compare also the opposing positions of T. E. Johnson 1995, 183–89, 193–95, and (critical of an Egyptian background) L. L. Mitchell 1976, 194–206. Messner 1991 and A. Budde 2001b; 2002 carry Engberding forward more strongly.

both in the Egyptian basic form and in the hyparchetype Ω reconstructed by Hieronymus Engberding (though in different lengths) and the double structure of anamnesis and epiclesis, as mentioned above, already goes back to Jewish prayers,[702] it certainly belongs to the oldest portions of this anaphora. Through observations made independently by Gabriele Winkler and Rowan Williams, however, it has become very clear that, in the fourth century, formulations of the symbols that were current at the time (and thus traces of the contemporary theological discussion) were incorporated into this old structure. But this very interaction between theological debate and liturgical daily life makes the *Anaphora of Basil* especially interesting for our contexts.

In its Greek text form, which is handed down from the medieval period and may not simply be identified with a late ancient *Urtext*, the relevant section from the so-called Egyptian recension of the *Anaphora of Basil* is as follows (= E-BAS Gk §§ 25–44 Budde; in distinction from the most recent critical edition of the various versions by Achim Budde, the abbreviations of the *nomina sacra* and other shortenings such as, for example, κ[αί], have always been unpacked and the text has been critically reviewed again):[703]

Ἅγιος, ἅγιος, ἅγιος· εἶ ἀληθῶς, κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν·
ὃς ἔπλασας ἡμᾶς,
καὶ ἐποίσας ἡμας
καὶ ἔθου ἡμᾶς 'ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ τῆς τρυφῆς' (Genesis 3.23).
παραβάντας δὲ τὴν ἐντολὴν σου διὰ τῆς ἀπάτης τοῦ ὄφεως
καὶ ἐκπεσόντας ἡμας ἐκ τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς,
καὶ ἐξορισθέντας ἐκ τοῦ παραδείσου τῆς τρυφῆς.
οὐκ ἀπέρριψας ἡμᾶς εἰς τέλος,
ἀλλὰ διὰ παντὸς ἐπεσκέψω ἡμᾶς διὰ τῶν ἁγίων σου προφητῶν.

καὶ 'ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων' (Hebrews 1.2)
ἐπέφανες ἡμῖν 'τοῖς ἐν σκότει καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου καθημένοις' (Luke 1.79),
διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς σου υἱοῦ, κυρίου δὲ καὶ θεοῦ καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ

[702] Giraudo 1981, 303–6; Gerhards 1983.

[703] Text according to Cod. Paris. Graec. 325 (saec. XIV), first edited by Renaudot 1847, 65–66 = Hänggi/Pahl 1998, nr. 471, pp. 348–51, partly supplemented by Engberding 1931, 10–17, and A. Budde 2004, (136–97) 140–52 (on the manuscript, cf. Brakman 1999 and A. Budde 2004, 60–61, 68–72). The central Sahidic fragment Ms. Lefort copt. s. n. from Leuven contains no parallels to the section cited below; for the significance of the edition, compare A. Budde 2004, 19–20; Dorresse/Lanne 1960, 14–33.

Χριστοῦ,
ὅς ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου
καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας [δεσποίνης ἡμῶν θεοτόκου καὶ ἀει]παρθένου[704] Μαρίας
(. . .)[705]
σαρκωθεὶς καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσας,

ὑπέδειξεν ἡμῖν ὁδοὺς σωτηρίας.
χαρισάμενος ἡμῖν τὴν ἄνωθεν ἀναγέννησιν ‘ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος’ (John 3.5)
καὶ ἐποίησεν ἡμᾶς ‘ἑαυτῷ λαὸν περιούσιον·’ (Titus 2.14).
ἡγίασεν ἡμᾶς τῷ πνεύματί σου τῷ ἁγίῳ.
ὅς ἠγάπησε ‘τοὺς ἰδίους τοὺς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ’ (τούτῳ)[706] (John 13.1)
‘ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν’ ‘ἀντίλυτρον’ (Titus 2.14 / 1 Timothy 2.6).
ἐν[707] ‘ᾧ κατειχόμεθα’ (Romans 7.6) πεπρασμένοι ὑπὸ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν,
καὶ κατελθὼν διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ εἰς τὸν ᾅδην (. . .),[708]
ἀνέστη ἐκ νεκρῶν τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ.
καὶ ἀνελθὼν εἰς οὐρανοὺς,
ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξίᾳ[709] σου τοῦ πατρός,
ὁρίσας ἡμέραν ἀνταποδόσεως,
καθ’ ἣν ἐπιφανεὶς[710] κρῖναι τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ
καὶ ἀποδοῦναι ‘ἑκάστῳ κατὰ τὴν πρᾶξιν αὐτοῦ’[711] (cf. Romans 2.6).[712]

Κατέλιπεν δὲ ἡμῖν τοῦτο τὸ μέγα τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον.
Μέλλων γὰρ παραδοῦναι ἑαυτὸν εἰς θάνατον, ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς.[713]

[704] The bracketed words are lacking in the non-Greek versions and are relegated to the apparatus in Engberding 1931.

[705] Ὁ λαός· ἀμήν (for the attestation, see A. Budde 2004, 142 s.v.).

[706] Lacking in the manuscripts (A. Budde 2004, apparatus *ad loc* [144]).

[707] Engberding 1931, 20, with various manuscripts: ὑφ’ ᾧ, in a New Testament manner, ἐν ᾧ.

[708] Ἀμήν, πιστεύομεν (for the attestation, see A. Budde 2004, 142 ad loc).

[709] Engberding 1931, 20, with various manuscripts: ἐκ δεξιῶν σου τοῦ πατρός.

[710] Engberding 1931, 20, with non-Greek manuscripts: ἐπιφανεῖ.

[711] Engberding 1931, 20, with non-Greek manuscripts and the biblical text: ἑκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ.

[712] Ὁ λαός λέγει· κατὰ τὸ ἔλεός σου κύριε καὶ μὴ κατὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν (for the attestation, A. Budde 2004, 150 *ad loc*).

[713] Translations from the German translation of A. Budde 2001a, 132–37: “Holy, holy, holy are you truly, Lord, our God, you who has formed us and made us and set us in the paradise of delight. But when we had transgressed your commandment through the deceitfulness of the serpent and had fallen out of eternal life and been excluded from the paradise of delight, you did not reject us once and for all but you constantly sought us out through

In comparison to the aforementioned texts from the apocryphal acts of apostles, the theological topoi from both circles of themes—"the human being before God" and "the salvific work of Christ" (Winkler; *Oratio Christologica*)—have been formulated in much greater detail and more generally in the anamnetic part of the so-called Egyptian recension of the *Anaphora of Basil*. Three sections can be distinguished in the portion of text cited here: lines 1–9 portray the economy of salvation after the *Sanctus*, while lines 10–31 contain the actual christological part, in which a part devoted to the redemption of human beings through baptism and atoning death can be further delineated (lines 18–23); this section connects the christological part to the general economy-of-salvation beginning. The quoted excerpt—which in the *Anaphora of Basil* follows, as a second main part, upon the well-known opening dialogue of the Eucharistic prayer Ὁ κύριος μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν . . . Ἄνω σχῶμεν τὰς καρδίας . . . and the *Pre-Sanctus* prayer Ὁ ὢν δέσποτα κύριε . . .[714]—proclaims the saving action of God in the confession of praise and is formulated as an address: "Our God who has formed us" (lines 1–2, ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν· ὃς ἔπλασας ἡμᾶς). This is characteristic of such anamnetic pieces.[715] The prayer is directed *to* the Father *through* the Son (cf. line 12); the Alexandrian theologian Origen briefly thematized and attempted to ground this prayer orientation in his aforementioned conversation with Bishop Heracleides and his colleagues in the middle of the third century.[716]

---

your holy prophets. And at the end of days until you appeared to us, we who sat in darkness and the shadow of death, through your only-begotten Son, our Lord and God and redeemer Jesus Christ, who from the Holy Spirit and from our Holy master, the God bearer and ever virgin Mary, became flesh and became human being, showed us the way of salvation by gracing us with the new birth from above from water and the Spirit and making us into a chosen people, he made us holy with his Holy Spirit. The one who loved his own in the world gave himself as a ransom to death, which ruled over us, in which we were held down, sold under sin. And having descended through the cross into the underworld he rose from the dead on the third day; and having ascended into heaven, he sat himself at the right of you, the Father, he determined a day of retribution on which he will appear in order to judge the world in righteousness and reward every one according to his deed. But he left us this great mystery of piety: for when he wanted to deliver himself to death for the life of the world" (a translation is also found in Messner 2001, 382–86; in the context of the great Catholic liturgy reform of the twentieth century, the inclusion of the Alexandrian recension of the *Anaphora of Basil* into the revised missal was considered: Gerhards 1992, 86–87, with documentation).

[714] Renaudot 1847, 63–64 = Hänggi/Pahl 1998, 348.

[715] Thus the definition in Messner 2001, 201.

[716] Origen, *Dialogus cum Heraclide* 4 (Scherer 1967, 62.24–25): Ἀεὶ προσφορὰ γίνεται Θεῷ παντοκράτορι διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὡς προσφόρου τῷ Πατρὶ τὴν θεότητα αὐτοῦ· μὴ δὶς ἀλλὰ θεῷ διὰ Θεοῦ προσφορὰ γινέσθω. For the interpretation,

The text section begins with the reinforcing repetition of the *Sanctus*, which is characteristic of this tradition: Ἅγιος, ἅγιος, ἅγιος· εἶ ἀληθῶς, κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν. In the other section quoted from the *Anaphora of Basil*, it is immediately conspicuous that it contains, on the one hand, a sort of “normal theology,” so to speak, which expresses the most important stations of the salvific work of Christ with the prevalent formulations that are also familiar from the so-called free *regula fidei* formulations and various firmly formulated private and synodal confessions of faith from the fourth century onward (e.g., line 17, σαρκωθεὶς καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσας), and yet, on the other hand, this vocabulary is also expanded through epithets (e.g., in the presumably late ancient[717] designation of the mother of God in v. 15, καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας δεσποίνης ἡμῶν θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας, which is only attested in the Greek version and is therefore presumably secondary). The close relation to the *regula fidei* formulations is already evident in the fact that the “history anamnesis of the resurrection and exaltation immediately passes over to the day of judgment after mentioning his sitting at the right hand of God”;[718] the prevailing theological debates are present through the doubled manner of the expression σαρκωθεὶς καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσας: it is meant to make clear that he not only assumed a body but fully became a human being. Since this double manner of expression is attested in many versions (e.g., in the Boharic version of E-BAS: ⲁϥϭⲓⲥⲁⲣⲝ ⲟⲩⲟϩ ⲁϥⲉⲣⲣⲱⲙⲓ),[719] it is worth asking how old this formulation could be. Gabriele Winkler is of the view that the formulation is “obviously inspired by the *Nicaeno-Constantinopolitanum*,” but one can also find it in authors as different as Eusebius of Caesarea, Athanasius of Alexandria, Gregory of Nyssa, Epiphanius of Salamis, and already in the confession of Eusebius as well as in the *Nicaenum*.[720] It thus belongs to a pre-Apolinarian consensus

---

compare also Vogel 1980, 402–3. There is an analogous formulation in the so-called *Traditio Apostolica* 4 (Schölgen/Geerlings 1991, 222.24–27 = Tidner 1963, 124.34–35) *gratias tibi referimus, Deus, per dilectum puerum tuum, Iesum Christum*. For this topic, compare also Capelle 1952.

717 For pre-Nicene attestations of the word θεοτόκος, compare PGL, s. v. (639).

718 Messner 2001, 202. Similarly Engberding 1931, LXXV. The Egyptian version is said to list “simply the soteriological main facts in a concise version . . . almost in the style of an apostolic κήρυγμα.”

719 Quoted from the synopsis in A. Budde 2004, 149; Winkler 2005, 607.

720 Winkler 2005, 645; for the *Nicaenum*, compare Athanasius, *De decretis Nicaenae synodi* 37.2 (Opitz 1935a, 36.38); but compare Eusebius, *De ecclesiastica theologia* II 4.2 (Klostermann/Hansen 1972, 102.32–33), and Eusebius’ confession in Athanasius, *De decretis Nicaenae synodi* 33.8 (Opitz 1935a, 30.7); Gregory of Nyssa, *Antirrheticus* (F. Müller 1958, 142.28; 143.10), and Epiphanius, *Panarion seu adversus Lxxx haereses* 75.1.3, as well as the *Nicaenum* in the confession of the synod of Diocaesarea 72.12.3

of the formation of the confession and may even have found entrance into the Eucharistic prayer as such. Actually, nothing would speak against still assigning it, with Engberding, to the original form of the anaphora (Ur-BAS), but the absence of the double formula σαρκωθεὶς καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσας in the common hyparchetype of the Armenian and Byzantine versions (Ω from Arm-BAS and Ψ) and in individual oriental versions evokes suspicion, as Winkler rightly observes. Thus it may be possible to reconstruct an older early form without this doubling and with only a simple incarnation statement that was quickly enriched from the confessional material and yet continued to survive in its simple version.[721] Another indication to the latest contexts of the anaphora is the mention of the descent into Hades (line 25, καὶ κατελθὼν διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ εἰς τὸν ᾅδην), which was first taken up in the so-called fourth Sirmian formula from 359 CE (= BSGR, § 163, p. 204) and comes from Syriac sources such as the aforementioned *Acts of Thomas*.[722] Likewise, the specific formulation of a resurrection *from the dead* on the third day (line 26, ἀνέστη ἐκ νεκρῶν τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ), which is attested for the first time in the so-called fourth formula of the Dedication Council of Antioch; the formula of a delegation of bishops (BSGR § 156, p. 187 = Athanasius, *De synodis* 25.3 [Opitz 1935a, 251.7–8]); and the mention of the throne in heaven at the right hand of God[723] as well as the judgment according to works (line 31, καὶ ἀποδοῦναι ‘ἑκάστῳ κατὰ τὴν πρᾶξιν αὐτοῦ’) from the fourth formula of Antioch (BSGR § 156, p. 187 = Athanasius, *De synodis* 25.3 [Opitz 1935a, 251.9–10]) betray the fact that passages from the latest confessions of the respective confessional situations of the imperial church have been incorporated here into the liturgical texts. Such connections to the current confession were clearly intensified in the later versions, especially in the first Armenian (Arm-BAS I) and the family formed from the Syrian and the Byzantine Greek versions (Ψ). Equally “dogmatically filled” and related to current controversies of the fourth century is the prayer that

(Holl/Dummer 1985, 222.30; 266.27). A great number of comparable formulations were not documented here—only the ones that were exactly identical linguistically. But compare the *Tomus ad Antiochenos* (PG 26: 805.9–10: φρονεῖν περὶ τῆς σαρκώσεως καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσεως τοῦ λόγου).

[721] Engberding 1931, 18; Winkler 2005, 665–76. (Winkler is certain on the basis of the stemmatic findings. Admittedly a circle arises in her argumentation insofar as she can show that an exact translation of the double formula in the Armenian and Syriac presuppose neologisms of the fifth century [p. 667]. So it would naturally also be possible that we have traces of abbreviating translations before us and the double formula was, in fact, original.)

[722] Attestations in Winkler 2005, 679–86.

[723] Markschies 1993 (= 2000e).

follows the dialogue *sursum corda* and precedes the *Sanctus* (*Pre-Sanctus* prayer). Here, God is addressed as "the truly Existing One" (. . . δοξάζειν τὸν μόνον ὄντως ὄντα θεόν . . .), predicated as "without beginning, invisible, incomprehensible, unlimited, and unchangeable"; thus it is formulated with a clearly anti-Arian and anti-Eunomian barb, as Rowan Williams was able to show, and follows a "pattern of confessional language in the Antiochene world."[724] Gabriele Winkler has now pointed to this passage's allusions to the angelic liturgies in Jewish mysticism of late antiquity and drawn upon texts from the Enoch tradition and the Hekhalot literature for comparison.[725]

Thus the section of the anaphora quoted above as an example in no way stands at a certain distance—as one could think at first—to the controversies of the time; rather, salvation history is made present in the anamnesis and applied to the present community by means of quasi-up-to-date formulations from the Antiochene confessional tradition of the imperial church. The synodal confession of the theologians is invoked in the worship service before the whole community, and at the same time, the common salvation history is made the history of precisely this community: "But when *we* had transgressed your command through the deception of the serpent . . . you did not reject *us* definitively" (lines 5–8, Παραβάντας δὲ τὴν ἐντολήν σου διὰ τῆς ἀπάτης τοῦ ὄφεως . . . οὐκ ἀπέρριψας *ἡμᾶς* εἰς τέλος). Alongside the sacramental realization, there is also thankful praise: above all, the biblical citations of the Eucharistic prayer point to Old Testament traditions of thanksgiving for God's benevolent deeds toward the individual who prays or toward the people of Israel (cf., for example, line 8, οὐκ ἀπέρριψας ἡμᾶς εἰς τέλος, with Theodotion Daniel 3.34, . . . μὴ δὴ παραδῷς ἡμᾶς εἰς τέλος).[726] The so-called Egyptian recension of the *Anaphora of Basil* is once again strongly grounded biblically, formulated with proper quotations or at least with a biblical vocabulary. Thus the language of "the paradise of delight" (lines 4 and 7, . . . τοῦ παραδείσου τῆς τρυφῆς) is found in the corresponding biblical account as well (Genesis 3.23-24; cf. Ezekiel 31.9), and similar documentation is also possible for many formulations in the following

[724] . . . ἄναρχε ἀόρατε ἀκατάληπτε ἀπερίγραπτε ἀναλοίωτε . . . for the text, compare section 2.3.5.3 with n. 703; for the interpretation, see R. Williams 2004, 40–44 (quotation from p. 41).

[725] Winkler 2005, 385–401.

[726] Giraudo 1981, 122–25 (analysis of Daniel 3.24–45), or 305 (*Anaphora of Basil*). Gerhards 1992, 80–81 (literature) provides orientation concerning the critical debate that followed Giraudo's thesis that elements of the Old Testament toda (i.e., the confession of the prayer of sacrifice) are present in the Eucharistic prayer. Gerhards 1992 refers to Gese 1977, 107–27 (1981, 117–40).

lines, so that here one can also speak again of a quotation cluster and yet one that first obtains its theological location through what is taken over from the contemporary confessions.

2.3.5.4 The *Barcelona Anaphora*

A clustering of biblical quotations and formulations of the *regula fidei* tradition is characteristic of many liturgical texts, even if they do not take over direct formulations of synodal confessions in the manner in which the *Anaphora of Basil* does. In the so-called *Barcelona Anaphora*—which we previously introduced at length in its tradition context—the characteristic theological themes also appear, admittedly in clearly abbreviated form and without direct contextualization in a contemporary debate. The liturgical text contained in the papyrus book of Barcelona or Montserrat also contains again the well-known three parts: The first (*pre-Sanctus*) part, which ends with the *Sanctus* (line 20/21, ἅγιος, ἅγιος, ἅγιος κύριος σαβαωθ· πλήρης {σου} ὁ οὐρανὸς <καὶ ἡ γῆ> τῆς δόξης σου.), contains the themes of creation and redemption, followed by an "angel liturgy."[727] This is followed by a second christological part, configured as a relative clause, which develops from the *Sanctus* (line 21/22, . . . ἐν ᾗ ἐδόξασας ἡμᾶς διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦ<ς> σου . . .). A subsequent offering statement (page 2, line 1/2, δι' οὗ προσφέρομεν κτίσματά σου ταῦτα, ἄρτον τε καὶ ποτήριον) leads to a third part of the Eucharistic prayer, which contains the epiclesis (in the form of a developed Spirit epiclesis); for this part, we possess a Coptic parallel piece that was already published in 1940.[728] In our interpretation, however, we will concentrate on only the first, anamnetic main part (lines 7–25), which is quoted here according to the edition of the papyrus of Roca-Puig:[729]

[727] Thus the division of Roca-Puig 1983, 8–9. The text is dealt with in more detail in Messner 1991, 128–29, as well.

[728] Compare Janeras 1984. The Greek text of the *Barcelona Anaphora* is represented apparently by yet a second witness—namely, Papyrus Vindob. G. 41043 verso, last edited in Hammerstaedt 1999, 156–60 (nr. 13) and dated to the sixth century. Here lines 1–7 of the Vienna Papyrus largely parallel lines 21–30 of the *Barcelona Anaphora*, which is, however, partially formulated in greater detail (deviations in Hammerstaedt 1999, 159–60).

[729] Roca-Puig 1999, 12–14. Text-critical observations are not of interest in our context. Mention may be made only of the fact that in line 17, the codex presents μυριάδων, for which reason earlier the editor read analogously ᾧ παριστᾶσιν χίλιαι χιλιάδες καὶ μύριαι μυριάδες ἀγγέλων, ἀρχαγγέλων, θρόνων . . . ; in line 19, the codex has ὑμῖν, but the editor has provided ἡμῖν in all publications.

Εἷς θεός Ἰησοῦς ὁ κύριος
Εὐχαριστία περὶ ἄρτου καὶ ποτηρίου
Ἄνω τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν. Ἔχομεν πρὸς
κύριον. Ἔτι εὐχαριστήσομεν. Ἄξιον καὶ δικαι–
ον· Ἄξιόν ἐστιν καὶ δίκαιον σὲ αἰνεῖν, σὲ
εὐλογεῖν, σὲ ὑμνεῖν, σοὶ εὐχαριστεῖν, δέσποτα
θεὲ παντοκράτορ, <πατὴρ> τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ ποι–
ήσας τὰ πάντα, οὐ ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος εἰς τὸ εἶναι,
τὰ πάντα, οὐρανοὺς γὴν θάλασσαν καὶ πάντα τὰ
ἐν αὐτοῖς, διὰ τοῦ ἠγαπημένου σου παιδὸς Ἰ(ησο)ῦ Χρ(ιστο)ῦ
τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, δι’ οὗ ἐκάλησεν ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ σκότο<υ>ς
εἰς φῶς, ἀπὸ ἀγνωσίας εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν δόξης ὀνο–
ματος αὐτοῦ, ἀπὸ φθορᾶς θανάτου εἰς ἀφθαρ–
σίαν, εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον· ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ ἅρμα–
τος χερουβιν καὶ σεραφιν ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ
ᾧ παριστᾶσιν χίλιαι χιλιάδων καὶ μύριαι
μυριάδων ἀγγέλων, ἀρχαγγέλων, θρόνων
καὶ κυριοτήτων, ὑμνούντων καί δοξολογούν–
των· μεθ’ ὧν καὶ ὑμεῖς ὑμνοῦντες λέγοντες·
ἅγιος, ἅγιος, ἅγιος κύριος σαβαωθ· πλήρης {σου}
ὁ οὐρανὸς <και ἡ γῆ> τῆς δόξης σου· ἐν ᾗ ἐδόξασας ἡμᾶς δι–
ὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦ<ς> σου καὶ πρωτοτόκου πάσης κτί–
σεως, Ἰ(ησο)ῦ Χρ(ιστο)ῦ τοῦ Κ(υρίο)υ ἡμῶν· ὁ καθήμενος ἐν
δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης σου ἐν τοῖς οὐρανι–
οις· ὅς ἔρχεται κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς·

δι’ οὗ προσφέρομεν κτίσματά σου ταῦτα, ἄρ–
τον τε καὶ ποτήριον· αἰτούμεθα καὶ παρακαλοῦ–
μέν σε ὅπως καταπέμψῃς ἐπ’ αὐτὰ τὸ ἅγιον
καὶ παράκλητόν σου πνεῦμα ἐκ τῶν
οὐρανῶν, <τοῦ ἁγιάσαι> αὐτὰ καὶ ποιῆσαι
τὸ<ν> μὲν ἄρτον σῶμα Χριστοῦ, τὸ δὲ ποτήριον αἷμα Χριστοῦ,
τῆς καινῆς διαθῆκης· . . .

Like the so-called Egyptian recension of the *Anaphora of Basil*, the *Barcelona Anaphora* contains the two thematic circles of “the human being before God” and “the salvific work of Christ,” albeit compressed into a few formulas. The integration of the community into salvation history stands out as comparably meager: δι’ οὗ ἐκάλησεν ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ σκότο<υ>ς εἰς φῶς (lines 11–12)—just as God created light in the darkness at the beginning and called the whole world into light from the darkness, so he called the community from darkness into light. Also in the *Barcelona Anaphora*, the strong biblical references in the formulations are again conspicuous: Christ is referred to as παῖς (line 10), and there is thereby an allusion not only to the Christian interpretation of the servant of God songs in Isaiah but perhaps also to an ancient παῖς-θεοῦ Christology,[730] which is also found in the prayers that the *Didache* brings into connection with the Eucharist[731] and in the Latin version of the so-called *Traditio Apostolica*. The formulation ἐπὶ ἅρματος χερουβιν is taken from the book of Chronicles (1 Chronicles 28.18), not from the relevant prophetic vision accounts (Isaiah 6.1–3; Daniel 7.10). The formulation ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ is found only in the Theodotion version of the book of Daniel (Theodotion Daniel 7.10), not in the Septuagint version.[732] Entirely analogous language is found already in *1 Clement*: λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή· μύριαι μυριάδες παρειστήκεισαν αὐτῷ καὶ χίλιαι χιλιάδες ἐλειτούργουν αὐτῷ (34.6; cf. [Theodotion] Daniel 7.10). The notion of the glory of the Father that is given to believers through the Son comes from the Gospel of John (line 21: cf. John 17.22); the designation μονογενής (line 22) also calls to mind this very Gospel (John 1.14, 18; 3.16, 18). The expression πρωτοτόκου πάσης κτίσεως (line 22) is a quotation from Colossians 1.15; the sitting at the right hand of the μεγαλωσύνη of the Father goes back to Psalm 109/110.1. As this concise commentary is already able to show, the *Barcelona Anaphora* can likewise be designated as a cluster of biblical passages and formulations of the *regula fidei* tradition. Here, the in-depth portrayal of the divine throne in the introduction of the *Sanctus* (lines 14–19) is especially conspicuous: ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ ἅρματος Χερουβιν καὶ Σεραφιν ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ, ᾧ παριστᾶσιν χίλιαι χιλιάδων καὶ μύριαι μυριάδων ἀγγέλων, ἀρχαγγέλων, θρόνων καὶ κυριοτήτων, ὑμνούντων καὶ δοξολογούντων. Here too a line of tradition is visible that leads from the Enoch literature via the Sabbath hymns from Qumran quoted at the outset down to the texts of late ancient Jewish mysticism and makes clear that the Christian worship service, like the Jewish service, was conceptualized and celebrated in the face of the liturgy of the angels.[733]

[730] Roca-Puig 1972; 1979, 10–11.

[731] *Didache* 9.2, Εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, πάτερ ἡμῶν, ὑπὲρ τῆς ἁγίας ἀμπέλου Δαυὶδ, τοῦ παιδός σου, ἧς ἐγνώρισας ἡμῖν διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου (cup prayer); 9.3, Εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, πάτερ ἡμῶν, ὑπὲρ ζωῆς καὶ γνώσεως, ἧς ἐγνώρισας ἡμῖν διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου (bread prayer); and 10.1, Εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, πάτερ ἅγιε, ὑπὲρ . . . καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς γνώσεως καὶ πίστεως καὶ ἀθανασίας, ἧς ἐγνώρισας ἡμῖν διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου (prayer of thanksgiving after meal); compare section 2.3.4.1 with n. 567 as well as Vööbus 1968, 163, and now summarizing Niederwimmer 1989, 182–85.

[732] Roca-Puig 1983, 10–11.

[733] Janeras 1984, 16–20; Winkler 2005, 376–79.

Our survey of key anamnetic passages of Eucharistic prayers from Christian antiquity has shown, above all for the *Didache*, the apocryphal acts of apostles, and the Egyptian *Anaphora of Basil*, that what is present here is by no means, as one could initially think, a sort of unspecific "normal theology" with a strong connection to central biblical passages and formulations. Rather, theological insights and concepts that are very clearly contingent in context and time were compressed into texts that were brought to hearing in a highly memorable way in every worship service for the restricted public of the community and were emphatically emphasized through signs such as gestures. Even stronger than in the *regula fidei* formulations, in the anaphora, the past history of creation and redemption was related in a specific theological contextualization to the believing individual and the whole community; the texts incorporated the whole community into this salvation event. Even if the Eucharistic prayers of Christian antiquity represented a unity and the detachment of a single part (as, for example, the anamnetic passages) hinders one from being able to thematize adequately the function of these texts for the worship service and the sacrament as a whole, it has nevertheless become clear that such pieces of the worship service, which still oscillate between relative freedom and fixed norming, point to an essential institutional context of "theology" in antiquity that is often overlooked, especially in Protestant research.

2.4 Concluding Reflections: Early Christian "Theology" in Its Institutional Contexts

As we have seen paradigmatically in relation to three institutions, Christian "theology" in the imperial period consisted not only in the explicit, scholarly *philosophia Christiana* of free teachers such as Justin and institutionalized schools such as the private university of Origen in Caesarea or the traditional apocalyptic that stood behind the "Montanist oracles" but also in the deeply thought-out "implicit theology" of the liturgy, especially of the Eucharistic worship service. The vast majority of Christians were probably familiar with this last form of "theology," whereas we should not have overly large illusions about the extent to which the other forms were disseminated. Thus, in the second and third centuries, Christian "theology"—viewed in the first instance from a purely institutional perspective—appears in a quite plural form, in very different linguistic and educational levels, and recognizably addresses very different problems as well. As we saw in the first chapter devoted to terminology, it is not at all designated with one and the same term θεολογία either. Thus the question of its thematic unity arises. In the following chapter, we will investigate this question, once again paradigmatically with reference to the different ways of dealing with an authoritative "theological" norm—namely, the respective 'canons' of biblical scriptures. In our analysis of the three different institutional contexts in this chapter, it has indeed already become clear how deeply the respective institutional frameworks stamp the explicit or implicit "theology" of a group. Like Maximus of Tyre, *Justin* orients himself in his topics toward the preferences of a religiously interested public in the capital. From his private university, Origen develops an educational canon of his own that both presupposes and seeks to surpass the contemporary pagan one. And at the Phrygian country estates in the middle of Asia Minor, the "new prophecy" is oriented toward the form of biblical prophetic sayings in its ecstatic prophecy and in doing so calls to mind the oracle prophecy of pagan provenance at the same time. Even if winning the greatest possible population strata—thus missionary activity—is not recognizably part of the agenda of the persons and groups named in our examples, these very different forms of religious reflection must nevertheless have spoken to very different circles. Even if only small groups were presumably won in each case—the more or less sizable crowd of those who listened to the lectures of Justin, the naturally limited number of students at the private university of Origen, the fellowship of those who no longer visited an Apollo oracle but listened instead to Montanus and his prophetesses, and finally the community of those who heard a Eucharistic prayer in a worship service—it is nevertheless surprising how different the people addressed in the diverse institutional contexts were in terms of educational level, geographical background, and religious socialization. But the institutions that we have investigated could only be the social basis for the spread of an ensemble of new ideas because they were so strongly adapted to certain population groups of a massive empire and their special needs.

For the development of its theological reflection on its own religion, ancient Christianity made use of almost all the possible educational institutions and—as the "new prophecy" shows—to some extent certain religious institutions as well. But it used, copied, and transformed these institutions in very different ways: It did not—leaving aside exceptions for the moment (section 2.1.1.2)—decidedly change the pagan-religious character of the elementary education and Christianize the educational contents but rather integrated the elementary education as a presupposition for a certain form of "theology" in a Christian educational program. By being active as elementary teachers as a matter of course, Christians still created the personal presuppositions for the existence of a sufficient number of educated Christians who could reflect on their religion at the level of contemporary standards and for the development of a doctrine on God that was scholarly according to ancient standards. The emergence of a Christian educational canon (section 2.1.2.2), in turn, formed the ideational presupposition for the emergence of the institution of a private Christian university in the third century and for the Christianization of the higher educational institutions in the following centuries. At the same time, however, the formation of such a Christian educational canon was also an important element in the formation of an explicit "theology" that oriented itself toward the standard of contemporary scholarly philosophy. The interaction with religious institutions, such as oracle prophecy in Asia Minor and the pagan sacrificial cult, is more difficult to describe. Here an explicit and very radical rejection of form and content by Christians is combined with the resolute development of substitutes from their own tradition, which regardless of all the discontinuities with the pagan competition sometimes look confusingly similar. Naturally, there is no dead animal lying on the table when the bishop of Carthage speaks of the "true and complete sacrifice." Naturally, the prophetic sayings of the "new prophecy" are not formulated by priestesses in a state of ecstasy and passed on by oracle priests in hexameter to those waiting. But a minimum level of analogy is necessary for successful religious competition. The situation is entirely similar with the new specification of the terms θεολόγος and θεολογία from the late third century on within the framework of Christian "theologies" (see section 1.1.1).

The institutionalization of explicit and implicit "theology" that has been paradigmatically described in the second chapter of this book altered the face of the new religion. On the one hand, it further inculturated an originally intra-Jewish movement that came from the context of a remote Roman province in the context of a globalized civilization and religion. One sees this especially clearly when the North African bishop Cyprian, like the pagan environment, places the true and complete sacrifice (*sacrificium verum et plenum*) of the priest (*sacerdos*) at the center of the cult (section 2.3.4.3). On the other hand, it developed characteristic differences in relation to all other religions: in spite of the partly high social and educational level of the adherents of the cult of Mithras in antiquity, one simply cannot conceive of a private university of Mithras adherents. In this way, the genuine connection of Christianity with Judaism simultaneously becomes clear once again, a connection that was very decidedly interrupted at so many other points—for it is well known that Hellenistic Judaism preceded Christianity along the path of the inculturation of their own religion in the educational system of antiquity and the concomitant formation of a "theology" that was oriented to contemporary scholarly standards. It was not completely by chance that this happened in Alexandria, thus in a metropolis that was likewise of great significance for analogous processes in Christianity.

In the framework of our reflections on the term "institution," we said that the establishment of a new idea is bound up with an institutionalization dynamic. The surprising diversity of the institutions concerned in some way with explicit or implicit theology that we observed—that is, the surprising variety of social arrangements in ancient Christianity "that effectively suggest and bring into force stability and duration inwardly and outwardly"—is a sign of the enormous dynamic with which the young religion developed. With reference to the example of the liturgy, one can see that not only do institutions always express the foundations of their order symbolically as well, but an institutionalization dynamic is also always bound up with a ritual dynamic, an adaption to the relevant circumstances of an environment that is stamped in a respectively specific manner.

3

Institution and Norm

In the first part of our investigation, we have seen with reference to three examples that ancient Christianity developed very different forms of implicit and explicit theology within diverse institutional frameworks and the process by which it did so (sections 2.1–2.3). At this point, it would now be possible to expand our paradigmatic approach, to continue with a comprehensive history of ancient Christian theology in the form of a classic history of ideas or intellectual history, and to show in this way how in diverse institutional contexts a theology was developed that was also quite varied in terms of content. With reference to a multitude of "theologoumena," one could then show the extent to which the differentness of these "theolog*ies*" was at least also dependent on their different institutional frameworks and wherein their unity nevertheless resided. In the framework of this investigation, this examination will, of course, again take place only paradigmatically, and an element of ancient Christian theologies will be taken into consideration that is especially easy to compare in various forms of "theology"—namely, the respective *norming processes* in the systems.

A certain tradition in the writing of the history of theology has above all considered three such processes under this key phrase and designated its conclusion with the not very successful term "early Catholic norms."[1] This highly problematic key phrase is commonly used to designate the fixing of the biblical canon, the development of firm norms for theology and confession, and the development of an ecclesiastical ordering structure and community offices. However, in our introductory reflections on the concept of "institution" (section 1.2.2), we already saw that such a process of the formation and refinement of norms directly belongs to an institutionalization process and, for this reason, if for no other, cannot be a

[1] The following small selection of possible titles should merely show how widespread this concept is, which, to my knowledge, goes back to Adolf von Harnack (Harnack 1990a [1909], 353–425, esp. 353–54) and has shaped the textbooks since then: Müller/Campenhausen 1941, 209–19; Loofs 1967 [1906], 129–36; Andresen/Ritter 1993, 26–27; Beyschlag 1988, 149–52. By contrast, Altendorf 1969, 65, speaks of a misleading abstraction. The presupposed model of a "crisis of Early Catholicism" that is intercepted and ended through these norm-settings is concisely discussed and criticized in Markschies 1998b, 353–55, and in greater detail in section 4.1 below.

sign of a special "early Catholic" period of the new religion of Christianity that led away from the "evangelical" beginnings. We saw further that in the framework of that process of institutionalization and stabilization of the group consciousness, a new idea that was originally weakly argued is, so to speak, naturally grasped with increasing precision and broken down into concrete norms and in this respect brought into a system and thus also dogmatized to a certain extent.

Therefore, in the third main part of our investigation, we will deal at greater length with the connection between institution and norm and between institutionalization and norm-setting and especially ask whether norms and norming processes in different institutional contexts of Christian theology differ from one another. For this purpose, we will simply choose a characteristic example and deal exclusively here with the canon of biblical scriptures—that is, with the scope and function of the authoritative textual basis of Christian theology (section 3.1). A detailed treatment of additional norms—for example, confession, rule of faith, and the developing ecclesiastical ordering structures—would have burst the framework of prolegomena into a history of early Christian theology. The fact that the following sections are largely focused on the *New Testament part* of the biblical scriptures is also due to this concern to limit the scope.

3.1 The New Testament Canon and the Christian Institutions

If one wishes to consider the 'canon of biblical scriptures' and its normative function in diverse institutional contexts of ancient Christianity, it is advisable to first give an account of which concept of 'canon' one wishes to base one's investigation on. This is especially the case because the idea and terminology of a κανών of divinely inspired books was first developed and stabilized in the fourth century. In the following presentation, a strict distinction will be made between the late ancient concept of a κανών of divinely inspired books and the notion of a 'canon' of normative Holy Scriptures that was already prevalent among Christians in the imperial period. I will always speak of 'canon' with single quotation marks when the word κανών is *not* used for the subject matter and is drawn upon as a modern interpretative instrument (and, by contrast, I will usually forgo quotation marks for the terms 'canonical' and 'canonization'). "Canonization" will then be understood very generally as *the action of making texts binding for a group by a certain elite*.[2] Such an action intends that nobody can explicitly

[2] This definition implies that the making binding of both religious and profane texts can be summarized under the same term 'canonization'; compare on this topic also Heckel 1999, 2–5.

dispute the fundamental character of these texts without placing themselves outside this group and their group consensus. 'Canon' designates the outcome of this process, more precisely a selection of texts, guided by specific criteria and usually determined exactly, that are made binding over time in the process of their canonization and that from now on permanently require interpretation with a view to their fundamental character. It is only in connection with an interpretation of the canonized text that canonization excludes the "misuse of the symbol as a risk."[3] As a general rule, canonized texts can be fundamental only for certain spheres of life; if, however, religious texts are canonized, then they are usually binding for the whole of life. The degree of authority claimed by the canon and the severity with which the disputation of the canonical authority is sanctioned is again dependent on the specific degree of fundamentality that is intended in a canonization. Since the norms and values of a group are represented in it, a canon has an orienting and representing function and is the most concise form in which a longer debate about the basic values in a society or a certain social group can be mediated. To this extent, it also has an unburdening function.[4] In such an understanding of canon, it immediately becomes clear that every canonization stands in close connection with enduring social arrangements—that is, with *institutions*—within which and through which the texts are made binding and the contesting of their authority is sanctioned.

In view of the theological explosiveness and present-day relevance of the topic, we begin our reflections on the *action of making biblical texts binding within early Christianity by a certain elite* with some introductory observations on the state of scholarship.

3.1.1 Some Introductory Observations on the Current State of Scholarship on the History of the Canon

To write about the emergence of a normative collection of Holy Scriptures is not so easy, both for the person who knows him- or herself to be obligated to these texts in his or her life and thinking and for the person who confronts its claim to religious or theological authority with skepticism or without understanding. This situation has increasingly intensified in the last centuries because the meaning and function of a binding collection of authoritative texts has become questionable even within Christian theology

[3] Luhmann 1982, 81.

[4] Those familiar with the extensive flood of literature on the topic will recognize the contributions from the discussion of the past years that are presupposed here: I name only Assmann 1997, 93–97, 174–76; Colpe 1987; Halbertal 1997, 1–10; B. Lang 1993; Stroumsa 1994; Zevit 1998.

itself: thus it has been said, for example, that there is a "crisis of canon and Scripture principle in the Protestant theology of the modern period."[5] In addition, as a sober observer of the current situation of scholarship, one increasingly receives the impression that an important material problem in the so-called history writing of the canon has emerged in the meantime—one can visualize this problematic situation especially well if one concentrates on the investigation of the canonization of the New Testament.

One receives the impression that since the two volumes, reaching 968 and 1022 pages, of the *Geschichte des Neutestamentliche Kanons* (History of the New Testament Canon) that Theodor Zahn compiled more than one hundred years ago and had not even brought to completion,[6] it is extraordinarily difficult to enrich the discussion with a greater number of unconsidered connections or overlooked lines of questioning. The discovery of the Gnostic library of Nag Hammadi more than fifty years ago and the increased attention to regional differences in early Christianity in the wake of the works of Walter Bauer has certainly modified the picture from the turn of the century at important points, but the framework of the debate is still very clearly marked out by the controversies of that time: one searches for the first attestation, from a chronological perspective, of the four-gospel 'canon,' carefully compiles witnesses to the use of certain New Testament books such as Revelation and Hebrews, and analyses the fourth-century documents from bishops and synods. This also applies to the most recent presentations on the topic. From the great abundance of relevant literature I mention here only Lee M. McDonald's book *The Formation of the Christian Biblical Canon*,[7] whose author is credited with profound erudition and learning by Helmut Koester in the book's preface,[8]

[5] Here reference may be made to the careful presentation of this event in the various articles in Reventlow/Sparn/Woodbridge 1988. Admittedly, Strathmann 1941 (= Käsemann 1970b, 41–61) already diagnosed a "crisis of the canon in the church." For Semler, compare also Hornig 1996; for the history of research, see now Markschies 2005a, and for the current discussion, Gamble 2002 and Greschat 2006.

[6] Zahn 1888; 1889; 1975. Another planned volume on the development of the canon from Origen to the definitive closing of the canon in the fourth century (Zahn, *Geschichte des Neutestamentliche Kanons* I/1 III) never appeared; Zahn supplemented the fragmentary opus magnum with a ninety-two page sketch of the history of the New Testament canon (Zahn 1985), which largely corresponds with his article on the canon of the New Testament in the *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche* (Zahn 1901a). In Zahn 1904, the development after the middle of the third century is at least treated in the form of a sketch.

[7] McDonald 1995. The critical assessment of the history of research presented here was also already formulated by Ernst Dassmann 1988b, 279. It can be said "that at the beginning of the twentieth century all the historical source material was carefully worked through and grasped." On the methodology of the history writing of the canon, see also Heckel 1999, 5–12.

[8] McDonald 1995, XIII.

and Bruce M. Metzger's 1987 monograph *The Canon of the New Testament: Its Origin, Development and Significance*.

While Zahn's comprehensive and fragmentary presentation, which unfortunately still lacks a detailed index, already received much criticism immediately following its publication,[9] it nevertheless remains unsurpassed up to now in its compilation of the relevant source material. Its erudition continues to command the highest respect from subsequent scholars, even those who cannot make Zahn's view their own.[10] For this reason, the observer who endeavors to be unbiased, which is scarcely possible in the case of this controversial topic, is often drawn to a mildly resigned judgment concerning the current situation, which can be expressed in the words of Ecclesiastes 1.9: οὐκ ἔστιν πᾶν πρόσφατον ὑπὸ τὸν ἥλιον. But can a history of the New Testament 'canon' actually still be set forth only as a more or less original perspective on the material that has been long known? The following reflections do not intend to provide a comprehensive excursus on this topic,[11] however, but rather a chapter in the framework of a monograph on the institutional context of Christian theology in the imperial period with the precise goal of analyzing the connection between norm and institution in relation to the example of the meaning of the 'canon' of Holy Scriptures for various institutions of Christian "theology."

3.1.2 Two Basic Problems in the Writing of the History of the Canon

Two simple preliminary questions obtain an absolutely central significance in every attempt to present the emergence of a 'canon' of the Christian Bible. One must first clarify what is actually being referenced when one speaks of

[9] B. M. Metzger 1987, 24 with n. 5, and now Swarat 1991, 253–352. Sharp critique was exercised already and above all by Harnack (first, Harnack 1889, passim). However, already in 1897, Harnack spoke of "the most learned work that has been written in our century in relation to the earliest Christian literature" (Harnack 1958b, VII). Later, at the celebration of his sixtieth birthday on May 18, 1911, Harnack said before his seminar, when he held a church history seminar for the first time (in Leipzig), that "the only one who really worked in a scholarly manner was . . . Theodor Zahn"; in this listing Lipsius, Volkmann, and Hilgenfeld are explicitly placed on the side of scholars who do not really work in a scholarly manner (Anonymous 1911, 8).

[10] The following references represent only a selection: J. Leipoldt 1907, 4 ("All these works of Zahn are characterized by astonishing learning and unify the material with a completeness that can scarcely be surpassed"); Schneemelcher 1993, 23; B. M. Metzger 1987, 23 ("Still an indispensable mine of information"); Dassmann 1988b, 279–80.

[11] Lietzmann 1907, 2–3 (= 1958, 17): "The task is very difficult; for the history of the canon, although this is generally unclear to non-specialists, belongs to the most complicated parts of church history scholarship." Excellent survey articles and presentations have been published precisely in recent years, which can only be referenced in summary fashion here: Le Boulluec 2004; Norelli 1997; Söding 2003; Schröter 2005 (= 2013, 249–71).

a 'canon' of the New Testament. Does one concentrate only on the Greek word κανών and its application to a collection of normative biblical scriptures? Since this terminological formulation first arose in the fourth century (section 3.1.2.1), one must also specify more precisely the criteria of canonicity with which one actually intends to ascertain the canonization of biblical texts before the fourth century, if the word κανών cannot represent the decisive criterion (section 3.1.2.2). In this way, the institutional contexts of the canonization of the biblical texts also become evident immediately.

3.1.2.1 The Greek Word κανών in Its Application to Biblical Writings

If one wanted to start only from the Greek word κανών itself, it is well known that a very easy answer could be given to the question of the canonization of the New Testament. This event would have to be dated very late: the word κανών "in its regular and technical application to the Bible of both Testaments . . . first crops up around the middle of the fourth century";[12] more precisely, it first appears with Athanasius of Alexandria about 350/351 CE. The bishop quotes from a book belonging to the so-called Apostolic Fathers, the *Shepherd of Hermas*, but adds the qualification that this book does not belong to the canon, in Greek: μὴ ὂν ἐκ τοῦ κανόνος.[13] The institutional context of this witness and the implicit conception of a normative scope of biblical texts is the imperial church office of bishop, whose original tasks included the drawing of boundaries between heretical and orthodox teaching. Since the bishop wishes to show the legitimacy of the disputed resolutions of a synod (namely, the council of Nicaea), he must make recourse to what is not disputed and also mark what is disputed as such.

The synodal canon of a (particular) synod in Phrygian Laodicea is usually placed alongside this first witness. This synod is admittedly difficult to date. The usual dating of 360[14] simplifies the actual findings:

[12] Zahn 1985, 1; compare also Meyer/Oepke 1938, 989–99; Ohme 1998, 2–3, 402–6; Schneemelcher 1993, 25–26.

[13] Athanasius, *De decretis Nicaenae synodi* 18.3 (Opitz 1935a, 15.20); according to PGL, s. v. (701), and elsewhere, one could still discuss an example in the church history of Eusebius: according to it, in his commentary on Matthew Origen, attests τὸν ἐκκλησιαστικὸν φυλάττων κανόνα, μόνα τέσσαρα εἰδέναι εὐαγγέλια (Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* VI 25.3 [Schwartz 1999, II/2: 576.4–5]). This writing admittedly appeared at least twenty-five years before Athanasius' *De Decretis Nicaenae Synodi*, but here the word κανών probably still has the traditional meaning "rule" of the church and not "canon of the Bible" (cf., for example, also B. M. Metzger 1987, 292, and n. 28 below).

[14] B. M. Metzger 1987, 292, dates it exactly to 363; according to Nardi 1983, a somewhat earlier placement could be likely; compare also Zahn 1975, II/1: 193–202; Thümmel 1988, 114–15; and now the presentation of the findings in Ohme 1998, 402–3.

Terminus post quem is the establishment of the province Phrygia Pacatiane around 325 CE. *Terminus ante quem* is the only independent mention of the synod in Theodoret around 430 CE—which, incidentally, simultaneously demonstrates that one should by no means overestimate the significance of this gathering for ancient Christianity or the integration of the collection into the Antiochene *corpus canonum* around the end of the seventies of the fourth century.[15] It was determined in Laodicea that in the church, only the τὰ κανονικὰ τῆς καινῆς καὶ παλαιᾶς διαθήκης, the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments, were permitted to be read and not ἀκανόνιστα.[16] In addition, together with the fifty-ninth synodal canon of this synod, as the sixtieth canon, a bipartite *list* has been handed down composed of the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments (βιβλία . . . τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης . . . , τὰ δὲ τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης).[17] Here, by the way, Revelation is lacking; Revelation's canonicity was still disputed among eastern theologians in the fourth century.[18] According to all that we know, however, this list represents a later addition to the canon of

[15] As the preamble of the canon says, the concern is with a coming together of bishops ἐκ διαφόρων ἐπαρχιῶν τῆς Ἀσιανῆς (Lauchert 1896, 72.4 = Beneševič 1974, 267.7) from the urban diocese IV (Andresen 1971, 395) and not with an imperial council. Only one partly contemporary author—namely, Theodoret of Cyrrhus—appeals to this provincial synod: συνελθοῦσα σύνοδος ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ τῆς Φρυγίας νόμῳ κεκώλυκε τὸ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις προσεύχεσθαι (Theodoret, *Interpretatio in epistulam Pauli ad Colossenes* II 18 [Schultze/Noesselt 1769–1774 III/1: 90 = PG 82: 613 B]).

[16] Canon 58/59 of the Synod of Laodicea; I quote from the handy collection of Lauchert 1896, 78, and provide for comparison the text of Beneševič 1974, 278.8–12. (Beneševič's text is not critical in the strict sense but wishes only to provide comparative material to the church Slavic tradition. But it is improved in relation to Lauchert, who prints only Mansi.) Interestingly the synod adds precision by beginning ὅτι οὐ δεῖ ἰδιωτικοὺς ψαλμοὺς λέγεσθαι; on deuterocanonical psalms, compare the compilation of Harnack 1958a, 795–97; additional passages and literature can be found in my Tübingen dissertation: Markschies 1992, 223–25.

[17] Canon 59/60 of the Synod of Laodicea (Lauchert 1896, 78.17–79.4 = Beneševič 1974, 278.13–279.13); in the order, Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Acts; the seven Catholic Letters, James, 1/2 Peter, 1/2/3 John, Jude; the fourteen Pauline Letters, Romans, 1/2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, 1/2 Thessalonians, Hebrews, 1/2 Timothy, Titus, Philemon (whereby according to Beneševič, 1/2 Corinthians, Galatians, and Philippians are lacking in a part of the tradition).

[18] Zahn 1975, II/1: 201, concludes from this, among other things, that we are dealing with a much older list. But Revelation is lacking also in the list of Gregory Nazianzus from 389 CE (B. M. Metzger 1987, 212; Greek text from *Carmina* I 12 lines 28–38 [PG 37: 474 = Zahn 1975, II/1: 216–17; cf. now also Thielman 1998]) and in the list of Cyril of Jerusalem (*Catecheses* IV 36 [Reischl/Rupp 1967, 128–30]); in the approximately contemporaneous list of Amphilochius of Iconium (*Iambi ad Seleucum* lines 289–319 [Oberg 1969, 38–39]; cf. Ficker 1906, 154–55), it says concerning Revelation, τινὲς μὲν ἐγκρίνουσιν, οἱ πλείους δέ γε| νόθον λέγουσιν . . . (lines 317–18; see Leipoldt 1907/1908, I: 197–98).

the synod.[19] But even with the canon of Laodicea, we do not yet have a clear witness for a thoroughgoing new use of the Greek word κανών to designate the normative collection of biblical books.[20] This is especially made clear by the first canon of the series, which establishes a rule for the problem of the second marriage κατὰ τὸν ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κανόνα. Here the term κανών is understood in a completely traditional manner as a "normative order that precedes the synodal rules," which is valid "in the church."[21] Thus one can more likely say in relation to the synod of Laodicea that according to its texts, in the second half of the fourth century, a binding number of normative books had now become a definitive part of the κανών ἐκκλησιαστικός—that is, the legal order of the church. This traditional use of the terminological field κανών and κανονικός also fits excellently, by the way, with a passage in Eusebius in which the bishop of Caesarea reports that Origen recognized only four gospels, τὸν ἐκκλησιαστικὸν φυλάττων κανόνα, 'in accordance with the ecclesiastical canon.'[22] Such examples make clear that in the framework of its institutional responsibility for a canon of church teaching, the synod also defined the scope of Holy Scriptures by which such church teaching was to be measured. Again the passages point to the institutional context of antiheretical church teaching of bishops and synods.

From a passage in Tertullian's treatise *De pudicitia*, it has occasionally been concluded that *canon-forming synods* already existed in the early third century, thus long before the synod of Laodicea. The North African theologian says that the *Shepherd of Hermas ab omni concilio ecclesiarum, etiam uestram* "is reckoned among the apocryphal and falsified (books)" and excluded from the "divine documents of the Holy Scriptures."[23] Hermann-Joseph Sieben, for example, took the passage as a reference to canon-forming synods,[24] whereas Hans Freiherr von Campenhausen

[19] Thus already Zahn 1975, II/1, 197–98, with a presentation of the manuscript findings (n. 2) or now, for example, B. M. Metzger 1987, 292 (see also p. 210 and the translation on p. 312).

[20] For example, it is stated with little precision that a "council held at Laodicea" (in truth, as we have said, a little known provincial synod) carried out "an important council decision regarding the biblical canon" (thus, however, McDonald 1995, 118).

[21] Thus Ohme 1998, 404; text in Lauchert 1896, 72, or in Beneševič 1974, 267.10–11.

[22] Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* VI 25.3 (Schwartz 1999, II/2: 576.4–5); for the concept in Origen, see now Ohme 1998, 193–201.

[23] Tertullian, *De pudicitia* 10.12 (Dekkers 1954b, 1301); for the reception of the *Shepherd of Hermas* in ancient Christian literature and its relation to the New Testament canon, compare the careful presentation of Brox 1981, 55–71, esp. p. 62 with additional literature in n. 31–33, and Henne 1990, 85–87.

[24] Sieben 1976, 353; according to Fischer/Lumpe 1997, 106 n. 84, Sieben admittedly corrected his view in the same year: "The existence of canon-forming synods cannot be derived from Tertullian, *De pudicitia* 10."

disputed the view that the term *concilium* referred at all to such a synod meeting.[25] Admittedly, the text only says that one book—namely, the *Shepherd of Hermas*—was excluded from a group of other texts that were already regarded as canonical. Interestingly, the assumption of a norming of the Old Testament 'canon' at a "synod of Jabne" or "Jamnia" has also proved to be an inadmissible synthesis of a whole series of rabbinical discussions and decisions of the most diverse periods.[26] Synodal judgments on the contents of the Bible first became common in the fourth century.[27]

The oldest preserved "complete" list of the twenty-seven canonical books of the New Testament in the sense of the late concept κανών τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης is found in a second text of the Alexandrian bishop *Athanasius*. At the same time, this text is one of the earliest witnesses for an application of the Greek word κανών to the collection of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament. It is handed down in the letter with which the bishop of Alexandria, after the feast of Epiphany in 367 CE, announced the date of Easter to the communities of Egypt, which is referred to somewhat misleadingly as the thirty-ninth "Easter Letter."[28] There, "he wrote down a canon (κανών) of the divine scriptures."[29] Athanasius says that he decided after exact investigations and at the request of the brothers[30] "to present the Scriptures in order that have been canonized, handed down, and confirmed as divine."[31] This introduction to his list of canonical books does not exactly make it sound like such a list was entirely common at this

[25] Campenhausen 2003, 382 n. 13 (= 1972, 331 n. 14). Fischer/Lumpe 1997, 106 n. 84, refer, admittedly, to Tertullian, *De jejunio adversus psychicos* 13.6, "where the word (*concilium*) is clearly used in the sense of council, synod"; compare also Lumpe 1970.

[26] Lewis 1964; Schäfer 1975; Stemberger 1977; 1976, 9–12; 1988, 163–74 (with a listing of important literature on p. 163 n. 4). See further Newman 1975 and recently Boyarin 2000, 21–30, 60–62. Talk of a "synod" evidently goes back to Graetz 1871; 1886.

[27] Thus also Campenhausen 2003, 382 (= 1972, 331).

[28] Zahn 1975, II/1: 203–4. Compare now the tables of the Athanasian Easter Letters in the edition of the tenth letter (from 338 CE) in Lorenz 1986, 15, and on the canon lists esp. pp. 12–13 with n. 33/34, and in general on the genre, Külzer 1988.

[29] Thus in the "preliminary report" on the Syriac translation, cited from Zahn 1975, II/1: 206 = Index § 39 (Martin/Albert 1985, 270.490–91): ܟܬܒ̈ ܩܢܘܢܐ ܡܛܠ ܟܬܒ̈ܐ ܐܠܗܝܐ ܟܬܒ̈; new (Coptic) fragments of the latter can be found in Lucchesi/Coquin 1982; Coquin 1984; Lucchesi 2001. On the "preliminary report," compare also Schwartz 1904 = 1959 (1–29) 3. Compare now also the Italian translations by Camplani 2003, 498–504 (introduction) and 504–18 (translation), and Aragione 2005.

[30] Athanasius, *Epistulae festales* 39.2 = 39.17 παρὰ γνησίων ἀδελφῶν καὶ μαθόντι ἄνωθεν (Preuschen 1910, 43.13 = Sakkos 1974, 178.16). German and English translations can be found in Schneemelcher 1990, 39–40; 1963, 59–60.

[31] Compare Athanasius, *Epistulae festales* 39.2 = 39.17 (Preuschen 1910, 43.13–15 = Sakkos 1974, 178.16–18) ἑξῆς ἐκθέσθαι τὰ κανονιζόμενα καὶ παραδοθέντα πιστευθέντα τε θεῖα (. . .) βιβλία.

time and as taken for granted as it ought to be today, even for confirmands. On the contrary, from the formulations, one senses instead the effort of the bishop to bring together such a binding specification of the scope of the Bible.[32] Therefore, one can hypothesize with good reason that the exact scope of the New Testament was certainly unknown to simpler priests, let alone to lay people.

In order to explain this finding, which is surprising at first glance, it is important to consider the thematic context of the remarks on the biblical κανών in the Easter Letter of Athanasius, which also points to the institutional backgrounds. The beginning of the text, which is not preserved in the Greek fragments, reads as follows according to the Coptic tradition: "In short, he became teacher for all in all."[33] With this, the actual topic of the bishop's letter is probably also given—for in the following passages, the author explains how Christ became teacher for Paul, the apostle; how he became teacher for the students of Paul; and finally how he became teacher for "us all." In addition, Athanasius concludes the passage, as in a refrain, with the sentences, "He (sc. Christ, the Logos) is the only teacher."[34] Some time ago, David Brakke convincingly showed that for the Alexandrian bishop in the years 366/367 CE (i.e., immediately after the return from his fifth and last exile), it was presumably still necessary to demarcate himself against Homoeans and Melitians with these marked clarifications.[35] For Athanasius portrays them as groups in which the tone is set by free teachers who are not in the hierarchy of the Alexandrian bishop and thus not obligated to obey him. Against this, he sets the orthodoxy of his Nicaean church in which Christ is the only teacher and not some human figures: the orthodox communities can celebrate the coming Easter feast "according to the traditions of our fathers, for we have the Holy Scriptures, which are completely sufficient in order to teach us";[36] in

[32] Except for the book of Revelation, the lists agree with the canon from Laodicea: four gospels, Acts, the seven Catholic Letters, James, 1/2 Peter, 1/2/3 John, Jude, and finally the fourteen Letters of Paul in which Hebrews stands before the Pastorals. On the topic, compare also Tetz 1984, 196–219, esp. 205.

[33] In the retroversion into Greek by Sakkos 1974, 174–86; here Athanasius, *Epistulae festales* 39.1 (174.9–10): καὶ ἁπαξαπλῶς τοῖς πᾶσι καὶ ἐν πᾶσι Διδάσκαλος.

[34] Athanasius, *Epistulae festales* 39.9: αὐτὸς δικαίως ἐστὶ μόνος διδάσκαλος (Sakkos 1974, 176.16–17).

[35] Brakke 1994. Admittedly, one should distinguish more sharply than Brakke between "Arians" and "Homoeans" in order to describe the heresiological intention of Athanasius precisely; compare W. A. Löhr 2005, 216–22. An excellent division of the letter can be found in Junod 2005, 183–94.

[36] Athanasius, *Epistulae festales* 39.15 (retroversion into Greek by Sakkos 1974, 177.18–20): ἡμῖν δὲ ἔξεστι καὶ νῦν πάλιν ἑορτάζειν κατὰ τὶς παραδόσεις τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, ὡς ἔχουσι τὰς γραφὰς ἀρκούσας ἡμῖν πρὸς διδασκαλίαν.

truth, the heretics do not celebrate an Easter feast at all but blaspheme it as Pilate and Herod did. Thus in the bishop's Easter Letter, the recollection of the canonical books is meant to serve the fight against the Melitian and "Arian" heresy.[37] The reader of the letter should ask himself whether or not the books that they know and use are the canonical ones and whether from that point of view they celebrate the Easter feast in proper obedience.[38] This anti-Homoean and anti-Melitian thrust of Athanasius' argumentation in relation to the biblical κανών is also indirectly confirmed by an admonition that the bishop adds to his listing of the biblical books: "No one should add anything to them or take anything from them" (μηδεὶς τούτοις ἐπιβαλλέτω μηδὲ τούτων ἀφαιρείσθω).[39] Some time ago, Willem C. van Unnik documented in a detailed article that this formula was used from biblical times onward (cf. Deuteronomy 4.2) to protect the word of God furnished with authority from alteration, though usually in a slightly altered form: μήτε προσθεῖναι μήτ' ἀφελεῖν.[40] Thus Athanasius makes use of a traditional admonition in order to legitimate the comparably new idea of a normative list of canonical (and apocryphal) books.

[37] According to the Coptic text (Preuschen 1910, 47.2–3 = Lefort 2000, I: 17.15); in the continuation, it becomes clear that (according to the view of Athanasius, which would have to be checked, for example, in Epiphanius) the Melitians used a canon that contained some apocryphal writings (Preuschen 1910, 51.21 = Lefort 2000, I: 21.13–14: ⲥⲉϣⲟⲩϣⲟⲩ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲉϫⲛ̄ⲛ̄ϫⲱⲱⲙⲉ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲙⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ ϫⲉⲁⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲟⲛ).

[38] Athanasius, *Epistulae festales* 39.11 (Preuschen 1910 47.28–30 = Lefort 2000, I: 18.4–7).

[39] Athanasius, *Epistulae festales* 39.2 = 39.27 (Preuschen 1910, 44.23–24 = Sakkos 1974, 181.6–7). Also the mention of the *Shepherd* and the *Didache*, which were not canonized according to Athanasius but specified by the fathers for the catechesis of the newly converted (*Epistulae festales* 39.11 = 39.29–10 [Preuschen 1910, 45.1–7 = Sakkos 1974, 181.11–182.1]), is most easily explained through the assumption that they were regarded as canonical elsewhere. In *Epistulae festales* 39.12, Athanasius distinguishes from the canonical writings (κανονιζόμενα) such writings that should be read aloud only without this claim (ἀναγινωσκομένα [Preuschen 1910, 45.8]); beyond these there existed only forgeries; he does not know of a separate category "apocrypha"; on the text, see Zahn 1975, II/1: 203–12, and B. M. Metzger 1987, 210–12.

[40] Unnik 1949 (= 1980, 123–56). This sentence is cited in a text of the anti–Montanist Anonymous in Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* V 16.3 (Schwartz 1999, II/1: 458.13; the debated question of the identification is not of interest here). Unnik 1949, 3 (= 1980, 125) asks whether it refers to the New Testament, which here is used "comme d'un recueil," and cites Zahn 1975, I: 112–16: "There can be no question that here the entire New Testament literature appears as a demarcated holy sphere, and the expansion of its borders is deemed to be a sacrilege." By contrast, Harnack 1889, 43, assumed the opposite: "This author wrote at a time in which one still regarded it as impossible that someone would dare to add something to the λόγος τοῦ εὐαγγελίου. The author wrote around the year 200! Thirty years later he would have made a fool of himself with his fear."

In presentations on the history of the New Testament "canon," it is common for only a few lines from Athanasius' thirty-ninth Easter Letter to be cited, and it is said that the bishop "took a position on the question of the scriptures recognized in the church and imparted a list of the recognized books of the OT and NT."[41] But with his letter, Athanasius attempted not only to impart a closed canon (κανών) of authoritative Christian scriptures and in this way to shape his readers, for whom such a canon was apparently no more familiar than it was for him prior to the composition of the letter, but to destroy with the help of this conception, which had apparently been accepted to a greater or to a lesser extent among theologians, the authority of free teachers such as Arius[42] in order to strengthen his own authority as the only bishop of the Alexandrian church. If one realizes that it was first the fight against the Homoean and Melitian competition in Egypt that forced the bishop to make present the exact demarcations and the precise content of the New Testament, then one must affirm a view that was expressed some time ago by David Brakke: "To speak of the history of the formation of the single Christian biblical canon may oversimplify the development and interaction of diverse forms of early Christian piety, which carried with them unique practices of scriptural collection and interpretation—that is, different kinds of canons."[43]

But the thirty-ninth Easter Letter of Athanasius also simultaneously shows that the interest in a precise specification of the borders of the canonical New Testament crops up in a very specific institutional context—namely, in the context of the monarchical office of bishop within the imperial church and more precisely in the fight for the establishment of this office against the traditional institutional claims of the free theological teachers. If Athanasius thus places his precise norm-setting against the free teachers who were characteristic for the history of the Alexandrian community since the second century (see section 2.1.3.2), then one can assume that advocates of this institution presupposed another concept of 'canon' and possibly also defined the scope of Holy Scriptures differently. We will return to this question again below (section 3.1.4).

It appears to speak against such a connection between interest in the precise boundaries of the New Testament 'canon' and the institution of the monarchical episcopacy that such a listing as is present in Athanasius is already attested much earlier—namely, in the form of the so-called *Canon*

[41] Schneemelcher 1990 (1–61) 2. This quotation does not appear to be present in Schneemelcher 1963, 19–68.

[42] Brakke 1994, 404, refers to the beginning of the *Thalia* in order to count Arius among the free, Spirit-inspired teachers of Alexandria: Athanasius, *Orationes contra Arianos* I 5.1 (Metzler/Hansen/Savvidis 1998, 113.3–6).

[43] Brakke 1994, 419.

Muratori (CPG I: 1862),[44] which is the best known and at the same time probably the most controversial example of such lists. The text, which is better designated as *Fragmentum Muratorianum* or *Muratori*,[45] is actually not at all a "list" with the mere listing of biblical books, but rather a fragment without its original beginning and conclusion, which—if one considers its literary form—is extremely difficult to link to an ancient literary genre. In it, we find passages that are reminiscent, with their concise information about the authors of New Testament books, of a prologue to an edition of the Bible or lexical indexes (e.g., of philosophers and their works) and yet also formulations that are reminiscent of catechetical literature or epistolary answers to questions about the authoritative biblical scriptures. In view of the fragmentary character of the *Muratorium*, one must first present its manuscript tradition in greater detail before questions concerning its literary genre, historical placement, and institutional context can be treated.

In 1700, the librarian, historian, and literary scholar Ludovico Antonio Muratori (1672–1750) discovered the text of the *Fragmentum* in a composite manuscript of the Biblioteca Ambrosiana, which was written during the eighth century in Bobbio (Cod. Ambr. I. 101 supp.).[46] In addition to pieces from the works of the late ancient bishop Eucherius of Lyon, it contains primarily passages from the Latin translation of texts by Chrysostom and a number of confessions of faith, as well as the aforementioned fragment followed by a piece from Ambrose' treatise *De Abraham* (CPL 127),[47] which appears twice in versions that deviate slightly from each other. The fragment (fol. 10^r–11^r) lacks any recognizable introduction, heading, or *subscriptio*; the text begins in the middle of a Latin sentence and contains, alongside the common characteristic features of late ancient Latin, a series of difficult grammatical

[44] The *Fragmentum Muratori* is cited here according to the continuous line numeration. Compare the editions in Lietzmann 1908, 4–11; Preuschen 1910, 27–25 (according to the collations of H. Achelis and W. Schüler) and Hahneman 1992, 6–7. There are facsimiles of the three pages of the manuscript in the appendix to S. Ritter 1926 and in H. Leclercq 1934, Table 8606 a–c. German and English translations can be found in Schneemelcher 1990, 27–29; 1963, 42–45. For important older literature, see Schürer 1888; Zahn 1901b; Harnack 1958c, 330–33; Beumer 1973; Burckhardt 1974; Campenhausen 2003, 282–303 (= 1972, 243–62); Dahl 1961; Stendahl 1962.

[45] The usual talk of a canon prejudices the open question, which can scarcely be resolved in my view, of the literary genre and pushes the text too much in the proximity of the canon lists that were established since the fourth century. For several very illuminating discussions on the text, I wish to warmly thank my colleague Jean-Daniel Kaesteli (Lausanne).

[46] Compare the *inscriptio*: *liber sĉti columbani de bobio* / *Iohis grisostomi* (cited from Hahneman 1992, 17). According to H. Leclercq 1974, 544, this text, however, comes from a hand "plus récente." In an inventory from 1461, the codex was listed as a Chrysostom manuscript (H. Leclercq 1974, 544).

[47] The last detailed listing of the content is found in Hahneman 1992, 18–19; previously already H. Leclercq 1974, 544–45.

and orthographic errors.[48] It is also clear from the content that the codex must have originally contained more texts from the fragment (at the very least, passages about the Gospel of Matthew and the Gospel of Mark, the fragmentarily preserved first sentence on fol. 10r referred, like the formulation *tertio euangelii librum sec(a)undo Lucan* [line 2], to the second gospel, i.e., Mark). Admittedly, one can by no means be certain that the original beginning of the text was preserved in the seven quires that are presumed to be missing, which probably consisted of quaternions. For a comparison with the short passages of Ambrosius (fol. 11r–12r; another excerpt from the same work fol. 71v–73r) that follow the fragment, which were likewise simply taken from the midst of the Milan bishop's treatise on Abraham without any separation and heading, makes clear that at other points, too, the codex contains only short excerpts from texts. Fortunately, for the passages of the *Fragmentum Muratori* that relate to Paul, there exists a parallel tradition in the manuscripts from Monte Cassino[49] that is much better in terms of language, and the sections on the Gospels were apparently available to Chromatius of Aquileia in the composition of his commentary on Matthew (CPL 218).[50] The careful use of red ink in the Milan manuscript in the mention of two of the four gospels (fol. 10r, l. 2 and 9) shows that the copyist, despite his various errors (in spite of the doubling of the Ambrosius passage[51]), probably still understood what he wrote. The specific mix of introductory writings, confessions of faith, and ascetic texts found in the codex indicates that we are probably dealing with a sort of monastic handbook on the Bible.[52]

The traditional dating of the original of the *Fragmentum Muratori* vacillates between 170 (Gregory/Westcott) and 210 (Erbes/Zahn).[53] Admittedly, some time ago, Albert C. Sundberg already presented an interesting argument against this common dating to the end of the second century, which initially received little attention.[54] But ever since Geoffrey Mark Hahneman attempted to support the late dating proposed by Sundberg with additional arguments, a lively controversy over the chronological placement of the fragment has broken out.[55] For Hahneman, the text is an eastern

[48] See recently Hahneman 1992, 10–14; another listing in H. Leclercq 1974, 547.

[49] In Hahneman 1992, 9–10, there is an edition of the pieces printed from four manuscripts of Harnack 1898a.

[50] This observation is lacking in Hahneman 1992.

[51] Contrast Zahn 1901b, 797.

[52] Similarly already H. Leclercq 1934, 546 (with references to texts of Cassiodorus).

[53] Attestations in H. Leclercq 1934, 552; Hahneman 1992, 27–30.

[54] Sundberg 1968; 1973.

[55] From the more recent discussion surrounding Hahneman 1992, compare Bolgiani 1995; Ferguson 1993; Henne 1993; Hill 1995; Horbury 1994; Kaestli 1994; Heckel 1999; Stanton 1997, 340; and previously already Ferguson 1982.

list of canonical books that belongs in the time after the end of the life of Eusebius of Caesarea and emerged at the earliest in 303 and at the latest in 392 CE. His argument is based, first, on observations on the literary genre and, second, on observations on individual passages of the fragment: Hahneman compares the Muratorium with the known lists of biblical books in the *codices Cheltenhamensis 12266 et Sangallensis* 133 (the "Mommsen Catalogue"[56]), in the *Codex Claromantanus*, in the *Decretum (Pseudo-) Gelasianum* (CPL 1676), the *Stichometry of Nicephorus*, and the so-called *Catalogue of the Sixty Books*.[57] But this argument is convincing only if one is prepared to overlook the considerable differences between the pure lists and the *Fragmentum Muratori*—in the end, there is no pure list of books in the *Muratorianum* as there is in the catalogues of the fourth century. As already indicated, we are more likely dealing with a detailed introduction to the biblical books that have been accepted (by a "we"; *recipimus*, fol. 11^r, l. 72). As a reason for such a detailed explanation, one can imagine both an epistolary inquiry directed to the (Roman?) community or house community or other Christian grouping (of this city?) and a catechetical situation within the community or in the instruction of free teachers. More important are Hahneman's observations on the text of the fragment itself, which relate primarily to a passage at the conclusion. As is well known, in books on the history of the canon prior to Sundberg and Hahneman, the text of the Canon Muratori was dated in the second century because in it the *Shepherd of Hermas* is characterized as follows: *Pastorem uero | nuperrim e(t) temporibus nostris In urbe | roma herma conscripsit sedente cathe|tra urbis romae aeclesiae pio ēps fratre(r) | eius* (lines 73–77).[58] But if that book is said to have been "written recently and in our time," then the text cannot be much later than 200 CE.[59] Sundberg had spoken out against this dating and Harnack's interpretation of the text as an official urban Roman document[60] by pointing first to the linguistic results of the Cyprian studies of Hugo Koch and showing that the term *nuperrime* does not represent, as

[56] Formerly in Sir Thomas Phillipps' collection, Cheltenham, nr. 12266, now Rome, Biblioteca Nazionale, Fondo Vittorio Emanuele 1235.

[57] Texts and commentary in Zahn 1975, II/1, 143–56, 157–72, 297–301, 290–92, or Dobschütz 1912; texts can also be found in Preuschen 1910, 36–42, 52–64, 68–70; for German and English translations, see Schneemelcher 1990, 30–35; 1963, 45–52. The argumentation is found in Hahneman 1992, 132–82.

[58] Text from Hahneman 1992, 7; compare his presentation of the research problems on pp. 34–72.

[59] In older text editions, it was often reconstructed as *nuperrime temporibus nostris*, but compare already Preuschen 1910, 32 (on line 74), and for this position, for example, Zahn 1975, II/1: 12–13 with notes, and B. M. Metzger 1987, 191–201.

[60] Harnack 1925 (against the thesis that Hippolytus was the author of the text) and Harnack 1926b.

every better Latin lexicon[61] already shows, a particularly precise indication of time but rather often crops up in apologetic lines of argument.[62] The very exclusion of a book still regarded by Irenaeus and Clement as canonical from the public reading in the framework of the reading of prophets or apostles is said to speak against the common dating.[63] Hahneman also deals with the argument that the *Shepherd of Hermas* is said to have been composed "recently" (lines 74–75) and that the fragment thus allegedly belongs in immediate temporal proximity to the *Shepherd of Hermas*—namely, in the second century. He points to the fact that the context of the Latin phrase *nuperrim e(t) temporibus nostris In urbe | roma* suggests a relatively late dating of the *Shepherd*, since the late Roman bishop lists indicate the time in which Pius, who is introduced here as the brother of Hermas, was in office as 140–154 CE. Hahneman explains the formulation in such a way that with it, only the temporal distance from the apostolic time is meant to be expressed: this formulation "recently and in our time" would then mean that the *Shepherd* was written not in the apostolic time but later, in the postapostolic period that continues up to the present.[64]

In view of the present-day discussion, it is first necessary, in order to make headway in the difficult question of dating of the *Fragmentum Muratori*, to systematize and weigh the arguments discussed since Sundberg. Too little attention has been given to the fact that the different arguments pertaining to orthographic, lexical, syntactical, and thematic questions have very different weight. Thus Hahneman's detailed observations on the orthography, lexis, and syntax of the Latin text,[65] which all point to a late linguistic stage of the fourth or fifth centuries, pertain in the first place only to the version in the Milan codex that arose in the eighth century or to its orthographically correct *Vorlage*, as this can be reconstructed with the help of the fragments from Monte Cassino. If one assumes, for example, a Greek original version of the Latin version, then not only the orthographic but also the lexical and syntactic observations would be less relevant, since

[61] Compare, for example, Georges/Georges 1995, II: 1228.

[62] Sundberg 1973, 5–6, with attestations on p. 9.

[63] Sundberg 1973, 13.

[64] Additional documentation in Hahneman 1992, 51. Hahneman 1992, 65–71, thinks that the relevant sentences in the *Muratorian Fragment* presuppose the tradition of an apostolic authorship of the *Shepherd of Hermas*, as this is first attested in Origen, and presents signs of a reserve toward the book that starts in the fourth century. Harnack 1958c, 331, argues, by contrast, with the passage against a late dating to the fourth or fifth century, which had already been advocated by Koffmane 1893.

[65] Hahneman 1992, 11–12, appeals to Campos 1960. Here the (more extensive) observations on orthography are less convincing than the (less extensive) observations on vocabulary and syntax.

they date only the Latin translation to the fourth or fifth century.[66] Then it is above all thematic observations that are left for narrowing down the emergence of the *Fragmentum Muratori* temporally.

In addition to the arguments that are already known, which cannot be discussed again here, one would also need to point, for example, to the passages about Arsinous, Valentinus, Miltiades (?), and Basilides (lines 81–85), which are—from the vantage point of the modern historian—completely chaotic. They are reminiscent of the specifications of later heresiologists,[67] which are likewise historically very chaotic but naturally can also be explained by the poor educational standing of the Roman community in the second century if one does not wish to explain their specifications as a complete corruption in the course of an extremely convoluted tradition process. Much depends on the translation of the relevant concluding passage: *Arsinoi autem seu ualentini. uel mitiad(ei)is | nihil In totum recipemus*. *Qui etiam nouū | psalmorum librum marcioni conscripse | runt una cum basilide assianum catafry | cum constitutorem* (lines 81–85). If one translates that the named persons (Arsinous, Valentinus, and Miltiades with Basilides) composed a new psalm book for Marcion “together,” then it is difficult to imagine that in the second century, one actually believed not only that the four men mentioned composed a psalm book for Marcion together but also that they simultaneously regarded Basilides as the founder of the “Cataphrygians”—that is, the Montanists. In the strict sense, this is naturally not ruled out so that the thematic observations—just like those on orthodoxy, lexis, and syntax of the Latin version—also do not offer an irrefutable argument for dating the fragment. However, one can also translate in such a way that nothing at all is received by Arsinous, Valentinus, and Miltiades,[68] who (each for himself) composed a psalm book for Marcion “at the same time as Basilides of Asia (Minor) or[69] the founder of the Cataphygians” (sc. Montanus). In that case, reference is made to the psalm books attested for Valentinus and others that were composed at the time of Basilides and Montanus. On the basis of this interpretation, the question arises of whether it was actually still necessary in the fourth century to

[66] Harnack 1958c, 330–31, energetically argues against a Greek primitive version with reference to the expression *iuris studiosus* (line 4); contrast, for example, Zahn 1901b, 798.

[67] Here Hahneman 1992, 27–29, could have argued with greater precision.

[68] Preuschen 1910, 32 *ad loc,* argues for a miswritten Tatiani, since many corrections were made at this point. Contrast Lietzmann 1907, apparatus *ad loc*: “*81–85 contain partly unknown, partly false: neither justify changes*.”

[69] The *sive* is found in the text of the fragment from Monte Cassino: Harnack 1898a, 132 line 36 = Hahneman 1992, 9; thus also Zahn 1901b, 797.

exclude "explicitly and formally the writings of Valentinus etc. from the canon." Thus an argument would be gained for the traditional dating.[70]

Whatever option one settles on, the most recent debate over the dating of the highly fragmented text should at least urge caution both for those who—like Harnack—see in the *Fragmentum Muratori* an official list translated from the Greek with which the Roman church in the second century wished to impose its conception of a canonical New Testament on the Christianity of the empire[71] and for those who are completely convinced of the late dating of the text. The majority of the arguments still speak for a dating around 200 CE, although the exact historical background and the precise literary form of the text remain unclear.

A certain chronological uncertainty in the evaluation of the text is easier to bear since the *Fragmentum Muratori* does not hold the absolutely central importance for the reconstruction of a chronology of the gradual canonization of the New Testament that is occasionally ascribed to it.[72] This text is significant primarily because it betrays something about the theological conceptions that were bound up with a norming of the scope of the Bible. Through allegory, the *Muratorianum* endeavors to elevate the historically accidental form of the New Testament corpus to the level of a principle. For this purpose, the following legend is narrated: first John wrote the seven missives of Revelation; then Paul, imitating him, wrote the seven letters. This legend attempts to explain the apparent particularity of the letters as a symbol of their universal validity: "The blessed apostle Paul himself, following the rule of his predecessor John, wrote by name to only seven communities in the following order: to the Corinthians, the first (letter), to the Ephesians, the second, to the Philippians, the third, to the Colossians, the fourth, to the Galatians, the fifth, to the Thessalonians, the sixth, to the Romans, the seventh. . . . Thus it is, nevertheless, clearly recognizable that one church is dispersed over the whole circle of the earth."[73] True to the rules of ancient

[70] Harnack 1958c, 332.

[71] Harnack 1925. Hahneman 1992, 24–27, above all calls into question the traditional argument that interprets the observation that Revelation is mentioned but not 1 Peter, James, and Hebrews in relation to a Western, urban Roman origin.

[72] In Hahneman 1992, 2–3, this impression emerges because the author presupposes that there is no fixed 'canon' among the Alexandrian authors and so strongly calls into question all other attestations for a Christian canon of the Bible in the second century that the *Canon Muratori* must become the central attestation.

[73] *ipse beatus | apostolus paulus sequens prodecessoris sui | Iohannis ordinē nonnisi (c)nomenatī semptaē | eccles(e)iis scribat ordine tali a corenthios | prima.ad efesios seconda ad philippinses ter|tia ad colosensis quarta ad calatas quin|ta ad tensaolenecinsis sexta. ad romanos | septima (. . .) una | tamen per omnem orbem terrae ecclesia | deffusa esse denoscitur* (lines 47–54, 55–57 are cited here according to the edition of Hahneman

number symbolism,[74] from the fact that there are seven Pauline letters, it is inferred that the whole is nevertheless concealed in them and thus written to the whole oikumene.[75]

Thus the *Fragmentum Muratori*, going beyond a mere list, reflects a portion of theology of the ‘canon’ and shows that an exact demarcation of the canonical scope of the New Testament presupposes theological interests whose institutional contexts can at least be inquired into. If one considers the institutions dealt with in the framework of this investigation, then due to the quite detailed, scribal argumentation of the fragment that is nevertheless also rich in imagery to some extent, an origin from the discourses of free teachers appears more likely than a narrower catechetical background and also more probable than an official answer to a letter of inquiry to the (Roman) community. If this hypothesis were on target, then we would have before us a learned counterpart to the list in the thirty-ninth Easter Letter of Athanasius, which is directed precisely against the free teachers (and presumably their ‘canon’ of authoritative biblical scriptures).

In the *Fragmentum Muratori*, it also becomes clear that a satisfactory presentation of the history of the New Testament canon must also contain the “history of the ‘dogmatic conceptions,’ a history of dogma of the canon, so to speak,” as Hans Freiherr von Campenhausen and Adolf von Harnack argued against Theodor Zahn.[76] Thus a presentation of the history of the canon that is limited to the term κανών is already excluded for terminological reasons: to be sure, Athanasius is the first author known to us to designate that collection with the word ‘canon,’ which was probably originally a Semitic loan word, but the word was already long in use for similar connections, as a concise overview of the history of the term can show.

The Hebrew קָנֶה[77] first means “reed,” then “shaft of a lampstand”; but finally also “measuring reed, measuring rod, measuring stick.”[78] With the adoption of the Semitic word into Greek, a far-reaching transference from

---

1992, 7). The same idea is attributed to Hippolytus of Rome by Dionysius Bar Salibi (H. Leclercq 1934, 554).

[74] Najock 1975; compare also the remarks of Zahn 1986, 168–71.

[75] By contrast, according to Sakkos 1970, 28–33, the concern is above all with a violent attempt to exclude Hebrews from the canon of the Pauline writings; Zahn 1975, II/1:73/74 n. 2, mentions other attestations; compare also the statements of Irenaeus about there being four gospels, which are cited below (n. 208).

[76] Campenhausen 2003, 1 (= 1972, ix).

[77] For a recent treatment of this topic (with literature), see Ohme 1998, 21–22. The Hebrew קָנֶה is, by the way, reproduced with ܩܢܝܐ in Syriac. According to Payne-Smith (Margoliouth) 1985, s. v. [510], however, this word is never used with the meaning “canon,” which is expressed by ܩܢܘܢ according to Payne-Smith 1879–1927, II: 3660–61.

[78] Gesenius 1962, s.v. [717–18]; no additional meanings are found in Jastrow 1996, 1388–89.

concrete into abstract took place.[79] Accordingly, κανών is usually rendered as *regula* in Latin.[80] The meaning "measuring reed" or "measuring stick" is found also in a philosophical context in Epictetus: "Philosophizing means nothing other than to investigate and determine standards/measuring sticks (κανόνες)." The term κανών is used here as a synonym to κριτήριον and designates the means for evaluating everything of that which can be evaluated as true or false: καὶ τὸ φιλοσοφεῖν τοῦτό ἐστιν, ἐπισκέπτεσθαι καὶ βεβαιοῦν τοὺς κανόνας, τὸ δ' ἤδη χρῆσθαι τοῖς ἐγνωσμένοις τοῦτο τοῦ καλοῦ καὶ ἀγαθοῦ ἔργον ἐστίν.[81] Epictetus compares the certain standard that philosophy offers in the place of mere "opining" (δοκεῖν) with the scales and rulers of the craftsman (*Dissertationes* II 11.13). In Greek, κανών is also used to designate a "straight edge"—that is, an instrument with which a carpenter determines the exact direction when working with stone or wood—and finally also the ruler and (more rarely) the scale beam.[82] Incidentally, this picture was also still used in the early modern age—namely, by Leonard Hutter (1563–1616) in his catechism for the higher school classes: he compares the canon with a scale with which one can weigh texts and find them to be "too light."[83]

Long before the transfer of the Greek term κανών to the designation of the normed scope of the twenty-seven books of the New Testament in the middle of the fourth century, Christian theology already used this expression in the sense of its basic meaning, "measuring stick." From the time of Irenaeus of Lyons, the expressions κανὼν τῆς ἀληθείας and κανών τῆς πίστεως, or *regula veritatis* and *regula fidei*, designated the kerygma received in baptism or in the baptismal instruction,[84] which could now be active itself in a norming manner for faith and life and present a criterion for the appropriate interpretation of biblical Scriptures.[85] As a rule

[79] Thus concisely Moog-Grünewald 1997, VII.

[80] Zahn 1985, 3 n. 8; Oppel 1937, 37–106, and on this basis, Ohme 1998, 28.

[81] Arrian, *Epicteti dissertationes* II 11.24–25 (Schenkl 1965, 153.1–3); compare also Arrian, *Epicteti dissertationes* II 11.13, 15, 16 (151.12, 21, 22); Ohme 1998, 24–26.

[82] Documentation in Zahn 1985, 2–3 with n. 4–12; compare also Oppel 1937, passim; Wenger 1942a; 1942b.

[83] Hutter 1961, 1.19 (Locus I 3).

[84] The findings in Irenaeus are clearly presented in Ohme 1998, 63–77. Ohme 1998 shows that the concern is with a term for the *entire* kerygma and "the right life conduct, thus ethics, is included" (76), as is the sphere of ecclesiastical order. In addition, he considers (with E. Lanne) that the bishop of Lyon is indebted to Philo of Alexandria for the terms (74–76).

[85] From the abundance of literature I mention now, alongside the concise survey article of Grossi 1984, only Ohme 1998, 61–155. The older portrayals of Kunze 1899, 100–126, and R. P. C. Hanson 1962, 85–94, are too strongly committed to the idea that with the κανών or *regula* it is a matter of a set of fixed formulas, as Ohme 1998, 70–72, rightly objects.

of faith in this specific sense, it must be strictly distinguished, according to Irenaeus, from a confession of faith, which is fixed in wording (*Adversus haereses* I 9.4–10.1; a different view is still advocated by Harnack, Kattenbusch, and Zahn[86]). Accordingly, κανὼν τῆς ἀληθείας is not to be identified with Scripture, either, but encompasses the theological teachings and ethical norms that are expressed in Scripture.[87] To this extent, for Irenaeus, it is possible in special cases to have the biblical texts in one's hand and yet miss the κανὼν τῆς ἀληθείας. But since, on the other side, for him this very Scripture can be called "perfect" and is understandable from itself, Scripture and κανὼν τῆς ἀληθείας are nevertheless closely bound together. Admittedly, one must always understand that such positions represent more the conception of a single theologian than the majority theology of an entire region, let alone the entirety of contemporary Christianity at the end of the second century.[88]

Thus the gradual adaption of the term κανών, specified in this way, for the canonical collection of the twenty-seven books of the New Testament shows that in the late fourth century this term was understood to mean an ecclesiastically handed down and normed collection that simultaneously formed norms,[89] which in this respect may be regarded, using the words of the Lutheran baroque dogmatic theologian Johann Gerhard, as ancient Christian theology's *unicum Theologiae principium*.[90] But one is not permitted to conclude from this that the original institutional *Sitz im Leben* of the notion of a normed scope of biblical Scriptures was exclusively the monarchic episcopacy and its propagandists among the theologians; active free teachers such as Justin or the leader of a private Christian university such as Origen in Caesarea must naturally have been able to give corresponding information about their normative (textual) foundations. This

[86] Documentation for Harnack, Kattenbusch, and Zahn can be found in Ohme 1998, 65 n. 21. The rule forms "*le critère qui permet de distinguer les fausses interprétations des Écritures d'avec les vraies*" (Eynde 1933, 286; affirmed by Ohme 1998, 64–65).

[87] Hägglund 1958, 14.

[88] With this, one will object against the observation in Campenhausen 2003, 213 (cf. 1971, 182), which is correct in itself, that Irenaeus marks "the transition from the old time of the faith in tradition to the new time of the conscious canonical norm-setting—in the direction of the later orthodoxy with its firmly-fixed canon of an Old and New Testaments" (cf. also Campenhausen 1965; Skeat 1992; Schultz 1978).

[89] In this extended meaning, canon becomes "a designation for the norm, the completed form, the standard, or the criterion" (Schneemelcher 1990, 2; cf. 1963, 21).

[90] "*Unicum Theologiae principium esse verbum Dei in scripturis propositum, sive, quod idem est, Scripturam Sacram (. . .). Docent ecclesiae nostrae, solos canonicos libros esse illud unicum theologiae principium*" (Gerhard 1762, p. 1 [= Locus I § 2 and § 4]); compare also Wallmann 1961, 37–41.

becomes clear at the latest when one looks away from the term κανών and considers other criteria for the canonicity of biblical texts.

3.1.2.2 Additional Criteria for the Canonicity of Biblical Writings in Christian Antiquity

What sources are available for the investigation of such other criteria and their institutional contexts? If the "emergence of the New Testament canon" cannot be purely tied to the term κανών and its application to the twenty-seven books and one does not wish to speak of an emergence of this 'canon' around 350 CE, then there remains first the consideration of the various official and private lists of books of the Old and New Testament. For this reason, the collection and evaluation of these 'canon' lists or catalogues play a substantial role in the writing of the history of the canon. For example, Theodor Zahn devotes an entire half-volume of his presentation to this task with 408 pages.[91] But the criterion of the lists is no more able to portray a fitting picture of the development than the concentration on the term κανών. For the early period, we only have the one single difficult text of the *Canon Muratori*, if it should go back to the second century, whereas all the other lists date much later.[92] The much older gospel lists are not taken into account here; one would have to clarify first whether structurally they ought to be paralleled at all with the later lists of canonical books of the Old and New Testaments.

But what other criteria can enable us then to specify which books are valid in a church as *unicum principium*? Since Johann Salomo Semler at the latest, the fact that they were included in the readings of the worship service has usually been discussed as a possible criterion of normative Scriptures. This is already presupposed by the *Canon Muratori*: *Apocalapse etiam Iohanis et Pe|tri tantum recip(e)imus quam quidam ex nos|tris legi In ecclesia nolunt* (lines 71–72; "Of Apocalypses we recognize only those of John and Peter: some of us, admittedly, do not want to let the latter be read in the church"). This would confirm anew that the Christian worship service represents an important institutional context of Christian theology in

[91] Zahn 1975, II/1: passim; but compare also Appendix IV, "Early Lists of the Books of the New Testament," in B. M. Metzger 1987, 305–15, and now Trobisch 1989, 38–45.

[92] I mention *only Codex Claromontanus* (Preuschen 1910, 40–42 = Cod Paris. Gr. 107; the text is probably older than the manuscript [sixth century], perhaps fourth century [Jülicher], differently Zahn 1975, II/1: 157–72); the so-called *Mommsen Catalogue* or *Cheltenham List* (Preuschen 1910, 36–40; see Zahn 1975, II/1: 143–56) and the *Decretum Gelasianum* (Preuschen 1910, 52–62); the *Stichometry of Nicephorus* (62–64) and the other canons mentioned in Preuschen 1910, 65–73, are translated, in part, in Schneemelcher 1990, 27–35; 1963, 45–52; compare also Trobisch 1989, 38–45.

the imperial period. Semler himself, of course, took a clear position against using this context as a criterion for a history of the canonization of the New Testament: "the quite certain divineness" of these Scriptures could not be inferred from the "public reading."[93] More than one hundred years after Semler, Theodor von Zahn and Adolf von Harnack fought again over this exact problem. Zahn advocated the view that a text read in the worship service was understood by the community to be "canonized Scripture."[94] By contrast, Harnack repeated just two years before his death, "Alongside the OT there were soon readings from the four-gospel collection (see Justin) and also from letters—not only the Pauline ones—and beyond that apocalypses received this distinction here and there . . . ; but not even in this way were the Christian texts made equal to the 'ultimately ancient' codex of the OT."[95]

But before one can enter anew into the old debate over the connection between worship service reading cycles and canonicity, one should first ask what was read in general in worship services. Our knowledge about this matter is unfortunately very slight, at least in relation to the early period. From a formulation in Justin, some have wanted to infer an early emergence of a "pericope ordering" of the New Testament books,[96] but not only is this interpretation controversial but there is also debate concerning the question of what scope exactly this reading cycle is to have had in the second century. It is difficult to determine in detail what was read in the Christian worship service at that time. A few texts were certainly read, such as, for example, the Letters of Paul,[97] with which the collection

[93] "1) That it was not so known and decided at that time which books could all alone be called divine; 2) that the certain divinity cannot be inferred from the public reading; 3) that among the various parties of Christians at that time there was not yet a general agreement about which books had to stand in the canon" (Semler 1980, § 3 [p. 21]).

[94] "The presupposition of viewing certain writings as a special class both of holy writings and of writings belonging to the Christian church is the use in the church, more specifically *the use in the church worship service*" (the italicized words are marked in the original; Zahn 1985, 11–12; cf. also Swarat 1991; Ohlig 1972, 296–309).

[95] Harnack 1928b, 338 (= 1980b, 819).

[96] Compare, Justin, *Apologia i* 67.3 Καὶ τῇ τοῦ ἡλίου λεγομένῃ ἡμέρᾳ πάντων κατὰ πόλεις ἢ ἀγροὺς μενόντων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συνέλευσις γίνεται, καὶ τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων ἢ τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν προφητῶν ἀναγινώσκεται, μέχρις ἐγχωρεῖ (Marcovich 1994, 129.6–9; cf. the commentary in Wartelle 1987, 297–98). The papyrological findings are essential, of course, for every thesis on the age of the order of the pericopae; Porter 2005 thinks he can observe corresponding markings already in the papyri of the late second and early third centuries.

[97] Compare my subsequent comments in this section and the indications in the Pauline corpus itself (e.g., the singular exhortation in 1 Thessalonians 5.27 [Ἐνορκίζω ὑμᾶς τὸν κύριον ἀναγνωσθῆναι τὴν ἐπιστολὴν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς] and the liturgical elements of the letter endings); on the topic, see also Hengel 1984, 35 n. 80, and Trobisch 1989, passim.

of the authoritative Scriptures alongside the Old Testament in the Christian church begins. But in the case of other texts, this is far less certain,[98] as we can gather from a well-known story that is set in the vicinity of Antioch at the beginning of the third century. Eusebius cites from a letter of the bishop Serapion of Antioch (ca. 190–203/211 CE) in which Serapion reports of a visit in the community in Rhossus (a small city on the gulf of Issus).[99] The *Gospel of Peter* is read in the worship service there, and Bishop Serapion initially permits this, without reading (and knowing) the text in question. Evidently, the community had turned to its lead shepherd with the question of whether a reading of this gospel in the worship service was permissible. But if the bishop decided this question without previously reading the text (!),[100] it does not appear to have been of absolutely central importance, and the question of the canonicity of the Gospel does not appear to have been relevant for the decision either—at least not as relevant as the question of the orthodoxy of the community; the orthodoxy of the community was initially more important than the orthodoxy of the text.[101] For after doubts about the orthodoxy of the community of Rhossus cropped up for the bishop (they were suspected of secretly leaning toward Marcion), he examined the *Gospel of Peter*, found its content to be dubious in part, and then questioned also the authenticity of the authorship. The *Canon Muratori* likewise shows that one should not specify too closely the connection between the canonicity of a book and its public reading in the worship services. The *Shepherd of Hermas*—whose dissemination in antiquity is documented by a quite large number of manuscripts[102] and which was first assigned from the seventeenth century to a

[98] Compare the Tübingen dissertation of Salzmann (Salzmann 1994, 246–49 [Justin], 348 [Clement of Alexandria], 416–18 [Tertullian], and the forward look at Origen and Cyprian on pp. 432–38 and 438–41) and Salzmann 1989. Compare also Markschies 2004b; the topic of the worship service readings was also already succinctly treated in the previous chapter (see above, sections 2.3.2 and 2.3.4.2).

[99] Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* VI 12.1–6 (Schwartz 1999, II/2: 544.4–546.7). The passage is also printed with a German translation in the new critical edition of Kraus/Nicklas 2004, 12–13, with analysis on pp. 13–16; for interpretation, compare also Junod 1988, 15. Tobias Nicklas rightly draws attention to the late version of the text of the *Gospel of Peter* in the so-called Akhmim Codex, P. Cair. 10759 (Nicklas 2002, 262–65; cf. only the Byzantine σταυρίσκειν instead of σταυροῦν in fol. 1^{v}.7 [Kraus/Nicklas 2004, 32]).

[100] Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* VI 12.4 (Schwartz 1999, II/2: 544.19–20) μὴ διελθὼν τὸ ὑπ’ αὐτῶν προφερόμενον ὀνόματι Πέτρου εὐαγγέλιον.

[101] McDonald 2002, 428. On the text and its relation to the “canonical” gospels, compare also Heckel 1999, 287–300; Hengel 2000, 12–15; 2008, 22–26.

[102] Compare Haelst 1976, 656: “Le Pasteur est l’écrit non canonique le mieux attesté, par les papyrus d‘Égypte.” Haelst 1976 collects nr. 655 (P.Amh. 2, 190 = PO 17, 472–77, sixth century); nr. 656 (P. Harris 128, fifth century); nr. 657 (P.Mich. 130 = C. Bonner 1927, end of the second century); nr. 658 (P. Berlin inv. 5104 = Treu 1970, fifth century); nr. 659

corpus that is clearly demarcated from the New Testament[103]—"should, it is true, be read." Yet according to the witness of the *Canon Muratori,* one cannot speak of an unrestricted canonicity of this book:

> *et ideo legi eum quidē Oportet se pu|plicare uero In eclesia populo Neque inter | profe(*)tas conpletum numero Neque Inter | apostolos In finē temporum potest* (lines 77–80; "Publicly in the church, it [sc. the *Shepherd*] can be read to the people neither among the prophets, whose number is closed, nor among the apostles in the end of times").[104]

The key words "prophets and apostles" describe the total biblical literature[105] that "is read publicly"; other, noncanonical literature is excluded from this reading. The slight authority of the *Shepherd* is also shown in the fact that neither a prophet nor an apostle composed such texts but rather a "recent" living author, as the text openly admits.[106]

Furthermore, one must realize that biblical texts were by no means read solely in worship service contexts but also, for example, at daily meal times.[107] Thus the fact that a certain text is publicly read in the worship services is suitable only up to a certain degree as a criterion for its canonicity.

(P.Oxy XV, 1783 = PO 18.503–504, fourth century); nr. 660 (P. Mich. 129 = C. Bonner 1925, second half of third century); nr. 661 (P.Oxy IX. 1172 = London, British Museum P. 067 = PO 18, 477–79, fourth century); nr. 662 (P. Berlin inv. 5513 = BKT 6.2.2 [Schmidt/Schubart 1910] = Harnack 1980a, 31–35 = PO 18, 468–71; third century [van Haelst/Wilcken]; fifth century [Harnack]); Nr. 663 (P.Hamburg 24 = PO 18, 479–81, fourth/fifth century); nr. 664 (P.Berlin inv. 13272 = Stegmüller 1937, fourth century); nr. 665 (P.Oxy XV, 1828, third century); nr. 666 (P.Berlin inv. 6789 = BKT 6.2.2 [Schmidt/Schubart 1910] = PO 18, 471–72, sixth century); nr. 667 (P.Oxy XIII, 1599 = London, British Museum P. 2467 = PO 18, 504–6, fourth century); nr. 668 (P.Oxy III, 404 = PO 18, 195–98, end of third/beginning of fourth century). To the list of the fourteen manuscripts from Haelst 1976 must now be added P.Oxy L, 3526 (P. Lond. Inv. 2067, fourth century); L, 3527 (third century); and L, 3528, as well as the discovery of a *Shepherd of Hermas* page from Codex Sinaiticus in the Sinai monastery (Aland/Aland 1989a, 117; 1989b, 107). Haelst 1976 nr. 949 a (P.Mich. inv. 6427 = Gronewald 1974, early fourth century) attests the use of Shepherd of Hermas, Mandate(s) I 1 (= 26.1) with Isaiah 61.1 combined in one prayer.

[103] Fischer 1974/1975.

[104] *Canon Muratori* lines 77–80 (text from Hahneman 1992, 7; also in Sakkos 1970, 12, or in Preuschen 1910, 32–33); for interpretation, compare, for example, Zahn 1975, II/1: 111–18.

[105] Since Moses too was counted as a prophet and the evangelists altogether as apostles, Zahn regards the expression "Old and New Testament," which is anachronistic in itself, as appropriate (documentation in Zahn 1975, I/1:100–101 with notes).

[106] See section 3.1.2.1 with notes 62-64; for the associated problem of pseudepigraphy, compare, for instance, Hengel 1972 = 1996a, 196–257; Meade 1986; Brox 1975; 1976; and more recently Edwards 1998.

[107] Thus Clement of Alexandria in *Stromata* VII 49.4 (Stählin/Früchtel/Treu 1970, 37.3–6): Prayer, reading, and praise are to have stood before meals, whereas psalms and singing followed it; the reading is lacking in *Paedagogus* II 44.1 (Stählin/Treu 1972, 184.1–5).

One can, of course, hold fast to the fact that a "quite certain divineness" can be inferred early on from the public reading of the Letters of Paul. When *1 Clement* brings them into connection with the εὐαγγέλιον, the revelation of God in Jesus Christ, even before the end of the first century, then one should not dispute the fact that a very special authority was already granted to this literature at an early date.[108] But, conversely, one may not infer a canonization for every text that was read in the worship service.[109] Martyr acts and bishop letters were, in part, read yearly without ever being perceived as "Holy Scripture."[110] This shows again the *limitations* of this criterion.

It would be just as inadequate to apply the manuscript tradition alone as a criterion of canonicity. Thus *1 Clement*, for example, was included in the New Testament in the famous *Codex Alexandrinus* from the fifth century, without it being permissible to conclude from this fact that for the commissioner of this manuscript, it belonged to the canonical scriptures in the narrower sense.[111] We have already spoken of the great abundance of papyri that contain the *Shepherd of Hermas*. If one compares the number of nineteen (or eighteen) manuscripts with the number of papyri of canonical New Testament writings, as can be obtained easily from a relevant table provided by Barbara and Kurt Aland,[112] then the extraordinary popularity of this book becomes clear, which can be explained easily with reference to the theme of repentance[113] and the generally understandable level of the theology of the book (Martin Dibelius).[114] Only the Gospel of Matthew, with eighteen attestations, and the Gospel of John, with twenty-two attestations,

[108] *1 Clement* 47.1–2: ἀναλάβετε τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τοῦ μακαρίου Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου. τί πρῶτον ὑμῖν ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἔγραψεν. The relevant works of Paul Glaue (Glaue 1907; 1924b; 1924a) require revision; compare also the literature pointer in n. 109.

[109] Thus, however, Zahn 1985, 38–40; 1975, I/1:431–52; compare also Urner 1952 (with Gaiffier 1954).

[110] Thus ca. 170 the Corinthian bishop about a letter of the Roman colleague Soter (ca. 166–74; Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* IV 23.11 [Schwartz 1999, II/1: 378.7–10]); on the reading of the martyr acts, see, for example, Hengel 1984, 36 n. 81.

[111] One can see this easily with reference to the facsimile edition of this work (British Museum, *Codex Alexandrinus* [Royal Ms. 1 D V–VIII] in Reduced Photographic Facsimile, fol. 159^{r}–168^{r}). The *Shepherd* stands there after Revelation, but compare also the placement of *1 Clement* in the Syriac Codex Add. MSS 1700 of the University Library Cambridge (Bensley 1899), where it stands between the Catholic Letters and the Corpus Paulinum (Zahn 1975, I/1:352, and Fischer 1993, 21–22; on the topic, see now also Lona 1998, 109–10).

[112] Aland/Aland 1989a, 112 (image 31); but compare also Epp 2005, 345–81 and 411–35.

[113] Compare, for example, Karp 1969, XXXIII–XXXIX (literature).

[114] The book is said to be "important as a monument of the everyday Christianity of the small people and broad strata" (Dibelius 1923, 425); on the other hand, it is said that the "literary clumsiness . . . is just as evident as the non-theological character of its piety" (Dibelius 1923, 423).

can surpass this high number. In light of this astonishing finding, a reference to the critical remarks on this book in the *Canon Muratori* (see n. 104 in this chapter) is not sufficient, especially since the book "reached the threshold of the canon and beyond."[115] But whether it ultimately did not get into the 'canon' because of its alleged use by the "Arians" (thus by Homoeans), as Harnack thought, must be questioned.[116]

If, however, the criteria that have served as a basis up to now—namely, the Greek term κανών in its application to a normative collection of biblical books, the public reading of texts in the Christian worship service, and the mention of them in authoritative lists—are not sufficient to explain the development of a canonical collection of biblical scriptures alongside the γραφή of primitive Christianity, which was later called "Old Testament," then the horizon of the investigations must be expanded. In the context of the present monograph, this will take place once again by taking various institutional contexts into consideration and asking what scope collections of normative books had in such contexts and what functions they possessed in each case. We will begin this treatment with three sections on free teachers—namely, Marcion (section 3.1.3), Clement of Alexandria (section 3.1.4), and certain Gnostics (section 3.1.5). In order to focus more strongly on the "implicit" Christian theology as well, this material will be followed by remarks on the everyday private use of Holy Scriptures and ancient libraries (section 3.1.6). The other institutions that have been discussed already as examples—namely, the Montanist prophets and the Christian worship service—are less suited for a detailed treatment, since, as we already saw for the worship service, the source material that has been handed down is not really adequate.

3.1.3 Marcion and the Canonization of the "New Testament"

One can divide the extensive amount of secondary literature on the canonization of a second section of the Bible in ancient Christianity in two

[115] Dibelius 1923, 419, with reference to Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* IV 20.2 (Rousseau 1965, II: 628.24 with commentary in Rousseau 1965, I: 248–50); Pseudo-Cyprian, *Adversus aleatores* 2 (Hartel 1871, 93.16–17 [= *Shepherd of Hermas, Similitude(s)* IX 31.5 = 108.5]) and 4 (96.10–13 [= *Shepherd of Hermas, Mandate(s)* IV 1.9 = 29.9]). Dibelius took this reference from Harnack 1958a, 51–58; a more recent compilation can be found in Brox 1981, 62–63.

[116] Thus far I have admittedly not been able to verify the use of the book by Arians, as claimed by Harnack 1891b, 428 (= 1980a, 32), in relation to Arian (and "Homoean") texts. In his history of literature, Harnack refers only to the Homoean "Opus imperfectum in Mt." (Harnack 1958a, 55–56); so long as its new edition (CChr.SL 87 B) has not yet appeared, there remains only a single passage: PG 56: 701 (cf. also Brox 1981, 68, and Henne 1990).

clearly arranged halves: For the one group of scholars, Marcion, whose lifetime can be specified as 85–160 CE, was, with his edition of the Bible, the direct reason that the majority church normed a "New Testament" with a fixed scope (the most prominent representatives of this direction are probably Campenhausen,[117] Harnack, and Knox[118]). For the other group, Marcion only accelerated a development that had already lasted for quite some time. Harnack stated provocatively that Marcion "is the creator of Christian Holy Scripture."[119] Theodor Zahn (and after him also Werner Georg Kümmel) pointed, by contrast, to a tendency toward canonization that is said to express itself in the later "New Testament." Kümmel named the whole norming process a "necessary taking form" of inherent authority[120] and could appeal in support of his position to the fact that Jesus spoke his words with undeniable authority (ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν; Matthew 5.21-44[121]). In the German-speaking world, it is less well known that the debate about Marcion's role in relation to the canonization of the New Testament has an English counterpart. In 1942, John Knox (Chicago) argued that Marcion must be understood as the decisive occasion for the emergence of the "New Testament," whereas Edwin Cyril Blackman (Cambridge) accepted that "the weight of probability is on the side of orthodox Christianity having moved toward canonization under the impulse of its own convictions."[122] It now seems to me that the old controversial question about the meaning of Marcion for the emergence of a normative collection of primitive Christian Scriptures can be discussed in a new light if one considers the *institutional context* of his activity.

Before this can happen, we must first recall a few generally known connections pertaining to the scope of Christian Holy Scripture around the middle of the second century. For Jesus of Nazareth and his immediate

[117] Compare also Groh 1974.

[118] Knox 1942. Compare the more moderate position in McDonald 1995, 159: "For the sake of canonical studies, Marcion undoubtedly was an important catalyst. He not only presented a well-defined collection of Christian Scriptures but he also undoubtedly caused the church to come to grips with the question of which literature best conveyed its true identity, and probably which literature could be called 'scripture.'"

[119] Harnack 1996, 151; Campenhausen 2003, 174 (cf. 1972, 148): "The idea and reality of the Christian Bible were created by Marcion, and the church that rejected his work did not go before him in this but—viewed from a formal perspective—followed his model." The history of research can be found also in Heckel 1999, 267–69.

[120] Kümmel 1950 = Käsemann 1970b (62–97) 70. A quite thorough bibliography can be found in Kinzig 1994, 535 n. 90.

[121] On the question of whether this formula actually implies a special authority of the one who uses it, compare, however, Lohse 1970 = 1976, 73–87; Jeremias 1979, 239–43.

[122] Blackman 1979 [1948], 39. On the history of research, compare also Gamble 2002, 291–94.

followers in the first century, the writings of the Hebrew Bible were Holy Scripture, although the scope that this Holy Scripture had in Palestine at that time is highly disputed at present.[123] A widespread name for what is often called the "Old Testament" today appears to have been "Law, Prophets, and Writings" at that time.[124] It is uncontroversial that these three parts of the Scripture were by no means regarded as equal at that time: for example, in contrast to the reading from the Prophets, it was forbidden to skip over material in the Torah reading,[125] which points, at any rate, to a continuous pericopae division that obtained a central position in the worship service at a very early point.[126] Apparently, in first-century Judaism, "the idea of a normative 'Scripture,' starting from the Torah, had established itself. One now spoke of a '*Schriftganzen*' (scriptural whole). But in contrast to the time of the closing of the canon, one did not yet take the idea of the totality of the document of revelation to its logical conclusion. The demarcation against literature that was also religious but not declared to be normative was still lacking."[127]

Like Philo, Paul presupposes such a scriptural whole and alludes to this, like other New Testament authors do, with the key word γραφή.[128] The synoptics, Paul, John, and Acts also use the Greek plural γραφαί, to which the rabbinic כתבי הקדו corresponds; Paul and John, by the way, also designate the scriptural whole with the term νόμος, which corresponds to the rabbinic תורה. תורה ונביאים[129] is very rarely used by rabbinic authors,[130] which corresponds to the phrase ὁ νόμος καὶ προφῆται in the synoptics and Paul.

[123] Compare on this topic only Meyer/Oepke 1938, 982: "At the time of Jesus there was neither in Palestine nor in Alexandria a closed canon" (marked in original) and "The canon owes its emergence above all to the epigone atmosphere in the post-exilic period"; Sundberg 1958, 205–26; K. Aland 1970, 147; G. Meyer 1974 (= 1989, 196–207); Wanke 1993, 1–8 (literature); Beckwith 1985 (and the criticism of this work in Sundberg 1988); J. Maier 1988; Rüger 1988; Hengel/Deines 1994; Dorival 2003.

[124] Compare *b. Sanhedrin* 90b, there attributed to Gamaliel II, ca. 90 CE.

[125] Compare *Megillah* 4.4 מדלגין בנביא ואין מדלגין בתורה.

[126] *Megillah* 4.10; compare also Elbogen 1995, 159–62, 538–40.

[127] Thus, in any case, Meyer/Oepke 1938, 980.

[128] Harnack 1928a (1980b, 823–40); Michel 1972 [1929]; Katz 1950, 125–38; Campenhausen 2003, 5–75 (= 1972, 1–61); Plümacher 1993a [1980]; D.-A. Koch 1986; Dorival 2003, 92–93. According to W. Bacher, the term γραφή corresponds with the Rabbinic כתוב (Bacher 1965a, 90–92), and in addition to the terminological מקרא (Bacher 1965a, 117–20) = Aramaic קרא (Bacher 1965b, 195–96).

[129] Thus, in any case, Bacher 1965a, 197; compare Plümacher 1993a, 10–11, and Billerbeck 1928.

[130] Billerbeck 1928, 416.

However, *1 Clement*, the letter of the Roman community to their Corinthian sister church,[131] also already intimates how additional entities came alongside this authoritative Bible. The author points to τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τοῦ μακαρίου Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου (47.1); it contains gospel proclamation, τί πρῶτον ὑμῖν ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἔγραψεν· (47.2), which is certainly not meant in the sense of a technical designation for the 'Gospels.'[132] By "gospel," Clement understands the good news of redemption through the blood of Christ.[133] But alongside this come above all the words of Jesus himself. Clement twice uses a "word of the Lord," which he either mixes from two gospels or quotes from memory or from oral discourses.[134]

A work that Papias, who was bishop or at least community leader in his home city of Hierapolis/Phrygia, wrote at the beginning of the second century presents another important witness for the development to a canonical collection alongside the Scripture that is later called "Old Testament." It bore the title λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσεως συγγράμματα πέντε,[135] which, according to everything that we know about the content on the basis of the fragment, must be translated "*Exegetical Presentation of the Tradition of the Lord in Five Books*."[136] Since the only certain *terminus ad quem* is Irenaeus' treatise *Adversus haereses*, some scholars have wanted to date the work of Papias between 80 and 160 CE. The current consensus of scholarship alternates between the date 125/130 CE and 130/140 CE. In the most recent edition of the Papias fragments, however, Ulrich H. J. Körtner has argued for an early dating to the year 110 CE[137] and grounded this view with the chronological placement by Eusebius: the bishop of Caesarea thinks that Papias lived at the time of Polycarp and Ignatius. And in his investigation of the history of the four-gospel 'canon,'

[131] Wrede 1891 or Harnack 1929; Hagner 1973, 221–48; B. M. Metzger 1987, 40–49, esp. 43.

[132] Thus also B. M. Metzger 1987, 42–43, and now also Lona 1998, 506–7 and 48–65.

[133] Compare, for example, *1 Clement* 7.4; 12.7; 21.6; likewise Fisher 1980—despite conspicuous points of contact with the terminology of Hebrews, the latter writing is not yet explicitly cited.

[134] On these "citations" in *1 Clement* 13.2 compare, for example, B. M. Metzger 1987, 41 with n. 8, and in detail Lona 1998, 214–17.

[135] Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* III 39.1 (Schwartz 1999, II/1: 284.24–25 = Körtner 1998b, fragment 5). Compare the commentary and literature references in Körtner 1998b, 74 n. 1 (on the text of p. 9); Zahn 1866, 668–69; Hilgenfeld 1875, 238; Heckel 1999, 219–65; Norelli 2005.

[136] With this rendering, I summarize what is explained about the content and genre of the work in Körtner 1998b, 31–35; for more detail see Körtner 1983, 151–67.

[137] Körtner 1998b, 30–31. A relatively comprehensive compilation of attempts at dating the work is provided by Körtner 1998b, 83 n. 137/138 (on the text of p. 30), which need not be repeated here; compare also Heckel 1999, 220–22.

Theo K. Heckel lands on a date between 120/130 CE.[138] But in light of the well-known problems of Eusebian dating, one may doubt with good reason whether any kind of certainty is reached with this.

More interesting is the question of which stage of the canonization of a second part of the Holy Scripture in the Christianity of Asia minor is presupposed by Papias in his text. Is he a witness for the view that the living *oral* tradition still stood in the place of a New Testament *committed to writing*? It is clear, first, that Papias himself preferred the oral Jesus tradition: "For I was of the opinion that book wisdom would not be as useful to me as the reports of the living and abiding voice."[139] The peculiar intermediate placement of this position in a history of the New Testament 'canon' was most perceptively recognized and stated by Karl Barth in conjunction with a sharply negative evaluation: "The saying of Papias . . . is characteristic for the turn, catastrophic in its effects, that has already entered in here at the beginning of the second century: the 'livingness' is now no longer sought and found in the written word of the apostle himself but in the 'voice' of such contemporaries who still knew the apostles themselves and this 'living and enduring voice' is now also already given priority over the 'books,' that is the apostolic scriptures."[140] Winrich Löhr, by contrast, has formulated the paradox that the lines of Papias implicitly contain as follows: "The oral tradition is evoked in order to legitimate—perhaps in competition to other written works—one's own *Schriftlichkeit* (use/form of writing)."[141] For it is, in fact, by no means said that the "reports of the living and abiding voice" (τὰ παρὰ ζώσης φωνῆς καὶ μενούσης) are not already present in a *written* source.[142] In addition, one will not be able to deny Papias a firm interest in the written forms of the Gospels, as is shown by his comments on the authors of the Gospels, which have been dealt with frequently and controversially. Incidentally, if with Charles E. Hill we attribute to Papias an anonymously transmitted passage in Eusebius,

[138] Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* III 36.1–2 (Schwartz 1999, II/1: 274.13–16).

[139] Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* III 39.4 (Schwartz 1999, II/1: 286.20–22 = Körtner 1998b, fragment 5): οὐ γὰρ τὰ ἐκ τῶν βιβλίων τοσοῦτόν με ὠφελεῖν ὑπελάμβανον ὅσον τὰ παρὰ ζώσης φωνῆς καὶ μενούσης; for interpretation, see Karpp 1964; Walls 1967; W. A. Löhr 1994, 237–41; Körtner 1998b, 47. It is said that Papias "is far from seeing in the Gospels the definitive or canonical form of the Jesus tradition, but confesses with pathos the priority of the oral tradition" (quotation from Campenhausen 2003, 154; cf. 1972, 130). A detailed commentary on the passage *Historia ecclesiastica* III 39.4 can also be found in Heckel 1999, 229–46.

[140] K. Barth 1985, 107.

[141] W. A. Löhr 1994, 238.

[142] W. A. Löhr 1994, 240 n. 29: "The word-for-word quotation of the presbyter in *Historia ecclesiastica* II 39.15 could speak for this hypothesis."

we would come to a very early dating of the four-gospel 'canon' (Hill argues for 125–135 CE).[143]

Against this background, one can ask the following question: what was the precise role of Marcion in the process of the norming of primitive Christian writings into a 'canon' of the 'New Testament'? Since in his day the Jewish Scriptures, as we have seen, had already been authoritative Holy Scripture for quite some time for most Christian theologians, at least in a certain sense, one can actually discuss only the question of whether Marcion was the creator of the New Testament and can hardly discuss seriously Harnack's thesis that he was simultaneously the creator of the whole bipartite Bible.[144] But what was the purpose of his critical edition of primitive Christian scriptures?[145] In order to answer this question, we have, beyond a concise note in Irenaeus[146] and other short polemics, only one detailed yet highly polemical source at our disposal—namely, Tertullian's *Against Marcion*, which was written after 207 CE.[147] A foreword to Marcion's edition or comparable information from Marcion about the meaning and goal of his undertaking is unfortunately not preserved either,[148] so we must rely on the disparaging report of Tertullian, Marcion's learned North African opponent.

There are, of course, certain difficulties with inferring from this report what Harnack says about the purpose of Marcion's edition of the Bible. Tertullian nowhere says that his opponent intended to create a 'canon' of authoritative scriptures. The fourth book of Tertullian's treatise begins

[143] Hill 1998. The dating (in debate with other positions) is found on p. 617. Similarly, Heckel 1999, 353, too already argued that the witness of Papias "probably already" looked back "to the fourfold gospel collection, which arose not long before."

[144] Likewise Schneemelcher 1993, 37.

[145] On this topic, compare also Zahn 1975, I/2: 585–718, and II/2:409–529; B. Aland 2000, 89, 91–93; May 1989 (= 2005b, 35–41); 2005a.

[146] Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* I 27.2 (Rousseau/Doutreleau 1979, II: 350.20–21, 28–29); compare for more detail n. 162 below.

[147] R. Braun 1977, 572. On the source problem, see now also U. Schmid 1995, 1–5, 31–33; introductory questions on the writing of Tertullian are treated on pp. 35–36. Schmid attempts to show that Marcion proceeded very carefully philologically and only carried out cautious deletions in the Paul edition used by him (Galatians 3.6–9, 14–18, 29; Romans 2.3–11; 4.1ff [?]; 10.5ff [?]; 11.1–32; Colossians 1.15b–16; Ephesians 2.14 [?]; Colossians 1.22 [?]). Thus by no means were all the passages that stood in contradiction to the theology of Marcion consistently deleted. U. Schmid 1995, 310, explains this as follows: "The Marcionite hermeneutic must have been much more flexible and text-imminent at this point than is suggested by the sharp and simplistic presentation of the antitheses."

[148] There is, however, an extended tradition of regarding the "antitheses" as such a preface: compare Burkitt 1929; Bruce 1988, 136; McDonald 1995, 157. Admittedly, Zahn 1975, I/2: 596 n. 1, already spoke against such an unfounded assumption. Due to the complexity of the material, I do not want to go into the problem of the so-called Marcionite prologue; for an initial orientation, compare B. M. Metzger 1987, 94–97.

with the following observations: “From now on we test every single opinion . . . of the godless and idol-serving Marcion on his gospel, i.e., on that which he has made his own through his interpolations.”[149] And at another point, the North African theologian accuses Marcion of changing the four gospels, which he designates as *instrumentum*, “proof-document” (Crehan[150]), whereas the heretic Valentinus is said to have taken them over without change.[151] Thus, according to the view of Tertullian, Marcion applied a philological principle to a text—namely, the elimination of interpolations (*interpolationes*)—which resulted in a text of his own recension.[152] But with this, the classic task of an ancient or modern text editor is described or caricatured in the critical lens of Tertullian. In his famous monograph *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott* (*Marcion: The Gospel of the Alien God*), Harnack basically advocated a similar view of Marcion’s work on the primitive Christian writings when he wrote, “Never and nowhere did M(arcion) claim that he found the unadulterated g(ospel) in a manuscript, but always only that he reestablished it.”[153] Such a viewpoint is supported by an observation that was likewise already pointed out by Harnack: the gospel of Marcion included no material that we would designate today as “apocryphal.”[154] In light of the not insignificant number of citations of such texts in Clement of Alexandria and Origen (see section 3.1.4), such an observation must be called especially striking. It is easier to explain if one understands Marcion’s goal initially as purely philological:

[149] Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem* IV 1.1 *Omnem sententiam . . . impii atque sacrilegi Marcionis ad ipsum iam euangelium eius provocamus, quod interpolando suum fecit* (Kroymann 1954, 544.23–25 = Moreschini/Braun 2001, 56.1–3). McDonald 1995, 157, goes even so far as to say that “Marcion probably did not know of a fourfold Gospel canon (Papias, a contemporary of Marcion, refers only to Matthew and Mark). We have no direct evidence that Marcion was aware of Gospels other than Luke, but it is likely that he had at least heard of the Gospel of Matthew, because it was so popular in the second century.”

[150] Tertullian, *De praescriptione haereticorum* 38.8 . . . *integro instrument uti videtur* . . . (Refoulé 1954, 219.22–23); compare Crehan 1959, 3; compare also Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem* IV 2.1 *evangelicum instrumentum* (Kroymann 1954, 547.6–7 = Moreschini/Braun 2001, 66.5).

[151] Compare also Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem* IV 4.4 (Kroymann 1954, 550.18–25 = Moreschini/Braun 2001, 78.26–80.33).

[152] For the Gospel of Marcion, compare supplement V.2 in Zahn 1975, II/2:455–94, supplement IV b in Harnack 1996, 183*–240*, U. Schmid 1995, 23–26, which also includes a presentation of more recent literature, and Roth 2015. Schmid 1995, 254–55, shows, however, that for the Apostolos “certain text changes can be shown only as omissions . . . With this is not claimed that Marcion could have made no changes at all in the manner of the described ‘textual alterations.’ To me this even appears to be entirely likely, but we can no longer say exactly where he did so.” Additional literature on this topic can be found in B. M. Metzger 1987, 97 n. 46.

[153] Harnack 1996, 250*; but on this topic, compare now Delobel 1989.

[154] Harnack 1996, 254*.

with philological methods, the theologian wanted to establish an edition of the text that was reliable in his eyes, and in doing so, he took up quite energetically the method of radical emendation because he evidently regarded the text that had to be worked on as quite corrupt. If one realizes that in the second century the whole of Christian theology was still experimenting, then one will comprehend that the philological endeavors of Marcion had an experimental character as well and did not yet reach the high level of scholarly philology that Origen shows due to his Alexandrian education.[155] It was evidently clear to Marcion that the Alexandrian philology aimed at the production of editions of works, of *corpora*, and critically emended the texts for this purpose—and so he edited a *corpus* of writings and emended the texts for this purpose. But Marcion was evidently not familiar with philology to such an extent that he knew that Alexandrian textual emendation did not imply a radical correction of the text in the sense of the destruction of whole lines or passages.[156] In other words, Marcion had not studied the Alexandrian praxis of cautious διόρθωσις and the subtleties of ἔκδοσις. Against the background of the scholarly standards of his day, he would have to be regarded as a scholarly amateur and dilettante, just like the Christian theologians of the second century with their meager knowledge of Plato (section 2.1.3.2) could not yet compete at the highest scholarly level. Again, Marcion did not want to create a normative 'canon' of primitive Christian writings in the sense of a religious textual corpus. He did not want place a New Testament alongside the Old Testament but rather to revise and edit a text as a literary corpus, a text that required such revision in his eyes. It was probably not at all clear to him that with this action, of course, he nevertheless indirectly carried out a canonization, as every producer of a philological edition does at all times.

The primarily philological interest of Marcion is probably also the reason his opponent Tertullian often raises purely philological questions in *Against Marcion*. He asks whether "gospels that are gospels in the actual sense of the word and have been published under the names of apostles or apostolic men"[157] may be treated as pseudonymous writings and whether "the gospel, i.e., the apostolic gospel" is the edition "that Marcion alone possesses."[158] Because Tertullian evidently viewed Marcion's undertaking

[155] This is impressively shown by Neuschäfer 1987.

[156] Pfeiffer 1978, 140–43, 264–65; compare also Giard/Jacob 2001.

[157] Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem* IV 3.2: *conititur ad destruendum statum eorum evangeliorum, quae propria et sub apostolorum nomine eduntur* . . . (Kroymann 1954, 548.21–22 = Moreschini/Braun 2001, 72.9–11).

[158] Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem* IV 3.5: *Aut si sub ipsum erit uerum, id est apostolorum, quod Marcion habet solus*? (Kroymann 1954, 549.16–17 = Moreschini/Braun 2001, 74.35–36).

primarily as the text-critical work of a (bad) philologist, he can provide a correspondingly low estimation of the significance of his edition: in Tertullian's eyes, the authority of the philology that stands behind Marcion's edition is much less decisive than the authority of the apostles and their successors who stand behind the majority church edition of these writings.[159] One can, by the way, hypothesize with good reason that this line of argumentation by the North African theologian goes back to Irenaeus rather than being first developed by Tertullian.[160]

An interpretation of Marcion's work on the Bible as a primarily philological activity, which incidentally was also already advocated by Robert M. Grant,[161] can be supported by a closer examination of other ancient authors. According to Irenaeus, "he shortened the Gospel according to Luke" and "cut out parts of the letters of Paul."[162] Finally, Epiphanius of Salamis began a paragraph of his chapter against Marcion and the Marcionites with the words ἐλεύσομαι δὲ εἰς τὰ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γεγραμμένα, "we come now to his writings,"[163] and he mentions a εὐαγγέλιον μόνον τὸ κατὰ Λουκᾶν and ἐπιστολὰς . . . τοῦ ἁγίου ἀποστόλου δέκα as works of Marcion. But one will scarcely be permitted to understand his formulations ἔχει and κέχρηται,[164] "Marcion *has* these two texts alone" or "*uses* them alone," in the sense of the statement "has only these two as *canonical* texts."

With these observations on the philological orientation of Marcion, it should not, of course, be claimed that Marcion's *philological* attempt to correct the text of various primitive Christian writings was not guided in a very specific way by *theological* principles and interests. One can already

159 Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem* IV 2.4 . . . *ut et si sub ipsius Pauli nomine euangelium Marcion intulisset, non sufficeret ad fidem singularitas instrumenti destituta patrocinio antecessorum* (Kroymann 1954, 548.30–32 = Moreschini/Braun 2001, 70.30–33).

160 Compare Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* III 3.1 and IV 32.1, 5 (Rousseau/Doutreleau 1974, II: 30.1–9, or Rousseau 1965, I: 796.1–798.30).

161 Grant 1984; compare also Barton 1997, 37: "I shall argue that even in this modified form Harnack's thesis about Marcion has obscured more than it has clarified in the history of the canon." Other positions are found, for example, in Zahn 1975, I/2:596–625; Bruce 1988, 134–41; Quispel 1998, 359, "he was a reformer, not a philologist"; and now May 2005a, 86–89.

162 Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* I 27.2: *Et super haec, id quod est secundum Lucam euangelium circumcidens (. . .). Similiter autem et apostolic Pauli epistolas abscidit (. . .)* (Rousseau/Doutreleau 1979, II: 350.20–21, 28–29); compare for this charge also the following notes.

163 Epiphanius, *Panarion seu adversus Lxxx haereses* 42.9.1 (Holl/Dummer 1980, 104.22–23); for an introduction to this passage, compare U. Schmid 1995, 150–68 (with important references to mistaken basic decisions in the text construction of Karl Holl).

164 Epiphanius, *Panarion seu adversus Lxxx haereses* 42.9.1 (Holl/Dummer 1980, 104.23); 9.3 (105.4–5) and for ἔχει p. 104.23 and p. 105.4 or κέχρηται p. 105.5.

recognize such principles and interests in the fact that Marcion, as Tertullian accuses him, “ascribes his gospel to no author.”[165] Marcion removes the author name “Luke” from his edition of the Bible, deletes the friendly mention of this figure from the (pseudo-) Pauline letter to the Colossians (cf. Colossians 4.14), and explicitly rejects the Lukan book of Acts—according to Harnack because he regarded Luke as a falsifier who had changed the holy texts in a “Jewish style” and was thus ultimately responsible for Marcion’s works of correction and restoration.[166] But one must wonder whether the modern criticism of Luke does not guide Harnack’s pen at this point. If, with Gerhard May, one regards the conflict between Peter and Paul in Antioch as a central point of departure for all Marcion’s theological thinking—which has much in its favor[167]—and accepts further that Marcion was already familiar with the tradition that Mark was Peter’s interpreter[168] and viewed Luke as the companion of Paul, then in light of this “theological labeling” of the Gospel of Mark,[169] it is not very surprising that Marcion made a decision *for* Luke and *against* Mark as a foundation for his gospel. But since Luke was of interest only as a representative of the Pauline tradition, there was no need for his individual name, and it was deleted.

E. C. Blackman thinks he has found another motive for Marcion’s undertaking: in place of the previous Holy Scripture of Judaism that was rejected by him and accepted by Christians, it is said to have been necessary for the Roman theologian to establish a new Scripture—namely, *his* New Testament.

> It is easy to see the motive which impelled him; and we see at the same time why it was not yet necessary for the Church to take such a step. The Church had as its basic scripture the Jewish Old Testament, and this was supplemented by the writings of its own Apostles. But Marcion regarded the Old Testament as the law of another God, and as incompatible with the Christian revelation. He was therefore bound to look elsewhere for the record of that revelation, and to invest other writings with that authority in his church which the Old Testament had among other Christians.[170]

[165] Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem* IV 2.3 *Contra Marcion euangelio, scilicet suo, nullum adscribit auctorem* . . . (Kroymann 1954, 547.18–19 = Moreschini/Braun 2001, 68.18–19).

[166] Harnack 1996, 250*; similarly, Heckel 1999, 332–33. Admittedly, Georgi 1993, 70, draws attention to the fact that he “(took) seriously the securing of Luke, that he critically compared the sources and decided for the most reliable.”

[167] May 1989, 209 (= 2005b, 41): “It seemed appropriate to understand the entire thinking and activity of the apostle in the light of these presentations.” On Luke as a student of Paul for Marcion, see also Heckel 1999, 331–35.

[168] Papias, fragment 5 Körtner 1998b = Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* III 39.15 (Schwartz 1999, II/1: 292); compare Körtner 1983, 56, 206–20.

[169] Körtner 1983, 212.

[170] Blackman 1978, 24.

But this thesis presupposes that the majority church of that time did not already recognize parts of our canonical New Testament as a "record of revelation." A correspondingly negative impression can arise for the reader of Blackman's monograph because its author makes recourse only to the Letter of Barnabas, a text that does not in fact use, let alone cite, any New Testament text as a "record of revelation."[171] But Helmut Koester[172] and his student Arthur J. Bellinzoni[173] have now shown that traces of the kind of authority of New Testament texts that Blackman disputes can, in truth, already be observed from the middle of the second century—for example, in Polycarp, *To the Philippians*, and (somewhat less controversially) in the Διδαχή, a text that probably emerged in the first century or at the latest at the beginning of the second century.[174] This assumption of an early authority of New Testament texts is also confirmed, to a certain extent, by a closer look at Marcion's attempt to correct "philologically" the text of the gospel and the Ἀπόστολος: a new investigation of Marcion's gospel comes to the conclusion that the

[171] Blackman 1978, 24.

[172] Koester 1957, 23: *1 Clement* used "none of our Synoptic Gospels" but recognized the authority of the sayings of the Lord; contrast B. M. Metzger 1987, 41 (few New Testament quotations), and Mees 1971. Mees argued for a form of the New Testament texts that was altered for the purposes of catechesis. Koester 1957, 60–61: Ignatius; cf. B. M. Metzger 1987, 45–49, and Smit Sibinga 1966. Koester 1957, 109–11: *2 Clement* used a written collection of sayings of the Lord from Matthew and Luke; the famous passage in *2 Clement* 14.2 τὰ βίβλία καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι is not interpreted in relation to the Gospels and Letters by Koester 1957, 67, as Blackmann 1978, 27–28, does. Compare also Hengel 1984, 19 n. 42; Baarda 1982; B. M. Metzger 1987, 67–72. Koester 1957, 120–23: Polycarp, *To the Philippians*, is dependent on canonical Matthew and perceives the passages to be authoritative but authorized by the κύριος. Koester 1957, 122, admittedly regards these passages as part of a later, second letter to the Philippians, which he dates to the middle of the second century; cf. also B. M. Metzger 1987, 59–63. Koester 1957, 156–58: *Barnabas*. Koester 1957, 239–41: *Didache*; B. M. Metzger 1987, 49–51. Koester 1957, 254–56: *Shepherd of Hermas*; cf. also B. M. Metzger 1987, 63–67. Compare now also Hagner 1973, passim; Petersen 1989; and the concise treatment of the connections in B. M. Metzger 1987, 43–49 (Ignatius), and in McDonald 1995, 146–49.

[173] Bellinzoni 1967, 47: "It is certain . . . that Justin did not quote from memory . . . but that he quoted from one or more written sources" or 48. "However, an examination of the text of Justin's sayings of Jesus indicates that Justin had before him written sources that harmonized texts from Matthew, Mark, and Luke and that combined material of similar context from different places in the same gospel" (cf. also p. 130). Here the author especially opposes Zahn 1975, I/2: 463–585, esp. 477–537, who claimed that Justin's deviations are explained by the fact that he was citing from memory; compare also Kline 1975; Skarsaune 1987, 223 n. 84: "I find Bellinzoni's arguments for a harmonistic source persuasive." Strecker 1978a and B. M. Metzger 1987, 146 n. 4, are critical of this notion.

[174] Niederwimmer 1989, 78–80, provides precise orientation concerning the discussion of this text's "time and place of composition"; on the discussion of possible citations from the Jesus tradition of synoptic provenance, compare Jefford 1989; Niederwimmer 1989, 71–77; 1995, 16–17 with n. 6; Rordorf 1993.

Roman theologian "may have transmitted his text with greater fidelity than has been supposed."[175] Such a form of philological attention to a text points, of course, to a canonical authority that was already present.

For our inquiry into the purpose of Marcion's edition of the Bible and its position in a history of the New Testament 'canon,' it is also important to consider whether one can still reconstruct the title of this work and its wording. On the basis of a number of passages in the work of Tertullian, Wolfram Kinzig argued some time ago in a stimulating article that Marcion was the first Christian theologian to use the title "New Testament" for his 'canon' and that his work was thus titled καινὴ διαθήκη. Kinzig admittedly does not conclude from this that Marcion also simultaneously "created" the 'canon' of the New Testament, let alone the idea of a New Testament: "It suffices to say that Marcion did play an important role in the process (sc. towards the formation of the canon of the New Testament) as we know it."[176] Moreover, it is uncertain whether one can really trace back the first use of the title "New Testament" to Marcion. In his overview of the canonization of the New Testament, at any rate, Wilhelm Schneemelcher comes to the judgment that "he probably did not have an overall name for this collection; at least, one cannot find any evidence for this."[177] This position was also advocated by Bruce, Lindemann, and Metzger.[178] For our line of questioning, however, the question of the title of Marcion's edition of the Bible is admittedly of only very secondary interest, as Kinzig himself shows, because it says little about the canonical claim that Marcion allegedly connected with his edition. In addition, one must always realize that the Pauline designation καινὴ διαθήκη apparently did not become accepted at first because it was bound up with a massive devaluation of the Old Testament.[179]

More important for an investigation of the position of Marcion's edition in the history of the Christian Bible, therefore, is the observation of von Campenhausen that none of Marcion's students treated the collection of his teacher as an authoritative (thus canonical) collection of Holy

[175] D. S. Williams 1989, 483. This article summarizes the results of the MA thesis of the author (D. S. Williams 1982), to which I did not have access. U. Schmid 1995, 29–31, also draws attention to the fact that the "normal corruption of the text" could have been just as responsible for the textual differences between Marcion's Bible and the later majority text. His summarizing judgment reads as follows: "Thus the influence of Marcionite theology upon the coming about of the Marcionite text was much less than has been assumed up to now" (282). Quispel 1998, 349–52, also refers to this point on multiple occasions.

[176] Kinzig 1994, 535.

[177] Schneemelcher 1993, 36.

[178] Documentation in Kinzig 1994, 536 n. 95.

[179] Thus first Unnik 1961, 220 (= 1980, 164–65); taken up by Plümacher 1993a, 9.

Scriptures.[180] Harnack's view, which remains convincing to this day, that Marcion "neither (could) claim nor did claim absolute certainty . . . for his textual purifications" likewise speaks quite clearly for a more philological intention of the Roman theologian. His students therefore "continued—sometimes more radically and sometimes more conservatively—to make changes to the texts. . . . For the master had not prohibited it; indeed he had perhaps encouraged them to do so."[181] Although Harnack's picture rests on polemical reports about Marcion to a greater extent than this great historian suspected,[182] we have no grounds for a complete revision of his position. On the contrary, Geoffrey M. Hahneman demonstrated some time ago that later Marcionite communities in no way limited themselves to the so-called 'canon' of Marcion and thus evidently did not receive the edition of the master as a canonical holy text.[183] We can conclude from these witnesses that Marcion evidently did not intend to submit a new 'canon' of Holy Scriptures but wanted to establish the philologically correct edition of a fundamentally corrupted text. Thus he was not the creator of the Christian Bible or the New Testament but, as Robert M. Grant already saw long ago, the first Christian textual philologist, who attempted to place himself in the Alexandrian tradition.[184] Marcion must be understood as another important witness for the inculturation of Christian theology in the scholarly institutions of its time, and therefore he must be placed in this tendency, regardless of his imperfections, alongside authors such as Justin or Clement. He is not the only author who is accused of "arbitrary changes" of the biblical text; here I need mention only Tatian and the Monarchians.[185] In the case of these figures, too, one naturally has to ask whether they could not, in truth, have contemplated corrections due to philological motives and could not likewise serve as examples of the fact

[180] Campenhausen 2003, 191 (= 1972, 162–63).

[181] Harnack 1996, 43, 173.

[182] See in detail U. Schmid 1995, 10–11.

[183] Hahneman 1992, 90–91. In the *Dialogue of Adamantius* II 16, 20 (Sande-Bakhuyzen 1901, 90.4–5 and 108.31), the Marcionite Markus cites two passages from John as authoritative Scripture; the '*Canon Muratori*' rejects a Marcionite psalm collection (compare section 3.1.2.1 with n. 67–69 and beyond this Casey 1938; McDonald 1995, 160–61).

[184] Grant 1984, 211–12; a cautious agreement in individual points is found in U. Schmid 1995, 257–60.

[185] Documentation in U. Schmid 1995, 16 n. 71: Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* IV 29.6 (Schwartz 1999, II/1: 392.4–6) or V 28.13–15 (Schwartz 1999, II/1: 504.11, 25–26), and Bludau 1925. Tertullian's changes to the text, which are determined by the subject matter, are documented by U. Schmid 1995, 67–72. According to Harnack 1889, 36, the charge against the Theodotians that they falsify the "divine Scriptures" is concerned only with the Old Testament. Harnack appeals to Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* V 28.19, and argues against Zahn 1975, I/1: 259 n. 3.

that Christian theologians, as they began to orient themselves toward general standards of contemporary scholarship, employed philological methods as well. Marcion's edition of the Bible was probably an initial sign of this reception and a correspondingly radical one. He did not intend to create a 'canon'; rather, he corrected a text of an already existing 'canon.' Thus he did not attempt to canonize a selection of texts but to make a *text recension* binding. For this reason, the most consistent reaction to Marcion's attempt also was not, as Campenhausen and Harnack thought, the norming of a divergent New Testament 'canon' by the majority church but the gospel harmony of Tatian and the harmony, if it really existed, of Theophilus of Antioch.[186]

Although his significance for the canonization of the New Testament has been overestimated in the last century, Marcion is nevertheless a good witness for a certain interaction with the solidifying 'canon' under the conditions of the theological "laboratory" in the second century. Beyond this, Marcion's radical philological interaction with the biblical text and the criticism of majority church theologians is a sign of the already astonishingly developed and high significance of these writings in the middle of the second century. Such an interest in the norming of a fixed scope of biblical writings is basically attested by Melito von Sardes, among whose works one also finds the first preserved Christian list of books of the Jewish Bible as well[187] (but not the first attestation for the term παλαιὰ διαθήκη, which is attested in the work of Clement of Alexandria).[188] But one must also realize that according to his own statement, he did not turn to the Jewish community of the city in which he was bishop for exact information about the scope of the Old Testament but traveled to Jerusalem.[189] In the seventies of the second century, there were evidently both educated Christians

[186] Thus also Hengel 2000, 217–18 n. 48 (p. 12 in the main text). I thank Prof. Hengel for placing the German manuscript of this work at my disposal long before its publication (see now Hengel 2008). The view that Theophilus wrote such a harmony of the Gospels goes back to Jerome, *Epistulae* 121 6.15: *quattuor evangelistarum in unum opus dicta conpingens* (Hilberg 1918, 24.24–27, quotation on p. 24.26). It is admittedly unclear whether this means Theophilus' commentary on the Gospels, which is attested elsewhere. (Thus, above all, Zahn 1883, 13: "It is therefore to be rejected as a misunderstanding when from these words of Jerome it is inferred that Theophilus composed a harmony of the Gospels and wrote his commentary on it"; cf. also the critical discussion of Zahn's edition by Sanday 1885, 89–101; Harnack 1883, 102–6; B. M. Metzger 1987, 117 with n. 9.)

[187] Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* IV 26.13–14 (Schwartz 1999, II/1: 386.20–388.8) = fragment 3 in Hall 1979 or Perler 1966; compare also Dorival 2003, 85–86.

[188] Unnik 1961, 163–64; Gamble 1992, 20; B. M. Metzger 1987, 123; Kinzig 1994, 528; Zahn 1975, I/1:105 n. 2.

[189] "It is curious that Melito had to make such a trip, since there were many Jews in his own vicinity" (McDonald 1995, 109).

and Jews who were not quite clear about the exact scope of their Bible or about a central part of their Bible.

To rephrase the matter in summary, the institutional background to which Marcion oriented himself in his philological work (even if, as we have seen, very imperfectly) was basically the institutions of Alexandrian philology, in which the Christian teacher himself possessed neither the necessary educational background for such an ambitious undertaking nor the requisite institutional backing. Marcion did not teach on the Serapeum and could not make recourse to an outstanding education, a library, and intelligent colleagues; rather, as a former entrepreneur, he probably appropriated the necessary knowledge in self-study more inadequately than effectively. His results—when viewed against the background of the standards of philological editing in Alexandria—were correspondingly poor, and they show with corresponding clarity the experimental character of all Christian theology in the second century. The institution of a free teacher that Marcion represented could not provide the context in which a philological editing of a great standard could be imitated, let alone surpassed. And yet, from an institutional perspective, with Marcion's imperfect attempt, a history begins that leads straight to the first private Christian university in Caesarea and to the diverse philological undertakings of its leader Origen, which could be regarded as competitive in every respect according to the standard of ancient philological editing. But because its philological character is already clearer due to scholarly level, the Hexapla and the diverse text-critical observations of the Alexandrian in his commentaries are also taken only as indirect evidence of his own conception of a biblical 'canon.' From this perspective, it is worthwhile to take a look at Clement of Alexandria, who stands between Marcion and Origen both chronologically and in other ways.

3.1.4 Clement of Alexandria and His Canon of the New Testament

Clement of Alexandria, the first Christian theologian to be very well educated according to ancient standards at the end of the second century, is often drawn upon, with his special stance toward an authoritative collection of New Testament writings, either as crowning witness for the view that at this time the concept of a 'canon' of the New Testament was still relatively vague in terms of form and content or as a singular figure who stands apart from the general development. Eusebius of Caesarea already claimed a hundred years after Clement that the Alexandrian theologian appealed "also to the disputed writings,"[190] and Hermann Kutter concluded

[190] Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* VI 13.6 (Schwartz 1999, II/2: 548.5–7): κέχρηται δ' ἐν αὐτοῖς (sc. his '*Stromata*') καὶ ταῖς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀντιλεγομένων γραφῶν (the

his investigation on "Clement of Alexandria and the New Testament" with the provocative thesis that Clement had "no collection of New Testament writings in front of him" and was not interested "in such a collection, either."[191] Campenhausen then even spoke pointedly of the "backwardness that Clement shows in the development to the canonical."[192] If one takes as a basis the concept of a linear and teleological development, as many presentations on the history of the canonization of the New Testament do, then one can indeed scarcely avoid either designating the concept of Clement as "backward" or setting forth a more reserved picture of the general authoritativeness of a canonical scope of the New Testament than these presentations presuppose. In the latter case, two predecessors of Clement, Justin and Irenaeus, with whose work Clement was undoubtedly familiar, then appear as solitary figures because they undoubtedly attempted to fix the second part of the Christian biblical canon and to interpret the concept of a fixed 'canon' from a theological standpoint. In the first case, Clement, with his vague understanding, would be a solitary figure in view of the development initiated by Justin and Irenaeus.

In this case, too, one can show that a consideration of the institutional contexts of the three theologians mentioned—namely, Justin, Irenaeus, and Clement—leads to a more precise apprehension of the findings. In the middle of the second century, the urban Roman apologist *Justin* from Samaria, a free teacher like many Gnostics, used the text of the Gospels with a certain freedom and harmonized the different versions for catechetical purposes[193]—a tendency that his student Tatian subsequently took up in his harmony of the Gospels.[194] In the context of such citations, Justin speaks multiple times of the "memoirs/recollections (ἀπομνημονεύματα) of the apostles,"[195] thus, inter alia, in the introduction to the words of the Lord's

---

following are listed: Wisdom of Solomon, Sirach, Hebrews, *Barnabas*, *1 Clement*, and Jude); compare B. M. Metzger 1987, 124.

191 Kutter 1897, 152; on the history of research, see now Schneider 1999, 6–9 and 29; see also in greater detail Hengel 2001, 15–19; 2008, 26–33.

192 Campenhausen 2003, 344 (cf. 1972, 298: "old-fashioned attitude").

193 See among others Cosgrove 1982 and above all Heckel 1999, 309–29 (with a presentation of the relevant secondary literature on pp. 315–18), and Hengel 2000, 19–20; 2008, 34–38.

194 Compare n. 186 above and for Tatian see now also Petersen 1994; 1990.

195 Attestations in Justin, *Apologia i* 66.3; 67.3; thirteen attestations in *Dialogus cum Tryphone*; compare Goodspeed 1912, s. v. (33–34), and now Pilhofer 1990, 64–66. Hyldahl 1960, 79–80, makes a distinction between "*Erinnerungen*/recollections/memoirs" (= ἀπομνημονεύματα) as recollections of an eyewitness of an important person, such as, for example, Xenophon of Socrates under this title and "*Denkwürdigkeiten*/memorabilia" (= ὑπομνήματα), for which reason one must translate carefully here; compare also the literature in Pilhofer 1990, 75 n. 52.

Supper, which he cites with extraordinary freedom.[196] Justin evidently means the Gospels with this designation. They bear this title "because in his day the designation 'gospel' was scarcely used otherwise than with the meaning 'good news,' thus in a non-literary sense."[197] "The name" ἀπομνημονεύματα was, as Zahn already said, "fittingly chosen and very well suited to give the literarily educated Gentiles a correct conception of the nature of the Gospels."[198] As Luise Abramowski has convincingly shown, Justin thereby accented the written character of the Gospels, which was "far from a given in the second century."[199] The Roman teacher stressed the written character against the oral secret traditions of the Gnostics about Jesus, against their special collections and special texts with which he had already dealt.[200] And yet, like *1 Clement*,[201] by "Scripture," Justin means only the Bible that is referred to today as the Old Testament.[202] But alongside this, an authority of the Gospels begins to emerge, which is derived, as the citations of the *verba testamenti* of the Lord's Supper paradosis show, primarily from the authority of the living Kyrios. But these words do not yet possess "canonical authority" in our sense (von Campenhausen).[203] As

[196] Justin, *Apologia i* 66.3 Οἱ γὰρ ἀπόστολοι ἐν τοῖς γενομένοις ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἀπομνημονεύμασιν, ἃ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια, οὕτως παρέδωκαν ἐντετάλθαι αὐτοῖς· 'τὸν Ἰησοῦν λαβόντα ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσαντα εἰπεῖν . . .' (Marcovich 1994, 128.11–13). Bultmann 1980, 148 (= 2007, 146), regarded this form of the words of institution as the oldest version.

[197] Hyldahl 1960, 78; compare also Abramowski 1983, 344 (= 1991, 326).

[198] Zahn 1975, I/2: 471. Zahn then mentions examples of this genre (471–76). In his Münster promotion lecture, Pilhofer 1990, 76, introduces certain corrections and explains (with Harnack) the term such that Justin understood the *Gospel of Peter* as ἀπομνημονεύματα Πέτρου and therefore formed after it the other ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων (77). But this explanation appears very farfetched to me; the example of Papias demonstrates that in the middle of the second century, one already regarded the apostles as authors of the Gospels so that one may not argue by appealing to the absence of this information in the texts themselves (as Pilhofer does).

[199] Abramowski 1983, 347–48 (= 1991, 329).

[200] Here, it is not possible to deal more extensively with this complex; compare, for example, Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* III 2.1 (Rousseau/Doutreleau 1974, II: 24.1–26). But around 150 there were probably not yet that many texts available; for the frequently assumed early dating of the Nag Hammadi writings, a watertight justification is usually lacking, compare Markschies 2001a, 54–62.

[201] Compare section 3.1.3 with n. 131–134.

[202] Abramowski 1983, 349 (= 1991, 330); Skarsaune 1987, passim.

[203] "The words of Jesus are applied rather than quoted in the strict sense and never explained and 'expounded' as the holy text in its fixed form. Alongside the Synoptic sayings, such sayings of Jesus that we must designate as apocryphal according to their origin and meaning are quoted unselfconsciously. In the first one and a half centuries of the church there is not a single gospel writing that is directly made known, named or otherwise emphasized when it is quoted" (Campenhausen 2003, 144; cf. 1972, 121).

is well known, the only writing of the New Testament that Justin cites by author and title is the Revelation of John;[204] whether a citation from the corpus Paulinum can be demonstrated at all is at least controversial.[205] The same applies to the Gospel of John.[206] While he did oppose—as did Irenaeus later—the Gnosis, he treated the New Testament writings with a certain freedom and at the same time in such a way that his use could make sense to outsiders and hearers of his lectures.

By contrast, Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons, must be addressed as the first theologian who explicitly presupposes a definitive collection of Holy Scriptures alongside the Jewish 'canon' as the basis for his argumentation in the eighties of the second century.[207] But he still found it necessary to argue theologically for the historically coincidental number of *four* gospels, for the "fourfold" character of the gospel, the εὐαγγέλιον τετράμορφον, as he calls it.[208] It needs to be clear that with this interest in grounding his view, Irenaeus occupies a special position in the second century. It is true that Martin Hengel has recently argued that with the words "the apostles and their followers"[209] Justin also already presupposed the notion of the four gospels and alluded to the two gospels of the apostles Matthew and John and

[204] Justin, *Dialogus cum Tryphone* 81.4 (Marcovich 1997, 211.28–30): . . . ἀνήρ τις, ᾧ ὄνομα Ἰωάννης, εἷς τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐν Ἀποκαλυψει. . . .

[205] Pilhofer 1990, 64 with n. 10.

[206] In his book *Die Johanneische Frage*, Hengel 1993, 61–67 (cf. 1989, 12–14), advocates the thesis that there is a "clear dependence" in some passages (Hengel 1993, 63 n. 187; 1989, 150 n. 72 documents a segment of the wealth of literature on this problem). I am in agreement with Hengel that one can, in any case, scarcely imagine that Justin's Logos teaching emerged without any connection to the prologue of John (cf. further also Campenhausen 2003, 198, with literature in n. 99 [= 1972, 169 n. 101]; Heckel 1999, 320–24, and from among the Justin texts above all Justin, *Apologia i* 61.4 [Marcovich 1994, 118.12–13; Wartelle 1987, 168.11] and its relation to John 3.5; cf., e.g., Wartelle 1987, 290, and Hengel 1993, 64–65; 1989, 12–14).

[207] Hengel 2008, 34, therefore speaks of Irenaeus, the first deliberately "biblical theologian"; on the topic, compare also Hernando 1990, 38–57.

[208] Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* III 11.9 (= fragment 11 apud Anastasius Sinaita, *Questiones et Responsiones* 144 [Rousseau/Doutreleau 1994, II: 162.10–12]): ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν τετράμορφον τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, ἑνὶ δὲ Πνεύματι συνεχόμενον; compare Skeat 1992, 194–99 (Irenaeus used an older *Vorlage*); 1997. The four-gospel "canon" in Irenaeus is also concisely discussed by Heckel 1999, 350–53.

[209] Justin, *Dialogus cum Tryphone* 103.8 (Marcovich 1997, 249.53–54): ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐκείνοις παρακολουθησάντων. On the famous expression ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων, which occurs fifteen times in Justin, compare Abramowski 1983; 1991; and previously already Hyldahl 1960. Ambramowski shows that the term ἀπομνημονεύματα attempts to make intelligible the form of the Gospels, which is odd for the non-Christian conversation partner, with the reference to the "memoirs/recollections of masters of philosophy" (Abramowski 1983, 346; 1991, 327; cf. also B. M. Metzger 1987, 145–46).

to the gospels of the apostle students Mark[210] and Luke, who were regarded, as is well known, as students of the apostles Peter and Paul.[211] In the next section on the New Testament 'canon' among Gnostic theologians, we will, however, see that the exact number of New Testament gospels was still thoroughly controversial in the second century. With his objections against the Johannine literature in the late second century, the Roman presbyter *Gaius* can be invoked as a witness for this circumstance, as can Serapion of Antioch, who initially allowed the Christian community of Rhossus in the vicinity of Syrian Antioch to read the *Gospel of Peter* in their worship services at the beginning of the third century (see section 2.1.2.2).[212] But Irenaeus argued not as a free teacher but as an episcopal champion of an ecclesiastical κανὼν τῆς ἀληθείας against free Gnostic teachers and against their Bible with its open boundaries; he set a clearly demarcated normed collection of Scriptures. The communities in Rome and Lyon (which were threatened in his view by such free teachers) form his institutional context; the authority of the monepiscopate (single bishop) presiding over these communities represented his institutional background.

The most likely conclusion from these findings appears to be their traditional *diachronic* interpretation. At the end of the second century, the 'canon' of the New Testament was already fixed in its core, at least in Rome and Lyon, but it was obviously still debated in other places. By contrast, in the middle of the century, there were still quite different views about the borders of a Holy Scripture being advocated, even in the city of Rome—if one thinks only of Marcion and Justin.[213] Clement of Alexandria would then need to be placed in this line of development that leads to the κανών of the fourth century. Could one interpret the findings

[210] This is admittedly debated; compare the controversy between Pilhofer 1990 and Thornton 1993; Hengel 1993, 67 (cf. 1989, 13–14); 1984, 15; Mutschler 2004, 704–16.

[211] Hengel 2008, 221 n. 83 (p. 20 in main text). Admittedly there are also "apocryphal motifs" in him (thus Hengel 2008, 222 n. 85 [p. 20 in main text]); compare Justin, *Dialogus cum Tryphone* 88.3 πῦρ ἀνήφθη ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ (Marcovich 1997, 223.14), and the Ebionite Gospel in Epiphanius, *Panarion seu adversus Lxxx haereses* 30.13.7–8 (Holl 1915, 351.1; cf. Bauer 1967, 134–39). Justin reports also on the readings in the worship service (Justin *Apologia i* 67.3–4 [Marcovich 1994, 129.7–11]); Hengel 2008, 37, draws attention to the placement of the "memoirs/recollections of the apostles" before the "writings of the prophets" in this passage (67.3): "It is interesting that already in him the Gospels are named *before* the prophetic writings, i.e. the Old Testament, which was understood entirely as a prophetic work directed to Christ. One almost wants to assume that the reading of the Gospels had a role already in his time in Rome, as the Torah did in the Jewish worship service, and had occupied this role also already for some time."

[212] Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* VI 12.4 ". . . then let it be read" (εἰ τοῦτό ἐστιν μόνον τὸ δοκοῦν ὑμῖν παρέχειν μικροψυχίαν, ἀναγινωσκέσθω [Schwartz 1999, II/2: 544.20–21; cf. Mara 1973, 215–19; B. M. Metzger 1987, 119–20]).

[213] Thus also Patterson 1989, 189.

synchronically as well, with a view to the different institutional contexts? For at first glance, it would stand to reason to assume that the better educated theologians, above all the free teachers, took up into their ‘canon’ a greater number of texts with a lower claim to authority as a whole, and the less educated theologians and bishops concerned for the unity of the church took up a smaller number of texts with a higher claim to authority as a whole. Interestingly, however, one cannot put the matter so simply: in the last third of the second century, the middle Platonist philosopher Celsus documents for Alexandria, thus a Christian church that was deeply shaped by free teachers, the fourfold gospel ‘canon’ and its combination with the letters of Paul in an authoritative collection of New Testament Scriptures.[214] In addition, we possess pointers to the fact that in the second half of the second century in Alexandria, a philologically fixed and to this extent standardized text of parts of the New Testament was normed, as the late classicist Günther Zuntz showed in his last work on the text of the Gospels.[215] Thus here a narrower ‘canon’ of Holy Scriptures with a double claim to authority, theological and philological, was established precisely by the theological and philological work of free teachers and not by the church-guiding measures of bishops, such as in Lyon. On the other hand, in his small and highly polemical book titled *Das Neue Testament um das Jahr 200* (The New Testament around the Year 200) from 1889, Adolf von Harnack listed a whole series of Syrian and Antiochene writings whose authors recognized only parts of our canonical New Testament as Holy Scripture (or as an additional part of the Holy Scripture) and did not, at any rate, value them as equal to what later came to be called the “Old Testament.” But these authors do not predominantly show an especially high subject-specific educational level and could scarcely be compared with free teachers such as Justin or Ptolemy. In addition to the educated Theophilus of Antioch,[216] Harnack names above all the *Grundschrift* of

[214] The Christians are said to have falsified the gospel after its first commitment to writing three and four times, indeed many times (Origen, *Contra Celsum* II 27 [Koetschau 1899b, 156.3–4]). Celsus apparently distinguished between the Gospels designated today as “canonical” on the one hand (*three and four times*) and the “apocryphal Gospels” (*indeed many times*); Hengel 2008, 22–23, with n. 90 on p. 222 advocating a similar interpretation.

[215] Zuntz 1995, 29–36. The question of whether and to what extent *logia* that appear also in the *Gospel of Thomas* have influenced the Western text merits a more extensive discussion than is possible here, since it would be a sign for the initially limited stability of the biblical text in some regions of the empire. Compare Quispel/Amersfoort 1975; Quispel 1998, 359–60.

[216] Harnack 1889, 39; compare also 1886, 320 (similarly 1980a, 389–90): “The information in the writing *Ad Autolycum* leads no further than to the assumption that ‘alongside the Holy Scriptures’ (the Old Testament) Theophilus cited a group of writings, which cannot be specified more precisely in terms of their extent, of Christian ‘Spirit-bearers’ and

the *Apostolic Constitutions*, the *Apostolic Canons*, and the *Doctrina Addai*.[217] Even if the development of a New Testament 'canon' was closely connected with the argumentative necessity of a theology oriented toward the standards of contemporary rationality (as we saw in relation to Justin, Marcion, and Irenaeus), there does not appear to be a one-way street leading from a certain institution to a quite specific understanding (whether it be relatively open or narrowly closed) of the number of normative books of the New Testament. The degree in which the respective collection was binding also does not appear to have been conditioned by the institution.

Against this background, which is already somewhat unclear due to the situation of the sources and is difficult to systematize with regard to the institutional contexts, it is worthwhile to examine more closely the work of Clement of Alexandria, a classic free teacher in the great educational metropolis of antiquity. Harnack has again marked out the field with his observation that Clement not only designates various books of the Old Testament, the Gospels, and occasionally Pauline letters as γραφή, Holy Scripture, but addresses and uses many other texts as inspired "Holy Scripture" as well. This finding was responsible for the aforementioned evaluation that Clement had only a vague concept of a normative 'canon' of authoritative biblical writings or even that he had no interest in such normings. Harnack himself admittedly concluded his observations on Clement with the surprising position that the term γραφή was used by Clement in the strict sense only in relation to the Old Testament texts.[218] On the other hand, the Alexandrian theologian argues clearly and without reserve for the inspiration of every text that is "holy and made divine."[219] In order to

ascribed to this group, which included the Gospels and the Pauline letters, the same status as he did to the Old Testament." Harnack appeals, among others, to Theophilus, *Ad Autolycum* II 22.5 (Marcovich 1995b, 70.17–18) ὅθεν διδάσκουσιν ἡμᾶς αἱ ἅγιαι γραφαὶ καὶ πάντες οἱ πνευματοφόροι, ἐξ ὧν Ἰωάννης λέγει (followed by a citation of John 1.1).

[217] Harnack 1889, 40.

[218] Harnack 1889, 41 (the term γραφή adheres "in the strictest sense" only to the Old Testament; cf. also Harnack 1886, 320–23 = 1980a, 391–94), but also Dausch 1894, 2–5, 39–47; Ruwet 1948, 85–86 (inspiration); Osborn 1984, 127–44; Bruce 1988, 188–89; Brooks 1992. As evidence, Harnack references Clement of Alexandria, *De pascha* fragment 28 (Stählin/Früchtel/Treu 1970, 217.7–8 = Dindorf 1932, 15) ταύτῃ τῶν ἡμερῶν τῇ ἀκριβείᾳ καὶ αἱ γραφαὶ πᾶσαι συμφωνοῦσι καὶ τὰ εὐαγγέλια συνῳδά and *Stromata* VII 82.2 (Stählin/Früchtel/Treu 1970, 58.23–28) τὶ τοίνυν περὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ γνωστικοῦ φήσαιμεν <ἄν>; 'ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε', φησιν ὁ ἀπόστολος, 'ὅτι ναός ἐστε τοῦ θεοῦ;' θεῖος ἄρα ὁ γνωστικὸς καὶ ἤδη ἅγιος, θεοφορῶν καὶ θεοφορούμενος. αὐτίκα τοῦ ἁμαρτῆσαι ἀλλότριον παριστᾶσα ἡ γραφὴ τοὺς μὲν παραπεσόντας τοῖς ἀλλοφύλοις πιπράσκει· 'μὴ ἐμβλέψῃς' δὲ 'πρὸς ἐπιθυμίαν ἀλλοτρίᾳ γυναικί'.

[219] Clement of Alexandria, *Protrepticus* IX 87.1–2 (Stählin/Treu 1972, 65.4–7): ἱερὰ γὰρ ὡς ἀληθῶς τὰ ἱεροποιοῦντα καὶ θεοποιοῦντα γράμματα, ἐξ ὧν γραμμάτων καὶ συλλαβῶν τῶν ἱερῶν τὰς συγκειμένας γραφάς, τὰ συντάγματα, ὁ αὐτὸς ἀκολούθως

obtain a more precise picture, we must examine the question of whether Clement drew exact borders between canonical and noncanonical material, between canonical and apocryphal writings.[220]

There can be no doubt that the educated Alexandrian theologian was familiar with certain writings that we now assign to the so-called apocryphal texts. This is shown already by an examination of the relevant index of the Berlin edition of Otto Stählin:[221] here one would need to mention, for example, the Greek *Gospel of the Egyptians* (CANT 14), the *Gospel of the Hebrews* (CANT 11), and certain "agrapha" (CANT 18)—that is, words of the Savior that are not found in any of the canonical or apocryphal writings known to us. But with its entries, the aforementioned index already demonstrates the ratios in which Clement used such texts: three pages contain quotations from the Gospel of Matthew, just under a page of attestations from the gospels of Mark and John; two pages from the Gospel of Luke; and one-and-a-half pages from the Letters of Paul. On the other hand, there are merely eight fragments from the Greek *Gospel of the Egyptians*, two from the *Gospel of Hebrews*, and one from the so-called *Protevangelium of James* (CANT 50 = BHG 1046). It is interesting that a great number of quotations are taken from *1 Clement*,[222] but we have already pointed out that this writing of the Roman community was evidently included in the 'canon' of New Testament writings in some parts of the empire.

It is now neither possible nor necessary in the framework of our investigation to verify these statistical observations in all detail in relation to the texts of Clement. A pure listing of percentages, as one can find for

ἀπόστολος, 'θεοπνεύστους' καλεῖ κτλ.; but compare also *Stromata* VII 95.2–3 (Stählin/Früchtel/Treu 1970, 67.15–18; here αἱ γραφαί and ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς διδασκαλίας . . . διά τε τῶν προφητῶν διά τε τοῦ εὐαγγελίου καὶ διὰ τῶν μακαρίων ἀποστόλων are placed as synonyms) and 101.5 (71.23 = 2 Timothy 3.16) as well as Zahn 1975, I/1: 93.

220 "With great hunger for knowledge and even greater credulity Clement read all possible pseudepigraphal and apocryphal literature. He was also inclined to attribute guilt to the harmful use that heretics made of such writings and to portray the given apocryphon, by contrast, as innocent" (Zahn 1975: I/1, 139, with reference to *Stromata* III 29.1 ἔκ τινος ἀποκρύφου [Stählin/Früchtel/Treu 1985, 209.17; incorrectly cited by Zahn]). Compare also B. M. Metzger 1987, 134–35: "By way of summary, one can say that, though Clement felt free to use unwritten tradition as well as to quote from a broad spectrum of Christian and pagan literature, it was the fourfold Gospels and the fourteen Epistles of Paul (including Hebrews), along with Acts, 1 Peter, 1 John, and the Apocalypse, that were regarded as authoritative Scripture. As for the other Catholic Epistles, Clement's opinion vacillated. On the whole one can say that, so far as his understanding of Scripture was concerned, he had an 'open' canon."

221 For additional literature, see Kutter 1897; Dausch 1894; Mees 1970; Molland 1938; Ruwet 1948; 1949.

222 Stählin/Treu 1980, 11–29.

oneself in the work of Metzger,[223] is naturally not enough: citations must be weighed, and the "theologies of the canon" must be ascertained. Thus, for example, the information that Clement cites 359 classical and non-Christian authors and only (in comparison to nearly 70 biblical texts) 36 or 38 writings that are classified today as patristic and "deuterocanonical" or "apocryphal" is useful only if one also simultaneously sees that two-thirds of the entire number of his citations nevertheless come from the Bible, with twice as many New Testament as Old Testament texts being cited.[224] We will focus here solely on two apocryphal gospels: the *Gospel of the Hebrews* and the Greek *Gospel of the Egyptians*,[225] as well as the so-called *Secret Gospel of Mark* (CANT 15) in an excursus of sorts. As far as we know, the *Gospel of the Hebrews* is the only Jewish Christian gospel whose title is handed down to us: τὸ καθ᾽ Ἑβραίους εὐαγγέλιον. According to Walter Bauer, this title shows that we are dealing with a gospel of the Greek-speaking Jewish Christian community: in view of the well-known problem of defining "Jewish Christianity" more precisely, this classification must, of course, remain hypothetical.[226] The first citation from the gospel in the *Stromata* or *Carpets* of Clement is introduced with an interesting sentence: "It is also written similarly in the *Gospel of the Hebrews*."[227] At this point, at least, there is not a word to indicate that the author has such a critical stance toward the canonical claim of this gospel as, for example, Origen, who likes to supply his citations with the following introduction: εἰ δέ τις παραδέχεται τό, "if anyone accepts the gospel."[228] But Clement cites exactly the same sentence from the

[223] B. M. Metzger 1987, 261–62, provides only the sheer page numbers; Stuhlhofer 1988 carries out his "statistical investigation of the history of the canon" (thus the subtitle) in somewhat greater detail.

[224] B. M. Metzger 1987, 131, on the basis of Stählin 1936; on the problem of the biblical texts in the church fathers, see also Aland/Aland 1989a, 178–81 (cf. 1989b, 169–73): "Here material is ready for a plethora of dissertations and learned investigations" (181; cf. 173).

[225] But compare also the possible reference to the *Protevangelium of James*: Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* VII 93.7 (Stählin/Früchtel/Treu 1970, 66.21–22). I do not deal with the question of the *Gospel and Traditions of Matthias*, although they obviously belong in our context. Compare for the time being Ruwet 1948, 400; H. C. Puech and B. Blatz in Schneemelcher 1990, 306–8 (cf. 1963, 308–13); W. A. Lohr 1996, 24–26, and excursus V on pp. 249–54.

[226] Bauer 1964, 56; P. Vielhauer in Schneemelcher 1990, 145 (cf. 1963, 162–63); Klijn 1988; Frey 2003, 187–212, esp. 200–208, on the text and character of the work.

[227] Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* II 45.5 (Stählin/Früchtel/Treu 1985, 137.4–5): ᾗ κἀν τῷ καθ᾽ Ἑβραίους εὐαγγελίῳ . . . γέγραπται.

[228] Origen, *Homiliae in Jeremiam* 15.10/17.5 XV 4 (Klostermann/Nautin 1983, 128.26–27); compare Origen, *Commentarii in evangelium Joannis* II 12.85 (Preuschen 1903b, 67.19–20): Ἐὰν δὲ προσιῆταί τις τὸ καθ᾽ Ἑβραίους εὐαγγέλιον, ἔνθα αὐτὸς ὁ σωτήρ φησιν . . . . Compare Handmann 1888, 27: "Nicholson . . . draws attention here to

Gospel of the Hebrews, whose introduction we have just conveyed, yet a second time in his main work in a much more detailed form. And here we find no sign that Clement treated the text as a part of a canonical gospel. He introduces the text as follows: "For the same (as Plato, *Timaeus* 90 D) is also meant by that sentence (from the gospel)."[229] From this passage, it becomes very clear that here the *Gospel of the Hebrews* is used as a source of wisdom sayings in the manner in which Clement also uses the Platonic dialogues for his argumentation. It is evident that the *Gospel of the Hebrews* possesses a certain authority for the author, but one can hardly say that this authority is really comparable, let alone equivalent, to the "canonical" gospels.

We turn now to the Greek *Gospel of the Egyptians* in Clement, a text presumably used by a group of Egyptian Christians. It is not identical with the so-called Coptic *Gospel of the Egyptians* from the findings of Nag Hammadi, which is actually called the *Holy Book of the Great Invisible Spirit* (NHC III, 2, and IV, 2).[230] According to Walter Bauer, the Greek *Gospel of the Egyptians* was used by the Egyptian Gentile Christians as part of the Holy Scripture.[231] If one reviews the citations from this writing

two things, 1) that the indicative (προσίεται) is used, which according to Greek grammar presupposes the hypothetical qualification already as certain, 2) that Origen here cites precisely the most peculiar fragment of the *Gospel of the Hebrews*, so that he was either himself attached to the foreign gospel or alternatively that it possessed such status among many that he could neither openly oppose it nor pass over it in silence." Handmann 1888, 27, then discusses Origen, *Commentarium in evangelium Matthaei* XV 14 (Kostermann/Benz 1935, 389.15–21): *Scriptum est in evangelio quodam, quod dicitur secundum Hebraeos (si tamen placet alicui suscipere illud, non ad auctoritatem, sed ad manifestationem propositae quaestionis)*. "In addition to the '*scripsum est*,' which was the common formula for the citation of canonical writings, here too we find again an addition, which allows one to recognize that absolute authority is not ascribed to the *Gospel of the Hebrews*, but it was merely drawn on for the clarification and explanation of a pending question."

229 Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* V 96.3 (Stählin/Früchtel/Treu 1985, 389.14): ἴσον γὰρ τούτοις ἐκεῖνα δύναται. Compare Ruwet 1948, 398–400; Handmann 1888, 94–95: "if also this passage, in the connection in which it stands in Clement, appears to have more the character of a philosophical reflection than the character of a divine teaching, . . . then it nevertheless becomes clear upon closer examination that we are right to explain it from New Testament presuppositions." On the *Gospel of the Hebrews*, compare also Zahn 1975, II/2: 642–723; B. M. Metzger 1987, 169–70; Klijn/Reinink 1973, 67–73.

230 Unfortunately, it has admittedly become common practice, with Jean Doresse, to refer back to the colophon of the scribe in NHC III,2 69.6–7, where one reads ⲠⲈⲨⲀⲄⲄⲈⲖⲒⲞⲚ <ⲛ̄> ⲛ̄ⲣⲙ̄ⲛ̄ⲕⲏⲙⲉ, thus actually "the Egyptian Gospel." However this title is to be interpreted, it is clear that it was added secondarily (thus also Böhlig/Wisse/Labib 1975, 18–23).

231 Bauer 1964, 53–56; for criticism of this view, see Hornschuh 1964, 6–13: "The thesis of Bauer is based on the presupposition that the entire non-Jewish territory, i.e. all 'Gentiles' of the land, were viewed as belonging to the 'Egyptians.' But that was not the

in Clement of Alexandria, then it is conspicuous that Clement hardly has a detailed knowledge of the content of this text and thus evidently has not even read it in its entirety: φέρεται δέ, οἶμαι, ἐν τῷ κατ’ Αἰγυπτίους εὐαγγελίῳ; “But (these words) stand, so I believe, in the *Gospel of the Egyptians*.”[232] Despite this circumstance, Clement cites the gospel eight times, admittedly always in connection with the so-called Encratites, a Christian group that was characterized by strict ascetic tendencies and especially by the view that marriage and all sexual relations defile the human being:[233] “The ones who oppose the creation of God under the pleasing appearance of continence also quote the words spoken to Salome that we mentioned earlier. But they stand, so I believe, in the *Gospel of the Egyptians*.”[234] At another point, it is indicated that “they explain that word in this way: with this the Lord wanted to say. . . .”[235] In all the passages cited, Clement differentiates clearly between the “canonical” gospels and the Greek *Gospel of the Egyptians*, as he also states clearly himself: “First we have the statement not in the four gospels handed down to us but in the Gospel of the Egyptians.”[236] Wilhelm Schneemelcher concluded his overview of the fragments of that gospel in Clement with this statement: “From the preceding texts it thus follows that Clement of Alexandria knows the Gospel of the Egyptians, does not regard it as equal in value to the four

---

case. The metropolis Alexandria with its Greek population had politically not even been counted as a part of Egypt. Even less were its inhabitants counted as Egyptians. But even in the hinterlands, in actual Egypt, the designation ‘Egyptian’ was reserved only for a certain part of the entire population, which was clearly distinguished by linguistic, ethnic, and legal borders from the rest of the inhabitants. It is known that the considerable *Greek* segment of the population . . . distanced itself consciously and emphatically from Egyptianness” (cf. also Treu 1961, 198–211 [allegorizing of the name “Egyptian”], and Zahn 1975, II/2: 628–42).

[232] Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* III 63.1 (Stählin/Früchtel/Treu 1985, 225.3–4; the German translations follow, in part, the translation of Stählin 1937/1938); but compare also Ruwet 1948, 396–98.

[233] But it is entirely unclear whether there was such a clearly defined group at all; thus rightly Bolgiani 1992, 281; on this topic, compare also Barnard 1968.

[234] Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* III 63.1 (Stählin/Früchtel/Treu 1985, 225.1–4): Οἱ δὲ ἀντιτασσόμενοι τῇ κτίσει τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ τῆς εὐφήμου ἐγκρατείας κἀκεῖνα λέγουσι τὰ πρὸς Σαλώμην εἰρημένα, ὧν πρότερον ἐμνήσθημεν· φέρεται δέ, οἶμαι, ἐν τῷ κατ’ Ἀἰγυπτίους εὐαγγελίῳ.

[235] Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* III 68 (Stählin/Früchtel/Treu 1985, 227.2–3): βούλεσθαι γὰρ λέγειν τὸν κύριον ἐχηγοῦνται . . . . But compare the critical remarks of Schneemelcher 1990, 175 (cf. 1963, 167–68), on the question of whether the following quotation comes from the *Gospel of the Egyptians*.

[236] Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* III 93.1 (Stählin/Früchtel/Treu 1985, 238.27–28): πρῶτον μὲν οὖν ἐν τοῖς παραδεδομένοις ἡμῖν τέτταρσιν εὐαγγελίοις οὐκ ἔχομεν τὸ ῥητόν, ἀλλ’ ἐν τῷ κατ’ Αἰγυπτίους. For interpretation of the passage, compare also Zahn 1975, II/1: 173.

canonical gospels, but also does not completely reject it."[237] According to Harnack, too, Clement recognized, alongside the later so-called Old Testament, only four gospels as canonical.[238] An interesting piece of evidence for this thesis is the use of the formula πιστεύειν ταῖς γραφαῖς ταῖς θέαις, "to believe the divine Scriptures," in Clement of Alexandria: ὁ πιστεύσας τοίνυν ταῖς γραφαῖς ταῖς θείαις, τὴν κρίσιν βεβαίαν ἔχων, ἀπόδειξιν ἀναντίρρητον τὴν τοῦ τὰς γραφὰς δεδωρημένου φωνὴν λαμβάνει θεοῦ· οὐκέτ' οὖν πίστις γίνεται δι' ἀποδείξεως ὠχυρωμένη; "Thus the one who believes the divine Scriptures has an incontrovertible standard for his judgment and obtains as an irrefutable demonstration the voice of God that the Scriptures have given to us. Thus faith ceases to be faith when it rests on firm demonstration."[239]

It is scarcely possible to treat the topic of "Clement of Alexandria and his 'canon' of the 'New Testament'" without mentioning the so-called *Secret Gospel of Mark*. We will deal with it in an excursus of sorts. In 1958, Morton Smith catalogued the remains of the library of the monastery of Mar Saba in Bethlehem, which was still quite extensive at that time.[240] While doing so, he found on the last page of a printed edition of the letters of Ignatius from the seventeenth century a previously overlooked handwritten text that was affixed to the back inside cover.[241] It appeared to be a fragment from a letter of Clement of Alexandria to a certain Theodore. The clean writing of the twenty-eight Greek lines indicated that at some time in the eighteenth century, a monk had noted down the lines in the edition. Today, it is admittedly still difficult to verify Smith's analysis: in the meantime, the valuable materials of the collection of the monastery, and with them also the aforementioned book, have been taken to the library of the Greek Orthodox Patriarch in Jerusalem. The last page of the edition of Ignatius has been lost since then, so that one must rely on the old photographs published by Smith and new photographs from the late 1970s in order to carry out an independent analysis of the findings.[242] According to

[237] Schneemelcher 1990, 176 (cf. 1963, 169).

[238] Harnack 1990, 391; for critique, see Flesseman-van Leer 1964, 413–14 with n. 35.

[239] Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* II 9.6 (Stählin/Früchtel/Treu 1985, 118.4–7); English translation in Roberts/Donaldson/Coxe 1983, 349 (A. C. Coxe). To my knowledge, Zahn 1975, I/1: 139, was the first to refer to the passage. It is discussed at greater length now, for example, in Schneider 1999, 281–97.

[240] The result of the works can be found in an article in the journal of the patriarchate: Smith 1960.

[241] I. Voss 1646.

[242] Smith 1973a; 1973b (= 1974) as well as Hedrick 2000; compare the balanced discussion of Kümmel 1975, 299–303. In 1999, the librarian of the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate in Jerusalem expressed to me the hypothesis that his predecessor in 1977 could have removed the text from the book because of its explosive nature (and not only for the

the text of the letter of (Pseudo-?) Clement, which was edited, translated, and commented on by Smith, Mark subsequently filled out his gospel that he had written in Rome under conscious selection of the material available in Alexandria into a "more spiritual gospel for the use of the perfected."[243] The first version did not contain "the mystical depths (τὰς μυστικάς)," whereas the second version evidently did. According to the witness of the text, it was kept secret by the Alexandrian Christian community and was intended for those members "who were initiated into the great mysteries (τὰ μεγάλα μυστήρια)"; it remains unclear whether or not this term simply means the mystery of *baptism*.[244] Clement was evidently, if one wishes to believe the letter discovered by Smith, one of these special members of the community who were initiated into the higher mysteries, since he could otherwise scarcely have cited from the second, "more spiritual" version of the Gospel of Mark. According to the evidence of the letter of (Pseudo-?) Clement, it is cited in order to criticize a falsified form of this gospel (ἀπόγραφον τοῦ μυστικοῦ εὐαγγελίου)[245] that was evidently in circulation in Alexandria and is attributed by Clement to Carpocrates, an

purpose of taking photographs) and hid it. Stroumsa 2003 reports of a failed attempt in early 1976 to remove the book from the monastery in which it was still located at that time for an analysis of writing and ink. In the process, Stroumsa and the scholars with him were able to see the text.

[243] Compare the text in Stählin/Treu 1980, XVII–XVIII, here XVII.21–22: συνέταξε πνευματικώτερον εὐαγγέλιον εἰς τὴν τῶν τελειουμένων χρῆσιν. Greek text and a literal translation can also be found in Merkel 1974, 125–28. For a bibliography of the published controversy between Merkel and Smith, see Merkel in Schneemelcher 1990, 90. For an overview of the discussion from the perspective of Smith, see Smith 1982, with a compilation of adherents and opponents of the ascription on p. 450. The American discussion has been summarized again more recently in Hedrick 2003; for critical objections, see Ehrman 2003. For the debate, see now also Burke 2013.

[244] Thus the view of E. C. Richardson expressed by letter, which is reported in Smith 1974, 74. He admittedly does not realize that if this interpretation were accurate, then a larger portion of the Alexandrian community would probably have known the "secret gospel."

[245] Compare from the letter: ὁ Καρποκράτης, ὑπ' αὐτῶν (sc. the demons) διδαχθείς καὶ ἀπατηλοῖς τέχναις χρησάμενος, οὕτω πρεσβύτερόν τινα τῆς ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ ἐκκλησίας κατεδούλωσεν, ὥστε παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐκόμισεν ἀπόγραφον τοῦ μυστικοῦ εὐαγγελίου, ὃ καὶ ἐξηγήσατο κατὰ τὴν βλάσφημον καὶ σαρκικὴν αὐτοῦ δόξαν. ἔτι δὲ καὶ ἐμίανε . . . (Stählin/Treu 1980, XVII.31–34). It is conspicuous that Carpocrates plays no such active role in the remaining work of Clement but an active role is played solely by his son Epiphanes (cf. Kraft 1952, 439), who founded the sect of the Carpocratians according to Clement (Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* III 5.1–2 [Stählin/Früchtel/Treu 1985, 197.16–20]). This observation leads, in my view, to an argument against the authenticity of the letter. This applies all the more if the misgivings that Kraft has presented against the historicity of Carpocrates should be justified (cautiously affirmed by Merkel 1974, 129–30). At best, one could consider that in his effort to denounce a certain text of the "secret gospel," Clement blamed a heretic about whom he himself knew nothing exactly (thus a consideration of Merkel 1974, 129).

Alexandrian Gnostic.[246] Thus, according to the logic of the argumentation in the letter discovered by Smith, there are three versions of the Gospel of Mark—namely, a first version without mystical depths; a second, more spiritual edition "for those who were perfected"; and a third version of the edition for the perfect that was falsified by Carpocrates.

Although a large number of scholars have asserted the authenticity of the letter and the traditions contained in it since the 1960s,[247] for extremely varied reasons, serious doubts have been expressed that can naturally only be touched on in the framework of this investigation.[248] The letter gives the impression of a "concocted authentication for the fragments from Mark's 'secret gospel.'"[249] But even if the letter were to be authentic and certain circles of the Christian community of Alexandria actually counted a more or less modified Gospel of Mark, in addition to the "canonical" four

[246] Kraft 1952 and Smith 1973a, 266–78, 295–350 ("Appendix B: The Evidence Concerning Carpocrates"). See more recently W. A. Löhr 1995. Löhr shows that the accusation of libertinism against the Carpocratians, which stands in the background of the supposed letter of Clement was brought forth with entirely polemical interests and does not actually reflect the group (32–34). With reference to the fragment of the supposed letter of Clement, he remains skeptical: "Already the fact that Clement, on the one hand, breaks without further ado the arcane discipline pertaining to the *Secret Gospel of Mark* in relation to his epistolary correspondent Theodore, but, on the other hand, exhorts Theodore to swear falsely if necessary in order to preserve the secret is quite suspicious. Furthermore, in his remaining writings Clement recounts . . . nothing of an Alexandrian stay of Mark and of a *Secret Gospel of Mark*. Finally, there is no other source that mentions or gives any indication of a *Secret Gospel of Mark*" (35). Most of these points, by the way, were mentioned already by Kümmel 1975, 302.

[247] Scholer 1997, 1043: "There has been debate over the authenticity of the letter but its genuineness appears to be established." The following scholars evidently start from this presupposition: Levin 1988, 4272, "The great majority of the scholars he (i.e., Smith, C. M.) consulted, though not all (15 out of 18), confirmed his opinion that the text is truly from Clement," and 4274, "From what we do know, I consider the epistle to be, more likely than not, a genuine work of Clement." Compare more recently also Bauckham 1991.

[248] Compare already the reasons mentioned by W. A. Löhr in n. 246 and the documentation of the New Testament scholars, Merkel, Brown, and Bruce, that the supposed quotations of Clement from the *Secret Gospel of Mark* presuppose all *four* canonical Gospels (conveniently compiled in Bruce 1988, 298–315 [Appendix I: The "Secret" Gospel of Mark = Ethel M. Wood Lecture, 1974]). In view of the relative remoteness and inaccessibility of the monastery, I can however not imagine, as Quesnell 1975 does, that the text was forged after the first edition of the word index of Clement in GCS (Stählin 1936) by a monk or even by Smith himself: in the 1950s, there existed in Israel and in the West Bank, if I see correctly, only three editions of this index—namely, in the École Biblique, in the Studium Biblicum Franciscanum, and in the Hebrew National Library.

[249] It is a total mystery to me how one can advocate this position and nevertheless regard the letter as authentic. This is, however, done by Morton Smith in a letter concerning a thesis of Murgia 1975, cited by Levin 1988, 4274. Levin refers to the *Letter of Aristeas* as "a classic sphragis" (4275 n. 9). Compare also Mullins 1976; Criddle 1995.

gospels, among their authoritative collection of Holy Scriptures,[250] one would nevertheless have to say that the additional new gospel was defined by its relation to the traditional four and probably also could be defended as “canonical” only to this extent.

We can now summarize our observations on Clement of Alexandria: it can scarcely be disputed that this highly educated free teacher used a ‘canon,’ a normed collection of authoritative biblical texts, as the corpus from which he derived his fundamental axioms.[251] Therefore, it appears to be precisely not the case that Clement represents a vague concept of the biblical and New Testament ‘canon.’ Rather, he deals in a relatively great scope with divinely inspired writings but distinguishes once more from these a narrower ‘canon’ of especially inspired biblical texts. One should not designate such a concept of graded canonicity as “vague” but exactly the opposite, as particularly considered. It presumably corresponds to the situations of discussion that resulted among predominantly pagan people interested in Christianity in an ancient educational metropolis. Clement’s freedom to use writings that were “apocryphal” according to the standard of our day (and of that time) and to interpret them in the sense of the “canonical texts” should be taken precisely not as a sign of a more or less open New Testament canon but as a reference to a highly elaborated theology.

One can make this interpretation of the texts of Clement of Alexandria even more probable if one briefly compares it with someone like Tertullian. In his pre-Montanist work *De cultu feminarum*, this North African contemporary of Clement explains that all the books that attest Christ are “Scripture,” even if they are not preserved *in armarium Iudaicum*.[252] As an example, Tertullian uses the (“apocryphal”) book of Enoch:

[250] It should admittedly give one pause that H. Koester, who certainly does not stand under suspicion of wanting to downplay the role of the apocryphal gospels, remains skeptical here (Koester 1990, 302). He regards the canonical Gospel of Mark, by the way, as an abbreviation of *Secret Mark* (Koester 1983).

[251] Thus also Méhat 1993, 105: “*Holy Scripture* posses the highest authority for Clement. He understands by this (in contrast to the Gnostics) both ‘prophecy’, i.e., the Old Testament, and the New Testament.” Dausch 1894, by contrast, thinks that the number of the writings is not clearly determined and one can therefore not speak of a “canon” in the classic sense of the fourth century either. He points for this to the *Hypotoposeis* of Clement (cf. on this Markschies 2000a, 72–73); here it is said that a quite specific collection of writings of the Old and New Testament is interpreted—namely, a collection “of initially private character according to layout and content” (Dausch 1894, 44): “Clement knows neither theoretically nor practically a visible or only ideally closed collection of this Christian-ecclesiastical church literature” (Dausch 1894, 57).

[252] Tertullian, *De cultu feminarum* I 3.1 (Turcan 1971, 56.1–3); compare Harnack 1889, 35, and on the reception of Enoch in Tertullian, compare Zahn 1975, 1/1:121. On the “problem of the book of Enoch,” compare also Hengel/Deines 1994, 216–18.

> *Sed cum Enoch eadem scriptura etiam de domino praedicarit, a nobis quidem nihil omnino reiciendum est quod pertineat ad nos. Et legimus "omnem scripturam aedificdationi habilem diuinitus inspirari."*
>
> But since in the same Scripture Enoch also spoke of the Lord, we have nothing at all to reject from that which is intended for us. We also read that "every Scripture that is useful for edification was inspired by God." (2 Timothy 3.16)[253]

With this statement, Tertullian can likewise be regarded as a witness for a graded concept of biblical canonicity that, alongside a great quantity of divinely inspired writings, also recognizes a narrower normative collection of authoritative biblical books—namely, a 'canon.'

Thus Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian are in the first instance witnesses for the thesis, which has already been repeatedly developed here, that the 'canon' of biblical texts, under the conditions of a "laboratory" of Christian theology in the second and early third century, served to secure the axiomatic character of certain theological statements and demonstrate them to an educated public: the 'canon' is that collection from which such fundamental axioms are taken. It has this function both for the theologians that worked as free teachers and also for those who led communities as bishops. If one searches for differences in the understandings of 'canon' that existed between free teachers and bishops and can be traced back to the very different institutional contexts, then one may not—as we have seen—expect a less binding concept of 'canon' and a more extensive scope of normative biblical Scriptures among the free teachers and a correspondingly narrower concept among the bishops. Instead, with his concept of graded canonicity, Clement (as a free teacher) is a good example, as is Tertullian, that the higher educational level of the free teachers also leads to an elaborated concept of canonicity—a canonicity, however, that does not differ at all from less elaborated concepts in the scope of the Scriptures normed by it.

3.1.5 The Gnostic Canon of the New Testament

In our comparative investigations of Justin, Irenaeus, and Clement, we established that the claim to authority bound up with the respective

[253] Tertullian, *De cultu feminarum* I 3.3 (Turcan 1971, 60.21–25). Harnack 1889, 36, refers to the strict distinction between *scripturae divinae*, gospel, and *Apostoli* in the pseudo-Cyprian writing *Adversus aleatoribus* (CPL 60; cf. Harnack 1888, 54–82): "The *scripturae divinae* include the Old Testament and the apocalypses of Hermas and John but not the Gospels and Letters. The author does not know a New Testament alongside the Old Testament." This finding gains yet another significance if one—in contrast to Harnack—dates the text after the end of the second century.

'canons' of biblical writings and the scope of the writings included in them did not fundamentally differ in the case of free teachers and bishops; rather, free teachers such as Clement of Alexandria simply developed a more considered concept of "graded canonicity" than the bishops known to us. It could, however, speak against such a rather unilinear interpretation of different institutional contexts of conceptions of 'canon' among ancient Christian theologians that Christian *Gnostics*—free teachers par excellence—advocated, at least at first glance, a model that clearly deviates from the biblical 'canon' of the majority church, in terms of both the scope and the concept of canonical authority. But this model was possibly determined very strongly by the institutional contexts of Gnostic groups. In order to scrutinize such natural hypotheses, we pose two relatively simple questions at the beginning of this section: Did the Gnostics use a normed 'canon' of authoritative Scriptures at all? And what was the difference between Gnostic and other contemporary Christian 'canons'? By contrast, we will not discuss at length the fundamental question of whether it is legitimate in the framework of our investigations to deal with Gnostic theologians in the context of Christian "theology" but will refer to relevant literature;[254] it will also become very clear in the course of the investigations that and to what extent the various Gnostic conceptions of a 'canon' of authoritative Holy Scriptures belong in the already developed general discussion of Christian theologians in the imperial period.

Did the Gnostics use a normed 'canon' of authoritative Scriptures at all? In his commendable compilation *Gnostic Scriptures*, Bentley Layton claimed that we know almost nothing regarding this question.[255] On the basis of the widespread notion of a scarcely calculable number of Gnostic "apocrypha," one could consider that various Gnostic groups used an "open canon" without firm demarcations. In her monograph titled *Gnosticism and the New Testament*, Pheme Perkins correspondingly states also that the "idea of 'gospel' as a closed narrative text embodied in the words of a book was not common in Gnostic circles."[256] The notion of a specific Gnostic

[254] Compare, for example, Markschies 2000c, 1045–46; 2001a.

[255] "There is no evidence, either direct or circumstantial, for the exact contents of a canon read in Gnostic churches, nor is it known how formal or informal that canon was" (Layton 1987, xxi).

[256] Perkins 1993, 190; compare also Perkins 2002. In her important monograph on *The Gnostic Dialogue* (Perkins 1980, 201), Perkins rejects the designation of these texts as "gospels," because in this way, a claim to canonicity is implied that the writings do not intend. By contrast, Hartenstein 2000, 27 n. 163, now critically opposes this view: "In my view the word 'gospel' in itself has no such implications, even the canonical gospels have from themselves no such claim." Also interesting to me, by the way, is also the attempt to document the "increasing influence" of the New Testament 'canon' in various Gnostic texts. It is only questionable whether we know enough about the literature history of the

'canon' that is tacitly presupposed at present in the research becomes quite a bit more tangible if one picks up, for example, the book *The Five Gospels* of the American Jesus Seminar, in which the apocryphal *Gospel of Thomas* is also contained alongside the classical four gospels and the various sayings of Jesus are marked in different colors according to the degree of their authenticity, thus their canonicity.[257]

What was the difference between Gnostic and other contemporary Christian 'canons'? We begin our attempt to answer the question of the canon of biblical Scriptures among Gnostic groups with a number of observations: There can be no doubt at all that various representatives of the so-called Gnostic texts presuppose and use the exact same biblical corpus as a normed collection of authoritative Scriptures as the so-called majority church. The texts are treated as Scriptures that are inspired by divine power.[258] In an in-depth analysis, all the textual material must naturally be investigated and a precise distinction must be strictly made between word-for-word citations that are introduced as such, "hidden" word-for-word citations that are only identifiable for those who are in the know, and more or less clear allusions to contents and linguistic borrowings.[259] In the context of our investigation, however, we will limit ourselves to three characteristic examples from different periods and schools of the Gnostic movement and deal in what follows with (1) the *Pistis Sophia* (Codex Askewianus, British Museum, Additional Manuscripts 5114), (2) the *Apophasis Megale* (Hippolytus, *Refutatio omnium haeresium* VI 9–18), and finally (3) the *Exegesis on the Soul* (NHC II, 6). In the process, the institutional context in which these writings emerged and were handed down will naturally be considered as far as this is possible.

3.1.5.1 The "Pistis Sophia"

The *Pistis Sophia*, a Gnostic text that presumably comes from the third century[260] but is preserved only in a manuscript of the sixth or seventh

Nag Hammadi texts for investigations of this sort: Cowen 1971; for a detailed investigation, one would need to consult Evans/Webb/Wiebe 1993 (the work is admittedly based only on the text of the English translation).

[257] Funk/Hoover/Jesus Seminar 1993 (the book is dedicated to Galileo Galilei, Thomas Jefferson, and David Friedrich Strauss).

[258] A comparable conception is found in Tuckett 1986; compare esp. p. 149: "Insofar as they reflect synoptic tradition at all, the texts examined here all seem to presuppose one or more of the finished gospels of Matthew, Mark or Luke."

[259] Compare, for example, Hartenstein 2000, 20–26, 285.

[260] See W. Till in his introduction to GCS Koptisch-gnostische Schriften I (Schmidt/Till 1981 [1905/1954], XIII), who appeals to Harnack 1891a, 94–104.

century,[261] recognizably presupposes the “canonical” authority of the most important books of the so-called Old Testament. It introduces, for example, a citation from the Pentateuch with the traditional formula, “It stands written in the law of Moses” (ϥⲥⲏϩ ϩⲛ̅ ⲛⲟⲙⲟⲥ ⲙ̅ⲙⲱϋⲥⲏⲥ [Schmidt 1905, 338.17–18 = Schmidt/Till 1981, 221.23]; cf. Exodus 21.17). What stands written “in the Law of Moses” must be interpreted through the Savior, but the Savior in no way annuls the regulations of the law—as he does, for example, according to the view of the urban Roman theologian Ptolemy, expressed in his letter to the matron Flora.[262] Admittedly, the author of the *Pistis Sophia* uses exactly the same introduction that he uses before the citation from Exodus 21.17 for a freely formulated nonbiblical sentence—and this only a few lines after the correct biblical citation. The verse that is formed freely but in loose dependence on Old Testament ימת מות sentences reads, “[E]veryone who will remain without the Savior and all his mysteries, his parents, shall not only die but go to ruin in perdition,” and it is astonishingly introduced with the phrase “The law has further said” (ⲛ̅ⲧⲁ ⲡⲛⲟⲙⲟⲥ ⲟⲛ ϫⲟⲟⲥ ϫⲉ [Schmidt 1905, 331.9 = Schmidt/Till 1981, 221.31]). To me it does appear possible to explain the initially astonishing similarity of the two citation formulae, which incidentally more or less represents a singular case in the *Pistis Sophia*, with reference to the normal citation praxis of ancient authors and the standards for literalness at that time. As is well known, people frequently cited by memory at that time and to this extent often not very correctly.[263] Our interpretation of the findings can be confirmed through a closer examination of other introductory formula for citations in this writing.

For example, the author of the *Pistis Sophia* uses the expression “This is what your (sc. Christ’s) light-power once prophesied through Moses” in order to introduce a citation from Deuteronomy 19.15 (ⲡⲁϊ ⲡⲉ ⲛ̅ⲧⲁ ⲧⲉⲕϭⲟⲙ ⲛ̅ⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ ⲡⲣⲟⲫⲏⲧⲉⲩⲉ ⲙ̅ⲙⲟϥ ⲙ̅ⲡⲓⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓϣ ϩⲓⲧⲙ̅ ⲙⲱϋⲥⲏⲥ [Schmidt 1905, 72.16–18 = Schmidt/Till 1981, 45.16–17]). But this formulation

[261] Thus the very vague dating in the first edition of GCS Koptisch-gnostische Schriften I (Schmidt 1905, XII–XIII); Till repeated this position in the second edition of 1954. Violet MacDermot bases her description of the manuscript in NHS 9 on W. E. Crum but provides no date of her own (Schmidt/MacDermot 1978).

[262] I refer to Schmidt 1905, 338.1–339.4 = Schmidt/Till 1981, 221.5–35, where Salome cites Exodus 21.17 and asks about the meaning of this commandment. The “Savior” interprets this text and expressly affirms its validity; for Ptolemy, compare Markschies 2000d.

[263] Compare Glover 1985. Luttikhuizen 1989, 122–26, by the way, showed well with reference to the example of an arrogant pronouncement of Jaldabaoth in BG 2 p. 44.14–15 (= Codex Berolinensis) that not every quotation compiled from Old Testament verses would also have had to recognized as such by ancient readers. On our topic, compare also Ludin Jansen 1958.

makes clear that here at least parts of the "Old Testament" were viewed as an inspired book or the speech of Moses recorded in it as an inspired text. The exact same view is also expressed on the occasion of the relatively free reproduction of a verse from Isaiah (cf. Isaiah 19.12): "Before you came the power found in the prophet of Isaiah prophesied over you (sc. the Savior) . . ." (ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲥⲡⲣⲟⲫⲏⲧⲉⲩⲉ ϭⲉ ϩⲁⲑⲏ ⲙ̄ⲡⲁⲧ̄ⲕⲉⲓ' ⲛ̄ϭⲓ ⲧϭⲟⲙ ⲉⲧϩ̄ⲛ ⲏⲥⲁⲓ̈ⲁⲥ ⲡⲉⲡⲣⲟⲫⲏⲧⲏⲥ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲥⲡⲣⲟⲫⲏⲧⲉⲩⲉ ϩⲁⲣⲟⲕ [Schmidt 1905, 28.2–3 = Schmidt/Till 1981, 17.3–4]). Moses and Isaiah are viewed as prophets and their prophecies as predictions of Christ—thus they are used in exactly the same way as the majority church used them. Admittedly, the author of the *Pistis Sophia* bases his argument on a 'canon' of biblical Scriptures that clearly goes beyond the contemporary Septuagint 'canon' in its scope: alongside the twenty-four canonical psalms that are cited in the *Pistis Sophia* (nine or twelve of them completely),[264] five psalms from the *Odes of Solomon* (CPG 1350 = Haelewyck 1998, 205) are imparted in a Gnostic interpretation as inspired texts.[265] Alv Kragerud investigated the position of the *Pistis Sophia* on the Old Testament with reference to the example of how it deals with the Psalms and established in summary that here a "pneumatic character" of this section of the Bible is presupposed, which is discovered and interpreted in the relevant interpretation of the Gnostic pneumatic.[266] In the *Pistis Sophia*, the canonical psalms—as Martina Janssen systematizes—are, on the one hand, usually commented on in a Gnosticizing manner through a paraphrase or

[264] Compare the careful listing in Harnack 1925, 34; for the textual foundations see also C. Schmidt 1925, 234 and Kragerud 1967 (with the discussion of K. Rudolph 1969). Kragerud investigates the use of psalms and shows that twelve psalms of lament are cited in full and twelve not in full (18). Reasons for what is left out are difficult to provide, but in principle, "it appears to apply that the psalm in its entirety should be quoted" (21). Philosophical observations of detail show that the author or authors endeavor to provide "an exact reproduction" of the psalm text (28); Kragerud even speaks of "loyalty" in relation to the text (29). However, two versions of the Psalter were evidently used (79 and elsewhere).

[265] Compare Schmidt Till 1981, 73.31–74.10 = *Psalms of Solomon* 5.1–9; p. 75.26–34 = *Psalms of Solomon* 19.1–4 (= *Odes of Solomon* 1); p. 85.21–86.7 = *Odes of Solomon* 6.7–15; p. 97.12–31 = *Odes of Solomon* 25.1–11 as well as p. 101.7–29 = *Odes of Solomon* 22.1–12 (1.1–5; 5.1–11; 6.8–18; 22.1–12; 25.1–12; cf. Lattke 1979, 24–31, 208–25). The texts are regarded as inspired: "As your power prophesied through Solomon" (Schmidt 1905, 133.4–5 = Schmidt/Till 1981, 86.9); compare also "about which your light power first prophesied through the ode of Solomon" (157.12–13 = 101.5–6).

[266] Kragerud 1976, 110–12. The asserted reserve of the *Pistis Sophia* in relation to the expression "Scripture says," which is claimed in Kragerud 1976, 110–12, must explain away the above-cited formulation "it stands written in the law of Moses" (ϥⲥⲏϩ ϩ̄ⲛ ⲛⲟⲙⲟⲥ ⲙ̄ⲙⲱⲩ̈ⲥⲏⲥ [Schmidt 1905, 338.20 = Schmidt/Till 1981, 221.23]) as an "exception" (Kragerud 1976, 10–11 with n. 122 on p. 255). It is, however, accurately observed that through the citation formula mentioned likewise above, the Spirit or Christ is identified as the ultimate speaker also of the Old Testament revelation (Kragerud 1976, 112). For a detailed treatment of the topic, see also Janssen 2003, 261–93.

more rarely through an allegorical interpretation and, on the other hand, integrated through a word-for-word quotation (that often immediately follows) as a psalm of repentance or thanksgiving of the pistis-sophia figure into the mythological narrative of the book of the same name or attributed to specific identification figures such as the risen Jesus or the disciples as speakers in a revelatory dialogue. In this way, only those psalm verses that are compatible with the presupposed Gnostic myth are reworked. Thus, for example, in the paraphrase of Psalm 102.1 LXX, "Praise the Lord my soul," the "soul" (ⲯⲩⲭⲏ) is replaced with the "power" (ϭⲟⲙ) and the "Lord" (ϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ) who is called upon is replaced by "light" (ⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ): "Praise the light my power." Here too the word-for-word quotation precedes the corresponding paraphrase (Schmidt 1905, 164.7–8 = Schmidt/Till 1981, 105.29–30, or Schmidt 1905, 165.5–6 = Schmidt/Till 1981, 106.15–16).[267] While the new Gnostic meaning is explicitly brought into the text in the paraphrase, in the case of a word-for-word quotation of the psalm as speech of the pistis-sophia figure, the resurrected Jesus, or the disciples, it emerges from the context that "the text itself constitutes the explanation."[268] This multistage Gnosticizing largely corresponds, of course, to the majority church's Christianizing of the Psalms, such as when, in the framework of the identification of the πρόσωπον λέγον, a psalm is specified as a speech of Christ or that of his church.[269]

In a foundational study in 1891, Adolf von Harnack investigated the Old Testament biblical citations and allusions of the *Pistis Sophia* and came to quite similar conclusions about the authority of the majority church collection of biblical writings for the circles who upheld this writing.[270] Harnack also examined the sayings of Jesus in the *Pistis Sophia* and their relation to the "canonical" New Testament of the late fourth century. Here, he could show for ninety-one of these sayings that they were formulated by the author or his source in close imitation or variation of the canonical sayings in the four gospels.[271] Harnack therefore opined,

> If one reviews these citations, there can be no doubt that the author of the *Pistis Sophia* used our Matthew, Luke, and John as sources. Most of his deviations can be easily explained as free variations; but some evidence nevertheless remains,

[267] Compare the synopsis of chapters 73.164 and 74.165 in Janssen 2003, 268.

[268] Kragerud 1967, 101; Janssen 2003, 275.

[269] Neuschäfer 1987, 263–68; Janssen 2003, 278–79.

[270] Compare also Harnack 1891a, 32: "The passage on p. 355 cannot be appealed to against this." Harnack means Schmidt 1905, 350.20–25 = Schmidt/Till 1981, 229.32–36: "The Savior answered and said to Maria: 'Truly, truly, I say to you: Before I came into the world, no soul entered into the light, and now, when I came, I opened the gate of light and opened the paths that lead to light.'"

[271] Harnack 1891a, 3–12 or 12–26.

> as has been shown, that appears to make the assumption likely that the texts were available in a light revision that was specific to the circle to which the author belonged. . . . [272]
>
> If one reviews these citations and relationships, one is astonished at how extensive the dependence of the *Pistis Sophia* on the canonical gospels is. The author who narrates something completely new, namely the dealings of Jesus with his disciples in the twelfth year after his resurrection, has nevertheless very strongly utilized the history and the proclamation of the historical Jesus.[273]

If one endeavors to critically review Harnack's arguments in detail after more than a hundred years (which we cannot, of course, do here), one will only be able to concur with his concluding evaluation: "But it does not appear to me that it can be further doubted that precisely these four gospels possessed a singular dignity for the author. Although he never mentions the names Matthew, Mark, etc., [sc. explicitly as authors of gospels] he is one with the catholic church in the valuation of the Gospels."[274]

Another passage of the *Pistis Sophia* shows clearly that the author of this work also viewed the Pauline Letters as authoritative writings in the same way as the majority church: the famous sentence of Paul from Romans 13.7 is introduced by Mary with the following words: "with respect to this word, my Lord, you once said through the mouth of our brother Paul . . ." (ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲡⲉⲓ̈ϣⲁϫⲉ ⲡⲁϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲉⲛⲧⲁⲕϫⲟⲟϥ ϩⲓⲧ̅ⲛ̅ ⲧ̅ⲧⲁⲡⲣⲟ ⲙ̅ⲡⲁⲩⲗⲟⲥ ⲡⲉⲛⲥⲟⲛ ⲙ̅ⲡⲓⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓϣ [Schmidt 1905, 293.17–19 = Schmidt/Till 1981, 190.12–14]); but with this introduction, the Pauline words are placed on the same level as the sayings of Jesus.[275]

The author of the Gnostic book *Pistis Sophia* used statements from the books of the Old and New Testament canonized in the majority church as inspired authoritative texts, so the likely conclusion is that he also regarded the books from which he took the words as inspired and authoritative texts. Naturally, at this point, the question immediately arises of whether a distinction must again be made between "inspired," "authoritative," or "normative" writings and canonical books. One can understand the differences thus alluded to by simply considering that the borders of the biblical 'canon' in Christian antiquity did not, of course, automatically also mark out the borders of the inspired literature at the same time—as we saw in relation to the concept of "graded canonicity" in Clement of Alexandria

[272] Harnack 1891a, 12.
[273] Harnack 1891a, 27.
[274] Harnack 1891a, 27–28.
[275] The interpretation of the passage by Harnack 1891a, 31, is similar (cf. also Harnack's interpretation on p. 24, "This presupposes the strictest theory of inspiration or the New Testament canon respectively").

and Tertullian (see section 3.1.4).[276] But the question immediately follows of whether the author of the *Pistis Sophia*, because he viewed books of both parts of the Bible as inspired, possessed also the same understanding of the biblical 'canon' as the non-Gnostic majority church. In order to answer this question with precision, one must consider first the canonical status that he assigns to his own book *Pistis Sophia*. Did he understand it as a text whose authority stood alongside or even over the biblical writings from which he cited? Or did he interpret his collection of sayings of Jesus as a pure *meditation* on the texts of the Gospels without a claim to normativity and canonicity? It is astonishing that this simple consideration has scarcely been reflected on in the scholarly literature and is lacking even in Harnack's excellent monograph.[277] It is presumably lacking because most scholars who occupy themselves with such literature either start from the view, almost as a given, that *all* Gnostic texts automatically make a claim to canonical authority (a higher authority than they are prepared to grant to the writings regarded as canonical in the majority church) or it is assumed (as we have seen in section 3.1.4) that the question was basically irrelevant for Gnostics.

In order to answer this group of questions, it is first advisable to give attention to the beginning of the book, which modern editors have called *Pistis Sophia* (Schmidt 1905, 115.10 = Schmidt/Till 1981, 74.13) after the subsequently inserted beginning of the second book ⲠⲘⲈϨⲤⲚⲀⲨ ⲚⲦⲞⲘⲞⲤ ⲚⲦⲠⲒⲤⲦⲒⲤ ⲤⲞⲪⲒⲀ (Schmidt 1905, 127.1 = Schmidt/Till 1981, 82.1), although the title "Books of the Savior" is somewhat better attested in the manuscript (namely, by the original hand in Schmidt 1905, 253.16 = Schmidt/Till 1981, 165.25, ⲞⲨⲘⲈⲢⲞⲤ ⲚⲦⲈ ⲚⲦⲈⲨⲬⲞⲤ ⲘⲠⲤⲰⲦⲎⲢ).[278] At the beginning of the book, the author narrates a familiar scene from this

[276] Compare the informative article by Thraede 1998, 351–55, and previously already Flesseman-van Leer 1964, 416, and Ohlig 1972, 244–68.

[277] But Harnack 1889, 26, does pose it, for example, in relation to the Monantists: "It is likewise correct when Zahn stresses that the Montanists, who recognized the New Testament, by no means incorporated their new revelation into it (see Tertullian) but rather they superordinated it as '*novissima lex et prophetia*,' thus as post-revelation (cf. my *Dogmengeschichte* I, p. 362 n2; 364 n. 2)." The reference in this quotation is to Harnack 1886.

[278] Thus Till in his preface to the translation of Schmidt (Schmidt/Till 1981, XX). It is rather irritating, by the way, that Burkitt 1978, 77, first discusses the somewhat chaotic argumentation of the *Pistis Sophia*, in order to then pose the following question about the author: "Is it a woman?." Compare also Widengren 1969, 275, "The fact that the pneumatic exegesis is characteristic for the writing *Pistis Sophia* as it is for other Gnostic texts and the fact that it is connected in some way with the allegorical exegesis employed by Philo and other Jewish exegetes is the starting point for the following considerations," and 280, "Thus we find that viewed in principle . . . *Pistis Sophia* is located on the same line as the rest of Christian interpretation of Scripture."

literature that naturally allows also a certain claim to “canonicity” to become clear: Jesus teaches his disciples eleven years after his resurrection on the top of the Mount of Olives. The author of the *Pistis Sophia* correspondingly introduces his own writing as a kind of “second gospel”—but the term admittedly does not occur. The first gospel was spoken ἐν παραβολῇ, and the second went forth παῤῥησίᾳ.[279] A symbol of this duplication is the doubling of the biblical story of the ascension scene, enriched with motifs that were taken from the transfiguration pericope: after eleven years of teaching, Jesus goes to heaven a second time and returns, glorified by a power of light (Schmidt 1905, 4.20–5.2 = Schmidt/Till 1981, 3.16–4.24).

But must one conclude from this that the author lays claim to a higher “canonical” authority for his “second gospel” than he was prepared to grant to the four canonical gospels of the majority church?[280] Some years ago, Kurt Rudolph introduced the term “revelation discourse” to describe phenomena like those that can be observed here, and one can indeed make good use of this term with minor modifications to its meaning: a “revelation discourse” is present when the “canonical” biblical narrative is not rejected but interpreted and expanded in the name of a higher revelation.[281] But, of course, it does not follow from this that such interpretations and expansions immediately move up to the rank of a canonical writing: one can make clear the difference between interpretation and canonization, by way of example, in relation to the famous ἄγραφα δόγματα of the Platonic school in the Roman Empire. In that case, too, no attempt was made at the time, as far as we know, to elevate the few texts that contain information about the so-called esoteric teaching of Plato to the same level of canonical authority with which the original Platonic dialogues were

[279] For this expression, compare, for example, Schmidt/Till 1988, 5.33–36: “From now on I will speak . . . to you openly (παῤῥησία) and I will speak to you face to face without parable (παραβολή).” Similarly on p. 173.28–30, “With regard to the soul . . . I have spoken to you first in a parable (παραβολή). . . .” For the presupposed situation of revelation, compare C. Schmidt 1967, 201–6, 370–71, and K. Rudolph 1996, 226–29. On the notion of a second gospel, compare Grant 1960 and Tuckett 1986, 155–56.

[280] Compare, for example, in the so-called *Gospel of Truth* from Nag Hammadi: “This <is> the gospel . . . , which <was> revealed to those who are perfect through the grace of the Father—the hidden secret, Jesus Christ” (ⲡⲉⲉⲓ <ⲡⲉ> ⲡⲉⲩⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲓⲟⲛ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲧⲟⲩⲕⲱⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲥⲱϥ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁ<ⲩ>ⲟⲩⲁⲛϩϥ̄ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧⲓ ϫⲏⲕ ⲁⲃⲁⲗ· ϩⲓⲧⲛ̄ ⲛⲓⲙⲛ̄ⲧϣⲁⲛϩⲧⲏϥ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲡⲓⲱⲧ ⲡⲓⲙⲩⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ ⲉⲑⲏⲡ ⲓⲏ(ⲥⲟⲩ)ⲥ ⲡⲉⲭⲣ(ⲓⲥⲧⲟ)ⲥ [NHC I,3 p. 18.11–16]); on the grammatical problem, compare the commentary of H. W. Attridge and G. W. MacRae in Attridge 1985, 49.

[281] K. Rudolph 1996a, 207 (on the *Apocryphon of John*): It is said to form “a ‘revelation discourse’ and commentary on Gen 1–6; since the first is secondary, the Gnostic ‘alternative exposition’ or new interpretation is left: the biblical report is not rejected, but corrected in the name of a higher revelation wisdom and expanded correspondingly.”

treated—for example, in the instruction of the Academy. The "new versions" of the biblical narratives in the so-called intertestamental literature of Hellenistic Judaism, which one now frequently calls "rewritten Bible" with Geza Vermes or "texte continué" with Charles Perrot, can serve as another example:[282] one would need to mention, for example, Jubilees,[283] the Genesis Apocryphon (1 Q Ap Gen), the Testament of Moses, and Pseudo-Philo's *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum*, and yet one could refer just as well to the Targums and parts of the works of Josephus.[284]

Let us then provide a concise answer at the end of this section to our initial two questions: there is no strict evidence for the view that the author of the *Pistis Sophia* granted his work a higher canonical value than the Gospels whose inspiration and canonicity he presupposes in a certain sense in almost every line. Real certainty can no longer be reached at this point. But one can at least hypothesize that "the fact that an author takes the trouble to provide an interpretation of a text suggests that the text in question is one whose correct interpretation is considered to be important and which therefore implicitly has a certain amount of authority for the person referring to it."[285] We have seen further that the author, at least with respect to the *Odes of Solomon*, presupposes a more extensive scope of his canonical Holy Scriptures than the contemporary Septuagint 'canon' of Hellenistic Judaism, which Christianity in the imperial period largely received without further ado.[286] Is this discernible deviation from the majority church consensus perhaps connected with the institutional context of the author of the *Pistis Sophia*? (Presumably we are dealing here with a free teacher who wrote for Gnostic circles.) It is evidently grounded first through the author's decided interest in psalms—as we have seen, twelve of them are cited completely from the canonical Psalter and usually also paraphrased in addition. Although one cannot say with ultimate certainty that the *Odes*—deuterocanonical according to the majority church standards—really possessed canonical authority for the author and that he did not count them among a group of Scriptures that were inspired but not to be given the same regard as the canonical Scriptures, it is nevertheless clear that his authorization of the *Odes* is connected

[282] Compare the corresponding documentation in Murphy 1993, 4–5; Feldman 1998; Jacobson 1996, 211–13.

[283] Already Dillmann 1851 wrote in the introduction (pp. 72–96) to his German first translation that the book was not written "in order to suppress the canonical Genesis but in order to supplement it" (p. 75). By the way, Charles 1902, XLVII, already pointed to the "esoteric tradition" that the author represented. A detailed study has more recently been presented by Ruiten 1997.

[284] M. A. Williams 1996, 64–65, for example, draws attention to these connections.

[285] Tuckett 1986, 10–11 (with reference to Bruce 1983, 37–60, esp. 47–48).

[286] See in detail Hengel/Deines 1994, 182–284, esp. 263–84.

with points of his explicit "theology" and (as the presupposed Gnosticizing of the deuterocanonical *Odes* and the canonical psalms shows) already has a prehistory in the Gnostic milieu. But such a theologically grounded special authority of a writing that is "deuterocanonical" according to the standards of the majority church is not specifically "Gnostic," as one can see from the way that Origen and Tertullian deal with the book of Enoch;[287] it is more characteristic of the theological self-confidence of free teachers. To this extent, the striking deviation from the majority church Septuagint 'canon' is therefore probably connected also with the institutional context of the author of the *Pistis Sophia*.

In order to deepen this line of thought, we will now investigate a few other Gnostic texts from various epochs and schools. We begin with the *Apophasis Megale*.

3.1.5.2 The *Apophasis Megale*

The *Apophasis Megale*, the "Great Revelation," is a collection of fragments that is handed down in the Roman presbyter Hippolytus' treatise *Refutatio omnium haeresium* (VI 9–18). The Roman theologian interprets these fragments at the beginning of the third century as a source for the particular kind of Gnosis that Simon Magus is said to have developed. But on the basis of a careful literary analysis, Joseph Frickel showed more than thirty years ago that this material by no means represents an excerpt by Hippolytus from the original *Apophasis* but the reproduction of a paraphrase of the original *Apophasis*,[288] and Edwin Yamauchi[289] has demonstrated that substantial differences exist between the "Great Revelation" and our classic picture of "Gnosis."[290] According to Hippolytus, "Simon

[287] All the Patristic quotations in the original languages can be found in Schürer 1986, 261–64; for Tertullian, compare also Zahn 1975, I/1: 120–22. Hengel/Deines 1994, 269, refer to Jude 14, where Enoch is introduced as a prophet (ἐπεπροφήτευσεν); mention should be made also of *Barnabas*, Athenagoras, Clement of Alexandria, Commodian, Cyprian, Hippolytus, Irenaeus, Justin, Minucius Felix, Origen, Tatian, and Tertullian (attestations in Schürer 1986, 261–64, or Hengel/Deines 1994, 228–29 with n. 132–38).

[288] Frickel 1968 (for the title see esp. 156–65); compare the critical remarks of B. Aland 1973, 410–18. B. Aland does, however, affirm Frickel's main thesis (410).

[289] Yamauchi 1973, 64–65.

[290] Yamauchi 1973, 64, quotes the following conclusions of Salles-Dabadie 1968: "The teachings of the Great Revelation differ from classical Gnosticism in several respects: (1) As a good disciple of Hellenistic philosophy the author finds that the cosmos is not evil but beautiful. (2) As a corollary the author betrays no contempt for the body, which is considered to be as divine as the cosmos. (3) One does not find the usual concepts or technical vocabulary of Gnosticism." On this topic, compare the controversial position statements of Beyschlag 1974, 37–47 (with additional literature), and Lüdemann 1975, 28–29, 100–103.

paraphrased the law of Moses in a foolish and deceitful manner";[291] in other words and without the antiheretic polemic and perspective from which the Roman theologian writes, the author of the *Apophasis*, whether or not it is Simon, intended exactly the type of "rewritten Bible" that one could observe already in the psalm paraphrases in the *Pistis Sophia*.

The author's interest in submitting a "rewritten Bible" with the *Apophasis* already makes clear the probable original beginning of this writing, which Hippolytus cites immediately after his polemical statement: according to this, the concern is with a hidden "Book of Revelation" (τοῦτο τὸ γράμμα ἀποφάσεως . . .), "for which reason it is sealed, hidden, covered."[292] But "Simon" (who is indeed the author of the *Apophasis Megale* from the perspective of Hippolytus) also accepts certain parts of the canonical writings of the majority church as sufficient texts that can be used without supplementary Gnostic interpretation: . . . ἱκανῶς, φησίν, εἴρηκεν ἡ γραφή.[293] And Hippolytus makes clear in the following sections of his argumentation that large parts of the *Apophasis Megale* consist in the interpretation of biblical texts, admittedly an interpretation that in his eyes "assigned (to these passages of Scripture) a deviant meaning (from the one that the holy authors assigned)."[294] All these observations make sufficiently clear that here the debate between Gnostics and the majority church was not over different *scopes* of the canonical literature but over different interpretations of the same canonical literature. Such an interpretation of the findings is documented also by the citation formula in the text in Hippolytus: the *Apophasis* cites "the law given by Moses"[295] and states, "The first book is Genesis. (Simon) says that the heading of the book is completely sufficient for a knowledge of the universe."[296]

Thus it is again shown that free teachers of Gnostic provenance by no means necessarily had to accept a 'canon' of authoritative religious Scriptures that was more extensive in its scope; on the contrary, they understood themselves as (an admittedly special) part of the community of interpreters

[291] Hippolytus, *Refutatio omnium haeresium* VI 9.3 (Wendland 1977, 136.8–9): λέγει δὲ ὁ Σίμων μεταφράζων τὸν νόμον Μωϋσέως ἀνοήτως τε καὶ κακοτέχνως.

[292] Hippolytus, *Refutatio omnium haeresium* VI 9.4 (Wendland 1977, 136.16 or 17–18): διὸ ἔσται ἐσφραγισμένον, κεκρυμμένον, κεκαλυμμένον.

[293] Hippolytus, *Refutatio omnium haeresium* VI 10.2 (Wendland 1977, 137.20–21).

[294] Hippolytus, *Refutatio omnium haeresium* VI 14.1 (Wendland 1977, 139.14): τὸν εἰρημένον τρόπον μετοικονόμησας ὁ Σίμων . . .

[295] Hippolytus, *Refutatio omnium haeresium* VI 15.1 (Wendland 1977, 141.11): οὗτος, φησίν, ἐστὶν ὁ νόμος, ὃν ἔθηκε Μωσῆς . . .

[296] Hippolytus, *Refutatio omnium haeresium* VI 15.2 (Wendland 1977, 141.13–14): τὸ πρῶτον βιβλίον Γένεσις· ἤρκει, φησί, πρὸς γνῶσιν τῶν ὅλων ἡ ἐπιγραφὴ τοῦ βιβλίου. Contrast the translation of Preysing 1922, 151: "The first book Genesis; the superscript of the book is sufficient for knowledge of the whole content."

of the biblical ‘canon’ of the majority church. Here, the learning of the free teachers does not show itself, as it did in Clement of Alexandria or Tertullian, in the form of a special elaborated theory of “graded canonicity” but in the multilevel interpretation of the canonized texts. To this extent, it is not so much the concept of ‘canon’ but the interaction with the canonized text that is connected with the institutional context.

We will conclude our fragmentary overview in this section on the biblical ‘canon’ among Gnostics with a short pass through the *Exegesis on the Soul* and a number of other writings from the textual findings of Nag Hammadi.

3.1.5.3 The “Exegesis on the Soul”

Another excellent example of an esteem for the biblical ‘canon’ of the majority church can be found in the *Exegesis on the Soul* (also known as *Tractate on the Soul* or *Narrative on the Soul*; NHC II,6), which is an explanation of the fall and salvation of the soul.[297] According to Paul-Hubert Poirier, we are dealing with a text of Valentinian provenance.[298] Here, at any rate, the whole history of the soul is narrated on the basis of the canonical writings of the Bible.[299] Only two characteristic passages will be cited here: after the introduction, “The Holy Spirit prophecies about the prostitution of the soul at many points. For it says in the prophet Jeremiah . . .” (ⲡⲉϫⲁϥ `ⲓ ⲅⲁⲣ ϩⲛ̄ ⲓⲉⲣⲏⲙⲓⲁⲥ ⲡⲉⲡⲣⲟⲫⲏⲧⲏⲥ ϫⲉ [p. 129.7–8]), there follows at the beginning of the tractate a long citation from this Old Testament book (Jeremiah 3.1-4) and thereafter additional passages from the prophetic books Hosea (2.4-9) and Ezekiel (16.23-26). After these three citations, the author mentions “the apostles of the Savior” (ⲛⲁ ⲓⲡⲟⲥⲧⲟⲗⲟⲥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲥⲱⲧⲏⲣ [p. 130.28–29]) and “Paul who writes to the Corinthians” (p. 131.2–3). In such passages, it is scarcely possible to doubt that the author accepted the cited texts as passages inspired by the Holy Spirit.[300]

[297] On the highly controversial placement of this writing, compare Arai 1977. Arai reports the position of K. Rudolph 1972, 320, 324, that the concern is perhaps with a “pre-Simonian tradition” (Arai 1977, 186) but argues himself against such a placement (Arai 1977, 200–203). See now in detail Kulawik 2006, which discusses the placement of the work on pp. 6–9.

[298] P.-H. Poirier 1986, 308 (with reference to Tardieu 1978, 192).

[299] Scopello 1985, 17–44, postulates a florilegium as a *Vorlage* (cf. also Scopello 1977; and the review by K. Rudolph 1990, 132–34). Additional literature on the citations and the writing can be found in Tuckett 1986, 52 n. 163–65.

[300] According to K. Rudolph 1996a, 193, the theory of inspiration evidently refers only to the Old Testament; on the texts themselves, see Nagel 1974; Kasser 1975; and now the detailed commentary on the passages in Kulawik 2006.

With its clear orientation to the biblical ‘canon’ of the majority church, the *Exegesis on the Soul* is not, of course, alone. The *Testimonium veritatis* or *Testimony of Truth* (NHC IX,3) correctly identifies citations from the first book of the Bible in a sort of midrash on the serpent in the primeval history (Gen 2–3)[301] with the formula “it stands written about this in the law” (ϥⲥⲏϩ ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲛⲟⲙⲟⲥ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲡ̣[ⲁï] [p. 45.23]) or “[in a] passage Moses wrote” ([ϩ]ⲛ̣̄ <ⲟⲩ>ⲙⲁ ⲉϥⲥϩⲁï ⲛ̄ϭⲓ ⲙⲱⲩⲥⲏⲥ [p. 48,16]) or “in the same way it stands written in the book that is called ‘Exodus’” ([ϩ]ⲙ̣̄ ⲡⲕⲉϫⲱⲱⲙⲉ ⲧⲁï ⲉⲧⲟⲩ|ⲙⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲉⲣⲟⲥ ϫⲉ ⲧⲉ̣ⲝⲟⲇⲟⲥ· | ⲉϥⲥⲏϩ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉïϩⲉ ϫⲉ; [p. 48.19–21]).[302] In the same way, the *Tripartite Tractate* (NHC I,5) mentions “law and prophets”: “The prophets, by contrast, have spoken nothing from themselves, but each one of them (has proclaimed) from what he saw and heard through the proclamation of the Savior” (p. 113.5–10).[303]

The picture that is obtained is further confirmed if one looks, so to speak as a control, at the limits of the biblical ‘canon’ in the so-called Nag Hammadi writings. Here too we begin again with the *Exegesis on the Soul* (NHC II, 6).[304] The tractate cites from *1 Clement*, with the following introduction: “For this reason he speaks (sc. the Father) through the Spirit to the prophets” (ⲇⲓⲁ ⲧⲟⲩⲧⲟ ⲡⲉϫⲁϥ ϩⲓⲧⲙ̄ ⲡⲉⲡ̄ⲛ̄ⲁ̄ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲡⲣⲟⲫ[ⲏⲧ]ⲏⲥ ϫⲉ [p. 135.29–31; for the citation cf. *1 Clement* 8.3]). There is no doubt at all that here the letter of the Roman community to the Corinthian community enjoys a certain authority, and one can therefore hypothesize that *1 Clement* was part of the biblical ‘canon’ of the author of the tractate from Nag Hammadi. But as we have already reiterated, in texts of the majority church, we also find traces of such a canonical status of this writing, which was first assigned to a corpus of its own, the “Apostolic Fathers,” in the early modern period.

An answer to our question posed above—namely, whether these Gnostic texts claimed “canonical” authority for themselves—is closely connected with the observation that in this material, books or writings are often mentioned that would have to be called “apocryphal” according to the standard of the majority church ‘canon.’ In the *Pistis Sophia*, the Savior refers to the mysteries that are found “in the books of Jeu, which I have made Enoch write in paradise” (ⲛⲁï ⲉⲧϩⲓ ⲛ̄ϫⲱⲱⲙⲉ ⲛ̄ⲓ̄ⲉ̄ⲟ̄ⲩ̄ ⲛⲁï ⲛ̄ⲧⲁïⲧⲣⲉ ⲉⲛⲱϫ ⲥϩⲁïⲥⲟⲩ ϩⲣⲁï ϩ̄ⲙ̄ ⲡ̄ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲇⲓⲥⲟⲥ [Schmidt 1905, 349.16–18 = Schmidt/Till 1981, 228.34–229.1]). At an earlier point, we already find

[301] See Pearson 1980, 314–15; 1975. A German translation is presented in Koschorke 1978; on the New Testament traditions, compare Tuckett 1986, 139–45.

[302] Pearson 1980.

[303] I follow the recently published translation of Nagel 1998, 69.

[304] This passage is used as example also in B. M. Metzger 1987, 87–88. Compare also Perkins 2002, 363–66, and the tables on pp. 366–69.

a comparable reference: "You will find them (sc. the mysteries) in the two great books of Jeu" (Schmidt 1905, 246.20–21 = Schmidt/Till 1981, 158.10[305]). Two "books of Jeu" have actually survived in Codex Brucianus of the Bodleian Library in Oxford.[306] In another noteworthy passage of the *Pistis Sophia*, there is a description of how the apostle Philip pushed forward with a book in his hand, stopped, and put the book down: "For he is the writer of all the discourses that Jesus spoke and all of that which he did" (ⲛ̄ⲧⲟϥ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲡⲉ ⲉⲧⲥϩⲁï ⲛ̄ϣⲁϫⲉ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲛⲉⲣⲉ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ ϫⲱ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙ̄ⲛ̄ ⲛⲉⲧϥ̄ⲉⲓⲣⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ [Schmidt 1905, 71.5–7 = Schmidt/Till 1981, 44.21–22]). This passage makes it quite clear that the author of the *Pistis Sophia* is evidently familiar with a writing of the sort that is handed down to us in the *Gospel of Philip* from Nag Hammadi (CANT 20).[307] Indeed, he attempts in the following lines to compare the authority of this book to the authority of the *Gospel of Thomas* and the Gospel of Matthew: "Here, Philip, you blessed one . . . you and Thomas and Matthew are the (*three*) who are commissioned to write all the discourses that I will say and do . . ." (Schmidt 1905, 71.19–22 = Schmidt/Till 1981, 44.33–35). Alongside the canonical Gospel of Matthew, however, there is mention here not only of the "apocryphal" *Gospel of Philip* but also of the *Gospel of Thomas* (CANT 19). In this respect, that citation gives the impression, at first glance, of an extraordinarily convincing piece of evidence for a provocative thesis of Helmut Koester, who maintains "that a dozen non-canonical gospels were known in the second century and that the evidence for these apocryphal writings compares quite well with the evidence for the canonical gospels."[308] In a publication from the early 1980s, Koester supplements his thesis through a succinct overview of the material that has been handed down and its attestation. Here, it is presupposed among other assumptions that Justin used two of our "canonical" gospels (namely, Matthew and Luke) and other traditions of Jesus' sayings that were never canonized. Clement of Alexandria is also enlisted there as an example of such a broad attestation and status of "apocryphal" gospels; he is said to use the

[305] On this passage, however, the translator Schmidt comments, "This sentence disturbs the context" (Schmidt/Till 1981, 158 apparatus).

[306] On the relations of the two writings, compare W. Till in the introduction of the translation in the Berlin Church Father Corpus (Schmidt/Till 1981, XXXI–XXXIII).

[307] Since allusion is made twice to the *deeds* of Jesus as content of the writing, one may ask whether here the *Gospel of Philip* from Nag Hammadi (NHC II, 3) is meant, which must, as is well known, be designated as a sayings gospel. For Schenke 1997, 1, though, there are no difficulties in the identification. But for the interpretation of the passage in the *Pistis Sophia*, compare also Harnack 1891a, 106–8.

[308] Koester 1980, 110. Compare the observations of Majella Franzmann on the topic, "Are Any of the Nag Hammadi Texts Gospels?" (Franzmann 1996, 18–19).

Greek *Gospel of the Egyptians* and the *Gospel of the Hebrews* and perhaps also the *Secret Gospel of Mark*.[309] In his 1980 article, Koester surprisingly does not draw the apparently unavoidable conclusion that very many Christians in the second century recognized not only the four gospels as "canonical" but a much higher number.

Through a closer examination of the preserved material, as we have been able to carry out here only in a very paradigmatic way, one can, of course, be very skeptical toward this picture of the New Testament 'canon' in the second century: we have already pointed to the simple statistical observation that Clement very rarely cites the aforementioned "apocryphal" texts and also does not at all treat them as equal in value with the four "canonical" gospels; as we have seen, in the *Pistis Sophia*, more than ninety allusions to the four "canonical" gospels stand over against the one allusion to the two "apocryphal" gospels according to Philip and Thomas.[310] With reference to the example of Clement, we have attempted to show that it is not sensible to impute to him a "vague understanding of canonicity" or to claim that his 'canon' of the New Testament was clearly more extensive than that of the contemporary majority church (see section 3.1.4). Rather, the use of biblical and nonbiblical citations in Clement of Alexandria is characterized by a concept of graded canonical authority that is supported and supplemented by a theory of inspiration. Clement—and one suspects many of his educated colleagues among the free teachers as well—did not think in the rigid alternatives of later generations and did not divide all the material that was handed down simply into the two categories of "canonical" and "apocryphal" but reckoned with intermediate levels. It would be worthy of a more detailed investigation to ask about how this model of graded canonicity was then applied in detail and which writings were set at which level. Here, it is sufficient to observe that there was certainly also a "reduced" or "secondary canonicity" or authority.[311] We have seen previously that the institutional context of the

[309] Koester 1980, 109. Koester calls this overview, for which he also draws again on the results of his Marburger dissertation (thus p. 256 n. 172), among other works, "deliberately conservative" (p. 108): "i.e., use of a particular gospel is only listed when it is clearly evident."

[310] Hengel 2008, 162–63, has drawn attention, in addition, to the fact that in the second century one quoted also the so-called Old Testament in relatively free form so that the freedom of the quotation may scarcely be taken as a decisive argument against the canonicity of a passage.

[311] Sundberg advocated already in 1961 the thesis that from Irenaeus (*Adversus haereses* III 13–15) and Tertullian (*Adversus Marcionem* IV 2–3), one can see that Luke is viewed here in a status of "dependent canonicity" (Sundberg 1964). For Irenaeus, Luke is said to be only *sectator et discipulus apostolorum* (III 10.1 [Rousseau/Doutreleau 1974, II: 112.1–2]), as Mark is said to be *interpres et sectator Petri* (III 10.6 [134.175–76]).

free teachers who developed this concept was certainly important for this theoretical model of a "graded canonicity" as well: whoever wished, in varied teaching contexts, to introduce people to the new literature of a new religion through writings that they already knew required good theological grounds in order to continue using at least a portion of the non-Christian literature already known to such people; he or she could not immediately and completely dismantle the previous authority of these texts. A concept of "graded canonicity" offered such good reasons for the use of corresponding writings.

The picture sketched by Koester of a scarcely calculable number of "apocryphal" writings that come alongside the comparably small number of the canonized writings of the New Testament (e.g., among the Gnostics) certainly needs to be critically scrutinized again. Especially in the literature of Nag Hammadi, writings are often mentioned that were completely unknown and also not previously attested to or mentioned in the ancient literature—writings that were not taken up into the majority church 'canon' of the New Testament and that supposedly formed a part of a Gnostic 'canon' that was much more extensive in scope. But can one really be certain that all these writings actually existed? A text without a title from the corpus of texts from Nag Hammadi that is traditionally called *On the Origin of the Word* (NHC II, 5, and XIII, 2) or *Origin of the World* and is characterized by its editor Hans-Gebhard Bethge as an "encyclopedic compendium of basic Gnostic ideas"[312] alludes to an "Archangelic (Book) of the Prophet Moses and . . . the first Book of Noraia"[313] (ϩⲛ̄ ⲧⲁⲣⲭⲁⲅ`|ⲅⲉⲗⲓⲕⲏ ⲙ̄ⲙⲱⲩⲥⲏⲥ ⲡⲉⲡⲣⲟⲫⲏ|ⲧⲏⲥ . . . . ϩⲛ̄ ⲧϣⲟⲣⲡ` ⲛ̄ⲃⲓⲃⲗⲟⲥ | ⲛ̄ⲛⲱⲣⲁⲓⲁⲥ` [p. 102.8–11]) and claims that the attentive reader of the tractate will find expressed there "the impact" of certain names of divine powers in these books. The reference to the "Seventh Universe of the Prophet Hieralias"[314] in the same tractate represents a similar case

From this, it would follow that Luke and Mark are canonical not in their own right "but are dependent upon apostolic teachers for their authority" (403). But Irenaeus simultaneously uses this argument also against Marcion: it is not permitted to separate Paul from his student and only to receive the apostle but not the apostle's student (III 14.1–2 [258–66]). According to Hartenstein 2000, 323, individual Gnostic dialogue Gospels present a "second teaching" that "is not in competition with the earlier teaching of Jesus and does not want to replace it either."

[312] Bethge 1989, 12.

[313] For the name "Noraia," compare Pearson 1990b, 84–94, esp. 85; for the writing in NHC II, 5, itself, compare Painchaud 1991; Perkins 2002, 363–64.

[314] I did not succeed in finding attestations of the name "Hieralias" in the relevant dictionaries and indexes; in the Hebrew National Library in Jerusalem, I had access to the third unpublished index volume of the PGM (completed 1941) as a photocopy from the possessions of Gerschom Scholem, in which one would be most likely to expect an attestation of this name.

(ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲙⲁϩ | ⲥⲁϣϥ ⲛ̄ⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ ⲛ̄ϣⲓⲉⲣⲁⲗⲓⲁⲥ ⲡⲉⲡⲣⲟⲫⲏ|ⲧⲏⲥ [p. 112.23–25]). Since such texts are mentioned nowhere else in ancient literature, one should not immediately dismiss the consideration that the supposed "apocryphal" books mentioned here never existed and that from this perspective, "blank references" were given in order to elevate the importance of the writing or its author; this procedure would then have to be compared to the references to specific books in the *Corpus Dionysiacum* from late antiquity, which likewise refers to nonexistent writings of the alleged author Dionysius Areopagites. Without a feeling for such doubts concerning whether we may be dealing with "blank references," the number of "apocryphal" writings alluded to in Gnostic texts is often set extremely high in recent scholarly contributions. For example, in a relevant listing, Kurt Rudolph mentions a "Book (or a scroll) of the Generation of Adam" and refers as evidence to a passage from the aforementioned Nag Hammadi tractate *Testimony of Truth*: "The [book of the] generation of Adam is [written for the ones] who [are in] the [generation] of the [law]" (ⲡϫ̣|ⲱⲱⲙⲉ ⲙ̄]|[ⲡ]ⲉϫⲡⲟ ⲛ̄ⲁⲇⲁⲙ ϥ̣[ⲥⲏϩ ⲛ̄ⲛⲁï]| ⲉⲧ `ϣⲟⲟⲡ` ϩⲙ̄ ⲡϫ[ⲡⲟ] ⲙ̣̄[ⲡⲛⲟⲙⲟⲥ˙] *Testimony of Truth* NHC IX, 3 p. 50.5–7).[315] But here there is definitely no reference to an "apocryphal" book, but reference is made to a biblical phrase *liber generationis*, as the comparison with Genesis 5.1 *hic est liber generationis Adam* makes clear.[316]

We have seen that at least those Gnostic texts that we have paradigmatically analyzed oriented themselves in a quite surprising manner toward the biblical 'canon' of the majority church. We observed a concept of "graded canonicity" that is quite similar to majority church models such as that of Clement of Alexandria in conjunction with a doctrine of inspiration that makes possible that open stance toward texts of other spiritual traditions that is characteristic of certain forms of ancient Christian theology and evidently shaped by the institutional context of free teachers. Thus if one wants to track down specific characteristics of Gnostic theologies of this time, then one may not ask about the validity and scope of the biblical 'canon' but must investigate the *loyalty* of those theologies vis-à-vis the texts that are presupposed, introduced, and used as normative there. Kurt Rudolph thinks that the Gnostics merely mustered a "formal loyalty" in relation to the biblical texts canonized by the majority church but were

315 It refers to an apocryphal book, according to K. Rudolph 1996a, 197.

316 Thus already Pearson 1980, 313. In a similar way it is, by the way, disputed whether there is an allusion to the canonical Gospels in the *Apocryphon of James* (NHC 1,2) p. 2.9–15: "The twelve disciples sat all together and remembered what the Savior had said to each one of them, whether in secret or openly, and [put it] in books." Abramowski 1983, 347 n. 27 (= 1991, 329 n. 27) opts for the canonical Gospels; Francis E. Williams in the first edition opts for an allusion to canonical ("open") *and* Gnostic ("secret") Gospels (Attridge 1985, 9).

obligated, in truth, to a Gnostic “worldview” that was very different from them and interpreted them from this perspective.[317] In the context of our investigation of the institutions of ancient Christian “theology,” we naturally cannot definitively answer the question of the loyalty of Gnostic theologians, but it is perhaps characteristic that precisely the same question is also raised in relation to the theology of Origen. Possibly we are dealing with the consequence of a certain modification of the profile of a theology that almost automatically provokes the question of loyalty: both the Gnostics and the Alexandrian theologians such as Clement and Origen oriented themselves toward the standards of the scholarly argumentation and research of their time in order to win over educated contemporaries for Christianity. But with this move, the question must have almost inevitably arisen of whether they also took up additional loyalties into the canon of their norm-giving instances alongside the classical authorities of Christian theology. In his book *Rethinking “Gnosticism,”* in which scholarly interaction with the category “Gnosis” is critically scrutinized, Michael Allen Williams also shows that the widespread concept of loyalty and change of loyalty leads to overly simple alternatives. One must only realize that Gnostic biblical interpretation is occupied with exactly the same notorious hermeneutical problems as that of the theologians of the majority church—and not only these. A nice anecdote narrates that Rabbi Hananiah ben Hezekiah burned three hundred buckets of oil before he was able to develop an exegesis of Ezekiel which would be appropriate for the basic tendency of Jewish biblical interpretation.[318] The complex reality of the situation is missed in the notion that Gnostic theologians usually did not know what to do with the text of biblical books (such as Genesis, for example) and for this reason “canonized” the exact opposite of the old narratives, whereas the majority church exegetes attempted to save what could be saved through allegory and other interpretative techniques. For this reason, in his monograph, Williams also criticized the well-known concept of a Gnostic “protest exegesis,” which was developed by the late Hans Jonas and is advocated, for example, by Kurt Rudolph and others with a certain emphasis. Williams suggested that the relevant interpretations be described with the term “value reversal” and explained the phrase as follows: “We might say that the hermeneutical activity . . . is not reversal

[317] K. Rudolph 1996c, 212. Kragerud 1967, 159–62, also discusses the question of loyalty for the psalm exegesis of the *Pistis Sophia*: The investigation of form and content of the interpretation has shown “that the psalm interpretation is not so arbitrary as is commonly assumed” (160). It is said that one is able to show that the exegesis of the biblical texts has had a guiding influence on the development of the myth (202–4).

[318] *B. Šabbat* 13b; compare *b.* Ḥagigah 13a and additional documentation in Dassmann 1988a, 1134.

for reversal's sake (i.e., reversal as the principle, reversal as protest, and so forth), but rather a very selective reversal whose predictability is limited and is primarily a function of the specific scriptural incident or figure involved."[319]

Williams' observations should be supplemented by precise descriptions of exegetical techniques. What looks at first glance like simple "protest exegesis" can be traced back, in truth, to Jewish forms of textual interpretation. Birger Pearson, for example, interpreted a passage in the *Testimony of Truth* (NHC IX,3 p. 45.23–49.7) on the basis of the Jewish exegetical traditions contained in it as a midrash on the paradise narrative in Genesis 2/3.[320] Such convincing new insights into the nature of Gnostic connections to the so-called Old Testament correct and supplement a series of well-known typologies of Gnostic exegesis, such as, for example, those developed some years ago by Peter Nagel, who distinguished six ways in which Gnostics used the Jewish Bible.[321] Birger Pearson submitted a somewhat simpler schematization.[322] If one thus describes the Gnostic interpretation of canonical writings in a very detailed manner and simultaneously provides a precise tracing of their tradition history, then it becomes clearer that with their interpretative techniques, the Christian

[319] M. A. Williams 1996, 63.
[320] Pearson 1990a.
[321] Nagel 1980, 51:

1. The open rejection, usually with mocking undertone (thus *The Second Logos of the Great Seth*, *Testimony of Truth*)
2. The interpretation in the opposite sense—that is, protest exegesis in the actual sense (*The Hypostasis of the Archons, On the Origin of the World*, *Apocalpyse of Adam*, Perates)
3. The "corrective interpretation" in connection with the interpretation in the opposite sense (*Apocryphon of John*, Ophites)
4. The "neutral" use by means of allegory (*Book of Baruch by Justin*, Naassenes, *Pistis Sophia*)
5. The "eclectic reference" for the legitimation of teaching or practices (Valentinians, Libertinists, such as Barbelognostics and Borborians)
6. The etiological or typological interpretation (*The Tripartite Tractate*; *Gospel of Truth*, *The Gospel of Philip*, *The Exegesis on the Soul*, and *Pistis Sophia*)

In 1993 Rudolph cites this differentiation approvingly (K. Rudolph 1996a, 201), while he—at least according to M. A. Williams 1996, 56—sooner regards *all* Gnostic exegesis as protest exegesis: "The most widespread is probably the last (sc. form of interpretation), since despite all 'protest exegesis' (type 1 and 2) the Bible must serve a legitimation or 'prefiguration' and its 'holy,' normative character is indirectly confirmed thereby" (K. Rudolph 1996a, 201).

[322] Pearson 1988: Pearson distinguishes between texts that indicate (1) "a wholly negative stance toward Jewish scripture," (2) "a wholly positive stance," and finally (3) "intermediate positions."

(and naturally also the Christian Gnostic) free teachers had recourse not only to the praxis of a comparable pagan institution but naturally to Jewish institutions as well.

In their interaction with the biblical 'canon,' majority church and Gnostic Christian free teachers practically did not differ; they also practically did not differ because they represented the same form of the institutionalization of explicit Christian theology. But the more elaborately they presented their teaching, the more strongly they presupposed engagement with books and thus with libraries. In our next section, we will turn to these institutions and ask about the concept of a 'canon' of biblical writings implicit in them.

3.1.6 The Christian Libraries and Their Canon

Free Christian teachers of a majority church or Gnostic provenance, as we have discussed them in the preceding sections of our investigation, evidently made recourse to public and private *libraries*—one need think only of Clement of Alexandria, whose equally rich and extensive citations from biblical and pagan traditions can scarcely be imagined without a large number of scrolls and codices from which the Christian scholar could cite as needed. In order not to be dependent on the support of fellow Christians, Origen sold—as Eusebius reports—the books of the non-Christian authors of his private library and obtained from the purchaser a daily "body rent" of four obols (a not particularly luxuriant sum from which one could not live),[323] and his grandstudent Eusebius accordingly praises also his gospel-commensurate poverty (Matthew 6.34; 10.10).[324] Nevertheless, in Caesarea at the latest, the scholar must have had access again to a well-stocked library that also possessed pagan literature. The urban Roman activity of Justin, for example, is also difficult to imagine without a minimum of books; the same is true for the teachers Valentinus and Ptolemy, who were active in the same city.

For our guiding question about the relationship between 'canon' and institution, (community) public and private Christian libraries represent an important field of research, since the biblical books kept in such collections

[323] A Roman high official in the early Roman period earned 300,000 sesterces (equivalent to 75,000 denarii) per year; his daily wage of 821 sesterces (about 205 denarii) stands in contrast to the four sesterces of a simple worker. If inflation is taken into account, then the annuity of Origen probably corresponds approximately to this last sum (Pekáry 1976, 109–11, 119–21, 132–33).

[324] Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* VI 3.9 (Schwartz 1999, II/2: 526.20–23). Such a stance, however, is not necessarily genuinely Christian; Lucian refers, for example, already to the fact that a scholar has to place his hopes not on a βιβλιοκαπήλων, a "book broker" and the largest possible library, but on himself and daily life (*Adversus indoctum* 24).

naturally also represented and documented a 'canon' of these writings—that is, what a certain group of library owners and library operators wanted to make binding for the users (or particular owners for their own individual use). In the sense of our definition developed above (section 3.1.6), the arrangement of a library represents already the attempt of a canonization and consequently the reception of biblical writings into a private or public book collection the attempt to establish a 'canon.'

But before one can turn to the private and (community) public Christian libraries and ask whether the implicit theology of canonicity represented by them, together with their institutional context, can still be reconstructed in individual cases, one must first clarify two fundamental practical questions: Who actually possessed Bibles and other Christian literature? And where could one actually purchase such texts? Only when one has set forth a relatively precise picture here can one turn to the libraries and their respective contents. With regard to the Christian libraries, the key questions are, Which manuscripts or codices of biblical and other Christian literature were at the disposal of an average community? Which were accessible to a halfway educated free teacher such as Justin or Ptolemy? Which were possessed by the library of the Christian private university of Origen in Caesarea? To put the question differently, what was the scope of the books possessed by average ancient Christian libraries such as that of a community, that of a free teacher, and that of an educational establishment such as a private university? Thus we will begin our overview of the material with reflections on the book market and on the buyers of canonical and other Christian literature.

3.1.6.1 The Purchase and Possession of Canonical and Other Christian Writings

Questions concerning the existence and character of a market at which one could buy canonical and other Christian literature are not easy to answer. The fundamental presentation of Barbara and Kurt Aland on the text of the New Testament already shows, from a purely linguistic perspective, how far one must work at present with largely unproven hypotheses if one poses the fundamental question of the circumstances of Christian book production:

> In the early period all the copies *were presumably* made by private people. The use of one of the scriptoria . . . was especially out of the question in times when Christians were threatened or persecuted. Naturally, it is *possible* that Christians among the scribes made copies as "homework." The earliest Christian scriptorium *may* have been in Alexandria ca. 200 CE, but it had meaning only for the Egyptian church province. Until then we must reckon with a "small serial production" of manuscripts everywhere [in Egypt] and elsewhere also later, namely

> until the beginning of the fourth century. . . . The Diocletian persecution involved a deep break . . . in the history of the New Testament text. The innumerable manuscripts destroyed in the persecution had to be replaced and in addition the extremely numerous communities that emerged after the "Constantinian turn" had to be supplied anew thereby. The exterior conditions for the establishment of church scriptoria in all the episcopal sees . . . were now in place.[325]

Since answering the question about the production, purchasing, and use of manuscripts of biblical and other Christian literature has scarcely been felt to be a relevant problem for scholarship up to now, there is also scarcely any secondary literature. An important exception is a 1912 study of Adolf von Harnack that dealt with the "private use of the Holy Scriptures in the ancient church."[326] There one also finds answers to some of the questions formulated above, though by no means all.[327] Some additional valuable insights are contained also in Harry Y. Gamble's book on *Books and Readers in the Early Church*, which was prepared for by some smaller contributions by the author.[328] Since only a limited number of relevant sources are available for the second and third centuries, we will supplement our pass through the material with evidence from later centuries, especially from the fourth century.

We need not give more detail other than that in the imperial period there was a book market and book sellers who effectively operated there and acted as editors, publishers, and dealers in one person. There were bookshops in the educational metropolises and bookstalls in harbor cities. However, due to the high prices for production and acquisition, one may not compare this market with the European modern period. Many people had to borrow books, copy them out themselves, or have them copied.[329] For example, in

[325] Aland/Aland 1989a, 80–81 (my emphasis); compare 1989b, 70.

[326] Harnack 1912. In relation to the example of P. Vindob. G. 31974 (Matthew 25.41–26.39), Kraus 2001a, 2, has recently shown how a papyrus can be interpreted as a "social artifact" and provide pointers regarding the reading habits in antiquity.

[327] Harnack 1912, 67–72: "On the dissemination of edifying literature, purchasability of Bibles, private possession, splendid Bibles, storage, and superstitious matters." The stimulating question of the percentage of people who could read at all within the Christian communities must be left out of view here, especially insofar as there were intermediate stages: Youthie 1971.

[328] Gamble 1995, 82–143.

[329] See Kleberg 1967, 42–44 (on bookstores in Rome), 11 (in Antioch), and Schubart 1962, 86–93. Lucian wrote an entire writing against the "ignorant book fool," who purchases old books with great zeal from antiquarian booksellers without proper understanding (*Adversus indoctum* 1–2, 4). As the task of true reading, he describes here "how one should speak and act in order to speak well and act nobly" (17: δυοῖν δὲ ὄντοιν, ἅττ' ἂν παρὰ τῶν παλαιῶν τις κτήσαιτο, λέγειν τε δύνασθαι καὶ πράττειν τὰ δέοντα ζήλῳ τῶν ἀρίστων καὶ φυγῇ τῶν χειρόνων).

the Oxyrhynchus papyri, we find a letter from the second century CE[330] that discloses an interesting view of a private person's possibilities for providing himself with literature in a middle-Egyptian province metropolis:[331] in his letter, the author of the work requests copies of two books on a prosopography of comedy writers.[332] Another work is said to be available from a book dealer who is referred to by name.[333] Borrowed books should be given back. Finally, the sender of the letter commissions the recipient, if in the course of this action "he should find something that I do not possess, to copy it and send it to me."[334] The fact that one evidently could purchase canonical and other Christian literature at this very book market already in the second century was, first of all, the natural consequence of a dramatically rapid acculturation of Christianity—it burst open from small villages on the Lake of Gennesaret into the educational metropolises of antiquity and had to take part in the ancient book culture and produce literature that was suitable for this market in some form if it also wanted to achieve missionary success there among the educated. In the composition of his antiheretical writing, Irenaeus evidently had found access to Justin, Tatian, and Theophilus,[335] and during his own lifetime, his own work *Adversus haereses* found its way, in the form of a book seller's copy, to Oxyrhynchus.[336] For the wording of a passage from Revelation, the Gallic bishop appeals to "all the old manuscripts that are to be taken seriously," which he could evidently consult in community or private libraries.[337] Origen is relevant for our questions in two respects: first, in his polemical writing against Celsus, he attests that this avowed opponent

[330] P.Oxy. XVIII, 1941 (pp. 150–52); compare also the request, in P.Oxy. LXIII, 4365 (a letter of the early fourth century), directed to a woman to borrow the book of Ezra (probably 4 Ezra: see Hagedorn 1997; Kraus 2001b) as a return gift, since the sender had lent her "the little Genesis" (lines 4–5: τὴν | λεπτὴν Γένεσιν), thus the book of *Jubilees* (see n. 283 above; Hagedorn 1997, 148). For this text, see also the detailed treatment in Epp 2005 (743–801) 761–77 (= Presidential Address at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature in Atlanta, Georgia on November 22, 2003, 21–35); additional relevant texts can be found in Gamble 1995, 53–54.

[331] Kees 1979, 119.

[332] Column 2, lines 28–29; book 6/7 of an otherwise unknown work of the author Hypsikrates of Amisos with the title κωμῳδούμενοι (cf. the commentary on author and genre on p. 152 *ad loc*).

[333] Column 2, line 37.

[334] ἐὰν εὑρίσκῃς μεθ' ἃ ἐγὼ κέκτημαι ποιήσα[ς] μο[ι] πέμψον (column 2, lines 41–43). On the possibility of having books copied, compare, for example, Birt 1959, 431, 436–37, 492–97; Hamman 1985, 36–39.

[335] Grant 1988, 182–90.

[336] Cambridge University Library Add. 4413 = P. Oxy III, 405; compare KV 46 in Aland/Rosenbaum 1995, 317–20; compare also Gamble 1995, 82–83.

[337] Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* V 30.1 ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς σπουδαίοις καὶ ἀρχαίοις ἀντιγράφοις (Rousseau/Doutreleau 1969, II: 370.27–28).

of Christianity could evidently purchase biblical books without difficulty as a non-Christian;[338] from his Matthew commentary, we learn that one could obtain such scrolls from pagan scriptoria as well and not only from Christians.[339] Moreover, in the biography of Origen, it becomes evident that the mass production of Christian literature required a quite high personnel expenditure: as is well known, through the court official Ambrosius, the scholar received financing not only for a scriptorium with seven speed writers, seven book writers, and seven female calligraphers[340] but also for the paper.[341] The patron Ambrosius was naturally interested not only in the quick production of his protégé but also in the extensive dissemination of his works. To this extent, one may assume that the women skilled in fine or elegant writing produced copies for the book trade or market. In his letters, Pliny mentions an autobiography of a little-known author and claims that it has been reproduced in a thousand copies and disseminated "across all Italy and the provinces."[342]

The information about the book market for canonical and other Christian books naturally becomes much denser in the fourth century. We know, for example, that when the church father Jerome had apparently completely withdrawn into isolation in the desert of Chalcis in the middle of the seventies of the fourth century, while staying in Concordia (today's Concordia Sagittaria between Venice and Aquileia) with his childhood friend Paul, to whom he had sent his biography of Paul of Thebes, he ordered for himself the Homoean bishop Fortunatianus of Aquileia's commentary on the Gospels,[343] Aurelius Victor's *De Caesaribus* ("so that I can teach myself about the persecutors of Christians"), and the letters of Novatian.[344] Therefore, one may not make an overly small estimate of the extent of his book purchases, even during the time that he attempted to portray as ascetic

[338] This was seen already by Harnack 1912: "Nowhere does he (sc. Celsus) betray thereby that it caused him difficulties to obtain the books in question."

[339] In his Matthew commentary, Origen connects this information with the accusation that the pagan scriptoria falsified the text (Origen, *Commentarium series in evangelium Matthaei* 134 [Klostermann/Benz/Treu 1976, 274.16–19]); on (falsifications or) forgeries, see Hamman 1985, 63–69.

[340] Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* VI 23.2 (Schwartz 1999, II/2: 568.25–570.5). The system of the taking down of stenograms by a *notarius* on the board, translation into normal writing (*schedulas scribere*), and establishment of the clean copy after corrections by the author is presented in detail in Kloeters 1957, 61–75, or Hamman 1985, 18–20; compare also Preuschen 1905, 6–14, 49–55; 1903. (Translator's note: I have drawn upon Watson 2013, 533, for the translation of the sentence in the main text.)

[341] Jerome, *Epistulae* 43 (Labourt 1949–1963, II: 92.23–93.4); for the prosopography, compare now Fürst 2003, 205. On the writing office of Origen, compare also Gamble 1995, 120–21.

[342] Pliny the Younger, *Epistulae* IV 7.2 (Kasten 1982, 196).

[343] Compare Jerome, *De viris illustribus* 97 (Ceresa-Gastaldo 1988, 202).

[344] Jerome, *Epistulae* 10.3 (Hilberg 1910, 38.2–5 / Labourt 1949–1963, I: 29.10–16).

isolation;[345] rather, the increase "of the rich treasure of his library," which Jerome could obtain "through God's help," became a sort of chief concern of the ascetic. In a "short postscript" that has unfortunately not remained preserved, he named additional books that the addressee of the letter was to copy and send.[346] In his youth, Jerome spent almost all his money on the books of Origen.[347] Admittedly, in all analyses of the relevant passages, one must realize that portrayals of relevant contexts have always been reshaped in relation to topoi as well. Already the information in the Pastorals that Paul left βιβλία and μεμβράναι in Troas (2 Timothy 4.13) initially certifies only a pseudepigraphal letter with information that seems especially authentic.[348] Jerome in particular often functionalized apparently authentic details about his situation of writing. He once claimed, for example, that he wrote a letter at night while the sailors had prepared the ship for sailing and thus primarily grounds only certain thematic dispositions of his letter.[349] How strongly such situational writings were shaped in relation to topoi from time immemorial can be seen, for example, with reference to the *Satyricon* of Petronius, where the blissfully writing poet Eumolpus wants to write on a "huge parchment" at the moment of the shipwreck and to put the poem in order at the end (115.2–4).

Despite all influence from topoi in such descriptions, one can at least recognize how expensive leather binding, parchment, and paper were and how expensive a good scribe was. It is true that Jerome testifies that one of his many epistolary correspondents, the bishop of Aquileia, did not lack paper, which the trade from Egypt introduced in abundance.[350] But during his stay in Constantinople (after 378), he himself could not afford a scribe to whom he could have dictated his translation of Origen's homilies on

[345] Thus also Kloeters 1957, 105. On the self-stylization of Jerome, compare the summary of recent works in Fürst 2003.

[346] Jerome, *Epistulae* 5.2 (Labourt 1949–1963, I: 18.29).

[347] *Et nostrum marsuppium Alexandrinae chartae euacuarunt* (Jerome, *Epistulae* 84.3 [Labourt 1949–1963, IV: 128.13–14]).

[348] Compare also Birt 1959, 57–58. Hengel 2000, 120; 2008, 204, draws attention to the fact that these passages possibly attest that already in an earlier period, apostolic writings were disseminated in the form of *codices*.

[349] Jerome, *Epistulae* 64.22 (Labourt 1949–1963 III: 140.8–12); on (supposed) work overload and night work, compare the diligent compilation in Kloeters 1957, 32–37. Kloeters did not, however, perceive the topos character of many examples.

[350] Jerome, *Epistulae* 7.2 (Hilberg 1910, 27.13–15, or Labourt 1949–1963, I: 22.1–5; translation in Schade 1937, 19) to Chromatius (Bishop 338–407); in Letter 9.4 (34.16–17 or 27.5–8), he requests a letter correspondent by the name of Chrysocomas (Fürst 2003, 165) to tell him if he has no material for writing; he himself lacks paper in the wilderness so that he must shorten a planned letter (*Epistulae* 11.1 [39.1–7/29.26–30.7]). Paper was evidently available in abundance only for purely official purposes; compare Schubart 1921, 14–18, and Hamman 1985, 32–36.

Jeremiah.[351] Diocletian's edict *De pretiis rerum venalium* from 301 CE provides the sum of twenty-five denarii for one hundred lines of the best writing and twenty denarii for one hundred lines of normal writing. Twenty-five denarii amounts to the daily wage of a *cloacarius* who had to clean the wastewater sewers.[352] The price of books, about which unfortunately saying something really precise is quite difficult, was relatively high in relation to wages and prices: at any rate, books in the imperial period represented an article that lay outside the financial possibilities of people with average incomes.[353] Admittedly, there were clear price differences on account of the different forms: on the basis of the handwriting in ancient texts, one can distinguish with relative certainty between private copies and copies for the book trade as well as between editions for the masses, special editions, and expensive luxury editions (*codices pretiosi* or *pretiosissimi*).[354] As is well known, from the beginning, Christians used the codex for the dissemination of their literature, although papyrus scrolls certainly continued to be used and written on until into the seventh century. Thus they used a form that was regarded in their environment as more of a notebook than a "real book." Joseph van Haelst, who has modified the fundamental hypotheses of Colin H. Roberts and Theodore C. Skeat in details, hypothesizes that the easier usability of a codex on journeys and in liturgical proceedings was a decisive reason for the fact that the New Testament books, for example, were disseminated in this form and not as scrolls: since these texts were used more as a "small handbook for the right life" than as a "normal" book, one needed to be able to page through them as quickly as possible.[355] This naturally made an impact on the price as well; Christian literature also spread so quickly because it was offered in an economical form. In the fifth century, purely the cost of production for a parchment codex with ninety-five quarto pages in uncial writing, which could include the whole Bible (Septuagint and New Testament), corresponded (according to a recent reckoning) to "about the equivalent value of an expensive military coat." Naturally, there were also much more expensive

[351] Kloeters 1957, 76; compare also Gamble 1995, 132–39.

[352] *Edictum Diocletiani* 7.32, 39–41 (Lauffer 1971, 120); compare also n. 323 above.

[353] On book prices in antiquity, compare, for example, Kleberg 1967, 56–62; Dekkers 1989/1990, 99–115, esp. 105–7; and now Mratschek 2000, 372–78; 2002, 445–53.

[354] Schubart 1921, 160–65; Hamman 1985, 54–61; Marrou 1949.

[355] Haelst 1989. Compare Sirat 1989, 115–24. Sirat's conclusions contradict van Haelst: "*L'hypothèse des sources juives pour le codex chrétien ne s'appuie ni sur les texts ni sur l'archéologie*." For extensive treatments of the topic, see also Roberts/Skeat 1989; Harris 1989; Gamble 1995, 49–66; Hengel 2000, 119–22; 2008, 201–7; Casson 2001b, 124–35 (= 2001a, 165–79).

codices; the equivalent value for the publication of a more extensive book is given time and again as half or all of a worker's wages for the year.[356]

Thus far we have considered a few observations on the question of where one could purchase canonical and other Christian literature. We can now turn to the libraries themselves.

3.1.6.2 The Emergence of Christian Libraries

The establishment of independent Christian libraries was connected not only with the dramatically quick acculturation of Christianity and the emergence of a class of educated theologians but also with the specific significance of books within the Christian communities. Some time ago, Alan K. Bowman and Greg Woolf assigned ancient Christianity to the "textual communities" and spoken of the "sacral graphocentrism" of ancient Christianity.[357] Since the second century at the latest, Christianity—like Judaism—did in fact define its identity, if not exclusively[358] then nevertheless *also*, by its stance toward the Holy Scriptures, as Robin Lane Fox has shown.[359] Even if very many Christians could not read and received the Scriptures mediated primarily through "sermon, catechesis, apologetic debates, in-house disputes, and personal pastoral care,"[360] private and (community) public libraries and the "experts" who could use them were nevertheless of central importance for the Christian life in worship service and instruction: in a system of "oral literacy" (Robert Pattison[361]) in which all oral communication of the Bible was always related to a normed written text, corresponding books and collections in the form of libraries were indispensable. First, the liturgists, preachers, and teachers needed a text as a basis; as is well known, Origen improvised his sermons in Caesarea with an annotated Bible in his hand.[362] But second, books had an elevated function for *illiterati* as well and everyone else who could not read them: through its visible presence in the worship services and catechetical events,

[356] Cassiodorus, *Institutiones divinarum et saecularium litterarum* I 14.2 (Mynors/Bürsgens 2003, 188.1–5); Mratschek 2002, 447–48.

[357] Bowman/Woolf 1996, 12. In his work on the canonization of the classical texts of the Jewish tradition, Halbertal 1997, passim, speaks of "text-oriented communities." On this topic, compare also Beard 1991.

[358] Compare A. M. Ritter 1987, 99: "Christianity, thus my concluding observation, has become even less 'a book religion' via the canonization of its 'Holy Scriptures' than Judaism, if also (partly) for other reasons."

[359] Lane Fox 1996.

[360] Gamble 1995, 141.

[361] Pattison 1982; compare also Graham 1987; Georgi 1986, 83–174 and notes 174–228 (= Georgi 1964).

[362] Markschies 1997a, 55–56.

it certified the authenticity of a text that was read aloud or a passage that was just discussed—one can see this, for example, in the central *visual* significance of a Bible codex or lectionary in the ancient Christian worship service. Liturgical forms of expressing this significance in the Catholic worship service up to the present include the elevation of the corresponding book in the context of its public reading and other liturgical ways of marking out the reading, whose age is admittedly difficult to determine.[363] Another form of expression, which was open to the public and visible (even for *illiterati*), of the central significance of canonical texts in the system of oral literacy was naturally the splendid form of the cover of the *codices* used for the reading or other representative editions, the costliness of the materials used, and the illustrations; known manuscripts such as Sinaiticus (British Library Add. 43725, א) or Vaticanus (Vat. Graec. 1209, *B*), which Theodore Skeat recently brought into connection again with the famous "Bible commission" of Emperor Constantine (see section 3.1.6.3),[364] are an excellent example of these connections.

Thus the entire structure of ancient Christianity and especially the developed system of "oral literacy" presuppose collections of books and the establishment of private and (community) public libraries. It does not speak against this viewpoint that only a small group of experts (namely, free teachers and theologians firmly appointed to teaching) read more fundamentally in the canonical writing, whereas another portion (namely, the lectors, already attested in Justin,[365] who read excerpts from the Old Testament and the letters) presumably confined themselves to reading aloud, and the greater portion of the communities to listening. Robin Lane Fox states pointedly, "If the general practice of Christians stood in an inverse relation to the exhortations written on it, scriptural study must have ranked almost as low as sexual fidelity."[366] Finally, as we have just seen, the canonical books were present not only in a solely visible manner; many preachers repeatedly urged their community to undertake their own study of Scripture. In addition to Origen, John Chrysostom is a good example of such promotion of the reading of the canonical books by simple community members as well. Chrysostom not only compared the reading of the Holy Scripture in the worship service with paradise—since God planted the knowledge of the Scripture that follows from the reading not merely in the soil of the earth, as in paradise, but in the souls of believers, the former is "even more

[363] Jungmann 1948, 548–62.
[364] Skeat 1999; compare also Aland/Aland 1989a, 117–18; 1989b, 107–8.
[365] Justin, *Apologia i* 67.4 (Marcovich 1994, 129.9–10).
[366] Lane Fox 1996, 146.

wonderful" than the latter—but also promoted the individual reading of Scripture. Reading Holy Scripture is said to be interaction with God.[367]

In a corresponding manner, we have reports about private and (community) public Christian book collections and libraries beginning from the second century.[368] From them, we can recognize that there were *four types* of Christian libraries, of which *three* are relevant for our connections.

A first type of such libraries is the *church libraries* or *community libraries*. The earliest tangible example and perhaps the most famous example of such a community library is the evidently rich holdings of the Jerusalem church from the third century, which Eusebius of Caesarea used time and again in the composition of his church history in the following fourth century.[369] Perhaps the local bishop Alexander, who most probably built up this collection during his episcopacy from 212/213 to 250 CE, oriented himself simply toward the experiences of his student days in Alexandria or copied what Origen, who was revered by him and likewise educated in Alexandria, had built up since 231/232 CE: despite all the calamities that decimated its book holdings, the famous library of the Egyptian seaport was functioning into the last third of the third century.[370] It is just as possible that when setting up his library, Alexander had at his side an experienced librarian in the person of the polymathic Julius Africanus from nearby Emmaus (Nicopolis), who had also studied in Alexandria and had established a library on the pantheon for Emperor Alexander Severus (222–235 CE) before moving to Emmau as an old man.[371] The remaining reports about community libraries already largely belong in the fourth century and will be treated only very briefly here:[372] a letter of Jerome provides information about the evidently first-rate scholarly theological holdings of the Roman community libraries in the fourth century;[373]

[367] John Chrysostom, *Homilia De studio praesentium* 1 (PG 63: 485.10–11) ὡς ἡδίστη ἡ τῶν γραφῶν ἀνάγνωσις, καὶ λειμῶνος παντὸς ἡδίων καὶ παραδείσου τερπνοτέρα, καὶ μάλιστα ὅταν γνῶσις τῇ ἀναγνώσει πρόσκειται.

[368] Gamble 1995, 144–202.

[369] Harnack 1981, 639 n. 2 (= Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* VI 20.1 [Schwartz 1999, II/2: 566.8] or Codex Ambrosianus H. 150).

[370] Compare Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* VI 3.9, and Harnack 1916a, 42 (originally: Harnack 1913).

[371] Compare Gamble 1995, 154–56; A. Ehrhardt 1891/1892; Thee 1984; Habas 1994.

[372] But compare Gamble 1995, 150–70.

[373] Jerome, *Epistulae* 48.3 (Labourt 1949–1963, II: 117.15–118.4, esp. 117.24–25). On this topic, compare also esp. Cecchelli Trinci 1983, 532, and H. Leclercq 1924, 863–73. Here we can unfortunately not deal with the rich complex of Roman libraries (for instance, the structural remains in the Lateran palace and the collection established by Pope Agapet [535–36 CE] at the Clivus Scauri on the Celius). Compare, however, Hamman 1985, 84–86.

unfortunately, we can only speculate about the beginnings of this library in the second century.[374]

Admittedly, the reports about book destructions during the Diocletian persecution of Christians as a consequence of the empire-wide edict on February 24, 303,[375] allow interesting inferences to be drawn about the church or community libraries of the third century: thus, for example, the events in the North African city Cirta/Constantina (today's El Hofra in Algeria) can be reconstructed rather well on the basis of a detailed quotation of the records in the minutes from a much later hearing.[376] According to these records, there is a *biblioteca* in the church in Cirta in which, however, no books can be seized since the *armaria*, the (book)shelves, are empty. Thus the community library of Cirta was presumably a room with various head-high book shelves whose shelf interior was divided by horizontal and vertical boards into compartments in which multiple volumes lay stacked on top of one another (as scrolls once did).[377] When he is interrogated, the bishop explains that the codices are found with the lectors: *Scripturas lectores habent*.[378] One will not want to hypothesize that the various lectors had put the respective lectionaries in their private libraries in order to prepare for the worship service readings at home, but in the present scene, we should probably detect instead a reference to the community's protective measures against confiscation in the framework of persecution. Accordingly, the bishop claims also that he does not know the names of his lectors and that his clerics supposedly do not know where the lectors of the Christian community live, either. In this text, the word *bibliotheca* certainly means a spatially separated community library and not a place for preserving a few liturgical books—after all, in Festus, the

[374] But on the question of a community library in Rome in the second century (Thornton 1991, 48–53; thus also already Hengel 1984, 38 with n. 88), compare the observations of P. Lampe 1989, 301–45; 2003, 357–408, on the "fractionation" of this community in the second century. See also Hengel 2001, 136–40; 2008, 231–37. Harnack 1916a, 41, had already spoken against a single community library.

[375] Frend 1965, 491; the text can now be found in the collection of J.-L. Maier 1987, nr. 1 (pp. 40–43). Also the records of the martyrs of Abitine (nr. 4 in Maier) show how strongly the confiscation of books stood at the center of the persecution (thus also H. Leclercq 1924, 860–62). Eusebius reports about the burning of such texts (*Historia ecclesiastica* VIII 2.1).

[376] Compare the *Gesta apud Zenophilum* (Ziwsa 1893, 186–88, or now J.-L. Maier 1987, nr. 29 pp. 214–39, and the introduction to this volume [pp. 211–14]); a partial English translation and commentary can be found in Gamble 1995, 145–48, compare also 148–54.

[377] Wendel 1943, 285–86 (= 1974, 64–92); cited here from the original pagination.

[378] *Gesta apud Zenophilum* (J.-L. Maier 1987, 218.92). The subdeacons explain interestingly that they had only a few books (220.158–160).

expression *bibliotheca* designates a *librorum magnus . . . numerus*.[379] It certainly also does not mean the general sacristy from which the government commission there confiscated an even greater quantity of liturgical equipment and clothing.[380] As shown, for example, by a number of excavations of bema sites in Northern Syria and the storage compartments for books found there, the actual lectionaries that were needed for the normal worship service were more likely preserved directly at the lecterns. Accordingly, during the searching of the church complex, a subdeacon under interrogation hands over as well *codicem unum pernimium maiorem*, an extraordinarily large book;[381] one will not err in seeing therein the gospel book for the worship service, which was evidently kept in the church and not in the bookshelves of the *bibliotheca*. The result of the subsequent confiscation action among the lectors also supports the assumption that the community library is concealed under the keyword *bibliotheca* and that *its* contents were brought to safety in the hands of the lectors: it yields twenty-seven *codices* and four notebooks, which corresponds, as we will see in section 3.1.6.3, to the average scope of a reasonably well-stocked provincial community library.

A second type is the so-called *community archives*, which should not be confused with proper libraries. Like every Roman public library, a Christian community library was characterized by its accessibility. An inscription from the reading room that Paulinus of Nola established as a church library reads, "Whoever has the holy will to reflect on the law (cf. Psalm 1.2[382]) will be able to sit here and direct his attention to the holy books."[383] While a church library was accessible, at least to all the clerics who wanted to reflect on the law, an archive usually served as a storage place that was not publicly accessible. One can infer the existence of such community archives already for the second century on the basis of various reports. Thus it is easily conceivable, for example, that the bishop lists of the great metropolises were reconstructed after the fact from lists in such archives.[384] Whether or not a famous phrase from Ignatius, *To the Philadelphians*, already makes reference to such archives is hotly contested, but

[379] Cited from H. Leclercq 1924, 842.

[380] *Gesta apud Zenophilum* (J.-L. Maier 1987, 219.115–125).

[381] *Gesta apud Zenophilum* (J.-L. Maier 1987, 220.152–153).

[382] Psalm 1.2 *in lege eius meditabitur die ac nocte*.

[383] Paulinus of Nola, *Epistulae* 32.16 (Skeb 1998, 782.5–6): *Si quem sancta tenet meditanda in lege voluntas/ Hic poterit residens sacris intendere libris*; text and interpretation can be found in Harnack 1916a, 44. The library was set up in the side conchae of the apse of the new basilica, so that they could presumably only be used by clergy; compare Mratschek 2002, 455–56, previously already Kötting 1980, 245–54, here 247.

[384] Thus at least Thornton 1991.

we do not need to occupy ourselves with this question here.[385] Finally, such archives are relevant only for a very early phase of the canonization of the New Testament—namely, the period when young communities collected the letters addressed to them. But whether the origin of the New Testament letter collection lies in such community collections or in an ancient book edition of the second century (as David Trobisch has claimed[386]) would have to be investigated first by experts in New Testament textual criticism.

Finally, as a third type, we can mention the *private libraries*, which we already touched on briefly above. Naturally, here too one must guard oneself against misunderstandings and overinterpretations of a small source basis. In the introduction to his Berlin Academy treatise with the title *Tertullians Bibliothek christlicher Schriften* (Tertullian's Library of Christian Writings), Adolf von Harnack pointed out that today one can still indicate with great precision "which Christian (and non-Christian) writings Tertullian knew and used." But he says that one cannot, of course, claim "that he possessed all the books himself."[387] Naturally, the work of compiling their respective "libraries from the works or indexes to the works of Justin, Celsus, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Hippolytus, Origen and Julius Africanus" is, as Harnack already saw, "an easy toil."[388] But all such statistics lead only to the works used by the respective authors and not to their individual possession of books and thus not to the actual inventory of their private libraries. To this extent, while all sorts of works have been published on the use of individual biblical and apocryphal writings in the Patristic literature, there have been no further studies on the private libraries of individual authors. One could mention the dissertations of Eva Aleith, Carola Barth, and Walther von Loewenich[389] and the studies of Elaine H. Pagels for the Gospel of John,[390] Wolf-Dietrich Köhler for the Gospel of Matthew,[391] and Ernst Dassmann and Andreas Lindemann

[385] For the interpretation of Ignatius, *To the Philadelphians* 8.2 ἐὰν μὴ ἐν τοῖς ἀρχείοις εὕρω, ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ, οὐ πιστεύω, compare the very different argumentation in Schoedel 1985, 207–9 (with reference to literature in n. 8); 1990, 329–30 with n. 8; Gamble 1995, 299–30 n. 22.

[386] Trobisch 1996.

[387] Naturally, not every book that can be postulated to be known by the author need also have been in the possession of an author (Harnack 1914, 303 = 1980b, 227), but the more frequently it is cited and the more the citations agree word-for-word with our editions, the more likely the possession of such a work becomes.

[388] Harnack 1981, 385. Compare now also Ogilvie 1978, which includes a comparison of the findings for Tertullian, Jerome, and Augustine on pp. 109–10.

[389] Aleith 1937; C. Barth 1911; Loewenich 1932; but compare also Pollard 1970; Hengel 1993, 9–150 (cf. 1989, 1–45).

[390] Pagels 1973.

[391] Köhler 1987.

for the reception of Paul.[392] Naturally, many older and newer studies on ancient Christian authors' understanding of Scripture also provide material.[393] If, however, one actually attempts to understand a private library in the strict sense as the private possession of books by learned individuals and not only as their mental library or intellectual horizon, then the ice of the historical tradition in the second and third century becomes extremely thin. Since there were twenty-eight public libraries in Rome in the fourth century alone and the new capital of Constantinople is said to have possessed twenty-eight public libraries already in the middle of the fourth century,[394] we cannot rule out the possibility that free teachers such as Justin, Valentinus, and Ptolemy read their texts there and not in their private libraries at home. Public libraries strived to obtain "all imaginable works from high literary epic verse to the banal cookbook"; presumably they bought Christian literature as well. Then the aforementioned urban Roman theologian could have read works of other Christian authors, for example, among the twenty thousand scrolls of Trajan's library in its glorious halls.[395] The situation of Clement of Alexandria is similarly uncertain, but one may wish to postulate a well-sorted private library just in light of the extensive number of citations. In the case of Origen, by contrast, one can be certain that he did not privately possess the books from which he richly cited during his teaching activity in Alexandria, since he had sold his private library, as we have seen (section 3.1.6), in the years of his youth. In Caesarea, however, a well-sorted library again stood at his disposal from the thirties of the third century, so that he could consult its books and could sometimes dictate lengthy passages to coworkers of his office.[396] Unfortunately, we do not know whether he used the library of the private university directed by him or an establishment of the community. Harry Y. Gamble hypothesizes that Origen had built up a library of pagan writings for the second time and made his new private library available for the instruction[397]—for this assumption, There is, of course, no source documentation in the ancient Christian literature. Perhaps one

[392] Dassmann 1979; 1986, 27–39; Lindemann 1979.

[393] For a selection from the literature, see Altermath 1977; Aono 1979; Mees 1970; Méhat 1972; Pagels 1982; Schelkle 1959; Seesemann 1936; Trummer 1970; Wickert 1962.

[394] *Libellus de Regionibus Vrbis Romae* (Nordh 1949, 97.9); compare Tønsberg 1976, passim, and 2001b, 80–108 (= Casson 2001a, 113–47); and for Constantinople, Wendel 1942 (= 1974, 46–63).

[395] Casson 2001b, 35 (= 2001a, 55). For the reconstruction of the library of Trajan, see 2001b, 83–89 (= 2001a, 116–22).

[396] For this, compare the extensive quotation of a passage from a Stoic lexicon in Markschies 1995a.

[397] Gamble 1995, 155.

is not permitted to make an artificial separation here, either: in more than forty years of work, Augustine of Hippo built up an extensive library, but because the priest and bishop of Hippo lived in a monastic community, the library formally belonged to the monastery—as his biographer Possidius put it, "the church of Hippo."[398] The *monastic libraries* undoubtedly represent a fourth type of ancient Christian libraries, but we can leave them out of consideration in the framework of our investigation, which is focused on the pre-Constantinian period.[399]

But which implicit concepts of canonicity are represented by such private and (community) public Christian libraries? On the basis of the previously discussed reports from ancient pagan and Christian literature, it is possible to provide an overview of the significance of such book collections for the Christianity of the time but not an answer to our leading question. If, however, one is also prepared to evaluate papyrological findings and not to restrict oneself to the first three centuries CE, then it is possible to make some observations on the implicit concepts of a 'canon' in such institutions. Let us turn to these in the next section.

3.1.6.3 The Canon of Biblical Scriptures in the Christian Libraries

An initial possibility for reconstructing the 'canon' of biblical Scriptures in private and public Christian libraries, at least as a beginning, is provided by the well-known *discovery complex of the Oxyrhynchus papyri*, as the American New Testament scholar and papyrologist Eldon Jay Epp has repeatedly shown.[400] In late antiquity, Oxyrhynchus (today Al-Bahnasa at a sidearm of the Nile, the Bahr Yusuf) constituted a not insignificant church center under a bishop. It lay about 186 miles (ca. 300 km) south of Alexandria. Twelve churches are attested for the fourth century[401] and about forty churches for the sixth century.[402] A Jewish synagogue is mentioned

[398] See Altaner 1948 (= 1967, 174–78); 1950, 429 (= 1967, 54); Scheele 1978, 62–65; Harnack 1930 (= 1980b, 853–95, esp. chapters 18.9 and 31.5–7). According to Scheele 1978, 70–71, part of the catalogue system of the library can be reconstructed (on the *Indiculus* of Possidius, see CPL 359).

[399] See Gamble 1995, 170–74.

[400] Epp 1997 (= 2005, 497–520), cited here from the original publication.

[401] Epp 1997, 54, refers to P.Oxy. XI, 1915, p. 26 (on P.Oxy. XI, nr. 1357), and Rufinus, *Historia monachorum in Aegypto* V 3 (Schulz-Flügel 1990, 282.8–9; the number mentioned by Epp is admittedly incorrect, as attested already in *Historia monachorum in Aegypto* V 3 [Festugière 1961, 42,3–4]: δεκαδύω γάρ εἰσιν ἐν αὐτῇ ἐκκλησίαι μεγίστης οὔσης τῆς πόλεως, ἐν αἷς οἱ ὄχλοι συνάγονται). In Sepphoris and Caesarea, there were supposedly seventeen or nineteen synagogues (*y. Kil'ayim* 9.4 32b and *y. Šabbat* 6 8a).

[402] P.Oxy. XI, 1357 for 535–36.

in the papyri as well,[403] and some members of the Alexandrian Μουσεῖον lived there.[404] Even if it is very difficult to estimate the populations of cities in antiquity, a recent work opts for the number of thirty thousand inhabitants in the fourth century[405] (and the theater discovered in 1922 is said to have held an audience of between eight and twelve thousand[406]). Even if 5 percent of this population should have been Christians in the late third century so that up to six hundred inhabitants were assigned to the Christian house community in some kind of form, the Christians would still have formed a small minority in the city prior to the revolutionary changes in the following century. It is therefore all the more astonishing that there are no less than twenty-eight papyri from the second to the fourth century among the extensive and thus far not definitively published discoveries from the city that contain texts from the New Testament; the overall number of the papyri is estimated at fifty thousand.[407] Among the New Testament papyri, we find six fragments of the Gospel of Matthew, five of the Gospel of John, and three of Romans. Interestingly, some New Testament texts are not even attested, including (not very surprisingly) the Gospel of Mark and some Pauline and Deutero-Pauline letters (2 Corinthians, Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians) as well as the Pastoral Letters, which are very important for ancient Christianity's theology of offices. In addition to the canonical Scriptures of the New Testament, four fragments of the so-called apocryphal logia of Jesus, seven fragments of the *Shepherd of Hermas*, and seven additional fragments of apocryphal acts and apocalypses are preserved, but in each case, with only a single attestation.[408] Perhaps the best-known pieces are the three fragments of

[403] P.Oxy. IX, 1205; compare also Bell 1954, 34–35.

[404] Epp 1997, 57: P. Merton I, 19 (from March 31, 173 CE), and P.Oxy. XVIII, 2192.

[405] Krüger 1990; Fichmann 1971; additional listings of relevant literature are in Epp 1997, 60.

[406] E. G. Turner 1952, 81.

[407] Epp 1997, 52; 2005, 751. This number corresponds to a good third of all the papyri known to us.

[408] A few apocryphal logia of Jesus from the third/fourth century were found: P. Oxy I, 1; IV, 654/655 = *Gospel of Thomas* (cf. Lührmann 2004, 144–81); VIII, 1081 = *Sophia Jesus Christ* (also L, 3525; cf. Attridge 1975); P. Ryl. III, 463; X, 1224; P. Lond.Christ 1 = *Gospel of Mary* (cf. Lührmann 2004, 105–24). The following writings were also found: *Shepherd of Hermas* (I, 5; III, 404; XV, 1828; L, 3528); *Apocalypse of Peter* (?: P. Vindob. Graec. [without number = Haelst 1976, nr. 619]); *Acts of Peter* (VI, 849); Irenaeus (III, 405, but compare IV, 264–65); an apologetic text (XVII, 2072); an anti-Jewish dialogue (XVII, 2070); a prayer (III, 407); a hymn to the Trinity with notation (XV, 1786 = Wessely 1946, 506–7); a Gnostic text (I, 4; XII, 1478; Pap. Harr. 107); and additional material (II, 210 [on this, cf. Porter 2001, 1101–8] and VI, 840 [on this, see Bovon 2000; contrast Kruger 2002]). From the later fourth century, see *Hermas* (IX, 1172 and L, 3526; XIII, 1599; L, 3527); *Didache* (XV, 1782); *Acts of John* (VI, 850); Aristides, *Apology* (XV, 1778);

the *Gospel of Thomas* that come from the third century, which come from three different manuscripts and thus testify to the popularity of this gospel in the Egyptian city.[409] There may also have been two copies of the *Gospel of Peter* on site, almost certainly at least one.[410]

From these statistical findings and the fact that "canonical" and "apocryphal" writings are together in some papyri, Eldon Jay Epp concludes that there was still no fixed scope of the New Testament in Oxyrhynchus and calls talk of a "New Testament" and its "apocrypha" anachronistic.[411] This conclusion is admittedly quite bold, since neither the 'canon' of a private library nor that of a (community) public church library needs to be identical with the official 'canon' of biblical Scriptures upon which the majority church bases its theological arguments and liturgical procedures. Why should so-called apocryphal writings not have been collected for the purpose of private edification or heresiological defense in the private and public libraries of Oxyrhynchus? From the fact that all these papyrus discoveries of Christian texts show no traces of text-critical signs, Epp has concluded (as Colin H. Roberts before him) that the preserved papyri were intended for everyday practical purposes (and not for scholarly ones).[412] This observation, however, leads immediately to the question of why a public that was able to read in an Egyptian city should have adhered to the scope of the biblical 'canon' that was in force for the worship service readings and theological discussions; the 'canon' of New Testament writings in private and (community) public libraries was presumably shaped by the taste of the reading public and the demands of theological apologetic.

A second possibility for answering the question of the 'canon' of biblical books in average Christian private libraries and community libraries

---

Passion of Dioscorus (L, 3529); *Apocalypse of Baruch* (III, 403); additional apocalyptic fragments (XVII, 2069); liturgical fragments (XVII, 2068); prayer (VII, 1058); three sermons (XIII, 1601 [Origen?: Haelst 1976, nr. 692], 1602 [Haelst 1976, nr. 606], and Sanders 1938, 79 n. 2; XVII, 2073); three amulets (PSI 719; P. Amst. I 26 = SB 10762); a Gnostic charm (VI, 924); and a prayer (XII, 1566). Compare C. H. Roberts 1979, 22.

[409] Edition in Attridge 1989.

[410] Thus at least Lührmann 1981; 1993 (revised in 2004, 55–104), on P. Oxy. XLI, 2949 and LX, 4009. New editions can be found in the critical text edition of the *Gospel of Peter* (Kraus/Niklas 2004, 56–58 and 59–63). The assignment of P. Oxy 4009 remains very uncertain.

[411] Epp 2005, 754–55.

[412] Thus cautiously Epp 1997, 67, with criticism of C. H. Roberts 1979, 9–10, 14, 21–25. Epp generalizes even: "What is relevant, however, is that early Christian books were essentially practical and produced for use in the life of the Christian community" (Epp 1997, 67; likewise Gamble 1995, 66 and 77–78). Extensive references on the practical use can also be found in Epp 2005, 779–82.

is presented by the *library catalogues or inventories of the Christian community libraries and private libraries*. They clearly come, however, from the time after Constantine and are therefore actually too late for our investigation. But, on the other hand, the material is so interesting that we should not leave it out of consideration here. There are thus far nineteen (or twenty-three) such lists known to me.[413] This enumeration could certainly be supplemented further.[414] Unfortunately, not all the lists can be clearly dated. Their place of discovery can usually be given only very generally as "Egypt" without further specification. Moreover, for most of the texts, we do not know if the inventory of a Christian community library or private library remained preserved or if there was simply a list of a certain selection of books, which was, for example, produced for sending purposes or alternatively documenting the assets of a private person, such as a certain monk. This fact therefore sets certain limits for the evaluation of these lists for our inquiry into the 'canon' of private and (community) public libraries and thus for the inquiry into the history of the canon:

1. P. Ash. Inv. 3; Greek inventory from the fourth century (Oxford)[415]
2. Ostr. Inst. Franç. Cairo IFAO 13315, a Coptic inventory from the monastery of Appa Elias, probably in the diocese of Kûs, about thirty-one miles (fifty kilometers) north of Luxor, possibly from the fifth century[416]
3. P. Wessley Prag. gr. I 13; Greek inventory from the fifth to sixth century (formerly St. Petersburg)[417]

[413] A much less comprehensive compilation that requires improvement in some respects can also be found in Scholten 1988, 156; other profane texts can be found in Wendel 1937 (= 1974, 13–17). Comprehensive information can be found in Otranto 2000, 123–44 (with extensive bibliography).

[414] Unfortunately, I have not yet been able to supplement these lists through requests to museums or collections of papyri for still unpublished inventories; additional catalogues—which are, however, pagan—are mentioned by Gerstinger 1932, 186–88. In addition, the whereabouts of the texts that were formerly in private collections would have to be clarified.

[415] C. H. Roberts 1938, 184–88 = Haelst 1976, nr. 1192 (p. 359).

[416] The text is also in H. Leclercq 1924, 878–84; Coquin 1975, 207–39, text on 209–12, translation on 214–19 (also in Hamman 1985, 91–92); for the localization and dating, compare Coquin 1975, 208 n. 4. The text has been printed more recently in KSB I: nr. 012 pp. 9–12.

[417] Wessely 1925, 184–85; Dostálová 1985.

4–8. Five Coptic ostraca and papyri from the monastery of Epiphanius at Thebes from the sixth to seventh century:[418]

4. Ostr. Cairo inv. 44674.18	(= Crum/White 1973, nr. 554, p. 116/294)
5. P. Metropolitan Museum of Art inv. 14.1.523	(= Crum/White 1973, nr. 555, p. 294)
6. Ostr. Cairo 44674.106	(= Crum/White 1973, nr. 556, p. 294)
7. Ostr. MMA 12.180.133	(= Crum/White 1973, nr. 557, p. 295)
8. Ostr. MMA 14.1.501	(= Crum/White 1973, nr. 558, p. 295)

9. P. Graec. Vindob. 26015; Greek inventory from the seventh to the eighth century[419]

10–12. Three Coptic ostraca:[420]

10. Egypt Exploration Fund 273	(= Crum 1902b, nr. 457, p. 75/42)
11. Egypt Exploration Fund 241	(= Crum 1902b, nr. 458, p. 75/42)
12. Cairo 8110	(= Crum 1902b, nr. 459, pp. 75–6/42)[421]

13. Oxford, Bodleian library nr. 486; Coptic ostracon[422]

14. P. f 46; Fragment of a Coptic papyrus inventory, eighth century[423]

15. P. Brit. Libr. London Or. 5301(14); Coptic papyrus inventory[424]

16–18. Three Coptic ostraca from Vienna:[425]

16. KO 620	(= Till 1960, nr. 147, p. 37)[426]
17. KO 679	(= Till 1960, nr. 148, p. 37)[427]
18. KO 446	(= Till 1960, nr. 149, p. 37)

[418] Crum/White 1973, nr. 554–58, pp. 116/294–95.

[419] Gerstinger 1932 = Haelst 1976, nr. 1199 (p. 361).

[420] Crum 1902b, nr. 457, 458, 459, p. 42.

[421] Out of consideration remains an ostracon, formerly belonging to Prof. Steindorff (Leipzig; nr. 16 [= Crum 1902b, Ad. 23, p. 43]), on which a silver cross, Acts, Isaiah, and "paradise" are placed together.

[422] Crum 1939, nr. 117, p. 47.

[423] Kahle 1954, nr. 56, p. 482.

[424] Crum/Petrie 1893, nr. 44, pp. 60–62 = Crum 1905, nr. 704, p. 312. Of the 105 writings, nine are composed in Greek—namely, one Psalter, five copies of the Gospel of Matthew, two copies of the Catholic Letters, and the "mysterion" (Crum/Petrie 1893, 61). An initial report is provided by Crum in Petrie 1892, 48–50.

[425] Till 1960, nr. 147–49, p. 37.

[426] First edited in Crum 1921, nr. 162, p. 40 (only Coptic text; the text evidently came from the private collection of Wessely).

[427] First edited in Crum 1921, nr. 165, p. 41.

19. Papyrus from the former Phillips Library (Cheltenham; without nr.), Coptic list of biblical books[428]
20. P. Lugd. Bat. XXV, 204; inventory of forty-five *codices* from the seventh/eighth century[429]

    Out of consideration for our reflections remain:
21. Wall inscriptions in the library of the White Monastery (Deir el-Abjad) near Sohag[430] (n. 470 in this chapter)
22. The 27 *Versus* (*Tituli*) of Isidore of Seville[431]
23. The list of books of the *Decretum Gelasianum*[432]
24. Books from the library of the Holy See at the Lateran Council in 649[433]

In the evaluation of these inventories, one must take into consideration that one can draw no particularly certain conclusions on the basis of only twenty of these texts, which also mostly cannot be exactly placed in terms of time or location of discovery. Some texts remain preserved only in fragmentary form and do not in themselves even provide a completely coherent picture. Thus these texts can at best confirm conclusions reached in other ways and corroborate hypotheses.

Two features are conspicuous in the lists (cf. also the tables in the appendix to this volume): First, one by no means encounters all the writings of the Bible in the inventories. One will scarcely be able to explain this finding otherwise than with the conclusion that entire Bibles were, in fact, present in far from all private, community, and monastic libraries. In a large number of churches, one presumably got by with lectionaries alone; these books were probably kept in the worship service locations where they were used and thus practically never turn up in the inventories.[434] Caspar René Gregory therefore stated already many decades ago: "The liturgical books were the main books of the communities. For a community or a monastery it was less crucial to have manuscripts of the New

[428] Crum 1921, nr. 166, p. 41.

[429] P. van Minnen in Hoogendijk/Minnen 1991, 40–49 (introduction), 50–55 (text and English translation), and 55–77 (commentary).

[430] Crum 1904, 564–67; Coquin 1975, 222.

[431] This text (CPL 1212) reproduces the inscriptions on walls and library shelves of the dwelling of the "last western church father" († 636); compare as text Beeson 1913, 133–66; edition 157–66 (in this respect a certain parallel to list 20); Weyman 1926.

[432] Text in Preuschen 1910, 52–62; partial translation in Schneemelcher 1990, 30–33, literature on p. 31 (cf. 1963, 46–49).

[433] Collected from the records in H. Leclercq 1924, 871–73; the lists in the edition of the records of the council in ACO 2 would need to be verified and corrected with reference to Riedinger/Lamberz 1984.

[434] With the exception of list 15, line 8: ⲛⲥϫⲱⲱⲙⲓ ⲛⲱϣ ⲙⲙⲉⲫⲣⲱⲛ *[= membrane]* λβ.

Testament books since these were not used in the public worship service; at most they could have been of interest to the clergy or the educated."[435] An entire Bible does not appear at all;[436] a complete New Testament, however, does turn up more often (lists 2, 13, 15, 17, 18). In addition, one must be clear that only a very small number of uncial codices originally contained an entire New Testament. A book produced in uncial script would have had the impressive length of one hundred to four hundred pages[437] and would have presumably exceeded the "budget" of a small community. For the production of the fifty splendid parchment bibles of his "Bible commission," Constantine had to call in the *rationalis* (καθολικός) of the diocese—that is, the head of the fiscal authority of one of the twelve administrative districts of the empire[438]—and he secured two wagons of the government postal service to transport them.[439] The Psalter, however, appears extremely often in the lists (twenty times); the book of Isaiah (seven times) appears comparably often but also the narrative of Job (six times) and Proverbs (four times). Ecclesiastes appears once, which is at least something. In the case of the New Testament, one may find it surprising

[435] Compare, for example, Aland/Aland 1989a, 172–78 (cf. 1989b, 163–70); and the careful presentation in Gregory 1900–1909, I: 327–86 (quotation on p. 327).

[436] Unless one is willing to recognize a designation of the Old Testament in list 15, line 12; on this, see n. 35 in the appendix to this volume. On the rarity of Old Testament manuscripts, see also Gregory 1900–1909 III: 1212; on the rarity of complete Bibles, see Skeat 1999, 616: "Manuscripts of the entire Greek bible are extremely rare at any period." Correspondingly it was emphasized in the literature of the time if someone possessed a whole Bible. Compare, for example, a report about the abbot Anastasius in the Nitrian desert, *habebat codicem in pergamenis valde optime scriptum, qui decem et octo valebat solidis. Totum enim Vetus et Novum Testamentum scriptum habebat* (*Vitae patrum, sive historiae eremiticae libri decem* III 30 [PL 73: 757 C/D]; cf. also *Apophthemata Patrum* [PG 65: 1451]), and the information about the community of Nicomedia in the *Synaxarium Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae* (= *Propylaeum ad Acta Sanctorum Novembris*: Delehaye 1902, 139).

[437] Compare the information for the uncials in Aland/Aland 1989a, 113/114, 134–35 (image 39). Compare 1989b, 103–4.

[438] Eusebius, *Vita Constantini* IV 36.1–4 (Winkelmann 1992, 133.27–134.21 = Letter 38 in Kraft 1955b, 259–60; on *rationalis*, see Demandt 1989, 249–50; for the whole complex, see also Wendel 1939 [= 1974, 35–45]), and now Skeat 1999, 583–625. Skeat 1999, 609–17, argues, as previously already Zuntz 1995, 42–45, that the two codices in Caesarea were produced by the same scribe and must be linked to the aforementioned Bible commission of Emperor Constantine. Sinaiticus is said to have not been sent to Constantinople because it was not finished. By contrast, the hypothesis, first expressed by Alfred Rahlfs, that Vaticanus agrees with the order of the biblical books mentioned by Athanasius in the Thirty-Ninth Festal Letter of 367 (Rahlfs 1899; cf. also Ruwet 1951, 10–12), is rejected in detail by Skeat 1999, 600–604 (cf. the table on p. 602).

[439] See Demandt 1989, 346. The pagan history writer Ammianus Marcellinus complained that the utilization of the government postal service for the bishops "severed the nerves of the postal system" (*Res Gestae* XXI 16.18 [Seyfarth 1968, 172.18–19]).

that in addition to the four gospel manuscripts (τετραευαγγέλιον; fourteen times),[440] a great number of individual gospel manuscripts also appear: with thirteen attestations, Matthew surpasses Mark (six), Luke (eight), and John (seven). Acts turns up significantly often—namely, no less than eight times. Here, one should understand the designation Ἀπόστολος (thirteen times) as an umbrella term for a New Testament without the Gospels and Revelation.[441] In three lists, we find both this collection and a Καθολικόν. Moreover, lists 1, 3, 8, 10, 11 (16) attest that there were (if the findings reliably reflect the circumstances) church libraries without a Corpus Paulinum, collections in which merely the Gospels were represented. On the other hand, with the inventory from Bala'izah (list 14), we have a text that names not only the letters of Paul but also the location of their composition.

Second, it is conspicuous that the "deuterocanonical books" turn up comparably infrequently. This may be due to the chance excerpt of the inventories and their relatively late dating. The 1886/1887 discovery of

[440] Soden 1911, 302–4, shows how statements of Irenaeus about the four gospels are reflected in the hypotheses of the four-gospel codices. His theologically significant statements—according to which the path from the preaching of the apostles to the *one* gospel (singular) in the (four) *writings* (plural) corresponds to the will of God, his plan of salvation—were evidently experienced as central (οὐ γὰρ δι' ἄλλων τὴν οἰκονομίαν τῆς σωτηρίας ἡμῶν ἔγνωμεν, ἀλλ' ἢ δι' ἐκείνων δι' ὧν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον κατήντηκεν εἰς ἡμᾶς· ὃ δὴ τότε μὲν ἐκήρυξαν, ὕστερον δὲ κατὰ θεοῦ βούλησιν ἐν γραφαῖς παρέδωκαν ἡμῖν, θεμέλιον καὶ στῦλον τῆς πίστεως ἡμῶν γενησόμενον; Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* III 1.1 [in the retroversion into Greek by Rousseau/Doutreleau 1974, II: 21.1–5]). This one gospel in the four writings is said again to be κατὰ θεοῦ βούλησιν θεμέλιον καὶ στῦλον τῆς πίστεως ἡμῶν (cf. also 1 Timothy 3.15); as is well known, Irenaeus again uses the two expressions "foundation" and "pillars" a little later in order to ground why there are only four gospels. With the reference to the four directions and four winds (*Adversus haereses* III 11.8 [Rousseau/Doutreleau 1974, II: 160.175–170.236]) and an interpretation of the throne-chariot vision (Ezekiel 1.4-28) in relation to the chariot of the enthroned God-Logos and the four wheels of the chariot that carry him through the world as the four gospels with the four faces (cf. Roloff 1984, 69, on Revelation 4.6; Zahn 1883, 257–75; 1890, 365–75; Harnack 1958b [1897], 681–700; B. M. Metzger 1987, 153–56), Irenaeus grounds the historically chance number of four gospels (compare n. 73 above on the allegorizing of the number seven in the *Muratorian Canon*). But the underlying thesis that there is only one gospel in four writings or a εὐαγγέλιον τετράμορφον (*Adversus haereses* III 11.8 [162.11]; cf. III 11.8 [169.222–224]) was already suggested because also the earliest manuscripts of the Gospels from the second century bore the title [εὐαγγέλιον] κατὰ Μαθθαῖον or Μᾶρκον, Λουκᾶν, Ἰωάννην. But this superscript only makes sense as the title of a book if one understands the writings, like Irenaus, as (four) parts of one gospel (cf. also Hengel 1984, esp. 11 [the witness of the papyri] and 47–51 [summary], and following him, Heckel 1999, 287–99; against this view without extensive justification, Schneemelcher 1990, 67 n. 7, and in somewhat greater detail, Lührmann 2004, 55 n. 2 [the apparatus of Nestle-Aland does not really confirm what is being argued], and Nicklas 2002, 265–67 [on the *Gospel of Peter*], or already previously B. M. Metzger 1987, 302–3).

[441] Aland/Aland 1989a, 172 (cf. 1989b, 163).

the well-known parchment manuscript with fragments of the *Gospel of Peter* in the tomb of a monk at Akhmim in Upper Egypt already shows that people liked to read such deuterocanonical texts in Egypt.[442] Still, the apocrypha do appear in list 9;[443] the attestation for the *Shepherd of Hermas* in list 1 would fit with the remaining picture of the history of the canon.[444]

Much more interesting and comparably unified is the finding that pertains to the sequence of the biblical books in relation to one another and their mixing with nonbiblical works. Today's viewer is surprised not only by the relatively chaotic lack of order of these lists but also by the lack of inhibition with which the Holy Scripture is mixed in with patristic texts. This impression, by the way, appears to apply to a number of pagan library inventories as well.[445] In the Christian lists, it is sometimes extremely difficult to recognize some sort of meaningful sequence let alone a rule: in the catalogue of the extensive monastery library (list 2), the Old Testament is admittedly ordered in a relatively conventional sequence,[446] but the second half of the Bible consists of a varied mixture of the canonical Scriptures.[447] It is even more muddled in the Oxford inventory (list 1) when Origen and the book of Leviticus follow the *Shepherd of Hermas*;[448] Acts follows Job; and after four additional titles (including Origen's John commentary), Exodus and Numbers suddenly appear, followed by the "Great Book"—that is, a codex with the four gospels.[449] The biblical text was evidently viewed neither as so closely belonging together nor, probably, as so holy that people refrained from mixing it with other literature (at least in the libraries). This finding is confirmed by other texts as well: in the former Petersburg inventory (list 3), the ψατηριον (instead of ψαλτήριον), the

[442] Compare the facsimile images in Gebhardt 1893, I–XX and now in the critical edition of Kraus/Niklas 2004, 25–31, on the so-called Akhmim Codex P.Cair. 10759.

[443] It would be interesting to know whether in this library the mentioned writings also actually operated as "deuterocanonical texts"; compare Gerstinger 1932, 190.

[444] See section 2.1.2.2 with notes 104 and 115.

[445] Gerstinger 1932, 185–87; likewise Wendel 1974, 14–15. For the sequence of the writings in the manuscripts see Aland/Aland 1989a, 91–92. Additional catalogues can be found in Segre 1935 and Wilken 1912 nr. 155 (pp. 182–84); for the subject see also Blum 1977; Thornton 1991, 40–45 with n. 86–99.

[446] Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, I–IV Kingdoms, I–II Chronicles, Ezra, two different Isaiah recensions, Jeremiah, Psalms recensions. However, Job, Proverbs, and Daniel fall completely out of the series.

[447] τετραευαγγέλιον, Luke + Ἀπόστολος, Matthew + Ἀπόστολος, 2 Ἀπόστολος, Acts + Καθολικόν + Revelation, Matthew + Mark, Luke, Acts + John, Acts.

[448] Scholten 1988a, 156 n. 96, considers, however, whether Ποι[μην should not be understood as a personal name. But the personal name lexica do not mention particularly many relevant examples; compare Fraser/Matthews 1987, 375; 1997, 365.

[449] C. H. Roberts 1938, 187; a detailed interpretation of this text is found in my dissertation (Markschies 1992, 263–64 [with literature in n. 22–28]).

prophet Daniel, and the "Great Book (of the Gospels)" are distributed without any discernible reason between other patristic texts.[450] Whereas today, in order to put an end to the chaos, one would most likely place the Psalter in front of Didymus' commentary on the Psalms, and perhaps place the τετραευαγγέλιον with the tractate *De resurrectione*, and also order the rest alphabetically, the owner of this manuscript chaotically jumbled his texts together. In the inventory from Leiden (list 20), a bilingual Psalter (τὸ Ψαλτήρ[ι(ον) δίγλωσ]σον; col. II, line 6) and the Greek book of Acts as well as a Καθο[λικ(όν) (col. II, line 8) are placed together with hagiographic literature and separated by liturgical objects and items of clothing from other Old Testament literature (col. V, lines 35–36). The New Testament gospels too are scattered between hagiographic literature (col. VIII, line 47, and col. IX, line 51). In view of this chaos, one understands the exclamation that is found at the end of an inventory:

οὐκ ηὗρον ἀλλ' εἰ εὑρίσκω | αὐτὸ καὶ πέμπω αὐτῇ[451]

Indeed, it must often have caused considerable difficulties to find a given title in such an arrangement. The findings of the larger monastery libraries (lists 2/15/20) differ only a little from those of smaller private libraries or community libraries. Only the famous library of the White Monastery Deir el-Abjad near Sohag (list 21) appears to have been reasonably well organized, although there too thirteen Psalter manuscripts appear in the midst of *vitae* of saints.[452] Perhaps the principle of alphabetical arrangement, according to which the scrolls or codices were stacked in order[453] on one another,[454] only applied to really large collections of books, which obviously did not include the Christian libraries whose inventories have been preserved here. In addition, the previously known library inventories deepen our differentiation of Christian library types (see section 3.1.6.2): on the one hand, there were modest representatives of the aforementioned three (or four) types of private, community, and monastery libraries, as well as the community

[450] Wessely 1925, 184; this can naturally be due to the fact that here a "type of accompanying declaration" to a book dispatch (Gerstinger 1932, 189) remained preserved, possibly even only the book packet was chaotically packed.

[451] List 3, line 15–16 (Wessely 1925, 184). The concern is evidently with a sort of "packing slip" for a "book packet"; one must view such a text against the background of the extensive practice of loaning among educated people in late antiquity (see Kloeters 1957, 114–18).

[452] Crum 1904, 567: inscription B 26. See also list number 10 and n. 39 in the appendix to the present volume.

[453] Wendel 1954, 268; see also Thornton 1991, 48–55.

[454] Images in J. W. Clark 1997, 35 fig. 11; H. Leclercq 1924, 887 (nr. 1553) and 889 (nr. 1554); Wendel 1954, 267 (images 2–4); on the system, see also Herter 1931.

archive in which there was only a very small inventory that was also somewhat untidy or unordered; on the other hand, there were very prominent and glorious establishments. This ambivalent impression fits very well with the image that one obtains in other places as well concerning the educational level of the Coptic communities and the monks of that time.[455]

One should not be surprised by the small number of texts in these libraries. While the lists of the small libraries allow one to infer a number of about 10 to 20 titles,[456] up to 80 (list 2) or 105 (list 15) titles are found in the larger (monastery) libraries of our inventories.[457] The libraries from which the well-known discovery of Gnostic texts in the twentieth century originated may not have been much larger.[458] On the other hand, we know of much larger libraries from other sources, through excavations in Egypt[459] and literary reports. The famous library of the private university of Origen in Caesarea, mentioned often in this investigation, which Jerome calls *Bibliotheca Origenis et Pamphili*[460] and Eusebius also probably used for his *Praeparatio Evangelica*,[461] possessed 30,000 scrolls at the time of Pamphilus,[462] but even

[455] Thus it emerges from a letter of Jerome to Augustine that evidently a whole series of libraries possessed the Hexapla of Origen (Jerome, *Epistulae* 119.19 [Labourt 1949–1963, VI: 39.14–15]); but compare also the instructions for dealing with books that Theodore the Studite (759–826 CE) gives the monks of the Studios Monastery in Constantinople: *Constitutiones Studitanae* 26 (PG 99: 1714 A/B).

[456] This corresponds also with the number of the books seized in Cirta, an episcopal see (from 256 CE)—namely, 27 + 4 (see section 3.1.6.2 above).

[457] Crum 1905, 61: “Reckoning only those where the reading is certain, we can count 105 separate works.” The library of the White Monastery with its great number of books (alone 119 τετραευαγγέλιον!) remains here outside of our considerations.

[458] The Gnostic library of Nag Hammadi contains thirteen codices with fifty-three writings; the Coptic-Manichaean library of Medinet Madi (see Böhlig 1989) contained originally at least three extensive (collections of) writings and (lost) letters of Mani. Of these, the *Kephalaia of the Teacher* alone comprised more than four hundred pages (H. Ibscher in Ibscher/Polotsky 1940, VI).

[459] Compare, for example, Scholten 1988a, 154 with n. 73–77, on the inventory of almost two hundred texts and over four hundred letters excavated in the Epiphanius monastery in Thebes.

[460] Jerome, *De viris illustribus* 113 (Ceresa-Gastaldo 1988, 214).

[461] Compare, for example, J. Sirinelli in Sirinelli/Des Places 1974, 58–60; Hamman 1985; Runia 1996. In view of the extensive and exact (Mras/Des Places 1982, LV) quotations in this work, one can start from the assumption that Eusebius himself created these quotations “from the rich episcopal library established by Pamphilos” (Mras/Des Places 1982, LVII n. 1: “The library would merit an investigation of its own”). According to Bernoulli 1895, 294–95, Jerome did not use this source of information for large parts of his collection of biographies, although he often comments on it—for example, in *Epistulae* 34 (Labourt 1949–1963, II: 44–48). He was allowed to take individual books home (see Bernoulli 1895, 294–310; Kloeters 1957, 163–64).

[462] Isidore of Seville, *Origines* VI 6.1 (Lindsay 1971, *ad loc*. line 23). The claim that the poet Serenus Sammonicus (third century CE) had a library inherited from his father

this number, which is larger in comparison with our inventories, pales in comparison to the library of the Mouseion of Alexandria, which contained 700,000 scrolls prior to its destruction.[463] The library in Caesarea evidently remained usable into the sixth century.[464] Karl Mras could even point to the "gaps" in this collection, to the extent to which one can draw conclusions from the oeuvre of Eusebius: it lacked "tragic poets, authors of comedies, lyric poets, and probably also the original writings of the Stoics and Epicureans, but it was rich in the works of the historians and later Platonists."[465] With the help of this information, one can paint a vivid picture of Eusebius, who, surrounded by the speed writers of the ecclesial scriptorium, sits on a chair in the library, reads from books, and comments on the classical works in his *Praeparatio Evangelica*. Unfortunately, the inventory of this impressive collection, which Eusebius appended to his biography of Pamphilius, has been lost.[466] However, from what has remained, the catalogue of the works of Origen,[467] one can still recognize that this library was well sorted. Thus the letters of the great church teacher were kept in various collections in a clearly ordered manner; some especially important or long letters were kept separate, as were writings that could be used to defend the author against theological attacks.[468] We are also relatively well informed about the aforementioned community library that Paulinus of Nola, the friend of Augustine and Jerome, established in 403 CE. A bit later, he describes in a letter that he established a *secretum* for "the prayers and those who reflect on the word of God"[469] and quotes the metrical inscription over the door of the room.[470] Since the complex of the two basilicas are excavated and well documented, to some extent, we can even imagine the setting of the library in a side room

that contained 62,000 scrolls (*Scriptores Historiae Augustae* 20 *Gordiani tres* 18.2 [Hohl 1971, II: 42.18–25]) is regarded as an exaggeration by Kleberg 1967, 49.

[463] Wendel 1954, 239; Schubart 1962, 48–49; Casson 2001b, 36–47 (= 2001a, 56–71).

[464] As the colophon of Codex Coislianus 202[2] (sixth century CE) shows; Swete 1914, 75.

[465] Mras/Des Places 1982, LVII–LVIII.

[466] Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* VI 32.3 (Schwartz 1999, II/2: 586.27–588.2); compare Jerome, *Adversus Rufinum* II 22 (Lardet 1983, 164.32–35).

[467] Jerome, *Epistulae* 33.4 (Labourt 1949–1963, II: 40.14–43.19; cf. Klostermann 1897, 853–70).

[468] Thus also the interpretation in Harnack 1958c, 48.

[469] Paulinus of Nola, *Epistulae* 32.12 (Hartel/Kampter 1999, 287.14–15 = Skeb 1998, 772.17–19); compare Harnack 1916a and Mratschek 2002, 454–57.

[470] *Si quem sancta tenet meditandi* [Hartel/Kampter: *meditanda*] *in lege voluntas* / *Hic poterit residens sacris intendere libris*; "Whoever has the holy will to meditate on the law, he will be able to sit here and direct his attention to the holy books" (translation from Harnack 1916a, 44 n. 1; text from Hartel/Kampter 1999, 291.10–11 = Skeb 1998, 782.5–6). The inscription over the door of the library of the White Monastery contains no indications of the purpose of the room (A 10 in Crum 1904, 563).

of the apse of the new basilica[471] and ask whether inferences could not be drawn from this about the often unclear description of the function of apse side rooms in ancient Christian basilicas. For North Africa, at least, Jürgen Christern has criticized their designation as "prosthesis" and "diaconicon" as "arbitrary" and "completely inappropriate and out of place."[472] Whether some of these rooms were not used as libraries in Cimitile/Nola would have to be investigated further.[473] There are, of course, some pagan parallels for the attachment of a library to a cultic building.[474]

The small number of scrolls in the inventories, by the way, corresponds roughly to the number that one finds on late ancient bookshelves in contemporary pictures as well—namely, between ten and twenty scrolls. The books could be kept in such shelves or cupboards, the so-called *armaria*. The well-known illustration at the beginning of Codex Amiatinus,[475] which shows Ezra as he writes the law, makes clear what has been said: while the prophet sits on a bench in the foreground and writes on a codex with a pen, there is an open cupboard, an *armarium*,[476] in the background with nine codices placed neatly

[471] For the relation of the excavations in Cimitile/Nola to the descriptions of Paulinus, compare A. Weis 1957; for the excavation history, see Korol 1987, 7–13, and now Lehmann 2003.

[472] Christern 1976, 229.

[473] The wall inscriptions in the library of the White Monastery (list 20, see above) make it possible to clearly identify (Crum 1904, 553) this room, which was also used as a sacristy. As in Nola, it is found at the northeast corner of the three apse choir of the basilica (cf., e.g., the floor plan in Brunner-Traut 1982, 570). According to Crum 1904, the inscriptions give the location of the texts in shelves or other receptacles in the room, as the following sketch is meant to make clear (with north on the left side of the sketch).

	Homiletic and Historical Works	
NT		(OT?)
	Biographical/Hagiographical Works	

(For the wall inscriptions, cf. the columns of list 20 in table nr. 10; the strict separation of the biblical texts appears to have been not completely maintained.)

[474] Wendel 1949, 407–28 (= 1974, 144–64), esp. 412–16 (148–50) and 427–28 (160). Wendel's observation that the pagan libraries at the temple have no inner relation to the cult can perhaps now be expanded through the findings of the lists (above all with respect to the lectionaries) to the Christian church libraries as well.

[475] Florence, Biblioteca Medicea-Laurenziana, Codex Amiatinus 1, fol. 577[r]; end of the seventh century CE.

[476] Wendel 1974, 64–92 (p. 71 on the Ravenna mosaic and on the Florence Codex, i.e., Amiatinus); 1946/1947 (= 1974, 93–107); 1950 (= 1974, 108–43); E. G. Budde 1940 (collects remains and images on codex image 13 nr. 23 [p. 22]; for criticism of the remarks on "Torah shelves" [E. G. Budde 1940, 41–48], see Galling 1956, 171).

next to one another in two stacks, lying on five shelf boards. The inscriptions, which can be read only with difficulty in most copies, designate them as the complete collection of the text of the Bible.[477] The mosaic representation of such a cupboard in the so-called Mausoleum of the Galla Placidia in Ravenna[478] emerged about two centuries earlier. Here too we find in an open cupboard two codices, which are designated by inscriptions as the four gospels, on each of the two shelves.[479] Closely related to this representation are the gold glasses upon which a Torah chest is represented:[480] in the cupboards, which are likewise open, there are about twenty scrolls, with up to six scrolls on four shelves.[481] One could have recognized the content of the scrolls from the *indices* or *tituli*, small pieces of paper that were attached to the scrolls or from small boards ("pinakes") fastened in front. To this day, the *cornua* have remained on the Jewish Torah scrolls with which the spindles (*umbiculus*), around which the scrolls (*volumina*) were wound, were decorated, as well as the precious cover (διφθέρα[482]). Next to it there were bookshelves.[483]

[477] Consider the following:

OC[tateuchus].LIB.	REG.
HIST.LIB.	PSALM.LIB
SALOMON.	PROPH.
EVANG. IIII.	EPIST. XXI.
ACT.APOSTOL.	

J. W. Clark 1997, 41; compare the division of the lists in Augustine, *De doctrina christiana* II 13.26 (Green 1963). However, he designates Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges + Ruth, Reg + Chronicles as historical (*Haec est historia*) books and follows them with the prophets among which he reckons the book of Psalms *et Salomonis tres* (Proverbs, Song of Solomon, Ecclesiastes) as well as the actual prophets (which is overlooked by Wendel 1974, 71 with n. 45/46).

[478] See E. G. Budde 1940, 23 nr. 24, image 14; Deichmann 1974, 77 (literature). A scroll (or here likewise an *armarium*) belongs to the Laurentius iconography and should symbolize his position as a deacon of the Roman church. In addition, he was revered as patron of librarians (Petzoldt 1990).

[479] See also J. W. Clark 1997, 39.

[480] Morey 1959 (Vatican, Museo Sacro) nr. 14 [p. 27]; nr. 115 [p. 27]; (New York, Metropolitan Museum of Modern Art) nr. 458 [p. 74]. Interestingly, Tertullian says, when he wishes to express that the book of Enoch belongs not to the Jewish canon, *nec in armarium Iudaicum admittitur* (*De cultu feminarum* I 3.1 [Kroymann 1954, 346.2–3]); compare also E. G. Budde 1940, images 33–37 and pp. 42–46, as well as Wendel 1950, 120–21.

[481] Compare also the image of a glass from the Berlin Museum in Leipoldt/Grundmann 1987, image 177 (= E. G. Budde 1940, image 32, nr. 9; Bode-Museum Inv. 6700).

[482] Compare Martial, *Epigrammata* X 93. On the antiseptic anointing of the scrolls with cedar oil, compare *Assumption of Moses* 1.17 and J. W. Clark 1997, 29 with n. 5.

[483] Kloeters 1959, 167, interprets in this way the expression *nidulus* in Jerome, *Epistulae* 47.3 (Labourt 1949–1963, II: 115.24).

As is well known, books were transported in so-called *rotuli* or *scriniae* or *capsae*,[484] receptacles not unlike the hatboxes of past times that belonged to the characteristic features of a late ancient author and philosopher[485] in which one could store between six and ten scrolls. According to the records, the martyrs of Scilla, apparently a very small locale in Numidia, were asked—after the *casus* was actually closed and the *crimen* of the Christ confession had been established—what they had in their book box: *Saturninus proconsul dixit: "Quae sunt res in capsa vestra?" Speratus dixit: "Libri et epistulae Pauli viri iusti."*[486]

This sign of literary education among people who had apparently lost their mind[487] softened the official and moved him to grant the Christians a one month reprieve. With much less pity, the Emperor Julian, by contrast, had his prefect of Egypt, Ecdicius, seize the books of the Homoean bishop George of Alexandria. After the latter was killed in riots on December 24, 361 CE, Julian took steps to obtain the contents of his library because "an irresistible compulsion to possess books was instilled in my nature from youth on," as the emperor openly acknowledges.[488] He knew that the bishop possessed "many philosophical works, many rhetorical writings, and also many works about the teaching of the godless Galileans."[489] Julian knew the bishop when he was still a Cappadocian priest. He

[484] Compare also Seeck 1921; Mau 1899.

[485] Compare, for example, the copy on the author portrait of Virgil in Codex Vergilius Romanus (Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Cod. Vat. lat. 3225, fol. 3v [image in Weizmann 1977, 10]), late fifth century, or fig. 10 in J. W. Clark 1997, 30. Martial (Epigrammata XIV 186) describes such a copy of Virgil: "Look here the book from skin! Virgil's violent poetry / hides it. On page one you find the poet's portrait."

[486] Knopf/Krüger/Ruhbach 1965, 29.18–19; Ruggieri 1991, 71–74; Lietzmann 1907, 49–50 (= 1958, 49–50); Bonner 1956. Compare also H. Leclercq 1924, 860–61, on the police measures against Christian books from the time of the Diocletian persecution. Against the background of the results of recent scholarship, one will need to revise the picture sketched in Aland/Aland 1989a, 74–75 (cf. 1989b, 64–65), of the "Lucianic text" that, so to speak, "pressed into" the gap that emerged through the persecution. Brennecke 1991, 478, has shown that we know practically nothing about the historical Lucian, and the dissemination of his cult as a martyr is an act of the homoean imperial church politics of the sons of the Emperor Constantine: "In view of the . . . problems one must ask whether the search for an Antiochene text may be burdened at all with the question of Lucian as its originator."

[487] *Scillitan Martyrs* 28.23. Rauschen 1913, 318 n. 5, considers the possibility that the *capsa* was seized because of the suspicion of magical writings.

[488] Julian, *Epistulae* 37: Ἄλλοι μὲν ἵππων, ἄλλοι δὲ ὀρνέων, ἄλλοι δὲ θηρίων ἐρῶσιν· ἐμοὶ δὲ βιβλίων κτήσεως ἐκ παιδαρίου δεινὸς ἐντέτηκε πόθος (cited according to B. K. Weis 1973, 102).

[489] Julian, *Epistulae* 37 (378 B); on Georgius and the incident, compare Bidez 1947, 32–34 or 244–46.

probably used his library then and produced copies—but at that time he still gave the works back.[490]

With the help of the papyrus discovery of Oxyrhynchus and the library lists on papyrus (as well as some supplementary pointers from the rest of ancient Christian literature), we have made clear that the concept of a 'canon' of biblical Scriptures in these institutions, even during the time after Constantine, still clearly differed from what the monarchic bishops and synods normed and what free teachers established as the basis for their argumentation—and this holds true despite all the qualifications that are required, on the one hand, by the situation of our knowledge about ancient Christian libraries[491] and, on the other hand, by the (when viewed as a whole) quite small and late tradition of the lists that for the most part cannot be clearly placed in terms of chronology or geography. We have seen that many libraries did not even possess the whole Bible (but parts of the Bible and lectionaries), and as the ordering of the book collections shows, the unity of "Holy Scripture" that was ecclesiastically normed by the 'canon' was not even close to being perceived as a hermetically sealed group of texts, as we view them today, not least because of the introduction of inexpensive editions of the Bible by Bible societies.

3.1.7 On the Significance of Ancient Christian Institutions for a History of the Christian Canon of the Bible

The significance of a statistical evaluation of the findings from Oxyrhynchus, on the one hand, and the inventory of ancient Christian libraries, on the other hand, would naturally be completely overestimated if one wanted to obtain from such statistics a new criterion for a traditionally understood "canonicity" of biblical Scriptures in antiquity.[492] We saw already with

[490] Julian, *Epistulae* 37 (378 C). About a quarter year after the first letter, the emperor sent an angry letter to the leader of the finance administration because the library had evidently still not yet cropped up (*Epistulae* 38).

[491] This applies as a whole for the complex of the history of the Christian library: "A comprehensive investigation of the Jewish, early Christian, and Gnostic libraries would be an urgent desideratum" (Hengel 1984, 37 n. 85 with literature); compare also the literature on Christian libraries in Scholten 1988a, 153 n. 61; from these references, see, in addition to the works that have already been mentioned, Wessel 1966; Plümacher 1993b, 414; Schermann 1904; Ghellinck 1933; E. D. Roberts 1934; see further Hunger 1988, 27–71 (literature on pp. 146–47); Schubart 1925 (and note in the third edition from 1962 the documentation is lacking). An annotated bibliography on the topic is found in Kleberg 1967, 108–12, and Cecchelli Trinci 1983.

[492] At any rate, one could point to the fact that the history-of-ideas approach to the topic, which has been predominant up to now, should be supplemented through the question of the de facto reception of writings as canonical Scriptures (thus also W. A. Löhr 2005, 202–3).

reference to the debate about the *Gospel of Peter* that broke out between a Christian community of the diocese of Antioch and their lead shepherd at some time around the turn from the second to the third century that the texts that could be read in church and the writings that were reckoned to the Holy Scriptures by the monarchic bishops (see section 3.1.2.2) were by no means completely identical. And we observed that one such monarchic bishop, Athanasius of Alexandria, even in the second half of the fourth century (like the bishop Serapion of Antioch almost two hundred years earlier), had to undertake careful research first before he could give precise information about the boundaries of the 'canon' of the New Testament (see section 3.1.2.1). Thus the 'canon' of biblical Scriptures in various ancient Christian libraries, which can be reconstructed to a certain degree from such statistical listings, does not represent a competing formation to the 'canon' of the monarchic bishops and synods or to the 'canon' of the free teachers but is the 'canon' of a distinct institution of ancient Christianity.

Statistical evaluations of the findings from Oxyrhynchus and the inventories handed down on papyrus are significant for a history of the Christian canon of the Bible also because they confirm the close connection between the norming of the 'canon' of the Christian Bible with the worship service and its readings, on the one hand, and the academic and catechetical instruction, on the other hand—thus with institutions that we have already discussed in detail. The key places where interested ancient Christians without a literary education experienced a 'canon' of biblical Scriptures were the Scripture readings and the catechetical instruction in the framework of preparation for baptism. While noncanonical books could naturally be read alongside canonical books in the publicly accessible instruction of free Christian teachers, especially when it took place at the university level as with Origen (the same also applies, of course, to private reading),[493] the 'canon' of the readings of the worship service was an especially sensitive field, as one can see from the debate over the *Gospel of Peter*. Therefore, the development of reading cycles, the marking of pericopes in manuscripts, and the compilation of lectionaries was not accidental[494] but secured the ecclesiastically defined 'canonicity' in the reading of the worship service. On the other hand, learned theologians such as Origen and Eusebius of Caesarea made use of their scholarly

[493] Church orders and church fathers, however, increasing placed a greater weight on the canonicity of the private reading. Cyril of Jerusalem, for example, insisted that "those writings that are not read at all in the church (publicly)" may not be read privately by a Christian either: Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catecheses* IV 36 (Reischl/Rupp 1967, I: 130): καὶ ὅσα [μὲν] ἐν ἐκκλησίαις μὴ ἀναγινώσκεται, ταῦτα μηδὲ κατὰ σαυτὸν ἀναγίνωσκε, καθως ἤκουσας; compare Gamble 1995, 231–37.

[494] B. M. Metzger 1972 and Markschies 2004b, 83–88.

literary knowledge to explain the historical accidents of the 'canon' of biblical Scriptures established in their churches to an educated environment, as Armin Baum and Alain le Boulluec have shown in detail with reference to a well-known passage from Eusebius' *Historia ecclesiastica*: the distinction between ὁμολογούμενα (ἐνδιάθηκος), ἀντιλεγόμενα, and γραφαὶ ἀμνημονούμεναι is indebted to the analysis of authenticity in Alexandrian philology, which was mediated to Eusebius via Origen and Pamphilius, whereby Origen, in distinction to Eusebius, makes use of the entire spectrum of the educated terminology: ὁμολογούμενα or ἀναντίρρητα or γνήσιοι and ἀντιλεγόμενα or ἀμφιβαλλόμενα or ψευδεπιγράφοι and finally ψευδῆ.[495] The distinction, which Eusebius makes in the aforementioned section, between ἀντιλεγόμενα and γραφαὶ ἀμνημονούμεναι (free, "writings that one should forget") specifies and radicalized the distinction, found by him in the church of Caesarea, between canonical and noncanonical writings. As justification for the sharp devaluation of individual apocryphal writings, the author of the *Church History* produces, according to the custom of Alexandrian philology, both stylistic arguments (the style of the apocryphal writings is said to stand παρὰ τὸ ἦθος τὸ ἀποστολικόν)[496] and thematic reasons. If one analyzes the institutional contexts of the different canonizations of Holy Scriptures in ancient Christianity, then the well-known alternatives from the discussion of recent decades—the model of a "self-establishment" of the 'canon' of the Christian Bible and the opposing picture of an authoritative establishment through the monarchic bishops and synods[497]—appear much too simplistic for describing the very different processes of the norming of a specific group of Scriptures in diverse institutional contexts.

We can maintain that the previous, rather monolithic picture of the development of the 'canon' of biblical Scriptures has considerably altered its contours in recent years already through a strongly geographical differentiation.[498] Our observations on ancient Christian institutions such as the

[495] Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* III 25.1–7 (Schwartz 1999, II/1: 250.19–252.24); compare Baum 1997 and previously already Schneemelcher 1990, 38–39 (cf. 1963, 56–68), or McDonald 1995, 208. Contrast Le Boulluec 2002.

[496] Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* III 25.7 (Schwartz 1999, II/1: 252.19–20).

[497] A. M. Ritter 1987. Ritter takes his topic from the observation that in the magisterial presentation of Hans Freiherr von Campenhausen it is said both that the Christian canon of the Bible "established itself and is at any rate not a work of the church" (Campenhausen 2003, 382 n. 12; cf. 1972, 331 n. 13) and also that Marcion "created . . . the idea and reality of a Christian Bible" (Campenhausen 2003, 174; cf. 1972, 148). But Ritter does not see that the thesis of the self-establishment of the canon follows the systematic conception of Gerhard Ebeling and is, just like the simple model of a decision by an ecclesiastical authority, not adequate for the description of a mixture of different motives and circumstances.

[498] Thus also the division of the content in B. M. Metzger 1987.

free teachers of majority church or Gnostic character; on the monarchic bishops, worship service, and instruction; and on the (community) public and private libraries show that such institutions developed their own respective ‘canons’ of biblical Scriptures that came into contact in core areas, as did the episcopal and synodal canons of various geographical regions, and yet also showed characteristic differences in relation to the other institutions.

3.2 Concluding Reflection: The Canon as an Example of the Connection between Institution and Norm

We saw in the preceding section that the canonization of holy texts (and thus simultaneously the establishment of a theological norm—namely, the norm of a ‘canon’ of Holy Scriptures that has also been designated as κανών from the fourth century onward) is most closely connected with the mediation, institutionalized since the second century, of Christian theology through free teachers, established schools, the monarchic episcopacy and the synods, and the liturgy of the worship services. But we have also seen that this close connection between norm-setting, norm, and institution, irrespective of all fundamental similarities, leads to ‘canons’ of biblical Scriptures that differ in content and are elaborated in very different ways as well.[499] In the fourth and last chapter of this book, we will next address the special relationship between shared norms and different emphases conditioned by the different institutions.

We have investigated the norming of the scope and content of biblical Scriptures as an example of the connection between norm and institution in early Christianity and shown with reference to a representative example how strongly the development of a theological idea of ancient Christianity was accompanied and guided by institutionalization processes. At the same time, these institutions—the lectures of the free teachers, the instruction of a private university, the Christian worship service, and the various types of libraries[500]—were the social basis for the representation and dissemination of the idea of a ‘canon’ of Holy Scriptures (or the differently profiled ideas of a ‘canon’). Moreover, it is the case that most of the institutions were

[499] Assmann 1997, 94, points to the context of *canonization*—that is, the freezing of a state in the stream of tradition and the *commentating* that follows in order to keep the texts comprehensible. Correspondingly, the different “theologies” also produce different forms of commentary literature.

[500] We have not taken up again in detail the institution of the so-called Montanist prophets and their so-called oracles, which we introduced in detail above, since the institution-conditioned special status of their ‘canon’ of holy writings was already explicated in detail in the corresponding section.

also a social objectification of specific structures of behavior that were bound up with the corresponding norm ‘canon’: in a worship service, a lector and the presbyter were bound to a quite specific reading; the manner in which he took up, carried, opened, read, and gave back the corresponding codex after using it was not left to his own arbitrary shaping but normed and implicitly expressed the theological meaning of the ‘canon’ of Holy Scriptures. One could certainly supplement further this rather chance reference to an “implicit theology” of canonicity, as we have obtained it above all from observations on the ancient worship service, if (with Harnack) one would consider again in greater detail the *private use of the Holy Scriptures* by Christians who did not belong to any of the aforementioned institutions or were not particularly responsible for them. It becomes evident in such examples that (far beyond the assumptions of a classic history of ideas) the idea of a ‘canon’ of biblical Scriptures as a norm also formed an action-guiding and communication-directing foundation for the respective institutions, and it was simultaneously strongly defined by these institutions in its development. More recent scholarship on the theory of institutions, which is more action oriented, points to the mutual interaction between institution and conflict: institutions do not merely produce a capacity for order but produce and resolve conflicts.[501] To a certain extent, with its norm-settings, the monarchic episcopacy produced diverging conceptions of a ‘canon’ of biblical Scriptures by the groups that it excluded as heretical. But it simultaneously resolved these conflicts through a more precise description of the scope of the biblical ‘canon,’ as we can observe in Athanasius.

In the fourth and final chapter, we turn—as mentioned—to the specific relationship between identity and plurality, which we could observe in the analysis of the various conceptions of a ‘canon’ of Holy Scriptures. This relationship has established itself as one of the key research problems in the discussion about ancient Christianity, especially in the twentieth century.

[501] Siedschlag 2000, 20–25.

This page intentionally left blank

4

The Identity and Plurality of Ancient Christianity

In this book we have studied—partly only very paradigmatically—the very different institutional contexts in which people practiced what we today, following a late ancient and medieval use of language, call "theology." With good reason, one must doubt whether an observer from the early imperial period would even have perceived as a unity everything that was carried out by free teachers in the great cities, permanently employed instructors in the schools, apocalyptic prophetesses on the Phrygian estates, and presiders in the worship service gatherings of private houses. He certainly would not have designated as "Christian philosophy" what presiders of Christian communities improvised as Eucharistic prayers in their homes or what the Montanist prophetesses uttered in ecstasy. We have seen that one must distinguish not only between "implicit" theology, as this characterizes liturgical texts, and "explicit" theology, which was taught by teachers in the open market and in the schools, but it is necessary also to differentiate the contents of these theologies according to their respective institutional *Sitze im Leben*. This became especially clear in the differing scope of the respective 'canons' of Holy Scriptures that we studied in the last section. Thus the unity of ancient Christian theology is up for debate both from a formal, institutional perspective and from a material, thematic perspective.

If, however, the institutional and thematic cohesion of what we designate today as "ancient Christian theology," "the theology of the ancient church," "the theology of early Christianity," or with some other designation is first constructed by us and would have been intelligible to an ancient observer only to a limited extent, then the question immediately arises of whether such a construction actually follows rightly or whether it is only a convention that has now shaped theological and publishing operations for centuries. The constructive character of every model of *the* ancient Christian theology has been perceived very clearly in the last decades, at least in some regional cultures of research (e.g., in the Anglophone sphere). On the one hand, this is certainly due to a general trend toward constructivist models and perspectives. But on the other hand, it is due to the impact (somewhat delayed temporally) of a 1934 German monograph that began to shape the discussion in the 1960s. Since for many years Walter Bauer's *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei in ältesten Christentum* (*Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*) provided the paradigmatic framework for every reconstruction of ancient Christian theology and often continues to do so, we will first present this monograph and its reception in relatively full detail (sections 4.1–4.2). In the process, it will become clear that even the scholar who is probably the most prominent critic of the traditional construction of a unity of ancient Christian theology from the most recent past presupposes the highly constructed picture of history of a liberal German Protestant. In order also to consider a very influential Catholic model, we will deal then with the concept of the "inculturation" or "acculturation" of Christianity (section 4.3), which originally comes from Catholic theology. Here, it will likewise be shown that both the hermeneutical and historical implications of this model and its consequences for the reconstruction of the history of ancient Christianity are far from satisfactory. In a concluding section, we will finally ask again about the unity of the forms of ancient Christian theology that are differentiated institutionally and thematically and thus also about the unity of ancient Christianity prior to Constantine (section 4.4). This will take place under the guiding terms "identity" and "plurality." The history of these terms will first be concisely explicated[1] so that the results of our investigations can then be summarized with the help of these two terms. For such a perspective, it is advisable to draw upon results of the identity discourse from other scholarly research, especially from psychology and ethnology, and in this way to supplement, to some extent, the strong history-of-ideas focus of the previous perspective. Our approach remains paradigmatic also in the final section. This implies that a whole series of other prominent models for the reconstruction of the unity of ancient Christian "theology" in the plurality of its manifestations can at most be touched on here and cannot be discussed in detail, such as the concept of "Jewish and Christian self-definition," made popular in Germany by Georg Kretschmar (from the late 1970s)[2] or the most recent attempts at a reconstruction on a semiotic basis.[3]

[1] But before they are explained in detail below (section 4.4), the guiding terms "identity" and "plurality" are also already used for the analysis of other conceptions.

[2] The three-volume project of Canadian McMaster University included alongside Judaism and Christianity also the pagan world (cf., e.g., Dillon 1982). Kretschmar 1988 (= 1999, 148–72) attempted a strongly modified application of the concept.

[3] Theissen 2000. Christianity is specified as "amazing cathedral of signs" (Theissen 2000, 410; cf. Theissen 1999, 306).

4.1 The Cultural Protestant Model of Walter Bauer

All debates about the unity of ancient Christian theology and the identity of ancient Christianity before Constantine have been deeply shaped for many years by a 1934 monograph that the New Testament scholar Walter Bauer (1877–1960),[4] then of the University of Göttingen, wrote with the title *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum* (*Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*).[5] The extraordinarily paradigmatic function of the book for the discussion, above all in the Anglophone sphere, is astonishing, at least at first glance. Bauer did not actually intend to write about the great question of the unity of ancient Christian theology or the identity of ancient Christianity. The goal of his monograph was much more modest. Bauer intended to shake, in an equally definitive and lasting way, the traditional picture of ancient Christianity that emerged from antiquity itself—namely, that heresies were simply a falling away from the original orthodoxy of the church. In this way, however, he simultaneously shook the presupposed picture of an original unity of theology, together with the presupposed identity of ancient Christianity, and replaced it with the model of an original plurality. In Bauer's monograph, the alternatives were made clear to the reader in a simplification that bordered on caricature: according to the classic picture of the development of ancient Christianity, which was in force for a thousand years,[6] Jesus established a pure and salvific teaching that was handed down afterward through the office in apostolic succession. Through the activity of the Holy Spirit, the teaching of the majority church was said to have always remained one and the same, whereas error and heresy were said to be the activity of Satan and their motive to be sin. According to this model of the development of early Christianity, correct teaching always preceded false teaching; heresy is inconsistent and a diversity that cannot endure in relation to the *one* Christ. Using our guiding concepts of "identity" and "plurality," one could say that in the classic theory that Bauer sought to refute, plurality was viewed as heretical on the basis of a unified standpoint and the presupposed identity of Christianity was explicated as an orthodox one.[7]

[4] On the person and theology of Bauer, see my subsequent comments in this section with n. 80.

[5] Bauer 1934a (first edition); 1964 (second revised edition with a supplement by G. Strecker); 1971 (English translation; for a link to Robert A. Kraft's updated electronic English edition, see Wayne Coppins' blog *German for Neutestamentler*). For discussion and pointers on this section of my book, I am especially thankful to my assistant Henrik Hildebrandt.

[6] Thus at least Schindler 1993b, 320.

[7] According to Schindler 1993b, 336, Bauer's basic thesis stands in strict tension with faith in an always existing church. It is said that the relationship between believed unity

In his monograph, Bauer attempted to refute the thesis of the priority of orthodoxy and thereby intensified observations that had been made already long ago by others. In the introduction, Bauer already asks whether one does not make oneself "excessively dependent on the position of one party" in the identification of "heretics"—namely, "the judgment of the antiheretical Fathers."[8] He begins his work with relatively extensive observations on the historical methods that he takes as a basis: "Must the researcher of history not stand above the parties in the same way as the judge does and make the hearing of the other side the highest principle?"[9] It follows from this command of impartiality that according to Bauer, the historian must help the loser (or underdog) find justice and attain an after-the-fact unfolding that was hindered in antiquity by the great church or majority church.[10] For this reason, it is said that one must deal with both the alleged "heretics" and the New Testament writings in a scholarly manner and not as holy books. Bauer points out that what "is reality in one generation can be outdated in the next—as progress or equally as a regression to an earlier state."[11] Perhaps the "heresies" were originally not heresies at all but the only form of the new religion or at least of the majority. Majority and minority could alternate: "We wish, of course, to hear what is said about both, not the church, i.e., one of the parties, but the history"—these pointed observations presuppose the distinction between historical and dogmatic methods in Ernst Troeltsch while freely varying his terminology.[12] They are sustained by a surprising trust in the objectivity of historical research. In light of the "crisis of historicism" diagnosed by many in his day, this trust makes an already slightly old-fashioned impression. In light of the demands for a new partisanship of the historian, which was promoted around the year 1933 and was suddenly advocated by many, the

---

and historical plurality must ever again be specified systematically and cannot be proven historically.

[8] Bauer 1964, 1 (cf. 1971, xxi). A short version was published by the author as a journal article under the title of the monograph (Bauer 1934b = 1967a, 229–33).

[9] Bauer 1964, 1 (cf. 1971, xxi).

[10] In conversation, Ekkehard Mühlenberg once pointed me very emphatically to the problems of these two expressions. Naturally, we do not know whether the "majority church" actually formed the statistical majority in every case and whether it can even be referred to as the "great church" in view of its small numbers. But as long as more serviceable expressions are not available for differentiating within the Christianity of the first centuries, there remain only the expressions that are open to misinterpretation with comments on them in footnotes. In always speaking of the "ecclesiastical standpoint," Bauer immediately identifies the theological construct of an "orthodoxy" with the church, which is a not unproblematic terminological preliminary decision.

[11] Bauer 1964, 2 (cf. 1971, xxii).

[12] Bauer 1964, 3 (cf. 1971, xxiii); compare Troeltsch 1981.

methodological conservatism of Bauer in his 1934 monograph simultaneously has a highly relevant dimension of refusal in relation to apparent "modernisms."

In his monograph, Bauer characterizes the traditional "ecclesiastical standpoint" that he seeks to overcome in four points:

1. Jesus revealed the pure teaching to his apostles.
2. After his death, the apostles divided among themselves the world according to missionary areas and each brought the pure gospel to his area.
3. Admittedly, the devil sowed in the wheat field, and thus certain Christians abandoned the pure teaching. But where there were "heresies," there must previously have been "orthodoxy": "All heretics come first to faith; later they then deviate from the rule of faith."[13]
4. The correct faith is unconquerable. In spite of all the efforts of Satan, it drives back errant belief and unbelief.

According to Bauer, this monolithic picture of the history of ancient Christianity has been torn down already, through historical research, since the Enlightenment. It is said that we now know that Jesus did not bring the pure teaching and that the twelve disciples did not play the role that had been ascribed to them; "a viewing of history that deserves this name" refuses "to bring into use the oppositions of true and untrue, good and evil."[14]

In a detailed historical analysis, Bauer then attempted to show that the heresies, so named after the fact, often had priority, and the subsequent orthodoxies were minorities that were in part only tolerated and only later gained influence through the patronage of Rome. He proceeded—admittedly without explicit justification—*geographically* and began with Edessa[15] in order to pace off thereafter in a great circle Egypt, Asia Minor, and the rest of Greece and to end in Rome. The goal of these sections is, in each case, the historical destruction of the traditional ecclesiastical founding legend. Thus in these passages of the monograph, we are dealing, for the

[13] Bauer 1964, 3 (cf. 1971, xxiii); compare Origen, *Commentarii in Canticum canticorum* III 4.6 (Lommatzsch 1831–1848, XV: 10 = Baehrens 1925, 179.4–6 = Brésard/Crouzel/Borret 1991/1992, II: 518: *Omnes enim haeretici primo ad credulitatem veniunt, et post haec ab itinere fidei et dogmatum veritate [Dei] declinant* [n.b.: The passage is quoted in Bauer but quite errantly referenced: "Comm. II in Cantic. Tom. XIV, S. 10 Lomm."]).

[14] Bauer 1964, 4 (cf. 1971, xxiv).

[15] Bauer 1964, 6–48 (cf. 1971, 1–43). The author possibly begins with Edessa and Egypt because his thesis can best be verified here (thus an oral pointer of my former Heidelberg colleague A. M. Ritter). In the following presentation of the theses of the monograph, I refrain from adding more recent secondary literature and from entering into the detailed debate with Bauer.

most part, with a criticism of the picture of history that one finds in Eusebius of Caesarea and basically with a radical destruction.[16] Bauer brackets out the New Testament because he regards it as too “unyielding and also too controversial”: “The majority of its heretic-fighting writings cannot be securely placed in time or place, and also the more exact circumstances of their emergence cannot in the least be specified with desirable precision.”[17]

For the Syrian metropolis of Edessa, Bauer showed that Abgar V. Ukama, the Black (9–46 CE), did not, as Eusebius reported,[18] request a portrait of Jesus and of the apostle Thomas and thus introduce Christianity—for the Edessan kings were not even Christians until at least 200 CE. This is said to be a legend for the legitimation of the (later) Edessan orthodoxy. Bauer’s thesis is therefore that Christianity in Edessa was not orthodox; that it was introduced late; and that it is not without reason that there is talk in the *Chronicle of Edessa* of the “exit of Marcion” (dated to 137/138 CE), the birth of Bardaisan/Bar Daisan (7.11.154), and the birth of Mani (*239/240 CE).[19] An ecclesiastical Christianity is said to have first existed from the fourth century. Ephraim testifies that the “orthodox” were called “Palutians” at the end of the fourth century, although a bishop by this name is lacking in the *Chronicle of Edessa*. By contrast, the designation for the adherents of Marcion is said to have been “Christians”; however, the well-known inscription with its famous formulation συναγωγὴ Μαρκιωνιστῶν provides evidence that this did not apply everywhere and at all times.[20] Bauer quotes from the legend of Mar Abas († 552 CE): “For he called the Marcionites Christians according to the convention there.”[21] In addition, he emphasizes time and again that only brute force and its government support could destroy the heresies (e.g., Rabbula in relation

[16] This may explain a bit of the fascination of this monograph since the 1960s.

[17] Bauer 1964, 5 (cf. 1971, xxv). It is surprising that Bauer, from this perspective, sets off writings of the New Testament from other ancient Christian texts, for example, of the second century, which are at least as difficult to date and concerning whose exact historical circumstances we likewise often know nothing.

[18] Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* I 13.1–4 (Schwartz 1999, II/1: 82.21–84.19).

[19] Compare the listing in Bauer 1964, 20–21 (cf. 1971, 15–16); for the Syriac text of the *Chronica minora*, see the edition of Guidi 1903, 4. For a very thorough investigation of the relevant sources on the Marcionites and on the topic in general, see B. Ehlers (= B. Aland) 1970, 285–86, 308–17.

[20] Dittenberger 1986, nr. 608/1, pp. 304–5 (= LeBas/Waddington 1870, 2558); compare Harnack 1915 (= 1980b, 305–25); Bauer 1964, 29 (cf. 1971, 24). The inscription was located on a door lintel in Deir Ali (Lebaba), about 15.5 miles (25 kilometers) south of Damascus.

[21] Bauer 1964, 28 (cf. 1971, 23); for the Syriac text, see Bedjan 1895 (206–87) 213; German translation in O. Braun 1915, 189–90 (§ 3).

to the heresy of Bardaisan).[22] Instead of the four gospels, the Diatessaron of Tatian is said to have been in force in Edessa for a long time; bishop Theodoret of Cyrrhus claims to have collected more than two hundred copies of this work.[23] According to Bauer, Kûnê (Κοῖνος), the first bishop mentioned in the *Chronicle of Edessa*, was the first to organize an "orthodox" church. He is said to have been active presumably between 289 and 313 CE: "He was, if I see correctly, the one who organized the orthodoxy in Edessa ecclesiastically and gave it—supported by the favor of the time and yet not without his own achievement—a considerable impetus."[24] Kûnê—whom Bauer portrays not only as a contemporary but also as a kindred spirit of Eusebius—is said to have also given the impetus for the emergence of the legend of Abgar; previously, "orthodoxy" and canon were allegedly Marcionite in the city. The legend of Abgar is said to have been an expression of the guiding theory of the new orthodoxy—namely, that the faith of Kûnê was older in comparison to that of the "heretics."

In a second chapter Bauer deals with Egypt. Here too the *argumentum e silentio*, which he uses amply in his monograph, despite methodological reservations that are occasionally made explicit, is given a central position for the new reconstruction of the early history of Christianity in Alexandria and Egypt. While Harnack established only the extraordinarily thin nature of the sources,[25] Bauer suggestively asks, "However, if these sources were not written by churchmen, they were nevertheless viewed and supervised by them. What reason would they have had for remaining silent about the beginnings of Christianity in such an important center as Alexandria if there had been something good to report?"[26]

Bauer connects the absence of reports about a Christianity that was "orthodox" according to later standards with the well-known reports about Gnostics from or in Egypt (such as Basilides with his son Isidore, Carpocrates, Valentinus with his students, Theodotus and Julius Cassianus, on the one side, as well as Apelles and Cerinthus together with the Barbelognostics) and infers from this that Gnosis was the first form of Christianity in Alexandria. He also interprets other texts against this background: even the "basic thesis" of the letter of Barnabas—namely, "that Judaism is an aberration to which Christianity is not able to connect and to

[22] Bauer 1964, 33 (cf. 1971, 27–28).

[23] Theodoret, *Haereticarum fabularum compendium* I 20 (Schulze/Noesselt 1769–1774, VI/1: 312).

[24] Bauer 1964, 38–39 (cf. 1971, 33).

[25] Harnack 1981, 706–7.

[26] Bauer 1964, 49 (cf. 1971, 45).

which only rejection is due, remains Gnostic."[27] He understands the Greek *Gospel of the Egyptians* as the oldest writing of this direction; it is said to have been the "normal" Egyptian gospel: "Since, however, there was never an association of heretics named 'the Egyptians,' the designation '*Gospel of the Egyptians*' points back to a time in which *the* Christians of Egypt used this gospel, and it alone, as their life of Jesus."[28] Since Bauer detected Gnostic heresies in the Jewish-Christian *Gospel of the Hebrews* as well, on the basis of these texts, he postulated two Christianities—Jewish Christianity and Gentile Christianity—that were separated rather than united in an overarching community and based in each case on a "syncretistic-Gnostic foundation."[29] Clement of Alexandria is dealt with on a very small source basis (namely, via a report of Photius that is late and certainly not unproblematic in terms of content[30]) and with extreme brevity: his effort to be separate from "heretical Gnosis" does "not hinder him from sharing central points with heretical Gnosis." But Clement could not yet be brought to reason by the subsequently victorious "orthodox party" because it still found itself in the minority.[31] It was first under bishop Demetrius (189–231 CE) that "orthodoxy" was established as the majority confession: "He lived long enough to establish himself and had enough consciousness of power to discipline even an Origen when the latter crossed his organizational measures that aimed to unite all power in the hand of the Alexandrian church head by assuming the office of presbyter from the hand of Palestinian bishops."[32]

In this detail, it becomes very clear that Bauer traces back the establishment of "orthodoxy" to power and the will to establish itself at other points in his monograph as well. Thus in 1934, he credits ancient Christian "orthodoxy" with the very determination to seize power and enforce conformity that was valued much more positively in his contemporary political context than it is qualified in the book, where it is merely credited with a certain world historical mission.[33] In the second chapter of the book, another central thesis of the monograph simultaneously becomes

[27] Bauer 1964, 52 (cf. 1971, 47). Bauer grounds his categorization of the writing in addition with a reference to the prominent position of the Greek word γνῶσις and its Christology, which "seems docetic" (52; cf. 48).

[28] Bauer 1964, 54 (cf. 1971, 50).

[29] Bauer 1964, 57 (cf. 1971, 53).

[30] Photius, *Bibliothecae codices* 109 (Bauer 1964, 60–61; 1971, 56–57; on this text, cf. Markschies 2000a).

[31] Bauer 1964, 60–62 (cf. 1971, 56–58).

[32] Bauer 1964, 58 (cf. 1964, 54).

[33] Thus, especially clearly in the first sentence of the concluding section, "It is, in fact, actually a peculiar game of history that western Rome was chosen, right at the beginning, to exercise the determining influence on a new religion whose cradle was in the orient, in

clear: for Bauer, the Roman church plays a decisive role in this process of the forceful establishment of "orthodoxy," and this is already recognizable in the Egyptian events. In his efforts to justify the expulsion of Origen and to bring the Christian instruction in Alexandria under the control of the church after his expulsion, Bishop Demetrius was supported only by Rome. Bauer also wishes to trace back to Rome the late introduction of the "church legend of Mark as the founder and first occupant of the Alexandrian bishop chair."[34]

The third chapter is devoted to Asia Minor, Macedonia, and Crete and thus deals above all with Ignatius and Polycarp. In view of the ambitious conception of the office of bishop that Ignatius of Antioch presents in his letters, Bauer advises caution "in the evaluation of the reality. . . . The fact that Ignatius portrays ideal pictures more than he does reality is already suggested by the fact that most of what is written is clothed in the form of admonition rather than description."[35] According to Bauer, for Ignatius, "the leadership of a group that stands in the most difficult fight for existence against almost overpowering opponents" is concealed behind the designation "bishop."[36] Thus the strongly rhetorically shaped designations of this group in the letters of Ignatius are taken at face value: "In his hometown Ignatius learned to know, hate, and fear the 'rabid dogs,' the 'beasts in human form,' as he calls them."[37] Bauer identifies these groups with the Gnostics; points to documentation for Menander, Cerdo, and Basilides; and defends himself against criticism that "Gnosis as a noteworthy factor in the construction of Antiochene Christianity at the beginning of the second century is too meagerly attested."[38] In addition, he lists various pieces of evidence for Marcionite, Montanist, and "Patripassianic" Christianity in the region; with the last key

order to give it the form in which it was to gain international standing" (Bauer 1964, 242; cf. Bauer 1971, 240).

[34] Bauer 1964, 63–64 (cf. 1971, 59–60). A number of recent investigations on the early history of Egyptian Christianity are summarized in A. M. Ritter 1993, 125–35; on the topic, see also Markschies 1992, 318–24.

[35] Bauer 1964, 65 (cf. 1971, 61). Probably the clearest contemporary allusion is found in this chapter: "But the situation must develop in a questionable manner for the one who sees himself in the minority and must now experience that his wishes scarcely find a hearing before those ruling or do not find one at all. Such a one easily comes to the conclusion that his legitimate claims are being neglected by the circle of rulers; and then there stirs within him the desire for a dictatorship, which should ground the supremacy of his own party" (Bauer 1964, 66; cf. 1971, 62).

[36] Bauer 1964, 68 (cf. 1971, 64).

[37] Bauer 1964, 69 (cf. 1971, 65). Bauer cites Ignatius, *To the Ephesians* 7.1 κύνες λυσσῶντες λαθροδῆκται.

[38] Bauer 1964, 70–71 (cf. 1971, 66–67). Bauer interprets Ignatius, *To the Smyrnaeans* 6.1/9.1, as an indication of a "Gnostic counterbishop in Smyrna" and interprets Polycarp, *To the Philippians* 1.1, from this perspective.

term, he designates the position of Noetus.[39] Due to a lack of reports, Bauer also wants to reckon the whole of "Macedonia in the post-Pauline period as well as the original Edessa together with Egypt and Syrian Antioch almost from the beginning to the regions touched by Christianity in which 'heresy' had priority."[40]

Strangely, the prehistory of the situation in Asia Minor during the second century that is reconstructed in the third chapter is first recounted in the fourth chapter. Here Bauer evaluates above all the Deutero-Paulines, Revelation, and the letters of Ignatius, and he makes ample use of the *argumentum e silentio*: Ignatius is said not to mention the communities of Pergamum, Thyatira, Sardis, and Laodicea written to in Revelation, as well as the communities of Hierapolis and Colossae mentioned in Colossians (Col 4.13, 16),[41] which are already "lacking" in Revelation. Bauer regards this as no accident. The places are no longer listed in Revelation and Ignatius because in the eyes of the authors there were allegedly no longer any points of contact for their proclamation. Bauer presents such *argumenta e silentio* on diverse pages of this chapter and combines them with observations indebted to a "hermeneutic of suspicion" vis-à-vis traditional assumptions. It is said to be not at all certain that the community described by Pliny in his famous exchange of letters with Trajan was "orthodox"; by no means does it become clear from the description "whether the concern is with heretics or whether it was a mixed fellowship from adherents of heresy and the church, or finally whether right faith entirely predominated in it."[42] When Bauer also mulls over whether Paul could establish himself in Ephesus or whether the pastoral letters show that "the apostle lost the match in Ephesus in the second century,"[43] or when he seeks to characterize

[39] Compare now Hübner 1999 with additions and corrections to the initial publication (Hübner 1989) on pp. 91–94.

[40] Bauer 1964, 79 (cf. 1971, 75).

[41] Bauer 1964, 83 (cf. 1971, 79): "Does it claim too much if one concludes from the silence and speech of Ignatius, who strives to extend the circle of his influence as far as possible, already for the sake of his Antiochenes, in view of the statements of Revelation that for him there was nothing more to hope for within the Christian spheres of Pergamon, Thyatira, Sardis, and Laodicea because there was no points of contact for him there, no 'bishop' was present of whom he could avail himself, because the heretics had remained or become predominant."

[42] Bauer 1964, 94–95 (cf. 1971, 91). The paragraph concludes with a critical remark that is documented with reference to Harnack: "In my opinion the latter is too quickly assumed as a given" (Bauer 1964, 95; cf. 1971, 91).

[43] Bauer 1964, 88–89 (cf. 1971, 84–85). On Ephesus, compare now the two recent monographs of M. Günther 1998 and Koester 1995. M. Günther 1998 sets himself off from Bauer (p. 123) and reckons with a new establishment of the community by the presbyter John (76–123). On Cerinthus, compare Markschies 1998d and (briefly in thesis-like form) M. Günther 1998, 140–46.

the confrontations that can be intuited in the three Letters of John with the terms "victory" and "weakness,"[44] then it becomes clear that for the author of *Orthodoxy and Heresy*, ancient theologians attempted to establish their theology in the fight above all with the methods of war, whereby they had to either win or throw in the towel. In Ephesus, Paul loses: instead of the Pauline gospel, there remains for Bauer, in view of Revelation, only "a Jewish Christianity, probably of Palestinian origin that was undoubtedly much better suited than the Pauline preaching for the anti-Gnostic struggle but otherwise absolutely incomparable with it."[45] It is said that Cerinthus was presumably himself the one who caused the name of the Ephesian community founder Paul to disappear with his anti-Paulinism; the name of John should have replaced it. A "great portion of the Gentile Christians" are said to have come "less and less into question for 'ecclesiastical fellowship' . . . so that in this fellowship the center of gravity must have shifted of its own accord strongly in favor of the Jewish Christian element."[46] On the other hand, the Jewish Christians of Asia Minor are said to have brought "their orthodox Gentile Christian brothers the law as an offering," opened themselves to Jewish influence, and adopted liturgical customs of the synagogue. In this way, the theological landscape is said to have been grouped in a new way: instead of the traditional conflicts between Jewish and Gentile Christians in the first century, now heretical Jewish Christianity and Gentile Christianity are said to have stood on the one side and orthodox Jewish Christianity and Gentile Christianity on the other side—Bauer's presentation shows clearly that he regards that bond as a church-political alliance of convenience without a more far-reaching theological rationale.[47] In addition, this argumentation shows paradigmatically that the point of departure in the book is always communities that are determined by a particular direction: a *single* writing documents the direction of the whole community; Bauer does not allow for a plurality in the churches of Asia Minor.

[44] Bauer 1964, 96–97 (cf. 1971, 92–93). Bauer, by the way, formulates in such a manner, without discussing in greater detail, the theological positions attacked there—subsequent denial by Christians that Jesus was the Messiah, on the one hand, and contestation of his complete earthly reality on the other hand—and without developing a profile of this direction or these directions.

[45] Bauer 1964, 88 (cf. 1971, 84). In the first note on this page, it is admittedly made a presupposition for the Palestinian origin that the apocalypticist is identical "with the πρεσβύτερος Ἰωάννης, τοῦ κυρίου μαθητής of Papias (in Eusebius, *Church History* III 39.4)." A little later, Bauer suggests that Jewish Christian circles left Palestine because through "the Gnosis with its decidedly anti-Jewish stance," "the ground had become somewhat hot" there (Bauer 1964, 90; cf. 1971, 86).

[46] Bauer 1964, 93 (cf. 1971, 89).

[47] Bauer 1964, 92–93 (cf. 1971, 88–89).

In the fifth chapter, "Rome and Christianity Outside of Rome," Bauer reaches a central point in his argumentation. The Christian community in Rome is clearly painted negatively by him and becomes the actual source of that ruthless orthodoxy that begins to establish itself at the expense of the original diversity. Already in light of the extremely unfriendly terminology, one is tempted to ask whence the author received his "anti-Roman fervor."[48] According to Bauer, the community in the capital of the empire was characterized above all by a hunger for power: the Roman church is said to have constantly attempted to expand its sphere of influence,[49] as *1 Clement*, an "awkward letter,"[50] is said to show. "The positive presentation of the community faith of the church, which is decidedly moralizing in character and based on the Old Testament and the sayings of the Lord," is simultaneously said to be "the best refutation of all Gnostic-colored Christianity."[51] Rome—as Bauer likes to call the Roman community by way of abbreviation—is dominated "by a strong striving after power"; it blows up "small matters into great concerns . . . in order to subjugate other churches to itself spiritually and then integrate them organizationally into its sphere."[52] This psychological interpretation of the Roman community then leads Bauer to appeal to the fact that "the internal strife strongly" reduced "the Corinthian community's power of resistance" and made it a kind of easy prey for the Roman striving for influence as a motivation for the composition of *1 Clement*.[53] Bauer concludes from the picture painted by 1 Corinthians and from the apocryphal correspondence of Paul with the Corinthians (so-called *3 Corinthians*[54]) that the Corinthian community was simply too "Gnostic" for the Roman community, that it incorporated too many elements of "Gnostic teaching" and therefore, among other reasons, wanted to "officially align itself toward the East and, in

[48] This conspicuous concentration was noted already by reviewers at the time; compare, for example, Moffatt 1933/1934, 475–76: "There is still a case for the other side here. Was not the Apostolic Canon of Scripture first formed, in its informal stages, in Asia Minor? Was not Asia Minor ahead of Rome in the formation of the Apostolic, Episcopal ministry? And does the Symbol not seem as likely to have emerged in Asia Minor as at Rome? Dr. Bauer's views to the contrary are sharply stated, but I do not detect any cogent, decisive arguments in support of his thesis at this point, beyond what other scholars have brought forward. The real thinking upon vital Christianity for centuries was done outside the Roman Church."

[49] Bauer 1964, 133 (cf. 1971, 129).

[50] Bauer 1964, 115 (cf. 1971, 111).

[51] Bauer 1964, 108 (cf. 1971, 104).

[52] Bauer 1964, 101 (cf. 1971, 97).

[53] Bauer 1964, 102 (cf. 1971, 103).

[54] CANT 211, IV (pp. 122–23).

doing so, to break away from the West."[55] With the Corinthian community and their lead shepherds at any rate, the Roman community experienced success with its attempt, at least according to Bauer: behind "Dionysius of Corinth with his efforts towards Greece, Crete and certain areas in the north of Asia Minor stands, in fact, ecclesiastical Rome,"[56] and in general "when we see those who contest heresy at work in the time between Clement and Dionysius . . . their relations to Rome" are said to be "usually quite clear and close."[57] Hegesippus is said to have stayed in Rome, Justin is said to have "feuded with heretics in word and writing"[58] from Rome, and Rhodon and Miltiades are also linked with Rome. Bauer even attempts to postulate a connection to Rome for Papias; after all, "his friend" Polycarp is said to have stood near to the "world capital," and Papias himself handed down Roman traditions on the authors of biblical writings. In addition to Corinth, in the second century, Rome is also said to have interfered already in Antioch, and in the third century then also in Alexandria.[59]

Bauer gives a distinct section the heading "Rome's Persuasive and Polemical Tactics."[60] The "unbroken succession of orthodox bishops" is late[61] but belongs just as much to the Roman strategy of exercising power as the ransom and support of brothers in faith.[62] The orthodoxy of the great church is "accordingly the result of the expansion of Roman churchdom that could establish itself not least because it was supported by political force."[63] Bauer also attempts to explain the concentration of the Roman tradition, which was originally related to two apostles (Peter and Paul), on a single apostle (Peter) within the framework of the apostolic chain of succession as "arising from the conflict with heresy": "Only Peter established the close connection with Jesus that alone provided the guarantee of the purity of church teaching. And Paul, whom one had still been able to deploy effectively against the schismatics in Corinth (*1 Clement* 47.1), was

[55] Bauer 1964, 106 (cf. 1971, 103).

[56] Bauer 1964, 110 (cf. 1971, 106).

[57] Bauer 1964, 110 (cf. 1971, 106).

[58] Bauer 1964, 111 (cf. 1971, 107–8).

[59] For a meddling of Rome in Antioch, Bauer lacks any evidence and leaves it with the claim that the writing of Ignatius to the church of Rome "reveals something of the measures . . . that Rome used in Antioch in order to open it to its influence" (Bauer 1964, 112; cf. 1971, 108).

[60] Bauer 1971, 111; compare Bauer 1964, 115: "*Roms Werbe- und Kampfmittel.*"

[61] Bauer 1964, 122–23 (cf. 1971, 118–19).

[62] Bauer 1964, 127 (cf. 1971, 123). A fixation, comparable to Bauer's presentation, on the so-called apostolic succession, which is, in truth, not at all as widely attested as theological concept, stamps the ecumenical dialogue between the Roman Catholic, Anglican, and Protestant churches (see Markschies 2004a).

[63] Strecker 1993, 319.

no longer of any help in the fight against Marcion."[64] Bauer likewise traces the late establishment of Peter as the first member of the Antiochene bishop list back to "Roman influence"; indeed the application of a list with successions of bishops as a "means of protection" against heresies is explained in general as resulting from "Roman influence."[65] Bauer especially finds additional evidence for such "influences" in the correspondence of the bishops of Corinth and Alexandria that bears the name Dionysius and yet also in the *inscriptio* of the Ignatian letter to the Romans.[66] And in addition to linking this influence to doctrinal teaching, he does not balk at connecting it with a targeted use of financial sums for the ransom of orthodox slaves and other redemptions: Rome is said to have not shied away from "throwing golden weights onto the scales in the religious struggle."[67]

If one asks what formed, for Walter Bauer, the actual motive for the energy with which the Roman community imposed its orthodoxy with partly forceful measures and partly gentle ones, then the monograph does not really provide a convincing answer. The author does make a constant and especially severe persecution pressure responsible for the fact that the community developed "the characteristics of shrewdness, energy, and harmoniousness" in its efforts within the inhabited world.[68] But Bauer did not provide a really precise reconstruction at this point, let alone one that is identifiable on the basis of sociological descriptions of groups. The author first becomes clearer in the summary. He makes clear once again that "orthodoxy . . . represents the form of Christianity that was supported by the majority in Rome"; around the middle of the second century, this form of Christianity is said to have found itself in "a life-and-death struggle."[69]

[64] Bauer 1964, 118 (cf. 1971, 114).

[65] Bauer 1964, 121, 125 (cf. 1971, 117, 121). Here we cannot investigate the contexts that led to the corresponding change of the Antiochene bishop list, which is attested for the first time in Origen (*Philocalia* 23.22 [Junod 1976, 204] in *Commentarium series in evangelium Matthaei* 77 [Klostermann/Benz/Treu 1976, 185.18–20]), but compare Caspar 1975, 133–43 = 1926, 347–57 (not mentioned in Bauer).

[66] Bauer 1964, 125–26 (cf. 1971, 121–22).

[67] Admittedly formulated in a strangely roundabout manner in Bauer 1964, 127 (cf. Bauer 1971, 123): "Dionysius, the decided enemy of heretics, cannot, however, want the 'you alleviate the poverty of the needy' to be understood in such a way that the Roman blessing indiscriminately met all impoverished if only they were baptized" (quotation from Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* IV 23.10 [Schwartz 1999, II/1: 376.20]). Bauer 1964, 128 (cf. 1971, 124), assumes that the Roman community expanded its financial scope for such church-political-motivated support through taxation of rich church members and provides as evidence the famous donation of Marcion. This, of course, remains pure speculation.

[68] Bauer 1964, 132 (cf. 1971, 128).

[69] Bauer 1964, 231 (cf. 1971, 229). This tone of speaking of a "deadly threat" often underlies talk of a "Gnostic crisis" of "early Catholicism" down to the present. A. M. Ritter 2000, 203 n. 5, energetically argues again *for* this model. "On the problem of so-called

It is said to have been the "sober sense of the Roman" that preserved him from Gnostic speculation—or should one say, with reference to Bauer's metaphor, from infection and deadly sickness? Historical explanations are replaced in the monograph by alleged certainties about the "nature" that is said, for example, to have made "the Roman" suitable as an organizer. One could speak of an attempt to provide an explanation that depends on a view of the history of mentalities, one admittedly shaped far too much by the traditions of a Romantic psychology of peoples and the image of the classical humanistic gymnasium about *the* Roman.[70] One will not, of course, want to perceive in this a reflex of the anthropological conceptions that were especially in fashion in the publication year 1934, but one will see a general influence by not unproblematic fundamental assumptions and metaphors of the political debate: this is especially clear when Bauer states that Rome advanced "purposefully toward the east" and "the course of Christianity . . . was directed from the beginning toward the west" because the Babylonian and Arabic east initially remained closed to it.[71]

In the seventh chapter, the author investigates the "nature and manner of the conflict between orthodoxy and heresy" and supplements his geographically structured presentation with general observations, especially on the tendential nature of antiheretical writing in the second century with reference to the example of the anti-Montanist literature.[72] In the eighth chapter, "The Use of Literature in the Conflict," he marshals evidence for the view that in individual local churches, "the great majority" (οἱ πολλοί) stood "in a position inimical to the church."[73] In the ninth chapter, with the heading "The Old Testament, the Lord, and the Apostles," Bauer points to the multitude of gospels that were in fashion in diverse groups in the second century according to his view and critically reviews early evidence for knowledge of the Gospel of John among church authors.[74] Again, it is only in the concluding section that a general need "for order and peace in the house"[75] is made responsible for the fact that one set oneself "against the syncretistic Zeitgeist" while opening oneself to

---

Early Catholicism," see the concise terminological, definitional, and historical remarks in Vouga 1994, 235–44, and Nagler 1994, 7–182.

[70] Bauer 1964, 232 (cf. 1971, 230).

[71] Bauer 1964, 233–34, and in greater detail, 175–76 (cf. 1971, 221–22 and 172–73).

[72] Bauer 1964, 135.

[73] Bauer 1964, 150, 195–97 (cf. 1971, 147, 192–94). "Often enough we hear churchmen moan about the magnitude of the danger of heretics, but we never see them make the attempt to produce numerical evidence for the success of their cause" (Bauer 1964, 195–96; cf. 1971, 193).

[74] Bauer 1964, 198, 212–15 (cf. 1971, 195, 209–12); compare since then above all Loewenich 1932 and Hengel 1993, 9–95.

[75] Bauer 1964, 239 (cf. 1971, 238).

other Christian theologies. Conversely, without much ado, the fact that in his dealings with Gentiles the historical Jesus exercised a noteworthy restraint is made responsible for such an opening.[76]

In his monograph *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*, Bauer practically did not deal with the New Testament, but with his views about the second century, he naturally implied a certain perspective on the first century. His positions become most clear in the concluding section, chapter 10, in which he contrasts "the elasticity of the Pauline spirit" with the later condemnations by the Roman orthodoxy of the second century and a preliminary form of such condemnations by a spiritually narrow, law-oriented Jewish Christianity: "The still rudimentary solidification of forms of thought in connection with the apostolic broadmindedness that can become all things to all people lets him develop a tolerance that scarcely knows a heretic; 'heretic' in the sense of the fellow Christian concerning whom one is convinced that his deviating stance in relation to the faith closes off the way of salvation for him."[77] Paul thus becomes the model of a well-ordered pluralism because "the most difficult moral derailing" (1 Corinthians 5.1-5) leads to exclusion from the community but not doctrinal deviation, which the apostle attempts to ward off with argumentation.[78] According to Bauer, the strategy of denouncing those who think differently as heretics was introduced by the Jewish Christians with their "inability to follow a development that took place on the ground of hellenized Gentile Christianity"[79]—one can hardly avoid speaking here of a strongly stereotyped liberal Protestant image of Paul that was set over against a then-common caricature of a legalistic and spiritually constricted Jewish Christianity and an "early Catholic" orthodoxy that stood in this tradition.

In light of the extremely clear implicit theological and historical presuppositions of Bauer's image of history, it is not unimportant to recall the *theological profile* of the author.[80] Walter Bauer was born on August 8, 1877, in Königsberg and studied in Marburg, Berlin, and Strasbourg, above all with Adolf Harnack, Heinrich Julius Holtzmann,[81] Adolf Jülicher, and Theodor Nöldecke. He came into closer contact with Holtzmann, and Jülicher had

[76] Bauer 1964, 241 (cf. 1971, 239).
[77] Bauer 1964, 236 (cf. 1971, 234–35).
[78] Bauer 1964, 237 (cf. 1971, 235).
[79] Bauer 1964, 238 (cf. 1971, 236).
[80] Schneemelcher 1962; Fascher 1962; a bibliography is provided by Hunzinger 1952; 1961.
[81] Bauer 1932, 50 (= 1967a, 341) devoted a biographical sketch to Holzmann that also gives information about his own relationship to his teacher: "That I belonged to those who were permitted to draw closer to Holtzmann is an advantage whose magnitude stands as vividly before my eyes today as it did then."

a strong influence on him. He obtained his doctorate in Marburg with his *Mündige und Unmündige bei dem Apostel Paulus* (Mature and Immature in the Apostle Paul)[82] and completed his habilitation the following year in the same place on the basis of a work on the history of the New Testament canon in Syria.[83] After ten years as a Privatdozent (private lecturer), Bauer taught for four years as a nontenured professor in Breslau (1913–1916). He then spent the rest of his life in Göttingen, first as a nontenured professor for three years (1916–1919) and then as a full professor for New Testament theology at this university. Julius Wellhausen became a friend of the family; by contrast, he did not come into closer contact with Erik Peterson or Karl Barth. He also found no relationship to the theological impetus in his subject that is connected, for example, with the name of Rudolf Bultmann[84] but remained a liberal exegete of the New Testament and historian of early Christianity who was interested in rigorous philology and solid historical information. After many years of teaching in Göttingen, Bauer also died there on November 17, 1960.[85] It is already clear from his set of teachers and yet also from the contemporary reactions to his first publications that people categorized Bauer as a representative of the "liberals."[86] His student, the Göttingen New Testament scholar Georg Strecker, also expressed the matter in this way: it is clear that Bauer "knew himself to be theologically connected to the liberals."[87] This connectedness can already be clearly recognized when one views the habilitation thesis on the "Apostolos der Syrer" (Apostolos of the Syrians) in the context of the debate at that time over the development of the New Testament canon. Against Zahn above all, but also against Harnack's attempt to historically demonstrate a closing of the canon at the earliest possible date, Bauer, after an in-depth pass through the material, stated, "In the land and time to which our investigation refers, the formation of the canon is, as we have clearly seen, by no means closed."[88] Such an interest in the late dating of a norming of canonical foundations of "orthodox" teaching showed Bauer to be—especially in view of the relevant works of Zahn—a historical and theological partisan of the liberals.

[82] Bauer 1902 (= 1967a, 122–54).

[83] Bauer 1903.

[84] Admittedly, he always calls "Bultmann his friend with admiration and recognition" (Fascher 1967, 32).

[85] Zimmerli 1961; compare also Zimmerli/Jeremias 1961.

[86] Compare, for example, Wohlenberg 1913; Kittel 1921. In his account of the life of Holtzmann, Bauer 1932, 49 (= 1967a, 340), reports that he received news of the death of his teacher in 1910 at the "Fünften Weltkongreß für freies Christentum und religiösen Fortschritt" (Fifth World Congress for Free Christianity and Religious Progress).

[87] Strecker 1993; 1978b.

[88] Bauer 1903, 77; compare Schneemelcher 1962, 15.

An interest, evidently theologically motivated, in the plurality of ancient Christianity and in its apparently remote geographical regions characterizes the publications of his first years as a private lecturer as well. He remained critical of the characteristic hypotheses of the history-of-religion school.[89] In 1909, his great work on *Das Leben Jesu im Zeitalter der neutestamentlichen Apokryphen* (*The Life of Jesus in the Age of the New Testament Apocrypha*) appeared,[90] but his decided interest in the language of the New Testament was also already being developed, the fruit of which was then presented in 1928 in the first edition of the famous dictionary overseen by him.[91]

Even if Walter Bauer manifestly regarded the question of a theological reception of exegetical and historical findings as the task of systematic and practical theologians,[92] one will not be able to dispute the fact that his book on "orthodoxy and heresy" not only produces the historical demonstration for a relatively late emergence of orthodoxy but also simultaneously develops a thesis on the quasi-Protestant *liberality* of the initial conditions. To put it somewhat provocatively, Bauer reconstructed the form of ancient Christianity that corresponded to his liberal Protestant ideal for a proper organizational church form: an astonishing variety stood at the beginning of the church. The so-called apostolic tradition is a tendentious construction, and the unity of the church was not defined in relation to the unity of teaching—at least at the beginning[93]—but this picture also clearly resembled that vision of a free and simultaneously living churchliness that was propagated by liberal theologians at the beginning of the century. Formulating the matter again somewhat pointedly, the power-oriented politics of the Roman church was modeled by Bauer after the liberal (caricature) image of the politics of the Prussian high church council and the so-called positives, thus after the model of institutions that were undoubtedly interested in an effective repression of the liberal influence. Such a liberal Protestant priming of the images of the beginnings of Christianity, which are indeed always set forth with a normative interest for the present, occasionally becomes very explicitly clear today, too.[94]

[89] Thus Fascher 1962, 26–27, on his views on the relation of the Gospel of John to Gnosis and 29–30 on the reception of editions of Mandaean texts by his Göttingen colleague Marc Lidzbarski.

[90] Bauer 1967c.

[91] Bauer 1967b; 1927 (= 1967a, 91–108); 1928.

[92] Thus, for example, Fascher 1962, 31–32, with regard to his John commentary.

[93] This summary follows Schneemelcher 1962, 19–20.

[94] Theissen 1994, 71–72: It moved "already in primitive Christianity in a very Protestant direction. Where two or three were together they formed a deviating minority" (cited also in A. M. Ritter 2004, 49).

This observation on the striking affinities between the historical reconstruction of Bauer and his theological mentality says nothing, of course, about the historical adequacy of his findings, but it has become characteristic of a very influential image of the beginnings of Christianity far beyond Bauer and therefore deserves to be identified if only for this reason. To rephrase the matter once again, the apparently revolutionarily deconstructionist thesis of Walter Bauer not only presupposes[95] the radical criticism of history of the Tübingen school of Ferdinand Christian Baur, the calling into question of the Tübingen dialectic of history by Albrecht Ritschl, and the radical deconstruction of the traditional history of development by Adolf von Harnack[96] but also owes more to the fundamental agendas of the liberal theology of the nineteenth century than was perhaps clear to Bauer himself. Surprisingly, only a few reviewers of the monograph observed these quite clear contexts of the image that Walter Bauer had set forth for early Christianity. Hans Lietzmann, for example, placed Bauer's image of history in a line with "my old teacher Hermann Usener's thesis that 'a broad area of common property lay between the rock of the teaching of Christ and the purely pagan lands.'"[97] But with this, Bauer is merely coopted for the classic fundamental assumptions of the history-of-religion school; a deconstruction of the liberal Protestant roots of his deconstruction of ancient images of the history of ancient Christianity does not take place—perhaps because Lietzmann came from a similar theological background.

4.2 The Discussion of Bauer's Model

The discussion of the picture of the development of ancient Christianity presented by Bauer, which was delayed for understandable reasons in Germany[98] and for the most part first flared up in America after the publication

[95] T. A. Robinson 1988, 15–26, pointed this out in his first extensive chapter on the history of research. Admittedly, one could work further here: already Johann Salomo Semler disputed that a unity stood at the beginning of the history of Christianity.

[96] As is well known, Harnack presented the "arch-heretic" Marcion with great, theologically motivated sympathy and in this way already radically deconstructed a traditional heresiological image; compare now Nowak 2001, esp. 228–37, and Kinzig 2002.

[97] Letter from Lietzmann to Bauer from April, 17, 1934, quoted from Strecker in Bauer 1964, 290 n. 1 (cf. Strecker/Kraft in Bauer 1971, 288 n. 2). The quotation within the quotation comes from Usener 1911, XI (there, of course, with characteristic use of lowercase letters).

[98] The thesis of the author fit, of course, badly into a theological landscape in which the confessing church wanted to demonstrate the continuity of their confession to the one confession of the primitive church; it was scarcely by chance that a broader reception in the German language sphere began at a time when the view of the "church struggle," as those involved presented it, also was increasingly shaken: Mehlhausen 1994, 44–45.

of an English translation,[99] has already often been traced; relevant overviews first appeared after the death of Bauer in 1960. But one should not think that the monograph was completely overlooked by German New Testament scholars and church historians following its appearance. The contrary is already demonstrated by the impressive number of reviews (thirty-five in all) that Strecker listed in the bibliography of the new edition of 1964.[100] Less important are the reviews discussed in the 1971 American edition, for which Robert A. Kraft, Gerhard Krodel, and the "Philadelphia Seminar on Christian Origins" were responsible, and in a second English publication from 1972; these are largely concerned with simple announcements of a book that is presented as "significant" or "revolutionary."[101]

In our context, the concern obviously cannot be with exhaustively tracing the reception of the monograph (and its English versions); what is indispensable is merely an overview of some of the positions taken on Bauer's picture of history and of the most important objections, which are focused on our guiding concepts—namely, identity and plurality.

First, one must be clear that this picture of history shapes most presentations of ancient Christianity down to the present, admittedly with somewhat divergent terminology: Bauer spoke of the "Vielfalt" (variety) of New Testament Christianity. Using almost the same terminology, his later Göttingen New Testament colleague Ernst Käsemann also related this picture of history in a pointed manner to the biblical canon and strengthened, at least for Protestants, the implicitly normative dimension of Bauer's reconstruction: "The N(ew) T(estament) canon as such does not ground the unity of the church. On the contrary, it grounds as such, i.e. in what is presently accessible to the historian, the multitude of the confessions."[102] Alfred Schindler spoke, by contrast, of a tacit pluralism that

[99] Bauer 1971 (for an active link to the Robert A. Kraft's updated English edition, see Wayne Coppins' blog *German for Neutestamentler*). But compare H. E. W. Turner 1954 (presentation and criticism by Strecker in Bauer 1964, 293–300; Strecker/Kraft in Bauer 1971, 297–302).

[100] Strecker in Bauer 1964, 288 n. 1. If one also draws on the information of Kraft in Bauer 1971, 287, then the following list emerges: Anonymous [= N. von Arseniew (?)] 1935; P. B. 1935; Bergdolt 1936; Bruders 1935; Dibelius 1935; Eysinga 1935; Goguel 1935; Heussi 1935; H. Koch 1934; Lebreton 1935; Leipoldt 1936; Lietzmann 1934; Loewenich 1935; Lohmeyer 1935; Martin 1935; Moehlman 1935; Moffatt 1933/1934; M. Schmidt 1935; Schuster 1937; Simonin 1936; Strathmann 1934; Völker 1935; Windisch 1935; Zwann 1937, 255; Anonymous 1936; Anonymous 1937. To this can be added the self-report of Bauer 1934b (= 1967a, 229–33).

[101] Bibliography in Harrington 1980, 290–91; compare also Desjardins 1991.

[102] Käsemann 1970a, 131 (= 1964, 221; 1982, 103). In the wake of Käsemann, Betz 1965, 303–5, has drawn attention to the fact that one must extend Bauer's model also to the New Testament and brought together materials from Bauer's oeuvre for this purpose.

led through scriptural proof to an open pluralism.[103] Adolf Martin Ritter pointedly expanded the insights of Käsemann in loose connection to Ernst Troelsch to different "ecclesiological *basic types*" that are already initiated or developed in the New Testament.[104] And Gerd Theissen described primitive Christianity against the background of semiotic insights as a new religious sign system whose sign language, "in spite of all dialectic in it . . . enables unity."[105]

Naturally, there were also critical voices from the beginning. For our contexts, it is less interesting that the first reviewers had already drawn attention to geographical regions and parts of ancient Christianity that were not treated in Bauer's book: fault was found above all with the fact that Bauer had not presented early Jewish Christianity and the beginnings of Christianity in Africa (e.g., Hans Koch[106]). The Heidelberg New Testament scholar Martin Dibelius asked in his review why Rome is portrayed as the engine of the development and not Asia Minor, where all the identity-forming elements of the Christianity of the imperial period were developed.[107] Even the Göttingen New Testament scholar Georg Strecker begins his epilogue to the 1964 new edition of Bauer's book with a long section, "On the Problem of Jewish Christianity," and expresses his amazement at the beginning of the passage that the process of testing traditional heresiological clichés intended in the monograph was not carried out "in extenso" in relation to ancient information about Jewish Christianity.[108] For the new edition, Strecker decided to add this aspect himself. His supplementation begins with a section on the history of scholarship; it is said that Jewish Christianity is neither to be identified with Ebionism nor to be disregarded as a marginal entity.[109] This is followed by a portrayal that is concentrated

[103] Schlindler 1993b, 321.

[104] A. M. Ritter 2004. In the first note on p. 43, Ritter provides references to his other works on the topic.

[105] For the first time in Theissen 1994, 70–86, quotation on p. 71.

[106] H. Koch 1934, 345.

[107] Dibelius 1935, 448; compare also my discussion in section 4.1 with n. 43.

[108] Strecker in Bauer 1964, 245 (cf. Strecker in Bauer 1971, 241): "This is above all noteworthy because here it would have been possible to refute most clearly the generalization of the ecclesiastically approved view of history: according to the New Testament witness, Jewish Christianity stands at the beginning of the development of the history of the church, so that not the Gentile Christian 'ecclesiastical teaching' but rather a Jewish Christian theology represents what is primary" (Strecker references p. 238 of Bauer's monograph).

[109] Strecker in Bauer 1964, 245–46 (cf. Strecker in Bauer 1971, 241–42). It is surprising that Strecker does not mention a small monograph of Adolf Hilgenfeld, which pursues exactly these two directions: Hilgenfeld 1966, 12–20 (criticism of Harnack), 118–22 (concluding section).

on the “nomistic Jewish Christianity that has its home in Greek speaking Syria” and that especially discusses—with recourse to other works of Strecker—the indirect witness of the Syrian *Didascalia*, the Jewish Christian ΚΠ (= κηρύγματα Πέτρου) source of the *Pseudo-Clementines*, and finally the majority church witnesses about the Ebionites.[110] Admittedly, a criticism of absent regions and parts of ancient Christianity in Bauer’s monograph can easily fall into anachronism: after the discovery of important ancient Christian texts or their remains in the twentieth century—such as, for example, through the new discoveries from the Dakhleh Oasis, Dura-Europos, Medinet Madi, Nag Hammadi, and Tura—the picture he set forth must be supplemented at many points in any case, and for this reason alone, his monograph must essentially be rewritten.

More interesting for our connections is the fundamental criticism of Bauer’s methodological approach to the material, which was advanced from the beginning: in 1936, the Leipzig New Testament scholar Johannes Leipoldt already regarded the boundaries between what Bauer already reconstructed for the second century as fixed entities of different theological systems, later so-called orthodoxy and heresy, as much more fluid than the author himself did.[111] In 1934 James Moffatt of Union Seminary in New York also called attention to the still very traditional perception, despite all the critical approach, of the second century in Bauer when he wrote:

> Gnostics such as Valentinus were more Christian than their later critics allowed, or than even Dr. Bauer believes. . . . A historian must be sensitive to what we may call the sense of the Centre in early Christianity. I should prefer that term to “orthodoxy.”[112]

As the lawyer Arnold A. T. Ehrhardt, who emigrated to England in 1935, already observed, a linguistic sign of this traditionalism of Bauer is Bauer’s constant talk of “ecclesiastical” teaching or theology.[113] Thus in his in-depth introduction to the English translation of the monograph, Robert A. Kraft also asked whether it is really sensible to apply the concept of an “orthodoxy” that was a given for the fourth and fifth centuries to the second and third centuries or whether this is not always a sign of a view of the beginnings of Christianity that implies certain theological valuations—of whatever sort they might be:

[110] Strecker in Bauer 1964, 248 (cf. Strecker in Bauer 1971, 244); compare Strecker 1981.

[111] Leipoldt 1936, 92–93. In the review of Völker 1935, which Strecker characterizes only extremely briefly as “critical distortion” in his review of research (Strecker in Bauer 1964, 291 n. 1; cf. Strecker/Kraft in Bauer 1971, 291), Bauer is placed in a tradition that goes back to G. Arnold and presented as an extreme pendulum swing in this direction.

[112] Moffatt 1933/1934, 375.

[113] Ehrhardt 1962, 93 n. 2 (= 1964, 172 n. 1).

> Is it possible to trace lines of direct and significant continuity back from this traditional "orthodoxy" (which came to wield political as well as social and theological weapons) toward the earliest period of Christianity, and to apply the title "orthodoxy" to them without confusing the issue? Is such a procedure desirable, and if so, why? Is such a procedure helpful? What happens when we find a person who is clearly a predecessor of "orthodoxy" in one sense but not in another? How do we handle a Tertullian, with his Montanist sympathies, or an Origen, condemned by some representatives of later "orthodoxy"?[114]

But above all, the new German edition of the book and the English translation provoked critical objections in scholarship. In his review of the new edition overseen by Strecker, Hans-Dietrich Altendorf calls "the 'orthodoxy' that repeatedly crops up as a *dea ex machine* that the author . . . thinks he sets in a certain delicate light . . . at least in part a bogeyman that never existed."[115] In a detailed article on the topic, he accused Bauer of a "constructive fantasy that is played out with the *argumentum ex silentio*" and described the thesis that with powerful energy Rome disseminated an "orthodoxy" through the whole of ancient Christianity as an "unchecked construction." By contrast, he regards Bauer's view that the Christian faith appeared in "in varied colors" and was "anything but homogenous" as a "valuable contribution."[116] But one must, he says, recognize that figures that were later excluded as heretics (such as the Montanists or Marcion) came forth as *reformers* within the church and (like the Valentinians) believed that they understood Christianity more deeply, whereas the majority church perceived their theology to be an invasion of alien ideas.[117] This dialectic shows that it makes little sense to turn the old schema on its head; Bauer is said to remain "ultimately still in the grip of ancient church history and heretic history." Instead, Altendorf says that one must understand decisive terms such as "orthodoxy" and "heresy" as "historical terms and not as designations of structure or nature."[118]

Soon not only were more or less sharp objections advanced against Bauer's picture of history, but explicit *countermodels* were also submitted. A few of these contributions are concentrated on individual points, whereas others make a more fundamental start. Thus, for example, a 1973 lecture by Hans Freiherr von Campenhausen on "Einheit und Einigkeit in der Alten Kirchen" (Unity and Agreement in the Ancient Church) can

[114] Kraft in Bauer 1971, 312.
[115] Altendorf 1966, 193.
[116] Altendorf 1969, 64.
[117] Altendorf 1969, 68–70.
[118] Altendorf 1969, 73 (a quotation from F. W. Deichmann).

be read as a comprehensive counterconception to Bauer's picture of history, because Bauer's analysis with its focus on the institutions and their power is replaced (in a manner characteristic of Campenhausen) by the power of an *idea*: not the establishment of agreement at the cost of factual plurality by the institution of the Roman community but the *unity that is always already given* is said to be the leading motive for the preservation and development of the unity of the ancient church. According to Campenhausen, the "original, spiritual idea of unity" consists in the fact that Christians understood themselves to be "a singular people that belonged to Jesus" and had its unity "only in the name of Jesus":[119] ὅπου ἂν ᾖ Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς, ἐκεῖ ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία (Ignatius, *To the Smyrnaeans* 8.2), "He (Jesus Christ) forms the substance of the church and the true ground of its catholicity."[120]

As clearly as this alternative model of the development of ancient Christianity is shaped by specific historiographic presuppositions (namely, the basic assumptions of a classical history of ideas about the historical effectiveness and relevance for actions of certain leading ideas) and certain theological implications (a mild Baltic Lutheranism),[121] so comparably fundamental arguments for the unity of ancient Christianity prior to all plurality were also formulated from completely different backgrounds. The well-known monograph of the English papyrologist Colin H. Roberts, *Manuscript, Society, and Belief in Early Christian Egypt*,[122] which has already been mentioned often in this investigation, attempts to demonstrate on the basis of the papyri found in Egypt that formulations of Gnostic systems neither stood historically at the beginning of Egyptian Christianity nor dominated the church there at any time. Just like Campenhausen's theological argumentation for the prior unity of the ancient church, such an attempt to document the original unity of ancient Christianity prior to its pluralization with the tools of

[119] Campenhausen 1979, 3 and 19. A detailed presentation of the theses of Campenhausen can also be found in A. M. Ritter 2004, 51–52.

[120] Campenhausen 1979, 4.

[121] Compare the lectures that were delivered on the occasion of the hundredth birthday of Freiherr von Campenhausen (December 3, 2003) at a ceremony of the theological faculty of the Ruprecht-Karls-Universität and the Heidelberg Akademie der Wissenschaften on December 10, 2003, in Heidelberg (published in Markschies/Dihle/Löhr 2008). An Anglican counterpart is H. E. W. Turner 1954. Turner criticized Bauer for "his persistent tendency to over-simplify problems, combined with the ruthless treatment of such evidence as fails to support his case" (p. 79). Turner's central argument is theological in nature: Bauer "fails to attain an adequate view of the nature of orthodoxy. . . . It [sc. Orthodoxy, C. M.] may appear in different forms at different periods without loss of continuity of life and unity of theme. For orthodoxy resembles not so much a stream as a sea, not a single melodic theme but a rich and varied harmony, not a closed system but a rich manifold of thought and life" (p. 80).

[122] C. H. Roberts 1979.

papyrology can be understood only against the background of the debate ignited by Bauer. The corresponding discussion is especially continued for Egyptian Christianity, as is shown, for example, by an article of the Dutch Patristics scholar Roelof van den Broek on "non-Gnostic Christianity in Alexandria."[123] Here there are, of course, also time and again decided arguments for regarding with Bauer the model of tracing back diversity "to a unified and authoritative origin" as an "unhistorical perspective."[124] Finally, there has recently been an attempt to argue again fundamentally for a prior unity of ancient Christianity on the basis of system theory. In the framework of "systematic differentiation," Christianity is said to have excluded certain theories as "heresies" and thus to have solidified or differentiated out its own code (the transcendence-immanence distinction): in his 2001 Augsburg Catholic habilitation dissertation, Johann Ev. Hafner attempted to reformulate the question of the self-definition of Christianity in the second century with the help of the system and religion theory of Niklas Luhmann.[125] In doing so, the author does not shy away from continuing to typify movements traditionally categorized as "heresies" in this way: for example, in Luhmann's book, the theology of ancient Gnosis is clearly distinguished as "false speech about God" from an appropriate speech about God in (majority) Christianity.[126] A "weakening of the religious code" through Gnosis was avoided, according to Hafner, because in their confrontation with Gnosis, the anti-Gnostic fathers simultaneously became aware of their own position as viewed from an outside perspective and cared for their code through the development of canon, rule of faith, and office.[127]

A number of *counterconceptions* concern only specific characteristics of Bauer's picture of history. His portrait of the development and role of the Roman community has especially provoked countermodels because—as we have already seen—it borders on caricature at points and is all too clearly shaped by the "anti-Roman fervor" of liberal German Protestantism. In his 1959 inaugural lecture as Regius Professor in Oxford titled "The Circle and the Ellipse," Henry Chadwick opposed Bauer's model of a Roman centralization with the model of an ellipse with the two focal points of

[123] Broek 1979.

[124] Thus in the concluding theses of Vouga 1994. Vouga reconstructs the history of Christianity according to the model of deterministic chaos (p. 16), admittedly without justifying this in greater detail.

[125] Hafner 2003, 1–17. In this work, one finds also a concise biography of Luhmann (pp. 69–70, unfortunately with loss of text) and a short description of his system and theory of religion (pp. 70–138).

[126] Hafner 2003, 43.

[127] Hafner 2003, 49. Compare p. 173: "Via codes systems encrypt all information for internal use."

Rome and Jerusalem and emphasized the inherent factors of the development.[128] A fundamental revision of the confessionally dominated pictures of the urban Roman Christianity in the second century admittedly first took place with the 1983 Bern theological dissertation of the Heidelberg New Testament scholar Peter Lampe.[129] In place of a unified desire for empire-wide theological and church political dominance, Lampe reconstructed a loose association of house communities that each designated themselves as ἐκκλησία. They have supposedly been "fractionated" in the sense that the synagogue community was also fractionated.[130] The fractionation in the house communities is said to have favored theological pluralism; indeed, there was allegedly "breathtaking theological variety." But the fractionation of house communities is also said to have favored tolerant behavior in relation to those who thought otherwise—that is, the *Gewährenlassen* (letting be or laissez faire). As documentation for this stance, the author refers, for example, to the Valentinians and their theory about graded levels of Christian natures: according to the theoretical concept of their teaching on classes of human beings, the Valentinians viewed themselves and the majority Christians as positioned, so to speak, in concentric circles around a single core and from this perspective allowed the majority Christians to be regarded as a reduced level of actual Christian nature.[131] The fractionation helped foster the ability of the presbyterial constitution to maintain itself for such a long time against all tendencies toward an elevated office of bishop, which first took form in Rome as monepiscopate in the second half of the second century. Lampe interprets the development of an urban Roman "orthodoxy" as a victory of the uneducated masses. The "heresy" is said to have been better educated and to have occupied a higher social status but to have found itself in the minority.[132] Even if it is possible to raise objections against the use of sources and the theoretical modeling of this monograph,[133] the basic characteristics of the picture of the Roman community in the second century remain valid.

The French classical philologist Alain le Boulluec's intellectual history of the conception of "heresiology" among the Christian authors of the second and third centuries also represents a decisive advance in relation to Bauer. Le Boulluec continues Bauer's approach insofar as he starts from an equal originality of "orthodoxy" and "heresy," but he very carefully traces the gradual emergence and development of ancient Christian

[128] Chadwick 1959.
[129] P. Lampe 1989 (= 2003).
[130] P. Lampe 1989, 320 (cf. 2003, 381).
[131] But compare the important clarifications of B. Aland 1977.
[132] P. Lampe 1989, 323 (cf. 2003, 383–84).
[133] Schöllgen 1989; Scholten 1988b.

heresiologies within this framework.[134] The author has supplemented his book with an article in which he points again to the late appearance of the Greek term ὀρθοδοξία in Christian authors starting in the middle of the third century and presents the development of a heresiology in the second century as a consequence of Christian theology being Platonized and conformed to contemporary scholarly standards.[135] Le Boulluec's monograph synthesizes a series of older contributions that dealt, for example, with the Greek term αἵρεσις and the development of a negative double meaning of "false teaching" and "splitting off" in the course of the second century. Important contributions came from Norbert Brox and Martin Elze.[136] Elze showed that we first find exclusions of "heretics" in the new, special sense of the word in the second century because the concern was previously much more with the unity of the body of Christ. According to Elze, the fact that the theological reflection of the majority church switched from the apocalyptic framework of Christian "theology" to a frame of reference that was oriented more strongly to Greek scholarship and philosophy is responsible for the changed situation. Admittedly, not only in the first century was a "doctrinal unity" out of consideration; rather, there was (e.g., in Rome) a theological pluralism until well into the second century.[137] The fight against Gnosis first suggested conceptions of a "unity of teaching," as advocated, for example, by Irenaeus. In the wake of the adoption of the Greek Logos concept into Christian theology, the notion of a unity of the church in the sense of a unity of its teaching is said to have been formed and then, for example, developed theologically by Irenaeus in his concept of the οἰκονομία.[138] Finally, in recent years, this more intellectual-historical or history-of-ideas approach to ancient Christian heresiology, prefigured in Elze and Brox and developed in Le Boulluec, has been supplemented once again by social-scientific investigations, which have shown that the exclusion of false teaching simultaneously functioned as a social label of certain groups inside or outside the new religion.[139]

[134] Le Boulluec 1985. On the research program of the author, compare above all vol. I, pp. 7–19.

[135] Le Boulluec 2000, 303–5.

[136] Elze 1974, 405–6; compare also Brox 1986. In Ignatius, the term αἵρεσις means above all "schism" (*To the Ephesians* 6.2; *To the Trallians* 6.1), whereas deviant teaching is called ἑτεροδοξία (To *the Magnesians* 8.1) or πλάνη (*To the Ephesians* 10.2).

[137] Elze 1974, 395–97.

[138] Elze 1974, 398–401, 408–9.

[139] Wilson 2002, 442; Desjardins 1991. Miroslav Volf finds it meaningful to pay attention to the tension-rich juxtaposition of difference and acculturation already in the New Testament (Volf 1995, 364). He differentiations between "soft" and "hard" difference (Volf 1995, 366).

Some years ago, in a detailed monograph titled *The Bauer Thesis Examined,* Thomas A. Robinson summarized the questions that have been raised in scholarly discussion against the "Bauer Thesis" in four points:[140]

1. "Had Bauer really shown an adequate sensitivity for the way groups define themselves?"[141]
2. "Had he given adequate attention to self-definition as *process*?"
3. "Had he stressed diversity too much, without considering the ways in which even diverse groups can share a common and friendly world?"
4. "And had he proven that heretical movements were both strong and early—two points essential to his thesis?"

Bauer's thesis on the original relationship between "orthodoxy" and "heresy" is directly connected—at least according to Robinson—with the fact that in all four points Bauer had too little sensitivity for historical developments and the meager source tradition.[142] The significance of Robinson's four questions lies not in the fact that the American scholar can find much more sympathy for the development, described rather negatively by Bauer, toward clear boundaries of an ecclesiastical and theological orthodoxy: according to his view, the "developing catholic church"[143] was virtually forced to deny apostolic roots to other "groups" in the competition between various interpretations of Christianity.[144] Finally, it is also not decisive that Robinson takes a clearly distanced stance toward the passion for objectivity of classic historical research that still stamps Bauer's monograph very clearly.[145] Rather, what is important about Robinson's monograph is the fact that

[140] T. A. Robinson 1988, ix (cf. p. 28 and passim). The sequence of the questions has been reordered. For discussion, see now Lüdemann 2000, 130–33. Lüdemann criticizes Robinson for not dealing with "possible further developments of the approach of Walter Bauer" and "remaining content with a simply negative reaction to Bauer's work" (p. 133).

[141] Here a concept (self-definition) is taken up that a research project of the McMaster University made popular, though without explicating it in detail; compare Markus 1980.

[142] In these methodological questions, it appears problematic that it is not sufficiently clear what actually "adequate sensitivity" and "adequate attention" really mean.

[143] Thus T. A. Robinson 1988, 3.

[144] Here an examination of the terminology already shows basic tendencies of the entire monograph: as a counterpart to the "catholic community," Robinson sees different, not more precisely defined "interpretations" or "claims," which then are or become heretical. Thus he stands closer than Bauer to the traditional view, at least terminologically. What is "catholic" stands firm already before any confrontation—namely, the "community," which develops into the "catholic church."

[145] In a note, Robinson designates this viewpoint of historians as tendentious: its motivations are said to range, in truth, from sympathy for the voices deviating from the church to downright indifference in relation to the question of truth: "a disinterested (and sometimes lazy) tolerance, unwilling to raise the question of truth" (T. A. Robinson 1988, 4).

he can show that Eusebius' late ancient view of the emergence of heresies in the second century, which is criticized time and again by Bauer, can be found already in sources of the second and third centuries and thus does not represent a product of the ideological safeguarding of the Constantinian imperial church. As examples, Robinson names the book of Acts, Ignatius,[146] Irenaeus, and Origen. The Gnostics also appealed to apostolic traditions. For Robinson, however, their claim became increasingly less credible because they found themselves in a minority position.[147] But Robinson regards Bauer's thesis as problematic above all because the author could not really convincingly show that the "heresies"[148] were really numerically strong (and thus dangerous for the church) or that they emerged at an early date (and thus were equally valid in comparison with the church).

If one lets the critical discussion that followed the publication of Walter Bauer's monograph subsequent to 1934 or 1964 pass in review, then in addition to the objections already formulated by Thomas A. Robinson, the following additional questions for Bauer arise and from them tasks for a more comprehensive analysis of the problem also emerge at the same time:

1. In Bauer's presentation, whole regions such as Palestine and thus important characteristics of the history of ancient Christianity are lacking. His investigations must therefore be expanded in terms of the geography of the religion.[149]

[146] Strangely reference is not made to such important passages as Ignatius, *To the Ephesians* 11.2; Ignatius, *To the Trallians* 6.2; and Ignatius, *To the Philadelphians* 2.1, where the key words ἕνωσις and μερισμός explicitly occur.

[147] "[The Gnostic] claims came to appear less and less credible as catholic Christianity increasingly forced uniformity of belief through the weight of church councils and the political force of a Christian empire equally dedicated to the concept of uniformity" (T. A. Robinson 1988, 9–10). Naturally, one can critically ask the author whether he has not overlooked the fact that most of the Gnostics understood themselves as the intellectual elite of Christianity and to this extent always already wanted to be a minority. Thus their increasing marginalization would not necessarily have represented a special theological challenge at all.

[148] Robinson sees no alternatives to terms such as "orthodoxy" and "heresy." He defines these terms by their relation to the entity "catholic community" or "catholic church," which is assumed to be clear. What the developing church takes up should be called "orthodox"; what it rejects should be called "heretical." Thus a methodologically neutral use of the two terms should be made possible, which initially sets aside the "theological question" that must be asked later—namely, whether the orthodoxy establishing itself hands down the teaching of Jesus more faithfully than other viewpoints that were lost.

[149] In recent years, I have attempted to contribute to closing such gaps by investigating (together with Henrik Hildebrandt) a number of regions that had previously received less attention—namely, the provinces of *Dalmatia*, *Pannonia*, *Palaestina*, and *Arabia*. For the results of this work, which will not be summarized separately here, see Markschies/Hildebrandt 2007.

2. Bauer's presentation is overly theory-laden; it is too strongly concentrated on the intellectual history and history of ideas. It lacks, for example, a presentation of the development of ethics in ancient Christianity. The emergence of an "orthodoxy" may not, however, be treated in detachment from the question of the formation of an "orthopraxy."

Finally, the most recent discussion of the picture of history that Bauer set forth more than seventy years ago has focused time and again on the question that Rowan Williams formulated some years ago as follows: "Does it make sense to speak of a pre-Nicene orthodoxy?"[150] Williams pointed (with Schneemelcher) to the fact that with his praise of the Pauline pluralism, Bauer definitely continued to advocate a modified theory of decline of a classic Protestant character and thereby presupposed an "essence" of religion, a supernatural, superworldly, ahistorical core of Christianity, although (with Jonathan Z. Smith) such "essentialism" must be identified as deeply problematic from a history-of-religion perspective.[151] According to Williams, this led to the fact that Bauer did not even notice that the theological debates of the late first and second centuries were not carried out over orthodoxy and heresy but over very specific theological problems such as the meaning of holy places or of religious norms for the entrance into the new religion and life in it.[152] Also, the possibility of addressing and solving dissonances in the communicative network represented by the various letter exchanges of leading theologians and bishops is said to have been underestimated.[153] If one were to accurately analyze such developments, then on the one hand, Williams says that one must affirm Bauer: it would be impossible to identify a "mainstream" Christian theology and churchliness that existed and was maintained from the beginning. On the other hand, Williams says that Chadwick must be affirmed also: the basal communication about the life and activity of Jesus in the differently stamped communities is said to have laid the foundation stone for the development of a "normative Christianity" that is said to have been developed in the orthodoxy of the great imperial councils of late antiquity.[154]

What remains of Bauer's monograph and the picture of history developed by its author in the face of such fundamental objections? First, the insight, which one can no longer go back on, that the notion of an original unity of ancient Christian theology and an identity of ancient Christianity

[150] R. Williams 2002, 1–3.
[151] R. Williams 2002, 4–5.
[152] R. Williams 2002, 9.
[153] R. Williams 2002, 13.
[154] R. Williams 2002, 18.

that always remained the same represents an ancient construction of reality (even if an extremely influential one). However, it has also become clear through our analysis of Bauer that such a construction, once it is first deconstructed, cannot be suddenly replaced by the "naked truth" or "pure reality" of irrevocable plurality. Rather, in his reconstruction of history, Bauer actually only replaced one theological frame of reference (orthodox ecclesiastical theology) with another (the frame of reference of liberal theology).[155] Here too the positivistic illusion that beyond the ideologically colored models of historical developments one can set forth an absolute model that is free from ideology and a priori conforms to reality is falsified in the carrying out of the model formation. The attempt to make room for a "purely historical" model through the deconstruction of classical, theologically profiled models fails because it must fail.

But how then can the development of early Christianity and its theology, its evident differences, and its possibly existing unity be apprehended conceptually? Through Bauer's monograph and the ensuing discussion, it has become clear that the categories of "orthodoxy" and "heresy" are usable only to a limited extent for such conceptual work. They must be replaced by guiding concepts that make it possible to focus more clearly on the *constructive* portion of such categories and the models created with them. We will discuss first the model of "inculturation" or "acculturation" of Christianity (section 4.3) and then the pair of terms "identity" and "plurality" (section 4.4); as we have seen, both are already implicitly present in Bauer's presentation.[156]

4.3 The Jesuit Model of the "Inculturation" of Christianity

In recent years, the development of Christian theology in the imperial period has also been dealt with time and again under the key word "inculturation" (or "acculturation") of Christianity. It appears possible to avoid the problems of the traditional heresiological terminology in this way because these processes have positive connotations in present-day culture. Unlike the discourse about "orthodoxy" and "heresy," one cannot

[155] Recently, Lyman 2003 has argued for completely forgoing the categories "orthodoxy" and "heresy." In their place, she sets cultural studies terminology that leaves behind the notion of an "assimilation" of a Christian basic narrative, which is fixed for all time, to a Hellenistic culture. As an example, she presents a careful analysis of the placement of Justin in the contemporary culture.

[156] Bauer places the plurality of the beginning extremely clearly into the light. Even if he says nothing about the most primitive identity of ancient Christianity, it nevertheless becomes clear that according to his picture of history, the Roman community pushed through an "identity surrogate" with brutal force.

identify for this terminology a single author such as Walter Bauer as an initiator with reference to whom the following scholarly discussion has been developed. Rather, with this terminology, a series of nontheological and theological concepts are simultaneously present (usually implicitly) that one can describe most precisely if one focuses on the terminological history of the words “acculturation” and “inculturation.” While both terms are often used synonymously, they come from very different history-of-ideas contexts.

The term “acculturation” is probably much older than its closely related counterpart “inculturation.” As the Freiburg ancient historian Ulrich Gotter showed some years ago, American ethnologists first spoke of “acculturation” at the end of the nineteenth century.[157] The encounter or the “culture contact” of an indigenous entity with the European-American civilization was regarded as the classic situation of acculturation, such as the culture contact between Native Americans and Europeans initiated by Columbus and his crew. There are many paradigmatic texts for the first contact between such previously separated civilizations. Thus the Venetian Alvise Cadamosto (1432–1488), who in 1454 sailed to West Africa in Portuguese service, describes how the natives came together “as though I were a marvel. It appeared to be a new experience for them to see a Christian person. They marveled no less at my clothing than at my white skin.”[158] But alongside such contacts between separated civilizations, the term “acculturation” also designates the long-term consequences of such contacts, which are often classified in specific types of the two-way reception (e.g., acceptance, adaption, or rejection[159]). “Acculturation” thus means both the “first-hand contact” and the “subsequent changes” of the two civilizations that come into contact and were previously completely separate.[160] It is difficult to dispute that the model of two completely separate civilizations precisely describes at least some epochs of the history of Christian mission. In addition to the reports of the first contacts between Native Americans and European explorers, one could call to mind, for example, the narrative in Acts about Paul and Barnabas’ visit to Lystra

[157] Gotter 2000. Gotter refers to Herskovits 1938, 2–12.

[158] Compare Bitterli 1991, 81–82 with n. 2; the reports of Cadamosto were first published in Fracan (Fracanzano) da Montalboddo’s work *Paesi novamente retrovati* (The newly discovered lands; see Montalboddo 1507).

[159] Gotter 2000, 385. Gotter discusses in detail the problem of typification as such and the various typifications. Bitterli 1991, 80, also has submitted such a typification: *Kulturberührung, Kulturkontakt, Kulturzusammenstoß und Kulturverflectung* (culture encounter, culture contact, culture collision, and culture interweaving).

[160] Gotter 2000, 385; W. Rudolph 1964 provides a critical perspective.

in Asia Minor (Acts 14.8-18).[161] But for many other epochs and situations, the notion of two hermetically sealed units that suddenly meet is thoroughly unsuitable and leads to problematic conceptions. This naturally applies also and precisely to antiquity: as Martin Hengel in particular repeatedly emphasized, the Judaism of Palestine at the time of Jesus was strongly stamped by Hellenistic civilization, and even the circles that critically opposed this civilization—such as the Qumran community—used its amenities, as can be seen, for example, in the water system of the settlement of Khirbet Qumran.[162] For understanding the encounter between Christianity and antiquity, the concept of acculturation is especially unhelpful[163] because it encourages the notion of two separate entities—namely, "Christianity" and "antiquity."[164] But such a separation of entities is helpful neither for one's understanding of Christian free teachers and Origen's private university nor for the interpretation of the Montanist prophecy and the Christian Eucharistic worship service.

By contrast, the term "inculturation" is much more recent and comes from theological contexts—more specifically from Jesuits of the Catholic faculty of the Belgian University of Leuven. If I understand correctly, the current consensus is that the word was first used in 1953 by the Leuven Catholic systematic theologian Pierre Charles SJ (1883–1954),[165] first became a key term in its French form at the twenty-ninth "missiological week" on the topic "mission and non-Christian cultures," and finally became widespread as an English expression after two 1975 events—namely, the thirty-second general meeting of the Jesuits and the *Internationale Wissenschaftliche Missiologie-Kongress* (International Scholarly Missiology Convention). The Jesuits used the term in 1975 because the term "acculturation" did not seem suitable to them for describing the encounter of "*the* gospel" with cultures: after all, "the gospel or the Christian message" does not, it is claimed, present itself "as a culture."[166] In order to describe the entrance of a pure gospel that is separated from culture into certain cultural circles, one drew upon the English term "enculturation," which likewise comes from American ethnology and describes the entrance of an individual into his culture—for example, the general attainment of the ability to express oneself in a culture linguistically, as one can observe

[161] On the Lycaonian local color, compare, for example, Lane Fox 1986, 99–100 and 698.
[162] Hengel 1996b, 260–62.
[163] Similarly for the later period also Osterhammel 1995, 260–62.
[164] Fontaine 1982 and Betz 1998, 542, are correspondingly emphatic.
[165] Collet 1999.
[166] Roest Crollius 1997, 17–18.

with children.[167] In other words, "enculturation" describes the processes by which existing cultural traditional material is internalized through education and socialization.[168] The Jesuits translated this term into Latin (*inculturatio*) and then back into the various European languages. Here the allusion to the term "incarnation," which is certainly not coincidental even in 1975, resonates up to the present in the expression "inculturation of the gospel," notably among both Catholic and Protestant theologians: Pope John Paul II, who died in 2005, pointed out that the term "inculturation" was suitable because it expressed "very clearly individual elements of the great mystery of incarnation."[169] And Volker Küster states in the newest edition of the encyclopedia *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (*Religion Past and Present*) that the incarnation legitimates the inculturation.[170]

Thus one can say in summary that like the term "acculturation," the notion of an "inculturation" is not unproblematic: it carries with it the notion that one can isolate a "pure" gospel as an original unity that encounters a plurality of cultures that is just as clearly differentiated from it. Moreover, through the term "inculturation," a clear line of demarcation between the theological notion of the incarnation of Christ in a Jewish human being, Jesus of Nazareth, and the explication of this notion in diverse cultural circles that can be traced by historians and analyzed by social scientists disappears or at least threatens to disappear. The fact that, the intention of its Jesuit fathers notwithstanding, the term "inculturation" was used as an alternative term for a certain level of "acculturation" already in 1974 and has been repeatedly used in this manner since then has probably increased the problems that were already implicit in the term. Thus in 1976 the Asian Catholic bishops used the term "inculturation" for a "regionalizing" of structures of the church and their message, for the process of the formation of local churches with their own traditions.[171] In such processes of regionalization, one is always already dealing, of course, with cultural forms of the gospel, so that the term "inculturation" is not being used in the original "Jesuit" sense of "inculturation of the gospel." By contrast, the term "accommodation" or "indigenization," which was already occasionally used in antiquity and is often used also in early modern Protestant

[167] Compare the (meager) documentation for a formation of the concept by Melville J. Herskovits in Roest Crollius 1997, 18 n. 1.

[168] K. Müller 1987, 178.

[169] Thus in an address to the Pontifical Biblical Commission on March 26, 1979 (John Paul II 1979, 607), which was taken over into the apostolic exhortation *Catechesi tradendae* from October 1979.

[170] Küster 2001, 479.

[171] Federation of Asian Bishops' Conferences 1976, 332; compare also Roest Crollius 1997, 19.

theology,[172] corresponds more closely with the original "Jesuit" sense of "inculturation":[173] God and his Holy Spirit are ultimately the ones who accommodate themselves to certain situations or civilizations. Naturally, one can use this word imprecisely and in an extended sense, but in its original meaning, it expresses again the notion of an original unity and a subordinate variety or plurality.

The conclusion of this section can be very succinctly summarized as follows: Like the terms "orthodoxy" and "heresy" that were made popular again by Bauer, concepts such as "acculturation," "inculturation," "accommodation," or "indigenization" are not very serviceable because they imply basic assumptions that are not unproblematic and presuppose concepts that hardly do justice to the historical reality of ancient Christianity. All these expressions imply the basic assumption that it is possible to set forth the relationship between a supposedly "pure" gospel and an equally "pure" culture that is strictly separated from it according to the model of two completely separated entities. But in reality we are dealing—as we have seen—with the gradual formation of very different institutions in specific cultural contexts and with groups that possess a specific identity and support these institutions.[174]

To this extent, it is worthwhile to inquire into the terms "identity" and "plurality" and to examine whether they can better describe the findings than the aforementioned expressions and models behind them that originally came from liberal Protestant and Jesuit Catholic piety.

4.4 The Complementary Model: "Identity" and "Plurality"

Before one can ask whether the presently widespread model of Christianity as a plural identity is also suitable for our connections and adequately describes ancient Christianity, one must also carefully investigate the terms and the implicit basic assumptions and concepts.

In contrast to the previously discussed expressions "orthodoxy" and "heresy" or "acculturation," "inculturation," "accommodation," and "indigenization," which differ in their confessional backgrounds and yet are all theologically shaped, the term "identity" in its social-psychological terminological dimension comes from the modern period, more precisely from the psychology of William James and George Herbert Mead. Because it is used in an almost inflationary manner at present, it is necessary to state very precisely what one actually means when one uses this

[172] Some references can be found in Körtner 1998a.
[173] Kollbrunner 1990.
[174] Gotter 2000, 395, also argues for this integration of the paradigm "identity."

term and to identify the implicit presuppositions that are concealed in a term that has such a psychological basis. Without making a claim to psychological competency in relation to a term, concerning which there is "unquestionably terminological chaos,"[175] the following assumptions are important: personal identities in the sense of implicit or explicit theories of the self are first constructed unintentionally from interaction with the environment in the course of an individual development, "the norms of a historical social structure and worldview initially determine the character of the primary social relations."[176] In the process, interactions between an individual and the society that surrounds this individual are especially important: "Personal identity therefore does not develop (genetically) from 'within' (as the biological individual does), but comes, so to speak, from 'outside.' It emerges from both subjective and interactive structured deposits of socially and symbolically mediated actions and impressions in an individual 'memory.' These deposits take place in the form of a social interaction and communication process that can be described with Cooley and Mead as a reciprocal mirror process."[177]

One could put the matter more sharply and say that there is no identity that an individual has in and for himself or herself that exists apart from the respective relations of the individual to his or her environment and society. Identity is constructed and is always simultaneously a means through which an individual contextualizes himself or herself in a group and yet also a means through which a group assigns an individual a place inside or outside of itself. In a corresponding manner, ethnological research is also focused on the identity of groups, which L. Honko defines as follows:

> [A] set of values, symbols and emotions joining people, through constant negotiation, in the realisation of togetherness and belonging, constituting a space for "us" in the universe (as well as distinguishing "us" from "them"). The word "we" brings semantic unity to the set of symbols, be they material or abstract, ideas, things, words or action. Much of this unity may be based on semantic compromise, even misunderstanding. The meaning of symbols is flexible in the sense that individuals may choose different emotional and attitudinal contents when experiencing and using them. These differences need not become visible at all.[178]

[175] Thus Luckmann 1981, 8. Compare also the contributions in Marquard/Stierle 1996 [1979], especially the sketch of (philosophical) identity concepts by Henrich 1981, 133–86, as well as Straub 1991. Niethammer 2000, 9, who provides an overview of the mass of literature on p. 21 n. 23, has called the term a "*Plastikwort*" (malleable word). Niethhammer 2009, 57–411 reconstructs above all a critical history of the term that begins with Carl Schmitt.

[176] Luckmann 1981, 11.

[177] Luckmann 1981, 11–12.

[178] Honko 1999, 24.

In connection with such insights, Jan Assmann has pointed out[179] that identity could be formed only jointly in ancient societies as well: "An I grows from the outside to the inside. Thus, the we-identity of the group has priority over the I-identity of the individual, or: identity is a social phenomenon or sociogenesis. Collective or we-identity does not exist outside the individuals that constitute and carry this 'we.' It is a matter of individual knowledge and consciousness."[180] In recent years especially, the term "identity" has often been used to describe specific characteristics of the development of ancient Christianity, for example, by the English New Testament scholar Judith M. Lieu. She compares the formation of identity among children and their gradual detachment from their parents with the identity formation of young Christianity and its detachment from Judaism. At the beginning, the identity is precarious; it oscillates between the identity offerings of the surrounding society, the mother religion, and the attempt of a community to gain its own new identity in the distancing from such identity offerings.[181] Lieu points to the famous formulation in the *Epistle to Diognetus* (5.3): καὶ Χριστιανοὶ ἐν κόσμῳ οἰκοῦσιν, οὐκ εἰσὶν δὲ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου; "Christians, too, live in the world, but they are not of the world."[182] Similar processes of the modification of existing societal identity offerings and the differentiation of one's own identity can be observed in almost all the Christian institutions that we have analyzed in detail. They make clear that such a construction of identity can take place only jointly, in institutions, and show how inevitable the construction of institutions in ancient Christianity was—a construction that modified the existing institutional forms of the pagan environment.

Thus if identity can be constructed only jointly (or in the form of an explicit counterconcept to a collective identity of a group), in a common sphere of experience, action, and expectation that is formed through the symbolic world of meaning of the collective memory and the theological framework implicit in it, then one must attempt to analyze this sphere of experience as precisely as possible. Thus, in our case, one must describe exactly the specifics of an ancient society, as we have done above for various educational spheres—namely, free teachers and established school contexts, oracle sanctuaries, and worship services. Sociologists differentiate between ancient and modern societies and define the difference between them as follows: in ancient societies, "economic, religious, and

179 Assmann 1997, 16–17. On the foundational theories of Maurice Halbwachs, see now Niethammer 2000, 314–66.

180 Assmann 1997, 130–31.

181 Lieu 1998 (= 2005, 171–89, here 174–75).

182 Lieu 2005, 178–79.

kinship functions are merely aspects of a more or less unified course of events," whereas "in modern society, economy, government, religion, and family" form "structures of action . . . which as such represent particular institutions. They are institutionally specialized. While these subsystems of the social structure are not completely independent from one another, they nevertheless follow for the most part their 'own' norms."[183]

If one applies these insights to the problems of the development of institutions of Christian theology in antiquity, with which we are concerned, then one must especially pay attention to the identity-forming interaction between the individual and society and not only to isolated history-of-theology conceptions and their developments. The lessons of the free teachers or institutions such as the Christian "private university" of Origen were, as we have seen, sites of identity-forming interaction, as were the worship services and the gatherings in which Montanist prophets gave their "oracles." The fact that there are clear differences in the institutions of theological reflection dealt with in this monograph leads to some questions: Did the development of different institutions of theological reflection in Christianity from the second century onward also lead to an institutional separation of their spheres of life? Or were all the spheres of life actually transformed by the new religious norms, and can one observe no autonomous determinations whatsoever? Our analyses have clearly shown that the development of institutions in ancient Christianity separated spheres of life to a fairly large extent. While the students of the Christian "private university" of Origen did continue to participate in the Eucharistic worship service and listened to the same Eucharistic prayers and sermons as the simpler Christians (the *simpliciores*), they simultaneously separated themselves from these fellow Christians and formed a community elite—with all the problems connected with it. With the Montanists of Asia Minor, we were able to observe that in ancient Christianity such institutional separations sometimes led to exclusion or withdrawal from the majority community. In this way, the institutionalization of ancient Christian theology contributed to the pluralization of ancient Christianity.

The term "plurality" is likewise a modern term.[184] The Latin word *pluralitas* first appears in Christian texts in the context of the Trinitarian controversy in late antiquity. Despite this fact, it is worthwhile to analyze the development of ancient Christianity under this guiding term, as shown by remarks of the Mainz patristic scholar *Gerhard May* at the convention of the *Wissenschaftliche Gesellschaft für Theologie* (Scholarly Society for Theology), which stood under the heading "pluralism

[183] Luckmann 1981, 14–15.
[184] Compare now Schwöbel 2000, 724–25.

and identity." May opposed a direct application of the term to ancient Christianity. According to May, the modern pluralism of worldviews is "the result of the collapse of a relatively closed system of religious and ethical notions in the course of the modern age," whereas Greco-Roman antiquity had "passed through the opposite development to that of the modern age, namely from pluralism to a unity of worldview."[185] Christianity is said to have fought the religious pluralism of the imperial period, which, however, is said to have unified itself. As key terms that describe the points of this development, May refers to "philosophy becoming religious" and the increasing attractiveness of monotheism for polytheistic piety. At the same time, despite such tendencies, the ancient pagan worldview is said to have remained pluralistic in principle. It is said that the Roman Empire could also be designated as "pluralistic." As the "civil religion," the imperial cult was the unifying bond of the empire; however, it demanded—at least according to the traditional view, which should be scrutinized again—merely "loyalty" from the citizens of the empire (and thus much less than other civil religions).

Terminological confusion arises because the terms "plurality" and "pluralism" are sometimes used synonymously and yet also sometimes demarcated from each other and defined differently, with the assignment of the two words to specific contents taking place in very different ways. The Jena philosopher Wolfgang Welsch understands "plurality" to mean a philosophically considered concept of factually existing variety—speaking also of "radical plurality"—and means by this a plurality that ultimately can no longer be captured, ordered, or framed by conceptions of unity or uniformity. Welsch speaks of a "hard concept oriented toward basic differences."[186] By contrast, Welsch evidently understands "pluralism" (but nowhere does he state this explicitly) as a soft, diffuse expression of a mere facile postmodernism, from which he repeatedly distances himself, as a chaotic hodgepodge of variety. By contrast, the Heidelberg theologian Michael Welker has suggested that the two words be used in the exact opposite manner: thus that "plurality" be used to designate a "a vague, contourless variety" and "pluralism" to designate "a systematic network."[187] We will follow this latter terminological distinction here. The decisive question of this chapter is then whether the institutions of theological reflection in ancient Christianity and Christianity itself can be described as a systematic network of variety ordered to unity ("pluralism") or merely as a vague,

[185] May 1995, 103.

[186] Welsch 1997, XVII. The history of the term is also traced in Schwöbel 2001, 135–37.

[187] Welker 1998; 1995.

contourless variety ("plurality"). In the final section of this monograph, we will attempt to clarify this question for ancient Christianity.

But before doing so, referencing an observation of the systematic theologian Eilert Herms—which was likewise presented at the Vienna convention of theologians on "pluralism and identity" in 1993—is of absolutely central importance for an answer to our line of questioning. At that time, Herms pointed out that plurality and identity may not be viewed as a strict opposition but basically belong together: "In the nature of things, pluralism and identity are phenomena that refer to each other. Every identical structure is built up internally from multiple elements and is related externally in manifold ways to the conditions of its environment. Here multiplicity does not threaten the identity of the units but constitutes them."[188] The synthesis, of course, is always threatened by a collapse into its parts: an overly strong pluralization endangers the identity (by breaking down the coherence principles of the interaction); an overly strong uniformity destroys the manifold character of the elements.[189] The key terms *Fraktionierung* and *Gewährenlassen* (fractionation and letting be or laissez faire) that Peter Lampe used to describe the urban Roman community of the second century do not adequately describe the balanced synthesis between identity and plurality in the Christianity of the capital city but (misre)present it too strongly in the direction of plurality (which was precisely not unrestrained). In addition to "extensive tolerance,"[190] there was certainly attentiveness to an endangering of Christian identity: Marcion was excluded from the community, as Lampe also must concede. The urban Roman pluralism was—to take up a differentiation of Trutz Rendtorff—not a mere plurality, and it was not "soft": it did not let everything possible be valid out of disinterest but rather negotiated what involved and concerned all Christians. (Rendtorff speaks of "hard pluralism.")[191] Thus the particular identity of ancient Christian reflection can be perceived especially well if one poses the question of the limits of plurality. On this point, Christian religious reflection did differ from pagan reflection, since the latter was not normative let alone confessional. To this extent, in paganism there could be no "heresy" in the Christian sense.[192] Cultic difference and cultic pluralism did not break up the basic consensus of pagan society; faithfulness to a religious doctrine and human salvation were not connected, nor were they up for debate.

[188] Herms 1995, 15–16.

[189] Herms 1995, 18–19.

[190] P. Lampe 1989, 320–34 (quotation on p. 333); compare P. Lampe 2003, 381–96 (quotation on p. 395). See also my discussion of Lampe in section 4.2.

[191] Rendtorff 1995, 22–23.

[192] Brox 1986, 249.

In a concluding section, we can now present ancient Christianity and especially its theological reflection as a plural identity of this sort.

4.5 Ancient Christian Theology: A Plural Identity

Our pass through the various ancient institutions in the context of which what we have called “theology” from the Middle Ages up to the present has been carried out has made abundantly clear the plurality of these undertakings in both formal and material respects. In the first chapter, we saw that the Greek term θεολογία and its Latin equivalent *theologia* are not suitable in themselves for constructing an identity within this plurality because for the first three centuries they were not even used to designate the totality of the reflection of the Christian religion that was oriented toward scholarly standards. During this early period, there was not a single Greek or Latin term that consolidated into a unity the diversity of what Justin, Montanus, and Origen did and what underlay the prayers in the Eucharistic worship service in different places. In the second chapter, we saw how differently such reflection could turn out in terms of content among free teachers such as Justin, members of a financially established school such as Origen, and prophetesses in the Phrygian high country and what different institutional contexts these people lived in. Whereas the free teachers had to support themselves with their lectures, the teachers in the schools could build on the more certain financial basis of a foundation or on the school fees of their hearers. Finally, as distinguished women on great estates, the Montanist prophetesses, if the meager information does not deceive us, appear to have obtained security solely through the wealth of their spouses and the rural economy of the fruitful Phrygian high plateau. The people whose reflections have entered into the formulations of the Eucharistic prayers of the fourth and fifth centuries remain completely in the dark. These prayers are certainly not witnesses of “lay theology” but rather deeply thoughtful compositions with clear reflexes of contemporary debates. Such observations demonstrate the continued urgency of a question that has already been addressed repeatedly in the debate over Walter Bauer’s theses, which has been succinctly traced above. What grounds can there be for speaking under such circumstances of a unity of ancient Christian “theology” and thus for simultaneously also presupposing basic features of a unified identity of ancient Christianity in the early Roman Empire prior to the imperial measures of the fourth century?

An initial important reason for speaking—not just for later times but also already in the pre-Constantinian period—of an ancient Christian identity that shows itself in the plural identity of the various “theologies” is certainly the perception of the new religion by outsiders, which we must go into only briefly here. The person who designated himself or herself as a Christian in public or assigned himself or herself to this group through his or her behavior was perceived as a Christian—and this took place independently of whether the majority church recognized this claim or, as in the case of certain Gnostics, rejected it.[193] When Christians from North African Scilla stood before their judges, they documented their belonging to the Christian religion for all to see with "letters of the Apostle Paul" that were used by Christians in the whole empire, and to document their uprightness, they referred to the uprightness of this author of their Holy Scriptures: *epistulae Pauli viri iusti*.[194]

A second important reason for speaking of an ancient Christian identity is a formal identity of the ancient Christian "theologies" in the form of their experimental character, which can be explained, on the one hand, by the necessity of the regional contextualization of an empire-wide religion and, on the other hand, by the widely disseminated form of the discursively based teaching as praxis of the "theology." We saw in relation to the example of the apologists, the Montanists, and the school of Origen that all these carried out their theology according to the model of a "laboratory." They can be compared to experimenting natural scientists who attempt, partly with quite similar and yet partly with very different methods, to experimentally implement an idea that was originally born in a completely different context. In the different ancient Christian theologies, there exist various forms of experimental contextualization whose unity is already given through the formal analogy of experimental contextualization. This model, which is designated with the metaphor "laboratory," also describes the conditions more adequately than talk, which is especially widespread among theologians, of a crisis that was ignited through the pluralism of various theologies, or the model in which the history of early Christian theology is reconstructed according to the analogy of a "deterministic chaos." Talk of a "crisis of Christian theology" in the second century, which is also found in the most recent publications,[195] appears to be indivisibly tied to an unusable teleology. I do not understand what the model of "deterministic chaos" is supposed to deliver for the precise description of historical causes and effects.[196] But the worship service as the focal

[193] Thus rightly Schäfke 1979, 488–89.

[194] Knopf/Krüger/Ruhbach 1965 as well as G. Bonner 1956; compare section 3.1.6.3 with n. 486.

[195] Recently in Andresen/Ritter 1999, 56–75 ("Die große innere Krisis des Christentums im 2. Jahrhundert" [The great inner crisis of Christianity in the second century]); ably defended in Altendorf 1969, 67.

[196] Vouga 1994, 13–16; compare p. 15: "If three or more causes affect an object or a system, then the result of their combined action is incalculable and unpredictable." The

center of Christian life also had a high formal unity: readings introduced it, a Eucharist followed next, and a blessing concluded it; only baptized members of the community had access to the Eucharist.

A third important reason for speaking of an ancient Christian identity lies in the great store of theological commonalities. We saw already in the analysis of Walter Bauer's monograph that the picture of "orthodoxy" and "heresy" developed at the end of the second century and in the following third century does not capture the reality of a time in which a theological "common sense" and an empire-wide hierarchical structure of the Christian community developed only slowly. But one must point out against Bauer that most forms of Christianity in these two centuries, if one looks at their "theology" (i.e., the implicit and explicit reflection), were extremely similar. One can explain this similarity, which we naturally can only assert but not develop in detail in the context of this presentation,[197] by the fact that the various "Christianities" (Dieter Georgi) of the first two centuries attempted to develop an identity-forming center—namely, an identity-determining impact of the word, work, and person of a Jewish itinerant preacher. One sees this, for example, when one studies how the urban Roman theologian Justin deals with the problem of Jewish Christianity in the middle of the second century and in doing so pleads for something that Lampe accurately designated at this point as "letting be": Justin argues that all the various forms of Christianity are united in their reference to Jesus of Nazareth and should confess him as the Crucified One and as the Messiah (Χριστός) of God and Lord of the future judgment.[198] Under these conditions, Justin is prepared to acknowledge Jewish Christianity as a legitimate form of Christian "theology."

Such a line of argumentation, which has been intensified by Justin in his argument with his Jewish conversation partner Trypho, could be generalized, and one could show that there were other components of such an identity-forming theological center of ancient Christianity. In addition to Jesus as the crucified and resurrected Christ, there is naturally the one

---

model of Vouga does lead to a welcome forgoing of teleological conceptions, but to me it appears not especially useful for a precise determination of connections of causality and convergence.

[197] The unfolding remains reserved for the detailed history of theology for which this monograph represents merely the prolegomena.

[198] In this way, he describes the theological commonalities with Jewish Christians, "who observe the ordinances of Moses in their life" (Justin, *Dialogus cum Tryphone* 46.1 [Marcovich 1997, 144.1–2]). It emerges from *Dialogus cum Tryphone* 46.2 (144–145.6–17) that the "ordinances" of Moses (τὰ διὰ Μωσέως διαταχθέντα) concern especially circumcision, the Sabbath commandment, questions of calendar and purity, and the food laws (cf. *Dialogus cum Tryphone* 46.2 [144–145.8–11]). On this passage, compare, for example, Hilgenfeld 1966 and Strecker in Bauer 1964, 276; Strecker in Bauer 1971, 274.

God and beyond that a certain conception of Christian life (ethics)[199] in a Christian community (ἐκκλησία) with sacraments and finally a basic stock of shared Holy Scriptures, as we saw in chapter 3, section 3.1, on the New Testament canon. This identity-forming center not only stamped many free teachers and the teaching process at the private university of Origen, but it is reflected also in an empire-wide analogous structure of the worship service, which formed the center of Christian community life. Thus one could speak of a *plural identity* in ancient Christianity, which the reflection of Christians on their own religion in the imperial period portrays, develops further, and holds fast. According to Origen, the plurality cannot be used as a convincing argument against Christianity, nor can the attempt to preserve an identity in the midst of this plurality: “The one who wishes to criticize Christianity because of the sects must criticize also the teaching of Socrates from whose teaching many schools have emerged that do not advocate the same views. But one could attack Plato’s teaching as well because of Aristotle, who left the instruction of his teacher and established new views.”[200] Origen attempts to explain the emergence of a plurality also with the freedom of the Christian conscience, which cannot be compelled to faith, as is well known.[201]

Christianity in antiquity can be described as a very complex process in which identity and plurality differentiate themselves in relation to each other in certain institutions, limits of a legitimate pluralism are probed, and the identity-forming center is interpreted in certain institutions of theological reflection and disseminated in this way. The identity-forming center possessed an identity-forming power that the theological tradition called the “Holy Spirit.”[202] One can therefore speak of a plural identity or a pluralism concentrated around an identity-forming center. This dialectical structure, which helped avoid a narrowing of identity to “singleness,” “sameness,” or

[199] Thus, for example, Irenaeus is prepared to allow a certain inner-church pluralism in the so-called Easter date controversy: A. Schindler 1993b, 325. On Christian basic reflections on ethics, see now Mühlenberg 2006, 39–151.

[200] Origen, *Contra Celsum* III 13 (Koetschau 1899, 213.2–6): ὁ δ’ ἐγκαλῶν τῷ λόγῳ διὰ τὰς αἱρέσεις ἐγκαλέσαι ἂν καὶ Σωκράτους διδασκαλίᾳ, ἀφ’ οὗ τῆς διατριβῆς πολλαὶ γεγόνασιν οὐ τὰ αὐτὰ φρονούντων σχολαί· ἀλλὰ καὶ Πλάτωνος ἐγκαλέσαι ἄν τις τοῖς δόγμασι δι’ Ἀριστοτέλην, ἀποφοιτήσαντα τῆς διατριβῆς αὐτοῦ ἐν καινοτομίαις·.

[201] According to Chadwick 1978, 1098, in the case of the agreement with the faith of the great church, it was a matter of an unheard of burdening of the conscience: “new burdens for which examples or correspondences can be shown only with difficulty in pre-Christian antiquity.”

[202] This is the central thesis of my 2001 Heidelberg inaugural lecture: Markschies 2004c. I will therefore not explicate it here.

"unity,"[203] is presumably also a reason for the astonishing success of Christianity in antiquity, which one can describe with evolutionary categories as "survival of the fittest" or with economic categories as the success of a new product among consumers in the religious market place.

Let me conclude with a concise observation: Through our consideration of the institutions of theological reflection in ancient Christianity and in Jewish and pagan comparative examples, we have attempted to avoid implicitly allowing the paradigm of the current organizational form of scholarly theological reflection at universities to obtain central importance for the reconstruction of ancient Christian thinking. The analysis of the institutions has simultaneously helped us describe ancient Christianity and its theological reflection as a plural identity. Now it must at some point be shown in a detailed portrayal of the history of ancient Christian theology that this particular viewpoint holds up—and that the prolegomena presented here can actually form the foundation of such an undertaking.

[203] In his introduction to a volume on Greek identity in the Roman Empire, Goldhill 2001, 17–18, admittedly draws attention to the fact that every concept of identity that ignores the broken, splintered, and nonunified character of identity remains undercomplex and points to corresponding discussions in the Anglo-Saxon sphere.

This page intentionally left blank

Appendix

Visual Presentation of the Findings on the Lists

1. P. Ash. Inv. 3; Greek inventory from the fourth century (Oxford)
2. Ostr. Inst. Franç. Cairo IFAO 13315, a Coptic inventory from the monastery of Appa Elias, probably in the diocese of Kûs, about thirty-one miles (fifty kilometers) north of Luxor, possibly from the fifth century
3. P. Wessley Prag. gr. I 13; Greek inventory from the fifth to sixth century (formerly St. Petersburg)

4–8. Five Coptic ostraca and papyri from the monastery of Epiphanius at Thebes from the sixth to seventh century:

4. Ostr. Cairo inv. 44674.18	(= Crum/White 1973, nr. 554, p. 116/294)
5. P. Metropolitan Museum of Art inv. 14.1.523	(= Crum/White 1973, nr. 555, p. 294)
6. Ostr. Cairo 44674.106	(= Crum/White 1973, nr. 556, p. 294)
7. Ostr. MMA 12.180.133	(= Crum/White 1973, nr. 557, p. 295)
8. Ostr. MMA 14.1.501	(= Crum/White 1973, nr. 558, p. 295)

9. P. Graec. Vindob. 26015; Greek inventory from the seventh to the eighth century

10–12. Three Coptic ostraca:

10. Egypt Exploration Fund 273	(= Crum 1902b, nr. 457, p. 75/42)
11. Egypt Exploration Fund 241	(= Crum 1902b, nr. 458, p. 75/42)
12. Cairo 8110	(= Crum 1902b, nr. 459, p. 75/42)

13. Oxford, Bodleian library nr. 486; Coptic ostracon
14. P. f 46; Fragment of a Coptic papyrus inventory, eighth century
15. P. Brit. Libr. London Or. 5301(14); Coptic papyrus inventory

16–18. Three Coptic ostraca from Vienna:

16. KO 620	(= Till 1960, nr. 147, p. 37)
17. KO 679	(=Till 1960, nr. 148, p. 37)
18. KO 446	(=Till 1960, nr. 149, p. 37)

19. Papyrus from the former Phillips Library (Cheltenham; without nr.), Coptic list of biblical books
20. P. Lugd. Bat. XXV, 204; inventory of 45 *codices* from the seventh/eighth century

1. The Old Testament in Lists 1–10[1]

Text	**List 1**	**List 2**	**List 3**	**List 4**	**List 5**	**List 6**	**List 7**	**List 8**	**List 9**	**List 10**
Gen		x		2x						
Exod	x	x								
Lev	x	x								
Num	x	x								
Deut		x								
Josh		x								
Judg		x								
Sam		x								
Reg		x								
Isa		2x					x			
Jer		x								
Bar										

[1] MNP = Minor prophets.

Text	**List 1**	**List 2**	**List 3**	**List 4**	**List 5**	**List 6**	**List 7**	**List 8**	**List 9**	**List 10**
Ezek										
MNP		x		x						
Ps		3x	x		x		x			
Job	x	3x			x					
Prov		x			x					
Ruth		x								
Song	x									
Eccl										
Lam										
Esth										
Dan		x	x							
Ezra		x								
Neh										
Chr		x								

2. The Old Testament in Lists 11–20

Text	**List 11**	**List 12**	**List 13**	**List 14**	**List 15**	**List 16**	**List 17**	**List 18**	**List 19**	**List 20**
Gen									x	
Exod										
Lev										
Num									x	
Deut										
Josh		x	x							
Judg		x	x							
Sam			x							
Reg			x							
Isa			x			3x				
Jer			x			x				
Bar			x							
Ezek						x				
MNP			x							
Ps		2x	x		8x		x	x		x
Job		x								
Prov		x	x							

Text	List 11	List 12	List 13	List 14	List 15	List 16	List 17	List 18	List 19	List 20
Ruth										
Song			x							
Eccl		x	x[2]							
Lam										
Esth										
Dan										
Ezra			x							
Neh			x[3]							
Chr			x							

[2] Crum 1939, nr. 117, p. 47, adds "[The preacher]."
[3] In Crum 1939, nr. 117, p. 47, "The first of Esdra and the [second . . .]."

3. The New Testament in Lists 1–10[4]

Text	List 1	List 2	List 3	List 4	List 5	List 6	List 7	List 8	List 9	List 10
4 Gos	x	x	2x					x		
Matt		2x				x				x
Mark		x								
Luke		2x								
John		2x				x				
Acts	x	4x		x			x			
Apo		3x		3x		2x	x			
Rom										
Cor										
Cath		x								
Rev		x								

[4] If the list contains a τετραευαγγέλιον (= 4 Gos), then its four gospels are not listed out again separately. The same approach is adopted in relation to the expressions Ἀπόστολος (= Apo) and Καθολικόν (= Cath). For the inscriptions of the manuscripts, see, for example, Soden 1911, 295–96.

4. The New Testament in Lists 11–20

Text	**List 11**	**List 12**	**List 13**	**List 14**	**List 15**	**List 16**	**List 17**	**List 18**	**List 19**	**List 20**
4 Gos			x		6x3[5]		x	x		
Matt			x		8x	?				
Mark	x				2x	?				x
Luke			x		4x	?				x
John	x		x		2x	?				
Acts					x					x
Apo			x		2x		x			
Rom				x						
Cor				x						
Cath			x		4x			x		x
Rev			x							

[5] In Crum/Petrie 1893, nr. 44, pp. 60–62 (= Crum 1905, nr. 704, p. 312), "Parts of Gospels 6x."

5. The "Deuterocanonical" Literature in Lists 1–10

Text	**List 1**	**List 2**	**List 3**	**List 4**	**List 5**	**List 6**	**List 7**	**List 8**	**List 9**	**List 10**
Herm	x									
Acts Pet.									x	
Acts Pil.									x	
ἔκστασις[6]				x						
Apoc. Ezra										

6. The "Deuterocanonical" Literature in Lists 11–20

Text	**List 11**	**List 12**	**List 13**	**List 14**	**List 15**	**List 16**	**List 17**	**List 18**	**List 19**	**List 20**
Herm										
Acts Pet.										
Acts Pil.										
ἔκστασις										
Apoc. Ezra										x

[6] This is the case if one wishes to assume that the Greek expression ἔκστασις is meant to designate an apocryphal writing of the type of the *Visio Beati Esdrae* (Wahl 1977) or *Visio Sancti Pauli* (Silverstein 1935). This, however, remains speculation. On the other hand, other texts with such titles are lacking (CPG s. v; C. Bauer 1955, 278).

7. The Internal Sequence of the Writings in Lists 1–6[7]

List 1	**List 2**	**List 3**	**List 4**	**List 5**	**List 6**
Herm.	Gen	Chronogr.	Jebius	Job	John
Origen	Exod	Thdot. Anc.	2 Apos	PsProv	?
?	Lev[8]	Basilius, ep.	Gen		2 Apo
Lev	Num + Deut	Didym., Ps.	MNP		Matt
?	Josh	<Abs.>Gr.	Gen		Sev. Ant.[9]
?	Judg + Ruth	Naz.	Sev. Ant.		
Job + ?	4 Reg	Tractate[10]	?		
Acts	1/2 Chron	4 Gos[11]	Evagr. Pont.		
Ap. Bal.	Ezra	Geron-tikon[12]	Bas. (Caes.?)		
?	MNP	Ps + Dan	Apo		

[7] The German abbreviations of authors follows PGL. The comparison of the inventories with the sequences of the books in the manuscripts, as Gregory 1900–1909, II: 850–58, provides in schematic form, illustrates again the chaotic order.

[8] Col. a. line 9–10, ⲙⲛ ⲛⲕⲁⲛⲱⲛ ⲡⲁⲡⲁ ⲁⲑⲁⲛⲁⲥⲓⲟⲥ ⲭⲁⲣ[ⲧⲏⲥ], included are thus the “canons” of Athanasius on papyri (CPG II, nr. 2302), but perhaps this writing must also be brought into connection with the nonauthentic canon of the Council of Nicaea that is handed down in Coptic (CPG II, nr. 2298).

[9] Contra Julian of Halicarnassus; compare Grillmeier 1986, 76.

[10] Line 8 τὸ τῆ(ς) γνώ(σεως) ἐσαγόντων τῆ(ς) ἁγί(ας) ἀναστάσε(ως).

[11] Line 9 μεγαλεῖον. See the corresponding note 16 on list 1.

[12] An edition of the sayings of the fathers has now been published under this title: Arras 1986.

7. The Internal Sequence of the Writings in Lists 1–6 *(continued)*

List 1	**List 2**	**List 3**	**List 4**	**List 5**	**List 6**
Song	Isa	Rules (?)[13]	ἔκστασις		
Origen, Jo.	Isa[14]	4 Gos	Petr. Iber.		
Ex + Num	Jer	. . .[15]	?		
4 Gos[16]	2 Ps		?		
	Ps[17]		Acts		
	4 Gos[18]		. . .		
	Lk + Apo				
	Mt + Apo				
	2 Apo				
	Acts + Cath + Rev				
	Pap.[19]				
	Mt + Mk + Lk				
	Acts + John				
	Acts				

[13] Line 12/13 ἔσα ἐγγὺς μο[νασ]τ(ηρίου) [ἔν]θα ἐκέλευ[ε] κἀκεῖνα πέμπω αὐτῇ.
[14] Col. a line 18–19; one papyrus (χάρτης) each or a parchment copy (μέ<μ>βρανον).
[15] On lines 15–16, see section 3.1.6.3 with n. 451.
[16] δέ[ρ]μ(α) μέγα βιβλίον ε. ω [with the explanation in C. H. Roberts 1938, 188; Roberts appears not to consider whether "ω." presents a number, since he reads δέ[ρ]μ(α) μέγα βιβλίον ε. ω.>.
[17] Col. a lines 21–22; two parchment copies, with one copy on old (παλαίον) papyrus.
[18] Col. a line 22 τετραευαγγέλιον.
[19] Col. a lines 29–31: papyrus parts.

List 1	List 2	List 3	List 4	List 5	List 6
	. . .[20]				
	3 Job + Prov				
	. . .[21]				
	Cath				
	. . .[22]				

[20] I have forgone listing the almost forty church father texts mentioned in col. b, which include writings of monks, vitae, martyr texts, panegyrics. Compare H. Leclercq 1924, 880–82, or Coquin 1975, 216–17. These are followed by Col. $b^{v.}$ Line 19 3x Job (2 x papyrus, 1 parchment + Proverbs).

[21] Col. b^{v} lines 19–21 contain four church father writings, then two copies of a Καθολικ<όν> (line 21).

[22] Col. b^{v} lines 19–40 follow more than ten additional church father writings, including a vita of Macrina, line 33, the book of Daniel.

8. The Internal Sequence of the Writings in Lists 7–12

List 7	**List 8**	**List 9**	**List 10**	**List 11**	**List 12**
Acts	4 Gos	?[23]	Matt	Mark	2 Ps
Apostolos	?	Acts Pet.[24]	. . .	John	Judges
Isaiah[25]	?	Mar-tyrEust[26]		?[27]	Shenute[28]
Psalms		Acts Pil.[29]			Job + Prov + Eccl
		Martyr-Georg			Chrysaph.
		? (Martyr)			Josh
		Discov-ery of the cross[30]			. . . [31]

[23] Line 1 [β]ί[βλος <ca. 14 letter gap>] προφήτοῦ. On this see Gerstinger 1932, 190: “According to the whole context one of the Old Testament apocrypha must have been listed here.”

[24] Line 2 βίβλο(ς) μαρτυρολ(ογίο<υ) ἁγί(ου) Πέτρου.

[25] Since, however, ⲁⲡⲡⲁ stands before the name, it is possible that the concern is with an (unknown) work of a monk. See, however, number 10, list 20 below.

[26] Line 3. For Eustathius, compare BHG I, nr. 641/642 (p. 89); for Georgius, compare BHG I nr. 670–79 (pp. 93–95).

[27] Line 3 ⲙⲛⲟⲩϫⲱⲱⲉ ⲉ [; line 4 ⲉⲣⲉⲧϣⲏⲣⲉ ⲙⲡ[; line 5 ϩⲓⲱⲱϥ, for instance: “and a book, containing ‘the daughter of.’” In the *Initia* (C. Bauer 1955, 512) and in CPG (V, p. 186), no further information is provided.

[28] Lines 2–3 ⲛⲉⲕⲣⲓⲧⲏⲥ ⲟⲩⲕⲁⲑⲏⲕⲉⲓⲥⲓⲥ (= καθήγησις) ⲛⲧⲉ ⲁⲡⲁ ϣⲉⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ.

[29] Line 4 [βίβλος τῶν ὑπο]μνημ(ά)τ(ῶν) Πιλάτου.

[30] Line 7 [βίβλος εὑρέσεως τοῦ] τιμίου σταυρο[ῦ.

[31] An extensive list of objects of daily use, including sixteen monks’ habits, concluded again with a literary work, the πληροφορία of Peter the Iberian.

9. The Internal Sequence of the Writings in Lists 13–18

List 13	**List 14**	**List 15**	**List 16**	**List 17**	**List 18**
Josh	Rom[32]	4 Gos	? (Gos)	Ps (small)[33]	4 Gos
Judges	1 Cor	3 x 4 Gos	Isa	Apost	Ps
1/2 Reg	2 Cor	Matt	?	4 Gos	Cath
1/2 Chron		2 Luke	Isa		?
1/2 Ezra		Mark	Isa		
Ps		Acts	Jer		
Prov		2 Apost	Ez		
Eccl		4 Cath	3 ?		
Song		4 Gos			
MNP		2 Matt			
Isa		4 Gos			
Jer		John			
Bar		Luke			
		Mark			
		8 Ps			
		44 Lection-aries			

[32] Interestingly, these lists indicate in each case where Paul wrote the letters (line 2 ⲛⲧⲁϥϣⲱⲁ[ⲁⲓ] ⲉϥⲉⲛ[, but this information is unfortunately always broken off; cf. the information on the locations in manuscripts: Soden 1911, 300 nr. [72]; "Here the notes on the place of origin of the letters are more frequent").

[33] Till 1960, 37: "the 'small' probably refers to the format of the books."

9. The Internal Sequence of the Writings in Lists 13–18 *(continued)*

List 13	**List 14**	**List 15**	**List 16**	**List 17**	**List 18**
		Sayings of Fathers[34]			
		2 Matt			
		Petr?[35]			
		Luke			
		John			
		2 Cath			

[34] Line 8 ⲛⲉϫⲱⲱⲙⲓ ⲛⲱϣ ⲙⲙⲉϥⲣⲱⲛ λβ ⲛⲁⲡⲉⲥ ⲛⲉⲃ[ⲉⲣ]ⲓ ιβ; for elucidation, compare Crum/Petrie 1989, 62 *ad loc* (ⲙⲙⲉϥⲣⲱⲛ = membrane; ⲁⲡⲉⲥ = paper).

[35] Lines 11–15 ⲛⲉϫⲱⲱⲙⲓ ⲛⲭⲁⲣⲧⲏⲥ. ζθ [ⲁ]ϩⲁ ⲕⲉ ιε ⲛⲁⲡⲉⲥ. ⲛⲉϫⲱ|[ⲱ]ⲙⲓ ⲙⲅⲣⲁⲫⲏ ⲭⲁⲣⲧⲏⲥ ε ⲙⲉϥⲣⲱⲛ ι ⲛⲉⲕⲁⲛⲕⲟⲩⲓ | ⲛϫⲱⲱⲙⲓ. ⲙⲙⲉϥⲣⲱⲛ. ⲛⲁⲡⲉⲥ ζ. ⲭⲁⲣⲧⲏⲥ ε ⲛⲁⲡⲉⲥ | ⲟⲩⲙⲓⲥϯⲕⲟⲛ ⲛⲟⲩⲉⲛⲓⲛ. ⲁϩⲁ ⲟⲩ <ca. 6 letters> ⲟⲗ. ⲛⲁⲡⲉⲥ ⲟⲩⲁⲛϯϥⲁⲛⲁⲣⲓ| ϫ]ⲱⲱⲙⲓ ϥⲁⲛⲧⲁⲩ ⲛⲉϯ <ca. 6 letters> ⲙⲡⲥⲟⲩⲣⲓⲁⲛⲏ ε. Crum (= Crum/Petrie 1989) interprets line 12 as an expression for the Old Testament (16 copies); for line 12, he reads μυστήϱια and ἀντιφονάϱιον; for line 15, he considers a writing error for Severian of Gabala or the Neoplatonist Syrianus, from whose writings (E. G. Schmidt 1979, 473–74) nothing has remained preserved.

10. The Internal Sequence of the Writings in Lists 19–21

List 19	**List 20**	**List 21**
Gen	Ps	North Wall
Num	Acts Cath	(B 12)
	Hagiography	59 x 4 Gos
	Serapion of Thmuis	(B 13)
	. . .	50 x 4 Gos
	Wisdom of Solomon	10 x 4 Gos
	Apocalypse of Ezra	(B 14)
	Vitae Patrum	Cath
	Father writings	Acts[36]
	. . .	East Wall
	. . .	(B 15–20)
	. . .	λόγος[37] and Father Writings

[36] Interestingly, the expression ⲘⲚⲚⲈⲠⲢⲀⲬⲒⲤ must be explained: ⲚⲀⲒⲚⲈⲚⲈⲠⲢⲀⲬⲒⲤ ⲚⲀⲠⲞⲤⲦⲞⲖⲞⲤ (Crum 1904, 564). Could one therefore have expected to find some apocryphal acts of apostles under this heading in this bookshelf as well?

[37] ⲚⲖⲞⲔ(*sic!*)ⲞⲤ ⲚⲀⲢⲬⲈⲠⲒⲤⲔⲞⲠⲞⲤ . . . , two additional works of the "archbishop," a book ὅϱοι (?), the history of Cyprian (Crum 1904: of Antioch), the letters of Epiphanius.

10. The Internal Sequence of the Writings in Lists 19–21 *(continued)*

List 19	**List 20**	**List 21**
	Mark	West Wall
	Cath	(B 22–25)
	Father writings	Vitae of Fathers[38]
	. . .	(B 26)
	Luke	13 x Ps[39]
	Apostolos	
	Apostolos	
	Act	
	Cath	
	. . .	

[38] In B 21/22, there are twenty-one mentioned by name, including understandably Shenute with eight (nine) copies, but also ⲛⲁⲡⲟⲥⲧⲟⲗⲟⲥ (sc. βίος), apocryphal apostle acts (?) according to Crum 1904, *ad loc*; in B 23, there are thirteen fathers, including twenty copies of the Pachomius-vita: “all these works are still partly extant among the fragments brought from the White Monastery” (Crum 1904, 567); in B 24–27, there are three to four more writings.

[39] ⲇⲁⲩⲉⲓⲇ ⲡⲉⲣⲣⲟ ιγ. 13 Psalter are probably intended here (against Crum 1904, 567); other writings by “King David” scarcely come into question.

Bibliography

Finding a Work in the Bibliography

In the English translation, the German version's threefold division of the literature into (1) *Quellen*, (2) *Hilfsmittel*, and (3) *Sekundärliteratur* has been compressed into a single bibliography. With the exception of select abbreviations, which are explained below, all works are referenced by author and date (e.g., Markschies 2007). If necessary, works from the same year are distinguished by the addition of a letter (e.g., 1965a and 1965b). While the bibliography sometimes includes earlier publication dates in square brackets (e.g., Bacher, W. 1965a [1889]), this information is not included in the in-text reference (e.g., Bacher 1965a).

Abbreviations

Abbreviations are based on the list of abbreviations in *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, compiled by S. Schwertner (Berlin, 1992); the *Greek-English Lexicon* of H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, and H. S. Jones (Oxford, 1968; = LSJ); the *Patristic Greek Lexicon* of G. W. H. Lampe (Oxford, 1961; = PGL); and the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* of P. G. W. Glare (Oxford, 1982). The English version has also drawn upon the *SBL Handbook of Style*. For the texts of Tertullian, I have followed suggestions of J.-C. Fredouille (Sources Chrétiennes 280 [Paris, 1980], 65), and for the Nag Hammadi writings, I have followed suggestions of K.-W. Tröger (*Altes Testament—Frühjudentum—Gnosis* [Gütersloh: Mohn, 1980], 16–17). For the main text and bibliography, special note should be made of the following abbreviations, some of which differ from the conventions adopted in the aforementioned works.

ACO	Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum (= Schwartz 1914–1940)
AwK	Altertumswissenschaftliches Kolloquium
BHG	Bibliotheca hagiographica Graeca
BHL	Bibliotheca hagiographica Latina
BHO	Bibliotheca hagiographica orientalis
BiTeu	Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana (= BSGRT)
BKT	Berliner Klassikertexte
BSGR	Bibliothek der Symbole und Glaubensregeln der alten Kirche, edited by A. Hahn, G. L. Hahn, and A. v. Harnack.
CAG	Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca
CANT	Clavis Apocryphorum Novi Testamenti, edited by M. Geerard
CIG	Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum
CIL	Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum
CPG	Clavis Patrum Graecorum, edited by M. Geerard
CPL	Clavis Patrum Latinorum, edited by E. Dekkers
DNP	Der Neue Pauly: Enzyklopädie der Antike, edited by H. Cancik and H. Schneider
DPAC	Dizionario Patristico e di Antichità Cristiane
FChr	Fontes Christiani, edited by W. Geerlings
FiE	Forschungen in Ephesos, published by the Österreichische Archäologische Institute
IG	Inscriptiones Graecae
IG Rom	Inscriptiones Graecae ad res Romanas pertinentes
ILCV	Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae veteres, edited by E. Diehl
ILS	Inscriptiones Latinae selectae, edited by H. Dessau
KSB	Koptisches Sammelbuch, edited by M. R. M. Hasitzka (Vienna: Hollinek, 1993 ff.)
LSJ	H. G. Liddell/R. Scott/H. S. Jones, Greek-English Lexicon
MAMA	Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua. Manchester and London, 1928–1993
P.	Papyrus
PG	Patrologia Graeca (= Patrologiae cursus completus: Series graeca), edited by J.-P. Migne (162 vols.; Paris, 1857–1886)
PGL	A Patristic Greek Lexicon (= G. W. H. Lampe 1958 [1879])

PL	Patrologia latina (= Patrologiae cursus completes: Series latina), edited by J.-P. Migne (217 vols.; Paris, 1844–1864)
PLRE	The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire (= Jones/Martindale/Morris 1971)
PO	Patrologia Orientalis
SC	Sources Chrétiennes
SEG	Supplementum epigraphicum Graecum
SVT	Stoicorum veterum fragmenta, edited by H. von Arnim
TAM	Tituli Asiae Minoris
TGL	Thesaurus Graecae Linguae
TLL	Thesaurus Linguae Latinae
ZAC	Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum

The numeration of the GCS volumes according to the order of their publication, which was given up after volume 53, is not provided. Individual fasciles of the PG and PL are likewise not included separately in the following bibliography.

Abramowski, L. 1983. "'Die Erinnerungen der Apostel' bei Justin." Pages 341–53 in *Das Evangelium und die Evangelien*. Edited by P. Stuhlmacher. WUNT 28. Tübingen: Mohr.

———. 1991. "The 'Memoirs of the Apostles' in Justin." Pages 323–35 in *The Gospel and the Gospels*. Edited by P. Stuhlmacher. Translated by J. Vriend. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Acham, K. 1992. "Struktur, Funktion und Genese von Institutionen aus sozialwissenschaftlicher Sicht." Pages 25–71 in *Institutionen und Geschichte. Theoretische Aspekte und mittelalterliche Befunde*. Edited by G. Melville. Norm und Struktur. Studien zum sozialen Wandel in Mittelalter und früher Neuzeit 1. Cologne: Böhlau.

Achelis, H., and J. Flemming. 1891. *Die ältesten Quellen des orientalistischen Kirchenrechts*. *Erstes Buch: Die Canones Hippolyti*. TU 6/4. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

———. 1904. *Die ältesten Quellen des orientalischen Kirchenrechts*. *Zweites Buch: Die syrische Didaskalia*. Translated and commented on by H. Achelis und J. Flemming. TU 25/2. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

Adler, M. 1930. "Der Arkesilaos-Papyrus." Pages 5–10 in *Charisteria: Alois Rzach zum achtzigsten Geburstag dargebracht*. Reichenberg: Gebrüder Stiepel Ges. m.b.H.

Adriaen, M., and D. Vallarsi, eds. 1970. *Commentarii in Prophetas Minores*. Vol. 6 of *Hieronymi Presbyteri Opera*. Part I: *Opera Exegetica*. CChr.SL 76A. Turnhout: Brepols.

Aland, B. 1973. "Die Apophasis Megale und die simonianische Gnosis. Bemerkungen zu J. Frickel, *Die 'Apophasis Megale' in Hippolyt's Refutatio VI 9–18. Eine Paraphrase zur Apophasis Simons*." *ThPh* 48: 410–18.

———. 1977. “Erwählungstheologie und Menschenklassenlehre. Die Theologie des Herakleon als Schlüssel zum Verständnis der christlichen Gnosis?” Pages 148–81 in *Gnosis and Gnosticism: Papers Read at the Seventh International Conference on Patristic Studies (Oxford, Sept. 8th–13th 1975)*. Edited by M. Krause. NHS 8. Leiden: Brill.

———. 1983. “Christentum, Bildung und römische Oberschicht. Zum ‘Octavius’ des Minucius Felix.” Pages 11–30 in *Platonismus und Christentum. Festschrift für Heinrich Dörrie*. Edited by H.-D. Blume and F. Mann. JbAC Ergbd. 10. Münster: Aschendorff.

———. 2000 [1992]. “Marcion/Marcioniten.” Pages 89–101 in *TRE* XXII (= Aland 2009, 318–40).

———. 2009. *Was ist Gnosis?* WUNT 239. Tübingen: Mohr.

Aland, K. 1960. “Bemerkungen zum Montanismus und zur frühchristlichen Eschatologie.” Pages 105–48 in *Kirchengeschichtliche Entwürfe*. Edited by K. Aland. Gütersloh: Mohn.

———. 1970. “Das Problem des neutestamentlichen Kanons.” Pages 134–58 in *Das Neue Testament als Kanon. Dokumentation und kritische Analyse zur gegenwärtigen Diskussion*. Edited by E. Käsemann. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

———, ed. 1994. *Kurzgefaßte Liste der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments*. 2 ed. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Aland, K., and B. Aland. 1989a. *Der Text des Neuen Testaments. Einführung in die wissenschaftlichen Ausgaben sowie in Theorie und Praxis der modernen Textkritik*. 2 ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

———. 1989b. *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism*. Translated by E. F. Rhodes. 2 ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Aland, K., and H.-U. Rosenbaum. 1995. *Repertorium der griechischen christlichen Papyri*. Vol. II: *Kirchenväter-Papyri*. Part I: *Beschreibungen <RGCO II/1>*. PTS 42. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Aleith, E. 1937. *Paulusverständnis in der Alten Kirche*. BZNW 18. Berlin: Töpelmann.

Alfonsi, L. 1979. “La struttura della I ‘Apologia’ di Giustino.” Pages 57–76 in *Paradoxos politeia. Studi patristici in onore di Giuseppe Lazzati*. Edited by R. Cantalamessa and L. F. Pizzolato. PUSC. SPMed 10. Milan: Vita e pensiero.

Alkier, S. 1993. *Urchristentum. Zur Geschichte und Theologie einer exegetischen Disziplin*. BHTh 83. Tübingen: Mohr.

Altaner, B. 1948. “Die Bibliothek des hl. Augustinus.” *ThRev* 44: 73–78 (= Altaner 1967, 174–78).

———. 1950. “In der Studierstube des heiligen Augustinus. Beiträge zur Kenntnis des schriftstellerischen Schaffens Augustins.” Pages 378–431 in *Amt und Sendung. Beiträge zu seelsorgerlichen und religiösen Fragen*. Edited by E. Kleineidam. Freiburg: Herder (= Altaner 1967, 3–56).

———. 1967. *Kleine patristische Schriften*. Edited by G. Glockmann. TU 83. Berlin: Akademie.

Altendorf, H.-D. 1966. Review of W. Bauer/G. Strecker, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei*. *ThLZ* 91: 192–95.

———. 1969. “Zum Stichwort: Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum.” *ZKG* 80: 61–74.

Altermath, F. 1977. *Du Corps Psychique au Corps Spirituel. Interprétation de 1 Cor. 15, 35–49 par les auteurs Chrétiens des quatre premiers siècles*. BGBE 18. Tübingen: Mohr.

André, J.-M. 1987. “Les écoles philosophiques aux deux premiers siècles de l’Empire.” Pages 5–77 in *ANRW* II 36.1.

Andresen, C. 1952/1953. “Justin und der mittlere Platonismus.” *ZNW* 44: 157–95 (= Andresen 1981).

———. 1971. *Die Kirchen der alten Christenheit*. RdM 29, 1/2. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

———. 1981. “Justin und der mittlere Platonismus.” Pages 319–68 in *Der Mittelplatonismus*. Edited by C. Zintzen. WdF 70. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft (= Andresen 1952/1953).

Andresen, C., and A. M. Ritter. 1993. *Geschichte des Christentums*. Vol. I/1. ThW 6/1. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

———. 1999. “Die Anfänge christlicher Lehrentwicklung.” Pages 56–75 in *Handbuch der Dogmen-und Theologie Geschichte*. Vol. 1: *Die Lehrentwicklung im Rahmen der Katholizität*. Edited by C. Andresen and A. M. Ritter. 2 ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Anonymous, ed. 1911. *Zur Erinnerung an den sechzigjährigen Geburtstag Adolf Harnacks am 7.6.1911. Das kirchenhistorische Seminar*. Berlin: Rosenthal.

Anonymous (= N. Von Arseniew[?]). 1935. Review of W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei*. *Irén* 12: 682–83.

Anonymous. 1936. Review of W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei*. VS: 177–78.

Anonymous. 1937. Review of W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei*. RScR 17: 23–24.

Aono, T. 1979. *Die Entwicklung des paulinischen Gerichtsgedankens bei den apostolischen Vätern*. EHS.T 137. Bern: Lang.

Aragione, G. 2005. “La *Lettre festale 39* d’Athanase. Présentation et traduction de la version copte et de l’extrait grec.” Pages 197–219 in *Le canon du Nouveau Testament. Regards nouveaux sur l’histoire de sa formation*. Edited by G. Aragione, É. Junod, and E. Norelli. Le Monde de la Bible 54. Geneva: Labor et Fides.

Arai, S. 1977. “Simonianische Gnosis und die *Exegese über die Seele*.” Pages 185–203 in *Gnosis and Gnosticism: Papers Read at the Seventh International Conference on Patristic Studies (Oxford, September 8–13, 1975)*. Edited by M. Krause. NHS 8. Leiden: Brill.

Arnim, H. von. 1898. *Leben und Werke des Dion von Prusa*. Berlin: Weidmann.

Arras, V. 1986. *Gerontikon*. CSCO.Ae 78/80. Leuven: Peeters.

Ash, J. L. 1976. “The Decline of Ecstatic Prophecy in the Early Church.” *TS* 37: 227–52.

Assmann, J. 1986. “Arbeit am Polytheismus. Die Idee der Einheit und die Entfaltung des theologischen Diskurses in Ägypten.” Pages 46–69 in *Theologen und*

Theologien in verschiedenen Kulturkreisen. Edited by H. v. Stietencron. Tübinger religionswissenschaftliche Ringvorlesungen. Düsseldorf: Patmos.

———. 1991. *Ägypten. Theologie und Frömmigkeit einer frühen Hochkultur*. 2 ed. Urban-Taschenbücher 366. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

———. 1992. *Politische Theologie zwischen Ägypten und Israel*. Carl Friedrich von Siemens Stiftung. Themen 52. Munich: VG Bild-Kunst.

———. 1997. *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis. Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen*. Munich: Beck.

Athanassiadi, P. 1999. *Damascius, The Philosophical History*: *Text with Translation and Notes*. Athens: Apamea.

Attridge, H. W. 1975. "P. Oxy. 1081 and the Sophia Jesus Christi." *Enchoria* 5: 1–8.

———, ed. 1985. *Nag Hammadi Codex I (the Jung Codex): Notes*. NHS 23. Leiden: Brill.

———. 1989. "The Greek Fragments." Pages 95–128 in *Nag Hammadi Codex II, 2–7 together with XIII, 2*, Brit. Lib. Or. 4926(1), and P.Oxy. 1, 654, 655 with Contributions by Many Scholars*. Vol. 1: *Gospel according to Thomas, Gospel according to Philip, Hypostasis of the Archons, and Indexes*. Edited by B. Layton. The Coptic Gnostic Library (= NHS 20). Leiden: Brill.

Aune, D. E. 1983. *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Ausbüttel, F. 1982. *Untersuchungen zu den Vereinen im Westen des Römischen Reiches*. Frankfurter Althistorische Studien 11. Kallmünz: Lassleben.

B., P. 1935. Review of W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei*. *Rel*. 11: 83–84.

Baarda, T. 1982. "2 Clement 12 and the Sayings of Jesus." Pages 529–56 in *Logia: Les Paroles de Jésus—The Sayings of Jesus, dédié à J. Coppens*. Edited by J. Delobel. BEThL 59. Leuven: Peeters.

Bacher, W. 1965a [1889]. *Die exegetische Terminologie der jüdischen Traditionsliteratur*. Part I: *Die bibelexegetische Terminologie der Tannaiten*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

———. 1965b [1905]. *Die exegetische Terminologie der jüdischen Traditionsliteratur*. Part II: *Die bibel-und traditionsexegetische Terminologie der Amoräer*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Bacht, H. 1951. "Wahres und falsches Prophetentum. Ein kritischer Beitrag zur religionsgeschichtlichen Behandlung des frühen Christentums." *Bib*. 32: 237–62.

Bader, G. 1996. *Psalterium affectuum palaestra. Prolegomena zu einer Theologie des Psalters*. HUTh 33. Tübingen: Mohr.

———. 1998. "Ritus III. Kirchengeschichtlich und systematisch-theologisch." Pages 270–79 in *TRE* XXIX.

Baehrens, W., ed. 1920. *Homilien zum Hexateuch in Rufins Übersetzung*. Part I: *Die Homilien zu Genesis, Exodus und Leviticus*. Vol. 6 of *Origenes Werke*. GCS Origenes VI. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

———, ed. 1921. *Homilien zum Hexateuch in Rufins Übersetzung*. Part II: *Die Homilien zu Numeri, Josua und Judices*. Vol. 7 of *Origenes Werke*. GCS Origenes VII. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

———, ed. 1925. *Homiliae in Regn., Ez. et al*. Vol. 8 of *Origenes Werke*. GCS Origenes VIII. Leipzig: Hinrichs.
Bagnall, R. S. 1993. *Egypt in Late Antiquity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Baltes, M. 1996. “Γέγονεν (Platon, Tim. 28 B 7). Ist die Welt real entstanden oder nicht?” Pages 76–96 in *Polyhistor: Studies in the History and Historiography of Ancient Philosophy, Presented to J. Mansfeld on His Sixtieth Birthday*. Edited by K. A. Algra, P. W. van der Horst, and D. T. Runia. Leiden: Brill.
Bammer, A. 1978. “Das Tieropfer am Artemisaltar von Ephesus.” Pages 107–57 in *Studien zur Religion und Kultur Kleinasiens. Festschrift für Friedrich Karl Dörner*. Vol. 1. Edited by S. Şahin. EPRO 66/1. Leiden: Brill.
Bandt, C. 2007. *Der Traktat “Vom Mysterium der Buchstaben.” Kritischer Text mit Einführung, Übersetzung und Anmerkungen*. TU 162. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
Bardy, G. 1932a. “L’église et l’enseignement dans les trois premiers siècles.” *RSR* 27: 65–90.
———. 1932b. “Les écoles romaines au second siècle.” *RHE*: 501–32.
———. 1934–1935. “L’église et l’enseignement au quatrième siècle.” *RSR* 13–14: 525–49, 1–27.
———. 1937. “Aux origines de l’école d’Alexandrie.” *RSR* 27: 65–90.
———. 1942. “Pour l’histoire de l’école d’Alexandrie.” *VivPen* 2: 80–109.
———. 1949. “‘Philosophie’ et ‘philosophe’ dans le vocabulaire chrétien des premiers siècles.” *RAM* 25: 97–108.
———, ed. 1973. *Les Trophées de Damas. Controverse Judéo-Chrétienne du VIIe siècle*. Turnhout: Brepols.
Barnard, L. W. 1968. “The Heresy of Tatian—Once Again.” *JEH* 19: 1–10.
Bartelink, G. J. M. 1960. “‘Philosophie’ et ‘philosophe’ dans quelques oeuvres de Jean Chrysostome.” *RAM* 36: 486–92.
———. 1994. “Homer.” Pages 116–47 in *RAC* XVI.
Barth, C. 1911. *Die Interpretation des Neuen Testamentes in der valentinianischen Gnosis*. TU 37/3. Leipzig: Hinrichs.
Barth, K. 1985 [1932]. *Die Lehre vom Wort Gottes. Prolegomena zur kirchlichen Dogmatik*. Vol. I/1 of *Die kirchliche Dogmatik*. 11 ed. Zürich: Evangelischer Verlag.
Barton, J. 1997. *Holy Writings—Sacred Text: The Canon in Early Christianity*. London: SPCK.
Barwick, K., and F. Kühnert, eds. 1964. *Flavii Sosipatri Charisii Artis grammaticae libri V*. BiTeu. Leipzig: Teubner.
Bauckham, R. 1991. “Salome the Sister of Jesus, Salome the Disciple of Jesus, and the Secret Gospel of Mark.” *NT* 33: 245–75.
Bauer, C. 1955. *Initia Patrum Graecorum*. Vol. I. SeT 180. Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana.
Bauer, W. 1902. “Mündige und Unmündige bei dem Apostel Paulus.” PhD diss., Marburg (= Bauer 1967a, 122–54).
———. 1903. *Der Apostolos der Syrer in der Zeit von der Mitte des vierten Jahrhunderts bis zur Spaltung der syrischen Kirche*. Gießen: Ricker.
———. 1912. *Das Johannesevangelium*. HNT 6. Tübingen: Mohr.

———. 1920. *Die Briefe des Ignatius von Antiochia und der Brief des Polycarp von Smyrna*. Vol. 2. HNT. Ergbd. 2. Tübingen: Mohr.
———. 1927. "Jesus der Galiläer." Pages 16–34 in *Festgabe für A. Jülicher*. Tübingen: Mohr (= Bauer 1967a, 91–108).
———. 1928. *Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur*. 2nd completely revised edition of E. Preuschen's *Vollständigem Griechisch-Deutschem Handwörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur* (1910). Gießen: Töpelmann.
———. 1932. *Heinrich Julius Holtzmann. Ein Lebensbild*. Aus der Welt der Religionen, bibl. Reihe 9. Gießen: Töpelmann (= Bauer 1967a, 285–341).
———. 1934a. *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum*. Tübingen: Mohr.
———. 1934b. "Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum." *FuF* 10: 99–101 (= Bauer 1967a, 229–33).
———. 1964. *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum*. Edited by G. Strecker. 2 ed. BHTh 10. Tübingen: Mohr.
———. 1967a. *Aufsätze und kleine Schriften*. Edited by G. Strecker. Tübingen: Mohr.
———. 1967b. "Der Palmesel." Pages 109–21 in *Aufsätze und kleine Schriften*. Edited by G. Strecker. Tübingen: Mohr.
———. 1967c [1909]. *Das Leben Jesu im Zeitalter der neutestamentlichen Apokryphen*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
———. 1971. *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*. English translation edited and supplemented by R. A. Kraft and G. Krodel with a team from the Philadelphia Seminar on Christian Origins. Philadelphia: Fortress. (For an active link to Robert A. Kraft's updated electronic English version, see Wayne Coppins' website, http://www.germanforneutestamentler.com.)
———. 1988. *Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur von Walter Bauer*. 6th completely newly revised edition. Edited by K. Aland with special collaboration by V. Reichmann in the Institut für neutestamentliche Textforschung/Münster. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
Baulig, H. 1984. "Das frühe Christentum in Hermopolis Magna." PhD diss., Trier.
Baum, A. D. 1997. "Der neutestamentliche Kanon bei Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl*. III, 25, 1–7) im Kontext seiner literaturgeschichtlichen Arbeit." *EThL* 73: 307–48.
Baumeister, T. 1978a. "Montanismus und Gnostizismus. Die Frage der Identität und Akkomodation des Christentums im 2. Jahrhundert." *TThZ* 87: 44–60.
———. 1978b. "Ordnungsdenken und Geisterfahrung in der Alten Kirche." *RQ* 73: 137–51.
Baumstark, A. 1950. "Anaphora." Pages 418–27 in *RAC* I.
———. 1971 [1923]. *Vom geschichtlichen Werden der Liturgie*. EcOra 10. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
Bausi, A. 2009. "The 'So-Called Traditio Apostolica': Preliminary Observations on the New Ethiopic Evidence." Pages 291–321 in *Volksglaube im antiken Christentum.*

Prof. Dr. Theofried Baumeister OFM zur Emeritierung. Edited by H. Grieser and A. Merkt. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Bayer, C. M. M. 1983. "Tertullian zur Schulbildung der Christen. Welche Art des Unterrichts ist Gegenstand der Eröterungen im 10. Kapitel des Werkes de idolatria?" *RQ* 78: 186–91.

Beard, M. 1991. "Writing and Religion: Ancient Literacy and the Function of the Written Word in Roman Religion." Pages 35–58 in *Literacy in the Roman World*. Edited by J. H. Humphrey. *Journal of Roman Archaeology* Supplementary Series 3. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Department of Classical Studies, University of Michigan.

Beard, M., J. North, and S. Price, eds. 1998. *Religions of Rome*. Vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Beaujeu, J. 1973. *Apuleius, Opuscules philosophiques (Du dieu de Socrate, Platon et sa doctrine, du monde) et fragments*. CUFr. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Becker, C. 1954. *Tertullians Apologeticum. Werden und Leistung*. Munich: Kösel.

Beckwith, R. 1985. *The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church and Its Background in Early Judaism*. London: SPCK.

Bedjan, P., ed. 1895. *Histoire de Mar-Jabalaha, de trois autres patriarches, d'un prêtre et de deux laïques nestoriens*. 2 ed. Leipzig: Harrossowitz.

Beeson, C. 1913. *Isidor-Studien*. Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters 4/2. Munich: Beck.

Behr, C. A. 1968. *Aelius Aristides and the Sacred Tales*. Amsterdam: Hakkert.

———. 1986/1981. P. Aelius Aristides, *The Complete Works*. Vol. I: *Or. I–XVI with an Appendix Containing the Fragments and Inscriptions* (1986). Vol. 2: *Or. XVII–LIII* (1981). Translated into English by C. A. Behr. Leiden: Brill.

Bekker, I., ed. 1837. *Aristotelis Metaphysica*. Berlin: Reimer.

Bekker, I., L. Dindorf, and F. Vogel, eds. 1985 [[3]1890]. *Diodori Bibliotheca Historica*. Vol. II. Post I. Bekker et L. Dindorf recognovit F. Vogel. Editio Stereotypa Editionis Tertiae. BiTeu. Stuttgart: Tuebner.

Bell, H. I. 1954. *Cults and Creeds in Graeco-Roman Egypt: Being the Forwood Lectures for 1952*. Liverpool Monographs in Archaeology and Oriental Studies. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

Belliger, A., and D. Krieger, eds. 2003. *Ritualtheorien, ein einführendes Handbuch*. 2 ed. Wiesbaden: Westdeutcher Verlag.

Bellinzoni, A. J. 1967. *The Sayings of Jesus in the Writings of Justin Martyr*. NT.S 17. Leiden: Brill.

Beneševič, N., ed. 1974 [1906]. *Syntagma XIV titulorum sine scholiis secundum versionem palaeo-Slovenicam. Adjecto textu Graeco e vetustissimis codicibus ms. Exarato*. Subsidia Byzantina 2b. Leipzig: Leipzig Zentralantiquariat der Dt. Demokrat. Republik.

Bensley, L. R., ed. 1899. *The Epistles of S. Clement to the Corinthians in Syriac*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Benz, R. 1969. *Die Legenda Aurea des Jacobus de Voragine*. Cologne: Hegner.

Berardino, A. d. 1972. "Maestri cristiani del III secolo nell'insegnamento classico." *Aug*. 12: 549–56.

Bergdolt, J. 1936. Review of W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei*. *Luth*. 47: 316–17.
Bernand, A., and E. Bernand. 1998. “Un procurateur des effigies impériales à Alexandrie.” *ZPE* 122: 97–101.
Bernardi, J. 1984. Gregory of Nanzianzus, *Discours 4–5: Contre Julien*. SC 309. Paris: Cerf.
Bernoulli, C. A. 1895. *Der Schriftstellerkatalog des Hieronymus. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*. Freiburg: Mohr.
Bethge, H.-G. 1989. “Introduction.” Pages 12–19 in *Nag Hammadi Codex II, 2–7*. Edited by B. Layton. NHS 21. Leiden: Brill.
Betz, H. D. 1965. “Orthodoxy and Heresy in Primitive Christianity: Some Critical Remarks on Georg Strecker’s Republication of Walter Bauer’s *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum*.” *Interpretation* 19: 299–311.
———. 1998. “Antike und Christentum.” Pages 542–46 in *RGG*[4] I.
Beumer, J. 1973. “Das Fragmentum Muratori und seine Rätsel.” *ThPh* 48: 534–50.
Bévenot, M. 1993 [1981]. “Cyprian von Karthago.” Pages 246–554 in *TRE* VIII.
Beyschlag, K. 1974. *Simon Magus und die christliche Gnosis*. WUNT 16. Tübingen: Mohr.
———. 1988. *Gott und Welt*. Vol. I of *Grundriss der Dogmengeschichte*. 2 ed. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
———. 1991. *Gott und Mensch. Das christologische Dogma*. Vol. 2/1 in *Grundriss der Dogmengeschichte*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
Bickerman, E. 1927. “Ritualmord und Eselskult. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte antiker Publizistik.” *MGWJ* 71: 171–87, 255–64 (= Bickerman 1980, 225–55).
———. 1980. *Studies in Jewish and Christian History*. Part II. AGJU 9.
Bidez, J. 1930. *La Vie de l’Empereur Julien*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
———. 1947. *Julian der Abtrünnige*. Translated by H. Rinn. 2 ed. Munich: Callway (= Bidez 1930).
Bidez, J., and F. Cumont., eds. 1922. *Imperatoris Caesaris Flavii Claudii Iuliani Epistulae Leges Poematia et Apophthegmata*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
Bidez, J., and G. C. Hansen. 1960. *Sozomenus Kirchengeschichte*. Edited by J. Bidez. Introduced, prepared for publication, and indexed by G. C. Hansen. GCS Sozomenus. Berlin: Academie.
Bidez, J., and F. Winkelmann. 1972. *Kirchengeschichte, mit dem Leben des Lucian von Antiochien und den Fragmenten eines arianischen Historiographen*. Edited by J. Bidez. 2nd revised edition provided by F. Winkelmann. GCS Philostorgius. Berlin: Akadamie.
Bienert, W. A. 1978. *Dionysius von Alexandrien. Zur Frage des Origenismus im dritten Jahrhundert*. PTS 21. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
———. 1997. *Dogmengeschichte*. Grundkurs Theologie 5/1 (= UB 425/1). Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
Bietenhard, H. 1954. “ὄνομα κτλ.” Pages 242–83 in *ThTWNT V*.
Bigelmair, A. 1902. *Die Beteiligung der Christen am öffentlichen Leben in vorconstantinischer Zeit. Ein Beitrag zur ältesten Kirchengeschichte*. VKSM 8. Munich: Lentner.

Billerbeck, P. 1928. "Der Kanon und seine Inspiration." Pages 415–51 in *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*. Vol. IV/1: *Exkurse zu einzelnen Stellen des Neuen Testaments. Abhandlungen zur neutestamentlichen Theologie und Archäologie*. Edited by H. L. Strack and P. Billerbeck. Munich: Beck.

Birt, T. 1907. *Die Buchrolle in der Kunst. Archäologisch-antiquarische Untersuchungen zum antiken Buchwesen*. Leipzig: Tuebner.

———. 1959 [1882]. *Das antike Buchwesen in seinem Verhältnis zur Litteratur*. Aalen: Scientia.

Bitterli, U. 1991. *Die "Wilden" und die "Zivilisierten." Grundzüge einer Geistes-und Kulturgeschichte der europäisch-überseeischen Begegnung*. 2 ed. Munich: Beck.

Björk, G. 1939. "Heidnische und christliche Orakel mit fertigen Antworten." *Symbolae Osloenses* 19: 86–88.

Blackman, E. C. 1978 [1948]. *Marcion and His Influence*. New York: AMS Press.

Blaise, A. 1954. *Dictionnaire Latin-Français de Auteurs Chrétiens, revu spécialement pour le vocabulaire théologique par H. Chirat*. Turnhout: Brepols.

Blass, F., and A. Debrunner. 1984. *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*. Revised by F. Rehkopf. 16 ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Bludau, A. 1925. *Die Schriftfälschung der Häretiker. Ein Beitrag zur Textkritik der Bibel*. NTA 11/5. Münster: Aschendorff.

Blum, R. 1977. "Kallimachos und die Literaturverzeichnung bei den Griechen. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Biobibliographie." *AGB* 18: 11–360.

Blümel, W. 1995. "Inschriften aus Karien I." *Epigraphica Anatolica* 25: 35–64.

———. 1997. "Ein weiteres Fragment des Kultgesetzes aus Bargylia." *Epigraphica Anatolica* 28: 153–56.

———. 2000. "Ein dritter Teil des Kultgesetzes aus Bargylia." *Epigraphica Anatolica* 32: 89–94.

———. Forthcoming. *Die Inschriften von Tralleis und Nysa*. Vol. 2: *Die Inschriften von Nysa*. Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien 36/2. Bonn: Habelt.

Böhlig, A. 1975. "Die griechische Schule und die Bibliothek von Nag Hammadi." Pages 9–53 in *Zum Hellenismus in den Schriften von Nag Hammadi*. Edited by A. Böhlig and F. Wisse. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

———. 1989. "Neue Initiativen zur Erschließung der koptisch-manichäischen Bibliothek von Medinet Madi." *ZNW* 80: 240–62.

Böhlig, A., F. Wisse, and P. Labib, eds. 1975. *Nag Hammadi Codices III, 2 and IV, 2. The Gospel of the Egyptians (The Holy Book of the Great Invisible Spirit)*. The Coptic Gnostic Library. NHS 4. Leiden: Brill.

Böhm, T. 2002. "Origenes—Theologe und (Neu-)Platoniker? Oder: Wem soll man mißtrauen—Eusebius oder Porphyrius?" *Adamantius* 8: 7–23.

Boissevain, U. P., ed. 1895–1931. *Cassii Dionis Cocceiani Historiarum Romanarum quae supersunt*. 5 vols. Berlin: Weidmann.

Boissonade, J. F., ed. 1849. *Eunapii Sardiani vitas sophistarum et fragmenta historiarum recensuit notisque*. Paris: Didot.

Bolgiani, F. 1992. "Encratism." Pages 271–72 in *EECh* 1.

———. 1995. “Sulla data del frammento muratoriano: A proposito di uno studio recente.” *RSLR* 31: 461–71.

Boll, F. 1908. *Catalogus Codicum Astrologorum Graecorum*. Vol. VII: *Codices Germanicos*. Brussels: Lamertin.

Bonner, C. 1925. “A Papyrus Codex of the Shepherd of Hermas.” *HThR* 18: 115–27.

———. 1927. “A New Fragment of the Shepherd of Hermas.” *HThR* 20: 105–16.

Bonner, G. 1956. “The Scillitan Saints and the Pauline Epistles.” *JEH* 7: 141–46.

Bonner, S. F. 1977. *Education in Ancient Rome, from the Elder Cato to the Younger Pliny*. London: Methuen.

Bonwetsch, G. N. 1881. *Die Geschichte des Montanismus*. Erlangen: Deichert.

Bonwetsch, G. N., and H. Achelis, eds. 1897. *Kleinere exegetische und homiletische Schriften*. Vol. I/2 of *Hippolyt Werke*. GCS Hippolyt I/2. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

Bonwetsch, G. N., and M. Richard, eds. 2000. *Kommentar zu Daniel*. Vol. I/1 of *Hippolyt Werke*. Edited by G. N. Bonwetsch. 2nd completely revised edition edited by M. Richard. GCS Hippolyt I/1. Berlin: Akademie.

Borleffs, J. G. P., ed. 1954. *Ad nationes*. Pages 9–75 in *Quinti Septimi Florentis Tertulliani Opera*. Part I: *Opera Catholica, Adv. Marcionem*. CChr.SL 1. Turnhout: Brepols.

Botte, B. 1947. “L’epiclèse de l’Anaphore d’Hippolyte.” *RThAM* 14: 241–51.

———. 1964. “L’Eucologe de Sérapion est-il authentique?” *OrChr* 48: 50–56.

———. 1976. “Die Wendung ‘adstare coram te et tibi ministrare’ im Eucharistischen Hochgebet II.” *BiLi* 49: 101–4.

———. 1984. *Hippolytus, La tradition apostolique d’après les anciennes versions*. SC 11. Paris: Cerf.

Botte, B., A. Gerhards, and S. Feldbecker. 1989. *La tradition apostolique de Saint Hippolyte. Essai de reconstitution*. Edited by B. Botte. 5 ed., edited by A. Gerhards with the collaboration of S. Feldbecker. LQF 39. Münster: Aschendorft.

Bouffartigue, J., and M. Patillon. 1979. *Porphyrius, De l’Abstinence*. Vol. II: *Livres II et III*. CUFr. Paris: Les Bettres Lettres.

Bouley, A. 1981. *From Freedom to Formula: The Evolution of the Eucharistic Prayer from Oral Improvisation to Written Texts*. SCA 21. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press.

Bousset, W. 1966 [^{6}1906]. *Die Offenbarung Johannes*. KEK XVI. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

———. 1975. *Jüdisch-christlicher Schulbetrieb in Alexandria und Rom. Literarische Untersuchungen zu Philo und Clemens von Alexandria, Justin und Irenaeus*. FRLANT 23. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Bovon, F. 2000. “Fragment Oxyrhynchus 840. Fragment of a Lost Gospel, Witness of an Early Christian Controversy over Purity.” *JBL* 119: 705–28.

Bowman, A. K., and G. Woolf. 1996 [1994]. “Introduction.” Pages 1–16 in *Literacy and Power in the Ancient World*. Edited by A. K. Bowman and G. Woolf. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Boyarin, D. 2000. “A Tale of Two Synods: Nicaea, Yavneh, and Rabbinic Ecclesiology.” *Exemplaria* 12: 21–62.

Boyaval, B. 1975. “Psaume 92 sur deux tablettes scolaires.” *ZPE* 17: 145–50.

Bradshaw, P. F. 1981. *Daily Prayer in the Early Church: A Study of the Origin and Early Development of the Divine Office*. Alcuin Club Collections 63. London: SPCK.

———. 1985. “Gottesdienst IV. Alte Kirche.” Pages 39–42 in *TRE* XIV.

———. 1989. “Kirchenordnungen I.” Pages 662–70 in *TRE* XVIII.

———. 1993. “Liturgy and ‘Living Literature.’” Pages 138–53 in *Liturgy in Dialogue: Essays in Memory of Ronald Jasper*. Edited by P. F. Bradshaw and B. Spinks. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press.

———. 2002 [1992]. *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship: Sources and Methods for the Study of Early Liturgy*. Revised and enlarged edition. London: SPCK.

———. 2004. *Eucharistic Origins*. An Alcuin Club Publication. London: SPCK.

Bradshaw, P. F., M. E. Johnson, and L. E. Phillips. 2002. *The Apostolic Tradition: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg Fortress.

Brakke, D. 1994. “Canon Formation and Social Conflict in Fourth-Century Egypt.” *HThR* 87: 395–419.

———. 2010. *The Gnostics. Myth, Ritual, and Diversity in Early Christianity*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Brakmann, H. 1981. “Zur Bedeutung des Sinaiticus Graecus 2148 für die Geschichte der melchitischen Markos-Liturgie.” *JÖB* 30: 239–48.

———. 1987. “Der Berliner Papyrus 13918 und das griechische Euchologion-Fragment von Der el-Bala’izah.” *OKS* 36: 31–38.

———. 1988. “Der Gottesdienst der östlichen Kirchen.” *ALw* 30: 303–410.

———. 1996. “Das alexandrinische Eucharistiegebet auf Wiener Papyrusfragmenten.” *JbAC* 39: 149–64.

———. 1999a. “Neue Funde und Forschungen zur Liturgie der Kopten (1992–1996).” Pages 451–64 in *Ägypten und Nubien in spätantiker und christlicher Zeit. Akten des 6. Internationalen Koptologenkongresses, Münster, 20–26. July 1996*. Vol. 1: *Materielle Kultur, Kunst und religiöses Leben*. 6 ed. Edited by S. Emmel. Sprachen und Kulturen des christlichen Orients. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

———. 1999b. “Zur Stellung des Parisinus graecus 325 in der Geschichte der alexandrinisch-ägyptischen Liturgie.” *Studi sull’ Cristiano* 3: 97–110.

———. 2002 [2001]. “Zwischen Pharos und Wüste. Die Erforschung alexandrinisch-ägyptischer Liturgie durch und nach Anton Baumstark.” Pages 323–76 in *Acts of the International Congress Comparative Liturgy Fifty Years after Anton Baumstark (1872–1948), Rome, 25–29 September 1998*. Edited by R. F. Taft and G. Winkler. OrChrA 265. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale.

Brandt, S., and G. Laubmann, eds. 1890. *Caeli Firmiani Lactanti opera omnia (. . .)*. Part I: *Divinae Institutiones et Epitome divinarum institutionum*. CSEL 19. Prague: Tempsky.

Brashear, W. 1986. “Holz-und Wachstafeln der Sammlung Kiseleff, 2. Teil (Tafel 1–12).” *Enchoria* 14: 1–19.

———. 1993. *Vereine im griechisch-römischen Ägypten*. Xenia 34. Konstanz: Universitätsverlag.

Braun, O. 1915. “Legende des Mar Abas (Geschichte der wunderbaren und göttlichen Kämpfe des heiligen Zeugen Mâr Abâ, des Katholikos, Patriarchen des Orients).” Pages 118–220 in *Ausgewählte Akten persischer Märtyrer. Mit einem Anhang: Ostsyrisches Mönchsleben*. Translated by O. Braun. BKV I/22. München: Kösel.

Braun, R. 1977. *Deus Christianorum. Recherches sur le vocabulaire doctrinal de Tertullien*. 2 ed. EAug 70. Paris: Études augustiniennes.

Bremmer, J. N. 2000. “Opfer III. Griechenland.” Pages 1240–46 in *DNP* VIII.

Brennecke, H. C. 1997. “‘*An fidelis ad militiam converti possit*’? (Tertullian, *de idolatria* 19,1). Frühchristliches Bekenntnis und Militärdienst im Widerspruch?” Pages 45–100 in *Die Weltlichkeit des Glaubens in der Alten Kirche. Festschrift für Ulrich Wickert zum siebzigsten Geburtstag*. Edited by D. Wyrwa. BZNW 85. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

———. 2000 [1991]. “Lucian von Antiochien.” Pages 474–79 in *TRE* XXI.

Brésard, L., H. Crouzel, and M. Borrett, eds. 1991/1992. *Origène, Commentaire sur le Cantique des Cantiques*. Vol. I: *Livres I–II*. Vol. II: *Livres III–IV*. SC 375–76. Paris: Cerf.

Brightman, F. E. 1900. “The Sacramentary of Serapion of Thmuis.” *JThS* 1: 88–113, 247–77.

———, ed. 1967 [1896]. *Liturgies Eastern and Western, Being the Texts Original or Translated of the Principal Liturgies of the Church*. Vol. 1: *Eastern Liturgies*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Brinkmann, A. 1901. “Gregors des Thaumaturgen Panegyricus auf Origenes.” *RhM* 1901: 55–60.

———. 1910. “Aus dem antiken Schulunterricht.” *RhM* 65: 149–55.

Brock, S. P. 1974. “The Epiclesis in the Antiochene Baptismal Ordines.” Pages 138–218 in *Symposium Syriacum 1972. Célebré dans les jours 26/31 octobre 1972 à l’Institut Pontifical Oriental de Rome*. OCA 197. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale.

Broek, R. van den. 1979. “Niet-gnostisch Christendom in Alexandrië voor Clemens en Origines.” *NThT* 33: 287–99.

———. 1995. “The ‘Christian School’ of Alexandria in the Second and Third Century.” Pages 39–47 in *Centres of Learning: Learning and Location in Pre-Modern Europe and the Near East*. Edited by H. J. W. Drijvers and A. A. MacDonald. Brill’s Studies in Intellectual History 61. Leiden: Brill (= Broek 1996, 197–205).

———. 1996. *Studies in Gnosticism and Alexandrian Christianity*. NHMS 39. Leiden: Brill.

Brooks, J. A. 1992. “Clement of Alexandria as a Witness to the Development of the New Testament Canon.” *JECS* 9: 41–55.

Brown, P. 1992. *Power and Persuasion in Late Antiquity: Towards a Christian Empire*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

———. 1993. *Die Gesellschaft und das Übernatürliche*. Translated by M. Pfeiffer. Berlin: Wagenbach.

———. 1995. *Macht und Rhetorik in der Spätantike. Der Weg zu einem “Christlichen Imperium.”* Translated by V. von Ow and K. Brodersein. dtv wissenschaft 4650. Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch-Verlag.

Brox, N. 1975. *Falsche Verfasserangaben. Zur Erklärung der frühchristlichen Pseudepigraphie*. SBS 79. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk.
———, ed. 1976. *Pseudepigraphie in der heidnischen und jüdisch-christlichen Antike*. WdF 484. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
———. 1981. *Der Hirt des Hermas, übersetzt und erklärt*. KAV VII. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
———. 1986. "Häresie." Pages 248–97 in *RAC* XIII.
Bruce, F. F. 1983. "Some Thoughts on the Beginning of the New Testament Canon." *BJRL* 65: 37–60.
———. 1988. *The Canon of Scripture*. Glasgow: Chapter House.
Bruders, H. 1935. Review of W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei*. *Schol*. 10: 589.
Brunner-Traut, E. 1982. *Ägypten. Kunst- und Reiseführer mit Landeskunde*. 4 ed. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
Buchinger, H. 2007. "Early Eucharist in Transition? A Fresh Look at Origen." Pages 207–27 in *Jewish and Christian Liturgy and Worship: New Insights into Its History and Interaction*. Edited by A. Gerhards and C. Leonhard. Jewish and Christian Perspectives 15. Leiden: Brill.
———. Forthcoming. *Wortgottesdienst und Eucharistiefeier bei Origenes. Mit einem Anhang: Perikopenverzeichnis zu den erhaltenen Homilien*. Liturgica Oenipontana. Münster: LIT.
Buckler, W. H. 1923. "Labour Disputes in the Province of Asia." Pages 27–50 in *Anatolian Studies Presented to Sir William Mitchell Ramsay*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
Buckler, W. H., W. M. Calder, and C. W. M. Cox. 1927. "Asia Minor 1924: IV.—A Monument from the Upper Tembris Valley." *JRS* 17: 49–58.
Buckler, W. H., W. M. Calder, and W. K. C. Guthrie, eds. 1933. *Monuments and Documents from Eastern Asia and Western Galatia*. MAMA IV. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
Budde, A. 2000. "Die Darbringung in Gedankengang des Eucharistischen Hochgebetes." Pages 185–95 in *Das Opfer—biblischer Anspruch und liturgische Gestalt*. Edited by A. Gerhards and K. Richter. QD 186. Freiburg: Herder.
———. 2001a. "Improvisation im Eucharistiegebet. Zur Technik freien Betens in der Alten Kirche." *JbAC* 44: 127–41.
———. 2001b. "Wie findet man 'Ägyptisches Heimatgut'? Der ägyptische Ursprung der Basileios—Anaphora in der Diskussion." Pages 671–88 in *Acts of the International Congress Comparative Liturgy Fifty Years after Anton Baumstark (1872–1948), Rome 25–29 September 1988*. Edited by R. F. Taft and G. Winkler. OrChrA 265. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale.
———. 2002. "Typisch syrisch? Anmerkungen zur Signifikanz liturgischer Parallelen. Der Ursprung der Basilius-Anaphora in der Diskussion." *JbAC* 45: 50–61.
———. 2004. *Die ägyptische Basilios-Anaphora. Text-Kommentar-Geschichte*. Jerusalemer Theologisches Forum 4. Münster: Aschendorff.
Budde, E. G. 1940. *Armarium und Κιβωτός. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des antiken Mobiliars*. Würzburg.

Bultmann, R. 1980. *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*. Edited by O. Merk. 8 ed. Tübingen: Mohr.

———. 2007. *Theology of the New Testament*. Translated by K. Grobel. Vols. 1–2. Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press.

Burckhardt, H. 1974. "Motive und Maßstäbe der Kanonbildung nach dem Canon Muratori." *ThZ* 30: 207–11.

Burkhardt, H. 1992. *Die Inspiration heiliger Schriften bei Philo von Alexandrien*. 2 ed. Gießen: Brunnen.

Buresch, K. 1973 [1889]. *Klaros. Untersuchung zum Orakelwesen des späteren Altertums, nebst einem Anhange, das Anecdoton* ΧΡΗΣΜΟΙ ΤΩΝ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΩΝ ΘΕΩΝ *enthaltend*. Aalen: Scientia.

Burghardt, W. J. 1979. "Primitive Montanism: Why Condemned?" Pages 339–56 in *From Faith to Faith: Essays in Honor of D. G. Miller on His Seventieth Birthday*. Edited by D. Y. Hadidian. Pittsburgh, Pa.: Pickwick.

Burke, T., ed. 2013. *Ancient Gospel or Modern Forgery? The Secret Gospel of Mark in Debate: Proceedings from the 2011 York University Christian Apocrypha Symposium*. Eugene, Oreg.: Wipf and Stock.

Burkert, W. 1987. *Ancient Mystery Cults*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

———. 2003. "Ritual zwischen Ethologie und Postmoderne. Philologisch-historische Anmerkungen." *Forum Ritualdynamik* 2: 1–16.

Burkitt, F. C. 1900. "The Original Language of the Acts of Thomas." *JThS* 1: 280–90.

———. 1929. "The Exordium of Marcion's Antithesis." *JThS* 30: 279–80.

———. 1978 [1932]. *Church and Gnosis: A Study of Christian Thought and Speculation in the Second Century (the Morse Lectures 1931)*. New York: AMS Press.

Buschmann, G. *Das Martyrium des Polykarp*. KAV VI. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989.

Cabié, R. 1983. "Les prières eucharistiques des Constitutions Apostoliques sont-elles des témoins de la liturgie du IVe siècle?" *BLE* 84: 83–99.

Calder, W. H., III, ed. 1998. *Theodor Mommsen—Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Briefwechsel 1872–1903*. Completely revised and expanded edition. Hildesheim: Weidmann.

Campenhausen, H. Freiherr von. 1951. "Lehrerreihen und Bischofreihen im 2. Jahrhundert." Pages 240–49 in *In Memoriam E. Lohmeyer*. Edited by W. Schmauch. Stuttgart: Evangelische Verlagswerk.

———. 1953. *Kirchliches Amt und geistliche Vollmacht in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*. BHTh 14. Tübingen: Mohr.

———. 1965. "Irenäus und das Neue Testament." *ThLZ* 20: 1–8.

———. 1972. *The Formation of the Christian Bible*. Translated by J. A. Baker. Philadelphia: Fortress.

———. 1979. "Einheit und Einigkeit in der Alten Kirche." Pages 1–19 in *Urchristliches und Altkirchliches. Vorträge und Aufsätze*. Tübingen: Mohr. (First published in *EvTh* 33 [1973], 280–93.)

———. 2003 [1968]. *Die Entstehung der christlichen Bibel. Mit einem Nachwort von Christoph Markschies*. 2 ed. BHTh 14. Tübingen: Mohr.

Camplani, A. 2003. Athanasius, *Lettere festali/Anonimo, Indice de lettere festali*. Letture cristiane del primo millennio 34. Milan: Paoline.

Campos, J. 1960. “Época del Fragmento Muratoriano.” *Helmantica. RevHum* 11: 485–96.

Cancik, H. 1984. “Gnostiker in Rom. Zur Religionsgeschichte der Stadt Rom im 2. Jahrhundert nach Christus.” Pages 163–84 in *Gnosis und Politik. Religionstheorie und politische Theologie*. Vol. 2. Edited by J. Taubes. Munich: Fink.

Cancik, H., and J. Rüpke. 1997. “Vorwort.” Page III in *Römische Reichsreligion und Provinzialreligion*. Edited by H. Cancik and J. Rüpke. Tübingen: Mohr.

Canivet, P. ed. 1958. *Théodoret de Cyr, Thérapeutique des Maladies Helléniques*. 2 Vol. SC 57/1/2. Paris: Cerf.

Capelle, B. 1946. “L’Anaphore de Sérapion. Essai d’éxegèse.” *Mus*. 59: 425–43 (= Capelle 1962, 344–58).

———. 1952. “Origène et l’oblation à faire au Père par le Fils d’après le papyrus de Toura.” *RHE* 47: 163–71.

———. 1962. *Traveaux liturgiques de doctrine et d’histoire*. Vol. II: *Histoire: La messe*. Louvain: Abbaye du Mont César.

Carettoni, G. 1963/1964. “Scavo del Tempio di Apollo a Hierapolis (Rapporto preliminare).” *Annuario della Scuola Archeologica di Atene* 41/42: 411–33.

Carratelli, G. P. 1963/1964. “Χρησμοί di Apollo Kareios e Apollo Klarios a Hierapolis in Frigia.” *Annuario della Scuola Archeologica di Atene* 41/42: 252–57.

Casel, O. 1921. Review of F. J. Dölger, *Sol Salutis*. *ThRev* 20: 182–85.

Casey, R. 1938. “The Armenian Marcionites and the Diatessaron.” *JBL* 57: 185–94.

Caspar, E. 1926. *Die älteste römische Bischofsliste. Kritische Studien zum Formproblem des eusebianischen Kanons sowie zur Geschichte der ältesten Bischofslisten und ihrer Entstehung aus apostolischen Sukzessionsreihen*. SKG 2. G. 4. Berlin: Deutsche Verlagsgesellschaft für Politik und Geschichte.

———. 1975. *Die älteste römische Bischofsliste. Kritische Studien zum Formproblem des eusebianischen Kanons sowie zur Geschichte der ältesten Bischofslisten und ihrer Entstehung aus apostolischen Sukzessionsreihen*. Hildesheim: Gerstenberg (1975, 133–43 = 1926, 347–357).

Casson, L. 2001a. *Bibliotheken in der Antike*. Translated by A. Beck. Düsseldorf: Patmos.

———. 2001b. *Libraries in the Ancient World*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

Cavalcanti, E. 1983. “Timoteo apollinarista.” Pages 3454–55 in *DPAC* II.

Cecchelli Trinci, M. 1983. “Biblioteche Cristiane.” Pages 531–33 in *DPAC* I.

Ceresa-Gastaldo, A., ed. 1988. Jerome, *Gli uomini illustri. De viris illustribus*. BiPatr 12. Florence: Nardini.

Cerrato, J. A. 2002. *Hippolytus between East and West: The Commentaries and the Provenance of the Corpus*. OTM. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chadwick, H. 1959. *The Circle and the Ellipse: Rival Concepts of Authority in the Early Church. An Inaugural Lecture Delivered before the University of Oxford on May 1959*. Oxford: Clarendon.

———. 1978. “Gewissen.” Pages 1025–107 in *RAC* X.

———. 1990 [1966]. *Early Christian Thought and the Classical Tradition: Studies in Justin, Clement and Origen*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———, ed. 1998. *Activa und Passiva im antiken Umgang mit der Bibel*. Hans-Lietzmann-Vorlesungen 3. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Champeaux, J. 1989. "'Pietas.' Piété personelle et piété collective à Rome." *Bulletin de l'association Guillaume Budé* 3: 263–79.

Chaniotis, A. 2003. "Der Kaiserkult im Osten des Römischen Reiches im Kontext der zeitgenössischen Ritualpraxis." Pages 3–28 in *Die Praxis der Herrscherverehrung in Rom und seinen Provinzen*. Edited by H. Cancik and K. Hitzl. Akten der Tagung in Blaubeuren vom 4. bis zum 6. April 2002. Tübingen: Mohr.

Charles, R. H. 1902. *The Book of Jubilees or the Little Genesis*. London: Black.

Charlesworth, J. H., and C. A. Newsom, eds. 1997. *Angelic Liturgy: Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*. Vol. 4B. The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Tübingen: Mohr.

Christern, J. 1976. *Das frühchristliche Pilgerheiligtum von Tebessa. Architektur und Ornamentik einer spätantiken Bauhütte in Nordafrika*. Wiesbaden: Steiner.

Christes, J. 1975. *Bildung und Gesellschaft. Die Einschätzung der Bildung und ihrer Vermittler in der griechisch-römischen Antike*. EdF 37. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

———. 1979. *Sklaven und Freigelassene als Grammatiker und Philologen*. FASk 10. Wiesbaden: Steiner.

Clark, A. J. 1968. "Child and School in the Early Church." *CER* 66: 468–69.

Clark, J. W. 1997 [1901]. *The Care of Books: An Essay on the Development of Libraries and Their Fittings, from the Earliest Times to the End of the Eighteenth Century*. Bristol: Thommes Press.

Clark, T. N. 1974. "Stadien wissenschaftlicher Institutionalisierung." Pages 105–22 in *Wissenschaftssoziologie II. Determinanten wissenschaftlicher Entwicklung*. Edited by P. Weingart. Sozialwissenschaftliche Paperbacks. Sonderserie: Perspektiven der Wissenschaftsforschung 2. Frankfurt am Main: Athenäum.

Clarke, M. L. 1971. *Higher Education in the Ancient World*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Clarysse, W., and A. Wouters. 1970. "A Schoolboy's Exercise in the Chester Beatty Library." *AncSoc* 1: 201–35.

Clauss, M. 1999. *Kaiser und Gott. Herrscherkult im römischen Reich*. Stuttgart: Teubner.

Clerc, M. 1895. "Inscriptions de Nysa." *BCH* 9, 124–31. (Also published in Blümel Forthcoming.)

Clerici, L. 1966. *Einsammlung der Zerstreuten. Liturgiegeschichtliche Untersuchung zur Vor-und Nachgeschichte der Fürbitte für die Kirche in Didache 9,4 und 10,5*. LQF 44. Münster: Aschendorff.

Cohn, L., and P. Wendland, eds. 1962 [1896–1915]. Philo, *Opera quae supersunt*. 6 vols. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Cole, R. P. 1909. *Later Roman Education in Ausonius, Capella and the Theodosian Code*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Collet, G. 1999. “Charles, Pierre.” Page 121 in *RGG⁴* II.

Colpe, C. 1987. “Sakralisierung von Texten und Filiation von Kanons.” Pages 80–92 in *Kanon und Zensur*. Edited by A. Assmann and J. Assmann. Archäologie der literarischen Kommunikation 2. Munich: Fink.

Connolly, R. H. 1929. *Didascalia Apostolorum: The Syriac Version* Translated and accompanied by the Verona Latin fragments. Oxford: Clarendon.

———. 1938. “The Eucharistic Prayer of Hippolytus.” *JThS* 39: 350–69.

Coquin, R.-G., ed. 1966. *Les canons d’Hippolyt*. PO 31/2. Paris: Didot.

———. 1969. “L’Anaphore alexandrine de Saint Marc.” *Mus*. 82: 307–56.

———. 1975. “Le catalogue de la bibliothèque du couvent de saint Élie ‘du rocher.’” *BIFAO* 75: 207–39.

———. 1984. “Les lettres festales d’Athanase (CPG 2102). Un nouveau complément: Le manuscript IFAO Copte 25.” *OLoP* 15: 133–58.

Corssen, P. 1896. *Monarchianische Prologe zu den vier Evangelien. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Kanons*. TU 15/1. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

———. 1901. “Die Töchter des Philippus.” *ZNW* 2: 289–99.

Cosgrove, C. H. 1982. “Justin Martyr and the Emerging Christian Canon.” *VigChr* 36: 209–32.

Couvreur, P., ed. 1971 [1901]. Hermeias of Alexandria, *In Platonis Phaedrum Scholia*. Ad fidem codicis Parisini 1810 denuo collati ed. et apparatu critico ornavit P. Couvreur. Bibliothèque de l’École des Hautes Études. 4. Section Sciences historiques et philologiques 133. Hildesheim: Olms.

Cowen, G. 1971. “Gnostic Concepts of a New Testament.” ThD thesis, New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary.

Coyle, J. K. 1984. “The Exercise of Teaching in the Postapostolic Church.” *EeT* 15: 23–43.

Cramer, W. 1979. *Der Geist Gottes und des Menschen in frühsyrischer Theologie*. MBTh 46. Münster: Aschendorff.

Crehan, J. H. 1959. “The Fourfold Character of the Gospel.” Pages 3–13 in *Studia Evangelica: Papers Presented to the International Congress on “The Four Gospels” Held at Christ Church, Oxford 1957*. TU 73. Berlin: Akademie.

Cribiore, R. 1996. *Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt*. ASP 36. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

———. 1997. “Literary School Exercises.” *ZPE* 116: 53–60.

———. 2005 [2001]. *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Criddle, A. H. 1995. “On the Mar Saba Letter Attributed to Clement of Alexandria.” *JECS* 3: 215–20.

Crouzel, H., ed. 1969. Gregory Thaumaturgus, *Remerciement à Origène. Suivi par la lettre d’Origène à Grégoire*. SC 148. Paris: Cerf.

———. 1979. “L’école d’Origène à Césarée.” *BLE* 71: 15–27.

———. 1983. “Gregor I (der Wundertäter).” Pages 779–93 in *RAC* XII.

———. 1990. “Héraclas.” Pages 1302–3 in *DHGE* XXIII.

Crum, W. E. 1902a. *Catalogue* générale *des* antiquités égyptiennes *du* Musée *du Caire*. Vol. IV: *Nos. 8001–8741, Coptic monuments*. Cairo: Impr. de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale.

———. 1902b. *Coptic Ostraca*. Egypt Exploration Fund. Special Extra Publication. London: Sold at the Offices of the Egyptian Exploration Fund.

———. 1904. "Inscriptions from Shenoute's Monastery." *JThS* 5: 552–69.

———. 1905. *Catalogue of the Coptic Manuscripts in the British Museum*. London: British Museum.

———, ed. 1921. *Short Texts from Coptic Ostraca and Papyri*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 1939. *Varia Coptica: Text, Translations, Indexes*. Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press.

———. 1979 [1939]. *A Coptic Dictionary*. Compiled with the Help of Many Scholars by W. E. Crum. Oxford: Clarendon.

Crum, W. E., and W. M. F. Petrie. 1893. *Coptic Manuscripts Brought from the Fayyum by W. M. F. Petrie*. Edited with commentaries and indices by W. E. Crum. London: Nutt. (See also Petrie 1892.)

Crum, W. E., and H. G. E. White. 1973 [1926]. *The Monastery of Epiphanius at Thebes II*. Publications of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, Egyptian Expedition. New York: Arno.

Cuming, G. J. 1980a. "ΔΙ' ΕΥΧΗΣ ΛΟΓΟΥ (Justin, *Apology*, i. 66,2)." *JThS* 31: 80–82.

———. 1980b. "Thmuis Revisited: Another Look at the Prayers of Bishop Sarapion." *ThSt* 41: 568–75.

———. 1982. "The Anaphora of St Mark: A Study in Development." *Mus*. 95: 115–29.

———. 1989. "The Shape of the Anaphora." Pages 333–45 in *Papers Presented to the Tenth International Conference on Patristic Studies Held in Oxford 1987, Critica, Classica Orientalia, Ascetica, Liturgica*. Edited by E. A. Livingstone. StPatr XX. Leuven: Peeters.

Cumont, F. 1989 [[3]1931]. *Die orientalischen Religionen im römischen Heidentum*. 9 ed. Nach der vierten französischen Auflage unter Zugrundelegung der Übersetzung Gehrichs bearbeitet von A. Burckhardt-Brandenberg. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Cüppers, H., ed. 1983. *Die Römer an Mosel und Saar, Zeugnisse der Römerzeit in Lothringen, in Luxembourg, im Raum Trier und im Saarland*. 2 ed. Mainz: Von Zabern.

Dahl, N. A. 1961. "Welche Ordnung der Paulusbriefe wird vom muratorischen Kanon vorausgesetzt?" *ZNW* 52: 39–53.

Dalmais, I. H. 1980. "La Tradition apostolique et ses dérivés dans les prières eucharistiques éthiopiennes (Anaphore de Apôtres et Anaphore de Notre-Seigneur Jesus Christus)." Pages 109–17 in *Ecclesia Orans. Mélanges patristiques offerts au Père Adalbert G. Hamman OFM à l'occasion de ses quarante ans d'lenseignement publiés par les soins de V. Saxter (= Aug. 20 [1980])*. Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum.

Dalman, G. 1981 [1905/1927]. *Grammatik des jüdisch-palästinischen Aramäisch nach den Idiomen des palästinischen Talmud, des Onkelostargum und Prophetentargum* *und der jerusalemischen Targume. Aramäische Dialektproben*. Revised and edited by G. Dalman. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Daniel, R., C. Römer, and K. A. Worp. 1997. “Das Gebet zur Handauflegung bei Kranken in P. Barc 155, 19–156, 5 und P. Kellis I 88.” *ZPE* 119: 128–31.

Daniélou, J., and R. D. Charlat. 1968. *La catéchèse aux premiers siècles*. Paris: Fayard-Mame.

Dassmann, E. 1979. *Der Stachel im Fleisch. Paulus in der frühchristlichen Literatur bis Irenäus*. Münster: Aschendorff.

———. 1986. “Zum Paulusverständnis in der östlichen Kirche.” *JbAC* 29: 27–39.

———. 1988a. “Hesekiel.” Pages 1132–91 in *RAC* XIV.

———. 1988b. “Wer schuf den Kanon des Neuen Testaments? Zum neuesten Buch von Bruce M. Metzger.” *JBTh* 3: 275–83.

———. 1991. *Kirchengeschichte I: Ausbreitung, Leben und Lehre der Kirche in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*. Vol. 10. KStTh. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

Dausch, P. 1894. *Der neutestamentliche Schriftcanon und Clemens von Alexandria. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Canons*. Freiburg: Herder.

Dautzenberg, G. 1975. *Urchristliche Prophetie: Ihre Prophetie, ihre Voraussetzungen im Judentum und ihre Struktur im ersten Korintherbrief*. BWANT 104. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

Dehandschutter, B. 1979. *Martyrium Polycarpi. Een literair-kritische studie*. BEThL 52. Leuven: Universitaire Pers Leuven.

Deichmann, F. W. 1974. *Ravenna. Hauptstadt des spätantiken Abendlandes*. Kommentar 1. Wiesbaden: Steiner.

Deissmann, A. 1897. *Neue Bibelstudien. Sprachgeschichtliche Beiträge, zumeist aus den Papyri und Inschriften, zur Erklärung des Neuen Testaments*. Marburg: Elwert.

———. 1905. *Die Septuaginta-Papyri und andere altchristliche Veröffentlichungen aus der Heidelberger Papyrus-Sammlung*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Dekkers, E. 1947. *Tertullianus en de Geschiedenis der Liturgie*. Catholica VI/2. Brüssel: De Kinkhoren.

———, ed. 1954a. Tertullian, *Apologeticum*. Pages 77–172 in *Quintus Septimus Florens Tertullianus Opera*. Part I: *Opera Catholica*. CChr.SL 1. Turnhout: Brepols.

———, ed. 1954b. Tertullian, *De pudicitia*. Pages 1279–330 in *Quintus Septimus Florens Tertullianus Opera*. Part II: *Opera Montanistica*. CChr.SL 2. Turnhout: Brepols.

———. 1989/1990. “Des prix et du commerce des livres à l’époque patristique.” *SE* 31: 99–115.

Delehaye, H. 1900. “Le deux saints Babylas.” *Anboll* 19: 5–8.

———, ed. 1902. *Synaxarium Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae e codice sirmondiano nunc Berolinensi*. Brussels: Apud Socios Bollandianos.

Delobel, J. 1989. “Extra-Canonical Sayings of Jesus: Marcion and Some ‘Non Received’ Logia.” Pages 105–16 in *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century*. Edited by W. L. Petersen. CJAn 3. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press.

Demandt, A. 1989. *Die Spätantike. Römische Geschichte von Diocletian bis Justinian 284–565 n. Chr*. HAW III/6. Munich: Beck.

Denis, A.-M. 1987. *Concordance Greque des Pseudépigraphes d'Ancien Testament. Concordance, Corpus des textes, Indices (. . .)*. Leuven: Peeters.

Desjardins, M. 1991. "Bauer and Beyond: On Recent Scholarly Discussions of Hairesis in the Early Christian Era." *Second Century* 8: 65–82.

Des Places, É. 1973. *Numénius Fragments*. Texte établi et traduit par É. des Places. CUFr. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

———. 1998. Diadochus de Photice. *Œuvres spirituelles*. SC 5ter. Paris: Cerf.

Dessau, H., ed. 1974. *Inscriptiones Latinae selectae*. 4 ed. Vol. II/2. Dublin: Weidemann.

Devos, P. 1986. "Un témoin copte de la plus ancienne anaphore en grec." *AnBoll* 104: 126.

Dibelius, M. 1923. *Der Hirte des Hermas*. HNT. Ergbd. 4. Tübingen: Mohr.

———. 1935. Review of W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei*. *DLZ* 6: 443–48.

———. 1956. "Die Mahl-Gebete der Didache." Pages 117–27 in *Botschaft und Geschichte. Gesammelte Aufsätze*. Vol. 2: *Zum Urchristentum und zur hellenistischen Religionsgeschichte*. Edited by G. Bornkamm and H. Kraft. Tübingen: Mohr.

Diehl, E., ed. 1903/1904/1906. *Procli Diodochi In Platonis Timaeum commentaria*. 3 vols. BiTeu. Leipzig: Tuebner.

———. 1970. *Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae Veteres*. 3 vols. 3 ed. Zürich: Weidmann.

Diels, H., and W. Kranz. 2004. *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker: Griechisch und deutsch*. Unaltered reprint of the 6th edition of 1951. Hildesheim: Weidmann.

Diercks, G. F., ed. 1954. *De oratione*. Pages 255–74 in *Quinti Septimi Florentis Tertulliani Opera*. Part I: *Opera Catholica, Adv. Marcionem*. CChr.SL 1. Turnhout: Brepols.

———. 1994. *Sancti Cypriani Episcopi Opera*. Part III/1: *Sancti Cypriani Episcopi Epistularium (epp. 1–57)*. CChr.SL 3B. Turnhout: Brepols.

———. 1996. *Sancti Cypriani Episcopi Opera*. Part III/2: *Sancti Cypriani Episcopi Epistularium (epp. 58–81)*. CChr.SL 3C. Turnhout: Brepols.

Diercks, G. F., and G. W. Clarke. 1999. *Sancti Cypriani Episcopi Opera*. Pars III/3: *Prolegomena. Codices—Editiones—Indices*. Cura et studio G. F. Diercks, praecedit dissertatio biographica/chronologica de Cypriani vita ac scriptis quam composuit G. W. Clarke. CChr.SL 3D. Turnhout: Brepols.

Dihle, A. 1986. "Philosophie—Fachwissenschaft—Allgemeinbildung." Pages 185–223 in *Aspects de la philosophie hellénistique*. EaAC 32. Vandoeuvres-Genève: Fondation Hardt.

———. 1996. "Die Theologia tripartia." Pages 183–202 in *Geschichte—Tradition—Reflextion. Festschrift für M. Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag*. Vol. 2: *Griechische und römische Religion*. Edited by H. Cancik. Tübingen: Mohr.

Dillmann. C. F. A. 1955 [1864]. *Lexicon Linguae Aethiopicae cum indice Latino. Adiectum est vocabularium Tigre dialecti septentrionalis compilatum a W. Munzinger*. New York: Ungar.

Dillon, J. 1982. "Self-Definition in Later Platonism." Pages 60–75 in *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*. Vol. III: *Self-Definition in the Graeco-Roman World*. Edited by B. F. Meyer and E. P. Sanders. London: SCM.

Dindorf, L., ed. 1932. *Chronicon paschale. Ad exemplar Vaticanum recensuit*. 2 vols. Bonn: Weber.

Dindorf, L., and G. de Budé, eds. 1916–1919. *Dionis Chrysostomi Orationes*. Post L. Dindorfium ed. G. de Budé. BiTeu. 2 vols. Leipzig: Teubner.

Dinkler, E. 1980. *Christus und Asklepios. Zum Christustypus der polychromen Platten im Museo Nazionale Romano*. SHAW.Ph 2. Heidelberg: Winter.

Dittenberger, W., ed. 1873–1897. *Corpus Inscriptionum Atticarum*. Berolini: Reimarum.

———, ed. 1960 [^{3}1915–1924]. *Syllogae Inscriptionum Graecarum*. 4 vols. Hildesheim: Olms.

———. 1986 [1903–1905]. *Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae*. Supplementum sylloges inscriptionum Graecarum. 2 vols. Hildesheim: Olms.

Dix, G. 1938. "Primitive Consecration Prayers." *Theology* 37: 261–83.

———. 1968 [1937]. *The Treatise on the Apostolic Tradition of St Hippolytus of Rome*. Reissued with corrections, preface and bibliography by H. Chadwick. London: SPCK.

Dobschütz, E. v. 1912. *Das Decretum Gelasianum. De libris recipiendis et non recipiendi, in kritischen Text herausgegeben und untersucht*. TU 38/4. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

Dölger, F. J. 1925. *Sol Salutis. Gebet und Gesang im christlichen Altertum, mit besonder Rücksicht auf die Ostung in Gebet und Liturgie*. 2 ed. LF 4/5. Münster: Aschendorff.

———. 1934. "Sacramentum infanticidii." *AuC* 4: 188–228.

———. 1936. "Das Niedersitzen nach dem Gebet. Eine Auseinandersetzung zwischen Christentum und Heidentum in häuslichen und liturgischen Gebetsbrauch. Ein Kommentar zu Tertullianus De oratione 16." *AC* 5: 116–37.

———. 1940. "Das ungefähre Alter des *Ite, missa est*. Zu *dominica sollemnia* bei Tertullianus." *AuC* 6: 108–17.

Dombart, B., and A. Kalb, ed. 1928/1929. *Sancti Aurelii Augustini, De Civitate Dei*. 2 vols. BiTeu. Leipzig: Teubner. (A text corresponding to the text of this volume can also be found in Dombart/Kalb 1955.)

———. 1955. *Sancti Aurelii Augustine De Civitate Dei Libri I–X et Libri XI–XXII*. Aurelii Augustini Opera, XIV/1–2. CChr.SL 47/48. Turnhout: Brepols. (This text corresponds to the text in Dombart/Kalb 1928/1929.)

Doresse, J., and E. Lanne. 1960. *Un témoin archaïque de la liturgie copte de S. Basile. En annexe: Les liturgies "basiliennes" et saint Basile par B. Cappelle*. BMus 47. Louvain: Publications universitaires.

Döring, K. 1979. *Exemplum Socratis. Studien zur Sokratesnachwirkung in der kynisch-stoischen Popularphilosophie der frühen Kaiserzeit und im frühen Christentum*. Hermes. Einzelschriften 42. Wiesbaden: Steiner.

Dorival, G. 2003. "L'apport des pères de l'Église à la question de la clôture du canon de l'Ancien Testament." Pages 81–110 in *The Biblical Canons (Fiftieth Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense . . . from July 25 to 27, 2001)*. Edited by J.-M. Auwers and H. J. d. Jonge. 163 BEThL.

Dörrie, H. 1955. "Ammonios, der Lehrer Plotins." *Hermes* 83: 468–71 (= Dörrie 1976, 324–60).

———. 1957. Review of C. Andresen, *Logos und Nomos. Die Polemik des Kelsos wider das Christentum*. *Gn*. 185–96 (= Dörrie 1976, 263–74).

———. 1959. *Porphyrios' "Symmikta Zetemata." Ihre Stellung in System und Geschichte des Neuplatonismus nebst einem Kommentar zu den Fragmenten*. Zetemata 20. Munich: Beck.

———. 1973. "Das Persönlichkeitsbild eines platonischen Philosophen um die Mitte des 2 Jahr. n. Chr." *Kairos* 15: 24–35 (= Dörrie 1976, 310–23).

———. 1974a. "Das Gebäude spätantiker Bildung mit seinen religiösen Zügen." Pages 247–61 in *Die Alte Kirche*. Edited by H. Frohnes and U. W. Knorr. KGMG I. Munich: Kaiser.

———. 1974b. "Zur Methodik antiker Exegese." *ZNW* 65: 121–38.

———. 1976. *Platonica minora*. STA VIII. Munich: Fink.

———. 1978. "Ammonius Sakkas." Pages 463–71 in TRE II.

———. 1983. "Gregor III (Gregor von Nyssa)." Pages 863–95 in *RAC* XII.

———, ed. 1987. *Die geschichtlichen Wurzeln des Platonismus. Bausteine 1–35: Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar, aus der Nachlaß*. Der Platonismus in der Antike. Grundlagen—System—Entwicklung 1. Stuttgart: Frommann-Holzboog.

Dörrie, H., and M. Baltes. 1990. *Der hellenistische Rahmen des kaiserzeitlichen Platonismus*. Edited and revised by M. Baltes. Der Platonismus in der Antike II. Stuttgart: Frommann-Holzboog.

———. 1993. *Der Platonismus im 2. und 3. Jahrhundert nach Christus. Bausteine 73–100: Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar*. Der Platonismus in der Antike. Grundlagen—System—Entwicklung 3. Stuttgart: Frommann-Holzboog.

Dostálová, R. 1985. "Der 'Bücherkatalog' Pap. Wess. Gr. Prag. I 13 im Rahmen der Nachrichten über Bücher aus frühchristlicher Zeit." *Βυζαντινά* 13: 535–47.

Douglas, M. 1966. *Purity and Danger*. London: Routledge.

———. 1987. *How Institutions Think*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Dounton-Fear, A. 1982. "The Ecstasies of Montanus." Pages 648–51 in *Papers Presented to the Eighth International Conference on Patristic Studies Held in Oxford 1979*. Edited by E. A. Livingstone. StPatr XVII/2. Leuven: Peeters.

Doutreleau, L., ed. 1962. Didymus the Blind, *Sur Zacharie*. Vols. I–III. SC 83–85. Paris: Cerf.

Draper, J. A. 2000. "Ritual Process and Ritual Symbol in Didache 7–10." *VigChr* 54: 121–58.

Drijvers, H. J. W. 1993 (1980). "Bardesanes." Pages 206–12 in *TRE* V.

———. 1995. "The School of Edessa: Greek Learning and Local Culture." Pages 49–59 in *Centers of Learning: Learning and Location in Pre-Modern Europe and the Near East*. Edited by H. J. W. Drijvers and A. A. MacDonald. Brill's Studies in Intellectual History 61. Leiden: Brill.

Droge, A. J. 1989. *Homer or Moses? Early Christian Interpretations of the History of Culture*. HUTh 26. Tübingen: Mohr.

Dubiel, H. 1976. "Institutionen." Pages 418–24 in *HWP* 4.

Duensing, H., ed. 1946. *Der aethiopische Text der Kirchenordnung des Hippolyt*. AAWG.PH 3/32. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Dufrasne, M. D. 1981. “Les tendances Ariennes et Pneumatomaques de l’Eucologe du Pseudo-Sérapion.” PhD diss., Louvain-la-Neuve.

Dujarier, M. 1979. *A History of the Catechumenate*. New York: Sadlier.

Duncan-Jones, R. P. 1977. “Age-Rounding, Illiteracy and Social Differentiation in the Roman Empire.” *Chiron* 7: 333–53.

Ebeling, G. 1962. “Theologie I. Begriffsgeschichtlich.” Pages 754–69 in *RGG*[3] VI.

Eck, W. 1997. “Der Euergetismus im Funktionszusammenhang der kaiserzeitlichen Städte.” Pages 306–31 in *Actes du X*[e] *Congrès International d’Épigraphie Grecque et Latine. Nîmes, 4–9 octobre 1992*. Edited by M. Christol. Publications de la Sorbonne. Série Histoire ancienne et médiévale 42. Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne.

Edwards, M. J. 1991. “On the Platonic Schooling of Justin Martyr.” *JThS.NS* 42: 17–34.

———. 1998. “Authorship and Canonicity: Some Patristic Evidence.” Pages 174–79 in *Understanding, Studying and Reading: New Testament Essays in Honor of John Ashton*. Edited by C. Rowland and C. H. Fletcher-Louis. JSNT.S 153. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Ehlers, B. (= Aland, B.). 1970. “Kann das Thomasevangelium aus Edessa stammen? Ein Beitrag zur Frühgeschichte des Christentums in Edessa.” *NovT* 23: 284–317.

Ehrenberg, V. 1960. “Theodor Mommsens Kolleg über Römische Kaisergeschichte.” *HdJb* 4: 94–107.

Ehrhardt, A. 1891/1892. “Die grieschische Patriarchalbibliotek von Jerusalem.” *RQ* 5/6: 217–65 and 339–65.

Ehrhardt, A. A. T. 1962. “Christianity before the Apostle’s Creed.” *HThR* 55: 73–119 (= Ehrhardt 1964, 151–99).

———. 1964. *The Framework of the New Testament Stories*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Ehrman, B. D. 2003. “Response to Charles Hedrick’s Stalemate.” *JECS* 11: 155–63.

Eisen, U. E. 1996. *Amtsträgerinnen im frühen Christentum. Epigraphische und literarische Studien*. FKDG 61. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Eisenstadt, S. N. 1968. “Social Institutions.” Pages 409–29 in *IESS* 14.

Elbogen, I. 1995 [[3]1931]. *Der jüdische Gottesdienst in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung*. Olms Paperbacks 30. Hildesheim: Olms.

Ellspermann, G. L. 1949. *The Attitude of the Early Christian Latin Writers toward Pagan Literature and Learning*. PatSt 82. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press.

Elze, M. 1974. “Häresie und Einheit der Kirche im 2. Jahrhundert.” *ZThK* 71: 389–409.

Emmett, A. 1975. “A Fourth Century Hymn to the Virgin Mary? Psalmus Responsorius: P. Barc. 149b–153.” Pages 97–102 in *Proceedings of the XIVth International Congress of Papyrologists: Oxford, 24–31 July 1974*. PEES. GR 61. London: Published for the British Academy by the Egypt Exploration Society.

Engberding, H. 1931. *Das eucharistische Hochgebet der Basileiosliturgie. Textgeschichtliche Untersuchungen und kritische Ausgabe*. Theologie des christlichen Ostens. Texte und Untersuchungen 1. Münster: Aschendorff.

———. 1956. “Neues Licht über die Geschichte des Textes der ägyptischen Markusliturgie.” *OrChr* 40: 40–68.

Engelmann, H., D. Knibbe, and R. Merkelbach, eds. 1980. *Die Inschriften von Ephesos*. Part III*: Nr. 600–1000 (Repertorium)*. Inschriften griechischer Städte in Kleinasien 13. Bonn: Habelt.

Ensslin, W. 1938. “Philippus 25).” Pages 2374–75 in *PRE* XIX/2.

———. 1940. “Nebridius 4).” Pages 550–51 in *PRE Suppl*. VII.

———. 1957. “Proairesios.” Pages 30–32 in *PRE* XXIII/1.

———. 1958. “Victor 6).” Page 2058 in *PRE 2.R*. VIII A 2.

Epp, E. J. 1997. “The New Testament Papyri at Oxyrhynchus in Their Social and Intellectual Context.” Pages 47–68 in *Sayings of Jesus: Canonical and Non-Canonical: Essays in Honour of Tjitze Baarda*. Edited by W. L. Petersen, J. S. Vos, and H. J. D. Jonge. NT.S 89. Leiden: Brill (= Epp 2005, 497–520).

———. 2005. *Perspectives on New Testament Textual Criticism: Collected Essays, 1962–2004*. NT.S 116.

Erler, M. 1997. “Römische Philosophie.” Pages 537–98 in *Einleitung in die lateinische Philologie*. Edited by F. Graf. Stuttgart: Tuebner.

Evans, C. A., R. L. Webb, and R. A. Wiebe, eds. 1993. *Nag Hammadi Texts and the Bible: A Synopsis and Index*. NTTS 18. Leiden: Brill.

Eynde, D. van den. 1933. *Les normes de l’enseignement chrétien dans la littérature patristique des trois premiers siècles*. Paris: Gabalda & Fils.

Eysinga, G. A. van den Bergh van. 1935. Review of W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei*. *NThT* 24: 374–76.

Fabricius, C. 1967. “Der sprachliche Klassizismus der griechischen Kirchenväter, ein philologisches und geistesgeschichtliches Problem.” *JbAC* 10: 187–99.

Fascher, E. 1927. *ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ. Eine sprach-und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*. Gießen: Töpelmann.

———. 1962. “Walter Bauer als Kommentar.” *NTS* 9: 23–38.

Federation of Asian Bishops’ Conferences. 1976. *His Gospel to Our People: Texts, Documents, and Other Papers*. Vol. II. Manila: Cardinal Bea Institute for Ecumenical Studies.

Fédou, M. 1998. “La figure de Socrate selon Justin.” Pages 51–66 in *Les Apologistes Chrétiens et la culture grecque*. Edited by B. Pouderon and J. Doré. ThH 105. Paris: Beauchesne.

Feldman, L. H. 1998. *Studies in Josephus’ Rewritten Bible*. JSJ. Suppl. 58. Leiden: Brill.

Ferguson, E. 1980. “Spiritual Sacrifice in Early Christianity and Its Environment.” Pages 1151–89 in *ANRW* II 23.2.

———. 1982. “Canon Muratori: Date and Provenance.” Pages 677–83 in *Papers Presented to the Eighth International Conference on Patristic Studies Held in Oxford 1979*. Edited by E. A. Livingstone. StPatr XVII/2. Oxford: Pergamum Press.

———. 1993. Review of Geoffry Mark Hahneman, *The Muratorian Fragment and the Development of the Canon*. *JThS* 44: 691–97.

Festugière, A.-J., ed. 1961. *Historia monachorum in Aegypto*. SHG 53. Brussels: Société des Bollandistes.

Feulner, H.-J. 1997. “Liturgien II. Patristische Zeit.” Pages 972–80 in *LThK*[3] VI.

Fichmann, I. H. 1971. “Die Bevölkerungszahl von Oxyrhynchos in byzantinischer Zeit.” *APF* 21: 111–20.

Ficker, G. 1905. “Widerlegung eines Montanisten.” *ZKG* 26: 447–63.

———. 1906. *Amphilochiana I*. Leipzig: Barth.

Finkelstein, L. 1928/1929. “The Birkat Ha-Mazon.” *JQR* 19: 211–62.

Fischer, J. A. 1974. “Die antimontanischen Synoden des 2./3. Jahrhunderts.” *AHC* 6: 241–73 (= Fischer/Lumpe 1997, 22–59).

———. 1974/1975. “Die ältesten Ausgaben der Patres Apostlici. Ein Beitrag zu Begriff und Begrenzung der apostolischen Väter I/II.” *HJ* 94/95: 157–90 and 88–19.

———. 1993. *Die apostolische Väter*. 10 ed. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Fischer, J. A., and A. Lumpe. 1997. *Die Synoden von den Anfängen bis zum Vorabend des Nicaenums*. Konziliengeschichte A: Darstellungen. Paderborn: Schöningh.

Fisher, E. W. 1980. “‘Let Us Look upon the Blood-of-Christ’ (*1 Clement* 7:4).” *VigChr* 34: 218–36.

Flaig, E. 2002. “Bildung als Feindin der Philosophie. Wie Habitusformen in der hohen Kaiserzeit kollidierten.” Pages 125–36 in *Gelehrte in der Antike. Alexander Demandt zum 65. Geburtstag*. Edited by A. Goltz, A. Luther, and H. Schlange-Schöningen. Cologne: Böhlau.

Flesseman-van Leer, E. 1964. “Prinzipien der Sammlung und Ausscheidung bei der Bildung des Kanons.” *ZThK* 61: 404–20.

Foester, R., and E. Richsteig, eds. 1903–1927. *Libanii Opera*. BiTeu. Leipzig: Tuebner.

Fontaine, J. 1982. “Christentum ist auch Antike. Einige Überlegungen zu Bildung und Literatur in der lateinischen Spätantike.” *JbAC* 25: 5–21.

Fontenrose, J. 1978. *The Delphic Oracle: Its Responses and Operations*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

———. 1988. *Didyma. Apollo’s Oracle, Cult, and Companions*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Foraboschi, D. 1971. *Onomasticon alterum papyrologicum. Supplemento al Namenbuch di F. Preisigke*. Testi e documenti per lo studio dell’antichità 16. Milan: Istituto Editoriale Cisalpino.

Forbiger, A. 1858. *Strabos Erdbeschreibung*. Vol. 4: *Buch 9 und 10*. Translated and commented on by A. Forbiger. Stuttgart: Hoffmann.

Förster, H. 1997. “Das angeblich älteste liturgische Schriftstück. Neuedition von P. Vindob. G. 2326.” *ZAC* 1: 169–77.

Förster, N. 1999. *Marcus Magus. Kult, Lehre und Gemeindeleben einer valentinischen Gnostikergruppe. Sammlung der Quellen und Kommentar*. WUNT. Tübingen: Mohr.

Fowden, G. 1977. “The Platonist Philosopher and His Circle in Late Antiquity.” *Philosophia* 7: 359–83.

Fraigneau-Julien, B. 1960. “Éléments de la structure fondamentale de l’eucharistie: I. Bénédiction, anamnèse et action de grâce.” *RevSR* 34: 35–61.

Frank, K. S., and E. Grünbeck. 1996. *Lehrbuch der Geschichte der Alten Kirche*. Paderborn: Schöningh.

Fränkel, M., ed. 1890 *Die Inschriften von Pergamon*. Vol. 1: *Bis zum Ende der Königszeit*. Altertümer von Pergamon VIII/1. Berlin: Spemann.

———, ed. 1895. *Die Inschriften von Pergamon*. Vol. 2: *Römische Zeit—Inschriften auf Ton*. Altertümer von Pergamon VIII/2. Berlin: Spemann.

Franzmann, M. 1996. *Jesus in the Nag Hammadi Writings*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

Fraser, P. M., and E. Matthews. 1987. *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*. Vol. 1: *The Aegean Islands, Cyprus, Cyrenaica*. Oxford: Clarendon.

———. 1997. *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*. Vol. IIIa: *The Peloponnese, Western Greece, Sicily and Magna Graecia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Frede, M. 1987. “Numenius.” Pages 1034–75 in *ANRW* II 36.2.

Frend, W. H. C. 1965. *Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church: A Study of a Conflict from the Maccabees to Donatus*. Oxford: Blackwell.

———. 1988. “Montanism: A Movement of Prophecy and Regional Identity in the Early Church.” *BJRL* 70: 25–34.

Frenschkowski, M. 1995. *Offenbarung und Epiphanie*. Vol. 1: *Grundlagen des spätantiken und frühchristlichen Offenbarungsglaubens*. WUNT 2/79. Tübingen: Mohr.

Freudenberger, R. 1967. “Der Vorwurf ritueller Verbrechen gegen die Christen im 2. und 3. Jahrhundert.” *ThZ* 23: 97–107.

———. 1968. “Die Acta Justini als historisches Dokument.” Pages 24–31 in *Humanitas—Christianitas. W. von Loewenich zum 65. Geburtstag*. Edited by K. Beyschlag, G. Maron, and E. Wölfel. Witten: Luther-Verlag.

Freund, S. 2000. *Vergil im frühen Christentum. Untersuchungen zu den Vergilzitaten bei Tertullian, Minucius Felix, Novatian, Cyprian und Arnobius*. SGKA.NF 16. Paderborn: Schöningh.

Frey, J. 2003. “‘Et numquam laeti sitis . . .’—Ein apokryphes Jesuswort und die Probleme des Hebräerevangeliums.” Pages 187–212 in *Oleum Laetitiae. Festschrift für P. Benedikt Schwank OSB zum 80. Geburtstag*. Edited by G. Brüske and A. Haendler-Kläsener. Jerusalemer Theologisches Forum 5. Münster: Aschendorff.

———. 2010. “Martin Hengel als theologischer Lehrer.” Pages v–xxiii in Martin Hengel, *Theologische, historische und biographische Skizzen*. Kleine Schriften VII. Edited by Claus-Jürgen Thornton, with an appreciation and complete list of publications by Jörg Frey. WUNT 253. Tübingen: Mohr.

Frickel, J. 1968. *Die “Apophasis Megale” in Hippolyt’s Refutatio VI 9–18. Eine Paraphrase zur Apophasis Simons*. OCA 182. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale.

Friedländer, L., and G. Wissowa. 1920. *Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms in der Zeit von Augustus bis zum Ausgang der Antonine III*. 9 ed. Leipzig: Hirzel.

Froehlich, K. 1973. “Montanism and Gnosis.” Pages 91–114 in *The Heritage of the Early Church. Essays in Honor of the Very Reverend Georges Vasilievich Florovsky*. Edited by D. Neimann and M. Schatkin. OrChrA 195. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale.

Fuchs, H. 1954. “Bildung.” Pages 346–62 in *RAC* II.

———. 1962. “Enkyklios Paideia.” Pages 365–98 in *RAC* V.

Funk, F. X. 1897. “Die Abendmahlselemente bei Justin.” Pages 278–92 in *Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen*. Vol. 1. Paderborn: Schöningh.

———. 1904. “Tertullien et l’Agape (Apol. 39).” *RHE* 5: 5–15.

———. 1905. *Didascalia et Constitutiones apostolorum*. Paderborn: Schöningh.

———. 1906. “La question de l’agape / un dernier mot.” *RHE* 7: 5–15.

Funk, R. W., R. W. Hoover, and the Jesus Seminar. 1993. *The Five Gospels. The Search for the Authentic Words of Jesus*: *New Translation and Commentary*. New York: Macmillan.

Funk, W. P. 2003. “*Valentinianische Abhandlung*” (NHC XI,2). Pages 747–62 in *Nag Hammadi Deutsch*. Vol. II: *NHC V,2-XIII* (= GCS.NF 12). Edited by H.-M. Schenke, H.-G. Bethge, and U. Ulrike. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Fürst, A. 2003. *Hieronymus. Askese und Wissenschaft in der Spätantike*. Freiburg: Herder.

Gaiffier, B. De. 1954. “La lecture des Actes des martyrs dans la prière liturgique en occident.” *AnBoll* 72: 134–66.

Gaiser, K. 1979. “Autorität und Liberalität in der Erziehung der Antike.” *Humanistische Bildung* 2: 1–96.

———. 1980. *Das Philosophenmosaik von Neapel. Eine Darstellung der platonischen Akademie*. AHAW.PH 2. Heidelberg: Winter.

———. 1988. *Philodems Academica. Die Berichte über Platon und die Alte Akademie in zwei herkulanensischen Papyri*. Supplementm Platonicm. Die Texte der indirekten Platonüberlieferung 1. Stuttgart: Frommann-Holzboog.

Gallay, P., and M. Jourjon, eds. 1978. Grégoire de Nazianze, *Discours 27–31 (Discours Théologiques)*. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes par P. Gallay avec la collaboration de M. Jourjon. SC 250. Paris: Cerf.

Galling, K. 1956. “Erwägungen zur antiken Synagoge.” *ZDPV* 72: 163–78.

Gamber, K. 1967. “Die Serapion-Anaphora ihrem ältesten Bestand nach untersucht.” *OKSt* 16: 33–42.

Gamble, H. Y. 1992. *The New Testament Canon: Its Making and Meaning*. 2 ed. Philadelphia: Fortress.

———. 1995. *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

———. 2002. “The New Testament Canon: Recent Research and the Status Quaestionis.” Pages 267–94 in *The Canon Debate*. Edited by L. M. McDonald and J. A. Sanders. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson.

Gärtner, M. 1985. *Die Familienerziehung in der Alten Kirche. Eine Untersuchung über die ersten vier Jahrhunderte des Christentums mit einer Übersetzung und einem Kommentar zu der Schrift des Johannes Chrysostomus über Geltungssucht und Kindererziehung*. KVRG 7. Cologne: Böhlau.

Gatti, P. 1997. “Charisius 3.” Pages 1102 in *DNP* II.

Gebhardt, O. von. 1893. *Das Evangelium und die Apokalypse des Petrus. Die neu entdeckten Bruchstücke nach einer Photographie der Handschrift zu Gizeh in Lichtdruck herausgegeben*. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

Gelston, A. 1982. "ΔΙ' ΕΥΧΗΣ ΛΟΓΟΥ (Justin, Apology i. 66,2)." *JThS* 33: 172–75.

Georges, K. E., and H. Georges. 1995 [[8]1913/1919]. *Ausführliches Lateinisch-deutsches Handwörterbuch*. Aus den Quellen zusammengetragen und mit besonderer Bezugnahme auf Synonymik und Antiquitäten unter Berücksichtigung der besten Hilfsmittel ausgearbeitet von K. E. Georges. Unaltered reprint of the eighth improved and expanded edition of H. Georges. 2 vols. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Georgi, D. 1964. *Die Gegner des Paulus im 2. Korintherbrief. Studien zur religiösen Propaganda in der Spätantike*. WMANT 11. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener.

———. 1986. *The Opponents of Paul in Second Corinthians*. Philadelphia: Fortress.

———. 1993. "Die Aristoteles-und Theophrastausgabe des Andronikus von Rhodos. Ein Beitrag zur Kanonsproblematik." Pages 45–78 in *Konsequente Traditionsgeschichte. Festschrift für Klaus Baltzer zum 65. Geburtstag*. Edited by R. Bartelmus, T. Krüger, and H. Utzschneider. OBO 126. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag.

Gerhardi, J. 1762. *Johannis Gerhardi Theologi quondam Jenensis celeberrimi Loci theologici*. Tübingen: Cotta.

Gerhards, A. 1983. "Die literarische Struktur des eucharistischen Hochgebets." *LJ* 33: 90–104.

———. 1992. "Entstehung und Entwicklung des Eucharistischen Hochgebets im Spiegel der neueren Forschung. Der Beitrag der Liturgiewissenschaft zur liturgischen Erneuerung." Pages 75–96 in *Gratias agamus. Studien zum eucharistischen Hochgebet. Für Balthasar Fischer*. Edited by A. Heinz and H. Rennings. Pastoralliturgische Reihe in Verbindung mit der Zeitschrift "Gottesdienst." Freiburg: Herder.

Gerstinger, H. 1932. "Ein Bücherverzeichnis aus dem VII.–VIII. Jh. n. Chr. im Pap. Graec. Vindob. 26015." *WSt* 50: 185–92.

Gese, H. 1977. "Die Herkunft des Herrenmahls." Pages 107–27 in *Zur biblischen Theologie. Alttestamentliche Vorträge*. BEvTh 78. Munich: Kaiser.

———. 1981. *Essays on Biblical Theology*. Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg.

Gesenius, W. 1962. *Wilhelm Gesenius' Hebräisches und aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament*. Revised by F. Buhl in collaboration with H. Zimmern. Unaltered reprint of the 17th edition published in 1915. Berlin: Springer.

Geytenbeek, A. C. van. 1973. *Musonius Rufus and Greek Diatribe*. Assen: Van Gorcum.

Ghellinck, J. de. 1933. "Diffusion, utilisation et transmission des écrits patristiques." *Gr*. 14: 356–400.

Giangrande, G. 1956. *Eunapii vitae sophistarum*. Scriptores Graeci et Latini. Rome: Academia Lynceorum.

Giannini, A. 1965. "Apollonii Historiae Mirabiles." Pages 120–42 in *Paradoxographorum Graecorum reliquiae*. Edited by A. Giannini. Milan: Istituto Editoriale Italiano.

Giard, L., and C. Jacob, eds. 2001. *Du livre au texte. Des Alexandries I*. Paris: Bibliothèque nationale de France.

Gimmler, A. 1996. “Institution und Individuum. Die implizite Institutionentheorie von Max Weber und Jürgen Habermas.” PhD diss., Bamberg.

Giraudo, C. 1981. *La struttura letteraria della preghiera eucaristica. Saggio sulla genesi letteraria di una forma. Toda veterotestamentaria. Bᵉraka giudaica. Anafora Cristiana*. AnBib 92: Biblical Institute Press.

Glaue, P. 1907. *Die Vorlesung heiliger Schriften im Gottesdienste*. Part I: *Bis zur Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche*. Berlin: Duncker.

———. 1924a. “Die Vorlesung heiliger Schriften bei Cyprian.” *ZNW* 23: 201–13.

———. 1924b. “Die Vorlesung heiliger Schriften bei Tertullian.” *ZNW* 23: 141–52.

Glover, R. 1985. “Patristic Quotations and Gospel Sources.” *NTS* 36: 235–51.

Goetz, G. 1899. “Charisios 8).” Pages 2147–49 in *PRE* III/2.

Goguel, M. 1935. Review of W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei*. *RHPH* 15: 163–67.

Gold, B. K. 1987. *Literary Patronage in Greece and Rome*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Goldbacher, A., ed. 1895. *S. Aureli Augustini Hipponiensis episcopi epistulae*. CSEL 34. Prague: Tempsky.

Goldhill, S. 2001. “Introduction. Setting an Agenda: ‘Everything Is Greece to the Wise.’” Pages 1–28 in *Being Greek under Rome: Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic and the Development of Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goldschmidt, V. 1950. “Théologia.” Pages 20–42 in *REG* 63.

Goltz, E. Freiherr von der. 1901. *Das Gebet in der ältesten Christenheit. Eine geschichtliche Untersuchung*. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

———. 1905a. Λόγος σωτηρίας πρὸς τὴν παρθένον *(De virginitate). Eine echte Schrift des Athanasius*. TU 29/2. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

———. 1905b. *Tischgebete und Abendmahlsgebete in der altchristlichen und in der griechischen Kirche*. TU 29/2b. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

Goodspeed, E. J., ed. 1984 [1914]. *Die ältesten Apologeten. Texte mit kurzen Einleitungen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Görgemanns, H. 1989. “Philosophie II. Patristik und Mittelalter.—A. Griechische Patristik.” Pages 616–23 in *HWP* VII.

Görgemanns, H., and H. Karpp, eds. 1992. Origen, *Vier Bücher von den Prinzipien*. TzF 24. 3 ed. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Gotter, U. 2000. “‘Akkulturation’ als Methodenproblem der historischen Wissenschaften.” Pages 373–406 in *wir / ihr / sie. Identität und Alterität in Theorie und Methode*. Edited by W. Essbach. Identitäten und Alteritäten 2. Würzburg: Ergon.

Goulet, R. 1981. “Les vies de philosophes dans l’Antiquité tardive et leur portée mystérique.” Pages 161–208 in *Les Actes Apocryphes des Apôtres. Christianisme et monde païen*. Edited by F. Bovon. Publications de la faculté de théologie de l’université de Genève 4. Geneva: Labor et Fides.

Graetz, H. 1871. “Der alttestamentliche Kanon und sein Abschluß.” Pages 147–73 in *Kohélet oder der Salomonische Prediger übers. und kritisch erläutert*. Leipzig: Winter.

———. 1886. “Der Abschluß des Kanons des Alten Testaments und die Differenz von kanonischen und extrakanonischen Büchern nach Josephus und Talmud.” *MGWJ* 35: 281–98.
Graham, W. A. 1987. *Beyond the Written Word: Oral Aspects of Scripture in the History of Religion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Grande, C. del. 1934. *Liturgiae Preces Hymni Christianorum e Papyris collecti, iterum editet*. Biblioteca Filologica Lofredo 3. Naples: In aedibvs L. Loffredo.
Grant, R. M. 1960. “Two Gnostic Gospels.” *JBL* 79: 1–11.
———. 1984. “Marcion and the Critical Method.” Pages 207–15 in *From Jesus to Paul, Festschrift for F. W. Beare*. Edited by P. Richardson and J. C. Hurd. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
———. 1988. *Greek Apologists of the Second Century*. London: SCM.
Green, G. M., ed. 1963. Augustine, *De doctrina Christiana libri quattuor*. CSEL 80. Vienna: Tempsky.
Gregory, C. R. 1900–1909. *Textkritik des Neuen Testamentes*. 3 vols. Leipzig: Hinrichs.
Grenfell, B. P., and A. S. Hunt, eds. 1908. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. Part VI: *Nos 845–1006*. London: Egypt Exploration Fund.
———, eds. 1915. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. Part XI. London: Egypt Exploration Fund.
———, eds. 1966 [1898]. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. Part I. Brussels: Adam. (See also Lobel/Roberts/Wenger 1941.)
Greschat, K. 2000. *Apelles und Hermogenes. Zwei theologische Lehrer des zweiten Jahrhunderts*. SVigChr 48. Leiden: Brill.
———. 2006. “Die Entstehung des neutestamentlichen Kanons. Fragestellungen und Themen der neueren Forschung.” *VuF* 51: 56–63.
Gressmann, H., and A. Laminski. 1992. *Die Theophanie. Die griechischen Bruchstücke und Übersetzung der syrischen Überlieferung*. Vol. 3/2 of *Eusebius Werke*. Edited by H. Gressmann. 2nd revised edition edited by A. Laminski. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
Grillmeier, A. 1986. *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche II/1, Das Konzil von Chalcedon, Rezeption und Widerspruch (451–581)*. Freiburg: Herder.
Grimmelt, L. 1942. “Die Eucharistiefeier nach den Werken des Origenes. Eine liturgiewissenschaftliche Untersuchung.” PhD diss., Münster.
Groh, D. E. 1974. “Hans von Campenhausen on Canon: Positions and Problems.” *Int.* 28: 331–43.
———. 1985. “Utterance and Exegesis: Biblical Interpretation in the Montanist Crisis.” Pages 73–95 in *The Living Text: Essays in Honour of E. W. Saunders*. Edited by D. E. Groh and R. Jewett. Lanham, N.Y.: University of America.
Gronewald, M. 1974. “Ein liturgischer Papyrus: Gebet und Ode 8. P. Mich. Inv. 6427.” *ZPE* 14: 193–200.
Grossi, V. 1984. “Regula Fidei.” Pages 2981–82 in *DPAC* II.
Gryson, R. 1982. “The Authority of the Teacher in the Ancient and Medieval Church.” *JES* 19: 176–87.
Guarducci, M. 1995 [1978]. *Epigrafia Graeca*. Vol. IV: *Epigrafi sacre pagane e cristiane*. Rome: Istituto poligrafico dello Stato.

Guidi, I., ed. 1903. *Chronica minora. Textus syriacus*. CSCO.Syr. 3/4. Leipzig: Harrassowitz.

Günther, M. 1998. *Zur Frühgeschichte des Christentums in Ephesus*. 2 ed. ARGU 1. Frankfurt am Main: Lang.

Günther, W. 2003. "'Unsterbliche Kränze.' Zur Selbstdarstellung milesischer Propheten in didymeischen Inschriftendenkmälern." *Chiron* 33: 447–57.

Guyot, P., and R. Klein. 1996. Gregory Thaumaturgus, *Oratio prosphonetica ac panegyrica in Origenem. Dankrede an Origenes. Im Anhang: Origenis Epistula ad Gregorium Thaumaturgum. Der Brief des Origenes an Gregor den Wundertäter*. Translated by P. Guyot. Introduced by R. Klein. FChr 24. Freiburg: Herder.

Gwynn, A. 1926. *Roman Education: From Cicero to Quintilian*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Haarhoff, T. 1920. *Schools of Gaul: A Study of Pagan and Christian Education in the Last Century of the Western Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Habas, E. 1994. "The Jewish Origin of Julius Africanus." *JJS* 45: 86–91.

Habets, A. C. J. 1983. "Geschiedenis van de indeling van de filosofie in de Oudheit." PhD diss., Utrecht.

Hadot, I. 1984. *Arts libéraux et philosophie dans la pensée antique*. Paris: Études Augustiniennes.

———. 1989. "Erziehung und Bildung bei Augustin." Pages 99–139 in *Internationales Symposium über den Stand der Augustinus-Forschung, 16.–18. April 1987*. Edited by C. Mayer and K. H. Chelius. Würzburg: Echter.

———. 1997. "Geschichte der Bildung; artes liberales." Pages 17–34 in *Einleitung in die lateinische Philologie*. Edited by F. Graf. Stuttgart: Teubner.

———. 2003. "Der philosophische Unterrichtsbetrieb in der römischen Kaiserzeit." *RhM* 146: 49–71.

Hadot, P. 1987a. *Exercices spirituels et philosophie antique*. 2 ed. Paris: Études Augustiniennes.

———. 1987b. "Théologie, exégèse, révelation, écriture dans la philosophie grecque." Pages 13–34 in *Les règles de l'interprétation*. Edited by M. Tardieu. Paris: Cerf.

———. 1991. *Philosophie als Lebensform. Geistige Übungen in der Antike*. Translated by I. Hadot and C. Marsch. 2 ed. Berlin: Gatza (= Hadot 1987a).

Haelewyck, J.-C. 1998. *Clavis Apocryphorum Veteris Testamenti*. Turnhout: Brepols.

Haelst, J. van. 1976. *Catalogue des papyrus littéraires Juifs et Chrétiens*. Université de Paris IV Paris-Sorbonne, Série "Papyrologie" 1. Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne.

———. 1989. "Les origines du codex." Pages 13–35 in *Les débuts du codex. Actes de la journée d'étude organisée à Paris les 3 et 4 juillet 1985 par l'Institut de Papyrologie de la Sorbonne*. Edited by A. Blanchard. Bibliologia 9. Turnhout: Brepols.

Hafner, J. E. 2003. *Selbstdefinition des Christentums. Ein systemtheoretischer Zugang zur frühchristlichen Ausgrenzung der Gnosis*. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder.

Hagedorn, D. 1997. "Die 'Kleine Genesis' in P.Oxy. LXIII 4365." *ZPE* 116: 147–48.

Hägglund, B. 1958. "Die Bedeutung der 'regula fidei' als Grundlage theologischer Aussagen." *StTh* 12: 1–44.

Hagner, D. A. 1973. *The Use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome*. NT.S 34. Leiden: Brill.

Hahn, J. 1987. *Der Philosoph und die Gesellschaft. Selbstverständnis, öffentliches Auftreten und populäre Erwartungen in der hohen Kaiserzeit*. HABES 7. Stuttgart: Steiner.

Hahneman, G. M. 1992. *The Muratorian Fragment and the Development of the Canon*. OTM. Oxford: Clarendon.

Håkanson, L., ed. 1989. Seneca the Elder, *Oratorum et rhetorum sententiae, divisiones, colores*. BiTeu. Leipzig: Tuebner.

Halbertal, M. 1997. *People of the Book: Canon, Meaning, and Authority*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Halkin, F., ed. 1957. *Bibliotheca hagiographica Graeca*. 3 ed. Brussels: Société des Bollandistes.

———. 1963. *Inédits byzantins d'Ochrida, Candie et Moscou*. SHG 38. Brüssel: Société des Bollandistes.

Hall, S. G. 1979. *Melito of Sardis, On Pascha and Fragments*. Oxford Early Christian Texts. Oxford: Clarendon.

Halperin, D. J. 1988. *The Faces of the Chariot: Early Jewish Responses to Ezekiel's Vision*. TSAJ 16. Tübingen: Mohr.

Hamman, A. G. 1985. *L'épopée du livre. La transmission des textes anciens, du scribe à l'imprimerie*. Collection pour l'Histoire. Paris: Librairie Académique Perrin.

Hammerstaedt, J. 1999a. *Die Orakelkritik des Kynikers Oenomaus*. BKP 188. Frankfurt am Main: Athenäum.

———. 1999b. *Griechische Anaphorenfragmente aus Ägypten und Nubien. Text und Kommentar*. ANRWA. Papyrologica Coloniensa 28. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Handmann, R. 1888. *Das Hebräer-Evangelium. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte und Kritik des Hebräischen Matthäus*. TU 5/3. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

Hands, A. R. 1974. Review of M. S. San Nicolo, *Äyptisches Vereinswesen zur Zeit der Ptolemäer und Römer*. *JHS* 94: 235–36.

Hänggi, A., and I. Pahl. 1998. *Prex Eucharistica. Textus e variis liturgiis antiquioribus selecti*. 3 ed. SpicFri 12. Fribourg: Éditions universitaires.

Hansen, G. C., ed. 1995a. *Socrates*, *Kirchengeschichte*. Edited by G. C. Hansen, with contributions by M. Širinjan. GCS Sokrates. Berlin: Akademie.

———, ed. 1995b. *Theodorus Anagnostes*, *Kirchengeschichte*. 2 ed. GCS.NF 3. Berlin: Akademie.

Hanslik, R. 1958. "Vibius 51), C. Vibius Salutaris." Pages 1982–83 in *PRE* VIII A 2.

Hanson, J. S. 1980. "Dreams and Visions in the Graeco-Roman World and Early Christianity." Pages 1395–427 in *ANRW* II 23.2.

Hanson, R. P. C. 1961. "The Liberty of the Bishop to Improvise Prayer in the Eucharist." *VigChr* 15: 173–76.

———. 1962. *Tradition in the Early Church*. The Library of History and Doctrine. London: SCM.

———. 1980. “The Christian Attitude to Pagan Religions up to the Time of Constantine the Great.” Pages 910–73 in *ANRW* II 23.2.

Hanssens, M. 1965. *La liturgie d’Hippolyte. Ses documents, son titulaire, ses origines et son charactère*. 2 ed. OrChrA 155. Rome.

Harden, J. M. 1921/1922. “The Anaphora of the Ethiopic Testament of our Lord.” *JThS* 23: 44–49.

Harder, R. 1951. “Plotinos.” Pages 471–592 in *PRE* XXI/1.

Hardy, B. C. 1968. “The Emperor Julian and His School Law.” *ChH* 37: 131–43 (= Hardy 1978).

———. 1978. “Kaiser Julian und sein Schulgesetz.” Pages 387–408 in *Julian Apostata*. Edited by R. Klein. WdF 509. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Harl, M., and N. de Lange. 1983. Origen, *Philocalie, 1–20. Sur les écritures*. Introd., texte, trad. et notes par M. Harl. *La lettre à Africanus sur l’histoire de Suzanne*. Introd., texte, trad. et notes par N. de Lange. SC 302. Paris: Cerf.

Harnack, A. v. 1883. *Der angebliche Evangeliencommentar des Theophilus von Antiochien*. TU 1/4. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

———. 1886. *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*. Vol. I: *Die Entstehung des kirchlichen Dogmas*. Freiburg: Mohr.

———. 1888. *Der pseudocyprianische Tractat De aleatoribus. Die älteste lateinische christliche Schrift. Ein Werk des römischen Bischofs Victor I. (Saec. II)*. TU 5/1. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

———. 1889. *Das Neue Testament um das Jahr 200. Theodor Zahn’s Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons (Erste Band, Erste Hälfte) gepüft*. Freiburg: Mohr.

———. 1890. “Antrittsrede des Hrn. Harnack.” Pages 788–91 in *SPAW.PH* (= Harnack 1980a, 1–4 = Harnack 1930, 209–13).

———. 1891a. *Über das gnostische Buch Pistis Sophia*. *Brod und Wasser: Die eucharistischen Elemente bei Justin. Zwei Untersuchungen*. TU 7/2. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

———. 1891b. “Über einen Berliner Papyrus des Pastor Hermae.” Pages 427–35 in *SPAW.PH* (= Harnack 1980a, 31–35).

———. 1898a. “Excerpte aus dem Muratorischen Fragment.” *ThLZ* 23: 131–34.

———. 1898b. “Über zwei von Grenfell und Hunt entdeckte und publicirte altchristliche Fragmente.” Pages 516–20 in *SPAW.PH* (= Harnack 1980a, 341–45).

———. 1906. “Sokrates und die alte Kirche.” Pages 29–48 in *Reden und Aufsätze*. Vol. I. 2 ed. Gießen: Töpelmann.

———. 1912. *Über den privaten Gebrauch der Heiligen Schriften in der Alten Kirche*. Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Neue Testament V. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

———. 1913. “Die älteste Inschrift einer öffentlichen Kirchenbibliotek.” Pages 111–14 in *Beiträge zum Bibliotheks-und Buchwesen. Paul Schwenke zum 20. März gewidmet*. Berlin: M. Breslauer (= Harnack 1916).

———. 1914. “Tertullians Bibliothek christlicher Schriften.” Pages 303–34 in *SPAW.PH* (= Harnack 1980b, 227–58).

———. 1915. “Die älteste griechische Kircheninschrift.” Pages 746–66 in *SPAW.PH* (= Harnack 1980b, 305–25).

———. 1916a. “Die älteste Kirchenbibliotheksinschrift.” Pages 39–44 in *Aus der Friedens-und Kriegsarbeit*. Gießen: Töpelmann (= Harnack 1913).

———, ed. 1916b. Porphyrius, *“Gegen die Christen,” 15 Bücher. Zeugnisse, Fragmente und Referate*. APAW.PH 1, 1916. Berlin: Reimer (= Harnack 1980b, 362–474).

———. 1918. *Der kirchengeschichtliche Ertrag der exegetischen Arbeiten des Origenes (I. Teil: Hexateuch und Richterbuch). Die Terminologie der Wiedergeburt und verwandter Erlebnisse in der ältesten Kirche*. TU 42/3. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

———. 1919. *Der kirchengeschichtliche Ertrag der exegetischen Arbeiten des Origenes (II. Teil: Die beiden Testamente mit Ausschluß des Hexateuchs und des Richterbuchs*). TU 42/4. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

———. 1925. “Über den Verfasser und den literarischen Charakter des Muratorischen Fragments.” *ZNW* 24: 1–16.

———. 1926a. “Die Bezeichnung Jesu als ‘Knecht Gottes’ und ihre Geschichte in der alten Kirche.” Pages 121–41 in *SPAW.PH* (= Harnack 1980b, 730–56).

———. 1926b. “Die marcionitischen Prologe zu den Paulusbriefen, eine Quelle des Muratorischen Fragments.” *ZNW* 25: 160–63.

———. 1927. *Die Entstehung der christlichen Theologie und des christlichen Dogmas: Sechs Vorlesungen*. Gotha: Klotz.

———. 1928a. “Das AT in den Paulinischen Briefen und in den Paulinischen Gemeinden.” Pages 124–41 in *SPAW.PH* (= Harnack 1980b, 823–40).

———. 1928b. “Die ältesten Evangelienprologe und die Bildung des Neuen Testaments.” Pages 322–41 in *SPAW.PH* (= Harnack 1980b, 803–22).

———. 1929. *Einführung in die Alte Kirchengeschichte. Das Schreiben der römischen Kirche an die korinthische aus der Zeit Domitians (I. Clemensbrief)*. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

———. 1930a. *Aus der Werkstatt des Vollendeten. Als Abschluß seiner Reden und Aufsätze*. Edited by Axel v. Harnack. Gießen: Töpelmann.

———. 1930b. *Possidius, Augustins Leben*. APAW.PH 1. Berlin: Akademie der Wissenschaften (= Harnack 1980b, 853–95).

———. 1958a [1893]. *Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius*. Part I: *Die Überlieferung und der Bestand der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius*. Revised with assistance from E. Preuschen. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

———. 1958b [1897]. *Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius*. Part II: *Die Chronologie der altchristlichen Litteratur*. Vol. 1: *Die Chronologie der Litteratur bis Irenäus nebst einleitenden Untersuchungen*. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

———. 1958c [1904]. *Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius*. Part II: *Die Chronologie der altchristlichen Litteratur*. Vol. 2: *Die Chronologie der Litteratur von Irenaeus bis Eusebius*. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

———. 1980a. *Kleine Schriften zur Alten Kirche*. Vol. I: *Berliner Akademieschriften 1890–1907*. Edited by J. Dummer. Opuscula IX/1. Leipzig: Zentralantiquariat der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik.

———. 1980b. *Kleine Schriften zur Alten Kirche*. Vol. II: *Berliner Akademieschriften 1908–1930*. Edited by J. Dummer. Opuscula IX/2. Leipzig: Zentralantiquariat der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik.

———. 1981 [⁴1924]. *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*. Wiesbaden: VMA Verlag.

———. 1990a [⁴1909]. *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*. Vol. I: *Die Entstehung des kirchlichen Dogmas*. Tübingen: Mohr.

———. 1990b [⁴1909]. *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*. Vol. 2: *Die Entwickelung des kirchlichen Dogmas*. Tübingen: Mohr.

———. 1990c [1910]. *Entstehung und Entwickelung der Kirchenverfassung und des Kirchenrechts in den ersten zwei Jahrhunderten*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

———. 1991a [1882]. *Die Überlieferung der griechischen Apologeten des zweiten Jahrhunderts in der Alten Kirche und im Mittelalter*. TU 1/1. Berlin: Akademie.

———. 1991b [1886]. *Die Lehre der zwölf Apostel nebst Untersuchungen zur ältesten Geschichte der Kirchenverfassung und des Kirchenrechts*. TU 2/1. Berlin: Akademie.

———. 1991c [⁷1931]. *Dogmengeschichte*. 8 ed. UTB 1641. Tübingen: Mohr.

———. 1996 [²1924]. *Marcion. Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Harrauer, C. 1997. "Astrampsychos." Pages 121–22 in *DNP* 2.

Harrauer, H., and P. J. Sijpesteijn. 1985. *Neue Texte aus dem antiken Unterricht*. MPSW.NS 15. 2 vols. Vienna: Hollinek.

Harrington, D. J. 1980. "The Reception of Walter Bauer's Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity during the Last Decade." *HThR* 73: 289–98.

Harris, W. V. 1989. *Ancient Literacy*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Hartel, W., ed. 1871. *Cypriani opera omnia*. CSEL 3/3. Vienna: Geroldi Filium.

Hartel, W. von., and M. Kampter, eds. 1999. *Epistulae*. 2 ed. CSEL 29. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Hartenstein, J. 2000. *Die zweite Lehre. Erscheinungen des Auferstandenen als Rahmenerzählungen frühchristlicher Dialoge*. TU 146. Berlin: Akademie.

Harvey, W. W., ed. 1965 [1857]. *Sancti Irenaei Episcopi Lugdunensis Libros quinque Adversus Haereses*. 2 vols. Ridgewood, N.J.: Gregg Press.

Hascall, T. B. 1984. "Christianity and the Pagan Schools of the First Three Centuries." PhD diss., University of New York.

Hatch, E., and Redpath, H. A. 1954 [1897]. *A Concordance to the Septuagint and Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (Including the Apocryphal Books)*. 2 vols. Graz: Akademische Druck-und Verlagsanstalt.

Hayduck, M., ed. 1891. *Alexandri Aphrodisiensis In Aristotelis Metaphysica commentaria*. CAG 1. Berlin: Reimer.

———. 1899. *Alexandri Aphrodisiensis In Aristotelis Meteorologicorum Libros Commentaria*. CAG 3/2. Berlin: Reimer.

Hebbelynk, A., ed. 1900/1901. “Les mystères des lettres grecques d’après un manuscrit copte-arabe de la bibliothèque Bodleienne d’ Oxford.” *Mus*. 1 [1900]: 5–26, 105–36, 269–300. *Mus*. 2 [1901]: 5–33, 369–414.

Heberdey, R. 1912. *Das Theater in Ephesos*. FiE II. Vienna: Alfred Hölder.

Heckel, T. K. 1999. *Vom Evangelium des Markus zum viergestaltigen Evangelium*. WUNT 120. Tübingen: Mohr.

Hedrick, C. W. 2000. “Secret Mark: New Photographs, New Witnesses.” *The Fourth R* 13: 3–11, 14–16.

———. 2003. “The Secret Gospel of Mark: Stalemate in the Academy.” *JECS* 11: 133–45.

Heine, R. E. 1986. “Can the Catena Fragments of Origen’s Commentary on John be Trusted?” *VigChr* 40: 118–34.

———. 1989. *The Montanist Oracles and Testimonia*. PatMS 14. Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press.

Heinemann, J. 1977. *Prayer in the Talmud. Forms and Patterns*. Studia Judaica 9. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Heintz, M. 2003. “δι’ εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παϱ’ αὐτοῦ (Justin, Apology 1.66.2): Cuming and Gelston Revisited.” *Studia Liturgica* 33: 33–36.

Helderman, J. 1984. *Die Anapausis im Evangelium Veritatis. Eine vergleichende Untersuchung des valentinianisch-gnostischen Heilsgutes der Ruhe im Evangelium Veritatis und in anderen Schriften der Nag Hammadi-Bibliothek*. NHS 18. Leiden: Brill.

Heller, E., ed. 1982. *Annalen: Lateinisch und deutsch*. TuscBü. Munich: Artemis & Winkler.

Helm, R. 1957. “Professor.” Pages 110–12 in *PRE* XXIII/1.

———. 1977. Apuleius, *Verteidigungsrede. Blütenlese. Lateinisch und Deutsch*. SQAW 36. Berlin: Akademie.

Helm, R., and U. Treu. 1984. *Eusebius Werke*. Vol. 7: *Die Chronik des Hieronymus, Hieronymi Chronicon*. Edited and revised in a 2nd edition by R. Helm. 3rd unchanged edition with preface by U. Treu. GCS Eusebius VII. Berlin: Akademie.

Hengel, M. 1972. “Anonymität, Pseudepigraphie und ‘Literarische Fälschung’ in der jüdisch-hellenistischen Literatur.” Pages 229–329 in *Pseudepigrapha I*. Edited by K. v. Fritz. Éntretiens sur l’Antiquité classique 18. Vandœuvres-Genève: Fondation Hardt (= Hengel 1996, 196–257, expanded and updated by J. Frey).

———. 1984. *Evangelienüberschriften*. SHAW.PH 3. Heidelberg: Winter.

———. 1989. *The Johannine Question*. London: SCM.

———. 1993. *Die johanneische Frage. Ein Lösungsversuch. Mit einem Beitrag zur Apokalypse v. J. Frey*. WUNT 67. Tübingen: Mohr.

———. 1996a. *Judaica et Hellenistica. Kleine Schriften I*. WUNT 90. Tübingen: Mohr.

———. 1996b. “Qumrān und der Hellenismus.” Pages 258–94 in *Judaica et Hellenistica. Kleine Schriften I*. WUNT 90. Tübingen: Mohr.

———. 2000. *The Four Gospels and the One Gospel of Jesus Christ: An Investigation of the Collection and Origin of the Canonical Gospels*. Translated by J. Bowden. London: SCM.

———. 2008. *Die vier Evangelien und das eine Evangelium von Jesus Christus. Studien zur ihrer Sammlung und Entstehung*. Tübingen: Mohr.

Hengel, M., and R. Deines. 1994. “Die Septuaginta als ‘christliche Schriftensammlung,’ ihre Vorgeschichte und das Problem ihres Kanons.” Pages 182–284 in *Die Septuaginta zwischen Judentum und Christentum*. Edited by M. Hengel and A. M. Schwemer. WUNT 72. Tübingen: Mohr.

Hengel, M., and C. Markschies. 1989. *The “Hellenization” of Judaea in the First Century after Christ*. London: SCM.

Henne, P. 1990. “Canonicité du ‘Pasteur’ d’Hermas.” *RThom* 90: 81–100.

———. 1993. “La datation du Canon de Muratori.” *RB* 100: 54–75.

Henner, J. 1999. “Der Unterricht im christlichen Ägypten.” Pages 51–54 in *Christliches mit Feder und Faden. Christliches in Texten, Textilien und Alltagsgegenständen aus Ägypten. Katalog zur Sonderausstellung im Papyrusmuseum der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek aus Anlaß des 14. Internationalen Kongresses für Christliche Archäologie*. Edited by J. Henner, H. Förster, and U. Horak. Nilus 3. Vienna: ÖVG.

Henrich, D. 1996 [1979]. “‘Identität’—Begriffe, Probleme, Grenzen.” Pages 133–86 in *Identität*. Edited by O. Marquard and K. Stierle. 2 ed. Poetik und Hermeneutik VIII. Munich: Fink.

Henrichs, A. 1968. “Philosophy, the Handmaiden of Theology.” *GRBS* 9: 437–50.

Henry, R. 1971. Photius, *Bibliothèque, Tome VI (“Codices” 242–245)*. Texte établi et traduit R. Henry. CUFr. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Hense, O., ed. 1990 [1905]. *C. Musonii Rufi Reliquiae*. BiTeu. Leipzig: Tuebner.

Hermann, C. F., ed. 1907. ΑΛΒΙΝΟΥ, *Εἰσαγωγὴ εἰς τοὺς Πλάτωνος διαλόγους*. Pages 147–51 in *Platonis Dialogi secundum Thrasylli tetralogias dispositi*. Vol. VI. BiTeu. Leipzig: Tuebner.

Hermann, P., ed. 1981–1989. *Tituli Lydiae linguis Graeca et Latina conscripti*. TAM V. Vienna: Academia Scientarum Austriaca.

Herms, E. 1995. “Pluralismus aus christlicher Identität. Vorblick auf den VIII. Europäischen Theologenkongreß.” Pages 15–19 in *Pluralismus und Identität*. Edited by J. Mehlhausen. VWGTh 8. Gütersloh: Mohn.

Hernando, J. D. 1990. “Irenaeus and the Apostolic Fathers: An Inquiry into the Development of the New Testament Canon.” PhD diss., Drew University.

Herskovits, M. J. 1938. *Acculturation: A Study of Culture Contact*. Gloucester, Mass.: P. Smith.

Herter, H. 1931. “Kallimachos.” Pages 386–96 in *PRE Suppl*. V.

Herz, P. 1988. “Juden in Gesellschaft und Wirtschaft des oberen Maiandros-Tales.” Pages 1–26 in *Ethnische und religiöse Minderheiten in Kleinasien. Von der hellenistischen Antike bis in das byzantinische Mittelalter*. Edited by P. Herz and K. J. Mainzer Veröffentlichungen zur Byzantinistik 2. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

———. 2002. “Sacrifice and Sacrificial Ceremonies of the Roman Imperial Army.” Pages 81–100 in *Sacrifice in Religious Experience*. Edited by A. I. Baumgarten. SHR 93. Leiden: Brill.

Herzog, R. 1989. “§ 560 Laudes Domini.” § 560 in *HLL* V (= HAW VIII/5, 330–31).

Hesseling, D. C. 1893. “On Waxen-Tablets with Fables of Babrius (Tabulae ceratae Assendelftianae).” *JHS* 13: 293–314.

Heussi, K. 1935. Review of W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei*. *HV* 30: 410–11.

Hilberg, I., ed. 1910. *Epistulae I–LXX*. CSEL 54. Vienna: Tempsky.

———, ed. 1918. Jerome, *Epistulae CXXI–CLIV*. CSEL 56/1. Vienna: Tempsky.

Hilgenfeld, A. 1875. “Papias von Hierapolis.” *ZWTh* 18: 231–70.

———. 1966 [1886]. *Judentum und Judenchristentum: Eine Nachlese zu der Ketzergeschichte des Urchristentums*. Hildesheim: Olms.

Hill, C. E. 1995. “The Debate over the Muratorian Fragment and the Development of the Canon.” *WThJ* 57: 437–52.

———. 1998. “What Papias Said about John (and Luke). A ‘New’ Papian Fragment.” *JTS* 49: 582–629.

Hirsch, S. 1927. *Die Vorstellung von einem weiblichen πνεῦμα ἅγιον im Neuen Testament und in der ältesten christlichen Literatur. Ein Beitrag zur Lehre vom Heiligen Geist*. Berlin: Ebering.

Hirschmann, V.-E. 2004. “‘Nach Art der Engel’—die phrygische Prophetin Nanas.” *Epigraphica Anatolica* 37: 160–68.

———. 2005. *Horrenda Secta*. Hist. Einzelschriften 179. Stuttgart: Steiner.

Hobein, H., and W. Kroll. 1930. “Maximus 37).” Pages 2555–62 in *PRE* XIV/2.

Hoek, A. van den. 1997. “The ‘Catechetical’ School of Early Christian Alexandria and Its Philonic Heritage.” *HThR* 90: 59–87.

Hoffmann, H. 1987. “Institution, II. Rechlich.” Pages 102–5 in *Staatslexikon III*.

Hoffmann, H., C. Hubig, and W. Lipp. 1987. “Institution.” Pages 99–109 in *Staatslexikon* III.

Hohl, E., ed. 1971. *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*. 2 vols. Ed. stereotypa correctior addenda et corrigenda adiecerunt Ch. Samberger et W. Seyfarth. 5 ed. BiTeu. Leipzig: Tuebner.

Holl, K. 1899. *Fragmente vornicänischer Kirchenväter aus den Sacra Parallela hg*. TU 20/2. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

———, ed. 1915. *Ancoratus und Panarion Haer. 1–33*. GCS Epiphanius I. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

———. 1969 [1904]. *Amphilochius von Ikonium in seinem Verhältnis zu den großen Kappadoziern*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Holl, K., and J. Dummer. 1980. *Panarion Haereses 34–64*. Vol. II of *Epiphanius Werke*. Edited by K. Holl. 2nd revised edition edited by J. Dummer. GCS Epiphanius II. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

———. 1985. *Panarion Haereses 65–80. De Fide*. Vol. III of *Epiphanius Werke*. Edited by K. Holl. 2nd revised edition edited by J. Dummer. GCS Epiphanius III. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Hölscher, L. 1978. “Öffentlichkeit.” Pages 413–67 in *GGB* IV.

Holtzmann, H. J. 1908. *Evangelium, Briefe und Offenbarung des Johannes*. 3 ed. HC 4. Tübingen: Mohr.

Holzhausen, J. 1993. “Zur Inspirationslehre Plutarchs in De Pythiae Oraculis.” *Phil*. 137: 72–91.

Honko, L. 1999. "Traditions in the Construction of Cultural Identity." Pages 19–33 in *National History and Identity: Approaches to the Writing of National History in the North-East Baltic Region Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*. Edited by M. Branch. Studia Fennica. Ethnologica 6. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Hoogendijk, F. A. J., and P. van Minnen, eds. 1991. *Papyri, Ostraca, Parchments and Waxed Tablets in the Leiden Papyrological Institute*. P. L. Bat. 25. Leiden: Brill.

Horbury, W. 1994. "The Wisdom of Solomon in the Muratorian Fragment." *JThS* 45: 149–59.

Hornig, G. 1996. *Johann Salomo Semler. Studien zu Leben und Werk des Hallenser Aufklärungstheologen*. Hallesche Beiträge zur Europäischen Aufklärung 2. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Hornschuh, M. 1960. "Das Leben des Origenes und die Entstehung der alexandrinischen Katechetenschule." *ZKG* 71: 1–25, 193–214.

———. 1964. "Erwägungen zum 'Evangelium der Ägypter,' insbesondere zur Bedeutung seines Titels." *VigChr* 18: 6–13.

Horsley, G. H. R. 1982. *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity*. Vol. 2: *A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri Published in 1977*. North Ryde: Macquarie University Press.

Hotz, S. 2005. "Bigger, Better, More—die Kleinstadt Bargylia im Bann eines Festes." Pages 58–65 in *Die Welt der Rituale. Von der Antike bis heute*. Edited by C. Ambros, S. Hotz, G. Schwedler, and S. Weinfurter. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Houston, G. W. 2014. *Inside Roman Libraries: Book Collections and Their Management in Antiquity*. Chapel Hill: UNC Press.

Hübner, R. M. 1989. "Die antignostische Glaubensregel des Noët von Smyrna." *Münchener Theologischer Zeitschrift* 40: 279–312.

———. 1999. "Die antignostische Glaubensregel des Noët von Smyrna." Pages 39–90 in *Der paradox Eine. Antignostischer Monarchianismus im zweiten Jahrhundert. Mit einem Beitrag von M. Vinzent*. SVigChr 50. Leiden: Brill.

Humann, C., C. Cichorius, W. Judeich, and F. Winter. 1898. *Altertümer von Hierapolis*. JdI. Supp 4. Berlin.

Hunger, H. 1988 [1961]. "Antikes und mittelalterliches Buchwesen." Pages 27–71 in *Die Textüberlieferung der antiken Literatur und der Bibel*. 2 ed. Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag.

Hunzinger, C.-H. 1952. "Bibliographie von W. Bauer." *ThLZ* 77: 501–4.

———. 1961. "Bibliographie von W. Bauer." *ThLZ* 86: 315–16.

Hurschmann, R. 1998. "Gebärden III. Griechenland und Rom." Pages 819–28 in *DNP* IV.

Hutter, L. 1961. *Compendium Locorum Theologicorum*. Edited by W. Trillhaas. KlT 183. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Hyldahl, N. 1960. "Hegesipps Hypomnemata." *StTh* 14: 70–113.

———. 1966. *Philosophie und Christentum. Eine Interpretation der Einleitung zum Dialog Justins*. AThD 9. Kopenhagen.

Ideler, J. L. 1963 [1842]. “De magna et sacra arte.” Pages 199–253 in *Physici et medici Graeci minores*. Vol. 2. Amsterdam: Hakkert.

Jacobson, H. 1996. *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo’s Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum, with Latin Text and English Translation*. 2 vols. AGJU 31/1–2. Leiden: Brill.

Jaeger, W. 1961. *Early Christianity and Greek Paideia*. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press (= Jaeger 1963).

———. 1963. *Das frühe Christentum und die griechische Bildung*. Translated by W. Eltester. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter (= Jaeger 1961).

———. 1964 [1953]. *Die Theologie der frühen griechischen Denker*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

Jaekel, S., ed. 1964. *Menandri Sententiae, Comparatio Menandri et Philistionis*. BiTeu. Leipzig: Teubner.

Janeras, S. 1984. “L’original grec del fragment copte de Lovaina núm. 27 en l’anàfora de Barcelona.” *Miscellània litúrgica catalana* 3: 15–23.

Janssen, M. 2003. “‘Deine Lichtkraft hat durch David prophezeit.’ Zum Psalmgebet in der Pistis Sophia.” Pages 261–93 in *Identität durch Gebet. Zur gemeinschaftsbildenden Funktion institutionalisierten Betens in Judentum und Christentum*. Edited by A. Gerhards, A. Doeker, and P. Ebenbauer. Studien zu Judentum und Christentum. Paderborn: Schöningh.

Jantsch, J. 1990. *Die Entstehung des Christentums bei Adolf von Harnack und Eduard Meyer*. Habelts Dissertationsdrucke. Reihe Alte Geschichte 28. Bonn: Habelt.

Jastrow, M. 1986 [1905]. *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature*. 2 vols. Jerusalem: Makor.

Jefford, C. N. 1989. *The Sayings of Jesus in the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*. SVigChr 11. Leiden: Brill.

Jensen, A. 1992. *Gottes selbstbewusste Töchter. Frauenemanzipation im frühen Christentum?* Freiburg: Herder.

Jeremias, J. 1954. “παῖς θεοῦ C./D.” Pages 676–713 in *ThWNT* V.

———. 1979 [1971]. *Neutestamentliche Theologie*. 3 ed. Gütersloh: Mohn.

John Paul II. 1979. “Address to the Pontifical Biblical Commission.” *AAS* 71: 606–9.

Johnson, M. E. 1995. *The Prayers of Sarapion of Thmuis: A Literary, Liturgical, and Theological Analysis*. OrChrA 249. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale.

———. 2000. “The Origins of the Anaphoral Sanctus und Epiclesis Revisited: The Contribution of Gabriele Winkler.” Pages 405–42 in *Crossroad of Cultures: Studies in Liturgy and Patristics in Honor of Gabriele Winkler*. Edited by H.-J. Feulner, E. Velkovska, and R. F. Taft. OrChrA 260. Rome.

Johnson, T. E. 1995. “Recovering Ägyptisches Heimatgut: An Exercise in Liturgical Methodology.” *Questions liturgiques* 76: 182–98.

Jones, A., J. R. Martindale, and J. Morris. 1971. *The Prosography of the Later Roman Empire (PLRE)*. Vol. 1: *A. D. 260–395*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jones, H. L. 1967–1970. *The Geography of Strabo. In Eight Volumes*. With an English Translation by H. L. Jones, based upon the unfinished version of J. R. Sitlington Sterrett. LCL 5. London: Heinemann.

Jouguet, P., and P. Perdrizet. 1906. “Le Papyrus Bouriant no. 1. Un cahier d’écolier grec d’Égypte.” *StPP* 6: 148–61.

Jourjon, M. 1976. “Justin.” Pages 75–88 in *L’eucharistie des premiers chrétiens*. Edited by W. Rordorf. PoTh 17. Paris: Beauchesne.

Jullien, E. 1885. *Les professeurs de littérature dans l’ancienne Rome et leur enseignement depuis l’origine jusqu’à la mort d’Auguste*. Paris: Leroux.

Jungmann, J. A. 1958. *Missarum Sollemnia. Eine genetische Erklärung der römischen Messe*. 2 vols. 4 ed. Vienna: Herder.

———. 1967. *Liturgie der christlichen Frühzeit bis auf Gregor den Großen*. Freiburg, Switzerland: Universitätsverlag.

Junod, É., ed. 1976. Origène, *Philocalie 21–27*. SC 226. Paris: Cerf.

———. 1988. “Eusèbe de Césarée, Sérapion d’Antioche et l’Évangile de Pierre. D’un évangile à un pseudépigraphe.” *RSLR* 24: 3–16.

———. 2005. “D’Eusèbe de Césarée à Athanase d’Alexandrie en passant par Cyrille de Jérusalem: De la construction savante du Nouveau Testament à la clôture ecclésiastique du Canon.” Pages 169–95 in *Le canon du Nouveau Testament. Regards nouveaux sur l’histoire de sa formation*. Edited by G. Aragione, É. Junod, and E. Norelli. Le Monde de la Bible 54. Geneva: Labor et Fides.

Junod, É., and J.-D. Kaestli, eds. 1983. *Acta Johannis*. Vol. I: *Praefatio-Textus*. Vol. II: *Textus alii—Commentarius, Indices*. CChr.SA 1/2. Turnhout: Brepols.

Kaestli, J. D. 1994. “La place du Fragment de Muratori dans l’histoire du canon: A propos de la thèse de Sundberg et Hahneman.” *CrSt* 15: 609–34.

Kahle, P. 1954. *Bala’izah. Coptic Texts from Deir El-Bala’izah in Upper Egypt*. Vol. I. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kaibel, G. 1965 [1878]. *Epigrammata Graeca ex lapidibus conlecta*. Hildesheim: Olms.

Kany, R. 1999. “Jünger.” *RAC* XIX: 258–346.

Karpp, H. 1964. “Viva Vox.” Pages 190–98 in *Mullus. Festschrift für Theodor Klauser*. Edited by A. Stuiber and A. Hermann. JbAC Supp 1. Münster.

———. 1969. *Die Busse. Quellen zur Entstehung des altkirchlichen Busswesens*. TC 1. Zürich: EVZ-Verlag.

Käsemann, E. 1964. *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen*. Vol. 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

———. 1970a. “Begründet der neutestamentliche Kanon die Einheit der Kirche?” Pages 124–33 in *Das Neue Testament als Kanon. Dokumentation und kritische Analyse zur gegenwärtigen Diskussion*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (= Käsemann 1964, 214–23).

———, ed. 1970b. *Das Neue Testament als Kanon. Dokumentation und kritische Analyse zur gegenwärtigen Situation*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

———. 1982. “The Canon of the New Testament and the Unity of the Church.” Pages 95–107 in *Essays on New Testament Themes*. Translated by W. J. Montague. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Kasser, R. 1975. “Citations des Grands Prophètes bibliques dans les textes gnostiques/coptes.” Pages 56–64 in *Essays on the Nag Hammadi Texts in Honour of Pahor Labib*. Edited by M. Krause. NHS 6. Leiden: Brill.

———. 1988. “Status quaestionis 1988 sulla presunta origine dei cosiddetti papiri Bodmer.” *Aegyptus* 68: 191–94.

Kasten, H., ed. 1982. Pliny the Younger, *Briefe*. *Lateinisch und Deutsch*. SQAW 35. Berlin: Akademie.
Kaster, R. A. 1983a. "Notes on 'Primary' and 'Secondary' Schools in Late Antiquity." *TAPA* 113: 323–46.
———. 1983b. "P. Panop. 14.25." *ZPE* 51: 132–34.
———. 1988. *Guardians of Language: The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquitity*. The Transformation of the Classical Heritage XI. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Kattenbusch, F. 1908. "Theologie." Pages 900–913 in *RE*³ XXI.
———. 1930. "Die Entstehung einer christlichen Theologie. Zur Geschichte der Ausdrücke θεολογία, θεολογεῖν, θεολόγος." *ZThK* 11: 161–205 (= Kattenbusch 1962b).
———. 1962a [1894/1900]. *Das apostolische Symbol. Seine Entstehung, seine geschichtlicher Sinn, seine ursprüngliche Stellung im Kultus und in der Geschichte der Kirche; ein Beitrag zur Symbolik und Dogmengeschichte*. 2 vols. Hildesheim: Olms.
———. 1962b. *Die Entstehung einer christlichen Theologie. Zur Geschichte der Ausdrücke θεολογία, θεολογεῖν, θεολόγος*. 2 ed. Libelli 69. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
Katz, P. 1950. *Philo's Bible: The Aberrant Text of Bible Quotations in Some Philonic Writings and Its Place in the Textual History of the Greek Bible*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Kaufmann, F.-X. 1987. "Normen und Institutionen als Mittel zur Bewältigung von Unsicherheit: Die Sicht der Soziologie." Pages 37–48 in *Gesellschaft und Unsicherheit*. Edited by B. Rückversicherung. Karlsruhe: Verlag Versicherungswirtschaft.
Kaufmann-Bühler, D. 1966. "Eusebeia." Pages 985–1052 in *RAC* VI.
Kees, H. 1979. *Das alte Ägypten: Eine kleine Landeskunde*. 4 ed. Berlin: Akademie.
Keil, B., ed. 1898. *Aelii Aristidis Smyrnaei quae supersunt omnia*. Vol. II: *Orationes XVII–LIII continens*. Berlin: Weidmann.
Keil, J. 1908. "Zur Geschichte der Hymnoden in der Provinz Asia." *JÖAI* 11: 101–10.
———. 1924. "Johannes von Ephesos und Polykarpos von Smyrna." Pages 367–72 in *Strena Buliciana. Commentationes Gratulatoriae Francisco Bulić ob XV vitae lustra feliciter peracta oblatae a discipulis et amicis, AD IV non. oct. MCMXXI*. Zagrebiae: Aspalathi.
———. 1936. "Notion." Pages 1075–77 in *PRE* XVII/1.
Kekeç, T. 1992. *Pamukkale/Hierapolis*. Istanbul: Hitit Color.
Keller, O., ed. 1877. "Apollonii Historiae Mirabiles." Pages 43–56 in *Rerum Naturalium Scriptores Graeci Minores*. Vol. I: *Paradoxographi Antigonus, Apollonius, Phlegon, Anonymus Vaticanus*. BiTeu. Leipzig: Tuebner.
Kenyon, F. G. 1909. "Two Greek School-Tablets." *JHS* 29: 29–40.
Kern, O., ed. 1963. *Orphicorum Fragmenta*. 2 ed. Berlin: Weidmann.
Kettler, F. H. 1972. "War Origenes Schüler des Ammonios Sakkas." Pages 327–34 in *Epektasis. Mélanges patristiques offerts au Cardinal Jean Daniélou*. Edited by J. Fontaine and C. Kannengiesser. Paris: Beauchesne.

Kienle, W. v. 1961. "Die Berichte über die Sukzessionen der Philosophen in der hellenistischen und spätantiken Literatur." PhD diss., Berlin.

Kinzig, W. 1988. "Asterius Amasenus, Asterius Sophista oder Asterius Ignotus?: Studien zur Autorschaft der Psalmenhomilien (ed. Marcel Richard)." PhD diss., Heidelberg.

———. 1994. "Καινὴ διαθήκη: The Title of the New Testament in the Second and Third Centuries." *JThS* 45: 519–44.

———. 1997. "Review of JbAC 38 (1995) (especially of C. Scholten, Die alexandrinische Katechetenschule)." *ThLZ* 122: 927–30.

———. 1998. "War der Neuplatoniker Porphyrius ursprünglich Christ?" Pages 320–32 in *Mousopolos Stephanos. Festschrift für Herwig Görgemanns*. Edited by M. Baumbach, H. Köhler, and A. M. Ritter. Bibliothek der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaften 2. R. NF 102. Heidelberg: Winter.

———. 2002. "Ein Ketzer und sein Konstrukteur. Harnacks Marcion." Pages 253–74 in *Marcion und seine kirchengeschichtliche Wirkung/Marcion and His Impact on Church History*. Edited by G. May, K. Greschat, and M. Meiser. TU 150. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Kirchner, J. 1935. *Inscriptiones Atticae Euclidis anno posteriores*. Vol. III/1. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Kittel, G. 1921. Review of W. Bauer, *Die Briefe des Ignatius von Antiochia*. *ThLB* 42: 370–71.

Klauser, T. 1965. *Kleine abendländische Liturgiegeschichte: Bericht und Besinnung*. Bonn: Hanstein.

Klawitter, F. C. 1975. "The New Prophecy in Early Christianity: The Origin, Nature and Development of Montanism A.D. 165–220." PhD diss., Chicago.

Kleberg, T. 1967. *Buchhandel und Verlagswesen in der Antike*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Klein, R. 1990. "Christlicher Glaube und heidnische Bildung (Zum sozialen Hintergrund eines innerchristlichen Problems in den ersten Jahrhunderten)." *Laverna* 1: 50–100.

Klijn, A. F. J. 1988. "Das Hebräer-und das Nazoräerevangelium." Pages 3997–4033 in ANRW II 25.5.

———. 2003. *The Acts of Thomas: Introduction, Text, and Commentary*. 2 ed. NT.S 108. Leiden: Brill.

Klijn, A. F. J., and G. J. Reinink. 1973. *Patristic Evidence for Jewish-Christian Sects*. NT.S 36. Leiden: Brill.

Kline, L. L. 1975. "Harmonized Sayings of Jesus in the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies and Justin Martyr." *ZNW* 66: 223–41.

Klinghardt, M. 1996. *Gemeinschaftsmahl und Mahlgemeinschaft. Soziologie und Liturgie frühchristlicher Mahlfeiern*. TANZ 13. Tübingen: Francke.

———. 2008. "The Marcionite Gospel and the Synoptic Problem: A New Suggestion." *Novum Testamentum* 50: 1–27.

Kloeters, G. 1957. "Buch und Schrift bei Hieronymus." PhD diss., Münster.

Kloppenborg, J. S., and S. G. Wilson, eds. 1996. *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World*. London: Routledge.

Klostermann, E. 1897. "Die Schriften des Origenes in Hieronymus' Brief an Paula." Pages 853–70 in *SPAW.PH*.

Klostermann, E., and E. Benz, eds. 1935. *Matthäuserklärung I: Die griechisch erhaltenen Tomoi*. Vol. 10 of *Origenes Werke*. Edited by E. Klostermann with the collaboration of E. Benz. GCS Origenes X. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

Klostermann, E., E. Benz, and U. Treu. 1976. *Matthäuserklärung II: Die lateinische Übersetzung der Commentariorum Series*. Vol. 11 of *Origenes Werke*. Edited by E. Klostermann with the collaboration of E. Benz. 2nd revised edition by U. Treu. GCS Origenes XI. Berlin: Akademie.

Klostermann, E., and G. C. Hansen. 1972. *Gegen Marcell. Über die kirchliche Theologie. Die Fragmente Marcells*. Vol. 4 of *Eusebius Werke*. Edited by E. Klostermann. 2nd edition reviewed by G. C. Hansen. GCS Eusebius IV. Berlin: Akademie.

Klostermann, E., and P. Nautin, eds. 1983. *Jeremiahomilien, Klageliederkommentar, Erklärung der Samuel-und Königsbücher*. Vol. 3 of *Origenes Werke*. Edited by E. Klostermann. 2nd revised edition edited by P. Nautin. GCS Origenes III. Berlin: Akademie.

Knackfuss, H., and A. Rehm. 1924. *Milet. Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen und Untersuchungen seit dem Jahre 1899*. Vol. I/7: *Der Südmarkt und die benachbarten Bauanlagen*. Edited by H. Knackfuss with an epigraphic contribution by A. Rehm. Berlin: Schoetz and Parrhysius.

Knauber, A. 1951. "Katechetenschule oder Schulkatechumenat? Um die rechte Deutung des 'Unternehmens' der ersten großen Alexandriner." *TThZ* 60: 243–66.

———. 1968. "Das Anliegen der Schule des Origenes zu Cäsarea." *MThZ* 19: 182–203.

Knopf, R., G. Krüger, and G. Ruhbach, eds. 1965. *Ausgewählte Märtyrerakten*. SQS. NF 3. Tübingen: Mohr.

Knox, J. 1942. *Marcion and the New Testament: An Essay in the Early History of the Canon*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Koch, D. A. 1986. *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums: Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus*. BHTh 69. Tübingen: Mohr.

Koch, G. 1993. *Sarkophage der römischen Kaiserzeit*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesselschaft.

Koch, G., and H. Sichtermann. 1982. *Römische Sarkophage*. Handbuch der Archäologie. Munich: Beck.

Koch, H. 1926. "Zum Lebensgange des Origenes und des Heraklas." *ZNW* 25: 278–82.

———. 1934. Review of W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei*. *ThLZ* 59: 343–46.

Koep, L. 1962. "'Religio' und 'Ritus' als Problem des frühen Christentums." *JbAC* 5: 43–59.

Koester, H. 1957. *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den Apostolischen Vätern*. TU 65. Berlin: Akademie.

———. 1980. "Apocryphal and Canonical Gospels." *HThR* 73: 105–29.

———. 1983. "History and Development of Mark's Gospel (From Mark to Secret Mark and 'Canonical' Mark)." Pages 35–57 in *Colloquy on New Testament Studies:*

A Time for Reappraisal and Fresh Approaches. Edited by B. Corley. Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press.

———. 1990. *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development*. London: SCM.

———, ed. 1995. *Ephesos, Metropolis of Asia. An Interdisciplinary Approach to Its Archaeology, Religion, and Culture*. Vol. 41. HThS. Valley Forge, Pa.: Trinity Press International.

Koetschau, P., ed. 1899a. *Buch V–III gegen Celsus. Die Schrift vom Gebet*. Vol. 2 of *Origenes Werke*. GCS Origenes II. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

———, ed. 1899b. *Die Schrift vom Martyrium. Buch I–IV gegen Celsus*. Vol. 1 of *Origenes Werke*. GCS Origenes I. Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter.

———, ed. 1913. *De Principiis (ΠΕΡΙ ΑΡΧΩΝ)*. Vol. 5 of *Origenes Werke*. GCS Origenes V. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

Koffmane, G. 1893. "Das wahre Alter und die Herkunft des sog. muratorischen Kanons." *NJDTh* 2: 163–223.

Kofsky, A. 2000. *Eusebius of Caesarea against Paganism*. Leiden: Brill.

Kohler, K. 1972 [1897]. "The Testament of Job. An Essene Midrash on the Book of Job: Reedited and Translated with Introductory and Exegetical Notes." Pages 264–338 in *Semitic Studies in Memory of A. Kohut*. Edited by G. A. Kohut. Jerusalem: Makor.

Köhler, W.-D. 1987. *Die Rezeption des Matthäusevangeliums in der Zeit vor Irenäus*. WUNT 2/24. Tübingen: Mohr.

Kohlschein, F. 1992. "Hochgebet und Gebärdensprache." Pages 211–25 in *Gratias agamus. Studien zum eucharistischen Hochgebet. Für Balthasar Fischer*. Edited by A. Heinz and H. Rennings. Pastoralliturgische Reihe in Verbindung mit der Zeitschrift "Gottesdienst." Freiburg: Herder.

Kolb, A. 1995. "Vereine 'Kleiner Leute' und die kaiserliche Verwaltung." *ZPE* 107: 201–12.

Kollbrunner, F. 1990. "Die klassische Theorie: Akkommodation." *NZM.S* 37: 133–41.

Kollmann, B. 1990. *Ursprung und Gestalten der frühchristlichen Mahlfeier*. GTA 43. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Köpf, U. 1988. "Dogmengeschichte oder Theologiegeschichte?" *ZThK* 85: 455–73.

Korol, D. 1987. *Die frühchristlichen Wandmalereien aus den Grabbauten in Cimitile/Nola. Zur Entstehung und Ikonographie alttestamentlicher Darstellungen*. JbAC Ergbd. 13. Münster: Aschendorff.

Körtner, U. H. J. 1983. *Papias von Hierapolis. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des frühen Christentums*. FRLANT 133. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

———. 1998a. "Akkommodation 1. Dogmatisch und fundamentaltheologisch." Page 254 in *RGG*[4] I.

———. 1998b. "Papiasfragmente." Pages 1–103 in *Papiasfragmente. Hirt des Hermas*. Edited by U. H. J. Körtner und M. Leutzsch. SUC 3. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Koschorke, K. 1978. "Der gnostische Traktat 'Testimonium Veritatis' aus dem Nag Hammadi Codex IX. Eine Übersetzung." *ZNW* 69: 91–117.

Kötting, B. 1978. "Geste u. Gebärde." Pages 895–902 in *RAC* X.
———. 1980 [1950]. *Peregrinatio Religiosa. Wallfahrten in der Antike und das Pilgerwesen in der alten Kirche*. FVK 33–35. Münster: Th. Stenderhoff.
Kötzsche-Breitenbruch, L. 1976. *Die neue Katakombe an der Via Latina in Rom. Untersuchungen zur Ikonographie der altestamentlichen Wandmalereien*. JbAC. Ergbd. 4. Münster: Aschendorff.
Kovacs, J. L. 2001. "Divine Pedagogy and the Gnostic Teacher according to Clement of Alexandria." *JECS* 9: 3–25.
Kraft, H. 1952. "Gab es einen Gnostiker Karpokrates?" *ThZ* 8: 434–43.
———. 1955a. "Die altkirchliche Prophetie und die Entstehung des Montanismus." *ThZ* 11: 249–71.
———. 1955b. *Kaiser Konstantins religiöse Entwicklung*. BHTh 20. Tübingen: Mohr.
———. 1978. "Die Lyoner Märtyrer und der Montanismus." Pages 233–47 in *Les martyrs de Lyon (177), Lyon, 20–23 septembre 1977*. Colloques internationaux du Centre national de la récherche scientifique 575. Paris: Éditions du C.N.R.S.
Kragerud, A. 1967. *Die Hymnen der Pistis Sophia*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
Krämer, H. J. 1983. "Die Ältere Akademie." Pages 1–174 in *Die Philosophie der Antike*. Vol. 3: *Ältere Akademie, Aristoteles—Peripatos*. Edited by H. Flashar. Basel: Schwabe.
Kraus, T. J. 2001a. "*Ad fontes*: Gewinn durch die Konsultation von Originalhandschriften am Beispiel von *P. Vindob*. G 31974." *Bibl*. 82: 1–16.
———. 2001b. "Bücherleihe im 4. Jh. n. Chr. P.Oxy. LXIII 4365*—ein Brief auf Papyrus und die gegenseitige Leihe von apokryph gewordener Literatur." *Biblos* 50: 285–96.
Kraus, T., and T. Nicklas, eds. 2004. *Das Petrusevangelium und die Petrusapokalypse*. *Die griechischen Fragmente mit deutscher und englischer Übersetzung*. GCS Neutestamentliche Apokryphen I = GCS.NF 11. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
Krause, W. 1958. *Die Stellung der frühchristlichen Autoren zur heidnischen Literatur*. Vienna: Herder.
Kretschmar, G. 1956a. "Die frühe Geschichte der Jerusalemer Liturgie." *JLH* 2: 22–46.
———. 1956b. *Studien zur frühchristlichen Trinitätstheologie*. BHTh 21. Tübingen: Mohr.
———. 1977. "Abendmahlsfeier I. Alte Kirche." Pages 229–78 in *Abendmahlsfeier I. Alte Kirche* I.
———. 1988. "Die 'Selbstdefinition' der Kirche im 2. Jahrhundert als Sammlung um das apostolische Evangelium." Pages 105–31 in *Communio Sanctorum: Einheit der Christen—Einheit der Kirche. Festschrift für Bischof Paul-Werner Scheele*. Edited by J. Schreiner. Würzburg: Echter (= Kretschmar 1999, 148–72).
———. 1999. *Das bischöfliche Amt*. *Kirchengeschichtliche und ökumenische Studien zur Frage des kirchlichen Amtes*. *Kirchengeschichtliche und ökumenische Studien zur Frage des kirchlichen Amtes*. Edited by D. Wendebourg. Göttingen Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
———. 2000 [1989]. "Katechumenat/Katechumenen I. Alte Kirche." Pages 1–5 in *Katechumenat/Katechumenen I. Alte Kirche* XVIII.

Kroll, G., ed. 1899/1901. *Procli Diodachi In Platonis Rem publicam commentarii*. 2 vols. Leipzig: Tuebner.
Kroymann, E., ed. 1954a. *Adversus Marcionem*. Pages 437–726 in *Quinti Septimi Florentis Tertulliani Opera*. Part I: *Opera Catholica, Adv. Marcionem*. CChr.SL 1. Turnhout: Brepols.
———, ed. 1954b. *Quinti Septimi Florentis Tertulliani Opera. Pars II Opera Montanistica*. CChr.SL 2. Turnhout: Brepols.
Krueger, P., and T. Mommsen, eds. 1877. *Corpus Iuris Civilis*. Vol. I: *Institutiones*. Recognovit P. Krueger. Vol. II: *Digesta*. Recognovit T. Mommsen. Berlin: Weidmann.
Krüger, J. 1990. *Oxyrhynchos in der Kaiserzeit. Studien zur Topographie und Literaturrezeption*. EHS. 3. Ser. 441. Frankfurt am Main: Lang.
Kruger, M. J. 2002. "P. Oxy. 840: Amulet or Miniature Codex." *JThS* 53: 81–94.
Kühn, C. G., ed. 1965 [1821–1829]. *Claudii Galeni opera omnia*. 23 vols. Hildesheim: Olms.
Kühner, R., and B. Gerth. 1904. *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*. Part II: *Satzlehre, (. . .) in neuer Bearb. v. B. Gerth*. 2 vols. 3 ed. Hannover: Hahn.
Kühner, R., and C. Stegmann. 1955. *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinische Sprache. Satzlehre*. 3 ed. Revised by A. Thierfelder. 2 vols. Hannover: Hahn.
Kühnert, W. 1949. "Der antimontanistische Anonymus des Eusebius." *ThZ* 5: 436–46.
Kulawik, C. 2006. *Die Erzählung über die Seele (Nag-Hammadi-Codex II,6)*. TU 155. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
Külzer, A. 1998. "Die 'Festbriefe' (ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΑΙ ΕΟΡΤΑΣΤΙΚΑΙ)—eine wenig beachtete Untergattung der byzantinischen Briefliteratur." *BZ* 91: 379–90.
Kümmel, W. G. 1950. "Notwendigkeit und Grenze des neutestamentlichen Kanons." *ZThK* 47: 277–313 (= Käsemann 1970b, 62–97).
———. 1975. "Ein Jahrzehnt Jesusforschung (1965–1975)." *ThR* 40: 289–336.
Kunze, J. 1899. *Glaubensregel, Heilige Schrift und Taufbekenntnis. Untersuchungen über die dogmatische Autorität, ihr Werden und ihre Geschichte, vornehmlich in der alten Kirche*. Leipzig: Dörffling & Franke.
Küster, V. 2001. "Jesus Christ II. 5. Jesus Christ in der christlichen Mission." Pages 479–81 in RGG[4] IV.
Kutter, H. 1897. *Clemens Alexandrinus und das Neue Testament. Eine Untersuchung*. Gießen: Ricker.
Kytzler, B. ed. 1982. Minucius Felix, *Octavius*. BiTeu. Leipzig: Tuebner.
Labourt, J., ed. 1949–1963. Saint Jérôme, *Lettres*. 8 vols. CUFr. Paris: Les Belles Lettres. (Vols. 6–8 edited by L. Pichard and H. Cazelles.)
Labriolle, P. de. 1913a. *La crise montaniste*. Paris: Leroux.
———. 1913b. *Les sources de l'histoire du Montanisme*. CF 15. Fribourg: Librairie de l'Université.
Lampe, G. W. H. 1987 [1961]. *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon.
Lampe, P. 1989. *Die stadtrömischen Christen in den ersten beiden Jahrhunderten. Untersuchungen zur Sozialgeschichte*. Tübingen: Mohr.

———. 2002. “The Phrygian Archaeological Surface Survey Project of the University of Heidelberg and the Discovery of Pepouza and Tymion.” *ZAC* 6: 117–20.

———. 2003. *Christians at Rome in the First Two Centuries: From Paul to Valentinus*. Translated by M. Steinhauser. Edited by M. G. Johnson. London: Continuum.

———. 2004. “Die montanistischen Tymion und Pepouza im Lichte der neuen Tymioninschrift.” *ZAC* 8: 498–512.

Lane Fox, R. 1986. *Pagans and Christians in the Mediterranean World from the Second Century AD to the Conversion of Constantine*. London: Penguin.

———. 1996 [1994]. “Literacy and Power in Early Christianity.” Pages 126–48 in *Literacy and Power in the Ancient World*. Edited by A. K. Bowmann and G. Woolf. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lang, B. 1993. “Kanon.” Pages 332–35 in *Handbuch religionswissenschaftlicher Grundbegriffe*. Vol. III. Edited by H. Cancik. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

Lang, C., ed. 1881. *Cornuti Theologiae Graecae Compendium*. BiTeu. Leipzig: Tuebner.

Lange, U., and B. Kilian. 1996. *Ikonographisches Register für das Repertorium der christlich-antiken Sarkophage*. Vol. I: *Rom und Ostia*. Dettelbach: J. H. Röll.

Langerbeck, H. 1967. *Aufsätze zur Gnosis. Aus dem Nachlaß*. Edited by H. Dörries. AAWG.PH 3. Folge 69. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Lanzoni, F. 1925. *Le leggende di San Cassiano d’Imola*. ND.NS 3. Torino: SEI.

Lardet, P. 1983. Saint Jérôme, *Apologie contre Rufin*. SC 303. Paris: Cerf.

Lattke, M. 1979. *Die Oden Salomos in ihrer Bedeutung für Neues Testament und Gnosis*. Vol. I: *Ausführliche Handschriftenbeschreibung, Edition mit deutscher Parallel-Übersetzung, hermeneutischer Anhang zur gnostischen Interpretation der Oden Salomos in der Pistis Sophia*. OBO 25/1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

———. 1995. *Oden Salomos*. FChr 19. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder.

Lauchert, F., ed. 1896. *Die Kanones der wichtigsten altkirchlichen Concilien nebst den apostolischen Kanones*. SQS 12. Freiburg im Breisgau: Mohr.

Lauffer, S. 1971. *Diokletians Preisedikt*. Texte und Kommentare 59. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Laurance, J. D. 1984. *Priest as Type of Christ: The Leader of the Eucharist in Salvation History According to Cyprian of Carthage*. American University Studies VII/5. New York: Lang.

Laurenti, R. 1989. “Musonio, maestro di Epitteto.” Pages 2105–46 in *ANRW* II 36.3.

Lavarenne, M., ed. 1951. *Le livre des couronnes (Peristephanon liber). Dittochaeon. Epilogue*. Vol. 4 of *Prudence*. CUFr. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Layton, B. 1987. *The Gnostic Scriptures: A New Translation with Annotations and Introduction*. London: SCM–Canterbury Press.

LeBas, P., and W. H. Waddington., eds. 1870. *Inscriptions grecques et latines recueillies en Grèce et en Asie Mineure*. Vol. III: *Textes*. Paris: F. Didot.

Le Boulluec, A. 1985. *La notion d’hérésie dans la littérature grecque IIe–IIIe siècles*. Vol. I: *De Justin à Irénée*. Vol. II: *Clément d’Alexandrie et Origène*. EAug. Paris: Études Augustiniennes.

———. 1987. “L’école d’Alexandrie. De quelques aventures d’un concept historiographique.” Pages 403–17 in *Ἀλεξανδρινά. Hellénisme, judaïsme et christianisme à Alexandrie. Mélanges offerts à C. Mondésert*. Paris: Cerf.

———. 2000. “Orthodoxie et hérésie aux premiers siècles dans l’historiographie récente.” Pages 303–19 in *Orthodoxie, Christianisme, Histoire. Orthodoxy, Christianity, History*. Edited by E. S., É. Rebillard, and A. Romano. CEFR 270. Rome: Ecole française de Rome.

———. 2002. “Écrits ‘contestés,’ ‘inauthentiques’ ou ‘impies’? (Eusèbe de Césarée, Histoire Ecclesiastique, III,25).” Pages 153–65 in *Apocryphité. Histoire d’un concept transversal aux religions du livre. En hommage à Pierre Geoltrain*. Edited by S. C. Mimouni. BEHE. R. 113. Turnhout: Brepols.

———. 2004. “Le problème de l’extension du canon des écritures aux premiers siècles.” *RevSR* 92: 45–87.

Lebreton, J. 1935. Review of W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei*. *RScR* 25: 605–10.

Leclercq, H. 1924. “Bibliothèques.” Pages 842–904 in *DACL* II/1.

———. 1933. “Messe.” Pages 513–774 in *DACL* XI.

———. 1934. “Muratorianum.” Pages 543–60 in *DACL* XII/1.

———. 1935. “Nisibe (École de).” Pages 1377–86 in *DACL* XII.

Leclercq, J. 1952. “Pour l’histoire de l’expression ‘philosophie chrétienne.’” *MSR* 9: 221–26.

Lefort, L. T. 1940. “Coptica Lovaniensia.” *Mus*. 53: 1–66.

———, ed. 2000 [1955]. Athanasius, *Lettres festales et pastorales en copte*. 2 vols. CSCO 150/151. Copt. 19/20. Leuven: Peeters.

Lehmann, T. 2003. “Die Kirchenbauten in Cimitile/Nola. Ergebnisse der Forschungen der letzten 15 Jahre.” Pages 95–127 in *Cimitile e Paolino di Nola. La tomba di S. Felice e il centro di pellegrinaggio. Trent’anni di ricerche. Atti della giornata tematica dei Seminari di Archeologia Cristiana (École Française de Rome—9 marzo 2000)*. Edited by H. Brandenburg and L. E. Pani. SSAC 15. Rome: Pontificio Istituto di Archeologia Cristiana.

Leipoldt, J. 1907/1908. *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*. 2 vols. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

———. 1936. Review of W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei*. *ThLBl* 57: 228–30.

Leipoldt, J., and W. Grundmann. 1987. *Umwelt des Urchristentums*. Vol. III: *Bilder zum neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*. 6 ed. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.

Leonhard, C. 2004. “Die Ursprünge der Liturgie des jüdischen Pesach und das christliche Osterfest.” Pages 150–66 in *Dialog oder Monolog? Zur liturgischen Beziehung zwischen Judentum und Christentum*. Edited by A. Gerhards and H. H. Henrix. QD 208. Freiburg: Herder.

Levin, S. 1988. “The Early History of Christianity, in Light of the ‘Secret Gospel’ of Mark.” Pages 4270–92 in *ANRW* II 25.6.

Levine, L. I. 1989. *The Rabbinic Class of Roman Palestine in Late Antiquity*. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America.

———. 2000. *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

Lewis, C. T., and C. Short. 1958 [1879]. *A Latin Dictionary Founded on Andrew's Edition of Freund's Latin Dictionary: Revised, Enlarged, and in Great Part Rewritten*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Lewis, J. P. 1964. "What Do We Mean by Jabneh?" *JBR* 32: 125–32.

Liddell, H. G., R. Scott, and H. S. Jones. 1983. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Compiled by H. G. Liddel and R. Scott. Revised and augmented throughout by H. S. Jones with the assistance of R. McKenzie and the cooperation of many scholars, with a supplement 1968. Oxford: Clarendon.

Lieberg, G. 1973. "Die 'theologia tripertita' in Forschung und Bezeugung." Pages 63–115 in *ANRW* I 4.

———. 1982. "Die theologia tripertita als Formprinzip antiken Denkens." *RhM* 125: 25–53.

Liebeschuetz, W. 1991. "Hochschule." Pages 858–911 in *RAC* XV.

Lies, L. 1982. *Wort und Eucharistie bei Origenes. Zur Spiritualisierungstendenz des Eucharistieverständnisses*. 2 ed. IThS 1. Innsbruck: Tyrolia.

Lietzmann, H. 1907. *Wie wurden die Bücher des Neuen Testaments heilige Schrift?* Lebensfragen 21. Tübingen: Mohr (= Lietzmann 1958, 15–98).

———. 1916a. "Carmen = Taufsymbol." *RhM* 71: 281–82 (= Lietzmann 1962, 54–55).

———. 1916b. "Die liturgischen Angaben des Plinius." Pages 34–38 in *Geschichtliche Studien. Albert Hauck zum 70. Geburtstage*. Leipzig: Hinrichs (= Lietzmann 1962, 43–47).

———. 1926. *Messe und Herrenmahl. Eine Studie zur Geschichte der Liturgie*. AKG 8. Bonn: A. Marcus und E Weber.

———. 1927. *Petrus und Paulus in Rom. Liturgische und archäologische Studien*. 2 ed. AKG 1. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

———. 1934. Review of W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei*. *ZNW* 33: 94.

———. 1958. *Studien zum Neuen Testament*. Vol. II of *Kleine Schriften*. Edited by K. Aland. TU 68. Berlin: Akademie.

———. 1962. *Studien zur Liturgie-und Symbolgeschichte. Zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte*. Vol. III of *Kleine Schriften*. Edited by Der Kommission für spätantike Religionsgeschichte (sc. der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften). TU 74. Berlin: Akademie.

———. 1970 [1904]. *Apollinaris von Laodicea und seine Schule. Texte und Untersuchungen*. Hildesheim: Olms.

Lieu, J. M. 1998. "The Forging of Christian Identity and the Letter to Diognetus." *Mediterranean Archaeology* 11: 71–82 (= Lieu 2005, 171–89).

———. 2005. *Neither Jew nor Greek? Constructing Early Christianity*. Studies of the New Testament and Its World. London: Continuum.

Lindemann, A. 1979. *Paulus im ältesten Christentum. Das Bild des Apostels und die Rezeption der paulinischen Theologie in der frühchristlichen Literatur bis Marcion*. BHTh 58. Tübingen: Mohr.

Lindsay, W. M., ed. 1971 [1911]. *Isidori Hispalensis Episcopi Etymologiarum sive Originum Libri XX*. SCBO. Oxford: Clarendon.

Lipp, W. 1987. "Institution, I. Sozialphilosophisch." Pages 99–102 in *Staatslexikon* III.

Lipsius, R. A. 1883. *Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten und Apostellegenden: Ein Beitrag zur altchristlichen Litteraturgeschichte* 1. Braunschweig: C. A. Schwetschke und Sohn.

Lipsius, R. A., and M. Bonnet. 1959 [1891–1903]. *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*. Post C. Tischendorf denuo ed. R. A. Lipsius et M. Bonnet. 3 vols. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Lloyd-Jones, H., and M. L. West. 1966. "Oracles of Apollo Kareios." *Maia* 18: 263–64.

Lobel, E., C. H. Roberts, and E. P. Wenger, eds. 1941. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. Part XVIII. London: Egypt Exploration Society.

Loewenich, W. von. 1932. *Das Johannes-Verständnis im zweiten Jahrhundert*. BZNW 13. Gießen: Töpelmann.

———. 1935. Review of W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei*. *ThG* 29: 8.

Lohmeyer, E. 1935. Review of W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei*. *HZ* 151: 97–100.

Löhr, H. 2003. *Studien zum frühchristlichen und frühjüdischen Gebet. Untersuchungen zu 1 Clem 59 bis 61 in seinem literarischen, historischen und theologischen Kontext*. WUNT 160. Tübingen: Mohr.

Löhr, W. A. 1989. "Der Brief der Gemeinden von Lyon und Vienne (Eusebius, h. e. V,1–2(4))." Pages 135–49 in *Oecumenica et Patristica, Festschrift für W. Schneemelcher zum 75. Geburtstag*. Edited by D. Papandreou, W. Bienert, and K. Schäferdiek. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

———. 1994. "Kanonsgeschichtliche Beobachtungen zum Verhältnis von mündlicher und schriftlicher Tradition im zweiten Jahrhundert." *ZNW* 85: 234–58.

———. 1995. "Karpokratianisches." *VigChr* 49: 23–48.

———. 1996. *Basilides und seine Schule: Eine Studie zur Theologie-und Kirchengeschichte des zweiten Jahrhunderts*. WUNT 83. Tübingen: Mohr.

———. 2005. "Norm und Kontext—Kanonslisten in der Spätantike." *BThZ* 22: 202–29.

Lohse, E. 1970. "'Ich aber sage euch.'" Pages 189–203 in *Der Ruf Jesu und die Antwort der Gemeinde. Exegetische Untersuchungen. Joachim Jeremias zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet von seinen Schülern*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (= Lohse 1976, 73–87).

———. 1976. *Die Einheit des Neuen Testaments. Exegetische Studien zur Theologie des Neuen Testaments*. Vol. I. 2 ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Lommatzsch, C. H. E., ed. 1831–1848. *Origenes opera omnia*. Vols. 1–25. Berlin: Haude et Spener.

Lona, H. E. 1998. *Der erste Clemensbrief*. KAV II. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Long, H. S., ed. 1964. *Diogenis Laertii Vitae Philosophorum*. 2 vols. SCBO. Oxford: Clarendon.

Loofs, F. 1899. “Gregorius von Nazianz.” Pages 138–46 in *RE*[3] VII.
———. 1967 [1906[4]]. *Leitfaden zum Studium der Dogmengeschichte*. 7 ed. Edited and reviewed by K. Aland. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
Lorenz, R., ed. 1986. *Der zehnte Osterfestbrief des Athanasius von Alexandrien, Text, Übersetzung, Erläuterungen*. BZNW 49. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
Lucchesi, E. 2001. “Un nouveau complément aux lettres festales d’Athanase.” *AnBoll* 119: 255–60.
Lucchesi, E., and R. G. Coquin. 1982. “Un complément au corps copte des lettres festales d’Athanase.” *OLoP* 13: 137–42.
Luckmann, T. 1981. “Anonymität und persönliche Identität.” Pages 8–38 in *Christlicher Glaube in moderner Gesellschaft, Teilband 25*. Edited by F. Böckle, F. X. Kaufmann, K. Rahner, and B. Welte. Freiburg: Herder.
Lüdemann, G. 1975. *Untersuchungen zur simonianischen Gnosis*. GTA 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
———. 2000. “Das Urchristentum (I).” *ThR* 65: 121–79.
Ludin Jansen, H. 1958. “Bibelske tekster i Pistis Sophia.” *DTT* 21: 210–18.
Luhmann, N. 1976. *Funktionen und Folgen formaler Organisation*. 3 ed. Schriftenreihe der Hochschule Speyer 20. Berlin: Duncker und Humblot.
———. 1982. *Funktion der Religion*. Suhrkamp-Taschenbuch Wissenschaft 407. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
Lührmann, D. 1972. “Erwägungen zur Geschichte des Urchristentums.” *EvTh* 32: 452–67.
———. 1976. *Glaube im frühen Christentum*. Gütersloh: Mohn.
———. 1981a. “Gal 2,9 und die katholischen Briefe. Bemerkungen zum Kanon und zur regula fidei.” *ZNW* 72: 65–87.
———. 1981b. “Glaube.” Pages 48–122 in *RAC* XI.
———. 1981c. “POx 2949: EvPt 3–5 in einer Handschrift des 2./3. Jahrhunderts.” *ZNW* 72: 216–26. (Revised version in Lührmann 2004, 60–73.)
———. 1988. “Die griechischen Fragmente des Mariaevangeliums POx 3525 und PRyl 463.” *NT* 30: 321–38. (Revised version in Lührmann 2004, 105–24.)
———. 1993. “POx 4009: Ein neues Fragment des Petrusevangeliums?” *NT* 35: 390–410. (Revised version in Lührmann 2004, 73–86.)
———. 2004. *Die apokryph gewordenen Evangelien. Studien zu neuen Texten und zu neuen Fragen*. NT.S 112. Leiden: Brill.
Lumpe, A. 1970. “Zur Geschichte der Wörter concilium und synodus in der antiken christlichen Latinität.” *AHC* 2: 1–21.
Luppe, W. 1993. “Christliche Weihung von Öl—Zum Papyrus. Barc. 156 A/B.” *ZPE* 95: 70.
Lupu, E. 2005. *Greek Sacred Law: A Collection of New Documents (NGSL)*. Religions in the Greco-Roman World 152. Leiden: Brill.
Luttikhuizen, G. P. 1989. “Intertextual References in Readers’ Responses to the Apocryphon of John.” Pages 117–26 in *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings: Essays in Honour of Bas van Iersel*. Edited by S. Draisma. Kampen: Kok.
Lyman, R. 2003. “2002 NAPS Presidential Address. Hellenism and Heresy.” *JECS* 11: 209–22.

Lynch, J. P. 1972. *Aristotle's School: A Study of a Greek Educational Institution*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Macina, M.-R. 1982. "L'homme à l'école de Dieu. D'Antioche à Nisibe: Profil herméneutique, théologique et kérygmatique du mouvement scoliaste nestorien. Monographie programmatique." *POC* 32: 86–124, 263–301.

Macleod, M. D., ed. 1974. *Libelli 26–43*. Vol. 2 of *Luciani Opera*. SCBO. Oxford: Clarendon.

Maier, J. 1988. "Zur Frage des biblischen Kanons im Frühjudentum im Licht der Qumranfunde." *JBTh* 3: 135–46.

Maier, J.-L. 1987. *Des origines à la mort de Constance II (303–361)*. Vol. I of *Le dossier du Donatisme*. TU 134. Berlin: Akademie.

Maier-Eichhorn, U. 1989. *Die Gestikulation in Quintilians Rhetorik*. EHS. 15. Ser. 41. Frankfurt am Main: Lang.

Malherbe, A. J. 1979. "Soziale Ebene und literarische Bildung." Pages 194–221 in *Zur Soziologie des Urchristentums. Ausgewählte Beiträge zum frühchristlichen Gemeinschaftsleben in seiner gesellschaftlichen Umwelt*. Edited by W. A. Meeks. ThB 62. Munich: Kaiser.

Malingrey, A.-M. 1961. *Philosophia. Étude d'un groupe de mots dans la littérature grecque des Présocratiques au IVe siècle après J.-C.* Paris: Klincksieck.

Malinowski, B. 1944. *A Scientific Theory of Culture and Other Essays*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Mandouze, A., 1982. *Prosopographie de l'Afrique chrétienne (303–533)*. Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas-Empire 1. Paris: Editions du Centre national de la recherche scientifique.

Mara, M. G., ed. 1973. *Évangile de Pierre*. SC 201. Paris: Cerf.

Marchesi, C., ed. 1953. *Arnobii adversus nationes libri VII*. CSLP 62. Torino: Paravia.

Marcovich, M., ed. 1990. Pseudo-Iustinus, *Cohortatio ad Graecos. De Monarchia. Oratio ad Graecos*. PTS 32. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

———, ed. 1994. *Iustini Maryris Apologiae pro christianis*. PTS 38. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

———, ed. 1995a. *Tatiani Oratio ad Graecos*. PTS 43. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

———, ed. 1995b. *Theophili Antiocheni Ad Autolycum*. PTS 44. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

———, ed. 1997. *Iustini Martyris Dialogus cum Tryphone*. PTS 47. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

———. 1998. "Alcestis Barcionensis." Pages 3197–206 in *ANRW* II 34.4.

Markschies, C. 1992. *Valentinus Gnosticus? Untersuchungen zur valentinianischen Gnosis mit einem Kommentar zu den Fragmenten Valentins*. WUNT 65. Tübingen: Mohr.

———. 1993. "'*Sessio ad Dexteram*.' Bemerkungen zu einem altchristlichen Bekenntnismotiv in der christologischen Diskussion der altkirchlichen Theologen." Pages 252–317 in *Le Trône de Dieu*. Edited by M. Philonenko. WUNT 69. Tübingen: Mohr (= Markschies 2000e).

———. 1994. "Nochmals: Wo lag Pepuza? Wo lag Tymion? Nebst einigen Bemerkungen zur Frühgeschichte des Montanismus." *JbAC* 37: 7–28.

———. 1995a. “Was bedeutet οὐσία? Zwei Antworten bei Origenes und Ambrosius und deren Bedeutung für ihre Bibelerklärung und Theologie.” Pages 59–82 in *Origenes—Vir ecclesiasticus. Symposion zu Ehren von Herrn Prof. Dr. H. J. Vogt*. Edited by W. Geerlings and H. König. Hereditas 9. Bonn: Borengässer.

———. 1995b. “Wie soll man Geschichte studieren, insbesondere Religionsgeschichte? Thesen und Nachschrift eines Vortrages vom 19.10. 1910 in Christiania/Oslo.” *ZNThG* 2: 148–59.

———. 1997a. “‘. . . für die Gemeinde im Grossen und Ganzen nicht geeignet . . .’? Erwägungen zu Absicht und Wirkung der Predigten des Origenes.” *ZThK* 94: 39–68.

———. 1997b. “Stadt und Land. Beobachtungen zu Ausbreitung und Inkulturation des Christentums in Palästina.” Pages 265–98 in *Römische Reichsreligion und Provinzialreligion*. Edited by H. Cancik and J. Rüpke. Tübingen: Mohr.

———. 1997c. “Valentinian Gnosticism: Toward the Anatomy of a School.” Pages 401–38 in *The Nag Hammadi Library after Fifty Years: Proceedings of the 1995 Society of Biblical Literature Commemoration*. Edited by J. D. Turner and A. McGuire. NHMS 44. Leiden: Brill.

———. 1997d. “Wann endet das ‘konstantinische Zeitalter’? Eine Jenaer Antrittsvorlesung.” Pages 157–88 in *Die Weltlichkeit des Glaubens in der Alten Kirche. Festschrift für Ulrich Wickert zum siebzigsten Geburtstag*. Edited by D. Wyrwa in connection with B. Aland and C. Schäublin. BZNW 85. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

———. 1998a. “Abendmahl II. Kirchengeschichtlich/Kirchenrechtlich, 1. Alte Kirche.” Pages 15–21 in *RGG*^{4} I.

———. 1998b. “Alte Kirche.” Pages 344–60 in *RGG*^{4} I.

———. 1998c. “Die politische Dimension des Bischofsamtes im vierten Jahrhundert.” Pages 438–69 in *Recht—Macht—Gerechtigkeit*. Edited by J. Mehlhausen. VWGTh 14. Gütersloh: Mohn.

———. 1998d. “Kerinth—Wer war er und was lehrte er?” *JbAC* 41: 48–76.

———. 1999a. *Between Two Worlds: Structures of Early Christianity*. Translated by J. Bowden. London SCM.

———. 1999b [1998]. “Wer schrieb die sogenannte Traditio Apostolica? Neue Beobachtungen und Hypothesen zu einer kaum lösbaren Frage aus der altkirchlichen Literaturgeschichte.” Pages 1–79 in *Tauffragen und Bekenntnis. Studien zur sogenannten “Traditio Apostolica,” zu den “Interrogationes de fide” und zum “Römischen Glaubensbekenntnis.”* Edited by W. Kinzig, C. Markschies, and M. Vinzent. AKG 74. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

———. 2000a. “‘Die wunderliche Mär von den zwei Logoi . . .’ Clemens Alexandrinus, Fragment 23—Zeugnis eines Arius ante Arium oder des arianischen Streits selbst?” Pages 70–98 in *Alta Trinità Beata*. Tübingen: Mohr.

———. 2000b. “Epikureismus bei Origenes und in der origenistischen Tradition.” Pages 190–217 in *Epikureismus in der späten Republik und in der frühen Kaiserzeit. Akten der 2. Tagung der Karl-und Gertrud-Abel-Stiftung vom 30. September–3. Oktober 1998*. Edited by M. Erler. Philosophie der Antike 11. Stuttgart: Steiner.

———. 2000c. "Gnosis/Gnostizismus II." Pages 1045–53 in RGG⁴ III.
———. 2000d. "New Research on Ptolemaeus Gnosticus." *ZAC* 4: 225–54.
———. 2000e. "'*Sessio ad Dexteram*.' Bemerkungen zu einem altchristlichen Bekenntnismotiv in der christologischen Diskussion der altkirchlichen Theologen." Pages 1–69 in *Alta Trinità Beata*. Tübingen: Mohr (= Markschies 1993).
———. 2000f. "Theologische Diskussionen zur Zeit Konstantins. Arius, der 'arianische Streit' und das Konzil von Nizäa, die nachnizänischen Auseinandersetzungen bis 337." Pages 99–195 in *Alta Trinità Beata*. Tübingen: Mohr.
———. 2001a. *Die Gnosis*. C. H. Beck Wissen in der Beck'schen Reihe 2173. Munich: Beck.
———. 2001b. *Zwischen den Welten wandern. Strukturen des antiken Christentums*. 2 ed. Fischer-taschenbuch 60101. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag.
———. 2003. "Der christliche Glaube und das Problem des Synkretismus in kirchengeschichtlicher Perspektive." Pages 89–112 in *Esoterik. Herausforderung für die christliche Kirche im 21. Jahrhundert*. Edited by H. Krech and U. Hahn. Hannover: LVH.
———. 2004a. "Apostolizität und andere Amtsbegründungen in der Antike." Pages 296–334 in *Das kirchliche Amt in apostolischer Nachfolge*. Vol. I: *Grundlagen und Grundfragen, mit Beiträgen von J. Frey u. a., für den Ökumenischen Arbeitskreis evangelischer und katholischer Theologen*. Edited by T. Schneider and G. Wenz. Dialog der Kirchen 12. Freiburg: Herder.
———. 2004b. "Liturgisches Lesen und die Hermeneutik der Schrift." Pages 77–88 in *Patristica et Oecumenica. Festschrift für Wolfgang A. Bienert zum 65. Geburtstag*. Edited by P. Gemeinhardt and U. Kühneweg. MThS 85. Marburg: Elwert.
———. 2004c. *Warum hat das Christentum in der Antike überlebt? Ein Beitrag zum Gespräch zwischen Kirchengeschichte und systematischer Theologie*. ThLZ.F 13. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.
———. 2005a. "Époques de la recherche sur le canon du Nouveau Testament en Allemagne: Quelques remarques provisoires." Pages 11–34 in *Le canon du Nouveau Testament. Regards nouveaux sur l'histoire de sa formation*. Edited by G. Aragione, É. Junod, and E. Norelli. Le Monde de la Bible 54. Geneva: Labor et Fides.
———. 2005b. "Odysseus und Orpheus christlich gelesen." Pages 69–92 in *Mythenkorrekturen. Zu einer paradoxalen Form der Mythenrezeption*. Edited by B. Seidensticker, M. Vöhler, and W. Emmerich. spectrum literaturwissenschaft 3. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
———. 2006. "Intellectuals and Church Fathers in the Third and Fourth Centuries." Pages 239–56 in *Christians and Christianity in the Holy Land: From the Origins to the Latin Kingdoms*. Edited by O. Limor and G. Stroumsa. Cultural Encounters in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages 5. Turnhout: Brepols.
———. 2008a. "Gesund werden im Schlaf. Einige Rezepte aus der Antike." Pages 62–99 in *Antike ohne Ende*. Edited by C. Markschies. Berlin: Berlin University Press.
———. 2008b. "Vergangenheit, Gegenwart und Zukunft der Ideengeschichte. Zum Werk Hans von Campenhausens." Pages 9–27 in *Hans Freiherr von Campenhausen.*

Weg, Werk und Wirkung. Edited by C. Markschies. Schriften der Philosophisch-historischen Klasse der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften 43/2007. Heidelberg: Winter.

———. 2012a. “Haupteinleitung.” Pages 1–180 in *Antike christliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung*. Vol. I: *Evangelien und Verwandtes (in zwei Teilbänden)*. Edited by C. Markschies and J. Schröter with the collaboration of Andreas Heiser. Tübingen: Mohr.

———. 2012b. “Montanism.” Pages 1197–220 in *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* 24.

———. 2015. *Gottes Köper. Jüdische, christliche und pagane Gottesvorstellungen aus der Antike*. München: Beck. (An English translation is expected to appear in 2016.)

Markschies, C., A. Dihle, and W. A. Löhr, eds. 2008. *Hans Freiherr von Campenhausen. Weg, Werk und Wirkung*. Schriften der Philosophisch-historischen Klasse der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften 43/2007. Heidelberg: Winter.

Markschies, C., and H. Hildebrandt. 2007. “Das Christentum und die Religionen in den römischen Provinzen Pannoniens vom dritten bis zum fünften Jahrhundert—Christentum in Stadt und Land: Religiöse Transformationsprozesse in der spätantiken Provinz Dalmatia—Die Provinz Arabia als spätantike religiöse Landschaft.” Pages 88–102 in *Antike Religionsgeschichte in räumlicher Perspektive. Abschlußbericht zum Schwerpunktprogramm 1080 der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft ‘Römische Reichsreligion und Provinzialreligion.’* Edited by J. Rüpke. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Markschies, C., and J. Schröter, eds. 2012. *Antike christliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung*. Vol. I: *Evangelien und Verwandtes (in zwei Teilbänden)*. Tübingen: Mohr.

Markus, R. A. 1980. “The Problem of Self-Definition: From Sect to Church.” Pages 1–15 in *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*. Vol. 1: *The Shaping of Christianity in the Second and Third Centuries*. Edited by E. P. Sanders. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Marquard, O., and K. Stierle, eds. 1996 [1979]. *Identität*. 2 ed. Poetik und Hermeneutik VIII. Munich: Fink.

Marquardt, J. 1975 [1886]. *Das Privatleben der Römer*. Handbuch der römischen Altertümer VIII/1. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Marrou, H. I. 1949. “La technique de l’édition à l’époque patristique.” *VigChr* 3: 208–24.

———. 1958. *Saint Augustin et la fin de la culture antique*. 4 ed. Paris: Boccard.

———. 1976. *Histoire de l’éducation dans l’antiquité*. 7 ed. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

———. 1977. *Geschichte der Erziehung im klassischen Altertum*. Translated by C. Beumann. Edited by R. Harder. dtv-wr 4275. Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag (= Marrou 1976).

———. 1981. *Augustinus und das Ende der antiken Bildung*. Translated by L. Wirth-Poelchau and W. Geerlings. Edited by J. Götte. Paderborn: Schöningh (= Marrou 1958).

Marshall, P. K., ed. 1991 [1968]. Aulus Gellius, *Noctes Atticae*. 2 vols. SCBO. Oxford: Clarendon.

Martin, A., and M. Albert, eds. 1985. *Histoire "acéphale" et Index syriaque des Lettres festales d'Athanase d'Alexandrie*. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes par A. Martin avec la collaboration pour l'édition et la traduction du texte syriaque de M. Albert. SC 317. Paris: Cerf.

Martin, C. 1935. Review of W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei*. *NReTh* 62: 750–51.

Martin, J., and K.-D. Daur. 1962. *Sancti Aurelii Augustini De Doctrina Christiana, De Vera Religione*. Vol. IV/1 of *Aurelii Augustini Opera*. CChr.SL 32. Turnhout: Brepols.

Mastandrea, P. 1979. *Un Neoplatonico latino: Cornelio Labeone (Testimonianze e frammenti)*. EPRO 77. Leiden: Brill.

Mau, A. 1899. "capsa 2.)." Page 1553 in *PRE* III.

May, G. 1989. "Der Streit zwischen Petrus und Paulus in Antiochien bei Markion." Pages 204–11 in *Von Wittenberg nach Memphis. Festschrift für R. Schwartz*. Edited by W. Homolka and O. Ziegelmeier. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (= May 2005b, 35–41).

———. 1995. "Pluralismus und Ethik in der christlichen Antike." Pages 103–6 in *Pluralismus und Identität*. Edited by J. Mehlhausen. VWGTh 8. Gütersloh: Mohn.

———. 2005a. "In welchem Sinn kann Markion als der Begründer des neutestamentlichen Kanons angesehen werden?" Pages 85–91 in *Markion. Gesammelte Aufsätze*. Edited by K. Greschat and M. Meiser. VIEG 68. Mainz: Von Zabern.

———. 2005b. *Markion. Gesammelte Aufsätze*. Edited by K. Greschat and M. Meiser. VIEG 68. Mainz: Von Zabern.

Mayser, E. 1906–1964. *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit mit Einschluß der gleichzeitigen Ostraka und der in Ägypten verfassten Inschriften*. 2 vols. in 6 parts. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Mazza, E. 1979. "La 'Gratiarum actio mystica' del libro VII delle Costituzioni apostoliche. Una tappa nella storia della anaphora eucaristica." *EL* 93: 123–37.

———. 1981. "L'anaphora di Serapione: Una ipotesi di interpretazione." *EL* 95: 510–28.

———. 1992. *L'anafora eucharistica. Studi sulle Origini*. Collana studi di liturgia N. S. 24 = Bibliotheca Ephemerides liturgicae. Subsidia 62. Rome: Edizioni Liturgische.

———. 1995. *The Origins of the Eucharistic Prayer*. Translated by R. E. Lane. A Pueblo Book. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press (= Mazza 1992).

McDonald, L. M. 1995. *The Formation of the Christian Biblical Canon*. 2nd revised and expanded edition. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson.

———. 2002. "Identifying Scripture and Canon in the Early Church: The Criteria Question." Pages 416–39 in *The Canon Debate: On the Origin and Formation of the Bible*. Edited by J. A. Sanders. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson.

McGinn, S. E. 1997. "The 'Montanist' Oracles and Prophetic Theology." Pages 128–35 in *Papers Presented to the Twelfth International Conference on Patristic Studies Held in Oxford 1995, Preaching, Second Century, Tertullian to Arnobius*. StPatr XXXI. Leuven: Peeters.

McGowan, A. B. 1999. *Ascetic Eucharists: Food and Drink in Early Christian Ritual Meals*. OECS. Oxford: Clarendon.

———. 2004. “Rethinking Agape and Eucharist in Early North African Christianity.” *SL* 34: 165–76.

Meade, D. G. 1986. *Pseudonymity and Canon: An Investigation into the Relationship of Authorship and Authority in Jewish and Earliest Christian Tradition*. WUNT 39. Tübingen: Mohr.

Mees, M. 1970. *Die Zitate aus dem Neuen Testament bei Clemens von Alexandrien*. QVetChr 2. Bari: Istituto di Letteratura Cristiana Antica.

———. 1971. “Schema und Dispositio in ihrer Bedeutung für die Formung der Herrenworte aus dem I Clemensbrief, Kap. 13.2.” *VigChr* 8: 257–72.

Méhat, A. 1972. “Clément d’Alexandrie et les sens de l’Écriture, Ier Stromate, 176,1 et 179,3.” Pages 355–66 in *Epektasis. Festschrift für J. Daniélou*. Edited by J. Fontaine and C. Kannengiesser. Paris: Beauchesne.

———. 1993 [1981]. “Clemens von Alexandrien.” Pages 101–13 in *TRE* VIII.

Mehlhausen, J. 2000 [1994]. “Nationalsozialismus und Kirchen.” Pages 43–78 in *TRE* XXIV.

Meineke, A., ed. 1866–1877. *Strabonis Geographica*. BiTeu. Leipzig: Teubner.

Melville, G. 1992a. “Institutionen als geschichtswissenschaftliches Thema. Eine Einleitung.” Pages 1–24 in *Institutionen und Geschichte. Theoretische Aspekte und mittelalterliche Befunde*. Edited by G. Melville. Norm und Struktur. Studien zum sozialen Wandel in Mittelalter und früher Neuzeit 1. Cologne: Böhlau.

———, ed. 1992b. *Institutionen und Geschichte. Theoretische Aspekte und mittelalterliche Befunde*. Norm und Struktur. Studien zum sozialen Wandel in Mittelalter und früher Neuzeit 1. Cologne: Böhlau.

Melville, G., and P. von Moos. 1998. “Geleitwort.” Pages v–xi in *Das Öffentliche und Private in der Vormoderne*. Norm und Struktur. Studien zum sozialen Wandel in Mittelalter und früher Neuzeit 10. Cologne: Böhlau.

Merkel, H. 1974. “Auf den Spuren des Urmarkus? Ein neuer Fund und seine Beurteilung.” *ZThK* 71: 123–44.

———. 1978. *Die Pluralität der Evangelien als theologisches und exegetisches Problem in der Alten Kirche*. TC 3. Bern: Lang.

Merkelbach, R. 1996. *Abrasax. Ausgewählte Papyri religiösen und magischen Inhalts*. Vol. 4: *Exorzismen und jüdisch/christlich beeinflußte Texte*. ARWAW. Papyrologica Coloniensia 17/4. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Merkelbach, R., and J. Stauber. 1998. *Steinepigramme aus dem griechischen Osten*. Vol. 1: *Die Westküste Kleinasiens von Knidos bis Ilion*. Stuttgart: Teubner.

Messner, R. 1991. “Prex Eucharistica. Zur Frühgeschichte der Basileios-Anaphora. Beobachtungen und Hypothesen.” Pages 121–29 in *Sursum Corda. Variationen zu einem liturgischen Motiv. Für Philipp Harnoncourt zum 60. Geburtstag*. Edited by E. Renhart and A. Schnider. Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt.

———. 2000. “Zur Eucharistie in den Thomasakten. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Frühgeschichte der eucharistischen Epiklese.” Pages 493–513 in *Crossroad of Cultures: Studies in Liturgy and Patristics in Honor of Gabriele Winkler*. Edited by

H.-J. Feulner, E. Velkovska, and R. F. Taft. OrChrA 260. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale.

———. 2001. *Einführung in die Liturgiewissenschaft*. UTB 2173. Paderborn: Schöningh.

Metzger, B. M. 1972. “Greek Lectionaries and a Critical Edition of the Greek New Testament.” Pages 479–97 in *Die alten Übersetzungen des Neuen Testaments, die Kirchenväterzitate und Lektionare. Der gegenwärtige Stand ihrer Erforschung und ihre Bedeutung für die griechische Textgeschichte*. Edited by K. Aland. ANTF 5. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

———. 1987. *The Canon of the New Testament: Its Origin, Development, and Significance*. Oxford: Clarendon.

———. 1993. *Der Kanon des Neuen Testaments. Entstehung, Entwicklung, Bedeutung*. Translated by H.-M. Röttgers. Düsseldorf: Patmos.

Metzger, M. 1971. “Les deux prières eucharistiques des Constitutions apostoliques.” *RevSR* 45: 52–77.

———. 1987. *Les Constitutions Apostoliques*. Part III: *Livres VII et VIII*. SC 336. Paris, Cerf.

Metzler, K., D. U. Hansen, and K. Savvidis, eds. 1998. *Orationes I et II contra Arianos*. Vol. I/1 of *Athanasius Werke*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Meyer, G. 1974. “Bemerkungen zum literargeschichtlichen Hintergrund der Kanontheorie des Josefus.” Pages 285–99 in *Josephus-Studien. Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament. Festschrift für O. Michel zum 70. Geburtstag*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (= Meyer 1989, 196–207).

———. 1989. *Zur Geschichte und Theologie des Judentums in hellenistisch-römischer Zeit. Ausgewählte Abhandlungen*. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.

Meyer, H. B. 1983. “Das Werden der literarischen Struktur des Hochgebetes. Hinweise zu einer wichtigen Neuerscheinung.” *ZKTh* 105: 184–202.

Meyer, R. 1989. *Zur Geschichte und Theologie des Judentums in hellenistisch-römischer Zeit. Ausgewählte Abhandlungen*. Edited by W. Bernhardt. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener.

Meyer, R., and A. Oepke. 1938. “κρύπτω κτλ. C. Beilage: Kanonisch und apokryph.” Pages 979–99 in *ThWNT* III.

Michel, O. 1972 [1929]. *Paulus und seine Bibel*. Darmstadt Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Millar, F. 1992. *The Emperor in the Roman World (31 BC–AD 337)*. 2 ed. London: Duckworth.

Milne, J. G. 1908. “Relics of Greco-Egyptian Schools.” *JHS* 28: 121–32.

Minnen, P. van. 1992. “A Schooltablet in the University of Michigan Collection.” *ZPE* 93: 209–11.

Mitchell, L. L. 1976. “The Alexandrian Anaphora of St. Basil of Caesarea. Ancient Source of ‘A Common Eucharistic Prayer.’” *AThR* 58: 194–206.

Mitchell, S. 1993. *Anatolia: Land, Men, and Gods in Asia Minor*. Vol. I: *The Celts in Anatolia and the Impact of Roman Rule*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Mitteis, L., and U. Wilcken. 1963 [1912]. *Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde. 1 Bd. Historischer Teil, 2 Hälfte: Chrestomathie von U. Wilcken*. Hildesheim: Olms.

Moehlman, C. H. 1935. Review of W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei*. *ChH* 4: 236–37.

Moffatt, J. 1933/1934. Review of W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei*. *ET* 45: 475–76.

Mohlberg, L. C. 1956. *Sacramentarium Veronense (Cod. Bibl. Capit. Veron. LXXXV [80])*. Edited by L. C. Mohlberg in connection with L. Eizenhöfer and P. Siffrin. RED.F I. Rome: Herder.

Molland, E. 1938. *The Conception of Gospel in the Alexandrian Theology*. SNVAO. HF 2. Olso: Dybwad.

Mommsen, T. 1955 [1899]. *Römisches Strafrecht*. Berlin: Akademie.

———. 1963 [3 1887/1888]. *Römisches Staatsrecht*. 3 vols. in 5 parts. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

———, ed. 1999 [1903–1909]. Eusebius, *Die Kirchengeschichte . . . Lateinische Übersetzung des Rufinus*. Vol. 2 of *Eusebius Werke*. The *Kirchengeschichte* is edited by E. Schwartz. The *Lateinische Übersetzung des Rufinus* is edited by T. Mommsen. GCS Eusebius II/1–3 = GCS.NF 6/1–3. 2nd unaltered edition by F. Winkelmann. Berlin: Akademie.

Mommsen, T., and U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff. 1935. *Mommsen und Wilamowitz: Briefwechsel, 1872–1903*. Edited by F. and D. Hiller von Gaertringen. Berlin: Weidmann.

Monaci Castagno, A. 1987. *Origene predicatore e il suo pubblico*. Collana del Dipartimento di Storia dell'Università di Torino. Milan: Angeli.

———. 2003. "Origene e Ambrogio: L'indipendenza dell'intellettuale e le pretese del patronato." Pages 165–93 in *Origeniana Octava. Origen and the Alexandrian Tradition. Origene e la tradizione Alessandrina. Papers of the Eighth International Origen Congress, Pisa, 27–31 August 2001*. Edited by L. Perrone, P. Bernardino, and D. Marchini. BEThL 164. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

Montalboddo, Fracanzano da. 1507. *Paesi novamente retrovati*. Vicenza: Henrico Vicentino.

Moog-Grünewald, M. 1997. "Vorbemerkung." Pages vii–xii in *Kanon und Theorie*. Neues Forum für allgemeine und vergleichende Literaturwissenschaft 3. Heidelberg: Winter.

Morani, M., ed. 1987. Nemesius, *De natura hominis*. BiTeu. Leipzig: Tuebner.

Moreschini, C., ed. 1991. *De philosophia libri*. Vol. III of *Platonici Madurensis opera quae supersunt*. BiTeu. Stuttgart: Teubner.

Moreschini, C., and R. Braun. 2001. Tertullien, *Contre Marcion Tome IV (Livre IV)*. Texte critique par C. Moreschini. Introduction, traduction et commentaire par R. Braun. SC 456. Paris: Cerf.

Morey, C. R. 1959. *The Gold-Glass Collection of the Vatican Library with Additional Catalogues of the Other Gold-Glass Collections*. Catalogo del Museo Sacro della Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana 4. Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana.

Moss, Candida R. 2010. *The Other Christs: Imitating Jesus in Ancient Christian Ideologies of Martyrdom*. New York: Oxford University Press.

———. 2013. *The Myth of Persecution: How Early Christians Invented a Story of Matyrdom*. New York: HarperOne.

Most, G. W. 1989. “Cornutus and Stoic Allegoresis. A Preliminary Report.” Pages 2014–65 in *ANRW* II 36.3.

Mras, K., and É. des Places, eds. 1982. *Die Praeparatio Evangelica. 1.Tl. Einleitung, die Bücher I bis X*. Vol. 8 of *Eusebius Werke*. GCS Eusebius Werke VIII/1. Edited by K. Mras. 2nd revised edition edited by É. des Places. Berlin: Akademie.

Mratschek, S. 2000. “Codices vestri non sumus. Bücherkult und Bücherpreise in der christlichen Spätantike.” Pages 369–79 in *Hortus Litterarum Antiquarum. Festschrift für Hans Armin Gärtner zum 70. Geburtstag*. Edited by A. Haltenhoff and F.-H. Mutschler. BKAW 109. Heidelberg: Winter.

———. 2002. *Der Briefwechsel des Paulinus von Nola. Kommunikation und soziale Kontakte zwischen christlichen Intellektuellen*. Hyp. 134. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Mühlenberg, E. 1977. *Psalmenkommentare aus der Katenenüberlieferung*. Vol. II: *Continens catenarum fragmenta ex Didymi commentario in psalmos 51–150*. PTS 16. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

———. 2006. *Altchristliche Lebensführung zwischen Bibel und Tugendlehre. Ethik bei griechischen Philosophen und den frühen Christen*. AAWG.PH III/272. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

———. 2010. Review of Markschies, *Kaiserzeitliche christliche Theologie*. *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen* 262: 230–47.

Müller, A. 1905. “Sterbekassen und Vereine mit Begräbnisfürsorge in der römischen Kaiserzeit.” *NJKA* 8: 183–201.

———. 1910. “Studentenleben im IV. Jahrhundert n. Chr.” *Phil*. 69: 292–317.

Müller, F., ed. 1958. *Gregorii Nysseni Opera dogmatica minora*. Part I. GNO 3/1. Leiden: Brill.

Müller, K. 1987. “Inkulturation.” Pages 176–80 in *Lexikon Missionstheologischer Grundbegriffe*. Edited by K. Müller and T. Sundermeier. Berlin: Reimer.

Müller, K., and H. Freiherr von Campenhausen. 1941. *Kirchengeschichte*. Vol. I/1. 3 ed. Tübingen: Mohr.

Müller, P. 1988. *Die Anfänge der Paulusschule, dargestellt am 2. Thessalonicherbrief und am Kolosserbrief*. AThANT 74. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag.

Müller, U. B. 1975. *Prophetie und Predigt im Neuen Testament. Formgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur urchristlichen Prophetie*. SNT 10. Gütersloh: Mohn.

Mullins, T. Y. 1976. “Papias and Clement and Mark’s Two Gospels.” *VigChr* 30: 189–92.

Mumprecht, V., ed. 1983. Philostratus, *Das Leben des Apollonios von Tyana. Griechisch-Deutsch*. TuscBü. Munich: Artemis.

Munier, C., ed. 1963. *Concilia Galliae A. 314–A. 506*. CChr.SL 148. Turnhout: Brepols.

Murgia, C. E. 1975. “Secret Mark: Real or Fake?” Pages 35–40 in *Longer Mark: Forgery, Interpolation, or Old Tradition?* Edited by R. H. Fuller. Center for Hermeneutical Studies. Colloquy 18. Berkeley: Center for Hermeneutical Studies.

Murphy, F. J. 1993. *Pseudo-Philo: Rewriting the Bible*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Musurillo, H. 2000 [1972]. *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs*. OECT. Oxford: Clarendon.

Mutschler, B. 2004. “Was weiß Irenäus vom Johannesevangelium? Der historische Kontext des Johannesevangeliums aus der Perspektive seiner Rezeption bei Irenäus von Lyon.” Pages 695–742 in *Kontexte des Johannesevangeliums. Das vierte Evangelium in religions-und traditionsgeschichtlicher Perspektive*. WUNT 175. Tübingen: Mohr.

Mutschmann, H., ed. 1914. *Adversus dogmaticos libros V*. Vol. 2 of *Sexti Empirici Opera*. BiTeu. Leipzig: Teubner.

———. 1917. “Das erste Auftreten des Maximus von Tyros in Rom.” *Sokrates* 5: 185–97.

Mynors, R. A. B., and W. Bürsgens. 2003. Cassiodorus, *Institutiones divinarum et saecularium litterarum/Einführung in die geistlichen und weltlichen Wissenschaften*. Vol. 1/1. Translated and introduced by W. Bürsgens. Reprint of the 1963 text edited by R. A. B. Mynors and published in Oxford by Clarendon, FChr 39/1. Freiburg: Herder.

Naether, Franziska. 2010. *Die Sortes Astrampsychi. Problemlösungsstrategien durch Orakel im römischen Ägypten*. Orientalische Religionen in der Antike/Oriental Religions in Antiquity 3. Tübingen: Mohr.

Nagel, P. 1974. “Die Septuaginta-Zitate in der koptisch-gnostischen ‘Exegese über die Seele’ (NHC II).” *APF* 22/23: 249–69.

———. 1980. “Die Auslegung der Paradieserzählung in der Gnosis.” Pages 49–70 in *Altes Testament—Frühjudentum—Gnosis*. Edited by K.-W. Tröger. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.

———. 1998. *Der Tractatus Tripartitus aus Nag Hammadi Codex I (Codex Jung)*. Translated by P. Nagel. Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 1. Tübingen: Mohr.

Nagler, N. 1994. *Frühkatholizismus. Zur Methodologie einer kritischen Debatte*. RSTh 43. Frankfurt am Main: Lang.

Najock, D. 1975. “Zahlenmystik.” Pages 1447–49 in *KP* V.

Nardi, C. 1983. “Laodicea (concili).” Pages 1898–99 in *DPAC* II.

Nautin, P., ed. 1950. (Pseudo-)Ioannes Chrysostomus, *Homélies pascales I. Une homélie inspirée du traité sur la Paque d’Hippolyte*. SC 27. Paris: Cerf.

———. 1979. *Origène. Sa vie et son œuvre*. Christianisme Antique 1. Paris: Beauchesne.

Nesselrath, H.-G. 1999. “Die Christen und die heidnische Bildung: Das Beispiel des Sokrates Scholastikos (Hist. Eccl. 3,16).” Pages 79–100 in *Leitbilder der Spätantike*. Edited by J. Dummer and M. Vielberg. AwK 1. Stuttgart: Steiner.

Nestle, E. 1901. *Die Kirchengeschichte des Eusebius, aus dem Syrischen übersetzt*. TU 21/2. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

Neuschäfer, B. 1987. *Origenes als Philologe*. SBAW 18/1–2. Basel: Reinhardt.

Newman, R. C. 1975. “The Council of Jamnia and the Old Testament Canon.” *WThJ* 38: 319–49.

Newsom, C. 1985. *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition*. HSS 27. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

———. 1998. “Shirot ‘Olat Hashabat.” Pages 173–401 in *Qumran Cave 4*. Vol. VI: *Poetical and Liturgical Texts*. Part 1. DJD XI. Oxford: Clarendon.

Newsom, C., and Y. Yadin. 1984. “The Masada Fragment of the Qumran Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice.” *IEJ* 34: 77–88.

Newton, C. T., ed. 1890. *The Collection of the Ancient Greek Inscriptions of the British Museum*. Vol. 3: *Priene, Iasos and Ephesos*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Neymeyr, U. 1989. *Die christlichen Lehrer im zweiten Jahrhundert. Ihre Lehrtätigkeit, ihr Selbstverständnis und ihre Geschichte*. Vol. 4. SVigChr. Leiden: Brill.

Nicklas, T. 2002. “Ein ‘neutestamentliches Apokryphon’? Zum umstrittenen Kanonbezug des sog. ‘Petrusevangeliums.’” *VigChr* 56: 260–72.

Niederwimmer, K. 1989. *Die Didache*. Kommentar zu den Apostolischen Vätern I. Göttingen Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

———. 1995. “Der Didachist und seine Quellen.” Pages 15–36 in *The Didache in Context: Essays on Its Text, History and Transmission*. Edited by C. N. Jefford. NT.S 77. Leiden: Brill.

Niethammer, L. 2000. *Kollektive Identität. Heimliche Quellen einer unheimlichen Konjunktur*. Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt.

Nilsson, M. P. 1945. “Pagan Divine Service in Late Antiquity.” *HThR* 38: 63–69.

———. 1988. *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*. Vol. 2: *Die hellenistische und die römische Zeit*. 4 ed. HAW V/2. Munich: Beck.

Nock, A. D. 1929. “Liturgical Notes I: The Anaphora of Serapion.” *JThS* 30: 381–90.

———. 1931. “Kornutos.” Pages 995–1005 in *PRE Suppl*. V.

———. 1933. *Conversion: The Old and the New in Religion from Alexander the Great to Augustine*. London: Oxford University Press.

Nock, A. D., and A. J. Festugière. 1945ff. *Corpus Hermeticum*. CUFr. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Nollé, J. 1987. “Südkleinasiatische Losorakel in der römischen Kaiserzeit.” *Antike Welt* 18: 41–49.

Nordh, A., ed. 1949. *Libellus de regionibus verbis Romae*. Istituto Svedese di Studi Classici. Skrifter 3. Lund: Gleerup.

Norelli, E., ed. 1987. Hippolytus, *L’anticristo. De Antichristo*. BiPatr 10. Florence: Nardini.

———. 1997. “Pertinence théologique et canonicité: Les premières apocalypses chrétiennes.” *Apocrypha* 8: 147–64.

———. 2005. “Papias de Hiérapolis a-t-il utilisé un recueil ‘canonique’ des quatre évangiles?” Pages 35–85 in *Le canon du Nouveau Testament. Regards nouveaux sur l’histoire de sa formation*. Edited by G. Aragione, É. Junod, and E. Norelli. Le Monde de la Bible 54. Geneva: Labor et Fides.

Normann, F. 1966. *Christos Didaskalos. Die Vorstellung von Christus als Lehrer in der christlichen Literatur des ersten und zweiten Jahrhunderts*. MBTh 32. Münster: Aschendorff.

Nowak, K. 2001. “Theologie, Philologie und Geschichte. Adolf von Harnack als Kirchen-historiker.” Pages 189–237 in *Adolf von Harnack. Theologe, Historiker, Wissenschaftspolitiker (Harnack—Symposium Schloß Ringberg/Tegernsee, 18.–20. März 1998)*. Edited by K. Nowak and G. Oexle. Veröffentlichungen des Max-Planck-Instituts für Geschichte 161. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Nutton, V. 1969. “The Doctor and the Oracle.” *RBPH* 47: 37–48.

Obbink, D., ed. 1996. Philodemus, *On Piety*. Part I: *Critical Text with Commentary*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Oberg, E., ed. 1969. *Amphilochii Iconiensis Iambi ad Seleucum*. PTS 9. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

O’Donnell, J. J. 1992a. *Augustine, Confessions*. Vol. II: *Commentary on Books 1–7*. Oxford: Clarendon.

———. 1992b. *Augustine, Confessions*. Vol. III: *Commentary on Books 8–13, Indexes*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Ogilvie, R. M. 1978. *The Library of Lactantius*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Ohlig, K.-H. 1972. *Die theologische Begründung des neutestamentlichen Kanons in der Kirche*. KBANT. Düsseldorf: Patmos.

Ohme, H. 1998. *Kanon ekklesiastikos. Die Bedeutung des altkirchlichen Kanonbegriffs*. AKG 67. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Opitz, H.-G., ed. 1934/1935. *Urkunden zur Geschichte des arianischen Streites 318–333*. Vol. III of *Athanasius Werke*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

———, ed. 1935a. *Die Apologien*. Vol. II/1 of *Athanasius Werke*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

———. 1935b. *Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung der Schriften des Athanasius*. AKG 23. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

———. 1938. “Philippos 40).” Pages 2350–51 in *PRE* XIX/1.

Oppel, H. 1937. *ΚΑΝΩΝ. Zur Bedeutungsgeschichte des Wortes und seiner lateinischen Entsprechungen*. Ph. Suppl. 30/4. Leipzig.

Oppermann, H. 1931. “Lairbenos.” Pages 521–35 in *PRE Suppl*. V.

Ort, W. 1983. “Zum Gymnasium im römerzeitlichen Ägypten.” Pages 223–32 in *Althistorische Studien. Festschrift für H. Bengtson zum 70. Geburtstag dargebracht von Kollegen und Schülern*. Edited by H. Heinen, K. Stroheker, and G. Walser. Historia Einzelschriften 40. Stuttgart: Steiner.

Osborn, E. 1984. “La Bible inspiratrice d’une morale chrétienne d’après Clément d’Alexandrie.” Pages 127–44 in *Le monde grec ancien et la Bible*. Edited by C. Mondésert. Bible de tous les temps. Paris: Beauchesne.

Osterhammel, J. 1995. “Kulturelle Grenzen in der Expansion Europas.” *Saeculum* 46: 101–38.

Österreichisches Archäologisches Institut. 1923. *Forschungen in Ephesus*. Vol. 3. Vienna: Hölder.

Otranto, R. 2000. *Antiche liste di libri su papiro*. Sussidi eruditi 49. Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura.

Pack, E. 1989. “Sozialgeschichtliche Aspekte des Fehlens einer ‘christlichen’ Schule in der römischen Kaiserzeit.” Pages 185–263 in *Religion und Gesellschaft in der* *römischen Kaiserzeit. Kolloquium zu Ehren von F. Vittinghoff*. Edited by W. Eck. Kölner Historische Abhandlungen 35. Cologne: Böhlau.

Pagels, E. H. 1972. "The Valentinian Claim to Esoteric Exegesis of Romans as Basis for Anthropological Theory." *VigChr* 26: 241–58.

———. 1973. *The Johannine Gospel in Gnostic Exegesis, Heracleon's Commentary on John*. SBL MS 17. Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon.

Painchaud, L. 1991. "The Redactions of the Writing without Title (CG II 5)." *SecCen* 8: 217–34.

Palazzo, E. 1993. *Le Moyen Age. Des origines au XIIIème siècle*. Histoire de livres liturgiques. Paris: Beauchesne (= Palazzo 1998).

———. 1998. *A History of Liturgical Books from the Beginning to the Thirteenth Century*. Translated by M. Beaumont. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press (= Palazzo 1993).

Palmer, A.-M. 1989. *Prudentius on the Martyrs*. Oxford Classical Monographs. Oxford: Clarendon.

Parke, H. W. 1985. *The Oracles of Apollo in Asia Minor*. London: Croom Helm.

Parke, H. W., and D. E. W. Wormell. 1956. *The Delphic Oracle*. Vol. I: *The History*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Parker, R. 2004. "What Are Sacred Laws?" Pages 57–70 in *The Law and the Courts in Ancient Greece*. Edited by E. M. Harris and L. Rubinstein. London: Duckworth.

Parthey, G., ed. 1965 [1857]. *Iamblichi De mysteriis liber*. Amsterdam: Hakkert.

Pasquali, G., ed. 1959. Gregory of Nyssa, *Epistulae 1–25*. GNO VIII/2. Ed. altera. 2 ed. Leiden: Brill.

Paton, W. R., M. Pohlenz, and W. Sieveking, eds. 1972. *Plutarchi Moralia*. Vol. III. BiTeu. Leipzig: Tuebner.

Paton, W. R., I. Wegehaupt, M. Pohlenz, and H. Gärtner. 1993. *Plutarchi Moralia*. Vol. I. Recensuerunt et emendaverunt W. R. Paton et I. Wegehaupt. Praefationem scripsit M. Pohlenz. Editionem correctiorem curavit H. Gärtner. BiTeu. Stuttgart: Tuebner.

Patterson, L. G. 1989. "Irenaeus and the Valentinians: The Emergence of a Christian Scripture." Pages 189–220 in *Papers of the Ninth International Conference on Patristic Studies Held in Oxford 1983*. Edited by E. A. Livingstone. StPatr XVIII/3 = PatMS 11. Leuven: Peeters.

Pattison, R. 1982. *On Literacy: The Politics of the Word from Homer to the Age of Rock*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Patton, W. R., and J. L. Myres. 1896. "Karian Sites and Inscriptions (I.)." *JHS* 16: 188–236.

Paulsen, H. 1978. "Die Bedeutung des Montanismus für die Herausbildung des Kanons." *VigChr* 32: 19–52 (= Paulsen 1997, 310–43).

———. 1979. "Papyrus Oxyrhynchus I. 5 und die ΔΙΑΔΟΧΗ ΤΩΝ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΩΝ." *NTS* 25: 443–45 (= Paulsen 1997, 162–72).

———. 1997. *Zur Literatur und Geschichte des frühen Christentums. Gesammelte Aufsätze*. Edited by U. Eisen. WUNT 99. Tübingen: Mohr.

Payne-Smith (Margoliouth), J. 1985 [1903]. *A Compendius Syriac Dictionary Founded upon the Thesaurus Syriacus of R. Payne Smith*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Payne-Smith, R. 1879–1927. *Thesaurus Syriacus*. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon.
Pearson, B. A. 1975. "Jewish Haggadic Traditions in the Testimony of Truth from Nag Hammadi (CG IX,3)." Pages 205–22 in *Religious Syncretism in Antiquity: Essays in Conversation with Geo Widengren*. Series on formative contemporary thinkers 1. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press.
———. 1980. "Gnostic Interpretation of the Old Testament in the Testimony of Truth (NHC IX,3)." *HThR* 73: 311–19.
———. 1988. "Use, Authority and Exegesis of Mikra in Gnostic Literature." Pages 635–52 in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by M. J. Mulder. CRI-ANT II/1. Assen: Van Gorcum.
———. 1990a. "Biblical Exegesis in Gnostic Literature." Pages 29–38 in *Gnosticism, Judaism, and Egyptian Christianity*. Studies in Antiquity and Christianity. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress.
———. 1990b. *Gnosticism, Judaism, and Egyptian Christianity*. Studies in Antiquity and Christianity. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress.
Peirce, S. 1993. "Death, Revelry, and Thysia." *ClassAnt* 12: 219–66.
Pekáry, T. 1976. *Die Wirtschaft der griechisch-römischen Antike*. Wiesbaden: Steiner.
Perkins, P. 1980. *The Gnostic Dialogue: The Early Church and the Crisis of Gnosticism*. New York: Paulist Press.
———. 1993. *Gnosticism and the New Testament*. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress.
———. 2002. "Gnosticism and the Christian Bible." Pages 355–71 in *The Canon Debate*. Edited by L. M. McDonald and J. A. Sanders. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson.
Perler, O. 1966. Melito of Sardis, *Sur la Pâque et fragments*. SC 123. Paris: Cerf.
Petersen, W. L., ed. 1989. *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century*. CJAn 3. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press.
———. 1990. "Tatian's Dependence on Justin's ἀπομνημονεύματα." *NTS* 36: 512–34.
———. 1994. *Tatian's Diatessaron: Its Creation, Dissemination, Significance and History in Scholarship*. SVigChr 25. Leiden: Brill.
———. 2001. "Tatian." Pages 655–59 in TRE XXXII.
Peterson, E. 1982 [1959]. "Über einige Probleme der Didache-Überlieferung." Pages 146–82 in *Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis. Studien und Untersuchungen*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
Petrie, W. M. F. 1892. *Medum*. London: D. Nutt. (See also Crum/Petrie 1893.)
Petzl, G., ed. 1987. *Die Inschriften von Smyrna*. Part II/1. Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien 24/1. Bonn: Habelt.
———. 1994. *Die Beichtinschriften Westkleinasiens*. Epigraphica Anatolica 22. Bonn: Habelt.
Petzoldt, L. 1990 [1974]. "Laurentius, Diakon." Pages 374–80 in *LCI* VII.
Pfeiffer, R. 1978. *Geschichte der klassischen Philologie. Von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des Hellenismus*. 2 ed. Munich: Beck.
Pfister, F. 1959. "Ekstase." Pages 944–87 in *RAC* IV.
Pilhofer, P. 1990. "Justin und das Petrusevangelium." *ZNW* 81: 60–78.

Pingree, D., ed. 1986. *Vettii Valentis Antiocheni Anthologiarum libri novem*. BiTeu. Leipzig: Teubner.

Pitra, J. B., ed. 1883. *Analecta Sacra Spicilegio Solesmensi parata*. Vol. III. *Patres Antenicaeni*. Venice: S. Lazaro.

Pleket, H. W. 1965. "An Aspect of the Emperor Cult: Imperial Mysteries." *HThR* 58: 331–47.

Plümacher, E. 1978. "Apokryphe Apostelakten." Pages 11–70 in *PRE Suppl*. XV.

———. 1993a [1980]. "Bibel II. Die heiligen Schriften des Judentums im Urchristentum." Pages 8–22 in *TRE* VI.

———. 1993b [1980]. "Bibliothekswesen II. Von der griechisch-römischen Antike bis zur Neuzeit." Pages 413–26 in *TRE* VI.

Poethke, G. 1967. "Homer-Präparationen für den Schulgebrauch auf einem griechischen Papyrus aus Ägypten." Pages 105–10 mit Table 37 in *Staatliche Museen zu Berlin. Forschungen und Berichte*. Vol. 8: *Archäologische Beiträge*. Berlin: Akademie.

Poirier, J. C. 1999. "Montanist Pepuza-Jerusalem and the Dwelling Place of Wisdom." *JECS* 7: 491–507.

———. 2004. "The Montanist Nature of the Nanas Inscription." *Epigraphica Anatolica* 37: 151–59.

Poirier, P.-H. 1986. "La bibliothèque de Nag Hammadi. Sa nature et son importance." *Studies in Religion* 15: 303–16.

Poland, F. 1967 [1909]. *Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens*. Preisschriften gekrönt und herausgegeben von der Fürstlich Jablonowskischen Gesellschaft zu Leipzig 38 = Historisch-nationalökonomische Section 23. Leipzig: Teubner.

Pollard, T. E. 1970. *Johannine Christology and the Early Church*. MSSNTS 13. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Polotsky, H. J. 1934. Review of W. C. Till, *Koptische Dialektgrammatik*. *GGA* 196: 58–67 (= Polotsky 1971, 363–72).

———. 1957. Review of W. C. Till, *Koptische Grammatik (Saïdischer Dialekt)*. OLZ 52, 219–34 (= Polotsky 1971, 226–33).

———. 1962. Review of W. C. Till, *Koptische Grammatik (Saïdischer Dialekt)*. OLZ 57, 478–81 (= Polotsky 1971, 269–71).

———. 1971. *Collected Papers*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press.

Polotsky, H. J., and H. Ibscher. 1940. *Manichäische Handschriften der Staatlichen Museen Berlin*. Vol. I/1 (Lfg. 1–10), *Kephalaia*. Edited by H. J. Polotsky with a contribution by H. Ibscher. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

Porter, S. E. 2001. "P.Oxy. II 210 as an Apocryphal Gospel and the Development of Egyptian Christianity." Pages 1101–8 in *Atti del XXII Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia. Firenze, 23–29 agosto 1998*. Vol. 2. Edited by I. Andorlini. Florence: Istituto papirologico G. Vitelli.

———. 2005. "Pericope Markers in Some Early Greek New Testament Manuscripts." Pages 161–73 in *Layout Markers in Biblical Manuscripts and Ugaritic Tablets*. Edited by M. C. A. Korpel and J. M. Oesch. Pericope. Scripture as Written and Read in Antiquity 5. Assen: Van Gorcum.

Pouderon, B. 1993. “Athénagore chef d’école. À propos du témoignage de Philippe de Sidè.” Pages 167–76 in *Papers Presented at the Eleventh International Conference on Patristic Studies Held in Oxford 1991, Liturgica, Second Century, Alexandria before Nicaea, Athanasius and the Arian Controversy*. Edited by E. A. Livingstone. StPatr XXVI. Leuven: Peeters.

———. 1994. “Le témoignage du Codex Baroccianus 142 sur Athénagore et les origines du Didaskaleion d’Alexandrie.” Pages 163–224 in *Science et vie intellectuelle à Alexandrie*. Edited by G. Argoud. Centre Jean Palerne, Mémoires XIV. Saint-Étienne: Université de Saint-Etienne.

———. 1998. “Réflexions sur la formation d’une élite intellectuelle chrétienne au IIe siècle: Les ‘écoles’ d’Athènes, de Rome et d’Alexandrie.” Pages 237–69 in *Les Apologistes Chrétiens et la culture grecque*. Edited by B. Pouderon and J. Doré. ThH 105. Paris: Beauchesne.

Pouderon, B., and M.-J. Pierre. 2003. Aristides, *Apologie*. SC 470. Paris: Cerf.

Powell, D. 1975. “Tertullianists and Cataphrygians.” *VigChr* 29: 33–54.

———. 1979. “Arkandisziplin.” Pages 1–8 in *TRE* IV.

Preisendanz, K., ed. 1928. *Papyri Graecae Magicae. Die griechischen Zauberpapyri*. Vol. I. Edited and translated by K. Preisendanz with the collaboration of A. Abt, S. Eitrem, L. Fahz, A. Jacoby, G. Möller, and R. Wünsch. Leipzig: Tuebner.

———. 1931. *Papyri Graecae Magicae. Die griechischen Zauberpapyri*. Vol. II. Edited and translated by K. Preisendanz with the collaboration of E. Diehl, S. Eitrem, and A. Jacoby. Leipzig: Tuebner.

Preisigke, F., and E. Kiessling. 1925–1927. *Wörterbuch der grieschischen Papyrusurkunden mit Einschluß der griechischen Inschriften, Aufschriften, Ostraka, Mumienschilder usw. aus Ägypten*. Authored by F. Preisigke. Completed and edited by V. E. Kiessling. 2 vols. Berlin: Selbstverlag der Erben.

Preuschen, E. 1903a. “Bibelcitate bei Origenes.” *ZNW* 4: 67–74.

———, ed. 1903b. *Der Johanneskommentar*. Vol. 4 of *Origenes Werke*. GCS Origenes IV. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

———. 1905. “Die Stenographie im Leben des Origenes.” *Archiv für Stenographie* 56: 6–14 and 49–55.

———. 1907. “Tatian.” Pages 386–94 in *RE*[3] XIX.

———. 1910. *Analecta. Kürzere Texte zur Geschichte der alten Kirche und des Kanons*. Part II: *Zur Kanongeschichte*. 2 ed. SQS 8/2. Tübingen: Mohr.

Preysing, K. Graf von. 1922. *Des heiligen Hippolytus von Rom Widerlegung aller Häresien (Philosophumena)*. BKV 40. Munich: Kösel.

Price, S. R. F. 1980. “Between Man and God. Sacrifice in the Roman Imperial Cult.” *JRS* 70: 28–43.

———. 1984a. “Gods and Emperors: The Greek Language of the Roman Imperial Cult.” *JHS* 104: 79–95.

———. 1984b. *Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Prieur, J.-M. 2004. “L’eucharistie dans les Actes apocryphes des apôtres.” Pages 253–69 in *Le Repas de Dieu/Das Mahl Gottes, 4. Symposium Strasbourg, Tübingen,* *Upsal, Strasbourg, 11–15 septembre 2002*. Edited by C. Grappe. WUNT 169. Tübingen: Mohr.

Puigalli, J. 1983. *Études sur la Dialexeis de Maxime de Tyre, conférencier platonicien du II^ième^ siècle*. Lille: Atelier national de reproduction des theses.

Quacquarelli, A. 1974. *Scuola e cultura dei primi secoli cristiani*. Brescia: Editrice La Scuola.

Quesnell, Q. 1975. "The Mar Saba Clementine: A Question of Evidence." *CBQ* 37: 48–67.

Quispel, G. 1998. "Marcion and the Text of the New Testament." *VigChr* 52: 349–60.

Quispel, G., and J. van Amersfoort. 1975. "The Gospel of Thomas and the Western Text. A Reappraisal." Pages 56–69 in *Gnostic Studies*. Vol. 2. Edited by G. Quispel. UNHAII 24/2. Istanbul: Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut.

Radermacher, L., and V. Buchheit, eds. 1971. *M. Fabi Quintiliani Institutionis Oratoriae Libri XII*. Edited by L. Radermacher. Part I: *Libros I–VI continens*. Part II: *Libros VII–XII continens*. Ed. stereotypa correctior ed. primae, addenda et corrigenda collegit et adiecit V. Buchheit. BiTeu. Leipzig: Tuebner.

Raeder, I. ed. 1904. *Theodoreti Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*. Leipzig: Tuebner.

Rahlfs, A. 1899. "Alter und Heimat der Vatikanischen Bibelhandschrift." Pages 72–79 in *NGWG.PH*.

Rahmani, I. E. 1968 [1899]. *Testamentum domini nostri Jesu Christi*. Hildesheim: Olms.

Rahn, H., ed. 1972/1975. *Quintillian, Institutionis Oratoriae Libri XII*. Part I: *Buch I–VI*. TzF 2. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1972. Part II: *Buch VII–XII*. TzF 3. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Ramsay, W. M. 1895. *The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia, Being an Essay of the Local History of Phrygia from the Earliest Times to the Turkish Conquest*. Vol. I: *The Lycos Valley and South-Western Phrygia*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Ratcliff, E. C. 1950. "The Sanctus and the Pattern of the Early Anaphora." *JEH* 1: 29–36 and 125–34.

Rauer, M., ed. 1959. *Die Homilien zu Lukas in der Übersetzung des Hieronymus und die griechischen Reste der Homilien und des Lukas-Kommentars*. Vol. 9 of *Origenes Werke*. 2 ed. GCS Origenes IX. Berlin: Akademie.

Rauschen, G. 1901. *Das griechisch-römische Schulwesen zur Zeit des ausgehenden Heidentums*. Bonn: Cohen.

———. 1913. *Frühchristliche apologeten und märtyrerakten*. BKV 14. Kempten: Kösel.

Rawson, E. 1997 [1989]. "Roman Rulers and the Philosophic Adviser." Pages 233–57 in *Philosophia Togata: Essays on Philosophy and Roman Society*. Edited by M. Griffin and J. Barnes. Oxford: Clarendon.

Ray, W. D. 1997. "The Strasbourg Papyrus." Pages 39–56 in *Essays on the Early Eastern Eucharistic Prayers*. Edited by P. F. Bradshaw. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press.

Refoulé, F. 1954. Tertullian, *De praescriptione haereticorum*. Pages 185–224 in *Quintus Septimus Florens Tertullianus Opera*. Part I: *Opera Catholica*. CChr.SL 1. Turnhout: Brepols.

———. 1957. Tertullian, Traité *de la prescription contre les* hérétiques. SC 46. Paris: Cerf.

Rehm, A., R. Harder, and T. Wiegand. 1958. *Die Inschriften (von Didyma)*. Authored by A. Rehm. Edited by R. Harder. *Didyma* 2 edited by T. Wiegand. Berlin: Mann.

Rehm, A., and P. Hermann. 1997. *Milet. Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen und Untersuchungen seit dem Jahre 1899*. Vol. VI/1: *Inschriften von Milet*. Part I A: *Inschriften n. 187–406*, by A. Rehm with a contribution from H. Dessau. Part I B: *Nachträge und Übersetzungen zu den Inschriften n. 1–406*, by P. Hermann. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Reif, S. 1993. *Judaism and Hebrew Prayer: New Perspectives on Jewish Liturgical History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Reifferscheid, A., and G. Wissowa, eds. 1954. Tertullian, *De idolatria*. Pages 1099–1125 in *Quinti Septimi Florentis Tertulliani Opera*. CChr.SL 2. Turnhout: Brepols.

Reischl, W. K., and J. Rupp. 1967. ΤΟΥ ΕΝ ΑΓΙΟΙΣ ΠΑΤΡΟΣ ΗΜΩΝ ΚΥΡΙΛΛΟΥ ΙΕΡΟΣΟΛΥΜΩΝ ΑΡΧΙΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΥ ΤΑ ΣΩΖΟΜΕΝΑ. *S. Patris nostri Cyrilli Hierosolymorum Archiepiscopi Opera quae supersunt omnia*. Vol. I: *Catecheses illuminandorum 1–11*. Edited by W. K. Reischl. Hildesheim: Olms, 1967 [1848]. Vol. II: *Catecheses illuminandorum 12–18*. Edited by J. Rupp. Hildesheim: Olms, 1967 [1860].

Reitzenstein, R. 1916. *Historia monachorum und historia Lausiaca. Eine Studie zur Geschichte des Mönchtums und der frühchristlichen Begriffe Gnostiker und Pneumatiker*. FRLANT 24. Göttingen Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Renaudot, E. 1847. *Liturgiarum Orientalium Collectio*. Opera et Studio E. Renaudot. Editio Secunda Correctior. 2 vols. Frankfurt am Main: Joseph Baer.

Rendtorff, T. 1995. “Über die Wahrheit der Vielfalt. Theologische Perspektiven nachneuzeitlichen Christentums.” Pages 21–34 in *Pluralismus und Identität*. Edited by J. Mehlhausen. VWGTh 8. Gütersloh: Mohn.

Rengstorf, K. H. 1935. “διδάσκω κτλ.” Pages 138–68 in *ThWNT* II.

Reventlow, H. Graf, W. Sparn, and J. Woodbridge, eds. 1988. *Historische Kritik und biblischer Kanon in der deutschen Aufklärung*. Wolfenbütteler Forschungen 14. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Riedel, W. 1968 [1900]. *Die Kirchenrechtsquellen des Patriarchats Alexandrien*. Aalen: Scientia.

Riedinger, R., and E. Lamberz. 1984. *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*. Series secunda. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Riedweg, C. 1994. *Ps.-Justin (Markell von Ankyra?), Ad Graecos de vera religione (bisher “Cohortatio ad Graecos”)*. Part II: *Kommentar*. SBAW 25/2. Basel: Reinhardt.

Riese, A., F. Bücheler, and E. Lommatzsch, eds. 1869–1926. *Anthologia latina. Sive poesis latinae supplementum*. BiTeu. Leipzig: Teubner.

Riesner, R. 1984. *Jesus als Lehrer. Eine Untersuchung zum Ursprung der Evangelien-Überlieferung*. 2 ed. WUNT II/7. Tübingen: Mohr.

Ritter, A. M. 1987. “Die Entstehung des neutestamentlichen Kanons: Selbstdurchsetzung oder autoritative Entscheidung?” Pages 93–99 in *Kanon und Zensur*. Edited by A. Assmann and J. Assmann. Beiträge zur Archäologie der literarischen Kommunikation II. Munich: Fink.

———. 1993. “Das frühchristliche Alexandrien im Spannungsfeld zwischen Judenchristentum, ‘Frühkatholizismus’ und Gnosis.” Pages 117–36 in *Charisma und Caritas. Aufsätze zur Geschichte der Alten Kirche*. Edited by A. Dörfler-Dierken. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

———. 1994. “Einleitung in die Mystische Theologie und die Briefe samt deren zeitgeschichtlichen Hintergrund.” Pages 54–73 in *Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita, Über die Mystische Theologie und Briefe*. BGrL 40. Stuttgart: Hiersemann.

———. 1999. “Dogma und Lehre im Leben der Alten Kirche.” Pages 99–283 in *Handbuch der Dogmen-und Theologiegeschichte*. Vol. I: *Die Lehrentwicklung im Rahmen der Katholizität*. 2 ed. Edited by C. Andresen and A. M. Ritter. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

———. 2000. “Israel als Gegenüber der Kirche in vorislamischer Zeit.” Pages 202–17 in *Israel als Gegenüber. Vom Alten Orient bis in die Gegenwart. Studien zur Geschichte eines wechselvollen Zusammenlebens*. Edited by F. Siegert. SIJD 5. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

———. 2004. “Die Einheit der Kirche als Problem des 1. Milleniums post Christum natum.” *ThZ* 60: 43–61.

Ritter, S. 1926. “Il frammento Muratoriano.” *RivAC* 3: 215–31.

Ritti, T. 1985. “Fonti Letterarie ed Epigrafiche.” Pages 7–12 in *Hierapolis. Scavi e Richerche I*. Rome: Bretschneider.

Robert, L. 1943. “Voyages épigraphiques en Asie Mineure.” *RevPhil*: 170–201.

———. 1949. “Le Culte de Caligula à Milet et la province d’Asie.” *Hell(P)* 7: 206–38.

———. 1968. “Trois oracles de la Théosophie et un prophète d’Apollon.” *CRAI*: 568–99.

———. 1969. “Les inscriptions.” Pages 247–389 in *Laodicée du Lycos I, Le Nymphée. Campagnes 1961–1963*. Edited by J. des Gagniers. Université Laval Recherches Archéologiques. Série I. Paris: Boccard.

Roberts, A., J. Donaldson, and A. C. Coxe. 1983. *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translation of the Writings of the Fathers Down to A.D. 325*. Vol. 2. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Roberts, C. H. 1938. “Two Oxford Papyri.” *ZNW* 37: 184–88.

———. 1967. Review of R. Roca-Puig, *Himne a la Verge Maria*. *JThS* 18: 492–94.

———. 1979. *Manuscript, Society and Belief in Early Christian Egypt*. London: Oxford University Press.

Roberts, C. H., and T. C. Skeat. 1989 [1987]. *The Birth of the Codex*. London: Oxford University Press.

Roberts, E. D. 1934. “Notes on Early Christian Libraries in Rome.” *Spec*. 9: 190–94.

———. 1968. “Trois oracles de la Théosophie et un prophète d’Apollon.” *CRAI*: 568–99.

Robinson, T. A. 1988. *The Bauer Thesis Examined: The Geography of Heresy in the Early Christian Church*. SBEC 11. Lewiston, N.Y.: E. Mellen Press.

Robinson, T. L. 1986. *Theological Oracles and the Sanctuaries of Claros and Didyma*. HThR.S. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Roca-Puig, R. 1965. *Himne a la Verge Maria. “Psalmus responsorius.” Papir Llatí del segle IV, 2.ª ed*. Barcelona: Asociación de Bibliofilos de Barcelona.

———. 1970. “Frases ‘extra textum’ en P. Barc. inv. 154b–157.” Pages 437–42 in *Proceedings of the Twelfth International Congress of Papyrology*. Edited by D. H. Samuel. American Studies in Papyrology 7. Toronto: Hakkert.
———. 1971. *Selecció de variants a les Catilinàries de Ciceró. P. Barc., I et II in Catilinam*. Barcelona: R. Roca-Puig.
———. 1972. “Citas y reminiscencias biblicas en las anaforas griegas ma primitivas. Los vocablos παῖς y ἠγαπημένος en P. Barc. inv. n.o 154–157.” *Βυζαντινά* 4: 193–203.
———. 1973. *Catilinàries. Papir de Barcelona, Inv. n.o 137ab*. Barcelona: R. Roca-Puig.
———. 1977. *Ciceró. Catilinàries (I et II in Cat.), Papyri Barcinonenses*. Barcelona: R. Roca-Puig.
———. 1979. *La “Creació” a l’Anàfora de Barcelona. Papir de Barcelona, Inv. n.o 154b*. Barcelona: R. Roca-Puig.
———. 1980. *El mite d’Alcestis. Papir de Barcelona, Inventari n.o 158–161*. Barcelona: R. Roca-Puig.
———. 1982a. *Alcestis. Hexàmetres Llatins. Papyri Barcinonenses, Inv. n.o 158–161*. Barcelona: R. Roca-Puig.
———. 1982b. *La “Redempció” a l’Anàfora de Barcelona. Papir de Barcelona, Inv. n.o 154b*. Barcelona: R. Roca-Puig.
———. 1983. *La “Litúrgia angèlica” a l’Anàfora de Barcelona. Papir de Barcelona, Inv. n.o 154b*. Barcelona: R. Roca-Puig.
———. 1984. *“Transició” i “Ofrena” a l’Anàfora de Barcelona. Papir de Barcelona, Inv. n.o 154b–155a*. Barcelona: R. Roca-Puig.
———. 1999. *Anàfora de Barcelona i altres pregàries (Missa del segle IV)*. Barcelona: R. Roca-Puig.
Roest Crollius, A. A. 1997. “Die ethnologisch-religionswissenschaftliche und missionstheologische Diskussion um En-und Inkulturation.” Pages 17–29 in *Die “Identität” des Glaubens in den Kulturen. Das Inkulturationsparadigma auf dem Prüfstand*. Edited by A. Lienkamp and C. Lienkamp. Würzburg: Echter.
Rogers, G. M. 1991. *The Sacred Identity of Ephesus: Foundation Myths of a Roman City*. London: Routledge.
Roloff, J. 1984. *Die Offenbarung des Johannes*. ZBK 18. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag.
Römer, C. 1997. “Christliche Texte (1989–August 1996).” *APF* 43: 127–45.
Rordorf, W. 1966. “La célébration dominicale de la sainte cène dans l’église ancienne.” *RThPh* 99: 25–37 (= Rordorf 1986, 59–71).
———. 1970. “Les prières eucharistiques de la Didachè.” Pages 65–82 in *Eucharisties d’Orient et d’Occident*. Vol. 1. Edited by B. Botte. Lex Orandi 46. Paris: Cerf.
———. 1978. “Les gestes accompagnant la prière, d’après Tertullien, De oratione 11–30, et Origène, ΠΕΡΙ ΕΥΧΗΣ 31–32.” Pages 191–203 in *Gestes et paroles dans les diverses familles liturgiques. Conferences Saint-Serge, XIVe semaine d’études liturgiques, Paris, 28 Juin—1er Juillet*. Edited by C. Andronikof. EL.S 14. Rome: Centro Liturgico Vincenziano (= Rordorf 1986, 109–21).

———. 1986. “L’eucharistie des premiers chrétiens: La Didachè.” Pages 187–208 in *Liturgie, foi et vie des premiers Chrétiens. Études patristiques*. Publications de la Faculté de Théologie de l’Université de Neuchâtel 1 = ThH 75. Paris: Beauchesne.

———. 1993. “Does the Didache Contain Jesus Tradition Independently of the Synoptic Gospels?” Pages 330–59 in *Lex Orandi—Lex Credendi. Gesammelte Aufsätze zum 60. Geburtstag*. Parad. 36. Freiburg, Switzerland: Universitätsverlag.

Rösel, M. 1998. “Theo-Logie der griechischen Bibel. Zur Wiedergabe der Gottesaussagen im LXX-Pentateuch.” *VT* 48: 49–62.

Rosenbach, M., and F. Préchac. 1969–1989. *Seneca, Philosophische Schriften, Lateinisch und Deutsch*. 2 ed. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Rossi, G. B. D. 1966 [1867]. *La Roma sotterranea cristiana, descritta ed ill. dal G. B. de Rossi pubbl. per ordine della santità di n. S. Papa Pio Nono*. Vol. 2. Frankfurt am Main: Minerva.

Rostovtzeff, M. 1930. “L’Empereur Tibère et le Culte Impérial.” *RevHist* 143: 1–26.

Roth, D. T. 2015. *The Text of Marcion’s Gospel*. Leiden: Brill.

Rousseau, A., ed. 1965. Irenaeus, *Contre les Hérésies, Livre IV*. Édition critique d’après les versions Arménienne et Latine sous la direction de A. Rousseau avec la collaboration de B. Hemmerdinger, L. Doutreleau, Ch. Mercier. 2 vols. SC 100. Paris: Cerf.

Rousseau, A., and L. Doutreleau, eds. 1969. Irenaeus, *Contre les Hérésies, Livre V*. 2 vols. SC 152/153. Paris: Cerf.

———, eds. 1974. Irenaeus, *Contre les Hérésies, Livre III*. 2 vols. SC 210/211. Paris: Cerf.

———, eds. 1979. Irenaeus, *Contre les Hérésies, Livre I*. 2 vols. SC 263/264. Paris: Cerf.

Rouwhorst, G. 1980. “Bénédiction, action de grâces, supplication. Les oraisons de la table dans le Judaïsme et les célébrations eucharistiques des Chrétiens Syriaques.” *Questions Liturgiques* 61: 211–40.

———. 1990. “La célébration de l’eucharistie selon les Actes de Thomas.” Pages 51–77 in *Omnes Circumadstantes: Contributions towards a History of the Role of the People in the Liturgy. Presented to Herman Wegman*. Edited by C. Caspers and M. Schneiders. Kampen: Kok.

———. 1997. “Jewish Liturgical Traditions in Early Syriac Christianity.” *VigChr* 51: 72–93.

———. 2002. “The Reading of Scripture in Early Christian Liturgy.” Pages 305–31 in *What Athens Has to Do with Jerusalem: Essays in Classical, Jewish, and Early Christian Art and Archeology in Honor of Gideon Foerster*. Edited by L. V. Rutgers. Leuven: Peeters.

———. 2004. “Jüdischer Einfluß auf christliche Liturgie.” Pages 70–90 in *Dialog oder Monolog? Zur liturgischen Beziehung zwischen Judentum und Christentum*. Edited by A. Gerhards and H. H. Henrix. QD 208. Freiburg: Herder.

Rowland, C. 1983. “Apocalyptic Visions and the Exaltation of Christ in the Letter to the Colossians.” *JSNT* 9: 73–83.

Rubenson, S. 2000. “Philosophy and Simplicity: The Problem of Classical Education in Early Christian Biography.” Pages 110–39 in *Greek Biography and Panegyric* *in Late Antiquity*. Edited by T. Hägg and P. Rousseau. The Joan Palevsky Imprint in Classical Literature. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Rudolph, K. 1969. “Gnosis und Gnostizismus. Ein Forschungsbericht.” *ThR* 34: 181–231.

———. 1972. “Gnosis und Gnostizismus. Ein Forschungsbericht.” *ThR* 37: 289–360.

———. 1990. “Die Gnosis. Texte und Übersetzungen.” *ThR* 55: 114–52.

———. 1996a. “Bibel und Gnosis. Zum Verständnis jüdisch-biblischer Texte in der gnostischen Literatur, vornehmlich aus Nag Hammadi.” Pages 190–209 in *Gnosis und spätantike Religionsgeschichte. Gesammelte Aufsätze*. NHMS 42. Leiden: Brill.

———. 1996b. “Geheimnis und Geheimhaltung in der antiken Gnosis.” Pages 220–43 in *Gnosis und spätantike Religionsgeschichte. Gesammelte Aufsätze*. NHMS 42. Leiden: Brill.

———. 1996c. “Loyalitätskonflikte in der Gnosis.” Pages 211–19 in *Gnosis und spätantike Religionsgeschichte. Gesammelte Aufsätze*. NHMS 42. Leiden: Brill.

Rudolph, W. 1964. “Akkulturation und Akkulturationsforschung.” *Sociologus* 14: 97–113.

Ruelle, C. E., ed. 1966 [1889]. *Damascii successoris Dubitationes et solutiones de primis principiis, in Platonis Parmenidem*. 2 vols. Amsterdam: Hakkert.

Ruge, W. 1899. “Charonion 4).” Page 2184 in *PRE III*.

Rüger, H. P. 1988. “Das Werden des christlichen Alten Testaments.” *JBTh* 3: 175–89.

Ruggieri, F. 1991. *Atti dei martiri scilitani*. AANL. Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche IX/1/2. Rome: Accademia nazionale dei Lincei.

Ruhbach, G. 1974. “Bildung in der Alten Kirche. Das Eindringen des Christentums in die gebildete Welt.” Pages 293–310 in *Die Alte Kirche*. Edited by H. Frohnes and U. W. Knorr. KGMG I. Munich: Kaiser.

Ruiten, J. T. A. G. M. van. 1997. “The Interpretation of Genesis 6:1–12 in Jubilees 5:1–19.” Pages 59–75 in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees*. Edited by M. Albani, J. Frey, and A. Lange. TSAJ 65. Tübingen: Mohr.

Runia, D. T. 1993. *Philo in Early Christian Literature: A Survey*. CRI III/3. Assen: Van Gorcum.

———. 1996. “Caesarea Maritima and the Survival of Hellenistic-Jewish Literature.” Pages 476–95 in *Caesarea Maritima: A Retrospective after Two Millennia*. Edited by A. Raban and K. G. Holum. DMOA 21. Leiden.

Rüpke, J. 1996. “Controllers and Professionals: Analyzing Religious Specialists.” *Numen* 43: 242–62.

Russell, D. A., and N. G. Wilson, eds. 1981. *Menander Rhetor*. Edited with translation and commentary by D. A. Russell and N. G. Wilson. Oxford: Clarendon.

Ruwet, J. 1948. “Clément d’Alexandrie—Canon des Écritures et Apocryphes.” *Bib*. 29: 77–99, 240–68, and 391–408.

———. 1949. “Les “agrapha” dans les œuvres de Clément d’Alexandrie.” *Bib*. 30: 133–40.

———. 1951. “Le Canon Alexandrin des Écritures. Saint Athanase.” *Bib*. 33: 1–29.

Saffrey, H. D., and L. G. Westerink., eds. 1968–1997. Proclus, *Théologie platonicienne*. Vol. 6: *Index géneral*. CUFr. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Sakkos, S. N. 1970. Ο ΚΑΤΑΛΟΓΟΣ ΤΟΥ *Muratori*. ΣΥΜΒΟΛΗ ΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ΕΙΣΑΓΩΓΗΝ ΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ΚΑΙΝΗ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗΝ. Thessalonica: Aristotéleion Panepistêmion.

———. 1974. Ἡ λθ' ἑορταστικὴ ἐπιστολὴ τοῦ Μ. Ἀθανασίου. Pages 129–96 in Τόμος ἑξακοσιοστῆς ἐπετείου Μεγάλου Ἀθανασίου (373–1973). Edited by G. I. Mantzarides. Thessalonica: Theologikē Scholē.

Salles-Dabadie, J. M. A. 1968. *Recherches sur Simon le Mage*. Vol. I: *L'Apophasis Megalè*. Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie.

Salzmann, J. C. 1989. "Pliny (ep. 10,96) and Christian Liturgy—A Reconsideration." Pages 389–95 in *Papers Presented to the Tenth International Conference on Patristic Studies Held in Oxford 1987, Critica, Classica Orientalia, Ascetica, Liturgica*. Edited by E. A. Livingstone. StPatr XX. Leuven: Peeters.

———. 1994. *Lehren und Ermahnen. Zur Geschichte des christlichen Wortgottesdienstes in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten* WUNT II/59. Tübingen.

Sanday, W. 1885. *A Commentary on the Gospels Attributed to Theophilus of Antioch*. SBEc I. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sande-Bakhuyzen, W. H. van de, ed. 1901. *Der Dialog des Adamantius* ΠΕΡΙ ΤΗΣ ΕΙΣ ΘΕΩΝ ΟΡΘΗΣ ΠΙΣΤΕΩΣ. GCS Adamantius. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

Sandelin, K.-G. 1986. *Wisdom as Nourisher: A Study of an Old-Testament Theme, Its Development within Early Judaism and Its Impact on Early Christianity*. AAAbo.H 64/3. Åbo: Åbo Akademi.

Sanders, H. A. 1938. "A Fragment of the Acta Pauli in the Michigan Collection." *HThR* 31: 73–90.

San Nicolo, M. 1972. *Ägyptisches Vereinswesen zur Zeit der Ptolemäer und Römer. 1. Die Vereinsarten. 2. Vereinswesen und Vereinsrecht*. 2 vols. 2 ed. MBPF 2/1–2. Munich: Beck.

Sanz, P. 1946. *Griechische literarische Papyri christlichen Inhalts*. Vol. I: *Biblica, Väterschriften und Verwandtes*. MPSW.NS 4. Baden near Vienna: Österreichische Staatsdruckerei.

Saxer, V. 1984. *Vie liturgique et quotidienne à Carthage vers le milieu du IIIe siècle. Le témoignage de Saint Cyprien et de ses contemporains d'Afrique*. 2 ed. SAC 29. Rome: Pontificio Istituto di Archeologia Cristiana.

Sayar, M. H. 1998. *Perinthos-Herakleia (Marmara Ereğlisi) und Umgebung. Geschichte, Testimonien, griechische und lateinische Inschriften*. ÖAW.PH Denkschriften 269 = Veröffentlichungen der kleinasiatischen Kommission 9. Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences.

Schackleton Bailey, D. R., ed. 1982. *Anthologia latina*. BiTeu. Stuttgart: Tuebner.

Schade, L. 1937. *Des Heiligen Kirchenvaters Eusebius Hieronymus* Ausgewählte *Briefe: II. Briefband*. BKV II. Munich: Kösel.

Schäfer, P. 1973. "Der synagogale Gottesdienst." Pages 391–413 in *Literatur und Religion des Frühjudentums. Eine Einführung*. Edited by J. Maier. Würzburg: Echter.

———. 1975. "Die sogenannte Synode zu Jabne. Zur Trennung von Juden und Christen im 1./2. Jh. n. Chr." *Jud*. 31: 54–64.

Schäfke, W. 1979. “Frühchristlicher Widerstand.” Pages 460–723 in *ANRW* II 23.1.

Schaller, B. 1979. *Das Testament Hiobs*. JSHRZ III/3. Gütersloh: Mohn.

Schäublin, C. 1991. Cicero*, Über die Wahrsagung (De divinatione)*. TuscBü. Munich: Artemis & Winkler.

Scheele, J. 1978. “Buch und Bibliothek bei Augustinus.” *Bibliothek und Wissenschaft* 12: 14–114.

Scheid, J. 1998. “Nouveau rite et nouvelle piété. Réflexions sur le ritus Graecus.” Pages 168–82 in *Ansichten griechischer Rituale. Geburtstagssymposium für Walter Burkert. Castelen bei Basel 15. bis 18. März 1996*. Edited by F. Graf. Stuttgart: Teubner.

Schelkle, K. H. 1959. *Paulus, Lehrer der Väter. Die altkirchliche Auslegung von Römer 1–11*. 2 ed. Düsseldorf: Patmos.

Schelsky, H., ed. 1970. *Zur Theorie der Institution*. Düsseldorf: Bertelsmann.

Schenke, H.-M. 1997. *Das Philippus-Evangelium (Nag-Hammadi-Codex II,3)*. TU 143. Berlin: Akademie.

———. 2001. “Das Evangelium nach Philippus (NHC II,3).” Pages 183–213 in *Nag Hammadi Deutsch*. Vol. I. *NHC I,1–V,1*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Schenkl, H., ed. 1965 [1916]. *Epicteti Dissertationes ab Arriano digestae*. BiTeu. Stuttgart: Tuebner.

Schepelern, W. 1929. *Der Montanismus und die phrygischen Kulte. Eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*. Tübingen: Mohr.

Scherer, J. 1967. *Entretien d’Origène avec Héraclide*. SC 67. Paris: Cerf.

Schermann, T. 1904. “Griechische Handschriftenbestände in den Bibliotheken der christlichen Kulturzentren des 5.–7. Jahrhunderts.” *OrChr* 4: 151–63.

———. 1917. *Frühchristliche Vorbereitungsgebete zur Taufe (Pap. Berol. 13415)*. Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung 3. Munich: Beck.

Schiffman, L. H. 1999. “The Early History of Public Reading of the Torah.” Pages 44–56 in *Jews, Christians, and Polytheists in the Ancient Synagogue: Cultural Interaction during the Greco-Roman Period*. Edited by S. Fine. Baltimore Studies in the History of Judaism 9. London: Routledge.

Schindler, A. 1993a [1979]. “Augustin/Augustinismus I.” Pages 646–98 in *TRE* IV.

———. 1993b [1985]. “Häresie II. Kirchengeschichtlich.” Pages 318–41 in *TRE* XIV.

Schindler, R. 1970. *Landesmuseum Trier. Führer durch die vorgeschichtliche und römische Abteilung*. Trier: Selbstverlag des Rheinischen Landesmuseums.

Schlange-Schöningen, H. 1995. *Kaisertum und Bildungswesen im spätantiken Konstantinopel*. Historia Einzelschriften 94. Stuttgart: Steiner.

Schmeller, T. 1995. *Hierarchie und Egalität. Eine sozialgeschichtliche Untersuchung paulinischer Gemeinden und griechisch-römischer Vereine*. SBS 162. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk.

Schmid, U. 1995. *Marcion und sein Apostolos. Rekonstruktion und historische Einordnung der Marcionitischen Paulusbriefausgabe*. ANTF 25. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Schmid, W. 1907. “Epiphanios 8.” Pages 195–96 in *PRE* VI/1.

———. 1952. “Frühe Apologetik und Platonismus. Ein Beitrag zur Interpretation des Proöms von Justins Dialogen.” Pages 163–82 in *ERMHNEIA. Festschrift für Otto Regenbogen zum 60. Geburtstag am 14. Februar 1951*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Schmidt, C., ed. 1905. *Die Pistis Sophia, die beiden Bücher des Jeû, unbekanntes altgnostisches Werk*. GCS Koptisch-Gnostische Schriften I. Leipzig: Hinrichs (cf. Schmidt/Till 1981).

———. 1914. “Zwei altchristliche Gebete.” Pages 66–78 (with two tables) in *Neutestamentliche Studien. Georg Heinrici zu seinem 70. Geburtstag (14. März 1914), dargebracht von Fachgenossen, Freunden und Schülern*. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

———. 1925. “Die Urschrift der Pistis Sophia.” *ZNW* 24: 218–40.

———. 1967 [1919]. *Gespräche Jesu mit seinen Jüngern nach der Auferstehung. Ein katholisch-apostolisches Sendschreiben des 2. Jahrhunderts*. TU 43. Hildesheim: Olms.

Schmidt, C., and V. MacDermot. 1978. *Pistis Sophia*. Text edited by C. Schmidt. Translation and notes by V. MacDermot. The Coptic Gnostic Library. Volume editor R. Mcl. Wilson. NHS 9. Leiden: Brill.

Schmidt, C., and W. Schubart. 1910. *Altchristliche Texte*. BKT 6. Berlin: Weidmann.

Schmidt, C., and W. C. Till, eds. 1981 [1905/1954]. *Die Pistis Sophia, die beiden Bücher des Jeû, unbekanntes altgnostisches Werk*. Edited by C. Schmidt. 2nd edition revised by W. C. Till. GCS Koptisch-Gnostische Schriften I. Berlin: Akademie.

Schmidt, E. G. 1979. “Syrianos.” Pages 473–74 in KP 5.

Schmidt, M. 1935. Review of W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei*. *Neues Sächsisches Kirchenblatt* (20 January).

Schneemelcher, W. 1962. “Walter Bauer als Kirchenhistoriker.” *NTS* 9: 11–22.

———, ed. 1963. *New Testament Apocrypha*. Vol. I: *Gospels and Related Writings*. Translated by A. J. B. Higgins, G. Ogg, R. Taylor, and R. McL. Wilson. Philadelphia: Westminster.

———, ed. 1964. *New Testament Apocrypha*. Vol. II: *Writings Relating to the Apostles; Apocalypses and Related Subjects. Index to Volumes I and II*. Translated by E. Best, D. Hill, G. Ogg, G. C. Stead, and R. McL. Wilson. Philadelphia: Fortress.

———, ed. 1990. *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung*. 6th edition of the collection founded by E. Hennecke. Vol. I: *Evangelien*. Tübingen: Mohr.

———. 1993 [1980]. “Bibel III. Die Entstehung des Kanons des Neuen Testaments und der christlichen Bibel.” Pages 22–48 in *TRE* VI.

———, ed. 1997. *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung*. 6th edition of the collection founded by E. Hennecke. Vol. II: *Apostolisches, Apokalypsen und Verwandtes*. Tübingen: Mohr.

Schneider, U. 1999. *Theologie als christliche Philosophie. Zur Bedeutung der biblischen Botschaft im Denken des Clemens von Alexandria*. AKG 73. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Schoedel, W. R. 1985. *Ignatius of Antioch*. Philadelphia: Fortress.

———. 1990. *Die Briefe des Ignatius von Antiochien. Ein Kommentar*. Translated by G. Köster. Munich: Kaiser (= Schoedel 1985).

Scholer, D. 1997. “Secret Gospel of Mark.” Pages 1043–44 in *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*. Edited by Everett Ferguson. New York: Garland.

Scholfield, A. F. 1958/1959. Claudius Aelianus, *De natura animalium*. 3 vols. LCL 3/4. London: Heinemann.

Schölgen, G., and W. Geerlings. 1991. *Didache. Zwölf-Apostel-Lehre*. Translated and introduced by G. Schöllgen. *Traditio Apostolica. Apostolische Überlieferung*. Translated and introduced by W. Geerlings. FChr 1. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder.

Schöllgen, G. 1982. “Die Teilnahme der Christen am städtischen Leben in vorkonstantinischer Zeit. Tertullians Zeugnis für Karthago.” *RQ* 77: 1–29 (= Schöllgen 1990b).

———. 1984/1985. “‘Tempus in collecto est.’ Tertullian, der frühe Montanismus und die Naherwartung ihrer Zeit.” *JbAC* 27/28: 74–96.

———. 1985. *Ecclesia Sordida? Zur Frage der sozialen Schichtung frühchristlicher Gemeinden am Beispiel Karthagos zur Zeit Tertullians*. JbAC.Ergbd. 12. Münster: Aschendorff.

———. 1986. “Die Didache als Kirchenordnung. Zur Frage des Abfassungszweckes und seinen Konsequenzen für die Interpretation.” *JbAC* 29: 5–26.

———. 1989. “Probleme der frühchristlichen Sozialgeschichte. Einwände gegen Peter Lampes Buch über ‘Die stadtrömischen Christen in den ersten beiden Jahrhunderten.’” *JbAC* 32: 23–40.

———. 1990a. “Die Teilnahme der Christen am städtischen Leben in vorkonstantinischer Zeit. Tertullians Zeugnis für Karthago.” Pages 319–57 in *Christentum und antike Gesellschaft*. Edited by J. Martin and B. Quint. WdF 649. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

———. 1990b. “Sportulae. Zur Frühgeschichte des Unterhaltsanspruchs der Kleriker.” *ZKG* 101: 1–20.

———. 1990c. “Wandernde oder seßhafte Lehrer in der Didache?” *BN* 52: 19–26.

Scholten, C. 1988a. “Die Nag-Hammadi-Texte als Buchbesitz der Pachomianer.” *JbAC* 31: 144–72.

———. 1988b. “Gibt es Quellen zur Sozialgeschichte der Valentinianer Roms?” *ZNW* 79: 244–61.

———. 1995. “Die alexandrinische Katechetenschule.” *JbAC* 38: 16–37.

Scholtissek, K., ed. 2000a. *Christologie in der Paulus-Schule. Zur Rezeptionsgeschichte des paulinischen Evangeliums*. SBS 181. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk.

———. 2000b. “Paulus als Lehrer. Eine Skizze zu den Anfängen der Paulus-Schule.” Pages 11–36 in *Christologie in der Paulus-Schule. Zur Rezeptionsgeschichte des paulinischen Evangeliums*. SBS 181. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk.

Schröder, H. O. 1986. Publius Aelius Aristides, *Heilige Berichte. Einleitung, deutsche Übersetzung und Kommentar*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Schröder, S. 1990. *Plutarchs Schrift De Pythiae Oraculis*. Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 8. Stuttgart: Teubner.

Schröter, J. 2005. “Jesus und der Kanon. Die frühe Jesusüberlieferung im Kontext der Entstehung des neutestamentlichen Kanons.” *BThZ* 22: 181–201 (= Schröter 2013, 249–71).
———. 2006. *Das Abendmahl. Frühchristliche Deutungen und Impulse für die Gegenwart*. SBS 210. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk.
———. 2013. *From Jesus to the New Testament*. Translated by W. Coppins. Baylor–Mohr Siebeck Studies in Early Christianity 1. Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press.
Schubart, W. 1921. *Das Buch bei den Griechen und Römern*. Handbücher der Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin 12. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
———. 1925. *Das Buch bei den Griechen und Römern*. 2 ed. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
———. 1962. *Das Buch bei den Griechen und Römern*. 3 ed. Leipzig: Koehler & Amelang.
Schubert, H. v. 1923. “Bildung und Erziehung in frühchristlicher Zeit.” Pages 75–105 in *Bilder und Studien aus drei Jahrtausenden. Eberhard Gothein zum siebzigsten Geburtstag*. Edited by G. Karo. Munich: Duncker & Humblot.
Schülein, J. A. 1987. *Theorie der Institution. Eine dogmengeschichtliche und konzeptionelle Analyse*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
Schultz, D. R. 1978. “The Origin of Sin in Irenaeus and Jewish-Pseudepigraphical Literature.” *VigChr* 32: 161–90.
Schulze, J. L., and J. A. Noesselt, eds. 1769–1774. *Theodoretus, Opera omnia*. 5 vols. Halle: Orphanotropheum.
Schulz-Flügel, E., ed. 1990. *Rufinus, Historia monachorum sive De vita sanctorum patrum*. PTS 34. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
Schürer, E. 1888. Review of J. Schurmans Steckhoven, *Het Fragment van Muratori, Academisch Proefschrift, Utrecht 1877*. *ThLZ* 2: 445–46.
———. 1986. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–-A.D. 135)*. Vol. III/1. A new English version revised and edited by G. Vermes, F. Millar, M. Goodman, literary editor P. Vermes, and organizing editor M. Black. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
Schuster, H. 1937. Review of W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei*. *DEE* 48: 260.
Schütz, W. 1984. *Der christliche Gottesdienst bei Origenes*. CThM B 8. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk.
Schwartz, E. 1904. “Die Osterbriefe.” Pages 333–56 in *NGWG.PH* (= Schwarz 1959, 1–29).
———, ed. 1914–1940. *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum. Concilium Universale Ephesenum*. Vol. I/1/2: *Acta Graeca. Collectio Vaticana 33–80*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1927. Vol. I/1/7: *Acta Graeca. Collectio Seguierana. Collectio Atheniensis. Collectiones minors*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1929. Vol. I/2: *Collectio Veronensis*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1926. *Concilium Universale Chalcedonense*, ed. E. Schwartz. Vol. II/1/3: *1. Epistularum collectiones. Actiones VIII–XVII. 18–31*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1935. Vol. II/3/1: *Epistularum ante gesta collectio. Actio prima*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1935. *Collectio Sabbaitica contra Acephalos et Origeniastas destinata*, ed. E. Schwartz. Vol. III: *Insunt acta synodorum Constantinopolitanae et*

Hierosolymitanae A. 536. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1940. *Concilium Universale Constantinopolitanum sub Iustiniano habitum*, ed. E. Schwartz. Vol. IV/2: *Iohannis Maxentii Libelli, Collectio Codicis Novariensis XXX, Collectio Codicis Parisinis 1682 (. . .)*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1914.
———. 1959. *Zur Geschichte des Athanasius*. Vol. III of *Gesammelte Schriften*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
———. 1963. "Über den Tod der Söhne Zebedaei." Pages 48–123 in *Gesammelte Schriften*. Vol. III: *Zum Neuen Testament und zum frühen Christentum*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
———, ed. 1999 [1903–1909]. Eusebius, *Die Kirchengeschichte . . . Lateinische Übersetzung des Rufinus*. Vol. 2 of *Eusebius Werke*. The *Kirchengeschichte* is edited by E. Schwartz. The *Lateinische Übersetzung des Rufinus* is edited by T. Mommsen. GCS Eusebius II/1–3 = GCS.NF 6/1–3. 2nd unaltered edition by F. Winkelmann. Berlin: Akademie.
Schweighäuser, J. 1977 [1800]. *Simplicii Commentarius in Epicteti enchiridion, accedit enchiridii paraphrasis Christiana et Nili enchiridion*. Vol. V of *Epictetae philosophiae monumenta*. Hildesheim: Olms.
Schwöbel, C. 2000 [1996]. "Pluralismus II. Systematisch-Theologisch." Pages 724–39 in *TRE* XXVI.
———. 2001. "Gnadenlose Postmoderne? Ein theologischer Essay." Pages 134–55 in *Glauben—Lieben—Hoffen. Theologische Einsichten und Aufgaben. Festgabe für Konrad Stock zum 60. Geburtstag*. Edited by M. Roth and K. Horstmann. Arbeiten zur historischen und systematischen Theologie 6. Münster: Lit.
Scopello, M. 1977. "Les 'Testimonia' dans le traité de 'l'Exégèse de l'âme' (Nag Hammadi II,6)." *RHR* 191: 159–71.
———. 1985. *L'exégèse de l'âme (NHC II 6)*. NHS 25. Leiden: Brill.
Sedley, D. 1998. "Pythagoras the Grammar Teacher and Didymon the Adulterer." *Hyperboreus* 4: 122–37.
Seeck, O. 1921. "Scrinium." Pages 893–904 in *PRE* II A 1.
Seeliger, H. R. 1995. "Käse beim eucharistischen Mahl. Zum historischen Kontext von Traditio Apostolica 6." Pages 195–207 in *Vorgeschmack. Ökumenische Bemühungen um die Eucharistie. Festschrift für Theodor Schneider*. Edited by B. J. Hilberath and D. Sattler. Mainz: Matthias-Grünewald-Verlag.
———. 2003. "Litteratulus Christianus. Beobachtungen und Bemerkungen zum Bildungsgrad antiker Christen." *ThQ* 183: 297–312.
Seesemann, H. 1936. "Das Paulusverständnis des Clemens Alexandrinus." *ThStKr* 107: 312–46.
Segre, M. 1935. "Epigraphica I: Catalogo di libri di Rodi." *RFIC.NS* 13: 214–22.
Semler, J. S. 1980 [1771]. *Abhandlung von freier Untersuchung des Canon (Nachdruck des progammatischen Teils der Erstfassung Halle 1771 <S. 1–128>)*. Edited by H. Scheible. 2 ed. TKTG 5. Gütersloh: Mohn.
Severus, E. von. 1972. "Gebet I." Pages 1134–258 in *RAC* VIII.
Seyfarth, W., ed. 1968. Armianus Marcellinus, *Römische Geschichte*. Part II: *Buch 18–21*. SQAW 21/2. Berlin: Akademische Verlag.

Sieben, H.-J. 1976. “Zur Entwicklung der Konzilsidee. XI: Aspekte der Konzilsidee nach Konzilssynopsen des 6. bis 9. Jahrhunderts.” *ThPh* 51: 347–80.

Siedschlag, A. 2000. *Politische Institutionalisierung und Konflikttransformation. Leitideen, Theoriemodelle und europäische Praxisfälle*. Opladen: Leske und Budrich.

Siegert, F. 1982. *Nag-Hammadi-Register. Wörterbuch zur Erfassung der Begriffe in den koptisch-gnostischen Schriften von Nag-Hammadi, mit einem deutschen Index, angefertigt von F. Siegert, Einführung v. A. Böhlig*. WUNT 26. Tübingen: Mohr.

———. 1993. “Homerinterpretation—Tora-Unterweisung—Bibelauslegung. Vom Ursprung der patristischen Hermeneutik.” Pages 159–71 in *Papers Presented at the Eleventh International Conference on Patristic Studies Held in Oxford 1991, Biblica Et Apocrypha, Orientalia, Ascetica*. Edited by E. A. Livingstone. StPatr XXV. Leuven: Peeters.

Sievers, G. R. 1969 [1868]. *Das Leben des Libanius*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Sijpesteijn, P. J., and K. Treu. 1988. “Zum liturgischen Fragment P. Würzb. 3.” *ZPE* 72: 67–68.

Silvagni, A., and A. Ferrura. 1964. *Inscriptiones Christianae urbis Romae*. Vol. IV. Rome: Pont. Inst. Archaeologiae Christianae.

Silverstein, T. 1935. *Visio sancti Pauli: The History of the Apocalypse in Latin: Together with Nine Texts*. SaD 4. London: Christophers.

Simonetti, M. 1988. “Un nuova ipotesi su Gregorio il Taumaturgo.” *RSR* 24: 17–41.

Simonetti, M., and C. Moreschini, eds. 1976. *Sancti Cypriani Episcopi Opera*. Part II: *Ad Donatum, De Mortalitate, Ad Demetrianum, De Opere et Eleemosynis, De Zelo et Livore*. Edited by M. Simonetti. *De Dominica Oratione, De Bono Patientiae*. Edited by C. Moreschini. CChr.SL 3A. Turnhout: Brepols.

Simonin, H.-D. 1936. Review of W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei*. *RSPTh* 25: 342–45.

Sirat, C. 1989. “Le livre hébreu dans les premiers siècles de notre ère. Le témoignage des textes.” Pages 115–24 in *Les débuts du codex. Actes de la journée d’étude organisée à Paris les 3 et 4 juillet 1985 par l’Institut de Papyrologie de la Sorbonne*. Edited by A. Blanchard. Bibliologia 9. Turnhout: Brepols.

Sirinelli, J., and É. Des Places. 1974. Eusebius of Caesarea, *La préparation évangélique, Livre 1*. SC 206. Paris: Cerf.

Sirks, A. J. B. 2006. “Die Vereine in der kaiserlichen Gesetzgebung.” Pages 21–40 in *Vereine, Synagogen und Gemeinden im kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien*. Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 25. Tübingen: Mohr.

Skarsaune, O. 1987. *The Proof from Prophecy: A Study in Justin Martyr’s Proof-Text Tradition: Text-Type, Provenance, Theological Profile*. NT.S 56. Leiden: Brill.

Skeat, T. C. 1992. “Irenaeus and the Four-Gospel Canon.” *NT* 34: 194–99.

———. 1994. “The Origin of the Christian Codex.” *ZPE* 102: 263–68.

———. 1997. “The Oldest Manuscript of the Four Gospels?” *NTS* 43: 1–34.

———. 1999. “The Codex Sinaiticus, the Codex Vaticanus, and Constantine.” *JThS* 50: 583–625.

Skeb, M. 1998. Paulinus of Nola, *Epistulae/Briefe*. FChr 25/2. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder.

Skinner, Q. 1969. “Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas.” *History and Theory* 8: 3–53.

Skutella, M., H. Jürgens, and W. Schaub, eds. 1981 [1934]. *Sancti Aurelii Augustini Confessionum Libri XIII*. Editet M. Skutella. Editionem correctiorem curaverunt H. Jürgens et W. Schaub. BiTeu. Stuttgart: Teubner.

Smit Sibinga, J. 1966. “Ignatius and Matthew.” *NT* 8: 263–83.

Smith, A., and D. Wasserstein. 1993. *Porphyrii Philosophi Fragmenta*. Edited by A. Smith. Fragmenta Arabica D. Wasserstein interpretante. BiTeu. Stuttgart: Tuebner.

Smith, M. 1960. “Hellenika Cheirographa en tei Monei tou hagiou Sabba.” *Nea Sion* 52: 110–25, 245–56.

———. 1973a. *Clement of Alexandria and a Secret Gospel of Mark*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

———. 1973b. *The Secret Gospel: The Discovery and Interpretation of the Secret Gospel According to Mark*. New York: Harper & Row.

———. 1974. *Auf der Suche nach dem historischen Jesus. Entdeckung und Deutung des geheimen Evangeliums im Wüstenkloster Mar Saba*. Frankfurt am Main: Ullstein.

———. 1982. “Clement of Alexandria and Secret Mark: The Score at the End of the First Decade.” *HThR* 75: 449–61.

Snyder, H. G. 2000. *Teachers and Texts in the Ancient World*. Religion in the First Christian Centuries. London: Routledge.

Sodano, A. R., ed. 1958. Porphyry, *Lettera ad Anebo*. Naples: L’Arte tipografica.

Soden, H. v. 1911. *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt hergestellt auf Grund ihrer Textgeschichte*. Vol. I/1. 2 ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Söding, T. 2003. “Der Kanon des Alten und Neuen Testaments. Zur Frage nach seinem theologischen Anspruch.” Pages xlvii–lxxxviii in *The Biblical Canons (Fiftieth Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense . . . from July 25 to 27, 2001)*. Edited by J.-M. Auwers and H. J. D. Jonge. BEThL 163. Leuven: Peeters.

Sohm, R., L. Mitteis, and L. Wenger. 1923. *Institutionen. Geschichte und System des römischen Privatrechts*. Munich: Duncker & Humblot.

Sokolowski, F. 1969. *Lois sacrées des cités grecques*. Paris: Boccard.

Spanneut, M. 1962. “Epiktet.” Pages 599–681 in *Epiktet* V.

Speck, P. 1986. “A More Charitable Verdict.” *Klio* 68: 615–25.

———. 1997. “Sokrates Scholastikos über die beiden Apolinarioi.” *Phil*. 141: 362–69.

Speyer, W. 1963. “Zu den Vorwürfen der Heiden gegen die Christen.” *JbAC* 6: 129–35.

———. 1989. “Realität und Formen der Ekstase im griechisch-römischen Altertum.” Pages 353–68 in *Frühes Christentum im antiken Strahlungsfeld. Ausgewählte Aufsätze*. WUNT 50. Tübingen: Mohr.

Staerk, W. 1936. “Die sieben Säulen der Welt und des Hauses der Weisheit.” *ZNW* 35: 232–61.

Stählin, O. 1936. *Clemens Alexandrinus*. Vol. 4: *Register*. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

———. 1937/1938. *Des Clemens von Alexandreia Teppiche wissenschaftlicher Darlegungen entspechend der wahren Philosophie (Stromateis)*. BKV 2.R. 19/20. Munich: Kösel.

Stählin, O., L. Früchtel, and U. Treu, eds. 1970. Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata Buch VII und VIII, Excerpta ex Theodoto, Eclogae Propheticae, Quis Dives Salvetur, Fragmente*. Edited by O. Stählin. Edited anew by L. Früchtel. Overseen to publication by U. Treu. GCS Clemens Alexandrinus III. Berlin: Akademie.

———, eds. 1985. Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata: Buch I–VI*. Edited by O. Stählin. Edited anew by L. Früchtel. 4th edition with supplements by U. Treu. GCS Clemens Alexandrinus II. Berlin: Akademie.

Stählin, O., and U. Treu, eds. 1972. Clement of Alexandria, *Protrepticus und Paedagogus*. Edited by O. Stählin. 3rd revised edition edited by U. Treu. GCS Clemens Alexandrinus I. Berlin: Akademie.

———, eds. 1980. *Register*. Part I: *Zitatenregister, Testimonienregister, Initienregister für die Fragmente, Eigennamenregister*. Edited by O. Stählin. 2nd revised edition edited by U. Treu. GCS Clemens Alexandrinus IV/1. Berlin: Akademie.

Stanton, G. N. 1997. “The Fourfold Gospel.” *NTS* 43: 317–46.

Stegmüller, O. 1937. “Christliche Texte aus der Berliner Papyrussammlung.” *Aegyptus* 17: 456–59.

Stemberger, G. 1976. “Stammt das synodale Element der Kirche aus der Synagoge?” *AHC* 8: 1–14.

———. 1977. “Die sogenannte ‘Synode von Jabne’ und das frühe Christentum.” *Kairos* 19: 14–21.

———. 1988. “Jabne und der Kanon.” *JBTh* 3: 163–74.

Stendahl, K. 1962. “The Apocalypse of John and the Epistles of Paul in the Muratorian Fragment.” Pages 239–45 in *Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation: Essays in Honor of O. A. Piper*. Edited by W. Klassen and G. F. Snyder. New York: Harper & Row.

Stengel, P. 1920. *Die griechischen Kultusaltertümer*. 3 ed. HAW V/3. Munich: Beck.

Stephanus, H. (and many others). 1953 [1865]. *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae*. Ab H. Stephano constructus post ed. Anglicam novis additamentis auctum, ordineque alphabetic digestum tertio ed. C. B. Hase, W. Dindorf et L. Dindorf. 9 vols. Graz: Akademische Druck-und Verlagsanstalt.

Stewart-Sykes, A. 1997. “The Asian Context of the New Prophecy and the Epistula Apostolorum.” *VigChr* 51: 416–38.

Stietencron, H. v. 1986. “Gedanken zur Theologie.” Pages 9–24 in *Theologen und Theologien in verschiedenen Kulturkreisen*. Tübinger religionswissenschaftliche Ringvorlesungen. Düsseldorf: Patmos.

Stiglmayr, J. 1913. *Kirchenväter und Klassizismus. Stimmen der Vorzeit über humanistische Bildung*. StML.E 114. Freiburg: Herder.

———. 1919. “Mannigfache Bedeutung von ‘Theologie’ und ‘Theologen.’” *ThGl* 11: 296–309.

Stockmeier, P. 1967. “Glaube und Paideia. Zur Begegnung von Christentum und Antike.” *ThQ* 147: 432–52.

Strathmann, H. 1934. Review of Walter Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei*. *ThG* 28: 192–93.

———. 1941. “Die Krisis des Kanons in der Kirche. Joh. Gerhards und Joh. Sal. Semlers Erbe.” *ThBl* 20: 295–310 (= Käsemann 1970b, 41–61).

Straub, J. 1991. “Identitätstheorie im Übergang?” *Sozialwissenschaftliche Literatur Rundschau* 23: 49–71.

Strecker, G. 1978a. “Eine Evangelienharmonie bei Justin und Pseudoklemens?” *NTS* 24: 297–316.

———. 1978b. “Walter Bauer—Exeget, Philologe und Historiker. Zum 100. Geburtstag am 8.8.1977.” *NT* 20: 75–80.

———. 1981. *Das Judenchristentum in den Pseudoklementinen*. 2 ed. TU 70. Berlin: Akademie.

———. 1993 [1980]. “Bauer, Walter.” Pages 317–19 in *TRE* V.

Strobel, A. 1977. *Ursprung und Geschichte des frühchristlichen Osterkalenders*. TU. Berlin: Akademie.

———. 1980. *Das heilige Land der Montanisten*. RGVV 37. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Stroumsa, G. G. 1994. “The Body of Truth and Its Measures: New Testament Canonization in Context.” Pages 307–16 in *Gnosisforschung und Religionsgeschichte. Festschrift für Kurt Rudolph zum 65. Geburtstag*. Edited by H. Preissler, H. Seiwert, and H. Mürmel. Marburg: Diagonal.

———. 1999. “Dreams and Visions in Early Christian Discourse.” Pages 189–212 in *Dream Cultures: Explorations in the Comparative History of Dreaming*. Edited by D. Shulman and G. G. Stroumsa. New York: Oxford University Press.

———. 2003. “Comments on Charles Hedrick’s Article: A Testimony.” *JECS* 11: 147–53.

———. 2005a. “From Master of Wisdom to Spiritual Master in Late Antiquity.” Pages 183–96 in *Religion and the Self in Antiquity*. Edited by D. Brakke, M. L. Satlow, and S. Weitzman. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

———. 2005b. *La Fin du sacrifice. Les mutations religieuses de l’Antiquité tardive. Préface de J. Scheid*. Collection du Collège de France. Paris: O. Jacob.

Stuhlhofer, F. 1988. *Der Gebrauch der Bibel von Jesus bis Euseb. Eine statistische Untersuchung zur Kanongeschichte*. Wuppertal: Brockhaus.

Stuiber, A. 1950. *Libelli Sacramentorum Romani. Untersuchungen zur Entstehung des sogenannten Sacramentarium Leonianum (Verona, Bibl. Capitolare, Cod. LXXXV)*. Theoph. 6. Bonn: Hanstein.

Sundberg, A. C. 1958. “The Old Testament of the Early Church.” *HThR* 51: 205–26.

———. 1964. “Dependent Canonicity in Irenaeus and Tertullian.” *StEv* 3: 403–9.

———. 1968. “Towards a Revised History of the New Testament Canon.” *StEv* 4: 452–61.

———. 1973. “Canon Muratori: A Fourth Century List.” *HThR* 66: 1–41.

———. 1988. “Review of R. Beckwith, *The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church and Its Background in Early Judaism*.” *Int*. 42: 78–82.

Sütterlin, L. 1960. “wissenschaftlich.” In *DWB* 14/2 (= Sütterlin 1984).

———. 1984. “wissenschaftlich.” Pages 798–800 in *DWB* 30 (= Sütterlin 1960).

Swarat, U. 1991. *Alte Kirche und Neues Testament. Theodor Zahn als Patristiker*. Wuppertal: Brockhaus.

Swete, H. B. 1914. *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*. 2 ed. Revised by R. Rusden Ottley, with an appendix, containing the Letter of Aristeas ed. by H. St. J. Thackeray. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Szarmach, M. 1985. *Maximos von Tyros. Eine literarische Monographie*. Torun: Uniwersytet Mikołaja Kopernika.

Tabbernee, W. 1997a. *Montanist Inscriptions and Testimonia: Epigraphic Sources Illustrating the History of Montanism*. PatMS 16. Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press.

———. 1997b. "'Our Trophies Are Better than Your Trophies': The Appeal to Tombs and Reliquaries in Montanist-Orthodox Relations." Pages 206–17 in *Papers Presented to the Twelfth International Conference on Patristic Studies Held in Oxford 1995, Preaching, Second Century, Tertullian to Arnobius*. StPatr XXXI. Leuven: Peeters.

———. 2003. "Portals of the Montanist New Jerusalem: The Discovery of Pepouza and Tymion." *JECS* 11: 87–93.

Tardieu, M. 1978. "Le Congrès de Yale sur le Gnosticisme [28–31 mars 1978]." *REAug* 24: 188–209.

Taylor, F. S. 1937/1938. "The Alchemical Works of Stephanos of Alexandria." *Ambix* 1/2: 116–39 and 38–49.

Tetz, M. 1984. "Athanasius und die Einheit der Kirche." *ZThK* 81: 196–219.

Thee, F. C. R. 1984. *Julius Africanus and the Early Christian View of Magic*. HUTh 19. Tübingen: Mohr.

Theissen, G. 1994. "Die Einheit der Kirche. Kohärenz und Differenz im Urchristentum." *ZMiss* 20: 70–86.

———. 1999. *A Theory of Primitive Christian Religion*. Translated by J. Bowden. London: SCM.

———. 2000. *Die Religion der ersten Christen. Eine Theorie des Urchristentums*. Gütersloh: Mohn.

Thesaurus Linguae Latinae. 1900–<2012>. Ed. Iussu et auctoritate consilii ab academiis societatibusque diversarum nationum electi. 9 vols. in 17 parts. Leipzig: Teubner.

Thielman, F. 1998. "The Place of the Apocalypse in the Canon of St. Gregory Nazianzen." *TynB* 49: 155–57.

Thomassen, E. 1989. "The Valentinianism of the Valentinian Exposition (NHC XI,2)." *Muséon* 102: 225–36.

Thornton, C.-J. 1991. *Der Zeuge des Zeugen. Lukas als Historiker der Paulusreisen*. WUNT 56. Tübingen: Mohr.

———. 1993. "Justin und das Markusevangelium." *ZNW* 84: 93–100.

Thraede, K. 1972. "Friedenskuß." Pages 505–19 in *RAC* VIII.

———. 1994. "Hymnus I." Pages 915–46 in *RAC* XVI.

———. 1998. "Inspiration." Pages 329–65 in *RAC* XVIII.

Thümmel, H. G. 1984. "Die Schule des Origenes." Pages 205–17 in *Graeco-Coptica. Griechen und Kopten im byzantinischen Ägypten, Martin-Luther-Universität*

Halle-Wittenberg. Edited by P. Nagel. Wissenschaftliche Beiträge 48/1984 [I 29]. Halle: Martin Luther Universität.
———. 1988. *Die Kirche des Ostens im 3. und 4. Jh*. KGE I/4. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.
Tidner, E. 1938. *Sprachlicher Kommentar zur lateinischen Didascalia apostolorum*. Kungliga Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademiens handlingar 45/1. Stockholm: Wahlström & Widstrand.
———, ed. 1963. *Didascaliae apostolorum, Canonum ecclesiasticorum, Traditionis apostolicae versiones latinae*. TU 75. Berlin: Akademie.
Till, W. C. 1960. *Die koptischen Ostraka der Papyrussammlung der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek. Texte, Übersetzungen, Indices*. DÖAW.PH 78/1. Vienna: H. Böhlhaus Nachf.
———. 1961. *Koptische Dialektgrammatik mit Lesestücken and Wörterbuch*. 2nd newly structured edition. Munich: Beck.
———. 1986. *Koptische Grammatik (Saïdischer Dialekt), mit Bibliographie, Lesestücken und Wörterverzeichnissen*. Leipzig: Enzyklopädie.
Till, W., and J. Leipoldt, eds. 1954. *Der koptische Text der Kirchenordnung Hippolyts*. TU 58. Berlin: Akademie.
Tønsberg, J. 1976. *Offentlige biblioteker i Romerriget i det 2. århundrede e. Chr*. Danmarks Biblioteksskoles skrifter 10. Copenhagen: Danmarks Biblioteksskole.
Trapp, M. B., ed. 1994. Maximus of Tyre, *Dissertationes*. Stuttgart: Tuebner.
Treu, K. 1961. “Etymologie und Allegorie bei Klemens von Alexandrien.” Pages 190–211 in *Papers Presented to the Third International Conference on Patristic Studies Held at Christ Church, Oxford, 1959, Part II: Biblica, Patres Apostolici, Historica*. Edited by F. L. Cross. StPatr IV = TU 79. Berlin: Akademie.
———. 1970. “Ein neuer Hermas-Papyrus.” *VigChr* 24: 34–39.
———. 1986. “Antike Literatur im byzantinischen Ägypten im Lichte der Papyri.” *Byzantinoslavica* 47: 1–7.
———. 1989. “Referat Christliche Papyri.” *APF* 35: 107–16.
———. 1991. “Referat Christliche Papyri.” *APF* 37: 93–98.
Trevett, C. 1989. “Apocalypse, Ignatius, Montanism: Seeking the Seeds.” *VigChr* 43: 313–38.
———. 1996. *Montanism: Gender, Authority and the New Prophecy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
———. 1999. “‘Angelic Visitations and Speech She Had’: Nanas of Kotiaeion.” Pages 259–77 in *Prayer and Spirituality in the Early Church*. Edited by P. Allen. Everton Park, Queensland: Center for Early Christian Studies, Australian Catholic University.
Trigg, J. W. 2001. “God’s Marvelous Oikonomia: Reflections of Origen’s Understanding of Divine and Human Pedagogy in the Address Ascribed to Gregory Thaumaturgus.” *JECS* 9: 27–52.
Trobisch, D. 1989. *Die Entstehung der Paulusbriefsammlung. Studien zu den Anfängen christlicher Publizistik*. NTOA 10. Freiburg, Switzerland: Universitätsverlag.

———. 1996. *Die Endredaktion des Neuen Testament. Eine Untersuchung zur Entstehung der christlichen Bibel*. NTOA 31. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag.
Troeltsch, E. 1981 [21922]. "Über historische und dogmatische Methode in der Theologie." Pages 729–53 in *Gesammelte Schriften*. Vol. II: *Zur religiösen Lage, Religionsphilosophie und Ethik*. Aalen: Scientia.
Tröger, K.-W., ed. 1980. *Altes Testament—Frühjudentum—Gnosis*. Gütersloh: Mohn.
Trummer, P. 1970. *Anastasis. Beitrag zur Auslegung und Auslegungsgeschichte von I Kor. 15 in der griechischen Kirche bis Theodoret*. Vienna: Notring.
Tuchelt, K. 1980. "Didyma: Bericht über die Arbeiten der Jahre 1975–1979." *IM* 34: 99–176 with images 40–75.
Tuckett, C. M. 1986. *Nag Hammadi and the Gospel Tradition: Synoptic Tradition in the Nag Hammadi Library*. Edited by J. Riches. Studies of the New Testament and Its World. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
Tuilier, A. 1982. "Les évangélistes et les docteurs de la primitive église et les origines de l'école (διδασκαλεῖον) d'Alexandrie." Pages 738–49 in *Papers Presented to the Eighth International Conference on Patristic Studies Held in Oxford 1979*. Edited by E. A. Livingstone. StPatr XVII/2. Leuven: Peeters.
Turcan, M. 1971. *Toilette des femmes*. SC 173. Paris: Cerf.
Turner, E. G. 1952. "Roman Oxyrhynchus." *JEA* 38: 78–93.
Turner, H. E. W. 1954. *The Pattern of Christian Truth: A Study in the Relations between Orthodoxy and Heresy in the Early Christian Church*. BaL 1954. London: Mowbray.
Turner, J. D. 1994. "Ritual in Gnosticism." Pages 136–81 in *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 1994*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
Unnik, W. C. v. 1949. "De la règle μήτε προσθεῖναι μήτε ἀφελεῖν dans l'histoire du canon." *VigChr* 3: 1–36 (= Unnik 1980, 123–56).
———. 1961. "Ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη—A Problem in the Early History of the Canon." Pages 212–27 in *Papers Presented to the Third International Conference on Patristic Studies Held at Christ Church, Oxford, 1959, Part II: Biblica, Patres Apostolici, Historica*. Edited by F. L. Cross. StPatr IV = TU 79. Berlin: Akademie (= Unnik 1980, 157–71).
———. 1980. *Sparsa Collecta: The Collected Essays*. Vol. II: *I Peter. Canon. Corpus Hellenisticum Generalia*. NT.S 30. Leiden: Brill.
Urner, H. 1952. *Die außerbiblische Lesung im Gottesdienst*. Vol. 6. VEGL. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
Usener, H., ed. 1877. *Acta S. Timothei*. Natalicia Regis Augustissimi Guilelmi Imperatoris Germaniae ab Universitate Friderica Guilelmia Rhenana. Bonn: Georgi.
———. 1911. *Das Weihnachtsfest*. 2 ed. Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen. Part I. Bonn: Bouvier.
Vernière, Y. 1990. "La théorie de l'inspiration prophétique dans les *Dialogues pythiques* de Plutarque." *Kernos* 3: 359–66.
Verzone, P. 1971. "Hierapolis." Pages 1203–23 in *RBK* II.
Veyne, P. 1978. *Foucault révolutionne d'histoire*. Paris: Seuil.

———. 1985. *Histoire de la vie privée*. Vol. 1: *De l'empire romain à l'an mil*. Paris: Seuil.
———. 1989. "Das römische Reich." Pages 19–227 in *Geschichte des privaten Leben*. Vol. I: *Vom römischen Imperium bis zum byzantinischen Reich*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer (= Veyne 1985).
———. 1992. *Foucault: Die Revolutionierung der Geschichte*. Translated by G. Rossler. Edition suhrkamp 1702. Neue Folge Bd. 702. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp (= Veyne 1978).
Victor, U., ed. 1997. Lucian of Samosata, *Alexandros oder der Lügenprophet*. EPRO 132. Leiden: Brill.
Vinzent, M. 1996. "Die frühchristlichen Lehrer, Gnostiker und Philosophen, und die Ziele ihres Unterrichts." *Das Altertum* 41: 177–87.
———. 2014. *Marcion and the Dating of the Synoptic Gospels*. Studia Patristica Supplements 2. Leuven: Peeters.
Vogel, C. 1980. "Anaphores eucharistiques préconstantiniennes. Formes non traditionelles." Pages 401–10 in *Ecclesia Orans. Mélanges patristiques offerts au Père Adalbert G. Hamman OFM à l'occasion de ses quarante ans d'enseignement*. Edited by V. Saxer. Roma: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum.
———. 1981. *Introduction aux sources de-l'histoire du culte chrétien au moyen âge*. Spoleto: Centro italiano di studi sull' alto Medioevo.
———. 1986. *Medieval Liturgy: An Introduction to the Sources*. Revised and translated by W. G. Storey and N. K. Rasmussen with the assistance of J. K. Brooks-Leonard. Washington, D.C.: Pastoral Press (= Vogel 1981).
Vogt, J. 1973. "Alphabet für Freie und Sklaven. Zum sozialen Aspekt des antiken Elementarunterrichts." *RhM* 116: 129–42.
———. 1983. *Sklaverei und Humanität. Studien zur antiken Sklaverei und ihrer Erforschung*. Hist. Einzelschriften 44. Wiesbaden: Steiner.
Volf, M. 1995. "Christliche Identität und Differenz: Zur Eigenart der christlichen Präsenz in den modernen Gesellschaften." *ZThK* 92: 357–75.
Völker, W. 1935. Review of W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei*. *ZKG* 54: 628–31.
Vööbus, A. 1968. *Liturgical Traditions in the Didache*. PETSE 16. Stockholm: Etse.
Voss, B. R. 1970. *Der Dialog in der frühchristlichen Literatur*. STA IX. Munich: Fink.
Voss, I. 1646. S. *Ignatii Martyris Epistolae genuinae ex bibliotheca Florentina; adduntur S. Ignatii Epistolae, quales vulgo circum feruntur*. Amsterdam: Blaev.
Vössing, K. 1992. "Augustins Schullaufbahn und das sog. dreistufige Bildungssystem." Pages 881–900 in *L'Africa romana. Atti del IX convegno di studi Nuoro, 13–15 dicembre 1991*. Edited by A. Mastino. Pubblicazioni del Dipartimento di storia dell'universita degli studi di Sassari 20. Sassari: Gallizzi.
———. 1997. *Schule und Bildung im Nordafrika der römischen Kaiserzeit*. CollLat 238. Brussels: Latomus.
Vouga, F. 1994. *Geschichte des frühen Christentums*. UTB 1733. Tübingen: Francke.
Wahl, O. 1977. *Apocalypsis Esdrae. Apocalypsis Sedrach. Visio Beati Esdrae*. PVTG IV. Leiden: Brill.

Wallies, M., ed. 1891. *Alexandri Aphrodisiensis In Aristotelis topicorum libros octo commentaria*. CAG II/2. Berlin: Reimer.

Wallmann, J. 1961. *Der Theologiebegriff bei J. Gerhard und G. Calixt*. BHTh 30. Tübingen: Mohr.

Walls, A. F. 1967. "Papias and the Oral Tradition." *VigChr* 21: 137–40.

Waltzing, J.-P. 1968 [1895]. *Étude historique sur les corporations professionnelles chez les Romains depuis les origines jusqu'à la chute de l'Empire d'Occident*. 5 vols. Rome: l'Erma di Bretschneider.

Walz, C., ed. 1836. *Rhetores Graeci ex codicibus Florentinis Mediolanensibus Monacensibus Neapolitanis Parisiensibus Romanis Venetis Taurinensibus et Vindobonensibus*. Vol. II. Stuttgart: Cotta.

Wanke, G. 1993 [1980]. "Bibel I. Die Entstehung des Alten Testaments als Kanon." Pages 1–8 in *TRE* VI.

Wankel, H., ed. 1979. *Die Inschriften von Ephesos, Tl. Ia Nr. 1–47 (Texte)*. Inschriften griechischer Städte in Kleinasien 11/1. Bonn: Habelt.

Wartelle, A. 1987. Saint Justin, *Apologies*. EAug. Paris: Études Augustiniennes.

———. 1998. "Quelques remarques sur le vocabulaire philosophique de Saint Justin dans le *Dialogue avec Tryphon*." Pages 67–80 in *Les Apologistes chrétiens et la culture grecque*. Edited by B. Pouderon and J. Doré. ThH 105. Paris: Beauchesne.

Waszink, J. H. 1947. Tertullian, *De Anima*. CChr.SL 2. Turnhout: Brepols.

———. 1965. "Bemerkungen zum Einfluss des Platonismus im frühen Christentum." *VigChr* 19: 129–62 (= Waszink 1979, 352–85).

———. 1979. *Opuscula Selecta*. Leiden: Brill.

Waszink, J. H., and J. C. M. van Winden. 1987. Tertullian, *De idololatria*. SVigChr. 1. Leiden: Brill.

Watson, F. 2013. *Gospel Writing: A Canonical Perspective*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Weber, K.-O. 1962. *Origenes, der Neuplatoniker. Versuch einer Interpretation*. Zetemata 27. Munich: Beck.

Weber, L. 1910. "Apollon Pythoktonos im phrygischen Hierapolis." *Phil.NF* 23: 178–251.

Wegman, H. A. J. 1981. "Un anaphore inclomplète? Les fragments sur papyrus Strasbourg gr. 254." Pages 432–50 in *Studies in Gnosticism and Hellenistic Religions, Presented to Gilles Quispel on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. Edited by R. van den Broek and M. J. Vermaseren. EPRO 91. Leiden: Brill.

———. 1991. "Genealogie des Eucharistiegebetes." *AfLW* 33: 193–216.

Wegner, M. B. 1966. *Die Musensarkophage (Die antiken Sarkophagreliefs 5/3)*. Berlin: Mann.

Weiler, G. 2001. "Stiftungen." Pages 993–95 in *DNP* IX.

Weinel, H. 1899. *Die Wirkungen des Geistes und der Geister im nachapostolischen Zeitalter bis auf Irenäus*. Freiburg: Mohr.

Weinfurter, S. 2005. "Einleitung." Pages 1–9 in *Die Welt der Rituale. Von der Antike bis heute*. Edited by C. Ambos, S. Hotz, G. Schwedler, and S. Weinfurter. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Weingart, P. 1974. "Wissenschaftlicher Wandel als Institutionalisierungsstrategie." Pages 11–35 in *Wissenschaftssoziologie II. Determinanten wissenschaftlicher*

Entwicklung. Sozialwissenschaftliche Paperbacks. Sonderserie: Perspektiven der Wissenschaftsforschung 2. Frankfurt am Main: Athenäum.

Weis, A. 1957. “Die Verteilung der Bildzyklen des Paulin von Nola in den Kirchen von Cimitile (Campanien).” *RQ* 52: 129–49.

Weis, B. K. 1973. Julian, *Briefe, griechisch-deutsch*. TuscBü. Munich: Heimeran.

Weis-Liebersdorf, J. E., ed. 1912. *Sancti Diadochi Episcopi Photicensis De Perfectione Spirituali Capita Centum*. BiTeu. Leipzig: Teubner.

Weissenborn, W., and M. Müller, eds. 1981. *Titi Livi ab urbe condita libri*. Vol. III. BiTeu. Stuttgart: Tuebner.

Weizmann, K. 1977. *Spätantike und frühchristliche Buchmalerei*. Translated by B. Sauerländer (introduction) and H. Preimesberger (image commentary). Die großen Handschriften der Welt. Munich: Prestel.

Welker, M. 1995. *Kirche im Pluralismus*. Kaiser-Taschenbücher 136. Gütersloh: Mohn.

———. 1998. “Missionarische Existenz heute.” *EvTh* 58: 417–21.

Welsch, W. 1997. *Unsere postmoderne Moderne*. 5 ed. Acta Humaniora. Berlin: Akademie.

Wendel, C. 1937. “Neues aus alten Bibliotheken (I).” *ZfB* 54: 585–89 (= Wendel 1974, 13–17).

———. 1939. “Der Bibel-Auftrag Kaiser Konstantins.” *ZfB* 56: 165–75 (= Wendel 1974, 35–45).

———. 1942. “Die erste kaiserliche Bibliothek in Konstantinopel.” *ZfB* 59: 193–209 (= Wendel 1974, 46–63).

———. 1943. “Der antike Bücherschrank.” Pages 267–99 in *NAWG.PH* 7/1943 (= Wendel 1974, 64–92).

———. 1946/1947. “Armarium Legum.” Pages 1–12 in *NAWG.PH* 1/1946/1947 (= Wendel 1974, 93–107).

———. 1949. “Die bauliche Entwicklung der antiken Bibliothek.” *ZfB* 63: 407–28 (= Wendel 1974, 144–64).

———. 1950. *Der Thoraschrein im Altertum*. HM 15. Halle: Niemeyer (= Wendel 1974, 108–43).

———. 1954. “Bibliothek.” Pages 231–74 in *RAC* II.

———. 1974. *Kleine Schriften zum antiken Buch-und Bibliothekswesen*. Edited by W. Krieg. Cologne: Greven.

Wendland, P., ed. 1977 [1916]. *Refutatio omnium haeresium*. Vol. 3 of *Hippolyt Werke*. GCS Hippolyt III. Hildesheim: Olms.

Wenger, L. 1942a. *Canon in den römischen Rechtsquellen und in den Papyri (SAWW 220/2)*. Vienna: Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky.

———. 1942b. “Über canon und regula in den römischen Rechtsquellen.” *ZSRG* 63 K. 32: 495–506.

Wernicke, K. 1895. “Apollon.” Pages 1–111 in *PRE* II/1.

Wessel, K. 1966. “Bibliotheken.” Pages 612–15 in *RBK* I.

Wessely, C. 1925. “Catalogus librorum saeculi V–VI. p. Ch. n.” Pages 184–85 in *Festschrift zu Ehren Emil v. Ottenthals*. SchlSchr 9. Innsbruck: Wagner.

———. 1946. *Les plus anciens monuments du Christianisme écrits sur Papyrus, Textes grecs édités, traduits et annotés*. 2 vols. Paris: Firmin-Didot.

West, M. L. 1967. Oracles of Apollo Kareios, a revised text. *ZPE* 1: 183–87.

Westendorf, W. 1965–1977. *Koptisches Handwörterbuch, bearb. auf Grund des Koptisches Handwörterbuch von W. Spielberg*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Westerink, L. G., and J. Cobès. 1986–1991. *Damascius, Traité des premiers principes*. Vol. I: *De l'ineffable et de l'un*. Texte établi par L. G. Westerink et traduit J. Cobès. CUFr. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1986. Vol. II: *De la triade et de l'unifié*. Texte établi par L. G. Westerink et traduit J. Cobès. CUFr. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1989. Vol. III: *De la procession*. Texte établi par L. G. Westerink et traduit J. Cobès. CUFr. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1991.

Weyman, C. 1926. "Zu den Versen Isidors von Sevilla über seine Bibliothek." Pages 171–77 in *Beiträge zur Geschichte der christlich-lateinischen Poesie*. Munich: Hueber.

Whaling, F. 1981. "The Development of the Word 'Theology.'" *SJTh* 34: 289–312.

Whittaker, M., ed. 1967. *Der Hirt des Hermas*. 2nd revised edition. GCS Apostolische Väter I. Berlin: Akademie.

———. 1976. "Tatian's Educational Background." Pages 57–59 in *Papers Presented to the Sixth International Conference on Patristic Studies Held in Oxford 1971*. Part III: *Tertullian, Origenism, Gnostica, Cappadocian Fathers, Augustiniana, with a cumulative index of contributors to Studia Patristica, Vols. I–XIV*. Edited by E. A. Livingstone. StPatr XIV = TU 117. Berlin: Akademie.

Wickert, U. 1962. *Studien zu den Pauluskommentaren Theodors von Mopsuestia als Beitrag zum Verständnis der antiocheniscen Theologie*. BZNW 27. Berlin: Töpelmann.

Wide, S. 1894. "Inschrift der Iobakchen, MDAI." *Athenische Abteilung* 19: 248–82.

Widengren, G. 1969. "Die Hymnen der Pistis Sophia und die gnostische Schriftauslegung." Pages 269–81 in *Liber Amicorum: Studies in Honour of C. J. Bleeker. Published on the Occasion of His Retirement from the Chair of the History of Religions and the Phenomenology of Religion at the University of Amsterdam*. SHR 17. Leiden: Brill.

Wiegand, T. 1906. *Milet. Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen seit dem Jahre 1899*. Vol. I/7. Berlin: Reimer.

Wieland, C. M. 1909. *Der ungelehrte Büchernarr*. Munich: Müller.

Wifstrand, A. 1967. *Die alte Kirche und die griechische Bildung*. DTb 388 D. Bern: Francke.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. v. 1965 [1881]. *Antigonos von Karystos*. 2 ed. Berlin: Weidmann.

Wilcken, U. 1912. *Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde*. Vol. I/1. Leipzig: Teubner.

———. 1934. *Mitteilungen aus der Würzburger Papyrussammlung*. APAW.PH 6. Berlin: Verlag der Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Wilken, R. L. 1979. "Kollegien, Philosophenschulen und Theologie." Pages 165–93 in *Zur Soziologie des Urchristentums. Ausgewählte Beiträge zum frühchristlichen*

Gemeinschaftsleben in seiner gesellschaftlichen Umwelt. Edited by W. A. Meeks. Munich: Kaiser.

———. 1984. “Alexandria: A School for Training in Virtue.” Pages 15–30 in *Schools of Thought in the Christian Tradition*. Edited by P. Henry. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Williams, D. H. 1989. “The Origins of the Montanist Movement: A Sociological Analysis.” *Religion* 19: 331–51.

Williams, D. S. 1982. “Marcion’s Gospel: Reconsidered.” MA thesis, University of Georgia.

———. 1989. “Reconsidering Marcion’s Gospel.” *JBL* 108: 477–96.

Williams, M. A. 1996. *Rethinking “Gnosticism”: An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Williams, R. 2000 [1996]. “Origenes.” Pages 397–420 in *TRE* XXV.

———. 2002 [1989]. “Does It Make Sense to Speak of Pre-Nicene Orthodoxy?” Pages 1–23 in *The Making of Orthodoxy: Essays in Honour of Henry Chadwick*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2004. “Oratio: Glaubensbekenntnis und Eucharistie.” Pages 38–57 in *Gratiarum actio. Reden anläßlich der Ehrenpromotion des Erzbischofs von Canterbury, the Most Revd Dr. Rowan Douglas Williams durch die Evangelisch-Theologische Fakultät der Rheinischen Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn am 11. März 2004*. Edited by W. Kinzig. Rheinbach: CMZ.

Willis, I. 1970. *Ambrosii Theodosii Macrobii Saturnalia, apparatu critico instruxit, In Somnium Scipionis Commentarios, selecta varietate lectionis ornavit*. 2 vols. BiTeu. Leipzig: Teubner.

Wilpert, W. 1929–1936. *I sarcofagi cristiani antichi*. Monumenti dell’antichita cristiana 1. Rome: Pontificio Istituto di Archeologia Cristiana.

Wilson, S. G. 1996. “Voluntary Associations: An Overview.” Pages 1–15 in *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World*. Edited by S. G. Wilson and J. S. Kloppenborg. London: Routledge.

———. 2002. “Dissidents and Defectors: The Limits of Pluralism.” Pages 441–56 in *Fair Play: Diversity and Conflicts in Early Christianity: Essays in Honour of Heikki Räisänen*. Edited by I. Dunderberg, C. Tuckett, and K. Syreeni. NT.S 103. Leiden: Brill.

Windisch, H. 1935. Review of W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei*. *ChW* 49: 138–39.

Winkelmann, F., ed. 1992. *Über das Leben des Kaisers Konstantin*. Vol. 1 of *Eusebius Werke*. 2 ed. GCS Eusebius I/1. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Winkler, G. 1978. “The Original Meaning and Implications of the Prebaptismal Anointing.” *Worship* 52: 24–45.

———. 1990. “Überlegungen zum Gottesgeist als mütterlichem Prinzip und zur Bedeutung der Androgynie in einigen frühchristlichen Quellen.” Pages 7–29 in *Liturgie und Frauenfrage. Ein Beitrag zur Frauenforschung aus liturgiewissenschaftlicher Sicht*. Edited by T. Berger and A. Gerhards. Pietas Liturgica 7. St. Ottilien: EOS.

———. 1994. “Nochmals zu den Anfängen der Epiklese und des Sanctus im Eucharistischen Hochgebet.” *ThQ* 174: 214–31.

———. 1996. “Weitere Beobachtungen zur frühen Epiklese (den Doxologien und dem Sanctus). Über die Bedeutung der Apokryphen für die Erforschung der Entwicklung der Riten.” *OrChr* 80: 177–200.

———. 1997. “Zur Erforschung orientalischer Anaphoren in liturgievergleichender Absicht I: Anmerkungen zur Oratio post Sanctus und Anamnese bis Epiklese.” *OCP* 63: 363–420.

———. 2002. *Das Sanctus. Über den Ursprung und die Anfänge des Sanctus und sein Fortwirken*. OrChrA 267. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale.

———. 2004. “A New Witness to the Missing Institution Narrative.” Pages 117–28 in *Studia Liturgica Diversa: Essays in Honor of Paul F. Bradshaw*. Edited by M. E. Johnson and L. E. Phillips. Studies in Church Music and Liturgy 8. Portland, Oreg.: Pastoral Press.

———. 2005. *Die Basilius-Anaphora. Edition der beiden armenischen Redaktionen und der relevanten Fragmente, Übersetzung und Zusammenschau aller Versionen im Licht der orientalischen Überlieferungen*. Anaphorae Orientales 2. Anaphorae Armeniacae 2. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale.

Wischmeyer, W. 1982. *Griechische und lateinische Inschriften zur Sozialgeschichte der Alten Kirche*. TKTG 28. Gütersloh: Mohn.

Wlosok, A. 1989. “§ 569 Arnobius.” Pages 365–74 in *Restauration und Erneuerung. Die lateinische Literatur von 284 bis 374 n. Chr*. Edited by R. Herzog. HLL V = HAW VIII/5. Munich: Beck.

Wobbermin, G. 1898. *Altchristliche liturgische Stücke aus der Kirche Ägyptens nebst einem dogmatischen Brief des Bischofs Serapion von Thmuis*. TU 17/3b. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

Wohlenberg, G. 1913. Review of W. Bauer, *Das Johannesevangelium*. *ThLB*: 485–87.

Wolf, P. 1952. *Vom Schulwesen der Antike. Studien zu Libanios*. Baden-Baden: Verlag für Kunst und Wissenschaft.

Wolter, M. 1997. “Ethos und Identität in paulinischen Gemeinden.” *NTS* 43: 430–44.

Wouters, A. 1988. *The Chester Beatty Codex Ac. 1499. A Graeco-Latin Lexicon on the Pauline Epistles and a Greek Grammar*. Chester Beatty Monographs 12. Leuven: Peeters.

Wrede, W. 1891. *Untersuchungen zum Ersten Klemensbriefe*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Wright, W. 1968 [1871]. *Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles*. Edited from Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum and Other Libraries with English Translation and Notes. Vol. I: *The Syriac Texts*. Vol. II: *The English Translations*. Amsterdam: Philo Press.

Wright, W. C. 1989. *Vitae sophistarum*. Pages 319–565 in Philostratus/Eunapius, *The Lives of the Sophists. With an English Translation by W. C. Wright*. LCL 134. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Yamauchi, E. M. 1973. *Pre-Christian Gnosticism: A Survey of the Proposed Evidences*. London: Tyndale Press.

Young, F. M. 1972. *The Idea of Sacrifice in Neoplatonic and Patristic Texts*. TU 108 = StP XI/2. Berlin: Akademie.

———. 1979. *The Use of Sacrificial Ideas in Greek Christian Writers from the New Testament to John Chrysostom*. PatMS 5. Cambridge, Mass.: Philadelphia Patristic Foundation.
Youthie, H. C. 1971. “Βραδέως γράφων: Between Literacy and Illiteracy.” *GRBS* 12: 239–61.
Zahn, T. von. 1866. “Papias von Hierapolis, seine geschichtliche Stellung, sein Werk und sein Zeugniß über die Evangelien.” *ThStKr* 39: 649–96.
———. 1883. *Der Evangeliencommentar des Theophilus von Antiochien*. FGNK 2. Erlangen: Deichert.
———. 1888. *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*. Vol. I/1. Erlangen: Deichert (= Zahn 1975).
———. 1889. *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*. Vol. I/2. Erlangen: Deichert (= Zahn 1975).
———. 1890. *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons. Zweiter Band: Urkunden und Belege zum ersten und dritten Band*. Vol. II/1. Erlangen: Deichert (= Zahn 1975).
———. 1892. *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons. Zweiter Band: Urkunden und Belege zum ersten und dritten Band*. Vol. II/2. Erlangen: Deichert (= Zahn 1975).
———. 1901a. “Kanon des Neuen Testaments.” Pages 768–96 in *RE* IX.
———. 1901b. “Kanon Muratori.” Pages 796–806 in *RE* IX.
———. 1975. *Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons*. 2 parts. Hildesheim: Olms (= Zahn 1888; 1889; 1890; 1892).
———. 1985 [1904]. *Grundriß der Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons*. 3 ed., expanded with an index. With an introduction by U. Swarat. Wuppertal: Brockhaus.
———. 1986 [1924]. *Die Offenbarung des Johannes*. KNT XVIII. Wuppertal: Brockhaus.
Zanker, P. 1995. *Die Maske des Sokrates. Das Bild des Intellektuellen in der antiken Kunst*. Munich: Beck.
Zevit, Z. 1998. “The Second-Third Century Canonization of the Hebrew Bible and Its Influence on Christian Canonizing.” Pages 133–60 in *Canonization and Decanonization*. Edited by A. van der Koij and K. van der Toorn. SHR 82. Leiden: Brill.
Ziebarth, E. 1909. *Aus dem griechischen Schulwesen. Eudemos von Milet und Verwandtes*. Leipzig: Teubner.
———. 1913. *Aus der antiken Schule. Sammlung griechischer Texte auf Papyrus, Holztafeln, Ostraka*. 2 ed. KlT 65. Bonn: Marcus und Weber.
Ziebritzki, H. 1994. *Heiliger Geist und Weltseele. Das Problem der dritten Hypostase bei Origenes, Plotin und ihren Vorläufern*. BHTh 84. Tübingen: Mohr.
Ziegler, K. 1988. Cicero, *Staatstheoretische Schriften. Lateinisch und deutsch*. SQS 31. Berlin: Akademie.
Ziehen, L. 1934. “θεολόγος.” Pages 2031–33 in *PRE* V A 2.
Zimmerli, W. 1961. “Ansprache bei der Trauerfeier. In Memoriam Walter Bauer (8.8.1877–17.11.1960).” *ThLZ* 86: 313–15.

Zimmerli, W., and J. Jeremias. 1961. "In Memoriam Walter Bauer." *ThLZ* 86: 313–16.
Zimmermann, A. E. 1988. *Die urchristlichen Lehrer. Studien zum Tradentenkreis der διδάσκαλοι im frühen Christentum*. 2 ed. WUNT 2.R. 12. Tübingen: Mohr.
Zimmermann, K. 2000. "Späthellenistische Kultpraxis in einer karischen Kleinstadt. Eine neue lex sacra aus Bargylia." *Chiron* 30: 451–85.
Zintzen, C., ed. 1967. *Damascii Vitae Isidori reliquiae*. Bibliotheca Graeca et Latina suppletoria 1. Hildesheim: Olms.
Ziwsa, C., ed. 1893. *Contra Parmenianum Donatistam, Appendix decem monumentorum veterum*. CSEL 26. Vienna: Tempsky.
Zuntz, G. 1995. *Lukian von Antiochien und der Text der Evangelien*. AHAW.PH 2. Heidelberg: Winter.
———. 2005. *Griechische philosophische Hymnen, aus dem Nachlaß*. Edited by H. Cancik and L. Käppel. Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 35. Tübingen: Mohr.
Zwann, J. de. 1937. Review of W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei*. *NThS* 20: 255.

This page intentionally left blank

Index of Ancient Sources

Hagiographica

Liturgica

Concilia, Symbola et alia Corpora

Gnostica

Inscriptions

Index of Ancient Names and Places

Index of Authors