



LOUIS CHARLES WILLARD

A Critical Study
of the Euthalian Apparatus

DE  GRUYTER

Louis Charles Willard
A Critical Study of the Euthalian Apparatus

Arbeiten zur
Neutestamentlichen Textforschung

Herausgegeben im Auftrag des
Instituts für Neutestamentliche Textforschung der Westfälischen
Wilhelms-Universität Münster/Westfalen

von David C. Parker und Holger Strutwolf

Band 41

Walter de Gruyter · Berlin · New York

Louis Charles Willard

A Critical Study of the Euthalian Apparatus

Walter de Gruyter · Berlin · New York

A Ph.D. dissertation originally submitted to Yale University in 1970

Prepared for publication by Simon Crisp

⊗ Printed on acid-free paper which falls within the guidelines
of the ANSI to ensure permanence and durability.

ISBN 978-3-11-021567-0

ISSN 0570-5509

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A CIP catalogue record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie;
detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

© Copyright 2009 by Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, D-10785 Berlin

All rights reserved, including those of translation into foreign languages. No part of this book
may be reproduced in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy,
recording, or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from
the publisher.

Cover design: Christopher Schneider, Laufen

Printed in Germany

Foreword to A Critical Study of the Euthalian Apparatus (2009)

In a remarkable twist, a conversation with Kurt Aland in the early 1970s about the possibility of including this dissertation in the monograph series he edited, *Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung*, is coming to fruition almost forty years later. Thanks to the support of the publisher, Walter de Gruyter; David Parker of the University of Birmingham, who is currently co-editor of the series; and Simon Crisp of the United Bible Societies, who has overseen the scanning and editing of the original typescript, the dissertation that collected, collated, and summarized the bibliographic and manuscript witnesses to the scholarly study of the Euthalian apparatus up to 1970 is now much more widely available to the academic community.

Thanks also to the support of theological librarians at Trinity Western University in British Columbia (Bill Badke), Princeton Theological Seminary (Kate Skrebutenas and Don Vorp), Luther Seminary (Bruce Eldevik), and the Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies in Toronto (James Farge), the bibliography in the present work expands the original bibliography in two ways. It now includes relevant bibliographic references to articles published since 1970 and, in addition, pre-1970 articles that might have appeared in the original bibliography but eluded the bibliographic net cast at the time by the author.

The second area of expansion is also a striking testimony both to the power of the Internet and digitized texts and indices, which were in their infancy in the late 1960s, and to the mastery of these new tools in the present by Bill Badke. It is a worthwhile story. Although I eagerly accepted the invitation for the inclusion of my dissertation in this series, *Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung*, I knew that I no longer had access to the extraordinary theological collections of Yale University and Princeton Theological Seminary, where the original research was done. I did, however, know Bill Badke, and his unique skills. He agreed to undertake the work of identifying relevant, post-1970 articles. At my request, he also sought relevant, pre-1970 articles that the original bibliography had not included. In two weeks, he produced a comprehen-

sive list of new articles. In response to my additional request, he also found seventeen articles and reviews not in the original bibliography. His work stunningly demonstrates the power of digitally-supported research, compared to the inevitably labour intensive process of going through the limited, mostly post-1950 print indexes, going through the annual indexes and tables of contents of a select number of likely journals back to the late nineteenth century, and finally following the leads from the bibliographic notes and references in the first-found articles. For the most part, the articles that Bill found were in journals that, because some selectivity was required, were not included in that initial survey.

The bibliography appears in its original structure, except that the reference works and primary sources are now in a single sequence. The additions, both earlier and subsequent, are incorporated into the bibliography, tagged with an asterisk.

The research in the Euthalian apparatus summarized in the original work tended to focus on externals: Who was the author? When was it written? What were the original constitutive parts, and what parts were later additions? What light do the different versions shed on these questions? In the last thirty-five years, two significant developments occurred.

The first is the brilliant article by Nils A. Dahl, “The ‘Euthalian Apparatus’ and Affiliated ‘Argumenta’” (2000). Having absorbed the studies of the external evidence, Dahl focuses on the content of the apparatus, in its constitutive parts, and reaches important conclusions with respect to authorship, provenance, dates, and the relationship among the various parts, e.g., prologues, chapter lists, *argumenta*, etc.

The second, reflected in the work of David Hellholm and Vemund Blomkvist, “Parainesis as an Ancient Genre-designation: The Case of the ‘Euthalian Apparatus’ and the ‘Affiliated Argumenta,’” (2005) looks at the apparatus from the point of view of a literary form. Blomkvist identified the journal articles incorporating the new literary form approach to the Euthalian apparatus.

The brief note on the Georgian version of the Euthalian apparatus, in Chapter 11, should now be supplemented by the more detailed study of J. Neville Birdsall, “The Euthalian Material and Its Georgian Versions.” Birdsall’s work, in turn, was based on the critical edition of the Georgian version of the apparatus by Korneli Danelia (cited in Birdsall’s article [172, fn. 8, “The Georgian Redaction of the Stichometry of Euthalius”]).

Finally, I want to acknowledge the work of Johannes G. van der Tak, who, in his monograph, *Euthalius the Deacon: Prologues and Abstracts in Greek and Church Slavic Translation* (2003), notes the existence of the Church Slavic version of the apparatus, which the 1970 dissertation did not know.

3 March 2009

Louis Charles Willard

Preface

Most introductory remarks of this sort, although preceding the subject matter at hand, are usually composed at the completion of the study; while it is, thus, fitting to review with thanks the variety of contributions that have made the work possible, I think it is also appropriate to give some consideration to the future. Although this has not been a labour of love, it has been one of a certain joy, and I am looking forward to continued study in the areas that this preliminary investigation has opened.

Materials to support the study of Euthalius have come from many places. I would like to express my appreciation for the book collections that have been gathered by Professor Raymond P. Morris of the Yale Divinity School and by my several predecessors at the Speer Library of Princeton Theological Seminary. I have used 680 with the permission of the Yale University Library, and I have appreciated the photographic facilities of the Harvard University Library, the Library of Congress, and the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. Professor Harold H. Oliver granted me permission to quote from his unpublished Th.M. thesis, “‘Helps for Readers’ in Greek New Testament Manuscripts” (Princeton Theological Seminary, 1955), and I am grateful to Professor Bruce M. Metzger for the suggestion that I consult that thesis.

A special word is due the Institut für neutestamentliche Textforschung in Münster, West Germany. Professor Dr. Kurt Aland and Herr Klaus Junack provided me with exceedingly generous access to the substantial microfilm collection there. The comprehensive survey that I was able to make would, without the resources of this institute, not have been possible. Conclusions would have been restricted to the reports on a limited number of manuscripts used by scholars decades ago; the direction of further study would remain uncertain.

There has been other support as well. From my first year of study at Yale, the Danforth Foundation has provided both financial and intellectual support for graduate study. The Graduate School of Arts and Sciences of Yale University made a grant toward the translation of the major piece of secondary literature in Armenian, and I was fortunate in the linguistic skills of Miss Vartouhi Semerjian. The faculty of the

Yale University Divinity School made possible the travel to the Institut für neutestamentliche Textforschung through the award of a Two Brothers Fellowship.

I particularly appreciate the thoughtful attention of Professor Nils A. Dahl, in whose seminar this thesis germinated and who has provided consistently helpful advice and observations. Whatever useful advances may come from my translation of Euthalius' prologue to the Pauline letters have benefited from the unerring command of patristic Greek of Professor Rowan Greer.

Because wives frequently have a low priority in the process of a dissertation, it is no surprise that Nancy appears toward the end rather than the beginning of this part. Her understanding and positive support, however, have made an immeasurable contribution to the completion of this work. As a symbol of my recognition of that concern and support, I would like to dedicate this essay to her.

Princeton, Easter, 1970

Louis Charles Willard

Conventions

The monograph generally follows the citation, punctuation, and formatting rules outlined in *The SBL Handbook of Style for Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Christian Studies* (ed. Patrick H. Alexander *et al.*; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1999).

Abbreviations for the books of the Bible used in this dissertation are those used in *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, edited by George Arthur Buttrick *et al.* (4 vols.; New York and Nashville, 1962). All other abbreviations or short titles for standard reference tools are those used in *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, edited by Josef Höfer and Karl Rahner (2nd revised ed., 11 vols.; Freiburg: Herder, 1957–67) or have been based on that system.

The abbreviations and short titles for the standard reference tools in this publication come from Siegfried M. Schwertner, *Internationales Abkürzungsverzeichnis für Theologie und Grenzgebiete: Zeitschriften, Serien, Lexika, Quellenwerke mit bibliographischen Angaben = International Glossary of Abbreviations for Theology and Related Subjects: Periodicals, Series, Encyclopedias, Sources with Bibliographical Notes* (2nd, rev. and enlarged ed.; Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter: 1992).

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Foreword to A Critical Study of the Euthalian Apparatus (2009) . | V |
| Preface | IX |
| Conventions | XI |

| | |
|---|---|
| Introduction and Manuscript Tradition | 1 |
|---|---|

Part One: Major Pieces

| | |
|------------------------------|----|
| 1. Prologues | 11 |
| 2. “Lection” Lists | 22 |
| 3. Quotation Lists | 29 |
| 4. Chapter Lists | 47 |

Part Two: Minor Pieces

| | |
|---|----|
| 5. Martyrium Pauli | 59 |
| 6. Argumenta | 69 |
| 7. Miscellaneous Pieces | 73 |
| Ἀποδημῖαι | 73 |
| Τάδε Ἦνεστιν Παύλου Ἐπιστολαί | 74 |
| Διὰ Τί | 75 |
| Ἐπίγραμμα and Πλοῦς | 76 |
| Πρὸς Ἐμαντόν | 77 |
| Subscriptions | 79 |
| 8. Colophon | 83 |
| Notes to Colophon | 84 |

Part Three: Versions

| | |
|-----------------------|-----|
| 9. Armenian | 95 |
| 10. Syriac | 102 |

| | |
|------------------------------|-----|
| 11. Minor Versions | 106 |
| Gothic | 106 |
| Latin and Georgian | 107 |

Part Four

| | |
|--|-----|
| 12. Dating, Authorship, and Provenance | 111 |
|--|-----|

| | |
|-----------------------|-----|
| Conclusions | 129 |
|-----------------------|-----|

Excursus

| | |
|-----------------------|-----|
| Stichometry | 137 |
|-----------------------|-----|

Appendices

| | |
|--|-----|
| 1. The Prologue of Euthalius, Bishop of Sulca, Prefixed to the Fourteen Letters of the Blessed Apostle Paul | 147 |
| 2. Quotation List in Acts | 157 |
| 3. Manuscript Survey | 158 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Bibliography | 171 |
| Selected Critical Books and Articles | 171 |
| Selected Texts and Reference Works | 178 |

| | |
|--------------------------------------|-----|
| Indices | 181 |
| Person, Place, and Subject | 181 |
| Manuscript Index | 182 |
| Scripture Index | 182 |

Introduction and Manuscript Tradition

This monograph deals with a body of material, ancillary to the Pauline and Catholic epistles and Acts, known as the Euthalian apparatus; this apparatus, in its most comprehensive form, includes prologues, chapter lists, *argumenta*, quotation lists, lection tables, and other literary notes. All or parts of it are found in numerous Greek as well as some Armenian and Syriac manuscripts of the New Testament; moreover, there may be traces in the Latin, Gothic, and Georgian versions. Some early printed editions of the Bible contained sections of the apparatus.¹ In 1698, Lorenzo Alessandro Zacagni published the first “critical” collection of this material,² and subsequently this text was reproduced by Gallandi³ and Migne.⁴

1 The numbers identifying the following editions, where available, have been taken from Thomas Herbert Darlow and Horace Franklin Moule, comps., *Historical Catalogue of the Printed Editions of Holy Scripture in the Library of the British and Foreign Bible Society* (2 vols. in 4; London: The Bible House, 1903–11). Sources for these early editions were Lorenzo Alessandro Zacagni, *Collectanea monumentorum veterum ecclesiae graecae* (vol. 1; Rome: Typis Sacrae Congreg. de propag. fide, 1698), lxi, lxxxvi, and Albert Ehrhard, “Der Codex H ad epistulas Pauli und ‘Euthalios diaconos,’” *ZfB* 8 (1891): 386.

1. *Biblia sacra polyglotta*, studio et opera Cardinalis Francisci Ximenes de Cisneros (6 vols.; Academia Complutensi: A. G. de Brocario, 1514–17). 1412.

2. *Nouum Instrumentū omne*, diligenter ab Erasmo Roterodamo recognitum & emendatum (Basel: In aedibus Ioannis Frobenii, 1516). 4591.

3. Τῆς Καννῆς Διαθήκης ἅπαντα (Paris: Ex officina Roberti Stephani typographi Regii, Regiis typis, 1550). 4622.

4. *Novum Testamentum*, accessit Prologus in Epistolas S. Apostoli Pauli, ex antiquissimo MSC (ed. by Johann Heinrich Boeckler; Strassburg: Mulbius, 1645). 4689. (2d ed.; Ex offic. I. Stadelii, 1660).

5. *Expositiones antiquae* . . . ex diversis sanctorum patrum commentariis ab Oecumenio et Aretha collectae (ed. by B. Donato; Verona: Apud Stephanum & fratres Sabios, 1532).

2 Zacagni, *Collectanea*, 401–708. The author’s name is sometimes spelled Zacagnius or Zaccagni.

3 Andreas Gallandi, ed., *Biblioteca veterum patrum antiquorumque scriptorum ecclesiasticorum* (vol. 10; Venice: Ex typographia Joannis Baptistae Albritii Hieron. fil., 1774), 197–320.

Our interest in this material was first aroused during a consideration of possible ways to trace what influence the library at Caesarea, as a center of learning and study of the text of the Bible, might have had on the text of the New Testament. In the course of this consideration we encountered the theory that associates the development of the Euthalian apparatus with the library at Caesarea. That encounter has not really been brought to an end, and this monograph represents a preliminary attempt to set out some of the results of our subsequent studies.

These studies have been shaped by three observations that seemed rather clear, following the initial examination of the secondary literature:

1. There is a disconnectedness about some of the arguments in this literature, a disconnectedness produced by an incomplete knowledge of or reference to the work of predecessors.
2. There is no English translation of any significant part of this apparatus. Although some critical points are rendered in the secondary literature and a translation of the chapter list of Acts, attributed to Pamphilus, is available,⁵ there is nothing else.
3. There is little or no information on the distribution of the apparatus in many Greek manuscripts. There is even less evidence from the versions.

The purpose of this monograph is to deal with problems inherent in these observations, and we may formulate it as follows: To provide a critical summary and evaluation of the positions maintained in the secondary literature, supplemented by the results of an extensive survey of the manuscript tradition, and to offer an annotated translation of the prologue to the Pauline epistles.

Immediately following this introduction, we will take up in detail the manuscript sources for these investigations. Our own research was limited to the Greek tradition; most of it was carried out at the Institut für neutestamentliche Textforschung at Münster. We reviewed there, on microfilm, more than 400 manuscripts that we had identified as possibly containing all or parts of the apparatus. In these manuscripts, the

4 PG 85: 627–790. References to the text of Euthalius are noted both in Zacagni and in Migne, citing the page in Zacagni and the column and section in Migne, e.g., Z 528 f.; M 708A.

5 Pamphilus, “An Exposition of the Chapters of the Acts of the Apostles” (ANF 6; Buffalo: The Christian Literature Company, 1886), 166–68.

text of the New Testament itself does not stand alone but is accompanied by a quantity of supplementary material. In addition to numerous pages of prefatory material, such as the prologues, “lection” lists, and quotation lists that are the subject of our study, the texts of individual letters are sandwiched between chapter lists and *argumenta*. Frequently, there is surrounding commentary so that the actual text may occupy only the inside-middle quarter of two facing pages of a manuscript. Moreover, we discovered that parts of the apparatus, particularly the smaller pieces, have no fixed position in relation to other parts but tend to float. In this respect, the orderly presentation that follows should not deceive the reader.

The first major section is a review of the relationships and contents of the more prominent sections of the apparatus, including commentary from the secondary literature. There are a number of other pieces, associated in the manuscript tradition with, and fixed by Zacagni’s edition to, the Euthalian apparatus; it is the function of the second major section to examine the probability of authenticity of these fringe elements.

The versional evidence represents an unusual sort of problem for us to handle. Apart from the difficulties surrounding the particular questions of this investigation, the several versions involved already manifest a complex array of unsolved riddles. Moreover, we are not equipped to handle these materials critically. We have, therefore, devoted the comprehensive discussion of the evidence that we have under review from these versions to a section following our review of the Greek tradition. There are, however, a number of instances in which the adducement of the facts from one or more of these versions was merited, e.g., where it is merely a question of the presence or absence of an entire piece from the tradition of a particular version or where the data are relatively straightforward and could usefully be taken into account in the general discussion, as in the case of the calendrical data in the *Martyrium*.

Following the comprehensive discussion of the versional evidence, we deal with the questions of dating, provenance, and authorship raised in the secondary literature. Finally, there is a summary restatement of the significant conclusions, together with an analysis of the important questions left unresolved with as much in the way of direction as may be appropriate.

The last part of the monograph is the annotated translation of the prologue to the Pauline epistles. The annotations include results of the manuscript survey together with notes on points that are significant

for an evaluation of the theological portrait of Paul implicit in the prologue.

For the purpose of an introductory orientation we will begin with the prologues and the data they provide, looking briefly and rather uncritically at what the author himself, whom we shall call Euthalius without prejudicing any final judgment of authorship, claims to have produced.

Even a very superficial examination turns up evidence that we are here dealing with work that has taken shape in several stages. Remarks appearing in the prologue to Acts distinguish between work at hand and earlier work on the Pauline letters. Moreover, Euthalius indicates that there are parts that are not original but were taken from an unnamed predecessor. Thus, we already know that we are dealing with sources and first and second editions; we may anticipate that there were probably “revised and enlarged” editions as well. These distinctions, however, we shall leave to later chapters.

There are three prologues. The Pauline is the longest and, according to the internal testimony of the apparatus, the first to be written. It has three major sections preceded by an elaborate apologia for the project. The first and third sections deal with the life of Paul. The first is more anecdotal, and the other, more narrowly chronological. The second section is a brief summary of the fourteen letters attributed to Paul. At the end of the second section, Euthalius reviews what he has been about, and this provides a minimal table of contents. He asserts

καθ' ἐκάστην δὲ συντόμως ἐπιστολὴν ἐν τοῖς ἐξῆς προτάξομεν τὴν τῶν κεφαλαίων ἑκθεσιν, ἐνὶ τῶν σοφωτάτων τινί, καὶ φιλοχρίστῳ πατέρων ἡμῶν πεπονημένην, οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν τῶν ἀναγνώσεων ἀκριβεστάτην τομὴν, τὴν τε τῶν θείων μαρτυριῶν εὐαπόδεκτον εὔρεσιν ἡμεῖς τεχνολογήσαντες ἀνεκεφαλαιωσάμεθα, ἐπιτιπορευόμενοι τῇ της ὑφῆς ἀναγνώσει.⁶

ἡ τῶν κεφαλαίων ἑκθεσις represents an outline of the contents of each letter, organized by chapters, some of which have subdivisions.

ἡ τῶν ἀναγνώσεων ἀκριβεστάτη τομὴ appears to be a table that groups one or more chapters into ἀναγνώσεις of varying length.

ἡ τῶν θείων μαρτυριῶν εὐαπόδεκτος εὔρεσις is a list of quotations found in the letters; these quotations are mostly from the Old Testament but also include some from the Gospels and a number of apocryphal books. In most manuscripts, there are two different types of lists,

6 Z 528 f.; M 708A.

and one of the purposes of the later, critical evaluation is to determine whether one of these preceded the other.

The other two prologues serve more the apologetic ends of the author than to introduce the material they preface. The prologue to the Catholic epistles repeats the announcement of the first and third items, “ἐγὼ δέ τοι στιχηδὸν τὰς καθολικὰς καὶ ἑξῆς ἐπιστολὰς ἀναγνώσομαι, τὴν τῶν κεφαλαίων ἔκθεσιν ἅμα, καὶ θείων μαρτυριῶν μετρίως ἐνθύνδε ποιούμενος.”⁷ The prologue to Acts, while it does not specifically mention this material, remarks on other aspects of Euthalius’ work, notably echoing part of the above, “πρῶτον δὴ οὖν ἔγωγε τὴν ἀποστολικὴν βίβλον στοιχιδὸν ἀναγνούς τε καὶ γράψας,”⁸ and later, “. . . τὴν τε τῶν πράξεων βίβλον ἅμα, καὶ καθολικῶν ἐπιστολῶν ἀναγνῶναί τε κατὰ προσῳδιαν, καὶ πῶς ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι, καὶ διειλεῖν τούτων ἑκάστης τὸν νοῦν λεπτομερῶς, . . . στοιχηδὸν τε συνθεῖς τούτων τὸ ὕφος κατὰ τὴν ἑμαυτοῦ συμμετρίαν πρὸς εὐσημον ἀνάγνωσιν.”⁹ In this introduction, we have only sought a limited inventory of the evidence in the prologues for material contents; in the above passages, there are, above this, references to the *form* of the text, and it will be necessary to take up the question of Euthalian stichometry in an excursus.

In the pages that follow we will take up successively the prologues, the “lection” lists, the quotation lists, and the chapter lists. These four parts constitute those sections that are included in Zacagni’s edition that also have some clear roots in Euthalius’ own outline of his work. There are a considerable number of pieces that are also included in Zacagni’s edition that have less *a priori* claim to inclusion. These we review following the discussion of the major pieces. Among these pieces are the following, which we here identify by title and briefly describe:

1. *Martyrium Pauli*:¹⁰ This is a brief chronological note that states the martyrdom of Paul in Rome and dates it with several chronological co-ordinates. These chronological notices have supplied the primary data for most attempts to date the whole apparatus.
2. *Argumenta*: These are paragraph length summaries of each of the epistles and Acts.
3. Ἀποδημία:¹¹ A bare Pauline travelogue.

7 Z 477; M 668B.

8 Z 404; M 629A.

9 Z 409 f.; M 633Bf.

10 Z 535 ff.; M 713B–716A.

11 Z 425 ff.; M 649B–652A.