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Geoffrey Mark Hahneman
Christ Church
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Trinity term, 1987

ABSTRACT

The traditional consensus that the New Testament Canon was formed by the end of the second century has been weakened by the results of modern studies. The traditional viewpoint now depends primarily upon the evidence of the Muratorian Fragment. Albert C. Sundberg, Jr., in his argument for a revision of the history of the Christian Canon, has called for the redating of the Muratorian Fragment. Through a careful analysis of the Fragment's traditional dating, and of its place within the history of the Canon, this study will confirm Sundberg's theory.

The second century date of the Fragment is ultimately dependent upon the simple Latin phrase, *nuperrime temporibus nostris*, within a series of references to The Shepherd of Hermas. Sundberg has attempted to broaden the common interpretation of this phrase, but the commonly held interpretation is dubious in itself because of the known poor transcription and the suspected careless translation of the Fragment, and because the other references to The Shepherd are erroneous and late. No other references within the Fragment support a conclusive second century date.

Within the history of the Christian Canon, the Fragment, if traditionally dated, is a serious anomaly in terms of concept, form, and contents. There is nothing to distinguish the Fragment from the fifteen undisputed Catalogues which appear in the fourth and early fifth century, and nothing to suggest that the Fragment is earlier. Indeed, there are numerous elements within the Fragment that are unparalleled in the West or are exceptional until later. The cumulative evidence is too significant to be dismissed because of one, most likely incorrect, association of Hermas with Pius of Rome.

The Muratorian Fragment redated as a fourth century Eastern document, possibly originating from Palestine or western Syria around 375, is a more reasonable conclusion of the evidence available.
In 1964, Albert C. Sundberg, Jr., published a distinguished work on the Old Testament in the early Church. As a consequence of this study, Sundberg argued for a revision of the history of the Christian canon which entailed moving the decisive period in the development of the New Testament from the end of the second century into the fourth century. The traditional argument for a New Testament canon at the end of the second century has been weakened by the results of modern studies and has now become dependent primarily upon the evidence of the Muratorian Fragment.

At the Third International Congress on New Testament Studies (Oxford, 1965), Sundberg called for the redating of the Muratorian Fragment. He suggested an early fourth century date and an Eastern (Syrian/Palestinian) provenance. Sundberg's argument has been generally ignored or dismissed by scholars. Yet Sundberg's proposals deserve serious study and consideration because the date of the Muratorian Fragment is so crucial to the common understanding of the history of the New Testament. Based upon a careful analysis of the Fragment's traditional dating and its place in the history of the canon, this study will confirm Sundberg's conclusions of an Eastern provenance and fourth century date for the Fragment.

The Muratorian Fragment was first published in 1740 as an example of a barbarous scribal transcription. The beginning and probably the end of the Fragment are missing. A substantial portion of its poor Latin may be credited to the carelessness of the scribe of the Codex Muratorianus, which is especially apparent in a repeated passage of Ambrose following the Fragment. Excerpts of the Muratorian Fragment discovered in three eleventh and one twelfth century Latin manuscript of the Corpus Paulinum at the Benedictine monastery on Monte Cassino confirm that the poor Latin of the Fragment is not that of the archetype.

The orthography of the Fragment suggests that it or one of its exemplar(s) was transcribed by dictation. The transcription parallels in many places spoken Latin of the third and fourth centuries. This lead J. Campos to demonstrate that the Latin of the Fragment is late. The vocabulary of the Fragment confirms a date for the Latin in the last decade of the fourth century. So late a date for the Latin of the text would preclude the possibility of a Latin original for the Fragment, since the Fragment contains elements that must be dated earlier. If Latin is not the language of the Fragment's autograph, then the Fragment is most likely a translation from Greek. The hypothesis of a Greek original has aided in understanding
some of the difficult and confusing passages in the Fragment as simply poor translations into Latin. However if the traditional dating of the Fragment is questioned and a Greek original for the Fragment is supposed, then the Fragment would be most likely to have an Eastern provenance.

The traditional Western origin of the Fragment is questionable. H. Koch has shown that the Fragment most probably did not originate from the city of Rome. The presence of Revelation in the Fragment is not remarkable, unless it was thought to be late fourth century. The absence of James and Hebrews (and I Peter) is inconclusive because of the probability of defects in the Fragment. If omissions are allowed then a provenance for the Fragment cannot be supported by the absence of James or Hebrews. Thus the traditional provenance of the Fragment is disputed.

A plain reading of the Fragment suggests that it was composed very shortly after the episcopacy in Rome of Hermas' brother Pius (c. 140-c. 154). However few scholars have been willing to date the Fragment so early, and have instead argued for composition anywhere between 170 and 220. The traditional dating for the Fragment, dependent upon the key phrase *nuperrime temporibus nostris*, is dubious because of the known poor transcription and the suspected careless translation of the MS. Dating the Fragment by other references is inconclusive, and there has been no scholarly consensus about its authorship. Moreover Sundberg has broadened the common interpretation of the statement upon which the date is traditionally based. The intention of the Fragmentist may well have been: "But Hermas wrote the Shepherd most recently (that is, later than the apostolic books previously mentioned) in our time (that is, not in apostolic time), in the city of Rome, while his brother Pius was the bishop occupying the episcopal chair of the church of the city of Rome" (11. 73-7). Such a translation would free the dating of the Fragment from association with the time of the writing of The Shepherd and the episcopacy of Pius.

While the traditional dating of the Muratorian Fragment is based upon its statements about The Shepherd of Hermas, those statements appear to be erroneous or misleading on several counts. First, the dating of The Shepherd in the Fragment during the episcopacy of Pius (c. 140-c. 154) is uncorroborated and most probably incorrect. The internal evidence of The Shepherd suggests a date around the term of the first century (c. 100), viz. with its apparent reference to Clement of Rome and to a persecution most readily identified with the time of Domitian or the early years of Trajan, and with the absence of mention of any earlier or later Roman history, or a monarchal episcopate. The fact that The Shepherd was so widely and approvingly disseminated, viz. among Irenaeus, Tertullian (in his Catholic phase), and Clement of Alexandria, without any apparent recollection of authorship, would also discourage a dating in the middle of the second century.

Secondly, the tradition of authorship of The Shepherd
presented in the Fragment, viz. by Pius’ brother, is also unlikely to be correct, and is otherwise unknown until the fourth century, viz. in the Liberian Catalogue (354) and the *Carmen adversus Marcionitas* (354+). The insistence in the Fragment that Hermas was not apostolic, would suggest a knowledge of the tradition of authorship by an apostolic Hermas, which probably originated with Origen (c. 244). This is a peculiarly Eastern tradition, viz. Origen, Eusebius, Jerome (in Bethlehem), and was probably dependent upon an Eastern recension of Romans which included chapter 16. Even chapter 15 of Romans may have been unknown in the West at the time when the Fragment is traditionally dated, and yet the Fragmentist appears to have known it.

Thirdly, the reception of *The Shepherd* in the church as depicted by the Fragment if traditionally dated is questionable because it is paralleled most clearly by Eastern sources of the fourth century, viz. Eusebius, Athanasius, the list in Codex Claromontanus, and Codex Sinaiticus. The attitude of limited acceptance reflected in the Fragment stands in contrast both to Tertullian who represents a sectarian rejection of the work and to the wholehearted acceptance of the work evidenced in Irenaeus and Clement of Alexandria.

If the statements in the Fragment about *The Shepherd* are mistaken on these counts, then the statement, viz. that the Fragment was composed shortly after the episcopacy of Pius, is dubious in itself. The traditional dating of the Fragment which is based primarily upon this statement must be seen as insecure at best.

Within the history of the Christian canon, the Muratorian Fragment, if traditionally dated, is a serious anomaly. The formation of the Christian Canon of Scriptures was otherwise a gradual process that culminated in the fourth century. In the case of Jewish Scriptures, the Church inherited a large body of works which it apparently attempted to define and limit only later in the fourth century. With regards to specifically Christian Scriptures, the Church began at an early stage to collect its valued works and accumulate a complement to the books of the Old Testament. However, not until the fourth century did the churches appear to define and restrict that New Testament Collection. The development of the New Testament Collection was one of continual accumulation and expansion into the fourth century. The Fourfold Gospel is the only sub-canonical Collection that appears closed before the actual activity of fourth century canonization. It is only in that later process that the other Collections, viz. the Old Testament, and the Pauline and Catholic Epistle Collections, appear to have been fixed and established.

The idea of a so-called "core New Testament Canon" at the end of the second century is now seen as misleading and unfounded. Once a distinction is made between "Scripture" and "Canon," the idea of a New Testament Canon does not appear applicable before the fourth century. Instead a "core New Testament Collection" might be spoken of, which while remaining open, contained a number of works which were regularly appealed to for religious authority, i.e. as
Scripture. But the elements of that "core New Testament Collection" are probably not as numerous as they were previously thought to be. The four later canonical Gospels enjoyed widespread usage, but there were disputes, and the Fourfold Gospel Canon should be seen as only an innovation at the end of the second and beginning of the third century. A "core" Pauline Collection of perhaps the letters to seven churches in the West, plus Hebrews in the East, appears accepted in the second half of the second century. But the Pastorals should not be thought of as elements of that Collection until later in the third century. Among the Catholic Epistle Collection, a "core" of I Peter and I John (and maybe James) might be postulated from the beginning of the third century. Thus there is a good case for postulating a "core New Testament Collection" of maybe the Fourfold Gospel, the Pauline letters to seven churches (and Hebrews in the East), and the Major Catholic epistles from the beginning of the third century.

The Muratorian Fragment suggests a much larger New Testament Collection than this "core," including the Pastorals, Jude, II & III (?) John, the Wisdom of Solomon, the Revelations of John and Peter, and Acts. The Fragment, if traditionally dated, is thus an anomaly in terms of its contents. It would be one of the earliest, if not the earliest, witness to a Fourfold Gospel Canon. It would be the earliest witness for the addition of the Pastorals to the Pauline Collection. The Fragment's Catholic epistle Collection is unparalleled, especially in its absence of I Peter, and maybe James. If these works are simply missing from the Fragment, then the Fragment would represent the earliest larger Collection including Minor Catholic epistles. Therefore the hypothesis of a "core New Testament Collection" does not support the traditional dating of the Fragment, but serves to emphasize the extraordinary character of its contents, if it is dated at the end of the second century.

More significantly, the Muratorian Fragment clearly represents something more than a Collection, however large. The Fragment represents a Canon---a closed collection of Scriptures. It delineates a specific group of works which the Fragmentist stated are accepted in the catholic church, viz. (Matthew, Mark), Luke, John, Acts, I & II Corinthians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Galatians, I & II Thessalonians, Romans, Philemon, Titus, I & II Timothy, Jude, I, II, & (III?) John, Wisdom of Solomon, Revelations of John and Peter. The Fragmentist also clearly noted works which were rejected, viz. Laodiceans, Alexandrians, and anything from Arsinous, Valentinus, and Miltiades (?), as well as those works which are disputed (Revelation of Peter) or restricted to private reading (The Shepherd). The Fragment entails both conceptual elements and contents which are not elsewhere found in the churches until the fourth century. Thus the Fragment, if traditionally dated, is an anomaly in the development of the Christian Canon both in the concepts it implies and the contents it suggests.

The Fragment, if traditionally dated, is also an anomaly in terms of form. The Fragment is clearly a
"Catalogue." It distinctly delineated the accepted, disputed, and rejected works, without significant narration. Boundaries are clearly established in the Fragment. Yet the Catalogue as a New Testament format is nowhere else extant in surviving literature until the fourth century, at least one hundred years later. In the fourth century, numerous Catalogues appeared in all parts of the Church. There is nothing about the form of the Fragment which distinguishes it from the fifteen undisputed Catalogues of the fourth and early fifth century, and nothing that suggests that it was earlier than the others, or that it influenced their development. Rather, the Fragment appears as simply another New Testament list which ought to find its place at that time. It is at the same time that the Church began to employ the word "canon" for its Scriptures and that the first MS. Collections of the whole Christian Bible are extant. While some list has to be first, it is more than a question of just being the first. The Muratorian Fragment, if traditionally dated, is an extraordinary anomaly in the development of the Christian Bible on numerous counts.

There are a number of peculiar features in the Fragment which would not be anomalous if the Fragment was redated to the late fourth century and thought to be Eastern. Numerous elements within the Fragment are unparalleled in the West, or are exceptional until later, viz. the Eastern order of Gospels, the form of its Johannine legend, its description of the Acts of "all" the Apostles, the apparent reference to the Latin Laodiceans, the inclusion of the Wisdom of Solomon and a denial of Solomonic authorship, the inclusion of Miltiades among heretics, the reference to the Marcionite psalter, the use of the work "cataphrygians," and its inclusion in a Codex in which all the readily dated contents are fourth and fifth century and two-thirds of the pages are from Eastern sources. The instances of fourth century Eastern parallels in the Fragment are too numerous to be quickly dispelled with, because of one, most likely incorrect, association of Hermas and Pius of Rome, with its entailment of a second century Western dating. The Muratorian Fragment redated as a fourth century Eastern document, possibly originating from Palestine or western Syria around 375, is far more probable because of the cumulative evidence of these peculiarities.
INTRODUCTION

In 1964, Albert C. Sundberg, Jr., published a distinguished work on the Old Testament in the early Church.1 This well received study refuted the hypothesis of an Alexandrian canon and radically changed the traditional understanding of the formation of the Christian Old Testament. It is now widely believed that the Christian church did not receive a closed canon of scripture from Judaism but a looser collection of sacred writings. The Jewish Canon appears not to have been established until after the Christians had left the synagogues. It was not until the third century and later that the Christians came to struggle with the problem of establishing their own canon of Jewish writings. This explains why the Old Testament of the early church differs from the Jewish Canon.

The year after Sundberg published his monograph, and as a consequence of this earlier work, he argued for a revision of the history of the New Testament canon at the Third International Congress on New Testament Studies (Oxford, 1965).2 Sundberg insisted that "the struggle to determine the Old Testament canon in the church plays a more significant role, at least as paralleling more closely the canonization of the New Testament in point of time and, perhaps, as an influencing factor in the formation of the New Testament canon."3 Such a revision, Sundberg acknowledged, would entail moving the decisive period of New Testament canonical history from the end of the second
century into the fourth century.

The ancient tradition that the Apostle John fixed the contents of the New Testament about the end of the first century was dispelled when the Age of Enlightenment produced critical studies revealing that some New Testament works had not been written by that time. J.S. Semler of Halle (1725-91) made perhaps the first modern investigation of the history of the canon and showed that the New Testament was not the work a single man and was not established until towards the end of the second century. B.F. Westcott popularized this tradition in England in the mid-nineteenth century.

The belief that a New Testament canon was established by the end of the second century was based primarily upon the evidence of the Muratorian Fragment in the West and the Peshitta in the East. The tradition was thought to be further supported by the existence in the second century of the Old Latin versions and by the scriptural references of Irenaeus of Lyons, Clement of Alexandria, and Tertullian in North Africa. As Westcott wrote, "From the close of the second century the history of the Canon is simple, and its proof clear." This history of the New Testament canon has remained virtually unaltered for the last hundred and thirty years.

However, the traditional argument for a New Testament canon at the end of the second century has been weakened by the results of several modern studies. It has now been shown, for instance, that the Peshitta did not originate until at least the late fourth century and is thus not a
witness to a second century New Testament canon. The Old Latin versions are no longer viewed as a unity and therefore do not represent a "canon," but only scattered translations, much like the Old Syriac versions. As F. Kenyon wrote, "we are not to suppose that the whole of the New Testament was translated (into Old Latin) at any one time, but at various times somewhat unliterary versions of different books were made, which were subject to haphazard revision and improvement at different times and in different localities." Furthermore the demonstration of extensive use of noncanonical writings by Clement of Alexandria, and to a lesser degree, by Irenaeus and Tertullian, further weakened the hypothesis. The redating of the so-called Anti-Marcionite and Monarchian Prologues to the Gospels has also undermined the tradition of a second century core New Testament. R.P.C. Hanson's conclusion that Clement of Alexandria and Origen had no concept of a New Testament canon in the third century showed yet another serious weakness in the traditional hypothesis. "It is quite possible that the Alexandrian school was unusual in their attitude to the Canon," wrote Hanson; "We have the evidence of the Muratorian Canon to show that in the time of Clement of Alexandria the 'closed canon' was a conception known at Rome. ... But certainly in Alexandria in the time of Clement and Origen the conception of 'a closed "apostolic canon"' is unknown." The traditional hypothesis of a core New Testament canon at the end of the second century has now become dependent primarily upon the evidence of the Muratorian Fragment.
A significant factor in Sundberg's call for a revised history of the formation of the New Testament was the redating of the Muratorian Fragment, for which he argued at the Oxford Congress in 1965. However, it was not until 1973 that Sundberg published in full his argument for the redating of the Fragment. Sundberg questioned the traditional late second century dating and Western provenance generally assigned to the Fragment since its publication in 1740. Instead he suggested an early fourth century date and an Eastern (Syrian/Palestinian) provenance. The idea of a later date for the Fragment was known to Westcott, who noted that "the opinions of those who assign it to the fourth century... scarcely deserve mention." Similarly Sundberg's argument has generally been dismissed by scholars, usually in footnotes, as "not convincing," "arbitrary," "questionable," not persuasive or raising more problems than it solves. E. Ferguson has published the only substantial rebuttal to Sundberg, but one which is still brief and dismissive. Yet a few scholars have been persuaded by Sundberg's argument. And Norman Perrin and Dennis Duling recognized the importance of the question, noting that "if he is correct, one of the major turning points in the development of the canon cannot be sustained as is usual."

Sundberg's predications deserve serious study and consideration because the date of the Muratorian Fragment is so crucial to the common understanding of the history of the New Testament. The present study will confirm Sundberg's argument that the traditional dating for the
Fragment is tendentious. Based upon a careful analysis of its traditional dating and its place in the history of the canon, this study will suggest an Eastern provenance and a fourth century date for the Fragment. The study will also reinforce Sundberg's call for a revised history of the New Testament canon, and will sketch a development of the Christian Bible that is more gradual in its formation and that culminates not at the end of the second century, but in the midst of the fourth.
CHAPTER ONE

THE PUBLICATION OF THE MURATORIAN FRAGMENT

Between the years 1738 and 1742, Lodovico Antonio Muratori (1672-1750), archivist and librarian at Modena (1700-1750), edited a collection of seventy-five essays in six volumes on different historical themes, entitled *Antiquitates Italicae Medii Aevi*. In the third volume of this collection (Milan, 1740), Muratori included an early list of the books of the New Testament from a Codex in the Ambrosian Library at Milan (no. I 101 sup.), where he was formerly a librarian (1695-1700). His object in publishing this document, the so-called Muratorian Fragment, was to exhibit a striking example of the barbarism of some scribes in Italy during the Middle Ages.¹

THE MURATORIAN FRAGMENT

The Muratorian Fragment consists of only 85 lines.² The beginning and probably the end are missing for the Fragment commences in the midst of a sentence and ends abruptly.

THE MURATORIAN FRAGMENT:³

The lines in bold print are rubricated in the MS.
The letters in parentheses were erased by corrector(s).
The letters italicized were added by corrector(s) either by substitution or superscription.⁴

Folio 10a

| quibus tamen Interfuit et ita posuit-   |
| tertio euangelii librum sec(a)undo Lucan | Lucas Iste medicus post ascensum xpi. |
| Cum eo Paulus quasi ut iuris studiosum.   | 5 Secundum adsumisset numeni suo |
| ex opinione concripset dnm tamen nec Ipse |
| (d)uidit in carne et ide prout asequi potuit- |
Ita et ad natiuitate Iohannis incipet dicere. quarti euangeliorum Iohannis ex decipolis
cohortantibus condiscipulis et eipis suis
dixit conieunate mihi odie triduo et quid
cuique fuerit reuelatum alterutrum
nobis ennarremus eadem nocte reue
latum andreae ex apostolis ut recognis
centibus cuntis Iohannis suo nomine
cuncta disciparet et ideo licit uaria sin
culis euangeliorum libris principia
doceantur Nihil tamen differt creden
tium fidei cum uno ac principali spiu de
clarata sint in omnibus omnia de natiui
tate de passione de resurrectione
de conversatione cum decipulis suis
ac de gemino eius aduentu
Primo In humilitate dispectus quod (fo
tu) secundum potestate regali pre
clarum quod futurum est. quid ergo
mirum si Iohannes tam constanter
sincula etia In epistulis suis proferat
dicens In semeipsu Quae uidimus oculis
nostris et auribus audiuimus et manus
nostrae palpauerunt haec scripsimus uobis

Folio 10b
Sic enim non solum uisurem sed & auditorem
sed et scriptor omnium mirabiliu dni per ordi
nem profetetur Acta aut omnium apostolorum
sub uno libro scribta sunt Lucas obtisme theopi
le comprindit quia sub praesentia eius singula
gerebantur sicut(e) et semote passione Petri
euidenter declarat Sed & profectione pauli a(d)b ur
be(s) ad spania proficescentis Epistulae autem
Pauli quae a quo loco uel qua ex causa directe
sint uolen(t)a)titulus intellegere Ipse declarant
Primu omnium corintheis scysmae heresis In
terdicens deIncepsb B callaectis circumcisione
Romanis aut(e) or(ni)dicre scriptrarum sed (et)
principium earum (ods) esse xpm Intimans
prolexius scripsit de quibus sincolis Neces
se est ad nobis desputari Cum ipse beatus
apostolus paulus sequens predecessoris sui
Iohannis ordine nonnisi (c)homenati semptae
ecles(e)iis scribat ordine tali a corenthios
praia.ad efesios seconda ad philippinse ter
via ad colosensis quarta ad calatas quin
ta ad tensaoleneinsis sexta. ad romanos
septima Uerum cor(e)hineis et thesolecen
sibus licet pro correbtione Iteretur una
tamen per omnem orbem terrae ecclesia
defusa esse denocitur Et Iohannis eni In a
pocalebsy licet septe eccles eiis scribat
tamen omnibus dicit ueru ad filemonem una:
et at titu una et ad tymotheu duas pro afec
to et dilectione In honore tamen eclesiae ca
tholice In ordinatione eclesiastice
A passage from Ambrose (De Abraham, 1.3.5) which follows the Muratorian Fragment in the Codex (Folio 11a, line 24-Folio 11b, line 27) exemplifies the carelessness of the scribe because the entire fragment, some thirty-five lines, is accidentally repeated immediately after itself (Folio 11b, line 27-Folio 12a, line 25). Thus the Codex contains two copies of the same text, one after another, presumably from the same original. Moreover in the Codex, Folios 11b and 12a, which open opposite each other, both commence with the same line, so that twenty-five lines of the repeated passage are directly in front of each other. Yet the scribe appeared not to be conscious of the repetition. Their divergence from each other provides an index of the kind and frequency of scribal errors to be found in the Fragment:
According to Westcott, there are in the duplicated portion "thirty unquestionable clerical blunders including one important omission, two other omissions which destroy the sense completely, one substitution equally destructive of the sense, and four changes which appear to be intentional and false alterations." To these serious errors must be added the persistent misuse and omission of certain letters. It appears from the repetition of several obvious mistakes in the duplicated portion from Ambrose,
viz. ad cratia, docit, homilior, dilectis (for delictis), that the scribe was particularly careless.

If such serious errors exist in a copy of only thirty-five lines, then it is very unlikely that errors of the same kind would not occur in a passage like the Fragment which is almost two and a half times as long. The Folio which precedes the Fragment also reveals the same kind of ignorance of construction, the same false criticism, and the same confusion of letters and terminations. Therefore the carelessness of this scribe is probably responsible for a significant portion of the barbarous transcription of the Fragment.

EXCERPTS FROM THE MURATORIAN FRAGMENT

Excerpts from the Muratorian Fragment discovered in a Prologue to Paul’s Epistles confirm that the poor Latin of the Fragment is not that of the archetype. The Prologue is contained in three eleventh century Latin manuscripts and one twelfth century Latin manuscript of the Corpus Paulinum at the Benedictine monastery on Monte Cassino, and was first published in Miscellanea Cassinese, vol. II, 1897. Parts of 24 lines of the Fragment are included in the Prologue, viz. 11. 42-50 (tali); 11. 54 (uerum)-57 (denoscitur); 11. 63 (fertur)-68 (concrui); and 11. 81-85.

A PROLOGUE TO PAUL’S EPISTLES

(Sentences in bold print are excerpts from the Fragment)

1 Primo omnium Corinthiis scisma heresis.

5 interdicens. deinde Galathis circumcisionem, Romanis autem, ordinem scripturarum sed et praecipuum earum esse Christum intimans, pro-

lixius sripsit. de quibus singulis necesse est
nobis disputare, cum ipse beatus apostolus Paulus sequens precessoris sui Johannis ordinem, nonnisi nominatim, septem aeclesias scripsit ordine tali (nam) cum Romanis ita agit apostolus

Paulus quasi cum incipientibus, qui post gentilitatem et initia fidei sortiantur et perveniant ad spem vitae aeternae, multa de phisicis rationibus insinuat, multa de scripturis divinis; ad Corinthios prima consecutos iam fidelis non recte conversantes obiurgat; ad Corinthios secunda contristatus quidem sed emendatos ostendit; Galatas in fide ipsa peccantes et ad Iudaismum declinantes exponit; Ephesios quia incipiens in custodiunt laudat, quod ea quae acceperunt servaverunt; Philipenses quod in quo crediderunt servantes ad fructum pervenerunt; Colosenses collaudat quia velud ignotis scribit et accepto nuntio ab Epafra custodisse evangelium gratulat; Thesalonicenses prima in opere et fide crevisse gloriat; in secunda praeterea quod et perseverationem passi in fide perseveraverint, quos et sanctos appellat, ut illos qui in Iudaem Christum confessi persecutiones fortiter tolerant; (ad) Hebraeos, ad quorum similitudinem passi sunt Thesalonicenses, ut in mandatis perseverantes persecutiones promptissime patiantur. furtur etiam ad Laudicenses, aliam ad Alexandrinos, Pauli nomine ficte, ad heresim Marcionis, et alia plura quae in aeclesiae catholica recipi non oportet. fel enim cum melle miscui non congruit, Arsinoe autem seu Valentini, vel Mitiadis, nihil in totum recipimus, qui etiam novum psalmorum librum Marcionis conscripsissent, una cum Basilide (sive) Asyano Catafrigum constitutorem, verum Corinthi, et Thesalonicensibus licet procorrectione uteretur, una tamen per omnem orbem terrae aeclesiae catholica diffusa esse dinoscitur. Triplex igitur Hebraeorum esse dinoscitur lingua. Heber unde Hebrei dicti sunt. Hanc linguam Moyses a domino legem accepit et tradidit, nam et Chaldeorum est alia, quam imperiti Iudaei vel Syri hebraeum fingunt, et ideo in multis male interpretantes apud illos dissonant multa, apud nos autem auctore est beatus apostolus Paulus dicens, se Hebraeum ex Hebraeos, hoc est, de tribu Beniamin.

The Benedictine manuscripts, viz. nos. 235 (C²), 349 (C), 535 (C³), 552 (C¹), contain only minor deviations among themselves. C² has some notable additions and omissions and changes in order, but none of these occur among the passages which correspond with the Muratorian Fragment. The Latin of the excerpts in the Benedictine MSS. is significantly better than that in the Fragment and this suggests a source not directly dependent upon the
Fragment. In comparison, the Benedictine texts present several important new readings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Muratorian</th>
<th>Benedictine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 42</td>
<td>1. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 43</td>
<td>1. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 43</td>
<td>1. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 45</td>
<td>1. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 47</td>
<td>1. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 48</td>
<td>1. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 56</td>
<td>1. 39-40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1. 67      | 1. 32       |
| 1. 81      | 1. 33       |
| 1. 81      | 1. 34       |
| 1. 83      | 1. 35       |
| 1. 84      | 1. 35       |
| 1. 84      | 1. 36       |
| 1. 84-5    | 1. 36-7     |

THE LANGUAGE OF THE FRAGMENT

Several scholars, e.g. J. Donaldson, F.H. Hesse, A. Harnack, A.A.T. Ehrhardt, have suggested that the Fragment was originally composed in Latin.10 Recent investigations by C. Mohrmann have demonstrated that the transition in language from Greek to Latin had begun in the Christian community of Rome as early as the middle of the second century.11 Hesse argued that if the Fragment were a translation it might be expected to be a very literal one and there would be no great difficulty in translating it back into Greek. But, as a matter of fact, there are many phrases where it is not easy to know what the Greek original must have been. However, Hesse did not take into account the barbarous transcription which has been shown
not to be that of the Fragment’s Latin archetype.

Many of the orthographic mistakes of the Fragment could be attributed to spoken Latin. This would suggest that an exemplar(s) of the Fragment was written by dictation, a common enough practice in many monastic scriptoria. Such a proposition could easily explain the following readings in the Fragment:

1. omission of the aspirate h, in odie for hodie (1.11), scysmae for schisma (1.42) (cf. scisma, 1.1 in CC¹C²C³), tensaolenecinsis for thessalonicenses (1.53).

2. omission of the final m, which was only weakly heard in pre-Christian Latin and then disappeared from inscriptions and common speech, in tertio for tertium (1.2), secundo for secundum (1.2), eo for eum (1.4), triduo for tridium (1.11), primo for primum (1.24), circumcisione for circumcisionem (1.43), semptae for semptem (1.49), ordinatione for ordinationem (1.62) (cf. Asyano (CC³) and Asiano (C¹C²) for Asianom, 1.36), and conversely, constitutorem for constitutore (1.85).

3. confusion of labial f for ph, in theophilo (11.35-6), filemonem for philemonem (1.59).

4. confusion of guttural c for g, in singulis for singulis (11.16-7), sincula for singula (1.28), sincolis for singulis (1.46), (note the correct spelling of singula in 1.36); callactis for galatis (1.43) (cf. Galathis, 1.2 in CC¹C²C³), calatas for galatas (1.52); concrunt for congruit (11.67-8); catafrugum for catfrugum (11.84-5) (cf. Catafrigum, 1.36-7 in CC¹C²C³).

5. confusion of labial b for p, in scribta for scripta (1.35), obtime for optime (1.35), correntione for correptione (1.55), apocalysy for apocalysi (11.57-8); and conversely, puplicare for publicare (11.77-8).

6. confusion of vowel y for i, in scysmae for schisma (1.42) (cf. scisma, 1.1 in CC¹C²C³), tymotheu for timotheum (1.60), (and conversely, cf. Catafrigum for catfrugum, 11.36-7 in CC¹C²C³; Asyano for Asianom, 1.36 in CC³).

7. omission of the dental d, in a for ad (1.50), se for sed (1.77), (cf. preccessoris for predecessoris, 1.7 in CC¹C²C³); and conversely, ad for a (1.47).

8. omission of the aphonic l, in miltiadis for miltiadis (1.81) (cf. 1.34, Mitiadis, CC¹; Mi(t)iadis, C²; Mitididis, C³).
9. omission of the guttural c, in cuntis for cunctis (1. 15), cunta before correction to cuncta (1. 16).

10. omission of the dental t in semeipsu for semetipsum (1. 29).

11. omission of the sibilant s, in concribset for conscripsit (1. 6), decipolis (1. 9) and decipulis (1. 22) for discipulis.

12. repetition of letters, in callactis for galatis (1. 43) (cf. Galathis, 1. 2 in CC¹C²C³), assianom for asianom (1. 84) (cf. 1. 36, Asyano, CC³; Asiano, C¹C²).

13. omission of repeated letters, in assequi for asequi (1. 7), colossensis for colossenses (1. 52), aeclesiae for ecclesiae (1. 76), eclesia for ecclesia (1. 78).

Donaldson argued that there is only one expression in the Fragment that suggests a Greek original, viz. alia plura quae in catholicam ecclesiam recepi non potest (11. 65-7)---a neuter plural with a singular verb. Likewise there is only one expression in the Fragment that suggests a Latin original, viz. the Latin pun, fel enim cum melle misceri non congruit (1. 67), but neither of these instances is conclusive. Donaldson believed the Fragment was composed originally in Latin, probably in the African church, but not until towards the end of the first half of the third century. Donaldson recognized that the Latin of the Fragment is late. He noted that the use of the words correptio, intimo, and ordo scripturarum are best paralleled from Tertullian (d. c. 225). Similarly Donaldson claimed that the phrase ecclesiastica disciplina was unknown to writers of the late second century. Though he could not find the phrase, sedente cathedra urbis Romae ecclesiae, in Tertullian, Donaldson observed that many such expressions are found in Cyprian (d. 258).
J. Campos recently engaged in a detailed grammatical and philological analysis of the Fragment. He carefully examined the spelling, vocabulary, and syntax of the Fragment's Latin and confirmed that many of the orthographic errors in the Fragment result from the common spelling and pronunciation of later Latin. According to Campos:

1. The terminations *es* and *is* have been easily confused since the third century, cf. *Iohannis* for *Iohannes* (11. 9, 15, 57), *colosensis* for *colossenses* (1. 52-3), *tensaoleneceinsis* for *thessalonicensis* (1. 53).

2. In tonic syllables the short *i* seems to have been exchanged for the closed *e* in almost the entire empire since the third century, cf. *disciberet* for *describeret* (1. 16), *comprindit* for *comprehendit* (1. 36), *philippenses* for *philippenses* (1. 51).

3. The confusion of *u* for the long *o* also first appears in the third century and is more frequent in even later centuries, cf. *numeni* for *nomine* (1. 5), *visurem* for *visorem* (1. 32), the emended *professoris* for *professuris* (1. 48); *completum* for *completo* (1. 79).

4. The confusion of the closed *o* for the long *u* is frequent in the fourth century, cf. *decipulis* for *discipulis* (1. 9), *foit* for *fuit* (1. 25), *futurum* for *futurum* (1. 26), *singulis* for *singulis* (1. 46), *sui* for *sui* (1. 48), *secunda* for *secunda* (1. 51).

5. In Italy the exchange of *e* for *i* is extensive during the fourth to sixth centuries, cf. *numeni* for *nomine* (1. 5), *decipolis* for *discipulis* (1. 9), *condescipulis* for *condiscipulis* (1. 10), *discipulis* for *discipulis* (1. 22), *profetetur* for *profitetur* (1. 34), *Corinthis* for *Corinthis* (11. 42, 54), *prolixius* for *prolixius* (1. 46), *desputari* for *disputari* (1. 47), *nomenatim* for *nominatim* (1. 49), *diffusa* for *diffusa* (1. 57), *denoscitur* for *dinoscitur* (11. 57-8), *descepline* for *disciplinae* (1. 65), *laudecenses* for *Laodicenses* (1. 64), *recipemus* for *recipimus* (1. 82).

6. The aphonia of *it* in *et* and the inverse in verbal termination seems to have been common only since the second half of the fourth century, cf. *concribet* for *conscripsit* (1. 6), *incipet* for *incept* (1. 8), *licit* for *licet* (1. 16).

7. The confusion of *o* for the termination of *um* is also very frequent in the *Peregrinatio Etheriae* (e.g. 4-5) and in Gregory the Great and Gregory of Tours, cf. *tertium* (1. 2), *secundo* for *secundum* (1. 2), *eo* for *eum* (1. 4).
Thus the Fragment reveals numerous examples of the spelling and pronunciation of Latin in the third and fourth centuries. Campos argued that the Latin of the Fragment originates from not earlier than the last decade of the fourth century, since some forms are not paralleled until very late in the second half of that century.

Campos reinforced a late dating for the Latin of the Fragment by vocabulary, since the Fragment contains terms which first appear only from the end of the fourth century. For instance, *intimans* (1. 45) is a word that was employed by the historians of the *Historiae Augustae* in the fourth century, but does not occur in classical or post-classical Latin.26 *Visurem* (*visorem*) appears initially in Augustine (c. 386).27 *Per ordinem* is first found in the Old Testament Vulgate of Jerome (c. 392-407). The appearance of the word, *palpaverunt*, when quoting I John in the Fragment (11. 33-4), also suggests a dependence upon Jerome's Latin. The Vulgate and other versions from the fathers use *contractaverunt* (I Jn. 1.1), while Jerome adopted *palpaverunt*.28 The use of these Latin terms (and others)29 would endorse a Latin original for the Fragment no earlier than the end of the fourth century. Campos argued that the Latin text discloses enough acquaintance with the Vulgate to suggest that it was probably not produced earlier than the first part of the fifth century. This late date for the Latin of the text would preclude the possibility of a Latin original for the Fragment, since the Fragment contains elements that must be dated earlier than the Latin of the text.
A Greek original for the Fragment was suggested by Muratoriori when he first published the list in 1740. This view received wide support, e.g. Simon de Magistris, C. Bunsen, A. Hilgenfeld, T. Zahn, B.F. Westcott, G. Salmon, B.J. Lightfoot, S. Ritter. As Salmon wrote, "if the fragment has the antiquity claimed for it, the presumption is that it is a translation from the Greek, since Greek is the language of all the literary remains that have come down to us from the Roman church of the second century". Several scholars have attempted to reproduce the Greek original, e.g. Bunsen, Hilgenfeld, Zahn, a task which is made especially difficult because of the corrupt nature of the Latin text. Lightfoot suggested that the original document was written in Greek verse, like the corresponding lists of Amphilochius and Gregory of Nazianzus, and he produced a Greek original for the Fragment in verse.

The hypothesis of a Greek original has aided in understanding some of the difficult and confusing passages in the Fragment as simply poor translations into Latin. For example, S.P. Tregelles took note of the puzzling passage, *Et sapientia ab amicis solomonis in honorem ipsius scripta* (11. 69-70), which is usually translated something like: "and Wisdom written by friends of Solomon in his honour." This attribution of the Wisdom of Solomon to his "friends" is nowhere else known. However Tregelles observed that Jerome's Preface to the Books of Solomon read: "Apud Hebraeos nusquam est, quin et ipse stylus Graecam eloquentiam redlet, et nonnulli scriptorum veterum hunc esse Judaei Philonis affirmant." Tregelles could find
no writer before Jerome to make this assertion and believed that Jerome based it upon reading a Greek original of the Fragment. The proposed Greek original might have read: 

\[ \text{καὶ ἡ Ἐκκλησία Ἑλληνική ὑπὸ φίλων ἐξ τῆς τὴν ἡμᾶς αὐτοῦ ἑξαρχῆς} \]

It is thus assumed that the Latin translator confused \text{φίλων} and \text{φίλων}, so as to translate \text{ab amicis} instead of a \text{Philone}. This is especially likely if the termination -ος was written in much smaller letters as was often the case in very early MSS. Jerome may have added the qualifier of \text{Judaeus} to \text{Philonis} by an unconscious amplification from familiarity with the name of that Philo (cf. \text{De vir. ill. 11}), or else Jerome may have thought that Philo of Alexandria was the Philo meant. If Jerome had seen a Greek original of the Fragment, then Jerome (c. 342-420) would be a \text{terminus ad quem} for the date of the Fragment.

P. Katz offered an additional example of a possible mistranslation in the Fragment.\(^\text{3}\) He noted the enigmatic sentence: \text{epistola sane Iude et superscriptio Iohannis duas In catholica habentur (11. 68-9)}, which is usually translated something like: "Certainly the epistle of Jude and two of the aforementioned John are held in the Catholic Church." The reference would seem to imply an acceptance of Jude and I & II John. Yet by tradition II & III John are so closely related that one would expect either only I John to be named, or all three Johannine epistles, but not I & II. Thus the mention of only two Johannine epistles is believed by many scholars to be particularly confusing. Westcott and Tregelles suggested the context of the
Fragment must mean that the two epistles of John mentioned here are II & III, where I John would have been implied already in a quotation about the Gospel of John earlier in the Fragment (11. 26-31). There is, however, some evidence of I & II John circulating independently of III John. Irenaeus, for instance, quoted freely from I John, and also from II John (e.g. Adv. Haer. 1.9.3; 3.16.5, 8), but there is no trace of III John in his writings. Cyprian and Tertullian also quoted frequently from I John, and at the same time in Africa, Aurelius Chullabi quoted from II John. Again there is no trace of III John. The Latin epitome of Cassiodorus contains notes on the first two epistles of John only. In the Latin Adumbrationes, supposed extracts from Clement of Alexandria's Greek Hypotyposes, there are only notes on I John and a short summary of "the Second Epistle of John." It is certain that Clement knew at least one more Johannine epistle besides I John, since in one of his quotations he cited I John as "the greater epistle" (Strom. 2.15.66). The Greek word μείον is comparative and not superlative, which in strictly correct classical Greek would imply that he knew only two. Papias made more than one quotation from "the former (προτέρος) epistle of John" (Eusebius, H.E. 3.39.17). Likewise this expression of "former epistle" would in correct classical Greek imply the existence of only two epistles. Yet in Hellenistic and Roman periods the comparative and superlative were frequently confused, and Eusebius himself has a similar expression in a context where he speaks explicitly of three
Johannine letters (H.E. 3.25.2). Moreover Eusebius (H.E. 6.14.1) and Photius both stated that Clement commented on all the Catholic epistles in his Hypotyposes. The brevity of III John may explain the silence about it. With the possible exception of one phrase in Papias, there is no explicit mention of III John until the third century, and no clear citation from it until the fourth century. Moreover whenever III John is disputed, II John is included with it in the dispute, but never I John. Thus, the apparent grouping of only I & II John in the Fragment is confusing.

The interpretation of catholica in the passage is also unusual. Elsewhere in the Fragment the Church is always called ecclesia catholica (11. 56, 61, 66, 73, 78), and a mere catholica would be uniquely interpreted here as "Catholic Church." According to Katz, however, catholica frequently stood for epistola catholica, and I John was sometimes considered to be the Catholic epistle par excellence. Origen, for instance, frequently spoke of a "Catholic epistle" in regards to not only I John, but also Jude, Barnabas, and I Peter. Dionysius of Alexandria also applied the word "Catholic" to I John, apparently to distinguish it from II & III John (Eusebius, H.E. 7.25.7, 10). Apollonius (c. 197) attributed to the heretic Themison the composition of a "Catholic epistle" in imitation of that of 'the Apostle', probably meaning John (Eusebius, H.E. 5.18.5). This title of I John was used long afterwards, e.g. Socrates and Theodoretus in the fifth century, especially in the form Ἰωάννου καθολική.
In the light of these considerations, Katz concluded that the Fragmentist meant two epistles of John in addition to the Catholic epistle, viz. I John. Noting that in the remainder of the sentence, \textit{Et sapientia ab amicis Salomoni in honorem ipsius scripta}, the \textit{ab amicis} is most likely a mistranslation of \textit{φιλοσοφία}, Katz suggested that the confusion with the Johannine epistles may also lie in the translation. He suggested a Greek original of \textit{δύο σύν καθολικά}, which was simply transliterated into \textit{duae sin catholica} in the Latin of the Fragment. Katz added that the prevailing meaning of \textit{σύν} at that time was "in addition to" and not "with," which would have been expressed by \textit{μετὰ}. Katz's suggested Greek would be translated something like: "Certainly the epistle of Jude and two (epistles) of the aforementioned John are held in addition to the Catholic (epistle)."

Since Latin is not the language of the Fragment's archetype, then the Fragment is probably a translation from Greek. The fact that several of the confusing passages in the Fragment may be explained by a mistranslation from Greek may confirm a Greek original for the Fragment. However if the traditional dating of the Fragment is questionable, and a Greek original for the Fragment is presumed, then the Fragment would most likely have an Eastern provenance, since Latin replaced Greek as the language of the Western church in the third century.

\textbf{THE CODEX MURATORIANUS}

The so-called Codex Muratorianus, which contains the
Muratorian Fragment, is dated in the seventh century. This date is confirmed by the age of the handwriting and ink of the Codex, and by a two-line inscription on the first page. This inscription assigns the Codex to Columbanus (c. 543-615), presumably sometime after 612 when he founded a monastery at Bobbio, and attributes the contents to John Chrysostom (c. 347-407):

\[ \text{liber scti columbani de bobio} \]
\[ \text{Iohis grisotomi} \]

The Codex contains seventy-six leaves of rather coarse vellum, measuring 27 by 17 centimeters. It consists of nine gatherings of eight, and four other leaves. Folios 6 & 74 are detached, and Folios 75 & 76 are conjugate leaves. The fact that the last page (Folio 76b) is blank suggests that this was the original ending of the Codex. This is confirmed by the contents of Folio 76a, which contains only a notice of the sum paid to the copyist, in an ancient cursive handwriting which is not that of the scribe himself.

On the top of the eleventh leaf (Folio 11a) the scribe wrote the letter I, and at the foot of Folio 17b he affixed the letter K. Thereafter he signed every eighth leaf on its conclusion with the next consecutive letter, except that he appears to have forgotten to insert the letter O at the foot of Folio 49b. The final signature of R is found on Folio 73b. The introduction of these letters would appear to be a means of pagination for the Codex. If so, why the scribe did not begin until the eleventh leaf, and why he began with the letter I, is uncertain. This peculiarity suggests that the Codex Muratorianus was either
copied from a mutilated exemplar or else lost some of its pages. If the scribe of the Codex or its exemplar had begun on the first page with the letter A, as many as fifty-three leaves may be missing. Since the eight-leaf cycle is not introduced until the eleventh leaf, then there may have been at least two breaks in the first part of the Codex.

The inscription on the first page is in a different hand than the rest of the Codex. It is also inserted into the top margin over a titular superscription. This suggests that one break could have been at the very beginning of the Codex or its exemplar. According to E.S. Buchanan the writing of the inscription is at least as old as the eighth century, maybe the seventh. Therefore, if the inscription was added after the present Codex lost some beginning Folios, then those pages must have been lost within a century after the Codex was transcribed.

The number of lines on the first eighteen pages of the Codex is 24 or 25. Beginning with the page on which the Fragment commences (Folio 10a), the number of lines of the next sixteen pages (Folios 10a-17b) is 31 or 32. The Fragment begins at the top of Folio 10a in the midst of a sentence. The previous page in the Codex ends abruptly in the middle of a quotation from Eucherius. There is no significant vacant space either at the bottom of Folio 9b or the top of Folio 10a. Thus some pages may be missing here in the Codex, as well as at the beginning.

The Codex Muratorianus consists of a miscellaneous collection of Latin tracts followed by five early Christian
Creeds. The contents of the Codex are identified by titular superscription and/or the spacing of initial words in a tract. The Folios containing the Muratorian Fragment (nos. 10a-11a), however, have no titular superscription or initial spacing.

**THE CODEX MURATORIANUS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Folio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>De Terr en is (of Eucherius)</td>
<td>1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Animantibus (of Eucherius)</td>
<td>4b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Nominis (of Eucherius)</td>
<td>8b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(The Muratorian Fragment)</td>
<td>10a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Abraam (of Ambrose)</td>
<td>11a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Expositione Diversarum Rerum (of Eucherius)</td>
<td>12a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De gentibus (of Eucherius)</td>
<td>12a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De locis</td>
<td>13a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De fluminibus et aquis</td>
<td>14b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De mensibus</td>
<td>15a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De solepnitatibus</td>
<td>15b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De idolis</td>
<td>15b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De uestibus</td>
<td>16a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De duplicus uestimentis</td>
<td>17a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De auibus uel uolatilibus</td>
<td>17a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De besteis uel serpentibus</td>
<td>17b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De ponderibus</td>
<td>17b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De mensuris</td>
<td>18a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De grecis uum nibibus</td>
<td>19a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Matheo Euange</td>
<td>19a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Die et Hora</td>
<td>28a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Tribus Mensuris</td>
<td>29b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Petro Apostolio</td>
<td>30b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Reparationem Lapsi (of Chrysostom)</td>
<td>31b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Abraam (Ante hostium sedebat abraam)</td>
<td>71b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fides Sancti Ambrosi Episcopi</td>
<td>73b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fides Sancti Luciferi Episcopi</td>
<td>75a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fides quae ex Niceno Concilio processsit</td>
<td>75a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fides Beati Athanasi</td>
<td>75b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expositio Fidei Chatolice**</td>
<td>74a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over half of the pages of the Codex (82/152) contain material from Chrysostom, which may account for the attribution to him in the inscription. Material from Eucherius of Lyons (d. c. 449) accounts for the next largest proportion (32/152). The prominence given to Eucherius might suggest that the collection was made in southern Gaul, rather than in Italy. The vulgarisms in the Codex support the hypothesis of a Gallic rather than an
Italian origin. If, as the inscription on the first leaf implies, this MS. or its exemplar actually belonged to Columbanus, then he might well have had the collection made for himself or his monasteries sometime while he was in Burgundy from 585-610.

All of the datable contents in the Codex belong to the fourth or fifth century. The entries entitled De Terrenis, De Animantibus, and De Nominis are chapters (nos. 3-5 respectively) from Eucherius' Formulae spiritualis intelligentiae, dated sometime during his episcopacy (c. 342-c. 350). The work titled De Abraham is a fragmentary portion of Ambrose's homiletic treatise, De Abraham (1.3.15-7), dating probably around 382-8. The various tracts listed under the heading De Expositione Diuersarum Rerum belong to the second book of Eucherius' Instructiones ad Salonium (2.3-14), also dated during his episcopacy (c. 342-c. 350). De Reparationem Lapsi is a Latin translation of the longer of Chrysostom's Paraeneses ad Theodorum lapsum. This treatise dates from the four year period when Chrysostom was an anchorite, probably sometime between 373 and 381.

Both G. Mercati and C.H. Turner suggested that the two short pieces, viz. De Tribus Mensuris and De Petro Apostolo, may be drawn from the same author as De Matheo Evangel. De Matheo Evangel. is an exposition of the eschatological passage of Matthew 14.20-44. Mercati attributed it an anonymous chiliast, while Turner assigned it to Victorinus of Pettau, whom he considered either as the original author or as the translator of a Greek source,
perhaps Hippolytus. A. Souter, on the other hand, suggested Ambrosiaster as the author, a position which was later substantiated by C. Martini on the grounds of both philological and theological contents.  

Zahn argued for Ambrosiaster as the author of *De Petro Apostolo* on the basis of a parallel with *Quaestio 104*. Martini supported the attribution by noting the affinities of *De Petro Apostolo* with other passages from Ambrosiaster. On the basis of linguistic and doctrinal elements, Martini also attributed *De Tribus Mensuri* to Ambrosiaster, while Buchanan suggested Ambrosiaster as possibly the author for *De Die et Hora*. If Ambrosiaster was the author of any of these works, then they would be dated generally from 363 to 384.

The *Fides Beati Athanasi* in the Codex is an early recension of the Athanasian Creed, the author and date of which is disputed. The Creed probably derived from Gaul, perhaps in the region of Lerins. A Gallican origin is supported in that the Creed first appears in a sermon of Caesarius of Arles and has remarkable correspondence with the recently discovered *Excerpta* of Vincent of Lerins. A date for the Creed between 381 and 428 was generally accepted. However J.N.D. Kelly has argued that the Christological heresy attacked was Nestorianism, not Apollinarianism, and thus that the Creed was composed after 428.

The two Creeds in the Codex attributed respectively to Ambrose (d. 397) and Lucifer (d. 370-1), viz. *Fides Sancti Ambrosi Episcopi* and *Fides Sancti Luciferi Episcopi*, are
probably spurious, but would date no earlier than the late fourth century if genuine. The *Fides Sancti Luciferi Episcopi* appears elsewhere as the work of Faustinus.⁷ The entry *Fides quae ex Niceno Concilio Processit* is an early version of the Nicene Creed, which must be dated after the First Council of Nicea in 325. The presence of an anathema and an explanation of 'homoousios' in the version of the Codex would suggest a date before the later Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed, which since the Council of Chalcedon (451) has been dated as 381.

This leaves in the Codex only the short work, *De Abraam*, and the fragmentary detached leaf, *Expositio Fidei Chotolice*, as unidentified. Otherwise all the works date from the fourth to fifth centuries, save possibly for the Muratorian Fragment. The majority of the works are clearly late fourth century. It is of course quite possible that the Fragment is a late second century work and that one such earlier work was included with the several later ones. However if other arguments suggest a later date for the Fragment, then its inclusion in this Codex among such later works could only be considered as corroborative.

THE PROVENANCE OF THE FRAGMENT

The Muratorian Fragment is traditionally assigned to the Western church, emanating either from Rome or a church associated with Rome. The designation of Rome not only as *urbs Roma* (1. 76), but as *urbs* alone (1. 38) suggests to many such an origin for the Fragment. Likewise the absence of James and Hebrews in the list, and the presence of
Revelation, would also commend a Western provenance.

Harnack argued that the Fragment was an official promulgation of Rome defining the contents of the New Testament for the rest of the Church. Harnack read such phrases as "we" and the "Catholic church" as interchangeable in the Fragment, obviously implying Rome. Hence the terms a nobis (1. 47), recipimus and non recipimus (11. 72, 82), catholicam ecclesiam recipi non potest (1. 66-7), in catholica habentur (1. 69), and quidam ex nostris (11. 72-3) were thought to designate Rome as the church to which the Fragmentist belonged. Harnack questioned whether any Western church (at the transition from the second to the third century) other than the Roman church would have spoken thus.

H. Koch disputed the linguistic arguments of Harnack as overstated, and showed that the term catholica ecclesia did not necessarily have the restricted referent of Rome. Numerous examples of catholica ecclesia are found in the third century, especially in Cyprian, used in reference to churches other than Rome. Koch also showed that the terms in urbe Roma and cathedra urbis Romae ecclesiae were not the usual phrases of documents written in Rome. Rather, writings from Rome usually employed the phrase hic in urbe Roma in reference to the city of Rome. If the Fragment had originated from Rome, the expected phrase would have been something like, pastorem hic in urbe Roma Hermas conscripsit... Sundberg noted that the meaning of the singular term urbs as Rome (1. 38) does not imply the place of the writing of the Fragment, but rather the
place, viz. Rome (cf. Acts 28:30-1), from which Paul's supposed journey to Spain would have originated (cf. Romans 15.24, 28). Thus, it is not necessary to think that the Fragment originated from Rome.

Zahn argued that "the circumstantial solemnity with which the position of Pius at the time of the writing of the Shepherd of Hermas is described is intelligible only if the author was writing, not indeed in Rome for Romans, but in or for a western church in some way connected with Rome." However such an explicit account of the situation in Rome might suggest just the opposite, viz. that detailed information as to the bishop of Rome and as to the authorship and origin of Hermas was unlikely to be within common local knowledge because of a lack of connection with Rome.

The supposition that the Fragment is Western because of the absence of James and Hebrews from the list, and the presence of Revelation, is also not well founded. Initially Revelation was as generally accepted in the East as it was in the West. Papias (c. 60-130) is said to have commented upon it, and Melito of Sardis (d. c. 190) was the author of a lost work on Revelation (Eusebius, H.E. 4.26.2; Jerome, De vir. ill. 24). Theophilus of Antioch (c. 186) alluded to it (Ad Autolyc. 2.28) and is said to have used testimonies from it in a lost work against Hermogenes (Eusebius, H.E. 5.24.1). Apollonius of Hierapolis (c. 186) is also said to have used testimonies from Revelation (Eusebius, H.E. 5.18.13). Clement of Alexandria quoted approvingly from Revelation (Paed. 1.6;
Strom. 6.13, 25; cf. Eusebius, *H.E.* 6.14.1), and Origen cited it frequently as well (*De Princ.* 1.2.10, 4.1.25; *Contra Celsum* 6.6, 23; 8.17; *Comm. on John* 1.1, 2, 14, 23, 42; 2.4; 5.3, 4; 6.35; cf. Eusebius, *H.E.* 6.25.9).

Dionysius of Alexandria (d. c. 264) reveals the first doubts about Revelation. According to Dionysius some people rejected Revelation as the work of Cerinthus (Eusebius, *H.E.* 7.25.1-2). This would appear to be a reference to the Alogi. Dionysius, however, accepted the work and replied, "But I could not venture to reject the book, as man brethren hold it in high esteem," and "it is the work of some holy and inspired man," and "I do not deny that...writer saw a revelation and received knowledge and prophecy" (Eusebius *H.E.* 7.25.4, 7, 26). Yet on the basis of literary criticism Dionysius did concur that the author of Revelation, i.e. John, is not the same as that John of the Gospel and Epistle (Eusebius, *H.E.* 7.25.1-27).

Similar reservations about Revelation may be reflected in the writings of Eusebius of Caesarea (c. 303-24). In one place Eusebius appeared to identify the author of Revelation as John, the apostle and evangelist (*H.E.* 3.18.1), while in another place he acknowledged that if it was not the apostle, it was probably the presbyter John who saw the Revelation (*H.E.* 3.39.5-6). In his own list Eusebius enumerated Revelation among the *homologoumena*, but with the qualifier, "if it really seem proper" (*H.E.* 3.25.2). A few lines later he declared that some rejected it, while others included it with the accepted works (*H.E.* 3.25.4). In the previous chapter, Eusebius had noted that
the opinions of most were still divided (H.E. 3.24.18). Eusebius' comments may reflect a hesitancy introduced by the remarks of Dionysius of Alexandria. Nonetheless Pamphilus in Caesarea (c. 309) still quoted from Revelation (Apol. pro Origene), as did Methodius of Olympus (d. c. 311) (on the Resurrection 3.2.9; Banquet 1.5; 6.5; 8.4; 9.3). Revelation was also included in the Byzantine text of the New Testament, probably created by Lucian of Antioch (c. 312). It was also included in the probably Alexandrian Catalogue of the Codex Claromontanus, without scribal mark, and in Athanasius' thirty-ninth Festal Letter (367).

A thoroughgoing rejection of Revelation did not come about in the East until the second half of the fourth century. Cyril of Jerusalem (350) is the first known writer to exclude Revelation without comment (Catech. 4.36). It is also omitted in the Apostolic Canons (c. 380). Revelation is also missing from the list (Carm. 12.31) of Gregory of Nazianzus (383-90), while Amphilochius of Iconium (396+) indicated that most declare it to be spurious (Iambi ad Seleucum 316). Revelation is also absent from a Syrian Catalogue (c. 400) and from the Peshitta Version of the Syriac, originating around the end of the fourth century. However, Epiphanius of Salamis (374-7) still included Revelation in his list (Haer. 76.5) and so did Jerome (394), writing from Bethlehem (Ad Paul. Ep. 53). Revelation is also found in the Codex Alexandrinus (c. 425).

Thus while some reservations about Revelation in the
East are apparent earlier (Dionysius, Eusebius) the work was generally accepted into the second half of the fourth century (Catalogue in the Codex Claromontanus, Athanasius, Epiphanius, Jerome). Only at the very end of that century was the book generally rejected in the East (Cyril, Apostolic Canons, Gregory of Nazianzus, Amphilochius, Syrian Catalogue, Peshitta). Thus the presence of Revelation in the Fragment would suggest a Western provenance only if the Fragment was thought to be dated in the very late fourth century, by which time Revelation was absent from most Eastern lists.

The absence of James and Hebrews from the Fragment is striking, but the absence of I Peter is even more surprising, especially since the Revelation of Peter is listed (11. 71-2). These absences have led many scholars to assume that references in the Fragment are missing. As has been noted previously, the Fragment is a barbarous transcription from a mutilated text. The scribe who accidentally repeated the passage of Ambrose which follows the Fragment omitted two and a half lines in copying it the second time. A similar omission within the Fragment may explain some of the remarkable absences.

Westcott, for instance, insisted that I Peter, James, and Hebrews "could scarcely have been altogether passed over in an enumeration of books in which the Epistle of St. Jude, and even Apocryphal writings of heretics, found a place." Likewise Tregelles argued that in regards to Hebrews and I Peter, "we cannot suppose them to have been rejected by the author of the Fragment, or to have been
writings with which he was unacquainted." It seems reasonable to suggest that the Fragment may have contained other references now lost, and that James and Hebrews (and I Peter) may have been among them.

C. Bunsen, for instance, supposed a defect in the Fragment after *in catholica habentur* and before *et sapientia* (ll. 69-70), where would be added mention of I Peter, James, and Hebrews, contrasting the composition of the latter with the Wisdom of Solomon which follows. Zahn suggested a break in the passage: *apocalapse Iohanis et Petri (unam) tantum recipimus (epistolam; fertur et altera) quam quidam ex nostris legi in ecclesia nolunt* (ll. 71-3), in order to include I Peter. Perhaps just as I John 1.1-4 is quoted in the Fragment (ll. 26-34) as proof of the eyewitness character of the fourth evangelist, I Peter may have been mentioned earlier in the Fragment in the lost account of Mark's Gospel.

The possibility of omissions is supported by the supposition of other defects in the Fragment. Lightfoot, for example, suggested that there is a hiatus after *Pauli nomine* (ll. 64-5) and before *fincte*, where he suspected other works of Marcion were referred to as forged, and not the Epistles to the Laodiceans and Alexandrians. Westcott noted that the whole passage from *et ideo* (l. 16) until *futurum est* (l. 26) has no connection with what precedes, which could be expressed by *ideo*, and similarly what follows is not connected with it by *ergo*. Likewise it appears that some words have been lost at the end of the sentence on line 39 after *ad spaniam proficescentis*. 
Westcott noted further that the present form of the Fragment seems to suggest that it was not originally continuous. Instead, he suggested that it had been made up of three or four different passages from some unknown author, and collected on the same principle perhaps as the quotations in Eusebius from Irenaeus, Clement, and Origen (H.E. 5.8; 6.24; 6.25.3-14). Such a supposition may aid in explaining apparent omissions in the Fragment. Whatever the truth of such suggestions, judgments based on omissions in the Fragment are not conclusive.

In summary, the traditional assumption of a Western origin of the Fragment is questionable. The association of the Fragment with Rome is disputed. The presence of Revelation is not remarkable, unless the Fragment was thought to be late fourth century. The absence of James and Hebrews (and I Peter) is inconclusive because of the probability of defects in the Fragment. Thus the provenance of the Fragment remains uncertain.

**DATING THE FRAGMENT**

The central passage upon which the traditional dating of the Fragment rests is:

Pastorem uero
nuperrim e(t) temporibus nostris In urbe
75 roma herma conscripsit sedente cathe
tra urbis romae aeclesiae Pio eπs fratre(r)
eius

The plain sense of the statement is that Hermas wrote The Shepherd in Rome during the time while his brother, Pius, was bishop there. Pius (I) is known to have been bishop of Rome from c. 140 until his death c. 154. The phrase,
temporibus nostris, appears to express contemporaneity for
the writing of The Shepherd with this established time
period of 140-54. The superlative, nuperrime, is then
thought to confirm the temporal relationship between the
composition of the Fragment and the writing of The
Shepherd.

The Fragment therefore appears to have been written
sometime shortly after the episcopacy of Pius (nuperrime
temporibus nostris). Although Muratori dated the Fragment
about 196, Westcott believed that the date of the
Fragment could not be "much later than 170 A.D." He
argued that "the statement in the text of the Fragment is
perfectly clear, definite, and consistent with its
contents, and there can be no reason either to question its
accuracy or to interpret it loosely." G. Salmon
suggested that c. 180 was "the latest admissible date" for
he contended "that no one would speak of an event as having
occurred 'very lately and in his own time,' if it was then
more than twenty years ago." J.P. Kirsch, however,
suggested the period of the Fragment's writing as
180-200. Zahn also argued for a later date because the
Fragment rejected Montanist writings. Zahn noted that
Montanism was not cast out of Rome until about 195 and out
of Carthage until after 203: "If the document was written
within the region of Roman influence, it can scarcely have
been written before 200-10." C. Erbes, in the most
detailed discussion of the Fragment's dating, suggested an
even later date. He concluded his study:

Doch ist das gleichgültig für den gelieferten
Nachweis der Abfassung des Muratorischen
Erbes pointed out that if the Fragmentist did indeed compose his list as late as 220, and was about 70-5 years old at the time, then he could still have been born shortly before or during the episcopacy of Pius in Rome. Thus despite the plain sense of the Fragment's statement, scholars have not been willing to date it "quite recently" after Pius' episcopacy, but as much as sixty-five years later.

Besides Pius, the only other readily datable references in the Fragment are the names of several heretics, viz. Marcion (11. 65, 83), Valentinus (1. 81), Miltiades (?) (1. 81), Basilides (1. 84), and the Cataphrygians (11. 84-5). These references are almost exclusively found in the last lines of the Fragment (11. 81-5) which are particularly garbled and end abruptly:

81 Arsinoi autem seu ualentini. uel m(e)itiad(ei)is nihil In totum recipemus. Qui etiam nouï psalmorum librum marcioni conscripse runt una cum basilide assianum catafry
85 cum constitutorem

There is obviously some confusion in these last lines since Basilides "of Asia Minor" is mistakenly named as the founder of the Cataphrygians, and is thought to have composed a new psalm book for Marcion, together with Arsinous, Valentinus and Miltiades (?). Moreover, this
confusion does not result from the poor transcription of the Fragment, since essentially the same reading reoccurs in the Benedictine texts (1. 33-7). The confusion must be traced to an ancient common exemplar. The absence of any continuation of this passage from the Fragment in the Benedictine texts (1. 37) may also suggest that either this was the original ending of the Fragment, or else the Benedictine texts were derived along with the Fragment from a common mutilated exemplar.

The identification of some of the individuals named in these last lines is uncertain. Miltiades is the presumed referent of "m(e)itiad(ei)is" (1. 81) in the Fragment (cf. 1. 34, Mitiadis CC¹; Mi(ti)adis C²; Mitididis C³). Marcion is usually assumed to be the referent of marcioni (1. 83). Harnack, however, suggested that marcioni was a corruption of \( \text{makpo} \) and that the phrase purported only "a large book of psalms" and not "a psalm-book for Marcion." The reading of the Benedictine texts (Marcionis, 1. 35), however, would seem to suggest a translation of "a psalm-book for the Marcionites".

No other record of a heretic named Arsinous (1. 81) has been discovered. Various suggestions by scholars have attempted to identify him with someone known. Simon de Magistris, for example, suggested that arsinoi. . . seu valentini meant that Valentinus was also known by the Egyptian name of Arsinous. A. Hilgenfeld conjectured that arsinoi perhaps should be read marcioni, which comes close to the letters in the Fragment. Two lines later marcioni does appear (1. 83) apparently out of
place—possibly a marginal correction taken up into the text. The Benedictine texts (1. 33), however, contain slightly different readings for arsinoi, viz. Arsinoia (CC1), and Arsmofa (C2C3), which cast doubt on this suggestion. G. Volkmar, on the other hand, supposed this arsinoi to be the Valentinian Ptolemy, a suggestion that K.A. Credner had made but later abandoned.\(^\text{82}\) This conjecture depends upon a "Ptolemy, the Arsinoite," referred to in Hippolytus (Haer. 5.14). Yet the Ptolemy in Hippolytus probably refers to Ptolemy Soter or Ptolemy Philadelphus, and not the Valentinian Ptolemy.\(^\text{83}\)

Credner conjectured that arsinoi was a corruption of Bardesanis.\(^\text{84}\) Bardesanes of Edessa (154–222) did take part in writing a large collection of Syriac hymns, and thus this may be a more likely reading. Moreover from the fourth century Bardesanes is attacked along with Marcion and/or Valentinus by Eastern fathers, e.g. the author of De recta in Deum fide (300+); Ephraem Syrus in the madrashes (c. 338–73); Theodoret of Cyrrhus in Eranistes seu polymorphus (447). However the presumption of an early dating and Western provenance for the Fragment led Hort to conclude that "according to the best authorities, the great Syrian lived after the probable date of the fragment, and in any case he was not likely to be known to its author."\(^\text{87}\) If so, then the reference may be simply to some comparatively obscure Arsinous, or some other heretic known as "the Arsinoite," from the Egyptian place name of Arsinoe.

Ferguson remarked that these references are all
second-century. Yet the referent of *arsinoi* is unknown and that of *marcioni* (cf. *marcionis*, l. 35 in the Benedictine texts) should perhaps be read as referring to the Marcionites and not Marcion himself (cf. *marcionis*, l. 65). Moreover if the Fragment's original ending is mutilated then further references may have followed those which have survived. The heretics named are also particularly literary, having book(s) especially associated with them. It may be this factor, rather than their dates, which accounts for their mention in a listing of the New Testament works. Indeed a sufficient period of time might be required to allow for the spread and infiltration of these heretical works into orthodox communities and for their subsequent delineation and exclusion from the acceptable collection. In any event, the date of the Fragment cannot be confidently deduced from these references alone.

The reference to *The Shepherd of Hermas*, therefore, remains the crux of traditional dating of the Fragment at the end of the second century. The plain sense of that reference (11. 73-7) suggests that the Fragment was written shortly after the episcopacy of Hermas' brother, Pius (c. 140-c. 154) and about the same time as *The Shepherd*. However the issues involved in the traditional dating are more complex than they appear at first sight and will be dealt with at length in Chapter Two.
THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE FRAGMENT

The question of authorship of the Fragment is unresolved. The attribution of authorship is usually made on the basis of an assumed date and provenance, and a supposed Greek original. Muratori, when he published the Fragment in 1740, proposed the Roman presbyter, Gaius (Caius), as the author.\(^0\) Gaius can be discounted because it is now known that he opposed as the works of Cerinthus the Fourth Gospel and Revelation, which the Fragment accepts as of the Apostle John.\(^1\) Simon de Magistris attributed the Fragment to Papias (c. 60-130).\(^2\) Previously the dates of Pius' episcopacy were less certain and were sometimes supposed to be as early as 127.\(^3\) However the later establishing of Pius' reign from c. 140-c. 154 would now exclude consideration of Papias. Bunsen suggested Hegesippus, which Donaldson disputed.\(^4\) If the author was Hegesippus, then it is disconcerting that Eusebius, who was much interested in lists of the New Testament, and whose writings contain many notes from the works of Hegesippus, made no mention of this list (cf. Eusebius, H.E. 4.22.1-9). J. Chapman argued for Clement of Alexandria (c. 150-c. 215).\(^5\) Harnack who had previously argued for Rhodon (c. 180-92) as the author of the Fragment, later proposed either Pope Victor I (189-98) or Zephyrinus (198-217), or one of their clerks on their behalf.\(^6\)

Lightfoot suggested Hippolytus (c. 170-c. 236) as the author of the Fragment, which has remained the most generally favored proposal.\(^7\) Lightfoot took the various
works attributed to Gaius (Caius) and attempted to show them all to be really the work of Hippolytus. In fact, Lightfoot thought Gaius to be a fiction, a \textit{dramatis persona}, invented by Hippolytus for rhetorical purposes. Moreover Lightfoot read the inscriptions on Hippolytus' chair as to include an "Odes Referring to All the Scriptures," of which he took the Fragment to be a part. However the discovery of a MS. of a commentary on Revelation by Dionysius Bar Salibi, a twelfth-century Syrian father, proved the existence of Gaius. Nevertheless T.H. Robinson argued for the Hippolytean authorship of the Fragment on the basis of a quotation from Hippolytus in Bar Salibi which is similar to a passage in the Fragment. Vernon Bartlet noted, however, that the two passages said just the opposite:

\textbf{BAR SALIBI}
\begin{quote}
John to the Seven Churches which are in Asia. \ldots Hippolytus says that, in writing to seven churches, he writes just as Paul wrote thirteen letters but wrote them to seven churches.
\end{quote}

\textbf{MURATORIAN FRAGMENT}
\begin{quote}
Since the blessed Apostle Paul himself, following the method (\textit{ordinem}) of his predecessor John, writes only to seven individual churches (11. 47-50).
\end{quote}

While Hippolytus made John write as Paul wrote, the Fragment reverses the comparison and makes John's action the model of Paul's. Moreover this reference in the Fragment suggests that the writing of Revelation was thought of as prior to the completion of Paul's church letters. This is unlikely for Hippolytus, who, as Bar Salibi observed, agreed with Irenaeus in believing that Revelation was "seen" about the end of Domitian's reign.
Bartlett went on to suggest that the author belonged to the later School of John, "in the generation after Papias and Polycarp—men like Melito of Sardis, Apollinaris of Hierapolis, and, somewhat later, Polycrates of Ephesus." Bartlett then proceeded to commend Melito of Sardis as the Fragment's author. Earlier, G. Kuhn had suggested Polycrates of Ephesus.

Other scholars continued to argue for Hippolytean authorship, while still others disputed it. Harnack, for instance, refuted Lightfoot's reading of the inscription on Hippolytus' chair, and noted the absence of any mention in Hippolytus of the Revelation of Peter, the Pauline epistles to the Alexandrians and the Laodiceans, the Wisdom of Solomon, Valentinus, Arsinous, or the new psalm-book of the Marcionites, all referred to in the Fragment. But as Hans von Campenhausen noted "the principal objection remains the one that it is simply impossible to ascribe to a man like Hippolytus the muddle-headed remarks to be found in the Muratorian Canon."

The numerous proposals for authorship reveal the difficulty involved in attributing the Fragment and the lack of scholarly consensus. Westcott concluded that "there is no sufficient evidence to determine the authorship of the Fragment. . .such guesses are barely ingenious."
CONCLUSIONS

The Muratorian Fragment was first published in 1740 as an example of a barbarous scribal transcription. The beginning and probably the end of the Fragment are missing. A substantial portion of its poor Latin may be credited to the carelessness of the scribe of the Codex Muratorianus, which is especially apparent in a repeated passage of Ambrose following the Fragment. Excerpts of the Muratorian Fragment discovered in three eleventh century Latin manuscripts and one twelfth century Latin manuscript of the Corpus Paulinum at the Benedictine monastery on Monte Cassino confirm that the poor Latin of the Fragment is not that of the archetype.

The orthography of the Fragment suggests that it or one of its exemplar(s) was transcribed by dictation. The transcription parallels, in many places, spoken Latin of the third and fourth centuries. This has led Campos to demonstrate that the Latin of the Fragment is late. The vocabulary of the Fragment confirms a date in the last decade of the fourth century for the Latin. This late of a date for the Latin of the text would preclude the possibility of a Latin original for the Fragment, since the Fragment contains elements that must be dated earlier. As Latin is not the language of the Fragment’s autograph, then the Fragment is probably a translation from Greek. The hypothesis of a Greek original has aided in understanding some of the difficult and confusing passages in the Fragment as simply poor translations into Latin. However if the traditional dating of the Fragment is questioned and
a Greek original for the Fragment is assumed, then the Fragment would most likely have an Eastern provenance. The Codex in which the Fragment is found is a seventh or eighth century MS. of the Bobbio monastery. Missing leaves in the Codex may account for the mutilated beginning of the Fragment, but not the abrupt ending. The attributable contents of the Codex Muratorianus are all dated in the fourth and fifth centuries. Almost two-thirds of the pages of identifiable material in the Codex are from Eastern sources.

The traditional Western origin of the Fragment is questionable. H. Koch has shown that the Fragment most probably did not originate from the city of Rome. The presence of Revelation in the Fragment is not remarkable, unless it was thought to be late fourth century. The absence of James and Hebrews (and I Peter) is inconclusive because of the probability of defects in the Fragment. If omissions are allowed, then a provenance for the Fragment cannot be supported by the absence of James or Hebrews. Thus the provenance of the Fragment remains uncertain.

A plain reading of the Fragment suggests that it was composed shortly after the period which it attributes to Hermas writing The Shepherd, viz. the episcopacy in Rome of Hermas' brother Pius (c. 140-c. 154). However few scholars have been willing to date the Fragment so early, and have instead argued for composition anywhere between 170 and 220. Dating the Fragment by other references is inconclusive, and there has been no scholarly consensus about its authorship. Therefore a careful analysis of the traditional dating is needed.
CHAPTER TWO

INTRODUCTION

The crux of the traditional dating of the Fragment is the phrase *nuperrime temporibus nostris* (1. 74). What the original Greek for the phrase was is uncertain. Ferguson was careful in his opposition to Sundberg to note that since the text is generally recognized as a translation, "arguments from the language employed in the Muratorian Fragment have limited value." Likewise there may be "limited value" in dating the Fragment upon a simple three word Latin phrase. The Latin translation, which has gone through several editions (cf. Benedictine texts), is suspect in various places (cf. Tregelles, Katz above), and was transcribed by a hand that has clearly shown itself, in the words of Westcott, "either unable or unwilling to understand the work which he was copying, and yet given to arbitrary alteration of the text before him from regard simply to the supposed form of words."

Sundberg has reinterpreted the Fragment's key dating phrase. To begin with, Sundberg translated *nuperrime* not as a relative superlative (e.g. "very recently") with reference to the Fragmentist, but as an absolute superlative (e.g. "most recently") with reference to the preceding books in the list. The meaning then of *nuperrime* would be that The Shepherd of Hermas is not comparable with the preceding works in the list in terms of antiquity of authorship. Sundberg did not insist that this is the only correct interpretation but that this is a viable
alternative. Even Ferguson acknowledged this to be a possible translation. This alternative would somewhat free the dating of the Fragment from temporal association with the writing of The Shepherd.

Sundberg also wished to broaden the traditional interpretation of *temporibus nostris* which reads these words as implying immediate contemporaneity. Sundberg noted the practice in the early Church of distinguishing the Apostles and their teaching from all that came after them. There is evidence that by the time of Hegesippus (c. 154-c. 180) this distinction had taken on a particularly sacred temporal aspect, for he considered the Church a pure and uncorrupted Virgin throughout the time of the Apostles and their hearers (cf. Eusebius, *H.E.* 3.32.6-8; 4.22.4). Eusebius (*H.E.* 3.31.6) could later clearly speak of "the Apostles themselves and the Apostolic age" as a distinct group and time.

Sundberg noted with particular interest a reference in Irenaeus (*Adv. Haer.* 5.30.3) which reads in part:

"...for that (the Revelation to John) was seen not a very long time ago, but almost in our own generation (Τῆς ἡμετέρας γενεάς) towards the end of the reign of Domitian" (cf. Eusebius *H.E.* 5.8.6). The phrase, "not a very long time ago, but almost in our own generation," was an odd statement for Irenaeus to make considering that the time span involved was almost a hundred years. Sundberg read the "almost" as suggesting that Irenaeus was trying to make a point about the lateness of Revelation, that it was written about the end of the apostolic period, i.e. "almost
in our own generation." This quotation would the
a clear distinction between the Apostolic Age and "our
time." As such it provides the precedent with which
Sundberg wished to read the temporibus nostris in the
Fragment, as meaning "our time" as distinguished from
Apostolic time.

Donaldson noted that "if the words nuperrime nostris
temporibus (sic), 'very lately in our days', be taken to
mean 'not in the days of the apostles, but within times
which may properly be called our times when inspiration has
ceased,' then there is no necessity for fixing an early
date." He dated the Fragment towards the end of the first
half of the third century. Zahn recognized this too,
writing: "If the words 'very recently,' by contrast with
the epoch of the prophets and apostles, would allow the
lapse of a considerable time between the writing of the
Shepherd and that of this document (the Fragment), 'in our
times' is conclusive for the birth of the author before the
death of Pius (not later than Easter, 154)." Yet the
Irenaeus quotation suggests that the phrase "in our times"
is not conclusive.

Ferguson interpreted the quotation from Irenaeus
somewhat differently. He read the "in our own generation"
as referring only to Irenaeus' own lifetime (c. 130-c.
200), and the "almost" as meaning only that Revelation was
written shortly before Irenaeus' time. But the quotation
suggests that Revelation was written over thirty years
before Irenaeus' birth, which might be stretching the
limits of "almost." Still Ferguson went on to suggest two
other examples where (ἐπὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας γενέας) meant only within one's lifetime, and not specifically post-apostolic time (I Clem. 5; Eusebius, H.E. 5.16.22; cf. 3.32.8). Ferguson provided no rationale for Irenaeus' use of the phrase, "not a very long time ago" in reference to a revelation almost a hundred years previous. The phrase would again make more sense if it referred to the post-Apostolic age and not to Irenaeus' own lifetime. Moreover Ferguson acknowledged that the early Church certainly distinguished apostolic from post-apostolic times. He declared "our times" was not the usual way of speaking about the post-apostolic era, but offered no alternative.

Sundberg's interpretation is then at least feasible, and possibly has a precedent. The Fragmentist may well have meant only to distinguish between apostolic and post-apostolic times with his use of temporibus nostris. The real point of the argument in the Fragment's statements about The Shepherd is not that it is heretical, but that it was written too late to be considered apostolic. The temporal references of nuperrime and temporibus nostris in this case should perhaps then be read with regards to The Shepherd of Hermas and the Apostolic Age. The conclusion of the Fragment's position for a late dating for The Shepherd need not refer to the lifetime of the Fragmentist at all, but only to the lifetime of Pius of Rome. The language of the Fragment can be read as making its case against The Shepherd without reference to the dating of the Fragmentist. Sundberg proposed the interpretation, "but
Hermas wrote the Shepherd most recently (that is, later than the apostolic books previously mentioned), in our time (that is, not in apostolic time), in the city of Rome, while his brother Pius was the bishop occupying the episcopal chair of the church of the city of Rome.” The traditional dating of the Muratorian Fragment at the end of the second century by virtue of the phrase, *nuperrime temporibus nostris*, is dubious.

The phrase, *nuperrime temporibus nostris*, occurs within a series of statements in the Fragment (11. 73-80) about The Shepherd of Hermas:

Pastorem vero 
nuperrim e(t) temporibus nostris In urbe 
75 roma herma conscripsit sedente catha 
tra urbis romae aeclesiae Pio eps fratre(r) 
eius et ideo legi eum quidē oportet se pu 
ublicare uero in eclesia populo neque inter 
profe(s)tas conpletum numero neque inter 
80 apostolos in fine temporum potent

These statements in the Fragment make four declarations: 1) that Pius I was the brother of Hermas; 2) that The Shepherd of Hermas was written while Pius was bishop of Rome (c. 140-c. 154); 3) that the Muratorian Fragment was written shortly thereafter; and 4) that at that time The Shepherd of Hermas was received as a secondary work, which ought to be read privately, but which could not be read publicly in the churches.

In order to determine the accuracy of the third declaration, upon which the traditional dating of the Fragment is centered, viz. that the Fragment was written shortly after Pius' episcopacy, it will be useful to investigate the accuracy of the other three statements. A careful study of The Shepherd of Hermas (hereafter, The
Shepherd) is needed so as to evaluate the temporal relationship between a) Hermas' writing of The Shepherd, b) Pius' episcopacy, and c) the Muratorian Fragment.

THE SHEPHERD OF HERMAS

The text of The Shepherd is not well attested. There are three Greek manuscripts, none of which is complete. The most extensive text (Vis. I.1-Sim. IX.30.2) is found in Codex Athous, a fifteenth-century manuscript from the monastery of St. Gregory on Mount Athos. Codex Sinaiticus, a fourth-century manuscript from the monastery of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai, contains the first quarter of The Shepherd (Vis. I.1-Mand. IV.3.6) after the New Testament and the epistle of Barnabas. A third-century papyrus, which contains most of the Similitudes (II.8-IX.5.1), is extant among the collection of the University of Michigan (Papyrus 129). In addition to these, the Greek text is also attested by a great number of papyrus and parchment fragments which include larger or smaller pieces from almost all sections of the book. Besides these authorities for the text, there are several citations in Greek from Clement of Alexandria and Origen, and considerable passages incorporated into the writings of Antiochus of Saba and pseudo-Athanasius. Critical editions of the Greek text, however, must still supplement their readings in one section for which there is no significant Greek witness (Sim. IX.30.3-end).

There are two Latin versions of The Shepherd which are virtually complete: the so-called Vulgata, an Old Latin
version of the late second century which exists in about twenty MSS. and which includes the end of the book, not extant in Greek;\textsuperscript{15} and the so-called Palatina, which belongs to the late fourth or early fifth century and exists in two fifteenth-century manuscripts.\textsuperscript{16} There is also an Ethiopic version probably from the sixth-century and two Coptic versions, an Achmimic and a Sahidic, which are only fragments, and finally, a fragmentary middle-Persian translation.\textsuperscript{17}

Certain fragments of one of the parables of The Shepherd were unearthed among Manichean writings as far east as Chinese Turkestan, where the religion of Mani is known to have spread some time between the third and the tenth century. Why a Manichean manuscript should contain excerpts from The Shepherd is unclear. F.C. Burkitt suggested that some of the western missionaries of the sect may have picked up a copy of the revelations of Hermas and confused them with the writings ascribed to Hermes Trismegistus, who is known to have been held in honor by certain of the Manichees.\textsuperscript{18}

H. Chadwick noted that no Syriac version of The Shepherd appears to have been made, nor is there any quotation from The Shepherd found in any native Syriac writer.\textsuperscript{19} He suggested that the work traveled from Rome to Asia Minor (Irenaeus) and to North Africa and Alexandria, where Tertullian, Clement, and Origen knew it, and then to Eusebius at Caesarea. Despite the latter's advocacy the Syrian church seems to have never adopted the work.
THE STRUCTURE

The Shepherd is an Apocalypse in its form and style, but not in its contents, since it includes no disclosures of the eschatological future or of the world beyond. Two heavenly figures, an old lady and a shepherd, mediate to Hermas, in and around Rome, revelations on the possibility of Christian repentance. The book takes its name from this second bearer, the shepherd, to whom four-fifths of the book is devoted. Formally, The Shepherd consists of five Visions, twelve Mandates, and ten Similitudes.

In 1923 M. Dibelius suggested, primarily on internal evidence, that The Shepherd consisted of two distinct editions, viz. Vis. I-IV, and Vis. V-Sim. X. He noted that the shepherd does not first appear until Vision V (25.1), whereas the mediator in Visions I-IV was the church in the guise of an elderly lady, who does not appear thereafter. Moreover Vision V is not a vision in the same sense as the preceding four, but rather serves more as an introduction to the Mandates and Similitudes which follow, and which are to be the content of this particular vision (cf. 25.5). Visions I-IV presuppose a "tribulation to come" (cf. 6.7, 7.4, 22.1, 23.5, 24.6), while Vision V-Similitude X suggest that the persecution is past and had produced apostates and blasphemers and betrayers (cf. 72.4, 95.3, 96.1).

Textual evidence supports a similar division. Vision V is given different titles in different manuscripts. It is called "The Fifth Vision" (σορτόθος συνέχεια) in Codex Athous and the Ethiopic version; but the Codex Sinaiticus
calls the first four "Visions" (ὁράσεις) and this one "Revelation Five" (ἀποκάλυψις ἑπτά). The Latin version, Palatina, leaves out this title completely. The Palatina describes the others Visions as prima, secunda, etc. but when it reaches the Fifth Vision it inserts incipiant pastoris mandata duodecem. The Latin version, Vulgata, reads here visio quinta, initium pastoris instead.

There is evidence to suggest that Vision V-Similitude X circulated independently at one time. The Michigan papyrus appears to have begun with the Fifth Vision and closed with the Tenth Similitude. The Sahidic version also appears to have begun with Vision V. Since the shepherd does not first appear until the Fifth Vision, it is feasible that this second section, to which alone the title of "The Shepherd of Hermas" properly applies, was once a separate work. If so, how early it would have been combined with the first four Visions is impossible to say. It is interesting to note that all quotations and allusions in Irenaeus, Tertullian, the Liberian Catalogue, the Carmen Adversus Marcionitas, the pseudo-Cyprianic Adversus Aleatores, and Commodian have to do with the second section, viz. Vision V-Similitude X. On the other hand, the imagery of the visions seen by Perpetua, a contemporary of Tertullian, reflects both parts of The Shepherd. Clement of Alexandria and Origen also freely quoted from both. However, Clement employed two different formulas of citation: for the Visions (I-IV) it was, "the power that appeared to Hermas in the vision," or something similar; for the second part (Vision
V-Similitude X) it was, "The shepherd says," or "The shepherd, the angel of repentance, said to Hermas."

There may also be a break in the text of Mandate XII at 46.3. In the Athous Codex the word, Ἀρχή, or "beginning," appears here. The Latin version, Palatina, has at this point in a large hand, the word, AMEN. And the Ethiopian translation inserts the following at that point: Finita sunt mandata duodecim. Initium similitudinum. Similitudo prima. Added to this is the fact that some editions vary in their numbering of the Similitudes. Thus it is supposed by some scholars that the last part of Mandate XII (46.4-49.5) may originally have been the first Similitude. G. Snyder suggested that Similitude IX was inserted later and the others were then renumbered, resulting in this section (46.4-49.5) serving as an interlude between the Mandates and Similitudes. Finally in his Festal letter of 339 Athanasius made no reference to the earlier Visions, but cited the testimony of The Shepherd of Hermas by quoting Mandate I as "the beginning of his book", viz. ante omnia discat quae ille scripto tradidit (Ep. Fest. 11.4). All the parts are known together, however, by the end of the second and beginning of the third century, e.g. in the so-called Vulgata version, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Codex Sinaiticus.

THE PROVENANCE OF THE SHEPHERD

That The Shepherd is to be located in Rome is almost certain. The opening line of the book declares it, viz. "The one who brought me up sold me to a certain
Rhoda in Rome" (1.1). Other geographical references are clearly Roman, viz. the road to Cumae (1.3, 5.1), the Via Campana (22.2). The Clement of 8.3 is most likely Clement of Rome. Moreover tradition offers no origin for The Shepherd other than Rome. The Muratorian Fragment depicts Hermas as the brother of a bishop of Rome, and Origen and others link him to the Hermas of Romans 16.14. However it should be noted that all the Roman references occur in the first part of The Shepherd, viz. Visions I-IV.

There is one other geographical reference in The Shepherd. In Similitude IX (78.4) Arcadia appears to be the subject of the vision. Zahn proposed an emendation in the text here of Ἀρκιάων for Ἀρκαδίαν. The advantage of this correction is that it would transfer the scene to the neighborhood of Rome. Zahn even attempted to identify the "rounded hill" of Aricia with the Italian Monte Gentile. While there is no textual evidence for the change in The Shepherd, Zahn noted a possible parallel in the Acts of Peter and Paul where a scribe has in error given Ἀρκαδίαν for Ἀρκιάων.

Snyder suggested that the parable of the ten mountains in Similitude IX might come from a Jewish-Christian parable similar to Enoch. In Enoch 24-32, the probable origin for the preceding Similitude (VIII), there is a parable of seven mountains in a similar description to that of Arcadia, where the mountains contain exotic trees, deep ravines, streams, and splendid stones, with Jerusalem in the middle. G.H. Box, on the other hand, took Arcadia to be the plain of Ardat modelled after a similar vision in 4
R. Harris argued that the scene described in Similitude IX is the ancient Orchomenus in Arcadia, a lofty natural fortress rising sheer out of a plain which is closed in by high mountains. Harris believed that he could identify at least three of the twelve mountains from the brief descriptions in The Shepherd, viz. Mts. Trachy, Sepia, Skiathis. J. Armitage Robinson attempted to identify four others, viz. Mts. Knakalus, Trikrena, Phalanthus, and Cyllene, and then to guess at two of the remaining five. Harris also noted that the details of the building of the Tower in The Shepherd parallel the early Cyclopean buildings of which there are many remains in the Peloponnesus. Robinson argued that such ruins existed on the very spot on which Hermas was supposed to stand. Harris asked, "How did the Roman Hermas find his way into the most inaccessible part of Greece?" At first he suspected that Hermas had access to a description of the region which was particularly suitable for his parable. The description in Pausanias (c. 167) of the plain of Orchomenus in Arcadia was probably too late to have been used by Hermas, but Harris suggested another source which Pausanias might also have known. Later, however, Harris agreed with Robinson's thesis that Hermas was probably a Greek slave, a native of Arcadia, who reproduced in his vision the natural features of his old home. In such a case Hermas' name, a common one for Greek slaves, would seem especially fitting for a native of this particular district, where there was much worship of Hermes, the Greek
god. Harris recalled that in the generation before Hermas, two brothers, who were also Arcadian slaves, rose to a great eminence in the Roman Empire, viz. Felix and Pallas. 319

There is some evidence to suggest that Similitude IX might have been an independent work at one time. One of the Latin MS., Palatinus lat. 150, inserts a large "AMEN" at the end of Similitude VIII, and then after a large space continues with Similitude IX, after which stands another "AMEN." There is also some editorial evidence for considering Similitude IX as a later addition. The last sentence of Similitude VIII reads: "I will show you the rest (τὰ λοιπὰ) after a few days" (77.5), as if what followed was distinct from the commandments and parables previously revealed. The first sentence of Similitude IX begins with a statement that the recipient of the revelation had already written the commandments and parables (78.1). A transitional phrase in Vision V reads: "So then, first of all, you write down my commandments and parables; but other things (τὰ άλλα) you shall write just as I show them to you" (25.5). The "other things" of 25.5 might well be understood as "the rest" of 77.5, in both cases distinct from "the commandments and parables."

Similitude IX also contains an apparently more developed Christology and ecclesiology. 327 The Son of God, for instance, mentioned beforehand only in 6.8, the parable of the vineyard (58; 59), and briefly in Similitude VIII (69.2; 77.1), plays a central role in the interpretation of Similitude IX (89.1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8; 90.2, 3 (bis), 5, 7;
Moreover in Similitude IX baptism is portrayed as an absolute necessity for entering the kingdom of God (93.2-4), whereas in Vision III the language is less forceful (11.5). The obvious literary intent of Similitude IX is a reinterpretation of the tower in Vision III (78.3). The tower is used to demonstrate the effectiveness of repentance in Similitude IX rather than as a call to repentance as in Vision III. In Vision III an ideal church not defiled by the unrepentant is presupposed, where the unsuitable stones never reach the tower (10.7-9, 15.1-6), while in Similitude IX the unsuitable stones are discovered in the tower itself and rejected by the Lord (81.6-8; 83.3-5, 8; 90.6-9). This is perhaps a more realistic portrayal of the church from which the unrepentant are to be cast out (95.3-5) and may suggest a slightly later development or time. In Vision III the foundation of the tower is "the apostles and bishops and teachers and deacons" (13.1), while in Similitude IX the foundation includes the patriarchs and prophets of the Old Testament as well as "the apostles and teachers" (92.4). However if Similitude IX was added later, then this must have happened before Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen, who quoted it with the other parts of the book. The possibility that Similitude IX was an independent work and a later addition diminishes the reference to Arcadia as serious grounds for disputing the Roman origin of The Shepherd.
DATING THE SHEPHERD OF HERMAS

The Muratorian Fragment (11. 73-7) clearly declares that Hermas wrote The Shepherd while his brother Pius was bishop of Rome (c. 140-c. 154). Yet all the evidence for determining the date of The Shepherd from within the text suggests a period much earlier that the middle of the second century. The Jewish-Christian elements in The Shepherd suggest that Hermas was of Jewish descent, while the first line of the book (1.1) implies that he was also a slave. The most probable time for a Jewish slave to have been brought to Rome was after the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 AD.

In Vision III (13.1) there is a hint that some of the apostles were still alive. In one sentence the "apostles" are listed with "the bishops, teachers, and deacons." This sentence is followed by one which reads: "Some (of them) have fallen asleep while others are still living" (13.1). This may suggest that some of the apostles were still living. Later in Similitude IX, however, the apostles appear to have all died (92.4; 93.5). Thus The Shepherd may have been written during the transition to the post-apostolic age, about the end of the first century.

Hippolytus, in his quarrel with Callistus (Haer. 9.8), quoted the book of Elchasai to the effect "that there was preached unto men a new remission of sins in the third year of Trajan's reign" (c. 100). This could possibly be The Shepherd. In the first part of The Shepherd (Vis. I-IV), the problem of repentance is applied directly to Hermas' household. The second part of The Shepherd (Vis. V-Sim. X)
is more clearly dominated by the shepherd as the angel of repentance. The doctrine of a second repentance is the general theme of the Mandates, especially in IV and XII, and culminates in Similitude VIII. If Hippolytus was referring to The Shepherd of Hermas, then the work could be clearly dated at the turn of the first century.

In Vision II Hermas is instructed by the elderly lady to write down his visions for the "elders."

So you shall write two little books and you shall send one to Clement and one to Grapte. Then Clement will send one to the other cities, for that has been entrusted to him. And Grapte will instruct the widows and the orphans. But in this city you yourself shall read it aloud with the elders who stand at the head of the church. (8.3)

Grapte is otherwise unknown and may have belonged to an order of widows, deaconesses, or virgins. The Clement here is most probably Clement of Rome (c. 92-101). I Clement was written c. 96 by Clement in the name of the Roman church to the church at Corinth. This precedent may account for Hermas' description of Clement as one who had authority to send letters and would imply a date for The Shepherd after 96.

Hermas' description of "the elders who stand at the head of the church" (8.3) suggests that there was not yet a monarchical bishop in Rome. Elsewhere he speaks of "officials of the church" (πρόεδροι), "bishops" (ἐπίσκοποι), and "elders" (πρεσβυτέροι), always in the plural. This is particularly revealing if Hermas' brother, Pius, is supposed to be just such a monarchical bishop (11. 75-7).

A monarchical episcopate at Rome probably did not yet
exist in the time of Clement. In I Clement only two orders are enumerated, viz. bishops and deacons (cf. 42). Moreover the term, ἐπισκόπος, is still synonymous with πρεσβύτερος as it is in the New Testament and appears to be in The Shepherd. Yet in the first or second decade of the next century, as exemplified by the epistles of Ignatius, the two terms begin to designate distinctive offices, and a widespread monarchical episcopacy is evidenced, at least in Asia Minor. The absence of a monarchical episcopacy in The Shepherd might suggest a date before the epistles of Ignatius (c. 110).

The only specific literary reference in The Shepherd is to the apocryphal Eldad and Modad (7.4). The two men are known from Numbers (11.26-9), but their prophecies are unrecorded there. The Book of Eldad and Modad is also referred to in the Palastinian Targums (Jerus. 1; 2) of the first century A.D. The close resemblance of the references in The Shepherd and the two Targums suggests the same source. Elsewhere the work is unknown, although in I Clement 23.3-4 (cf. 2 Clem. 11.2-3) a long quotation, not found in the Old Testament, is thought by Lightfoot and Holtzman to be from the Book of Eldad and Modad.

There is an absence of mention in The Shepherd of any of the early documents to or from Rome, e.g. Romans (c. 58), Mark (c. 65), I Peter (c. 65). Nor does there appear any mention or influence of the later prominent teachers at Rome, e.g. Valentinus (c. 136), Cerdo (c. 140), Marcion (c. 140), Justin (c. 148). While the significance of these absences is questionable, they perhaps fit best with a date
at very beginning of the second century, sufficiently removed from the earlier writings and the later teachers.

"A great tribulation" appears at hand in Visions I-IV (6.7, 7.4, 22.1, 23.5, 24.6). Which persecution is meant is uncertain. The Neronian persecution (c. 64) would probably not have been anticipated, and there is a reference to a past persecution in 9.9, which would preclude the Neronian persecution as the "tribulation to come." That this past persecution was Nero's is perhaps confirmed by the description of what was suffered, viz. "whips, prisons, great persecutions, crosses, wild beasts, for the sake of the name" (10.1). The "tribulation to come" could have occurred anytime thereafter, as the persecution of Christians appears intermittent and sporadic from Nero to Diocletian.

Attempts have been made to identify the "tribulation to come" more specifically with the persecutions of either Domitian (c. 95) or Trajan (c. 112). Trajan's correspondence with Pliny reveals Christian trials in Bithynia (Pliny, Epis., 96-7). There is no evidence, however, that the persecution spread to Rome or anywhere else. In writing to the emperor, Pliny notes that, "Having never been present at any trials of Christians, I am unacquainted with the method and limits to be observed either in examining or punishing them" (Pliny, Ep. 96). Pliny acknowledges that there have been trials of Christians before the time of his writing (c. 112), perhaps in Rome before he left (c. 104). There are hints of such trials in the Similitudes, e.g. "those who suffered for the
sake of the law...those who were persecuted for the sake of the law and did not suffer" (69.6-7), and those who "were questioned when arrested by the authorities and did not deny, but suffered readily...but as many as were cowardly and became doubtful and considered in their hearts whether they should deny or confess, and suffered" (105.4; cf. 50.3). If Pliny was referring to trials before he left Rome (c. 104) then the tribulation in The Shepherd may have been in the early years of Trajan's reign (98-117), around the turn of the century.

The persecutor of the tribulation to come is described by Hermas as the "beast," a synonym for Rome in much apocalyptic literature (cf. Revelation). Yet the beast does not appear to harm the faithful (22.6-9), e.g. "And the beast came on with a rush as if it could destroy a city...stretched itself out on the ground and did nothing but thrust out its tongue" (22.9). This may be a reference to a threatened persecution under Trajan which may never have materialized in Rome itself. Nonetheless in Similitude VIII, "apostates," "betrayers," and "blasphemers," have been produced (72.4, 62.3, cf. 96.1).

There is evidence of a persecution in Rome under Domitian (c. 95), but it may not have been directed specifically at Christians. Nevertheless Domitian's demand that public worship be given to him as Dominus et Deus could produce among Christians what the faithful might well call "apostates, blasphemers, and betrayers." If the persecution in The Shepherd was under Domitian, then the reference in 10.1 would refer naturally to the martyrs of
Nero's persecution.

Hermas himself, who had been originally prosperous in trade (14.7, 28.5, 50.1), lost his business in the persecution (20.2), having been betrayed, it would seem, by his children (3.1, 6.2, 7.1). At the time of the Visions he seems to have been employed in cultivating a farm (9.2; 50.5, 7; 66.1). Zahn, who placed the persecution under Domitian, ingeniously conjectured that Hermas was one of those victims of the tyranny of Domitian to whom Nerva made restitution by giving land instead of the goods of which they had been despoiled.\textsuperscript{51} The persecution mentioned in The Shepherd might best be assigned then to Domitian (95), or the early years of Trajan (c. 100).

The internal evidence of The Shepherd supports an early date for all its parts. The first section (Visions I-IV) appears to be written before a threatened persecution under Domitian or perhaps Trajan. The second section (Vision V-Similitudes VII, X) appears to have been written shortly thereafter to describe the nature of repentance for Christians in the persecution. Similitude IX seems to have been written to unify the work and threaten those who had been disloyal to the church and left it.

Only the tendentious evidence of the Muratorian Fragment suggests a later date for The Shepherd. An early date makes other references of the work more easily intelligible, e.g. the mention of Clement of Rome, the lack of a monopolical episcopacy, a persecution under Domitian or Trajan, and the absence of later Roman history. B.H. Streeter noted that "scholars of the sharpest critical
acumen have allowed themselves to be terrorised, so to speak, into the acceptance of a date which brings to confusion the history of the Church in Rome, on the evidence of an authority no better than the Muratorianum." Consequently numerous scholars have dismissed the dating of The Shepherd suggested by the Fragment, e.g. Donaldson, C. Bigg, W. Wilson, Streeter, W. Coleburne, Sundberg. Others will acknowledge that certain parts of the book were most likely written at or before the turn of the first century, but they wish to allow that other parts may have been written as late as 140, the earliest possible date to concur with the Fragment's statements, e.g. Harnack, S. Giet, L.W. Barnard, Snyder, J. Reiling.

The Fragment plainly states that "Hermas wrote the Shepherd, most recently in our own times in the city of Rome, while the bishop Pius, his brother, was seated on the throne of the church of the city of Rome" (11. 73-7). If The Shepherd was written, not, as the Fragment says, while Pius was bishop of Rome, but thirty or more years before, then the Fragment is making a grave misstatement in a point essential to its argument for the rejection of the work. It is more reasonable to assume that the whole statement in the Fragment is in error.

MULTIPLE AUTHORSHIP

The recognition of the possibility of different editions of The Shepherd has raised the question to modern scholars of multiple authorship. In 1963, S. Giet proposed
that the existing text consists of three different works by
three authors who wrote at different times. According to
Giet, the first and oldest of these comprised Visions I-IV
and was probably written by Hermas himself early in the
second century. The second work consisted of only
Similitude IX and was probably written by the brother of
Pius of Rome, c. 140-50. The third work was of distinctly
Jewish-Christian tendency and was written several years
after Similitude IX, i.e. c. 155-60. This third work
comprised the remainder of the text, viz. the Mandates and
Similitudes I-VIII. The unknown third author Giet called
Pseudo-Pasteur (named after an attribution in the Liber
Pontificalis) who passed himself off as the original Hermas
of the Visions.

The Shepherd, however, is a rambling prophetic work
which cannot be easily systematized. The style of the
entire work is a masterpiece of inconsistencies. Giet's
attempt to portray Similitude IX as by an "orthodox"
theologian and then attempting to identify this theologian
with the brother of Pius is very questionable. There was
probably no rigid idea of "orthodoxy" in the second
century, and though the Similitude does portray a more
developed Christology and ecclesiology, there is no
internal evidence in Similitude IX to date the work so late
as the middle of the second century. Similitude IX
reinterprets the tower in Vision III, and if it is a
separate work, it is obviously later than Visions I-IV.
However Similitude IX need not be seen as much later than
the beginning of the second century. While the apostolic
period is apparently over in Similitude IX, it seems to have been written in the generation that immediately followed "the apostles and teachers of the proclamation of the Son of God" (92.4; cf. 93.5). A date around the episcopacy of Pius (c. 140-c. 154) would appear to be a bit late. Giet was simply trying to correlate the reference in the Fragment with the obvious literary divisions of The Shepherd.

The editorial references in The Shepherd suggest that Similitude IX was later than Vision V-Similitudes I-VIII, X (25.5; 77.5; 78.1) rather than earlier, as Giet suggested. Similitude IX appears to have been inserted among the Similitudes, causing them to be renumbered and rearranged. Therefore the so-called work of Pseudo-Pasteur would likewise have to be dated in the generation following the apostles. Giet's date of c. 155-60 again appears too late.

Another scholar, W. Coleburne, also attempted to define multiple authors for The Shepherd. Coleburne envisioned at least six authors for the work, breaking the text into seven parts, viz. Visions I-IV (called V), Vision V (called R), Mandates I-XII.3.3 (called M), Mandate XII.3.3-6.5 (called E), Similitudes I-VII (called S), Similitude VIII (called S8), and Similitude IX (called S9). The divisions are based primarily upon linguistic evidence from what Coleburne calls his apparatus discernendi. Similitude X is not considered by Coleburne since no significant fragments of the Greek text are known.

On the basis of his analysis and of manuscript evidence already mentioned, Coleburne believed that the
groundwork of The Shepherd was Mandates I-XI (M), to which was added by another hand Similitudes I-VII (S). According to Coleburne, this second author (S) wished to continue the homiletic teaching of moral purity found in M, as well as to put forward his own definite adoptionistic views. Then to M and S a third hand added Vision V (R) and Mandate XII.3.3-6.5 (E). In order to identify the anonymous speaker in M and "the shepherd" in S, this third author, according to Coleburne, introduced the speaker in R and E as "the shepherd, the Angel of Repentance," a formula that does not appear elsewhere. Coleburne noted that there is some evidence that what has grown to RMES in his terminology was in circulation in the eastern Mediterranean world in that form. Then came the prefixing of Visions I-IV (V), which Coleburne thought might also have existed as a separate pamphlet. It is V that has the specific setting of Rome, and the notable personalities of Hermas and the lady, who are not named elsewhere. It is this fourth hand that wished to warn of the tribulation to come. Then came the adding of Similitude VIII (S8). Afterwards a sixth hand added Similitude IX (S9). While both S8 and S9 reflect upon the Tower of Vision III, Coleburne thought that S9 could have had an independent existence. Similitude X is not dealt with. Thus what began for Coleburne as M, became MS, then RMES, then VRMES, then VRMESS8, and finally VRMESS8S9.

Interestingly none of Coleburne's six authors are dated near the middle of the second century. He placed V during the persecution of Domitian, c. 95. According to
his theory of composition, M and S must be even earlier, perhaps c. 60, in response to the controversy about the remission of sins after baptism found in Hebrews (cf. Heb. 6.4-6). No clear evidence of dating R and E is found, but they must be placed between M and S, and V. SS is placed by Coleburne in the last years of the first century and the reign of Nerva. For S9 the well-ordered reign of Trajan would seem a possibility, c. 100, but not much later, said Coleburne, or else it would fall into the period of monarchical episcopacy. Coleburne dismissed the reference to Hermas in the Muratorian Fragment, but suggested that the apostolic Hermas of Romans 16, noted by Origen, may have been the author of the original work M. The author of V then reintroduced the name of Hermas around 95 A.D. as a "concession to a strong Roman tradition."97

Neither Giet's or Coleburne's suggestion of multiple authorship has received strong support from other scholars, although there is general agreement that different editions may have appeared. Giet's interpretation has been subjected to a severe and detailed criticism by R. Joly, who completely rejected it.98 A. Hilhorst, who has seen Coleburne's unpublished apparetus discernendi, disputed the conclusions based upon it.99 Differences in composition do not rule out the possibility of a single author, which is still the generally favored thesis.100 Moreover a significant time span is not suggested nor needed for the completion of later additions. Attempts to expand substantially the time of composition of The Shepherd cannot be founded upon internal evidence which suggests a
date around 100 for all the parts, but only upon later
traditions about authorship which associate the author with
Romans 16.14 (c. 54-7) and Pius of Rome (c. 140- c. 154).

TRADITIONS ABOUT AUTHORSHIP

The Shepherd of Hermas is written as autobiography and
often in the first person. The author is quickly (1.4) and
repeatedly identified as "Hermas" although all the specific
references occur only within Visions I-IV (1.4; 2.2, 3, 4;
4.3; 6.2; 7.1 (bis); 9.6, 9; 16.11; 22.4, 7). If a single
author is assumed for the work, there are four traditions
about its authorship.

1) First there is the unlikely notion that the Apostle
Paul was the author. The transcriber of the Ethiopic
version suggested this in a marginal note, probably based
on nothing more substantial than the identification of Paul
with the god Hermes in Acts 14.12.\textsuperscript{*1}

2) G. Gaab and Zahn first proposed as author of Hermas
an otherwise unknown contemporary of Clement of Rome (c.
96).\textsuperscript{*2} This proposal is based primarily upon the reference
to Clement in 8.3. All the internal evidences for dating
The Shepherd would also be consistent with such a
suggestion; e.g. the lack of a monarchical episcopacy, the
reference in Hippolytus, a possible persecution in Rome
under Domitian or in the early years of Trajan, and the
absence of later Roman history.

3) A third possibility is to identify the author of
The Shepherd with the Hermas to whom a salutation is sent
by Paul at the end of his epistle to the Romans (Rom.
16.14). Origen, in his Commentary on Paul’s Epistle to the Romans (c. 244), in a section which is known only from the Latin translation of Rufinus (c. 397), is the earliest extant witness to attribute the authorship of The Shepherd to this apostolic Hermas:

"Salutate Asyncritum...fratres." De istis simplex est salutatio nee aliquid eis insigne laudis adiungitur. Puto tamen, quod Hermas iste sit scriptor libelli illius, qui Pastor appellatur, quae scriptura valde mihi utilis videtur et ut puto divinitus inspirata. Quod vero nihil ei laudis adscripsit, illa opinor est causa, quia videtur, sicut scriptura illa declarat, post multa peccata ad paenitentiam fuisse conversus; et ideo nec opprobrium ei aliquod adscripsit, didicerat enim scripturam non improperare homini convertenti se a peccato. Neque laudis aliquod tribuit, quia adhuc positus erat sub angelo paenitentiae, a quo tempore opportuno Christus rursus deberet offerri. (Commentary on Romans 10.31)

Eusebius in chapter three of the third book of Church History (c. 303) provided some introductory comments on the writings of the Apostles. After discussing the works attributed to Peter and Paul, Eusebius concluded with a note on The Shepherd of Hermas, revealing the same tradition of apostolic authorship:

But since the same apostle (Paul), in the salutations at the end of the Epistle to the Romans, has made mention among others of Hermas, to whom the book called The Shepherd is ascribed, it should be observed that this too has been disputed by some, and on their account cannot be placed among the acknowledged books; while by others it is considered quite indispensable, especially to those who need instruction in the elements of the faith. Hence, as we know, it has been publicly read in churches, and I found that some of the most ancient writers used it. (H.E. 3.3.6)

Likewise Jerome in his Lives of Illustrious Men (c. 392), in the first chapter after those on the Apostles, provided a similar account of the apostolic authorship of
The Shepherd:

Herman, cuius apostolus Paulus ad Romanos scribens meminit: "Salutate Asyncritum etc.", asserunt auctorem esse libri qui appellatur "Pastor" et apud quasdam Graeciae ecclesias etiam publice legitur, re vera utilis liber multique de eo scriptorum veterum usurpavero testimonia, sed apud Latinos paene ignotus est. (De vir. ill., 10)

All of these accounts are probably derived from the same source with each adding very little to the tradition and only commenting on the present position of The Shepherd in the church. Eusebius noted that The Shepherd had been publicly read in churches and was still considered indispensable by some. Jerome, too, acknowledged it as a useful book, but remarked that in the West it was virtually unknown.

It is unlikely that the Hermas mentioned in Romans is the same Hermas who wrote The Shepherd. To begin with the date of Romans (c. 54-7) appears too early for The Shepherd. Secondly the work itself shows no trace that the author wished to be taken for the Hermas associated with the Apostle Paul. If the author was seeking a pseudonym, the obscure reference in Romans seems an unlikely choice for a later writer. But most importantly is the question of the integrity of chapter 16 in Romans.

New Testament scholars have debated the authenticity of chapter 16 in Romans on a number of grounds, especially its long list of names (Rom. 16.1-15). It would be surprising to discover that Paul had so many Christian friends and would commend the deaconness, Phoebe (16.1), to a church he had never visited. If Rome was the intended recipient of the chapter, then at least nine of the
twenty-six people mentioned there must have emigrated from the East where Paul would have known them, viz. Prisca and Aquila (16.3-5), Epaenetus (16.5), Andronicus and Junias (16.7), Ampliatus (16.8), Stachys (16.9), Rufus and his mother (16.13). It would hardly have served Paul’s purpose in Romans if he had greeted emphatically so many old friends instead of the leading personalities of the congregation. The warning against troublemakers (16.17-8) also accords better with a church for which Paul had pastoral responsibility rather than the church at Rome where he was a stranger, and which he addressed earlier with a measure of diffidence and with every effort to avoid the appearance of criticism (cf. 1.10-2; 12.3-5; 15.14-5, 18-20). Thus many scholars have suggested that chapter 16 was not originally written for the church at Rome, and may not have originally been a part of the Epistle.\footnote{63}

If chapter 16 was not intended for the church at Rome, then the Hermas mentioned by Paul in 16.14 could not be the Hermas of The Shepherd. For the Hermas of Romans (16.14) would then not have resided in Rome, as did the Hermas of The Shepherd. Moreover the association of the apostolic Hermas in Romans with the Hermas of The Shepherd would not have been made except where and when chapter 16 had been attached to the remainder of the Epistle. Yet chapter 16 appears not to have been a part of the version of Romans that circulated in the West at the end of the second century.

The evidence for the early church in the West suggests a recension of Romans with neither chapter 15 nor 16.
Marcion, for instance, appears to have used a text of Romans that concluded at the end of chapter 14. According to chapter lists in Cyprian, the Old Latin version placed the doxology (16.25-7) after chapter 14, suggesting a natural conclusion to the work. The same placement occurs in some Latin Vulgate MSS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ch. 1-14 only</th>
<th>Marcion in Rome (d. c. 160) acc. to Origen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ch. 1-14 w/ (16.25-7)</td>
<td>African Old Latin (end of 2nd cen.) acc. to chap. lists in Cypr. (d. 258)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ch. 1-14 w/ (16.25-7)</td>
<td>Vulgate (c. 400) acc. to Vulgate MSS. 1648, 1792, 2089 acc. to chap. lists in Amiantus &amp; Fuldensis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus Marcion’s recension may have been prevalent in the West, or else the omission of chapter 15 & 16 was not his work but represented an early form in which the text reached him. There is no quotation from either chapter 15 or 16 in the writings of Irenaeus, Tertullian, or Cyprian, although their works are considerable and the chapters were known to Clement of Alexandria.

If Romans was known with only chapters 1-14 in the West at the end of the second and beginning of the third centuries, then this may be further evidence against dating the Muratorian Fragment at that time, because it reveals possible acquaintance with chapter 15. The Fragment explained the absence in Acts of any account of Paul’s missionary journey to Spain by insisting that Luke was not present when the Apostle set out and only recorded the things he witnessed (cf. 11. 35-9). In doing so, the Fragment employed the uncommon Latin form, Spania, for Spain (1. 39), instead of the familiar Hispania. Επαναλήψεως was the word employed by Paul in Romans 15.24 and 15.28
when describing his plans for a visit to Spain, and was probably the word present in the Greek original of the Fragment, which appears to have been simply transliterated in the Latin translation. If so, then the Fragmentist was probably familiar with chapter 15 of Romans in Greek, and that was not likely in the West at the end of the second and beginning of the third century.

T.W. Manson suggested that it was in Alexandria that chapter 16 was added to Romans. The earliest manuscript which includes chapter 16 is the Egyptian P (c. 200), the exemplar of which appears to have ended after chapter 15.

The earliest reference to chapter 16 also comes from Egypt in Clement of Alexandria (viz. Paed. 1.6, cf. 3.12). Perhaps it was only in the East and shortly before the time of Origen that an identification of the Hermas mentioned in Romans with the Hermas of The Shepherd could have been made, because before then and elsewhere chapter 16 containing the name of Hermas does not appear to have been part of the Epistle. The identification of the two Hermas's may have originated with Origen himself or a contemporary.

Origen's association of the Hermas mentioned in Romans with the author of The Shepherd occurs in his Commentary on Romans written towards the end of his life (c. 244). Although Origen referred to The Shepherd many times, nowhere else did he make this claim about its authorship. Nor does any writer before Origen (save possibly for the Fragmentist) appear to identify the author of The Shepherd with the Hermas of Romans, or for that matter, with anyone
else. In the Commentary, Origen appears to justify Paul's salutation to Hermas by conjecturing (\textit{puto tamen}) that this may be the Hermas of The Shepherd and then praising the work himself (\textit{et ut puto divinitus inspirata}). Origen similarly conjectured that the Clement mentioned in Paul's Epistle to the Philippians (Phil. 4.3) was Clement of Rome (\textit{Comm. on John 6.36}). Both these conjectures are unlikely. It is probable that Eusebius derived his account of the apostolic Hermas from Origen, and Jerome derived his from Eusebius. Therefore Origen may be the ultimate source of the tradition which associates the Hermas of Romans with the author of The Shepherd, and which would then date no further back than the middle of the third century.

The Muratorian Fragment may bear an indirect and a reluctant testimony to knowledge of the Eastern tradition of the apostolic authorship for The Shepherd. The Fragment allowed private reading of The Shepherd, but wished to exclude it among canonical works specifically because Hermas, in the view of the Fragmentist, was not apostolic. The Fragment's whole contention was that The Shepherd was written "most recently, in our own time," by pope Pius' brother, and "therefore it ought indeed to be read, but it cannot to the end of time be read publicly in the church to the people, either among the prophets, whose number is settled, or among the apostles" (11. 77-80). There would be no need to deny so emphatically the apostolicity of Hermas in the Fragment, unless a tradition associating Hermas with an Apostle was known. Such a tradition is unknown before Origen (c. 244) and may well have originated
with him. If the Fragmentist betrays an awareness of that tradition then the Fragment would have to be dated after Origen. Additionally the tradition of the apostolic Hermas appears to be a particularly Eastern one, based upon what is an Eastern recension of Romans which included chapter 16, and passed on among fathers writing in the East, viz. Origen, Eusebius, Jerome (in Bethlehem). If the Fragment reveals an awareness of the tradition of the apostolic Hermas, then this would be more easily understood if the Fragment was an Eastern document.

4) A fourth tradition of authorship identifies the Hermas of The Shepherd as the brother of Pius, bishop of Rome. This association is found in three major sources. The first is the Fragment:

```
Pastorem uero
nuperrim e(t) temporibus nostris In urbe
75 roma herma conscripts sedente cath
tra urbis romae aeclesiae Pio ep's fratre(r)
eius
```

This tradition is also found in an early list of popes through Liberius (352-66), sometimes called the Liberian Catalogue, or the Bucherian Catalogue after the Jesuit, A. Bucherius, who first printed the list in 1636. The list is also sometimes called the Philocalian Catalogue from Philocalus (or Filocalus) whose name appears on the title page as the illuminator and who consequently was supposed to have been an ancient editor of the collection."

```
Sub huius (Pius') episcopatu frater eius Ermes
librum scripsit in quo mandatum continetur, quod
ei precepit angelus, cum venit ad illum in habitu
pastoris.
```

The third appearance of the kinship of Hermas and Pius is in an early Latin poem against the Marcionites, viz.
Carmen adversus Marcionitas, attributed to Tertullian:

Post hunc (Hyginus) deinde Pius, Hermas cui germaine frater, Angelicus Pastor, qui tradita verba locutus (Carmen adv. Marc. 3.387-9)

The association of Hermas and Pius is also found in the Felician Catalogue (c. 530), but the reference here is obviously an elaboration dependent upon the earlier Liberian Catalogue. In addition to the statement found in the Liberian Catalogue, the Felician Catalogue added that Pius was an Italian, that his father's name was Rufinus, and that he was buried beside the body of St. Peter. The Felician Catalogue also recorded that the unnamed angelic "mandate" of the Liberian Catalogue was that Easter should be universally kept on a Sunday according to Roman usage. The observance of Easter is nowhere mentioned in The Shepherd, and this report clearly represents a later account, obviously at a time when The Shepherd was little known. The same declaration about Easter appears in a spurious letter of Pius (Migne PG, 5.1119-21).

It is unlikely that the Hermas of The Shepherd was the brother of Pius. The Hermas of The Shepherd appears to have been a foundling slave (1.1), who would be unlikely to know who his parents or siblings were. "Hermas" is a Greek name, while "Pius" is Latin. Hermas wrote in Rome before a monarchical episcopacy was established there, casting further doubt on his brother being a monarchical bishop. Hermas never mentioned a brother in The Shepherd although he frequently referred to the leaders of the church and to the members of his family, viz. his wife and children. Hermas appeared to be writing at a considerably earlier
time (c. 100) than that of Pius' episcopacy (c. 140-c. 154) and it is also unlikely that The Shepherd, if written during Pius' episcopacy, would have been regarded as inspired so quickly in the church, e.g. Irenaeus, Clement, Tertullian, while at the same time with no apparent recollection or tradition of its authorship. The purpose of linking Hermas with Pius in the Fragment appears to be to combat a supposed apostolicity for Hermas, a tradition which cannot be traced earlier than Origen (c. 244).

The traditional dating of the Muratorian Fragment is in jeopardy if The Shepherd was not written in the middle of the second century, and if Hermas is not Pius' brother. It is unlikely that a contemporary witness (nuperrime temporibus nostris) would be so mistaken in information vital to its argument concerning the position of Hermas, which, moreover, other contemporary witnesses could or would dispute. However, if the Fragment was written later, then it is more easily understood how a mistake could be made, and not disputed. Later generations would be unlikely to remember exactly when The Shepherd was written or who the brothers of Pius were, and would possess a highly popular work claimed as authoritative by predecessors, but for reasons perhaps unknown. Supposing a later date for the tradition that Hermas was the brother of Pius would also explain the high regard in which The Shepherd was held by the early church, since the work would probably not have been so highly received if it was thought to be dated from the middle of the second century. Later generations would also be more likely to conjecture that
the apostolic Hermas was the author, if the tradition that
Hermas was the brother of Pius was later and no other
tradition was known.

The plain sense of the words *nupperrime, temporibus nostris* in the Fragment suggests a contemporary account of
Hermas as the brother of pope Pius and as writing The
Shepherd in the middle of the second century. Yet there is
more reason to suspect that these words were misleadingly
translated or transcribed, than to suggest that The
Shepherd was indeed written while Pius was bishop in Rome
or that Pius was Hermas' brother. The attempt to explain
the statements in the Fragment as exaggerated
anti-Montanist polemic, still assumes that the Fragment
was written in the late second century. It is an attempt
to keep the traditional date of the Fragment, while
correcting or explaining the misinformation about the date
of Hermas. But if the information about Hermas is in fact
incorrect, then it is unlikely that the Fragment was
written at the end of the second century. Such a
misstatement about Hermas would be better understood as
being made by later generations unfamiliar with the work
itself or its author, but interested only in discrediting
Hermas as apostolic, in response to a tradition which may
not have originated until the time of Origen (c. 244). The
dating of the other sources associating Hermas and Pius
confirm the tradition as later.

The Liberian Catalogue

The Liberian Catalogue is one of several tracts in a
collection of documents gathered together and edited for
the use of Christians at Rome in the fourth century by a
compiler who T. Mommsen dubbed "The Chronographer of
354." All the existing MSS. of this collection are
fragments, but by piecing them together virtually the whole
collection can be reconstructed. The work is extant in
only two significant transcripts each made from a MS. now
lost, but known in modern times. The Brussels MS. is
believed to be a transcript of a seventh or eighth century
document. The Vienna MS. is a fourteenth century
transcript of a ninth century original.

The Liberian Catalogue comprises a chronological
account of the bishops of Rome from St. Peter to Liberius
(352-66). The length of each episcopate is given in years,
months, and days. The names of the emperors are also
given, and occasional historical notes are sometimes added
recording important events in the life of the Roman church.
There is in the list a marked break at Pontian (230-5).
The method of reckoning the imperial reign is more specific
thereafter, suggesting perhaps that a later editor worked
with an earlier piece that listed only the years, and not
the months and days. There are no historical notices in
the earlier portion, with two exceptions; the date of St.
Peter's crucifixion, and the reference to Hermas.

There are numerous historical notes from Pontian
(230-5) to Lucius (253-4). A break in the Catalogue may be
suggested after Lucius (253-4), because there is an absence
of historical notices for the remaining part of the
Catalogue with one exception, viz. Julius (337-52). Thus
the first continuator of the earliest part of the list ending at Pontian seems to have written under Stephen (254-7), the successor of Lucius, and to have described the events of the twenty years intervening possibly from personal knowledge, if not official sources.

A third break towards the end of the Catalogue is also possible. Lightfoot noted that four other works in the collection of the Chronographer of 354 were compiled about 334, viz. the Commemoration Days of Bishops and Martyrs, the Chronicle of the World, the Chronicle of the City, and the Regions of the City. Lightfoot contended that an earlier list of the popes incorporated into the Liberian Catalogue ended about the same time, evidenced by the lack of historical notes from Lucius (253-4) until Julius (337-52). The immediate predecessor of Julius was Marcus (336), who was bishop less than a year and about whom there may have been nothing to note. The second continuator of the original list may have compiled his catalogue at the end of the episcopate of Sylvester (314-35), c. 334.

The Chronographer of 354 was probably the final editor of the Liberian Catalogue. He could have added the last three names (Marcus, Julius, Liberius) and the historical note about Julius (337-52). The note about Julius (337-52) is the most elaborate notice in the whole document, even containing an enumeration of the churches built by him. This note is most probably the work of a contemporary. The Chronographer of 354 may not have included notes for Marcus (336) and Liberius (352-66), because the reign of the former was too brief and the latter was just beginning. At
which point then, was the tradition about Hermas being the brother of Pius introduced into the Liberian Catalogue, viz. 231-5, 254-7, 334, 354?

Lightfoot argued that Hippolytus (c. 170-c. 236) was the editor of the original list (231-5) from which the Liberian Catalogue is derived and that Hippolytus introduced the historical note about Hermas being the brother of Pius. One of the other treatises included by the Chronographer of 354, along with the Liberian Catalogue, is the Chronicle of the World. This Chronicle is brought through to the year 334 and is headed: Incipit chronica Horosii; Liber generationis mundi. The ascription to Orosius, a well known chronographer, is misleading since he did not live until a century later. This same Chronicle exists elsewhere under the title, Liber Generationis. When the two are compared it is apparent that they are independent Latin translations of a Greek original. The Liber Generationis however is not brought down to 334, but seems to have been compiled in the year of Alexander Severus' death (234). Lightfoot argued that the Liber Generationis is a translation of the named, but previously unknown work of Hippolytus (c. 170-c. 236), viz. the Chronica.

At the close of the table of contents of the Liber Generationis is listed: Nomina episcoporum Romae et quis quotannis praefuit. No catalogue of Roman bishops follows in any MSS. of the Liber Generationis. The so-called Fredegar manuscript (641) may have omitted it because a more complete list, carried down to pope Theodore
(642-649), is given elsewhere. The two Middlehill MSS., one from either the eighth or ninth century, and the other from the tenth century, are mutilated at the end, and it is unknown whether the catalogue of bishops originally appeared. However the Liberian Catalogue is found with the second recension of the Liber Generationis, viz. the Chronicle of the World. Since there is a break in this Catalogue at precisely the same date as the Liber Generationis ended, some scholars argued that the author of the one may be the author of the other. The author of both may be Hippolytus.

Inconsistencies and errors within the Liberian Catalogue suggest that the original list, from Peter to Pontian, contained only the names of the bishops and their durations of office in years, with all the other information, viz. the names of emperors, historical notes, being added by the later editors. This would also fit the description in the table of contents of the Liber Generationis, viz. Nomina episcoporum Romae et quis quotannis praefuit. There is a note respecting the fate of "Hippolytus the presbyter" in the historical information about Pontian in the Liberian Catalogue which may suggest that the second editor knew that his primary source was from Hippolytus. Hippolytus’ opponent, Callistus, is thought to have relied heavily upon Hermas for defense of his position on repentance, and Hippolytus, it is argued, would gladly have discredited the work if he knew any reason to. Some scholars, as was noted earlier, have argued that Hippolytus was the author of the Fragment.
itself and therefore was familiar with the Hermas-Pius tradition.²

While Hippolytus may have been the author of the original list of the Liberian Catalogue, there are serious objections to the claim that the note about Hermas being the brother of Pius was introduced into the list at that time. There are only two historical notes in the earliest part of the list, viz. the date of Peter's crucifixion and the Hermas-Pius tradition. Lightfoot denied that Hippolytus introduced the first note, especially since Hippolytus appears to have dated the Crucifixion in A.D. 28, while the compiler of the Liberian Catalogue dates it A.D. 29. Nonetheless Lightfoot allowed the solitary note relating to Hermas to have been part of the original list.³ If Hippolytus was the author and included more than just names and dates, a historical note about Callistus or Zephyrinus might have been more likely.

Hippolytus refused to accept the teaching of pope Zephyrinus and rejected his successor, Callistus, as a heretic, which seems inconsistent with their recognition in the Liberian Catalogue as genuine popes, without comment. The rejection of The Shepherd by Hippolytus is based upon the supposed use of The Shepherd by Callistus, deduced from a vague reference in Tertullian (De pud. 10). Callistus is now disputed by scholars as the referent of Tertullian, who is now thought to have been not Callistus, but Bishop Agrippinus of Carthage.⁴ Moreover this tradition about Hermas' brother does not seem to be known to any other Church father of that time, e.g. Irenaeus, Clement, Origen.
The only evidence for the prior existence of the tradition about Hermas and Pius is the assumption of the Muratorian Fragment as a late second century document. But the main reason for presuming that dating of the Fragment is its reference to Hermas and his brother. If the Muratorian Fragment is thought to be later, then there is little reason to credit Hippolytus or a contemporary with inserting a single historical note into the original list of the Liberian Catalogue. It was most probably added by a later editor. It is unlikely to have been inserted by the supposed editor of 334, since he is noted for his absence of historical information. The only two editors who are believed to have added historical notes are those of 254-7 and 354. In either of these two cases, the author of the historical note could have been responding to Origen’s association (c. 244) of the Hermas of The Shepherd with the Hermas of Romans (16.14).

The tradition about Hermas in the Liberian Catalogue might have been added at the same time as the historical notice on Peter’s crucifixion, the only other note in the earliest part of the list. The note on Peter reads: *Passus autem cum Paulo die iii Kl. Iulias, cons. ss. imperante Nerone.* The striking aspect of this note is that Peter and Paul are said to have been killed together by Nero. Jerome (c. 394) is the earliest witness to confirm the tradition of Peter and Paul being executed together (*De vir. ill. 5*). In the Acts of Peter (c. 180), Paul is clearly not even in Rome when Peter was killed. The idea that they suffered together was probably an
inference from the union of their names in Clement (I Clem. 5), Ignatius (Rom. 4), Gaius (Eusebius, H.E. 2.25), and Tertullian (Praescript. 36; Scorp. 15). Dionysius (d. c. 264) may have encouraged the tradition with the statement that they "suffered martyrdom at the same time" (κατὰ τὸν ἀυτὸν καὶ τὸν) (Eusebius, H.E. 2.25.8). Prudentius (c. 400), perhaps aware of the conflicting traditions in the Acts of Peter and the Liberian Catalogue, represented the Apostles as suffering on the same day one year apart (Peristeph. 12.5). Since the tradition that Peter and Paul were martyred together is otherwise unknown before the end of the fourth century, it was probably added to the Liberian Catalogue by the editor of 354 rather than the editor of 254-7. If the historical note about The Shepherd was added at the same time, then the tradition that Hermas was the brother of Pius would not have been introduced into the Liberian Catalogue until the fourth century and the final editor (354).

Carmen Adversus Marcionitas

The tradition that Hermas was the brother of Pius is also present in the third book of the Carmen adversus Marcionitas, a poem in opposition to Marcionism, containing 1302 hexameters written in poor Latin in five books. The poem was first published in 1564 among the works of Tertullian. Although there was some dependence upon Tertullian's Adversus Marcionitas (c. 212), there is little foundation for an attribution to him. Thus the author is generally known as pseudo-Tertullian.
Within the poem there is a list of the bishops of Rome, by which the advent of Cerdo and Marcion to Rome is dated. A statement that Pius and Hermas were brothers is found within the mention of Pius' episcopacy.

Hac cathedra, Petrus qua sederat ipse, locatum maxima Roma Linum primum considere iussit; post quem Cletus et ipse gregem suscepit ovilis. huius Anacletus successor sorte locatus; quem sequitur Clemens; is apostolicis bene notus. Evaristus ab hoc rexit sine crimen legem. Sextus Alexander Sixto commendat ovile, post expleta sui qui iustri tempora tradit Telesphoro; excellens his erat, martyrique fidelis adventit Roman Cerdo... (3.360-73) Iamque loco nono cathedram suscepit Higinus. Post hunc deinde Pius, Hermas cui germane frater, Angelicus Pastor, qui tradita verba locutus Sub quo Marcion his veniens... (3.385-9)

The order of bishops given in the poem is unique among early lists, but reveals the separation of Cletus and Anacletus (Anencletus) into two persons, as does the Liberian Catalogue:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Petrus</td>
<td>Petrus</td>
<td>Petrus</td>
<td>Petrus</td>
<td>Petrus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linus</td>
<td>Linus</td>
<td>Linus</td>
<td>Linus</td>
<td>Linus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaclet.</td>
<td>Anenclet.</td>
<td>Clemens</td>
<td>Clemens</td>
<td>Cletus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clem.</td>
<td>Clemens</td>
<td>Cletus</td>
<td>Anacletus</td>
<td>Anacletus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaris.</td>
<td>Ewares.</td>
<td>Anaclet.</td>
<td>Evaristus</td>
<td>Clemens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex.</td>
<td>Alex.</td>
<td>Evaris.</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>Evaristus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixtus</td>
<td>Xystus</td>
<td>Alex.</td>
<td>Sixtus</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teleph.</td>
<td>Teleph.</td>
<td>Xystus</td>
<td>Teleph.</td>
<td>Sixto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyginus</td>
<td>Hyginus</td>
<td>Teleph.</td>
<td>Iginus</td>
<td>Teleph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pius</td>
<td>Pius</td>
<td>Hyginus</td>
<td>Anicetus</td>
<td>Higinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anicet.</td>
<td>Anicetus</td>
<td>Anicetus</td>
<td>Pius</td>
<td>Pius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soter</td>
<td>Soter</td>
<td>Pius</td>
<td>Soter</td>
<td>Anicetus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The separation of Cletus and Anacletus (Anencletus) into two different persons was probably a scribal error originating in one of the revisions of the Liberian Catalogue, from which it passed into the Felician Catalogue and later editions of the Liber Pontificalis. It is more
likely that pseudo-Tertullian would be dependent for his papal list on an edition of the Liberian Catalogue than that an editor of the Catalogue would rely upon the *Carmen adversus Marcionitas*. Thus the *Carmen adversus Marcionitas* was probably dependent upon one of the editions of the Liberian Catalogue, directly or indirectly. Note that both works are possibly Roman in origin. However in pseudo-Tertullian the duplication of Cletus and Anacletus is placed before Clement, while in the Liberian Catalogue the duplication occurs after Clement (the *Liber Pontificalis* inserted Clement between the duplication).

Likewise Anicetus is after Pius in pseudo-Tertullian, as it was in most lists, but before him in the Liberian Catalogue. Thus a case of direct dependence cannot be established between the Liberian Catalogue and the *Carmen adversus Marcionitas*. The variations between the lists suggest that the dependence was mediated by some other source or influence.

If pseudo-Tertullian was dependent upon one of the editions of the Liberian Catalogue for its duplication of Cletus and Anacletus (Anencletus), then it is probable that he received the tradition of Hermas being the brother of Pius from the same source. If the Hermas-Pius tradition was introduced into the Liberian Catalogue at the same time as the historical note about Peter's crucifixion, then it was probably introduced into the final edition of 354. Thus the *Carmen adversus Marcionitas* was perhaps dependent upon the final edition of the Liberian Catalogue.

The authorship of the *Carmen adversus Marcionitas* is
uncertain. About 160 verses of the poem have been discovered in a cento, entitled *Victorini versus de lege domini* (Cod. Vat. 582). In the same MS. another poem by the same author on the life of Jesus contains about twenty other verses of the *Carmen adversus Marcionitas.* Isidore of Spain (c. 560-636) noted that: *Victorinus episcopus composuit et ipse versibus duo opuscula admodum brevia, unum adversus Manicheaos..., aliud autem adversus Marcionistas, qui duo principia, i.e. duos deos fingunt, unum malum, iustum creaturarum conditorem et retributorem factorum, alterum bonum, animarum susceptorem et indultorem criminum.* This reference could substantiate an attribution of the *Carmen adversus Marcionitas* to a Victorinus, except that the poem is not really *admodum brevia.* A. Oxe and H. Waitz both attributed the poem to Commodian, who is dated anywhere from the middle of the third century to the fifth. It is thought that Commodian may have incorporated parts of other works, perhaps one by a Victorinus.

The date of the *Carmen adversus Marcionitas* is disputed. W. Brandes placed the work in the sixth century. F. Oehler argued for Victorinus of Marseilles (c. 430-40) as author, while E. Huckstadt believed the work to be that of Victorinus Afer (c. 360). L. Duchesne also argued for Victorinus of Marseilles, because he believed the confusion of Hermas with the Pastor in the poem (3.388) resulted from a misreading of Rufinus (c. 404), viz. *In Novo vero Testamento libellus qui dicitur Pastoris seu Hermas, qui appellatur Duae viae vel Judicium*
Petri (Comm. in Symb. Apost. 38). The confusion of Hermas, the author, with the mediator of the revelation, viz. the shepherd, suggests that the poet had little knowledge of the actual work. Jerome, it will be remembered, noted that among the Latins The Shepherd was almost unknown in his day (De vir. ill. 10).

Hilgenfeld and Waitz thought to date the poem in the second half of the third century, c. 260-300. Certain lines in the poem are thought to portray a time of persecution (e.g. 1.109, 190, 212/3). Paganism was also still prevalent (cf. 1.136-8; 3.6-9). They also noted that Marcionism was the only heresy named in the work. Arianism and Manichaeism were not mentioned, though they both flourished in the fourth century and were known in the West. Still the poem was directed against Marcionism and might be excused from mentioning other heresies.

Harnack, however, wished to push the date a little further forward, c. 315-c. 350, and argued that Hilgenfeld and Waitz misunderstood the situation in the Western church after Constantine. Harnack noted that Arianism and Manichaeism were not active in the West until the latter half of the fourth century. Moreover some paganism continued after Constantine, e.g. among the aristocrats and bureaucrats. And after Constantine, there were still persecutions, e.g. Donatists. Harnack noted, as Brandes did before him, that pseudo-Tertullian wrote: Filius, imenso genitus de lumine lumen (4.29) and De patre principium, genitum de lumine lumen (5.199). While Tertullian wrote: ita de spiritu spiritus est, de deo deus
ut lumen de lumine accensum (Apol. 21), the crucial, genitum, is missing. Harnack and Brandes could find no example of this important formula, genitum de lumine lumen, before Nicaea (325). Thus a date for the Carmen adversus Marcionitas in the second half of the third century is perhaps unlikely.

More recently K. Holl argued for an even later dating. Besides the phrase, genitum de lumine lumen, which has no precedent before Nicea (325), Holl noted the phrase, cum patre semper erat, unitus gloria et aevo (5.201). This phrase, according to Holl, hints at Arian concerns of coaevus and aequaevus, which played no roll in Western theology before 360. The tradition that Adam was buried on Golgotha in the Carmen adversus Marcionitas (2.258-66) was, according to Holl, dependent upon the form of that tradition found in Jerome (Ep. 46.3). Although the tradition was known among Christians as early as Origen (Comm. on Matt. 2.126), and known to numerous Eastern fathers from the end of the fourth century, e.g. Chrysostom (c. 347-407), Basil the Great (c. 330-79), Nonnus of Panopolis (c. 400), pseudo-Athanasius, Basil of Seleucia (d. c. 459), Holl noted that it does not appear in the West until Ambrose (c. 339-97) and Caesarius of Arles (c. 470-542). Similarly Holl believed the description of the Church’s origin as depicted in the poem (2.252-7) was dependent upon Augustine. The reference to Jeremiah’s not dying (3.245/6) is thought dependent upon Victorinus of Pettau’s (d. 304) Commentary on Revelation (11.3). Finally Holl perceived the influence of semi-Pelagianism in the
poem (4.58-67), and this would move up the date considerably. Holl concluded that an unknown poet of southern Gaul wrote the *Carmen adversus Marcionitas* in the last quarter of the fifth century, or perhaps a little later, c. 475-525.

The variety of suggested dates is witness to the difficulty of reaching a firm conclusion, but most recent scholars have opted for a date in the fourth century, after 325. Holl has pushed the date to at least after 360. Overall, therefore, there seems good grounds for claiming that the *Carmen adversus Marcionitas* is later than the Liberian Catalogue, and probably dependent upon it for its tradition of Hermas being the brother of Pius.

In summary, both the Liberian Catalogue and the *Carmen adversus Marcionitas* as sources for the Hermas-Pius tradition are much later than the traditionally dated Muratorian Fragment. Both sources are probably to be dated sometime after Origen's *Commentary on Romans* (c. 244) and the tradition could have arisen in response to the apostolic Hermas tradition suggested by Origen. Perhaps Pius did have a brother named Hermas, a common enough name at that time. A later generation could easily confuse the two. But it is unlikely that the Hermas of The Shepherd was the brother of Pius; and it is also unlikely that a contemporary source like the Fragment, as traditionally dated (*nuperrime temporibus nostris*), would make such a error. If the Fragment were to be dated in the fourth century, then the mistake would be more understandable, and the witness it would present to the Hermas-Pius tradition
would be contemporaneous with the other surviving testimonies.

RECEPTION IN THE CHURCH

Attestation of The Shepherd within the church is early and widespread. The oldest extant testimony is Irenaeus of Lyons (c.130-c. 200), who simply quoted a passage from the work with the words, "Well said the Scripture" (Ὅροφα); Adv. Haer. 4.20.2; cf. Euseb. H.E., 5.8.7), in the midst of quotations from Genesis, Malachi, Ephesians, Matthew, Revelation, I Peter, and Colossians. The fact that Irenaeus did not name the source may suggest that he was quoting a well-known text. None of the other scriptural references were identified either. Additionally, the first reference to Genesis was also introduced as from the "Scripture" (Scriptura, 4.20.1).

The mutilated beginning of the Stromateis of Clement of Alexandria (c. 150-c. 215) opens in the middle of a sentence from The Shepherd, and about ten times elsewhere he quoted from the book,

always with a complete acceptance of the reality and divine character of the revelations made to Hermas. Clement also quoted from The Shepherd in the Eclogae propheticae (45). The context was often clearly among Scriptural references, e.g. John, Ephesians (1.17); Romans, Deuteronomy, Isaiah (2.9); Ezekiel, Matthew, Romans (6.6); Psalms, Luke, Matthew, Mark (Eclog. proph.). Clement appeared to regard Hermas as inspired, for in one place Clement wrote; "Divinely (Θεῖος) therefore the power which spoke to Hermas by
revelation said. . .." (1.29). Elsewhere he wrote, "And it is well said by the shepherd. . .." (6.6).

The Shepherd seems to have been translated into Latin by Tertullian's time (c. 160–c. 225), since he described it by the Latin title *Pastor* and not by a Greek title, as he usually did when he referring to Greek writings. In *De oratione* (16), Tertullian (198-204) disputed the practice of sitting down immediately after prayer, for which he knew no other reason except that Hermas is said to have sat upon a bed after praying (25.1). The Shepherd seems to have been a very influential work in the Church at that time, and Tertullian did not dispute the authority of the book, only the unreasonableness of converting a narrative statement into a rule of discipline. Thus Tertullian appears to have accepted *The Shepherd* at that point.

The Shepherd, as evidenced by Irenaeus in Lyons, Clement in Alexandria, and Tertullian in North Africa, appears to have been widely accepted in the Church at the end of the second century and the beginning of the third, although none of these writers appears to have known the origin of the book or anything about its author. Such widespread acceptance and unknown origins for *The Shepherd* would not be remarkable if the work was written at the end of the first century (c. 100) by a relatively unknown author and if the Muratorian Fragment was of a later date. However the widespread acceptance and unknown origins for *The Shepherd* are remarkable if *The Shepherd* was composed during Pius' episcopacy (c. 140–c. 154) and if the tradition that Hermas was Pius' brother was known at the
end of the second century, as would be the case in some areas of the Church at least with the traditional dating of the Muratorian Fragment.

Twenty years after his comments in *De Oratione*, and after his conversion to Montanism (c. 207), Tertullian came to reject The Shepherd, vehemently attacking it as "the book that loves adulterers" and noting that "every" synod, even of the non-Montanists, have habitually counted it "spurious" *(sed cederem tibi, si scriptura Pastoris, quae sola moechos amat, divino instrumento meruisset incidis, si non ab omni concilio ecclesiarum, etiam uestrarum, inter apocrypha et falsa iudicaretur, De pud. 10)*. This reference suggests that Tertullian's opponent had cited The Shepherd in his defense. That opponent was formerly thought to have been Pope Callistus (217-22) but is now generally believed to have been Bishop Agrippinus of Carthage.105

Tertullian's remarks in *De pudicitia* (c. 220) are the first indisputable criticisms of The Shepherd. *De pudicitia* is a polemic against the penitential discipline of the church, a position which contradicted Tertullian's own earlier views in *De paenitentia* (c. 203). Indeed in *De pudicitia*, Tertullian introduced a class of sins for which there is no forgiveness, the *irremissibilia*. Among these was idolatry, and thus there was no scope for repentance of idolatry, which was the very theme of The Shepherd. It was not surprising that the Montanist Tertullian railed against the popular and influential work of The Shepherd. His statement that it was rejected by every synod of the
churches, even those of the non-Montanists, however, cannot be objectively verified, and might be thought of as an example of his famous rhetoric. Later in De pudicitia (De pud. 20) Tertullian commented on Hebrews (extat enim et Barnabae titulus ad Hebraeos), noting that this work was at least more received than The Shepherd, suggesting something less than the previously described universal rejection for the book (et utique reception apud ecclesias epistola Barnabae illo apocrypho Pastore moechorum, De pud. 20).

Tertullian's reasons for rejecting The Shepherd are clearly sectarian and it should not thought that there was widespread rejection of the work. A. Julicher noted that "The 'Shepherd' of Hermas was treated by practically all the Greek theologians of the third century who had occasion to use it as a canonical document." Even in the West The Shepherd must have remained popular as some twenty MSS. still exist in an Old Latin version of the second or third century. There is strong evidence of a familiarity with The Shepherd in the Passio SS. Perpetua et Felicitatis (202/3). While The Shepherd was not directly cited at all by Cyprian (d. 258), this is not particularly surprising. Cyprian had a comparatively rigorist position in regards to the repentance of the sacrificati and thurificati of the Decian persecution, and would not have taken kindly to the more lenient repentance allowed in The Shepherd. There is a clear allusion to Similitude II, however, in Commodian, viz. Sicut ulmus amat vitem, sic ipsi pusillos (Instruct. 1.30). The Shepherd was not unfavorably mentioned in the Liberian Catalogue (354) or...
the *Carmen adversus Marcionitas* (c. 475–c. 525). John Cassian (c. 360–435) also cited *The Shepherd* in his *Collationes Patrum* (13.12) (c. 420).

Moreover in the pseudo-Cyprianic *Adversus Aleatores* there are numerous allusions to *The Shepherd*, and at one point it was specifically cited as "divine scripture" (*dicit enim scriptura divina, 2*). The *Adversus Aleatores* is a sermon written in late Latin against dice-throwing. The date of the work is disputed, and it is not found among the earliest MSS. of Cyprian, e.g. the catalogue dated 359 discovered by Mommsen. The tract is not quoted as Cyprian's until the fourteenth century. At one time Harnack assigned it to Pope Victor (189–99). Harnack's position however received little support. Harnack himself later expressed doubt about his dating, writing: "Ich habe früher die pseudocyprianische Schrift *Ad aleatores* dem Victor vindicirt (Texte u. Unters. V, Heft 1), bin aber jetzt gegen diese Hypothese skeptisch geworden. Ist sie nicht von Victor, so ist sie von einem novatianischen Romischen Bischof aus d. Jh. 260–309." The first official notice of dice-throwing in the Church is at the Council of Elvira (c. 300), viz. canon 79. The late Latin of this work is similar to other documents found amongst the Cyprianic correspondence. Koch therefore held that the *Adversus Aleatores* was written by a bishop of North Africa after Cyprian's time, perhaps c. 300.

If the *Adversus Aleatores* is dated after Tertullian's *De pudicitia* (c. 220), as seems evident, then there is continued evidence in the Latin church of a high regard for
The Shepherd, viz. as *scriptura divina*. The only extant rejection of the work is limited to the Montanists, although their influence combined with the Novatianist controversy may account for a decline in the usage of The Shepherd in the West.

It is in the East that more general, non-sectarian reservations about The Shepherd developed. Origen (c. 185-c. 254) certainly had a high regard for the work. In *De principiis* (c. 220-30), he quoted The Shepherd along with the Psalms and 2 Maccabees as *ex Scripturum auctoritate* (1.1.5). In his *Homilies on Luke* (c. 233-4) having quoted from an apocryphal work which he knew might be disputed, Origen added that if this work offended anybody, they could find the same doctrine in The Shepherd (*Hom. on Luke 35*), as if The Shepherd was a widely acknowledged source. In his *Commentary on Romans* (c. 244), Origen called The Shepherd "divinely inspired" (*divinitus inspirata*). Six times he referred to it without commenting on its inspiration. Yet Origen was also aware that the work had its despisers. Later in *De principiis* he described Hermas as *τῷ άπό τῶν καταφορούμενω βίβλω* (4.1.11), but it is obvious that he himself was not one of these despisers. Who the despisers were is not certain, and these comments may reflect nothing more than Montanist dissatisfactions.

The fact that Origen interjected a personal opinion in his *Commentary on Romans* (c. 244), viz. *et puto divinitus inspirata*, perhaps suggests a continued controversy about the book. In his *Commentary on Matthew* (c. 246), Origen
described The Shepherd as φερομένης μὴν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ γραφής, οὐ γὰρ πᾶσιν de ομολογομένης εἶναι Θεός (14.21). Remarks which exist only in Rufinus' loose translation express similar hesitation about the work later in Origen's life. For instance, in the Commentary of Matthew (c. 246) the phrase, *si cui placeat illum legere librum* (2.53), is found. In Origen's Homilies on Numbers (246-54) it is written, *si cui tamen Scriptura illa recipienda videtur* (8.1), and in Homily I on Psalm 38 (c. 247) is found, *si cui tamen libellus ille recipiendus videtur* (1). What exactly occasioned this new found hesitation in Origen is not known; but it would seem that despite the apparent hesitation, Origen still approved of the work. It seems unlikely that Origen became aware of opposition to The Shepherd when he visited Rome around 212, since Origen does not appear to have revealed any personal hesitancy until some thirty years later, viz. 244-54. However while in Rome, Origen may have learned of the Montanist disparagement of The Shepherd, reflected in his comment in De principiis. Since Origen revealed no knowledge of the tradition of authorship for The Shepherd accorded in the Fragment, it seems unlikely that the Fragment's objections could have been the source of Origen's apparent later hesitancy. It is possible that Origen became hesitant about The Shepherd when he moved to Caesarea (c. 232), if the work was not accepted there. Origen's later remarks do not so much suggest that The Shepherd had been rejected, as only that it was not received.
Eusebius of Caesarea (c. 260-c. 340) appears to mark the turning point for the acceptance of The Shepherd. While relating the apostolic Hermas tradition of authorship in his *Church History* (c. 303), Eusebius noted that this work had been disputed by some, and thus on their account it could not be placed among the acknowledged books (οὐκ ὁμολογούμενος, 3.3.6). Still Eusebius made it clear that others considered the work quite indispensable, especially to those who needed instruction in the faith (3.3.6). Eusebius reported that The Shepherd had been publicly read in churches, and that some of the most ancient writers used it (3.3.6; cf. 5.8.7). Immediately after these comments on The Shepherd, Eusebius wrote: "This will serve to show the divine writings that are undisputed as well as those that are not universally acknowledged" (Ταύτα εἰς παράστασιν τῶν Θεων ἀνατρέποντων καὶ τῶν Μη τάρα τάραν ὁμολογούμενων θείων γραμμάτων, 3.3.7). The Shepherd obviously belonged to the latter class of works, those that were not universally acknowledged. A little later in the *Church History* (3.25.1-5), Eusebius, in listing books of the New Testament, placed The Shepherd among the spurious (νόθως) works, along with the Acts of Paul, the Revelation of Peter, the epistle of Barnabas, the Didache, and perhaps Revelation and the Gospel according to the Hebrews. On the one hand, these works were distinguished from the accepted writings (ὁμολογούμενας), viz. the four Gospels, Acts, the epistles of Paul, I John, and I Peter, and from the...
disputed books (ἀντιλεγομένων), viz. James, Jude, II Peter, and II & III John. On the other hand, these writings were also distinct from those which were cited by the heretics under the name of the apostles, viz. the Gospels of Peter, Thomas, Matthias, and of any others besides them, and the Acts of Andrew and John and the other apostles, which "are not to be placed even among the spurious writings (Νόθους), but are all of them to be cast aside as absurd and impious" (3.25.6/7). Unlike Origen, who while acknowledging a dispute about The Shepherd, continued to accept the work, Eusebius, in acknowledging the dispute, clearly placed The Shepherd in a secondary class.

A parallel situation for The Shepherd appears to be reflected in the list of the Codex Claromontanus (D*). In this list of New Testament works, the scribe placed a line or bar before the last four entries, viz. the epistle of Barnabas, The Shepherd, Acts of Paul, and the Revelation of Peter. This line or bar suggests a dispute about these works. The contents of this secondary class in the list of the Codex Claromontanus is almost identical to that of Eusebius (3.25.4). Revelation which Eusebius noted that some rejected (ἀθέτωσον) while others placed it among the accepted books (ομολογομένως), is here placed among the accepted books. The Gospel according to the Hebrews, which Eusebius acknowledged that some have placed in the spurious group, although he himself seemed reluctant to, is absent altogether from the list in Codex Claromontanus. The remaining works which Eusebius had
grouped all together are exactly those which are distinguished in this list, although the order is different, viz. Acts of Paul, The Shepherd, the Revelation of Peter, and the epistle of Barnabas. The presence of these works in the list suggests an Eastern origin, perhaps associated with the school of Alexandria. The absence of reservations about James, Jude, II Peter, and II & III John, which Eusebius expressed (H.E. 3.25.3), would perhaps suggest a later date.

In Codex Sinaiticus (X), The Shepherd again appears to be in a secondary class. Following the books of the New Testament and the epistle of Barnabas, a space of over one and a half columns is left vacant, after which The Shepherd was added. Such a gap may suggest a secondary class for The Shepherd. There are divisions indicated in the margin of the Gospels in Codex Sinaiticus which are a device derived from Eusebius for forming a harmony of the Gospels. Thus this Codex like the Catalogue in Codex Claromontanus was probably later than Eusebius.

Athanasius (c. 296-373) in an earlier work, the De Incarnatione Verbi Dei (c. 318), called The Shepherd "most edifying" (᾿ὁ ἐξ Θεοῦ δόξα τῆς ἁλτείας) (3), and quoted it between Genesis and Hebrews. In his Paschal letter of 339, however, Athanasius appeared more hesitant. When he quoted from Mandate I (26.1) among citations from Deuteronomy, Hebrews, Isaiah, John, the epistles to Timothy, Romans, etc., he introduced it with an apology in the style of Origen, "if any man is not offended at its testimony" (Ep. Fest. 11.4). Perhaps the Arian appeal to Mandates I (cf.
Ep. ad Afros 5) led Athanasius to later emphasize that The Shepherd was "not in the canon," e.g. De Decretis 18 (350/1). In his famous Paschal letter of 367 Athanasius clearly placed The Shepherd among a secondary class of works, which were not in the canon but were nonetheless useful to be employed in catechetical instruction (Fest. Ep. 39.7). Distinct from apocryphal writings (Ἀποκρύφων), this secondary class also included the Didache, and several Hebrew works, viz. the Wisdom of Solomon, Sirach, Esther, Judith, and Tobit.

Jerome (c. 342-420) in his preface to the Books of Kings (391), also placed The Shepherd among Hebrew writings, viz. the Wisdom of Solomon, Sirach, Judith, and Tobit, which non sunt in canone (Prol. Gal.). In his Lives of Illustrious Men (392), Jerome noted that while The Shepherd was almost unknown in the West, it was read publicly in some churches in Greece (De vir. ill. 10). He noted that it was in fact a useful book (re vera utilis liber) and many of the ancient writers quoted from it as authoritative (multique de eo scriptorum veterum usurpaverer testimonia). Yet if The Shepherd was the work referred to in Book I of his Commentary on Habakkuk (392), then Jerome appears to have viewed it there as foolish, viz. Ex quo liber ille apocryphus stultitiae condemnandus est, in quo scriptum est, quemdam angelum nomine Tyri praesse reptilibus (1.14) (cf. Hermas 23.4). Still in Book II of his Commentary on Hosea (406), he wrote with a hesitancy reminiscent of Origen and Athanasius: "Unde et in libro Pastoris, si cui tamen placet illius recipere
Rufinus (c. 345-410) also mentioned The Shepherd in a secondary class. In his *Commentarius in Symbolum Apostolorum* (397/8) Rufinus presented a list of books of the Old and New Testaments. Thereafter he added some works, which he called "ecclesiastical," viz. sciendam tamen est quod et alii libri sunt qui non canonici sed ecclesiastici a majoribus appellati sunt (Comm. in Symb. Apost. 38). The characteristic of this class of books was that they could freely be read in the churches, but could not be appealed to as authoritative (Quae omnia legi quidem in ecclesii voluerunt, non tamen proferri ad auctoritatem ex his fidei confirmandam; 38). In this group, Rufinus included the Wisdom of Solomon, Sirach, Ecclesiasticus, Tobit, Judith, and the books of the Maccabees. And in *Novo vero Testamento libellus qui dicitur Pastoris seu Hermas, qui appellatur Duae viae vel Judicium Petri* (38). Rufinus also recognized another class of works, the "apocrypha," which were those which could not be read in the churches, viz. *Caeteras vero Scripturas Apocryphas nominarunt, quas in Ecclesiis legi noluerunt* (38).

Within the Muratorian Fragment, The Shepherd was also clearly placed in a secondary class. It was excluded from among the prophets and apostles, whose number was complete (11. 78-80). Yet its private reading was still encouraged, but The Shepherd ought not to be read publicly in church (11. 77/8). The Shepherd was reported to have been read in churches by Eusebius (*H.E. 3.3.6*), Jerome (*De vir. ill.*).
10), and Rufinus (Comm. in Symb. Apost. 38). Despite Origen's hesitancy, it was only with Eusebius that The Shepherd was put into a secondary class of limited acceptance. Eusebius clearly noted that The Shepherd "has been disputed by some, and on their account cannot be placed among the acknowledged books" (H.E. 3.3.6). Origen appears never to have gone so far. But throughout the fourth century in the East, The Shepherd is found in such a secondary class, e.g. Eusebius, Athanasius, the list in Codex Claromontanus, Codex Sinaiticus, and Rufinus (whose tradition was at least influenced by the East). Thus the statements about The Shepherd in the Fragment would not be particularly remarkable if the Fragment was dated in the fourth century in the East.

Ferguson disputed the argument that Eusebius was the turning point in regard to the acceptance of The Shepherd. Instead he suggested that Eusebius' statements "are in a historical context; he was reporting a situation which we know goes back at least to the time of Tertullian." Yet Tertullian's remarks are quite different from those of the Fragment and it is hard to correlate Tertullian's description of The Shepherd as "the book that loves adulterers," with the encouragement in the Fragment that The Shepherd ought to be read privately. Tertullian, after his conversion to Montanism, rejected the work utterly, while the Fragment maintained a limited acceptance of The Shepherd. While the Montanists may have introduced a dispute about The Shepherd, its acceptance was not limited in the Church at large, as far as is known, until Eusebius.
Thereafter The Shepherd remained accepted, but in a secondary class, throughout the fourth century.

Ferguson suggested that: "The approval which Irenaeus gave the work and Clement of Alexandria’s regard for it as inspired could be the very use against which the Canon Muratori was protesting, or alternatively the very kind of private use which the author approved." Yet it cannot be both. Irenaeus and Clement of Alexandria appear unaware of any dispute or restriction of the work. If Ferguson could not correlate Irenaeus’ and Clement’s usage with one or the other of the statements in the Fragment, then they cannot be used as support for the Fragment’s views and evidence of its date.

Tertullian’s rejection of The Shepherd was clearly a sectarian and isolated incident, not a general trend. In the West the work was still quoted or alluded to by Tertullian’s opponent, viz. Bishop Agrippinus of Carthage, by Commodian, John Cassian, and especially by the author of Adversus Aleatores, who specifically cited the work as “divine scripture.” Moreover The Shepherd was not unfavorably mentioned in the Liberian Catalogue or by the author of the Carmen adversus Marcionitas; and some twenty Old Latin MSS. of the work survive. In fact besides Tertullian’s complete renunciation of The Shepherd in De Pudicitia, there is no extant unfavorable remark about The Shepherd in the West until Jerome (if considered Western), who at one point appeared to call it "foolish" while at another time, "useful." It was only in the East, and after Origen’s time, that questions about The Shepherd caused it
to be excluded from among the universally acknowledged writings and placed into a secondary class of limited acceptance. The statements about The Shepherd in the Muratorian Fragment imply that it was received into just such a secondary class. Thus its attitude towards The Shepherd suggests a fourth century date for the Fragment.

CONCLUSION

While the traditional dating of the Muratorian Fragment has been based upon its statements about The Shepherd of Hermas, those statements themselves appear to be erroneous or misleading on several accounts. First, the dating of The Shepherd in the Fragment during the episcopacy of Pius (c. 140–c. 154) is uncorroborated and most probably incorrect. The internal evidence of The Shepherd suggests a date around the turn of the first century (c. 100), viz. with its apparent reference to Clement of Rome, to the lack of a monarchical episcopate, and to a persecution most readily identified with the time of Domitian or the early years of Trajan. The fact that the work was so widely and approvingly disseminated, viz. among Irenaeus, Tertullian (in his Catholic phase), and Clement of Alexandria, would also discourage a dating in the middle of the second century.

Secondly the tradition of authorship presented in the Fragment, viz. by Pius' brother, is also unlikely to be correct, and is otherwise unknown until the fourth century, viz. in the Liberian Catalogue (354) and the Carmen adversus Marcionitas (354+). The insistence in the Fragment that Hermas was not apostolic, would suggest a
knowledge of the apostolic Hermas tradition of authorship, which probably originated with Origen (c. 244). This is a peculiarly Eastern tradition, viz. Origen, Eusebius, Jerome (in Bethlehem), and was probably dependent upon an Eastern recension of Romans which included chapter 16. Even chapter 15 of Romans may have been unknown in the West at the time when the Fragment is traditionally dated, and yet the Fragmentist appears to have known it.

Thirdly, the reception of The Shepherd in the church as depicted by the Fragment militates against the traditional dating. It is paralleled most clearly by Eastern sources of the fourth century, viz. Eusebius, Athanasius, the list in Codex Claromontanus, and Codex Sinaiticus. The attitude of limited acceptance reflected in the Fragment contrasts both with the complete rejection of the work by the sectarian Tertullian and the strong acceptance of the work by Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen.

If these statements in the Fragment about The Shepherd are erroneous or misleading, then the apparent statement in the Fragment that it was composed shortly after the episcopacy of Pius is dubious in itself. The traditional dating of the Fragment, dependent upon the key phrase, \textit{nuperrime temporibus nostris}, which Sundberg has attempted to reinterpret, is also presumptuous because of the known poor transcription and the suspected careless translation of the MS. Thus the traditional dating of the Muratorian Fragment has no sure foundation, and the place of the Fragment within the history of the New Testament canon needs to be reconsidered.
CHAPTER THREE

SCRIPTURE AND CANON

In this chapter, a survey of the history of the Christian canon will reveal that the Muratorian Fragment as traditionally dated is an anomaly in the development of the New Testament. Albert Sundberg suggested at the Third International Congress on New Testament Studies (Oxford, 1965) that "in order to write a coherent and accurate history of the development of the New Testament it becomes necessary to distinguish between the terms 'scripture' and 'canon' as termini technici in the history of canon." ¹ Sundberg contended that scholars often fail to make this distinction and instead treat the two terms as synonymous. He defined "Scripture" as religious literature that is appealed to for religious authority. "Canon" is then a closed collection of "Scripture," to which nothing can be added and from which nothing can be subtracted. Whereas the concept of Canon presupposes the existence of Scriptures, the concept of Scriptures does not necessarily entail the notion of Canon. It is entirely possible to possess Scriptures without having a Canon, and this was in fact the situation in the first few centuries of the Church.

THE OLD TESTAMENT

Sundberg's distinction between "Scripture" and "Canon" is based on the fact that the literature received from Judaism was treated as authoritative in the early Christian
church, together with the view now widely held that the Jewish literature received by Christianity was not a closed collection. Until recently, most scholars thought that the Jewish Canon was completed in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah long before Jesus and the rise of Christianity. An account in II Maccabees 2.13 (c. 90-50 BC) noted that Nehemiah founded a library and collected the sacred writings. II (IV) Esdras 14.44 (c. 100 AD) recounted that Ezra restored in forty days the sacred books which had been destroyed by the Babylonians, being supernaturally empowered to recall the entire Scriptures. In 1518, Elias Levita formulated the theory, based on passages from the Talmud, that the men of the Great Synagogue under Ezra established the Canon of the Hebrew Bible. This theory was widely accepted by Jewish and Christian scholars until the end of the nineteenth century.

A number of different factors challenged the traditional understanding of the Jewish Canon. B. Childs summarized them as follows:

First of all, the discovery of a complex historical development in the literature, especially the Pentateuch, seriously damaged the idea of a direct, unbroken link between the original writing and its final stage in which the book's authority had been accepted from its inception. Again, the recognition of a long prehistory raised serious questions respecting the traditional authorship, and thus threatened the canon's authenticity. Then again, the discovery that certain of the works, especially Daniel, probably derived from a period after the alleged closing of the canon under Ezra's leadership did much to question the accuracy of the traditional concept of the canon's history.

The studies of A. Kuenen made it especially difficult to defend the closing of the Jewish Canon by Ezra and
While the Law and the Prophets may have been long established among the Jewish Scriptures, the remaining books of the Jewish Canon do not appear to have been defined in the pre-Christian era. Ben Sira in the prologue to his translation of Ecclesiasticus (c. 130 BC) thrice mentioned the sacred writings, each time leaving the last element of the collection undefined:

a) Whereas many great teachings have been given to us through the Law and the Prophets and the others that followed them.

b) My grandfather, Jesus, after devoting himself especially to the reading of the Law and the Prophets and the other books of our fathers.

c) Not only this work, but even the Law itself, the Prophecies, and the rest of the books differ not a little as originally expressed.

Likewise in II Maccabees 15.9 (c. 90-50 BC), Judas is noted "encouraging (his men) from the Law and the Prophets."

A reference to Nehemiah's "memoirs" and library in chapter 2 (2.13-5) suggests that a collection of "writings" in addition to the Law and the Prophets was known to the author. Philo of Alexandria (c. 49 AD) mentioned "the Laws, and the words foretold by the prophets, and hymns and the other writings, by which knowledge and piety are multiplied and perfected" (De vita contempl. 25). However Philo never quoted from the "writings," although he referred to most of the books of the Law and the Prophets.
The New Testament also frequently referred to the Law and the Prophets without mention of the "writings" (e.g. Mt. 5.17, 7.12, 11.13, 22.40; Lk. 16.29, 31, 24.27; Jn. 1.45; Acts 13.15, 28.23). It is noted in Acts (13.15) that "the Law and the Prophets" were read regularly in the synagogues (cf. Luke 4.17; Acts 13.27). At one point in Luke (24.44) the Psalms were also included, viz. "in the Law of Moses and the Prophets and the Psalms..." A few verses before however they were absent, viz. "And beginning with Moses and all the Prophets, he (Jesus) interpreted to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself" (24.27).

Thus the Law and the Prophets appear to have been defined elements within the Jewish Scriptures before the Christian era. But the "writings," the remaining element, still appears undefined to New Testament writers.

The Jewish Canon appears not to have been closed in the days of the New Testament writers. The numerous quotations and allusions to the books of the Jewish Canon which appear in the New Testament cannot be distinguished from numerous quotations and allusions to Jewish Scriptures outside the Jewish Canon. Similarly, references by the early writers of the Christian churches, both in the East and West, do not neatly distinguish between the works of the Jewish Canon and other Jewish Scriptures. The books now called "deuterocanonical" by Roman Catholics or "apocryphal" by Protestants were in the early Church employed in ways indistinguishable from the books included in the Jewish Canon.

To account for the differences between the Jewish
Canon and Christian usage of Jewish Scriptures, it was first argued independently by J.E. Grabe (1666-1711) and J.S. Semler (1725-1791) that the early Church adopted an Alexandrian (or Septuagint) Canon from diaspora Judaism. In addition to the books of the Jewish (or Palestinian) Canon, the Alexandrian Canon, according to this theory, included the literature now known as "deuterocanonical" or "apocryphal." But Sundberg in his monograph has, as Childs put it, "successfully destroyed the widespread theory of an Alexandrian canon and seriously damaged the assumption of parallel canons, one narrow and one broad, which were held by different geographical communities within Judaism." It would seem that when the Christians separated from the Jewish synagogues in the first century they did not take with them a defined Old Testament Canon, but rather a looser collection of Jewish Scriptures.

The discoveries at Qumran confirm this point. In a way similar to Christian writers, the works found at Qumran include quotations and allusions to the books of the Jewish Canon which are indistinguishable from quotations and allusions to other Jewish Scriptures outside the Jewish Canon. In both a Jewish sectarian group that came to an end in Palestine about 68 AD, and in primitive Christianity that arose within Judaism in Palestine after 30 AD, there is a similar treatment of Jewish religious writings. It does not seem likely that the one group influenced the other. The usage of "deuterocanonical" writings at Qumran further confirms that the wider body of Jewish Scriptures was not restricted to Alexandria or the diaspora, but was
found throughout Judaism in the first century AD. This larger body of literature is known to have circulated in Greek among the Greek speaking Jews in Palestine as well as in the diaspora. Indeed there appears to have even been a Palestinian recension of the Greek Septuagint. Thus the Scriptures of Alexandrian-Hellenistic Judaism probably did not differ significantly from those of the Jews of Palestine. Moreover there is no known restriction against the use of this wider body of Scriptures in Judaism before the end of the first century AD.

When the Jewish Canon was closed is not certain. It is not until the end of the first century A.D., after the Christians had separated from the synagogues, that there is any clear evidence of the establishment of the Jewish Canon. Josephus (c. 100) is the first extant witness for a closed Jewish Canon. In Contra Apionem (1.37-41) he considered the Jewish Canon closed, the text inspired and inviolable, the period of time within which these books originated fixed, and the number of the books established (at 22). Josephus' polemic, however, may suggest that an established Jewish Canon was a recent innovation. The exact contents of Josephus' collection remain uncertain, and the last element of the Canon untitled, viz. "the remaining four (books) contain hymns to God and maxims of life for men." II (IV) Esdras 14.19-48 (c. 100) also suggests a closed Jewish Canon. Here ninety-four Jewish works are alluded to. Twenty-four books are to be made public while the remaining seventy works are "to be delivered in secret to the wise." The twenty-four books
would appear to be the Jewish Canon. Indeed it was probably to limit the contents of Jewish Canon against so many other writings and influences that it was finally closed. Thus at the turn of the first century AD (c. 100), both Josephus and II (IV) Esdras witnessed to a closed Jewish Canon. These writings are the earliest surviving witnesses to a closed Jewish Canon, though they disagree about the exact number of works included, viz. Josephus (22), II (IV) Esdras (24).

Disputes about which works were included in the Jewish Canon continued into the second and third centuries AD. Ecclesiastes and the Song of Solomon were discussed at Jamnia (c. 90 AD). Esther and Ezekiel were still disputed in the third century. Ecclesiasticus, although not part of the Jewish Canon, was quoted three times in the Talmud apparently as Scripture. According to the Gemara, some rabbis still did not admit Proverbs, Esther, Ezekiel, and Ruth. Origen evidently knew I Maccabees in Hebrew and in the hands of Jews, though outside their Canon. Judith and Tobit were still obtainable in Hebrew from Jews in Jerome's day, while the Talmud conceded that Ben Sirach could be read. Thus, while the concept of a closed Jewish Canon apparently became accepted in Rabbinic circles from the end of the first century AD, the exact contents of that Canon continued to be disputed for some time.

Confusion about the exact contents of the Jewish Canon is evidenced by Christian writers as well. Melito (c. 170) provided a list of the books of the Jewish Canon in answer to frequent questions from his brother (bishop?) Onesimus,
who "desired to have an accurate statement of the ancient books as regards their number and order" (Eusebius, *H.E.* 4.26.13-4). Apparently unable to fulfill his request in Sardis, Melito "went East and came to the place where these things were preached and done." In his list of twenty-one books, Melito oddly omits mention of Esther and Lamentations and placed Ezekiel after Daniel. Origen also provided a list of the Jewish Canon. "But it should be known that there are twenty-two canonical books, as the Hebrews have handed them down; the same as the number of the letters of their alphabet. . .These are the twenty-two books according to the Hebrews. . ." (Eusebius, *H.E.* 6.25.2). Origen included a transliteration in Greek of the Hebrew titles to parallel the names of the books as known in the Septuagint. He appears to have omitted the book of the Twelve Prophets, since his intended list of twenty-two books includes only twenty-one Hebrew titles. He also noted the book of the Maccabees at the end of his list.

Both lists that Melito and Origen presented are clearly Jewish catalogues and not Christian ones. Origen drew a clear distinction between "their Scriptures" (i.e. of the Jews) and "our Scriptures" (i.e. of the Church), both with respect to the reading of the text (cf. *Ad Africanum* 5, 9, 13) and with respect to the number of books. He noted for instance that the Jews did not use Tobit and Judith to which the churches did appeal (*Ad Africanum* 13.3). Origen appears to have suggested confinement by Christians to the Jewish Canon only for polemic purposes with Jewish opponents (*Ad Africanum* 5.13).
A similar need may be behind Melito's list, for he is known to have made a collection of "testimonies" from the Jewish Canon (Eusebius, *H.E.* 4.26.12, 14).

The extant evidence suggests that the Jews defined their Canon (c. 100) sometime after the Christians had separated from the synagogues and that the Christians inherited a larger body of Jewish Scriptures than the later Jewish Canon. The Eastern church felt the impact of the newly established Jewish Canon more clearly than the Western. Melito, implicitly, and Origen, explicitly, attempted to correlate Christian usage with the Jewish twenty-two book list, at least for polemical reasons. Like their successors, they correlated, in varying combinations, separate Septuagint works under the Hebrew titles of the Jewish Canon (see chart). In Epiphanius there are three different attempts to correlate Christian usage of Jewish Scriptures with the Jewish Canon. These variations suggest that while the tradition of a twenty-two book Jewish Canon was received from Palestine, no clear tradition of the content or of how the Jews arranged or counted their Scriptures was known to the church. There is in the Christian and Jewish lists a general disagreement about contents, order, and grouping. None of the Christian lists of the Old Testament agree with the Masoretic Jewish Canon until the Synod of Dort in the seventeenth century. These differences indicate the fluidity that once existed, and further confirm that the early church did not inherit an established Jewish Canon.
## EASTERN CHRISTIAN LISTS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Melito</th>
<th>Origen</th>
<th>Athan</th>
<th>Cyril</th>
<th>Epiph1</th>
<th>Epiph2</th>
<th>Epiph3</th>
<th>Gregory</th>
<th>Amphil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>Gen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exod</td>
<td>Exod</td>
<td>Exod</td>
<td>Exod</td>
<td>Exod</td>
<td>Exod</td>
<td>Exod</td>
<td>Exod</td>
<td>Exod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num</td>
<td>Lev</td>
<td>Lev</td>
<td>Lev</td>
<td>Lev</td>
<td>Lev</td>
<td>Lev</td>
<td>Lev</td>
<td>Lev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lev</td>
<td>Num</td>
<td>Num</td>
<td>Num</td>
<td>Num</td>
<td>Num</td>
<td>Num</td>
<td>Num</td>
<td>Num</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut</td>
<td>Deut</td>
<td>Deut</td>
<td>Deut</td>
<td>Deut</td>
<td>Deut</td>
<td>Deut</td>
<td>Deut</td>
<td>Deut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh</td>
<td>Josh</td>
<td>Josh</td>
<td>Josh</td>
<td>Josh</td>
<td>Josh</td>
<td>Josh</td>
<td>Josh</td>
<td>Josh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judg</td>
<td>-Judg</td>
<td>Judg</td>
<td>-Judg</td>
<td>Judg</td>
<td>Ps</td>
<td>Job</td>
<td>Ps</td>
<td>Ps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>-Ruth</td>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>-Ruth</td>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>Prov</td>
<td>Judg</td>
<td>-Ruth</td>
<td>Ruth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4 K</td>
<td>1-2 K</td>
<td>1-2 K</td>
<td>1-2 K</td>
<td>1-2 K</td>
<td>Job</td>
<td>Eccl</td>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>1-4 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 Ch</td>
<td>3-4 K</td>
<td>3-4 K</td>
<td>Ps</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Ps</td>
<td>1-2 Ch</td>
<td>Eccl</td>
<td>1-4 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps</td>
<td>1-2 Ch</td>
<td>1-2 Ch</td>
<td>Prov</td>
<td>Josh</td>
<td>1 Ch</td>
<td>1 Ch</td>
<td>Prov</td>
<td>1 Ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prov</td>
<td>1-2 Esd</td>
<td>1-2 Esd</td>
<td>Eccl</td>
<td>-Judg</td>
<td>2 Ch</td>
<td>Job</td>
<td>Job</td>
<td>Job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eccl</td>
<td>Ps</td>
<td>Ps</td>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>-Ruth</td>
<td>1 K</td>
<td>Ps</td>
<td>Ps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Prov</td>
<td>Prov</td>
<td>Job</td>
<td>1 K</td>
<td>1-2 Ch</td>
<td>2 K</td>
<td>Eccl</td>
<td>Prov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>Eccl</td>
<td>Ps</td>
<td>2 K</td>
<td>1-2 K</td>
<td>3 K</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Eccl</td>
<td>Song</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Prov</td>
<td>3 K</td>
<td>3-4 K</td>
<td>4 K</td>
<td>Prov</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Prov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jer</td>
<td>Isa</td>
<td>Job</td>
<td>Eccl</td>
<td>4 K</td>
<td>Twelve</td>
<td>Twelve</td>
<td>Twelve</td>
<td>Twelve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twelve</td>
<td>Twelve</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>1 Ch</td>
<td>Isa</td>
<td>Eccl</td>
<td>Isa</td>
<td>Eccl</td>
<td>Isa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>-Lam</td>
<td>Twelve</td>
<td>2 Ch</td>
<td>Jer</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Jer</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Jer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek</td>
<td>-Ep</td>
<td>-Jer</td>
<td>Isa</td>
<td>Twelve</td>
<td>Ezek</td>
<td>Twelve</td>
<td>Ezek</td>
<td>Ezek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Esther)Dan</td>
<td>-Lam</td>
<td>-Baruch</td>
<td>-Jer</td>
<td>1-2 Esd</td>
<td>Jer</td>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Dan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek</td>
<td>-Ep</td>
<td>-Lam</td>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>Ezek</td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Ezek</td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Dan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>Ezek</td>
<td>-Ep</td>
<td>1 Esd</td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>2 Esd</td>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>Esther</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>-Baruch</td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Ezek</td>
<td>1 Esd</td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>Esther</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ezek</td>
<td>2 Esd</td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Esther</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Entries in **bold** print are not in the Jewish Canon.
## EARLY CHRISTIAN CODICES OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vaticanus 22</th>
<th>Sinaiticus 23</th>
<th>Alexandrinus 24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genesis</td>
<td>Genesis</td>
<td>Genesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exodus</td>
<td>Exodus</td>
<td>Exodus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leviticus</td>
<td>Leviticus</td>
<td>Leviticus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deuteronomy</td>
<td>Deuteronomy</td>
<td>Deuteronomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>Joshua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges</td>
<td>Judges</td>
<td>Judges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>Ruth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4 Kings</td>
<td>1-4 Kings</td>
<td>1-4 Kings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 Chronicles</td>
<td>1 Chronicles</td>
<td>1-2 Chronicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 Esdras</td>
<td>2 Esdras</td>
<td>Hosea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psalms</td>
<td>Tobit</td>
<td>Micah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proverbs</td>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Joel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecclesiastes</td>
<td>1-4 Macc</td>
<td>Obadiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song of Solomon</td>
<td>Isaiah</td>
<td>Jonathan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>Nahum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td>Lamentations</td>
<td>Habakkuk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sirach</td>
<td>Joel</td>
<td>Zephaniah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>Obadiah</td>
<td>Haggai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Jonah</td>
<td>Zechariah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobit</td>
<td>Nahum</td>
<td>Malachi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosea</td>
<td>Habakkuk</td>
<td>Isaiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amos</td>
<td>Zephaniah</td>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micah</td>
<td>Haggai</td>
<td>Baruch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel</td>
<td>Zechariah</td>
<td>Lamentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obadiah</td>
<td>Malachi</td>
<td>Epistle Jeremy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonah</td>
<td>Psalms</td>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahum</td>
<td>Proverbs</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habakkuk</td>
<td>Ecclesiastes</td>
<td>Esther</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haggai</td>
<td>Song of Solomon</td>
<td>Tobit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zechariah</td>
<td>Wisdom of Solomon</td>
<td>Judith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malachi</td>
<td>Sirach</td>
<td>1-2 Esdras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah</td>
<td>Job</td>
<td>1-4 Maccabees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Psalms</em>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baruch</td>
<td></td>
<td>151st Psalm**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamentations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistle Jeremy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proverbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ecclesiastes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td></td>
<td>Song of Solomon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wisdom of Solomon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sirach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Entries in **bold print** are not in Jewish Canon

* Before the Psalms are placed the Epistle of Athanasius to Marcellinus on the Psalter, and a summary of the contents of the Psalms by Eusebius.

** After the Psalms, there are placed a number of canticles extracted from other parts of the Bible.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hilary</th>
<th>Jerome1</th>
<th>Jerome2</th>
<th>Rufinus</th>
<th>Augustine</th>
<th>Carth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>Gen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exod</td>
<td>Exod</td>
<td>Exod</td>
<td>Exod</td>
<td>Exod</td>
<td>Exod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lev</td>
<td>Lev</td>
<td>Lev</td>
<td>Lev</td>
<td>Lev</td>
<td>Lev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Num</td>
<td>Num</td>
<td>Num</td>
<td>Num</td>
<td>Num</td>
<td>Num</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deut</td>
<td>Deut</td>
<td>Deut</td>
<td>Deut</td>
<td>Deut</td>
<td>Deut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh</td>
<td>Job</td>
<td>Josh</td>
<td>Josh</td>
<td>Josh</td>
<td>Josh</td>
<td>Josh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Judg</td>
<td>Josh</td>
<td>-Judg</td>
<td>-Judg</td>
<td>-Judg</td>
<td>-Judg</td>
<td>-Judg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 K</td>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>1-2 K</td>
<td>1-2 K</td>
<td>1-4 K</td>
<td>1-4 K</td>
<td>1-4 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 K</td>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>3-4 K</td>
<td>3-4 K</td>
<td>1-2 Ch</td>
<td>1-2 Ch</td>
<td>1-2 Ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 Ch</td>
<td>Isa</td>
<td>1-2 Ch</td>
<td>1-2 Ch</td>
<td>1-2 Ch</td>
<td>1-2 Ch</td>
<td>1-2 Ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 Esd</td>
<td>Twelve</td>
<td>1-2 Esd</td>
<td>Twelve</td>
<td>Tobit</td>
<td>Tobit</td>
<td>Tobit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps</td>
<td>Isa</td>
<td>Ezek</td>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>1-4 Sol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prov</td>
<td>Jer</td>
<td>Twelve</td>
<td>Isa</td>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Twelve</td>
<td>1-2 Macc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eccl</td>
<td>Ezek</td>
<td>Job</td>
<td>Jer</td>
<td>1-2 Macc</td>
<td>1-2 Esd</td>
<td>1-2 Macc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Ps</td>
<td>Ezek</td>
<td>Ps</td>
<td>Ezek</td>
<td>1-2 Macc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twelve</td>
<td>Ps</td>
<td>Prov</td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Prov</td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Dan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Ecc1</td>
<td>Twelve</td>
<td>Prov</td>
<td>Prov</td>
<td>Prov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Jer</td>
<td>Sol</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Job</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Song</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Lam</td>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Ps</td>
<td>Ecc1</td>
<td>Ecc1</td>
<td>Ecc1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Ep</td>
<td>1-2 Ch</td>
<td>1-2 Ch</td>
<td>Prov</td>
<td>Wisd</td>
<td>Wisd</td>
<td>Wisd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Ezra-Neh</td>
<td>1-2 Esd</td>
<td>Ecc1</td>
<td>Sirach</td>
<td>Sirach</td>
<td>Sirach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek</td>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>1-2 Esd</td>
<td>1-2 Esd</td>
<td>1-2 Esd</td>
<td>1-2 Esd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>Jer</td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Isa</td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Dan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Tobit)</td>
<td>(Tobit)</td>
<td>(Tobit)</td>
<td>(Tobit)</td>
<td>(Tobit)</td>
<td>(Tobit)</td>
<td>(Tobit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Judith)</td>
<td>(Judith)</td>
<td>(Judith)</td>
<td>(Judith)</td>
<td>(Judith)</td>
<td>(Judith)</td>
<td>(Judith)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hilary, *Prolog. in Lib.* Ps. 15.
Council of Carthage (397), canon 26.
I-IV Sol. probably includes Prov, Eccles, Song, Sirach, Wisd.

Entries in **bold** print are not in the Jewish Canon.
The Eastern fathers of the fourth century appear to have accepted the proposition that the Old Testament of the Church should be limited to the Jewish Canon. This conviction however was at first not completely integrated into their usage, for the Eastern fathers continued to use works from the larger body of Jewish Scriptures throughout the fourth century. There is no marked difference, for instance, between Athanasius' use of the books of the Jewish Canon and those of the larger body of Jewish Scriptures. Quotations from the non-canonical Jewish Scriptures are introduced with formulas regularly used with the books of the Jewish Canon. A similar practice is to be found in the writings of Cyril of Jerusalem and Gregory of Nazianzus.

The Western fathers of the fourth century do not appear to have felt compelled to limit their use of Jewish Scriptures to the Jewish Canon. The earliest reflection of the impact of the Jewish Canon in the West is in Hilary of Poitiers (d. 368), who was probably following Origen's list of the Jewish Canon. Elsewhere he made use of Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Baruch, and Susanna in a way corresponding to his use of Jewish canonical works. Augustine, in a radical contrast to the Eastern practice of the fourth century, postulated an equal and identical divine inspiration for both the Jewish Canon and the Christian Old Testament of the Septuagint (cf. City of God 18.42-3). The later church councils of the West, viz. Hippo 393, Carthage 397, 412, confirmed Augustine's witness to a larger body of Jewish writings than the Jewish Canon. The presence of the
Jewish Canon was ultimately not decisive in the Western church’s Old Testament Canon. Jerome in Bethlehem, in contrast to Augustine and Western fathers in general, rejected whatever was not originally written in Hebrew. Specifically he rejected the Wisdom of Solomon, Sirach, Judith, Tobit, and I & II Maccabees (Prol. Gal.). Rufinus (c. 380) compromised by placing the books which Jerome rejected in a special class known as the “ecclesiastical writings.” "Ecclesiastical writings" could be read in church, according to Rufinus, but they could not be used to establish doctrine (Comm. in Symb. Apost. 38).

In summary, it is clear that not only did the Church not inherit a Canon of Scripture from Judaism, but that the Church was forced to determine an Old Testament Canon for itself. Sundberg’s distinction between "Scripture" and "Canon" is useful in distinguishing between the time when the Church’s Old Testament Scriptures were undefined, and the fourth century when the churches were struggling with fixing an Old Testament Canon. The establishment of the Jewish Canon does not seem to have prompted the Christians at first to define their own Old Testament. The early lists of the Jewish Canon of Melito and Origen appeared necessary only for polemic purposes. Only in the fourth century did the Eastern fathers attempt to limit their Old Testament Scriptures to the Jewish Canon. The Western fathers on the other hand were content to establish an Old Testament Canon without limitation by the Jewish Canon. In the West, Jewish non-canonical Scriptures like Judith, Tobit, Ecclesiasticus, and the books of the Maccabees found
their way into the Christian Old Testament Canon. Whether in the West or the East, the crucial period in the formation of the Christian Old Testament Canon was the fourth century.

The Muratorian Fragment as traditionally dated at the end of the second century contrasts greatly with the establishing of the Old Testament in the fourth century. The Fragment clearly represents a New Testament Canon. To accept the Fragment as traditionally dated would suggest that the Church was engaged in defining a New Testament Canon more than a hundred and fifty years before it began fixing an Old Testament Canon. While this is not impossible, it is unlikely, and it must have been such a consideration that encouraged Sundberg to reconsider the date of the Fragment.

COMMENTS, COLLECTIONS, CATALOGUES

The references that scholars use to trace the development of the New Testament are of differing forms. If the differences of format among these references are not acknowledged then misleading theories can be established in the history of the Canon. For example, Charles Buck, in "The Early Order of the Pauline Corpus," sought to establish that the early Pauline corpus began with Corinthians and ended with Romans. To support his thesis, Buck provided a table (p. 352) comparing entries found in the Muratorian Fragment, Tertullian, and Origen.
Buck, however, failed to acknowledge the differences in the format of his sources. He had to construct the lists for Tertullian (Adv. Marc. 4.5) and Origen (Contra Celsum 3.19-20) from narrative material. In order to create his list for Origen, Buck introduced Corinthians at the head by virtue of an unnamed Pauline quotation at the end of the previous chapter in Origen. Buck's attributing a specific order for the letters in Tertullian is dubious since in the same chapter Tertullian named the four Gospels in the unusual sequence of John, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and elsewhere listed the Pauline letters in a different manner (Praescript. 36). Both Origen's and Tertullian's lists are incomplete, as Buck noted: "Although it is impossible to say where Colossians and Philemon occurred in Tertullian's corpus, or Galatians and Philemon in Origen's, it is certain that these letters occurred in their respective lists" (pp. 352-3). The Fragmentist, unlike Tertullian and Origen, quite clearly intended to catalogue the complete Pauline corpus in a specific order without significant narration or omission. Buck, however, included only a partial list from the Fragment in his table, omitting any mention of the epistles to Timothy and Titus.

Buck's comparison is faulted for failing to appreciate the differences in format between his sources, and to allow
for the possible implications of those differences. It will be helpful to build upon Sundberg's differentiation of "Scripture" and "Canon" by introducing some technical distinctions between the forms which sources used in studying the development of the New Testament take. It is recognized of course that context is the ultimate cause of format. However general forms are still distinguishable. For the sake of convenience, three categories are here proposed: "Comments," "Collections," and "Catalogues."

1) Comments

Comments is the most ambiguous of the three categories proposed, and simply refers to any mention of works as Scripture or as authoritative. The reference may often be to only two or three works, and may frequently be in the context of some other discussion. There is usually no intention of completeness in this category and this is its most distinctive feature.

Buck's reference to Paul's letters from Tertullian (Adv. Marc. 4.5) is a good example of a Comment. The mention of Paul's epistles occurs in the context of a discussion about Luke's Gospel. The reference betrays no intention of completeness, which explains why other Pauline letters accepted by Tertullian are not mentioned, viz. Colossians and Philemon, and why this list differs in order and content from his Comments on Paul's letters in De praescriptione haereticorum (36).

2) Collections

Collections are more definite than Comments. They have clear and distinct boundaries, which include certain
specifiable works. Yet the boundaries are by definition not rigid. Collections are easily altered, and thus they do not imply as firm boundaries as their form suggests. Collections are specific, but not final, for they are often amended and enlarged. They are by definition not closed.

The group of Pauline letters represented by the so-called Marcionite Prologues is a good example of a Collection. In their original form the Prologues probably represented a Collection of the Pauline letters to seven churches, viz. Galatians, Corinthians, Romans, Thessalonians, Laodiceans, Colossians, Philippians. This Collection probably did not include Hebrews or the Pastoral Epistles. Ephesians may have been addressed to the Laodiceans and Philemon may have been incorporated with Colossians. At a later stage, or stages, the original Prologues were translated into Latin and new Prologues were composed for Philemon and for the second letters to the Corinthians and Thessalonians. Subsequently, Prologues for Hebrews and the Pastoral Epistles, viz. I & II Timothy, Titus, were added, and an Ephesians Prologue replaced Laodiceans. Thus while the original Prologues constituted a distinct Collection with definite boundaries, the Collection itself was easily altered and enlarged.

3) Catalogues

The category of Catalogues is the most distinct since by its very nature it is precise and definite. The boundaries which it declares are explicitly fixed and more permanent than the boundaries of Collections. This is evident in Catalogues when works beyond the boundaries are
sometimes noted and dismissed. In its pure form, a Catalogue is simply an accepted list, to which nothing can be added or subtracted.

The Muratorian Fragment is a good example of a Catalogue. The Fragmentist quite clearly intended to list the Pauline corpus in a specific order, without omission. He stated that Paul wrote first to the Corinthians, then to the Galatians, and then to the Romans (11. 42-5). It would seem that the Fragmentist intended to list Paul’s letters in the order in which he considered them written. He did not carry this through, however, but started over again, saying that following the example of his predecessor John (11. 46-50), Paul wrote in a similar pattern to seven churches in the following order: Corinthians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Galatians, Thessalonians, and Romans (11. 50-4). He then added that: "he (Paul) wrote to the Corinthians and to the Thessalonians once more for their reproof" (11. 53-5). After a couple of lines, again noting John’s writing to seven churches (11. 57-9), the Fragmentist awkwardly continued: "But to Philemon one, and to Titus one, and to Timothy two, (written) out of goodwill and love, are yet held sacred to the glory of the catholic church for the ordering of ecclesiastical discipline" (11. 59-63). The Fragmentist intended to present not only a specific order for Paul’s epistles, but also a complete list, noting for example those letters which were rejected as forgeries, e.g. to the Alexandrians and the Laodiceans.

The Fragment is more than a Catalogue of Paul’s epistles, it is a Catalogue of New Testament works. Other
writings are declared accepted by the Fragment, just as some are equally rejected. While the concept of a fixed boundary is evident in the Fragment, the determination on which side of the boundary some works fall is still uncertain. For example, in the Fragment it is acknowledged that some do not want the Revelation of Peter read in the churches (11. 71-3) and that The Shepherd ought to be read privately, but not publicly (11. 73-80). Nonetheless the Fragment implies an explicitly fixed boundary that is more permanent than that of Collections.

These distinctions in format are particularly useful in differentiating the implications of the context and nature of sources when comparing different canonical listings. They also hint at the development of the Canon. The movement from Comments to Collections to Catalogues is instructive in the formation of the Christian Bible. The boundaries of the elements of the Canon are fixed gradually, just as the boundaries of these categories are gradually defined. Comments appear to precede Collections in the formation of the Christian Canon, just as Collections appear to precede Catalogues.

Sundberg, in urging a revised history of the New Testament Canon, suggested three phases: 1) the rise of Christian literature to the status of Scripture; 2) the conscious collection of Christian writings into closed subcollections; and 3) the formation of the New Testament list. These three stages can be correlated with the categories here introduced, except that Collections remain "open." Sundberg's "Scripture" and "Canon" reflect
concepts in the formation of the Canon. "Comments," "Collections," and "Catalogues" represent the shapes these concepts took in the development of Canon. The formats of "Comments" and "Collections" usually imply the concept of "Scripture," just as the presence of "Catalogues" usually implies the concept "Canon." Thus it is entirely possible to make Comments about Scriptures and/or to possess a Collection of Scriptures without also having a Catalogue or intending a Canon. This was in fact the situation in the first several centuries of Christianity.

MARCION’S COLLECTION

Marcion (d. c. 160) is often seen as an important milestone in the history of the New Testament Canon. In the nineteenth century some scholars, like Zahn, argued that the Church already had a New Testament Canon before the time of Marcion. Zahn demonstrated through the Comments of the Church fathers that the majority of New Testament writings were read and valued throughout much of the Christian Church at an early date. This kind of evidence does not necessarily imply a Canon as here defined, but suggests only that New Testament writings were beginning to be seen as authoritative religious literature, i.e. as Scripture.

J. Knox in his famous monograph suggested that Marcion was the creator of the New Testament. He argued that "it is apparent that the non-Marcionite churches, at the time when Marcion set up his 'Gospel and Apostle' and wrote his Antitheses, had no Scripture except what we call the Old
Testament." He concluded that after Marcion "Christian writings had for the first time become Christian Scripture." Knox wished to assert more than that Marcion was the first promoter of Christian "Scripture." But Knox, who noted that "a canon is by necessity a 'closed' canon," failed to distinguish carefully between Scripture and Canon in his argument, and, like Harnack before him, concluded that "Marcion is primarily responsible for the idea of the New Testament (Canon)." Even E.C. Blackman who disputed much of the influence on the Canon which Harnack and Knox attributed to Marcion, still acknowledged that: "The first closed New Testament canon of which we have knowledge was made by Marcion.

Did Marcion introduce a Canon of Scripture, or did he simply promote among the churches a Collection of Christian Scriptures as opposed to the already extant Collection of Jewish Scriptures? Were Marcion's Scriptures closed? The nature of Marcion's work as an editor and collector of Christian Scriptures suggests that neither the content nor text of his Scriptures were fixed. Marcion's basic intent appears to have been to recover a lost tradition by editing the sources known to him. There is no direct evidence that Marcion knew other gospels or that he knew that the Gospel which he received was Luke's (Tertullian, Adv. Marc. 4.2). The Gospel which Marcion received appears to have been unnamed and in his literal-mindedness he may have understood those passages where Paul spoke of "his gospel" or "the gospel" to be referring to a particular book, which had been at the apostle's disposal. Later Marcionites
considered Paul, or even Jesus, to have been the author.36
So far as is known, Marcion never polemized against the
other gospel traditions. Although Tertullian accused
Marcion of rejecting certain Pauline epistles, there is no
evidence that Marcion knew them. Thus Marcion appears to
have accepted and edited the Scriptures known to him.

Although Marcion may have made certain changes and
adjustments in the Gospel of Luke and the Pauline epistles
which he received, this was not a radical procedure.
Matthew and Luke not only expanded their Marcan source but
also revised and corrected it. In the same way the Fourth
Evangelist reshaped his material with theological intent,
and it is unlikely that Basilides was much more cautious
than Marcion when composing his gospel. Tatian, too, in
compiling the Diatessaron appears to have made major
excisions of his sources. Other Pauline editors are also
known to have conflated and rearranged the texts known to
them. Marcion's activities seem no different than other
collectors of Christian Scriptures at that time.

Marcion apparently never handed down his Collection as
traditional or "revealed," for his editorial work was
carried on by his disciples.37 It is probable that later
Marcionites admitted into their Scriptures verses from the
Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and John. Ephraem Syrus said
that the Marcionites had not rejected Matthew 23.8 (Song
24.1). John 13.34 and 15.19 are quoted by the Marcionite
Marcus in Adamantius' Dialogue (2.16, 20). Similarly the
Marcionites are accused of corrupting Matthew 5.17 by
Adamantius (2.15). Origen in his Commentary on Matthew
(19.12) quoted a Marcionite interpretation. The followers of Marcion may also have added to the texts of their received epistles. It is probable that the doxology at the end of Romans (16.25-7), while unknown to Marcion, was added later by his followers. 38

If Marcion and his followers added verses to their accepted texts, then they may just as well have added additional sources to their Collection of Scriptures. Marcion's followers, at least, appear to have easily added to his Scriptures, suggesting that the boundaries of his Collection may have been specific but were not fixed. The proscription of forged letters "to the Laodiceans and Alexandrians and several others," as well as "a new book of Psalms for Marcion" in the Fragment itself (11. 64, 83), suggest that the Marcionite Collection of Luke and ten Pauline epistles was later expanded and enlarged. Like the Fragment, Epiphanius at the end of the fourth century confirmed the presence among the Marcionite Collection of an epistle to the Laodiceans (as distinct from Ephesians). 39 Maruta, Bishop of Maipherkat, in his work De Sancta Synodo Nicaena, confirmed that the Marcionites at the beginning of the fifth century had composed psalms of their own for use in worship instead of the Davidic psalms, and also in place of the book of Acts had one he called the "Summa." 40 This might be Marcion's Antitheses or perhaps another work. Marcion's Antitheses appears to have stood at the head of his Collection, perhaps with equal authority to the "Gospel and Apostle," for Tertullian in Adversus Marcionem responded to it first (books 1-3) and without
apparent distinction, followed by Luke (book 4) and Paul's letters (book 5). That the Pastorals were at some time accepted by later Marcionites is suggested by a passage from Chrysostom which said that Marcionites used II Timothy (1.18) as evidence for their doctrine of two gods. The so-called Marcionite Prologue to Titus may be suggestive of a Marcionite origin. The Armenian Marcionites appear to have received the Diatessaron. Finally, the Chronicle called the Fihrist recorded that Marcion wrote a book which he called the "Gospel," and that his disciples composed a number of books "which God alone is able to find."

Since there is no direct evidence that Marcion's Collection was closed, it is something of a misnomer to refer to it as Marcion's "Canon." Marcion may have been an early promoter of a Collection of New Testament Scriptures, but it is misleading to credit him with creating a New Testament Canon.

THE FOURFOLD GOSPEL CANON

The establishment of the Fourfold Gospel is another important milestone in the history of the New Testament Canon. It is the first definitive evidence of an attempt to limit the number of Christian Scriptures even if only within a sub-canonical group. As such, it is perhaps the initial step in "closing" the New Testament Collection. Edgar Goodspeed placed the establishing of the Fourfold Gospel at 115-25 A.D. He arrived at this date by attempting to show the acquaintance with, and dependence upon, the Fourfold Gospel in the Preaching of Peter, II
Peter, The Gospel of Peter, Papias of Hierapolis, Epistula Apostolorum, and Justin Martyr. The attempt by Goodspeed to push the formation of the Fourfold Gospel back to 115-25 rests on particularly precarious grounds since four of his sources, viz. II Peter, The Gospel of Peter, Epistula Apostolorum, and The Preaching of Peter, are usually dated only from the middle of the second century. Adolf von Harnack argued that the Fourfold Gospel could be traced back to Asia Minor to the time of Irenaeus' youth, "just before the middle of the second century." John Knox suggested that Rome produced the Fourfold Gospel sometime after 150 but before 175 A.D., by which time it was "well established." Knox argued that there was "no sufficient occasion for the formation" until the challenge of Marcion's "Gospel." Blackman argued that Montanism rather than Marcionism was the decisive factor in producing the New Testament Canon, and declared that in principle, the limits of the whole Canon were fixed by 180. B.H. Streeter believed the fourfold Gospel to be "firmly established" c. 180 in Antioch, Ephesus, and Rome.

There seems to be a confusion in the minds of many scholars between acquaintance with the four Gospels and the Fourfold Gospel Canon. The former does not imply the later. Comments do not necessarily imply a Collection, nor does a Collection necessarily imply a Canon. These scholars have not distinguished between the possession of Gospel Scriptures and a Gospel Canon. Thus it is essential to reconsider the formation of the Fourfold Gospel Canon with these considerations in mind.
The canonical Gospels may be among the earliest gospels to be written. Nonetheless others continued to be composed through much of the second century, and Christian writers of the second century refer to many other gospels besides the canonical Four. This would seem unlikely if the Fourfold Gospel Canon had already been established. The second century, therefore, possessed a multiplicity of written gospels besides the canonical Four.

Papias (c. 60-130) is the first extant witness to mention or quote any known written gospel tradition. In remarks preserved by Eusebius, Papias wrote of the Gospel of Mark:

This also the presbyter (John?) said: Mark, having become Peter's interpreter, wrote down accurately all that he remembered, not indeed in order, of the things said or done by Christ. For he had not heard the Lord, nor had he followed him, but later on, as I said, followed Peter, who adapted his teaching to the needs of his hearers, but with no intention of giving a connected account of the Lord's discourses, so that Mark did nothing wrong in thus writing down single points as he remembered them. For to one thing he gave attention, to leave out nothing of what he heard and to make no false statements in them. (H.E. 3.39.15)

Immediately after this, Eusebius attached another quotation from Papias: "So then, Matthew collected the oracles (logia) in the Hebrew language, and every one interpreted (translated?) as he was able" (H.E. 3.39.16). There is a certain defensiveness in Papias' remarks about Mark, perhaps implying that his Gospel had been criticized as incomplete or lacking in proper arrangement. Papias' statements about Matthew are also of interest, since the canonical Matthew is not strictly a collection of logia nor was it most probably composed in Hebrew. All that can be
confidently concluded from these remarks is that Papias knew Mark and at least one other gospel-type document, possibly Matthew (or Q?).

Although Papias knew written gospels, he preferred the oral tradition:

If anyone ever came who had followed the presbyters, I questioned him in regard to the words of the presbyters, what Andrew or Peter or Philip or Thomas or James or John or Matthew, or any other of the Lord's disciples, had said, and what Ariston and the presbyter John, the disciples of the Lord, say. For I did not think that information from books would help so much as the word of a living and abiding voice." (H.E. 3.39.4)

This preference for the oral tradition is also evident in other Christian literature of the early second century. H. Koester has shown that the citations of gospel traditions among the Apostolic Fathers are more likely to be drawn from oral tradition than to be free quotations from written gospels, to which no explicit appeals are made.

Written gospels probably became increasingly used as oral tradition began to dissipate and grow unreliable. Originally they must have circulated individually and perhaps were used in isolation from each other, with only one such document being valued and used in any given Christian community. Marcion, it should be remembered, employed only the Gospel of Luke, and probably did not reject other gospel traditions but simply did not know them. The only surviving gospel codices of the first half of the second century appear to have contained only one work each, viz. P (John) and Pap. Egerton 2 (an Unknown Gospel). All but one of the extant late second and early third century gospel codices also included only one
source, viz. P* (John); P**, P^ (Matthew); Pap. Oxy. 1 (Thomas). Even in the third century, numerous single-gospel codices have survived, viz. P^, P^3, P^70, P^7 (Matthew); P^4, P^ (Luke); P^, P^7, P^22, P^28, P^37, P^80 (John); Pap. Oxy. 654, 655 (Thomas); Pap. Bodmer V (Protevangelium Jacobi); Pap. Rainer (Fayyum) (an Unknown Gospel). P^75, which includes Luke and John, is the first multiple-gospel codex extant and is thus the first manuscript witness to a Gospel Collection. Its editors dated this MS. between 175 and 225. The Egyptian codex, P^45, is the earliest MS. to include the Fourfold Gospel (along with Acts) and thus is the first manuscript witness to the Fourfold Gospel Collection. The codex was dated by its editor in the first half of the third century.

Even when written gospels came into customary use, their authority was not absolute, as their texts were not beyond substantial alteration. Marcion altered Luke. Additional material was appended, probably in the first half of the second century, to the earliest MSS. of Mark which ended at 16.8, e.g. in 1) the traditional longer ending (RSV 16.9-20), 2) the gnostic-sounding shorter ending (given at the bottom of the page in RSV), and 3) the "Freer ending" inserted after 16.14. Similarly the twenty-first chapter of John appears to have been added to the original text. The story of the woman taken in adultery (John 7.53-8.11) was certainly not original to John's Gospel. Papias appears to have related this story, which, according to Eusebius, was contained in the Gospel according to the Hebrews (H.E. 3.39.16). The Gospel
traditions were thus first enlarged by adding material to their individual texts. Later, Gospel traditions appear to have been enlarged by the addition of other written gospels.

Through the circulation of individual gospels, Christian communities must have gradually become acquainted with a variety of gospel documents, and Gospel Collections were established. The first direct evidence of a knowledge and use of several gospels comes from the middle of the second century in the writings of Justin Martyr, who taught in Rome between 150 and 165. In his Dialogue (49), Justin quoted directly from Matthew 17.10-13; for he included the words "then the disciples understood that he spoke to them concerning John the Baptist," which are specifically Matthean and are not found in Mark. There are good, if not quite so strong, reasons for supposing that Justin also knew Luke (cf. Dial. 76, 81, 95, 100, 103, 105; I Apol. 17, 63, 66; On the Resurrection 3). That Justin knew Mark is more doubtful (cf. On the Resurrection 2, 8; I Apol. 16) and there is no firm evidence that Justin knew John. The notion of the Logos, which is sometimes used as proof that Justin was acquainted with the Johannine Gospel, was current throughout the ancient world at that time.

Because it is probable that Justin was acquainted with at least some of the canonical Gospels, many scholars have thought that nearly all his quotations are derived from these, but that because he relied upon his memory he quoted them so inaccurately. As W. Sanday showed, the proportion
of variation in Justin is more than three times as high for quotations from the Gospels as for those from the Old Testament. It is much more likely that Justin also relied upon other gospel sources similar to, but different from, the later canonical Gospels. He seems at numerous points to have relied on oral tradition, or a compilation of sayings of Jesus, or perhaps on gospels not known, or variously on all of these. Evidently Justin did not invest any exclusive authority in the Gospels which ultimately became canonical. Thus while several gospels were known to Justin, it cannot confidently be said that he knew all four of the later canonical Gospels, or that he relied solely upon them.

The existence of gospel Harmonies at the end of the second century suggests that the Fourfold Gospel Canon was not yet established. In compiling the Harmonies, the authors made use of the later canonical Gospels in the same way that the writers of these four Gospels utilized the materials in their hands. Each of these writers made use of the gospel materials available to them in compiling their works. No one would argue, for instance, that Mark's Gospel was canonical simply because Matthew and Luke used parts of Mark in their own Gospels.

Tatian, a Syrian Christian who had studied with Justin in Rome, is the best known gospel harmonizer. He undertook (c. 170) to weave several separate gospels into one consecutive narrative, called in the East, The Gospel of the Mixed, but in the West, The Diatessaron. For his narrative Tatian employed all four of the later canonical
Gospels and he is thus the earliest-known witness for the use of all four of these Gospels. But the position of the four later canonical Gospels in his day was not so secure that they could not be displaced by the Diatessaron in the Syriac church. It is notable that Tatian apparently encountered no criticism for his work, but rather the Diatessaron enjoyed great popularity. This Harmony actually established itself as the gospel for the Church in Syria, and was dislodged only at a late date, in the fifth and sixth centuries, and that with a great deal of difficulty. Some scholars have even argued that before the time of Tatian only the Gospel of Thomas had reached Edessa.

There is no consensus regarding the sources employed by Tatian. Eusebius implied that Tatian harmonized the four canonical Gospels, although he acknowledged that he was unfamiliar with the work (H.E. 4.29.5-6). Rufinus's translation of Eusebius accentuated the implication (viz. *conposuit euangelium unam ex quattuor*), and thereafter the opinion that Tatian quarried only the four later canonical Gospels became normative. Victor of Capua, on the other hand, reported in the preface to the Codex Fuldensis that Tatian named his harmony *diapente*, perhaps suggesting that Tatian worked from five gospels. But it is possible that the origin of the names "Diatessaron" and "Diapente" derived as much from music as from a fourfold or fivefold gospel source, since both names were musical terms. Epiphanius reported that the Diatessaron was sometimes called the Gospel according to the Hebrews (Haer. 46.2.9).
M. Black has therefore suggested that the Gospel according to the Hebrews was a fifth source. There are also numerous parallels between the Diatessaron and the Coptic Gospel according to Thomas. Tatian probably employed several apocryphal works. It is enough to recognize that Tatian apparently knew many gospel traditions, none of which were considered either canonical or non-canonical at the time of the Diatessaron's composition.

In the West a Harmony closely akin to the Diatessaron exists. The Codex Fuldensis of Victor of Capua (546), contains a gospel in which verses from the canonical Gospels of the Vulgate are harmonized. In a preface Victor explained that he found it anonymous, but that on reading Eusebius he came to the conclusion that it was the work of Tatian. Burkitt suggested that this Latin harmony may have been the predecessor of Tatian's Diatessaron. This would explain the absence of references to the Diatessaron in the West and the rarity of surviving copies. That Tatian had anything to do with a Latin ancestor of the Codex Fuldensis is nothing more than conjecture made by Victor of Capua upon the strength of a passage in Eusebius. Eusebius acknowledged that he had never seen the work (H.E. 4.29.6). The MS. found by Victor was anonymous, and all the tradition that connects Tatian with the Diatessaron relates to the Diatessaron in Syriac. Therefore another Harmony, this time in Latin, may have existed sometime in the second century in the West.

Other Gospel Harmonies are also known. No less a personage than Theophilus of Antioch is said to have
"combined the words of the four Evangelists in one work"
(Jerome, Ep. 121.6). Although this information occurs only in Jerome, the harmony was mentioned by him again in Lives of Illustrious Men (De vir. illl. 25) and in the Prologue to his Commentary on Matthew. That Tatian cannot have been the only compiler of gospel harmonies is apparently confirmed by Ambrose, who noted in his Commentary on Luke (1.2): plerique etiam ex quattuor evangeli liberis in unum ea quae venenatis putaverunt assertionibus convenientia refererunt. The "Alexandrian Ammonius" is also said to have composed a kind of synopsis of the four Gospels about 220 (Eusebius, Ep. ad Carp.). A fragment allegedly derived from Melito of Sardis' writings appears to suggest that he also combined John and the Synoptics (Migne PG 89.229).

Besides the Gospel Harmonies, individual gospels other than the later canonical Four were still being employed by Christians across a wide geographic area at the end of the second and beginning of the third centuries. The Valentians in Rome (c. 180), for instance, availed themselves of the Gospel of Truth (Irenaeus, Adv. haer. 3.11.8). Heracleon (fl. c. 145-80) made use of the Preaching of Peter (Origen, Comm. on John 13.17). The Valentinian Theodotus quoted the Gospel according to the Egyptians and the Gospel of Thomas (Clem.Alex., Excep. ex Theo.). Hegesippus (c. 180) quoted from the Gospel of Hebrews (Eusebius, H.E. 4.22.8). Julius Cassianus (c. 190) used the Gospel according to the Egyptians (Clem.Alex., Strom. 3.13). The Church at Rhossos was reading the Gospel
of Peter at the end of the second century, and what is more, with the explicit approval of Serapion, the then bishop of Antioch, permission which he only later withdrew on dogmatic grounds (Eusebius H.E. 6.12.4,8). Despite the bishop’s later disapproval, the Syrian Didascalia was still using the Gospel of Peter in the third century.** Serapion’s predecessor at Antioch, Theophilus, also appears to have recorded allusions to Petrine pseudepigrapha, viz. the Preaching and Revelation of Peter.*** The Nicolaitans used the Traditions of Matthias (Clem. Alex., Strom. 3.4) The Naasenes used the Gospel according to the Egyptians in the early third century (Hippolytus, Haer. 5.7) as did the Sabellians (Epiphanius, Haer. 62.4), and the Ebionites used the Gospel according to the Hebrews (Eusebius, H.E. 3.27.4). It is difficult therefore to acknowledge the claim that the Fourfold Gospel was "firmly established" in the last quarter of the second century.

Nowhere before Irenaeus (c. 180-9) is there any specific mention of the Fourfold Gospel Canon as such, a concept which entails a "principle of exclusivity." The earliest extant proponent of that principle is Irenaeus (Adv. Haer. 3.11.11). The other extant evidence of that time suggests only that the later canonical Gospels were beginning to achieve growing significance and recognition as sources of tradition in the third quarter of the second century, but not that they were regarded as an exclusive and inviolable norm. Nonetheless Irenaeus stated that "it is not possible that the Gospels can be either more or fewer in number than they are" (Adv. Haer. 3.11.8). He
then continued with a long allegorical interpretation of why there could only be four Gospels, noting, for instance, that there were four zones in the world, four principal winds, four faces to the cherubim, and four principal covenants (Adv. Haer. 3.11.8). Irenaeus' argument suggests that toward the end of the second century a fixed Collection of four Gospels was becoming current in at least the Western church. But his remarks also suggest that this must have been something of an innovation, for if a Fourfold Gospel had been established and generally acknowledged, then Irenaeus would not have offered such a tortured insistence on its numerical legitimacy.

The Gospel of John is certainly a surprising member of any orthodox Gospel Canon at the end of the second century. It appears not to have been known or used by most second-century Christian writers, and to all appearances was first employed among gnostic Christians. Hippolytus reported that Basilides, a gnostic teacher in Alexandria (c. 130), used the Gospel of John in the time of Hadrian (Haer. 7.22). The Encratite Tatian (c. 160) is the earliest writer in whose works are found formal quotations of the Gospel and even then he did not name the book (cf. Oratio 13.1, 19.4). The Valentinian gnostic teachers Ptolemaeus and Heracleon (160-70) both wrote expositions on the Gospel of John. Theirs are the earliest known commentaries on the Gospel of John, or for that matter on any early Christian writing, and the fact that they considered it worthy of such detailed study shows that John had acquired considerable standing in gnostic Christianity.
by the middle of the second century. By contrast, outside gnostic circles there is scant knowledge of or interest in John, and prior to the late second century no broad recognition of its authority. The Gospel of John was also used by the so-called "new prophecy" of Montanism, which flourished in the latter half of the second century. Its adherents claimed that the coming of the Paraclete promised in John (e.g. Jn. 14.26, 15.26) had actually been fulfilled in the person of Montanus, the founder of the movement, and that the new Jerusalem foreseen in Revelation (21.2) would soon descend to earth. Thus the use of John by Gnostics and Montanists may have militated against its more general acceptance. No orthodox theologian is known to have explicitly supported the Gospel before Theophilus of Antioch (c. 180).

In Rome at the beginning of the third century, the theologian Gaius, who according to Eusebius was an orthodox churchman (H.E. 2.25.6), rejected the Gospel of John as a work of the heretic Cerinthus. Hippolytus (c. 212-c. 236) is the first known defender of the Gospel in Rome, and his lost work, *Defense of the Revelation and Gospel of John*, confirms that there were serious attacks on the Gospel. The polemic against Johannine writings may have first arisen in Asia Minor in the late second century, for Irenaeus also knew of a rejection of John by a group of orthodox Christians there (Adv. Haer. 3.11.9). These Alogi, as Epiphanius called them, may not have been a heretical group rejecting the long accepted Gospel of John, but rather an orthodox element protesting against the
introduction into the Church's usage of a Gospel which heretics had long used.

Irenaeus (c. 180) is the earliest witness to suggest that there was an apostolic connection for the Fourth Gospel (Adv. Haer. 3.1.1). Irenaeus appears to have believed that the John of whom his teacher, Polycarp, had been a disciple, was the Apostle and author of the Fourth Gospel. This tradition is not known before Irenaeus, and is probably based upon a confusion of persons by him. Whether or not the confusion was deliberate, the tradition that the Apostle John was the author of the Fourth Gospel gave the work apostolic authority and thus made it a more acceptable member of any orthodox Gospel Collection. From the beginning of the third century, the Gospel of John has been generally accepted in the churches.

In Irenaeus' defense of the Fourfold Gospel, there are also hints that the Gospel of Luke was not readily acceptable in orthodox circles at the end of the second century. After his famous dictum for the Fourfold Gospel Canon (Adv. Haer. 3.11.8, cf. 3.1.1), Irenaeus proceeded with a passage of advocacy for the status of Luke (chapters 13-5). The Gospel of Luke was seen as canonical by Irenaeus, not in its own right, but by a dependence upon its special relationship to Paul and the other apostles. Irenaeus' argument included a defense of Paul's apostolicity: "For neither can they (?) contend that Paul was no apostle, when he was chosen for this purpose; nor can they prove Luke guilty of falsehood, when he proclaims the truth to us with all diligence. . .his (Luke's)
testimony, therefore, is true, and the doctrine of the apostles is open and steadfast, holding nothing in reserve; nor did they teach one set of doctrines in private, and another in public” (Adv. Haer. 3.15.1). The thrust of Irenaeus' argument here was not entirely directly against the followers of Marcion and Valentinus (Adv. Haer. 3.14.4), for Irenaeus would have no cause to defend Paul's apostleship to these groups. Therefore it appears that Irenaeus was not only refuting the Marcionite misuse of Luke, but that his greater concern was to give an apology for the use of Luke in the Gospel Collection of the Church.

One would expect to find in Irenaeus a similar apology for Mark as is found for Luke. Mark is a dependent Gospel (upon Peter) and it was used by a group of an apparently docetic nature; viz. "Those who separate Jesus from Christ alleging that Christ remained impassible but it was Jesus who suffered prefer the Gospel of Mark" (Adv. Haer. 3.11.7). Yet Irenaeus gave no apology for Mark's Gospel. His attention was focused primarily upon the status of Luke. If Irenaeus' list of the use of each Gospel by a heretical group (Adv. Haer. 3.11.7), viz. Ebionites used Matthew, Marcionites used Luke, docetists preferred Mark, and the Valentinians used John, then in view of the apologetic for Luke's Gospel that followed, its purpose would seem to have been to support Luke by implying that, since the other three Gospels were each used by a heretical group, Luke's Gospel ought not to be eschewed because of its use by Marcionites.

Despite Tertullian's implicit witness for the Fourfold
Gospel Canon (Adv. Marc. 4.2), the Gospel of Luke appears not to have been readily appreciated by him. According to Tertullian, Luke was inferior to Paul as Paul was inferior to the other apostles: "But Luke was not an apostle but apostolic, not a master but a pupil; in any case he was less than a master; certainly as inferior (to his master) as the inferiority of the apostle he followed, Paul without doubt, was (to the other apostles)" (Porro, Lucas non apostolus, sed apostolicus; non magister, sed discipulus; utique magistro minor; certe tanto posterior, quanto posterioris apostoli sectator, Pauli sine dubio; Adv. Marc. 4.2). Tertullian went on, "that, had Marcion even published his Gospel in the name of Paul himself, the single authority of the document, destitute of all support from preceding authorities, would not be a sufficient basis for our faith" (4.2). Since Luke's Gospel agreed with the Gospels written by the apostles then it too ought to be considered apostolic (4.3), i.e. it is not apostolic on its own merit, but is dependent on this corroboration. It is clear from these passages that Tertullian did not regard Luke's Gospel as authorative in itself. "Inasmuch, therefore, as the enlightener of St. Luke himself desired the authority of his predecessors for both his own faith and preaching, how much more may not I require for Luke's Gospel that which was necessary for the Gospel of his master?" asked Tertullian (Adv. Marc. 4.2).

The arguments which Irenaeus and Tertullian give would certainly be odd, if the Fourfold Gospel Canon was "firmly established" at that time as so many scholars have
suggested. The character of Tertullian's argument, with its strong depreciation of Luke, is more understandable if the Marcionite use of this Gospel resulted in a continuing aversion to it by significant numbers in the churches. Both Irenaeus' and Tertullian's position suggest that Marcionism was of continuing strength in their day with a consequent hesitation in the Church about full acceptance of that Gospel which Marcion had abused. These passages put forward a view which Sundberg called "dependent canonicity" and which was probably intended by their authors not only to defeat the Marcionite claims about their Gospel, but also to counter a hesitancy toward Luke in the Church. Thus Irenaeus' explicit and Tertullian's implicit position on the Fourfold Gospel Canon, far from proving its establishment, seem to be promoting it at a time when it is still not fully settled.

Although Clement (Strom 3.93) and Origen (Hom. on Luke 1) explicitly affirmed in the East a principle of exclusivity for the Fourfold Gospel, they did not abide by that principle in practice. If the principle was one of long standing, then their use of other gospels would be particularly troublesome. However, their liberal usage may reflect the vestige of a previous practice to which this principle was being applied. Both of them continued to quote from noncanonical gospels. Clement, for instance, quoted passages from the Preaching of Peter on numerous occasions, e.g. Strom. 1.29 (cf. 2.15, Eclog. proph. 58); 6.5 (bis); 6.6; 6.7 (?); 6.15; always with complete acceptance that it contained what Peter "said" or
"wrote." Similarly Clement also quoted in several places from the Gospel of the Egyptians, e.g. Strom. 3.6 (cf. Exc. Theo. 67.2), 9, 13. In the first instance he took over a quotation from the Gospel of the Egyptians without naming the book (Strom. 3.6). In the second instance he stated that he "thinks" his reference is from the Gospel of the Egyptians (Strom. 3.9). Clement emphasized, however, that the words quoted should be marked by those people who "submit to anything rather than to the true rule of the gospel" (Strom. 3.9). In the final instance Clement was sure that the quotation did come from the Gospel of the Egyptians, which had been cited by the heretic, Julius Cassianus; and he stopped there to point out that the Church accepted four Gospels and only four; Egyptians was not one of them (Strom. 3.13). Nevertheless he went on carefully to allegorize the passage. In the Stromata (2.9) Clement introduced a quotation with the words, "It is written in the Gospel according to the Hebrews," without commenting upon its genuineness or spuriousness. When he later quoted from the same passage in the Gospel according to the Hebrews in Stromata (5.14), he did so without naming his source. The Traditions of Matthias was used by the Nicolaitans according to Clement (Strom. 3.4), but Clement quoted from it as well (Strom. 2.9; 7.13, cf. 7.17). Clement cited an unknown saying of Jesus as from "scripture" in Stromata 1.17 (cf. Epiphanius Haer. 44.2.6). In Stromata 5.63.7 he introduced another unknown quotation with the words, "in some gospel it says." Other passages of unknown derivation were quoted elsewhere (Strom. 1.94.5,
So in spite of his statement about the four Gospels "transmitted to us," Clement did not hesitate to make use of other gospel sources.

Like Clement, Origen occasionally quoted statements attributed to Jesus but not recorded in canonical sources (e.g. Hom. on Pss. 4.2; Comm. on John 19.2; De orat. 2.2; Hom. on Num. 23.4), one of which (Hom. on Lev. 10.2) he called "apostolic." It is significant that Origen quoted non-canonical sources much less frequently than his predecessor. Origen cited the Gospel according to the Hebrews quite a few times, but expressed doubts about its authority on occasion (Hom. on Jer. 15.4; Comm. on John 2.12; Comm. on Matt. 15.4). When Origen made a list of condemned gospels (Hom. on Luke 1), he did not include the Gospel according to the Hebrews in the list even though he was well aware that it lacked ecclesiastical authorization and authority. In a passage from the Commentary on Matthew (10.17) Origen mentioned the Gospel of Peter and seemed inclined to believe a story which he found in it. He described the Preaching of Peter in the Concerning First Principles as "not counted among the ecclesiastical books," though he took the trouble to explain away the argument based upon it on other grounds. In the Commentary on John (13.17) he mentioned the Preaching of Peter again and seemed uncertain about its genuineness. Finally Origen recorded a number of disconnected historical facts (or guesses) not found in the New Testament. Although Origen regarded the Gospel Canon as closed in a more final sense than did Clement, his basic attitude was the same. In the
words of Hanson: "Fundamentally Origen's attitude to the
canon is the same as Clement's; he will accept as Christian
evidence any material that he finds convincing or
appealing."

Other sources which have been used to establish a
second century date for the Fourfold Gospel Canon are now
disputed. Many manuscripts of the Vulgate, for example,
contain prologues to the different biblical books with
information about the author of each, its importance and
characteristics, and sometimes its occasion and history.
There is a series of longer prologues to the Gospels, the
so-called Monarchian Prologues, which used to be assigned
to the first half of the third century. P. Corssen argued
that they were Monarchian in character, coming from one and
the same pen, and had been intended originally for an early
edition of the Four Gospels, perhaps even the first. Harnack suggested that Rome was the most likely place of
origin, probably during the pontificate of Zephyrinus
(198-217), and that they were afterwards worked over in an
orthodox interest, and were of such high repute that they
were incorporated in the Vulgate. However the idea of a
Monarchian origin was abandoned after J. Chapman connected
the Prologues with Spain. The Prologues are now
generally thought to have been composed at the end of the
fourth or the beginning of the fifth century by some
Priscillianist. This point is of considerable importance
since this set of Prologues is clearly dependent upon the
earlier so-called Anti-Marcionite Prologues. If the
so-called Monarchian collections could really have been
assigned to the pontificate of Zephyrinus, then there would have been incontestable evidence for the primitive dating of the earlier set.

This other series of Prologues to Mark, Luke, and John were believed to be anti-Marcionite in origin by D. de Bruyne and Harnack, and consequently assigned to a period shortly after the Marcionite crisis, c. 160-80. They were believed to have been composed at Rome, originally in Greek, but translated in Africa at the end of the third century for a new edition of the Old Latin Gospels. A copy of the Prologue to Luke exists in both Greek and Latin. The arguments in favor of the original unity of the Prologues were that they are united in two main branches of the manuscript tradition, that the Prologues to Mark and Luke have similar phrases, that the Prologues to Mark and Luke are both used in the Monarchian Prologues, and that the Prologues to Luke and John both show, the one implicitly, the other explicitly, an anti-Marcionite tendency. However these arguments have lost much of their impressiveness upon further examination.

Harnack and De Bruyne took it for granted that all three Prologues came from the same pen, but the disproportion in length and in content, and the difference in coloring and atmosphere, make it difficult to accept that assumption. Rather the Prologues were probably not originally united. The Prologues to Mark and Luke may have been associated before the later Prologue to John was added to them. The Prologue to Mark reflects the tradition of the Gospel much as it was known in the West towards the end
of the second century. The Prologue to Luke, which in its present form is most clearly designed as a Prologue for the Gospel circulating independently, is not specifically anti-Marcionite, and probably dates from the third or early fourth century. The Prologue to John dates possibly from the fourth or fifth century. It is possible, though not certain, that all the Prologues were originally composed in Greek. However the very fact that these Prologues were composed separately over several centuries militates against the assumption of an established Fourfold Gospel Canon. This is seen especially in the independent character of the Prologue to Luke. No unified set of Prologues to all four later canonical Gospels is evident until the fourth century. Yet within another century or so, the two Gospel Prologue sets are widely circulating among the Vulgate manuscripts.

In the end Campenhausen concluded that "the restriction to four 'Canonical' Gospels must be seen as the result of a gradual, and at first quite limited, development which spread as a defence against the Marcionite and other heretical gospels, and finally prevailed."

Previous attempts to suggest that the Fourfold Gospel Canon was "firmly established" in the last quarter of the second century must now be abandoned. Acquaintance with the four later canonical Gospels does not necessarily imply a Fourfold Gospel. Non-canonical gospel usage still abounded, even by some who promoted the Fourfold Gospel Canon, e.g. Clement of Alexandria and Origen. Moreover the prominence of Gospel Harmonies tends
to suggest that the contents of the later canonical Gospels were still not thought to be sacred at the end of the second century. Direct evidence for the Fourfold Gospel Canon is really rather limited now that the Gospel Prologues are believed to be later. Irenaeus is the earliest witness for the Fourfold Gospel Canon, and may have been the earliest promoter. His and Tertullian's polemic suggest some resistance to the acceptance of Luke in orthodox circles. The troubles in Rome and Asia Minor betray reluctance in accepting the Gospel of John at the end of the second and beginning of the third century. Even Clement of Alexandria and Origen's "firm" support of the Fourfold Gospel Canon is questionable because of their liberal use of other gospel sources. Thus the Fourfold Gospel Canon was not widely accepted before the beginning of the third century, and was probably not "firmly established" until the latter half of that century.

Consequently the presence of a Fourfold Gospel in the Muratorian Fragment, if traditionally dated, would be surprising. While the Fragment's witness to the Fourfold Gospel Canon would not be impossible at the end of the second century and might take its place alongside Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Clement of Alexandria, this is unlikely because the Fragment bears none of the marks of recent development for the Fourfold Gospel. The strongest evidence against a late second century date for the Fragment's witness is a realization that the Fragment represents more than just a Gospel Canon. It represents a New Testament Canon. The presence of a New Testament Canon
in the last quarter of the second century would be remarkable and completely anomalous with the other sources of the formation of the Christian Bible. Such a date for the Fragment would require greater justification than it has thus far received. For the remaining elements of the Christian Bible, viz. the Old Testament, the Corpus Paulinum, the Catholic epistolary, all appear to be still in the early stages of development at the end of the second century. These other elements still appear as looser Collections, which are generally continuing to expand and develop. But the Fragment represents the New Testament as closed, even on occasion specifying rejected works. A survey of the other elements will confirm that except for the Gospel sub-canonical group, the remaining sub-canonical groups of the Christian Bible are still at the stage of Collections, i.e. the concept of Canon as applied to more than just the Gospels is not evident with Christian Scriptures before the fourth century.

THE PAULINE LETTER COLLECTION

The history of the Pauline corpus up to and including the fourth century is one of continual expansion. The original letters of Paul were soon followed by pseudonymous additions. The Pauline authorship of II Thessalonians, Colossians, and Ephesians, for instance, is frequently disputed. If any of these letters are not genuine, then they most probably represent pseudonymous Pauline literary activity of the generation after Paul's martyrdom (c. 65). The Pastoral epistles, viz. I & II Timothy, and Titus,
Similarly represent pseudonymous Pauline literary activity of the next generation, probably after the turn of the second century. Pseudonymous Pauline literary activity continued. The Acts of Paul (c. 185–95) contain apocryphal correspondence between Paul and the church at Corinth including a letter attributed to Paul, the so-called III Corinthians, which appears as a separate entity in a Coptic version, two Vulgate Latin MSS. and in the biblical Canon of the Armenian church. Ephraem Syrus (c. 360) treated III Corinthians as genuine, and included remarks on it in his Pauline Commentary. A spurious correspondence (3rd cent.) of fourteen epistles between the philosopher Seneca (eight letters) and the apostle Paul (six letters) appears to have been accepted as genuine by Jerome, who noted that they were read by many (De vir. ill. 12), and by Augustine (Ep. 153.14). The so-called Latin epistle of Paul to the Laodiceans (4th cent.) met with considerable dissemination in Western MSS. The Muratorian Fragment mentions epistles to the Laodiceans and Alexandrians and "several others," forged in Paul's name for the sect of Marcion (11. 63–7). It is unlikely that pseudonymous Pauline works would have continued to be composed into the fourth century if the Corpus Paulinum was closed. This continued literary activity in Paul's name suggests that there was no established Pauline Canon, and that the Pauline Collection remained open through the third and into the fourth century.

With the exception of the Fragment as traditionally dated, there is no evidence of a Pauline Canon until the
fourth century. Prior to that time there is ample attestatation of a continually expanding Pauline Collection. The first indisputable evidence of a Collection of Paul's letters is Marcion's *Apostolikon*. The contents are known from Tertullian's fifth book of his *Adversus Marcionem* (5.4) and Epiphanius' *Haereses* (1.42). According to Tertullian, the later canonical Ephesians was clearly referred to by Marcion as to the "Laodiceans." However, in Epiphanius' listing, Laodiceans is listed separately from Ephesians. Epiphanius might have been confused here, or else the Collection may have been expanded by then to include a "new" epistle to the Laodiceans. The Fragment also attests to a Marcionite Laodiceans distinct from the canonical Ephesians (ll. 51, 64). The Fragment also suggests that at least one other epistle, viz. to the Alexandrians, was added to the Marcionite Pauline Collection (ll. 63-5). As mentioned previously, the Pastorals may also have been later accepted by the Marcionites. Thus the Marcionite Pauline Collection was clearly expanded in the third and into the fourth century.

Besides the testimony of Marcion's *Apostolikon*, a Collection of Paul's epistles is also evidenced by the so-called Marcionite Prologues. Recently N.A. Dahl has argued that the Prologues presuppose an edition which was very similar to, but not identical with, Marcion's, and that the Prologues represent an early non-Marcionite Pauline Collection. The order of the Prologues appears to be due to chronological considerations. The early place of Romans within the chronological scheme, as well as the
assignment of its composition to Athens rather than to Corinth, suggests that the author of the original Prologue did not know Romans 15-16, and this would confirm an early date for the Prologue. Galatians is first, then, because it was thought to have been written first, and thus there is no need for a theory of a Marcionite substitution of Romans for Ephesians (Laodiceans) as Knox argued. The address to the Laodiceans is often seen as peculiarly Marcionite. But the Ephessians address is only attested from Irenaeus onward. The Laodicean address need not be an invention of Marcion. The original set of Prologues may have been composed before the title "To the Ephesians" was generally accepted, i.e. before the end of the second century. Perhaps the unfavorable comments of Revelation (3.14-22) about the church of Laodicea were a factor in the change. Ephesus, on the other hand, was treated far more kindly (2.1-11). That the original Prologue might have treated Ephesians as a letter to the Laodiceans, could suggest a pre-Marcion origin for the Prologues and an earlier tradition.

Dahl disputed the common attribution of the Prologues to Marcionites. If the Prologues are not Marcionite, then they confirm the earliest evidence of an orthodox Pauline Collection and its expansion. From at least the fourth century onwards, commentators and editors took the repeated references to "false apostles" in the Prologues to represent heresy. De Bruyne and his followers argued that the false apostles represented a Judaistic distortion of the gospel, while Paul as recovered by Marcion represented
the true apostolic faith. The crucial question is which reading is more accurate. The Prol Gal states that the Galatians "were tempted by false Apostles to turn to the law and circumcision" (temtati sunt a falsis apostolis ut in legem et circumcisionem verterentur), a particularly Marcionite phrase. Yet the information could just as easily have been derived from the contents of the epistle itself. Most of the other Prologues speak only in general terms about the false apostles.

The Prol Cor states that the Corinthians "were perverted variously by false Apostles, some by the wordy eloquence of philosophy, others brought in by the sect of the Jewish Law" (subversi multifarie a falsis apostolis, quidam a philosophia verbosa eloquentia, alii a secta legis iudaicae inducti). If nothing else, the false Apostles appear here not to be a unified group, but are supposed to have taught several forms of heresy. The notion of two different heresies, one Judaizing and the other rhetorical and philosophical, corresponds more to what one might expect from an anti-heretical catholic spokesman than a Marcionite. Moreover Dahl noted textual variants of ab apostolos and ab apostolis in et his similiter ab apostolo audierunt verbum veritatis. The plural is attested by many, diverse, and excellent manuscripts. Thus it is probably original and not a correction. Such a reading would conflict with the Marcionite perception of Paul as the only true apostle and all the others as false apostles. The plural could refer to Paul, Silvanus, and Timothy (II Cor. 1.19) or Paul and Cephas and Apollos (I Cor. 1.11-2;
3.21-2).

While the Prologue to the Corinthian letters makes
difficulties for the conjectured Marcionite origin, the
Prol Rom provides the strongest argument in its favor. A
catholic author would not be likely to say that false
Apostles introduced the Roman Christians to the law and the
prophets, which sounds like a criticism of the Old
Testament Scriptures. Romans does not explicitly refer to
false teachers except in 16.17-8, which the author of the
Prol Rom is thought not to have possessed. Consequently
the author must have inferred what he says about the
activity of the false apostles from those parts of Romans
in which Paul explains how the law and the prophets are
properly to be understood (viz. Rom 1.17b, 3.31-4.25, and
most of chapters 9-11). Yet Dahl noted that these are
exactly the parts of the letter which are not attested for
Marcion. This suggests that the author of the Prol Rom had
the short version of Romans, without chapters 14-16, but
not Marcion’s revision of that text in front of him.

Dahl’s proposed interpretation of the Prol Rom may not
be entirely satisfactory, but it is easier to ascribe the
Prol Rom to a catholic author than to ascribe the Prol Cor
to a Marcionite. Finally the Prol Tit also hints at a
rejection of the Old Testament. It says that the heretics,
who are to be avoided, believed in “Jewish scriptures”
(scripturis iudaicis) rather than in Jewish myths or fables
(cf. Tit 1.14). Yet a Marcionite origin of the Prologues
to the Pastorals is unlikely if the original Prologues are
not Marcionite. If Prol Tit is not considered Marcionite,
then there is no reason to take the *scripturae iudaicae* to be the later canonical Jewish Scriptures. The author may have had in mind such Jewish writings of the pseudepigrapha as the Book of Jubilees or Enoch. It also seems unlikely that later Marcionites would have added secondary Prologues which so soon became standard in catholic manuscripts.

The Prologue to Philemon also appears secondary. This may suggest a Collection of Paul's letters which did not include Philemon. Ephraem did not comment upon the letter, probably because it was not in his Collection. In their prefaces to Philemon, Jerome, Chrysostom, and, more specifically, Theodore of Mopsuestia all defend the canonicity and value of the letter. Apparently their opponents did not so much attack the letter as defend an ancient form of the Pauline Collection which did not include it. If the original Prologues presuppose a Collection without Philemon, then they are probably not of Marcionite origin. However there is another possibility. John Knox has argued that Marcion followed an ancient order which treated the letters to the Colossians and to Philemon as one, just as the two letters to the Corinthians or Thessalonians were treated as one." Thus the Prologue to Colossians could have been meant to cover both Colossians and Philemon. The probability of a lost Prologue which treated Ephesians as a letter to the Laodiceans does not prove a Marcionite origin; neither does the possible lack of an original Prologue to Philemon disprove it.

Dahl's summary of the history of transmission of the Prologues suggested that a non-Marcionite author composed
the original set of Prologues, most likely in Greek, as an introduction to Paul's letters to the seven churches in the middle of the second century. At a later stage, probably in the middle of the third century when the "seven churches edition" was obsolete, the original Prologues were translated into Latin and new Prologues composed, to be used as prefaces to the individual letters in an edition of the thirteen letters of Paul.\textsuperscript{100} A Prologue to Hebrews was probably not added until the latter half of the fourth century.\textsuperscript{101} In the fourth century the Prologues became a common part of Paul manuscripts, at least in Italy, and various types of texts emerged already before the Prologues were incorporated into Vulgate manuscripts in the early fifth century. The striking similarities between Marcion's Apostolikon and the original Prologues are easily explained upon the assumption that in the second century a Collection of Paul's letters similar to that of Marcion circulated even outside Marcionite circles. This Collection did not contain the Pastorals, Hebrews, and perhaps Philemon. It did not distinguish between the two letters to the Corinthians and the Thessalonians, and it also probably called Ephesians, Laodiceans, and contained the shortened form of Romans. Later in the third and fourth centuries both the Marcionite Collection and the Collection represented by the so-called Marcionite Prologues were clearly expanded.

Another Collection of Paul's epistles is found in the so-called Chester Beatty Papyri (P\textsuperscript{48}), which confirms that the Pastorals were not part of the earliest Pauline
Collection(s) and were only added in the third century. This group of papyrus codices, most of which were acquired by A. Chester Beatty in 1931, may have formed part of the same library as the Bodmer papyri, in which case they are probably from Panopolis (Akhmim). The University of Michigan (no. 6238) supplemented the Pauline find in 1935 with 30 additional leaves. Together they form the earliest manuscript evidence of a Pauline Collection. F. Kenyon, who handled all the manuscripts from the find, dated P*** in the first half of the third century; H.A. Sanders placed it in the second half.102

The nine letters contained in the Collection are in the order: Romans, Hebrews, I & II Corinthians, Ephesians, Galatians, Philippians, Colossians, I Thessalonians. There are some fourteen unaccounted for pages missing from the end of the manuscript. There is extant text until the end of I Thessalonians (5.27). II Thessalonians, which would naturally follow, contains ninety-nine lines of text. As some fifteen lines with the title could appear on the remainder of the last fragmentary page, only three pages of twenty-seven lines per page would be needed to complete this epistle. Eleven pages would remain left in the codex. The first page of the manuscript was not numbered and contained no text, so one might assume that the last page was also blank. The scribe averaged about nineteen lines of Oxford text per page for the first 140 pages. Then he began crowding an average of at least twenty-six Oxford lines to a page, perhaps realizing that the amount of text which he wished to include seemed larger than he first
thought. If he was going to have ten (or eleven) pages unused at the end, he would have discovered that fact earlier and might have stopped crowding the lines some time before the end of the manuscript. The last five leaves (or ten pages) might have been left blank, just as the editors presume for an Old Testament codex in the same find. If not, then these last ten (or eleven) pages could accommodate between 270 and 300 lines of Oxford text. Philemon contains only 40 lines, I Timothy 215 lines, II Timothy 156, and Titus 90, for a total of 501. Even assuming that all eleven pages were crowded to their very utmost, one page or more would need to be added to accommodate just I and II Timothy, without Philemon or Titus. Titus and Philemon could fit, but at least five pages would still remain blank. It is uncertain therefore what, if any, text(s) followed II Thessalonians. Perhaps some other work was meant to be included. It is not certain whether Philemon was originally present, but it seems most improbable that the Pastorals were included in P. J. Quinn suggested that P represented only a Collection of Pauline letters to the churches (including Hebrews), and that perhaps another Collection of Pauline letters to individuals existed as well.

There is no evidence that the Pastoral Epistles were part of the earliest Pauline Collection(s). Tertullian stated that Marcion (c. 150) rejected (recusaverit) the Pastorals (Adv. Marc. 5.21), but there is really no proof that Marcion actually knew them. The so-called Marcionite Prologues to the Pastorals are secondary and not part of
the original Collection. The Pastorals are absent in P46 (c. 200). Attestation of the Pastorals before the end of the second century is very weak. The points of contact between Clement of Rome (c. 95) or Ignatius (c. 107) and the Pastorals concern only isolated expressions, for which no literary dependence can be proved. The linguistic agreements between the Pastorals and Polycarp (c. 135) suggest no more than that they both stood in the same ecclesiastical and cultural tradition. The author of the Acts of Paul (c. 160) mentioned various characters who appear elsewhere only in the Pastorals, e.g. Onesiphorus and Hermogenes, but no direct dependence can be established. No certain evidence of acquaintance with the Pastorals is extant before the third quarter of the second century, but from that time onwards the epistles are cited more regularly. Tatian (c. 172), according to Jerome (Preface to Titus), accepted Titus, but denied the authenticity of I Timothy. Theophilus (c. 177-80) alluded to I Tim. 2.2 with "that we may lead a quiet and peacable life" (Ad Autolyc. 3.14), while Irenaeus (c. 180-200) is the earliest witness to make allusions to all the Pastorals. Consequently the Pastoral epistles are generally believed to have been accepted in the churches later than the other Pauline epistles and not without some difficulty.\textsuperscript{103}

The earliest Western Pauline Collection appears to have been based upon a pattern of letters to seven churches. The particularity of Paul's letters may have been a problem in the ancient church.\textsuperscript{104} The idea that
Paul, like John in Revelation (1-3), had written to seven churches, and thus to the whole Church, was frequently noted by early writers, viz. Hippolytus, Cyprian, Victorinus of Pettau, pseudo-Chrysostom, Jerome, and Isidore of Seville. Through the mediation of Jerome and Isidore, the idea of Pauline epistles to seven churches found its way into the Vulgate preface to the Epistles. Knox argued that Marcion’s Apostolikon consisted of letters to seven churches, although Marcion himself is nowhere known to have specifically numbered them so. Scholars who have hypothesized about a pre-Marcion Pauline Collection have usually assumed that it took the shape of letters to seven churches. Explicit citation of the seven-churches scheme, however, is not found in the West until the third century.

The earliest Pauline Collection(s) was expanded, probably in the third century, by the addition of the Pastorals. Eventually the description of the Pauline Collection(s) changed from the pattern of letters to seven churches to a specifically thirteen letter Collection, with the Pastorals included. The addition of the secondary Prologues of the so-called Marcionite Prologues in the middle of the third century represented such a thirteen letter Collection. Eusebius noted that Gaius mentioned “thirteen” epistles of Paul, not counting the Epistle to the Hebrews with the others (H.E. 6.20.3). Whether this actual count was Gaius’ or Eusebius’ is not clear. If it was Gaius’ then he would be the earliest extant witness to the "new" thirteen epistle Collection of Paul.
Otherwise Eusebius (and then Jerome) are reading back into his remarks a count which became well known in the West only later. A Collection of specifically "thirteen" epistles was cited in the West during the fourth century, viz. in the Mommsen Catalogue (359), as well as in Filaster (c. 383), cf. Haer. 88/9. The African Council at Carthage (397), while accepting Hebrews, perhaps revealed an earlier pattern of enumeration with its listing, viz. Pauli Ap. Epistolae xiii; eiusdem ad Hebraeos una. Similarly Ambrosiaster (c. 380) and Pelagius (c. 400) in their Pauline Commentaries dealt only with thirteen epistles of Paul, as perhaps Hilary (c. 315-67) did (although elsewhere Pelagius, Comm. on Rom. 1.17, and Hilary, De Trin. 4.11, both speak of Hebrews as a book of the Apostle). The new Collection of thirteen letters may have been suggestive of the Platonic collection.

In the late fourth century, the Pauline Collection in the West was enlarged again, this time by the addition of the Epistle to the Hebrews. The Epistle, however, was known in the West from an early date. Clement of Rome used it according to Eusebius (H.E. 3.38.1). Irenaeus is also reported by Eusebius (H.E. 5.26) to have mentioned Hebrews and cited passages from it (cf. Adv. Haer. 2.30.9; 3.6.5; 4.17.1; 5.32.2). But up until the end of the fourth century, there is no evidence in the West that Hebrews was considered Pauline. Marcion did not include it in his Apostolikon (cf. Jerome, Preface to Titus). According to Photius, Hippolytus rejected Pauline authorship for Hebrews (Biblio. 121). Stephanus Gobarus said that neither
Hippolytus nor Irenaeus thought Paul wrote it (Photius, Biblio. 232). Tertullian (c. 220) and the author of a Latin treatise wrongly attributed to Origen, Tractatus Origenis de libris SS. Script, ascribed Hebrews to Barnabas the apostle. Gaius also rejected Pauline authorship, an opinion that Eusebius noted was "still held by some Romans" (H.E. 6.20; cf. Jerome, De vir. ill. 59).

Later Western fathers, perhaps influenced by the East, persuaded the Western church to accept Hebrews into the Pauline Collection. The Prologue to Hebrews among the so-called Marcionite Prologues is obviously secondary and not added to the Collection until c. 350-80. Hebrews was included in the New Testament Canon approved at the three African Councils, viz. Hippo, 393; Carthage, 397, 419.

That Hebrews was just being accepted into the Pauline Collection at that time in the West is evident from the enumeration at the synods. At Hippo (393) and the first Carthagian council (397), the enumeration, as already noted, read: Pauli Ap. Epistolae xiii; eiusdem ad Hebraeos una. By the second Carthaginian council (419), the clause had been altered to read: Epist. Pauli Ap. numero xiv.

Rufinus also numbered the Pauline epistles fourteen (Comm. in Symb. Apost. 36), as apparently did Pope Innocent (Ad Exsup. Tol.);112 though Jerome noted that "the custom of the Latins does not receive it (Hebrews) among the canonical Scriptures" (Ep. ad Dard. 129,3; cf. Comm. on Matt. 26.8, 9; in Is. 6.2; 8.16), and that "very many rejected the Epistle to Hebrews" (Ep. ad Paul. 53.103; cf. De vir. ill. 5; Comm. on Gal. 1.1). Jerome also expressed
doubts about the Pauline authorship (Comm. on Amos 8.7, 8; Comm. on Jer. 31.31). At times Augustine left the question of the canonicity of Hebrews uncertain (Inchoat. Expos. Ep. ad Rom. 11), while at other times he appears to have accepted it on the authority of "the Eastern churches" (de pecc. mer. et remiss. 1.27, 50; cf. Serm. 55.5). When listing the books of the New Testament, however, Augustine numbered Paul's letters "fourteen" and included Hebrews (De Doct. Christ. 2.8.12). The late acceptance of Hebrews and a tentativeness about its authorship may be reflected in its position in most Western manuscripts. Hebrews was usually attached to the very end of the Pauline Collection, after Philemon, e.g. in Old Latin codices, in manuscripts of the Latin Vulgate, in Augustine's Catalogue (De Doct. Christ. 2.8.12).

In the East, Hebrews was included in the Pauline Collection at an early date, which may account for the absence of any early Eastern witnesses to the letters to seven churches pattern. C. Anderson suggested that Hebrews was a part of the Pauline Collection in the East from the very beginning. In Alexandria, Hebrews was regarded as an Epistle of Paul in every known ancient account. Clement, according to Eusebius (H.E. 6.14.2/3), wrote in the Hypotyposes:

... that the Epistle to the Hebrews is the work of Paul, and that it was written to the Hebrews in the Hebrew language; but that Luke translated it carefully and published it for the Greeks. . . the words, Paul the Apostle, were probably not prefixed, because in sending it to the Hebrews, who were prejudiced and suspicious of him, he wisely did not wish to repel them at the very beginning by giving his name. (Eusebius, H.E. 6.14.2/3)
Farther on, it was noted that Clement wrote:

But now, as the blessed presbyter (Pantaenus?, cf. *H.E.* 5.11.2; 6.13.2) said, since the Lord being the apostle of the Almighty, was sent to the Hebrews, Paul, as sent to the Gentiles, on account of his modesty did not subscribe himself as apostle of the Gentiles when he wrote to the Hebrews out of his superabundance (*Eusebius, H.E.* 6.14.4).

Origen also, according to Eusebius, acknowledged the linguistic difficulties of ascribing Hebrews to Paul (*H.E.* 6.25.11), but noted "that the thoughts of the epistle are admirable, and not inferior to the acknowledged apostolic writings, any one who carefully examines the apostolic text will admit" (*Eusebius, H.E.* 6.25.12). Then he added:

If I gave my opinion, I should say that the thoughts are those of the apostle (Paul), but the diction and phraseology are those of some one who remembered the apostolic teachings, and wrote down at his leisure what had been said by his teacher. Therefore if any church holds that this epistle is by Paul, let it be commended for this. For not without reason have the ancients handed it down as Paul's. But who wrote the epistle, in truth, God knows. The statement of some who have gone before us is that Clement, bishop of the Romans, wrote the epistle, and of others that Luke, the author of the Gospel and the Acts, wrote it (*Eusebius, H.E.* 6.25.13/4).

Dionysius, Theognostus, Peter Martyr, Alexander and Athanasius of Alexandria all attest to the unanimous tradition of the church in Alexandria accepting Hebrews. The example of Alexandria was followed by Syria, for Eusebius of Caesarea stated: "Paul's fourteen epistles are well known and and undisputed (σαφές)" (*H.E.* 3.3.5). Later when cataloguing the books of the New Testament (3.25.2), Eusebius included after Acts and among the "acknowledged" (οικολογουμένα) books, the epistles of Paul, without enumerating or delineating the contents. The
implication is that Hebrews was included since the Epistle was not mentioned among either the spurious or rejected works that follow. The Syriac fathers, from Ephraem onwards, made it clear that the canonicity and apostolicity of Hebrews was undisputed in their part of the world. The Peshitta New Testament, for instance, included it from the beginning. Thus there is no evidence of a Pauline Collection in the East which excluded Hebrews.

The Collection of fourteen Pauline epistles that won acceptance in the West late in the fourth century, appears in the East perhaps as early as Origen. In a passage that is preserved only in the Latin translation of Rufinus, Origen apparently spoke of "fourteen Epistles of St. Paul" (Hom. on Jos. 7). Eusebius as noted above, when discussing the epistles of the Apostles, wrote that Paul's "fourteen" epistles were "well known" and "undisputed" (σαφείς) (H.E 3.3.5). However, in the very next sentence, Eusebius would appear to have introduced a qualification by declaring that as a matter of fact Hebrews had been disputed by the church of Rome and rejected by some (H.E 3.3.5).

Elsewhere, Eusebius appears to have ranked Hebrews among the "disputed" (ἀντιλεγόμενα) works (H.E. 6.13.6). Later in the fourth century (c. 396), Amphilochius revealed that a dispute about Hebrews was still known in the East, noting "that some maintain that the Epistle to the Hebrews is spurious (νόθοι)" (Iambi ad Seleu.). Amphilochius does not say who the "some" are. Like Eusebius, he may be referring to Western objections.

Although Eusebius and Amphilochius acknowledged a
dispute about Hebrews, it was generally accepted in the East. Hebrews was included in Codices Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, and Alexandrinus, and in the Syrian New Testament Catalogue, the list of Amphilocthius, and probably in the Catalogue of the Codex Claromontanus. Athanasius in his New Testament Catalogue (Ep. Fest. 39) enumerated the Epistles of Paul as "fourteen" and included Hebrews among the delineation. Other Eastern fathers just numbered the Pauline letters as "fourteen" without the need of delineation, viz. Cyril (Catech. 4.33), Epiphanius (Haer. 76.5), the Apostolic Canons (85), Gregory of Nazianzus (Carm. 12.31). Thus the Eastern fathers of the fourth century may have simply become aware of the Western disputes about Hebrews' Pauline authorship; a dispute which they themselves seem never to have entertained.

While Hebrews does not appear to have ever been seriously disputed by the Eastern churches, there was a change in its status in the fourth and fifth centuries. Previous to this time, in Egypt and Syria, Hebrews was generally listed among the letters of Paul to the churches. Hebrews was included among the letters to the churches in the Chester Beatty Collection (P* A), the archetype of Codex Vaticanus (B) (according to chapter numeration), the Sahidic translation of Athanasius' 39th festal letter, a Syrian canon (c. 400), and numerous minuscule manuscripts. Hence it appears that, in Egypt in the third century and in Syria in the fourth century, Hebrews stood among the letters of Paul to the churches. Yet for some reason in the fourth and fifth centuries, Hebrews was removed from
among the letters to the churches in the East and placed elsewhere. In Syria, Hebrews appears to have been placed at the end of the Pauline Collection, after Philemon, as it was found in the West, perhaps because of Western influence. The numerous MSS. of the Peshitta (c. 400) and Harklean (616) versions placed Hebrews in that position, and this suggests that it was probably placed there in the lost translation made for Philoxenus of Mabug (508). According to Junilius, a high official at the court of Justinian, Hebrews followed Philemon in the canon of the church in Nisibis (De part. div. legis 1.6). Elsewhere in the East, Hebrews was generally moved to after II Thessalonians, i.e. after the letters to the churches and before those written to individuals. No Latin or Syriac manuscripts have the epistle in this place. Yet Hebrews is clearly placed there in Codices Vaticanus (B), Sinaiticus (X), and Alexandrinus (A), as well as six other uncial and at least sixty minuscule codices. Hebrews probably appeared there in the Catalogue found in the Codex Claromontanus.

The earliest patristic writer who bears witness to Hebrews after II Thessalonians is Athanasius (367). In the Euthalian prologue to the Pauline epistles (c. 350), Hebrews is mentioned between the two epistles to the Thessalonians and the two letters to Timothy. Epiphanius (d. 403) said that some manuscripts of the New Testament "have the Epistle to the Hebrews tenth (in order) before the two to Timothy" (Haer. 76.5). Jerome (c. 394) spoke of Hebrews as the "eighth" of Paul's epistles, just after the
letters addressed to churches and before the names of Timothy, Titus, and Philemon (Ep. 53.8). Cyril of Alexandria's (d. 444) proof texts have Hebrews before I Timothy. Hebrews also appears there among the Pauline commentaries of Theodoret of Cyrrhus (d. c. 466). Hebrews is found in the same place in Cosmas Indicopleustes (c. 547), John of Damascus (d. c. 749), the pseudo-Athanasian Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae (7th century), and in the so-called Laodician Canon number 60 (7th-9th century).

The dispute about Hebrews reflected in the writings of Eusebius and Amphilochius appears never to have been so serious that Hebrews was rejected by Eastern fathers, but it may account for the change in the placement of Hebrews among the Pauline letters in the East during the fourth and fifth centuries. If the dispute was about the Pauline authorship of Hebrews then it might account for the transferring of Hebrews in the Syrian churches to the end of the Pauline Collection after Philemon, as was done in the West. However such a dispute is a less likely explanation for the change of Hebrews' placement generally reflected in the rest of the East, viz. after the letters to the churches but before the letters to the individuals.

The Western pattern of letters to seven churches in the early Pauline Collection(s) was known in the East at the end of the fourth century, viz. in Amphilochius (Iambi ad Seleu.) and Jerome (Ep. Paul 53.8). There is no evidence that this pattern of letters was known in the East any earlier. The Eastern churches may have never considered the pattern of letters to seven churches before
because Hebrews was a part of the Eastern Pauline Collection(s) from a very early point, if not from the beginning. The introduction in the East, at the end of the fourth century, of the pattern of letters to seven churches may have caused some confusion as to the place of Hebrews, and may have resulted in the transfer of Hebrews from among the letters to the churches to either the end of the Collection as in Syria, or after the letters to the seven churches as in the rest of the East. Jerome, writing from Bethlehem, referred to Hebrews as the "eighth epistle," but noted that it "is not generally counted in with the others (the other seven?)" (Ep. Paul. 53). Thus the movement of Hebrews in the Eastern Pauline Collection(s) of the fourth and fifth century may have resulted from the introduction in the East of the Western pattern of Pauline letters to seven churches.

In any event, the various additions and adjustments to the Pauline Collection(s) of both the East and West during the third and fourth centuries confirm that the Collection(s) remained open. A Pauline Canon seems not to have been established until the fourth century. It is at that time that the first Pauline Catalogues appear, and that the Collection becomes so established that it can be referred to by number only. Thus the Fragment's witness to a closed Pauline Canon (as reflected in the rejection of the letters to the Alexandrians and Laodiceans), and its inclusion of the Pastorals, would be extraordinary, if traditionally dated.

The Fragmentist, if writing in the East and in the
late fourth century, would provide another witness to the introduction of the Western pattern of letters to seven churches. This may also account for the Fragment’s confused reproduction of the pattern. In his Catalogue, the Fragmentist stressed the importance of the pattern of letters to seven churches several times (11. 46-50, 57-9), but carelessly reversed the relationship between John’s seven letters and Paul’s. His stress and confusion may suggest that the pattern was unfamiliar and needed explanation. Indeed the reason why the Fragmentist stopped delineating the epistles of Paul after Corinthians, Galatians, and Romans (11. 42-6), and then started over again after introducing the pattern of letters to seven churches (11. 46-54), may have been the presence of Hebrews among the letters to the churches in the East. It was after these letters delineated by the Fragmentist in the first instance, viz. Corinthians, Galatians, and Romans, that Hebrews generally followed when it was included among the letters to the churches in the East. Hebrews may have been either carelessly omitted in the Fragmentist’s efforts to list the Western pattern of letters to seven churches and then the remaining letters to individuals (11. 59-63), or else Hebrews may be absent from the Fragment as a result of the Western dispute about its authorship.

THE CATHOLIC EPISTLE COLLECTION

The Collection of Catholic Epistles was gradually enlarged in the Church in a similar way to that which has been shown in the case of the Corpus Paulinum. Eusebius
(c. 260–c. 340) is the first extant witness to the
Collection of "seven" Catholic epistles that eventually
became part of the New Testament (H.E. 2.23.25). The
Collection of seven letters was probably established before
the canonization process of the fourth century. However
not all seven Catholic Epistles were generally received
until the latter half of that century. Eusebius accepted
as undisputed only I John and I Peter (H.E. 3.25.2).
James, Jude, II Peter, and II & III John were included by
Eusebius among the "disputed (ἀντίλεγόμενοι) which are
approved (γνωρίζονται by many" (H.E. 3.25.3; cf. 2.23.25;
3.3.1). Although Origen knew all seven, he too viewed only
I Peter and I John as undisputed (cf. Eusebius, H.E.
6.25.10), and held II Peter, II & III John, Jude, and James
as disputed. Nonetheless the seven Catholic epistles were
included in the probably Alexandrian Catalogue found in
Codex Claromontanus. The Festal letter of Athanasius (367)
contained all seven. Cyril of Jerusalem (d. 386) and
Epiphanius (d. 403) both accepted all seven. Gregory of
Nazianzus (d. 391) recognized all seven Epistles as did
Amphilochius of Iconium (c. 380), though the latter
acknowledged that some limit them to three. By the end of
the fourth century in the East (excluding Syria), all seven
letters were received by most fathers.

In Syria, it appears that none of the Catholic
epistles were accepted until the fifth century. The
Doctrina Addai (c. 390-430) reported that the founder of
the Church of Edessa, in his farewell speech to his
follower Aggai, ordered that no writings other than the Old
Testament, the Gospel (Diatessaron?), the Epistles of Paul, and the Acts of the Twelve Apostles, should be read in the churches. From the period around 400, a Syrian Catalogue is preserved which named in the New Testament, the Gospels, Acts, and Pauline epistles, but no Catholic Epistles. By the early fifth century the Syrian Collection of New Testament Scriptures as reflected in the Peshitta had expanded to include James, I Peter, and I John. The Alexandrian merchant Cosmas Indicopleustes confirmed the new Syrian Catholic Epistle Collection of three letters. After he became a monk (535-547), he defended himself from the charge of not making use of all the Catholic epistles by appealing to the practice of the Syrian church, which accepted only the three Epistles (Top. Christ. 7.265). The remaining Catholic Epistles (viz. II & III John, II Peter, Jude) were added to the Syrian Collection with the appearance of the so-called Philoxenian version in 508. Ephraem Syrus (c. 307-373), however, appears to have accepted all seven Catholic epistles earlier, according to translations of his works surviving only in Greek. If so, there is no other trace of the reception of II & III John, II Peter, and Jude in the Syrian church until the Philoxenian version. John Chrysostom (c. 347-407) and Theodoret (c. 393-c. 466) used only the three (viz. James, I John, I Peter), while Theodore of Mopsuestia (c. 350-428) and his followers, Junilius and Paul of Nisibis, appear to have accepted a Catholic Epistle Collection of only two (viz. I John, I Peter). Junilius, however, noted that "very many add"
the five other Epistles. Thus the Catholic Epistle Collection of Syria expanded to seven letters slowly and probably not until the late fifth century.

In the West Irenaeus (c. 130-c. 200) cited I Peter, and I & II John as Scripture. Tertullian (c. 160-c. 225) knew I John, I Peter, and Jude. The Roman Novatian (c. 250) quoted I John. In North Africa in the works of Cyprian (d. 258) only I John and I Peter among the Catholic epistles are cited, and at the same time in Africa, Aurelius Chullabi quoted from II John. The first Catholic Epistle Collection can be established in the West with the African Mommsen Canon (c. 360), which named "epistulae Johannis III una sola," "epistulae Petri II una sola," but omitted Jude and James. The contradictory scribal note of una sola suggests a protest and may imply an earlier Catholic Epistle Collection in the West of only I Peter and I John. Hilary of Poitiers (d. 367) cited James and II Peter as Scripture. Lucifer of Calaris (d. 370-1) accepted Jude and II Peter. Yet not until the end of the fourth century with Jerome (c. 342-420) and Augustine (354-430), and the African synods of Hippo (393) and Carthage (397, 419) is there any explicit evidence that all seven letters were contained in the Catholic Epistle Collection of the West.

In summary, the Catholic epistles as a sub-canonical element were regularly grouped in specific combinations. These Collections themselves expanded to the Canonical seven, though sometimes with resistance. In Syria, for a significant period of time, none of the Catholic epistles
were received (e.g. *Doctrina Addai*, Syrian Canon c. 400).

A combination of only I John and I Peter received early and wide support (e.g. Papias, Polycarp, Cyprian, Hilary, Facian, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Paul of Nisibis), and was enlarged with some resistance (e.g. Canon Mommsen, Eusebius). A Collection of only James, I John, & I Peter also received wide support (e.g. Irenaeus, Peshitta, Chrysostom, Theodoret), and was also expanded with some resistance (e.g. Amphilocheius of Iconium). The Collection of all seven Catholic epistles, however, eventually became the norm (e.g. Athanasius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Epiphanius, Apostolic Canons, Gregory of Nazianzus, Philaster, Ambrose, Rufinus, Jerome, Council of Carthage, Philoxenian Version, Priscillian). Beyond these Collections, other combinations are rare and irregular (e.g. Tertullian and Origen mentioned Jude as well as I John & I Peter; Lucifer of Calaris noted Jude as well as I John, I Peter, & James).

The Collection of Jude and I, II, & III (?) John represented in the Muratorian Fragment is without parallel, and reflects none of the recognized patterns of expansion. The absence of I Peter especially, and perhaps James too, is suggestive that further entries in the Fragment are missing. Thus the Fragment may witness to a larger combination of Catholic epistles, but such larger Collections which included the minor Catholic epistles of Jude and II & III (?) John were not prominent until the early fourth century. Once again then the Fragment, if traditionally dated, would be an anomaly.
MISCELLANEOUS WORKS

The remaining New Testament books which were later deemed canonical, viz. Acts, and Revelation, entered the Canon as individual works, and not as members of an earlier Collection. Though Acts might be expected to be associated with Luke, or Revelation with the other Johannine works, there is little evidence of such groupings. The place of Acts and Revelation in most MSS. further supports their independent acceptance. The idea of an Apocalyptic Collection, perhaps of The Shepherd, and the Revelations of John and Peter, is no more than speculation, just as is any notion of an earlier Collection of Acts of various Apostles.

Other works too, which like Acts and Revelation, were held as Scripture prior to the fourth century, found themselves attached to the later New Testament Catalogues and Collections, e.g. The Shepherd, the Revelation of Peter, I & II Clement, the Wisdom of Solomon, Barnabas, and the Acts of Paul. The claims of these works to be considered canonical in the fourth century were like those of Acts and Revelation; not as members of any earlier Collection, but simply as works which had been appealed to as Scripture in the period before canonization. Thus the boundaries of the New Testament Canon were settled in the fourth century in the process of canonization itself. Likewise the final expansion of the earlier Collections of Pauline and Catholic epistles was closed in the process of fourth century canonization. After the fourth century, the
entire Christian Canon, viz. the Old Testament, The Fourfold Gospel, the Pauline Letter Collection, the Catholic Epistle Collection, and miscellaneous works, were generally perceived as closed, despite the occasional continuing dispute about one work or another, or the occasional appearance in a MS. of an apocryphal writing.

CONCLUSIONS

The formation of the Christian Canon of Scriptures was a gradual process that culminated in the fourth century. Prior to that time the churches gathered together and defined a number of different Collections which were later incorporated into the New Testament, along with a number of singular works. In the case of Jewish Scriptures, the Church inherited a large body of works which it apparently attempted to define and limit only later in the fourth century. With regards to specifically Christian Scriptures, the Church began at an early stage to collect its valued works and accumulate a complement to the books of the Old Testament. However, not until the fourth century, did the churches appear to define and restrict that New Testament Collection. Thus the development of the New Testament Collection was one of gradual accumulation and expansion into the fourth century. The Fourfold Gospel is the only sub-canonical Collection that appears closed before the actual activity of fourth century canonization. It is only in that later process that the other Collections appear to have been fixed and established.

The idea of a so-called "core New Testament Canon" at
the end of the second century is now seen as misleading and unfounded. Once a distinction is made between "Scripture" and "Canon," the idea of a New Testament Canon does not appear applicable before the fourth century. Instead a "core New Testament Collection" might be spoken of, which while remaining open, contained a number of works which were regularly appealed to for religious authority, i.e. as Scripture.

But even the elements of that "core New Testament Collection" are probably not as numerous as they were previously thought to be, once a distinction between "Commentaries" and "Collections" is made. The four later canonical Gospels enjoyed widespread usage, but there were disputes, and the Fourfold Gospel Canon should perhaps be seen as only an innovation at the end of the second and beginning of the third century. A "core" Pauline Collection of perhaps the letters to seven churches in the West, plus Hebrews in the East, appears accepted in the second half of the second century. But the Pastorals should not be thought of as elements of that Collection until later in the third century. Among the Catholic epistle Collection, a "core" of I Peter and I John (and maybe James) might be postulated from the beginning of the third century. Thus there is a good case for postulating a "core New Testament Collection" of maybe the Fourfold Gospel, the Pauline letters to seven churches (and Hebrews in the East), and the Major Catholic epistles from the beginning of the third century.

The Muratorian Fragment suggests a much larger New
Testament Collection than this "core," including the Pastoral, Jude, II & III (?), John, the Wisdom of Solomon, the Revelations of John and Peter, and Acts. The Fragment, if traditionally dated, is thus an anomaly in terms of its contents. It would be one of the earliest, if not the earliest, witness to a Fourfold Gospel Canon. It would be the earliest witness for the addition of the Pastoral to the Pauline Collection. The Fragment's Catholic epistle Collection is unparalleled, especially with its absence of I Peter, and maybe James. If these works are simply missing from the Fragment, then the Fragment would represent the earliest larger Collection including Minor Catholic epistles. Therefore the hypothesis of a "core New Testament Collection" does not necessarily support the traditional dating of the Fragment, but serves to emphasize the extraordinary character of its contents, if it is dated at the end of the second century.

More significantly, the Muratorian Fragment clearly represents something more than a Collection, however large. The Fragment represents a Canon---a closed collection of Scriptures. It delineates a specific group of works which the Fragmentist stated are accepted in the catholic church, viz. (Matthew, Mark), Luke, John, Acts, I & II Corinthians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Galatians, I & II Thessalonians, Romans, Philemon, Titus, I & II Timothy, Jude, I, II, & (III?) John, Wisdom of Solomon, Revelations of John and Peter. The Fragmentist also clearly noted works which were rejected, viz. Laodiceans, Alexandrians, and anything from Arsinous, Valentinus, and Miltiades (?),
as well as those works which are disputed (Revelation of Peter) or restricted to private reading (The Shepherd). The Fragment entails both conceptual elements and contents which are not elsewhere received in the churches until the fourth century. Thus the Fragment, if traditionally dated, is an anomaly in the development of the Christian Canon both in the concepts it implies and the contents it suggests. Moreover if traditionally dated, the Fragment does not seem to have greatly influenced the development of the New Testament Canon either conceptually or with regards to contents.

Finally the Fragment, if traditionally dated, is not only an anomaly in terms of contents, and concepts, but also in terms of form. The Fragment is clearly a Catalogue. It distinctly delineates the accepted, disputed, and rejected works, without significant narration. Boundaries are clearly established in the Fragment. Yet the Catalogue as a New Testament format is nowhere else extant in surviving literature until the fourth century, at least one hundred years later. In the fourth century, numerous Catalogues appeared in all parts of the Church. While some list has to be first, it is more than a question of just being the first. The Muratorian Fragment, if traditionally dated, is an extraordinary anomaly in the development of the Christian Bible on numerous accounts.
Excluding the Muratorian Fragment, there are no Catalogues of the Christian Canon until the fourth century. As Albert Sundberg noted in his argument for the redating of the Fragment:

...during that century New Testament canonical lists came to appear in many parts of the church: in Syria/Palestine the list of Eusebius, *H.E.* 3.25 (3037-25); that of Cyril of Jerusalem (348), *Catech.* 4.33; of Epiphanius, *Haer.* 8.6 (sic); and of Chrysostom (c. 407), *Synopsis Sacr. Script.*; the list in Codex Claromontanus; and a Syrian canon of c. 400; in Alexandria, the list of Athanasius, *Ep. Fest.* 39; an African canon of about 360; and the Carthaginian Catalogue (397); in Asia Minor, the list of Gregory Nazianzus, *Carm.* 12.31; of Amphiloctius, *Iambi. ad Seleucum*; and the Laodicene Catalogue (363); and in Rome, a canon dated about 400.¹

The sudden and widespread appearance of New Testament Catalogues confirms that the Fragment, if traditionally dated, is an anomaly in the formation of the Canon. A consideration of the various Catalogues of the fourth century will also assist in a more precise placing of the Fragment within that century, which now seems so much more likely to be its true date.

THE UNDISPUTED CATALOGUES

Sundberg acknowledged by footnote that his enumeration of fourth century Catalogues was drawn from the lists in Westcott and Souter.² Sundberg's list included at least one work which by his own dating is not specifically fourth century, viz. Chrysostom (c. 407). Three of Sundberg's entries, viz. the Laodicene Catalogue, the Roman Canon (c.
400), and Chrysostom, are disputed, and will be considered later. Sundberg, however, inexplicably failed to include several other important references which were also present in Westcott and Souter, viz. The Apostolic Canons, 85 (380), Jerome, Ad Paulinum Ep. 53 (394); Augustine, De Doctr. Christ. 2.8.12 (c. 396-7); Rufinus, Comm. in Symb. Apost. 36-7 (400); and Pope Innocent, Ad Exsuper. Tol. (405). With these items added, there appear to be fifteen undisputed Catalogues from the fourth (and very first years of the fifth) century:

NT CATALOGUES OF THE FOURTH CENTURY

1. Eusebius, H.E. 3.25.1-7
2. Catalogue in Codex Claromontanus
3. Cyril of Jerusalem, Catech. 4.33
5. The Mommsen Catalogue
6. Epiphanius, Haer. 76.22.5
7. The Apostolic Canons, 85
8. Gregory of Nazianzus, Carm. 12.31
9. The African Canons
12. Amphilochius, Iambi. ad Seleucum
13. Rufinus, Comm. in Sym. Apost. 36
15. Syrian Catalogue of St. Catherine's

For the sake of convenience, the contents of these Catalogues is set out in columnar form on pages 191-2. In order to see how the Fragment is best related to these Catalogues, it is necessary to note the outstanding characteristics of each.

1) Eusebius

The Canon of Scriptures was a recurrent theme in Eusebius, since he acknowledged an interest in recording the usage of the ancient fathers (H.E. 3.3.3; 5.8.1).
### UNDISPUTED NEW TESTAMENT CATALOGUES OF THE FOURTH CENTURY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>1. EUSEBIUS</strong></th>
<th><strong>2. CLERMONT</strong></th>
<th><strong>3. CYRIL OF JERUS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Homolegoumena&quot;:</td>
<td>Four Gospels</td>
<td>New Testament:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Gospels</td>
<td>Mt</td>
<td>Four Gospels:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts</td>
<td>Jn</td>
<td>Acts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eps. of Paul</td>
<td>Mk</td>
<td>Seven Catholic Eps:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Jn</td>
<td>Lk</td>
<td>Jas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Pet</td>
<td>Eps. of Paul</td>
<td>Pet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev?</td>
<td>Rom</td>
<td>Jn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Antilegomena&quot;:</td>
<td>I &amp; II Cor</td>
<td>Fourteen Paul Eps:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disputed-</td>
<td>Gal</td>
<td>&quot;Pseudepigrapha&quot;:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jas</td>
<td>Eph</td>
<td>Gos of Thomas:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jude</td>
<td>(Phil)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Pet</td>
<td>(I &amp; II Thess)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II &amp; III Jn</td>
<td>(Heb)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spurious-</td>
<td>I &amp; II Tim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts of Paul</td>
<td>Titus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermas</td>
<td>Col</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev of Pet</td>
<td>Philemon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnabas</td>
<td>I &amp; II Pet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didache</td>
<td>Jas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev?</td>
<td>I, II, &amp; III Jn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gosp of Heb</td>
<td>Jude</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cited by Heretics:</td>
<td>---Barnabas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gos of Pet</td>
<td>Rev</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gos of Thomas</td>
<td>Acts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gos of Matthias</td>
<td>---Hermas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts of Andrew</td>
<td>---Acts of Paul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts of Jn</td>
<td>---Rev of Pet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>4. ATHANASIUS</strong></th>
<th><strong>5. MOMMSEN</strong></th>
<th><strong>6. EPHPHANIUS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Testament:</td>
<td>Gospels III</td>
<td>Four Gospels:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Gospels</td>
<td>Mt</td>
<td>Fourteen Paul Eps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt</td>
<td>Mk</td>
<td>Acts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk</td>
<td>Jn</td>
<td>Catholic Eps:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk</td>
<td>Lk</td>
<td>Jas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jn</td>
<td>Paul Eps XIII</td>
<td>Pet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts</td>
<td>Acts</td>
<td>Jn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Cath Eps</td>
<td>Rev</td>
<td>Rev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Js</td>
<td>Eps of Jn III</td>
<td>Wis of Sol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two of Pet</td>
<td>(una sola)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three of Jn</td>
<td>Eps of Pet II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jude</td>
<td>(una sola)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourteen Paul Eps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two to the Cor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two to the Thes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two to Tim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philmon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catechetical:</td>
<td>Didache</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hermas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Perhaps as a consequence, Eusebius created lists or Catalogues of the New Testament from the writings of his predecessors, viz. Irenaeus (*H.E. 5.8.1-15*), Clement of Alexandria (*H.E. 6.14.1-7*), and Origen (*H.E. 6.25.3-14*). A reading of these passages reveals that Eusebius simply weaved together various texts from their works in order to create the impression that each of these church fathers had a "Canon." It was Eusebius who created the "Canon" from their Comments, not the writers themselves, so that none of these lists are original Catalogues. They are expressions of Eusebius' interest in the Canon, and not that of his sources. Their remarks reflect only the concept of Scripture. R.P.C. Hanson has confirmed that no list, not even the concept of a closed Collection of New Testament Scriptures, was entertained by Origen and Clement of Alexandria.

The absence of original New Testament Catalogues in Eusebius' works, other than his own (*H.E. 3.25.1-7*), is a reliable indication that no such Catalogues were known to him, and that perhaps no such Catalogues existed prior to his time. If Eusebius had known, or even heard of, any earlier Catalogue he would surely have made a reference to it. That Eusebius created such Catalogues for himself and others, suggests that the interest in Catalogues was his. The interest in defining the Canon by the use of Catalogues, which was widely repeated in the fourth century, may be traced back no further than Eusebius.

Eusebius' own New Testament Catalogue appears in the *Church History* (*3.25.1-7*). The exact date of his Catalogue
is uncertain because the *Church History* went through several editions. In its present form the work covers the period from the foundation of the Church to the victory of Constantine over Licinian in 324. The Catalogue, therefore, is probably to be dated before 325. The earliest edition of the book may have appeared before the persecution of Diocletian in 303. In *H.E.* 5.8.1, Eusebius wrote that "when beginning this work we made a promise to set forth from time to time quotations from the ancient ecclesiastical presbyters and authors in which they committed to writing the traditions that came down to them about the canonical (Διαθήκη) scriptures." The present introduction contains no such reference, but it was probably altered with later editions, and the reference may have been dropped or moved. A promise of the sort mentioned does occur in *H.E.* 3.3.3. The interest in the Canon may have been part of the earliest edition of the work. In any case the Catalogue is to be dated sometime between c. 303-325.

The motivation behind the Catalogue is uncertain. During the Diocletian persecution (303-11), Christians were forced to hand over their Holy books to be burnt (Eusebius, *H.E.* 8.2.4-5; *Gesta apud Zenophilum*; Lactantius, *De mort.* persec. 11-3). A clarification as to which works were considered Scripture might have been helpful, but the persecution at Caesarea was very spasmodic, and was vigorously enforced during less than three out of the ten and a half years. During the persecution's whole course, not one of the Palestinian bishops was put to death.
Pamphilus' great library at Caesarea does not seem to have suffered either. Moreover the earliest edition of the Church History may have appeared with the Catalogue before the persecution began. Thus the Diocletian persecution was probably not a major factor in Eusebius' drawing up his Catalogue.

The official recognition, and later sanction, of the Christian Church by Constantine (313-37) and his successors was also probably too late to be part of Eusebius' motivation, but it may have been a factor in the numerous other Catalogues of the fourth century. Eusebius did not meet Constantine until they both attended the Council of Nicaea in 325, by which time the final edition of the Church History was probably completed. In 331, Constantine commissioned Eusebius to prepare fifty copies of the sacred Scriptures for the church at Constantinople (Eusebius, Life of Constantine 4.36). In 340, Alexandrian scribes in Rome prepared copies of the Christian Scriptures for the Emperor Constans (Athanasius, Animadv. 15). Such activities surely played a role in the development of the Canon in the fourth century, but Eusebius' Catalogue was earlier and probably not influenced by them.

The greatest influence upon Eusebius was probably that of the presbyter Pamphilus, who had migrated from Alexandria and enlarged the library and school at Caesarea which Origen had founded half a century earlier (232). Under Pamphilus' guidance Eusebius embarked upon biblical scholarship; studying, copying, translating, and correcting the texts of Scriptures. After Pamphilus' death in 310,
Eusebius appears to have been the director of the school, and about 313 he became bishop of Caesarea. Despite his renowned work as a biblical scholar, Eusebius was more concerned in his *Church History* with "higher" criticism than with "lower." There was more interest in the authorship and authenticity of the books of the New Testament, than in a comparison of variant readings such as Eusebius frequently made when quoting Jewish Scriptures. What determined his attitude towards the "canonicity" of a New Testament work was almost exclusively its use by the churches or by Christian writers such as Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, or Origen. It was his work as a historian more than anything else that may have led him to categorize his conclusions. The inconsistent usage of his predecessors may also account for his inability to place all of the works clearly. Therefore Eusebius' introduction of a New Testament Catalogue in the *Church History* may have been motivated by nothing more than the simple wish to summarize his reading of history on this matter.

In many ways Eusebius' work on the Canon was a natural continuation of that of Origen, the founder of the school at Caesarea. Origen also had a keen interest in determining the authenticity and authorship of the books to which the churches appealed. In his *Commentary on John* (13.17), Origen divided several works claiming to be inspired into three categories, viz. genuine (γρηγορός), spurious (ναούς), and rejected (μηκτός), although elsewhere he did not often keep to this division and his vocabulary varied on other occasions. Eusebius also
employed a variety of terms to identify his categories. The lack of an established vocabulary and definite categories confirm that the activities of Eusebius were innovative.

Eusebius, in discussing the works of the Apostles (H.E. 3.3.1-7), appears to have employed different words or phrases to distinguish the works which were universally acknowledged from those which were disputed:

acknowledged: (3.3.1) οὐκ...ἀναμολογηθὰν
(3.3.1) ἀναμφιλέκτων
(3.3.3) τῶν ἔνακαθήκων καὶ ὀμολογουμένων
(3.3.4) έγγραφῶν
(3.3.5) δόξης
(3.3.5) ἀναγκαστικῶν
disputed: (3.3.1) οὐκ ἐνδεικτηκὼν
(3.3.2) οὐδὲ ἐν καθολικῷ
(3.3.3) τῶν αντιλεγομένων
(3.3.7) ἀντιλεκτάς
(3.3.7) μὴ...ἐμπλουτισμένων

Eusebius refined his language somewhat within his New Testament Catalogue (H.E. 3.25.1-7). The universally acknowledged works were simply called the ὀμολογουμένως and included the Four Gospels, Acts, the Epistles of Paul, I John, I Peter, and maybe Revelation (H.E. 3.25.1-2).

Other works were called disputed (ἀντιλεγομένως, viz. James, Jude, II Peter, II & III John (H.E. 3.25.3); and others still were spurious (Nόθος), e.g. Acts of Paul, Hermas, Revelation of Peter, Epistle of Barnabas, Revelation?, the Gospel to the Hebrews (H.E. 3.25.4-5).

However the spurious works were really only a further division of the disputed category (τὰ οὕτως δὲ πραγμα τῶν ἀντιλεγομένων ἐν εἰς Ἡ. 3.25.5). So, Eusebius’ division was really between the “true and genuine and commonly accepted, from those others which, although not
canonical but disputed, are yet at the same time known to
most ecclesiastical writers" (δια ἐκκλησιαστικῆς κατὰ
tὸν ἑκκλησιαστικὸν πολέμον ἀληθείας καὶ ἀπλάστων
καὶ ἀναμυνομένης γραφῆς καὶ τὰς ἄλλας παρὰ πάσης
ουκ εὑρισκόμενοι μὲν ἄλλα καὶ ἀναμυνόμενας, ὃς
dὲ παρὰ πλείστον τὰν ἑκκλησιαστικὰν γραμμάτων
H.E. 3.25.6).

Furthermore all of these writings were then distinguished
from the "fictions of heretics" (ἀληθικῶν ἄρσην
ἀφασματα, H.E. 3.25.7), which "are not to be placed even
among the spurious (ὐθός) writings, but are all of them
to be cast aside as absurd (ἀτοπῶς) and impious
(ἀνθρώπε.)" (H.E. 3.25.7), e.g. the Gospels of Peter,
Thomas, Matthias, and the Acts of Andrew and John.

Eusebius, like Origen before him, could not simply
distinguish between the canonical and non-canonical
writings, but was forced to introduce a secondary class of
works which were not strictly canonical nor completely
rejected. This secondary class confirms that the Canon of
the church was not yet fixed, i.e. that there was no clear
distinction between the accepted books and others. The
employment of a secondary class suggests a transitional
stage between undefined Scriptures and a finalized Canon.

However even with a secondary category, which itself
is subdivided, Eusebius is unsure where to place certain
works, e.g. Revelation, the Gospel to the Hebrews, (I
Clement?, cf. H.E. 3.16). This confusion suggests that the
categories themselves are only just beginning to play a
role in the formation of the Canon, and that the
development of the New Testament Canon is still in its
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creative stages.

The difference between Eusebius' activity and that of his predecessor, Origen, was comprehensiveness. Eusebius carried the procedure one step further than Origen. Rather than considering works one by one as Origen had done, Eusebius considered the categories one by one, filling in the individual books into each according to the usage of the church fathers. There is an important distinction between Origen's attempt to authenticate individual works and Eusebius' concern to categorize the complete Collection of works. It is with this new concern that the concept of Canon, as opposed to a mere Collection of accepted Scriptures, arises.

2) The Catalogue in Codex Claromontanus

Within the Codex Claromontanus (D*) there is found a stichometrical Catalogue of the books of the Old and New Testaments. Codex Claromontanus itself, which contains the Pauline Epistles and is generally assigned to the fifth or sixth century, is a bilingual Greek and Latin manuscript, similar to Codex Bezae (D), which contains the Gospels, Acts, and a small fragment of III John. The existence of a Latin text is sufficient to suggest that the MS. was written in the West. Its exact place of origin is uncertain. The Latin belongs to the African type of the Old Latin version, suggesting Africa for its place of origin. However, the Latin text is almost identical with that used by Lucifer of Cagliari, and thus the MS. may have been written in Sardinia.
The Catalogue within the Codex was probably not original to the MS. It is written in Latin only, and is found between the texts of Philemon and Hebrews. Zahn noted that the ink and handwriting of the Catalogue differ from the preceding Pauline texts. The Catalogue, which does not contain Hebrews, differs in the order of Paul's letters from the Codex, which does contain Hebrews, and in the order of the Gospels in Codex Bezae. Thus the origin of the Catalogue may be different from the biblical text.

The Catalogue lists the books of the Old and New Testament. It numbers the Gospels four, and names them in the so-called Western order, Matthew, John, Mark, and Luke. Then follows the Pauline Epistles: Romans, I & II Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, I & II Timothy, Titus, Colossians, and Philemon. Philippians and I & II Thessalonians are absent from the list, probably by accidental omission. The confusing stichometry for II Corinthians and I Timothy may confirm a certain carelessness on the part of the scribe. Next are listed all the Catholic epistles, followed by Barnabas, Revelation, Acts, Hermas, Acts of Paul, and the Revelation of Peter. A horizontal line or bar, however, has been placed before four of the works, viz. Barnabas, Hermas, Acts of Paul, and Revelation of Peter, perhaps suggesting some dispute about them.

Westcott and Julicher suggested that following Tertullian's example (De pudicitia 20), the Epistle to the Hebrews was listed as "Barnabas" in the Catalogue. Wescott pointed out that the stichometry for Barnabas in
the Catalogue, viz. DCCCL, differed significantly from Nichephorus' stichometry of MCCCLX (MCCVI) for Barnabas. C.F. Andry, however, compared the stichometry in the Catalogue with the Pauline texts in the Codex and then compared the resulting numerical ratio with the texts of both Hebrews and Barnabas as found in Codex Sinaiticus. His results confirmed that the Catalogue reference is clearly to the Epistle of Barnabas and not to Hebrews. 15

Although the Catalogue appears in Latin in a Western MS., it probably had an Eastern origin. 16 Harnack and Zahn both noted that the inclusion in the Catalogue of all seven Catholic epistles would be remarkable in the West before the last third of the fourth century, c. 366-400, 17 and the appearance of the Acts of Paul, the Revelation of Peter, Barnabas, and The Shepherd at that time in the West would be most unlikely. The presence of Barnabas, the Acts of Paul, The Shepherd, and the Revelation of Peter suggests an association with the school of Alexandria. 18 Yet, it would be startling not to find Hebrews listed in a Catalogue associated with Alexandria. Zahn suggested that a reference to Hebrews was accidentally dropped after Ephesians and before I Timothy along with the references to Philippians and I & II Thessalonians. 19 Hebrews would most likely follow II Thessalonians and precede I Timothy in a fourth century Alexandrian list. 20 The similarity in Greek titles of Ephesians, viz. προς Ἐφεσους, and Hebrews, viz. προς Ἔφραμ, may even explain the omissions.

The date of the Catalogue is uncertain. This is the
only Catalogue, other than the Fragment, which has been dated prior to Eusebius. M.J. Lagrange dated it after Clement of Alexandria, declaring: "Au temps d'Origène, et d'après ses écrits, on n'aurait pu obtenir une pareille liste." Yet this is a misleading statement since no real "lists," parallel or not, are extant with which to compare. The very formation of a list or Catalogue suggests a time after Origen. Harnack noted a similarity between this Catalogue and Eusebius', where the four works marked by the scribe are also grouped together by Eusebius, along with the Didache (§.E. 3.25.4). However this Catalogue does not reflect the reservations expressed by Eusebius with regards to James, Jude, II Peter, II & III John, and Revelation (§.E. 3.25.3). The lack of these reservations may suggest a date after Eusebius (c. 303-25). The presence in the Catalogue of Barnabas, The Shepherd, the Acts of Paul, and the Revelation of Peter, even with the scribal marks, may suggest a period before Athanasius (367), where notice of Barnabas, the Acts of Paul, and the Revelation of Peter was omitted altogether, and The Shepherd (with the Didache) was clearly placed in a secondary class outside the Canon (Fest. Ep. 39). Didymus the Blind (c. 313-98), however, seems still to have considered The Shepherd, Barnabas, the Didache (and I Clement) as Scripture. Sometime in the second quarter of the fourth century is perhaps the most probable date for the Catalogue in Codex Claromontanus, with a provenance in the East, perhaps in Alexandria.
3) Cyril of Jerusalem (c. 315-86)

Cyril of Jerusalem's most famous work is the twenty-four *Catecheses*, which he delivered mostly in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem in 348 (or 350). A note preserved in several of the manuscripts recorded that they were taken down in short-hand, which suggests that the texts are transcripts made by one of his listeners, and are not by Cyril himself. In the fourth Catechetical Lecture, Cyril outlined the Christian Faith, concluding with comments on the Divine Scriptures. Within these remarks, Cyril warned the catechumens "to read none of the apocryphal (αποκρύφων, 4.33; cf. 4.35) writings" which were "disputed" (ἀπογραφήματα, 4.33), but only those from the Church. He then listed the books of the Old and New Testaments. He counseled that there are only four Gospels, for the rest have "false titles and are mischievous" (ψευδογραφα καὶ βλασφέρα, 4.36). Of these he explicitly mentioned only the Gospel of Thomas. Then Cyril listed "the Acts of the Twelve Apostles," and "the seven Catholic epistles of James, Peter, John, and Jude." Finally he mentioned without delineation the "last work of the disciples, the fourteen epistles of Paul."

Cyril's Catalogue is notable for its absence of Revelation. Revelation appeared as generally accepted in the East until the second half of the fourth century. Dionysius may have introduced an element of doubt about the work, perhaps reflected in Eusebius' confusion in placing Revelation (H.E. 3.25.2, 4). Yet Cyril is the earliest
witness to the rejection of Revelation in an Eastern list.

In Cyril's Catalogue, there is no class of secondary works, i.e. books which while not universally accepted are approvingly used by many (cf. Eusebius, H.E. 3.25.3). Although much of Cyril's language is similar to Eusebius', viz. "those which are acknowledged among all" (ὁμολογουμένα, 4.33), "apocryphal writings" which are "disputed" (4.33), those of "secondary rank" (4.36), and those which have "false titles" (Ὑευδηπηγαφα, 4.36), only the "homolegoumena" is received by Cyril. After the Catalogue in Cyril, there follows the warning to "let all the rest be put aside in a secondary (ἐν δεύτερω, 4.36) rank" and "whatever books are not read in Churches, these read not even by thyself" (4.36). Cyril's several references to what ought to be read by his listeners, viz. 4.33 (bis), 4.35, 4.36, may suggest that some were reading other works. The intent of Cyril's Catalogue was to limit reading to the universally accepted writings, viz. the "homolegoumena."

4) Athanasius (c. 296-373)

During the third century it became customary for the bishops of Alexandria to announce each year, by a letter to the suffragan sees usually issued shortly after Epiphany, the beginning of Lent and the correct date of Easter. These pastoral letters would also contain a discussion of current ecclesiastical affairs or problems. In 367, Athanasius issued his 39th Festal Letter as bishop of Alexandria, which was specifically concerned with the fact
that apocryphal (ἀποκρύφους) books were leading the
simple "astray by the similarity of their names with the
ture books" (Ep. Fest. 39.1). Athanasius then set forth
"in order the writings that are in the list and handed down
and believed divine," by cataloguing the books of the Old
and New Testament. The New Testament list is the first
which is identical with the traditional twenty-seven book
New Testament Canon.

There is a distinctive secondary class in Athanasius,
for following his list, he mentioned "other books apart
from these, not indeed in the list, but produced by our
ancestors to be read by those who are just coming forward
to receive oral instruction in the word of true religion
(viz. catechumens)" (Ep. Fest. 39.7). The approval of
non-canonical catechetical reading contrasts sharply with
Cyril's warnings, and may confirm a common practice to
which Cyril was responding. Athanasius included among the
New Testament catechetical reading the Didache and The
Shepherd. Any mention of Barnabas, the Revelation of
Peter, and the Acts of Paul, on the other hand, is
noticeably absent.

5) The Mommsen Catalogue

In 1885 Theodor Mommsen discovered a stichometrical
Catalogue of Old and New Testament books in a tenth century
MS. (no. 12266) in the Phillipps Collection at Cheltenham
(thus sometimes called the Cheltenham list). The MS. is
now in the Biblioteca Nazionale at Rome. Another copy of
the Catalogue has turned up in a ninth century MS. (no.
The contents of the Codex in which the Cheltenham list was found can be dated by two references. At the end of the *Liber Generationis*, which was included in the Codex, is a chronological calculation brought down to the consulship of the two brothers Eusebius and Hypatius in the year 359. There is an interval of five pages between this note and the biblical Catalogue, but the text which connects them was not all taken from the same work. At the beginning of the table of contents of the *Liber Generationis* is another note which would bring the date down to the consulship of Valentinian and Valens in 365. These two chronological notations, viz. 359 and 365, are near enough to each other to suggest that the compiler(s) of the MS. was active about that period, or shortly thereafter.

The New Testament Catalogue names in Latin the four Gospels followed by the thirteen, unnamed epistles of Paul. Next is listed Acts, Revelation, three epistles of John and two of Peter. There is no mention of James, Jude, or Hebrews. Moreover in the Cheltenham list, following the listing of the Johannine and Petrine epistolary there follows on each occasion the phrase, *una sola*, suggesting a protest by the scribe at including among the Catholic epistles anything more than I John and I Peter.

The absence of Hebrews and the presence of Revelation in a Catalogue of the last third of the fourth century suggest a Western provenance. A number of the Old Testament books in the Catalogue are found in a peculiar order, some of the patterns have a parallel in Augustine.
The order of the Gospels in the Catalogue, viz. Matthew, Mark, John, Luke, however, is paralleled only in the Old Syriac Versions and in the so-called Commentary of Theophilus of Antioch, where in the preface the symbols of the Gospels are described in that order. It is possible that these coincidences are accidental. The usual Western order of the Gospels was Matthew, John, Luke, Mark. After the Catalogue is a short note on the stichometry:

\textit{Quoniam indiculum versuum in urbe Roma non ad liquidum, sed et alibi avariciae causa non habent integrum, per singulos libros computatis syllabis posui numero XVI versum Virgilianum omnibus libris numerum adscripsi.}

It may be assumed from this note that the author of the Catalogue was not writing in Rome, but that he knew well the customs of trading there. The stichometry found in the Catalogue is that of the Vulgate (382+), and was perhaps the source for it, since none of the Vulgate MSS. have any stichometries for Ezra-Nehemiah, which are both wanting in the Mommsen Catalogue. The absence of Hebrews could confirm a date before 393 for the Catalogue since the Epistle was only tentatively accepted as Pauline in the Hippo Breviary. There is also little evidence for the acceptance of III John and II Peter in the West prior to the Councils in North Africa at the end of the fourth and beginning of the fifth century, viz. Hippo (393), Carthage (397, 419). The Catalogue may be seen as possibly dated between 365 and the later Councils of North Africa, beginning in 393. Zahn favored a later rather than an earlier dating (c. 370-90) because of the use of the word \textit{canonicus} in an interpolation between the Old and New
Testament lists. In either case, this Catalogue would represent the earliest known list of North Africa, and the Western church.

6) Epiphanius of Salamis (c. 315-403)

There is no single Catalogue of Old and New Testament books in Epiphanius. In his *Panarion Haereses*, completed about 377, he included both Old and New Testament lists, but they are not placed together. The *Panarion Haereses* is Epiphanius' most voluminous and valuable work, refuting a series of eighty heresies. After dealing with the philosophical heresies of the pagan schools and just before confronting the heresies of the Jewish sects, Epiphanius included a Catalogue of the Old Testament (*Haer. 8.6*). In the midst of a long discussion about Aetius, the Anomoean, Epiphanius listed a Catalogue of New Testament works (*Haer. 76.22.5*). In another work, *De mensuris et ponderibus* (4, 23), completed in 392, Epiphanius included two other Old Testament lists.

The Four Gospels are numbered but not named in the New Testament Catalogue, just as the fourteen epistles of Paul are numbered but not named. The Catholic epistles, however, were not numbered seven as they were by most writers in the East, viz. Eusebius, Cyril, Athanasius, Gregory of Nazianzus, Jerome (in Bethlehem), and Amphilochius. Epiphanius' New Testament Catalogue is most remarkable for its inclusion of the Wisdom of Solomon and Sirach as New Testament works. The Catalogue is also unusual for its inclusion of Revelation (cf. *Haer. 51.3*,
35), for in the last half of the fourth century, Revelation was absent from many Eastern sources (e.g. Cyril, Apostolic Canons, Gregory of Nazianzus, Amphilochius, Peshitta).

7) The Apostolic Canons

In the eighth book of the so-called *Apostolic Constitutions* (8.47), there is a collection of 35 so-called *Apostolic Canons*, apparently compiled by the redactor of the Constitutions. The Canons dealt almost exclusively with the election, ordination, and duties of the clergy, and were entirely in the form of the canons of councils. The contents of the Canons are similar to the decisions of Antioch (341) and Laodicea (c. 360), and are probably later than them. The absence of any hint of the Nestorian controversy would suggest a date earlier than the beginning of the fifth century. Canon 85 enumerates the books of the Old and New Testament.

The eight books of the Constitutions represent the largest collection of legislative and liturgical material of the early church. The compiler drew from a number of earlier sources, e.g. the Didascalia, the Didache, the Apostolic Traditions of Hippolytus. A Syrian provenance for the Constitutions is suggested by the celebration of Christmas on December 25th and the equalization of the Sabbath with Sunday as an ecclesiastical holiday. The Antiochene liturgy and the Syrian calculation of the months confirm a Syrian origin. All eight books of the Apostolic Constitutions, including the Apostolic Canons, were probably compiled by the same author and originated c. 380.
in Syria.  

Except for the Canons, the Constitutions were condemned by the Synod of Trullo (692). Thus they did not have much influence in the Greek church since only excerpts from them found their way into the Eastern collections of Canon Law. The first fifty Canons were translated into Latin by Dionysius Exiguus (d. c. 545), who added them to his larger collection of Canons. These fifty canons came to be well known in the West. Why Dionysius copied only the first fifty canons is not known since he spoke throughout as though he was producing a complete translation. C.H. Turner suggested that the compiler drew up the series of canons in two recensions. The larger collection which included the Catalogue (canon 85) may have come a little later.

The four Gospels are named in the Catalogue in the Eastern order of Matthew, Mark, Luke, John. The fourteen epistles of Paul are numbered but not named. The Catholic epistles are in a remarkable order for the East: Peter, John, James, Jude. These are surprisingly followed by the two Epistles of Clement and the Apostolic Constitutions themselves. Acts is listed last. Revelation is missing.

8) Gregory of Nazianzus (329-89)

Two Catalogues of books of the Old and New Testament have been preserved among the works of Gregory of Nazianzus, both in verse. The second Catalogue, though it bears the name of Gregory, is now commonly attributed to his contemporary Amphiloctius of Iconium. It was at the end of his life, during his retirement at Arianzum, that
Gregory composed his poems. He retired around 384 and died a few years later in 389-90. His Catalogue is dated sometime in this last period of his life, 384-90.

There are about 400 extant poems attributed to Gregory, and in one of them, *In suos versus*, he explained how he turned to poetry at the end of his life to prove that the new Christian culture was not inferior to the old pagan one, and how, since certain heresies spread their teachings in verse, it was necessary to refute them in verse. Thus almost forty of his poems are dogmatic in nature on a variety of themes, including the short poem entitled, *De veris Scripturae libris*, which consists of a Catalogue of accepted Scriptures (Carm. 12.30-9).

The Gospels are listed first among the New Testament works and named in the Eastern order: Matthew, Mark, Luke, John. Remarkably, they are not numbered as they are in all the other fourth century Catalogues. This may be because of the demands of poetry. Gregory then listed the "Catholic Acts of the wise Apostles" and the fourteen Epistles of Paul, without naming them. Then he mentioned the seven Catholic epistles in the order, James, Peter, John, Jude. Gregory concluded with the words: "In these you have all the inspired books; if there be any book besides these, it is not among the genuine (Scriptures)."

Though he admitted the canonicity of the seven Catholic epistles, Gregory does not appear to have ever quoted them by name elsewhere in his extant writings. There are, however, two possible allusions to James, both unattributed (Orat. 26.5, 40.45). Although he omitted
Revelation from his Catalogue, Gregory once made an obvious allusion to it (Orat., 29) and in another place he referred to it expressly with marked respect (Orat., 40.45).

9) The African Canons

There were three African synods in the late fourth and early fifth centuries at which Catalogues of the Old and New Testaments were approved. According to the Codex Canonum Ecclesiae Africanae, the first of these synods was held in the Secretarium of the Basilicia at Hippo on October 8th, 393. The complete acts of this synod have been lost. An abridgment of the canons of Hippo, however, was read out and renewed at a synod in Carthage held on August 28th, 397, and it is from this Hippo Breviary that the actions of Hippo are known. A copy of the Hippo Breviary is found in the canons of Carthage (397) and in the works of Leo. On May 25th, 419, Aurelius presided over another synod at Carthage at which he decided that a copy of the Acts of Nicaea, together with the canons of the former African councils, should be added to the Acts of this synod. Thus all the canons of the previous Carthaginian synods, along with those from Milevis and Hippo, were read, approved, and received a new sanction from this synod of 419. This collection became known as the Codex Canonum Ecclesiae Africanae. Unfortunately Dionysius Exiguus (c. 500-50), who incorporated these African canons in his collection, inserted only the headings of the acts of Hippo, and not the canons themselves.
Augustine appears to have been a principal figure behind the synod at Hippo in 393 and may have been an important influence on the contents of the Catalogue adopted there. In 392, Augustine promoted the importance of synods in a letter to Aurelius, archbishop of Carthage since 391 (Epis. 22.1.4). The choice of location of this synod the next year, confirms that Augustine was a factor in its organization, especially since he was allowed to deliver an address to the assembly while still only a priest (Possidius, Life of Augustine, 50.7). The Catalogue accepted does not substantially differ from Augustine's own and is remarkable for its acceptance of Hebrews, II Peter, and III John (cf. Mommsen).

The New Testament list of Hippo (393) and Carthage (397) was straightforward and reads: "the Four Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, thirteen Epistles of Paul, one Epistle of Paul to the Hebrews, two Epistles of Peter, three Epistles of John, the Epistle of James, the Epistle of Jude, the Revelation of John." The canon was followed by the statement, "Concerning the confirmation of this canon, the transmarine Church shall be consulted." The Catalogue concluded with a note that on the anniversaries of the martyrs, their acts would also be read, thus allowing the public reading of non-canonical works. The separation of Hebrews from the other Pauline letters suggests that the acceptance of the book was tentative. This is perhaps confirmed in that the later Catalogue of Carthage (419) numbered the Pauline epistles as fourteen, without any separate mention of Hebrews.\textsuperscript{36} This Catalogue

\textsuperscript{36} This Catalogue
also omitted any mention of the reading of the acts of the martyrs.

10) Jerome (c. 342-420)

Jerome, in a letter written from Bethlehem in 394, urged his friend, Paulinus of Nola, to make a diligent study of the Scriptures and to devote himself to God (Epis. 53). Within the context of this letter, Jerome enumerated the books of both the Old and New Testament. There is a short description of each book accompanying the list of the Old Testaments (53.8), but the letter went on for such length that Jerome, by his own admission, cut short the description of the books of the New Testament (53.9).

He named Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John as "the Lord's four" (quadriga Domini). Next he related that Paul wrote to seven churches, which went unnamed, although he added, "for the eighth epistle—that to the Hebrews—is not generally counted in with the others." He wrote that Paul "instructs Timothy and Titus; he intercedes with Philemon for his runaway slave." Acts was then mentioned, followed by "The Apostles James, Peter, John, and Jude, (who) have published seven epistles." Lastly Revelation was added, which is remarkable for a Catalogue originating from the East at the end of the fourth century.

11) Augustine (354-430)

Augustine's De Doctrina Christiana was written for the most part (1-3.25, 36) in 396-7, but not completed until 426-7. Books I and II commented upon the training
necessary for a successful study of Scripture. In Book II, chapter eight, Augustine listed the books of the Old and New Testaments, "those of them, at least, that are called canonical (canonicae)" (2.12). He wrote:

That of the New Testament, again, is contained within the following: Four books of the Gospel, according to Matthew, according to Mark, according to Luke, according to John; fourteen epistles of the Apostle Paul—two to the Romans, two to the Corinthians, one to the Galatians, to the Ephesians, to the Philippians, two to the Thessalonians, one to the Colossians, two to Timothy, one to Titus, to Philemon, to the Hebrews; two of Peter; three of John; two of Jude; and one of James; one of the book of the Acts of the Apostles; and one of the Revelation of John (De Doct. Christ. 2.13).

Augustine's enumeration of the Old and New Testament works is almost identical with that of the Synod of Hippo (393) as preserved in the canons of the Synod of Carthage (397). Augustine was present at these councils and was probably influential in the decisions. Even the tentativeness in accepting Hebrews as Pauline, reflected in the contrasting statements of Hippo and Carthage, is apparent in the works of Augustine. Although his Catalogue appears to have unhesitatingly accepted Hebrews as Pauline, Augustine himself seems to have wavered on the issue.^^

12) Amphilochius (c. 340-c. 396)

Cosmas Indicopleustes (c. 547) referred to Amphilochius as the author of the Iambi ad Seleucum (Top. Christ. 7.265), although the work has come down among those of his cousin Gregory of Nazianzus. It seems probable that the work is Amphilochius', although it is his only known composition in verse.^^ Amphilochius, who became bishop of
Iconium in 373, admonished Seleucus through the poem in the devout life and in the study of Scripture, adding a complete list of the Old and New Testaments in verses 251-319.

K. Bone argued that the date of the Iambi ad Seleucum could not be before 396, although Amphilochius is last mentioned in 394, when he attended the Synod of Constantinople. The year of Amphilochius' death is unknown, and if this Catalogue was written after 396, then it was probably not much later and shortly before his death.

The Catalogue is similar to that of Gregory of Nazianzus, but more detailed. The New Testament Catalogue begins with the four Gospels in the order Matthew, Mark, Luke, John. Then Amphilochius listed Acts and the Epistles of Paul to the "seven churches," followed by two to Timothy, Titus, Philemon, and Hebrews, after which he added:

But some maintain that the Epistle to the Hebrews is spurious (\(\nu\varepsilon\ \varepsilon\\omicron\omicron\omicron\nu\)), not speaking well; for the grace (it shews) is genuine. To proceed: what remains? Of the Catholic Epistles some maintain that we ought to receive seven, and others three only, one of James, and one of Peter, and one of John. . .The Apocalypse of John again some reckon among (the Scriptures); but still the majority say that it is spurious ( ). This will be the most truthful Canon of the inspired Scriptures.

13) Rufinus (c. 345-410)

Tyrannius Rufinus returned to Rome in 397 and to his native Aquileia in 399, after spending about seventeen years (371/2-97/8) in the East. It was only after his
return to the West that he embarked upon writing and translating, including his translation of, and additions to, Eusebius' *Church History* in 402-3. Rufinus' most important original work, *Commentarius in symbolum Apostolorum*, was written in 400.

In his translation of Eusebius' *Church History*, Rufinus revealed his concerns about the Canon by the alterations he made to Eusebius' statements. Rufinus weakened many remarks by Eusebius that tended to cast doubt on the canonicity of any New Testament work, e.g. James and Jude (*H.E* 2.23.25), II Peter (*H.E* 3.3.1-4; 6.25.7-14), Revelation (*H.E* 3.25; 7.25.8-9), Hebrews (*H.E* 3.3.5; 6.20.3).²

Rufinus' exposition on the Apostles' Creed was made at the request of an otherwise unknown, Bishop Laurentius (*Comm. in Symb. Apost.* 1). Rufinus introduced his Catalogue of the Old and New Testaments among reflections upon the Holy Spirit and the Holy Church:

> And therefore it seems proper in this place to enumerate, as we have learnt from the tradition of the Fathers, the books of the New and of the Old Testament, which, according to the tradition of our forefathers, are believed to have been inspired by the Holy Ghost, and have been handed down to the Churches of Christ (*Comm. in Symb. Apost.* 36).

The New Testament list is straightforward and without elaboration:

> Of the New there are four Gospels, those of Matthew, Mark, Luke, John; the Acts of the Apostles, composed by Luke; fourteen Epistles by the Apostle Paul; two by the Apostle Peter; one by James, brother of the Lord and Apostle; one by Jude; three by John; and the Apocalypse of John (*Comm. in Symb. Apost.* 37).³

Rufinus' stress on the fact that Paul, Peter, and James
were all Apostles may be an indication that for Rufinus canonicity depended on apostolic authorship.**

The Commentarius in symbolum Apostolorum was partly based upon the Catechetical lectures of Cyril of Jerusalem so that Rufinus was probably familiar with Cyril's Catalogue (Catech. 4.33). Rufinus may have known Athanasius' Catalogue (Ep. Fest. 39) as well, since Rufinus studied in Alexandria (c. 372) and since Athanasius founded the monastery (c. 345) in which Rufinus was baptized and received training, when Athanasius stayed in Aquileia during one of his exiles.***

In addition to the "canonical" books Rufinus introduced a secondary class of works which were not strictly canonical, but which he designated as "ecclesiastical" (eclesiastici). The distinctive characteristic of these books was that they could be read freely in the churches, but could not be invoked as authoritative for doctrine (Comm. in Symb. Apost. 38).

This secondary class included among the New Testament: The Shepherd, The Two Ways, and The Judgment of Peter. This position is similar to Jerome's, who declared in one passage that Tobias, Judith, and the books of the Maccabees "are not among the canonical Scriptures," but that "the Church reads them for the edification of the people, and not for the support of ecclesiastical doctrine" (Pref. to the bks. of Sol.). Rufinus also mentioned a third category of works, the "apocryphal" (apocryphas), which could not be read out in the churches (38).
14) Pope Innocent I (d. 417)

A gathering of the letters of Pope Innocent I (402-17) is reflected in an epistle (Ep. 4.5) of Leo the Great (443) and formed the principal part of the first collection of papal decretals. Of the thirty-six surviving letters of Innocent, the one to Bishop Exsuperius of Toulouse (405) contains a list of the books of the Old and New Testaments (Ep. 6). C.H. Turner provided a critical text for the letter based upon the evidence of thirteen MSS. ranging in date from the end of the sixth century to the end of the ninth.** The number of MSS. suggests that the list of canonical books must have been very widely known. If the disputed Damasine Decree is not authentic, then Pope Innocent’s letter is the earliest extant copy of a New Testament Catalogue from the city of Rome.

The Catalogue is introduced with the words: Qui uero libri recipiantur in canone breuis adnexus ostendit. haec sunt quae desiderata moneri uoce uoluisti (Ad Exsurp. Tol., 11. 1-2). There follows an unadorned list of the Old Testament books, immediately followed by the New Testament Catalogue: euangeliorum IIII; apostoli Pauli epistulae XIII(I); epistulae Iohannis III; epistulae Petri II; (epistulae Iudae I); epistula Iacobi I; actus apostolorum; apocalypsis Iohannis (Ad Exsurp. Tol. 11. 24-31). The Catalogue concludes with the statement: cetera autem quae uel sub nomine Mathiae siue Iacobi minoris; uel sub nomine Petri et Iohannis, quae a quodam Leucio scripta sunt; (ueI sub nomine Andreeae, quae a Xenocaride et Leonida philosophis); uel sub nomine Thomasae; et si qua sunt alia;
There are several notable differences among the MSS. The absence of Jude in the Chieti MS. is presumably a mere omission by homoeoarcton. Three MSS., including the best of all (Vaticanus Regiae 1997), read for the epistles of Paul "XIII" instead of "XIII." This divergence may be explained by an accidental confusion between these two numbers, but it must also be remembered that the church at Rome was very slow in accepting Hebrews as Pauline. Pope Innocent did not in fact cite Hebrews elsewhere in his extant decretals. Eight MSS., again including the best of all, omit the mention of "writings published under the name of Andrew, and in fact, composed by the philosophers Xenocrides and Leonidas." M.R. James suggested that the work in question was the Leucian Acts of Andrew and that the philosophers named were characters in whose name the Acts was written.47 The omission is probably accidental since it is difficult to account for its insertion.

15) A Syrian Catalogue

Among the Syriac MSS. from the Convent of St. Catherine on Mt. Sinai published by A.S. Lewis,48 there is a Syrian stichometrical Catalogue of the books of the Old and New Testaments. It derives from a ninth century MS. attributed to Irenaeus.49 According to J. Rendel Harris, the Catalogue appears Edessan in origin and dependent upon the Peshitta, and must therefore be dated later, c. 400.50

Acts follows, after which is listed without enumeration the Pauline epistles, including Hebrews. The most notable feature of the Catalogue is the absence in the New Testament list of any Catholic Epistles or Revelation. Revelation is often absent from Eastern lists of the second half of the fourth century. The Catholic Epistles are also absent in the Doctrine of Addai. Likewise neither in Aphraates nor in the genuine works of St. Ephraem, both fourth century Syriac authors, is there any reference to any Catholic Epistle.

DISPUTED CATALOGUES

Before considering the relationship between the Muratorian Fragment and these fifteen undisputed Catalogues, it is important to review the four traditional Catalogues, already briefly mentioned, viz. the Laodicene Canon (60), the Damasine Decree, the Roman Canon (c. 400), and John Chrysostom’s Synopsis Veteris et Novi Testamenti. The authenticity of each of these Catalogues has been questioned.

a) The Laodicene Canon (60)

In many old collections of the Councils, which have their origins in the sixth century and later, there is found the acts of the Synod of Laodicea, placed after those of Antioch of 341, but before those of the second Ecumenical Council of 381. Canon 59 of the Synod in most manuscripts reads: “No psalms composed by private individuals or uncanonical (खने) books may be read in the church, but only the canonical (खने)
books of the Old and New Testaments." The last Canon, usually numbered 60 but sometimes added to 59, named the books of the Christian Bible.

The Gospels are listed in the Eastern order, viz. Matthew, Mark, Luke, John. Acts follows, then the seven Catholic epistles are listed, viz. James, I & II Peter, I, II, & III John, Jude. These are followed by the fourteen epistles of Paul, which are named, with Hebrews after the Thessalonian correspondence and before the epistles to Timothy. Revelation is not listed. The list as given closely resembles that of the Apostolic Canons, no. 85 (84), and Cyril of Jerusalem (Catech. 4.33).

There are questions about the authenticity of the sixtieth canon. The oldest copy of the canons of Laodicea is found in a Syrian translation of an early Greek collection of canons (c. 501). The sixtieth canon is not present there. It is also not present in the oldest Latin translation extant, that of Dionysius Exiguus (c. 500-550). It might be argued that he omitted it because in Rome, where he composed his work, the Catalogue of Pope Innocent took precedence. The sixtieth canon is also missing in the collection of John Scholasticus (d. 577) and Martin of Braga (c. 520-80) and the African Cresconius (c. 690). Since the last indisputable canon of Laodicea insinuates a list of "canonical" books, it would be easy to understand the motivation of some later compiler of canons to include a Catalogue to "complete" the fifty-ninth canon. The absence of the sixtieth canon from the earliest sources of the council, suggests that the Catalogue was not original
to the Synod of Laocicea (c. 360).

b) The Damasine Decree

A Catalogue of the Old and New Testaments is found in a decree attributed in several MSS. to Pope Damasus (366-84). In other and more numerous MSS. the same decree occurs in an enlarged form assigned within the documents in some cases to Pope Gelasius (492-6), in others to Pope Hormisdas (514-23), and in a few cases the documents are simply anonymous. The copies of the decree attributed to Damasus are contained in four MSS., two dated in the eighth century and two in the ninth. Each decree is headed *Incipit concilium urbis Romae sub Damaso Papa de explanatione Fidei*. Each consists of three short chapters, the second of which treated *de scripturis divinis agendis est quid universalis catholica recipiat ecclesia et quid vitare debeat*. There follows a Catalogue of Old and New Testament books. The later editions appended a list of apocryphal books and retitled the second chapter *De libris recipiendis et non recipiendis*.

The Damasine documents are not dated nor is the year or number of the Council given. Conjecture has assigned the document to a known Roman Council in 382. Very little is really known about this synod. No official acts have been preserved, and the only surviving conciliar pronouncement may be this Damasine Decree, for which there is no known reference until the end of the eighth or the beginning of the ninth century. The three brief contemporary references to the synod do not refer to any decree. Jerome mentioned the synod twice, but only in
passing. In his letter to Eustochium he wrote:

It so happened that at that time the bishops of the East and West had been summoned to Rome by letter from the emperors (Theodosius and Valentinian) to deal with certain dissensions between the churches, and in this way she (Paula) saw two most admirable men and Christian prelates, Paulinus bishop of Antioch and Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis, or, as it is now called, Constantia, in Cyprus (Ep. 108.6).

In a letter to Ageruchia (Ep. 123.10), Jerome related a story about a married couple he saw "A great many years ago while I was helping Damasus bishop of Rome with his ecclesiastical correspondence, and writing his answers to the questions referred to him by the councils of the east and west." The only other contemporary reference to the synod is from Theodoret, when he reported that a synodal letter which was sent from the Council of Constantinople was replied to by the fathers who met at Rome in the following year. Besides these three references there is no other information about the Council of Rome in 382.

It is very strange and somewhat incredible that, if Jerome, who was probably present at the Council and was certainly at Rome, had ever heard of such a pronouncement about canonical books, he should nowhere have mentioned it, or that it should not have qualified his own statements on the Canon. For instance, why would Jerome write in his Preface to the Books of Solomon: *Sicut ergo Judith, et Tobii, et Macchabaeorum libros legit quidem Ecclesia, sed inter canonicas Scripturas non recipit (Prologus Galeatus)*, when the Damasine Decree contained all those books in its Old Testament list? Again in the Preface to his Commentary on Proverbs, Jerome wrote: "The Book of Jesus, son of
Sirach, the Wisdom of Solomon, Judith, Esther, Tobias and Maccabees are read for edification, but do not enjoy canonical authority," yet all of these works are accepted as canonical in the Damasine Decree. If the Damasine Decree is authentic, then Jerome must have changed his views and must have done so almost immediately after an official pronouncement from a synod which he probably attended and by a pope whom he greatly regarded and by whom he was patronized. Yet there is no mention or evidence of a change of position in the works of Jerome. The authenticity of at least the Catalogue in the Damasine Decree is thus questioned.

Nicholas I (858-67), when writing about the Canon to the church of Gaul, wrote:

*Sed reponsuri sunt isti qui non ad obediendum potius quam ad resistendum sunt parati aientes. Quod inter Canones inveniatur Capitulum S. Papae Innocentii; cuius autoritate doceatur a nobis utrumque Testamentum esse recipiendum, quamquam in ipsis paternis Canonibus nullum eorum ex toto contineatur insertum.*

It is noteworthy that Pope Nicholas referred to the Decree of Innocent I issued in 405 A.D. and completely ignored the supposed earlier and thus more important decree of Damasus. It is also noteworthy that the later writers of the ninth century, who refer to the decree under the name of Gelasius or Hormisdas, should have entirely omitted any reference to the Damasine decree upon which it supposedly depended.

If the Damasine Decree were genuine, then it would represent the earliest known official Catalogue of canonical books in the Western church. Yet the work is not mentioned in any independent document before the year 840,
nor was it named by any of the ecclesiastical historians such as Gennadius, Ildefonsus, Isidore Hispalensis, Sigebert of Gembloux, or Honorius of Autun. The earliest collection of Latin conciliar canons and decretals, namely that of Dionysius Exiguus, began with those of Siricius, the successor of Damasus. That fact that Dionysius began at that particular date with the decretals of an obscure pope implies that Siricius was the first pope who issued decretals. If so, this fact could explain the false attribution to Damasus, in that there would be no means later of verifying it and no appeal to an earlier genuine work on decretals and canons. There are also difficulties in identifying the Decretum Gelasianum with a supposititious Roman synod in 494. Dionysius Exiguus, for instance, did not mention the Decree among those of Gelasius in his collection. Consequently it appears that both the decrees were written after the time of Gelasius, and only later attributed to these early bishops of Rome.

Those who sustained the authenticity of the Decree argued that the enlarged Decretals were really later editions of a primitive Damasine text. The treatment of the second and third Epistles of John as by John "the presbyter" was suggested by Turner as evidence of Jerome's influence. Similarly the description of Jeremiah in the Decree with the phrase, cum Cinoth id est Lamentationibus suis, may be related to Jerome, who used the same phrase word for word in the Prologus Galeatus. The third part of the Decree, according to Turner, is similar to the preface of the "Isdorian" translation of the Nicene canons.
Howorth, however, disputed that there was any dependence between the third part of the Decree and the "Isidorian" preface. The phrases from Jerome could have been borrowed at any later time. Therefore a serious doubt about the authenticity of the Damasine Decree remains.

c) A Roman Canon (c. 400)

Sundberg listed among his fourth century Catalogues a Roman Canon dated about 400, which he derived from Souter. The Roman Catalogue, first published in 1901 by C.H. Turner, is a stichometrical list from MS. Monac. lat. 6243 (olim Frising 43). A copy of the Damasine Decree is also found in the MS. (fol. 1a). The Roman Catalogue, which occupies fol. 189b to fol. 191b, was attributed to Jerome, just as the Catalogue of the Damasine Decree was attributed to Pope Damasus.

Turner dated the Roman Catalogue around 400 because he noted nothing in the MS. to indicate that its original material was later than the first half of the fifth century. The term theotokos in line 45 of an anti-Arian creed found in the MS. militated against a date earlier than c. 400. Other documents of the MS., however, were thought by Turner to be fourth century, viz. the Law of Constantine against Arius, the Damasine Decree, and a very primitive version of some of the Canons of Nicaea and Sardica.

The dating of the Roman Catalogue was also dependent upon similarities with other documents. In particular, Turner compared the Roman Catalogue with one in a Vatican MS. (Reginae 199, fol. 84a; saec. xii) attributed to Pope
Gelasius (492-6). The principal point of contact between the Roman Catalogue and the Decretum Gelasianum was their possession of a common stichometry which, according to Turner, was quite independent of anything else known in Latin. The epithet "canonical" for the Catholic Epistles in the Roman Catalogue appeared in both the Damasine Decree and the Decretum Gelasianum, and the title "Zealot" applied to Jude was again common with the Damasine list. The phrase *Actus apostolorum quos descripsit Lucas* recurs in Rufinus. Turner concluded that the author of the Roman Catalogue depended for the stichometry of his biblical list on an earlier Greek original possibly associated with the library of Pamphilus at Caesarea, c. 300-50.

Turner’s dating, however, depended entirely upon the authenticity of the Damasine Decree and the Decretum Gelasianum. In the first edition of Souter’s work, he bracketed his references to the Damasine Decree, which he said in a postscript to the preface, "must now disappear from history, thanks to the epoch-making results of Professor E. von Dobschutz of Breslau" (p. viii). Souter acknowledged that the decrees concerning the Canon which were attributed to popes Damascus and Gelasius were not earlier than the sixth century. Consequently both Catalogues in his Selected Documents carried notes to that effect. But the note with the Roman Canon dated 400 only mentioned certain analogies with the Gelasian list. E. von Dobschutz, however, carefully analyzed both the Freisingen and Vatican MSS. presented by Turner, and clearly included them in the Gelasian family, thus confirming a date for
them of no earlier than the sixth century. If the Damasine Decree and Decretum Gelasianum are seen as inauthentic, then this Roman Catalogue cannot reliably be dated around 400, but is apparently related to much later documents.

d) John Chrysostom (c. 347-407)

Sundberg also included a Catalogue found in Wescott from a work entitled Synopsis Veteris et Novi Testamenti, which Montfaucon published as among the works of John Chrysostom. The Synopsis Veteris et Novi Testamenti is an introduction to the Scripture, in which the contents of each biblical book is briefly described, and its importance and place in the history of revelation made clear. Thus the work is very similar to the Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae which was falsely attributed to Athanasius and is to be dated much later, perhaps in the sixth century. The texts of the Synopsis Veteris et Novi Testamenti are incomplete, with quite a number of chapters lost, especially on the books of the New Testament. Moreover the oldest MSS. goes back only to the eleventh century.

It is from the introduction to the Synopsis Veteris et Novi Testamenti that Westcott derived his Catalogue. The New Testament works were listed there in a single paragraph and included in this order: the fourteen Epistles of Paul; four Gospels, two by the disciples of Christ, John and Matthew, and two by Luke and Mark, disciples of Peter and Paul; Acts; and three unspecified Catholic Epistles, presumably I John, I Peter, and James. According to Westcott this Catalogue of New Testament works agreed
exactly with Chrysostom's usage, except for one very
doubtful quotation from II Peter (Hom. in Joan. 34).73
While the Synopsis Veteris et Novi Testamenti does show
some agreement with the distinctive exegetical
characteristics of Chrysostom, it contrasts strongly with
his other works with regards to language and style.74 Thus
it is now generally believed to be spurious.75

The authenticity of all four of these Catalogues, viz.
The Laodicene Canon (60), the so-called Damasine Decree,
Turner's Roman Canon, and pseudo-Chrysostom's Synopsis
Veteris et Novi Testamenti, is seriously disputed. None of
them will be considered in the conclusions of this chapter,
since all of them probably derive from a period
significantly removed from the fourth century.

COLLECTIONS OF THE FOURTH CENTURY

Before drawing any conclusions, one other piece of
evidence needs to be cited. Just as there are no
Catalogues of the Christian Canon until the fourth century,
so there are no extant manuscripts which are thought to
have contained a complete Christian Bible before the fourth
and early fifth century. Though the number of surviving
MSS. is small, the appearance of codices and versions of
the entire Christian Bible may also be reflective of a
conceptual transition from Scriptures to Canon in the
fourth century. Consequently the contents and order of
these Collections are relevant to the questions of the
formation of the Catalogues.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vaticanus</th>
<th>Sinaiticus</th>
<th>Peshitta</th>
<th>Alexandrinus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mt</td>
<td>Mt</td>
<td>Mt</td>
<td>Mt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk</td>
<td>Mk</td>
<td>Mk</td>
<td>Mk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk</td>
<td>Lk</td>
<td>Lk</td>
<td>Lk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jn</td>
<td>Jn</td>
<td>Jn</td>
<td>Jn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts</td>
<td>Rom</td>
<td>Acts</td>
<td>Acts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jas</td>
<td>I Cor</td>
<td>Jas</td>
<td>Jas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Pet</td>
<td>II Cor</td>
<td>I Pet</td>
<td>I Pet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Pet</td>
<td>Gal</td>
<td>I Jn</td>
<td>II Pet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Jn</td>
<td>Eph</td>
<td>Rom</td>
<td>I Jn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Jn</td>
<td>Phil</td>
<td>I Cor</td>
<td>II Jn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III Jn</td>
<td>Col</td>
<td>II Cor</td>
<td>III Jn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jude</td>
<td>I Thes</td>
<td>Gal</td>
<td>Jude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom</td>
<td>II Thes</td>
<td>Eph</td>
<td>Rom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Cor</td>
<td>Heb</td>
<td>Phil</td>
<td>I Cor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Cor</td>
<td>I Tim</td>
<td>Col</td>
<td>II Cor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gal</td>
<td>II Tim</td>
<td>I Thes</td>
<td>Gal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eph</td>
<td>Titus</td>
<td>II Thes</td>
<td>Eph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil</td>
<td>Philmon</td>
<td>I Tim</td>
<td>Phil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col</td>
<td>Acts</td>
<td>II Tim</td>
<td>Col</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Thes</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Titus</td>
<td>I Thes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Thes</td>
<td>I Pet</td>
<td>Philmon</td>
<td>II Thes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb.</td>
<td>II Pet</td>
<td>Heb</td>
<td>Heb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I Tim)</td>
<td>I Jn</td>
<td></td>
<td>(I Tim)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(II Tim)</td>
<td>II Jn</td>
<td></td>
<td>(II Tim)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Titus)</td>
<td>III Jn</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Titus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Rev)</td>
<td>Jude</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barnabas</td>
<td></td>
<td>Barnabas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hermas.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hermas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A) Codex Vaticanus

Codex Vaticanus contains the Old and New Testaments in Greek. The beginning of the Codex is lost as far as Genesis 46.28; in the middle Psalms 106-18 have fallen out; and the ending is mutilated after Hebrews 9.14. I & II Timothy, Titus, Philmon, and Revelation are believed to have been lost. Whether other works were also included is uncertain.

The Pauline epistles in Vaticanus have "chapter" numbers which do not start again with each work but...
continue in one series from Romans onwards. In the manuscript Hebrews follows II Thessalonians, but the sequence of the chapter numbers reveals that previously Hebrews had followed Galatians. The "chapter" divisions in the other Epistles do not include II Peter, suggesting an origin for the divisions pre-dating the general acceptance of this work as canonical.

Paleographic and textual evidence suggest Alexandria as the likely provenance of Codex Vaticanus, though the MS. appears to have been corrected in the seventh century in Caesarea. Certain resemblances in style with the Codex Sinaiticus suggest that both works may have come from the same scriptorium, but the similarities are not sufficient for C. Tischendorf's assertion that the same scribe copied both. The writing in Vaticanus is in small and delicate uncials, perfectly simple and unadorned. There are no enlarged initials, no periods or accents, and this complete absence of ornamentation in Vaticanus has led to its being generally regarded as slightly older than Sinaiticus.

Codex Vaticanus is identical with Athanasius Catalogue (Fest. Ep. 39) in content and in the sequence of biblical books of both the Old and New Testaments, as far as they can be compared since Vaticanus ends in the midst of Hebrews. It has been suggested that Vaticanus may represent the copy which was prepared for the Emperor Constans by Alexandrian scribes in 340 at Rome while Athanasius lived there in exile (Athanasius, Animadv. 15).
B) Codex Sinaiticus

The story of the discovery of Codex Sinaiticus by Tischendorf is well known. The MS. originally contained the whole Greek Bible, but in the case of the Old Testament only pieces escaped the waste-paper basket of the Sinai monastery. The extant MS. contains only portions of I Chronicles, II Esdras, Tobit, and Jeremiah, and all of Esther. The canonical New Testament is complete, and at the end of the MS. are added the Epistle of Barnabas and part of The Shepherd. Whether other works followed is unknown.

The provenance of Codex Sinaiticus is not certain. K. Lake argued for Alexandria as the most likely provenance, since the spelling in the MS. bears a distinct resemblance to the spelling of papyri from Egypt dated considerably earlier. In addition, the text of the Psalms in Sinaiticus is remarkably like the text in the early Coptic version found in the Pistis Sophia. However Harris, followed by Lagrange, argued for a Caesarean origin. Sinaiticus almost certainly was in the library of Pamphilus at Caesarea during the sixth or seventh century, since it is likely that the corrector worked on it there. The Eusebian Canons are indicated in the margin of the Gospels, in a hand evidently contemporaneous with the text.

Comparison with other hands of the fourth century, which are now more numerous, seems to indicate that Codex Sinaiticus cannot be dated appreciably later than the middle of the fourth century. As previously noted, the Emperor Constantine commissioned Eusebius in 331 to prepare
fifty copies of sacred Scripture for the church at Constantinople (Eusebius, Life of Constantine, 4.36). In describing the execution of the Emperor's request, Eusebius wrote: Ταύτα μὲν οὖν βασιλεὺς διεκελεύετο αὐτίκα τῷ ἐποικοδομεῖσθαι τῶν λόγων ἐν πολυτελῇ ἑκατερενοῦς περίκες καὶ Τετράσας διατεμφαντῶν ημῶν...

(Life of Constantine, 4.37) The meaning of Τετράσας καὶ Τετράσας is uncertain. It has usually been taken to mean "in gatherings of three or four sheets," but two alternative suggestions have been made. It may mean that the completed codices were sent "by threes and fours." Lake, however, argued for another alternative, whereby the codices were "written in three and four columns to the page." There are four narrow columns to each page in the Codex Sinaiticus (except in the poetical books, where there are only two), and there are three columns to a page in the Codex Vaticanus. These are the only known MSS. of exactly this type. Therefore some scholars have suggested that both Vaticanus and Sinaiticus were originally among the fifty copies of Scripture which Constantine ordered.

Whether the suggestion is correct or not, the parallel does insinuate that at the time of Eusebius calligraphic fashion consisted of manuscripts written in three or four columns. The column divisions of Vaticanus and Sinaiticus support a date for both of these codices in the early part of the fourth century.

C) The Peshitta

The Peshitta is not the name of a single MS. like
Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, but of a Syriac version of the Old and New Testaments which though frequently reproduced represents an ancient original source. Peshitta literally means "simple," and has been so named since the ninth century to distinguish it from the more elaborate forms of the Syriac text, such as the Hexaplaric version of the Old Testament or the Harclean version of the New Testament, both of which have marginal variants and other critical apparatus. There are over 350 MSS. of the Peshitta version, two of the fifth century, more than a dozen not later than the sixth, and three bearing precise dates, viz. 530-9, 534, 548. The New Testament of the Peshitta appears to have contained only twenty-two books; II Peter, II & III John, Jude, and Revelation are usually absent from the MSS.

The date of the New Testament Peshitta is disputed. Scholars in the early nineteenth century generally believed the Peshitta originated in the first half of the second century. In 1858 and 1910, MSS. were published of an Old Syriac version which served as the basis of the New Testament Peshitta revision, just as the Old Latin version was the basis of the Vulgate revision. The form of the text which the Old Syriac version preserves dates from the close of the second century or the beginning of the third. The Peshitta must therefore be later.

Since both the Monophysite and the Nestorian churches used the Peshitta, it must have been generally accepted before 431, when the Nestorian secession took place. Copious quotations from the Old Testament Peshitta are
found in the writings of Ephraem (d. 373) and Aphraates (middle of fourth century). It was formerly supposed that Ephraem also used the New Testament Peshitta, but F.C. Burkitt disputed such contentions since there is no other evidence of its use before the fifth century, to which the earliest extant MSS. of it belong. Burkitt argued instead that Rabbula, Bishop of Edessa (412-35), translated the Peshitta New Testament.

Recent studies have challenged Burkitt’s thesis. It is unlikely that either the Monophysite or Nestorian parties would have knowingly adopted a text revised by Rabbula. On the basis of a careful examination of the Gospel quotations in Rabbula’s translation of Cyril of Alexandria’s *De recta fide*, made towards the end of his life, M. Black revealed that Rabbula’s revision contained a considerable Old Syriac element. Moreover some remnants of the Peshitta have emerged in a MS. in the British Museum (Add. MS. 12150) copied in 411 in Edessa. Thus the last decades of the fourth century appear as the most probable date for the origin of the Peshitta, although it may not have enjoyed widespread recognition until the second half of the fifth century.

D) Codex Alexandrinus

Codex Alexandrinus is the name given to the Greek Bible which Cyril Lucar, then Patriarch of Constantinople, offered to James I of England, where it was received in 1627. The MS. contains almost the whole Bible, except for certain accidental mutilations. The two Epistles of
Clement of Rome are included after the New Testament, after which the Psalms of Solomon followed according to the table of contents. The title of the Psalms of Solomon, however, is separated from the others in the table of contents in such a way that suggests that it stood on a different footing from those preceding. The leaves containing the Psalms of Solomon have been lost. The whole of Matthew as far as 25.6 is lost, as is a good part of John (viz. 6.50-8.52), part of II Corinthians (viz. 4.13-12.6), one leaf of I Clement and the greater part of II Clement.

Cyril Lucar, according to contemporary accounts, brought the MS. to Constantinople from Alexandria, of which see he had previously been patriarch. An Arabic note at the beginning of the MS., signed by "Athanasius the humble," now known as Athanasius II, patriarch of Alexandria (d. 1316), states that the MS. was a gift to the Patriarchal cell in that city. Similar notes in two other volumes still in the Patriarchal Library at Alexandria suggest that Athanasius acquired the manuscript in Constantinople, where he spent many years in the service of the emperor.

Another Arabic note, written in the thirteenth or fourteenth century, states that the MS. was written by Thecla the Martyr. Cyril Lucar himself repeated this statement, adding that Thecla was a noble lady of Egypt, and that she transcribed the MS. shortly after the Council of Nicaea (325), and that her name was originally written at the end. The authority for this tradition is unknown, and such an early date is hardly possible. The appearance
in the MS. before the Psalms of a summary of their contents by Eusebius (d. c. 340), and the Epistle of Athanasius to Marcellinus on the Psalter, make a date before the middle of the fourth century unlikely. The Eusebian Canons are also found in the margin of the Gospels. The style of writing, with its enlargement of initial letters and similar elementary ornamentation, suggests that Alexandrinus is somewhat later, perhaps in the first half of the fifth century.\textsuperscript{100} Alexandrinus is the earliest example of a division into chapters of the Gospels, but the absence of a similar division of the Acts and Epistles, ascribed to Euthalius of Alexandria (c. 458), supports a date not later than the middle of the fifth century.

**CHRONOLOGY**

Thus there appear to be fifteen undisputed Catalogues and four Collections of the Christian Canon belonging to the fourth and early years of the fifth centuries. None of the Catalogues or Collections seems to predate Eusebius. Eusebius' own writings seem to confirm an absence of earlier lists in his creation of Catalogues for Irenaeus, Clement, and Origen, and in his ambiguous and inconsistent use of terminology. Only one of these Catalogues other than Eusebius', viz. the Catalogue in the Codex Claromontanus, is likely to be earlier than the middle of the fourth century. The earliest extant Catalogues are derived from Caesarea and Alexandria.

The reasons for the introduction of Catalogues are uncertain. It seems clear that the Catalogues are, in part
at least, a natural development of the biblical scholarship inherited from the schools at Alexandria and Caesarea, but a more specific element in their formation may also have been a systematic attempt to limit and combat the writings used by heretics. The establishment of the Church under the Roman Emperor Constantine (312-337) seems also to have contributed to their proliferation. But the introduction of Catalogues is not a particularly surprising development and can readily be understood as an attempt by the churches to get their affairs in order. Whatever the reasons, however, the activity of Cataloguing the books of the Christian Bible is most evident from the middle of the fourth century onwards.

CHRONOLOGY OF FOURTH CENTURY CATALOGUES

1. 303-25 Eusebius, *H.E. 3.25.1-7*
2. 303-67 Catalogue in *Codex Claromontanus* (331-50 *Codex Vaticanus*) (331-50 *Codex Sinaiticus*)
3. 350 Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catech.* 4.33
5. 365-90 Mommsen Catalogue
6. 374-77 Epiphanius, *Haer.* 76.22.5
7. c. 380 Apostolic Canons (85)
8. 383-90 Gregory of Nazianzus, *Carm.* 12.31
9. 393-419 The African Canons
12. 396+ Amphilochnius, *Iambi ad Seleu.* (c.400 The Peshitta)
15. c. 400 Syrian Catalogue of St. Catherine's (c. 425 *Codex Alexandrinus*)

PROVENANCE

Although Sundberg's list of New Testament Catalogues needed some modification, his conclusion that numerous lists appeared during the fourth century throughout the
Church remains accurate. The geographical provenance of the undisputed Catalogues and Collections is indeed widespread.

THE PROVENANCE OF FOURTH CENTURY CATALOGUES

Palestine/Western Syria:
303-25 Eusebius
350 Cyril
374-77 Epiphanius
380 Apostolic Canons
394 Jerome

Alexandria/Egypt:
303-367 Claromontanus
(331-50 Codex Vaticanus)
(331-50 Codex Sinaiticus)
367 Athanasius
(c. 425 Codex Alexandrinus)

Asia Minor:
390 Gregory Nazianzus
396+ Amphilochius

Northern Africa:
365-90 Mommsen Catalogue
393-419 The African Canons
396-7 Augustine

Rome/Italy:
404 Rufinus
405 Pope Innocent

Eastern Syria:
(c. 400 The Peshitta)
c. 400 Syrian Catalogue

The impetus for the development of the Christian Canon appears to be located in the first half of the fourth century in the regions of Alexandria/Egypt and Palestine/Western Syria, perhaps from the schools at Alexandria and Caesarea. From there it seems to have spread northward to Asia Minor and westward to North Africa. Finally the development spread to Eastern Syria, and across the Mediterranean to Rome/Italy.

The influence of the great catechetical schools upon
the development of the Canon may also be reflected in the number of known authors of Catalogues who were students there. Athanasius and Cyril of Jerusalem were students at the catechetical school in Alexandria. Eusebius was a student of Pamphilius at the school in Caesarea, and in 312 became its head. Gregory of Nazianzus was a student at Caesarea and, like Jerome and Rufinus, was also a student of Didymus the Blind, the last of the famous teachers at the school of Alexandria.

A "CANON" OF SCRIPTURE

The conceptual shift from Scriptures to Canon exemplified by the appearance of Catalogues may also be implied in the late employment by the Church of the Greek word κανόν for a list of books counted as accepted Scripture. Prior to the fourth century, the word "canon" had a long history of being applied both to metaphorical ideals and fixed lists.

Metaphorically the word κανόν referred to any "norm" or "measure," and so it was applied in Aristotle's ethics, Epicurean philosophy, and Doryphoro's description of the sculpture of Polycletus. From the time of Irenaeus (c. 180), "canon" was used in the Church in a variety of ways to depict the normative ideals of Christian teachings, in phrases like the "canon of truth," the "canon of faith," or the "ecclesiastical canon." But although early Christianity in the first three centuries employed the word in this metaphorical sense, it apparently never did so in connection with specific written materials.
Besides the metaphorical usage, "canon" had also been applied to fixed lists. The Alexandrian grammarians, for instance, spoke of the group of classical Greek authors as ὸ Kαύή (Quin. Inst. Orat. 10.1.54, 59). Similarly the word Kαυύ̀ was used for a "list" or "table" in astronomical, mathematical, and chronological writings. Eusebius employed the term in The Chronicle (c. 303) in reference to the second part of the work, which consisted of synchronous tables arranged in parallel columns. Similarly the the system of lists devised by Eusebius on the basis of the Ammonian Sections indexing parallel Gospel passages was called the Eusebian Canons (Kαύή). After the Council of Nicea (325), the resolutions of Church synods were regularly called Kαυύ́. An official list of the clergy also became known in the fourth century as a "canon."¹⁰²

The word "canon" was not applied by the Church to Christian writings until the fourth century. Eusebius (c. 303-25) used the term Kαυύ̀ in H.E. (6.25.3), but the reference is probably to the Fourfold Gospel Canon and not the New Testament in general.¹⁰³ Athanasius (c. 350) provides the earliest extant use of Kαυύ̀ in reference to the Scriptures in general, when he wrote that The Shepherd was not part of the "Canon" (ἐκ τοῦ Καυύ́, De decretis Nicaenae synodi 18.3). Somewhat later (367), Athanasius provided a Catalogue of accepted Christian writings and described them as "canonical" (Kαυύ́γονέννα, Fest. Ep. 39). At about the same time the Council of Laodicea (c. 360) referred to the
"canonical" (κανονικα) and "uncanonical" (δικανονικα) books of the old and new covenants (59). The adjectival form, "canonical" (canonicus), is also found in Origen (De princ. 4.1.33; Prol. Cantic.; Comm. on Matt. 117.28) and may possibly suggest an Alexandrian origin for Athanasius' usage. However, all of Origen's references are extant only in the Latin translation of Rufinus and it is more probable that their presence there is due to Rufinus, who frequently introduced the Latin word into his translation of Eusebius' Church History where it was not present in the Greek. The Greek κανών, however, quickly found entry among the Latins, occurring in the Mommsen Catalogue (c. 360), and later in Priscillian, Filaster, Rufinus, and Augustine. In Latin canon became used synonymously with biblia.

After the middle of the fourth century, "canon" was regularly used in both the East and West for the accepted collection of Scripture. While such usage may be dependent upon the earlier sense of a metaphorical norm, the philological evidence and the late introduction of this usage suggest that here "canon" primarily had the simple sense of "list," and thus that its appearance in this sense in the fourth century coincided with the proliferation of Christian Catalogues.

OBSERVATIONS

The contents of the undisputed fourth century Catalogues (and Collections) reveal certain patterns which support the conclusions drawn in the previous chapter.
regarding the formation of the Christian Canon in the
fourth century.

Old Testament:
The endorsement of an Old Testament for the Christian
Church appears interwoven with the fixing of the New
Testament Canon in the fourth century. Almost all the New
Testament Catalogues of that time (and all of the New
Testament Collections) are preceded by an Old Testament.
Melito's and Origen's earlier Old Testament Catalogues
(H.E. 4.26.14; 6.25.2, respectively) appear to be only
Christian lists of the Jewish Canon. The first extant
Christian recensions of the Old Testament are dated in the
fourth century, and during that period there are seventeen
undisputed Old Testament Catalogues, all but one of which
was associated with a New Testament list. The exception is
Hilary's Old Testament Catalogue (Prol. in Lib. Ps. 15)
which was probably derived from Origen. Eusebius is the
only New Testament Cataloguer without an original Old
Testament list. This absence in Eusebius may be
contextual, since his New Testament list appeared after a
discussion of the Apostles, and since he provided Melito's
and Origen's Old Testament lists later in the work (H.E.
4.26.14; 6.25.2, respectively). Epiphanius also did not
immediately precede his New Testament list (Haer. 76.5)
with one from the Old, but an Old Testament list is present
earlier in the source where the New Testament Catalogue is
found (Haer. 8.6). Moreover Epiphanius provided two other
Old Testament Catalogues elsewhere in his writings (De
mens. et pond. 4, 23). Thus the action of Cataloguing
Christian Scripture not only appears to have originated in the fourth century, but also to have been a matter related generally to the whole Christian Canon, and not simply to the Old or New Testament independently. New Testament Catalogues always appear in the context of the formation of the whole Christian Canon, and not in response to a previously established Old Testament.

The Fourfold Gospel:

The Fourfold Gospel Canon appears to be established before the activity of fourth century Cataloguing. The fact that the Gospel Canon is numbered, often unnamed, and usually in the same order in the fourth century Catalogues confirms that it was a well-known and independent entity. The Gospels are specifically numbered four in all but one of the Catalogues (and in the table of contents of Codex Alexandrinus). The exception is the Catalogue of Gregory of Nazianzus, where poetry may have dictated the absence of numbering the Gospels. In numerous Catalogues the Gospels are numbered four without even being individually named; among them Eusebius (the earliest list), Cyril of Jerusalem, Epiphanius, the African Canons, and Pope Innocent’s letter (possibly the latest). Thus the Fourfold Gospel Canon, as suggested in chapter three, appears established before and independently of the remaining New Testament Scriptures.

The Corpus Paulinum:

A Pauline Collection of fourteen epistles appears established in the East prior to fourth century Cataloguing. The Pauline epistles are specifically
numbered fourteen in all the Eastern lists except the Syrian Catalogue, Amphilochius' Catalogue, and the Catalogue in the Codex Claromontanus (for Eusebius, cf. H.E. 3.3.5). And only in Athanasius' list, the Catalogue in the Codex Claromontanus, Amphilochius' Catalogue, and the Syrian Catalogue are the letters individually named. The fact that the lists in the Codex Claromontanus and the Syrian Catalogue are stichometrical may account for their delineation. However the order of the Pauline Collection does not appear to have been previously established. This is especially evident in the shift of Hebrews (cf. Athanasius, Amphilochius, Syrian Canon) from among the letters to the churches, but is also apparent in the varying place of Colossians (cf. the Catalogue in the Codex Claromontanus, Athanasius, Syrian Canon).

A Pauline Collection of thirteen epistles was probably established in the West prior to the fourth century. In the earliest Western list, viz. the Mommsen Catalogue, Paul's epistles are specifically numbered thirteen and unnamed. The African Canons testify to the expansion of the Collection, in that the Catalogue from the Hippo Breviary (393) reads: Epistolae Pauli Apostoli xiii, eiusdem ad Hebraeos una, while the Canon is altered in Carthage (419) to read: Epistolae Pauli Apostoli xiii. Jerome's comments (Ep. 53.9) may suggest that Hebrews was not counted in the West and some MSS. suggest that Pope Innocent I counted only thirteen epistles for Paul. Yet Augustine and Rufinus specifically number Paul's epistles as fourteen, with Rufinus, like Pope Innocent I, not
bothering to name them individually. In the West at least, the fourteen epistle Pauline Collection appears to have been established only well on in the process of fourth century Cataloguing.

Catholic epistles:

The seven letter Collection of Catholic Epistles was known in the East before the fourth century, but was not entirely received. Eusebius numbered the Collection as seven (H.E. 2.23.25), and all were named in his Catalogue but all were not accepted (H.E. 3.25.2/3). All seven were named and accepted in the next surviving Eastern list, viz. the Catalogue of the Codex Claromontanus, but they were not specifically numbered there as seven. The Catholic Epistles were specifically numbered seven in all of the remaining Greek Catalogues, viz. Cyril, Athanasius, Epiphanius, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Amphilochius, (and in Jerome writing from Bethlehem), and in the table of contents of Codex Alexandrinus, with one exception, viz. the Apostolic Canons. The absence in the Apostolic Canons of enumerating the epistles as seven may be because of the inclusion of the Clementine epistles or because of Syrian influence, where the minor Catholic epistles were only accepted later. In his Catalogue Amphilochius acknowledged that there was some dispute about the number of Catholic letters. The order of the Catholic epistles is the same in all of the Eastern lists, viz. James, Peter, John, Jude, except again for the Apostolic Canons which may reflect Syrian influence, and in the Catalogue in the Codex Claromontanus where the Latin translator may have altered
the order to put Peter first. That the Catholic Epistle Collection was an independent unit established before the fourth century is reflected in the fact that it was generally numbered, unnamed, and in the same order throughout the Eastern lists, except in Syria. The entire Collection would not appear to have been commonly accepted in the East until the Cataloguing of the fourth century (cf. Eusebius).

None of the Western Catalogues, viz. the Mommsen Catalogue, the African Canons, Augustine, Rufinus, or Pope Innocent I, numbered the Collection of Catholic epistles as seven. The Mommsen Catalogue included only the Johannine and Petrine letters, and apparently with a scribal protest. The remaining Western lists, however, included all seven epistles. Yet in none of these lists do the letters appear in the same order. Thus while a seven letter Collection probably existed before the fourth century, it was only in the process of Cataloguing that the complete Collection was accepted as part of the Canon, first in the East, and then later in the West.

Spurious works:

Throughout the fourth century, in the Catalogues of both the East and West, there is evidence that the contents of the Canon was still disputed. The fact that certain works were neither universally accepted nor completely rejected, but placed in a secondary class of spurious items, suggests a period of formation, where tradition had not clearly decided the issue, and which had to be worked out among the churches themselves.
In the East, Eusebius' secondary class of works was itself divided, between those writings which were recognized by many (viz. James, Jude, II Peter, and II & III John) and those which were rejected (viz. Acts of Paul, The Shepherd, the Revelation of Peter, Barnabas, the Didache, Revelation?, and the Gospel of Hebrews). The scribal marks in the Catalogue of the Codex Claromontanus suggest a dispute about Barnabas, The Shepherd, Acts of Paul, and the Revelation of Peter.

After the middle of the fourth century, the debate appears to have expanded to consider not only what works were spurious, but also what place the spurious works should have in the Church. On several occasions Cyril of Jerusalem clearly rejected even the private reading of what he called the "apocrypha": "And, pray, read none of the apocryphal writings: for why dost thou, who knowest not those which are acknowledged among all, trouble thyself in vain about those which are disputed?" and also, "And whatever books are not read in Churches, these read not even by thyself, as thou hast heard me say." In contrast, Athanasius allowed the reading of the spurious works by the catechumens:

But for greater exactness I add this also, writing of necessity; that there are other books besides these not indeed included in the Canon, but appointed by the Fathers to be read by those who newly join us, and who wish instruction in the word of godliness. The Wisdom of Solomon, and the Wisdom of Sirach, and Esther, and Judith, and Tobit, and that which is called the Teaching of the Apostles, and the Shepherd. But the former, my brethren, are included in the Canon, the latter being (merely) read; nor is there any place a mention of apocryphal writings (Ep. Fest. 39).

Epiphanius did not explicitly name a class of spurious
works, but he did amend his various lists and seemed unsure where to place certain writings. In one of his Old Testament lists (De mens. et pond. 23) he added Lamentations at the end, while in another Old Testament list in the same work (De mens. et pond. 4) he attached the Wisdom of Solomon and Sirach to the end. In his New Testament list (Haer. 76.5) Epiphanius again appended the Wisdom of Solomon and Sirach to the conclusion. In the Apostolic Canons Sirach appears after the Old Testament list with the instruction: "And besides these, take care that your young persons learn the Wisdom of the very learned Sirach." The New Testament list that follows included the Apostolic Constitutions itself, about which it noted: "dedicated to you the bishops by me Clement, in eight books; which is not fit to publish before all, because of the mysteries contained in them." Amphilochius acknowledged that four of the Catholic epistles were still disputed; and, that Hebrews and Revelation were considered spurious, by some in the first case and by the majority in the latter. The Psalms of Solomon were separated in the table of contents of the Codex Alexandrinus suggesting a secondary position. Thus throughout the fourth century in the East, certain works were disputed and considered spurious. Some among the New Testament Scriptures, e.g. the minor Catholic epistles and Revelation, were eventually accepted as canonical, while others, e.g. the Acts of Paul, The Shepherd, the Revelation of Peter, Barnabas, the Teaching of the Apostles, the Didache, and the Gospel of Hebrews, were eventually rejected and forgotten.
The situation was similar in the West. The *una sola* of the Mommsen Catalogue suggests a scribal dispute about the minor Catholic epistles. The counting of the Pauline letters in the canons of the Hippo Breviary at Carthage (397) suggest a controversy about Hebrews. Jerome acknowledged that Hebrews was not counted with the others, and was not accepted by many. Yet both Hebrews and the minor Catholic epistles were later accepted in the West as canonical. The contents of Rufinus' clearly defined class of spurious works, which he called "ecclesiastical," were later completely rejected. After listing the books of the Old and New Testaments, he wrote:

At the same time we should appreciate that there are certain other books which our predecessors designated 'ecclesiastical' rather than 'canonical'. In the New Testament we have the little work known as The Book of the Shepherd, or Hermas, and the book which is named the Two Ways, and The Judgment of Peter. They desired that all these should be read in the churches, but that appeal should not be made to them on points of faith. The other writings they designated 'apocryphal', refusing to allow them to be read out in church (*Comm. in Symb. Apost.* 38).

Rejected works:

The concept of a class of rejected writings is inherent in the formation of a Canon. Occasionally within a Catalogue some mention of this class, or even some members of it may be found. Eusebius named several of the "fictions of heretics," viz. "the Gospels of Peter, of Thomas, of Matthias, or of any others besides them, and the Acts of Andrew and John and the other apostles" (*H.E.* 3.25.6). These he declared "are not to be placed even among the rejected writings, but are all of them to be cast aside as absurd and impious." Cyril named only the Gospel
of Thomas among those which "have false titles and are mischievous." Athanasius and Rufinus both mentioned the "apocrypha" without delineating any particular works. Pope Innocent mentioned several apocryphal Acts. Jerome in Pro, Gal. named The Shepherd along with several Old Testament apocrypha. Long lists of apocrypha, however, did not appear until later, e.g. the so-called Decretum Gelasianum (sixth century), the Catalogue of the 60 Canonical books (seventh century), and the stichometry of Nicephorus (ninth century).

THE MURATORIAN FRAGMENT

The Muratorian Fragment does not differ in form from the undisputed Catalogues of the fourth century and could easily find a place among them. The supposed Greek original for the Fragment would, however, necessitate that if dated at this time, the Fragment would be Eastern in origin.

The beginning of the Muratorian Fragment is missing so that it is not known whether an Old Testament Catalogue preceded it. An Old Testament list is perhaps probable in that the only New Testament Catalogues which were not preceded by Old Testament lists were those of Eusebius and Epiphanius, both of whom included Old Testament Catalogues elsewhere in their works. The reference in the Fragment to "the prophets, whose number is settled" (1. 79) may be a reference to the Old Testament Canon.

Because the beginning of the Fragment is mutilated it cannot be determined whether the Gospels were specifically
numbered at the start of the New Testament list. However the fact that Luke is called "The third Gospel book" (tertio evangelii librum, 1. 2) and that John is named as the "fourth of the Gospels" (quarti evangeliorum, 1. 9), suggest that the Fragment recognized the Fourfold Gospel Canon and ordered them in the so-called Eastern order.

The Fragment lists thirteen Pauline letters, although they were not numbered so specifically. The delineation of the Pauline epistles in the Fragment is, however, somewhat confusing, as the Fragmentist started (11. 39-46), stopped (11. 46-50), and started over again (11. 50-63) in the midst of introducing the scheme of letters to seven churches (11. 46-50, 57-9). Hebrews may have been lost in the confusion.

The Catholic epistles mentioned in the Fragment are idiosyncratic both in terms of contents and order. The absence of I Peter (and James) is extraordinary, and may confirm omissions. The letters II & III (?) John and Jude, found in the Fragment, are elsewhere only in found in larger Collections of the Catholic Epistles which were accepted as canonical only in the fourth century. Jude, which is listed before John in the Fragment, was usually listed last among the Catholic letters in both the East, where the order (James, Peter, John, Jude) was standard, and in the West, where the order varied. Only in Rufinus' list is Jude listed before John, but then only after Peter and James.

The Fragment clearly lists certain spurious works. The private reading of The Shepherd, for instance, was
encouraged by the Fragmentist, but the public reading of it was disallowed (11. 77-80). The Revelation of Peter was accepted by the Fragmentist, although he noted that some people opposed the public reading of the Revelation of Peter (11. 72-3).

Certain works are completely rejected in the Fragment, viz. Pauline forgeries by the Marcionites to the Laodiceans and the Alexandrians and several others (11. 63-6), and anything from Arsinous, Valentinus, Miltiades (?), or the new psalm book of Marcion (11. 81-5).

The Fragment, if traditionally dated, is an anomaly in the development of the New Testament not only in terms of the concept of Canon and its contents, but also in terms of its format as a Catalogue. There is nothing about the form of the Fragment which distinguishes it from the fifteen undisputed Catalogues of the fourth and early fifth century, and nothing that suggests that it was earlier than the others, or that it influenced their development. Rather, the Fragment appears as simply another New Testament list which ought to find its place at that time.
CHAPTER FIVE

INTRODUCTION

There are a number of peculiarities in the Muratorian Fragment which are often attributed to barbarous Latin, omissions in the text, incorrect translation, poor transcription, or confusion on the part of the Fragmentist. In a number of these instances, however, the irregularity is removed with the supposition of a fourth century Eastern origin for the Fragment. While none of these instances in itself is sufficient to demand redating of the Fragment, the cumulative effect is a substantial refutation of the traditional date, and corroborates the findings of the earlier chapters for a later fourth century date and an Eastern provenance.

THE GOSPEL ORDER

The assumed order of the Gospels in the Muratorian Fragment would be extraordinary if the Fragment was Western and traditionally dated in the late second century. As is well known, the beginning of the Fragment is lost. As noted, some pages may be missing in the Codex Muratorianus since the page previous to the Fragment ends abruptly in the middle of a quotation from Eucherius with the Fragment commencing in the middle of a sentence at the top of the next extant page. There is no vacant space either at the bottom of the previous page or at the top of the page upon which the Fragment begins. It is assumed that four Gospels were originally mentioned in the Fragment since the Gospel
of Luke is called the "third Gospel book" (tertio evangeli librum secundo lucan, 1. 2) and shortly afterwards the Gospel of John is named the "fourth Gospel" (quarti evangeliorum iohannis ex decipolis, 1. 9).

Since no Collection of four Gospels other than of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John is known in the Church, it is supposed that Matthew and Mark were the first two Gospels mentioned, in the missing portion of the Fragment. The first surviving line of the Fragment reads: . . . quibus tamen interfuit et ita posuit (or "... at which however he was present and so he has set it down") (1. 1). This line of the Fragment would appear to refer to either Matthew or Mark. Matthew seems an unlikely choice since the order of Mark, Matthew, Luke, and John for the Gospels is without precedent in biblical manuscripts and patristic texts. Mark, for that matter, is not found at the beginning of any ordering of the Fourfold Gospel. Thus, the first line of the Fragment, presumably regarding the second Gospel, is usually understood to refer to the evangelist Mark. The quibus tamen interfuit in this first line may suggest that the Fragmentist thought Mark had been present at some event of Jesus' ministry and had faithfully recorded it (e.g. Mark 16.9-20, cf. 14.51-52).

The quibus tamen interfuit of the first line may have referred to someone else, for in mentioning Luke the Fragmentist wrote dominum tamen nec ipse uidit in carne (11. 6-7). This phrase seems to suggest that someone previously mentioned in the Fragment had also not seen the Lord in the flesh. If this is meant to refer to either
Matthew or Mark, clearly Mark would be favored. However such a conclusion would then conflict with the previous interpretation of quibus tamen interfuit in line 1. The remark in lines 6-7 may not be meant to refer to someone else at all, or perhaps the someone else was mentioned in narrative material about Mark or Matthew. Paul was mentioned in the narrative material about Luke (1. 3), and Andrew in that about John (1. 14). Perhaps in a similar fashion Peter was mentioned in the narrative material about Mark, and the quibus tamen interfuit of the first line may then have referred to him. Or else, Mark may have been present (quibus tamen interfuit) at Peter’s preaching, though he had not seen Jesus (dominum tamen nec ipse uidit in carne), and Mark wrote down what he heard (et ita posuit). Papias (c. 60-c. 130), as preserved in Eusebius (H.E. 3.39.15), recorded that Mark, though he had neither heard nor followed Jesus, was the interpreter of Peter (cf. Acts 12.12; I Pet. 5.13). A similar association between Mark and Peter is found in the writings of Justin (Dial. 106), Irenaeus (Adv. Haer. 3.1.1), Tertullian (Adv. Marc. 4.5), Origen (in Eusebius, H.E. 6.25.5), Eusebius (H.E. 2.15), and Jerome (De vir. ill. 8). Westcott read the et ita therefore as Kaie oux, i.e. "even so (as Mark had heard from Peter)." Various other constructions to complete the sentence have been proposed by scholars, but it is enough for present concerns to acknowledge that the Gospel referred to in line 1 was probably Mark’s, and that the order of the four Gospels in the Fragment appears to have been: Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John.
The ordering of the Gospels as Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John is the so-called Eastern order. When this order became generally received is not certain. Clement of Alexandria (c. 150-c. 215) accepted the Fourfold Gospel (Strom. 3.93.1), but the manner in which he ordered them is not clear. Eusebius (H.E. 6.14.5) reported that Clement in the Hypotyposes declared "the tradition of the earliest presbyters" was that the Gospels containing the genealogies were written first. Rufinus clarified this statement in his translation of Eusebius' Church History by interpolating here, id est Matthaei et Lucae. After this statement Eusebius related the occasion which Clement gave for the composition of the Gospel of Mark (H.E. 6.14.6), and then noted that Clement considered John's Gospel "last of all" (H.E. 6.14.7). These remarks would suggest a chronological order of either Matthew, Luke, Mark, and John; or Luke, Matthew, Mark, and John. Since there is no precedent for the order Luke, Matthew, Mark, and John, it is probable that Clement believed the chronological order of the Gospels to be Matthew, Luke, Mark, and John. In either case Mark was thought by Clement to have been written after Matthew and Luke.

Thereafter in the East, the order of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John was generally considered to be the correct chronological order of the Gospels. Origen (c. 185-c. 254) in the first book of his Commentary on Matthew, as quoted by Eusebius (H.E. 6.25.4-6), acknowledged the Fourfold Gospel as written in the Eastern order, viz. "I have learned by tradition that the first (of the four Gospels)
was written by Matthew... The second is by Mark... And the third by Luke... Last of all that by John.* This same order is found in P*, an Egyptian codex dated by its editor in the first half of the third century.  

The Eastern order was also given by Eusebius (H.E. 3.24.6-7, 9-12) and was utilized by him in his Canons. It is found in nearly all Greek and Syriac manuscripts, including all the earliest extant Greek MSS. before the fifth century, viz. P*, Codex Vaticanus (B), Codex Sinaiticus (X), Codex Alexandrinus (A), as well as the Sinaitic Old Syriac MS. and the Peshitta versions. The same order is also found in all but one of the fourth century Eastern New Testament Catalogues where the Gospels are named, viz. in Athanasius, the Apostolic Canons, Gregory of Nazianzus, Amphilochius, Jerome (writing from Bethlehem), and the Syrian Catalogue. The exception is the Catalogue in the Codex Claromontanus, whose order may have been corrupted by Western influence when translated into Latin.

In the West a different order for the Gospels initially prevailed. The so-called Western order placed the Gospels of the two apostles first. Most existing manuscripts of the Western church before the fifth century testify to the order Matthew, John, Luke, and Mark. So stand the Gospels in the manuscripts of the Old Latin versions of the second and third centuries, in the Gothic versions of Ulphilas (c. 311-83), and in the uncial Codex Bezae (D). In other Western sources, the apostles are predominantly listed first. Tertullian (c. 200) in one place gave the order John, Matthew, Luke, and Mark (Adv.
Ware, 4.2), and in another John, Matthew, Mark, and Luke (Adv. Marc. 4.5). The Latin Catalogue of the Codex Claromontanus has the order of Matthew, John, Mark, and Luke. The Mommsen Catalogue departed from the Western pattern with the unusual sequence of Matthew, Mark, John, and Luke, perhaps in order to list Luke just before his other work, Acts.

When the Western preference for listing the Gospels of the apostles first became generally accepted is not clear. Irenaeus (c. 180), the first extant witness to the Fourfold Gospel, ordered the Gospels in several different ways, but never in the Western order. On three occasions Irenaeus ordered the Gospels in the sequence of Matthew, Luke, Mark, and John (Adv. Haer. 3.9.1-11.6, 3.11.7, 4.6.1), as perhaps Clement of Alexandria had ordered them. In the famous passage where Irenaeus insisted that "it is not possible that the Gospels can be either more or fewer in number than they are," he listed them in the order of John, Luke, Matthew, and Mark (Adv. Haer. 3.11.8). On another occasion he listed the Gospels in the Eastern order, viz. Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John (Adv. Haer. 3.1.1; cf. Eusebius, H.E. 5.8.2-4), apparently as a chronological order. The appearance of the Eastern order in Irenaeus, however, seems to be an exception, especially since this order does not reappear in Western sources for two hundred years. But at the end of the fourth century the Eastern order became widely accepted by Western writers. Jerome adapted the Old Latin versions to the Eastern order in the Vulgate (384) and it became the standard sequence for the Western church.
At about the same time the Eastern order is also attested to in the writings of Augustine (De Doctr. Christ. 11.12.8), and Rufinus (Comm. in Symb. Apost. 37).

The Gospel order of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John in the Muratorian Fragment, if considered Western and traditionally dated, would be remarkable. While a precedent can be found in one of Irenaeus' references, it is a precedent which is itself exceptional—exceptional even in Irenaeus. The common Western tradition was to place the Gospels of the two apostles first. However, the Gospel order of the Fragment would not be in the least extraordinary if a fourth century date and an Eastern provenance for the Fragment is supposed.

THE JOHANNINE LEGEND

A Johannine legend recorded in the Muratorian Fragment also suggests an Eastern origin for the Fragment and a later date than has been traditionally assigned. In the narrative material about the Gospel of John, the Fragmentist recorded a curious legend about the origin of that Gospel (ll. 9-16).

quarti evangeliorum iohannis ex decipolis
cohortantibus condescipulis et episcopis suis
dixit coelitunate mihi hodie triduo et quid
cuique fuerit reuelatum alterutrum
nobis ennarremus eadem nocte reue
latum andreae ex apostolis ut recognis
centibus cunctis iohannis suo nomine
cuncta disciberet...

There are three elements to be particularly noted in this legend about the origin of the Gospel of John. The first element to be noted is the description of who compelled John to write his Gospel. In the Fragment, John...
is "urged by his fellow-disciples and bishops"
(cohortantibus condescipulis et episcopis suis, l. 10).

Clement of Alexandria appears to have been making an
allusion to a similar tradition when he wrote:

"But last of all, John, perceiving that the
physical things were made known in the Gospels,
being urged by his pupils (προσεκτέθηκεν ὑπὸ
τῶν μνήμων) and taken up in the
Spirit to God, composed a spiritual Gospel."
(Eusebius, H.E. 6.14.7)

Victorinus of Pettau recorded a similar story:

Johannes evangelium postea conscriptum. cum
essent Valentinus et Cerinthus et Ebion et cetera
scola Satanae sparsa per orbem, convenerunt ad
illum (sc. Johanne) de finitimis civitatibus
episcopi et compilerunt eum, ut ipse testimonium
conscriberet in Dominum (Comm. Rev. 11.1)

Jerome also related the tradition:

Johannes apostolus quem Jesus amabat plurimum,
filius Zebedaei et frater Jacobi
apostoli. . .novissimus omnium scripsit
evangelium, rogatus ab Asiae episcopis, adversus
Cerinthum aliosque haereticos et maxime tunc
Ebioitarum dogma, qui adserunt Christum ante
Mariam non fuisse (De vir. ill. 9)

ultimus Johannes apostolus et evangeliasta, quem
Jesus amavit plurimum, qui super pectus Domini
recumbens purissima doctrinarum fluenta potuit,
et qui solus de cruce meruit audire: Ecce mater
 tua; is cum esset in Asia et iam tunc hereticorum
semina pullularent Cerinti, Hebionis et ceterorum
qui negant Christum in carne uenisse, quos et
ipse in epistula sua antichristos uocat et
apostolus Paulus requenter percutit, coactus est
ab omnibus paene tunc Asiae episcopis et multarum
ecclesiarum legationibus de diuinitate Salvatoris
altius scribere et ad ipsum ut ita dicam Dei
uernum non tam audaci quam felici temeritate
prorumpere. Vnde et ecclesiastica narrat
historia cum a fratribus cogeretur ut scriberet,
ita facturum se respondisse si indicito ieiunio in
commune omnes Dominum precarentur; quo explet
revelatione saturatus in illud proemium caelo
ueniens eructavit: In principio erat Verbum. . .
(Prae. Comm. in Matt., 11. 39-54)

All these references agree that John was somehow
prevailed upon to write his Gospel although they differ in
their depiction of who it was that compelled him. In Clement of Alexandria (c. 150-c. 215) it was John’s γνώριμοι. Lampe suggests a meaning of either "pupil" or "disciple" for γνώριμοι.11 Clement used the word elsewhere for the followers of Christ (Paed. 1.5) and for converts of Paul (Strom. 7.9.).12 Rufinus translated Clement’s account in Eusebius with discipulis (H.E. 6.14.7). The original intent of the story may well be that converts of John, his pupils and disciples, urged him to write the Gospel.

In Jerome’s account from ecclesiastica historia those who urged John were the fratres (Prae. Comm. in Matt., 1. 50).13 The vagueness as to the identity of Clement’s γνώριμοι and the fratres of ecclesiastica historia probably account for the later elaboration. With the passage of time the identity of those who urged John to write his Gospel became more important as did the Gospel itself. In Jerome’s retelling and in Victorinus’ story those who urged John are episcopi. The introduction of episcopi into the tradition is probably a later element. In Victorinus of Pettau (d. c. 304) John was "compelled by the bishops from neighboring provinces." Victorinus may have intended these bishops to be identified with those whom John went off to appoint in a tale handed down by Clement of Alexandria (Quis dives salv. 42) and repeated by Eusebius (H.E. 3.23.5-6). Jerome (c. 342-420) identified the bishops more specifically with the phrase, Asiae episcopis. Victorinus’ and Jerome’s accounts are also similar in mentioning, as a factor in John’s writing,
certain heresies, especially of Cerinthus and Ebion. Jerome knew Victorinus' Commentary on Revelation, and his description of the Asiae episcopis in the Johannine legend appears to be a clarification of Victorinus' de finitimis civitatibus episcopi.

The Fragment named those who urged John to write his Gospel as condescipulis et episcopis suis (1.10). Condescipulis is similar to Clement's πληρεύουμαι and the fratres of the ecclesiastica historia, but the inclusion of episcopis in the Fragment suggests a later development. This element of the legend would seem to imply that the Fragment's version is later than that of Clement and the ecclesiastica historia of Jerome.

The second element to be particularly noted in the Johannine legend is the mention of a fast. The procedure of forcing a vision by means of a fast is an ancient one (cf. Apocalypse of Ezra 1.5). Clement of Alexandria remarked that John was "taken up by the Spirit to God" εν πνεύματι θεοπορθητα in the writing of his Gospel (Eusebius, H.E. 6.14.7). The introduction into the legend of a fast may represent an attempt to explain the circumstances and occasion of John's "inspiration." As such it would represent a later development. The length of the fast in the ecclesiastica historia is not recorded by Jerome nor is there any mention of an intended sharing of revelations by the participants of the fast. These two elaborations found in the Fragment probably confirms that the version of the legend in the Fragment is later than that of the ecclesiastica historia.
While John called for a three-day fast in the Fragment's account, the decisive vision was seen by Andrew in the first night, i.e. right at the beginning of the fast. No further visions are recorded, and neither is it known whether John and his companions continued their fast or began immediately to compile their analects. Thus the legend in the Fragment appears defective. The introduction of Andrew's vision interrupts the flow of the story, and is probably an interpolation.

The mention of the Apostle Andrew is the third element to be particularly noted in the legend and may be the most revealing because few early traditions about Andrew are known. He appears inconsequentially in a couple of stories in Mark (1.29-31; 13.3-4). However mention of Andrew was neglected in these stories when retold by Matthew (8.14-7; 24.4) and Luke (4.38-41; cf. 21.8-36). Nonetheless Andrew was included among the twelve Apostles in all the Synoptic lists (Mt. 10.2-4; Mk. 3.16-9; Lk. 6.14-6) and also in Acts (1.13). Andrew played a more prominent role in the Gospel of John. Here Andrew was portrayed as a follower of John the Baptist, who brought his brother Simon Peter to Jesus (Jn. 1.35-44). At the feeding of the five thousand, it was Andrew who called attention to the boy with five loaves and two fish (Jn. 6.5-14). Finally, when certain Greeks wished to see Jesus, Philip turned to Andrew with the request (Jn. 12.20-34). The association of Andrew with John in the legend of the Muratorian Fragment may be based upon nothing more substantial than the prominence given Andrew in the Gospel of John.
Early legends about Andrew are found almost exclusively in Eastern sources and materials. According to Origen Andrew's field of labor was Scythia (Eusebius, H.E. 3.1) and stories about Andrew circulated in the East as early as the second century. The Acts of Andrew (Eusebius, H.E. 3.25.6) is dated in W. Schneemelcher between c. 120–c. 200. Stories of Andrew are also found in the Gospel of Peter (c. 150), the Acts of John (c. 150), the Epistle of the Apostles (c. 160), Origen (d. 254), Pistis Sophia, Eusebius (d. c. 340), Gregory of Nazianzus (d. c. 389), Epiphanius (d. c. 403), John Chrysostom (d. c. 407), Jerome (d. 420), and Theodoret of Cyrrhus (d. c. 466). The Byzantine Church promoted Andrew as the "First-Called" of the Apostles (cf. Jn. 1.41-2; also Papias, in Eusebius H.E. 3.39.4), probably in opposition to Rome's claims concerning Peter (cf. Mt. 16.18-9). Still, according to P.M. Peterson, there are some notable absences of mention, e.g. Proclus of Constantinople (d. 446), Socrates (c. 439), Hesychius of Jerusalem (d. 440). In the West, on the other hand, Andrew received little attention until the late fourth century, e.g. the Gothic Calendar of Ulphilas (d. c. 381), Filaster (d. c. 397), Pacian (d. 390), Evodius of Uzala (d. 424), Eucherius of Lyons (d. 450), Peter Chrysologus of Ravenna (d. 450), Turribus of Astorgia (d. 460), and Pope Gelasius (d. 496).

The incorporation of Andrew so prominently into the Fragment's legend about John suggests an Eastern origin. Similarly the introduction of episcopi among those who
urged John to write his Gospel and of a three-day fast as the means of inspiration probably derive from a time after Clement of Alexandria and the *ecclesiastica historia* known to Jerome. Each of these elements is extraordinary within the Fragment if traditionally dated in the West at the end of the second century. However, none of these elements would be particularly remarkable if the Fragment was a fourth century Eastern document.

THE ACTS OF ALL THE APOSTLES

After the Gospels in the Muratorian Fragment, there is a short description of the book of Acts (11. 34-9).

Acta autē omniu apostolorum

35 sub uno libro scribta sunt Lucas obtime theofile conprindit quia sub praesentia eius singula geregabantur sicut(e) et semote passionē Petri eidenter declarat Sed & profectione pauli a(d)b ur be(s) ad spaniā proficescentis

The presence of Acts in a Catalogue of the early Church is not surprising for it appears in almost all known lists of New Testament Scripture. There are possible allusions to Acts in early works, e.g. Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Barnabas, Didache, The Shepherd, and Polycarp, and more probably in Justin Martyr (150-60).²⁰ Marcion seems not to have known the work,²¹ although the author of the Gospel of Truth (c. 180) appears to have been acquainted with it.²² Irenaeus (c. 180) provides the earliest known explicit quotations from Acts (e.g. *Adv. Haer.*, 3.12-14.2).

If the author of Acts had provided a title or superscription for the work, it has not been preserved. Irenaeus quoted from or referred to Acts frequently, but
without ever naming the work. Tertullian, on the other hand, mentioned the title for the book on numerous occasions. From the beginning of the third century, it has been called "Acts" or "Acts of the Apostles" by Greek, Latin, and Syriac writers. If the Muratorian Fragment is late second century, its mention of Acts would be the earliest explicit reference extant and the first to provide a title for the work.

The description in the Fragment of Acts as "the Acts of all the Apostles" (Acta autem omnium apostolorum, 1. 34) is something of an overstatement, since Acts really does not contain a history of "all" the Apostles, but only a few. Some scholars, e.g. Knox and Campenhausen, believed that such an exaggeration revealed an anti-Marcionite concern for apostolicity. If so, it is perhaps remarkable that the Fragment's title is nowhere paralleled in the anti-Marcionite polemics of any other writer.

The Fragment's title for Acts is similar to Cyril of Jerusalem's (c. 349) description of it as "The Acts of the twelve Apostles" (Catech. 4.36). Similarly the Doctrina Addai (c. 390-430) referred to it as "The Acts of the twelve Apostles" (Philips, p. 44). Gregory of Nazianzus (383-90) listed Acts in his New Testament Catalogue as the "catholic Acts of the wise apostles" (Carm. 12.13) and Amphilochius (396+) described the work as "the catholic Acts of the apostles" (Iambic ad SeuL.). Thus there was, in the East from the middle of the fourth century, a concern to amplify the title of Acts.

These amplifications may have been in response to the
Manichaean collection of five apocryphal Acts, viz. of Paul, Peter, Andrew, Thomas, and John. Photius (c. 810-c. 895) in his Bibliotheca described this collection in some detail and said that it was written by one, Leucius Charinus. The Manichaean Psalm-Book (c. 340), preserved in a Coptic translation, reveals knowledge of the Acts of these five Apostles. There is also an allusion to these same five Apostles by the Manichaean Faustus of Mileve (Augustine, C. Faust. 30.4). Filaster of Brescia (d. c. 397) mentioned Acts of Andrew, John, Peter, and Paul in the hands of the Manichaeans (De haer. 88.6). And Innocent I (405) rejected writings "under the names of Peter and John, which were composed by a certain Leucius; and that under the name of Andrew, by the philosophers Xenocarides and Leonidas; and that under the name of Thomas" (Ad Exsup. Tol.). The mention of Leucius suggests that apocryphal Acts are in question. The statements of Filaster and Innocent confirm the use of a collection of apocryphal Acts by the Manichaeans. There is not much significance in the fact that Filaster and Innocent represented the contents of the collection as different from that presupposed by the Manichaean Psalm-Book and Faustus of Mileve. The omission of the Acts of Thomas by Filaster and of Paul by Innocent may only suggest that they were insufficiently informed.

It seems that the Collection described by Photius appeared in the fourth century as a clearly defined corpus of apocryphal Acts in use among the Manichaeans and substituted by them for the Lukan Acts. K. Schaferdiek concluded with "the assumption that it was the initiative
taken by Manichaean circles that was responsible for uniting within this corpus the Acts which they found and took over, which had been circulating separately or in loose association among Christian sects, and in the case of the Acts of Paul within the Church itself. This situation may account for the amplifications in describing Acts in Cyril, The Doctrine of Addai, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Amphilochius. Likewise, this situation may account for the description of Acts in the Fragment, if the Fragment is a fourth century Eastern document. No adequate explanation of the title is given if the Fragment is traditionally dated.

Like Irenaeus, the Fragmentist (11. 34-5) knew the tradition of Luke's authorship of Acts. Clement of Alexandria (Strom. 5.82.4), Tertullian (Adv. Marc. 5.2; Praescript. 23), and Origen (Eusebius, H.E. 6.25) also knew Luke as the author of Acts. Earlier in the Fragment (1. 3) Luke was identified as a physician (cf. Col. 4.14), a tradition repeated in Irenaeus (Adv. Haer. 3.14.1), Eusebius (H.E. 3.4.6), and the so-called Monarchian Prologue to Luke. The Fragment (11. 4, 35-6) also identified Luke as a companion of Paul (cf. Philem. 24, II Tim. 4.11). Irenaeus portrayed Luke as an "inseparable" companion of Paul (Adv. Haer. 3.14.1), although elsewhere he (Adv. Haer. 3.10.1, 14.2) and the so-called Monarchian Prologue to Luke portrayed him as a pupil of a number of apostles. The "we" sections of Acts was probably the source for the tradition in the Fragment (1. 36) that Luke was an eyewitness to the accounts in Acts, a tradition
repeated by Eusebius (H.E. 3.4.8).

Parts of the description of Acts in the Fragment, however, relied upon some tradition(s) besides the work itself, since the Fragment stated that Luke was not present at the passion of Peter and that Paul, without Luke, journeyed to Spain; facts not deductible from Acts alone. There are few early traditions about Luke and no trace of any from independent sources until the third century.30 The notion in the Fragment, for instance, that Luke (and Mark) were not disciples (tamen nec ipse uidit in carne, 11. 6-7) was repeated by Megethios in the Dialogue of Adamantius called De recta in Deum fide (c. 300). But Adamantius responded that they were in fact two of the seventy disciples (Lk. 10.1). The tradition of Paul traveling to Spain, which he himself proposed (Rom. 15.24, 28), and which may be hinted at by Clement of Rome (I Clem. 5.7), was widely accepted in the East from the second half of the fourth century, e.g. Cyril of Jerusalem, Epiphanius, Jerome, Chrysostom. The Fragmentist's insistence that Luke was absent from the trip to Spain and from Peter's crucifixion suggests that he was familiar with accounts of both. The Acts of Peter (c. 190), which seems to have come from Syria or Palestine, gave a detailed account of Paul's departure for Spain, omitting any mention of Luke. The Acts of Peter also contains an account of Peter's Passion. C. Schmidt concluded therefore that the Fragmentist knew the Acts of Peter.31 Origen (Eusebius, H.E. 3.1.2) and Commodian (Carmen apol. 626, 629-30) also related traditions found in the Acts of Peter, while the Didascalia
and the Acts of Paul seem to have actually used it.\textsuperscript{32} The sources mentioning the Acts of Peter become rather more plentiful in the fourth century,\textsuperscript{33} but the use of it in the Manichaean Psalm-book probably led to its almost total disappearance thereafter. Thus traditions that relied upon the Acts of Peter are more likely to be fourth century.

**THE EPISTLE TO THE LAODICEANS**

Following the listing of Paul's canonical epistles, the Fragment mentions two letters, one to the Laodiceans and another to the Alexandrians, which the Fragment declared were forged in Paul's name by the Marcionites (II. 63-8).

This remark in the Fragment about the epistle to the Alexandrians is all that is known about the work. Attempts to identify the reference with Hebrews have been unconvincing.\textsuperscript{34} Zahn believed he had found a fragment of Alexandrians in a lesson from an eighth century Sacramentary and Lectionary at Bobbio. The lection was headed "Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Colossians," but it was not from Colossians or any other known Pauline letter.\textsuperscript{35} M.R. James doubted Zahn's conclusions and suggested further that the word fincte in the Fragment (l. 65) might have applied only to the second letter, viz. to the Alexandrians, and should be in the singular number, leaving the letter to the Laodiceans possibly unrelated to
the Marcionites. The evidence of numerous scribal errors may lend credence to such a hypothesis, for there is obviously some corruption in the text. Lightfoot suggested that there is a hiatus after Pauli nomine (11. 64-5), and that the fincte referred to the mutilated epistles of Marcion, and not to the epistles to the Laodiceans or Alexandrians, so that neither of these letters should be considered Marcionite forgeries.

Tertullian reported (Adv. Marc. 5.11, 17) that the Marcionites regarded the canonical "Ephesians" as an epistle to the "Laodiceans," and that Marcion himself had made the change in the title. The address to the Ephesians in the text (1.1) is absent in the earliest MSS. Nonetheless the Fragmentist listed the canonical epistle to the Ephesians among the letters of Paul to the seven churches (1. 51). Since both Ephesians and Laodiceans are listed in the Fragment, the Fragmentist must have either 1) been confused about Laodiceans, not realizing that the Marcionite Laodiceans was the same as the canonical Ephesians, or else 2) been aware of a letter to the Laodiceans that was distinct from the canonical Ephesians. Since the Fragmentist listed two separate works, the presumption should be that he knew two different epistles.

The Fragmentist therefore may have been referring to the so-called Latin Epistle to the Laodiceans, if no other pseudo-Pauline epistles to Laodicea are assumed. The Latin Laodiceans, which is found in many biblical MSS. of the sixth to fifteenth centuries and in early printed editions of the New Testament, consists of only twenty
verses, with words and sentences taken from canonical Pauline letters, especially Philippians. A reference to an epistle to the Laodiceans in Colossians 4.16 probably provided the motivation for the obvious forgery. Indeed, Marcion or some contemporary may have been lead by this reference to give the title "Laodiceans" to the probably untitled work which he possessed and which only later became known as "Ephesians."

Harnack promoted the hypothesis that the Latin Epistle was indeed a Marcionite forgery. He saw the opening verse adapted from Galatians 1.1 as evidence, along with several departures from corresponding verses in Philippians. More recently G. Quispel has promoted the Marcionite character of the Latin Laodiceans. Yet their thesis has not been generally accepted. The Latin Laodiceans is devoid of any apparent purpose, doctrinal or otherwise, to suggest that it is of the Marcionite character that would be expected on the basis of its description in the Fragment. The text is so brief that Schneemelcher concluded "the Marcionite origin of the Latin Epistle to the Laodiceans is an hypothesis that can neither be proved nor sustained."

The Latin Laodiceans could not have been thought to be Marcionite until after the canonical Ephesians was no longer considered by the Marcionites to be a letter to the Laodiceans. Harnack recognized that the Latin Laodiceans could not have been forged by Marcion himself, but only by one of his disciples, after the Marcionite Laodiceans took the title of Ephesians, thereby freeing the reference in
Col. 4.16. The vital question here would be when did the Marcionites apply the title of Ephesians to their Laodiceans? Harnack suggested that the Latin Laodiceans was forged by one of Marcion’s disciples between 160 and 190. Yet Tertullian (c. 212) declared that the Marcionites still called Ephesians, “Laodiceans” (Adv. Marc. 5.11), and he would have certainly mentioned it had the Marcionites known to him referred to any other epistle as Laodiceans. Epiphanius (374-7), however, did list an epistle to the Laodiceans along with one to the Ephesians among the Collection of the Marcionites (Haer. 42.9.4; 42.12.3). Since both Ephesians and Laodiceans are listed in Epiphanius, he too must have either 1) been confused about Laodiceans, not realizing that the Marcionite Laodiceans was the same as the canonical Ephesians, or else 2) been aware of a letter to the Laodiceans that was distinct from the canonical Ephesians.

The first certain mention of the Latin Laodiceans occurs in the fifth century with a quotation of verse 4 in the pseudo-Augustinian Speculum (CSEL 12.516). The earliest manuscript which contains the Latin Laodiceans is the Fuldensis (546-7).** However an epistle to the Laodiceans is referred to earlier both in the East and West. Filaster of Brescia (385-91) briefly mentioned an epistle to the Laodiceans in a discussion about Hebrews (Haer. 84). Later Gregory the Great (c. 595) acknowledged that Paul wrote one more letter than the recognized fourteen (Moralia 35.20.48), probably implying the Latin Laodiceans. Haymo of Halberstadt (+853), Aelfric abbot of
Eynsham (+1020), Hervey of Dole (c. 1130), and John of Salisbury (+1180) reveal similar support for the Latin Laodiceans. The Latin Laodiceans appears generally accepted in the West. It was widely disseminated in Western MSS. and translated into Western vernaculars.*

Although an epistle to the Laodiceans was known to them, the Eastern fathers of the late fourth and fifth century generally rejected it. It is placed among the Collection of the Marcionites by Epiphanius (374-7). Jerome (392), writing from Bethlehem, reported that Laodiceans was read by some people, but rejected by all (De vir. ill. 5). Theodore of Mopsuestia (c. 350-428) condemned Laodiceans as spurious (Rab. Maur. Op. 6), as did Theodoret (c. 393-c. 466). Timotheus, who became Patriarch of Constantinople in 511, included an epistle to the Laodiceans in a list of works forged by the Manicheans. He may have been confusing the Manicheans with the Marcionites. Several centuries later the Second Council of Nicaea (787) found it necessary to warn people against "a forged epistle to the Laodiceans" (Act. 6. Tom. 5). Thus, while the epistle is not found in any extant Greek MS., an epistle to the Laodiceans was certainly known in the East.

A Latin original is often postulated for the Latin Laodiceans because of the absence of a Greek text. Since the Latin Laodiceans is a cento of Pauline passages, one would expect the Latin in that case to have been taken directly from the Latin versions of Paul's letters. Yet the Latin of the Latin Laodiceans differs widely from both the Old Latin and Vulgate versions. Moreover there is
ample evidence that the Epistle was known to Eastern writers. Lightfoot argued for a Greek original because of the close adherence to Greek idiom in the Latin Laodiceans. He suggested that the habitual divergences from the Latin versions indicates that the author wrote in Greek and was more familiar with Paul's letters in that language.48

A date for the Latin Laodiceans is uncertain. Regardless of whether the original was Latin or Greek, the Latin Laodiceans appears in Western MSS. from the sixth century. In the fifth century it was quoted by the pseudo-Augustine. From the end of the fourth century, it is presumably referred to by a number of writers, viz. Epiphanius, Filaster, Jerome, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret, Timotheus. Even if the Latin Laodiceans was a Marcionite forgery, there is no evidence of its existence earlier than the late fourth century. The Muratorian Fragment, if it is a late fourth century Eastern list, would fit in with the other existing evidence. The Fragment would take its place among other Eastern witnesses, of that time, which rejected the epistle to the Laodiceans. It would particularly parallel the testimony of Epiphanius, who also listed letters to both the Ephesians and Laodiceans. Such a provenance for the Fragment would also remove the question of confusion by the Fragmentist. However, if traditionally dated, the Fragmentist must either be seen as confused, or providing a unique Western witness for the rejection of the Latin Laodiceans over 150 years before any other extant mention of the work.
THE WISDOM OF SOLOMON

After mentioning Jude and the epistles of John, the Fragmentist continued his Catalogue with the inclusion of the Wisdom of Solomon (11. 69-71).

The Fragment's mention of the Wisdom of Solomon is remarkable on two accounts: 1) that Fragmentist apparently denied the Solomonic authorship of Wisdom, and 2) that he included it in a list of New Testament Scriptures.

The Wisdom of Solomon professed King Solomon as its author (7.1-4 and 8.17-9.18 recall Solomon's prayer for wisdom in I Kg. 3.6-9 and II Chron. 1.8-10). The Fragment stated that the work was written "in honor of Solomon," and by his "friends," or perhaps "Philo." Yet, the earliest Church fathers unanimously attributed this often quoted work to Solomon, viz. Clement of Alexandria (e.g. Strom. 6.93.2), Tertullian (e.g. Adv. Val. 2.2), Cyprian (e.g. Adv. Fort. 12), pseudo-Cyprian(s) (e.g. De sing. cler. 14, 16, 17; De mont. Sina et Sion 7, 13), pseudo-Hippolytus (e.g. Adv. Iudea. 16, 17-8, 20), Lactantius (e.g. Epitome 42), and Cyril (e.g. Catech. 9.2).

Origen acknowledged that the Wisdom of Solomon was not esteemed authoritative by all (De Princ. 4.1.33), but the dispute which Origen noted was probably not about the authorship of the work, for Origen himself quoted Wisdom frequently as a work of Solomon (e.g. Contra Celsum 5.29). The dispute he mentioned was possibly about Wisdom's
absence from the Jewish Canon (cf. Eusebius, H.E. 6.25.2).

Augustine (413-26), who quoted from the Wisdom of Solomon almost eight hundred times, is the earliest extant witness to deny that Solomon was the author (City of God 17.20). Nevertheless Augustine acknowledged that the work was Scripture and a part of the Christian Canon (De Praed. Sanct. 14.26-9; De Doct. Christ. 2.13). In De Doctrina Christiana, Augustine suggested that Ben-Sira might have been the author (2.8), a suggestion which he later retracted (Rectract. 2.4). Jerome (392) noted in his Preface to the Books of Solomon that the style of the work was Greek, not Hebrew, and that some thought Philo was the author of the Wisdom of Solomon. If Tregelles' suggestion for the original Greek at this point in the Fragment's text is correct, then Jerome may have seen the Fragment or derived his information from it. Nonetheless there is no expressed doubt about the Solomonic authorship of Wisdom until the very end of the fourth century. The Fragment, if traditionally dated, would then be unusual for its claims regarding the authorship of Wisdom. However redating the Fragment would support and confirm the dispute about authorship in the late fourth century, and could well be the very source of Jerome's information.

The presence of the Wisdom of Solomon in a New Testament Catalogue is also particularly remarkable. It is precisely this listing which first attracted Sundberg's attention to the question of the place and date of the Fragment. Sundberg saw in this inclusion evidence that the Old Testament Canon was closed at the time of the
Moreover Sundberg thought this implication was further supported by a later statement in the Fragment:

"And therefore it (The Shepherd) ought indeed to be read, but it cannot be read publicly in the Church to the people either among the prophets, whose number is settled, or among the apostles to the end of time" (11. 77-80).

Sundberg understood the phrases, "among the prophets" (inter prophetas, 11. 78-9) to refer to the Old Testament, and "among the apostles" (inter apostolos, 11. 79-80) to refer to the New Testament. "Prophets" would hardly refer to apocalypses, i.e. the Revelations to John and Peter (11. 71-2), since the Fragmentist nowhere named their authors as "prophets" and no closed Collection of apocalypses as such was known in the churches. The suggestion that "prophets" referred to Montanist prophets also seems unlikely. The context suggests public readings in Church (puplicare uero in eclesia populo, 11. 77-8), not ecstatic revelations, and such an interpretation would strangely require the qualifier, "whose number is settled" (conpletum numero, 1. 79) to be applied to Montanist prophets, but not to the apostles. A reference to "prophets and apostles" was, however, a common designation for the Old Testament and Christian writings in the churches, and the phrase should be interpreted in that way in the Fragment (e.g. II Clem. 14.2; Polycarp, Phil. 6.3; Justin, I Apol. 76.3; Irenaeus, Adv. Haer. 3.19.2, 24.1; Hippolytus, Comm. Dan. 4.12.1; Tertullian, De Pud. 12.2; Origen, De Princ. 4.2.7). The use of the qualifier, "whose number is settled," suggests that the Old Testament Canon was closed, but that a New
Testament Canon was not yet established. Such a circumstance may explain the motivation for the Fragmentist's drawing up this list of New Testament works. Until recently the inclusion of the Wisdom of Solomon in a New Testament Catalogue was something of an enigma. This was because it had long been assumed that early Christianity received a closed canon from Judaism, not the Jewish Canon per se, but a larger collection including the books of the Apocrypha, thought to be the Alexandrian Canon of diaspora Judaism. This larger collection included the Wisdom of Solomon, so there was no need to include it in a New Testament list, except perhaps by mistake. However, as Sundberg has demonstrated in his monograph The Old Testament of the Early Church, the supposed Alexandrian Canon never existed. Consequently it is now understood that the closing of the Old Testament Canon within the Church was a longer and more complex process than previously assumed, and so far as our existing information reveals, it would appear that the church in the West was particularly slow in becoming concerned with the closing of the Old Testament. When the churches did take up the matter, the Old Testament Canon of the Western church usually included the Wisdom of Solomon (e.g. Augustine, De Doct. Christ. 2.13; Council of Carthage, canon 26).

In the Eastern church, however, the impact of the closing of the Jewish Canon in the late first or early second century was more immediate. This is evidenced in the lists of the Jewish Canon drawn up first by Melito and Origen (Eusebius, H.E. 4.26.14; 6.25.2, respectively).
the East, the tendency in the churches was to exclude the books which are now called the Apocrypha from the Old Testament, including the Wisdom of Solomon. Sometimes these "deuterocanonical" works were included under the titles from the Jewish Canon (e.g. Athanasius, Ep. Fest. 39.4; Cyril, Catech. 4.35; Epiphanius, Adv. Haer. 1.1.8). The heading of Daniel in many Eastern lists included the Song of the Three Holy Children, the History of Susanna, and the Story of Bel and the Dragon, all of which were excluded from the Hebrew Bible. Similarly for the Christians Esdras implied I Esdras, Ezra, and Nehemiah; and Jeremiah included Lamentations, Baruch, and the Epistle of Jeremy. Other deuterocanonical works were recommended for secondary reading, or considered with the New Testament writings.

Athanasius (367), for example, excluded the Wisdom of Solomon from his Old Testament Catalogue, but included it among a list suitable for the catechumens, along with Ecclesiasticus, Esther, Judith, Tobit, the Didache, and The Shepherd (Ep. Fest. 39). Another Eastern father, Epiphanius of Salamis (d. 403), also omitted the Wisdom of Solomon from his Old Testament Catalogues, but like the Fragmentist, included it in his New Testament Catalogue, along with Ecclesiasticus (Haer. 76). Eusebius, when illustrating Irenaeus' use of Scriptures, included a quotation of Irenaeus from the Wisdom of Solomon along with other quotations of his mentioning the works of Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Revelation, I John, I Peter, and The Shepherd (H.E. 5.8.1-8). The association of the Wisdom of
Solomon with these New Testament Scriptures appears to have been made by Eusebius, not Irenaeus. Eusebius derived his reference from *Adv. Haer.* (4.38.3) where Irenaeus quoted Wisdom 6.19 without mentioning the source of the quotation and even without acknowledging the fact that he was quoting written material. Nor was Wisdom quoted there by Irenaeus among New Testament Scriptures. Elsewhere (*Adv. Haer.* 2.28.9) Irenaeus may have again alluded to passages from Wisdom (9.13–7) without mentioning his source. Rufinus, perhaps influenced by his time in the East, listed Wisdom among his "ecclesiastical" works (*Comm. in Sym. Apost.* 38). Thus in the fourth century the Wisdom of Solomon, among other works, was excluded from the Old Testament of the churches and was sometimes placed among New Testament Scriptures or accepted as secondary readings, viz. in Eusebius, Athanasius, Epiphanius, Rufinus. According to Sundberg, it is probable that Ecclesiasticus, the Wisdom of Solomon, Judith, and Tobit were excluded from the Old Testament canon of the Eastern church because they were not a part of the Jewish Canon (cf. Eusebius, *H.E.* 4.26.14; 6.25.2) and could not be included by the process of agglomeration under the titles in the Jewish list. The full impact of the closed Jewish Canon upon the formation of a Christian Old Testament does not appear to have become an issue until the fourth century. The inclusion by Epiphanius and Eusebius of the Wisdom of Solomon among New Testament Scriptures, like Wisdom's presence as catechumenate reading in Athanasius, was probably due to a continued interest in the usefulness
of this work in the church even though it could not be seen as part of the Jewish Canon. Since there are no parallels in the West to the placing of the Wisdom of Solomon among New Testament Scriptures, the presence of Wisdom in the Fragment would seem to suggest an Eastern provenance. Since the Old Testament Canon was not an issue for the churches until the fourth century, Wisdom's inclusion in the Fragment would appear to suggest a later date than traditionally given.

THE REVELATION OF PETER

The Fragment included the Revelations of John and of Peter at the end of its list of canonical books (11. 71-3). The Fragmentist noted, however, that some people did not want the Revelation of Peter read in Church.

apocalapse etiam Iohanis et Pe tri tantum recip(e)imus quam quidam ex nos tris legi In eclesia nolunt

The presence of the Revelation of Peter (c. 125-c. 150) in the Fragment may be significant in determining the Fragment's provenance, since there is only the scantiest evidence for the use of the Revelation of Peter in the West. The first explicit references to the work in the West are found in the fourth-century Homily on the Ten Virgins (11. 58/9). 56

Egypt, whence derive all the known MSS. of the Revelation of Peter, is its probable place of origin. The text is known primarily from a 8th-9th century Greek fragment discovered in Upper Egypt in 1887 and an Ethiopic translation of the 7th-8th century found in 1910. 57
Besides these, there are two small Greek fragments, one from the fifth century, which was bought in Egypt in 1894/5, and one from a 3rd-4th century MS., which M.R. James thought was part of the same manuscript.\textsuperscript{5163} The oldest surviving quotations of the work come from Clement of Alexandria.

According to Ch. Maurer, all the significant citations to the Revelation of Peter are from Eastern fathers.\textsuperscript{57} Theophilus of Antioch alluded to the Revelation of Peter (\textit{Ad Autolyc.} 2.19) around 180. Clement of Alexandria (c. 150–c. 215) appears to have quoted from it in \textit{Elogae ex propheticis scripturis} (41.1), and later, on several other occasions, to have explicitly named the Revelation of Peter (41.2, 48.1, 49). Methodius of Olympus (d. 311) quoted from chapter 8 (\textit{Symposium} 2.6), while Macarius of Magnesia (c. 400) quoted once each from chapters 4 and 5 (\textit{Apocriticus} 6, 7). A number of Eastern apocrypha used the Revelation of Peter, e.g. the Epistle of the Apostles (c. 150), Book II of the Sibylline Oracles (c. 150), Acts of Paul (c. 185), Acts of Thomas (c. 250), and the Revelation of Paul (latter half of the 4th century).\textsuperscript{50}

A dispute about the Revelation of Peter is first reflected in the fourth century and solely among Eastern writers. Eusebius noted that Clement of Alexandria in his \textit{Hypotyposes} gave "abridged accounts of all canonical Scripture (ἐνδαπτὴκου γραπτῆς), not omitting the disputed (ἀπολεγμένα) books,---I refer to Jude and the other Catholic epistles, and Barnabas and to the so-called Revelation of Peter" (\textit{H.E.} 6.14.1). The description of the
Revelation of Peter as a "disputed" work reflected Eusebius' judgment, not Clement's. Clement clearly considered the book to be Scripture (Eclog. proph. 41.1) and the author to be Peter (41.2, 48.1, 49). Methodius (d. 311) too reckoned the Revelation of Peter as being among the inspired (Θεοπνεύστου;) writings (Symposium 2.6).

The Catalogue in the Codex Claromontanus accepted the Revelation of Peter among the books of the New Testament.\(^1\) The list is believed to be Eastern, possibly Alexandrian, and dated perhaps in the second quarter of the fourth century. In the Catalogue, however, the scribe placed a horizontal line before Barnabas, The Shepherd, Acts of Paul, and the Revelation of Peter, perhaps indicating some reservation about these works. The fact that the Revelation of Peter was listed in the Codex Claromontanus even with a scribal mark and that Clement and Methodius considered the work inspired Scripture suggests that any dispute about the work was later.

In one place Eusebius completely rejected the Revelation of Peter, along with the Acts of Peter, the Gospel of Peter, and the Preaching of Peter, noting that "no ecclesiastical writer of the ancient time or of our own has used their testimonies" (H.E. 3.3.2). Yet this was certainly an overstatement on the part of Eusebius, for elsewhere he reported that Clement of Alexandria commented on the Revelation of Peter (H.E. 6.14.1). Moreover in Eusebius' own listing of canonical Scriptures, the Revelation of Peter appeared among the "spurious" (Νόθος;) works along with the Acts of Paul, The Shepherd,
Barnabas, the Didache, Revelation, and perhaps the Gospel of the Hebrews (H.E. 3.25.4-5). The Revelation of Peter was not placed by Eusebius among the heretical works which followed (viz. the Gospels of Peter, Thomas, Matthias, or the Acts of Andrew, John, and the other apostles), "which no one belonging to the succession of ecclesiastical writers has deemed worthy of mention in his writings" (H.E. 3.25.7).

Jerome, after he moved East, wrote his De viris illustribus sive de scriptoribus ecclesiasticis (392), and in the very first chapter, having noted the acknowledged writings of Peter, went on to list books attributed to Peter but rejected; and, among them is included the Revelation of Peter. Jerome's list is similar to Eusebius', and it is perhaps likely that Jerome became acquainted with the Revelation of Peter in Palestine. Despite the rejections by Eusebius and Jerome, Sozomen (439-450) reported that the Revelation of Peter was being read in his day in some of the churches in Palestine on the Day of Preparation (Hist. 7.19). The references to the work in Macarius of Magnesia's Apocriticus (6, 7) might also suggest continued use of the work by Christians in Palestine (c. 400). The Stichometry of Nicephorus (c. 850) listed the Revelation of Peter among the "antilegomena" (αντιλεγομενα), along with Revelation, Barnabas, and the Gospel of the Hebrews (11. 44-8). These works were distinguished from the "apocrypha" of the New Testament (11. 62-70), which included the travels of Peter, John, and Thomas, the Gospel of Thomas, the Didache, I & II
Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp, and The Shepherd.

The surviving evidence clearly shows that the Revelation of Peter circulated primarily in the Eastern church with witnesses to it especially concentrated in Syria and Palestine, e.g. Theophilus of Antioch, Methodius of Tyre, Eusebius in Caesarea, the Stichometry of Nicephorus in Jerusalem, Macarius in Syria, Jerome in Bethlehem, and Sozomen, a native of Bethelia in Palestine (exceptions are Clement of Alexandria and the probably Alexandrian Catalogue in the Codex Claromontanus). A dispute about the Revelation of Peter does not appear until the fourth century, with the earlier Eastern fathers who quoted the Revelation of Peter indicating no questions about its authority, e.g. Theophilus, Clement of Alexandria, and Methodius. Reservations about the work are reflected in the scribal mark in the Catalogue of the Codex Claromontanus and in the writings of Eusebius, Jerome, and perhaps Macarius. Though rejected by some in the fourth century, the book was still favored by others, e.g. Methodius and Sozomen. It is in the fourth century, then, that the reservations mentioned in the Fragment would find the strongest parallel. On the other hand, there is almost no evidence to support Western second century doubts about (or approval of) the Revelation of Peter, as would be suggested by the Fragment as traditionally dated.

THE CATALOGUE OF HERESIES

The concluding lines of the Fragment (11. 81-5) break off abruptly, after which a little more than half a line is
left vacant. The next line in the Codex begins with a passage from Ambrose, so that any possible defect at the end of the Fragment does not arise from mutilation of the Codex Muratorianus. Excerpts from the Fragment in the Benedictine texts (ll. 33–7) include the last lines of the Fragment, but add nothing.

The concluding lines of the Fragment appear to refer to works which were entirely rejected, as contrasted with the Revelation of Peter, the public reading of which some objected to (ll. 72/3), and The Shepherd of Hermas, which ought only be read privately (ll. 77/8). Westcott wrote of these lines: "The conclusion is hopelessly corrupt, and evidently was so in the copy from which the Fragment was derived."

Arsinoi autem seu ualentini uel m(e)itiad(ei)is nihil In totum recipemus. Dui etiam nouũ psalmorum librum marcionis conscripserunt una cum basilide assianuom catafry

85 cum constitutorem

Miltiades is the presumed referent of "m(e)itiad(ei)is" (l. 81) in the Fragment (cf. Mitiadis CC¹, Mi(ti)adis C², Mitididis C³). An anonymous writer quoted in Eusebius mentioned a certain "Miltiades" in the company of Justin, Tatian, and Clement as among the writers who, before Victor’s episcopate (189–198), had written "in behalf of truth against the heathen, and against the heresies which existed in their day" (H.E. 5.28.4). Tertullian also named a Miltiades in the company of Justin, Irenaeus, and one Proculus, as a writer against heresy (Adv. Val. 5). Eusebius himself mentioned Miltiades as the author of a work against the Montanists, another against
the Greeks, another against the Jews, and an "Apology" addressed to "the earthly rulers" (H.E. 5.17.1-5). Jerome twice mentioned Miltiades (De vir. ill. 39; Ep. ad Magnum) naming Eusebius' anonymous writer as Rhodo (180-92), but providing no further information.

In chapter 17 of Eusebius' Church History there is some confusion about Miltiades (H.E. 5.17.1). Eusebius here continues to quote a series of extracts from an anonymous anti-Montanist writer which he had began in chapter 16. Eusebius notes, "In this (unnamed) work he (the anonymous anti-Montanist author) mentions a writer, Miltiades, stating that he also wrote a certain book against the above-mentioned heresy (Montanism)" (H.E. 5.17.1), and then proceeds to quote the reference. The reference, however, names "Alcibiades" as the author of the anti-Montanist work, not "Miltiades" (H.E. 5.17.1). All the MSS. and versions unanimously testify to "Alcibiades," and not "Miltiades," although most editors have thought it necessary to change the reference to Miltiades to make Eusebius consistent with himself. Immediately after the extracts from the anonymous anti-Montanist writer, Eusebius notes, "But the Miltiades to whom he (the anonymous anti-Montanist writer) refers has left other monuments of his own zeal for the Divine Scriptures" (H.E. 5.17.5), which Eusebius then lists. Eusebius seems to have mistakenly named Alcibiades in his text where the anti-Montanist author had apparently written, and Eusebius had read, Miltiades.

Earlier in the Church History (H.E. 5.3.2-4), Eusebius
did mention an Alcibiades, a prominent follower of Montanus, who along with one Theodotus, was widely received because of the many miracles associated with them. A Montanist Theodotus is also mentioned near the end of chapter 16 (H.E. 5.16.14-5), and this association may account for Eusebius' confusion at the beginning of chapter 17. The confusion is perhaps confirmed at the beginning of chapter 16 (H.E. 5.16.3), where Eusebius records within the context of opponents of the Phrygian heresy, an anonymous author who mentions writing "a treatise against the heresy of those who are called after Miltiades." It seems likely that there has been a confusion of persons, unless one assumes two Miltiades are mentioned in consecutive chapters, one an anti-Montanist (H.E. 5.17.1) and one a Montanist (H.E. 5.16.3). To leave the texts uncorrected would also suggest two Alcibiades, one a Montanist (H.E. 5.3.2-4), and the other an anti-Montanist writer (H.E. 5.17.1).

There is no explicit evidence for a Montanist named Miltiades to support Eusebius' reference in chapter 16 (H.E. 5.16.3). Tertullian, as noted, mentioned a Miltiades (Adv. Val. 5), even giving him the appellation, Sophista Ecclesiarum, evidently intended in a commendatory sense. But Tertullian's favorable mention is not enough to suggest that he was a Montanist, for Tertullian was equally commendatory in this passage of Justin and Irenaeus. In the confusing last lines of the Muratorian Fragment a Miltiades is apparently named in connection with Marcion, Arsinous, Valentinus, Basilides, and the "Cataphrygians."
Yet, this passage is so corrupt that it cannot count for direct support of a Montanist Miltiades. Rather it would seem more likely that Eusebius, or his copyists, simply confused the name of the anti-Montanist Miltiades with the Montanist Alcibiades in the extract quoted in chapter 16, and then again in the very next chapter. If the confusion in Eusebius is accepted, then all the references would agree. Alcibiades would clearly be the leader of a sect of Montanists (H.E. 5.3.4; and 5.16.3 corrected), and Miltiades was the prolific writer against heresies, including Montanism, mentioned in Eusebius (H.E. 5.17.1a, 5; and 5.17.1b corrected), and also by the anonymous writer quoted in Eusebius (H.E. 5.28.4), by idv. Val. 5, and twice by Jerome (De vir. ill. 39; Ep. ad Magnum).

The last lines of the Fragment are obviously confused since Basilides "of Asia Minor" (?) is mistakenly named as the founder of the Cataphrygians, and as someone who with Arsinous, Valentinus, and Miltiades was thought to have composed a new psalm book for Marcion. The association of Miltiades with these several heretics, however much the passage is confused in the Fragment, is extraordinary. The only other explicit mention of Miltiades among heretics is found in the convoluted passage of chapter 16 in Eusebius (H.E. 5.16.3), where Eusebius appears to have mistakenly named Miltiades as a Montanist leader. All the other references portray Miltiades as a writer against heresies; most sources depict Miltiades as a spokesman specifically against Montanism. It is unlikely that Eusebius was dependent upon the Fragment for the portrayal of Miltiades.
as a Montanist leader. If the reference in Eusebius was simply a copying error as has been suggested, then the Fragment's mentioning of Miltiades with the heretics, and especially the Montanists, is all the more exceptional, unless of course the Fragmentist was specifically familiar with this passage in Eusebius (H.E. 5.16.3). If so, the Church History would be the terminus a quo for the Fragment.

The use of the term "Cataphrygians" (catafrycum 11. 84-5; cf. Catafrigum in the Benedictine texts) within these last lines of the Fragment is also remarkable. The Latin Catafrigum is a contraction obviously dependent upon the Greek phrase, κατὰ φῦγας. The Montanists were sometimes referred to in early Greek sources simply as the "Phrygians," (e.g. Clement of Alexandria, Strom. 4.93.1; 7.108.2; Hippolytus, Ref. 10.21 (bis); anonymous in Eusebius, H.E. 5.16.22; Didymus, Trin. 2.15; Epiphanius, Haer. 48.1; and Sozomen, Hist. 7.18.12). In the Church History, Eusebius noted that Apollinarius wrote κατὰ τὴν φῦγαν (H.E. 4.27). By the middle of the fourth century, the contraction appeared. 67 Athanasius (c. 358) used the redundant phrase κατὰ φῦγας ἀπὸ φῦγας in his Orationes contra Arianos (1.3). Cyril of Jerusalem (350) and Epiphanius (374) employed the simple contraction, καταφυγας (Catech. 16.8; Ancoratus 1.2.2 respectively). The appearance of the contraction in Latin is not extant, however, until the end of the fourth century, viz. Cataphrygae in Jerome (De vir. ill. 40) and Augustine (Haer. 86), and Cataphryges in Augustine (Ep.
That the contraction, "Cataphrygians," was not used until the fourth century is confirmed in the pseudo-Tertullian writing, *Adversum omnes haereses*. This catalogue of thirty-two heresies is found appended to *De praescriptione haereticorum* (ch. 46-53) of Tertullian (c. 200), but is usually regarded as a mere summary of the *Syntagma* of Hippolytus. E. Schwartz argued that this appendix was originally a Greek treatise by Pope Zephyrinus (198-217) or one of his priests which was later translated into Latin by Victorinus of Pettau (d. c. 304). Jerome attributed to Victorinus a work of this title (*De vir. ill.* 74). In any case the contraction, "Cataphrygians," is surprisingly absent from the text of the *Adversum omnes haereses*. The Montanists are referred to in the text with the Latin phrase, *qui dicuntur secundum Phrygas* (7.21). It is unlikely that the original Greek read *καταφρυγαί*, because similar Greek phrases in the same paragraph were transliterated into Latin, viz. *kata Proclum, kata Aeschinen*. Thus, it would appear that the Greek contraction was not present in the original early third century work, nor was the Latin contraction employed by the translator at the beginning of the fourth century.

The presence of the contraction, "Cataphrygians," in the Fragment is exceptional if it is traditionally dated. Precedents for the Greek contraction of "Cataphrygians" do not appear until the middle of the fourth century, and not for the Latin until the end of that century. However, if the Fragment is thought to be a fourth century Eastern
document, then the likely presence of the Greek contraction, $\text{Kata}\pi\nu\gamma\nu\varsigma$, in the archetype of the Fragment, which was then transliterated into the Latin Catafrigum, is not remarkable.

The reference to a *novum psalmorum librum marcioni* in the Fragment (11. 82-3) might also suggest a later date for the Fragment than has been traditionally assigned (cf. *novum psalmorum librum Marcionis* in the Benedictine texts, l. 35). Little else is known of the Marcionite psalter. A Manichean Psalm-Book, however, is known to have existed in the fourth century (c. 340),\(^1\) and canon 59 of the Laodicean synod (c. 360) warned against "psalms composed by private individuals." In the work *De Sancta Synodo Nicaena*, Maruta, Bishop of Maipherkat, included a catalogue of heresies which stated that the Marcionites had composed psalms of their own, instead of the Davidic psalms, for use in their meetings of worship.\(^2\) This probably referred to Marcionites in Mesopotamia at the beginning of the fifth century and to the "new Marcionite psalm book" mentioned in the Fragment, unless two different Marcionite psalm-books are assumed. It would be remarkable that nothing else is known of this psalter if it was mentioned both in the Fragment, traditionally dated in the late second century in the West, and by a bishop in Mesopotamia in the early fifth century. This circumstance would be less remarkable, of course, if the Fragment itself was a late fourth century Eastern product from Palestine or western Syria.

CONCLUSION
Thus a number of peculiar features have been noted in the Fragment which do not readily fit a second century date, but which would not be anomalous if the Fragment was redated to the late fourth century and thought to be Eastern. These instances of fourth century Eastern parallels to particular features in the Fragment are too numerous to be quickly dismissed with, on the basis of one, most likely incorrect, association of Hermas and Pius of Rome, with its entailment of a late second century Western dating. The cumulative evidence noted makes it much more reasonable to redate the Muratorian Fragment as a fourth century Eastern document, possibly originating from Palestine or western Syria.
CONCLUSION

The argument for redating the Muratorian Fragment is a cumulative one. It is important therefore to bring together in conclusion the various points made earlier in this work, even at the risk of some repetition. For only then can the entire picture be clearly seen.

The traditional date of the Muratorian Fragment needs revision. The traditional dating at the end of the second century ultimately relies upon the Latin phrase, *nuperrime temporibus nostris*, and is presumptuous since the scribal transmission of the Fragment is known to be particularly barbarous. The original Greek is uncertain and the translation is suspect at several other points, e.g. at the mention of the epistles of John and the authorship of the Wisdom of Solomon. Even so Sundberg has suggested a viable interpretation that does not require the Fragment to be contemporary with Pius' episcopacy, viz. "but Hermas wrote the Shepherd most recently (i.e. later than the apostolic books previously mentioned), in our time (i.e. not in apostolic time), in the City of Rome, while his brother Pius was the bishop occupying the episcopal chair of the church of the city of Rome."

The Latin phrase, *nuperrime temporibus nostris*, occurs within statements in the Fragment about The Shepherd of Hermas. Those statements suggest that Pius I was the brother of Hermas; that The Shepherd was written while Pius was bishop of Rome; that the Muratorian Fragment was written shortly after Pius' episcopacy; and that at that
time The Shepherd was received as a secondary work, which ought to be read privately, but which could not be read publicly in the churches.

Yet Hermas was most probably not the brother of Pius. The earliest other sources for the tradition that Hermas and Pius were brothers are both fourth century, viz. in the Liberian Catalogue (354) and the Carmen adversus Marcionitas (354+). The Fragmentist's use of this supposed kinship between Hermas and Pius to deny the apostolicity of The Shepherd suggests that he is refuting a tradition about an apostolic Hermas. This tradition seems to have originated with Origen (c. 244) and to be dependent upon an Eastern recension of Romans. The Shepherd was also probably not written while Pius was bishop of Rome (c. 140–c. 154), but about forty years earlier (c. 100–10). Nor do most scholars date the Muratorian Fragment shortly after Pius' episcopacy, but anywhere from 170–220.

The reports of The Shepherd being publicly read in the churches are derived from the East and do not appear until the fourth century, e.g. in Eusebius, Jerome (in Bethlehem), and Rufinus (just after returning from the East). The Shepherd is also not placed in a secondary class until the fourth century in the East, viz. in Eusebius, Athanasius, the Catalogue in the Codex Claromontanus, Codex Sinaiticus, and Rufinus. Tertullian's rejection of The Shepherd stands in contrast to the attitude of limited acceptance reflected in the Fragment and is clearly sectarian, for the work is still valued in the West by Tertullian's unnamed opponent in De pudicitia,
Commodian, John Cassian, and the author of *Adversus Aleatores*. Nor is The Shepherd unfavorably mentioned by the author of the *Carmen adversus Marcionitas* or in the Liberian Catalogue, and some twenty Old Latin MSS. of the book survive.

The Fragment, if traditionally dated, would be an anomaly in the history of the Christian Canon in terms of its form and concept. No other Catalogues of the New Testament are extant until the fourth century, when fifteen undisputed lists are found throughout the Church. As a Catalogue, the Fragment implies the concept of a New Testament Canon. While the concept of Canon appears to have been first applied in the Church to the Gospel Collection by Irenaeus at the end of the second century, the concept is unknown for the New Testament as a whole until the fourth.

The Fragment, if traditionally dated, is also an anomaly in terms of its contents. The "core New Testament Collection" at the end of the second century most probably contained no more than the Fourfold Gospel (as a new innovation at that time), a Collection of Pauline letters of perhaps seven in the West and eight in the East, and perhaps I John and I Peter (and possibly James). Yet the Fragment suggests a much larger New Testament Collection than this "core," including the Pastorals, Jude, II & III John, the Wisdom of Solomon, Acts, and the Revelations of Peter and John. These additions are all suggestive of a later period in the history of the Canon.

The Fragment, if traditionally dated, would represent
the establishment of a New Testament Canon over a hundred years before the churches appear to have begun settling the Old Testament Canon; and would have the churches establishing the New Testament before the Old. The Jewish Scriptures inherited by the churches were clearly only a Collection of sacred writings. While the Jews seems to have established their Canon about the end of the first century, Christians appear not to have engaged in the canonization process until the fourth century.

The Fragment, if traditionally dated, clearly represents a closing of the New Testament Collection as a whole. Yet the history of the New Testament Collection appears to be one of gradual accumulation and expansion into the fourth century. Only the Fourfold Gospel Collection appears to have been closed before the general activity of fourth century canonization. The anomalous character within the development of the Christian Canon of the Fragment, if traditionally dated, and the unreliable nature of the Fragment’s statements about The Shepherd used to determine the date traditionally ascribed to it, demand that the Fragment’s date be considered anew. When that is done, there is clearly a strong case for proposing that the Fragment is an Eastern list of New Testament works originating from the fourth century. This provenance is supported by many details.

Eusebius appears to be the individual within the history of the Canon who developed and promoted New Testament Catalogues, and thus, the Fragment most probably derives from sometime after Eusebius. This is perhaps
confirmed if the Fragment's mention of Miltiades is dependent, as suggested, upon a copyist's error in Eusebius' Church History. Thus Eusebius's Church History (c. 303-24) may be the terminus a quo for the Fragment. If Jerome's ascription of the authorship of the Wisdom of Solomon is dependent, as suggested, upon the Fragment's supposed original Greek, then Jerome's Lives of Illustrious Men (392) would be the terminus ad quem. Thus the Fragment would need to be dated between 303 and 392.

The supposed Greek original for the Fragment would necessitate that, if dated between this period, the Fragment would be Eastern in origin. The Fragment is found in a Codex in which over two-thirds of the attributable contents are known to be of Eastern derivation (85/121), and all of the attributable contents are known to be fourth or fifth century. An Eastern origin for the Fragment is also supported by its ordering of the Gospels and its interpolation of a legend about Andrew. A fourth century date is perhaps also confirmed by the introduction of episcopi into the Johannine legend about the origin of that Gospel.

An Eastern fourth century provenance for the Fragment is further supported by its description of Acts and its consideration of The Shepherd as a secondary work suitable for private reading, but not for public use. The inclusion of the Wisdom of Solomon among New Testament works also suggests an Eastern fourth century provenance, reflecting the Eastern churches' desires at that time to continue using works excluded from the Jewish Canon, cf. Eusebius
(303) and Epiphanius (374-77). The inclusion of the Revelation of Peter clearly suggests an Eastern origin for the Fragment, and the mention of dispute about its use would suggest a fourth century date.

While Sundberg argued that the Fragment was early fourth century, a later date may be preferable for a number of reasons. The Fragment’s denial of Solomonic authorship for Wisdom, cf. Jerome (392), and Augustine (413-26), and the apparent mention (and rejection) of the Latin Laodiceans, cf. Epiphanius (374-7), Filaster (385-91), Jerome (392), and Theodore of Mopsuestia (c. 400), are both unparalleled until late in the fourth century. Similarly the introduction of the term, “Cataphrygians,” might suggest an Eastern source and a date in the second half of the fourth century, cf. Cyril (350), Athanasius (c. 358), and Epiphanius (374), as might the mention of a Marcionite Psalmbook, cf. Maruta (d. c. 420). The Fragment’s inclusion of the scheme of Pauline letters to seven churches is also not found in writers in the East until this time, cf. Jerome (392), and Amphilochius (396+), and may explain the Fragment’s omission of Hebrews.

If the Fragment’s association of Pius I and Hermas is dependent, as suggested, upon the Liberian Catalogue (354), then the Fragment would have to be dated in the second half of the fourth century. There were frequent travelers between the West and the East by which the tradition might have passed. Liberius himself was exiled to Beroea (Thracia) for several years (355-8). The presence of Revelation in the Fragment might discourage a date in the
last two decades of the fourth century, for Eastern Catalogues of that time generally omit mention of Revelation, cf. the Apostolic Canons (c. 380), Gregory of Nazianzus (383-90), the Syrian Catalogue (c. 400), the Peshitta (c. 400), or else Revelation is declared spurious, viz. in Amphilochius (396+). Revelation is, however, present without comment in the Codex Alexandrinus (c. 425). While reservations about Revelation are apparent earlier, cf. Eusebius (303), and the work is omitted in Cyril (350), it is listed without distinction in the Alexandrian Catalogue of the Codex Claromontanus (c. 303-67), Athanasius (367), Epiphanius (374-77), and Jerome (394). Thus a date for the Fragment of c. 375 is early enough to include Revelation without explanation, but late enough to employ the term "Cataphrygians," to deny Solomonic authorship for Wisdom, to mention the Latin Laodiceans and the Marcionite Psalmbook, to note in the East the seven-churches scheme for Pauline letters, and to be informed by the Liberian Catalogue. A slightly later date would also be possible.

Sundberg argued for a Syrian/Palestinian provenance for the Fragment primarily on the grounds of its inclusion of the Revelation of Peter and parallels with Eusebius. Alexandria/Egypt would seem an unlikely source for the Fragment with its omission of Hebrews and its mention of the seven-churches scheme, cf. Jerome (392), and Amphilochius (396+). The Fragment's inclusion of The Shepherd and the Revelation of Peter, without mention of Barnabas, the Didache, or the Acts of Paul, might also
discourage locating the Fragment in Alexandria/Egypt.

Eusebius in Caesarea (303) considered The Shepherd and the Revelation of Peter as spurious, along with the Acts of Paul, Barnabas, and the Didache. In Alexandria/Egypt all of these works continued to be accepted in some way or another, while in the Fragment only The Shepherd and the Revelation of Peter are mentioned, the former for private reading only and the latter under some dispute. The Shepherd and the Revelation of Peter, along with Barnabas and the Acts of Paul, are accepted in the Alexandrian Catalogue in the Codex Claromontanus (c. 303-67), although they are marked by the scribe. The Shepherd and the Didache are accepted as catechetical reading in Athanasius (367), while the Didache and Barnabas are apparently still considered Scripture by Didymus the Blind (c. 398). Thus even in the second half of the fourth century in Alexandria, the Didache, Barnabas, or the Acts of Paul might be included among New Testament Scriptures. Their absence in the Fragment suggests a different provenance.

An interest in New Testament Catalogues is not apparent in Asia Minor until very late in the fourth century. Moreover the Catalogues when they do appear are noted primarily for their rejection of Revelation, cf. Gregory of Nazianzus (390) and Amphilochius (396+), which the Fragment includes. Amphilochius, however, parallels the Fragment in his mention of the seven-churches scheme; but so does Jerome in Bethlehem (394). Amphilochius noted that some maintain Hebrews to be spurious, which may explain why Hebrews is absent in the Fragment; but again
Jerome in Bethlehem also noted that Hebrews is not generally counted in with the others. Thus there is no strong case for an origin of the Fragment in Asia Minor either.

Several remarkable parallels with Epiphanius (374-77) would seem to confirm a Syrian/Palestinian provenance around 375 for the Fragment, viz. the inclusion of the Wisdom of Solomon in a New Testament Catalogue, the mention of a Marcionite Laodiceans (in addition to the canonical Ephesians), and the presence of Revelation without comment. These, combined with the public reading of the Revelation of Peter noted in the Fragment and various similarities with Jerome (392), viz. the seven-letter Pauline scheme, Philo as the author of Wisdom, a rejection of Laodiceans, an inclusion of Revelation, and doubts about Hebrews, would seem to confirm that the Muratorian Fragment is not a Western late second century document, but is instead a late fourth century Eastern Catalogue, probably deriving from Western Syria or Palestine.

Redating the Fragment removes it as an anomaly in the formation of the New Testament. The early development of the Christian Canon can be seen to be a gradual accumulation of valued writings to complement the inherited Collection of Jewish Scriptures. The Fourfold Gospel is the only sub-canonical group that appears closed before the fourth century. The other New Testament Collections, viz. of the Pauline Letters and Catholic Epistles, seem to have gone through a process of expansion and adjustment lasting into the fourth century. It was only at that time that
they, along with the Old Testament Canon, were finally established for the churches. Thus the decisive period in the formation of the Christian Canon is to be located in the fourth century. It is at the time that the Church appropriated the word "canon" to describe its Collection of sacred writings, and that the earliest extant MSS. of the whole Christian Bible are dated. And it is also at that time that fifteen undisputed Catalogues of the Christian Canon appear throughout the churches. The redated Muratorian Fragment should find its place among these.
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