

COMMENTARII PERIODICI PONTIFICII INSTITUTI BIBLICI

BIBLICA

VOL. 97

FASC. 4

ESTRATTO

Dan Batovici

The Apostolic Fathers in Codex Sinaiticus
and Codex Alexandrinus



2 0 1 6

SUMMARIUM

Commentationes

| | |
|---|---------|
| <i>D.J. Fuller</i> : Towards a New Translation of דָּבַר in Genesis 37,2 | 481-491 |
| <i>T.R. Yoder</i> : The Silence of the (Spotted) Lambs: Ovine Otherness in the Hebrew Bible | 492-502 |
| <i>O. Sergi</i> : The Omride Dynasty and the Reshaping of the Judahite Historical Memory | 503-526 |
| <i>J. Banister</i> : “I feared” or “I saw” in Habakkuk 3,2? | 527-536 |
| <i>S.C. Jones</i> : Psalm 1 and the Hermeneutics of Torah | 537-551 |
| <i>B. Mathew</i> : The Syntax of John 13,1 Revisited | 552-563 |
| <i>J.-N. Aletti</i> : Exegesis of the Ecclesiology of the Pauline Letters in the XX th Century: A <i>Status Quaestionis</i> and a Changing Paradigm..... | 564-580 |
| <i>D. Batovici</i> : The Apostolic Fathers in Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Alexandrinus | 581-605 |

Recensiones

Vetus Testamentum

| | |
|--|---------|
| <i>G. Deiana</i> : Thomas HIEKE, <i>Levitikus 1–15; Levitikus 16–27</i> | 606-611 |
| <i>P.L. Redditt</i> : Nancy C. LEE, <i>Hannevi’ah and Hannah. Hearing Women Biblical Prophets in a Women’s Lyrical Tradition</i> | 611-613 |
| <i>R. Poser</i> : Tobias HÄNER, <i>Bleibendes Nachwirken des Exils. Untersuchungen zur kanonischen Endgestalt des Ezechielbuches</i> | 613-617 |
| <i>B. Schmitz</i> : Anne-Mareike WETTER, “ <i>On Her Account</i> ”. Reconfiguring Israel in Ruth, Ester and Judith | 617-619 |

Novum Testamentum

| | |
|--|---------|
| <i>B. Gerard</i> : Carlos Raúl SOSA SILIEZAR, <i>Creation Imagery in the Gospel of John</i> | 620-622 |
| <i>C. Gil Arbiol</i> : Loïc BERGE, <i>Faiblesse et force, présidence et collégialité chez Paul de Tarse</i> | 622-625 |
| <i>F.J. Matera</i> : Orrey MCFARLAND, <i>God and Grace in Philo and Paul</i> | 626-628 |
| <i>J. Lambrecht</i> : Jeff HUBING, <i>Crucifixion and New Creation. The Strategic Purpose of Galatians 6,11-17</i> | 628-630 |

Varia

| | |
|---|---------|
| <i>E. Schuller</i> : Trine Bjørnung HASSELBALCH, <i>Meaning and Context in the Thanksgiving Hymns</i> | 630-633 |
|---|---------|

Nuntii personarum et rerum

| | |
|---|---------|
| <i>Libri ad Directionem missi</i> | 634-638 |
|---|---------|

The Apostolic Fathers in Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Alexandrinus¹

Is there any canonical significance to the presence of the works of the Apostolic Fathers² in Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Alexandrinus? To state the facts briefly, there are today only four codices from Late Antiquity that put together the Greek Old Testament and the New Testament: Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, and Ephraemi Rescriptus, all on parchment, spanning from the mid fourth to the fifth century. Up to this time, biblical books seem to have circulated individually or in partial collections and on papyrus, and it is not until several centuries later that we start having surviving Greek biblical *pandects*³.

Two of the four codices include writings which later were clearly non-biblical. This raises the question of whether they would have been regarded as canonical by those who ordered the codices. This question — which has proved to be recurrent in modern scholarship, although it has been answered in quite different ways — is addressed here by focusing on the four Apostolic Fathers (AF) found at the end of two of the great codices: the *Epistle of Barnabas* and the *Shepherd of Hermas* in Codex Sinaiticus, and *1* and *2 Clement* in Codex Alexandrinus. We do not know whether there were other texts at the end of Sinaiticus. The later index attached to Alexandrinus, however, mentions that *2 Clement* was followed by the *Psalms of Solomon*, which is now lost. It is sometimes suggested that Codex Vaticanus might have had at the end the *Didache*⁴, but this remains a speculation.

¹ I would like to thank Joseph Verheyden, Tobias Nicklas, Matthew Crawford and the reviewer of *Biblica* for their comments and suggestions on earlier versions of this article. This research was made possible through the generous help of a FLOF grant from the Faculty of Theology and Religious Studies at KU Leuven.

² This designation is used here for the sake of convenience, and it is not intended to imply that the whole collection was known under this name (or another) in antiquity. As it stands today, it is a modern construct; see D. LINCICUM, “The Paratextual Invention of the Term ‘Apostolic Fathers’”, *JTS* 66.1 (2015) 139-148.

³ So G.R. PARAPULOV, “Bibles of the Christian East”, *The New Cambridge History of the Bible*. Volume 2: From 600 to 1450 (eds. R. MARDSEN – E.A. MATTER) (Cambridge 2012) 309-324, esp. 321-322.

⁴ See, e.g., C.-B. AMPHOUX, “Codex Vaticanus B: les points diacritiques des marges de Marc”, *JTS* 58 (2007) 440-466, here 441 n. 7.

A straight answer is hindered primarily by uncertainties regarding their provenance (and, to a lesser extent, their dating), which remain a matter of dispute ⁵. Following a generally well-received argument for the Caesarean provenance of Sinaiticus and Vaticanus ⁶, T.C. Skeat famously proposed, in a somewhat more speculative vein, that they were produced by Eusebius in response to Constantine's order of fifty copies of the Bible. This proposal did not gain acceptance ⁷. In fact, the alternative provenance — Egypt, probably Alexandria — seems to be still on the table ⁸. As far as dating goes, their current dating is established on palaeographical grounds by G. Cavallo: around 350 for Vaticanus, around 360 for Sinaiticus ⁹. Alexandrinus is dated palaeographically to the first half of the fifth century; the provenance, however, is even less clear, with various theories favouring Alexandria (the traditional view), Caesarea, Constantinople, or Ephesus ¹⁰.

I. Past Solutions, Terminological Considerations, and the Present Proposal

What, then, are we to make of the presence of the AF in the two codices? Even a brief survey of past research not only confirms that

⁵ S. MCKENDRICK, "The Codex Alexandrinus or the Dangers of Being a Named Manuscript", *The Bible as a Book. The Transmission of the Greek Text* (eds. S. MCKENDRICK – O.A. O'SULLIVAN) (London 2003) 1-16; P. ANDRIST – E. NORELLI – F. AMSLER, "Introduction: Les enigmas scientifiques du *Codex Vaticanus*," *Manuscrit B de la Bible* (ed. P. ANDRIST) (Laussane 2009) 5-12; D. JONGKIND, "Date and Provenance", in his *Scribal Habits of Codex Sinaiticus* (T&T 5; Piscataway, NJ 2007) 18-21.

⁶ T.C. SKEAT, "The Codex Sinaiticus, the Codex Vaticanus and Constantine", *JTS* 50 (1999) 583-625, reprinted in J.K. ELLIOTT, ed., *The Collected Biblical Writings of T. C. Skeat* (SNT 113; Leiden – Boston, MA 2004) 193-237; see also J.K. ELLIOTT, "T.C. Skeat on the Dating and Origin of Codex Vaticanus," in the same volume, 281-294.

⁷ E.g. H.Y. GAMBLE, "The New Testament Canon: Recent Research and the Status Quaestionis", *The Canon Debate* (eds. L.M. McDONALD – J.A. SANDERS) (Peabody, MA 2002) 267-294, here 294; D.C. PARKER, *Codex Sinaiticus. The Story of the World's Oldest Bible* (London 2010) 20-23; J. VERHEYDEN, "Read, Write, and Correct. The Scribe and the Perfect Text", *Lire demain. Des manuscrits antiques à l'ère digitale / Reading Tomorrow. From Ancient Manuscripts to the Digital Era* (eds. C. CLIVAZ *et al.*) (Lausanne 2012) 445-472.

⁸ PARKER, *Codex Sinaiticus*, 7.

⁹ G. CAVALLO, *Ricerche sulla maiuscola biblica* (STP 2; Florence 1967) 52-56 and 60-61.

¹⁰ MCKENDRICK, "Codex Alexandrinus", 1-16.

this remains a germane and persistent question but also shows that modern scholarship tends to oscillate between two opposing answers to this question.

1. *Lines of Interpretation*

A line of prominent scholars maintains that the presence in Codex Sinaiticus and Alexandrinus indicates in some way a canonical standing for the AF they contain. A recent example would be C. Tuckett, who, in a note to his presidential address at the 2013 meeting of the *Studiosum Novi Testamenti Societas*, writes: “Some of these were evidently regarded as canonical by some by being included within biblical/NT codices [...] as are Barnabas and Hermas in Sinaiticus”¹¹. Similar views are held by J.K. Elliott¹² and B. Ehrman¹³. This position seems to follow a rather venerable tradition. F. Madden records its existence a whole century before the authors cited above: “In the opinion of Bishop Beveridge, indeed, the latter statement [*viz.* that from the Apostolic Canons it would appear that *1* and *2 Clement* were reckoned among the canonical books] receives some confirmation from the fact of their being found annexed to the books of the New Testament in so ancient and authentic a manuscript as the *Codex Alexandrinus*”¹⁴. It is also the view held by Tischendorf, who seems to consider Codex Sinaiticus to be an actual canon and not merely a collection of authoritative texts¹⁵.

A second line of authors no less prominent, however, regards these texts as mere appendices to the NT instead. This stance, too, stands on

¹¹ C.M. TUCKETT, “What is ‘New Testament Study’? The New Testament and Early Christianity”, *NTS* 60 (2014) 157-184, here 172 n. 51.

¹² J.K. ELLIOT, “Manuscripts, the Codex and the Canon”, *JSNT* 63 (1996) 105-123, here 111.

¹³ B.D. EHMAN, *The Apostolic Fathers II* (LCL 25; Cambridge, MS – London 2003) 169; B.D. EHMAN, *Lost Christianities. The Battles for Scripture and the Faiths We Never Knew* (Oxford 2003) 245. Of a similar opinion seems to be D.E. AUNE, *The Westminster Dictionary of New Testament and Early Christian Literature and Rhetoric* (Louisville, KY 2003) 55, and, regarding *1 Clement*, T.J. HERRON, *Clement and the Early Church of Rome. On the Dating of Clement’s First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Steubenville, OH 2008) 5.

¹⁴ F. MADDEN, *Photographic Facsimiles of the Remains of the Epistles of Clement of Rome Made from the Unique Copy Preserved in the Codex Alexandrinus* (London 1856) iii.

¹⁵ C. VON TISCHENDORF, *Die Sinaibibel. Ihre Entdeckung, Herausgabe und Erwerbung* (Leipzig 1871) 67.

an old tradition: J.B. Lightfoot speaks of “the famous Alexandrinus [...] to which it [*I Clement*] is added as a sort of appendix together with the spurious so-called Second Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians”¹⁶, and he speaks elsewhere in similar terms of *Barnabas* and *Hermas* in Sinaiticus¹⁷. F. Madden should probably also be added here, since his quote above is rather disapproving of the view he is reporting. This is also the view of C.H. Turner, of H.J. Milne and T.C. Skeat¹⁸, and, some decades later, of L.W. Barnard¹⁹. One should add here also authors who do not use the word appendix, yet nonetheless regard the AF as separate from the NT. Such a group includes B. Metzger: “In codex Sinaiticus ... the *Shepherd* (with the *Epistle of Barnabas*) stands after the close of the New Testament”²⁰. N. Brox considers *Hermas*’ presence in Sinaiticus as indicative of the authority of the book, yet he does not think that this evidence is enough to indicate that it is thereby part of the NT²¹; similarly, sceptical considerations are offered by J. Carleton Paget regarding *Barnabas*²².

This polarisation invites further investigation, especially since the one thing the positions cited above have in common is that they tend to be expressed in an assertive manner rather than as the result of an argument.

¹⁶ J.B. LIGHTFOOT, *The Apostolic Fathers*. With short introductions and English translations. Edited and completed by J.R. Harmer (London 1891) 3.

¹⁷ LIGHTFOOT, *Apostolic Fathers*, 242.

¹⁸ C.H. TURNER, “Is Hermas also among the Prophets?”, *JTS* 14 (1913) 404-407, here 406; H.J. MILNE – T.C. SKEAT, *The Codex Sinaiticus and the Codex Alexandrinus with Seven Illustrations* (London 1955) 12 and 35. The same thing is suggested by the title of Lake’s important facsimile: H. LAKE – K. LAKE, *Codex Sinaiticus Petropolitanus*. The New Testament, the Epistle of Barnabas and the Shepherd of Hermas (Oxford 1911). The corresponding facsimile is entitled *Facsimile of Codex Alexandrinus*. New Testament and Clementine Epistles. Published by the Order of the Trustees (London 1879).

¹⁹ L.W. BARNARD, *Studies in the Apostolic Fathers and their Background* (Oxford 1966) 118.

²⁰ B.M. METZGER, *The Canon of the New Testament*. Its Origin, Development, and Significance (Oxford 1987) 65. Similarly, B.M. METZGER, *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible*. An Introduction to Palaeography (Oxford 1981) 86. The same position is also implied in C. OSIEK, *The Shepherd of Hermas*. A Commentary (Hermeneia; Minneapolis 1999) 5-6.

²¹ N. BROX, *Der Hirt des Hermas* (KAV 7; Göttingen 1991) 71.

²² J. CARLETON PAGET, *The Epistle of Barnabas*. Outlook and Background (WUNT 2/64; Tübingen 1994) 252-253.

2. Terminological Considerations

The question as to whether the AF were considered canonical by those who decided to include them in the codices depends, of course, on how strictly one defines canonical. It is important, therefore, to place the present discussion within the ongoing conversation on the terminology regarding the biblical canon²³. There are several proposals available that aim to classify books that seem to have been associated with the biblical canon. Probably the best known is A. Sundberg's category of "scripture", denoting "writings regarded as in some sense authoritative", which is to be distinguished from "canon", denoting "a closed collection of scripture to which nothing can be added, nothing subtracted"²⁴. If one understands "canonical" to denote Sundberg's "scripture", then it is clear that the AF are made canonical by the mere inclusion in the codices, since they are not explicitly signaled as something else. The same would apply when working within the framework of an "open canon", to which books are still added and from which books can still be taken out. Yet the notion of an open canon tends to be used in relation to authors who were earlier than our codices — for instance, in accounting for references to early Christian books as "authoritative" by Clement of Alexandria (who does not offer explicit lists)²⁵. But both these views run the risk of oversimplifying matters. The question is how we can further qualify and better understand the data in a meaningful way that allows us to go beyond the obvious fact that the four AF are included in the codices. What is needed is a way of understanding the evidence that allows us to verify whether or not they can be construed as, in some way, secondary.

Seeking to refine Sundberg's distinction, G.T. Sheppard proposes two distinct categories: "Canon 1", used "to refer to a rule, standard,

²³ A helpful survey is found in GAMBLE, "Status Quaestionis", and more recently in T. BOKEDAL, "Dimensions of the Concept of Canon as Applied to the Biblical Writings," in his *The Formation and Significance of the Christian Biblical Canon. A Study in Text, Ritual and Interpretation* (London – New York 2014) 64-70. See also J. VERHEYDEN, "The New Testament Canon", *The New Cambridge History of the Bible. From the Beginnings to 600* (eds. J. CARLETON PAGET – J. SCHAPPER) (Cambridge 2013) 389-411.

²⁴ A.C. SUNDBERG, JR., "Toward a Revised History of the New Testament Canon", *SE* 4 (1968) 452-561, here 452-454.

²⁵ See METZGER, *Canon of the NT*, 153, 271-275. For a critique of this concept, see E. ULRICH, "The Notion and Definition of Canon", *The Canon Debate* (eds. L.M. McDONALD – J.A. SANDERS) (Peabody, MA 2002) 21-35.

ideal, norm, or authoritative office or literature” that displays “internal signs of elevated status”; and “Canon 2”, used “to signify a temporary or perpetual fixation, standardization, enumeration, listing, chronology, register, or catalogue of exemplary or normative persons, places or things”²⁶. K.W. Folkert retains the terminology of “Canon 1” and “Canon 2”, but he re-sets it on a more functional level, emphasizing the dual way in which scripture works in a community: “Canon 1’s place in a tradition is largely due to its ‘being carried’ by some other form of religious activity,” and its significance “cannot be grasped fully without reference to its carrier and to the relationship between the two [...] Canon II most commonly serves as a vector of religious authority;” of the two, only the latter is “normative, true, and binding”²⁷.

Categories such as “scripture” or “Canon 1” go a long way to accommodate books that seem to be on the fringes of the canon. The scripture/canon terminology seems particularly suggestive, given that these terms do convey by themselves the open character of the former, as well as the closed character of the latter. The question about the status the AF in Sinaiticus and Alexandrinus would then translate into the question of whether the two codices are meant to offer a scriptural collection, or a canonical one. Yet the scripture/canon distinction is arguably less helpful in addressing the status of a selection of books within the same collection (as this article does), as it is not meant to assess such differences. The least we can say, however, is that the inclusion in the two codices indicates at least scriptural status for the four AF.

Mostly without interaction with previous terminological efforts in the field, F. Bovon notably proposed the category of “books useful for the soul”, as distinguished from “canonical books” (and from completely rejected ones). The four AF are mentioned as possible examples of this category²⁸. This manner of indicating what is, in fact, a secondary class of books finds a parallel in some ancient testimonies.

²⁶ G.T. SHEPPARD, “Canon”, *Encyclopedia of Religion* 3. Second Edition (ed. L. JONES) (Detroit, MI 2005 [1987]) 1405-1411, here 1407. The same terminology is found in L.M. McDONALD, “The Integrity of the Biblical Canon in Light of Its Historical Development”, *BBR* 6 (1996) 95-132, esp. 101-103, or, more recently, his *Formation of the Bible. The Story of the Church’s Canon* (Peabody, MA 2012) 32.

²⁷ K.W. FOLKERT, “The ‘Canons’ of Scripture”, *Rethinking Scripture. Essays from a Comparative Perspective* (ed. M. LEVERING) (Albany, NY 1989) 170-179, here 173 and 176.

²⁸ F. BOVON, “Beyond the Canonical and the Apocryphal Books, the Presence of a Third Category: The Books Useful for the Soul”, *HTR* 105 (2012) 125-137, here 127. Previously, F. BOVON, “Beyond the Book of Acts: Stephen, the First

Bovon mentions Origen, Eusebius and Athanasius, among others. However, it would be inexact to equate Eusebius' secondary books (ἀντιλεγόμενα) with "books useful for the soul", since they are categories of a different nature: the primary function and meaning of the term ἀντιλεγόμενα is to describe books according to their status as writings rejected from the first tier of books (ὁμολογούμενα). They may well be useful for the soul, but that is not how Eusebius describes them primarily. In any event, the category is not necessarily a novelty in modern scholarship. Since his first category of books would certainly overlap with that of canon, the same would be true, at least to some extent, for his category of "books useful for the soul", as paralleled in the scripture of other authors, or perhaps whatever remains when subtracting the books in the canon from the scriptural books. The question would be, in this case, whether the four AF are included in the two codices as canonical or as "books useful for the soul", and this designation may seem to make sense of non-canonical yet authoritative works. It is, however, equally problematic when inquiring into whether a selection of books is distinguishable in this way from other books in the same manuscript, if only for the inherent ambiguity in such a designation: canonical books would certainly be "books useful for the soul" as well. Bovon does present several characteristics of "books useful for the soul", but they are rather general and are not meant — and nor would they work — as clear-cut criteria for establishing whether any one book is canonical or just "useful for the soul" in any given context²⁹. In fact, to produce his description, he offers as examples for the latter category only works which are clearly non-canonical. At any rate, just as with the scripture designation, the AF are clearly at least "books useful for the soul" in the two codices, but it is still to be determined whether they are canonical as well. The problem would be then to see whether the available evidence — beyond the mere inclusion in the codices, which by itself is indicative of at least a scriptural, or "useful for the soul", status for the four AF — suggests canonical status as well.

Even though scholars sometimes use canon and scripture interchangeably, the distinction will be maintained here in view of the terminological scholarship mentioned above: "scriptural" designates the writings which are authoritative in some way, and so should be regarded

Christian Martyr, in *Traditions Outside the New Testament Canon of Scripture*, *PRS* 32 (2005) 93-107.

²⁹ F. BOVON, "Books Useful for the Soul", 133-135.

as a more inclusive category than “canonical”, which in turn can only describe a limited (and normally explicit) list of writings. In establishing whether the AF are canonical or just scriptural in this context, the question remains: how can we verify if the evidence points in any way to the AF being secondary in the two codices. Finally, in applying this terminology to the survey of past solutions sketched above, I wish to point out — at the risk of being presumptuous — that I take the affirmations of the first group of scholars above to mean that they would see the four AF in the two codices as, in some way, canonical. Conversely, I would take the statements of the latter group of scholars to mean that they would see them as scriptural or “useful for the soul”, but not canonical.

3. *Present Proposal*

We can now turn to the outline of the present proposal. In the following, I will first revisit the larger context of the reception of these AF, arguing that the hypothesis that they are canonical here fails to have any clear external support in the rest of their reception history. I will show that in some cases it is not possible to ascertain that they are canonical as opposed to scriptural, whereas in the remaining instances — the majority — they clearly have a secondary status. As such, the indirect evidence rather points in the other direction. Indeed, they can be commended for reading — and implicitly for being copied — for one reason or another (hence not being completely rejected as dangerous), while at the same time not being included explicitly in the first class of books.

I will then turn to the manuscripts themselves, giving due attention to the fact that the two codices are the only direct evidence available. The analysis will show that the AF are treated like other books in these manuscripts in all respects except two: they are placed, in both cases, toward the end of the codex, and they are not grouped with the books of the same genre. *Barnabas* and *1 and 2 Clement* are conspicuously not grouped with the rest of the letters; and neither is *Hermas* grouped with Revelation. They are clearly worthy of inclusion and circulation with the rest of the books in the two codices, but there is also reason to regard them as, in some way, secondary. I argue that the fact that they are treated in the same manner as other books supports the possibility that they are recommended, secondary books (as are, for instance, the *Apocalypse of Peter* and especially the *Shepherd* in the so-called Muratorian Fragment), even without excluding the possibility that they are canonical. The mentioned separation, however, points more to the former than to the latter.

Summing up, while recognizing that the available evidence does not preclude the possibility that the AF are included in Codex Sinaiticus and Alexandrinus as canonical, it can be argued nonetheless cumulatively that, so far as the evidence allows it, it is more likely that they are secondary.

II. A Context for the Two Codices

In that they gather the OT and the NT, these codices are paralleled by a number of canonical lists from late Antiquity³⁰, such as those found in the Muratorian Fragment, Eusebius of Caesarea (*Historia ecclesiastica* 3.25.1-7), Athanasius of Alexandria (*Festal Letter* 39), Rufinus of Aquileia (*Exposition of the Creed* 37-38), and Pseudo-Athanasius (*Synopsis scripturae sacrae* 74-76). Such lists have in common the fact that they seem to account for, and organise, the whole of Christian literature with the help of three basic categories: generally accepted books, then books that are secondary to, or rejected from, the first group but which are still useful for one reason or another, and finally writings completely rejected as dangerous or heretical.

The Muratorian Fragment³¹, for instance, after listing accepted (OT and NT) books, mentions completely rejected books (the *Epistle to the Laodiceans* and the *Epistle to the Alexandrians*), and then two other early Christian books, the *Apocalypse of Peter* and the *Shepherd*, which belong to neither of the two previous categories. The former is accepted, even though some (*quidam*) would not read it in the church (*legi in ecclesia nolunt*). Concerning the latter, the Fragment says that it cannot be proclaimed to the people in the church (*se publicare uero*

³⁰ For further discussion of these lists, see E. JUNOD, “D’Eusèbe de Césarée à Athanase d’Alexandrie en passant par Cyrille de Jérusalem: De la construction savante du Nouveau Testament à la clôture ecclésiastique du canon,” *Le canon du Nouveau Testament. Regards nouveaux sur l’histoire de sa formation* (eds. G. ARAGIONE – E. JUNOD – E. NORELLI) (MB 54; Geneva 2005) 169-195, esp. 169-172.

³¹ Text in G.M. HAHNEMAN, *The Muratorian Fragment and the Development of the Canon* (Oxford 1992) 6-7. The traditional dating — the late second or early third century — was famously challenged in A.C. SUNDBERG, “Canon Muratori: A Fourth-Century List”, *HTR* 66 (1973) 1-41 and G.M. HAHNEMAN, *The Muratorian Fragment and the Development of the Canon* (Oxford 1992). See also GAMBLE, “Status Quaestionis”, 269-270, and especially J. VERHEYDEN, “The Canon Muratori: A Matter of Dispute”, *The Biblical Canons* (eds. J.-M. AUWERS – H.J. DE JONGE) (BETL 163; Leuven 2003) 487-556, who mainly argues that Sundberg and Hahneman’s arguments do not withstand close scrutiny.

in ecclesia populo neque ... potest)³², but also interestingly that it must be read nonetheless (*legi eum oportet*). In any event, the implication is that the *Shepherd* is not rejected in the same way (or on the same level) as the *Epistle to the Laodiceans* is (quite the contrary, since it is “to be read”). This implies some sort of a hierarchy regarding the authority of these writings, with the *Apocalypse of Peter* and the *Shepherd* having a secondary status, somewhere between the accepted (or not disputed) writings and the clearly rejected ones.

In *Historia ecclesiastica* 3.25.1-7, Eusebius of Caesarea notably presents his views about which books are to be accepted and which are to be rejected³³. Having presented the generally accepted books (the ὁμολογούμενα), he lists the *Acts of Paul*, the *Shepherd*, *Barnabas*, and the *Didache* as ἀντιλεγόμενα νόθα, a designation that separates them from the first category. Other early Christian books, in contrast, are completely rejected as dangerous: e.g., the *Gospel of Peter*, the *Gospel of Thomas*, and the *Acts of John*. The second group is described as “not canonical but disputed, yet familiar to most churchmen”, and as not to be confused with the third group, containing books which are proclaimed or published (προφερομένους) by the heretics under the names of the apostles (3.25.6). Even if the exact shape of the secondary group of book is interpreted in various ways, it is generally acknowledged that writings such as the *Shepherd* and *Barnabas* are not rejected in the same way as “heretical books” are rejected³⁴.

Athanasius of Alexandria, in his famous *Festal Letter* 39³⁵, also presents the literature used by Christians on three levels: the canonized

³² At least not as part of the prophets or the apostles; cf. R. ROUKEMA, “La tradition apostolique et le canon du Nouveau Testament”, *The Apostolic Age in Patristic Thought* (ed. A. HILHORST) (VCS 70; Leiden 2004) 86-103, at 97.

³³ Greek text in G. BARDY, *Eusèbe de Césarée: Histoire ecclésiastique I-IV* (SC 31; Paris 1952) 134.

³⁴ E.g. A.D. BAUM, “Der neutestamentliche Kanon bei Eusebios (*Hist. eccl.* III,25,1-7) im Kontext seiner literaturgeschichtlichen Arbeit”, *ETL* 73 (1997) 307-348; A. LE BOULLUEC, “Écrits « contestés », « inauthentiques » ou « impies »? (Eusèbe de Césarée, *Histoire Ecclésiastique*, III, 25)”, *Apocryphité : Histoire d'un concept transversal aux religions du livre*. En hommage à Pierre Geoltrain (ed. S.C. MIMOUNI) (BEHESR 113; Turnhout 2002) 153-165; and JUNOD, “D'Eusèbe à Athanase”, 169-195.

³⁵ A. CAMPLANI, *Atanasio di Alessandria: Lettere festali. Anonimo: Indice delle lettere festali* (LCPM 34; Milan 2003) 498-518. See also E. JUNOD, “D'Eusèbe à Athanase”, 184, and D. BRAKKE, “Canon Formation and Social Conflict in Fourth-Century Egypt: Athanasius of Alexandria's Thirty-Ninth 'Festal Letter'”, *HTR* 87 (1994) 395-419.

books (κανονιζόμενα) of the Old and New Testament, presented as “the spring of salvation”; a secondary category of books — including the *Shepherd* and the *Didache* — which have been used for instruction; and finally apocryphal books (τὰ λεγόμενα ἀπόκρυφα), understood as writings that bear names similar to those of genuine books. These have been written and published “as if they were ancient”, but, according to Athanasius, they are to be completely rejected. Therefore, the secondary category, containing books that to Athanasius are unambiguously not canonized (οὐ κανονιζόμενα), is destined for catechetical use. E. Junod suggests that these books are added to the list as a concession, which would presuppose that such secondary books are already in use around him³⁶. While it is set in contrast with the κανονιζόμενα, this group is mentioned again in *Festal Letter* 39.20 not only “for the sake of greater accuracy”, but also “by necessity” (ἀναγκαίως), and, what is more, these books are said to be prescribed (τετυπωμένα) by the ancestors (παρὰ τῶν πατέρων) to be read. Some scholars suggest that, despite this distinction, in practice there is no difference between Athanasius’ use of ἀναγιγνωσκόμενα books and that of κανονιζόμενα. For instance, J. Leemans argues that this is the case for Σοφία Σολομῶντος, mentioned by Athanasius in the second category. A. Camplani agrees with Leemans’ assessment, but he notes that Athanasius is noticeably cautious when quoting from the *Shepherd*, reflecting therefore that the secondary status is still preserved³⁷.

Rufinus of Aquileia also presents a general list, describing in the *Exposition of the Creed*³⁸ the OT and the NT, after which he mentions (37-38) the *Shepherd*, and possibly the *Didache* and the *Apocalypse of Peter*³⁹ as ecclesiastical books. These are clearly not canonical, but past authorities wanted them to be read in churches (*legi in ecclesiis voluerunt*), even though not for the purpose of discussing matters of faith. Then a third group is mentioned, namely apocryphal books, which are not to be read in churches (*quas in Ecclesiis legi noluerunt*). A final example is drawn from Pseudo-Athanasius, *Synopsis scripturae sacrae* 74-76⁴⁰, where, after the list of OT and NT writings, the author

³⁶ JUNOD, “D’Eusèbe à Athanase”, 195.

³⁷ J. LEEMANS, “Athanasius and the Book of Wisdom”, *ETL* 73 (1997) 349-368; A. CAMPLANI, *Lettere festali*, 501.

³⁸ Latin text in M. SIMONETTI, *Tyrannius Rufinus. Opera* (CCSL 20; Turnhout 1961).

³⁹ On the ambiguities of the text see R.E. ALDRIDGE, “Peter and the ‘Two Ways’”, *VC* 53 (1999) 233-264.

⁴⁰ Greek text in PG 28, 432.

lists the ἀντιλεγόμενα of the latter: the *Journeys of Peter*, the *Journeys of John*, the *Journeys of Thomas*, the *Gospel of Thomas*, the *Teaching of the Apostles*, and the *Clementines*. These writings are clearly not in the New Testament, but they are at least in part divinely inspired (θεόπνευσθα), read (ἀναγινωσκόμενα), and approved by the ancients; they are different from the completely rejected ἀπόκρυφα, which should be thrown away.

Returning now to our codices, the question remains: are they similar to such lists, hence containing canonical or universally accepted books followed by select recommended secondary books, or, on the contrary, do they display collections of writings which are all ὁμολογούμενα or κανονιζόμενα? That the former is possible is indicated by the fact that in the lists presented above — except for that of Eusebius, which is unclear in this regard — the secondary books are not just tolerated; on the contrary, their reading is prescribed. This is expressed in various ways: *legi eum oportet* in the Muratorian Fragment; τετυπωμένα δὲ παρὰ τῶν πατέρων ἀναγινώσκεισθαι in Athanasius' *Festal letter* 39.20; *legi in ecclesiis voluerunt* in Rufinus' account; and θεόπνευσθα and ἀναγινωσκόμενα in that of Pseudo-Athanasius. Eusebius simply notes that they are known and used by ancient authors. They are to be read, and thus a hypothetical pandect codex containing, after the New Testament, the *Shepherd* and the *Didache* would have been congruent with Athanasius' account, just as one with the *Shepherd* and the *Apocalypse of Peter* after the New Testament would have been a way of putting into practice what the Muratorian Fragment seems to prescribe. This matter will be picked up in the next section of the paper.

The other possibility — that all books in the two codices are ὁμολογούμενα or κανονιζόμενα for those who ordered them — raises the question of whether there are other instances in the reception history of the four AF where they are clearly canonical and not secondary. In the remainder of this section, I will argue that in all cases where the four AF are treated as authoritative writings, either they are clearly secondary, or it is impossible to establish with certainty that they are canonical and not secondary; hence, such instances do not support the hypothesis that they are canonical in the two codices.

III. Insights from the Reception History of the Four Apostolic Fathers

The authoritative reception of *Barnabas* by Patristic authors seems to have started — and to have reached a peak — with Clement of Alexandria. From Eusebius we know that Clement's now lost *Hypotyposeis* included abridged accounts of the Scripture and also of the *Epistle of Barnabas* and the *Apocalypse of Peter*; this fact by itself suggests that the epistle is in some way authoritative for Clement. The other apparent indicator of *Barnabas*'s authority in Clement — which might account for its inclusion in the biblical commentary that may have been offered in the *Hypotyposeis* — is the fact that the Alexandrian considers it an apostolic writing. Several quotations from the latter (e.g. in *Strom.* 2.6.31) are explicitly attributed to Βαρναβᾶς ὁ ἀπόστολος. Even more explicitly, in *Strom.* 2.20.116.3, one quotation is introduced as belonging to the “apostolic” (ἀποστολικός) *Barnabas*, “who was one of the seventy and a fellow-worker of Paul”⁴¹.

According to J. Carleton Paget, Zahn held that *Barnabas* was canonical to Clement (“i.e. placed the letter in class 1”), whereas Lightfoot held the opposite view, presumably on the grounds that in *Paed.* 2.84:3 Clement seems to disagree with an interpretation found in *Barnabas* (without an explicit reference to the latter). From this evidence, Lightfoot concludes: “notwithstanding his profuse and deferential quotations he (Clement) does not treat the book as final and authoritative”. While suggesting that “in the final analysis we must suspend judgement,” the author eventually holds that for Clement — as well as for other Egyptian witnesses, such as Origen and Codex Sinaiticus — *Barnabas* “seems to have had the status of a group 2 book (on the fringes of the canon)”⁴². Indeed, when using any variant of the canon/scripture — or canon 1/canon 2 — distinction, it becomes clear that the data only point to scriptural status, given that Clement does not offer a closed list, which alone would have pointed to canon in a clear manner.

⁴¹ Greek text in P.T. CAMELOT – C. MONDÉSERT, *Clément d'Alexandrie. Les Stromates II* (SC 38; Paris 1954) 122.

⁴² Quotations from J. CARLETON PAGET, *Barnabas*, 249, 250, 256. Pace J.A. BROOKS, “Clement of Alexandria as a Witness to the Development of the New Testament Canon,” *Second Century* 9 (1992) 41-55, who notes at 47: “The fact that Clement included the *Epistle of Barnabas* and the *Apocalypse of Peter* in a biblical commentary may indicate that he regarded them as scripture”.

Origen is also of interest here, since in *De principiis* 3.2.4 he quotes from the Psalms, Ecclesiastes, Paul, again the Psalms, again Paul, the *Shepherd*, and finally *Barnabas* to illustrate his theory about the sources of thoughts, and he starts by saying that it is confirmed by the “holy scripture” (*scripturae divinae*). It is, of course, unclear whether Origen’s expression “holy scripture” extends to include the last two texts; indeed, he introduces the *Shepherd* quotation in a somewhat adversative way (*sed et Pastoris liber declarat*: “but also the Shepherd book says”). It is also unclear whether *scripturae divinae* is a term synonymous with canonical, as opposed to scriptural⁴³. In *Contra Celsum* 1.63, Origen mentions “the catholic epistle of Barnabas” (τῆ Βαρναβᾶ καθολικῆ ἐπιστολῆ), but again it is unclear whether we can understand this as a canonical designation.

The difficulty is that *Barnabas* does not seem to appear in any of the extant lists in Origen (nor do *Hermas* or *1 Clement*), such as the one in his *Homily on Joshua* 7.1⁴⁴. Nor is it mentioned in Origen’s canonical list as preserved by Eusebius in *H.E.* 6.25.1-13⁴⁵, although I would also point out that the former does not seem to avoid mentioning opinions different from his own, as is the case with the status of the *Shepherd* in Irenaeus’ works. The first two instances above, however, show clearly enough that *Barnabas* is authoritative for Origen, but its absence from the extant lists would suggest that the former is considered scriptural and the latter canonical. This is perhaps not unexpected if one considers J. Barton’s observation that “the ‘canon’ people use when not attending to questions about scriptural authority is hardly ever the same as the ‘canon’ they explicitly acknowledge when answering a question about it”⁴⁶.

The authority of the *Shepherd* is also reflected in its use by subsequent Christian authors. Any survey on the matter⁴⁷ characteristically notes that it was highly regarded by a number of prominent Patristic authors, as it was considered to be at least scriptural in the case of Ire-

⁴³ See also CARLETON PAGET, *Barnabas*, 250-251.

⁴⁴ Latin text in A. JAUBERT, *Origène. Homélie sur Josué* (SC 71; Paris 1960) 194-196.

⁴⁵ Greek text in G. BARDY, *Eusèbe de Césarée. Histoire ecclésiastique V-VII* (SC 41; Paris 1955) 125-128.

⁴⁶ J. BARTON, *Holy Writings, Sacred Text. The Canon in Early Christianity* (Louisville, KY 1997) 23.

⁴⁷ An extended survey of testimonies of the *Shepherd* up to the sixth century can be found in BROX, *Der Hirt*, 55-71. See also OSIEK, *The Shepherd*, 4-7; R.M. GRANT, “Apostolic Fathers First Thousand Years”, *CH* 31 (1962) 421-429.

naeus of Lyon⁴⁸, Clement of Alexandria⁴⁹, and, as seen above, Origen. H. Gamble notes that in Tertullian's *De oratione* 16 the *Shepherd* is "fully acknowledged as scripture"⁵⁰, but such reading may be a bit optimistic since all that *Or.* 16 seems to indicate is that the *Shepherd* has some authority. Tertullian only says that Hermas' practice of lying on his bed after praying should not be followed. The precise nature of *Hermas'* authority — whether in any way scriptural — remains unclear.

Perhaps the most vigorous claim is that *the Shepherd* was canonical for Didymus the Blind:

"Not only does he use it to validate his interpretation of Scripture (a "canonical verification"), but also, in so doing, he presents it as a canonical equal to 2 Corinthians by placing the two elements in a parallel construction — one for the validation of an element of his interpretation, the other as a Scriptural amplification of a different element"⁵¹.

This is argued along the same lines for *Barnabas* and *I Clement* as well, but it should be noted that B. Ehrman uses scriptural and canonical interchangeably. If one applies the scripture/canon distinction to Ehrman's findings, they are more likely to indicate that to Didymus the *Shepherd* is scripture rather than canon. Given that Didymus is not in any way clear on this matter and does not provide an explicit list elsewhere, Ehrman's analysis shows indeed that *Hermas* is authoritative, hence scriptural, but also that there is nothing to indicate that it would be also canonical; in fact, Ehrman himself allows for this qualification: "It must be reaffirmed that these are tentative conclusions based on fragmentary evidence" (p. 8). Indeed, there is no basis to distinguish between primary and secondary writings in this case. The same goes for Didymus' view of *Barnabas* and *I Clement*. It should be

⁴⁸ The discussion revolves around a quotation of the *Shepherd* in *Adv. haer.* 4.20.2 which is introduced by ἡ γραφή ἡ λέγουσα. Starting from this introductory formula, a number of authors argue that for Irenaeus the *Shepherd* was scriptural, while other authors argue that this is not the case; a recent survey of these stances is available in D. BATOVIĆ, "Hermas' Authority in Irenaeus' Works: A Reassessment", *Aug* 55 (2015) 5-31.

⁴⁹ D. BATOVIĆ, "Herms in Clement of Alexandria", in *Studia Patristica LXVI* (ed. M. VINZENT) (Leuven 2013) 41-51, arguing that Clement regards Hermas' visions as genuine revelations. See also BROOKS, "Clement of Alexandria as a Witness", 41-55.

⁵⁰ GAMBLE, "Status Quaestionis", 289.

⁵¹ B.D. EHRMAN, "The New Testament Canon of Didymus the Blind," *VC* 37 (1983) 1-21, here 11-12. See also BROOKS, "Clement as Witness", 46; Grant, "First Thousand Years", 423

noted, however, that *2 Clement* does not appear in the material examined by Ehrman.

So far as *2 Clement* is concerned, it does not seem to have left traces of its own, but it is mentioned only in connection with *1 Clement*. There are Syriac versions of *1* and *2 Clement* in a Syriac NT manuscript of the 12th century. *1 Clement* was also translated — with no traces of *2 Clement* — into Latin (apparently again a rather early translation), as well as Coptic (Akhmimic), the latter surviving in two Coptic papyri. Apart from the Syriac, *1* and *2 Clement* are found together in Greek in Codex Hierosolymitanus and Codex Alexandrinus.

As he did for *Barnabas*, so Clement of Alexandria also introduces a number of quotations from *1 Clement* in *Strom.* 4.17 as coming from the apostle Clement⁵². However, as in the case of *Barnabas* and the *Shepherd*, so also in this instance there is no clear evidence indicating that Clement of Alexandria considered *1 Clement* as canonical. The same goes for Origen⁵³ and, as seen above, for Didymus the Blind. None of the Patristic authors mentioned here seems to quote or mention *2 Clement* in a similar manner. C. Tuckett discusses possible references to *2 Clement* in Irenaeus and Origen, both of which are unclear. For the former, if it were indeed a reference to *2 Clement*, it would show an early association with *1 Clement*, but it remains uncertain whether it is a reference to this text at all. The earliest authors to explicitly acknowledge this writing are Eusebius and Jerome; both present it as a writing rejected from the first class of books⁵⁴.

Further Discussion

Conversely, for all these texts there are late antique testimonies that state clearly that they are not received in the first level of books, as is the case with the already mentioned lists and other points of their reception. Eusebius explicitly rejects *2 Clement*, as well, from the generally accepted books in *Hist. eccl.* 3.38.4, but he accepts it as a secondary book and not one to be rejected as dangerous or heretical. Jerome, too, mentions all four Apostolic Fathers as rejected from the canon⁵⁵. Such instances are sometimes taken to indicate a counter-re-

⁵² JAUBERT, *Clément de Rome*, 15, lists the *1 Clement* quotations in Clement of Alexandria's works.

⁵³ GRANT, "First Thousand Years", 423.

⁵⁴ C.M. TUCKETT, *2 Clement*. Introduction, Text, and Commentary (OAF; Oxford 2012) 7-13.

⁵⁵ CARLETON PAGET, *Barnabas*, 252; OSIEK, *The Shepherd*, 6-7; TUCKETT, *2 Clement*, 9.

action to those who might have regarded such texts as canonical⁵⁶. Yet such mirroring is bound to be speculative, as there is no way to establish whether in the alleged mirrored views such texts imply an early form of a canon or only a loose form of scripture. In the *Shepherd's* case Eusebius provides an example of an ancient author who held this text as scriptural (Irenaeus), while in the case of *2 Clement* he does not, stating that “we do not even know if the primitive writers used it” (C. Tuckett’s translation of *Hist. eccl.* 3.38.4). What would he be reacting to, then, in the latter case? Does he mean his contemporaries who might consider *2 Clement* as scriptural or canonical, or rather those who only “use it”? In his actual text Eusebius simply reports the existence of a second letter ascribed to Clement, saying that he does not know whether it is as recognised as the other, for he does not know if the primitive authors used it at all (*Hist. eccl.* 3.38.4); he seems more concerned with the attribution to Clement than with any alleged canonicity. All this goes to show that such mirroring is wobbly at best when there are no explicit reports of the status of a work (as there are in the *Shepherd's* case, e.g. in Irenaeus as reported by Eusebius), and also that any claim of even scriptural status for *2 Clement* before the time of the two codices simply falls short of the available evidence.

A possible counterexample — however, from the times of the codices, not earlier — is the testimony of the *Apostolic Canons*, normally dated to the end of the fourth century, where *1* and *2 Clement* appear to be included in the NT (ch. 85)⁵⁷. In order to explain this inclusion, B. Metzger, noting that the *Apostolic Canons* were decreed by the “authorities who were to make law in the Church” at the Trullan Council of 691 and 692, proposes that “such an extraordinary situation can be accounted for only on the supposition that the members of the council had not even read the texts thus sanctioned”⁵⁸. For his part, J.B. Lightfoot, doubts that the version ratified at that council mentions the two Clementine letters, suggesting then that this would be a later interpolation in the transmission of the *Apostolic Canons*. The SC edition of the Greek text and its apparatus, however, offer no support

⁵⁶ So, for instance, with respect to *2 Clement* (which is the most interesting text for our argument) TUCKETT, *2 Clement*, 9 and 12, and P. PARVIS, “*2 Clement* and the Meaning of Christian Homily”, *ExpT* 117 (2006) 265-270, here 265.

⁵⁷ Greek text in M. METZGER, ed., *Les Constitutions apostoliques III* (SC 336; Paris 1987) 308.

⁵⁸ METZGER, *Canon of the NT*, 216.

for this hypothesis ⁵⁹. Moreover, Metzger's presupposition is far from certain. A further peculiarity of this list prompts a simpler explanation: the fact that this New Testament list (which does not mention Revelation) also includes the *Apostolic Constitutions*, of which the *Apostolic Canons* are, in fact, the last part ⁶⁰. To the extent that they include themselves in the canon they posit, it is obvious that what the *Apostolic Canons* offer is not an actual canonical list, such as the one in Athanasius' *Festal letter* 39. In all probability, the aim of the *Apostolic Canons* is not to assemble a definite list of the biblical books, but more to put forward an ecclesial regulation — the *Apostolic Constitutions* — preceded, perhaps for the purpose of self-legitimization, by a list of biblical books. From this perspective, the *Apostolic Canons* cease to be evidence for *1* and *2 Clement* as clearly canonical in the strict sense; instead they are evidence for them being scriptural, or Canon 1, or indeed Folkert's more functional Canon I. In turn, this indicates that, at least for *2 Clement*, there is no clear instance of it being regarded as canonical, either before or during the times of the codices.

What we do know from the available data, however — so far as the Patristic strand of reception is concerned — is that the four AF appear to have enjoyed authority to various degrees, with the *Shepherd* at one end of the spectrum (with most potent claims to being scriptural) and *2 Clement* at the other end (with virtually no claim prior to the codices) ⁶¹. Moreover, this spectrum distribution is matched in the other two strands of reception: manuscripts and versions. And what is more, by the time Codex Sinaiticus was written, Patristic authors seem to have stopped mentioning the *Shepherd*, and for that matter also *Barnabas*, as being scriptural in any way ⁶², and this is even more so in the case of *1 Clement* in Codex Alexandrinus a century later. D. Stökl Ben Ezra argues that the “the strong attestation to at least *Hermas* among the papyri” may well indicate that its presence in Sinaiticus indicates canonicity ⁶³.

⁵⁹ J.B. LIGHTFOOT, *S. Clement of Rome, The Two Epistles to the Corinthians*. A Revised Text with Introduction and Notes (London 1869) 374-376.

⁶⁰ Pace Parvis and Tuckett who both take Alexandrinus and the *Apostolic Canons* together as evidence for *2 Clement*'s canonicity: TUCKETT, *2 Clement*, 9; PARVIS, “*2 Clement*”, 265.

⁶¹ On this see also LIGHTFOOT, *Clement of Rome*, 13.

⁶² As noted by H. CHADWICK, “The New Edition of *Hermas*”, *JTS* 8 (1957) 274-280, here 279.

⁶³ D. STÖKL BEN EZRA, “Canonization – a Non-Linear Process? Observing the Process of Canonization through the Christian (and Jewish) Papyri from Egypt”, *ZAC/JAC* 12 (2008) 229-250, here 213.

His proposal might have some weight in the *Shepherd's* case, but the author seems to feel less secure about *Barnabas* on this matter, as it gets left aside; surely nothing of such a nature could be argued regarding *1* and *2 Clement* in Alexandrinus.

To conclude, there are no clear instances in which any of the four AF are clearly canonical (as opposed to just scriptural), either before Codex Sinaiticus was written, or up to the time in which the Codex Alexandrinus is usually dated. This is not to say that it is impossible, for this very reason, that they were canonical in the eyes of those who ordered two codices, but only that the rest of their reception does not provide indirect evidence for the argument that they were canonical. Virtually all such evidence points to scriptural status, reflecting their circulation and transmission as authoritative, recommended secondary books during Late Antiquity.

IV. Looking for Evidence of Assigning Status of the AF in the Manuscripts

In the absence of any historical testimonies for why these works are included, the only sources are the manuscripts themselves. The first thing that needs emphasizing is that these texts are not included because some leafs of the last quire remained blank when everything was done and had to be filled with something: *Barnabas* extends over two quires, and the *Shepherd* over at least three others. And if Sinaiticus initially contained the whole of the *Shepherd*, the number of quires covered by the AF would be increased by one. The preserved leaves contain most of the following chapters in continuous numbering: 1-31 on its first quire which only lacks its last leaf, and 65-68, respectively 91-95 on a second quire of which only the first and the last leaf survive. The numbering of the latter quire indicates that a whole quire was lost between them (which would have contained chapters 32-64). The ending is lost, so we cannot be sure whether the initial manuscript also contained the remaining 95-114 chapters as well, but it is not unthinkable that it did, given that the writings in the manuscript tend to be complete. At the very least, this goes to show that the decision regarding the inclusion of these texts cannot be explained as filling-up empty space. The other important thing is the lack of any marker before these texts to distinguish them from the NT texts they follow. It would seem that no effort was made to mark any sort of difference, i.e., nothing by way of an explicit title, note, or separation marker.

A closer look at the AF in the two manuscripts can substantiate this claim on codicological and palaeographical grounds, by taking into account the way these texts are treated as compared to other books that are undisputedly biblical — especially those written by the same hands — on various levels: the relationship between quire structure, numbering and the distribution of scribal tasks, the disposition of titles and colophons, the use of *nomina sacra*, and the various elements involved in paragraphing throughout the four books ⁶⁴.

For instance, in Sinaiticus the text of the *Shepherd* is written by scribe B ⁶⁵ and begins on the first page of a new quire, after the end of *Barnabas* (written by scribe A), leaving approximately one and a half columns empty. Throughout Sinaiticus there are seven books which start on the beginning of a new quire, with similar empty space left in the previous quire: 4 Maccabees, Isaiah, Joel, Psalms, Matthew, John and Romans, and in four of these cases the scribe of the previous quire is different; it seems that such an event is not unusual when the scribe is changing ⁶⁶.

The various sections of the *Shepherd* are marked in Sinaiticus using column-centred, above-and-below-dashed subtitles. They are quite similar in form to the titles of the Minor Prophets, written by the same scribe as the *Shepherd* (B) — Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, and Malachi — although they all start at the very top of a column, often with several blank lines in the previous column where needed, unlike the subtitles of the *Shepherd* which are included in the column in a continuous manner. The difference is seemingly inherent to the written text: the titles (in the case of the Minor Prophets)

⁶⁴ An assessment of the available data is available in D. BATOVICI, “The Less-Expected Books in Codex Sinaiticus and Alexandrinus: Codicological and Palaeographical Considerations”, *Comment le Livre s'est fait livre* (eds. C. RUZZIER – X. HERNAND) (Bib 40; Turnhout 2015) 39-50.

⁶⁵ Since the time of Tischendorf, the scribe of *Hermas* has been designated with the letter “B”. More recently, A. MYSHRALL, “The Presence of a Fourth Scribe?”, *Codex Sinaiticus. New Perspectives on the Ancient Biblical Manuscript* (eds. S. MCKENDRICK – D. PARKER – A. MYSHRALL) (London 2015) 139-148, explores the possibility of distinguishing between B2 who would have copied the Minor Prophets and *Hermas*, and B1 who was responsible for all the other work attributed to B. However, since the validity of this proposed distinction does not affect the argument presented here, the traditional designation B is used throughout for the sake of simplicity.

⁶⁶ For a discussion of the distribution of the scribes and the struggle with space in Codex Sinaiticus, and of its relevance for the production of the manuscript, see JONGKIND, *Scribal Habits*, 39-59.

receive a slightly greater emphasis than the subtitles (of the *Shepherd*'s various sections), even though otherwise they are similarly executed. There is also a technique of paragraphing in the text of the *Shepherd* in Codex Sinaiticus: a rather small *ekthesis*, usually accompanied by unused space in the previous line, having the function of marking either a shift of focus or a general movement from antecedent to consequent in the narrative. But this has a rather uneven distribution throughout the text. Similarly, such a paragraphing technique appears in other books written by scribe B with a similarly uneven distribution⁶⁷.

Therefore, if we pick the *Shepherd* as an example, it can be argued that its treatment in the codex is similar, on all levels, to the treatment of the biblical books that were written by the same scribe B: in the case of the *Shepherd* the B scribe aims to present a clear, readable text — without particular adornment, but with a sense of paragraphing — in the very same format in which he writes the rest of his work in the codex⁶⁸.

The situation is clearly similar in the case of the other three AF in the two manuscripts. For instance, with regard to the quire placement of the beginning of the text, *Barnabas* starts in the next column on the same page with the ending of Revelation (both are written by scribe A), as is the case for most of the other biblical books in the codex, save for the eight mentioned above, which start at the beginning of a new quire. In Codex Alexandrinus, *1 Clement* starts on a new recto (a new scribe's work as well, just as in the case of the *Shepherd*), Revelation having finished on the first column (of two) of the previous verso, quite similar to the way Acts follows John, or to the way Romans follows Jude in the same manuscript. *2 Clement* starts on the same page where *1 Clement* ends, only on the top of the second column, being similar to James in that sense, which starts on the top of the second column on the same page that the book of Acts ends. The same appears to be the

⁶⁷ On this, see BATOVIĆ, "Less-Expected Books", 47.

⁶⁸ One further insight potentially relevant for understanding the treatment received by the AF texts in Codex Sinaiticus as compared to the rest of the texts in the manuscript is provided by the corrections made in the scriptorium: if the Old Testament books — which "remain virtually uncorrected" (JONGKIND, *Scribal Habits*, 58; see also 48) — do stand in contrast with the New Testament books in that the latter group receives extensive correction in the scriptorium, the *Shepherd* together with *Barnabas* stand — at least in this regard — on the par with what we now call the New Testament. For a full treatment of Hermas' correctors in Sinaiticus, see D. BATOVIĆ "Textual Revisions of the Shepherd of Hermas in Codex Sinaiticus," *ZAC/JAC* 18 (2014) 443-470.

case with 1 Peter after James, and so on. So far as the execution of titles is concerned, while the ending of the *Shepherd* is no longer extant, and therefore a comparison of it with other endings of the same scribe is out of the question, the text of *Barnabas* is complete, and its colophon is clearly similar, in several ways, to that of Revelation (written by the same scribe). There is ample space before each colophon (six empty lines before it in the case of Revelation, four in the case of *Barnabas*); both titles are of two words and are column-centred yet stretched over three lines (one word being written on two), with additional horizontal spaces of about a line each, with the result that both titles measure about five lines in height). In both cases, there are above-and-below dashes at both ends of a line. Finally, a similarly executed *coronis* marks the end of the two works on the left side of and under their last line. The scribe clearly missed a good opportunity — in fact four — to hint at any sort of difference between the two texts. The same goes for Codex Alexandrinus: we do not have the last page of *2 Clement*, but we do have that of *1 Clement* which is very elaborate and morphologically similar to those of Kings and Chronicles, and indeed to those of all OT books written by the same scribe⁶⁹.

It seems that in none of these cases is there a formal marker to differentiate the four AF from the rest of the biblical books in the two codices, and also that many opportunities were missed to mark a difference. Not only did the scribes not write anything to say they are different from the rest (e.g. a title or explanation), but they seemed to have made the effort to ensure that these works are treated the same as others, as shown by the execution of titles and, more clearly, by the rather elaborate colophons.

The main implication of the codicological and palaeographical data is that the “appendix” terminology is, in fact, inaccurate, given that virtually any addition to a collection becomes part of that collection unless it is marked as an appendix. The four AF are therefore very much part of these collections, clearly worthy of inclusion and circulation with the rest of the books in the two codices, either as canonical or as recommended secondary books. Indeed, I would argue that the possibility that they appear in the two codices as secondary is (at least) equal to the possibility that they are canonical. My argument is based on two facts: (1) that they are seen in other points of their reception as recommended secondary books; and (2) that some of them appear in lists of

⁶⁹ For more details see BATOVICI, “Less-Expected Books”, 38-50.

books, such as in Athanasius' *Festal letter* 39 and the Muratorian Fragment, where they follow the OT and the NT. This would presuppose that in their milieu their secondary status would have been known from such lists, so that no special marking was needed. It would make the two codices scriptural collections, and not strictly canonical ones. In this regard, it is relevant that, at least in the case of Alexandrinus, it is fairly clear that it can include extra-canonical writings, unless one wishes to consider that the inclusion of Athanasius' *Epistle to Marcellinus* and Eusebius' *Hypothesis of Psalms* before the Psalms ⁷⁰ makes these Patristic writings canonical ⁷¹.

Also pointing in this direction is the second implication of the above analysis, namely that only two elements remain to indicate—in the manuscripts—a clear separation: the fact that they are, in both codices, placed toward the end of the manuscript, and the fact that *Barnabas 1* and *2 Clement* are clearly separated from the other letters in the two codices, as is the *Shepherd* from the other apocalyptic text, Revelation. Perhaps different explanations could be proposed for such a separation, for instance that the exemplars used by the scribes for transcription were smaller collections, perhaps one of the NT and another with the AF, whose order they kept while still transcribing them as canonical ⁷². Indeed, it needs to be recognized that there is nothing in the available—direct or indirect—evidence to rule out such speculations, but also that they are precisely that. As shown here, the hypothesis that they are canonical does not have support in their reception history (which points in fact in the opposite direction) beyond their simple inclusion in the codices; and at least for Alexandrinus, it is fairly clear that it can include books that are *scriptural* at best. The contrary hypothesis—that the two codices are scriptural collections that include

⁷⁰ The full list of contents in Alexandrinus is available in W.A. SMITH, *A Study of the Gospels in Codex Alexandrinus*. Codicology, Palaeography, and Scribal Hands (NTSD 48; Leiden 2014) 60.

⁷¹ This is not to say that it is impossible that they were canonical in the strict sense; in the absence of clear evidence that this is the case, it is, however, more likely that this is a scriptural or else a Canon 1 type of collection due to that.

⁷² Some may also object that the placement of a writing at the end of a composite codex does not indicate that the writing is secondary as compared to those that precede it: the Gospel of John, for example, is placed at the end of a four-gospel manuscript. I would, however, make the point precisely that the structure which is common to the two codices is a more complex one, paralleled not by a four-gospel or a Pauline letters manuscript, but indeed by tripartite canonical lists like that of Athanasius.

AF as secondary books — is allowed by their placement at the end of the codices and not with the other letters, since this arrangement finds a parallel in the tripartite lists that organise and describe Christian literature all throughout Late Antiquity.

If the present proposal be accepted, then various parallel instances emerge where the AF are included in biblical or NT manuscripts, suggesting that their presence in Sinaiticus and Alexandrinus is not an isolated event. This fact argues against the possibility that these codices present these writings, in a bold and perhaps subversive way, as canonical. For instance, the *Shepherd* still appears at the end of biblical manuscripts in Latin as late as the ninth century and even into the fifteenth⁷³, and one may suspect that in those manuscripts *Hermas* is not canonical, while the other books are⁷⁴. Similarly, *I Clement* appears in a Syriac NT manuscript of the twelfth century⁷⁵. Granted, these are quite late examples, but there may be some examples closer to the time of the two codices. In the Bibliothèque Nationale de Strasbourg there are papyrus fragments of the Epistle of James in Coptic, the Gospel of John in both Coptic and Greek, and *I Clement* in Coptic, which might have belonged to the same codex⁷⁶. Potentially even more interesting in this respect are the Akhmimic Coptic papyrus fragments in the Centrale Bibliotheek of KU Leuven which preserve several fragmentary leaves of Genesis, Luke and *Hermas* which also might have belonged to the same codex⁷⁷.

⁷³ Par.lat.1153 (Sangermanensis) of Codex Dresden A47; see C. TORNAU – P. CECCONI, eds., *The Shepherd of Hermas in Latin*. Critical Edition of the Oldest Translation Vulgata (TU 173; Berlin 2014) 13 and 16.

⁷⁴ Again, this is not to say that it is impossible that the *Shepherd* could be canonical in those manuscripts, only that at that time it is more likely that it was, in some way, scriptural.

⁷⁵ Add. MSS 1700, University Library, Cambridge. TUCKETT, *2 Clement*, 5, observes that they are “placed (without any obvious break) after the Catholic epistles (which appear here before the Pauline corpus)”.

⁷⁶ These are P. k. 362, 379, 382 and 384 (LDAB 2806). The Coptic is Akhmimic, and the manuscript was recently re-dated — based on the Greek fragments of John (P6) — to 400-450, in P. ORSINI – W. CLARYSSE, “Early New Testament Manuscripts and Their Dates: A Critique of Theological Palaeography”, *ETL* 88 (2012) 443-474, here 469.

⁷⁷ This is dated to the fourth century, but that might be problematic, given the known difficulties in dating Coptic manuscripts. On this issue, see B. LAYTON, “Towards a New Coptic Palaeography”, *Acts of the Second International Congress of Coptic Studies, Roma 22–26 September 1980* (eds. T. ORLANDI – F. WISSE) (Rome 1985) 149-158.

To conclude, Codex Sinaiticus and Alexandrinus, as scriptural collections, would indeed provide two examples of how a rule like the one in the Muratorian Fragment could have been put into practice. All texts are to be read, and nothing apparently prevents them from being included within an authoritative collection, since the different levels of authority involved can still be observed. They illustrate the circulation of secondary books in Late Antiquity as unproblematic. In turn, lists such as the Muratorian Fragment or the one in Athanasius' *Festal letter* 39 provide examples of how the implied audience of the codices might come to know that such texts are in fact of the second category, further explaining why there was no need for signalling their secondary character in the manuscript other than by grouping them at the end, as opposed to being grouped with writings of the same genre.

KU Leuven
Sint-Michielsstraat 4
Box 3101
3000 Leuven

Dan BATOVIĆI

Summary

The article offers a discussion of the significance of the presence of the Apostolic Fathers in two of our earliest biblical manuscripts: the *Epistle of Barnabas* and the *Shepherd of Hermas* in Codex Sinaiticus, and *1* and *2 Clement* in Codex Alexandrinus. It will be argued that the reception of these works does not provide support for the hypothesis that they were canonical for those who ordered the codices, and that it is more likely that they were included as recommended secondary books.