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Chapter 1

Prolegomena

The author of the text preserved in *P. Bodmer 5* is not trying to add to the New Testament canon (to whatever extent it existed at the time) but has, rather, two aims: first, to teach the hermeneutics and techniques for confirming that the Scriptures are written according to τέχνη and that the writings that would eventually constitute the canon of the New Testament are written “according to the Scriptures”; and second, to provide the knowledge and critical skills for ensuring the unaltered tradition of these texts and teachings.

Perhaps the best way of explaining how I deduced these two aims is to provide a short history of my own inquiry. I began with a problem stated in the secondary literature on the so-called *Protevangelium Iacobi*: Why does a text called “The Nativity of Mary” end with an account of “The Death of Zechariah,” given that most of the narrative seems to be about Mary? The question of the relationship between the title and the narrative directed me to the oldest extant manuscript of the text—*P. Bodmer 5*, a papyrus dating to the end of the second century AD. In *P. Bodmer 5*, the title of *PJ* reads “Τενεσις Μαριας Αποκαλυψις Ιακωβ”—four nouns (two nominatives, a genitive, and a Hebrew name), placed together without any conjunction or any other indication of a hierarchy. For a title, this form is highly

---

unusual—it is in fact unprecedented in Greek literature and unique to *P. Bodmer 5*. But it was not so much the form of the title that interested me at first: I was more puzzled by the juxtaposition of the two nouns γένεσις and ἀποκάλυψις: Why call the same work a “γένεσις” (seemingly an allusion to the book of *Genesis* and the references to the βιβλίον γενεσεως in *Genesis* and *Matthew*) and an “ἀποκάλυψις” (seemingly an allusion to the *Apocalypse* of John)?

A second, related question began to emerge when I began reading about the historical context of the time of the work’s composition. In contrast to other, seemingly comparable works of “early Christian apocryphal literature,” the Church had accepted *PJ* as tradition (παράδοσις) from early on—evidenced in the work’s significance as the earliest source for events in the life of Mary, the θεοτόκος (such as her birth to Joachim and Anna and her entrance into the temple), which are celebrated in the liturgical cycle of the Church but do not seem to be reported in any other early sources. And unlike other “apocryphal writings”—whose sole unifying characteristic seems to be an “unstable” manuscript tradition—the text of the different manuscripts of *PJ* is remarkably uniform. How was this uniformity achieved and maintained before a wider distribution of manuscripts and the audience’s increasing familiarity with the narrative through liturgical usage made major alterations of the text less and less possible?

At first, the question of the stability of the text seemed to me linked to the literary unity of the narrative. And so I began research for what I thought would be essentially a literary study, taking my start from the possibility that someone put together the two seemingly disparate parts of the narratives (one on Mary, the other on Zechariah) and
perceived and/or presented them as one—assuming this to be the function of the title and of the references in the work’s epilogue to the writing of “this historia.” *PJ* either has an original literary unity (as had been argued before by Émile de Strycker: I discuss the scholarly debate more fully in Chapter 2) or would have been read by audiences schooled in classical literary criticism with a view to finding such a unity; and I postulated that this narrative unity of *PJ* is not apparent to modern readers only because the narrative reflects an anthropology manifested in different social units, different liturgical forms, and even different calendars.

This literary approach proved only partially successful. I found links between the different parts of the narrative, but these links, while interesting, and sometimes unexpected, were far from being conclusive evidence for a tightly argued narrative, and the unifying subject matter (or argument) of the narrative remained elusive—if there indeed were any.

My perception of the text as opaque and unyielding changed when I began using (and eventually perceiving) *PJ* as an introduction to reading the writings of the Old and the New Testament (a necessary side effect of searching for the sources of paraphrases composed of phrasal and syntactical allusions) and to studying the teachings of the grammarians on subjects highlighted in *PJ* through the use of technical terminology and through allusions to classical authorities and examples.

---

2 E.g., ἱστορία (1.1, 13.1, 25.1), διπλὰ (1.1), χαρακτήρ (2.2), φωνή (2.3, 11.1, 20.4, 24.2), λόγος (11.2, 24.2), προφέρειν (3.3 *P. Bodmer 5*); ἤχειν (8.3); ἀληθῆ λέγειν (15.4, 19.1, 23.2; i.e., ἔτυμα λέγειν); ἐξηγεῖσθαι (19.3); παράδοξα (19.2, 20.4); and ἁνακεφαλαίονθαι (13.1).
PJ can be read as a commentary (ὑπόμνημα) by those familiar with ή γραμματική—familiar, that is, with the philosophical underpinnings of the art—and with a mode of instruction that requires an inquisitive, active audience, one trained in methodically searching for—and expanding and illuminating—statements that are dark or implausible because of their conciseness and their fragmentary presentation and distribution. For such a reader of PJ, there is no need for Prolegomena. The first and the last pages of all versions—and in P. Bodmer 5 also the last sentence—fill this role. But for most of us, the concepts of ή γραμματική invoked in the text through brief phrases and allusions to “canonical” (often Homeric) examples are already foreign territory.

These teachings are not “esoteric.” They are preserved in the writings of the grammarians. But the “dryness” with which these authors present much of their knowledge—brief definitions illustrated by short phrases or groups of analogies, or long lists with rules of accentuation and inflection—makes reading them a less than inviting prospect, and often seems to be meant to impede rather than to further a true understanding of what is said. Handing on teachings through definition and (syllogistic or enthymematic) demonstration is only one aspect of the various didactic methods (“διδασκαλικοὶ τρόποι” or “μέθοδοι”), however. A longer narrative can serve the same function as brief comparisons accompanying abstract definitions, while also serving as the source from which

---

3 A group of four τρόποι (identical with the four “διαλεκτικαὶ μέθοδοι”) is mentioned most often—διαιρετικός, ὁριστικός, ἀποδεικτικός, and ἀναλυτικός.
audiences can infer the (implied) proposition of the narrative’s argument⁴ or a concise, abstract definition (ὅρος, i.e., ὁρμος or ὑπογραφή) of the narrative’s subject matter.

Comments on overly skeptical or contentious audiences, combined (in philosophical exhortations and textbooks alike) with emphasis on being συνεργός of the author and actively “following along” (or even anticipating what the author will say), do suggest that classical and Late Antique authors did not expect, or even intend, that technical flaws or gaps in their arguments would remain hidden or be glossed over. This is especially likely to be the case with authors who remind their readers of their own grammatical training by incorporating technical terminology into their texts. The presence of such terminology in PJ suggests that the authors of the different versions of PJ counsel their readers to employ—in reading the passages highlighted in this way (and their parallels and analogues)—the grammatical teachings (and exegetical procedures) encapsulated in these phrases, essentially calling them to remember these teachings (definitions, precepts, and canonical examples) and to practice them with the material provided for them by the author. Questions—(which imply διαλέγεσθαι, i.e., question and answer)—or descriptions of the text or instructions concerning its completion or transformation⁵ add another dimension.

This interpretation of the function of individual phrases as guides and pointers to intertexts and common signifieds is hypothetical, since the usage of the texts and the function of references to writing (e.g., through technical terminology or metaphors), composite

quotations, different paraphrases of the same text in one source and so forth have not yet received much (if any) scholarly attention, in contrast to subjects such as literacy in antiquity, classical paideia (and the role of grammarians), conceptualization of writing (based on literary texts, but not on the writings of the grammarians themselves), or pseudonymity and pseudepigraphy, all of which are well studied. But the interpretation is supported by cumulative evidence and is a fruitful way of looking at a text that otherwise remains veiled. Looking at PJ in the light of these teachings, and with the same approach (following the cross-connections built into the text), shows the text and argument to be highly complex and intricate. PJ’s “artlessness” is carefully constructed.

I gradually began to realize the importance of γραμματική when I returned to the question of the title of P. Bodmer 5—why call the work ἄποκάλυψις, if in all the other manuscripts the only title of the work is “Nativity of Mary”? It turned out, on closer examination, that the latter is not entirely true.⁶

The question of how to divide the four nouns of the title of P. Bodmer 5 made me take a look at the papyrus itself (until then I had worked with Testuz’s diplomatic edition), to see whether there were any visual signs that would help determine the syntactical relations between the four words. The title is displayed on the first and on the last page. I noticed that on both pages, the individual components of the title are placed in alignment with other words of the text to which they are related and also positioned relative to vertical axes of the page and of the column of text (the text block’s middle and golden sections).

⁶ For a discussion of the modern title, see Chapter 2.
Alternative distributions of the text of the first and the last page of *P. Bodmer 5* that would result in even numbers of lines and syllables are possible; but such a visual “smoothing” of the text would also destroy the geometrical relations between spatially separated parts of the text, and the same holds true for incorporating additions into the text. Emendations in the margins and between lines or cross-references based on distinct spellings of words thus raise two questions concerning the tradition of a text. First, how can an author assure that exegetically relevant elements of the written text are not mistakenly corrected or otherwise altered in the process of transmission? Second, how can a scribe determine which features of the text have to be preserved and which can be adjusted (if necessary) to provide sufficient guidance for the reader, without changing what is signified—and circumscribed—by the text?\(^7\)

Determining the position of an element of a text is, in part, a mathematical problem—one that is arithmetic (emphasizing intervals) and, in the case of a written text, also geometrical (relational)—and I began entertaining the possibility that writings and the space occupied by them is perceived differently—not only one-dimensionally (linearly, with a chain-like succession of elements, as in the recitation of a text) but also two-dimensionally (like a plane), without a predetermined “course” or “direction” of reading or writing. Consequently, I began to count letters and syllables and compare the texts of the individual versions.

\(^7\) Put differently, how could a scribe or reader determine whether or not an element added to the text is a correction necessary for completing a sentence—and thus to be copied into the text or to be spoken aloud in a recitation—or a visually or spatially distinct part of the text meant to remain separate to clarify an ambiguity or highlight alternative readings?
PJ does not have a uniform title; but all manuscripts have a uniform beginning. The texts of the different manuscript versions of PJ agree, with almost no variants in longer passages of the introductory narrative, even though changes in word order would have removed ambiguities, stressed allusions, or aligned statements through parallelisms. The first of these longer, “stable” parts of the text has forty syllables, beginning in 1.1 with the words “ἐν ταῖς ἱστορίαις τῶν δώδεκα φυλῶν.”

When the text of this common introduction is arranged in lines with an equal number of syllables, the letters in lines 1-5 at the left side of the text column form an acrostic—“ἔφερε”. The verb corresponds to the stem of the composite verb προσέφερε in lines 3-4.⁸

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ven. Marc. II, 82 (A)</th>
<th>Paris gr. 1468 (E)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>λέγων</td>
<td>λέγων ἐν ἑαυτῷ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ε ἐν ταῖς ἱστορίαις τῶν δώδεκα</td>
<td>ε ἐν ταῖς ἱστορίαις τῶν δώδεκα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φ φυλῶν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ ἢν Ἰωακ</td>
<td>φ φυλῶν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ ἢν Ἰωακ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ε εἰμὶ πλουσίος σφόδρα καὶ προσέφε</td>
<td>ε εἰμὶ πλουσίος σφόδρα καὶ προσέφε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ρ ρε τὰ δώρα αὐτοῦ διπλὰ λέγων</td>
<td>ρ ρε τὰ δώρα αὐτοῦ διπλὰ λέγων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ε ἔσται τῆς περιουσίας μου παν</td>
<td>ε/ε ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἔσται τὸ τῆς περι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τὶ τῷ λαῷ καὶ τὸ τῆς ἄφεσε</td>
<td>σ σειας μου παντὶ τῷ λαῷ καὶ τὸ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ως ΚΩ εἰς ἰλασμόν ἐμοὶ ἡγιγικ</td>
<td>τ τῆς ἄφεσεως κυρίῳ τῷ θε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εν δὲ ἡ ἡμέρα κυρίου ἡ</td>
<td>ω ὁ μοι εἰς ἰλασμόν ἐμοὶ ἡγισ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μεγάλη καὶ προσέφερον οἴ v</td>
<td>-&gt; εν δὲ ἡ ἡμέρα κυρίου ἡ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ιοὶ Ἰσραήλ τὰ δώρα αὐτῶν</td>
<td>μεγάλη καὶ προσέφερον οἴ v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ιοὶ Ἰσραήλ τὰ δώρα αὐτῶν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100 syllables (10x10) 110 syllables (11x10)

In three manuscripts of PJ (Paris gr. 1454 (C), Ambr. gr. 192 (O),⁹ and 1¹⁰), “λέγων” is preceded by the prepositional phrase “κατὰ τὸ ἔθος”—“καὶ προσέφερε τὰ δώρα αὐτοῦ

---

⁸ In Paris gr. 1468, lines 1, 5, and 10 begin with the same syllable.
⁹ In O, λέγων is followed by “ἐν ἑαυτῷ” (a cross-reference through which Joachim’s offering in 1.1 is associated with his vow in 1.4 and his definition of a sign in 5.1).
διπλὰ κατὰ τὸ ἐθος λέγων.” Syntactically, the phrase limits προσφέρειν, διπλὰ, or λέγειν. The manuscripts with “κατὰ τὸ ἐθος” do not feature the acrostic “ἐφερε” characteristic of the first five lines of manuscripts with “λέγων” or “λέγων ἐν ἐαυτῷ”—the forty-first syllable (τὸ) does not include the epsilon necessary for the verb’s completion. Nevertheless, all have acrostics in the beginning(s) of the text.

Acrostics also occur in the prepositional phrase at the beginning of the stable text, with (A) and without (B) the genitive “τοῦ Ἰσραήλ”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Α 8x2</th>
<th>l</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>B 6x2</th>
<th>l</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>l</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>εὐναίσ</td>
<td>ε</td>
<td>εναίσ</td>
<td>ε</td>
<td>ε</td>
<td>ε</td>
<td>ε</td>
<td>ε</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ιστο</td>
<td>τ</td>
<td>στο</td>
<td>σ</td>
<td>σ</td>
<td>σ</td>
<td>σ</td>
<td>σ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ριαστ</td>
<td>ρ</td>
<td>ριαστ</td>
<td>ρ</td>
<td>τ</td>
<td>ρ</td>
<td>ρ</td>
<td>ρ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ωνύωδ</td>
<td>ω</td>
<td>ωνυώ</td>
<td>ω</td>
<td>ω</td>
<td>ω</td>
<td>τ</td>
<td>ω</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εκα</td>
<td>δ</td>
<td>δεκαφ</td>
<td>δ</td>
<td>φ</td>
<td>δ</td>
<td>φ</td>
<td>δ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φυλων</td>
<td>ν</td>
<td>υλων</td>
<td>ν</td>
<td>ν</td>
<td>ν</td>
<td>ν</td>
<td>ν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τοι</td>
<td>τοι</td>
<td>τοι</td>
<td>τοι</td>
<td>τοι</td>
<td>τοι</td>
<td>τοι</td>
<td>τοι</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σραηλ</td>
<td>ηλ</td>
<td>σραηλ</td>
<td>ηλ</td>
<td>η</td>
<td>η</td>
<td>η</td>
<td>η</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These acrostics are related to the text of the narrative—for example, the book of Daniel (column A, r) is represented in 1.1 through an allusion to the story of Susanna, in 18.2 through several allusions to the first part of the vision of Joseph, and in 25.1 through allusions to Nebuchadnezzar dream of the image with feet of clay (Dn 2) or the song of the three young men (Dn 3). Similarly, the nouns “ὑδωρ” (B la) and “φῶς” (B lb) occur in the body of the text (ὑδωρ in 3.2, 11.1, 16.1, 18.2; φῶς in 19.2, 22.3).

The geometrical and numerical characteristics of the different texts of PJ are suggestive of a method of ensuring the unaltered transmission of texts. They do not reveal

---

10 Ms. I is an incomplete version (ending with 23.3 [46.6]).
whether this method is unique to the authors of the different versions of PJ or has a theoretical foundation, on the basis of which the authors of the different manuscript versions of PJ could expect that readers would pay attention to features such as the layout of the text, its recitation, and the number and distribution of syllables and letters in the lines. Nor do they explain the existence of manuscript variants.

Proving that any of these observable features is intentional seemed virtually impossible, given that we do not have any explicit instructions on how to copy a text. We do find some information in authors describing their own work as editors (e.g., Galen’s edition of Hippocrates, and his comments on μεταγραφή and καλλιγράφος), or detailing individual steps in the publication of a multi-volume work (e.g., Apollonius of Perga in the preface to his Konica, or Hypsicles of Alexandria), or explaining the steps in the correction of a book for reading; mathematical principles were used by some authors for structuring their narrative, and there were readers searching for acrostics; and we do have technopaignia; but on the whole, any evidence about the practical considerations (and steps) that go into assuring the transmission of a text (or any theoretical reasons behind them) is conspicuously absent.

Still, expositions by classical grammarians on τρόποι and σχέματα (in the context of εξηγήσαςθαί and διορθοίν) and on letters (γράμματα) and writing hint that there is a

---

14 For the most recent overview, see Christine Luz, Technopaignia: Formspiele in der griechischen Dichtung, Mnemosyne Supplements 324 (Leiden: Brill, expected 2010).
“technical” basis (and reasons) for the empirically verifiable “arithmetic” (and even geometrical) characteristics of the different texts of PJ, and even for stylistic characteristics. I became aware of this when I had a closer look at other texts with a last sentence comparable to the one in P. Bodmer 5 (εἰρήνη τῶ γράφαντι καὶ τῶ ἀναγινώσκοντι).

Several other papyri end with a similar sentence as the one in P. Bodmer 5. Two of them are in the same collection as P. Bodmer 5—a copy of Melito of Sardis’ Περί Πασχα (P. Bodmer 13), and a copy of the letters of Peter (P. Bodmer 8); they begin with the same noun as the sentence in P. Bodmer 5 (εἰρήνη). Two contain school exercises—excerpts from Demosthenes’ speech Περί τοῦ στεφάνου (De corona) in the one (P. Rylands 59), writing exercises of increasing complexity in the other (P. Sorb. 826 (=P. Bouriant 1)); they begin with the adverb “εὖτεχῶς.” The two participles τῷ γράφαντι and τῷ ἀναγινώσκοντι also occur at the end of the Βίος Σεκοῦνδου Φιλόσοφου and, with μεταγράφειν instead of γράφειν, at the end of παραίνεσις λόγῳ in the Greek Λόγοι παραίνετικοι πρὸς τοὺς κατ’ Ἀἰγυπτίων μοναχοὺς of Ephraem the Syrian.

Two of these proved particularly helpful in learning how to “open” P. Bodmer 5—P. Sorb. 826 and Παραίνεσις λόγῳ. An excerpt from the first half of the preface to Babrius’s Fables in P. Sorb. 826 features a reference to a time when “καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν ζωῆν φωνῆν

---

ε[ν]αρθρον εἰχε καὶ λόγους ἡδη.” “Φωνῇ ἐναρθρος” is a technical term of γραμματική; this pointed me to related concepts (and discussions) in the writings of the grammarians.19 Ephraem’s Παραϊνεσίς λδ´ first attracted my attention because of a peculiarity of P. Bodmer 5—the text includes hardly any punctuation or breathing marks. The “speaker” of the first sentence of the παραϊνεσίς advises the reader to add marks (“σημείωσατ”).

ἀγαπητε, ἐὰν προσταχῇ σοι ἀναγνῶναι ἐν τοῖς ὠπὶ τῆς ἀδελφότητος σημείωσαι μετ’ ἀκριβείας ποῦ τετέλεκεν ὁ ἐναρξάμενος καὶ λαβὼν τὴν λέξιν 30 ἐνάρχον τῆς ἀναγνώσεως.

The infinitive “ἀναγνώναι” fleshes out this instruction through allusions to texts in the Old and New Testaments describing reading and writing; σημείωσαῖ stresses one of these in particular—the prophecy on Ariel in Isaiah, which includes a reference to a στιγμή (emphasizing reading “κατὰ διαστολήν”)21 and to sealed books and knowing γράμματα, but allusions to the reading of the book of Isaiah in Luke 4 (with an allusion to the book of Esther) and to Daniel also point to distinguishing between numbers and letters. The sentence with the two participles “ἀναγνώσκοντι” and “μεταγράφοντι” through which I became aware of this text is preceded by instructions on the ἐπιγραφή and on the στίχες of a book. Significantly, the reference to the ἐπιγραφή is preceded by a reference to the other means of identifying a work—the first words of the text (ἀρχή).

εἰ δὲ ἀρχὴ ἔστι λόγον, λέγε τὴν ἐπιγραφήν· οὐτῶ γὰρ γνωσθῆται τὸ λεγόμενον. εἰ δὲ κέκτησαι βιβλίον εὐστίχες κτῆσαι αὐτό· μὴποτε εὑρεθῇ ἐν αὐτῷ πρόσκομμα τῷ ἀναγνώσκοντι ἢ καὶ μεταγράφοντι.

Both texts directed me to expositions, in the grammarians, on the similarities and differences between γράμματα and στοιχεῖα and on speaking and assessing statements that

---

19 Especially commentaries on the Τέχνη Γραμματική of Dionysius Thrax.
20 [Longinus] Subl. 28.2.8 (on περιφρασις).
21 See Grammatici Graeci 1.1, 6.4-13.
may or may not be true. But παραίνεσις λόδι additionally raised for me the question of how
to identify the ἐπιγραφή (as reader) or attach it to the body of the text (as writer). How do
στὶχες, στὶχοι, and ἐπιγραφή provide protection (i.e., serve as φυλακῇ and τείχοι) for
the text and the reader or the writer? The search for an answer led me on the one hand to
theoretical discussions of the different exegetical headings (which include the αἱτία τῆς
ἐπιγραφῆς and the related heading of “σκοπός”) and on the other hand to the actual
beginnings of different manuscripts of PJ. One of them—Ambr. gr. 798—features an
allusion to an unexpected author.

Ambr. gr. 798 (O) is one of five versions of PJ whose beginnings include the phrase
“λόγος ἱστορικός”, and one of two among these five in which this phrase is accompanied
by a participle. In O, the first words of PJ read

λόγος ἱστορικός δηλῶν τὴν σύλληψιν καὶ ἀπότεξιν τῆς ὑπεραγίας θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας.

---

22 See Sir 34:16, 34:23. All references to the Old Testament are to the Septuagint.
24 The other manuscript with a participle as predicate of λόγος ἱστορικός is Vatic. gr. 455 (G, without 25.2-
39.9), λόγος ἱστορικός τοῦ ἔγγου Ἰακώβου ἐξεγοθεμένος ὡς τὴν ἔξ ἐπαγγελίας γέννησιν ἔσχεν ἢ
θεοτόκος καὶ περὶ τοῦ μνηστήριος αὐτῆς Ἰωσήφ. The remaining three are: Ven. Marc. 363 (12th-13th c.)
(B) λόγος ἱστορικός εἰς τὸ γενέσιον τῆς ὑπεραγίας θεοτόκου, συ[γ]γραφεῖ παρὰ Ἰακώβου τοῦ
ἀδελφοῦ τοῦ κυρίου (Like O, B is a version of PJ that includes the prepositional phrase “κατὰ τὸ ἔθος”
between λέγων and ἔσται (1.1). B is the only manuscript in which Ἰακώβος is called “ἀδελφὸς τοῦ κυριοῦ”
(see Gal 1:19)—thus defining ἱστορία and ἱστορικός through Gal 1:18 ἑστερήσαι Κηφᾶν); Paris gr. 1176
(12 or 13th c.) (N) τοῦ ἔγγου Ἰακώβου τοῦ ἀδελφοθέου λόγος ἱστορικός εἰς τὸ γενέσιον τῆς ὑπεραγίας
θεοτόκου; Vindob. theol. gr. 123 (13th–14th c.) (I) λόγος ἱστορικός εἰς τὸ γενέθλιον τῆς ὑπεραγίας
θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας; F.
25 36 syllables, 9 letters.
26 On the phrase “σύλληψις καὶ ἀπότεξις”, see St. John Chrysostomos’ comment on Mt 1:18, in Catena
repr., 1967), 10.12-14 ἡ σύλληψις παράδοξος: ἦ δὲ ἀπότεξις φυσική, συνώψει δὲ τῷ μνηστήρι ἢ
Μαρία, διὰ τὸ συνεκκαταμένος γενέσθαι τὴν γέννησιν.
27 Three of the nouns of this part of the introduction have counterparts in the body of the text—“λόγος” (11.2,
24.2), σύλληψις” (19.1), and “María” (19.2, 21.3).
These words are followed by the prepositional phrase of the “shared” (fixed) introduction and the first finite verb of the text.

The phrase “λόγος ... δηλων” occurs in several works of Aristotle,28 in the context of discussions of definition (δορος)29 and of the unity of a λόγος. Aristotle’s De Interpretatione is incorporated into the texts of all versions of PJ through the verb “ηρεμησεν” (14.1),30 placed at the beginning of a description of Joseph’s as διαλογιζομενος. This links the heading of O (1.1) to the body of the text and aligns the direct object of δηλων in 1.1 to the subject(s) pondered by Joseph in —περι ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν (suggested by an allusion to 2 Mcc 12:43 διαλογιζομενος) and to the word on who would betray him31 (through “παραδίδονς αίμα ἀθῶν,” an allusion to the betrayal of Judas). The phrase in the Analytica posteriora associates the heading of O with a definiton of βροντή—which aligns the sentence to John 12:29, or associates the writer (25.1 Ἰακώβος), through Mark 3:17, with the son of Zebedee.

The text of the heading of O does display acrostics, when the syllables are arranged in lines of equal length, which point to examples for illustrating grammatical concepts.

---

28 Arist. Int. 17a15; An. post. 93b35, 39; and Top. 153a15.
29 Commentaries on these passages explain δορος by contrasting it with ὁρισμός.
30 Arist. Int. 16b21. For two definitions of ηρεμείν, see Arist. Ph. 239a11.
Both acrostics lead to examples in Homer used in the grammarian literature for clarifying grammatical concepts. “Λιται” associate text column A with Phoenix’s description of “Prayers” in his answer to Achilles in *Iliad* 9.32

καὶ γὰρ τε λιται εἰσὶ διὸς κοὐραῖ μεγάλοιο,
χωλαὶ τε ῥυσαὶ τε παραβλώπες τ’ ὀφθαλμῶ.

Phoenix’s speech contains a line with a composite of the verb used in the Τέχνη of Dionysius Thrax for clarifying the meaning and usage of the term “γράμματα”—a composite of the verb ἕσσαι. This acrostic associates the heading of the manuscript with the sentence with the substantivized infinitive “τοῦ γράψαι τὴν ἱστορίαν ταύτην” in 25.1—through “ζωγράφεῖν”33—by pointing to an (etymological) explanation of “ζωγράφος.”34

<ζωγράφος>: Ἡθόκριτος, Ὑποί ζωογράφοι τάκριβεα γράμματ’ ἐγραφαν. οὕχ ὅτι γράμματι χρῆται, ἀλλ’ ὅτι τῇ γραφίδι προσκαταξεῖ. γράφαι γὰρ τὸ ἔσσαι. οὐκ ἔχει δὲ τὸ ἑ ἐπιστρεψάμενον. ἐστὶ γὰρ ζωον ζῶον μουρόγραφος.

Through the allusion to Aristotle in the horizontal lines, the acrostic “νηῦς” in the vertical line of column B points to the examples illustrating metaphor and “tongue”

33 See 4 Mcc 17:7, 2 Mcc 2:29.
34 E.g., *EM* 412.51–55.
(γλῶσσα) in Aristotle’s Poetics. The acrostic associates the heading with a discussion of μέρη λέξεως.

This manner of drawing on examples and combining them to define an unstated signified corresponds to a form of teaching “χωρίς ὁρων” (ἀνάλυσις instead of διάρεισις). A demonstration of this method is given by Galen in Book Four of his “Περὶ διαφορὰς σφυγμῶν” (a book ending with a reference to Aristotle’s Analytica).

Galen begins his exposition on ποιεῖν διδασκαλίας “χωρίς ὁρων” with a comparison between the indicating of τὰ σημαινόμενα τῶν ὄνομάτων (μέρη λέξεως) by “παλαιοὶ” and the clarifying (σαφηνίζειν) of phrases (λέξεις) by γραμματικοί (ἐξ ἐτέρας).

αὐτοὶ μὲν γὰρ οἱ παλαιοὶ χωρίς ὁρων ἐποιοῦντο τὰς διδασκαλίας, ἐνδεικνύοντο τὰ σημαινόμενα τῶν ὄνομάτων ὃν ἔλεγον αὐτὴ τῇ κατὰ τὴν ἐρμηνείαν ἴδεα, καθ’ ἢν δηλοῦτοι καὶ τὰς παρ’ Ὀμήρῳ λέξεις ἀπασί τε τοῖς ἄλλοις παλαιοῖς οἱ γραμματικοὶ σαφηνίζοντο. τὸ γὰρ τῇ ἐρμηνείᾳ μὴν σαφὲς ἐξ ἐτέρας εὔδηλον γίνεται, καθάπερ ἐπὶ τοῦ πίσυρας, ἐν μὲν γὰρ τῷ πίσυρες ἐραίχειν ἐπὶ πιστεύει τὰ σαφὲς οὐδὲν τὸ σημαινόμενον ἔστιν, ἐν μὲν γὰρ τῷ ἐνθὲν τέσσαρα μὲν σάκε ἐλλον, δούρατα δ’ ὀκτὼ, καὶ πίσυρας κυνέας, εὔδηλον ἐγένετο. τεττάρων γὰρ ὄντων τῶν καθοπλιξόμενων, ὑστερῷ σάκη τέσσαρα λαβεῖν αὐτοῦς φήσων, οὕτω καὶ περικεφαλαίας τέσσαρας.

Bound together by ἐν τῷ, agreement in case, number, and gender, and through juxtaposition, and paralleled to a line from Homer’s other work (ἐν ... τῷ ἐνθὲν ..., καὶ πίσυρας κυνέας’), the three words πίσυρας, ἐραίχειν, and ἰπποῦ suggest that the first phrase illustrating the usage of “πίσυρας” is a quotation of the second half of a verse in Iliad

35 See Arist. Poet. 1457b10.
37 See Galen, De differentia pulsuum, 764-65.
38 Galen, De differentia pulsuum, 715.11-716.6.
39 See Od. 22.110-11 ἐνθέν τέσσαρα μὲν σάκε ἐξελε, δούρατα δ’ ὀκτὼ / καὶ πίσυρας κυνέας χαλκήρεας ἰπποδασείας.
23. The selected verse\(^{40}\) belongs to the account of Achilles’ placing the dead Patroclus on the funerary pyre; it is the numerical middle (the seventh of thirteen lines) of a segment of the narrative framed by two prepositional phrases with 'έν.\(^{41}\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{έν δὲ πυρὶ ὑπάτῃ νεκρὸν θέσαν ἀχνύμενοι κήρ} \\
pολλὰ δὲ ἱφία μήλα καὶ εἰλίποδας ἐλικός βοῦς \\
pρόσθε πυρὶς ἐδερὸν τε καὶ ἄμφητον· ἐκ δ’ ἁρα πάντων \\
ὅμου ἔλων ἐκάλυψε νέκυις μεγάθυμος Ἀχιλλεύς \\
ἐς πόδας ἐκ κεφαλῆς, περὶ δὲ δρατὰ σώματα νήμη. \\
ἐν δ’ ἐτίθει μέλιτος καὶ ἀλέιφατος ἄμφιφορή, \\
pρὸς λέχεα κλίνων· πίσυρας δ’ ἐραύγενας ἱπποὺς \\
ἔσομένως ἐνέβαλε πυρὶ μεγάλὰ στεναχίζων \\
ἐννέα τῷ γε ἄνακτι τραπεζῆς κύνες ἤσαν \\
καὶ μὲν τὸν ἐνέβαλε πυρὶ δύο δειροτομήσας \\
dῶδεκα δὲ Τρώων μεγαθύμων νιέας ἑσθολός \\
χαλκὸς δημών· κακὰ δὲ φρεσὶ μηδέτερ έργα· \\
ἐν δὲ πυρὸς μένος ἦκε σιδήρεον, ὅφα νέμοιτο
\end{align*}
\]

The passage centering on the verse with πίσυρας\(^{42}\) has two immediate parallels (based on cross-references through diction)—the washing, anointing, and covering of Patroclus with a soft linen cloth, followed by his being placed on a couch, which is recounted in 18.343–67, and the preservation of Hector’s flesh by Aphrodite and Apollo, recounted in 40. Il. 23.171.

\(^{40}\) Il. 23.171.

\(^{41}\) Repetition of the preposition ‘έν with the verb πιθέναι (II. 165, 70) suggests an additional division of the text into two equally long parts (six and a half lines, 23.165–71 (100 syllables) and 171–77 (104 syllables)).

\(^{42}\) The number of the types of offerings placed by Achilles on the pyre or cast into it is the same (‘μέλιτος καὶ ἀλέιφατος ἄμφιφορή, ἐραύγενες ἱπποί, τραπεζῆς κύνες, and Τρώων μεγαθύμων νιέας ἑσθολός’). ‘ἵπποι,” in “πίσυρες ἐραύγενες ἱπποί” (I. 171), is the only noun modified by two adjectives in the same case; πίσυρες, interpreted as a numeral, is the first of four numerals in the account (the other three are ἐννέα in I. 173, δύο in I. 174, and δῶδεκα in I. 175) and the only one that is inflected (and declinable) (acc. pl.). But since two of the numerals apply to one category (κύνες [or νιέας]), bound together as a sum (deduction), and ἐννέα can limit either μεγάλα or νιέας, it is unclear for at least one category how many were placed on or cast into the pyre (and for the three others the number of those who were not slain). At first glance, it is the number of ἄμφιφορή that has to become “ἐξ ἐτέρας εὔδηθον” (as Galen puts it). The genitives μελίτος καὶ ἀλείφατος suggest that there is an even number of jars (stressing καὶ), a different jar for either liquid—provided that μελίτος does modify ἄμφιφορής (which is not necessarily the case). But it is also possible that πίσυρας (I. 171) modifies ἄμφιφορής (I. 170) (through ὑπερβατόν) since the adjective is in agreement with the last word of either line—ἄμφιφορής in line 170, ἱπποὺς in line 171. In this case (supported by a parallelism between μελίτος καὶ ἀλείφατος ἄμφιφορής ... πίσυρας and Τρώων μεγαθύμων νιέας ἑσθολός) the category without a number (but like ἄμφιφορής and νιέας with an adjective) is ἱπποί, not ἄμφιφορής.
The three passages are connected through Achilles’ vow in 18.333–42, until the fulfillment of which Patroclus lies at the side of the beaked ships.

In *Iliad* 23.170, the words cited by Galen in the nominative are in the accusative case. But they are also represented in the nominative in Homer, although not together as in the line in *Iliad* 23—“πίσυφες” occurs two times in the *Odyssey* (in addition to the verse quoted by Galen); “ἐριαύχενας ἵππους” occurs one time in the *Iliad*. This division of the two phrases reflects the division of the words in *Iliad* 23 through the particle “δέ”.

The phrase “ἐριαύχενας ἵππους” (in the nom.) associates the funeral scene with a description of Agamemnon in *Iliad* 11. By combining the two passages (the one represented through the substantivized phrase “τό ...” with the three elements, the other through the nominative), Galen—or the author of his example—suggests that Patroclus corresponds to a “desired charioteer,” and draws a comparison between Agamemnon and the fire.

---

43 See Il. 18.333-43 γυν δ’ ἐπει οὖν, Πάτροκλε, σε ὑπεροσ εἰμ’ ὑπὸ γαῖαν / οὐς σε πρὶν κτερὼ, πρίν γ’ Ἐκτὸς τοῦ ἐνθάδ’ ἐνείκα / τεύχεα καὶ κεφαλήν, μεγαθύμον σείο φοιής / δόδεκα δὲ προπάροιθε πυρῆς ἀποδιορομῆσαι / Τρῶν ἀγλα ἀπάντη, σθένει κταμένου χολῳθείς: / τόφρα δὲ μοι παρὰ ἤρωι κορωνίς κείσαι αὕτως, / ἀμβί δὲ σε Τρώα καὶ Δαιρανίδες βαθυκόλται / κλαύσονται νύκτας τε καὶ ἠματα δάκρυ χέουσαι, / τάς αὐτοὶ καμόμεσθα βιβήτι τε δουρί τε μακρῷ, / πιέρας πέρθουντε πόλεις μερόσων ἀνθρώπων.

44 See Il. 18.338.

45 See Od. 5.70-71 κρήναι δ’ ἔξεις πίσυφες ζέουν ὑδατι λευκῷ, / πληρίει αὖληλὼν τετραμένην Ἀλλιδῆς ἄλη, 16.249 ἐκ δὲ Σάμῃ πίσυφές τε καὶ Εἴκοσι φῶτες ἔσαιν.

46 See Il. 11.151.

47 Il. 11.147–62 τοὺς μὲν ἐαρ’ ὑδ’ δὴ τελείαν κλωνότοα φαλαγγεσ, / τῇ ῥ’ ἔνφορου’, ἀμα δ’ ἂλλοι ἐκδονύμιδες Ἀχαιοὶ, / πεζοὶ μὲν πεζοὺς δέλχον φεύγουσιν ἀνάγκη / ἱππεῖσ δ’ ἱππήσας, ὑπὸ δὲ σφαιρὸ / ὅρτο κούσῃ / ἐκ πεδίου, τὴν ὄροσ’ ἐρτύδουσι πόδες ἱππων, / χαλκῷ δημώντες, / ἀτὰρ κρέων Ἀγαμέμνονοι / αἰεν ἀποκτείσθ’ ἐπε τ’ Αργείως καλεύομε, / ὥς δ’ ὅτε πῦρ ἀδήλην ἐν ἀξίλῳ ἐμπέσῃ ὡλῃ, / πάντ’ς τ’ εἰληφὼν ἀνείμος φέρει, οἱ δὲ ταῦμαι / πρόρρειζοι πίπτουσιν ἐπέγραμμοι πυρὸς ὀρμή: / ὡς ἀρ’ ὑπ’ Ἀτρείδη Ἀγαμέμνοι πίπτε κάρμνα / Τρῶων φευγόντων, πολλοὶ δ’ ἐριαύχενες ἱππαῖ / κεῖν’ ὁγεα κραστάλων ἀνά πολέμου χεῦρας, / ἥρωις ποθόντες ἀμύμονας: οἱ δ’ ἐπί γαῖῃ / κείσοτο, γύπεσαι πολὺ φιλτροι ἢ ἀλλόχοισιν.
The meaning of “πίσυρες,” in the line selected from the *Odyssey*, is not clarified through the words of the quotation, but derived enthymematically from a combination of the items taken by Telemachus from the storeroom and by the list of men for whom they are meant (together with the number of items per person). Galen highlights several words in *Odyssey* 22 through his own interpretation (paraphrase) of individual “tongues” (γλώσσαι), for example by rendering τεύχειν as καθοπλίζειν and κυνέα as περικεφαλαία. Through links in the narrative, the adjective “πίσυρες” in the description of Calypso’s cave (*Od. 5*) points to ξύσαι (i.e., γράψαι). Associated with old age and death, and with losing strength, this then provides a comment on the narrative in *Iliad* 23.

This method of combining phrases in one statement requires preserving the exact form and sequence of the individual phrases.

*PJ* has not fared well with modern, scholarly readers (see Chapter 2). This is certainly also the case because we are not trained to search for—or pay attention to—elements of the text included by the authors of the different versions to assist the reader in assessing the quality of the copy, identifying the main reference works, and determining its subject matter, or in expanding “concise” sentences. The author of *PJ* points to the concepts related to γράμματα and στοιχεῖα by referring to ἰστορία (discussed in Chapter 3). Ἰστορία is linked to the correction of texts (διόρθωσις) and to ἀνάλυσις; this is a point particularly stressed in *P. Bodmer 5* (Chapter 4). The references to ἰστορία in *PJ* lead to sentences problematizing authorship and the identification of sources through headings or descriptions of the content or to passages with grammatical concepts; in both categories, the selected sources connect as intertexts the individual statements with the term ἰστορία to each
other. Even inconspicuous elements of the text, such as the seemingly generic endings, function as reminders of grammatical teachings and as commentaries on Scriptural examples of reading and writing (Chapter 5).
Chapter 2

Author and Text

The text that is now called the *Protevangelium Iakobi* (*PJ*),\(^{48}\) and usually dated to the period between the last quarter of the second and the beginning of the third centuries AD, is ascribed to a James (῾Ιάκωβος),\(^{49}\) identified in the individual manuscripts either as James the Apostle\(^{50}\) or as “ὁ ἀδελφὸς τοῦ θεοῦ”,\(^{51}\) the archbishop of Jerusalem.\(^{52}\) Distinct ruptures in the flow of the narrative, marked by abrupt changes in style and narrative focus, would suggest to any reader—especially one schooled in classical literary theory—that the text must have had other authors besides James. Yet, despite possible doubts about the specifically apostolic authorship of the treatise, *PJ* has been declared “apocryphal” only in the West;\(^{53}\) in the Eastern churches, it appears to have been accepted relatively soon after its composition as part of Scriptural tradition (*παράδοσις*) in a technical (grammatical) sense.

\(^{48}\) The title is not original. Introduced by G. Postel (1510-81), it appears for the first time in M. Neander’s edition of the Greek version, published by him as an appendix to his *Catechesis Martini Lutheri parva graecolatina* (Basle, 1564), 356-92.

\(^{49}\) See Mss G, H, F\(^b\), R 1.1. For a list of sigla, see É. de Strycker, *La forme la plus ancienne du Proévangile de Jacques: Recherches sur le papyrus Bodmer 5, avec une édition critique du texte Grec et une traduction annotée* (Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1961), 30-35.

\(^{50}\) See Mss P, M 1.1.

\(^{51}\) See Mss A, D, N 1.1. James is called “brother of the Lord” only once, in Ms B.

\(^{52}\) See Mss A, P 1.1.

\(^{53}\) See *Decretum Gelasianum* (*PL* 59.162A), where an “Evangelium nomine Iacobi Minoris, apocryphum” is listed in the “notitiae librorum apocryphorum qui non recipiuntur”.
The acceptance of *PJ* by the Church, evidenced by its liturgical and iconographical influence along with the attribution of the work to Ἰάκωβος and the tradition of the text in its extant form, indicates that *PJ* as a whole was judged to be the genuine work and word of the apostle despite the seemingly strong evidence to the contrary. Additionally, the events and persons were considered worthy of memory, and the writing useful. This raises the question: Why was *PJ* originally recognized as part of the apostolic tradition while other seemingly comparable works were not?

**PJ and Early Christian Literature**

By the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, scholars had become more skeptical, not only about *PJ*’s apostolic origin but also about other aspects of the text. Cullmann categorized the work as an apocryphal “infancy gospel,”54 Van Stempevoort as a Christian midrash.55 Their positions are reflections of a still prevalent view: first, that *PJ* is a New Testament ἀπόκρυφον, whose author rewrites the canonical infancy stories, expanding the material given in *Matthew* and *Luke* by adding (largely ‘legendary’) material about the conception, birth, and education of Mary; and second, that the author was just trying to put before the eyes of the “simple faithful” God’s miraculous interventions in history and to satisfy their curiosity about Mary, a person about whom the canonical gospels say comparatively little. According to this view, then, no aspiration towards doctrinal teaching

---

could really be imputed to the author. Nevertheless, the text does have a theological (apologetic) dimension: the emphasis on Mary’s perpetual virginity indicates that the author was responding to Jewish anti-Christian polemics and to intra-Christian debates in the second half of the second century AD.

This now traditional view of the text can be challenged in several ways. One may question the usefulness of the category “New Testament apocrypha” for describing such treatises: one may support the trend that sees *PJ* as a Christological rather than a Mariological work, or one may argue against referring to it as an “infancy gospel” in the first place.\(^56\) *PJ* defies the notion that “apocryphal Christian literature” should be defined by an unordered and irregular transmission of the texts in the absence of any canonizing authority.\(^57\) Even in contrast to other “apocryphal” writings, the work’s manuscript tradition is remarkably uniform. There are only two versions—one shorter (represented by the manuscript that I am discussing—*P. Bodmer 5*) and one longer, which includes Joseph’s vision and Salome’s prayer, and is more or less the text of the other extant manuscripts. Thus, *PJ*’s comparatively stable and burgeoning manuscript tradition makes it difficult to maintain that the treatise is “apocryphal” in this sense.

The uniformity of the later manuscript tradition may be explained by the Church’s liturgical commemoration of both the birth and the presentation of Mary, which can be traced


\(^{57}\) É. Junod, “La littérature apocryphe chrétienne constitue-t-elle un object d’études?” *Revue des études anciennes* 93 (1991): 397-414 at 404. In defining what constitutes an *apokrupphon*, Junod does not specify whose authority warrants that a written text is handed on without alterations. The context suggests that he thinks of an institutionalized (regulated) system of text production.
back to the sixth century.\textsuperscript{58} \textit{PJ} happens to be the only earlier source that mentions the events celebrated in these festivals. We have at least, therefore, a sixth-century testimony to the work’s acceptance—and therefore preservation—by the Church. But this does not explain why \textit{PJ} might have been recognized, either then or earlier, as the work of an apostle. Seemingly comparable works of early “Christian apocryphal literature”\textsuperscript{59} were not so well regarded.

Certainly, \textit{PJ} was not preserved solely because it presented information about Mary seemingly found nowhere else (at least not in the same detail) or because its attribution to an apostle and disciple made the work valuable in itself and mandated that the work be handed on without corruption. At the time when \textit{PJ} was composed and began to circulate, there were other Christian apocryphal writings whose authors, claiming to be apostles, “disclosed” to their audiences information about the events and characters found in the Scriptures or revealed words of the Lord, hitherto known only to a few. Yet these texts did not enjoy the same long-lasting liturgical influence as \textit{PJ} nor were they transmitted in unaltered fashion—if in fact they were transmitted at all.

**Apostolic Attribution**

\textit{PJ}’s attribution is especially surprising since the narrator really makes no claim to being an apostle. That \textit{PJ} is the work of James, one of the twelve, or perhaps even of James

\textsuperscript{58} On the early history of the feasts of the Nativity of Mary and of her Entry into the Temple, see A. P. Jou nel, “The Veneration of Mary”, in A. G. Martimort \textit{et al.}, \textit{The Church at Prayer}, vol. 4, \textit{The Liturgy and Time}, new ed. (Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1986), 130-50 (esp. 130f.).

\textsuperscript{59} For a definition, see Junod, “La littérature apocryphe chrétienne,” 401-8.
the Just, the “brother of the Lord,” is simply suggested by the writer’s name—“‘Ιάκωβος,” by a statement locating the writing of “this historia” in Jerusalem at the time of the death of Herod, and by an “apostolic” greeting—all in the last chapter of the work. While none of these features is conclusive evidence for Iakobos’ identity, a syntactical parallelism between the referent of an oracular response in 24.4 [48.13]—ostensibly Symeon the Elder 60—and this ‘Ιάκωβος (25.1 [49.1-2]) could give some credence to the attribution of P. Bodmer 5 to James the Just. An implied comparison suggests that the oracular response with which the narrative ends concerns not only Symeon but also ‘Ιάκωβος; implicitly, ‘Ιάκωβος is thereby described as a person who, like Zechariah’s successor, saw “the Christ of the Lord” 61 and was chosen by lot for Zechariah’s place.

P. J’s James does not claim to be an apostle, however: he introduces himself merely as a “‘Ιάκωβος”—a “son (descendant) of ’Ιακώβ”—without adding any other epithet, quite unlike the way in which the author of the letter of James introduces himself (‘Ιάκωβος θεοῦ καὶ κυρίου ’Ιησοῦ Χρίστου δοῦλος) 62 or Paul refers to James in the letter to the Galatians (‘Ιάκωβος ὁ ἀδελφὸς τοῦ κυρίου). 63 Nor does he compare himself to Symeon. A relationship between Symeon and Iakobos is suggested merely by the proximity of their names in the manuscript, and the applicability of the χρησμός to both Symeon and James, the apostle. But this connection is tenuous, since the epilogue is not firmly attached to the narrative—for example, it does not contain any information (at least none that is immediately apparent) that clearly identifies “ἡ ἱστορία αὕτη”, written in Jerusalem (25.1 [49.2-3]), as

60 See Lk 2:22-35. All references to the New Testament are to the Mehrheitstext.
62 Jas 1:1.
63 Gal 1:19.
The narrative that begins in 1.1 [1.3-4] with the words “Joachim was a very rich man” and ends in 24.4 [49.1] with the falling of the lot on Symeon. Thus, based on the information in the epilogue alone, the traditional attribution of PJ to an apostle, let alone to James the Just, seems to be conjecture rather than certainty.

**The Modern View**

The question of PJ’s attribution and the meaning of references to “παράδοσις” in early testimonies to the text has received relatively little attention in modern scholarship on PJ. The main focus has been on reconstructing the Redaktionsgeschichte (and the date) and on determining the subject matter and models of the work (e.g., the relationship to midrash⁶⁴ or to the classical novel⁶⁵). In the modern secondary literature, the question of PJ’s author is closely tied to that of the genesis of the written text.

**The Genesis of the Text**

Three main theories on the composition of PJ have been proposed in the last one hundred years. At the heart—and beginning—of the scholarly debate is what Émile de Strycker called the “theory of three documents,”⁶⁶ that is, Harnack’s suggestion that the text of PJ (known to him only in its longer version) consists of three originally independent

---


documents strung together by a redactor in the middle of the fourth century AD. These documents are what Harnack calls a *Nativity of Mary* (chapters 1-17); an *Apocryphum Josephi* (chapters 18-20; in *P. Bodmer 5* in an abbreviated form); and an *Apocryphum Zachariae* (chapters 22-24)—each of which centers on a different protagonist (Mary, Joseph, and Zechariah, respectively).\(^67\) Except for de Strycker, who argues for *PJ*’s original unity (he maintains that most of *PJ* was composed at the same time),\(^68\) most scholars have adopted Harnack’s view, although with slight adjustments to take into account the differences between the “longer” and the “shorter” version of *PJ*, which became available with the publication, in 1958,\(^69\) of *P. Bodmer 5*, so far the oldest extant manuscript of *PJ*. The chapters Harnack assigned to the *Apocryphum Josephi* are now widely held to be part of the *Nativity of Mary* (chapters 1-20),\(^70\) while chapters 22-24 continue to be considered a (more or less) separate narrative revolving around the murder of Zechariah.

The addition of chapters 18-20—the story of the Nativity in the cave—to Harnack’s *Nativity of Mary* is not accepted unanimously,\(^71\) mainly because the genesis of *PJ*’s text is no longer seen as the composition of a text from independent treatises (Harnack’s suggestion), but as the gradual expansion of a basic document comprising either chapters 1-17 or chapters

---


\(^{71}\) See É. de Strycker, *La forme la plus ancienne du Protévangile de Jacques* (Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1961), 393.
1-20. Even though this new conception of the redaction of PJ constitutes an (at least partial) departure from the theory of the three documents, Harnack’s partition still influences the interpretation of PJ, since many scholars continue to define the boundaries of each of PJ’s individual parts based on whomever they consider to be that part’s main protagonist. With few exceptions, the person held to unify, and thus delimit, PJ’s basic document is Mary—an interpretation that suggests itself, considering that a reference to Mary (her proper name and/or a title) appears in the headings of all of PJ’s manuscripts.

Whether PJ’s hypothetical core document includes or excludes chapters 18-20 depends to a large degree on how individual scholars evaluate Mary’s role in PJ’s basic narrative. Read mariologically, PJ’s core document is a “Life of Mary,” an encomium exalting Mary’s purity for apologetic reasons; consequently, it ends with chapter 17. Read Christologically, the document includes chapters 18-20, since only then does the “Mary narrative” (chapters 1-17) build up to—and culminate in—the description of the events in and at the cave.

---

72 See Cullmann, “The Protevangelium of James”. Although chapter 16 would seem to be a more logical conclusion of the “Mary narrative” (chapter 17 begins with an allusion to the beginning of the infancy story in Luke), Harnack included chapter 17 in his Genesis Marias, because the diction changes in chapter 18 from the third to the first person. Chapters 18-20 also have in common that the reported events take place at the same location (the cave) and that the midwives are present.

73 De Strycker, Le Protévangile de Jacques: Problèmes critiques et exégétiques, 351-2. In his argument for PJ’s original unity de Strycker stresses that the account of the “Nativity in the cave” is a logical continuation of this hagiographical “Life of Mary;” but he also makes it clear that he believes that the author of PJ is primarily interested in Mary, not in Jesus (354).

The method of assessing a narrative’s unity by the presence (or absence) of a main character is used not only for delimiting a text, but also for singling out sections thought to belong to other narratives—or considered to be narratives in their own right—since they revolve around persons other than the perceived main protagonist. *PJ* 22-24 is such a “foreign” element: the chapters are set apart from the preceding narrative by a different main protagonist and a changed theme—the narrative no longer centers on the Nativity at the cave but on Herod’s murder of Zechariah. Both Harnack and the supporters of the theory of an additive composition of *PJ* conclude from this break in the narrative that the story of the murder of Zechariah, told in chapters 22-24, was added to an already existing, independent document. But they disagree on when these texts were merged: according to Harnack, chapters 22-24 and two other independent treatises were joined together at the same time (resulting in the longer version of *PJ*); according to his opponents, these chapters were attached to an independent, rudimentary version of *PJ* some time after it had come into existence. The latter group is divided by its stance on the validity of Harnack’s view on chapters 22-24: while one side maintains that the story of the murder of Zechariah already circulated as an independent treatise before it was added to equally independent works, the other conceives of it as a new account, composed of material taken from existing Zechariah traditions and written as a continuation of *PJ*’s original narrative.

For the most part, the notion underlying both theories—namely that the murder of Zechariah, recounted in chapters 22-24, is not an integral part of the narrative in chapters 1-20—has not been seriously challenged. A noteworthy exception is the suggestion that *PJ*
had an “original redactional unity,” a thesis de Strycker presented first in 1961\textsuperscript{75} and then again in 1964.\textsuperscript{76} On both occasions, de Strycker argued that the longer of PJ’s two extant versions represents the work’s original (that is, its “oldest”) form and that PJ had not been composed in stages but at a distinct point in time. What makes this theory stand out against the other two reconstructions of PJ’s redaction history is not de Strycker’s insistence that PJ as a whole was created at the same time, but rather his claim that the entire narrative, and not just chapters 22-24, was a newly written and unified work.

De Strycker defends this view by arguing that Harnack’s three documents are interconnected building blocks of the same narrative—which rules out the notion that they were at one time autonomous. The individual parts of the narrative are interrelated in two ways—by imitation of plot; and by central character (Mary). The narrative adheres, from chapter 10 on, to the story-line(s) of the canonical infancy gospels—from the annunciations of the births of John (10.2) and Jesus (11.1-3; 14.2), through the Nativity, to the Presentation in the Temple (implied in 21.1 and 24.4). The order in which the events of the narrative are arranged follows the sequence of events in the canonical infancy gospels: this suggests that PJ’s seemingly separate parts are linked. De Strycker acknowledges that there are two narratives in PJ, one encompassing chapters 1 to 20 and centering on Mary, the other consisting of chapters 21 to 24 and revolving around Zechariah. But he stresses that what Harnack considered to be separate narratives—the Apocryphum Iosephi (chapters 18-20; in P. Bodmer 5 in an abbreviated form) and the Apocryphum Zachariae (chapters 22-24)—are part of a larger whole, a narrative in which a group, consisting of Jesus, Mary, and Joseph,

\textsuperscript{75} See de Strycker, \textit{La forme la plus ancienne du Protévangile de Jacques}, 392-404.
Their journey from the cave (17.1-3), into Judea (21.1), and eventually to Jerusalem (implied by 24.4), redirects the focus of the narrative from the Nativity (chapters 17-20) to the Presentation in the Temple (implied by 24.4).

**Implied Author and Audience**

All three modern theories on the creation of *PJ* reflect the same opinion about the person who assembled and completed its text, judging him by *PJ*'s perceived shortcomings as a narrative. The writer who is implied—as a redactor—by the theories that describe *PJ* as a composite of three or two narratives did not select texts that fit the theme and plot indicated by the title and content of the original “Nativity of Mary.” He chose narratives centered on persons that appear in the original text (Joseph and Zechariah) and arranged them in chronological sequence, but did not sufficiently connect these building blocks to create a coherent whole. As the author of a conclusion to an already existing narrative, the writer failed to “fill out” the narrative outlined in the title and bring the original narrative to a logical conclusion. Finally, as the author of an entirely new narrative, *PJ*’s writer did not prepare the end in advance, was verbose—since he added a long excursus without clear connection to the rest of the narrative—and ended abruptly.

This view of *PJ* and its author implies that the story’s first audiences received favorably the work not primarily because of any independently verifiable (i.e., demonstrable) historicity of the reported events, or its cogent plot, or a convincing argument supported by

---

proofs (e.g., from Scripture). Rather, they believed in the historicity of the writer and considered his name and the information about the circumstances under which he wrote sufficient to guarantee the truthfulness of the account—which otherwise would be implausible, contradictory, and unattested—or (leaving aside the question of historicity) they judged the story to provide useful (edifying) teachings on virtue.

The modern notion that PJ was copied and became more widely known despite the limited (and ambiguous) information about the author found in the treatise and despite the apparent inconsistencies and exaggerations marring the narrative rests on two—more or less unquestioned—assumptions about PJ’s early reception. First, the narrative’s audiences consistently overlooked (consciously or unconsciously) those elements of this “mixed” account—composed of traditional and new material (invented or of recent memory)—that challenged seeing the work as a truthful (objective) historical narrative or a fictional account exalting virtuous individuals. Second, the individuals who received and commissioned copies of PJ used less exacting standards in their study and criticism of the text \(^{78}\) than many of their contemporaries would have done in similar situations—whether they were like the Athenians in Acts \(^{79}\) interested in hearing of a new teaching or like the members of the synagogue in Beroea searching the Scriptures to see whether it was as Paul said. \(^{80}\)

There were certainly some—perhaps even many—among those who encountered the story at an early stage in its life who were quick to believe that what they heard was either

---


\(^{79}\) See Acts 17:17-21.

\(^{80}\) Acts 17:11.
true or false. But that the preservation of the text of *PJ* in its extant forms resulted from—and depended on—a consistently uncritical reading of the narrative by its audiences, as the modern view of the work suggests, seems highly unlikely in the cultural and educational context of the second and third centuries AD—not least because the modern view that *PJ*’s author is wanting as writer and as exegete runs counter to the assertion that he wrote for didactic or apologetic reasons.

Any author writing in the period could expect (and thus anticipate) that his execution of compositional and exegetical (technical) tasks would undergo close scrutiny—indepently of the audience or purpose for which he wrote. Systematic criticism of a narrative was not the prerogative of a small group of highly educated individuals. Students began to acquire the skills necessary for assessing the qualities of texts like *PJ* as narratives already at a relatively early stage of their education, through “προγυμνάσματα” in the schools of the grammarians.81 These preliminary exercises prepared the student for the composition and critical assessment of narratives in the schools of the rhetoricians,82 where

---

81 Contemporary treatises written on the preliminary exercises (προγυμνάσματα) show that students, after learning how to paraphrase and to compose fables (μυθόλογοι) and narratives (διηγήματα), advanced to the exercises of refutation (ἀνασκέψεις) and confirmation (κατασκέψεις) of narratives (e.g., fables or myths) and “fictional” elements in historical accounts (on the latter, see Quint. *Inst.* 2.4.19). In gathering their material for ἀνασκεψη and κατασκεψη, the students learned to employ headings (κεφάλαια). With the material thus found, they were to argue for or against a narrative by discussing its brevity (συντομία), clarity (σαφήνεια), and credibility (πιθανότης) with respect to as many of its “elements” (e.g., action, person, time, location) as possible.

narratives were composed, refuted (those of the opponent) and defended (one’s own) as part of the composition of (mostly) juridical or deliberative speeches.\(^{83}\)

In both contexts, practice in composition was accompanied by training in evaluating examples (παραδείγματα) illustrating the precepts of the art. Guided by the teacher in their study of authoritative examples, the students learned not only to search for and discover violations of an established standard but also to determine the reasons for these perceived ἀμαρτήματα. Authors who included in their own works material from other written sources thus subjected themselves to two types of criticism: they were evaluated both as exegetes and judges of stylistic and argumentative models and as writers who selected and placed their material where they considered it most useful for attaining an argumentative goal.\(^{84}\)

From the point of view of classical rhetorical theory a work’s didactic and apologetic effectiveness hinges more on such technical aspects—and on the skill of the reader (reciter)—than on what audiences may or may not know about its actual author. What counts argumentatively is the ethical, not the actual character of the speaker—that is, the ὑθος created in and through the λόγος of which the narrative is a part, since a listener’s perception of the knowledgability and trustworthiness (i.e., virtue) of an author—while influenced (positively or negatively) by

---

83 In speeches, the narrative prepares the argumentation by describing crucial proofs in a manner later exploited in the argumentation. (Standard examples are the stories of the death of Ajax (see RhetHer) and the death of Clytemnestra.)

84 If PJ’s author aimed at defending the antiquity of the Christian religion against “pagans” while distancing himself from Gnostics and their myths, he had to show rhetorical versatility and demonstrate knowledge of teachings since this task requires a re-interpretation of the history of the past and explanation of μυστήρια; knowledge of γραμματική and of the law is necessary to argue against Marcionites and Jews (which requires defending an exegetical method for “opening” the Scriptures).
preconceived views on author or subject matter—also results from the author’s argumentation and utilization of proofs (including the interpretation of testimonies and his character and πάθος).

References to PJ by authors such as Origen of Alexandria and Epiphanius of Salamis indicate that the work was used in discussions of theological questions. “Hostile” or “envious”—or even simply contentious—readers would certainly have looked for—and criticized—any perceived or real weaknesses of the narrative as a literary composition and used the author’s misinterpretations or omissions of written proofs and laws to demonstrate by what kind of teachers and “λόγος” Christians—either as a whole or within a particular branch—are swayed to worship that which is not or to worship a god other than the one their fathers knew. If PJ were as vulnerable to criticism as it seems to modern readers, the text would provide material for a well-argued (irrefutable) speech demonstrating—from the authentic words of an apostle—that Christians believe in πλάσματα or false testimonies. The ecclesiastical recognition of such an argumentatively “weak” λόγος as the work of a disciple and apostle—taken to its logical conclusion—would imply that Jesus is not “the Christ, the Son of God” and, therefore, did not “reveal the Father.”

85 The importance attributed to pre-conceived notions (about a particular case and the persons involved, including the speaker) is reflected by the instructions on the composition of introductions and conclusions, and the definition of the types of cases (genera causarum) in manuals of classical rhetoric.
86 Mt 16:17.
Title

One of the more important arguments for the negative judgment about the author and his work in the modern scholarly literature—and the corresponding view of the audience—is a perceived mismatch between the story of the “Death of Zechariah” and the title of *PJ*. Because a work called *Genesis* (or *Gennesis*) *Marias* recounts the “nativity” (γένεσις) of Mary and her “coming-into-being” (τὸ γένεσθαι) as mother of the “king of the Jews” (22.1) and of the Christ (22.2, 24.4), the title does not leave room for, or does not require, the story of the murder of Zechariah.

But this argument lacks a solid foundation, since it is based on a short, “generic” title that seems to reflect the manuscript tradition—but is not actually attested.

Only two versions of *PJ* have a “formal” title (i.e., a title without references to the text as “λόγος”, “ἠστορία”, or “διηγησίς”)—*Paris. gr. 1468* (11th c.) and *P. Bodmer 5*. While the titles of *PJ* in *Paris gr. 1468* and *P. Bodmer 5* are not the same, they begin with almost identical phrases—“γέννησις μαρίας” (*Paris gr. 1468*) and “γένεσις μαρίας” (*P. Bodmer 5*). “Τένεσις” appears in the introduction of only one of the other manuscripts; however, the noun “γέννησις” is also represented in the introductions of six other manuscripts. Since both titles include the name “Μαρία” in the genitive, this seems to imply that “γέννησις μαρίας” is the work’s original (and, therefore, authoritative) title. Both “γένεσις μαρίας” and “γέννησις μαρίας” are translated (without distinction) as “Nativity

---

88 Mary is visible in the narrative until the end of the nativity story in 20.3 (the angel’s order to Salome); after that, she appears briefly, as the mother of the little child, at the end of the story of the Adoration of the Magi (in 21.3) and for the last time, as Maria, in the story of the Sign of the Manger (in 22.2).

89 *Vatic. Gr. 455* (Ms F9), described as “Ἀστορία Ἰακώβου εἰς τὴν γένεσιν τῆς παναγίας θεοτόκου”.
of Mary” (De Nativitate Mariae). This short title (seemingly original) and the title Protevangelium Iacobi (stemming from the sixteenth century) are usually the ones used to refer to (and describe) the narrative in the modern secondary literature on the work.

The different etymological explanations of the two verbs “γεννῶ” and “γενῶ”, and discussions of the terms “γένεσις” and “γέννησις” by authors such as Galen, Origen, or Epiphanius of Salamis show that the difference between the two terms is significant—not only etymologically and semantically but also with respect to their function (within the individual works of these authors) as “pointers” to explanatory sources in the writings of the Old and the New Testaments.

What is more, neither title ends after the first two words, contrary to the modern usage of referring to the narrative as “Nativity of Mary”; and the syntax of both, together with morphologically ambiguous forms, allows several readings, all of which can be supported through material from the body of the text.

Paris. gr. 1468 (E)

The full title of PJ in Paris gr. 1468 (E) is “γέννησις μαρίας τῆς ἁγίας θεοτόκου καὶ ὑπερένδοξου μήτρος Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ” (27 syllables). The sentence is followed by the

---

91 Origen, Scholia in Matthaeum, PG 17, 289.
92 E.g., see Epiphanius of Salamis, Panarion 1.372.25-77.15.
93 E.g., see EM 225 <γεννῶ>: τὸ πίκτω· παρὰ τὴν γῆν τὴν πάντων μητέρα. ἐστὶ γὰρ γέα, ἕξ ὀ ῥήμα, γέω, καὶ πλεογασιό μο τού ν, γεννώ, ἤ παρά τὸ γεῖω, γεννὼ· ἐπὶ μὲν τῆς γεννήσεως, διὰ δύο ἰν· ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς ποιήσεως καὶ κτίσεως, δι’ ἐνός ν· ἕξ οὗ καὶ γενητός, ὁ κτιστός. τὰ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ γινό̓ γινομένα ὁμόματα δι’ ἐνός ν ἐκφέρονται· οἶον, γένεσις, γενέθλιον.
prepositional phrase “ἐν ταῖς ἱστορίαις τῶν δώδεκα φυλῶν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ” (16 syllables)—
the beginning of the first, longer section of text shared by almost all manuscript versions.

At first glance, the syntax confirms the modern view that the main subject of the
narrative is Μαρία, since the first two words seem a well defined syntactical unit, separated
from the rest of the title by the definite article “τῆς”.94 The noun “Μαρία” is defined by two
genitives as ἡ ἁγία θεοτόκος (the subject of γεννᾶν in the passive voice) and as ὑπερένδοξος μήτηρ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (the subject of γεννᾶν in the active voice). This
parallelistic reading of the syntax of the title requires defining the gender of “ὑπερένδοξου”
(m. and f.) by analogy with “ἁγία” (f.) and interpreting the force of the conjunction “καί” as
connective (resembling in this the definite article τῆς). While this is the reading that has
governed modern interpretations of the content of PJ, it is only one of several possible
interpretations of the syntax.

The name “Μαρία”, emphasized by its position at the beginning of the long title,
attracts the attention of readers familiar with the writings of the New Testament. Readers
primarily (or only) acquainted with the writings of the Old Testament, or versed in the
technical terminology of γραμματική and ρητορική, may have been more interested in
“ὑπερένδοξου”—the first word(s) of the second half of the introduction. The composite
adjective “ὑπερένδοξος” is rare, especially in the genitive. In the writings of the Old and
the New Testament it is used only three times—once in a verse at the beginning of the Song

94 The article introduces an extended genitive object with two syntactically similar elements (adjective and
“composite” noun) connected to each other through a coordinating conjunction (καί). This genitive—whose
gender, number, and case are defined by “τῆς”—is in agreement with “Μαρίας” (i.e. it is the name’s
predicate); “Μαρίας” in turn, is the genitive object of “γεννηθαίης”.

of the Three Young Men in the book of *Daniel*\(^{95}\) (in the translations of the book according to the Seventy and according to Theodotion)—and twice in the version of the same song in the *Odes of Solomon*.\(^{96}\) In all three instances, the adjective is in the nominative singular, preceded by the adjective ὑπερώμητος, and followed by the prepositional phrase “εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας”.

The book of *Daniel* is a source emphasized through its position—the narrative begins in 1.1 with a reference to the beginning of the story of *Susanna*\(^{97}\); an allusion to the end of *Daniel* is incorporated into Joseph’s vision\(^{98}\); and the epilogue ends in 25.2 with an allusion to the story of Nebuchadnezzar’s dream of the image with feet of clay.\(^{99}\) Readers familiar with the adjective from the Greek text of the Old Testament are thus more likely to see “ὑπερένδοξος” as an allusion to a passage in the book of *Daniel* or in the *Odes of Solomon* than (solely) as an epithet honoring a mother of Jesus Christ. Since the adjective in these books refers to “κυρίος”, Old Testament usage suggests interpreting ὑπερένδοξος in the title of manuscript E as a substantivized adjective (m.) limited by the genitive “μήτρος” rather than as an adjective attribute in agreement with μήτρος. In this case, the title refers to two “γεννήσεις”: the other “γέννησις” described by the title—paralleling the “γέννησις μαρίας τῆς ἁγίας θεοτόκου”—is a “γέννησις ... [τοῦ] ὑπερένδοξου τῆς μήτρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ”.

---

\(^{95}\) See Dn 3:52-56 at 53.

\(^{96}\) See Odes 8.53, 56.

\(^{97}\) Sus 4.

\(^{98}\) See 18.2; Bel and Dragon 33.

\(^{99}\) See Dn 2.
These interpretations of the syntax presuppose that the text of the title is elliptic. But the position of the second half of the title between a conjunction (καὶ) and a preposition (ἐν ταῖς ἰστορίαις...), and the genitive case and the components of “ὑπερένδοξου” (ὑπέρ is prefix of ἐνδόξος or preposition [+gen.]) also supports reading the second part of the title as an alternative or separate description of the text as λόγος “ὑπὲρ ἐνδόξου μητρὸς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ”, separated from the first part (or title) by “καὶ”.100 Separating “ὑπέρ” from the adjective “ἐνδόξος” aligns “ἐνδόξος” in the title with the two references to “παράδοξα” in the narrative,101 and associates all three (as two of the four τροποὶ102 of a rhetorical “ζήτημα”) with an allusion to ἀνακεφαλαίωσις in Joseph’s recapitulation of “ἡ ἰστορία τοῦ Ἀδάμ” in 13.1.

Such a division of the text into two distinct parts may seem forced when one glances at a modern edition, in which the text of the heading is divided into individual words and the accents have been added. But the results of displaying the text in different ways (stressing the two possibilities) suggest that both interpretations are feasible.

With “ὑπερένδοξου” as composite, the text has 27 syllables and can be displayed in a narrow (9x3 syllables) or in a wide column (3x9 syllables). The narrow column displays an

---

100 Interpreting “ὑπέρ” as preposition rather than as prefix (recognizable only through the position of accents and breathings) and as the beginning of an alternative title is supported by the alternative title of Demosthenes’ speech “Περὶ τοῦ Στέφανου”—“ὑπὲρ Κτησιφώτους”. The speech is one of the sources of the phrase “ἀλλ’ ἔδωκεν ἐκατὸν εἰς” in 1.4.
101 In 19.3 [38.11] and 20.4 [41.6].
102 The other two are ἀδοξοῦ and ἀμφίδοξον.
acrostic linked to χωρεῖν (οὐδός)\textsuperscript{103} and thus etymologically associated with “γῆ” (“ἡ πάντα χωροῦσα”). The second part of the heading is additionally associated with “χωρεῖν” through the midwife’s “καυνὸν θέαμα”, which is linked to the title through the phrase “τῆς μητρὸς + gen.” (see below).

Moving the genitive “μαρίας” to the end of the first part of the title eliminates the acrostic “οὐδός”. The first part of this altered title displays acrostics, including “γῆ” (A, l).\textsuperscript{104}

The alternative interpretation of “ὑπὲρ” as a preposition (ὑπὲρ ἐνδόξου) rather than a prefix (ὑπερενδόξου) can be stressed by displaying the text of the title in a bisected column

\textsuperscript{103} See EM 229.50-53 <γῆ>: παρὰ τὸ γῶ, τὸ χωρῶ, ἡ πάντα χωροῦσα. τοῦτο δὲ παρὰ τὸ χωρεῖν. τροπή τού χ ἐις γ, γω: ἀφ’ οὐ παράγωγον, χεῖσθαι οἶνον, οὐδός δ’ ἀμφοτέρους οδε χείσται [Od. 18.17].

\textsuperscript{104} “Αἰνη” (column A, r) is an adjective (αἰνη) or a verb (αἰνή).
whose halves are connected through “καὶ”. In this case, the two columns are semantically linked through two words in the horizontal lines—ιατρὸς (l. 5) and θεότης (l. 6). One half of each noun is provided by the column to the left (A), the other half by the column to the right (B).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>7x2</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>6x2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>γένινη</td>
<td>καὶ</td>
<td>ὑπερ</td>
<td>\étvoε \νυ \μή</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σις μαρ</td>
<td>\ιας \αγ</td>
<td>ένδοξ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τής αγ</td>
<td>\ία \θεοτ</td>
<td>άπρος έι</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ζ</td>
<td>\θοκον</td>
<td>\ν</td>
<td>Χριστοῦ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While acrostics can help prevent alterations in the word order (or signal such alterations), such horizontal links between the two columns have the same function in the case of interpolations.

Μήτηρ Ἰσοῦ Χριστοῦ

With a personal pronoun (m.) in place of the name (“τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ”), the phrase “μητρὸς Ἰσοῦ Χριστοῦ” has two counterparts in the text, one at the end of the account of what the midwife (and Joseph) see in the place of the cave (19.2), the other in the report on what the magi see in the cave (21.3). Both times the phrase is followed by the name “Μαρία” in the genitive.

19.2 καὶ πρὸς ὄλιγον τὸ φῶς ὑπεστέλλετο ἐως τὸ βρέφος ἔφανη καὶ ἦλθε καὶ ἔλαβε μαθὴν ἐκ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ Μαρίας καὶ ἀνεβόησεν ἡ μαία καὶ εἶπεν Μεγάλη μοι σήμερον ἡμέρα ὅτι εἶδον τὸ καινὸν θέαμα τοῦτο

105 See 20.4.
21.3 ἰδόντες δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ μάγοι ἐστῶτα μετὰ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ Μαρίας ἐξενεγκαίτες ἅπο τῆς πίρας δώρα χρυσὸν καὶ λίβανον καὶ σμύρναν προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ

“Τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ Μαρίας” in the first sentence is an allusion to a genitive absolute in the first sentence of the narrative on the manner of the “γέννησις” of Jesus Christ in the gospel according to Matthew,106

τοῦ δὲ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ γέννησις οὕτως ἢν, μηθευθείσης τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ Μαρίας τῷ Ἰωσήφ, πρῶτον ἔσωθεν αὐτοῖς εὑρέθη ἐν γαστρὶ ἐκ χούσα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου.

The account in Matthew includes a paraphrase of prophecies in Isaiah,107 incorporated into the text of the apparition of the angel to Joseph.108 “Μετὰ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ Μαρίας” in the second sentence (21.3) is an allusion to the text of the Adoration of the Magi in the gospel according to Matthew.109

The double allusion in PJ 1.1 to the genitive absolute in chapter 1 and the prepositional phrase in chapter 2 of Matthew link the phrase “μητρὸς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ” in the title to two sections of the narrative with additional allusions to Matthew—the “καλοῖν θέαμα” (19.3) announced by the midwife and questioned by Salome (παρθένος ἔγεννησεν—an allusion to Isaiah with elements of “τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου διὰ τοῦ προφήτου ...” in Mt 1:22-23), and the σημεῖον seen by the magi, linked to Herod’s inquiry from the priests (in 21.2)110 through his order to the magi, “ἀναζητήσατε ποῦ γεννᾶται

106 Mt 1:18.
107 Is 7:14 and 8:8, 10.
108 See Mt 1:22-23; Is 7:14, 8:8, 10.
109 See Mt 2:11.
110 See Mt 2:4-6.
καὶ ἐὰν εὑρήτε ἀπαγγειλατέ μοι ὡς κἀγὼ ἔλθων πρόσκυνήσω αὐτῶν” (paralleling
the priests’ inquiry in the Scriptures, likewise in 21.2). The one centers on “ἡ γεννῶσα”, the
other on “ὁ γεννηθεὶς βασιλεὺς”.

The allusion in 19.2 (ἐκ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ Μαρίας) to the account on the
“γέννησις” of Jesus Christ in the gospel according to Matthew is prepared through an
exchange of questions and answers between the midwife and Joseph in 19.1. Asked by her
“καὶ τίς ἐστιν ἡ γεννῶσα ἐν τῷ σπηλαίῳ;”, Joseph tells the midwife first
“ἐμνηστευμένη μοι αὕτη Μαριάμ ἐστι”; then he recapitulates the events recounted in
8.1-9.3 (the allotment), 13.1-14.1 (Joseph’s dream), and 15.1-16.3 (the trial).

καὶ ἐκληρωσάμην αὐτὴν γυναίκα· καὶ οὐκ ἐστιν μου γυνή, ἀλλὰ σύλληψαν ἐχεῖ ἐκ
πνεύματος ἀγίου.

When the midwife responds with the question “τοῦτο ἄλθητε;”, Joseph tells her
“ἔρχου καὶ ἴδε”.

The two imperatives are an allusion to Philip’s words when he hears Nathanael’s
question, “ἐκ Ναζαρέτ δύναται τι ἁγαθὸν εἶναι;” In PJ spoken by Joseph, the words
align Joseph’s answers to the midwife to Philip’s announcement at finding Nathanael.

εὑρίσκει Φιλίππος τὸν Ναθαναὴλ καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ
ὅν ἐγραμέν Μωσῆς ἐν τῷ νόμῳ καὶ οἱ προφῆται εὑρήκαμεν, Ἰησοῦν τὸν υἱὸν
tοῦ Ἰωσήφ τοῦ ἀπὸ Ναζαρέτ.

Consequently, the midwife’s reaction to what she sees in the place of the cave (in
19.2-3) is implicitly compared to Nathanael’s confession, “ῥάββι σὺ εἰ ὦ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ σὺ

111 The personal pronoun in 21.1 refers to the grammatical subject of γεννῶν in the magi’s conclusion from
their observation of the star—“καὶ ἥμεις οὗτος ἐγινώμεν ὑπὶ βασιλεὺς ἐγεννηθή ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ
ἡλθομεν προσκυνήσαι αὐτῶν”.
112 Jn 1:46.
ei' o basileus tov 'Iσραηλ’

— and similarly answered with an allusion to (or repetition of) Jacob’s dream at Bethel.

In conjunction with the participle “εμνηστευμένη” and the allusion to the dream apparition (σύλληψιν ἔχει ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου), the name Μαρίαμ associates Joseph’s answer in 19.1 with the order given in Matthew by the angel to Joseph in his dream.

‘Ιωσήφ υἱὸς Δαυίδ μὴ φοβηθής παραλαβεῖν Μαρίαμ τὴν γυναίκά σου: τὸ γὰρ ἐν αὐτῇ γεννηθὲν ἐκ πνεύματος ἔστιν ἁγίου ...

“Μαρίαμ” occurs only two times in Matthew; thus, the allusion to the first instance of the name in the gospel points to the second, in Matthew 13:55, in the account on Jesus’ teaching in the synagogue in his πατρίς. The teaching causes astonishment and questions.

The substantivized participle “ἡ γεννώσα” in 19.1 associates the subject of the midwife’s question—the antecedent of αὐτή Μαρίαμ—with Mary’s διακρίνειν of the angel’s message in the Annunciation, recounted in 11.2. In E, the verb γεινάν occurs two times in the exchange, both times in Mary’s (Μαρίαμ’s) question.

καὶ ἴδου ἀγγελὸς κυρίου ἔστη ἐνώπιον αὐτῆς λέγων μὴ φοβοῦ Μαρίαμ· εὑρες γὰρ χάριν ἐνώπιον τοῦ πάντων δεσπότου, συλλήψῃ γὰρ ἐκ λόγου αὐτοῦ.

---

113 Jn 1:49.
114 See Jn 1:51.
115 As allusion to Mt 1:18, “εμνηστευμένη” implies the phrase “τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ Μαρίας”.
116 In Mt 1:20.
117 Mt 13:54; see Mt 7:28, 19:25, 22:33.
The direct object of γεννάν is implied through the sources of the finite verbs “γεννήσω” (Ezekiel) and “γεννά” (Proverbs)—the direct object of “γεννήσω” is ἀνθρώποι,118 of γεννά σοφία.119

The questions of Mary (to the angel, in the future tense) and the midwife (to Joseph, a present participle) are linked to the midwife’s words to Salome and Salome’s response (both past tense) (in 19.3), which follow after the first sentence in E with the phrase “τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ Μαρίας”.

καὶ ἀνεβόησεν ἡ μαία καὶ εἶπεν
Μεγάλη μοι σήμερον ἡμέρα, ὅτι εἴδον οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ μου τὸ καυνὸν θέαμα.
καὶ ἐξήλθεν τοῦ σπηλαίου ἡ μαία, καὶ ἀπήνησεν αὐτῇ Σαλώμη, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ ἡ μαία
Σαλώμη Σαλώμη, καυνὸν θέαμα ἐχὼ ἐξηγήσασθαι120 σοι· παρθένος ἐγέννησεν ὁ οὗ χωρεῖ ἡ φύσις αὐτῆς.
καὶ εἶπεν Σαλώμη
ζῇ κύριος ὁ θεός μου, ἕαν μὴ ἴδω, οὐ μὴ πειθῶ ὅτι παρθένος ἐγέννησεν

Both sentences with the phrase “παρθένος ἐγέννησεν”—a compact allusion to Isaiah 7:14, 9:5, and 49:21121—include phrases from the gospel according to John: “οὐ χωρεῖ,”122 with a neuter pronoun, suggests that the midwife refers to the great light that appeared in the cave (καὶ ἐφανῇ φῶς μέγα ἐν τῷ σπῆλαιῳ; “ἔαν μὴ ἴδω,“123 spoken by Salome, parallels the midwife’s words to the words spoken by the other disciples to Thomas

---

118 See Ez 36:12 καὶ γεννήσω ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς άνθρώπος τῶν λαῶν μου Ισραήλ, καὶ κληρονομήσουσιν ὑμᾶς, καὶ ἐσεῖθε αὐτοῖς εἰς κατάσχεσιν καὶ οὐ μὴ προστεθήτε ἐπὶ ἀτεκνωθήματα ἀπ’ αὐτῶν.
119 Pr 8:25; cf. Pr 8:22.
120 The verb suggests an allusion to Lv 14:57, the “νόμος τῆς λέπρας”.
121 See 3.1.
122 See Jn 8:37; Jn 21:25.
123 See Jn 20:25.
the twin—“ἐοράκαμεν τὸν κύριον.”\textsuperscript{124} Salome’s demand for proof corresponds to asking to see and touch the marks of the nails and the spear—the text in 19.3 presupposes, paraphrases, and confirms the testimony of the disciple in \textit{John} 19:33-37.

Mary’s comparison between herself and “πᾶσα γυνη” in 1.1 suggests an allusion to Joseph’s comparison (in 13.1) between Mary and Εὕα, the γυνη of Adam.\textsuperscript{125} But in 11.2, “πᾶσα γυνη” is the grammatical subject of “γεννῶν”, not τίκτειων.\textsuperscript{126} The prepositional phrase “ἐκ λόγου αὐτοῦ” in the angel’s message hints that Mary is pondering whether or not she will bring forth “ἐκ σπέρματος ἀνδρός”.\textsuperscript{127} Her question in 11.2 prepares an allusion to the \textit{Wisdom} of Solomon in 22.2.

\begin{quote}
ἀκούσασα δὲ Μαριὰμ ὅτι ἀναρεῖται τὰ βρέφη, φοβηθείσα ἔλαβε καὶ αὐτή τὸν παῖδα καὶ ἐσπαργάνωσεν αὐτὸν καὶ ἐθηκεν ἐν φάτνῃ τῶν βων.
\end{quote}

The swaddling clothes are mentioned in \textit{Wisdom} (in the same context as “ἐκ σπέρματος ἀνδρός”).\textsuperscript{128}

\begin{quote}
ἐν σπαργάνωι ἀνετράφη καὶ φροντίσω.
οὐδεὶς γὰρ βασιλέων ἔτέραν ἐξεκέν γενέσεως ἀρχῆν,
μία δὲ παισίων εἰσοδος ἐις τὸν βίον ἔξοδος τε ἱση.
\end{quote}

In conjunction with the allusion to \textit{Ezekiel} in the Annunciation (in 11.2), the reference to the swaddling clothes indicates that Mary has brought forth someone who is

\begin{quote}
θητὸς ἀνθρωπος ἴσος ἀπαίν καὶ γηγενοῦς ἀπόγονος πρωτοπλάστου\textsuperscript{129}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{124} Jn 20:25.
\textsuperscript{125} Joseph’s narrative parallels the account in 11.2, since he speculates on what has happened in his absence.
\textsuperscript{126} See Gn 3:16 ἐν λύπαις τέξῃ τέκνα.
\textsuperscript{127} See Wis 7:2.
\textsuperscript{128} Wis 7:4-6.
\textsuperscript{129} Wis 7:1-2.
In 22.2, the child’s mortality is stressed through an allusion to the account of the entombment of Christ in Matthew 27:59-60 (already prepared in 19.1, through an allusion to the Raising of Lazarus\(^\text{130}\)).

καὶ λαβὼν τὸ σῶμα ὁ Ἰωσήφ ἐνετύλιξεν αὐτὸ ἐν σινδώνι καθαρὰ καὶ ἔθηκεν αὐτὸ ἐν τῷ καινῷ αὐτοῦ μυμημεῖῳ ὦ ἐλατόμησεν ἐν τῇ πέτρᾳ καὶ προσκυλίσας λίθον μέγαν τῇ θύρᾳ τοῦ μυμημείου ἀπῆλθεν.

At the same time, the allusion to Proverbs in 11.2 underlines that the account in chapter 7 of Wisdom does not apply in every respect—as Wisdom, he is “begotten before”\(^\text{131}\) and, therefore, not “ἐκ σπέρματος ἀνδρός καὶ ἡδονῆς ὑπνῷ συνελθούσης.”\(^\text{132}\)

In the form “ἡ μήτηρ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ,” the phrase “μητρὸς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ” has three parallels in the gospel according to John—two in the story of the wedding at Cana\(^\text{133}\) (where Jesus made the beginning of the signs),\(^\text{134}\) and one in the crucifixion (linked to John 2 through “ἡ ὥρα αὐτοῦ”).\(^\text{135}\) In E, the making of the beginning of the signs (in John 2) is implied, in 24.4, through the participle γεγενημένον.

καὶ τὸ πτώμα αὐτοῦ οὐχ εἶφον, ἀλλὰ τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ λίθον γεγενημένον.

In the gospel according to John, “ἀπεγενημένον” refers to the water that became wine (τὸ ὕδωρ αἰνοῦ γεγενημένον).\(^\text{136}\)

\(^{130}\) “Ἐρχον καὶ ίδε” in Jn 11:34.

\(^{131}\) Pr 8:25.

\(^{132}\) Wis 7:2.

\(^{133}\) See Jn 2:1, 3.

\(^{134}\) See Jn 2:11.

\(^{135}\) See Jn 19:25.

\(^{136}\) Jn 2:9. The order “ἀγενέσατε” in Jn 2:7 associates the brief allusion, in 24.3, in the story of the wedding in Cana in the gospel according to John with the description of Mary’s filling the κάλπις with water in 11.1 (an allusion to the story of David’s thirst in 4 Mcc 3:6-18).
The reference to the blood that became stone connects the report on the finding in 24.3 to Zechariah’s prediction (or revelation) of the pouring out of innocent blood (in 23.3) and to the allusion to the betrayal of Judas in 14.1. These references come together in Jesus’s prediction of the ἐκδίκησις of all the righteous blood poured out onto the earth “ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος Ἀβελ τοῦ δικαίου ἔως τοῦ αἵματος Ζαχαρίου υἱοῦ Βαραχίου ὁν ἐφονεύσατε μεταξὺ τοῦ ναοῦ καὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου”.

Thus, when one follows the allusions and cross-references, the phrase “μητρὸς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ” in the second part of the title is connected, through allusions to Matthew and John, to Jesus’s word on the the blood of the righteous—the death of Zechariah is an integral element of the title and the narrative.

**P. Bodmer 5**

The title of *P. Bodmer 5* in its full form poses different exegetical challenges. *P. Bodmer 5* begins with the words “γένεσις μαρίας αποκάλυψις ιακώβ”, followed by the phrase “εν ταις ιστοριαις των δωδεκα φιλων” (all without accents or punctuation marks).

For a title, the juxtaposition of four nouns without conjunction (ἤ or καί) or preposition is highly unusual. Yet even though it is unprecedented in Greek literature and unique to the source, the form of the title of *P. Bodmer 5* is quite unlikely to be a scribal error. *P. Bodmer 5* is a carefully copied and corrected document; and the words of the title appear not

---

137 Mt 23:35.
138 For a discussion, see É. de Strycker, *La forme la plus ancienne*, pp. 212-213. In those cases in which a treatise is known by two names, the alternative title tends to be separated from the main title by a conjunction (ἤ). Frequently, the second title is introduced by a preposition that either indicates the content (περί) or the recipient (πρὸς) of the work.
only in the colophon, but also in an identical form at the beginning of the treatise, where they constitute the opening lines of the document.

Modern discussions of the titles of *P. Bodmer 5* may leave the impression that dividing the four words “γενεσίς μαριάς αποκάλυψις ίακωβ” into two groups and selecting the first (γενεσίς μαριάς) as the work’s main title are the logical—if not inevitable—choices any reader would make when seeing the words on the page. But a look at the document shows quickly that this is not the case. On the first page, they fill the first one and a half lines of the text block; the noun ἀποκάλυψις is divided into two halves (ἀποκάλυψις), one placed at the end of the first line, the other at the beginning of the second.

This division of the noun, seemingly necessitated by a line break caused by the width of the page, leaves it open whether “ἀποκάλυψις” is to be added to the first two words or joined to the fourth.

On the last page, the words of the title are distributed in three lines, visually set apart from the last lines of the text and from the last sentence of the papyrus.

The line breaks suggest that the title falls into three groups (γενεσίς μαριάς / ἀποκάλυψις / ίακωβ). The distribution of the words “γενεσίς μαριάς αποκάλυψις ίακωβ” in the title section, differences in the size of the letters, and the positions of the words
relative to each other and to other position markers on the page, all suggest that deciding which of the words is the title of *P. Bodmer 5* depends first on determining the criteria for a particular word separation.

The sequence of the nouns suggests analogies—since a nominative singular noun of the third declension is followed by a name in the genitive, followed, in turn, by a second nominative singular of the third declension and a name, the uninflected name “ιακωβ” seems to be a genitive (τοῦ Ιακωβ, corresponding to “μαριαζ”). The letters of the name “ιακωβ” can represent any grammatical case, however. The conventional form of a title suggests a division following “γενεσιζ”—“Μαριαζ αποκαλυψιζ”. Ιακωβ can be linked to the preceding phrase as genitive (limiting αποκαλυψιζ) or dative (“for” or “through” Ιακωβ), or be a nominative, separated from the phrase in the middle (like γενεσιζ).

The arrangement of the words in the first lines of page α’ suggests that considerations of numbers and ratios played a role in defining the “width” of the first line, and, with it, of the text column. *P. Bodmer 5’s* “flexible” introductory line comprises 14 syllables (28 letters), divided through a line break into two groups. As in the clause as a whole (14 syllables, 28 letters), the ratio of syllables to letters in these two groups is 1:2 (9+5 syllables, 18+10 letters). An even distribution stresses the 1:2 ratio of the total number of syllables to the total number of letters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>P. Bodmer 5 1.1 [1.1-2]</em></th>
<th>s</th>
<th>l</th>
<th>Even Distribution</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>l</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>γενεσιζ μαριαζ αποκαλυψιζ Ιακωβ</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>γενεσιζ μαριαζ α</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λυψιζ Ιακωβ</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>ποκαλυψιζ Ιακωβ</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In both distributions, the letters at three of the four “corners” of the text block are the first three letters of the Greek alphabet. This even continues to be true when the text is displayed in a narrow column of two syllables per line, since the first (and only) letter representing the second to last syllable is an *alpha*, and the last letter of the last syllable is a *beta*. In all three cases, an *alpha* is in the middle of the three letters (γ / α / β); but in the narrowest column, the letter’s position changes both in the column—from first to last (second)—and in the respective line—from last to first, and right to left.

While *gamma* and *beta* remain the same in the three configurations, the letter *alpha* belongs each time to a different syllable—but still marks the “end” of a line. This hints at a second criterion for line-breaks, in addition to multiples of the same number—namely ending (or beginning) each line with the same letter. The line break of the first lines of the first page of *P. Bodmer 5*—and the letter’s total number—suggest *alpha* as the marker of a line end. In contrast to the other letters in the “corners” (one instance each), the letter *alpha* is represented five times in the brief text—more than any other letter. When added up, the number of letters by which these *alphas* are separated, yield groups of equal sums, first 2(ρι)+1(ς) = 3(ποκ) with the two sums of the “intervals” between the four *alphas* in line 1 (ρι ας α ποκ), then with this sum and the number of letters separating the last *alphas* of lines 1 and 2 (2+1+3 (l. 1) = 6 (ρι ας αποκα / λυψις α -)). The text columns resulting from such a division are uneven in length, both in syllables and numbers—the lines count between 1 and 4 syllables, and 2 and 9 letters.
The page number α'—included in both column I and II—serves as a reminder that the same sign can represent a written letter (alpha) or a spoken syllable (sound, long or short), but (with the addition of additional signs) also a number—a numeral (εις, μια, ἔν [with rough breathing]) in column I, or an ordinal in column II (α' = πρωτος, -η, -ον),\(^\text{139}\) marking the (position of the) first letter of each line. Read as an allusion to the title of the Apocalypse of John, “αποκάλυψις” underlines the latter—“α” and “ω” are ordinals and names.\(^\text{140}\)

The letters at the line endings of column II suggest several semantically meaningful words when read downward—μία, σκιά—or upward—βίος; but they always fall short of providing all the letters required to complete the respective word. This alignment does not have to be at the extremes of each line, however (see column II, “α'”, read as ordinal and heading of the first one-letter column). The layout of the title on the last page points to a geometrical alignment by position in a sequence of vertically aligned letter-columns as an alternative.

---

\(^{139}\) See 1.2 [1.15] “πρωτών”.

\(^{140}\) E.g., see Apoc 1:8, 22:13.
The problem to be addressed is the direction of reading, and how to deal with diphthongs/combinations of vowels (i.e., keep them together, so that they are read as a unit\textsuperscript{141} or long vowels (lengthening through position; \textit{βιοσις}, \textit{βιωσις}, \textit{βιωσις};\textsuperscript{142} \textit{φυλῶν} (p. \textit{α’}, l. 3) and \textit{φύλλον} (p. \textit{β’}, l. 3)). The page provides the material for solutions.\textsuperscript{143}

The narrowest text column with an equal number of syllables per line has seven lines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7x2 Syllables</th>
<th>A l r</th>
<th>B l r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>γενεσ</td>
<td>5 γ σ</td>
<td>4 γ ε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ιομα</td>
<td>4 ι α</td>
<td>6 ζ ρ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ρια</td>
<td>3 ρ α</td>
<td>2 ι α</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σαπο</td>
<td>4 σ  ο</td>
<td>5 σ κ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καλψι</td>
<td>5 θ</td>
<td>4 α ψ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ισι</td>
<td>3 ι ι</td>
<td>ι↑ ι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ακωβ</td>
<td>4 α β</td>
<td>α β</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The acrostic “σκιά” (A, l), as part of a title, evokes distinctions between different forms of definition (\textit{ὑπογραφή} and \textit{ὁρισμός});\textsuperscript{144} δψ (A, r) is a synonym of \textit{φωνή} used in

\textsuperscript{141} Cf. \textit{διαίρεσις}.
\textsuperscript{142} See Sir pr. 12, Acts 26:4.
\textsuperscript{143} For example, in \textit{γραμματική}, the term \textit{διπλά} (1.1 [1.6]) denotes double consonants \textit{ζητα} (ζ) (δ+σ), \textit{κσι} (ξ, illustrated on page a’ by “εξίστατ’” in l. 15) (κ+σ), and \textit{ψι} (αποκαλψις) (π+σ).
\textsuperscript{144} E.g., see \textit{Ammonius in Porphyrii isagogen sive quinque voces}, edited by A. Busse, Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca 4.3 (Berlin: Reimer, 1891), 54.23-55.7 (Ammonius comments on “οι καὶ \textit{ὑπογράφοντες ἀποδεδωκασι}”) ταύτη οὖν διαφέρει ο ὁρισμός τῆς \textit{ὑπογραφής} τῷ τῶν ὁρισμῶν ἕκ τῆς οὐδεσιαtaskId
etymologies of nouns denoting “human” (such as μέρος or ἄνθρωπος) to define humans as beings with an articulate voice (φωνή ἔναρθρος). In the context of arranging γράμματα in lines, the acrostic “ἰασίς” (B, l) points to the theory of the four elements (στοιχεῖα, κρᾶσις).

The “shared” beginning of PJ in P. Bodmer 5 is shorter than its counterpart in the other manuscripts of the text. Instead of the name of the numeral (δώδεκα—or the sum δυο καὶ δέκα / δέκα δυο), P. Bodmer 5 features the number twelve (ιβ) as numeral; the genitives limiting “ἐν ταις ἱστορίαις” end with “ψυλων”, which is immediately followed by the name Ἰωάκιμι, in turn followed by the finite verb η(ν). Since the number can be represented as name (δώδεκα) or as sum (δυο δέκα), the text can be 10, 13, or 15 syllables “long.” The shortest version (10 syllables) can be written separately or together with the flexible introduction (24 syllables, divided into 2x12, 3x8, 4x6, 8x3, 12x2 [adding the two columns together]); the longest version can only be divided separately from the flexible introduction, and the other (13) can only be read together with the text of the flexible title (14+13 syllables, arranged 9x3 or 3x9).

145 E.g., see EM 580.37-41 (μέρος): συνώνυμον γίνεται παρά τού μείρο, τὸ μερίζω, ὃ μεμερισμένην τὴν ὅπα (ὅ ἐστι τὴν φωνὴν) ἔχων καὶ ἐισαρθοῦν ὡς πρὸς σύγκρισιν τῶν ἄλλων ζώων ἐπειδὴ, ἐὰν εἶπο ἄνθρωπος, μερίζεται εἰς συλλαβάς. ἢ ὅτι οὐ πάντες τὴν αὐτὴν φωνὴν ἔχουσι.
146 See Chapter 3.
147 E.g., see Ex 28:21, Sir 44:23.
148 In the other versions the name is preceded by ἦν—and thus spatially separated from “τοῦ Ἰσραήλ”.

δεικνύει τὰ πράγματα, τὴν δὲ ὑπογραφὴν ἐκ τῶν συμβεβηκότων. ὑπογραφὴ δὲ λέγεται οἷς σκιαγραφία τις οὐσα· ὥστε γὰρ ἢ πραγματεύεται σκιαγραφία δηλοὶ μὲν τὸ μέμημα τῆς εἰκόνος, οὐ μὴν δημιουργεῖται, οὕτως καὶ ὑπογραφή δηλοὶ μὲν πῶς τὸ πράγμα, οὐ μὲντοι δημιουργεῖται· ὃ τι ὄρισμός αὐτὸ ἤμεν τὸ πράγμα σαφῶς παράστησιν, ἀναλογεῖ ὅτι ἢ μὲν ὄρισμός τῇ τελείᾳ γραφῇ, ἢ δὲ ὑπογραφὴ τῇ σκιαγραφίᾳ· διὸ καὶ ὑπογραφή λέγεται.
“Ἀσω” associates the prepositional phrase in the column with the song (Ἄσμα) of Anna, in 6.3 [14.2].
With two syllables per column, and a bisected column (the last letter of “ιακωβ” provides the ordinal/page number for the second column); the two columns are connected horizontally through “γενεσίς” and “μαρία”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>α′</th>
<th></th>
<th>β′</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|γενεσίς|→|στο
|μα|→|ισ
|ρια|ισ|
|σαπο|τωνδο
|καλψ|δεκαφ
|ισ|υλων|
|α|ακω|κ

When “β” is transcribed as “δέκα δύο”, a line break between “γενεσίς” and μαρία makes “Μαρία” the name of the author of the revelation\(^{149}\):

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{γενεσίς} & 1\gammaν \varepsilonις \muαριας \alphaποκ \alpha \\
\text{μαριας} & \lambdaυψις \iακωβ \epsilonν \tauαις \ιστορ \\
\text{αποκα} & 3\iασ \tauων \deltaεκα \deltaυο \phiυλον \\
\text{λυψι} & \deltaεκα \deltaυο \phiυλον \\
\text{ακωβεν} & 1-4: \gammaαιων \text{ or } \gammaεν(ν)\alphaιων \\
\text{ταισιστο} & \\
\text{ριαιστων} & \\
\text{δεκα δυ} & \\
\text{o φιλων} & \\
\end{array}
\]

\(^{149}\) 8 syllables, 16 letters.
In this version, in which the first two lines correspond to the lines in *P. Bodmer 5* (3x9 syllables), the phrase “δέκα δύο φιλῶν” suggests an allusion to *Sirach 44:23*.150

**How many ἱστορίαι?**

In every version of *PJ*, the term “ἱστορία” occurs four times.151 In two of the four instances, the noun is limited by a “name” in the genitive: “τῶν δώδεκα φιλῶν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ” in the work’s “fixed” introductory line (1.1 ἐν ταῖς ἱστορίαις); and “τοῦ Ἀδαμ” in the middle of the narrative (13.1 ἡ ἱστορία; with paraphrase).152 In the other two—both in the epilogue (25.1)—“ἡ ἱστορία” (followed by a demonstrative pronoun) is the direct object of the verb “γράφειν” in a sentence in the first person singular.

In general, modern scholars, following Tischendorf’s division of the text, read “ἐγὼ δὲ Ἰάκωβος ὁ γράφας τὴν ἱστορίαν ταῦτην ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ” (the words with the first of the two references to “ἡ ἱστορία αὐτῆς”) as one sentence, the first of the epilogue. The demonstrative pronoun limiting “τὴν ἱστορίαν” seems to imply, therefore, that “ἡ ἱστορία αὐτῆς” refers to the narrative as a whole, thought to end in 24.4 with an allusion to the story of Symeon the Elder and the “Meeting in the Temple” recounted in the gospel according to Luke. Moreover, seemingly not part of the narrative proper, and placed side by side with the name Ἰάκωβος (a name in a larger number of manuscripts used in the flexible introductory line), the first reference to “ἡ ἱστορία αὐτῆς” suggests an allusion to the phrase “ἐν ταῖς

---

150 See Sir 44:23 καὶ δίστετελεν μερίδας αὐτοῦ, ἐν φυλαῖς ἐμέρρεσεν δέκα δύο.
151 Except C—the epilogue of the manuscript lacks the reference to “ἡ σοφία τοῦ γράφας τὴν ἱστορίαν ταύτην”.
152 *P. Bodmer 5* is the only version of *PJ* without the personal names “τοῦ Ἰσραήλ” and “τοῦ Ἀδαμ” in 1.1 and 13.1.
ιστορίαις” in 1.1, thus placing “ἡ ἰστορία αὐτή” among (i.e., “ἐν”) the “ἰστορίαι” mentioned there. Ἰάκωβος—referring to himself as “ὁ γράφας τὴν ἰστορίαν ταύτην”—claims to be the author of a “ἰστορία τῶν δώδεκα φυλῶν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ”, a narrative beginning in 1.1 with “ἡν Ἰωακεὶμ πλοῦσιος σφόδρα” and ending in 24.4 with the words “μὴ ἰδεῖν θάνατον ἐως ἀν ἢν τὸν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκί”.

Both suggestions are problematic, not to mention that neither one addresses whether or not the Death of Zechariah is an integral—i.e., necessary—part of the narrative. The first rests on an assumption—on the position of the name Ἰακώβος and the reference to “ἡ ἰστορία αὐτή” in the work, their syntactical relation, and the referent of the demonstrative (the narrative as a whole)—that does not take into account the polyvalence of the written text at the transition from the narrative to the epilogue. The text with the name Ἰάκωβος and the phrase “τὴν ἰστορίαν ταύτην” can be divided (and enunciated) in several ways, depending on the selection of analogies for punctuation. “Ὁ γράφας” is not in all possible versions the predicate of Ἰάκωβος.

The second suggestion (linking the first and the third reference to “ἰστορία” in P.J) presupposes two things—namely that the reference to “ὅ γράφας” is part of the epilogue (rather than of the narrative, similar to “ἡ ἰστορία τοῦ Ἀδάμ”) and that both references in 25.1 to “γράφειν τὴν ἰστορίαν ταύτην” have the same signified, and (therefore) the same speaker.

The repetition of the phrase “τὴν ἰστορίαν ταύτην” in the epilogue, in sentences with the same grammatical person and number, suggests that “ἡ ἰστορία αὐτή” refers to the
same narrative. But the phrases with γράφειν are very different syntactically. In the first sentence, the words “γράφειν τὴν ἰστορίαν ταύτην” are part of a participial phrase (“ὁ γράφας τὴν ἰστορίαν ταύτην”—the predicate of a name or the subject of a finite verb); in the second, they are bound together as a substantivized infinitive (or imperative) in the genitive (“τὸ γράφαι τὴν ἰστορίαν ταύτην”). Consequently, the two references recall different models in the writings of the Old and the New Testaments (with the same syntactical patterns), which define the direct objects of γράφειν in the two sentences by analogies. These models, in turn, are linked to other Scriptural patterns.

In addition to alluding to different models in the Old and the New Testaments, the sentences with the references to the writing of “ἡ ἰστορία αὐτῆς” point readers to different parts of the narrative. The words “ἐγὼ δὲ Ἰάκωβος” align the sentence beginning with the pronoun “ἐγὼ” in 25.1 to the beginning of Joseph’s vision in 18.2. As in the clause in 25.1, in 18.2 Joseph’s description of what he sees begins (in most manuscripts) with the words “ἐγὼ δὲ” followed by a name (Ἰωσήφ instead of Ἰάκωβος); the pronoun is preceded by a prepositional phrase with “ἐν” (ἐν Βηθλεέμ) that can be attached to the preceding clause (ending with “μαίαν”) or to the clause with “ἐγὼ δὲ”.

καὶ παρέστησεν αὐτὴ τοὺς ὑιόντας αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐξήλθων ἐζήτησεν ἑαυτῶν ἠμαῖαν ἐν Βηθλεέμ. ἐγὼ δὲ Ἰωσήφ περιπέταυν καὶ οὐ καὶ περιπέταυν.

Περιπάτησεν in 18.2 corresponds to συντέλλειν in 25.1 (in those versions in which the latter is in the first person singular).\(^{153}\)

---
\(^{153}\) The connection between the two parts of the narrative is stressed in versions of PJ with “ἐν τόπῳ ἔρημω” in 25.1.
The verbal link connecting 18.2 “ἐγώ δὲ Ἰωσήφ περιεπάτουν” and 25.1 “ἐγώ δὲ Ἰάκωβος ὁ γράφας” and the emphasis on the first person singular suggest that Daniel 4 is the main model for περιεπάτουν without the negative—therefore the account in Daniel 4 features περιεπάτουν (μετὰ τῶν θηρίων) and ἐγραψε, connected to each other through the same grammatical subject, king Nebuchadnezzar.

The phrase “δοξαζεῖν τὸν δόντα [+ dat. (personal pronoun) +acc.]” similarly associates the second sentence in 25.1 mentioning “γράφειν τὴν ἱστορίαν ταύτην” with a sentence in the body of the text (14.2). This sentence is placed at the end of a longer account with allusions to the betrayal of Judas in the gospel according to Matthew to the narrative of the appearance of an angel to Joseph “κατ᾽ ὁμορφ”, after Joseph has decided to dismiss Mary secretly.

καὶ ἀνέστη Ἰωσήφ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὑπνοῦ, καὶ ἔδοξασε τὸν θεὸν Ἰσραήλ τὸν δόντα αὐτῷ τὴν χάριν ταύτην, καὶ ἔφυλασσεν αὐτὴν.

“Καὶ ἀνέστη Ἰωσήφ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὑπνοῦ”, the sentence preceding the sentence with the participle “τὸν δόντα” in 14.2 is either a sentence combining two concise statements with different verbs—“ἀνέστη ἀπὸ τῆς κλίνης” and “ἡγέρθη ἀπὸ τοῦ ὑπνοῦ”—or a

---

154 Another possible model “περιεπάτουν” is in chapter 3 of Theodotion’s translation of Daniel. See Dn (θ΄) 3:23-24 καὶ οἱ τρεῖς οὗτοι Σέφραχ, Μίσαχ καὶ Αβδειγαώ ἔπεσον εἰς μέσον τῆς καμίνου τοῦ πυρὸς τῆς καιομένης πεπεδήμενοι. καὶ περιεπάτουν ἐν μέσῳ τῆς φλογὸς ὑμνοῦντες τῶν θεῶν καὶ εὐλογοῦντες τῶν κύριών. The participle “πεπεδημένα” (also in Dn 3:91) leads to Is 9:1 (through Ps 106:10; notice Ps 78(79):10).

155 A link to 1.1 πελαζόμενος (in Heb 11) and 1.4, an allusion to the Temptation in the gospel according to Mark.

156 See Dn (LXX) 4:37b.

157 13.1-14.2, covering one day, and including the reference to the ἱστορία τοῦ Ἀδάμ.

158 In 14.1 παραδόσεις αἵμα ἄθος; see Mt 26:25, 46, 48, and 27:4.

159 14.2; see Mt 1:20-24.

σολοικισμός (use of the preposition “ἀπό” instead of “ἐξ” with “τοῦ ὑπνοῦ”), or else a juxtaposition, in the written text, of parts of diction (a verb, a nominative [sg.], and a preposition) that belong to different thoughts.

Interpreted as two concise statements, the words “καὶ ἀνέστη Ἰωσήφ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὑπνοῦ” describe Joseph (and his actions after “standing up”) through allusions to two sources. With “ἐγερθείς”, the prepositional phrase “ἀπὸ τοῦ ὑπνοῦ” aligns the end of the account on Joseph’s dream in 14.2 to the end of the same account in Matthew.

εἰσερθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰωσήφ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὑπνοῦ ἐποίησεν ως προσέταξεν αὐτῷ ὁ ἄγγελος κυρίον καὶ παρέλαβεν τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ.

But “ἀνέστη Ἰωσήφ ἀπὸ τῆς κλίνης” associates Joseph with Tobias, and glosses the preceding narrative (13.1-14.2) through Tobias’ account of the making of Adam and Eve and the events leading to his making of the prayer.

Even though they are linked (through verbal echos) to different parts of the narrative, and thus separated from each other in chapter 25, the two references to “ἱστορία” in 25.1 are connected to each other through their counterparts in the body of text. For, these narratives are bound together through the person of Joseph and through intertexts—for example, both feature allusions to dreams, to “κατακρίνειν θανάτῳ”, and to Aristotle’s Physica.

This casts doubt on the notion that the first reference to “ἡ ἱστορία αὐτῆς” in 25.1 refers to the entire text, or at least raises the question of how the individual narratives in the

\[161\] Mt 1:24.
\[162\] See Tb 8:4-8 ὃς δὲ συνεκλείσθησαν ἁμφότεροι, ἀνέστη Τοβίας ἀπὸ τῆς κλίνης καὶ ἐπένε
\[163\] Ἀνάστηθι, ἀδελφή, καὶ προσευχήσεται ἡμᾶς ἡμᾶς ἐλεησθῇ ὁ κύριος.
\[164\] In 14.2 Mt 1:20 ὅπερ; in 18.2 Dn 4 ἐνυπνοῦν.
\[164\] Through the allusion to the betrayal of Judas in 14.1, see Mt 27:4, 20:18; and Dn 4:37 in 18.2.
\[165\] 14.1 Arist. Ph. 239α11 ἠρέμησεν, in 18.2 Arist. Ph. 253α27, 254β1 ἠρεμοῦντα.
text (with different narrators) are related to the narrative as a whole, or to those sections singled out through the noun ἱστορία.

The review of the secondary literature thus leaves us with two questions—the function of the title, and the function and interpretation of the reference to ἱστορία. In the next chapter we will see that the two are closely related.

166 E.g., does the vision correspond to the narrative, and if it does, what are the implications for reading the text?
We have seen in our discussion (ch. 1) of Galen’s example of διδασκαλία “χωρίς ὁρων” that the interpretation or translation (ἐρμηνεία) of what is signified by a term (in Galen’s case πίσυρες) is brought about by juxtaposing two sentences or verses from different passages or texts, one of which allows a clarification of the meaning (but not of the usage) of the word it has in common with the other. The usage of the term is clarified through the juxtaposition, without connectives, of two phrases selected from different origins; these words or phrases evoke tightly woven narratives and arguments that, in their proper locations, clarify their usage. Placed together, these phrases syntactically imitate another sentence featuring both—and thus serving as common referent. Together, the different references point to ὁμοια in the narratives that clarify what is signified by the term.

Without keeping in mind this mode of defining a term (through a λόγος defining the subject descriptively and through usage, illustrated through examples incorporated into the very definition itself, e.g., through verbal or morphological allusions), the present chapter may seem to lack inner coherence or even relevance for our discussion of PJ. But this chapter is meant to help us determine not just the meaning but the usage of the term Ἰστορία in the period when PJ was composed and began to circulate—even though much of it is devoted to
a discussion of a chapter in the *Tεχνη Διονυσίου γραμματικόν* entitled “περὶ στοιχείου” that does not mention “ἰστορία” at all!

We will see, however, that in order to determine the usage of “ἰστορία” we have to inquire into the usages of γράφειν (and to some extent of ἀναγιώσκειν, too). Despite its heading, “περὶ στοιχείου” is a discussion of both γράμματα and στοιχεία, with explanations of the terms through etymology and examples demonstrating usage together with the plausibility of the etymologies. Clarifying the usage of the term “ἰστορία” by studying grammatical teachings on γράμματα and στοιχεία, and on writing and reading, does have antecedents in the writings of the grammarians. More importantly, however, taking such a “grammatical” approach is not only true to the period—in the case of the references to “ἰστορία” in *PJ* it is quite necessary. The two verb forms (and substantives) “ὁ γράφας” and “τοῦ γράφαι” are used by the authors of the different versions of *PJ* to allude to sources in the Old and in the New Testaments. But placed together in the same chapter, and juxtaposed to the grammatical term “ἰστορία”, they also point point the reader to classical παραδείγματα used by grammarians to illustrate and clarify definitions of the terms “γράμματα” (letters, lines) and “στοιχεία” (elements, ἀτομα).

Because definitions of grammatical terms such as “ἰστορία” are accompanied by, and clarified through, “canonical” examples (especially from Homer)—examples that may also be illustrating the usage of other words—the terms themselves are associated with metaphors and signifieds that may not be immediately apparent from the abstract definition alone (especially not to the modern reader), or may be fully understandable only in relation to other concepts. In the case of “ἰστορία”, such a conceptual web is reflected in (and thus to
some extent accessible through) different characteristics of the appearance and structure of
the spoken and written word such as repetitions or paraphrases for completing and
“straightening” otherwise fragmentary or misleading statements, usage of vocabulary and
syntax that is not σύνθεσις or consistent, or preference for indirect speech and pronouns
instead of personal names (causing syntactical ambiguities) and “dynamic” (flowing)
sentence boundaries.

The different παραδείγματα explaining the terms γράμματα and στοιχεία
associate the term “ἰστορία” with “general” narratives associated with “γράφειν”. They fall
into into three groups, corresponding to different explanations of the term “στοιχεία” in
Dionysius Thrax— one emphasizing an analogy between στοιχεία and the four κόσμικα
στοιχεία, another stressing a link to “στοιχος” and “τάξις”, and a “mixed” one combining
aspects of both. These narratives (which draw on the definition of ἀνθρωπος as ζῷον
λογικῶν θνητῶν and as having a φωνή ἐγγράμματος) do fit PJ (e.g., Anna’s change of
clothing, or Zechariah’s death), and especially the parts of the treatise called “ἰστορία” (and
the models after which the sentences with the term are patterned).

Second, the word is conceptualized as “flowing” (a φωνή ἐναρμόνιος, with
σύνθεσις as main “ordering” device) or as “architectonic” (φωνή ἐναρμόνιος; with emphasis
on “parts” and structure). This implies that when we are reading a text called “ἰστορία”, we

167 E.g., see Grammatici Graeci 1.3, 317.18-28 στοιχεία δὲ εἰρήνηται ἐκ τοῦ στιχονόμου γράφεσθαι
στίχεοι, καὶ πλεονάσμῳ τοῦ <ο> στοιχείοις ἀι δὲ πλεονάσμῳ τοῦ <¢> στοιχείων φασιν, ἐν γὰρ τοῖς
τοῖχοις ἐγγράφωστο πρότερον, πάλιν οὖν λέγουσιν ἀλλοι οὐνομασθήναι αὐτὰ ἀπὸ τοῦ στείχου, εἰς οὔ
γίνεται στοιχος· καὶ ὁπερ ἀπὸ τοῦ πρῶτος γίνεται πρωτεῖον, οὕτω καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ στοιχος στοιχείων.
τινὲς δὲ φασὶ στοιχεία αὐτὰ οὐνομασθήναι ἐκ μεταφορᾶς τῶν κοσμικῶν στοιχείων ὥσ τρόπον γὰρ
ἐκείνα τῇ μίξει τῇ πρὸς ἄλληλα τὰ ἡμέτερα σώματα καθίστασι τε καὶ ἀποτελεῖ, τὸν αὐτῶν τρόπον
καὶ ἀπὸ τούτων τῶν στοιχείων τῇ πρὸς ἄλληλα κοινωνία ἀποτελοῦται αἱ συλλαβαί, καὶ ἀπὸ
συλλαβῶν ἢ τῶν λέξεων σύστασις.
have to take both aspects into account. Αἴστορία is a φωνή ἐγγράμματος that may not be harmonious (or remain without thought) without help in restoring the proper proportions (size, τόνος, etc.) and order for reading without stumbling (or sending forth a λόγος).

Διόρθωσις

The problem of distorting a text by removing necessary components from their assigned position or by altering their form falls into the same category as the problem of introducing changes into a text by “correcting” seeming textual corruptions. Grammarians writing on the topic of τρόποι and σχήματα (figures of speech and of thought) emphasize that—in order to determine accurately whether a deviation from customary usage (συνήθεια) in writing or speaking is an ἀρετή (or κακία) (which is the basis for judging the poet)—it is necessary to examine whether the discovered “ἀμάρτημα”168 is voluntary or involuntary and to inquire into the author’s reason for committing it. Some even liken this process to an ἀγων in a court of law, in a legal case in which both sides agree that a deed was done but debate its quality (and definition). Consider, for example, Heliodorus’ explanation of the difference between σχῆμα and σολοκισμός.169

διαφέρει δὲ σχῆμα σολοκισμοῦ, ἐπειδὴ σχῆμα μὲν ἐστὶ ποιητοῦ ἢ συγγραφέως ἀμάρτημα ἐκούσιον διὰ τέχνην ἢ ξενοφωνίαν ἢ καλλωπισμόν, σολοκισμός δὲ ἀμάρτημα ἀκούσιον, οὐ διὰ τέχνην ἀλλὰ δι’ ἀμαθίαν γινόμενον.

168 “Ἀμάρτημα” reflects the goal of γραμματική—to speak without sinning; e.g., see Eliae in Porphyrii isagogen et Aristotelis categorias commenaria, ed. A. Busse, Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca 18.1 (Berlin: Reimer, 1900), 5.

The emphasis on ἐκούσιον or ἀκούσιον (each additionally divided by the cause—
διὰ τέχνην or διὶ ἀμαθίαν) associates this definition with discussions on the
commonplaces for speeches of defense whose authors stress the defendant’s intent.¹⁷⁰

The search (for corrections or confirmation of an impression (perception) or
prejudgment by the reader or listener) requires assessing ὀρθογραφία (and the four κανόνες
τῆς ὀρθογραφίας), and identifying the σκοπός of the book.¹⁷¹

Ὅρθογραφία

Finding an “ἀπολογία” for a perceived flaw in a written text (and thereby correcting
it) includes determining which of the four “κανόνες τῆς ὀρθογραφίας” (ἀναλογία, διάλεκτος, ἐτυμολογία, and ἱστορία) is to be applied in judging the respective case. A
κανών¹⁷² can take the form of a paradigm—a phrase demonstrating usage (in which case the
“ἀμάρτημα” may be a correctly written allusion to a source)—or the form of an abstract
definition (clarified through analogous examples).

¹⁷⁰ E.g., see Quint. Inst. 7.4.
¹⁷¹ “Διορθοδοῦ” (of these ἀμαρτήματα) takes two forms—making physical (and lasting) corrections on the page
(or in another place for the same work), or changing the perception (by pointing to the reason or an analogy
demonstrating usage, or by identifying the speaker).
¹⁷² For an etymology of “κανών”, see EM 489. <κανών>: παρὰ τὸ καὶνό, τὸ κόπτω, ὁ τὰ τῶν λέξεων
cόπτων ζητήματα. ἔστι δὲ εἰδοὺς περιεκτικοῦ. εἰρηται δὲ κανών ἀπὸ τῶν τεκτονικοῦ κανόνος·
ὡσπερ γὰρ ὁ τέκτων κέχρηται κανόνα διὰ τὸ ἐπανορθώσαι τὸ ἀποτελούμενον, τὸν αὐτόν τρόπον καὶ
ἡμεῖς κεχρήμεθα τῷ κανόνι διὰ τὸ ἐπανορθώσαι τὰς λέξεις. ἔστι δὲ κανῶν λόγος ἐντεχνος
δηλωτικός, ἀπευθύνων ὁμοιότητα πρὸς τὸ καθόλου. <κανώνας> ἐπὶ τῆς ἀσπίδας, τὰς ράβδους, αἱς
εκράτους τὰς ἀσπίδας· οὗτο γὰρ ἔχρωντό τοῖς πόρταξιν, οὗς ὄχινα ἐκάλουν· ύπέρ τοῦ ἰατροῦ ἐπενοίηθη
ὑπὸ Καρών, ὡς ἀνακρέων φησί.
Both types of κανώνες are represented in this explanation of "ὁρθογραφία", which belongs to a chapter "περὶ προσφοδίας" in the treatise "Περὶ γραμματικῆς" by the grammarian Theodosius.\(^\text{173}\)

ιστέον δὲ, ὅτι δώο σημαίνει τὸ τῆς ὀρθογραφίας ὄνομα· ἔστι γὰρ ὀρθογραφία λέξις ὁ ὀρθῶς γεγραμμένη· ἔστι καὶ ὁ κανών ὁ ἀποδεικτικὸς τῆς ὀρθῶς γεγραμμένης λέξεως

οἷον εὰν γράψω: 'ταχεία'· διὰ τῆς εἰ διφθόγγου, αὕτη ἢ λέξις ἢ γραφεῖσα ὀρθῶς ὀρθογραφία καλεῖται·

καὶ εὰν ἑρωτηθῶ τὴν αἵτιν πῆς γραφῆς καὶ εἰπὼ τὸν κανώνα, ὅτι 'τὰ ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς <νς>· ληγόντων ἁρσεινικῶν ἡθικά παρεσχηματισμένα· διὰ τοῦ εἰα διὰ τῆς εἰ διφθόγγου γράφονται, οἷον ταχύς ταχεία, ὅκυς ὀκεια, ἢδυς ἢδεια, ὤξυς ὀξεια.\(^\text{174}\)

αὕτω τὸ κανῶν ὀρθογραφία καλεῖται.

"Ταχεία" is used twice in the paragraph, in statements paralleled to each other through the repetition of phrases ("οἷον", "διὰ τῆς εἰ διφθόγγου", "ὁρθογραφία καλεῖται") and also contrasted to each other through the tenses and grammatical persons and numbers of the finite forms of γράφειν—"γράψω" (linked to the λέξις) and "γράφονται" (linked to the γραφή). "Ταχεία" in the first sentence is aligned to "γραφεῖσα ὀρθῶς" through its position (immediately behind the verb γράφειν) and to "οἷον ταχύς ταχεία" through "οἷον"; this suggests that the two words illustrate different usages—the first "ταχεία" limits the verb (similar to the adverb "ταχέως", by analogy with "ὁρθῶς"); the second is a substantivized adjective (ὄνομα) in the nominative singular feminine, a "παρεσχηματισμένον" ("οἷον ταχύς ταχεία").

---

\(^{173}\) Theodosii Alexandrini grammatica, ed. K. Göttling (Leipzig: Libraria Dykiana, 1822), 61.22-32.

\(^{174}\) The γραφή of the κανών (spoken in answer to the question about the αἵτιν πῆς γραφῆς) is composed of a quotation of a sentence, interrupted in the middle by a phrasal allusion (to another sentence). Both sentences are from the grammarian Aelius Herodianus and end with a list of analogies that include "ταχύς ταχεία". See Herodiani partitiones, ed. J. F. Boissonade (1819; repr., London, 1963), 222.20-223.3; and Grammtici Graeci 3.2, 708.27-30.
The list with the four pairs of adjectives suggests that “ταχεία”, too, has two signifieds. The “λεξίς” ταχεία (followed, after an utterance, by the adjective ὄκεια) points to a phrase in the Iliad terminating in “ταχεία”—the words spoken by Zeus at dispatching Iris: “βάσκ᾽ ἵθι Ἰρί ταχεία”.175 These words begin a message (ἀγγελίη or μῦθος) to be conveyed by the messenger. At the end of the message, a sentence in the third person singular refers to Iris again, this time with an epithet—“ὁκέα Ἰρις”.176 Written with the diphthong “εῖ”, i.e., as ὄκεια (the form of the adjective in the list of analogies), the combination of the name with the adjective points to the account on the descent of Iris (born by Electra to Thaumas) in Hesiod’s Theogony—“ἡ δ᾽ ὄκειαν τέκεν Ἰριν”.177 There, the adjective is in the accusative case.178 By analogy with “ταχεία” and “ὄκεια”—joined by one referent (Ἰρις)—the two adjectives “ἡδύς” and “ὄξυς” are linked as synonyms of “λεγύς”179—and, therefore, point to Nestor.

The correctness of the spelling is based on two criteria—a phrase in Homer (and in Hesiod) serves as measure; the writing is correct but the authority has to be found; or the καινῶν the closest to (i.e., the most like) the writing has to be found, to reconstruct the correct word and identify its analogues.

175 II. 8.399; 11.186; 15.158; 24.144.
176 The spelling “ὁκέα” instead of “ὁκεία” is an example illustrating διάλεκτος.
177 Hes. Theog. 266.
178 The epithet “ὁκεία” is explained through a comparison in Hes. Theog. 269.
179 E.g., see EM 564.54-57, illustrated with II. 1.248.
Corrective statements can be part of the text itself. But guidance for the reader is also provided by the “σκόπος” of a work, which is in agreement with and “contained” in the ἐπιγραφή. A rigorous scrutiny of what is said in the “λόγος” and of its agreement with the ἐπιγραφή is part of the introductory discussion a work by exegetes. Lists of the headings guiding the exegete in this task (ὁ σκοπός, τὸ χρῆσιμον, τὸ γνήσιον, ἡ τάξις, ἡ αἰτία τῆς ἐπιγραφῆς, ἡ εἰς τὰ μόρια διαίρεσις, ὁ διδασκαλικὸς τρόπος) appear in commentaries on individual works, such as Aristotle’s Categories or the Τεχνή of Dionysius Thrax, or Aphthonius the Sophist’s Progymnasmata, but also in prolegomena to bodies of works (such as the anonymous Prolegomena Philosophiae Platonicae).

In this excerpt from Pseudo-Archytas’ treatise Περὶ παιδεύσεως ἠθικῆς, the meaning of the term “σκοπός” is clarified through Homeric examples anchored in the text through phrasal allusions.

180 E.g. Προλεγόμενα τῶν Ἀφθονίου Προγυμνασμάτων 1, in Prolegomenon Sylloge, ed. H. Rabe (Stuttgart and Leipzig: Teubner, 1995), 73 (see 6 pp. 76-78); Grammatici Graeci I.3, 162.22 (159 l. 9 σκοπός; l. 11 χρήσιμον; 160 l. 24 γνήσιον; 161 l. 9 τάξις, l. 12 αἰτία τῆς ἐπιγραφῆς, l. 17 εἰς τὰ μόρια διαίρεσις, l. 20 διδασκαλικοὶ τρόποι, l. 25 ὕπο τι μέρος).
183 The reference to the τέλος associates the nautical imagery with Alcinoû’s description of the ships of the Phaeacians. In conjunction with the chariot race imagery, the image points to Iλ. 23.319.
184 See Od. 10.140-41 (arrival on Circe’s island) ἔστε ὁ τὸν ἀκτής νῆς κατηγογόμεσα σωπὴ ναῦλοχον ἐσ λιμένα, καὶ τῶς θεός ἰγεμόνευεν. The account continues with a description of Odysseus as σκοπός (εἰ πως έργα ἔδοιξε μητρῶς εὐποίην τε πυθόμην) in 10.148-50 ἐστεν δὲ σκοπήν ἐς παταλόδεσσαν ἀνέλθαν, / καὶ μοι ἔεσσατο κατίνῳ ἀπὸ χθονος εἰρυμοδείς, / Κύρκης ἐν μεγάρῳ, διὰ δριμὰ πυκνὰ καὶ ἐλαὶν.
The examples illustrating in the first clause what is by necessity the first in everything—namely “σκοπᾶν τὸ τέλος”—are taken from the Iliad and Odyssey. The second clause—paralleled to the first through the repetition of “ἀνάγκα”—features allusions to a passage in Plato’s Laws on ἐκφορά and ταφή.186

Where the judgment of written statements is concerned the σκοπός is the σκοποὶ of the writer.187 Knowing the σκοπός is essential for a successful (knowledgable) reading of the text.188

When the σκοπός is not be stated explicitly by the author, it has to be derived (inferred) from the text.

The headings “σκοπός” and “αἰτία τῆς ἐπιγραφῆς” are interrelated.189

---

185 The phrase ἀνάγκα δὲ τέρμα δρόμῳ is a combined allusion to II. 23.358-61 and 460 ἴνα ἄναξ. See II. 23.358-61 στὰν δὲ μεταστοιχί, σήμερον δὲ τέρματ’ Ἀχιλλεὺς / τηλώθεν ἐν λείῳ πεδίῳ παρὰ δὲ σκοποὺς ἐξειν / ἀντίθεον Φώκικα, ὅπως σαφώς ἔστησεν, / ὡς μεμεῖστο δρόμου καὶ ἀληθείη ἀποετοῦ. 186 These allusions to Plato are prepared by the participle “προτιθέμενοι”, which links the grammatical subjects of the three Homeric examples to the passage in the Laws. 187 See Ammónios in Aristotelis categorías commentarius, ed. A. Busse, Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca 4.4 (Berlin: Reimer, 1895), 7.17-21 Τὸν σκοπὸν τοῦ βιβλίου ὡσπερ γὰρ ὁ τοξότης, οἷς τοίχοι, σκοπὸν τινα ἔχει πρὸς νὰ βάλλει καὶ οὐθεὶν τυχεῖν, οὔτω καὶ οὐ γράφων τι πρὸς τὸ τέλος ἀφορά κάκεινον σπουδάζει τυχεῖν· δει τοῖς τούτοις ἐπιεικεῖται ὁ τι ποτὲ ἐστί, δεύτερον ἐπὶ τούτῳ τί χρήσιμον ἔχομεν ἕκ τον συγγράμματος, εἰ μὴ συνασφαλίσατο τῷ σκοπῷ (ἔπι πολλῶν γὰρ τούτῳ συμβαίνει). 188 Davidson prolegomena et in Porphyrii isagogen commentarium, ed. A. Busse, Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca 18.2 (Berlin: Reimer, 1904), 80.16-81.3.
Similar to the examples of “ταχεία” and of the list of adjectives in the “κανών”—both of which lead to examples in Homer illustrating other, related concepts—expositions on the term “Ιστορία” are linked to examples clarifying the meaning of term relative to other concepts, or leading to technical discussions of related terms. Even though these other examples and concepts may not be stated explicitly, they are included in the text through allusions or cross-references and are presupposed in the argumentation (e.g., as referents of abstract statements).

At first glance, abstract definitions of Ιστορία are more or less the same—in general, “Ιστορία” is defined as a type of narrative. For example, the grammarian Tryphon, commenting on the definition of the third part of γραμματική in Dionysius Thrax, first paraphrases an abbreviated quotation of the entry in Dionysius Thrax (stressing συντομία and ἐρώτησις) and then (after distinguishing between διάλεκτος and γλώσσα) speaks of γλώσσα and Ιστορία separately:

190 See Grammatici Graeci 1.1, 6.1 τρίτον γλωσσῶν τε καὶ Ιστοριῶν πρόχειρος ἀπόδοσις.
A very similar worded definition of ἱστορία (probably drawing on the story of Arion and the dolphin in Herodotus as clarifying example) is given by the grammarian Theodosius in a brief list with questions and answers on five “τρόποι” of ἀνάγνωσις (ἀναλογία, ἐτυμολογία, συναλοιφή, διάλεκτος, ἱστορία). “Τί ἦστιν ἱστορία;” is the last question. (Except for the third—“συναλοιφή”—these “τρόποι” correspond to the four κανόνες of ὀρθογραφία.)

Both Tryphon and Theodosius associate “ἱστορία” with ὀρθογραφία (which determines/shapes προφορά). In Tryphon, this is accomplished through the comment on γλώσσα (linked to ἐτυμολογία and ὀρθογραφία through the different spellings—and thus pronunciations—of words); in Theodosius, the same occurs in a brief definition of the ἀρχή

192 See Hdt. 1.24. This is suggested by the combination of a rhematikon of ἱστορεῖν and a rhematikon derived from ἀφηγεῖσθαι in Hdt. 1.24. Aristides Quintilianus uses the phrase in his work Peri μουσικῆς; he identifies the “makers” of such accounts as “ποιηταῖ” (in the context of invoking the Muses and Apollo); see Aristides Quintilianus de musica libri tres, ed. R. P. Winnington–Ingram (Leipzig: Teubner, 1963), 1.3.1-5 “ἡδη δὲ καὶ ἤμιν ἐκτέον τοῦ πρόσω πθένει μουσικῆς κατά νόμον καλεσχαμένης, τοῖς μὲν γὰρ ποιηταῖς καὶ ταῦτα μηδὲν μουσικῆς περὶ διασδομένης μικρὸ δὲ των ταύτων μορίων πράξεων παλαιῶν ἀφηγεῖσθαι ποιομένους Μούσας τε καλοῦνται καὶ Ἀπόλλων Μουσῶν ἔπιστάτης”. Aristides then refers back to “ποιομένους” with the words “παλαιοῦς μὲν θεόν διηγησομένους” (1.3.6-7).

193 See Theodosii Alexandrini grammatica, 57.30 (5 modes). Twelve modes are listed in Grammatici Graeci 1.3, 169.11-18, 309.6-8, 453.27, and 454.14-16.

194 Theodosii Alexandrini grammatica, 57.29-58.5.

195 The definition of συναλοιφή presupposes μέρη λέξεως (τελευταία, πρώτη) and a distinction between vowels and consonants; without “συναλοιφή”, the τρόποι are bound together by the acrostic “ἰδέα” (read from bottom to top).
and τέλος of γραμματική (with emphasis on barbarisms and solecisms in speaking) in the paragraph preceding the discussion of the question “τί ἔστιν ἀνάγνωσις?”

The same association of ἱστορία with διήγησις as in Tryphon and in Theodosius is part of a complex exposition on the term by Heliodorus. In contrast to Tryphon and Theodosius, however, Heliodorus puts particular emphasis on a connection between ἱστορία and γράμματα and στοιχεία. In his exposition, “ἱστορία” is clarified through the definitions and through the examples (from Homer and the ancients) incorporated into them.

Heliodorus refers to “ἱστορία” five times in discussing the description of the third part of γραμματική in Dionysius Trax’ Τέχνη. In the middle part of his exposition, he connects individual statements on ἱστορία (and the entry in Dionysius Thrax explained by him) to statements made by him on other, related parts of the Τέχνη. Through the phrase “ἱστορία δὲ διητῶς λέγεται” at the beginning of a longer paragraph, Heliodorus associates a description (λέγειν) of “ἱστορία” as “διήγησις τῶν πάλαι πραγμάτων” with definitions of “ἱστορία”, “μῦθος”, and “πλάσμα” in his comments on Dionysius Thrax’ introduction of γραμματική as “ἐμπειρία τῶν παρὰ ποιηταῖς τε καὶ συγγραφεύσιν ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ λεγομένων”, with the same phrase he links the

---

196 See Theodosii Alexandrini grammatica, 57.6-11, 56.3-4.
197 169 (i.e., 13^2) syllables; 400 letters.
198 See Grammatici Graeci 1.3, 470.4-5 ἱστορία δὲ διητῶς λέγεται καὶ γάρ τὴν διήγησιν τῶν πάλαι πραγμάτων ἱστορίαν φαμέν καὶ τὴν τῶν παλαίων χρήσιν.
199 See Grammatici Graeci 1.3, 449.11-14 ἱστορία δὲ πραγμάτων γεγονότων ἢ ἐν τούτῳ ἡ δυνάτω σαφῆς ἀπαγγέλει μῦθος δὲ ξένων πραγμάτων ἀπροακεμέων διήγησις ἢ δυνάτων πραγμάτων παρεσαγωγή πλάσμα <δὲ> τὸ δυνάμενον μὲν γενέσθαι μὴ γενόμενον δὲ. This connection between the two parts of his explanation is strengthened through a reference to “πεπλασμέναι” in 470.10-11, at the end of the exposition on different types of γραμματικοί.
200 Grammatici Graeci 1.1, 5.2-3.
sentence(s) about ἱστορία to a description of στοιχείον in a discussion of the seeming contradiction between the beginning of Dionysius’ chapter “περὶ στοιχείου” (γράμματα ἐστιν εἰκοσιτέσσαρα) and its continuation (τὰ δὲ αὕτὰ καὶ στοιχεία καλεῖται).

The paragraph with the words “ἱστορία δὲ διττῶς λέγεται” begins and ends with a sentence on ἱστορία. The positions of the individual parts of speech are “fixed” through acrostics.

Heliodorus gives his “double” definition of ἱστορία in explaining Dionysius Thrax’ definition of the third part of γραμματική—“τρίτων γλωσσῶν τε καὶ ἱστοριῶν πρόχειρος ἀπόδοσις”. Yet the participle “τετριμμένη” in the sentence at the end of this paragraph is an allusion to an adjective in Dionysius Thrax’ definition of the first part of γραμματική—“πρώτων ἀνάγνωσις ἐντριβής κατὰ προσῳδίαν”. Moreover, the sentence

---

201 See Grammatici Graeci 1.3 λέγεται δὲ στοιχείον διττῶς τὰ τε ἀδ’ ἑαυτῶν ἀρχόμενα γράμματα, καὶ τὰ ἐξ ὧν σύγκειται τὰ σώματα.
202 Grammatici Graeci 1.1, 9.2.
203 Grammatici Graeci 1.1, 9.5-6.
204 Grammatici Graeci 1.3, 470.4-11.
with the reference to ἱστορία as “τετριμμένη” is followed by an explanation (γάρ) with an allusion (the participle πεπλασμέναι) to Heliodorus’ first definition of ἱστορία as “σαφῆς ἀπαγγελία”, which is part of a discussion of Dionysius’ introduction of γραμματική as ἐμπειρία (aligning ἱστορία to λεγόμενα).

Heliodorus additionally stresses the connection between ἱστορία and ἀνάγνωσις in the sentence with the participle “τετριμμένη” through a reference to an explanation (λέγειν and μετραφράζειν) of the pronunciation (τόνος) of “μηνίς” for one who is introduced (εἰσαγόμενος), which follows after an exposition on how a grammarian knows “πᾶσα γλώσσα” (through κανόνες), and a statement on διάλεκτος and ὀρθογραφία. He draws on the same example (μηνίς) in discussing the order of the different μέρη γραμματικῆς in reference to a νέος, beginning with ἀνάγνωσις. In both cases, “μηνίς” is associated with “ἐμμένειν”—explained through διάλεκτος and through ἐτυμολογία.

The participle τετριμμένη is usually in agreement with ἀνάγνωσις, not with “ἱστορία”. The verb “τρίβειν” emphasizes ἀνάγνωσις according to what is transmitted by the ancient grammarians, i.e., customary and examined (ἐντριβής is paraphrased as συνήθης and δεδομεμένη). Ἀνάγνωσις, linked to a discussion on στοιχεία (through διττῶς λέγεται), suggests an allusion to the explanation of the term “ἀνάγνωσις” as “ἡ δευτέρα γνώσις” by γραμματικοῖ, which expresses a core distinction between συλλαβαί (the subject of “ἡ πρώτη γνώσις”) and μέρη λέξεως (the subject of ἡ δευτέρα

207 See Grammatici Graeci 1.3, 13.11-18; 169.3-6; 305.17-19 454.4-7.
208 See Grammatici Graeci 1.3, 57.12-17; 305.14-16; 453.34-454.1.
γνώσεως) as basic units in the conceptualization of sound. (This distinction corresponds to a distinction between φωνή ἕναρμόνιος and φωνή ἕναρθρος.)

The sentences on ἱστορία in the discussion of γραμματικοὶ are preceded by a paragraph with seven phrases excerpted from Homer (varying in length from a single word to two lines); the quotations, which are introduced by a definition of “γλώσσα”,

\[ \text{209} \text{ See Grammatici Graeci 1.3, 469.10-12 γλώσσα ἔστι λέξις ἔννοι μεταφραζόμενη εἰς τὴν ἰμετέραν διάλεκτον, ἢ λεγομένη μὲν προσεχῶς, μεταφραζόμενη δὲ εἰς τὸ σύνθεσις.} \]

illustrate different modes of how “λύονται αἱ γλώσσαι”. The phrases and the comments on individual words in them are subdivided and bound together through five ordinals (from πρῶτον to πέμπτον, arranged in ascending sequence) and through two acrostics (“ἐδει”), as well as through the books of Homer from which they are taken.

\[ \text{210} \text{ With the exception of “ἐπιλυσις” (with two subdivisions), the categories correspond to the κανόνες of οἰρογραφία. Ἐπιλυσις is in the place of ἀναλογία.} \]

The explanation of “μῆνις” associates the statement on how a grammarian ought to know “πᾶσα ἱστορία” with the last two examples of Heliodorus’ list, including “κατὰ ἱστορίαν” (the fifth category with the preposition “κατά”). The adverb “πάλαι”, in contrast, links the definition of “ἰστορία” as “ἡ διήγησις τῶν πάλαι πραγμάτων” to the

\[ \text{211} \text{ E.g., the first letters of the accusatives of “κατά” form the verb “ἐδει”: ἐπιμολογία, διάλεκτος, ἐπιλυσις, ἱστορία.} \]

\[ \text{212} \text{ See II. 6.328, 12.436, 15.413, 17.736.} \]
first entry—“κατὰ ἐτυμολογίαν”. This corresponds to a division by speakers—Calchas and Phoenix—and analogies between ἰστορία and θεοπρόπιον and ἰστορία and ἐτυμον.

**Θεοπρόπιον**

“Μηνυν” seems to refer to the first word of book A of the *Iliad*—“μηνυν θειά Πηλημάδεω ’Αχιλής / οὐλομένην”; in Heliodorus’ explanation, however, it also points to Calchas answer, in *Iliad* 1.74-75, to Achilles’ suggestion to call for someone to speak on the cause of the plague—“ὡ ’Αχιλεῦ, κέλεαί με, διίφιλε, μυθήσασθαι / μηνυν ’Απόλλωνος ἐκατηβελέτας ἄνακτος”. Which line of the *Iliad* is meant (1.1 or 1.74) depends on the finite verb of which “μηνυν” is the direct object—“ἀδειν” or “μυθεῖσθαι”—or on the speaker—“ἡ θειά” (*Il. 1.1*, a muse), or the referent of “με” (*Il. 1.74*). “Με” has two antecedents, since Achilles proposes

άλλ’ ἄγε δὴ τινα μάντιν ἐρείομεν ἡ ἱερὴ, ἡ καὶ ὀνειρόπολον, καὶ γὰρ τ’ ὄνομ ἐκ διός ἐστιν, ὃς κ’ εἶποι ὅ τι τόσον ἐχώσαιτο Φοῖβος ’Απόλλων, 213

and Calchas (the speaker of “κέλεαί με”) is introduced as

... οἰωνοπόλον ὃς ἁρίστος, ὃς ἡ δὴ τά τ’ ἐώντα τά τ’ ἐσσώμενα πρό τ’ ἐώντα, 214
καὶ νῆσος’ ἡγήσατο ’’Αχαιῶν ’’Ἰλιὼν εἰσώ ἡν διά μαντοσύνην, τὴν οί πόρε Φοῖβος ’’Απόλλων. 215

The words then spoken by Calchas as μάντις 216—summarily described by Achilles as “θεοπρόπιον” 217 spoken by someone with sure knowledge 218—cause an angry response

---

213 *Il. 1.62-64.*
215 *Il. 1.69-72.*
216 *Il. 1.92.*
217 *Il. 1.85, 385.*
by Agamemnon. Heliodorus quotes the first two lines of Agamamnon’s words to Calchas in explaining the fourth mode of solving “tongues” (i.e., ἐξ ἀντιφραζομένου).

In the list with the examples, the fourth mode is closely related to the fifth (κατὰ ἱστορίαν) both are taken from the same book of Iliad; and the first implies a reference to the second (Calchas’ θεοπρόπιος revealing the cause of Apollo’s wrath).

In the Iliad, each of the quoted passages is linked to a second statement with a description of the respective speaker through the same participle. Chryses makes his first request as “ἐυχόμενος”. The quotation of his invocation of Apollo has a counterpart in a prayer made by him on behalf of the Danaans, again as ἐυχόμενος, after Odysseus returns Briseis to her father with a payment; in this prayer, in Chyrses refers to his first request (emphasizing that he was honored by Apollo). In contrast to his first prayer, Chryses does not invoke Apollo as Σμινθεὺς.

---

218 Il. 1.385.
219 100 syllables from “τέταρτον” to “τοῦ Σμινθείου”.
220 See II. 1.93-100 (1.94 refers to 1.9-12), 2.384f.; 1.109.
221 Grammatici Graeci 1.3, 469.20-26.
222 The grammatical form “τοῦ Σμινθείου” in “ἡ ἱστορία τοῦ Σμινθείου” can be explained in two ways: the definite article “τοῦ” is the article of the noun limiting “ἡ ἱστορία” (in the nominative “ὁ Σμινθεὺς” (θεός) or “τὸ Σμινθείου” (τιτάν); or it is the genitive of a neuter article through which a noun (ὄνομα) quoted in the genitive is substantivized—“τοῦ Σμινθείου”, in analogy to the first syllables of the verse from Homer quoted for illustration, “ὁς τὸ Σμινθεύ, εἰ ποτὲ τοῦ” “οὐ κακά” in the explanation of the example for the fourth mode (μάντι κακῶν... τὰ κακ’ ἐστὶ φύλα). “Ἀκούστος κακά ἔργα” is the subject matter of a speech in Il. 9.595 (referred to an ἐκφάσις of the taking of a city made by Meleager’s wife). Linked to “ἡ ἱστορία”, the genitive describes the subject matter of the narrative or inquiry (e.g. ἡ ἱστορία περί τοῦ Σμινθείου) or the source of “ἡ ἱστορία”.
223 See Il. 1.43.
224 See Il. 1.450-57.
The words that cause Agamemnon’s anger are spoken by Calchas as \(\text{θεοροπεόων}\).

This is stressed by Agamemnon in the lines following Heliodorus’ excerpt.\(^{225}\)

\[
\text{ἔσθλὼν δ’ οὐτὲ τί πω ἠπιας ἐπος οὔτ’ ἐτέλεσας}
\text{kai νῦν ἐν Δαναοίς θεοροπεόων ἀγορέεις ...}
\]

The participle associates the passage with a report on another prophecy by Calchas, this time in a speech by Odysseus. In arguing for enduring rather than leaving, Odysseus recalls the “μέγα σήμα”\(^{226}\) of the sparrows and the serpent at the sacrifice in Aulis and Calchas’ interpretation of the “δεινά πέλωρα” as “τέρας μέγα” shown by Zeus. Similar to Agamemnon, he first mentions what Calchas divined.\(^{227}\)

\[
\text{τλάτε, φίλοι, καὶ μείνατ’ ἐπὶ χρόνου, δόρα δαώμεν}
\text{η ἐτεόν Κάλχας μαντεύεσται, η καὶ οὐκ \nonumber}
\]

Odysseus returns to what Calchas said after describing the great sign witnessed by all. Now he refers to Calchas as one who “spoke prophecying”.\(^{228}\)

\[
\text{ήμείς δ’ ἐσταότες θαυμάζομεν οἶον ἐτύχθη}
\text{ὡς οὖν δεινὰ πέλωρα θεῶν εἰσήλθ’ ἐκατόμβας}
\text{Κάλχας δ’ αὐτίκ’ ἐπείτα θεοπροπέων ἀγόρευε \nonumber}
\]

At the end of his recitation of Calchas’ words, Odysseus again stresses the manner in which Calchas spoke.\(^{229}\)

\[
\text{κείνος τῶς ἀγόρευε· τὰ δὴ νῦν πάντα τελεῖται} \nonumber
\]

With the assertion that now all things are being fulfilled or will be fulfilled or accomplished Odysseus counters Agamemnon’s argument for returning home—viz. that after nine years, the task of taking Troy is unfulfilled.\(^{230}\)

---

\(^{225}\) Il. 1.108-9. In his paraphrase of Calchas’ words, Agamemnon omits mentioning ἀτιμοῦν τῶν ἀρητῆρα, according to Calchas the main reason for Apollo’s wrath; see Il. 1.94.

\(^{226}\) See Il. 2.308 ἐνθ’ ἐφάνη μέγα σήμα.

\(^{227}\) Il. 2.299-300.

\(^{228}\) Il. 2.320-22.

\(^{229}\) Il. 2.330.
These two instances of θεοπρόπιον involving Calchas illustrate two meanings of the noun (and emphasize Calchas’ knowledge of past and future things).\(^{231}\)

<θεοπρόπιον>: τὸ ἐκ θεοῦ μάντευμα· ἡ τὸ θεϊκός πρέπειν· οὕτοι γὰρ, ὡς πάντα ἐπιστάμενοι, λέγουσι τὰ τοῖς ἄνθρωποις ἡγομέναι· οἶονεὶ θεοπρέπιον τι διν. ἡ θεοπρόπιον, τὸ ἐκ θεοῦ προλεγεόμενον. καὶ θεοπρόπτια, θηλυκόν. παρὰ τὸ ἐπω, τὸ λέγω, γίνεται ἐπιτον, ὡς λέγω, λόγιον καὶ μετὰ τῆς πρὸ γίνεται προεύποιν συγκοπῆ, πρόπιον καὶ μετὰ τοῦ θεὸς, θεοπρόπιον.

The revelation of the dishonoring of the priest as reason why Apollo is angry concerns an ἄγνόημα (Achilles is not aware of it); the sign and its interpretation are spoken beforehand.

The truth of Calchas’ statement cannot be determined before the advised action or before the limit (and requires comparison between an event or prediction in the past and events now). It thus depends, in part, on the time whether a narrative can be defined as πλάσμα or ἱστορία.\(^{232}\)

"Έτυμον"

"Πάλαι" links Heliodorus’ definition of “ἱστορία” as “ἡ διήγησις τῶν πάλαι πραγμάτων”\(^{233}\) to the first entry—“κατὰ ἐτυμολογίαν”—of the modes of γλώσσας λύεσθαι.\(^{234}\)

λύονται δὲ αἱ γλώσσαι πενταχῶς· πρῶτον κατὰ ἐτυμολογίαν, ὡς τὸ ὀρσεν ἐπὶ χλούνην σὺν.\(^{235}\) παρὰ τὴν χλόην καὶ τὸ ἑυνάζεσθαι, ὁ χλοεύνης εἰρηταί.

\(^{230}\) See Il. 2.137-38 ἔργον ... ἀκράαντον.
\(^{231}\) EM 446.1-8.
\(^{232}\) See Grammatici Graeci 1.3, 449.11-14.
\(^{233}\) Grammatici Graeci 1.3, 470.4-5.
\(^{234}\) Grammatici Graeci 1.3, 469.12-14.
\(^{235}\) Il. 9.539; see 9.533 ὄρσε.
The adverb πάλαι associates the definition of ἱστορία with the sentence in Phoenix’ response to Achilles. Before speaking the quoted words (τὸ ὁφρεύν ἐπὶ χλούνην σὺν’), Phoenix refers to what was long ago.

μέμνημαι τὸδε ἔργον ἐγὼ πάλαι, οὗ τὶ νέον γε, ὡς ἦν· ἐν δ’ ὑμῖν ἐρέω πάντες σει φιλόσου.  

Phoenix prepares the account on the ἔργον that he remembers by referring to “οἱ πρόσθεν”:

οὔτω καὶ τῶν πρόσθεν ἐπευθόμεθα κλέα ἄνδρῶν ἡρώων, ὅτε κέν τιν ’ ἐπιζήλευες χόλος ἰκοι· δωρητοὶ τε πέλοντο παράρρητοι τ’ ἐπέεσσι.

In addition, Phoenix (the person and speaker) connects Heliodorus’ definition of ἱστορία to the narrative on the chariot race at the funeral games for Patroclus in book 23 of the Iliad, which provides material illustrating “στοῖχος” and “τάξις” in Dionysius Thrax’ explanation of “στοιχεῖα”. There, Phoenix appears as “σκοπός”.

While “πάλαι” and “τὸ ὁφρεύν ἐπὶ χλούνην σὺν’” illustrate the explanation of the first mode with a passage in the Iliad, “τὸ ἐννάζεσθαι” associates the second half of the exposition with the first sentence voiced (φωνεῖν) by Calypso after hearing from Hermes that she is to send away with all speed the man who is with her (παρεῖναι).

σχέτλιοι ἐστε, θεοί, ζηλήμονες ἔξοχον ἄλλων οἱ τε θεαῖς ἁγάσσει παρ’ ἄνδρᾶσιν ἐννάζεσθαι ἀμφαδίην, ἥν τίς τε φίλον ποιήσετ’ ἀκοίτην.

---

236 See Od. 5.119; Hymn. Hom. Ven. 5.190.
237 See Il. 9.475.
238 Il. 9.527f.
239 Il. 9.524-26.
240 See Il. 23.358-61. Through a syntactical ambiguity, “σκοπός” refers to the τέρμα of the race (described in Il. 23.324-33, see Il. 7.89 πάλαι κατατεθησάσθαι and to Phoenix.
241 Od. 5.118-20.
242 See Od 5.105-12, see 5.129.
Because the text in \textit{Iliad} 9 on which Heliodorus draws in his definition of "\textit{ιστορία}" falls into the category of "\textit{κατά ἐτυμολογίαν}", the examples of the speeches of Phoinix and Calypso are glossed through definitions of \textit{ἐτυμολογία} and an etymological explanation of "\textit{ἐτυμολογία}" as "\textit{Άληθινολογία}".\footnote{E.g., see \textit{Grammatici Graeci} 1.3, 470.29-31 \textit{ἐτυμολογία} ἐστὶ λόγος λέξεων ἐννοιαν ἐξηγούμενος, ἢ ὄνοματων ἔξηγής, καθ' ἣν αὐτίκα τὴν πρώτην ἐσχον προσηγορίᾳν.}

Heliodorus associates his definition of "\textit{ιστορία}"—with its allusion to these words by Phoinix—through the phrase "\textit{λέγεται διττῶς}" to his explanation of a change from a discussion of "\textit{γράμματα}" with a discussion of "\textit{στοιχεῖα}" in Dionysius Thrax' chapter \textit{περὶ στοιχείου}. He thereby highlights examples (in the narratives about and by Phoinix) clarifying etymological explanations of the two terms \textit{γράμματα} and \textit{στοιχεῖα} in Dionysius' \textit{Τεχνή}. For, "\textit{τὸ ἐννάξεσθαι}" points to the beginning of Phoinix' answer, which provides one of the example clarifying the usage of a verb (\textit{ξύσαι}) to which Dionysius Thrax points in explaining the term "\textit{γράμματα}".\footnote{Grammatici Graeci 1.3, 470.36-71.1 καὶ ἕστιν ἡ ἐτυμολογία ὡς ἂν εἶποι τις ἄληθινολογία.}

\textit{Γράψαι γὰρ τὸ ἔξυσαι …}

The phrasal link (through the repetition of "\textit{διττῶς λέγεται}") between Heliodorus' definition of \textit{ιστορία} and his reference to Dionysius Thrax' explanation of the terms \textit{γράμματα} ("\textit{γράψαι τὸ ἔξυσαι}") and \textit{στοιχεῖα} suggests that Heliodorus, by adding the

\footnote{See \textit{II.} 13.553.}

\footnote{\textit{Hymn. Hom. Ven.} 224.}

\footnote{\textit{Il.} 11.388; see \textit{II.} 13.553.}
second substantivized phrase to the first, wants his audiences to focus on what Calypso says after referring to “εὐνάζεσθαι”: First the nymph compares her own situation with those in which two other goddesses found themselves—Dawn (with Orion), and Demeter (with Iasion). In the comparison between herself and Demeter, she mentions an εὐνή.

Then, having described how the ἀνήρ came to her whom she is now ordered by Zeus to send away, Calypso says

... ἢδε ἐφασκον θήσειν ἄθανατον καὶ ἂγήραον ἕματα πάντα.²⁴⁹

The example of Dawn receives clarification through the story of Dawn and Tithonius in the Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite—which is the second source of Heliodorus’ “τὸ εὐνάζεσθαι”. The implications of Calypso’s offer are brought to the fore through this hymn and through the story of Demeter’s nursing of Demophoön in the Homeric Hymn to Demeter. Heliodorus points to these narratives by singling out—through his definition of ἱστορία as “διήγησις τῶν πάλαι πραγμάτων”—a passage in Phoenix’ speech with the adjective “νέος” and by highlighting (through the juxtaposition of the quotations from Phoenix’ and Calypso’s speeches) two words found in both speeches—μυγνύοι and θήσεια.

“Νέος” links Phoenix’ introduction to the story of Meleager’s boar to the beginning of his response to the words spoken by Achilles. The adjective—referring to Phoenix—occurs in the introduction to the story how Phoenix came to accompany Achilles to Ilium,

²⁴⁹ Od. 5.135f., repeated in Od. 7.257, 23.336.
entrusted by Achilles’ father Peleus with teaching Achilles deeds of war and speaking in
counsel.\(^{250}\)

Heliodorus’ indirect allusion (through “τὸ εὔναξεσθαί”) to Calypso’s reference to
Demeter’s μιγνύναι points to the reason why Phoenix’ father cursed his son. Phoenix
recounts how he, persuaded by his mother, had intercourse with his father’s concubine before
his father (προμιγήναι).\(^{251}\)

He refers to the curses a second time\(^{252}\) in speaking of how he reared\(^{253}\) Achilles
when Achilles was a child.

Phoenix recalls his mother’s pleading and his father’s curses in explaining that he
does not want to be left behind by Achilles should the latter leave to return to Peleus.\(^{254}\)

The combination of νέος and ἡβων associates Phoenix with Nestor who describes
the strength in his “supple limbs”\(^{255}\) when he killed Itymoneus.\(^{256}\)

---

\(^{250}\) See II. 9.442f. τούνεκα με προήκε διδασκέμεναι τάδε πάντα, / μύθων τε ῥητήρ’ ἐμεναι πρηκτήρα
τε ἐργον.

\(^{251}\) II. 9.451-7.

\(^{252}\) See II. 9.492-5.

\(^{253}\) See II. 9.485 καὶ σε τοσοῦτον ἑθηκα, θεοῖς ἑπιείκελ’ Ἀχιλλεύ, 9.495 ἀλλὰ σε παιδα, θεοῖς ἑπιείκελ
Ἀχιλλεύ, πολεύμην.

\(^{254}\) II. 9.444-48.
“Θήσειν” aligns Phoenix’ description of himself as “μοι ... γῆρας ἀποξύσας” to the description of Odysseus, the βροτὸς and ἀνήρ who is the referent of Calypso’s offer to make him ageless (θήσειν ... ἀγήραον). 257

Παρὰ τοῖς παλαιοῖς

The verb “ἀποξύειν” and the participle “ηβώοντα” in Phoenix’ hypothetical condition “εἰ κέν μοι ὑποσταῖθε θεός αὐτὸς γῆρας ἀποξύσας θήσειν νέον ἦβωντα” point to the text “παρὰ τοῖς παλαιοῖς” with “ξῦσαι” at the heart of Dionysius Thrax’ explanation “γράφαι γὰρ τὸ ξῦσαι”—the story of Eos and Tithonius in the Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite. In this story, the infinitive ξῦσαι—followed by a prefix (ξῦσαι ... ἀπο)—is part of a comment by Aphrodite 258 on a request made by Dawn concerning Tithonius, a βροτὸς ἀνήρ who is “ὑμετέρῃς γενεῆς, 259 ἐπιείκελον ἀθανάτους”.

255 See Il. 11.684 νέος, 11.762.
256 Il. 11.668-72.
257 Stressed by Heliodorus, the verbal link between the two passages in the (on in the Iliad, the other in the Odyssey) suggests an implied comparison between the “νέος” (at the time when he left Hellas) and the ἡμερίς “stretching” around the hollow cave of the nymph—both nouns are limited by a participle of “ἡβῶ” (ἡβώοντα and ἦβωσα respectively).
Aphrodite refers to Tithonius in answering a request made by Anchises after she shows herself to him as goddess.\textsuperscript{260}

\[\text{άλλα σε πρὸς Ζηνῶς γουνάζομαι αἰγιόχοιο, μή με ζῶντ, άμεμπρον ἐν ἀνθρώπωσιν ἐάσης ναείν, ἀλλ' έλεαρ.} \] eπεὶ οὐ βιοθάλμιος ἀνήρ γίνεται, οὐ τε θεαὶς εὐνάζεται ἀθανάτης\]

This request is highlighted by Heliodorus in his explanation “κατὰ ἐτυμολογίαν” through the verb εὐνάζεσθαι.

Aphrodite implicitly compares Tithonius—whom Dawn wants “to be deathless and to live all days”—to Ganymede, whom she mentions immediately before she recounts the story of Dawn and Tithonius. Ganymede is “ἀθανατος καὶ ἀγήρως ίσα θεοῖσιν.”\textsuperscript{261} Tithonius, in contrast, because of Dawn’s oversight, is eventually “pressed down by hateful old age”. Aphrodite uses Tithonius’ decline and how he eventually “lives all days” in explaining why she will not take Anchises to be deathless among the immortals.\textsuperscript{262}

\[\text{άλλ' οτε δὴ πάμπαν στυγερὸν κατὰ γῆρας ἔπειγεν, οὐδὲ τι κινῆσαι μελέων δύνατ' οὐδ' ἀναείραι, ἤδε δὲ οἱ κατὰ θυμὸν ἀρίστη φαίνετο βουλή ἐν ταλάμῳ κατέθηκε, θύρας δ' ἐπέθηκε φαινάς. τοῦ δ' ἤ τοι φωνῇ ἰκεῖ ἀσπετός, οὐδὲ τι κίκως ἐσθ', οὐ πάρος ἐσκεν ἐπὶ γναμπτοῖσι μέλεσαι οὐκ ἀν ἔγω γε σὲ τοίον ἐν ἀθανάτοιον ἐλοίμην ἀθανατὸν τ' εἶναι καὶ ζώειν ἕμματα πάντα.}\]

This part of the story is linked to the passage with the infinitive ξύσαι through a repetition of the words of Dawn’s request.\textsuperscript{263} This cross-reference is preceded by an allusion to the beginning of the hymn—the phrase “θύρας δ’ ἐπέθηκε φαινάς.”\textsuperscript{264} associates the

\textsuperscript{260} Hymn. Hom. Ven. 187-90
\textsuperscript{263} Hymn. Hom. Ven. 240, 221.
\textsuperscript{264} Hymn. Hom. Ven. 236; see 60.
place where Tithonius’ “unspeakable voice flows” (φωνῆ ῆει ἄσπετος) with the temple of Aphrodite in Paphos on Cyprus where her precinct (τεμένος) and altar are; there, Aphrodite is bathed by the Graces and anointed with oil and puts on “περὶ χροὶ εἴματα καλὰ” or “σιγαλάντα” before she goes to Troy and appears to Anchises on Ida.

The place where Dawn lays down Tithonius connects the description of the “τεμένος” on Cyprus to Aphrodites’ description of the trees called τεμενή, mentioned by her in speaking of the nymphs who will rear the son to whom she will give birth. These pines or oaks, Aphrodite explains, spring up when these nymphs come to be. Towering into heaven, they are not cut by mortals,

\[\text{_COMPILER_ERROR:180_180_268}\]

The verb “ἀζάνεται” associates this example with ζῆν, the topic stated by Anchises in his request (μή με ζῶντ’ ἀμενηνόν ἐν ἀνθρώποισιν ἐάσης ναίειν) and addressed by Aphrodite with her example of Dawns request “[αὐτόν] ζῶειν ἡματα πάντα”.

Aphrodite speaks of the trees after predicting for Anchises what will happen to him soon, being at present in appearance (ἐιδος) like the gods.

\[\text{_COMPILER_ERROR:180_180_271}\]

269 Notice P. Bodmer 5 20.1 [40.7-8] καὶ εἰδοὺ ἡ χειρ μου πυρὶ ἀποπτί πι σπετοὶ ἀπ᾿ εμοῦ.
270 “Ἀζω”—with smooth breathing—means ἔξοριν, explained as negation of ζῆν, “τὰ γὰρ ἐξηρά ὦ ζῆν, τὸ δὲ ζῶν καὶ ὑγρὸν ἐστιν” (EM 22.29). With rough breathing—“ἀζω”—means σέβεσθαι.
The verb “παριστάναι” aligns γήρας with μοῖρα θανάτου. Thus, by analogy, the symptoms preceding the death of the trees (and of the nymphs) correspond to the effects of old age on Anchises, the βροτὸς ἀνήρ. “Ἀποξύσας” concerns that which enwraps (ἀμφικαλύπτειν).

The change in strength and physical appearance that is old age (or brought about by it) receives more explanation through an allusion to a passage in the Odyssey. The wording of the verse in between the intratextual allusions (the sentence with ξύσας and the sentences with τεμένη) echos a statement in book 11 of the Odyssey (differing only in the tenses of εἶναι)—Odysseus’ description of the ψυχή of Agamemnon.

In the Odyssey, these verses are connected to two other references with the phrase “εἶνι γναμπτοίσι μέλεσι”, in a passage linked to the verse in book 11 through a reference to Agamemnon’s death (of which Odysseus learns from Agamemnon’s soul). The two instances of the prepositional phrase belong to descriptions of a plan and its execution—beginning with Athena’s declaration that she will make Odysseus ἀγνωστὸς βροτοῖς.

---

273 Od. 11.390-94 at 394.
274 See Od. 13.382-85, 11.405-34.
275 Od. 13.397-403.
276 Notice Od. 7.235; II. 5.61, .
The description of the execution of the plan closely resembles Athena’s announcement. But instead of the one statement about the “λαΐφος”, there are two sentences concerning δέρματα (and three with “ἀμφί”).277

The adjective “ἀλλό” suggests that “δέρμα ... γέροντος” corresponds to “ράκος”—with an additional analogy between “παλαιός” and the attributes describing “ράκος” and “χιτών” (ῥωγαλέα ῥυπόωντα, κακῷ μεμορυγγμένα καπνῷ)—and that both nouns render “λαΐφος”.

Both ράκος and λαΐφος are mentioned again in later books of the Odyssey. The ράκος resurfaces in Odysseus’ “Cretan tale”, which is linked through an allusion to the account on Odysseus’ encounter with Agamemnon’s soul that features the line incorporated into the Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite.278 The first mention made of the ράκος in this story is almost identical with line in the account on Odysseus’ transformation in book 13. Speaking to Eumaeus, Odysseus now attributes his clothing to Thesprotian sailors.279

277 Od. 13.431-37.
279 Od. 14.341-43.
Odysseus then refers to the ῥάκος again in describing how he escaped from the anchored ship, having been bound by the Thesprotians and left behind alone. The gods easily “bent back” his δεσμόν, he explains, and then

... κεφαλῆ δὲ κατὰ ῥάκος ἀμφικαλύψας
ξεστόν ἐφόλκαιον καταβᾶς ἐπελασσα θαλαάσσῃ
στῆθος ...

In the Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite, “γῆρας ... ἀμφικαλύψει” expresses this link between the first description of the ῥάκος in book 13 and the second.

In addition to the instance in Athene’s announcement of what she will do, the noun λαῖφος is used only one more time in the Odyssey (in the plural), in lines addressed by the cowherd Philoetius to Odysseus, whom he encounters in the disguise as aged stranger. Having wished him ὀλβος, Philoetius draws a comparison between his master Odysseus and the stranger (to whom he refers as ἀνήρ and as being brought into existence by Zeus πάτηρ).282

Иδιον, ὡς ἐνύσα, δεδάκρυνται δέ μοι δοσε
μνησμένω Ὁδυσσεί, ἐπει καὶ κεινον ὀλῳ
τολάδε λαῖφε ἕχοντα κατ’ ἀνθρώπους ἀλλήσθαι,
εἰ ποὺ ἐτὶ ζωεὶ καὶ ὃρα φάος ἐλίσσο.

The participle “ἕχοντα” reinforces the allusion, which rests on the noun “λαῖφος”, to Athena’s announcement concerning the λαῖφος that “ὁ στυγήσιν ἀνθρώπος ἰδὼν ἕχοντα”.

Before speaking to the stranger, Philoetius asks the swineherd Eumaeus questions about him; he ends his inquiry by commenting that the stranger is

282 Od. 20.204-7.
In *Odyssey* 20, the phrases with λαΐφος and δέμας are connected to each other chiastically (τοιάδε λαΐφε' / δέμας βασιληί ἀνακτή). This suggests that λαΐφος is a metaphor for the body of a human who is (still) alive (emphasized by ζωεί) and that τοιάδε corresponds (i.e., is paralleled or opposed) to what befits a “lord king” (βασιλεύς ἀναξ).

Read in conjunction with Calypso’s offer to Odysseus to make him “ἀθάνατον καὶ ἀγήραον”, ἀποξύειν in *Iliad* 9 additionally connects Phoenix’ words to the *Homerian Hymn to Demeter*. The combination of the two adjectives (and especially ἀγήραος) associate Calypso’ words with two lines in the story of Demeter’s nursing of Demophoön. The first marks (with ἀγήρων τ’ ἀθάνατον τε) the end of the description of how Demeter cared for the child at day and at night.

---

283 *Od*. 20.194-6.
284 E.g., see *EM* 255.36-44 <δέμας>; τὸ σῶμα: παρὰ τὸ δέω, τὸ δεσμεύω· τῇ γὰρ ψυχῇ συνεδεται τὸ σῶμα· ἦ ἀπὸ τοῦ δαίδο δεδείθαι, διόδημον· ὁ παθητικὸς παρακείμενος, δέδεμαι, ἐξ αὐτοῦ δέμας· τὸ γὰρ σῶμα δεσμὸς ἐστὶ τῆς ψυχῆς· ἦ παρὰ τὸ δεμό, τὸ οἰκοδομῶ, δέμας· περιδόμημα γὰρ ἐστὶ τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ οἰκητήριου· ἵστεν ὅτι τὸ βρέτασ, δέπας, δέμας, οὐ κλίνονται· οὐ γὰρ λέγουσι τούτων τὰς γενικὰς. ἐθέτει εἰς τὸ κράνος τοῦ κανόνα, *EG* (άλλων - ζειαί) 344.8-10 <δέμας>; ... δεῖ δὲ γινώσκειν, ὅ τι ὁ ποιητής δέμας εἴθεδε λέγειν τὸ ἐμψυχον παρὰ τὸ δεδέσθαι τῇ ψυχῆν ἐν αὐτῷ, σῶμα δὲ τὸ ἄμφος, ἑπειδή σήμα ἐστὶν ψάφος τοῦ ποτε ζωειός.
The second line (with ἀθάνατον κέν τοι καὶ ἀγήραυν ἡματα πάντα)—is part of Demeter’s rebuke of Metaneira, Demophoön’s mother. Demeter begins with declaring that humans are are not foreseeing (προγινώσκειν) their lot, whether good or bad; then she contrasts what she would have done with what will come to be (because of Metaneira’s interference). (The phrase “ἀθάνατον ἡματα πάντα” echos Dawns request in the Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite.)

παίδα φίλον ποίησα καὶ ἄφθιτον ὀπάσα τιμής
νῦν δ’ ὦκ ἔσθ’ ὦς κεν θάνατον καὶ κήρας ἀλέξαι

The reference to κῆρες is one of the explanations of the metaphor “δαλός” used for the child (and the significance of the fire).

In the Homeric Hymn to Demeter, Demeter herself is the example of “shedding off” old age—she is γραύς at first, but then casts off old age. This action, which parallels apoxuein geras, results in a different appearance, ... and from her body (χροα) shines a light, and her hair becomes gleaming.

The examples (images) from the Homeric Hymn to Demeter seem to be reflected in nouns whose etymologies are linked to “ξύειν”.

<γραύς>: ή παλαιά γυνή· ἀπὸ τοῦ γράειν ὁ ἐστιν ἔσθειν ἢ ξύειν· ἢ ταῖς ῥυτίσι κατεξυμενή· ἢ παρά τὸ ραίω, ραῦς καὶ γραύς, ἢ διαρρασθείσα ὑπὸ χρόνου. ἢ παρὰ τὸ γράφεσθαι, ὃ ἐστι καταξεύσθαι, γράφος, ἢ κατεξυμενή τὸ σώμα διὰ τὸ γῆρας
<γραβδίς>: ἢ λαμπάς, παρὰ τὸ γράφω, τὸ ἔξω, ἢ κατεξυμενή καὶ διεσχισμένη· ἢ παρὰ τὸ γράφεσθαι, τὸ ξύεσθαι, γραβδίς, ἢ κατεξυμενή λαμπάς.

287 With emphasis on the derivation from μείρῳ μάρτος (and in analogy to φθειρῷ, φθαρτός) βρωτός is defined as “ὁ ὑπὸ μῷραν πεπτωκός” (EM 215.43-44) and as “φθαρτός ἀνθρώπος”. Μοῖρα and φθορά connect (and contrast) “βρωτός” and “μάκαρ”. The latter explanation of the name is stressed through the second source associated with Phoenix’s statement.

289 I.e., lack of childbirth and lack of beauty.
Through ξύσαι (γράμματα) στοιχεία are explained as the four elements. The stories associated by Heliodorus with “ίστορία” address the separation of body and soul (θάνατος and Hades), and γένεσις and φθόρα.

Thus, when we pursue the grammatical explanations of these terms, we can see that there are “canonical” narratives: the statement “γράψαι γὰρ τὸ ξύσαι” (with sources in which to find the verbs and the associations) points to a μεταβολή turning with what is aged and dried, ancient and stained through exposure to heat or smoke, in rags, or blackened, through cleansing (washing, anointing—making the body shine) into something renewed and adorned (clothes and ornaments). This describes a process of change over time (ζην, being as one of the μακαρεῖς in appearance).

While this process is illustrated through examples of persons, it also applies to words or phrases. For example, Eunapius, writing about the excess of the παιδεία and ἀνάγνωσις of Libanius, describes Libanius’ treatment of an ancient λέξις in the same terms.291

Παρ ’ Ὄμηρῳ

The line “παρ ’ Ὄμηρῳ” quoted in Dionysius Trax’ chapter περὶ στοιχείου belongs to a group of four passages in the Iliad—all with (composites) of “γράφειν”—whose individual members are paired (or yoked together) and linked to each other through

the same words and phrases. In two of them (II. 11.388 ἐπὶ γράφασι and 4.139 ἐπεγραψε)292 “ἐπιγράφειν” describes an archer’s “scratching” the surface of a body (ἐπιφανεία τοῦ σώματος) with an arrow and reddening a dry surface with blood or staining it with a liquid that dries and solidifies (with red or with “black” blood); the other two293 are linked through the direct object of γράφειν—σῆμα—and through “δείξει.”

Χρόα

In the account on the second wounding of Diomedes through an arrow—this time by Alexander, husband of Helen294—the sentence with the participle “-γράφας” belongs to words addressed by Diomedes to Alexander (after Alexander, and before Nestor (see II. 11.661)); “ἐπὶ” is either the prefix of the participle (the latter with “με” as accusative) or a preposition with “ταρσόν” as accusative.

eἰ μὲν δὴ ἀντίβιον σὺν τεύχεσι πειρηθεῖσι, 
οὐκ ἄν τοι χραίσμησι βίος καὶ ταρφέσι λοῖ·
νῦν δὲ μ’ ἐπί γράφασι ταρσόν ποδός εὐχεία αὐτῶς
οὐκ ἀλέγω, ὡς εἰ μὲ γυνὴ βάλοι ἢ πάις ἄφρων
κυψὶν γὰρ βέλος ἄνδρος ἀνάλκιδος οὐτιδανίο
ἡ τ’ ἄλλος ὑπ’ ἐμεῖο, καὶ εἰ κ’ ἀλλ’ ἐπέπαυρῃ
όξυ295 βέλος πέλεται, καὶ ἀκήριον αὐφαί τίθησι
τοῦ δὲ γυναικὸς μὲν τ’ ἀμφίδρυνοι εἰσὶ παρεῖται,
παίθες δ’ ὀφανικοὶ· ὁ δὲ θ’ αἰματι γαίαν ἐρεύθων
πῦθεται, αἰωνὶ δὲ περὶ πλέες ἐν γυαίκες

293 II. 7.187 ἐπιγραφάς and II. 6.169 γράφας.
294 The first time Diomedes is wounded be the arrow of Pandarus (see II. 5.794-5, 798). The two passages are additionally connected through the noun “ἀκήριος” (II. 5.812, 17; 11.392). “Οξύ βέλος”, in II. 11.392, associates the accusative “ἀκήριον” is the direct object of “βέλος ... τίθησι”. The grammatical subject “ἀκήριος” is linked to being struck by an “οξύ βέλος”, the.
295 “Οξύς” is etymologically linked to “εὔω”. E.g., see EM 625.50ff. <ὁξύς>: παρὰ τὸ εὔω ἔως· καὶ ὡς πλάτος πλάτυς, οὕτως καὶ ἔως ἔως· καὶ ἐν ὑπερβησμῷ, ὁξύς. Ibid. 627.[-]5 ὁξύων ἐκ τοῦ ὁξύς, ὤσπερ δὲ παρὰ τὸ χέω χόος χοθ, οὕτως παρὰ τὸ ἔως ἔως ἔως· καὶ ἐν ὑπερβῆσμῳ, ὁξύς· καὶ ὁξύ, τὸ ἀντιδιαστελλόμενον τῷ ἀμβλεί.
Tarsov (~ limited by podos) is a term denoting a part or the width (or "ākron") of the foot, which is "dried" and "fleshless". These qualities contrast "tarsov" in "μ’ ἐπὶ γράφας ταρσοῦν ποδός" (and the phrase’s parallel "ὅλιγον ἐπαύρη") with "γῆ" in "ὁ δὲ θ’ αἴματι γαῖαν ἔρευθων" — a staining or reddening of earth through blood.

Through Diomedes’ comparison, the participial phrase "ἐπὶ γράφας ταρσοῦν ποδός" is associated with a "bélos" that is "κωφόν" (i.e., not hearing or not talking) and contrasted to an "ὀξύ βέλος". Such a dart is mentioned at the end of the account.

... ὃ δ’ ὄπισθε καθεξόμενος βέλος ὦκυ
ἐκ ποδός ἐλκ’, ὀδύψῃ δὲ διὰ χρόος ἧλθ’ ἀλεγεινή.

The sentence with "ἐπὶ γράφας" in Iliad 11.388 (illustrating and explaining the terms "γράμματα" and "στοιχεῖα") is a paraphrase of a third person narrative (in II. 11.368-78) on the wounding of Diomedes—with a first mention of "ταρσός" (the direct object of katephkto?). This account, which begins with a description of Diomedes’ position and posture, is separated from Diomedes’ words to Alexander by the word (or line) (ἐπος) with which Alexander, speaking as "ἐυχόμενος", sums up the longer narrative.

... ὃ δὲ τόξου πῆχυν ἄνελκε
καὶ βάλεν, οὔδ’ ἀρα μιν ἄλιον βέλος ἐκφυγε χειρός,
tαρσοῦν δεξιτεροῦ ποδός διὰ δ’ ἀμπερές ἓσσ
ἐν γαῖᾳ κατέπηκτο: ὃ δὲ μάλα ἣδυ γελάσσας
ἐκ λόχου ἀμπηήθησε καὶ εὐχόμενος ἐπος ἡδά: βεβληια οὔδ’ ἄλιον βέλος ἐκφυγεν’ ὡς ὄθελον τοι νειατον ἐς κενεῶνα βαλών ἕκ θυμον ἐλέσθαι ...

296 See EM 747.7-15 <ταρσός>; ἐκ μέρους ἦ τὸ πλάτος τοῦ ποδός, ἦ τὸ ἄκρον τῆς χειρός, ῥητορική. ἐστὶ δὲ καὶ ποιητική· οἶνον νῦν δὲ μ’ ἐπιγράφας ταρσοῦν ποδός παρά τὸ τερσαίνεσθαι, ἡγοῦν ἔπραίνεσθαι· ἄσαρκον γὰρ τὸ πρὸς τοὺς δακτύλους μέρος. ὡρος. σημαίνει τρία· τὸ ἄγγειον, ὡς τὸ, ταρσοῦ μὲν τυρὼν βρίθουν καὶ τὸ ἄκρον τοῦ ποδός. ταρσοῦ δεξιτεροῦ ποδός καὶ τὴν πόλιν.
297 II. 11.388.
298 II. 11.391. For examples of ἐπαυρεῖν with χρόα as accusative, see II. 11.573, 15.316 παρος χρόα λευκὸν ἐπαυρεῖν; II. 13.649 μὴ τὶς χρόα χαλκῷ ἐπαύρη.
299 II. 11.379.
Diomedes’ comparison of the effects of a “κωφὸν βέλος” (hitting ταρσόν ... ποδός) and an “ὁξὺ βέλος” (reddening the earth with blood) suggests (by reverse analogy) that the reddening of the earth is preceded by hitting (with an ὁξὺ βέλος) “ἐς κενεῶνα” (II. 5.857). This prepositional phrase associates the text [selected in Dionysius Thrax as example] with Iliad 5, a description of Diomedes’ striking of Ares (with a spear) in book 5 of the Iliad. (The two passages are linked through wounding of Diomedes.)

As a result of the wound, Ares bleeds—“δείξεν δ’ ἄμβροτον αἶμα καταρρέον ἐξ ὦτειλῆς” (II. 5.869). The wound is healed (with the curdling (πηγνύναι) of milk as comparison).

“Ἐπιγράψας” has an antecedent in book four of the Iliad. The finite verb ἐπέγραψε in Iliad 4.139 belongs to the account on the breaking of the oaths through the wounding of Menelaos.

The passage with ἐπιγράψειν is followed by an image beginning and ending with a reference to staining (μιαίνειν).

... διαπρὸ δὲ εἰσατο καὶ τῆς.
ἀκρότατον δ’ ἄρ’ ὀστός ἐπέγραψε χρόα φωτός·
αὐτικά δ’ ἐρρεεν αἶμα κελαινεφὲς ἐξ ὦτειλῆς.

300 Iliad 4.141-47.
The passages in the *Iliad* with ἐπιγράφειν are all linked to the term “χρώα”.

<χρώα>: χρώον, εἰρηταί εἰς τὸ <βόα> <βοῦν>, καὶ <διὰ χρώος>  
γίνεται παρὰ τὸ χρώ, οὐ σημαίνει τὸ βάπτισθα. Εὖ δὲ καὶ χρώμα, η ἑυθεία, χρώος· ὅθεν τὸ χρώος ἀμεναι ἀνδρομέουσι.  
οὐ καὶ μεταβολή τῆς ΟΥ, χρώος, ὡς βοῦς βως παρὰ Δωριέσσι.

Staining with blood leads to χρώζειν.

Σήμα

“Ἐπιγράφας” (with “ἐπι” as prefix) associates the words addressed by Diomedes to Alexander and quoted in the chapter “περὶ στοιχείου” with the account on the selection of Ajax through the casting of lots (λαχείν) for single combat with Hector.

301 Ἰλ. 11.398.  
302 Ἰλ. 21.70.  
303 Ἰλ. 7.181-92 at 187.  
304 The relative pronoun ὅς links the verse with the participle to Nestor’s general description of the one of the nine about to be chosen; see Ἰλ. 7.171-74 κλήρον πεπάλαισθε διαμπερέσ, ὅς κε λάχησιν / ὡσ φάρ δὴ ὁνήσει ἐυκήρυξις Ἀχαιοῦς, / καὶ δ’ αὐτὸς ὃν θυμὸν ὁνήσεται, αἱ κε φύγησι / δῆσιν ἐκ πολέμου καὶ αἰώνος δηματήτος.  
305 The phrase “κυνη βάλε” clarifies that ἐπιγράφειν (Ἰλ. 7.187) corresponds to κλήρου σημαίνειν (Ἰλ. 7.175).
noun also points to a σήμα described by Hector when issuing the challenge that leads to the casting of the lots. Hector declares that he will bring the armor of his opponent as offering to the temple of Apollo, but will give the body (νέκυς) to the Achaeans for burial.

σήμα τε οί χείρωσιν ἐπὶ πλατέι Ἑλλησπόντῳ
cαι ποτὲ τίς εἶπησι καὶ ψυγόνων ἄνθρωπων
νὴ πολυκλήδει πλέων ἐπὶ οἴνοποσ πόντων·
ἀνήρας μὲν τόδε σήμα πάλαι κατατεθηκώτος
ὅν ποτ’ ἀριστεύοντα κατέκτανε φαίδημος ἔκτωρ’
ὡς ποτὲ τίς ἔρεει· τὸ δὲ ἐμὸν κλέος οὐ ποτ’ ὀλεῖται

The verse with the reference to “σήμα” has a very similar parallel in Iliad 23.331, in Nestor’s advice to his son, to always look at the turning-post (in the race) and, at first, at the man who leads.

σήμα δὲ τοι ἔρεω μᾶλ’ ἄριφραδές, οὐδὲ σε λήσει
ἐστηκε ξύλον αὐνόν δοον τ’ ὅργυ’ ὑπὲρ αἴής
ἡ δρῦος ἠ πεῦκης· τὸ μὲν οὐ καταπύθεται ὅμβρῳ,
λαε δὲ τοῦ ἐκάτερθεν ἐρήμηθαι δοὺ λευκῷ
ἐν χυνοχῆσιν ὀδοὺ, λείος δ’ ἵπποδρομος ἄμφες·
ἡ τε σήμα βροτοῖο πάλαι κατατεθηκώτος,
ἡ τὸ γε νῦσσα τέτυκτο ἐπὶ προτέρων ἄνθρώπων,
καὶ νῦν τέρματ’ ἔθηκε ποδάρκης δίος Ἀχιλλεὺς

Instead of ἀνήρ, Nestor speaks of a βροτός.306

The conclusion “κλέος οὐ ποτ’ ὀλεῖται” associates the σήμα on the plane of the Hellespont with Calchas’ θεοπρόπιον on the μέγα σήμα in Aulis.307

Σήματα

“Σήμα” in the plural is the direct object of γράϕειν in the account on the meeting of Diomedes and Glaucus in book six.308 The sentence with γράϕειν is part of Glaucus’

---

306 Here, too, is a casting of lots, linked to arrangement in order; and Phoenix appears again, as “σκοπός”.
307 Il. 2.323-29 at 325.
308 See Il. 6.169.
answer to a Diomedes’ question whether his one of the immortals (in which case Diomedes would not challenge him) or a mortal. In his answer, Glaucus first addresses whether he is ἄνους by comparing the γενέα of men to leaves poured “χαμάδις”. Then Glaucus turns to speaking on his γένος, claiming descent from Bellerophon. The passage with the verb γράφειν (ὅ γράφας) is preceded by a brief account on the reason why Bellerophon was sent by Proetus to the king of Lycia to perish there. (Bellerophon had been falsely accused by Anteia, Proetus’ wife, of having wanted to sleep with her against her will.)

309

πέμπε δέ μιν Λυκήνυδε, πόρεν δ’ ὁ γε σήματα λυγρά, γράφας ἐν πίνακι πτυκτῷ θυμοθόρα πολλά, δεῖξαι δ’ ἦνώγειν ψ πενθερῷ, ῥφ’ ἀπόλοιτο

Σήματα—the direct object of “γράφας” (in attributive position)—and “πόλλα”—the direct object of both γράφας and δεῖξαι is taken up twice in the next part of the narrative, the account on the king’s request, on the tenth day, to see a σήμα. 310

καὶ τότε μιν ἔρεειν καὶ ἦτε σῆμα ἱδέσθαι, ὅτι ρά οἱ γαμβρόι πάρα Προῖτοιο φέροιτο αὐτάρ ἐπεὶ δὴ σῆμα311 κακῶν παρεδέξατο γαμβροῦ πρώτον μὲν ... δεύτερον αὖ ... τὸ τρίτον αὖ ... τῷ δ’ ἄρ’ ἀνερχόμενῳ πυκνῶν δόλων ἄλλον ὕφαινε ...

From these deeds, says Glaucus, the king of Lykia “γίγνοσκε θεοῦ γόνον ἣν ἔόντα”. 312

309 See II. 6.164-65’τεθναίης, ὢ Προῖτ, ἣ κάκταινε Βελλεροφώντην, / ὃς μ’ ἐνελευ φιλότητι μιγήμεναι οὐκ ἐθελοῦσθη.
310 II. 6.176-90.
311 An entry on “σήμα” in EM clarifies the meaning of “σήμα” in the story of Bellerophon through other examples (EM 711.9-13): τό σήμα παρὰ τὸ σῶ, τὸ ὑγιαίνει σήματε καὶ τὸ γράμμα, Ἡλίαδος, καὶ ψῆμα ἤδεσθαι: τὸ ζημεῖον ὡς τὸ σήμα δὲ τοὐ ἐρέω μῆλ’ ἄριστος [II. 23.326, Od. 11.126]: καὶ τὸν τάφον, ὡς τὸ, ἀνοίκς μὲν τὸς σήμα πάλαι καταταθήκητος” [II. 7.89 ἀνήρ; 23.331 μισός]. The verse with “ἐρέω” (identical in Iliad and Odyssey) points to two texts—Nestors instructions for his son before the race, and the sign given to Odysseus by Teiresias.
312 II. 6.191.
Chapter 4

P. Bodmer 5

The most prominent (and most discussed) difference between P. Bodmer 5 and other manuscript versions of PJ is the absence of longer parts of the narrative from the text. More puzzling, however, is a feature less visible to modern readers of PJ, who are most likely to encounter the text in the form of a modern, printed edition, in which the text is displayed in the form of numbered paragraphs (not text columns), with word divisions, accents and breathing marks provided by the editor(s). The text of P. Bodmer 5 has almost no punctuation, accents, or breathing marks, even though the papyrus ends with an explicit reference to a reader (25.2 [49.16-17]). In addition, despite two different systems of corrections—which suggests that the text was read and corrected either by at least two persons or twice by the same person—the manuscript is full of uncorrected phonetic spellings or duplications (e.g. και / καί\(^{313}\) and πτωμ / πτωμ\(^{314}\)); corrections are at times confusing; and emendations (interlinear and in the margins) suggest that entire words or phrases were omitted or added. This raises two questions: If P. Bodmer 5 is a faithful copy of a (no longer extant) original, why correct some mistakes and not others? If it is an original

\(^{313}\) See 24.3 [48.4-5].

\(^{314}\) See 24.3 [47.15-48.1]
(i.e., an autograph), why not correct all mistakes to create the basis of a clean copy, which
then can serve as model for future copies?

The incompleteness of the corrections in *P. Bodmer 5* might simply be due to
inattentive proofreaders. But there is another possible explanation, one that is grounded in an
approach to reading the text trained through exercises in composition.

Correcting a copy by comparing the written text of copy and original and making
adjustments where a scribe accidentally omitted or misspelled letters or words is a
comparatively mechanical task that does not require much training. *Διόρθωσις* (*emendatio*)
in the technical sense is the work of the critic and of the teacher. In the case of the latter,
correction means not only correction of the written work (e.g., by adding punctuation or
making stilistic improvements) but also of the student, or rather of the student’s assessment
(manifest in his compositions) of the models provided for him by the teacher for imitation
and emulation.

Imitation and emulation of authors can take two forms, since what is imitated can be
the diction or an author’s treatment of thought or subject matter. The two are interrelated, but whichever aspect is emphasized would determine the questions with which a reader approaches a work or even only a passage, to study them in detail with view to imitation.

Plutarch sets forth the modes of reading suited for both. He stresses that the student is to examine how something is said, trying to find better ways of expressing the same thought.\(^{316}\)

\[\chiρήσιμον\ \deltaε\ \piρός\ \tauούτο\ \kαί\ \τὸ\ τῆς\ \παραβολῆς, \δόταν\ \γειώμενοι\ \kαθ’\ \αὐτοὺς\ \άπο\ \τῆς\ \άκροδεσεως\ \καί\ \λαβώντες\ \τι\ \τῶν\ \μὴ\ \καλῶς\ \η\ \μὴ\ \ικανῶς\ \είρησθαι\ \δοκοῦστων\]

\(^{315}\) Implied, for example, by Quintilian’s comments on commonplaces; see Quint. *Inst.* 2.4.30.

\(^{316}\) Plut. *Mor.* 40e. He points his readers to Plato’s dialogue *Phaedrus* for a more detailed discussion.
This exercise either demonstrates that the author exercised much diligence in formulating his thought, or points to the cause or origin of the perceived flaws. Quintilian puts a similar emphasis on studying in detail individual authors or passages that will be used for imitation.

Imitation of the subject matter, in contrast, requires paying attention to κεφάλαια.

Once learned, this mode of attending to what is said does no longer require a teacher (or rests on finding different expressions of the same thought by different authors). But for those who have not yet acquired this critical skill, a teacher’s guidance is necessary. Stressing that the teacher may not discourage the student through the strictness of a correction (emendationis severitate), Quintilian recommends two methods of correction for teachers: Leaving certain parts without comment, the teacher (praeeceptor) is either to

---

317 See Plut. Mor. 40b.
318 See Quint. Inst. 10.1.20. Having stressed that a speech’s virtutes are often hidden, Quintilian warns to be cautious in judging canonical authors (and persons), “modesto tamen et circumspecto iudicio de tantis viris pronuntiandum est, ne, quod plerisque accidit, damnent quae non intellegunt”.
319 See Quint. Inst. 10.5.8.
320 Plut. Mor. 48b-48c.
321 See Quint. Inst. 2.4.12-13: iucundus ergo tum maxime debet esse praeeceptor, ut remedio, quae aliquo natura sunt aspera, mollis manu leniantur: laudare aliquam, ferre quaedam, mutare etiam reddita cur id fiat ratione, inluminare interponendo aliquam sui. nonnumquam hoc quoque erit utile, totas ipsum dictare materias, quas et imitetur puer et interim tamquam suas amet: at si tam neglectens ei stilius fuerit, ut emendationem non recipiat, expertus sum prodesse, quotiens eandem materiam rursus a me retractatam scribere de integro iuberem: posse enim eum adhuc melius. Quintilian gives his recommendations in a digression in a chapter on the preliminary exercises (progymnasmata). These exercises provide training in assessing the quality of a work, e.g., with
praise some parts of a student’s composition while correcting others (*mutare etiam reddita cur id fiat ratione, inluminare interponendo aliquid sui*), at times additionally prescribing or dictating (*dictare*) complete themes (*totae materiae*) for imitation; or, having gone over the same *materia* again, he is to order (*iubere*) the student to write on it anew and better (helped by the additional explanations).\footnote{Quint. Inst. 2.4.12-13.}

Corrections (added to the text as visible corrections) do provide alternative readings of a passage and do, therefore, reflect—and invite—comparison and judgment of which alternative is better, or what subject matter is clarified. The absence of almost all punctuation marks (emphasizing *ἀνάγνωσίς* according to *ὑπόκρισίς*, *προσφοδία*, and *διαστολή*) and the uncorrected misspellings etc. that are characteristics of *P. Bodmer 5* suggest that the reader is meant to examine sentences by reading them with different boundaries, discover reasons for alterations, or determine which lack of clarity is to be helped through the additions. Statements are to be corrected by analogy with the models incorporated into the text and in view of the teachings represented in the text through allusions. *P. Bodmer 5* provides the basis—the material and the argument (or *παράδειγμα*)—for creating different, “beautified” versions of the same narrative; the authors of these other versions emphasize different alternatives.

*P. Bodmer 5* provides examples for assessing alternatives. In this chapter we will examine two—the account on Anna’s second vow, and Zechariah’s name. In the case of Anna’s vow, uncorrected deviations from *ὀρθογραφία* that seem to indicate phonetic respect to its credibility (through the exercises *ἀνάσκευή* and *κατασκευή*) or through comparison (*σύγκρισις*) (not only of persons, but also of statements expressing the same thought through different words).
spelling (i.e., “βαρβαρισμοί”) lead to intentional “phonetic” ambiguities (expressing a “kinetic” quality of the text) based on different άναλύσεις of vowels (i.e., an etymological assessment of changes). Corrections provide alternative readings of the same text by pointing to different Scriptural models and by creating different cross-connections. Zechariah’s name (spelled Zαχάριας) links two spatially separate parts of the narrative.

“της μητρος αυτης”

Anna makes her second vow when she sets Mary on the ground (χαμαί) to test whether the child can stand and Mary, “having walked around seven and seven steps,” comes to the bosom of her mother.

This account is a narrative nodal point, connected through the adverb “χαμαί” (spelled χαμε) to the account on Joseph’s reaction at finding “ογκωμενη” (13.1 [26.16] ερψεν αυτων χαμαι), through περιπατειν to the account on Anna’s going down “ις των παραδεισων αυτης του περιπατησαι” (2.4 [5.6-7]), and through the verb “απαξω” to Joseph’s description of the place (17.3 [37.7]) where he finds the cave. In addition to these

323 “Διαπειράσατο” suggests an allusion to the introductory statement of a speech, by relatives of the king, on his continued attempts to “αφανισαται” the Jews (i.e., to send them to Hades) (3 Macc 5:39-40) — “οι δε συνανεμεμενοι συγγενεις την άσταθη δανον των αυτων βαμμαζοντες προφεροντο ταδε Βασιλευ, μεχρι τινως ως άλλων ημας διαπειράζεις προστάσισιν ήμη τρίτων αυτως αφανίσαι και πάλιν ἐπι των πραγμάτων ἐκ μεταβολῆς άναλών τα σοι δεδογμένα; ...” The speech is paralleled by a προσευχη by Eleazar (one of the priests of the region) and the elders around him. “Αλλογως”, the direct object of διαπειράζειν in 3 Maccabees, and προφερειν (ταδε) associates the account with the verb in 6.1 with an earlier one in ΠΙ, linked to the account with “διαπειράσατο” through phrasal cross-references based on the corrections of “αυτη” in 6.1.
phrasal links, the time limit (εως) joins the narrative on the making of the vow to the account on its fulfilment—Mary’s entrance into the temple, in 7.2-3.

The text describing Mary’s steps (βῆματα) features a larger number of words that, in spelling and syntax, deviate from customary usage (τὸ συνήθες). This is not only surprising because the account is so well connected to other passages (which suggests that readers of the papyrus consulted it more than once for clarification) but also because some of these mistakes are corrected while others are not. Words that remain without correction are “εκρατευετο” and “γεναμενους” and the endings of “χαμε”, “διαπειραιε”, and “ιστατε” (all with “ε” instead of “αι”). Letters are added to correct the adjective “εξαμενου” (an “η” is written above the “ε”) and alter the case endings of “εξαμηνου” (εξαμηνους) and of the pronoun “αυτη”.

This (seeming) inconsistency in correcting the text illustrates the problem of corruption through incorrect alterations of a text (word or sentence)—and thus underlines the importance of determining the reasons for deviations from συνήθεια. For, a closer look at the sources of the unclear words and phrases demonstrates that there are indeed “λόγοι”—arguments and parallels for the drawing of analogies—that can be “returned” for leaving “εκρατευετο” uncorrected and for having alternative endings (and punctuation) for “αυτη · η μητηρ αυτη”.

---

324 Testuz suggests “γεναμενης”, de Strycker (La forme la plus ancienne, 251-52) a contamination of “γεναμενους” and “γενομενης”.
The letters “εκρατευέτο” suggest two “κανόνες” in the writings of the Old and the New Testaments for “straitening” the phrase—“ἐκραταλοῦτο” or “ἐγκρατεύεται”. Together, the sources combined in “εκρατευέτο” through these allusions point to a shared signified—being ἅγιος.

“Εκρατευέτο” (or either one of its “correct” versions) does not have any verbal parallels in PJ. Joined by a pronoun, the noun “ἡ μητήρ”, in contrast, does occur three times in the account on Anna’s second vow in 6.1. The corrections alter the grammatical cases (and syntax) of the pronouns preceding and following the first instance of the noun: a nu, written above a στιγμή (or sigma) separating the pronoun from the definite article of ἡ μητήρ, turns the first pronoun (with ἡ παῖς as antecedent) from the nominative into the accusative; a sigma (possibly followed by a cancelled nu), written (in raised position) in the space between the letters ἑτα (of the second pronoun) and χι (of ἄνθρωπος) turns the second pronoun from the nominative into the genitive. The change in the grammatical cases highlights what would otherwise be unclear, because of the absence of breathing marks—the corrected pronouns are personal pronouns, not demonstrative pronouns.

The sentence with the corrections is followed by a sentence in which “ἡ μητήρ” is in the genitive and limits the accusative of the preposition εἰς—“περιπατήσασα σαμνὸν ἔλθεν εἰς τὸν κολάσαν τῆς μητρός αὐτῆς”. Because of the grammatical case of μητήρ, the syntax

---

325 Rhythmically, the two verbs differ from each other and their model through the lengths of the ultimate and the penultimate.

326 Testuz’ reading; but cf. 24.3 [48.1] “οὐχ ἐφορσάν”, the only other instance of a sign in this shape in P. Bodmer 5. (Testuz omits the στιγμή.)
of “αὐτῆς” has two explanations—the pronoun is in agreement with the noun (ἡ μήτηρ αὐτῆς), or it limits the noun as genitive (ἡ μήτηρ αὐτῆς). Each reading pairs “τῆς μήτρος αὐτῆς” with a different phrase in the text—syntactically, “τῆς μήτρος αὐτῆς” (limiting “ἐις τοῦ κολποῦ”) corresponds either to “ἡ γῆ αὐτῆ” (the dative of the preposition “ἐν” [12.4], paralleled by “ἐν τῷ ναῷ ΚΥ”’) or to “ἡ μήτηρ αὐτῆς” (contrasting “ἐστησεν αὐτὴν χαμε” on page ια’ (6.1 [11.14]) with “ἀνηρπασεν αὐτὴν” on page ιβ’ (6.1 [12.2]) or “ἀνηρπασεν” on page ιγ’ (6.3 [13.14-15])). Since the personal pronoun αὐτῆς limiting ἡ μήτηρ refers to the grammatical subject of “ἐκρατευέτο”, the referent of the noun “ἡ μήτηρ” changes with the verb chosen as the correct form of the barbarism “ἐκρατευέτο”.

In conjunction with the prepositional phrase “ἐις τοῦ κολποῦ”, the “Schriftbild” suggests the phrase with the corrections displays “layered” allusions to two παραδείγματα of mothers—the mother of the little child in the judgment of Solomon,327 combined with a τιθηνός in a comparison in the story of the “μνήματα τῆς ἐπιθυμίας” in Numbers;328 and mothers mentioned in Lamentations 2:12. The one model depicts Mary as “ὁ λαὸς οὗτος”, taken into the bosom of the one who took her into the womb (γαστήρ), gave birth to her (τίκτευ), and is feeding her with morsels of cakes made of manna, with the taste of honey.329 Ὁῆλάζειν (in both Numbers and 3 Kings) stresses the reference to Anna’s giving the breast to the child and “naming her name” in the sentence preceding the account on Mary’s steps (in 5.2 [11.9-11]); at the same time, the phrasal allusion to the story of the Judgment of Solomon indicates that her mother gives her share of the little child away (to

---

328 See Nm 11:12; and 3 Kgs 3:21.
329 Notice the references to Mary’s taking “τροφὴν ἐκ χεὶρος αγγελου” (or αγγελων) in 8.1, 13.2, and 15.3; see Wis 16:20.
another woman whose son died) lest the child who is alive be put to death.\(^{330}\) The other model\(^{331}\)—based on the interpretation of “της μητρος αυτης” as “η μητηρ αυτης”—portrays Mary as a ψυχή (the subject of Anna’s first vow), poured out into the bosom of her mother.\(^{332}\)

Both phrases (η μητηρ αυτη and η μητηρ αυτης) have referents in other parts of the narrative, to which they are connected through the repetition of phrases and through intertexts. The implied comparison between “η μητηρ αυτη” and “η γη αυτη” (suggested, in 6.1, by the first interpretation of the genitive “της μητρος αυτης”—corresponding to the not corrected “αυτης· η μητηρ αυτη”) associates the dative “εν τη γη αυτη” in Anna’s vow with a dative in the last question raised by Anna in the lament made by her after going down “ις των παραδεισουν αυτης του περιπατησαι”. The answer to the question is the only one in the lament in which Anna does confirm a likeness:

οιμμοι τινι ομοιωθην εγω τη γη ταυτη στι και η γη προφερει τους καρπους αυτης κατα καιρον και σε ευλογι ΚΕ

In 3.1-3, the referent of “η γη αυτη” in Anna’s lament is defined in detail through allusions to a wide variety of sources (discussed below). In 6.1, all of these receive additional commentary through an allusion to the gospel according to John.

---


\(^{331}\) Lm 2:12.

\(^{332}\) See Lm 2:11-12 ἐξέλπον ἐν δάκρυσιν οἱ οφθαλμοί μου, ἐπαράχθη ἢ καρδία μου. / ἐξεχύθη εἰς γῆν ἢ δόξα μου ἐπὶ τὸ σύντρημα τῆς θυγατρός του λαοῦ μου. / ἐν τῷ ἐκλειπεὶν ἡμῖν καὶ θηλάζοντα ἐν πλατείαις πόλεως. / Ταῖς μητράσιν αὐτῶν εἰταν Ποῦ σίτος καὶ οἴνος; / ἐν τῷ ἐκλείπεικα αὐτοῖς ὡς τραυματίας ἐν πλατείαις πόλεως. / ἐν τῷ ἐκχείσθαι ψυχὰς αὐτῶν εἰς κόλπον μητέρων αὐτῶν.
“Χαμε 오늘 is a verbal link associating the account on Mary’s steps with the report on Joseph’s finding of “ογκομενη”. But the two parts of the narrative are also connected through allusions to weeping for the συντριμμα of a daughter.333

We will see that the different analogies for the corrected phrase “αυτη”. η μητηρ αυτη 오늘 connect the report on the steps of the child to passages with allusions to grammatical concepts (linked to the description of Mary’s steps through “περιπατειν” and “χαμαι”—λόγος προφορικός and ἀνάγνωσις (περιπατειν) and διαστολή (13.1 χαμαι).

“Εκραταιοῦτο”

Read as “εκραταιουτο” (i.e., interpreting the letters “ευ” and “ε” as representing the diphthongs “αι” and “ου”), the letters “εκρατευετο” associate the first sentence after the report on the naming of Mary (in 5.2 [11.10-11]) with two instances of the phrase “το δε παιδιον ηξανεν και έκραταιοῦτο” in chapters 1 and 2 of the gospel according to Luke. In Luke, the grammatical subjects of the verb are John the Baptist334 and Jesus.335 The account in PJ with the verb “εκρατευετο” contains links to both passages. Mary is thus implicitly compared to both “παιδια”336—but with different emphases. The brief descriptions of her naming and of the location where she is until the fulfillment of her mother’s second vow

---

334 See Lk 1:80.
335 See Lk 2:40.
336 The terms “παιδιον” and “παις” denote different stages in the γενεσις and ανεξης of a human being—as does Mary’s ability to “walk around”; “παιδιον δε το πτεφομενον υπο της τιθηνοι παιδαριον δε το ηδη περιπατομεν και λεξεως αντεχομεν παιδισκος δε ο εν τη εχομενη ηλικια παις δε ο δια των έγκυκλων μαθηματων δυναμοις ιεναι την δε εχομενη ταυτης ηλικιαν οι μεν παλληται οι δε βοσηπαιδα οι δε αντιπαιδα οι δε μελεμποβιβ καλοδυν” (Herennius Philo: De diversis verborum significationibus, ed. V. Palmieri (Naples: d’Auria, 1988), 42.5-10).
align the reference to Mary’s “κραταιονθαί” to the sentence concerning John (the son born for Zechariah from Elizabeth).\(^{337}\)

τὸ δὲ παιδίον ἡζανεν καὶ ἐκραταιούτο πνεύματι, καὶ ἤν ἐν ταις ἐρήμοις ἐως ἡμέρας ἀναδείξεως αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὸν Ἰσραήλ

Her mother’s first vow—patterned after the vow with which Hannah, the mother of Samuel, dedicates her son as Nazirite\(^{338}\)—and the allusion to Anna’s purification from childbirth associate the sentence with the sentence on Jesus, preceded by a reference to the “law of the Lord” and to Nazareth.\(^{339}\)

καὶ ως ἐτέλεσαν ἀπαντα τὰ κατὰ τὸν νόμον κυρίου ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἑαυτῶν Ναζαρέθ. τὸ δὲ παιδίον ἡζανεν καὶ ἐκραταιοῦτο πνεύματι πληρούμενον σοφίας καὶ χάρις θεοῦ ἦν ἐπ’ αὐτῷ.

Mary is paralleled to John through the position of the sentence with the verb ἐκρατευέτο in \textit{PJ}—it is preceded by a brief report on the naming of Mary\(^{340}\) and followed by a description of the ἀγίασμα in which she is.\(^{341}\) This (implied) comparison between the two texts stresses the naming of the child’s name “Maria” and helps fills out the brief report in \textit{PJ} through the drawing of analogies with the more detailed account in \textit{Luke}.

In the gospel according to \textit{Luke}, the account on the naming of John falls into two parts—first Elizabeth objects to the name by which they were calling him, then Zechariah declares in writing what the little child’s name is.\(^{342}\)

καὶ ἐκάλουν αὐτὸ ἔπι τῷ ὄνοματι τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ Ζαχαρίαν.
καὶ ἀποκριθεῖσα ἥ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ ἐπευν·
οὐχί, ἀλλὰ κληθῆσεται Ἰωάννης.

\(^{337}\) Lk 1:80.
\(^{338}\) 4.1 [7.16-8.4]; see 1 Kgs 1:11.
\(^{339}\) Lk 2:39-40.
\(^{340}\) See 5.2 [11.10-11].
\(^{341}\) See 6.1 [12.5-8].
\(^{342}\) Lk 1:59-63.
Elizabeth’s correction “ἀλλὰ κληθήσεται” echos a phrase in a sentence in chapter 60 of Isaiah.  

More importantly, perhaps, in PJ it associates Anna’s description of the steps of the little child’s steps—alluding to John 8:12 (on following the “φῶς τοῦ κόσμου”)—with a prophecy in Isaiah concerning a promise of the φῶς αἰώνιον.  

The name written by Zechariah—“Ἰωάννης”—is the name revealed to Zechariah by Gabriel in the temple. It is the name of a son of the priest Symeon and the name of one of the five sons of this Symeon’s son Mattathias. The name stresses an explanation on the “seed of these men” in 1 Maccabees 5:62—“ἦσαν ἑκ τοῦ σπέρματος τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐκείνων οίς ἔδοθη σωτηρία Ἰσραὴλ διὰ χειρὸς αὐτῶν”.

---

343 Is 60:18. Chapter 60 begins with the call “Φωτίζου φωτίζου, Ἰερουσαλήμ, ἤκει γὰρ σου τὸ φῶς, καὶ ἡ δόξα κυρίου ἐπὶ σὲ ἀνατέταλκεν”, an allusion to the three days of darkness in Egypt (Is 60:2, see Ex 10:22-23), and a call to “ἀρον κόκλῳ τοῖς ὄφθαλμοῖς σου καὶ ἴδε συνημένα τὰ τέκνα σου”.  
344 In Is 60, the references to the walls and the gates draw on a brief passage in Is 60:10-11.  
345 See Is 60:19.  
346 See Lk 1:13.  
347 See 1 Mcc 2:1.  
348 See 1 Mcc 2:2 ὁ ἐπικαλούμενος Γαδδί.
The infinitive “καλείσθαι” aligns the question directed to Zechariah to the second of two offers made by king Alexander in a letter to Jonathan.\(^{349}\)

καὶ νῦν καθεστάκαμέν σε σήμερον ἀρχιερέα τοῦ ἐθνὸς σου καὶ φίλον βασιλέως καλείσθαι σε (καὶ ἀπέστειλεν αὐτῷ πορφύραν καὶ στέφανον χρυσοῦν) καὶ φρονεῖν τὰ Ἦμων καὶ συντηρεῖν φιλίας πρὸς Ἦμας.

Zechariah’s written response—’Ιωάννης, not Ιωναθαν—highlights the offer of the archpriesthood. This associates “Ιωάννης” with John (Gaddi), mentioned as archpriests at the end of the first book of Maccabees,\(^{350}\) and points to another golden wreath—the στέφανος χρυσοῦς in the description of Aaron in Sirach.\(^{351}\)

In addition to the implied comparison between the names (which does highlight the name “Μαριαμμὴ” in 17.2-3\(^{352}\)), the allusion to the παιδίον by the name’Ιωάννης points to Anna’s making of the ἀγίασμα and aligns Mary’s stay there with her stay in the temple.\(^{353}\)

In the case of the little child John, Luke reports that

τὸ δὲ παιδίον ηὗξανεν καὶ ἐκραταίοντο πνεύματι, καὶ ἦν ἐν ταῖς ἐρήμοις ἐώς Ἦμερος ἀναδείξεως αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὸν Ἰσραήλ.

The noun “τὸ παιδίον” at the beginning of the sentence has two antecedents, both of which bound back to the first reference; one belongs to a description of the reaction of all those who heard “all these words”, the other is part of Zechariah’s prophecy—“καὶ σὺ δέ, παιδίον, προφήτης ύψιστον κληθήσῃ”.\(^{354}\) Through the allusion to the “προφήτης

\(^{349}\) 1 Mcc 10:20.

\(^{350}\) See 1 Mcc 16:24.

\(^{351}\) See Sir 45:12. The passage is linked to the account on Mary’s steps through a reference to Aaron’s steps (βήματα) in Sir 45:9.

\(^{352}\) Mariamne the Hasmonean was the second wife of Herod the Great; falsely accused of adultery and of plotting to murder her husband, she was executed by Herod.

\(^{353}\) See 8.1.

\(^{354}\) “Κληθήσῃ”, with a person as grammatical subject (and with reference to ἔρημοι), associates Zechariah’s words with Is 58:12 οἰκοδόμος φραγμῶν.
ψίστου”, the phrase “ἐν ταῖς ἑρήμοις” recalls Ezekiel 13:4 and its context. In Ezekiel, the place in which the prophets were to stand is “ἐν στερεώματι”.  

Anna’s vow features an allusion to words in the gospel according to John that are preceded by the question about the prophet from Galilee and followed by questions about his father (with emphasis on two or three witnesses). This phrasal allusion stresses an (implied) comparison between Mary and Jesus—as Nazirites. The vow of the Nazirite is implied by the wording of Anna’s first vow, echoing the vow made by Hannah. It is also implied by “απαξω”—in the counterpart of the verb in Anna’s second vow in a question by Joseph, in 17.3 [37.7]—“ποις σε απαξω;” This question is modelled after a question in 1 Maccabees 3 in which the pronoun refers to Nazirites:  

Mary, in 6.1 the grammatical subject of “ἐκραταλοῦτο”, is the prophetess and a Nazirite (i.e., ἀγία).

355 See Ez 13:2-6 ἑρείς πρὸς αὐτῶς Ἰκουσατε λόγον κυρίου Τάδε λέγει κύριος Οὐκαί τοίς προφητεύουσιν ἀπὸ καρδίας αὐτῶν καὶ τὸ καθόλου μὴ βλέπουσιν. οἱ προφητεύουσιν, Ἰσραήλ, ὡς ἀλώπεκες ἐν ταῖς ἑρήμοις· οὐκ ἔστησαν ἐν στερεώματι καὶ συνήγαγον ποίμνα ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. οὐκ ἀνέστησαν οἱ λέγουσι· Ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κυρίου· βλέπουσις θευμὴ, μαντευμένοις μάταιοι οἱ λέγουσι· λέγει κύριος, καὶ κύριος οὐκ ἀπέσταλκεν αὐτούς, καὶ ἤξεσιν τῷ ἀναστῆσαι λόγου.

356 See Ex 26:33-34 καὶ θήσεις τὸ καταπέτασμα ἐπὶ τοὺς στῦλους καὶ εἰσοδοὺς ἑκεῖ ἑσώτερον τοῦ καταπέτασμας τῇ κιβωτῷ τοῦ μαρτυρίου· καὶ διορίζει τὸ καταπέτασμα υμῖν ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ ἀγίου καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ ἀγίου τῶν ἁγίων· καὶ κατακαλύψεις τὸ καταπέτασμα τῇ κιβωτῷ τοῦ μαρτυρίου ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ τῶν ἁγίων. Anna’s making of a ἁγίασμα in her bedchamber (6.1 [12.5-6]) suggests an allusion to placing of the curtain and its function—διορίζειν (see Gn 1:6 διασχιζεῖν).

357 See Jn 7:52.
358 See Jn 8:17-19.
359 See 4.1; 1 Kgs 1:11.
360 3 Mcc 3:49-51.
361 See Is 8:3.
“’Εγκρατεύεται”

“Εκραταίουτο” is the reading attested in all manuscripts versions of PJ except P. Bodmer 5. The verb “περιπατεῖν”—used twice in the relatively brief account in 6.1 (περιπατησάσα and περιπατησης)—suggests “ἐγκρατεύεται” as an alternative correction of “ἐκρατευετο”—and thus an allusion to a different text: 1 Corinthians 9:25.

οὐκ οἶδατε ὅτι εἶ ἐν σταθὼ πρέξοντες πάντες μὲν πρέξονυ, εἰς δὲ λαμβάνει τὸ βραβεῖον; οὕτως πρέξετε ἵνα καταλάβητε. πᾶς δὲ ὁ ἀγωνιζόμενος πάντα ἐγκρατεύεται, ἐκείνοι μὲν οὐν ἕνα φθαρτὸν στέφανον λάβωσιν, ἡμεῖς δὲ ἀθαντον.

Here, too, the reference to the (first) naming of Mary plays a role in supporting this “corrected” reading of “ἐκρατευετο”. But in contrast to the allusion to Luke resulting from a reading of “ἐκρατευετο” as “ἐκραταίουτο”, the emphasis is on the words used for the giving of the name (and on allusions based on them).

καὶ ἐδώκε τὸν μασθόν· τῇ παιδί καὶ ονομάσεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς μαρία

“‘Ονομα ὄνομαξείν”, concerning the name of a female, associates the sentence with a promise in Isaiah 62. In the prophecy, the name is joined by a reference to a στέφανος.

διὰ Σιών οὐ σιωπήσομαι καὶ διὰ Ιερουσαλήμ οὐκ ἄνήσω, ἐως ἂν ἐξέλθῃ ὡς φῶς ἤ δικαιουσύνη μου, τὸ δὲ σωτήριον μου ὡς λαμπάς καυθήσεται. καὶ ὃφιται ἐθνή τὴν δικαιουσύνην σου καὶ βασιλείς τὴν δόξαν σου, καὶ καλέσει σε τὸ ὄνομά σου τὸ καινόν, ὁ ὁ κύριος ὄνομάσει αὐτόν. καὶ ἐστὶ στέφανος κάλλους ἐν χειρὶ χυρίου καὶ διάδημα βασιλείας ἐν χειρὶ θεοῦ σου.

The name “Μαριὰ” is likened to the name of a “city of David”.

Διδόναι +dat. (τῇ παιδί) associates the two clauses in 5.2 describing the nursing of the child by Anna and the naming of her name with a brief account on a blessing. At the
banquet given by Joachim when the first year comes around, Mary (ἡ παίς) is offered by Joachim to the priests whom he called and blessed by them.\textsuperscript{362}

The part of the blessing singled out in the account on the naming of Mary (through the phrase διδόναι τῇ παιδί ... ονόμα) draws on a promise in Isaiah, spoken by the Lord as the one who gathers together the dispersed of Israel. Identified through the noun ονόμα (modified by the two adjectives “αἰώνιον” and “όνομαστόν”) the line in Isaiah selected in PJ marks the end of a section of a promise that follows after a call to “do justice and mercy”\textsuperscript{364} and the announcement of the approaching of the σωτήριον of the Lord and the impending revelation of his mercy.\textsuperscript{365}

This allusion to Isaiah in 6.2 stresses the context of the second instance of the verb “ἐγκρατεύ σθαι” in the First Letter to the Corinthians:\textsuperscript{366}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[362] 6.2 [13.3-7].
\item[363] The finite verb “προσήγκευεν” (echoing Heb 11:4; see Heb 9:14) suggests that Ἰωάκημ is portrayed as Abel (i.e., as δίκαιος); see Heb 11:4. This allusion aligns Ἰωάκημ’s offering of the child to Abel’s offering of a thysia.
\item[364] Notice Gn 24:49; and Is 63:7ff.
\item[365] Is 56:3-5.
\item[366] 1 Cor 7:8-9.
\end{footnotes}
In conjunction with the allusion to being εὐνοῦχος, the allusion to this advice (resting on ἐκραταίοντο) associates the account on Mary’s steps with the word on being eunuch in the gospel according to Matthew.367 The word is preceded by Jesus’ answer to a question with which the Pharisees test him—“εἰ ἔξεστιν ἀνθρώπω ἀπολῦσαι τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν;”368 This answer causes the disciples to comment “εἰ οὕτως ἔστιν ἡ αἰτία τοῦ ἀνθρώπου μετὰ τῆς γυναῖκος, οὐ συμπέφερε γαμῆσαι”.369

In the gospel according to Matthew, the noun αἰτία occurs only three times—twice in the discussion on divorce, and one time the crucifixion.370 In the crucifixion, αἰτία is part of the sentence describing the placement of the written charge against him (40 syllables). The text displays acrostics when it is arranged in lines of four or of five syllables.371

| I 10x4 | l r l r l r l r |
|-------|----|----|----|----|
| καὶ ἐπέθηκ | κ | κ | κ | κ |
| αὐτῶν | α | ω | ε | ε |
| τῆς κεφαλῆς | τ | σ | θ | θ |
| αὐτοῦ τὴν αἰ | α | ι | ε | ϕ |
| εγράμμενη | ε | η | η | η |
| οὐτὸς ἔστιν | η | η | η | η |
| Ἰησοῦς ὁ | ι | ο | ο | ο |
| βασιλεὺς τῷ | β | ω | η | η |
| Ἰουδαίων | ν | ν | ν | ν |

| II 8x5 | l r l r l r l r |
|-------|----|----|----|----|
| καὶ ἐπέθηκαν | ν | ν | ν | ν |
| φαλῆς αὐτοῦ τὴν | η | η | η | η |
| αἰτίαν αὐτοῦ | ε | ϕ | ϕ | ϕ |
| γεγραμμενήν οὕτ | η | η | η | η |
| σοῦς ὁ βασιλεὺς | η | η | η | η |
| τῶν Ἰουδαίων | η | η | η | η |

---

367 See Mt 19:11-12.
368 Mt 19:3.
369 Mt 19:10.
370 Mt 27:37.
371 On νοῦν (I r), see Mt 24:15, with Hb 2:2, 4; on φάγος (II A l), see Mt 11:19.
“η γη αυτη”

Anna’s vow features phrasal links to three definitions of “η γη”—“η γη αυτη”, the phrase “ου μη περιπατησης εν”, and the referent of the demonstrative pronoun (χαμε).

Anna’s lament

Περιπατειν “on this earth” connects the vow to Anna’s walk in her garden (κατεβη ως του παραδεισου αυτης του περιπατησαι) and to her θρηνος, in which she refers to herself as being like “this earth/land”.

The lament is preceded (and thus seemingly caused) by the sight of a “καλλια στρουθων εν τη δαφνιδεα”, seen by Anna after she goes down into the garden, sits down beneath a laurel tree, rests, prays to the master (ελιπανευσε(n) τον δεσποτην), and groans up into heaven (ανεστεναξεν). Having seen the “sparrows’ hut” (καλια), Anna immediately “makes” a lament “εν αυτη”. In all versions, the lament falls into two parts, the second of which is additionally divided into two sections. The first part—in which Anna asserts that she was begotten/brought forth as a curse before all and before the sons of Israel (thus contrasting “ευλογειν”)—begins with brief questions with allusions to Isaiah, the Pseudo-Aristotelian treatise De Mundo, and Sophocles’ Oedipus Tyrannus and ends with a

372 2.4 [5.5-7].
373 See 3.3 [7.5-10].
374 3.1 [5.16-17].
375 2.4 [5.9-10].
The second part begins with comparisons based on being “γονίμα ενώπιον σου, ΚΕ” and ends with a section on εὐλογεῖν. It includes comparisons between Anna and “τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ” and between her and “ἀλογα ζώα”, and ends with comparisons drawn by Anna between herself and “ἀδατά” and between herself and “ἡ γῆ”. (The latter is the only comparison in which Anna affirms a likeness.)

καὶ εἴδεν καλλιαν στρούθων εν τῇ δαφνίδεᾳ καὶ εὐθέως εὐσπῆσαν δρηνον Ἀννα εν αὐτῇ λεγοῦσα
οἱμοι τις μοι εὐγενῆσεν ποια δὲ μητρὰ εξέφυσεν με ... ὁμοια τινι ὀμοιωθήν εγὼ οὐκ ὁμοιωθη(ν) τοις πετεινοῖς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ οτὶ γονίμα εστὶν ενώπιον σου. ΚΕ
οἱμοῖοι τινι ὀμοιωθήν εγὼ οὐκ ὀμοιώθην τοῖς αλογοῖς ζῴως οτί καὶ τα αλογα ζώα γονίμα εστίν ενώπιον σου ΚΕ ...
οἱμοῖοι τινι ὀμοιωθήν εγὼ οὐκ ὀμοιώθην τοῖς υδάησιν τοῦτοι οτί καὶ τα υδάτα ταῦτα γαληνώντα καὶ σκριτωντα καὶ οἱ ἱγθεις αυτῶν σε εὐλογουσιν ΚΕ
οἱμοῖοι τινι ὀμοιωθήν εγὼ τῇ γῇ ταυτῇ οτί καὶ η γῇ προφερεί τους καρπους αὐτῆς κατὰ καιρον καὶ σε εὐλογι ΚΕ

The first question (τίς μοι εὐγενῆσεν) associates the lament with a prophecy in Isaiah 49.

The second question—ποια μητρα εξέφυσε με—associates it with Sophocles’ tragedy Oedipus Tyrannus. The question contains allusions to three lines spoken by Oedipus, each in a different part of the tragedy.

In conjunction with the interrogative pronoun “ποία;”, the phrase “ἐκφύειν με” directs the reader to a question toward the end of Oedipus’ consultation of the seer Teiresias.

376 See Is 49:21 καὶ ἔρεις ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου Τίς ἐγέννησέν μοι τοῦτούς; ἐγὼ δὲ ἀτεκνὸς καὶ χήρα, τοῦτος δὲ τίς ἐξέφυσεν μοι; ἐγὼ δὲ κατελείπθη μόνη, οὕτως δὲ μοι ποῦ ἦσαν;
377 See Soph. OT 437 ποίασι; μείνον· τίς δὲ μ’ ἐκόψει βροτῶν; 827 ἐξέφυσε καζέθυσε με, and 1017 ἐξέφυσε μέ.
378 Soph. OT 437.
Here, the pronoun “ποίοι” refers to γονεῖς; the grammatical subject of “ἐκφύειν” (in P. Bodmer 5 μητρα) is “τίς βροτῶν” (ἐμφρων). The demonstrative pronoun “ταύτ’” in Teiresias’ response to Oedipus’ characterization of the seer’s words prepare Teiresias’ last description of the person for whom Oedipus is looking.380

The grammatical subject of the phrase “ἐξέφυσε μέ” in P. Bodmer 5 is “μητρα”. This underlines the noun “γυνή” in Teiresias’ response.

In Isaiah, the prophecy continues with a second, similarly phrased question—“ἐγὼ δὲ ἀτεκνὸς καὶ χήρα, τούτος δὲ τίς ἐξέθεψεν μοι.”381 The allusion to the verb “ἐξέθεψεν” in Isaiah (implied by the phrase “τίς μοι ἐγεννησεν”) glosses an allusion to De Mundo in P. Bodmer 5 whose referent is defined through a combination of the verb “ἐκφύειν” in the question at the beginning of the lament and the prepositional phrase “κατὰ καιρόν” at its end. With “ἡ γῆ” as grammatical subject, the prepositional phrase “κατὰ καιρόν” associates the last sentence of the lament with the pseudo-Aristotelian treatise De Mundo. In De Mundo, “ἐκφύειν” is the first of several participles following “κατὰ καιρόν”

380 Soph. OT 457-61.
and limiting “ἡ γῆ”; the second participle (joined to the first through “τε ... καὶ ...”) is “τρέφουσα”.\(^{382}\)

“Ἑκτρέφειν” highlights verbal links\(^ {383}\) between this paragraph and a second one.\(^ {384}\)

Not mentioned in the second paragraph, “ἡ γῆ”, in De Mundo, is defined at the beginning of the treatise in a definition of “κόσμος” (by its position, an epithet from the Homeric Hymns to Demeter and to Delian Apollo and from Hesiod’s Theogony), and two metaphors (ἔστια καὶ μήτηρ).

In the Homeric Hymn to Demeter, “φερέσβιος” is the attribute of “ἄρουρα”;\(^ {385}\) thus, the allusion to De Mundo in P. Bodmer 5 singles out another reference in Sophocles’ Oedipus Tyrannus.\(^ {386}\)

In P. Bodmer 5, the two paragraphs in De Mundo (one identified by “ἑκτρέφειν”, the other by “ἡ γῆ”) are joined to each other through an allusion to an epithet of God in the

---

\(^{382}\) Arist. [Mund.] 397a24-29.

\(^{383}\) See Arist. [Mund.] 399a24, 25, 35 “κατὰ καὶ καὶ καὶ ...”, “πάθη”, and “μυρίαι ιδέαι”.

\(^{384}\) Arist. [Mund.] 399a24-30.


\(^{386}\) Soph. OT 1255-57.
second book of *Maccabees*. Anna’s entreaty, which precedes the sight of the “καλλια στρουθων εν τη δαφνιδεα”, is introduced by an allusion to an entreaty with a more detailed direct object of “λιτανεύειν” than “τὸν δεσπότην”.

Implicitly present in *P. Bodmer 5* through the allusion framing Anna’s entreaty, the participle “τὸν συστήσαντα” points on the one hand to the definition of “κόσμος” as “σύστημα ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς καὶ τῶν ἐν τούτοις περιεχομένων φύσεων” preceding the definition of earth in *De Mundo* and on the other hand to the question about the permanence of the σύστημα ἐξ ἑαυτῶν ἀρχῶν.

**Anna’s vow**

The phrase “οὐ μὴ περιπατήσῃς” associates Anna’s vow with a testimony by Jesus in the gospel according to *John*.

This testimony by Jesus is linked to the second ending of the gospel according to *John* through the participial phrase “ὁ ἀκολουθῶν μου”—a definition clarified in *John 21*

---

387 3.1 [5.16-17].
388 In 2 Mcc 14:15.
389 Arist. [*Mund.*] 391b9-10.
390 Arist. [*Mund.*] 396a33-34.
391 Jn 8:12 36 syllables. Arrangend in 9 lines of 4 syllables each, the initial letters of lines 5-8 read “ὁπτά”, the final letters of lines 6-9 “ναός”.

with an example—the call to Peter “σὺ ἀκολούθει μου”\textsuperscript{392} and the word signifying how Peter would glorify God (featuring the verb περιπατέωι).\textsuperscript{393}

In the gospel according to John, the testimony incorporated into Anna’s vow is additionally linked to the second ending through an acrostic—“ὁπτά” (A, I)—and through a confirmation of the truth of the μαρτυρία.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jn 8:12 9x4 Syllables</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>l</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Jn 8:14 8x3 Syllables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>εγώ εἰμι</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>ι</td>
<td></td>
<td>ἀληθής</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>σ</td>
<td></td>
<td>σ ἔστιν ἡ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μου ἦ ἄκο</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>μαρτυρί</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λουθὼν ἐμοί</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>i</td>
<td></td>
<td>α μου, ὃ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οὐ μὴ περι</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>πι οἶδα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πατήσῃ ἐν</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>π</td>
<td>ν</td>
<td>πόθεν ἥλθο</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τῇ σκοτίᾳ,</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>τ</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>οὐ καὶ ποῦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀλλ’ ἔξει τὸ</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>ὑπάγω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φῶς τῆς ἐωῆς.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jn 21:24 13x3 Syllables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>οὗτος ἐστ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὑν ὁ μα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θητής ὁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μαρτυρῶν π</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ερί τοῦτ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁν ὁ γρά</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ψας ταῦτα κ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αἱ οἶδα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μεν ὅτι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀληθή</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σ αὐτοῦ ἦ μ μαρτυρί</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a ἔστιν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{392} Jn 21:22, 19.
\textsuperscript{393} See Jn 21:19.
The allusion associates Anna’s vow with the sentence on “ο γραψας την ιστοριαν ταυτην” in 25.1—one of the sources of the sentence is the second ending of the gospel according to John.394

“Περὶ αὐτῆς”

The prepositional phrase “εἰς τον κολπον της μητρος αυτῆς” is preceded by the participle phrase “περιπατησασα επτα και επτα βηματα”—an allusion to two passages in the Wisdom of Sirach with the noun “βημα” in the plural. The one refers to a human being’s βηματα as signs: “στολισμος άνδρος και γέλως οδόντων και βηματα άνθρωπου ἀναγγελει τα περι αυτον”.395 The other associates βηματα with the sound of the bells on the λώμα of the στολή of Aaron.396

καὶ ἐκύκλωσεν αὐτὸν βοήσκοις,
χρυσοῖς κώδωσιν πλείστοις κυκλώθεν,
ηχησαι φωνὴν ἐν βημασιν αὐτοῦ,
ἀκουστὸν ποιησαι ηχον ἐν ναῷ
εἰς μνημοσύνων υἱοὶς λαὸν αὐτοῦ

This account draws on the instructions to Aaron in Exodus 28:35

καὶ ἔσται Ααρων ἐν τῷ λειτουργεῖν ἀκουστῇ ἡ φωνὴ αὐτοῦ ἐστιντε ἐις τὸ ἁγίον ἐναυτῶν κυρίῳ καὶ ἕξιόντε, ἵνα μὴ ἀποθάνῃ.

“Τὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ”—in Sirach 19:30 the direct object of ἀναγγελεῖ—associates the description of the steps in 6.1 with the words spoken by Joseph in 13.1, having found ἀναγγελεῖν and cast himself onto the ground (ἐρείψεν αὐτοῦ χάμαι). Weeping bitterly397

Joseph asks first “ποίω προσωπο τενισω προς ΚΝ τον ΘΝ τι αρα ενξωμαι περι

394 See ch. 5.
395 Sir 19:30.
396 Sir 45:9.
397 An allusion to the “σύντριμμα τῆς θυγατρός τοῦ γένους μου”, in Is 22:4.
auth~. Then he explains and/or confesses “οτι παρθενον παρελαβον εκ ναου ΚΥ του Θυ και ουκ εφυλαξα αυτην”.398

In P. Bodmer 5, question and narrative (or reason) together have 33 syllables (11x3 or 3x11). The introductory phrase in P. Bodmer 5—“τι αρα”—aligns Joseph’s question in 13.1—“τι αρα ευξωμαι περι αυτης;” (10 syllables)—to Euthine’s question in 2.3—“τι αρα εσωμε σε“ (7+11 syllables).399 Euthine speaks of Anna’s “μητρα”.400 The intratextual allusion to Euthine’s words connects the paraphrase “περι αυτης” (2.3) to the question “ποια δε μητρα εξεφοισεν με” (3.1 [6.3-4]).

**Joseph (13.1)**

| τι αρα | ευξωμαι |
| περι αν | της οτι π |
| αρθενον | παρελαβ |
| ον εκ να | ου και ουκ |
| εφυλαξ | α αυτην |

**Euthine (2.3)**

| τι αρα | εσωμε |
| σε καθοτ |
| ι ουκ ηκ |
| ουσας της |
| φωνης μου |

In most versions the finite verb of the question is ευξωμαι. “Ευξωμαι” is an allusion to the account, in chapter eight of Exodus, on the Lord’s “παραδοξαζειν” of the land of Geshem through the plague of the κυνόμωλα. As grammatical subject of the finite verb in PJ 13.1, Joseph is implicitly compared to Moses. For, in Exodus 8, seemingly responding to the

---

398 13.1 [27.2-7].
399 2.3 [4.12-13].
400 2.3 [4.14-16].
401 See Ex 8:18.
request “εὑξασθε οὖν περί ἐμοῦ πρὸς κύριον”, 402 Moses says to Pharaoh “GREEK οἴδη ἐγὼ ἐξελέψομαι ἀπὸ σου καὶ εὐξομαι πρὸς τὸν θεόν”. 403 “Εὐξομαί”, in the first part of Joseph’s speech, prepares Joseph’s statement (or question) “καὶ εἰς πατησεῖν” in the story about the serpent and Eve in the second part of the speech, since Moses, having announced the departure of the κυνόμυλα, ends with the words “μὴ προσθῆς ἔτι, Φαραώ, ἐξαπατήσαι τοῦ μὴ ἐξαποστείλαι τὸν λαὸν θύσαι κυρίῳ”. 404

This is not the only function of the allusion, however. The selected passage demonstrates how ἐξαπατάν is brought about.

The adverb “ἔτι” and the phrase “θύσαι κυρίῳ” indicate that the answer in Exodus 8:25—which connects Joseph’s question “τί εὐξομαί περὶ τῆς κόρης ταύτης”, in 13.1, to the narrative on Eve—concerns not only Pharaoh’s request in the account on the plague of the κυνόμυλα but also an earlier, identically worded request in the account on the plague of the frogs. During this plague, Pharaoh says to Aaron and Moses, 405

εὐξασθε περὶ ἐμοῦ πρὸς κύριον, καὶ περιέλετο τὸν βατράχον ἀπὸ ἐμοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λαοῦ, καὶ ἐξαποστείλω τὸν λαὸν, 406 καὶ θύσωσιν κυρίῳ.

“Εὐξομαί”—the variant reading of the question in P. Bodmer 5—is an allusion to Moses’ answer then. In the plague of the frogs Moses gives an order, requesting from Pharaoh that he set a time. 407

---

402 Ex 8:24.
403 Ex 8:24-25.
404 Ex 8:25.
405 Ex 8:4.
406 Pharaoh does not specify whose people he will send away.
407 Ex 8:5. The position of the third personal pronoun σοῦ—limiting “λαός” or “βάτραχος”—highlights the two references to a λαός in Pharaoh’s request, and the two sources of frogs.
τάξαι πρός με, πότε εὐξωμαί περὶ σοῦ καὶ περὶ τῶν θεραπόντων σου καὶ περὶ τοῦ λαοῦ σου ἀφανίσαι τοὺς βατράχους ἀπὸ σοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ λαοῦ σου καὶ ἐκ τῶν οἰκίων ὕμων, πλὴν ἐν τῷ ποταμῷ ὑπολειφθήσονται.

Preceded by a prepositional phrase with πρός +acc., Joseph’s question “τι εὐξωμαί περὶ αὐτῆς” — has elements in common with Moses’ answers in Exodus 8:24 (εὐξωμαί περὶ σου) and Exodus 8:8 (εὐξομαί πρὸς τὸν θεόν). Pharaoh specifies “πρὸς κυρίον”.

The account on the plague of the κυνόμνια in Exodus 8 features two more sentences with the verb εὐχεσθαί — in both, the phrase reads “ηὗξατο πρὸς θεόν”. In the account on the frogs — where it is “πρὸς κυρίον” — the verb is βοᾶν, not εὐχεσθαί, and the genitive of “περὶ” is “τοῦ ὀρισμοῦ τῶν βατράχων”. The only instance of εὐχεσθαί in the writings of the Old and the New Testaments in which Moses is the grammatical subject of εὐχεσθαί and the pattern is ἑὔξατο +πρὸς κύριον +περὶ +gen. is in the account on the making of the serpent of bronze in Numbers 21:7.

καὶ παραγενόμενος ὁ λαὸς πρὸς Μωυσῆν ἔλεγον ὅτι ἡμᾶρτομεν ὅτι κατελαλήσαμεν κατὰ τοῦ κυρίου καὶ κατὰ σου: εὐξαί οὖν πρὸς κύριον, καὶ ἀφελέτῳ ἂφ᾽ ἡμῖν τὸν ὄρν.
καὶ ηὗξατο Μωυσῆς πρὸς κύριον περὶ του λαοῦ.
καὶ εἰπεν κύριος πρὸς Μωυσῆν
ποίησον σεαυτῷ ὄρνας καὶ θές αὐτὸν ἐπὶ σημείον, καὶ ἐσται ἐὰν δάκη ὁφὸς ἀνθρωπον, πᾶς ὁ δεδημένος ἰδὼν αὐτὸν,408 ζησται.
καὶ ἐποίησεν Μωυσῆς ὄρνας χαλκοῦ καὶ ἐστήσει αὐτὸν ἐπὶ σημείον, καὶ ἐγένετο ὅταν ἔδακνεν ὁφὸς ἀνθρωπον, καὶ ἐπέβλεψεν ἐπὶ τὸν ὄρναν τὸν χαλκοῦ καὶ ἔζη.

Λόγος προφορικὸς and ἐνδιάθετος

The preposition “ἐν” is used twice in the narrative preceding the participle “λέγουσα”409 in the account on Anna in the garden. The repetition suggests that the personal

408 The difference in wording between the instruction and the execution highlights that the relative pronoun “αὐτὸν” in the instruction (the direct object of “ἰδών”) has an ambiguous antecedent — “ὁφὶς” (the direct object of “θές”) or the grammatical subject of “δάκη”) or “ἄνθρωπος”.
pronoun refers to the laurel tree (ἐν η δαφνίδες), thus likening Anna to a sparrow and her “making a lament” and “speaking” in the tree to the activities and sounds of these “birds of heaven” (πετυμα του ουρανου). But because of the position of the prepositional phrase between the personal name Anna and the participle “λέγουσα”, it is also possible that the pronoun refers to Anna (ἐν αυτη), which would place inside her the “making of a lament” and the “speaking” and portray Anna (in her entreaty) as Hannah, the mother of Samuel.

Depending on the interpretation of the referent of the pronoun, Anna’s words are audible or silent.

An allusion to Isaiah (and later an allusion to Hannah’s vow) puts the second (aspirated) reading of “ἐν αυτη” first. The question “τις μοι εγγυνησεν” defines “ἐν αυτη” more closely by aligning the prepositional phrase in Anna’s lament to a prepositional phrase in a prophecy in chapter 49 of the book of Isaiah—“και ἐρείς ἐν τη καρδια σου Τίς ἐγένησεν μοι τούτος;” The “technical” implications of the two prepositional phrases—ἐν αυτη in P. Bodmer 5, ἐν τη καρδια in Isaiah—are clarified through the verb προφέρειν in the sentence at the end of the lament.

Προφέρειν, contrasted to “ἐν αυτη λέγουσα”, describes Anna’s words as “λόγοι” (corresponding to “οι καρποι αυτης” [i.e., “της γης”]) and points to a distinction between two species of λόγος—one ἐνδιάθετος (emphasizing “ἐν αυτη”), the other

---

409 See 3.1 [6.2].
410 3.1 [5.17].
411 See 3.1 [6.11].
412 See 1 Kgs 1:13, 15.
413 See 4.1 [8.1-4], 1 Kgs 1:11.
414 See 3.3 [7.9-10].
415 3.3 [7.10].
The "λόγοι" spoken by Anna "ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ" are "ἐνδιάθετοι", according to the author of an explanation of the noun "προφορά" in Dionysius Trax’ definition of "ἀνάγνωσις" as "ποιημάτων ἡ συγγραμμάτων ἀδιάπτωτος προφορά".⁴¹⁶

The allusion to the "twofold" λόγος at the beginning and end of the lament stresses the question and answer on "ἀλογικά" in the middle and the prepositional phrase "κατὰ καιρόν" at the end. "Ἀλογικά, in the second context, stresses that ἐνδιάθετος is linked to a definition of "ἀνθρωπός" as "ζώον λογικῶν θητῶν", since ἀλογικά, too, can have a "λόγος προφορικός".⁴¹⁸ But in contrast to the sounds issued by "Ἀλογικά", a human’s voice is “brought forth” by thought—⁴¹⁹—the completion of which is indicated by a στιγμή (since syllables, not μέρη λέξεως determine the “length” of the utterance).

⁴¹⁶ Grammatici Graeci 1.3, 568.36-42.
⁴¹⁸ E.g., see Sextus Empiricus, Adversus mathematicos 8.275-76 οὖν δὲ δομικοὶ πρὸς ἐκεῖνον μὲν τῶν ὀντῶν ἐπικεχερεύματα πεθύμπτα, τοῦτατι τὴν κατασκευαζούσας βαςίν, ὅτι ἀνθρώπως οὔχι τῷ προφορικῷ λόγῳ διαφέρει τῶν ἀλόγων ἄρχων (καὶ γὰρ κόρακες καὶ φιττακίς καὶ κίττας ἐναρθρούσῃ προφέρονται φωνῶς), ἀλλὰ τὸ ἐνδιάθετον, οὔτε τῇ ἁπλῇ μόνῳ φαντασίᾳ (ἐφαντασιουσώ ἐπάθειας κάκειν), ἀλλά τῇ μεταβατική καὶ συνθετική. Here, “προφορικὸς λόγος” is associated with a "φωνή ἐναρθροῦ" (and contrasted to "ἐνδιάθετος λόγος"—implied through the reference to ἐπιπειρήματα).
⁴¹⁹ E.g., see Diog. Laert. 7.55.4,56.8 ἐστὶ δὲ φωνῆ ἀπὸ πεπληγμένου καὶ τὸ ἱδίον αἰσθητῶν ἀκούσας, ὡς φησὶ Διογένης ὁ Βοιβόλων ἐν τῇ Περὶ φωνῆς τέχνης. ζῷον μὲν ἐστὶ φωνή ἀπὸ ὑπὸ ὑμὴς πεπληγμένου, ἀνθρώπῳ δὲ ἐστὶν ἐναρθρός καὶ ἀπὸ ἀποικίας ἐπεκπομενής, ὡς ὁ Διογένης φησίν, ἀπὸ ἀπὸ δεκατεσσάρων ἐτῶν τελειοῦται. ... λέξεις δὲ ἐστὶν κατὰ τοὺς Στιχακός, ὡς φησὶ Διογένης, φωνῇ ἐγγεγράμματος, οἴον Ἦμβρα, λόγος δὲ ἐστὶ φωνὴ σημαντική ἀπὸ ἀποικίας ἐπεκπομενής, <οἴον Ἦμβρα ἐστὶν> διάλεκτος δὲ ἐστὶ λέξεις κεχαραγμένη ἑθικῶς τε καὶ Ἐλληνικῷς, ἡ λέξες ποταπῆ, τούτεστι ποιὰ κατὰ διάλεκτον, οἴον κατὰ μὲν τὴν Ἀττιδὰ Θάλαττα, κατὰ δὲ τὴν Ἰάδα Ἦμβρη.
What is the purpose of the allusion, in 13.1, to the two interconnected accounts in *Exodus* 8, and why are these passages associated with *Numbers* 14? Both passages in *Exodus* contain technical vocabulary—“Διαστολή” in the plague of the κυνόμια, “ὁρισμός” in the plague of the frogs—and examples illustrating them. In addition, both frame the account on the plague of the gnats, explained by the ἐπαινεῖν as “Δάκτυλος θεοῦ”—a link to the “πλάκες λίθωναί”. In *Exodus* 8, the announcement of the παραδοξάζειν of the land is followed by an explanation of the purpose of “τὸ σημεῖον τοῦτο”,

ἐνα εἴδης ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι κύριος ὁ κύριος πάσης τῆς γῆς καὶ δώσω διαστολήν ἀνά μέσον τοῦ ἐμοῦ λαοῦ καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ σοῦ λαοῦ· ἐν δὲ τῇ αὕριον ἔσται τὸ σημεῖον τοῦτο ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

The attribution position of the personal pronouns in “τοῦ ἐμοῦ λαοῦ” and “τοῦ σοῦ λαοῦ” addresses διαστολή and points to a distinction in the ἀπόδοσις of Pharaoh’s vow between “τοῦ ἐμοῦ λαοῦ” and “τοῦ λαοῦ” and an ambiguity in θύσωσιν (who, whom?), both highlighted in Moses’s response “ἀπὸ τοῦ λαοῦ σοῦ ἀφανίσαι τοὺς βατράχους”.

The repetition of “ἀπό”, and the beginning of the sentence with a verb suggest a partition into four clauses (mentioning “κύριος” in the first and the last).

εἴσαχθε περὶ ἐμοῦ πρὸς κύριον καὶ
περιελέτω τοὺς βατράχους ἀφ’ ἐμοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λαοῦ καὶ
ἐξαποστελῶ τὸν λαὸν καὶ
θύσωσιν κυρίῳ

The distinction between two λαοὶ in the phrase “ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ ἐμοῦ λαοῦ καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ σοῦ λαοῦ” highlights that “καί”—the first syllable of the second group of 24 syllables, between the two prepositional phrases with “ἀπό”—can be a sign of the beginning.

---

420 Ex 8:15.
421 Ex 31:18, Dt 9:10.
of a new thought that marks a turning from the request to the ἀπόδοσις. Such a division into two sections is suggested by a change in the mood of the verbs (from aorist imperative to future indicative) and through the number of syllables in each section (2x24).

εὗξασθε περὶ ἐμοῦ πρὸς κύριον καὶ
περιελέτω τοὺς βατράχους ἀφ’ ἐμοῦ
καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λαοῦ
καὶ ἐξαποστελῶ τὸν λαὸν
καὶ θύσωσιν κυρίῳ

Since it is placed between “ἐξαποστελῶ” and “θύσωσιν”, the accusative “τὸν λαὸν” can be the direct object of either one of the two verbs. To avoid this ambiguity, the sentence requires a brief stop after the last “καὶ”.

8x6 Syllables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syllables</th>
<th>8x6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| εὗξασθε περὶ ἐμοῦ πρὸς κύριον καὶ περιελέτω τοὺς βατράχους ἀφ’ ἐμοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λαοῦ καὶ ἐξαποστελῶ τὸν λαὸν καὶ θύσωσιν κυρίῳ | ε ↓  
μοῦ πρὸς κύριον καὶ περιελέτω τοὺς βατράχους ἀφ’ ἐμοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λαοῦ καὶ ἐξαποστελῶ τὸν λαὸν καὶ θύσωσιν κυρίῳ | ι ↓ | β ↓ | α ↓ | λ ↓ | ε ↓ |

With shorter lines, other acrostics emerge.

4x3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4x3</th>
<th>8x3</th>
<th>4x3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>εὗξασθε περὶ ἐμοῦ πρὸς κύριον καὶ περιελέτω τοὺς βατράχους ἀφ’ ἐμοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λαοῦ καὶ ἐξαποστελῶ τὸν λαὸν καὶ θύσωσιν κυρίῳ</td>
<td>π ↓</td>
<td>στελῶ τὸν λαὸν καὶ θύσωσιν κυρίῳ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

422 Addressed in Ex 8:22.
The position of the prepositional phrase ἐν τῇ αὐριον indicates problems with the division of the sentence according to verbs. (But it does stress a parallelism aligning διαστολήν and τὸ σημεῖον τούτο.)

16x4  A  l  l  r  B  l  r

In Moses’ address to Pharaoh in the plague of the κυνόμυα, the adverb “αὐριον” separates the announcement of the departure (ἀπελεύσεσθαι) of the κυνόμυα and the order not to add to the deceiving. “Αὐριον” (a “καλρός”) is the time in given by Moses in announcing the departure of the κυνόμυα—corresponding to the time ἐν αὐριον, similarly
between two verbs—δῶσω and ἔσται) when “τὸ σημεῖον τοῦτο” came to be on the land. The adverb draws back on Pharaoh’s answer—“ὁ δὲ εἰπεν εἰς αὐριον”. 'Εξαπάταν is linked to the words (or manner) of the statement and to its tense (τὸ μέλλον, not specifying the καιρός).

“Ζαχχαριᾶς”

In P. Bodmer 5, a brief reference to Zechariah’s silence and its duration (10.1) and two reference to his being murdered are linked through a unique spelling of the name—Ζαχχαριᾶς instead of Ζαχαριᾶς. The spelling, which is not attested in any other literary sources, thus visually (and audibly) connects accounts on two events that, in all versions of PJ, are also linked through references to a φωνή, allusions or references to the pouring out of water or of blood, and through intertexts—the narrative on the annunciation of the birth of John the Baptist in Luke and chapter 9 in the book of Daniel and 10 (απεσταλῆν and οπτασιαν), the models for the two “sides” of the narrative in Luke.

The text in Luke also provides the model for Zechariah’s inquiry and prayer “περὶ αὐτῆς” after the council of the priests when Mary has been in the temple for twelve years. This associates these texts with Joseph’s question in 13.1—through “εὐξεσθαί ...”—alluding, therefore, to Exodus 8 and to the making of the serpent of bronze.

423 See 10.2 Ζαχχαριᾶς εσηγήσεν, 23.3 περὶ τὸ διαφανμα εφονευθη Ζαχχαριᾶς, and 24.2 Ζαχχαριᾶς εφονευται.
424 The doubling of the consonant lengthens the first syllable.
425 Through references to the “ὁρα θυμιάματος” and to Gabriel in Lk 1:19, 10; see Dn 9:21, 8:16.
Given that there are these other links, why connect the two passages through the unusual spelling?

Openings

The unusual spelling of the name \(Z\alpha\chi\chi\alpha\rho\iota\alpha\varsigma\) serves to encourage comparing (\(\sigma\upsilon\gamma\kappa\rho\iota\sigma\iota\varsigma\))—and clarifying through the drawing of analogies—seemingly unrelated or disconnected parts of the narrative(s). Visual parallels and symmetries between individual elements of the text displayed on facing pages facilitate a comparative mode of reading. At the same time, the nearly but not entirely effected juxtaposition of repeated phrases (or the syntactical continuation of lines) suggests altering the relative positions of words in lines of juxtaposed sections of the column, for example by displaying the text in lines of equal length.

\(\kappa\beta′\) and \(\kappa\gamma′\)

The name Zechariah occurs twice on page \(\kappa\beta′\) of the papyrus (10.1). It is first spelled \(Z\alpha\chi\alpha/\rho\iota\alpha\varsigma\) (ll. 4-5, with elongated \(iota\)), divided through a line break into two groups of four letters and four syllables, and then \(Z\alpha\chi\chi\alpha\rho\iota\alpha\varsigma\) (l. 7, centered).

The text on page \(\kappa\beta′\) is written in fifteen lines, with marginal emendations at the end of line 2 and the beginning of line 3 and an interlinear emendation between lines 2 and 3.

\(426\) The addition of a second \(chi\) raises the number of letters from eight to nine. This has the (intended or unintended) effect of creating an acrostic with the \(nomen sacrum\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma\) when the nine letters are displayed in three lines of three.
The facing page (κγ') has the same number of lines (15), and two corrections. The opening displays visual parallels through juxtaposition (παράθεσις) (based on continuation of the lines in reading) that invite drawing analogies between what is on the left and what is on the right. For example, the clause with the customary spelling “Ζαχάριας”—“Ζαχάριας εσιγησεν”—is on the same height on page κβ’ as “και ηλκεν την προφυραν” is on page κγ’ (corresponding to ‘μαρια δε λαβουσα το κοκκινον εκλοθε(ν)’); etymological links between ἐλκεν and κλοθεν (connecte through κατάκλωθεν) and between κλοθευν and γλῶσσα and portrayals of both Ζαχάριας and Μαρια as wise persons suggest an implied comparison between the silence of the one and the words spoken by the other. Similarly, the name Ζαχάριας is in the same position as the name μαρια in “λεγων μη φοβου μαρια ...” (the first syllable of the name is the eighth syllable from the end of the line)—thus suggesting an allusion to the first words of the angel in Luke 1:13 with the...

---

427 On page κγ’, the noun "καιν(υ)’" (1. 2) is corrected to read “καλπι(υ)” (a lambda is placed in raised position between the letters alpha and pi); the correction corresponds in its position on the page to “την” on page κβ’. A personal pronoun (αυτου) has been added in line 9 after “λογου”, written above the letters “η” on the base line. The emendation αυτου in line 9 of κγ’ is in the same line as the sentence with “καλπιν” on page κβ’.

428 E.g., in line 3, “λαβουσα” (κβ’) is mirrored by “ελαβεν” (κγ’); in line 7, the name “μαρια” occurs on both sides (in the nom. on p. κβ’; in the voc. on p. κγ’); similar, in line 12, “λεγουσα” (limiting φωνη, followed by the question “ποθεν”) on page μγ’ has a counterpart on page μγ’ (“λεγουσα εν αυτη”, limiting μαρια). E.g., see EM 495.24-28.<katακλωθες>: κατάκλωθες τε βαρειαι [Od. 7.196-8]. αι ἐπικλώσεις των Μωυσεων, παρά το κλώθω τούτο δε παρά το κατω καθέλκειν τούς των νηματων όκλους: κλώθειν γάρ το νήθειν ὁθεν και κλωστήρ, παρά των κλώσω μέλλοντα, και κλωστήρ.

429 E.g., see Orion, Etymologicum (excerpta e cod. Darmstadin 2773), gamma 613.23-26 γλῶσσα, οἷον γνώσας διαγωνική οὕσα τῶν κρυπτῶν ἔνωσιστον κλαθμενή γάρ τὴν ἐναρθρον φωνήν ἀποδίωσε γλύξεσθαι, παρὰ τὸ λιαν ἐχεσθαι, EM 235.20-24 γλῶσσας: παρὰ τὸ γνιὸ γνώσα γνώσα καὶ γλῶσσα, ἤ ὑπὸ γνώσαν ἄγουσα τὰ ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ: ἢ δι’ ἐς τὰ τῆς ψυχῆς βουλεύματα γυνώσκωμεν, ἢ παρὰ τὸ κλώθω κλώσω, κλῶσα, καὶ γλῶσσα ἱσθομενής γάρ τῆς γλώσσης έξερχονται οἱ λόγοι, ἢ διὰ τὸ εὐχερῶς κλάσαθαι καὶ γάρ κλωμενή τῇ ἐναρθρόν φωνήν ἀποδίωσε.

430 E.g., see Orion, Etymologicum (excerpta e cod. Darmstadin 2773), gamma 613.23-26 γλῶσσα, οἷον γνώσας διαγωνική οὕσα τῶν κρυπτῶν ἔνωσιστον κλαθμενή γάρ τὴν ἐναρθρον φωνήν ἀποδίωσε γλύξεσθαι, παρὰ τὸ λιαν ἐχεσθαι, EM 235.20-24 γλῶσσας: παρὰ τὸ γνιὸ γνώσα γνώσα καὶ γλῶσσα, ἤ ὑπὸ γνώσαν ἄγουσα τὰ ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ: ἢ δι’ ἐς τὰ τῆς ψυχῆς βουλεύματα γυνώσκωμεν, ἢ παρὰ τὸ κλώθω κλώσω, κλῶσα, καὶ γλῶσσα ἱσθομενής γάρ τῆς γλώσσης έξερχονται οἱ λόγοι, ἢ διὰ τὸ εὐχερῶς κλάσαθαι καὶ γάρ κλωμενή τῇ ἐναρθρόν φωνήν ἀποδίωσε.

431 The reference to Zechariah’s silence (10.1 [22.4-5] εσιγήσεν; see Lk 1:20 καὶ ἰδοὺ ἔση σιωπῶν καὶ μὴ δυνάμενος καλῆσαι) suggests an allusion to Sir 20:5-7 ἦστιν σιωπῶν ἑυρίσκομενος σοφὸς, καὶ ἦστιν μησίτος ἀπὸ πολλῆς λαλάς. ἦστιν σιωπῶν, ό γάρ ἔχει ἀπόκρισιν, καὶ ἦστιν σιωπῶν ἑλός καρών, ἢ ἄνθρωπος σοφὸς συγήρη εῶς καιρόν, ἢ δὲ λαπιτῆς καὶ ἄφρων ὑπερβήσεται καιρόν. Through her spinning of material for the weaving of the curtain of the temple (10.1 [21.2-3, 21.14-22.4]), Mary is implicitly compared to the women described in Ex 35:25 καὶ πάσα γυνὴ σοφὴ τῇ διανοίᾳ ταῖς χεραῖς ἤρεθεν ἤρεθεν πυρηνίμενα, τῇ ὑάκυνθῳ καὶ τῷ πορφυρᾷ καὶ τῷ κόκκινον καὶ τῷ βύσσον.
The sentence with the name Ζαχαρίας is short (38 syllables), especially compared to the much longer account on the discovery of his death. It comprises two main clauses bound together in a chiasm, without conjunction or particle—the first clause begins with a reference to time and ends with a verb, the second clause begins with a verb and ends with a reference to time. The name “Ζαχαρίας” is immediately followed by the name “Μαρία”, the grammatical subject of the next clause (marked off against the preceding one through “δέ”). This has the effect of juxtaposing two syllables that (disregarding the boundaries of the “λόγοι” and of the individual “μέρη λέξεως”) can be pronounced together as “ἀσμα”.

In a more complex form, the same continuation of a word (in the same line, without consideration of the empty space between the individual sections of the column) occurs in the
text of a “trisected” column in which the three names Ζαχαρίας, Σαμουήλ, and Ζαχαρίας are at the bottom of each section of the column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A 6x2</th>
<th>B 7x2</th>
<th>C 6x2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>τω δε</td>
<td>σευνε</td>
<td>μεχρι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>καλρω</td>
<td>γενετ</td>
<td>ο τε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ηκιν</td>
<td>ο α</td>
<td>τελε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ζ α</td>
<td>μτλ αυτ</td>
<td>ησ εν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The text displays the preposition “ἀντί” twice (in column B ll. 4-5; and in l. 5 AB, with an additional genitive—αυτης (paralleling αυτου)), and similarly the verb “εγενετο” (in column B ll. 2-4; and in l. 3 BC). The last line adds a name composed of a part of the name Σαμουήλ and a part of the name Ζαχαρίας—’Ηλίας (l. 7 BC). In the context of the sentence (alluding to the birth of John the Baptist and to the song of Zechariah), the name ’Ηλίας points to the prophecy about Elijah in the prophet Malachi[^432] and to the reports on the Transfiguration.^[433]

This reading the text vertically (from top to bottom) and horizontally (from left to right) applies to the text on the pages of the openings as well, without any re-scribing and arranging of the letters. The description of Mary’s reaction to the voice—“περιεβλεψεν τα δεξια και τα αριστερα”[^434]—suggests following her example in applying such an examining of two sides (and of the question πόθεν;[^435]) also in the case of the “φωνη έγγράμματος” displayed in single columns on the two pages, or on one page in two

[^432]: See Mal 3:22; Mt 17:10-13, Mk 9:11-13.
[^433]: See Mt 17:3, Mk 9:4, Lk 9:30-31.
[^434]: 11.1 [22.13-14]. The verb “περιεβλεψεν” associates this passage with the description of Elizabeth’s search for a τόπος ἀπόκρυφος, in 22.3 [43.11].
[^435]: 11.1 [22.14]; see 13.3 [28.13, 29.1].
columns. Similarly, distinguishing (Διακρίνειν) between (and then comparing) what is earlier and what is later—e.g., the words of the “φωνὴ λεγοὺσα” (below the sentence with “Διεκριθη”) and to the left of Mary’s question) and of the “αγγέλος λεγὼν”\textsuperscript{436} (above the sentence with “Διεκριθη”)—is recommended through the emphasis on time in the description, on page κβ’, of the duration of Zechariah’s silence (“τῷ δὲ καὶ ω εκλειπον”, “μεχρὶ οτὲ”) and through allusions, on page κγ’, to the order of the travelers on their journey to Bethlehem (17.2).\textsuperscript{437}

\textbf{μς’ and μζ’}

The other two instances of the name Zechariah spelled “Ζαχαριας” are written on facing pages near the end of the manuscript (μς’ and μζ’). On page μς’, the name written on the base line is spelled Ζαχαριας; a second “χ” and a στιγμή are placed in a raised position between the letters alpha and chi (ζαχαριας). On page μζ’, both chis share the same base line, but are separated by a line break and a dot (ζαχαριας). The names are the grammatical subjects of “εφονευθη” ([46.4]) and “εφονευται” ([47.6]), respectively.

\begin{tabular}{l l}
μς’ & μζ’ \\
\textit{ποτες μου δειξητε οτι αθοονν} & \textit{σαν παντες τολμηας δε >} \\
* \textit{αιμα εκχυνις εις τον προθυρα} & \textit{τις εξ αυτων εισηλθεν εις το} \\
\textit{του ναου ΚΥ και περι το διαφαιν} & \textit{αγιασμα και ειδεν παρα το θυ} \\
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{436} In lines 12-13 the φωνη “χαίρε κεχαριτωμένη συ εν γυναιξίν” corresponds to Mary’s paraphrase of the message of the angel—Mary’s words are thus a paraphrase of both the φωνη and the message; in addition, Mary discerns “in herself” the two messages in the lines on the two pages (II. 6-9 on page κγ’ and 11-12 on page κβ’) connected through the sentence “μαρία διεκριθη εν εαυτη” (I. 10) on page κγ’.

\textsuperscript{437} The name Samuel and the verbs “ηλκεν” and “εκαθίσεν” occur in 10.1-11.1 and in 17.2 [35.15-36.2]—και εστρωσεν τον οικον και εκαθίσεν αυτην και ηλκεν ο υιος αυτου και ηκολυβη Σαμουηλ.
The position (on the same base line) and size of the two *chis* link the name on page μζ′ (ll. 5-6) to the name on page κβ′ (l.), in the paraphrase with the allusions to Gabriel’s pronouncement (on not being able to speak)⁴³⁸ and the opening of Zechariah’s mouth at the naming of John.⁴³⁹ At the same time, the combination of letter and στιγμή (*ch*′) associates the lines with the third instance of the name (with this spelling) on page μζ′ with the “corrected” version on the preceding page (μζ′), a relation stressed through the verb φονεύειν and the positions of the names in lines at roughly the same height on facing pages.

The spatial juxtaposition of the name of Zechariah spelled with two *chis* highlights a difference in the spelling of two finite verbs in the passive voice on page μζ′ that, at first glance, seems to result from an uncorrected, unintended mistake—the first verb reads “εφονευθή”, the second “εφωνευθή”. The misspelling of the second verb is especially eye-catching because it is placed side by side with a second instance of the verb φονεύειν in the same line on the page to the right (μζ′), this time in the middle voice—“εφονευταί”.

⁴³⁸ See Lk 1:20.
⁴³⁹ See Lk 1:64.
The same page also offers an analogue for the long second vowel of “εφωνευθῆ” (23.3 [46.6])—the noun “φωνη” (24.2 [47.5]). This raises a question—which verb, or noun, is the “ὀρθογραφία”?

ή πορφύρα: νήθειν, κλώθειν, and στρωφάν

“Ζαχαρίας εσηγησεν” is on the same height on the left side (κ β’) of the opening as “καὶ ηλκεν τὴν προφυραν” is on the right (κ γ’). This juxtaposition suggests that the material spun by Mary corresponds to the words spoken by her.

In 11.1, Mary’s words and appearance are described through allusions—through the task of spinning for the curtain of the temple, she is presented in 11.1 as “γυνὴ σοφὴ εἰς διανοία”; the angel’s words “ευφες γαρ χαριν ενώπιον τοῦ παντων δεσποτοῦ” in 11.1 portray her as an Esther;440 “εκαθίσεν” (11.1) associates her—through “εστρωσεν” in 17.2—with Judith.441

Of what kind the words spoken by Esther are, this is indicted in Esther’s entreaty in preparation for her meeting with the king. Esther requests of the Lord

---

440 See Est 5:8, 7:3.
441 See Jdt 12:15 καὶ ἐστρωσεν αὐτὴ ... χαμαι τὰ κόλα. Judith’s words require following along; see Jdt 11:5-6. The implied comparison between Mary and Judith (strengthened through allusions to the book of Judith in 1.2 (Jdt 4:14 προσέφερον) and 25.1 (Jdt 6:1 κατέπαυσεν ὁ θόρυβος) (the response to Achior’s λόγος)) portrays Mary as having wisdom, being “ἀγαθὴ ἐν τοῖς λόγοις αὐτῆς”, and having ἱστανεῖσαι λόγων; see and Jdt 11:20-23. The allusion, in 11.1 (and 17.2), to Judith as γυνὴ ἀγαθὴ (Jdt 11:5-6 connects as intertext the passages with “ἐκάθισεν” in 11.1, 17.2) prepares the prediction, in 25.2 (with 14.2), that those who fear the Lord will have this χάρις—an allusion to the γυνὴ ἀγαθὴ of Sir 26.3.
δός λόγον εὑρήσων εἰς τὸ στόμα μου ἐνόπτων τοῦ λέουστος καὶ μετάθες τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ εἰς μέσος τοῦ πολεμοῦτός ἡμᾶς εἰς συντέλειαν αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ὀμονοοῦτων αὐτοῦ.442

The reference to ῥυθμὸς associates the λόγος for which Esther asks with number (ἁρπαγμός) and with speech that, while emphasizing the “χρόνων τάξεως”443—and thus the arrangement of phrases and κόλα into περίοδοι—never is entirely metrical.

The depiction of the scene, the paraphrasing of “κλωθεῖν” and “νήθεῖν” as “ἐλκεῖν”,444 and the references to πορφῦρα445—“ἡ ἀλήθινη πορφῦρα”446 (i.e., ἀλιπόρφυρα) and “πορφῦρα”447—suggest that the author draws not only on Scriptural models but also on Homeric ones, and especially on two παράδειγματα from the Odyssey—Helen and Arete. The reference to the ῥόνος points to Helen448 and (where speech is

442 Est 4:17.
443 E.g., see Anonymi in Hermogenem, Commentarium in librum peri lógeōn, in Rhetores Graeci, vol. 7.2, ed. C. Walz (1834; repr., Stuttgart: Cotta, 1968), 861-1087 at 892.7-893.13, especially 892.7-893.5.
444 See Il. 12.433-35 ἄλκειν. And EM 495.24-28 <κατακλώθες>: κατάκλωθες τε βαρείᾳ [Od. 7.197]. οἱ ἐπικλώσεις τῶν Μοιρῶν, παρὰ τὸ κλώθω· τούτο δὲ παρὰ τὸ κάτω καθέλκειν τοὺς τῶν νημάτων οἷκος· κλώθειν· γὰρ τὸ νήθειν· οἷς καὶ κλώστης· παρὰ τὸν κλώσω μέλλοντα, καὶ κλωστήρ.
445 The reference to πορφῦρα and the distinction between “πορφῦρα” and “ἄληθινή πορφῦρα” are etymological glosses on the text. E.g., see EM 684.10-19 <πορφῦρα>: ἀπὸ τοῦ πορφῦρῳ ῥήματος, τοῦ σημαίνοντος τὸ Bouleoumai, γίνεται πορφῦρα· τοῦτο παρὰ τὸ περιφέρειν τὸν νόον ὥστε κάκεισε. 'Ὀδυσσείας δ', πολλὰ δὲ οἱ κραδὶ πόρφυρε καίντι [Od. 4.427, 572; 10.309], τὸ δὲ Ἡλιάδος ε', ὡς δ', δότε πορφύρει πέλαγος [Il. 14.16]: ἀντί τοῦ μελαίζει. καὶ γὰρ <πορφύρων τάματοι> λέγουσι τὸν μέλαν· καὶ <κύμα πορφύρων>, τὸ μέλαν. ἐν οἷς δὲ μετέφρασαν τὸ περίεργον, ἀντὶ τοῦ κατὰ βάθος κυινεῖται· ἐνθὲν καὶ τὸ κατὰ βάθος κυινεῖται· ἐνθὲν καὶ τὸ κατὰ βάθος μεριμνᾷ <πορφὺρων> λέγονται. And 486.30-34 <Κάλχας>: παρὰ τὸ καλαίσχειν, ὃ ἐστι κατὰ βάθος μεριμνάν· καὶ <κάλχης>, ἣ πορφῦρα· ὃς παρ αὐτήν πορφύρειν, τὸ μεριμνᾶ, ἢ παρά τὸ κάλχη, ὃ σημαίνει τὴν βοσάνην, δὲ ἢ ἢ πορφύρα βάπτεται. Κάλχας δὲ ἔστιν, ὃ τὰ βάθη τῶν μαντείων ἑρευνῶν· ὃ τοῖς βασιλεύων τὰ ἐκ θεοῦ μαντεύματα φανερῶν.
446 10.1 [22.2-3] with marginal and interlinear emendation.
447 10.1 [23.3].
448 See Od. 4.133-6 τῶν ἡμέρας Φιλών παρέβηκε νεῖρους / νήματος ἀκτιτόο βεβιασμένον· αὐτάρ ἐπ τοῦ αὐτοῦ / ἡλιακή τετάνυστο ἱδινικής εἰρήνος ἤχους. / ἐξετο δ' εν κλισμῷ, ὑπὸ δὲ θρήνος ποσίν ἦν.
concerned) her φάρμακα, especially her μυθος in Odysseus’ secret entering of Troy.\footnote{143}

Arete is a model suggested by the references to the purple and to Mary’s seated position.\footnote{144}

**Τὸ κόκκινον: φωνεῖν and φονεύειν**

“Φωνεῖν”, “φωνεῖν”, “φωνή”, and φόνος, together with the spelling of φατνώματα as παθνώματα in 24.3 (which provides analogies for adjusting the spellings), the announcement of an ἐκδίκησις, all associate the account on the death of Zechariah with a group of interrelated etymologies. These etymologies draw on a number of examples in Homer, and are linked through them to examples illustrating ἐπιγράφειν.

Θο/φωνῆ/φωνή and φωνεῖν are etymological linked to φόνος and φονεύειν.


“Φόνος” (murder) is linked to φωνή through emphasis on the sound (ἡχος) caused by the pouring (χύσις) of the blood (associating legein with χέειν—and with conceptualizations of voice/sound as liquid (flowing; with syllables as smallest units)).

<φόνος>.\footnote{146} ἐπάρα τὸ φῶς, τὸ φονεύω, φένω· καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ φόνος· ἀπὸ τῆς φυσήςσεως, καὶ τοῦ ἤχου τοῦ γινομένου ἐν τῇ χύσι τοῦ αἵματος

\footnote{143} See Od. 4.220-32.
\footnote{144} See Od. 4.239-64. The text of the μυθος contains one of the grammatical examples explaining ἀναγινώσκειν, at Od. 4.250; for another example, see Od. 23.206.
\footnote{145} See Od. 6.52-3 ἢ μὲν ἐπ᾿ ἐσχάρῃ ἢστα ὡς ἀμφίπολος γυναῖξιν / ἡλάκατα στρωφῶσ’ ἀλιπόρφερα, 6.305-7 ἢ δ’ ἢσται ἐπ᾿ ἐσχάρῃ ἐν πυρὸς αὐγῆ, / ἡλάκατα στρωφῶσ’ ἀλιπόρφερα, θαῦμα ἵδεσθαι, / κίοις κεκλιμένη.
\footnote{146} EM 803.803.52-57.
\footnote{143} EM 798.8-10.
A connection made in this entry between “φόνος” and “φένω” adds the notion of “τελειοῦν”.454
tὸ δὲ φόνος παρὰ τὸ φένω, τὸ ἀναιρῶ, ὡς λέγω λόγος· τὸ δὲ φένω παρὰ τὸ ἐνω, τὸ φονεῦω, ἐξ οὗ καὶ Ἐνυάλιος καὶ Ἐνυά, ἡ πολεμικὴ θεός· τὸ δὲ ἐνω παρὰ τὸ ἐω, τὸ τελεῖο.

Φένω points to an explanation of the derivation of φόνος by analogy with λέγω that combines φῶ (λέγω) and φῶ (φονεῦω). Φῶ has four significations.455

<φῶ>: σημαίνει δ’ φῶ τὸ λέγω, ἐξ οὗ καὶ φωνή: φῶ, τὸ φαινω, ἐξ οὗ καὶ φῶς· φῶ, τὸ φονεῦω, ἐξ οὗ καὶ φόνος· φῶ, τὸ θάλπω, ἐξ οὗ καὶ φῶςαι, τὸ θάλψαι. τὸ δὲ φῶ, τὸ λέγω, παρὰ τὸ φῶς· φῶς γάρ τῶν πραγμάτων, οἱ λόγοι.

Φόνος is source of φονή—explained as “ὁ τόπος τῶν ἀναιρουμένων”456 or “ὁ τόπος ὁποῦ οἱ νεκροὶ κεῖνται”457, and illustrated through the story Odysseus’ and Diomedes’ raid of the encampment of the Thracians (see II. 10.521). Φόνος and φονή, in turn, are linked to ποινή.458

<Ποινή>:459 ἡ ύπὲρ φόνου ζημία καὶ ἀντέκτισις καὶ τιμωρία, φονή τις οὕσα, πλεονασμὸ τοῦ τὰ δεδε καὶ παρ’ Ὄμηρῳ ἄποινα· οἶνον, Αυσόμενος τε πάγατρα, φέρων τ’ ἀπερείσῃ ἀποινά. σημαίνει δὲ τὰ ύπέρ ἀπολυτρώσεως φόνου προσαγόμενα δόρα. καὶ ἄποινων ὧδὴν τὸ κυρίω ο θεότης Ἡ Μοῦσῆς ύπὲρ τῶν Ἰσραηλίτων ὑμνθέντων τοῦ πάρ’ Ἀιγυπτίων φόνου, καὶ εἰπέν, Ἀίσωμεν τὸ κυρίω. Ἰστέον ὅτι ἐστὶ τεῖνο διὰ τῆς Εἰ διφθόγγου· ἐξ οὗ γίνεται τοινή καὶ ποινή· εἰ δ’ ἂν ἐμοὶ τιμῆν Πρίαμος, καὶ ἔξης· τίνειν οὐκ ἐθέλησε, μαχήσομαι εἰνεκα ποινής. ἡ ἀπὸ τοῦ πόνος γενέται ποινή καὶ ποινή. ἕκ δὲ τοῦ ποινῆ γίνεται <πουναῖος>, καὶ <ποιναῖω>, αὐτὸ τοῦ τιμωρητικῆ.

---

454 EG (ἄἄλιον — ζειαί) s.v. ἄποινα, 170.21-171.3.
455 EM 804.1-5.
456 EM 170.10.
458 See EG (ἄἄλιον — ζειαί) s.v. ἄποινα, 170.6-171.5.
459 EM 678.57-679.13.
While φοινεύειν (and φόνος, through an allusion\textsuperscript{460}) and φωνή are represented in written form on the pages of the opening, ποινή, another, related terms is only implied by the references to the ἐκδίκος and the “wiping off” of Zechariah’s blood in 24.2 [47.8, 6-7].

Φωνή, in the story of Odysseus’ and Diomedes’ raid, describes what a counselor of the Thracians sees when he wakes up.\textsuperscript{461} The death of the men (through the hand of Diomedes) is recounted at the beginning of the story.

... τῷ δ’ ἐμπνευσε μένος γλαυκώπις’ Ἀθήνη, κτείνε δ’ ἐπιστροφάδην τῶν δὲ στόνος ὄρνυτ’ ἀεικής ἄορι θειομένων, ἐρυθαίνετο δ’ αἵματι γαία.

The phrase αἵματι γαία ἐρυθαίνειν\textsuperscript{462} and Diomedes as the one inflicting the wounds associate the example in \textit{Iliad} 10 illustrating a usage of φωνή with one of the examples illustrating the usage of ἐπιγράφειν—in the passage with the line quoted by Dionysius Thrax in his chapter περὶ στοιχείου (ἐπιγράφας ταρσόν ποδός),\textsuperscript{463} Diomedes boasts that a man hit by his weapon will be caused to rot, reddening the earth with blood (ὀ δὲ θ’ αἵματι γαῖαν ἐρεύθων / πῦθεται).\textsuperscript{464} Through “φοινίσσειν”, reddening is part of the semantic (etymological) field of φόνος—φοινός is explained with references to φόνος and to φοινίσσειν, i.e., dyeing with blood (αἵματι βάπτειν).\textsuperscript{465}

While ἐρυθαίνειν in \textit{Iliad} 10 is a link to the grammatical explanation of the usage of the term γράμματα, “ἐπιστροφάδην” associates the description of the φωνή with στοῖχος

\textsuperscript{460} To Ez 43:7-8 (through τῷ προθύρα (sg.), in 23.3 [46.2-3]).
\textsuperscript{461} See Il. 10.521 ἄνθρακς τ’ ἀσπάραγον ἐν ἀργαλέσι φοινίσσιν.
\textsuperscript{462} See Il. 10.484 ἐρυθαίνετο δ’ αἵματι γαία.
\textsuperscript{463} Il. 11.388 in \textit{Grammatici Graeci} 1.1.9.4-5.
\textsuperscript{464} Il. 11.394-5.
\textsuperscript{465} For φοινός, see \textit{EM} 797.25ff. s.v. “φοινίς” and 797.35 “φοινίζω”; and \textit{EM} s.v., “Δαφονύς”, “Φοίνικες”, “Φοινικοῦν”, “Φοινίττων”.
(one of the explanations given in Dionysus Thrax for the term στοιχεία). The εὔναί of the men killed by Diomedes are arranged in three rows (τριστοιχία)\textsuperscript{466}.

This connection between φόνος and φονή, signaled in \textit{P. Bodmer 5} through the spelling of the passive form of φονεύειν as “εφονευθή” \textsuperscript{23.3 [46.4]} and as “εφωνευθή” \textsuperscript{[46.6]}, associates the description of the coagulated blood (αιμα πεπηγος) at the side of the altar with with examples in Homer illustrating the usage of ἐπιγράφειν. In addition, these etymological allusions associate the description of the murder of Zechariah with earlier references τὸ κόκκινον, since the latter is one of the synonyms offered for ἐρυθαινεὶν.\textsuperscript{467}

“Τὸ κόκκινον” is mentioned in the Annuntiation as direct object of κλώθειν.\textsuperscript{468} The substantivized adjective also appears in the account on the Visitation, where it denotes an object thrown by Elizabeth (12.[25.] ἐρύπψειν τὸ κόκκινον). The verb ῥῖππειν associates Elizabeth’s κόκκινον with the σκεπήριον thrown by Joseph at the sounding of the trumpet with which “all the widowers of the people” are gathered.\textsuperscript{469} The implied comparison between these two objects suggests that, in Elizabeth’s case, “σκεπήριον” signifies “ἐριλων”.\textsuperscript{470} The indirect allusion in 23.3 to the carpenter’s axe (σκεπήριον) additionally associates the report on the revelation of the death of Zechariah with grammatical explanations of writing and reading. In the \textit{Odyssey}, Odysseus uses a σκεπήριον ἐὗξον as

\textsuperscript{466} See \textit{Il.} 10.471-73.
\textsuperscript{468} See 10.1 [22.8].
\textsuperscript{469} See, e.g. \textit{EM} 717.26-27 <σκέπαρπον>: τὸ ἔριον, διὰ τὸ σκέπειν τὸν ἄρνα. This allusion to the etymology of σκέπαρπον suggests that the passages with “ηλκεῖ” in the description of Mary’s spinning of the πορφύρα (11.1) and “το κόκκινον” in the account on the Annuntiation (12.2) are connected through an intertext—\textit{Iliad} 12.434.
tool for smoothening (ξέειν) the wood cut by him for his raft.\textsuperscript{471} The counterpart of this third person narrative is Odysseus’ recounting of how he made the λέχος (which included ἀμφιξέειν and ξέειν\textsuperscript{472}). Odysseus gives σήματα ἐμπεδα\textsuperscript{473} and σήματα ἀριφραδέα... τῆς εὖνῆς\textsuperscript{474} “known again” (ἀναγινώσκειν) by Penelope through which Penelope knows that his claim to be who he is and the report about his return are true (ἐτεόν).\textsuperscript{475} Penelope’s explanation why she did not love him at first when she saw him—she refers to Helen who “ἀνδρὶ ἀρα’ ἀλλοδαπῷ ἐμίγη φιλότητι καὶ εὖνῆ”—links her account to the example of Demeter and mentioned by Calypso, which is associated with ξύσαι.

These allusions (which rely on cross-connections) are glosses on the report about the death of Zechariah that associate the text with theoretical discussions of reading and writing; their presence encourages searching it for other examples illustrating and clarifying these and related concepts with the methods in agreement with them.

\textbf{Σιγή and πέρας}

The first part of \textit{P. Bodmer 5} presents several alternative readings, since the text on the first page does not have a “fixed” number of syllables or letters. The page features emendations in lines 3 (η(ν)) and 15-16 (τα δω / ρα σου)) that may (or may not) be included in the count, a group of four letters in line 5 (τω κω) that may (or may not) have been

\textsuperscript{471} See \textit{Od.} 5.237 σκεπάρνον, 5.245 ξέοσε δ’ ἐπισταμένως καὶ ἐπὶ στάθμην ἱθυνεν; and \textit{Od.} 23.197 εὖ καὶ ἐπισταμένως, καὶ ἐπὶ στάθμην ἱθυα. For ξέειν (instead of—or with—ξέειν) as explanation for γράμματα, see \textit{EG} (ἀ铊ον - ζεία) 321.13-17.
\textsuperscript{472} See \textit{Od.} 23.196, 199.
\textsuperscript{473} See \textit{Od.} 23.206.
\textsuperscript{474} See \textit{Od.} 23.225.
\textsuperscript{475} See \textit{Od.} 23.107-8.
cancelled, as the letters are encircled with dots and the third and fourth seem blurred, and a
number in line 3 (ιβ’) that may (or may not) be counted as a syllable or as letters. Depending
on whether or not the syllables and letters of the “augmented” text are included, the number
of syllables can differ by six syllables (14 letters [+end νου], and 2 numbers).

Similar to “Iακωβ”, the name “Ιωακειμ” lacks a definite article and is not inflected;
itss grammatical case is solely defined by its syntax. Since the position and letter(s) of “ην”
suggest that the verb was added to line three (it is written in the margin), “Ιωακειμ”, read as
the first word of the narrative, is the grammatical subject (nom. sg.) of two clauses—the one
elliptic (Ιωακειμ / πλουσιος σφοδρα), the other with a finite verb in the imperfect (Ιωακειμ
ην / πλουσιος σφοδρα).

The existence of these alternative beginnings does not affect the display of the text of
the two parts of the introduction, which together comprise 24 syllables (14+10, counting ιβ’
as one syllable). But when the text up to the end of Ιωακειμ’s inner speech is divided—
which includes not only “η(ν)" but also the two “cancelled” syllables of “τω κω”, the letters
in the first nine lines of P. Bodmer 5 represent synoptically three different texts (14+10+x)—
one with 85 syllables (with “τω κω”, but without “ην”; x=61), another with 86 (with “h(n)”
and “τω κω”; x=62), and a third with 83 (with “η(ν)”, but without “τω κω”; x=59). Of these
three text segments, only one can be displayed in a text column with lines of equal length—
namely the text in which the beginning of the narrative is elliptic (85 syllables, 17x5 or
5x17—both without acrostics).

476 See Chapter 2.
The same principle applies to the text of the first part of \textit{PJ} as a whole. The addition or subtraction of the two parts of the introduction (together or individually) results in different text blocks. Counting only the syllables within the boundaries of the text block, without the 24 syllables of the introduction and the five syllables of the marginal emendations (ην and τα δω / ρα σου), the number of syllables is a cubic number—7³. (Omitting the page number, the first page has 343 letters.) When the syllables of the emendations (5) and of “τω κω” (2) are included, the text has a total of 372 (i.e., 31x12) syllables (a multiple of twelve, the text in the first 13 lines corresponds to the text on page a'); the number of the letters on the first page (ll. 1-13) in this configuration (omitting the page number and the end-nu of ην) is 343—i.e., 7³. When the dots encircling “τω κω” are read as cancellation signs (but the emendations are included), the number of syllables is a multiple of ten (370, i.e., 37x10).

The text of the first part with the elliptic beginning (7³ syllables, omitting all marginal emendations) displays acrostics (συγή and σιωπη) that have (implied) counterparts in those two parts of the narrative in which the name Zechariah is spelled Ζαχαρίας on the base line. When the columns are shifted vertically relative to each other—with “ελυπηθην Ιωκειμ σφοδρα” and “[ε]λυπειτο Ιωκειμ σφοδρα” in the same line in different columns—the lines display words composed of fragments from two neighboring parts of the trisected column; the placement of words in the same lines of different parts of the column visualizes analogies and parallels (e.g., “εστησαν” and “[αν]εστησαν” (with their respective grammatical subjects) or highlight syntactical ambiguities (πρωτω); or different endings (allusions to different texts).
### Exegesis

The parts of the text with the references to Ζαχαριας feature allusions to technical aspects of exegesis.

---

477 See Am 8:2.
A Zechariah is mentioned twice in the summary account with the references to the beginning and the end of his silence (10.1 [22.4]).

τῶν δὲ καιρῶν ἐκείνων ᾿Ζαχαρίας ἐσιγήσεν εἰς ἐννέα αὐτοῦ σαμουηλικαὶ μέχρι ὅτε ἐλάλησεν ᾿Ζαχαρίας.

The referents of the two written names ᾿Ζαχαρίας and ᾿Ζακχαρίας are seemingly the same—but they are distinguished from each other as grammatical subjects of finite verbs with different counterparts in the Old and the New Testaments: “ἐσιγήσεν” associates the name “Ζαχαρίας” with a syntactical parallel in the book of Acts; the verb λαλεῖν, in conjunction with a defined time, identifies the referent of the name “Ζακχαρίας” through Gabriel’s prediction and its fulfillment in the first chapter of Luke.479

In the gospel according to Luke, Gabriel announces the time until which Ζαχαρίας will not be able to speak.

ἐγὼ εἰμὶ Γάβριηλ ὁ παρεστηκὼς ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἀπεστάλησα480 ἵλινα πρὸς σέ,481 καὶ εὐαγγελίσασθαι σοι ταῦτα καὶ ἰδοὺ ἔσῃ σιωπῶν καὶ μὴ δυνάμενος

478 The name Samuel (which highlights two allusions to Samuel in Gabriel’s announcement of the birth of John the Baptist in the gospel according to Luke—see 1 Kgs 1:11, 7:3) and the brief reference to a succession link this note (and the reports on the event on which it is based) to the priests’ decision to “set up someone for the place of Zechariah”—“μετὰ δὲ τῶν πρώτων ημερῶν εὐθείᾳ ἐκ τοῦ τοποῦ τοῦ Ζαχαρίου καὶ ανεβῆ ὁ κληρονομὸς εἰς Συμεων” (24.4 [48.]). An allusion to a report in the first book of Maccabees, on the taking down of the altar defiled by the nations and the building of a new one, underlines here the words of Gabriel to Daniel (about the βδέλυγμα τῶν ἐρημωθέων; see Dn 9:27) in the source of the account, in the gospel according to Luke, on the ὕπτασια seen by Zechariah in the temple. With “ἱερεῖς” as grammatical subject, “ἐκτίθεσαν” juxtaposes the deliberation and decision of the priests in 24.4 about the “τόπος τοῦ Ζαχαρίου” to a deliberation “πρὶ τοῦ ἀναστηρίου τῆς ὀλοκληρωμένης τοῦ βεβηλωμένου” in the first book of Maccabees (see 1 Mcc 4:43-46). The defilement of the altar is reported in 1 Maccabees 1:54 and 59, with an explicit reference to the building of a “βδέλυγμα ἐρημωθέως” on the altar. The account on the deliberation in 1 Maccabees 4 ends with the limitation of the storage of the stones until here would be a prophet who would answer concerning them.

479 See Lk 1:20, 64; notice Lk 1:70, Acts 3:21 ἐλάλησεν διὰ στόματος τῶν ἁγίων.

480 See Dn θ’ 10:11.

481 See Dn θ’ 10:11.
“Καίρος”, the first noun of the paraphrase in PJ, is present in Gabriel’s words in Luke in three ways: through the name “Γαβριήλ”, the prepositional phrase “εἰς τὸν καίρον αὐτῶν”, and the participle “σιωπῶν”. The choice of the finite verb “εσηγησεν” in 10.1 [22.4]—combined with the participle σιωπῶν—defines the referent of the name Ζαχαρίας generically, through an allusion to the Wisdom of Sirach, as “ἀνθρωπὸς σοφὸς”.

A reference to Daniel’s Chaldean name Belteshazzar at the beginning of the vision in Daniel 10 that serves as model for the second part of the narrative on the annunciation of the birth of John in Luke hints at the type of wisdom, since Zechariah is likened (through the allusion to Daniel/Belteshazzar) to the four παιδαρία mentioned in chapter 1 of Daniel.

καὶ τὰ παιδάρια ταῦτα, οἱ τέσσαρες αὐτοί, ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ὁ θεὸς σύνεσιν καὶ φρόνησιν ἐν πάσῃ γραμματικῇ καὶ σοφίᾳ καὶ Δανιήλ συνήκεν ἐν πάσῃ ὀράσει καὶ ἐνυπνίοις.

“Εσηγησεν” (10.1 [22.4]) further explains this allusion to “γραμματικῇ” by connecting it to an account in Acts (the council of Jerusalem) with two instances of the verb ἔξηγησαν.

ἔσηγησαν δὲ πᾶν τὸ πλῆθος καὶ Ἰκουνον Βαρναβᾶ καὶ Παύλου ἔξηγουμενῶν ὅσα ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς σημεία καὶ τέρατα ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν δι’ αὐτῶν μετὰ δὲ σιγῆσαι αὐτοὺς ἀπεκρίθη Ἱάκωβος λέγων ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, ἀκούσατε μου Συμεών ἐξηγήσατο καθὼς πρῶτον ὁ θεὸς ἐπεσκέπτατο λαβεῖν ἐξ ἐθνῶν λαὸν τῷ ὄνοματι αὐτού, καὶ τούτῳ συμφωνοῦσιν οἱ λόγοι τῶν προφητῶν ...

---

482 See Dn θ’ 10:17.
483 See Dn θ’ 10:11; 10:9, 15.
484 See Lk 1:20.
485 See Sir 20:6-7 ἐστιν σιωπῶν οὐ γὰρ ἔχει ἀπόκρισιν / καὶ ἔστιν σιωπῶν εἶδός καὶ ἀφήνεις, / ἀνθρωπὸς σοφὸς σιγῆσαι ἐὼς καροῦ, / ὅ δὲ λατιστῆς καὶ ἀφρών ύπερβησται καροῦ.
486 See Dn θ’ 10:1, see Dn θ’ 1:7.
487 See Dn θ’ 1:17.
The indirect allusion to “ἐξηγείσθαι” in 10.1 connects the brief reference to the silence of ᾽Ιακώβος to the midwife’s words to Salome in 19.3 [39.11-12]—“κενον [488] σοι θέαμα ἐχω εξηγησάσθαι”. In 19.3, the verb is an allusion to the law of leprosy in Leviticus [489] and points to the second part of γραμματική—“ἐξηγησίς κατὰ τοὺς ἐνυπάρχουτας ποιητικοὺς τρόπους” [490].

“οτι ᾽Ιακώβος πεφωνεται”

The narrative on the murder of Zechariah raises the same question for its reader as the prophet Isaiah does for the Ethiopian eunuch [491].

περὶ τίνος ὁ προφήτης λέγει τούτο; περὶ ἑαυτοῦ ἢ περὶ ἐτέρου τινὸς;

In P. Bodmer 5, this question includes whether the corrected name is “spoken” (or written) by Zechariah.

At first glance, the sentence with the first instance of the name Zechariah with the “double” chi seems to belong to the same account (and writer) as the sentence with the second, as it follows after what seems to be the end of Zechariah’s answer to Herod’s second order, addressed to him through assistants.

Zechariah’s words resemble those of his first answer in their brevity and diction (first person). He identifies himself as “μαρτυς ... του θεου” and as being “του θεου” [492] and,

---

[488] See Dt 32:47 ὁτι οὐχὶ λόγος κενὸς οὕτος ὑμᾶν, ὅτι αὕτη ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν. In 19.3, the λόγος is “παρθενος εγεννησεν αὐτῷ νη φύσις αυτῆς”.
[490] Grammatic Graeci 1.1, 5.5.
[491] Acts 8:34.
with an explanation, tells Herod “ἐχε μου το αίμα”. The sentence with the “corrected” name comes next, in what seems to be a report on Herod’s response (the sending of murderers), followed by the account on the uncovering of what the sons of Israel did not know about this Zechariah—viz. “ποις ἐφωνευθη”. The corrected name suggests that the sentence with “ἐφωνευθη” (Zechariah) corresponds to the sentence with “ἐφωνευταί” (Zecharias) and that both are related to the passage on Samuel’s succession “με ερπι στε ἔλαλησεν Ζαχαριασ”.495

But the more one compares the ending of Zechariah’s answer to Herod’s first inquiry the less clear it becomes whether the word about the προθυρα in the second account is indeed the end of the message spoken by Zechariah, to be conveyed to Herod through the assistants. In the first inquiry, Zechariah is explicitly said to answer speaking to (and through) the assistants sent by Herod. The end of the answer is signaled by a brief reference to the departure of the assistants and their report to Herod—“καὶ απηλθοσαν οι υπηρεται αυτοι και απηγγιλαν αυτω παντα ταυτα”. Such explicit mention of the assistants’ departure is absent from the account on Herod’s second inquiry—if the word(s) on the “προθυρα του ναου ΚΥ” are the end of Zechariah’s answer. Only their departure to Zechariah is mentioned, and that they spoke to him.

καὶ απηλθοσαν οι υπηρεται και απηγγιλαν αυτω ταυτα
και αποκριθεὶς εἰπεν
μάρτυς

492 See Nm 16:5.
493 See 23.2 [45.15-46.3].
494 23.3 [45.5-6].
495 10.1 [22.5-7].
496 23.2 [44.9-11, 13] “καὶ επεστειλεν υπηρετας εν τω θυσιαστηριω προς Ζαχαριαν λεγων αυτω ... ο δε απεκρυσατο λεγων αυτοις ...”.
497 23.2 [45.12-14].
The verb ἀπαγγέλλειν occurs only one more time after the sentence in 23.2 [45.4]— in 24.3, following the last sentence of an account introduced with the words “καὶ ηκουσαν καὶ εἶδαν τὸ γεγονός”. 498

καὶ πτω πτωμα αυτων ουχ ευρωσαν αλλα ευρων το πτωμα αυτων λεθον γεγενημενον και φοβηθεντες εξηλθαν και και απαγγειλαν ὅτι ζαχαριας πεφονευται καὶ ησαν πασαι αι φυλαι του λαου και επενθησαν ...

In 23.2, ἀπαγγέλλειν is used with a direct and an indirect object (“αυτω παντα ταυτα”). In 24.3, the verb is followed by words resembling the beginning of the φωνη in the sanctuary (“Ζαχαριας εφονευται”). Agreement in number with the verb of the preceding sentence suggests that the grammatical subject of “απεγγειλαν” is the same as the one of “εξηλθαν”. The combination of the two verbs “ἐξέρχεσθαι” and “φοβεῖσθαι” suggests that “φοβηθεντες εξηλθαν” in 24.3 [48.4] is an allusion to the report, in 24.2 [47.8-11], on the exit of the “one of them” who “dared to enter the sanctuary”, meant to align the two accounts. The number of the direct object of “ἐνηγγυλεν” and the position of the three sentences relative to each other suggest that the grammatical subject of “ηκουσαν”, in 24.3 [47.11], is “εἶρεις” and also “αυτοι”, the grammatical subject of the verb of the sentence placed behind “καὶ εἰδαν τὸ γεγονός”.

καὶ ακουσας τω(ν) λογων τωτων εφοβηθη και εξηλθεν και ενηγγυλεν τοῖς ἱερευσιν καὶ εἶδεν

498 “Τὸ γεγονός” combines “τὸ γεγονός” and “ὁ γεγονός”. The latter is an allusion to 2 Mcc 4:1 and Gal 3:17.
Preceded in 24.3 [47.8-9] by the statement "των λόγων τούτων εφοβηθη", the composite of σχίζειν in the middle voice in 24.3 [47.14] suggests an allusion to a description, in the book of Isaiah, of how three men—Eliakim, Shebna, and Joah—report the words of the ambassador sent by king Sennacherib of Assyria to king Hezekiah, to Jerusalem.499

καὶ εἰσῆλθεν Ελίακιμ ὁ τοῦ Χελκιοῦ ὁ οἰκονόμος καὶ Σομνᾶς ὁ γραμματεύς τῆς δυνάμεως καὶ Ἰωαχ ὁ τοῦ Ασαφ ὁ ὑπομνηματογράφος πρὸς Ἑζεκίαν ἐσχισμένοι τοὺς χιτώνας καὶ ἀπῆγγελαν αὐτῷ τοὺς λόγους Ραφακοῦ.

In the fourth book of Kings, the same scene is reported with almost identical words.500

καὶ εἰσῆλθεν Ελίακιμ ὁ τοῦ Χελκιοῦ ὁ οἰκονόμος καὶ Σομνᾶς ὁ γραμματεύς καὶ Ἰωαχ ὁ τοῦ Ασαφ ὁ ἁναμμηναῖος πρὸς Ἑζεκίαν διερρήχοτες τὰ ἰμάτια καὶ ἀνήγγειλαν αὐτῷ τοὺς λόγους Ραφακοῦ.

"Περιεσχισαντο", with "τοὺς χιτώνας", seems to be a gesture similar in meaning to the phrase "διαρρηγνύναι τὰ ἰμάτια"—a sign of mourning. This chain of associations seems to imply that, unlike "ἀπῆγγελαν" in 23.2 [45.4], the direct object of "ἀπεγγειλαν" in 24.3 [48.5] is not "αὐτῷ" (i.e., Herod) but "πασαὶ αἱ φυλai τοῦ λαοῦ", relating the mourning mentioned in 24.3 [48.7]) to the proclamation "οτί Ζαχαριᾶς πεφονεύται".

But "φοβῆθεντες εξῆλθαν καὶ ἀπῆγγειλαν"501 can also be a delayed reference to the assistants’ departing and reporting to Herod, corresponding to "καὶ ἀπηλθόσαν ὁι ὑπηρεταὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπηγγειλαν αὐτῷ πάντα ταυτα" in 23.2 [45.2-3]. In this case, "οτί Ζαχαριᾶς πεφονεύται" (24.3 [48.5-6]) is a summary of everything said by Zechariah "ἀποκριθεὶς" (23.3 [45.14]), including "περὶ τὸ διαφωμα εφονεύθη Ζαχαριᾶς", and

499 Is 36:22; see Is 37:6.
500 4 Kgs 18:37.
501 24.3 [48.4-6].
the explanation of the enigmatic words (or παράθεσις)—either by him, or by someone else; and φοβηθεντες parallels those who leave to Joseph (9.3 [20.9]), thus aligning the account in 24 to the story of Dathan, Abiram, and Koreh, and of their αντιλογία, recounted in 9.3 by the priest, and to Joseph’s recapitulation of it in 13.1, having found “ἐν τῇ οἶκῳ ... ὀγκωμενήν”.

The text is composed in such a manner (with respect to number of syllables and placement of verbs) as to allow excerpting—without leaving traces—long passages corresponding to both interpretations from the text, to emphasize the different interpretations of the diction (mimetic or simple). (In both configurations, the raised dot separating “εφών” and “ευθή” is placed at the end of a line; in addition, when the text is displayed in two columns, a change in the grammatical subject—from “ενηγγίλεν ... α εἶδεν” to “ηκουσαν καὶ εἶδαν”—becomes more apparent.)

The different alignments illustrate an aspect of ἀνάγνωσις mentioned in the grammarians—finding the proper order of graphic elements for reading well—and present εξήγησις as a “ὁδηγησις” taking place on a plane, i.e., in two dimensions (through continuation along the same lines but in different columns of text, and through spatial “παράθεσις” for comparisons and the drawing of analogies).

503 23.3 [46.6].
504 24.2 [47.10-12].
505 24.3 [47.11-12].
506 E.g., implied in Grammatic Graeci 1.3 197.9-11, 319.16-20, 324.38-325.2.
και περὶ τὸ διαφαμα εφὼν
εὐθὺς Ζαχαρίας καὶ οὐκ ἦδεισαν ἀν οἱ νοοὶ ΙΗΛ πῶς εφὼν; εὐθὺς ἀλλὰ τὴν ὑπνίαν τοῦ ἀσπασμοῦ αὐτός καὶ οὐκ ἦδεισαν αὐτοὶ κατὰ τὸ ἔθος τῆς εὐλογίας τοῦ ζαχαρία

ιοῦ καὶ εὐθύμησαν οἱ ἱερεῖς προσδοκοῦσι τοῦ ζαχαρίαν τοὺς ἀσπασσάμενοι αὐτὸν εἰν εὐχὴν καὶ δοξάζασι τοῦ Ψιστοῦ ΘΝ χρονισάσιν

τὸς δὲ αὐτοῦ εὐθύμησαι παντεῖς τὰ

οὐ δὲ τῆς εὐλογίας καὶ εἰδὲ

ν παρὰ τὸ θυσιαστήριον ΚΥ

αἰμα πεπηγός καὶ φωνὴν λεγοὺν

ριας εφονευται καὶ οὐκ εξαλλάθησαι τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἔως ελθῇ εκδίκος καὶ ακουσάς τὸν λογοῦ τούτων εφοβήθη καὶ εξῆλθεν καὶ ενηγγίλῃ ἐν τοῖς Ιερεὺς αἱ ἐπειδὴ καὶ εἰδάν τὸ γέγονὼς ἤ

涑 a↓ a↓ α πανωματα τοῦ ναοῦ ολολ ο ι ν ἴδα(ν) καὶ αὐτοὶ περεσχίσαν αὐτοὺς

ο το επανωθὲν ἔως κατὸ τὸ πτωμα αὐτοῦ οὐχ ἐνετῶν αὐτὸν λίθῳ ὑνε ξῆλθαν καὶ αἰμα πεπηγός καὶ ἐφονευται

294 (42x7 / 2x (21x7)) Syllables

καὶ οὐκ ἦδεισαν οἱ ν οἱοὶ ΙΗΛ πῶς εφὼν; εὐθὺς ἀλλὰ τὴν ὑπνίαν τοῦ ἀσπασμοῦ αὐτὸς καὶ οὐκ ἦδεισαν αὐτοὶ κατὰ τὸ ἔθος τῆς εὐλογίας καὶ εἰδὲ

α το ἐθος τη ευλογι

λα το τυχαριου καὶ εὐθύμησαν οἱ

εἰς προσδοκοῦσι τοῦ ζαχαρίας τοὺς ἀσπασά

μαι αὐτῶν εἰν εὐχὴν καὶ δοξάζασι τοῦ Ψιστοῦ ΘΝ χρον

ιαυτὸς δὲ αὐτοῦ εὐθύμησαι παντεῖς τὸ

λιμάςας δέ τις εὐτων εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸ αγι

αἰμα καὶ εἰδὲν παρὰ τὸ θυσιαστήριον

ΚΥ αἰμα πεπηγός καὶ

φωνὴν λεγουσαν Ζαχαρία

ριας εφονευται καὶ οὐκ εξαλλάθησαι τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἔως ελθῇ εκδίκος καὶ ακουσάς τὸν λογοῦ τούτων εφοβήθη καὶ εξῆλθεν ἐν καὶ ενηγγίλῃ τοῖς Ιερεὺς αἱ ἐπειδὴ καὶ εἰδάν τὸ γέγονὼς ἤ

UpEdit ηγεννημένο(ν) καὶ φοβηθὲν η

ντες εξῆλθαν καὶ αἰμα πεπηγός καὶ ἐφονευται

21 φωνὴν λεγουσαν Ζαχαρία
In this interpretation, the φωνή seen in the sanctuary and the proclamation are one—which is an invitation to determine in which way the two statements “Ζαχαριας εφονευται” and “Ζαχαριας πεπφονευται”—and their sources—correspond to each other.

Read in conjunction with the description of the φωνή in 24.2 [47.5] and with the number indicated by the definite article “τό”, Zechariah’s reference to “το προθυρον” in his answer to Herod prepares the reports on the murder in 24 by pointing to a sentence at the beginning of a prophecy in a report on a vision of the glory of the Lord in the book of Ezekiel.507

καὶ οὐ βεβηλώσουσιν οὐκέτι οἶκος Ἰσραήλ τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ἅγιον μου, αὐτοὶ καὶ οἱ ἡγούμενοι αὐτῶν, εν τῇ πορνείᾳ αὐτῶν καὶ ἐν τοῖς φόνοις τῶν ἡγούμενων ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν, ἐν τῷ τιθέναι αὐτοῖς τὸ πρόθυρον μου εἰν τοῖς προθύροις αὐτῶν καὶ τάς φλίς μου ἑχομένας τῶν φλιῶν αὐτῶν καὶ εἴδωκαν τὸν τοίχον μου ὡς συνεχόμενου ἐμοῦ καὶ αὐτῶν καὶ ἐβεβήλωσαν τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ἅγιον μου ἐν ταῖς ἁπάσις αὐτῶν, αἷς ἐποίουν.

Through the allusion to Ezekiel, the φωνή in the sanctuary is equated with the φωνή from the house,508 which comes to Ezekiel in his vision; the person who witnesses it (having dared to enter—an allusion to Joseph of Arimathea)509 is likened to Ezekiel. The same prophecy is followed by an order to make a διαγραφή of the house.510 This is the last of three passages in Ezekiel with references to διαγράφειν; they provide links to εὐξωμαί in 13.1 (through σημεῖον τοῦτο in Ez 4:3), the context for the references to γράφειν in the epilogue of PJ.

507 Ez 43:7-8.
508 See Ez 43:6 καὶ ἐστην, καὶ ἰδοὺ φωνή ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου λαλοῦντος πρὸς με.
509 24.2 [47.1], see Mk 15:43.
510 See Ez 43:12, 11.
Summary

The examples of “αυτη· η μητηρ αυτη” and of “Ζαχαρας”, phrases with corrections, are both accompanied by verbs resembling in their written form customary verb forms without matching them entirely. We have seen in this chapter that in both cases the uncorrected misspellings and the corrected words or phrases do have an exegetical function.

“Εκρατευετο”, seemingly a ἀμάρτημα (a barbarism), can be interpreted as misspelled form of “ἐκραταιοῦτο” or “ἐγκρατεῦεται”, verb forms represented in the writings of the New Testament. The one (ἐκραταιοῦτο) defines the grammatical subject of the verb in 6.1 as “ἀγια” (by analogy with “ἀγιος” in Lk 1:80,511 and Ναζωραῖος in Lk 2:40512), the other (ἐγκρατεῦεται) associates the account in 6.1 with discussions, in 1 Corinthians, on ἀγωνίζεσθαι and whether or not to marry513 and with explanations, in the gospel according to Matthew, on the αἰτία τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.514 Synonyms (κλωθείν, ἔλκειν) and distinctions in the referents of homonyms (πορφύρα and ἀληθινή πορφῦρα) in chapter 11 and vowel changes (“ἐφονεύθη” and “ἐφονεύθη”) in chapter 24 associate the two passages with references to Ζαχαριας with clarifying examples in Homer; these examples, in turn, are linked to texts used in grammatical treatises to explain usages of γράφειν—ξύσαι in the case of Mary’s spinning (11), ἐπιγράψαι in the case of the murder (24).

511 Emphasizing λειτουργῶν in Anna’s first vow (4.1 [8.2-4]). On ἀγιος, see Nm 17:20, 16:7.
512 Emphasized through Joseph’s question “πον σε σπαξω” in 17.3 [37.7], which is an allusion to 1 Mcc 3:49-50.
513 See 1 Cor 7:9 “ει δε ουκ ἐγκρατεύεσθαι, γαμησάτωσαι, κρείττον γαρ ἐστιν γαμήσαι και πυροδοθαι”; 9:25 ἐγκρατεύεσται.
514 Mt 19:3-12 (with Gn 1:27, 5:2, 2:24 and Dt 24:1, 3), 27:37; linked, in P. Bodmer 5 (6.2 [.5-6]) to Wis 3:13-14, through Is 56:3, 5.
Similar to the function of the graphically ambiguous form of the verb “ἐκρατεύετο” (containing verbal allusions to different texts), the phrase “αὐτὴ· ἡ μητὴρ αὐτῆς”, and Ζαχαρίας—are “double” cross-references, split into an allusion based on the “original” form and another based on the corrected one.

A double reading of “αὐτῆς· ἡ μητὴρ αὐτῆς” makes the account in 6.1 on Mary’s steps and Anna’s second vow a “middle”, connecting Anna’s lament in the garden and Joseph’s finding of “ὁγκώμενην”. This connection between the three parts of the narrative is bolstered by cross-references through the repetition of phrases (τὴν γῆν ταύτην and χαμαί) and through intertexts.515 Both Anna’s lament and Joseph’s inner speech are associated with grammatical concepts (λόγος προφορικός and ἐνεπίθετος; and διαστολή and ὀρισμός) that have bearing on the reading and interpretation of the description of Mary’s steps.

An allusion to two references to βῆματα in Sirach516 in 6.1 underlines verbal links between the accounts on Zechariah’s and Joseph’s making of a vow.517 The phrase “ἡ ἐξατο περὶ +gen.” (8.3) and the verb form “ἐπέωμαι” (13.1) are rare in the writings of the Old and New Testaments—“ἡ ἐξατο περὶ +gen.” is represented twice,518 “ἐπέωμαι” only once.519 In P. Bodmer 5, both point to the same source—the story of the making of the serpent of bronze in Numbers 21.520 In 6.1, the site of the double allusion to Sirach, Anna’s vow features an

---

517 “Η εξατο περὶ αυτῆς”, in 8.3 [18.3], with mention of the bells on the vestment of the highpriest (λαβὼν τοῦ β’ κοδωνα) in [18.1-2]; and “ἐπέωμαι περὶ αυτῆς” in 13.1 [27.4].
518 See Nm 21:7, 4 Mcc 4:13.
519 See Ex 8:5.
520 The one (ἡ ἐξατο περὶ +gen. in 8.3) through its exact grammatical form, the other through the combination of ἐχεσθαι with two prepositional phrases (πρὸς +acc. and περὶ +gen. in 13.1).
allusion to the testimony on the “φῶς τοῦ κόσμου” in the gospel according to John,\(^{521}\) this associates the vow with the second ending of John—one of the sources of the reference to “ο γραφαὶ την ἱστορίαν ταυτήν” in 25.1. The allusion in 6.1 to the gospel according to John (and to the sentence in 25.1) is a gloss on the allusions to the sign of the serpent in 8.3\(^{522}\) and 13.1\(^{523}\); the sign(s) there are linked to the reference to the exaltation of the son of man in John 3:14-15, and thus to John 12:32-33 (adding the phrase “ποιῶ θανάτῳ”). These allusions to John link the references to vows in 6.1, 8.3, and 13.1 to the sentence on “ο γραφαὶ την ἱστορίαν ταυτήν” in 25.1, stressing the call “σὺ ακολούθει μοι” and the prediction on how Peter would glorify God,\(^{524}\) and associating “ἱστορία” with “εἰχή”.

The allusions to different sources have structural functions. For example, εὐξωμαί, in 13.1, points not only to διαστολή in Exodus 8:19 and ὅρισμός in Exodus 8:8 but also to a reference to “τὸ σημεῖον τοῦτο”, a phrase used only twice with the definite article in the writings of the Old and of the New Testaments\(^{525}\) and only once without.\(^{526}\) The allusion to Acts (τὸ σημεῖον τοῦτο τῆς ἱάσεως) emphasizes “ὡρα” in 13.1\(^{527}\)—which is a link connecting 2.4 (περὶ ὁραν θῆ), 8.3,\(^{528}\) and 13.1 (ἐν τῇ ὁρᾳ τῆς δοξολογίας αὐτοῦ)—and associates the account in 13.1 with the report on the healing of the lame man at the Beautiful Gate and Peter’s and John’s words in the Stoa of Solomon before the Sanhedrin. The

\(^{521}\) Jn 8:12.
\(^{522}\) Implicitly compared to the sign of Jonah the prophet in Mt 16:1 through the verb ἐπιδείκνυειν in 8.3 [18.7-8]—“ὡ εἰσὶν ἐπίδειξιν ΚΣ ὁ ΘΣ σημείων ...”.
\(^{523}\) Equated with “τὸ σημεῖον τοῦτο” in Ex 8:19, Acts 4:22, and Ez 4:3.
\(^{524}\) Jn 21:19, 22.
\(^{525}\) In Ex 8:19 and Acts 4:22.
\(^{526}\) In Ez 4:3.
\(^{527}\) See Acts 3:1.
\(^{528}\) The narrative draws on account on Zechariah’s vision at the hour of incense in Lk 1:10, and its model in Dn 9:21.
indirect allusion to “σημεὶόν ἐστι τοῦτο” in Ezekiel 4:3 (a prophecy beginning with the διάγραφειν of Ἰερουσαλήμ as πόλις on a brick) is emphasized through the first words of Joseph’s question concerning making a vow “τι ἀρα ...”—which, by associating Joseph’s question with Euthine’s question and explanation, stresses συγκλείειν in the prophecy in Ezekiel. As intertext, the allusion to Ezekiel 4 connects Joseph’s words (and thus Euthine’s also), to the reference to “τοῦ προθύρα” in 23.3 [46.2]—in the singular, the noun is an allusion to Ezekiel 43:8 (likewise with διαγράφειν).

The passages from Exodus 8, Matthew 27, and John 8 and 21 incorporated in P. Bodmer 5 feature statements with acrostics. This—or, rather, the arrangement of text in lines—is illustrated by the sentences with “Ζαχαριασ”. Even without any rewriting of the text, the openings with this spelling of the name (κβ’ - κγ’ and μζ’ - μζ’) display spatial parallels between statements and actions that suggest the drawing of analogies. The layout of the text on the pages invites (and facilitates) σύγκρισις through παραθεσίς. Rewriting of the text with lines of equal length and changing how these lines are arranged (in a bisected (24) or trisected (11) column) stress these parallels and clarify ambiguous sentence boundaries, syntax, or referents (e.g., by indicating changes in the number of verbs or connecting statements through shared grammatical subjects). The correction, in 24.1, of “Ζαχαριας” as “ΖαχαΡιας” (the one name corresponding to “ΖαχαΡιας εἰσιγνάσεν” in 10.1 [22.4-5], the other to “εἰλαλησεν ΖαχαΡιας” [22.6-7]) highlights a difficulty in determining the diction—or, rather, the speaker—of the account with the reference to the

529 See 2.3 [4.14-15], Gn 20:18.
in the sanctuary. Allusions to sources with emphasis on reading and interpretation—Daniel and Luke 4—point to demonstrations (in Daniel and in Luke) on the mode of reading required for “opening” or “unfolding” the text.

Through emendations and cancellations, in P. Bodmer 5 the first part of PJ is represented in three versions, each with a different number of syllables. When written in a trisected column, the text of one of the three versions—lacking “η” in line 3 and “τα δω / ρα σού” in lines 15 and 16—reveals the same two-dimensional (vertical and horizontal) layering of the text (interweaving or superimposing two sentences or phrases on the other) exemplified by the passages with the references to Zαχαριας. The latter are connected to this (first) part of the narrative through acrostics—“σιωπή” points to an allusion to Amos 8 in 24.3 (τα πάθωματα του ναου ολουξα(v)), σιγή to the reference to Zαχαριας in 10.2.

The examined examples represent two grammatical explanations of the term στοιχεία. Emphasis on στοιχεία in Anna’s lament and on ιατρεία in the passages related to the account on Mary’s steps and in other parts of the narrative suggests that στοιχεία in the case of “αυτή· η μητηρ αυτή” are associated with the four elements (their κράσις

530 The speakers are Zechariah, the father of John the Baptist, on the death of Zechariah, the son of Barachi, or a third person narrator on the death of Zechariah, the father of John the Baptist.
531 Esp. Dn 9:2 and 1:4, 17.
532 Through allusions to the sign of Sennacherib in 24.3 [47.14] “περισχείαντο” (Is 36:22; see Is 37:6; 4 Kgs 18:37); 24.3 [48.5] “πεφονευταί” (Tb 2:3, with references to Sennacherib in Tb 1:18, 22); and 1.2 [1.16] “σπερμα ουκ επομενας” (Is 37:31). The sign is represented in Lk 4:17 through “αναπτύξεσ” (see 4 Kgs 19:14).
533 See Am 8:3 και ολολέξει τα φατνώματα του ναου· εν έκεινη τη ήμερα, λέγει κύριος, πολυς ο πεπτωκώς· εν παντί τόπω, ἐπιρρέψω σιωπήν.
and μικρά). The arrangement of the text in lines suggests that, in the case of the references to Ζαχαρία, στοιχεῖα are linked to στοιχεῖα and πάξιμο.

These findings are strong evidence that the author of *P. Bodmer 5* was familiar with the concepts and παραδείγματα of γραμματική and with the writings of the Old and the New Testaments and wrote for an audience of whom he did (or could) expect the same.
In the previous chapter I showed that, in *P. Bodmer 5*, graphic and syntactic ambiguities and the addition of corrections have an exegetical function. They lead the reader through the narrative by pointing out cross-connections; at the same time, these characteristics of the papyrus provide (or necessitate) a recapitulation of grammatical teachings concerning γράμματα and στοιχεῖα. Corrections in the text (even different “transcriptions” of numbers) lead to alternative readings that demand of the reader to determine whether or not they are “ἀμαρτήματα”, which “layer” of the synoptically displayed versions yields which reading, and whether or not these readings agree with each other.

These features are absent from the other manuscripts of *PJ*. But even in *P. Bodmer* they merely assist the structural and subject defining function of the four sentences with the noun ἱστορία. These sentences allude to phrases in sources that are connected to each other in two ways: through references, in a single text, to several of them; and through interpretations (readings) of the earlier texts in the later ones (as in layered transparencies).

---

536 E.g., “nested”, as in 2 Mcc or Heb 11:17-19.
Because of these interconnections (and their subject- and argument-defining function), finding—or describing—a structure or unifying subject matter of the narrative in *PJ* is not an easy task. Instead of providing, in a single sentence or paragraph, a clear and concise definition of the subject matter and purpose of the narrative, the text demands of the reader an inductive approach leading—through re-readings, repeated comparisons, and cumulative evidence—from a rough sketch to an increasingly more detailed image of the narrative’s structure and subject matter.\(^{537}\)

The type of reading required by *PJ* may perhaps be best described as “apocalyptic” in the Scriptural sense of “ἀποκαλύπτειν τὸ ὤτιον” or “ἀποκαλύπτειν τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς”. \(^{537}\)——illustrated, for example, by the story of the making of a covenant between Jonathan and David—denotes a telling beforehand or making known a plan in words clarified through the account of how the announced event came to be.\(^{539}\)

'Ἀποκαλύπτειν τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς similarly implies a comparison. The meaning of the phrase is explained by the story of Balaam and his ass\(^{540}\)—a brief narrative on Balaam’s attempts, on the way to Balak who called him to curse Israel for him, to “straighten”\(^{541}\) the path of the ass whom he rides, as the ass first walks into the plain, then brushes at the side of a wall, and finally “sits” down beneath her rider. Each time, Balaam strikes her, believing that she mocked him. Only when God opens first the mouth of the ass and then the eyes of

---

\(^{537}\) E.g., by pointing to ὤμοια (the shared signified unifying the many allusions) or to the same texts (interpreted in different sources).

\(^{538}\) E.g., see 1 Kgs 20:1-21:1 at 20:2, 13; 1 Kgs 22:8, 17; 9:15-17 at 9:15 (similar to 16:1, 3, 12); or 2 Kgs 7:27 (with 7:19-21).

\(^{539}\) E.g., see 1 Kgs 20:2, 2 Kgs 11:27, 12:11-12, 16:20-22.

\(^{540}\) See Nm 22:15-35. Ἀποκαλύπτειν τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς is additionally illustrated through Balaam’s παραβολή; see Nm 24:4, 24:16.

\(^{541}\) See Nm 22:23 καὶ ἐπαταξεὶ τῆν ὄξυν τῇ ῥάβδῳ τοῦ ἐφθάνατε αὐτήν ἐν τῇ ὄξυ. Notice Nm 23:3 καὶ ἐπορεύθη ἐν θέλειαν.
the prophet does Balaam see that of which, before, he did not take notice—an angel opposing him on the way and a drawn sword in his hand, the sight of which caused the ass to deviate to the left and to the right and from what is her habit. God’s enables the prophet to see what he overlooked—because he referred the signs to the wrong causes—and to recognize what he did not know before.

Among the elements of the text that might be heard imperfectly or overlooked at first are instructions on how to read, included in the text through allusions. Through these allusions, the authors of the different versions of *PJ* warn their readers to pay attention to what is implied or will be addressed later, and to what is said, in what manner and by whom. For example, all versions include an allusion to Demosthenes’ speech *Περὶ τοῦ Στεφάνου* (*De Corona*) in 1.4. Demosthenes begins his speech by emphasizing Solon’s laws on how judges are to listen. Similarly, all versions of *PJ* include an allusion to the treatise *De Mundo* in Anna’s lament, which includes discussions of different systems of structure and order, one in close proximity to the passage with the phrase included in Anna’s lament, the other nearer to the end. Other instructions on how to read the text are demonstrative, based on intertexts and paraphrases. For example, all versions begin with an indirect allusion to the sacrifices of Abel and Cain, which puts emphasis on dividing correctly (όρθῶς

---

542 See Nm 22:26 οὐκ ἦν ἐκκλίναν δεξιάν οὐδὲ ἀριστεράν, Nm 22:33.
543 See Nm 22:30 καὶ λέγει ἡ ὄνος τῷ Βαλαάμ Οὐκ ἑγὼ ἦν ὄνος σου, ἐφ’ ἡς ἐπέβαινες ἀπὸ νεότητός σου ἐως τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας; μὴ ὑπερφάνει ὑπεριδόνα ἑποίησα σοι ὦτως; 544 See Nm 22:34 καὶ ἐλευθερώσω ἐπιστάμην ὅτι σὺ μοι ἀνθέστηκας εἰς τῇ ὀξύστερον ἡμέραν.
545 See Dem. *De Cor.* 1-2, 7.
546 See Arist. [*Mund.*] 396a33-397a8.
547 See Arist. [*Mund.*] 399b29-400a4.
Small differences in phrasing have an exegetical, structural function. Reuben’s explanation “καθότι σπέρμα οὐκ ἐποίησας ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ” (1.2)—an allusion to the sign of Sennacherib in the book of Isaiah—is paraphrased by Ἰωακείμ as “εἰ ἔγω μόνος οὐκ ἐποίησα σπέρμα ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ;” (1.3)—an allusion to the words “καὶ κατελείφθην ἔγω μόνος” spoken by Simon Maccabeus. The connection between the two texts is the participle οἱ καταλελειμμένοι in Isaiah 37:31 καὶ ἔσονται οἱ καταλελειμμένοι ἐν τῇ Ιουδαίᾳ φυήσουσιν ἥζαν κατῷ καὶ ποιήσουσιν σπέρμα ἄνω. The two allusions are taken up again individually at the end of the narrative, in 24.3, the one in the proclamation that “Ζαχαρίας πεφώνευται”, the other in the description of the mourning for Zechariah by all the tribes of the people (καὶ ἐπένθησαν αὐτῶν).

In this chapter, we will have a look at three features like these to see how the authors of the different versions of PJ, as exegetes, guide (ὁδηγεῖν) the readers through the text—the “layering” of allusions (exemplified by the phrases “πλούσιος σφόδρα” and “ὁ γράφας”), allusions and cross-connections linking the different references to ἱστορία through intertexts, and the endings of the different versions of PJ.

---

548 See Lk 18:23, Gn 4:6-7; and Gn 15:10.
550 24.3; see Tb 2:3 (S) εἶς ἐκ τοῦ ἐθνοῦς ἦμῶν πεφώνευται. The beginning of the book of Tobit includes references to the reign and death of Sennacherib; see Tb 1:15, 18-19, 21. An allusion to Am 8:3 in 24.3 stresses Tb 2:6 (with quotation of Am 8:10).
551 See 1 Mcc 13:26, 12:52.
552 On the explanation of ἐξήγησις as ἡ τοῦ ἔξης ὁδήγησις, see Grammatici Graeci 1.3 302.11-19, 455.22-456.22. For an example, see Acts 8:26-39 at 8:31. Philip is exegete, guiding the eunuch through the landscape of the text.
"ἡν πλούσιος σφόδρα καὶ προσέφερε τὰ δώρα ..."

The phrase “πλούσιος σφόδρα” in 1.1 associates the beginning (and first clause) of *PJ* with three protagonists and narrative contexts—Abraam (in *Genesis*),\(^{553}\) Joachim (in *Susanna*),\(^ {554}\) and one of the rulers (in *Luke*).\(^ {555}\) “Προσέφερε”, the finite verb of the second clause of the narrative, has parallels in two texts—the book of *Job*, and the letter to the *Hebrews*. The allusion to *Job* adds a fourth example of one who is “very rich” to the other three.\(^ {556}\)

With Abraam as the grammatical subject, the phrase “προσέφερε τὰ δώρα” in 1.1 is an allusion to the first two clauses of a paraphrase of the Sacrifice of Isaac in the Letter to the *Hebrews*.\(^ {557}\)

\[\textit{πίστει προσενήμοχεν}'\(^ {558}\) Αβραὰμ τὸν Ἰσαὰκ πειραζόμενος\(^ {559}\) καὶ τὸν μονογενῆ προσέφερεν, ὅ τὰς ἐπαγγελίας ἀναδεξάμενος, πρὸς ὃν ἐλαλῆθη ὅτι ἐν Ἰσαὰκ κληθήσεται σοι σπέρμαα.\(^ {560}\) λογισάμενος ὅτι καὶ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγείρειν\(^ {561}\) δυνατὸς ὁ θεός,\(^ {562}\) θεν αὐτὸν καὶ ἐν παραβολῇ ἐκομίσατο.\]^ {563}

\(^{553}\) See Gn 13:2 Αβραὰμ δὲ ἦν πλούσιος σφόδρα κτήρεσιν καὶ ἀργυρίῳ καὶ χρυσίῳ.

\(^{554}\) See Sus 4 ἦν Ἰωακεὶμ πλούσιος σφόδρα καὶ ἦν αὐτῷ παράδεισος γειτνῶν τῷ οίκῳ αὐτοῦ καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν προσήγωντο οἱ Ιουδαῖοι διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν ἐνδοξοστορον τάντων. The story addresses the commandment not to desire a neighbor’s wife (see Sus θ’ 61; with Ex 20:17, Dt 5:21, and Dt 22:24, 26; notice 4 Mcc 2:5) and the laws on guiltless blood (Sus θ’ 62 αἷμα ἀναίτιον; see Dt 19:10, 13; 21:8, 9).

\(^{555}\) See Lk 18:23 ο δὲ ἄκοψας ταῦτα περιλυπός ἐγενήθη· ἦν γὰρ πλούσιος σφόδρα.

\(^{556}\) See Jb 1:3. In addition, the allusion to Jb 1:5 stresses the phrase “κατὰ τῶν ἁρμίμων” in Jo 4:5, the source of the genitive τῶν δώδεκα φυλῶν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ limiting “ἐν ταῖς ἱστορίαις” in 1.1.

\(^{557}\) Heb 11:17-19; 96 syllables. In the letter to the *Hebrews*, the account on the Sacrifice of Isaac in the book of *Genesis* is explicated through through cross-references to other parts of the letter based on the repetition of phrases or nouns (e.g., σπέρμα 'Αβραὰμ (Heb 2:16); παραβολή (Heb 9:9)) and through allusions to a variety of sources—*Numbers* (προσενήμοχεν); *Job* (προσέφερε), *Luke* (πειραζόμενος and ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγείρειν), *Psalm* 18 of the *Psalms of Solomon* (μονογενῆς and σπέρμα 'Αβραὰμ), 4 Maccabees (ἀναδεξάμενος), *Wisdom* (λογισάμενος, linked to 1.3 through Wis 8:17, 3 Kgs 5:21 ἐδωκεν τῷ Δαυὶδ χίλια φρονίμου), and Daniel (δυνατὸς ὁ θεός).

\(^{558}\) The perfect tense of προσέφερεν suggests that in Heb 11:17α the offering recounted in Gn 22 is explained through the context of Nm 31:50 “καὶ προσενήμοχεν τὸ δῶρον κυρίῳ, ἀνὴρ ὁ εὑρέθη σκέφτης χρυσοῦν, χλόϊτις καὶ ψελίων καὶ δακτύλιοι καὶ περιδέξιοι καὶ εμπλόκιον, ξυλόμαςθαι περὶ ἠμῶν ἐπαινεῖς κυρίου".

\(^{559}\) See Gn 22:1-2 ἢ καὶ ἐγένετο μετὰ τὰ ἥμιστα ταῦτα ὁ θεὸς ἐπείραζεν τὸν Ἀβραὰμ ...". Aside from Heb 11:17, “πειραζόμενος” is only used in Mk 1:13, Lk 4:2, and Jas 1:13.
Through the allusion to Hebrews, the finite verb “προσέφερε” in 1.1 has potentially three grammatical subjects, each of them a participle—“πειραζόμενος”, “ἀναδεξάμενος” and “λογισάμενος”, the latter additionally defined through a paraphrase—“ὅτι ... δυνατὸς ὁ θεὸς”.

Two of the three participles—“πειραζόμενος” and “ἀναδεξάμενος” connect the clause with “προσέφερε” in 1.1 to two brief segments of the narrative at the end of the first chapter of PJ, in 1.4 (πειραζόμενος) and in 1.3 (ἀναδεξάμενος). These consecutive parts of the chapter are connected to each together through a shared theme—“τὸ ζήν”. In addition, each is joined (through intertexts) to a sentence with the term “ἱστορία”—the one in 1.4 (πειραζόμενος) points to the sentence with the substantivized infinitive “τοῦ γράψαι τὴν ἱστορίαν ταύτην” in 25.1, the other, in 1.3 (ἀναδεξάμενος), is linked to the sentence with “τοῦ γράψαι τὴν ἱστορίαν ταύτην” in 25.1 and to Joseph’s question concerning “ἡ ἱστορία τοῦ Ἰσαάκ” in 13.1.

In 1.1, the different texts incorporated through allusions into the paraphrase of the Sacrifice of Isaac in Hebrews 11:17-19 are glossed through the phrases by which the allusion to Hebrews is preceded. For example, the phrases “τῶν δώδεκα φυλῶν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ” and “προσφέρειν τὰ δῶρα” clarify the referent(s) of an allusion in Hebrews 11:17 based on

---

560 Gn 21:12.
561 In conjunction with “ἄρχηγός” in Heb 12:2, “ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγείρειν ...” (Heb 11:19), associates the entry with Acts 3:15.
562 See Gn 18:14; Dn 3:17.
563 See 2 Mcc 8:33 (καὶ τῶν ἀξίων τῆς δισεβείας ἐκομίσατο μισθόν); notice 2 Mcc 8:36 (ὁ ... ἀναδεξάμενος). The allusion to 2 Mcc 8:33 suggests that the referent of the demonstrative pronoun αὐτόν in Heb 11:19 is μισθός—the sentence alludes to the promise of a “μισθός πολύς σφόδρα” in Gn 15:1.
564 With Demosthenes’ speech De Corona as intertext.
565 Through allusions to 2 and 4 Mcc.
“προσενήμοχεν”. “Προσενήμοχεν” in 1.1 with “δώρα” as (implied) direct object—is an indirect allusion to Balaam’s advice to Balak, associated with the stories of the Baal of Phegor and Phineas’ zeal. The offering of a δώρον by each of the χιλιάρχοι and ἐκατοντάρχοι after the defeat of the five kings of Midian (reported in Numbers 31) is linked to the Lord’s vow on the death of the generation of ἀνδρὲς πολεμίσται, and (therefore) to the census in the Sinai and at the Jordan. The accounts on these two census are also connected to each other through a crossreference to the first ἐπίσκεψις under Moses with Aaron in the summary of the ἐπίσκεψις under Moses and Eleazar.

καὶ αὐτὴ ἡ ἐπίσκεψις Μωϋσῆ καὶ Ἐλεάζαρ τοῦ ἱερέως, οἱ ἐπεσκέψαντο τοὺς ὕιοὺς Ισραήλ ἐν Ἀραμώθ Μωαβ ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου κατὰ Ιεριχω.  
καὶ ἐν ποτὲ οὐκ ἦν ἄνθρωπος τῶν ἐπεσκέπτευσιν ὑπὸ Μωϋσῆ καὶ Ἀρωμ, οὗ ἐπεσκέψαντο τοὺς ὕιοὺς Ισραήλ ἐν τῇ ἑρῆμῳ Σινα·  
ὅτι εἶπεν κύριος αὐτοῖς  
Θανάτῳ ἀποθανοῦνται ἐν τῇ ἑρῆμῳ.  
καὶ οὐ κατελείφθη ἐξ αὐτῶν οὐδὲ εἰς πλήν Χαλὲβ ὕιος Ιερουνη καὶ Ἰησοῦς ὁ τοῦ Ναου.

“Οτι εἶπεν κύριος αὐτοῖς Θανάτῳ ἀποθανοῦνται”, the explanation of reason why not a single person of those examined by Moses and Aaron remained—save Caleb and Joshua—links the report on the census in Numbers 26 to the vow in Numbers 14. But the wording of the explanation adds important details: Θανάτῳ ἀποθανοῦνται is an allusion to the commandment given to Adam in Genesis 2:17, “ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ ξύλου τοῦ γυνώσκειν καλὸν καὶ ποιητῆν, οὐ φάγεσθε ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ· ἢ δ’ ἦν ἡμέρα φάγητε ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ, θανάτῳ...”.

---

566 Heb 11:17.  
567 Recounted in the book of Numbers (see Nm 251-18, 31:8, 15) and in the ode in Deuteronomy (See Dt 32:15-21).  
568 See Nm 31:8.  
569 See Dt 2:14, 16, linked to Nm 31:49 through the phrase ἀνδρὲς πολεμίσται; on the oath, see Nm 14:20-24, 28-35; 14:3. The definition, in Nm 14:23, of those to whom the Lord will give the land is incorporated into Is 7:16 “διότι πρὶν ἡ γνώση τοῦ παιδίου ἄγαθον ἡ κακόν ἀπειθεῖ ποιητῆ ὑπὸ ἑκλέξασθαι τὸ ἄγαθον ...”.  
570 See Nm 26:64.
Thus, the explanation in the summary of the census at the Jordan points to the death of all humans.571 “Καὶ οὖ κατελείψη ἐξ αὐτῶν οὐδὲ εἶς” parallels the death of the men to the death of Pharaoh and his military force in Exodus 14:28. Together, these allusions point to a single text, the sign in Numbers 16 by which the congregation will know that the Lord sent Moses.572

Καταπίνειν and καλύπτειν in the description of the fulfillment573 associate this sign with the retelling of the fate of Pharaoh and his army in Exodus 15 (where θάλασσα is in the place of γῆ).

In PJ, this connection between the first clause of the entry on the Sacrifice of Isaac in Hebrews and the census of all humans in Numbers 16 is emphasized through the placement of the phrase “πλούσιος σφόδρα” between the phrases “προσφέρειν δώρα” and “τῶν δώδεκα φυλῶν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ”.574 The latter is an allusion to a speech addressed by Joshua to twelve men of the ἐνδοξοί, summoned by him from the sons of Israel.575 In the book of Joshua, the text with the phrase “τῶν δώδεκα φυλῶν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ” is preceded by a speech

571 See Nm 16:29. The place “ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ” associates this with the description, in Numbers 14, of the falling of those of the census in the desert; see Nm 14:29 ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ταύτῃ πεσοῦσα τὰ κύλα ὑμῶν καὶ πάσα ἡ ἐπισκοπὴ ὑμῶν καὶ οἱ κατηρεθμένοι ὑμῶν ἀπὸ εἰςκοσαετοὺς καὶ ἐπάνω, ὅσοι ἔγογγυσαν ἐπὶ ἔμοι. 572 Nm 16:28-30. 573 See Nm 16:28-30. 574 Jo 4:5. 575 See Jo 4:4.
with a very similar sounding beginning. In this first speech, Joshua calls the sons of Israel to draw near and hear the word of the Lord their God; then he declares that “ἐν τούτῳ γνώσεται ὅτι θεὸς ζῶν ἐν ὑμῖν”.

Through the almost identical introductory words, the sign announced by Joshua is paralleled to the sign of the census spoken of by Moses in Numbers 16.

The allusions to Joshua’s address to the ἐνδοξοὶ in the book of Joshua and to the offerings brought by the leaders of hundreds and thousands in the book of Numbers highlight that the “πλούσιος σφόδρα” mentioned in 1.1 is ἐνδοξοτερος πάντων [τῶν Ἰουδαίων] (according to Susanna) and “τίς ... ἄρχων” (according to the Gospel according to Luke). As readings of the passage in Genesis with the first instance of the phrase, the two later texts point out links connecting Genesis 13:2 (Ἀβραὰμ δὲ ἦν πλούσιος σφόδρα κτήμεσιν καὶ ἄργυρὶς καὶ χρυσίῳ) to the stories of Lot’s captivity and Melchizedek’s blessing in Genesis 14, the promise of seed to Abraam in Genesis 15, and the oath sworn by the Lord by himself in Genesis 22. They thus prepare a reference to Abraham as πατριάρχης in 1.3, which, in the letter to the Hebrews, draws on two very similar worded sentences describing

576 See Jos 3:9-13. Like the speech addressed to the twelve ἐνδοξοὶ, this earlier speech (addressed to all the sons of Israel) begins with the imperative προσαγάγετε (followed by a reference to a location), features a sentence with ἐκλείπειν as finite verb, and—in describing the ark as “ἡ κιβωτὸς τῆς διαθήκης κυρίου πάσης τῆς γῆς”—associates the crossing of the Jordan with the σημεῖα of the κυνάμματα—i.e. the giving of a διαστολὴ between the people of Pharaoh and the people of the Lord (recounted in chapter eight of the book of Exodus).

577 See Jo 3:9 προσαγάγετε ὅτε καὶ ἀκούσατε τὸ ῥῆμα κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν. The reference to the ῥῆμα is probably an allusion to Dt 1:26.

578 E.g., Abraam and Lot, the owners of flocks and herds, are brothers (Gn 13:7-8; see Gn 14:16; cf. Gn 14:12); “πλούσιος σφόδρα” (Gn 13:2) is taken up again in “πλούσιειν” (Gn 14:23, 20).

579 See Gn 14:14 ἄκουσας δὲ Ἀβραὰμ ὅτι ἤχυμαλότευται Λωτ ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ, ἤριθμησεν τοὺς ἰδίους οἰκογενεῖς αὐτοῦ, τριακοσίους δέκα καὶ ὀκτώ, Gn 15:3, 5.

Melchizedek—“ψ καὶ δεκάτην ἀπὸ πάντων ἐμέρισεν Ἄβραὰμ”581 and “ψ καὶ δεκάτην Ἄβραὰμ ἔδωκεν ἐκ τῶν ἄκροθινῶν ὁ πατριάρχης”.582

The participle “πειραζόμενος” in Hebrews has several parallels in the writings of the New Testament.583 The second participle in Hebrews 11:17-19—“ἀναδεξάμενος” (an allusion to the ὑπόδειγμα of Eleazar’s death in 2 Maccabees 6)—and allusions, in 1.3, to an ἀπαρχὴ (through the term ἄκροθινία)584 and to the ἀγών of Eleazar and the seven sons and her mother in the fourth book of Maccabees (resting on the phrase Ἄβραὰμ ὁ πατριάρχης) suggest that the source of the participle “πειραζόμενος” singled out in 1.1 is the Letter of James. James speaks of one who is put to the test (πειραζόμενος) in the context of an argument for enduring trial (ὑπομένειν πειρασμόν) to attain to the “στέφανος ζωῆς” promised by God to those who love Him. He continues by declaring death to be an offspring of sin585 and reminding his audience that they were born to be an ἀπαρχὴ τῶν αὐτοῦ κτισμάτων.586 The reference to the στέφανος (which implies an ἀγών)587 and to death are taken up through allusions, in the paraphrase of the Sacrifice of Isaac in Hebrews 11, to Hebrews 12 and 2 Maccabees 6.

581 Heb 7:2.
582 Heb 7:6.
583 Aside from the sentence in the letter to the Hebrews, the participle occurs three times in the writings of the Old and the New Testaments—two of the three instances appear in the story of the Temptation—in the Gospel according to Mark (see Mk 1:13) and according to Luke (see Lk 4:2); a third example is in the first chapter of the letter of James (see Jas 1:13).
584 E.g., see EM 53:10-13 <ἀκροθινία>: ἀκροθινία λέγονται αἱ ἀπαρχαὶ αἱ τῶν καρπῶν θινῶν ὁ ἄριος, ἡγοῦν τῶν σωρῶν, ἡδὲ καὶ ἀπὸ θήρας, καὶ ἄλλων, παρὰ τὸ θιν θινῶν, ὃ σημαίνει τοῖς σωροῖς τῶν χρημάτων, θινῶν, καὶ ἄκροθινῶν.
585 See Jas 1:12-15 μακάριος ἄνηρ ὃς ὑπομένει πειρασμόν, ὃς δόκιμος γενόμενος λήμψεται τὸ στέφανον τῆς ζωῆς ὑπὸ ἐπεργεῖλατο ὁ κύριος τοῖς ἁγιάσαντι αὐτὸν. μηδὲις πειραζόμενος λέγετο ὃτι ἀπὸ θεοῦ πειράζομαι· ο γὰρ θεὸς ἀπειραστός ἐστιν κακῶς, πειράζει δὲ αὐτὸς αὐθεντικά. ἐκεῖστος δὲ πειράζεται υπὸ τῆς ἱδίας ἐπιθυμίας ἐξελόμενος καὶ δελεαζόμενος· εἰτα ἡ ἐπιθυμία συλλαβοῦσα τικται ἀμαρτίαν, ἡ δὲ ἄμαρτία ἀποτελεσθεῖσα ἀποκύει βάναυσιν.
586 The pronoun refers to τοὺς πατρὸς τῶν φιλῶν; see Jas 1:17.
587 See Heb 12:1, 4 Mcc 17:11.
In Hebrews 11:17, the direct object of προσέφερε is the substantivized adjective “ὁ μονογενής”. In conjunction with the allusion to the seed of Abraham in Hebrews 11:18 (through “ἐν Ἰσαὰκ κληθήσεται σοι σπέρμα”), the referent of this accusative is defined by analogy with the accusative of the preposition “ἐπί” in Psalm 18 of the Psalms of Solomon.

τὰ κρίματά σου ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν μετὰ ἐλέους, καὶ ἡ ἁγάπη σου ἐπὶ σπέρμα Ἀβρααμ ὑιὸς Ισραήλ.

Τὸ παιδεία σου ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς ὡς υἱὸν πρωτότοκον μονογενῆ ἀποστρέφαις ψυχήν εὐήκοιον ἀπὸ ἀμαθίας ἐν ἀγνοίᾳ, καθαρίσαι ὁ θεὸς Ισραήλ εἰς ἡμέραν ἐλέους ἐν εὐλογίᾳ, εἰς ἡμέραν ἐκλογής ἐν ἀνάξει ἀρχιτού.

Through this allusion to παιδεία, “πειραζόμενος” is additionally explained as an allusion to the account on the Temptation of Jesus in the Gospel according to Luke (connecting 1.1 to 1.4).

“Καὶ τὸν μονογενῆ προσέφερεν” associates the entry on the Sacrifice of Isaac in Hebrews 11 with an argument, in Hebrews 12:5-11, for enduring and continuing to run in the contest. This argument (or παράκλησις) is preceded, in Hebrews 12:1-3, by a call to “let us run” looking towards Jesus.

τοιγαροῦν καὶ ἡμεῖς τοσοῦτον ἔχοντες περικείμενον ἡμῖν νέφος μαρτύρων, ὅγκον ἀποθέμενον πάντα καὶ τὴν εὐπερίστατον ἀμαρτίαν, δι’ ὑπομονῆς πρέξας τῶν προκείμενων ἡμῖν ἄγωνα ἀφορώτες εἰς τὸν τῆς πίστεως ἀρχηγόν καὶ τελεωτὴν Ἰησοῦν, ὃς ἄντι τῆς προκείμενης αὐτῷ χαρᾶς ὑπέμεινεν σταυρών αἰσχύνης καταφρονήσας ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θρόνου τοῦ θεοῦ κεκάθικεν. ἀναλογίσασθε γὰρ τὸν τοιαύτην ὑπομεμεινηκότα ὑπὸ τῶν ἀμαρτώλων εἰς αὐτὸν ἀντιλογίαν, ἵνα μὴ κάμητε ταῖς ψυχαῖς υἱῶν ἐκλογεῖς.

588 See Gn 21:11-12.
589 Psalms of Solomon 18:3-5. The psalm is entitled “ψαλμὸς τῶν Σαλωμῶν ἐπὶ τοῦ χριστοῦ κυρίου”.
590 The allusion to Jb 1:5 (resting on the same verb—προσέφερε) emphasizes καθαρίζειν.
591 See Lk 4:2, 4, with Dt 8:3, 5 as intertext.
592 See Heb 12:5, with quotation of Pr 3:11-12.
593 The repetition of ὑπομεμεινηκότα suggests a comparison between the direct objects of the verb—“ὑπέμεινεν σταυρών” and “τὸν τοιαύτην ὑπομεμεινηκότα ... ἀντιλογίαν”.
594 See Heb 2:10.
The appellation “ἀρχηγός” and the phrase “ἐν δεξιᾷ τε τοῦ θρόνου ... καθίζειν” associate this paragraph with a paraphrase of Psalm 8:6 in Hebrews 2:10 (stressing στεφανοῦν and θάνατον γεύσθαι) and with a “κεφάλαιον ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις” in Hebrews 8:1 (“τοιοῦτον ἔχομεν ἀρχιερέα”)595 followed by references to “τὸ προσφέρειν δῶρα τε καὶ θυσίας”596 (see 1.1) and to those who “ὑποδείγματι καὶ σκιᾷ λατρεύουσιν τῶν ἐπουρανίων”.597

The topic of παιδεία—and of the archpriest who offered himself598—is reinforced through “ἀναδεξάμενος”, the second of three participles in the entry on Abraham in Hebrews 11:17-18. 'Αναδεξάμενος is an allusion to the beginning of the account on Eleazar in the Second book of Maccabees.599

Eleάζαρος τις τῶν πρωτευόντων γραμματέων, ἀνὴρ ἡδονοκότας τὴν ἡκλικίαν καὶ τὴν πρόσωπον τοῦ προσώπου κάλλιστος, ἀναχανόν ἦν ἀγακάζετο φαγεῖν ἕλεον κρέας, ὡς δὲ τὸν μετ᾽ ἐκκλείας θάνατον μᾶλλον ἡ τὸν μετὰ μέσους βίων ἀναδεξάμενος, αὐθαυτός ἐπὶ τὸ τύμπανον προσήγηεν, προπτύσας δὲ καθ᾽ ὅν ἐδεί πρόπον προσέρχεσθαι τοὺς ὑπομένοντας ἀμένασθαι ὑπὸ θέμις γεύσασθαι600 διὰ τὴν πρὸς τὸ ζῆν φιλοστοργίαν.

The description of Eleazar’s death is preceded by an exhortation to reckon the recounted events as τιμωρίαι not for the destruction but rather for the παιδεία of the γένος of the Jews.601

595 See Heb 8:1-2 κεφάλαιον δὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις, τοιοῦτον ἔχομεν ἀρχιερέα, ὃς ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θρόνου τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν τοῖς οἴκων τῶν ἀγίων λειτουργῶς καὶ τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθείας. ἤν ἐπήχεν ὁ κύριος, καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρώπος.
596 See Heb 8:3.
597 See Heb 8:5 ἐαυτῶν ἀνεινέγκας; Jas 2:21.
598 See Heb 7:27.
599 2 Mcc 6:18-20.
600 See Heb 2:9 τῶν δὲ βραχὺ τι παρ᾽ ἀγγελίας ἡλαττωμένων βλέπομεν Ἰησοῦν διὰ τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου δόξη καὶ τιμῆ ἐστεφανωμένων ὅπως χάριτι θεοῦ ὑπὲρ παντὸς γεύσασθαι θανάτου.
601 See 2 Mcc 6:12 παρακαλεῖ ὁ παρὰ τός ἐνυχαίριοι τῆς τῇ βίβλῳ μὴ συστέλλεισθαι διὰ τὰς συμφορὰς, λογίζεσθαι δὲ τὰς τιμωρίας μὴ πρὸς ὀλθέρου, ἀλλὰ πρὸς παιδείαν τοῦ γένους ἢμῶν εἶναι. The verb “συστέλλειν” in 25.1 suggests an allusion to this passage.
“Ὁ μὲτ’ εὐκλείας θάνατος”, the direct object of the participle, receives two additional comments in the account on Eleazar in 2 Maccabees 6. Both times Eleazar’s death—that is, his “ὑπὲρ τῶν σεμνῶν καὶ ἀγίων νόμων ἀπεθανατίζειν” and the manner of his μεταλλάσσειν [τὸν βίον]—is declared a ὑπόδειγμα. In the letter to the Hebrews, the indirect allusion to the story of the Baal of Phegor in the first sentence of the paraphrase of the Sacrifice of Isaac underlines that Eleazar refuses even only pretending (ὑποκρίνεσθαι) eating the meat of impure animals and “τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως ποροστεταγμένα τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς θυσίας κρεῶν” lest the young are led astray because of him. In PJ, the indirect allusion to this ὑπόδειγμα connects “προσέφερε τὰ δώρα” (in 1.1) to “μὴ ἱδεῖν θάνατον” in 24.4 (a maxim that, in Hebrews 11:5, refers to Henoch—according to Sirach a “ὑπόδειγμα μετανοίας”) and to “ὁ γράφας” in 25.1 (associated in the Gospel according to John with the giving of the ὑπόδειγμα at the meal before the feast, in John 13).

In PJ 1.1, the indirect allusion to Eleazar (through ἀναδεξάμενος in Hebrews 11:17-19) is preceded by an allusion to the beginning of the story of Susanna (πλούσιος σφόδρα),

602 See 2 Mcc 6:28 τοῖς δὲ νεόσις ὑπόδειγμα γενναίων καταλελατόσις εἰς τὸ προθύμως καὶ γενναίως ὑπὲρ τῶν σεμνῶν καὶ ἀγίων νόμων ἀπεθανατίζειν, and 6:31 καὶ οὗτος ὃν τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον μετήλλαξεν οὐ μόνον τοῖς νεόις, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς πλείστοις τοῦ ἑδυνομένων τῶν ἑαυτοῦ θάνατον ὑπόδειγμα γενναίστερον καὶ μημόσυνον ἀρετῆς καταληφτῶν.
603 See 2 Mcc 6:21, 24, 25.
604 See 2 Mcc 6:18 φαγεῖν ἄλοιπον κρέας.
605 2 Mcc 6:21; see Nm 25:2-3 καὶ ἐκάλεσαν αὐτούς ἐτι ταῖς θυσίαις τῶν εἰδώλων αὐτῶν, καὶ ἔδαγεν ὁ λαὸς τῶν θυσιῶν αὐτῶν καὶ προσεκώπησαν τοῖς εἰδώλοις αὐτῶν. καὶ ἐτελέσθη Ἰσραήλ τῷ Βεελφεγωρ. Similar in Ps 105(106):28.
606 See Heb 11:17 and 8:5, with ὑπόδειγμα in Heb 8:5 and 2 Mcc 6:28, 31.
607 See Sir 44:16. The indirect allusion to Sirach in 24.4 stresses two allusions to Sirach in Rm 16, one of the sources of “ὁ γράφας” in 25.1 (Rm 16:25 στηρίζει, Sir 42:17, 24; Rm 16:27 μιᾷ σφοatinum, see Sir 1:8, 4 Mcc 7:23).
608 Jn 21:24 γράφας ταῦτα καὶ οἴδαμεν is linked to Jn 13:17 εἰ ταῦτα οἴδατε, μακάριοι ἐστε ἠνὶ ποιήτε ἀυτά; a ὑπόδειγμα is mentioned in Jn 13:15 ὑπόδειγμα γὰρ ἔδωκα ὑμῖν ἡνὶ καθὼς ἠγό ἐποίησε ὑμῖν καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιήτε.
which features a reference to κυβερνάν. In conjunction with what is said in Hebrews about the atoning sacrifice of this highpriest, κυβερνάν associates the bearer of the name Eleazar (the referent of ἀνάδεξάμενος) with a priest by the name Eleazar in the fourth book of Maccabees. This Eleazar is compared to an ἀριστος κυβερνήτης who sailed for and reached the beach of the immortal victory and to a city that is besieged but not taken. More importantly, however, in view of the allusion to the highpriest who offered himself (Heb 7:27), in 4 Maccabees 7:11-12 Eleazar is compared to Aaron—with an explicit reference to Aaron’s ἐξιλάσκεσθαι περὶ τοῦ λαοῦ in Numbers 17:11-15. This comparison stresses and explicates a prayer made by Eleazar.

大全τὸ ὑες (Heb 11:19), finally, is an allusion a part of the answer of the three young men to Nebuchadnezzar in Daniel (LXX) 3:16-18.

This allusion emphasizes what Nebuchadnezzar says to his friends after hearing the three men’s singing of hymns and seeing them alive and the report on what he, the rulers, and the friends of the king see when the three go forth from the fire.

---

609 See Sus θ' 5 καὶ ἀπεδείχθησαν δύο πρεσβύτεροι ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ κριταί ἐν τῷ ἐναυτῷ ἔκεινῳ, περὶ ὧν ἐλάλησεν ὁ δεσπότης ὅτι Ἐξήλθεν ἀνομία ἐκ Βαβυλώνος ἐκ πρεσβύτερων κριτῶν, οἱ ἐδόκουν κυβερνάν τὸν λαόν.

610 See 4 Mcc 5:4.

611 See 4 Mcc 7:1-3.

612 See 4 Mcc 7:4.

613 See 4 Mcc 6:28-29.

614 The function of the blood is underlined, in 1.1, through allusions to “καθαρίσατ” in Psalms of Solomon 18:5 and “ἐκαθάριζεν ἀυτοὺς” in Jb 1:5.
In *PJ* 1.1, present in the text through the allusion to *Hebrews* 11:17-19, the allusion to the statement “θεός εἰς” in the answer of the three young men (where it is combined with “εἰς κύριος”) is highlighted through the beginning of the account with the phrase “πλοῦσιος σφόδρα” in chapter 18 of the Gospel according to *Luke*.\(^{616}\)

καὶ ἐπηρώτησεν τις αὐτῶν ἄρχων λέγων·
διδάσκαλε ἀγαθέ, τί ποιήσας ζωήν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω;\(^{617}\)
ἐπεν δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς·
τί με λέγεις ἀγαθῶν; οὔδείς ἀγαθὸς εἰ μή εἰς ὁ θεός.

The words of both question and answer are carefully chosen and placed to display additional words when written in bisected columns. In both cases, the words connecting the two parts of the column provide glosses on the text written in the column and on the text of the story of the ruler’s question.

The question of the ruler has 22 syllables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Α l 6x2</th>
<th>r 5x2</th>
<th>Β l 7x2</th>
<th>r 4x2</th>
<th>C l 6x2</th>
<th>r 5x2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 διδάσκ</td>
<td>αλε</td>
<td>διδάσκ</td>
<td>ὠν t</td>
<td>διδάσκ</td>
<td>ἰν ai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 ἐ, τί</td>
<td>ὁν k</td>
<td>ἐ, τί</td>
<td>μῆσω</td>
<td>ἐ, τί</td>
<td>ὁν om</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 ας ζω</td>
<td>μῆσω</td>
<td>ας ζω</td>
<td>ἰν ai</td>
<td>ας ζω</td>
<td>ἦ σω</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In two distributions of the text in the bisected column (A and C), the letters in line 5 combine to read “ποίησον”.\(^{618}\) In A, line 3 reads “ἀγαθήν”,\(^{619}\) and line 6 ζωον;\(^{620}\) in B, line 3 displays “ἀγάθον”\(^{621}\) and line 4 “τιμήσω”.\(^{622}\)

---

\(^{615}\) See Dn (LXX) 3:92 ἰδοὺ ἐγώ ὁ ἄρων ἄνδρας τέσσαρας λευμένους περιπατοῦντας ἐν τῷ πυρί, καὶ φθορά οὐδεμία ἐγεινήθη ἐν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἡ ὀρασίς τοῦ πετάρτου ὁμοιωμα ἀγγέλου θεοῦ.

\(^{616}\) Lk 18:18-19.

\(^{617}\) See Gn 15:8; Lk 10:25, 18:18.
The ruler’s wish to have life (implied by his question) and emphasis on teaching (διδάσκειν) turn his question “τί ποιήσας ...;” into an allusion to an instruction in Psalm 33(34).623

δεῦτε τέκνα ακούσατε μου·
φόβον κυρίου διδάξω ὑμᾶς.
τίς ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος ὁ θέλων ἔως
ἀγαπῶν ημέρας ἰδεῖν ἀγαθάς;
παῦσον τὴν γλῶσσάν σου ἀπὸ κακοῦ
καὶ χείλη σου τοῦ μὴ λαλήσαι δόλων,
ἐκκλινον ἀπὸ κακοῦ καὶ ποίησον ἄγαθόν,
ζητήσων εἰρήνην καὶ διώξον αὐτήν.

In PJ 1.1, the indirect allusion to εἰρήνην διώκειν (Ps 33(34):15) underlines an exhortation in Hebrews 12:14 (after the discussion on παιδεία)—“εἰρήνην διώκετε μετὰ πάντων καὶ τὸν ἄγιασμόν, οὗ χωρὶς οὐδείς ὁφεται τὸν κύριον”.

Unlike the ruler’s question, Jesus’ question and response (spoken by him as a teacher) can be represented in columns of different width (18 syllables, i.e., 9x2 or 6x3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A 9x2</th>
<th>B 6x3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>τί με</td>
<td>τί μ έλέγη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λέγει</td>
<td>έν έισάγη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ζ ἀγα</td>
<td>έν έ σ άγαθ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θόν οῗδ</td>
<td>οὐδείς οἴς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εί μη</td>
<td>εις άγαθος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Εἰσάγει (A) with the allusion to the “ἄγαθόν” in Psalm 72(73) suggests an allusion to Deuteronomy 8:7—“present” in 1.1 and 1.4 through allusions to the the first challenge by the slanderer in the text of the Temptation in Luke.624

618 See Ps 33(34):15.
619 As alternative direct object of “κληρονομήσω”, “ἄγαθήν” suggests a link to the promise of “ἡ γῆ ἄγαθή” in Ex 3:7. The sentence with “κληρονομήσω” after which the ruler’s question is patterned is first spoken by Abraham, in Genesis 15:8. In Genesis, the verb has a different direct object than in the Gospel according to Luke—ἀὐτήν [i.e., τὴν γῆν ταύτην] instead of ζωὴν αἰώνιον. The phrase “γῆ ἄγαθή” occurs in the story of the apostasy at Kadesh, in Numbers 14:7 (recalled in Dt 1:25).
621 See Lk 18:19, Ps 33(34):15.
622 See Nm 22:17, 24:11.
623 Ps 33(34):12-15 at 15.
The statement “ἀγαθὸς ὁ θεὸς” (emphasized through the letter distribution in B) is an allusion to the first verses of Psalm 72(73) (entitled Ψαλμὸς τῷ Ἀσάφ).

Psalm 72(73) has a reversal in the middle in which the speaker refers back to what he said before, commenting that, without considering the ἐσχάτα of the sinners, it is without understanding. Consequently, a description of the destruction of the lawless follows (together with a self-assessment by the speaker). The psalm ends with a statement on what the speaker judges to be an ἀγαθὸν. 625

Προσκολλάν τῷ θεῷ”—the ἀγαθὸν for the speaker of Psalm 72(73)—links the end of the psalm to the condition of a longer promise in Deuteronomy 11:22 626 as well as to Sirach 13:16.

The allusions to the Sacrifice of Isaac, the reference to “θεὸς εἷς”, and the allusion to the letter of James based on the participle πειραζόμενος associate the beginning of the

624 Through πειραζόμενος in 1.1 (Heb 11:17, placed in Lk through Lk 18: πλούσιος σφόδρα), combined with Mt 4:2-4 (1.4) defined through Jo 4:6, 7, 21 (1.1)
626 See Jo 23:8.
narrative with a part of the letter of James in which James turns from one audience to another.\textsuperscript{627}

\begin{align*}
\text{James} & \quad \text{Hebrews} \quad \text{Luke} \\
\text{Wisdom of Solomon} & \quad \text{Wisdom of Solomon} \quad \text{Wisdom of Solomon}
\end{align*}

The three sources—the letter of James (φίλος θεοῦ), the letter to the Hebrews, and Luke (εἰς ἀγαθός)—lead to a description of wisdom in the Wisdom of Solomon,\textsuperscript{628} a book quoted at the beginning of the letter to the Hebrews\textsuperscript{629} and represented in the paraphrase of the Sacrifice of Isaac through the participle “λογισάμενος”.\textsuperscript{630}

The juxtaposition of “πλούσιος σφόδρα” and “προσέφερε τὰ δῶρα” in 1.1 thus amounts to a commentary on the account on the Sacrifice of Isaac in Hebrews. Together, all of these sources define the τέλος of the work (τὸ ἀγαθόν, ὁ ἀγαθός) and point to the teaching\textsuperscript{631} handed on through it.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{627} Jas 2:18-23.
\item \textsuperscript{628} Wis 7:26-29.
\item \textsuperscript{629} See Heb 1:3.
\item \textsuperscript{630} See Heb 11:19; Wis 8:17. In PJ, “λογισάμενος” in Heb 11:19—an allusion to Wis 8:17—limits the referents of the phrase “ἐκ νεότητος μου” in Lk 18:21 (ταύτα πάντα ἐφύλαξα ἐκ νεότητος μου) to Wis 8:2, thus explaining the ruler’s answer to Jesus’ reference to the five commandments (in Lk 18:20) as an allusion to the wisdom and understanding of this people (see Dt 4:6, with Dt 4:10, Ps 33(34):12).
\item \textsuperscript{631} See Mt 22:31-32, Mk 12:26-27, Lk 20:37-38.
\end{itemize}
All sentences in *PJ* referring to ἱστορία have models in the writings of the Old and the New Testaments. But despite allusions to multiple sources, the number of texts connecting the different references to “ἱστορία” is remarkably limited. All of these sources (e.g., Esther, Esdras, Maccabees, Sirach) are “contained” (in one way or another) in the letter to the Hebrews, or (in the case of allusions to Demosthenes) attached to parts it.\(^{632}\)

Statements such as the exhortation “κατέχωμεν τὴν ὁμολογίαν τῆς ἐλπίδος ἀκλίνη”\(^{633}\) and its context—an ἐπισυναγωγὴ\(^{634}\)—associate the letter to the Hebrews with the second and the fourth books of Maccabees.\(^{635}\) The text of the second book of Maccabees includes allusions and references to the book of Esther (at the beginning, in the greeting of the second letter,\(^{636}\) and at the end\(^{637}\)) as well as to Jeremiah\(^{638}\) and 1 Esdras\(^{639}\) (both in the second letter at the beginning of 2 Maccabees).

“ἐν ταῖς ἱστορίαις” and “ὁ γράφας τὴν ἱστορίαν ταύτην”

The older (earlier) sources of the phrases with the noun ἱστορία in *PJ* are incorporated into the later sources through allusions. Thus, “ἐν ταῖς ἱστορίαις” in 1.1

---

\(^{632}\) The letter to the Hebrews is represented in *PJ* through several allusions at the beginning and the end of the narrative; see 1.1 προσέφερε (Heb 11:17); 2.3 τοῦ πατριάρχου Ἰαβραάμ (Heb 7:4); 2.4 βρώματα καὶ πόματα (Heb 9:10); 24.4 χρηματισθείς (Heb 11:7), and 24.4 μὴ ἰδεῖν θάνατον (Heb 11:5).

\(^{633}\) See Heb 10:23.

\(^{634}\) See Heb 10:25.

\(^{635}\) See 2 Mcc 2:7 ἐπισυναγωγὴ; 4 Mcc 6:7, 17:3 ἀκλίνης.

\(^{636}\) See 2 Mcc 1:10, Est 6:1.

\(^{637}\) See 2 Mcc 15:36, Est 8:12a, 9:21.

\(^{638}\) See 2 Mcc 2:1 ἐν ταῖς ἀπογραφαῖς.

\(^{639}\) See 2 Mcc 2:13, 1 Esdr 2:17 ἐν ταῖς ύπομνηματισμοῖς.
represents two prepositional phrases in two letters in the book of Esther—ἐν τοῖς γεγραμμένοις \(^{640}\) and ἐκ τῶν παλαιοτέρων ἱστορίων; \(^{641}\) both letters (and the prepositional phrases) are paralleled, through phrasal allusions, to writings mentioned in 1\(^ {642}\) and 2\(^ {643}\) Esdras. Echoing parts of sentences in the endings of the letter to the Romans and the Gospel according to John, \(^ {644}\) the phrase “ὁ γράφας τὴν ἱστορίαν ταύτην” in 25.1 draws on these sources—the letter to the Romans features allusions to Esther\(^ {645}\) and 1 and 2 Esdras,\(^ {646}\) the endings of the Gospel according to John feature phrases from 1 Esdras.\(^ {647}\)

In the letter to the Romans, “ὁ γράφας” is preceded by a personal pronoun (first person singular) and a name (transcribed and Hellenized), and followed by a noun of the first declension (fem. sg.) and a prepositional phrase with “ἐν”—a pattern also displayed by the sentence in PJ.

25.1  
ἐγώ δὲ Ἰακώβος / ὁ γράφας τὴν ἱστορίαν ταύτην / ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ

Rm 16:22  
ἐγώ Τέρτιος / ὁ γράφας τὴν ἐπιστολήν / ἐν κυρίῳ

---

\(^{640}\) See Est 3:13. 

\(^{641}\) See Est 8:12. 

\(^{642}\) “Τὰ ὑπογεγραμμένα” in Est 8:12\(^ a\) draws on 1 Esdr 2:19; the allusion suggests that the ἱστορία in Est 8:12\(^ b\) correspond to the ὑπομνήματα in 1 Esdr 2:17 (and in 2 Macc 2:13). 

\(^{643}\) “Ἐβουλήθην”, in Est 3:13, is an allusion to Ps 39(40):9-10 ἔτει ἐπον Ἰδοὺ ἤκει, / ἐν κεφαλά ἱβιλίου γέγραπται περὶ ἔρωτι / τῷ ποιήσαι τὸ θέλημα σου ὁ θεός μου ἐβουλήθην, / καὶ τῶν νόμων σου ἐν μέσῳ τῆς καρδίας μου. “Κεφαλῆς” associates the letter with 2 Esdr 6:2 καὶ εὐφέβη ἐν πόλει ἐν τῇ βάρει τῆς Μηδών πόλεως κεφαλῆς μία. “Κεφαλῆς βιβλίου” (Ps 39(40):8) is taken up in Ez 2:9. 

\(^{644}\) Respectively Rm 16:22 ἐγὼ ... ὁ γράφας ἀκ. (τὴν ἐπιστολήν) and Jn 21:24 ὁ γράφας ἀκ. (ταῦτα). The letter to the Romans is a source incorporated into the account on “ἡ ἱστορία τοῦ Ἰσαάκ” through the verb “ἀνακεφαλαίοθησαί” (13.1) (see Rm 13:9) and joined to Hebrews through a quotation of Hb 2:4—ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ... ζήσεται (see Rm 1:17, Heb 10:28); the report on the Wedding in Cana in the Gospel according to John is the source of the participle “γεγενημένου” in 24.3, and the allusions to the second ending of John (γράφας and δοξάζειν τὸν θεόν) in 25.1 are linked through an intertext (1 Esdr 1:30 ἐν ὅλη τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ ἐπέθεσαν) to the reference to the mourning (πενθείν) of the people at hearing that “Σαχαρίας πεφόνευται” (24.3).

\(^{645}\) See Rm 16:17 (Est 8:12\(^ a\)), subscriptio (Est 8:10). 

\(^{646}\) See Rm 16:26, 1 Esdr 1:16. Rm 10:5 ἡμῶν οὐρά γράφει τὴν δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ τοῦ νόμου ὅτε ὁ ποιήσας αὐτὰ ἀνθρώπως ζήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς, 2 Esdr 19:29. (The personal pronoun “αὐτὰ” suggests that the quotation is from 2 Esdr 2:29 rather than from Lv 18:5. The quoted line is part of an entreaty preceded by a reference to the reading of the law and followed by a reference to writing and sealing.) 

\(^{647}\) See Jn 20:30, 1 Esdr 1:12 γεγραμμένα ἐν βιβλίῳ; Jn 21:25, 1 Esdr 1:31 καθ’ ἐν.
The syntactical and verbal similarities suggest that the direct objects of “γράψας” in 25.1 and in Romans 16:22—“η ἱστορία αὐτῆ” and “η ἐπιστολή”—and the referents of the names and of the two participles correspond to each other.

In the Gospel according to John (Jn 21:24), the substantivized participle “ὁ γράψας” is the second of two participles. Similar to the sentence in the letter to the Romans, “ὁ γράψας” is followed by an accusative—in this case “ταῦτα”. In most manuscripts, the two participles are not separated from each other through a conjunction but connected through a prepositional phrase (περὶ τοῦτων). A conjunction connects the statement(s) with the participles to a sentence with a finite verb in the first person plural.

The similarities (in morphology and position) between the participle in 25.1 and “ὁ γράψας” in the Gospel according to John are less pronounced than in the letter to the Romans, since the sentence in the Gospel lacks the combination of “ἔγω” and personal name.

The “double” allusion to the two sentences—one in the letter to the Romans, the other in the Gospel according to John—provides a gloss on “τὴν ἱστορίαν ταῦτην” in 25.1 by suggesting analogies between the direct objects of “γράψας” in the three texts.

“τὴν ἐπιστολὴν”

In the majority of manuscripts of the letter to the Romans, the passage with the participial phrase “ὁ γράψας τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἐν κυρίῳ” is followed by a greeting, a
sentence fragment or dedication (120 syllables), and a brief statement composed of two clauses (19 syllables), joined to (or separated from) the doxology through “ἀμήν” (2 syllables).

ἀμήν τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ ὑμᾶς στηρίζει ... μόνῳ σοφῷ θεῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὃ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας ἄμην ἐπιστολή πρὸς ῾Ρωμαίους ἐγράφη διὰ Φοῖβης διακόνου.648

The grammatical subject of “ἐγράφη” joins the last sentence to the sentence with the substantivized participle “ὁ γράφας” in Romans 16:22, since these are the only sentences with the noun ἐπιστολή in the letter.

**Esther in Romans**

The allusions to Esther are in built in Romans into the paragraphs that precede and follow the section with the participial phrase “ὁ γράφας τὴν ἐπιστολήν”. One of them is stressed by (and paired with) the allusion in 1.1—the same sentence that provides the model for the prepositional phrase “ἐν ταῖς ἱστορίαις +gen. (pl.)” also provides the material for an allusion in Romans (σκοπείν +εἰς).649 The other—with one of the instances of the verb γράφειν in Romans—is at the very end of the letter, in the subscriptio (ἐγράφη διὰ +gen.).650

“Σκοπεῖν”

Esther 8:128 (ἐκ τῶν παλαιοτέρων ἱστοριῶν)—the sentence with one of the models for the prepositional phrase in 1.1 (ἐν ταῖς ἱστορίαις τῶν δώδεκα φυλῶν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ)—is incorporated, through the infinitive “σκοπεῖν”, into an exhortation in Romans

648 Rm subscriptio. On Φοίβη, see Rm 16:1-2.
649 Rm 16:17; see Est 8:12f.
650 See Est 8:10.
16:17-20. In the *Mehrheitstext*, the paragraph has 190 syllables. Arranged in lines of 19 syllables each, the text displays an acrostic—“ἡ δῆμος” (ll. 4-10), the tree sacred to Apollo, associated with oracles and with ῥαψῳδία. The presence of the acrostic suggests a link to teachings on γράμματα and στοιχεία.

**10x19 Syllables**

παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀδελφοί, σκοπεῖν τοὺς τὰς διαστασίας καὶ τὰ σκάνδαλα παρὰ τὴν διαχήρη ἢν ὑμεῖς ἐμάθετε τοι{o} ὄντας, καὶ ἔκλινατε ἀπ’ αὐτῶν· οἱ γὰρ τοιοῦτοι τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν Χριστῷ οὐ δουλεύουσιν ἀλλὰ τῇ ἔκαστῳ κοιλίᾳ, καὶ διὰ τῆς κρηστολογίας καὶ εἰσοδότης ἐξαπατώσωμεν τὰς καρδίας τῶν ἄκακων. ἢ γὰρ ὑμῶν ὑπακοὴ εἰς πάντας ἃ \[\phi\] φίλοι · χαίρω ὡς τὸ ἐστ’ ὑμῖν, θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς σοφότεροι μὲν εἶναι εἰς τὸ άγαθόν, ἀκεραίους δὲ εἰς τὸ κακόν, ὡς ὁ θεὸς τῇ ἐκκλήσει τῶν σατανῶν ὑπὸ τῶν πόδων ὑμῶν ἐν τάχει. ἢ χάριν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἡσυχ Χριστοῦ μεθ’ ὑμῶν.

Unlike the sentence with σκοπεῖν in *Esther*, the sentence in *Romans* lacks any explicit information on where to examine “τοὺς ... ποιοῦντας”.

The paragraph singled out in *PJ* through the allusions to *Esther* in 1.1 and to *Romans* in 25.1 features an indirect allusion to the sign of the διαστολή in *Exodus* 8 (incorporated in *PJ* into the Joseph’s speech in 13.1 through the finite verbs ἔβομαι or (in *P. Bodmer 5*) ἔβδομαι). This allusion rests on the juxtaposition of the verbs μανθάνειν and ἐξαπατάω in the paragraph with the infinitive σκοπεῖν in *Romans* 16.

“Ἐμάθετε”, the finite verb of the relative clause limiting “ἡ διαχήρη” is the only instance of the verb μανθάνειν in written form in the letter to the *Romans*. The verb is implicitly present in a sentence in *Romans* 11:9, however, through an allusion to the

---

651 The adjective παλαιοτέρεων (Est 8:12ε) does have counterparts in the letter—in *Rm* 6:6 (τοῦτο γινώσκοντες ὅτι ὁ παλαιὸς ἡμῶν ἄθροισας συνεσταυρώθη) and *Rm* 7:6 (ὡστε δουλεύειν ἡμᾶς ἐν καινότητι πνεύματος καὶ οὐ παλαιότητι γράμματος).
prophecy on Ariel in Isaiah 29.652 “Πνεύμα κατανύξεως”, the direct object of “ἐδωκεν” in a composite quotation in Romans 11:9,653 echos a dative in a sentence in Isaiah 29:10;654 in Isaiah, this sentence is immediately followed by a comparison.

καὶ ἔσονται ὑμῖν πάντα τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα ὡς οἱ λόγοι τοῦ βιβλίου τοῦ ἑσφραγισμένου τούτου, ὁ ἐὰν δώσιν αὐτῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐπισταμένῳ γράμματα λέγουτες Ἀνάγνωθι ταῦτα· καὶ ἔρει Ὦδυναμεν ἀναγίνωναι, ἑσφράγισται γάρ, καὶ δοθήσεται τῷ βιβλίον τούτο εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπου μὴ ἐπισταμένου γράμματα, καὶ ἔρει αὐτῷ Ἀνάγνωθι τοῦτο· καὶ ἔρει Ὦδυναμεν γράμματα.

The verb μανθάνειν occurs twice at the end of the chapter.655

Because of this (indirect) link to Isaiah 29, the warning, in Romans 16, to stay away from those who διὰ τῆς χρηστολογίας καὶ εὐλογίας ἔξαπτώσιν τὰς καρδίας τῶν ἀκάκων and the emphasis put on the need for examining “τοὺς ... ποιοῦντας” suggests an allusion to Isaiah 28:22-21

καὶ ἔξωλεθρεύθησαν οἱ ἁνομοῦντες ἐπὶ κακία καὶ οἱ ποιοῦντες ἁμαρτείν ἀνθρώπους ἐν λόγῳ πάντας δὲ τοὺς ἑλέγχοντας ἐν πύλαις πρόσκυμμα θήσουσιν καὶ ἐπλαγίσασιν ἐν ἀδίκοις δίκαιον.

The prophecy on Ariel includes a reference to a στιγμή656—a technical term for a sign indicating a διαστολή657 (and implying reading “κατὰ διαστολὴν”, with emphasis on

652 An allusion to the same prophecy is incorporated into the first sentence of the prologue of Sirach; see Sir prol. 4.
653 See Rm 11:9 καθὼς γέγραπται ἐδωκεν αὐτοῖς ὁ θεὸς πνεῦμα κατανύξεως, ὁθαλμοῦ τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν καὶ ὅτα τοῦ μὴ ἀκούειν, ἐως τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας. The sentence begins with an allusion Is 29:10 (see Is 6:9) and ends with a quotation of a phrase from Dt 29:3.
654 See Is 29:9-10 ἐκλύθη καὶ ἐσκτήθη καὶ κραίσφραγεται οὐκ ἀπὸ σικερά οὐδὲ ἀπὸ οἴνου ὁτι πεποίηκα ἡμᾶς κύριος πνεύμα κατανύξεως καὶ θεμύσει τοὺς ὁθαλμούς αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν προφητῶν αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν ἀρχόντων αὐτῶν, οἱ ὁρῶντες τά κρυπτά.
655 In Is 29:24 καὶ γινώσκονται οἱ τῶν πνεύματι πλανώμενοι σύνεσιν, οἱ δὲ γογγύζοντες μαθήσονται ὑπακούειν, καὶ αἱ γλώσσαι αἱ φιλιξουσαι μαθήσονται λαλεῖν εἰρήνην.
656 See Is 29:5 καὶ ἔσται ὡς στιγμὴ παραχρῆμα παρὰ κυρίου σαβαωθ.
the completion of a thought (διάνοια)). In conjunction with the verb ἐξαπατᾶν in Romans 16, ἐμάθετε thus suggests an allusion to Exodus 8.

A quotation of verses from Psalm 68(69) in Romans 11: 9-10—including v. 23 “γενηθήτω ἡ τράπεζα αὐτῶν ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν εἰς παγίδα, καὶ εἰς ἀνταπόδοσιν καὶ εἰς σκάνδαλον”—provides a verbal link (based on the noun σκάνδαλον) between the passage with the allusion to Isaiah 29 (in Rm 11:8) and the passage with the allusion to the sentence from Esther’s and Mardochai’s letter (in Rm 16:17). This psalm connects the allusion based on the infinitive σκοπεῖν to the second allusion to Esther in Romans—which rests on the phrase “ἐγράφη διὰ +gen.”

“ἐγράφη διὰ +gen.”

The phrase “ἐγράφη διὰ +gen.” associates the sentence in the subscriptio of Romans with a sentence in a third person account, in the book of Esther, on the writing of the letter with the sentence with the phrases “σκοπεῖν” and “ἐκ τῶν παλαιοτέρων ἱστοριῶν”. In Esther, the verb ἐγράφη either has no explicit grammatical subject or has as subject the direct object of ἔξαπέστειλαν—τὰ γράμματα.659

ἐγράφη δὲ διὰ τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ ἐσφραγίσθη τῷ δακτυλίῳ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔξαπέστειλαν τὰ γράμματα διὰ βιβλιαφόρον ὡς ἐπέταξεν αὐτοῖς ...

In the book of Esther, the references to the δακτύλιον and to sealing, and the verb “ἐπιτάσσειν” associate this sentence with the king’s answer to Esther’s request concerning

---

657 In Romans, the term διαστολή occurs twice—first in Rm 3:22, then in Rm 10:12.
658 See Grammatici Graeci 1.1 7.3-8.2.
659 Est 8:10-11.
the γράμματα sent by Haman. “Γράφειν”, in this answer, has a direct object—the pronoun “οὐσα”.

οὐσα γὰρ γράφεται τοῖς βασιλεῖσι ἐπιτάξαντος καὶ σφραγισθῆ τῷ δακτυλίῳ μου, οὕτω ἔστιν αὐτοῖς ἀντειπεῖν.

The tense of the verb associates “οὐσα γὰρ γράφεται” with the first sentence of the letter written by Haman.

Βασιλεὺς μέγας Ἀρτάξερξης τοῖς ... υποτεταγμένοις τάδε γράφει: ...

“Γράφειν” occurs in the letter to the Romans only six times in the active voice—three times in the imperfect (ἐγράφη) (counting the verb in the subscriptio), one time in the present tense (γράφει, the only instance in which the verb has a named subject), and two times in the aorist (ἐγραψα and γραψα). Only one of these verbs—ἐγραψα in Romans 15:15—is in the first person singular.

The finite verb ἐγράφη in the subscriptio has two parallels in the body of the letter. The verb nearer to the beginning of the letter, in Romans 4:23, is preceded by a negative and followed by the reason (διὰ +acc.) for writing what is then introduced by “οτί”—a brief quotation of only two words (ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ).

οὐκ ἐγράφῃ δὲ δι’ αὐτὸν μόνον ὅτι ἑλογίσθη αὐτῷ ἄλλα καὶ δι’ ἡμᾶς, οἷς μέλλει λογίζομαι, τοῖς πιστεύουσιν ἐπὶ τὸν ἐγείραντα Ἰησοῦν τὸν κυρίον ἡμῶν ἐκ νεκρῶν, ὡς παρεδόθη διὰ τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν καὶ ἡγέρθη διὰ τὴν δικαιώσειν ἡμῶν.

---

---
“Ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ” is a triple allusion to Genesis 15:6, Psalm 105(106), and 1 Maccabees 2:52. The sentence with the phrase in Genesis (referring to Abraham) and the person to whom “αὐτῷ” in Psalm 105(106) refers (Phineas) are “in” the speech with the third instance of the phrase in 1 Maccabees—they are included among the examples of which Mattathias reminds his children at his death, encouraging them to strive for receiving an ὄνομα αἰώνιον.

The allusion to the entry on Phineas in Psalm 105(106) associates the paragraph with “ἐγράφη” in Romans 4 with a paraphrase, in Psalm 105(106), of the story of the Baal of Phegor in Numbers 25, glossed with an allusion to Aaron’s atoning for the people in Numbers 17. Through the allusion to one of the books of Maccabees (in the text of the letter), the implied comparison between Aaron and Phineas, the son of Eleazar the son of Aaron the priest, connects the allusion, in Romans 4, to Mattathias’ brief reference (in 1 Mcc) to the priest(s) atoning for the people to a comparison between Aaron and Eleazar (the γέρων) in 4 Maccabees.

In Romans 4, the allusion to the Baal of Phegor (through the reference to Phineas’ zeal) is combined with an allusion to Daniel 3 (explaining offering to idols and prostrating in front of them). In Romans 4:22, a slightly longer quotation of the phrase from Genesis

---

665 Quoted in Rm 4:3 and 4:22.
666 See Ps 105(106):30-31 καὶ ἐπτή Φυσες καὶ ἐξιλάσατο, καὶ ἐκόπασεν ἡ θραύσις; / καὶ ἔλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην / εἰς γενέαν καὶ γενεάν ἔως τοῦ αἰῶνος.
667 See 1 Mcc 2:52-54 Αβρααμ ὁ φρί ς ἐν πειρασμῷ ἐφέδρῃ πιστός, καὶ ἔλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην; Ἰωσήφ ἐν καίρῳ στενοχώριας αὐτοῦ ἐθέλαξεν εὐτολή ὁ καὶ ἐγένετο κύριος Αλγύπτου. Φυσές ὁ πατήρ ἦμων ἐν τῷ ἔρωτι μετὰ ζηλοῦ ἔλαβεν διαθήκην ἱεροσόμιος αἰώνιος.
668 See 1 Mcc 2:51; cf. 1 Mcc 5:57, Gn 11:4. Isaiah’s prophecy on the ὄνομα αἰώνιον (Is 56:5) is included in PJ in a blessing (in 6.2).
669 See Nm 25:1-3; Ps 105(106):28 καὶ ἔτελεθησαν τῷ Βεελφεγώρ, καὶ ἔφαγον θυσίας νεκρῶν.
670 See Nm 17:13, Ps 105(106):30 καὶ ἐπτή ... / καὶ ἐκόπασεν ἡ θραύσις.
671 We have encountered the latter already in discussing Hebrews 11:17-19.
15:6—in the conclusion of a description of the νέκρωσις of Abraham’s and Sarah’s bodies—
precedes the sentence with ἐγράφη.\textsuperscript{672}

εἰς δὲ τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ θεοῦ ὡς διεκρίθη τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ ἀλλ’ ἐνέδυναμώθη τῇ πίστει, δοῦσι δόξαιν τῷ θεῷ καὶ πληροφορήσεις ὅτι ὁ ἐπήγγελται δύνατὸς ἔστιν καὶ ποιήσαι. διὸ καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην'.

The phrase “δύνατός ἐστιν” is an allusion to a statement in the response of the three young men to Nebuchadnezzar question “καὶ τίς ἐστιν θεὸς, ὃς ἔξελείται ὑμᾶς ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν μου;”\textsuperscript{673}—which we have already encountered in discussing the paraphrase of the Sacrifice of Isaac in Hebrews 11:17-19. As allusion to chapter 3 of Daniel, “δύνατός” connects the allusion to the promise of the birth of Isaac (Gn 17) in Romans 4 to another example given by Mattathias—Mattathias reminds his children that “Ἀνανίας, Αζαρίας, Μισαὴλ πιστεύσαντες ἐσώθησαν ἐκ φλογὸς”.\textsuperscript{674} In the letter to the Romans, the phrase “ἐσώθησαν ἐκ φλογὸς”\textsuperscript{675} adds to the allusion, in Romans 4:21, to the young men’s answer to Nebuchadnezzar an allusion to the reason given in Daniel 3 for the order “ἐὑλογεῖτε τὸν κύριον”. The order is addressed to Ἀνανίας, Αζαρίας, and Μισαχ at the end of the song sung by them “as if from one mouth”.\textsuperscript{676}

672 Rm 4:21-22.
673 See Dn 3:15-18.
674 1 Mcc 2:59.
675 Implied through the allusion to Dn 3:17 in Rm 4:21 and “ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ” in Rm 4:23.
676 Dn 3:88; see Dn 3:51.
The song ends with words directed to all “οἱ σεβόμενοι τὸν κύριον τὸν θεοῦ τῶν θεῶν”—thus reverting to the first part of the song, where σεβεῖν is mentioned for the first time.677

The first sentence with “ἐγραφή” in the body of the letter (Rm 4:22) is connected to the second (Rm 15:4) through two intertexts—the story of Balaam’s advice to Balak in Numbers 22;678 and the story of the three young men in the fiery furnace, in chapter 3 of the book of Daniel.

The other instance of “ἐγραφή”, in Romans 15:4, nearer to the end of the letter, is preceded by a line from Psalm 68(69), the phrase ὅσα προέγραφη, and a prepositional phrase (εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν διδασκαλίαν).679

In Romans 15, the connection between Romans 4:22 “οὐκ ἐγράφη δὲ δι’ αὐτὸν μόνον” and Romans 15:4 “εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν διδασκαλίαν ἐγράφη” resting on the story of the Baal of Phegor in the book of Numbers as intertext is highlighted through the phrase

677 See Dn 3:33.
678 Summarily in Nm 31:16.
679 Rm 15:2-4.
680 This is the second of two references to οἰκοδομή in the letter to the Romans. The noun occurs for the first time in Rm 14:19 ἀρα οὖν τὰ τῆς εἰρήνης δεῖκνωμεν καὶ τὰ τῆς οἰκοδομῆς τῆς εἰς άλλήλους. The proximity and the phrasal link between the two passages suggest that “ἀγαθοῦν”, in Rm 15:2, is an allusion to Ps 33(34):15 ἐκκλινον ἀπὸ κακοῦ καὶ ποίησον ἀγαθον, ἡ χήτησον εἰρήνην καὶ διώξον αὐτήν.
“ἀρέσκειν +dat.” in the sentence preceding the quotation of the verse from Psalm 68(69).

The phrase with “ἀρέσκειν” occurs in the same psalm, but in a different verse. 681

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{aiνέσω τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ μετ᾽ ψόδης,} \\
\text{μεγαλυνώ αὐτὸν ἐν αἰνέσει,} \\
\text{καὶ ἀρέσει τῷ θεῷ ὑπὲρ μόσχου νέου} \\
\text{kέρατα ἐκφέροντα καὶ ὑπλάς.}
\end{align*}
\]

The only other instance of “ἀρέσει τῷ θεῷ” (in this form) in the writings of the Old and the New Testaments belongs to a sentence addressed by Balak to Balaam, in Numbers 23:27—“δεῦρο παραλάβω σι eἰς τόπον ἄλλον, εἰ ἀρέσει τῷ θεῷ καὶ καταράσαι μοι αὐτὸν ἐκείθεν”. The account introduced by these words includes a reference to the building of altars and the offering (ἀναφέρειν) of a calf and a ram, followed by a description of what Balaam does 682 and says, and by a brief reference to his advice for Balak. 683

While this allusion to the story of the Baal of Phegor is “in” the psalm quoted in Romans 15, the allusion to Daniel 3 rests on the phrase “ἐν ἐνὶ στόματι δοξάζειν” in the prayer following the sentence with the two instances of the verb γράφειν.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ὁ δὲ θεὸς τῆς ὑπομονῆς καὶ τῆς παρκλήσεως δόθη ἵμιν τὸ αὐτῷ φρονεῖν ἐν ἄλλῳ ἄλοις} \\
kατὰ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν Ἰδοὺ ἵνα ὑμοθυμαδὸν ἐν ἐνὶ στόματι δοξάζητε τὸν θεόν καὶ πατέρα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.
\end{align*}
\]

In conjunction with the phrase “δοξάζειν τὸν θεόν”, the prepositional phrase “ἐν ἐνὶ στόματι” associates the purpose clause with a comparison at the beginning of the second part of the song of the three young men.

---

681 Ps 68(69):31-32 at 32.  
682 See Nm 24:1 οὐκ ἐπορεύθη κατὰ τὸ εἰρθὸς εἰς συνάντησιν τοῖς οἰωνοῖς καὶ ἀπέστρεφεν τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν ἐρμον. The prepositional phrase κατὰ τὸ εἰρθὸς is incorporated, in Lk 4, into the account on the reading of the prophet Isaiah in the synagogue of Nazarath (see Lk 4:16).  
683 See Nm 24:14.
The juxtaposition, in Romans 15:3-4, of a quotation of Psalm 68(69) and an allusion to the brief narrative section separating the two parts of the song in Daniel 3 singles out an additional verse of Psalm 68(69).  

The three young men are cast into the furnace “pepedemenoi”. This links the beginning of the account with the bipartite ode to the end, with Nebuchadnezzar’s report on what he observes.

**Esdras in Romans**

The sentence with the allusion to Esther 8:10 in the subscriptio is preceded by a reference to γραφαὶ in Romans 16:26, in a sentence fragment bracketed by two participles in the genitive.

The prepositional phrase “κατ’ ἐπιταγήν”, followed by the genitive “τοῦ αἰωνίου θεοῦ” links this passage to the end of the first half of the account on king Joshiah in the first book of Esdras.

---

684 Ps 68(69):33-34.

685 An allusion to Gn 21:33 and Sus 42.
The syntactical parallelism between “κατ’ ἐπιταγήν τοῦ αἰώνιου θεοῦ” and “κατὰ τὴν ἐπιταγὴν τοῦ βασιλέως Ἰωσια” implicitly portrays “ὁ αἰώνιος θεὸς” as king; a chiasm suggested by the positions of the attributes “αἰώνιος” and “Ἰωσια” in the respective prepositional phrases contrasts “αἰώνιος” and “Ἰωσια”—and thereby stresses the report on the death of Josiah, his burial, and the mourning for him in 1 Esdras.

“ὁ γράφας”

In the letter to the Romans, the participle “ὁ γράφας” belongs to a group of four greetings preceded by the elliptic statement—“ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς μεθ’ ὑμῶν” and “ἁμήν”—and followed by the first part of a doxology. Each of the four greetings begins with a finite form of the verb “ἀσπάζεσθαι”, followed by the direct object (ὑμᾶς), and the grammatical subject(s) (personal names in the nominative—four (divided into one and three), one, one, and two respectively). The participle is placed in the middle between the second and the third instance of the finite verb.

ἀσπάζονται ὑμᾶς Τιμόθεος ὁ συνεργὸς μου
καὶ Λουκίος καὶ Ἰάσων καὶ Σωσίπατρος οἱ συγγενεῖς μου
ἀσπάζομαι ὑμᾶς ἐγὼ Τέρτιος
ὁ γράφας τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἐν κυρίῳ
ἀσπάζοιται ὑμᾶς Γάιος
ὁ ξένος μου καὶ ὅλης τῆς ἐκκλησίας
ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς Ἑραστὸς ὁ οἰκονόμος τῆς πόλεως καὶ Κούαρτος ὁ ἀδελφός

Without punctuation, the written text does not reveal whether “ὁ γράφας” is the predicate of Τέρτιος or Γάιος, or whether the participial phrase or the reference to Γάιος are elliptic clauses standing on its own. It is similarly unclear whether “ἐν κυρίῳ” modifies

---

686 See Rm 16:25-27.
the participle “ὁ γράφας” or the finite verb “ἀσπάζεται”, or whether the personal pronoun “μου” of “ὁ ξένος μου” refers to “ἐγώ” or to the same person as the pronouns limiting “συνεργός” and “οἱ συγγενεῖς”.

In Romans 16:22-23, the problem of determining how to read κατὰ διαστολήν is accompanied by one of signification. The transliterated Hellenized name “Τέρτιος” (i.e., τρίτος) can refer to a Latin name (Tertius) or ordinal (in which case “ἐγώ” could be the third person who “wrote the letter”). Also, the antecedent of the personal pronoun “μου” (limiting ξένος) is ambiguous—the pronoun in the sentence with the third instance of “ἀσπάζεσθαι” refers to ἐγώ or has the same referent as the pronouns in the sentence with the first instance of “ἀσπάζεσθαι” (In Rm 16:21 ὁ συνεργός μου and οἱ συγγενεῖς μου.).

The tense associates “ὁ γράφας”—the model invoked through the phrase “ἐγώ + name + ὁ γράφας” in 25.1—with the grammatical subject of “ἐγραψά” in Romans 15:15—that is, according to a detailed comparison (ἐγραψά ... ὃς) following the finite verb, one who wrote “ἀπὸ μέρους ὃς ἐπαναμιμησκων” and was given the χάρις from God to be “λειτουργὸς Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη” and “ἱερουργῶν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ.”

The substantivized adjective “ὁ ξένος μου” suggests that “ὁ γράφας”, read as grammatical subject of “ἀσπάζεται ... Γάιος”, points back to the quotation of the verse

687 See Κουφάρτος, in Rm 16:23.
688 See Rm 15:15-16: τολμηρότερον δὲ ἐγραψά ὑμῖν ἀπὸ κήρυκαν ὃς ἐπαναμιμησκων ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, διὰ τὴν χάριν τὴν δοξηίσθαι μοι ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς τὸ εἰςαμαχκαν Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, ἱερουργοῦντα τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ, ὡς γένηται ἡ προσφορὰ τῶν εὐπροσδέκτων, ἡμιχριστιανὴ ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ.
from *Psalm* 68(69):9-10 in *Romans* 15:4. The lines preceding in *Psalm* 68(69) (ll. 9-10) the verse quoted in *Romans* 15:3 feature a reference to one who has become “ξένος”.

> ἀπηλλοτριωμένος ἐγενήθην τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μου
> καὶ ξένος τοῖς ὑόις τῆς μητρός μου
> ὅτι ζήλος τοῦ οἴκου σου κατέφαγέν με
> καὶ οἱ ὀνειδισμοὶ τῶν ὀνειδιζόντων σε ἐπέπεσαν ἐπὶ ἐμέ

The difficulties with separating the individual λέξεις are reflected by different acrostics that emerge when one divides the 44 syllables of the two sentences with ἀσπάζεται (23 and 21 syllables respectively) according to μέρη λέξεως or units of thought and arranges them in order. The number of syllables allow for only a few meaningful divisions.

When both sentences are written together in four lines, both sides of the text block display acrostics—on the left side “ἀσω” (ll. 1-3),689 on the right side “οίος” (ll. 1-4; see Rm 16:18).

### 4x11 Syllables

| α | ἀσπάζομαι υμᾶς ἐγὼ Τέρτιο | ο | ω | ξ | ξένος μου καὶ ὀλης τῆς ἐκκλησίας |
| σ | σ ό γράψας τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἐν κυρι | l | ω | ω |  |
| ξ | ξένος μου καὶ ὀλης τῆς ἐκκλησίας |

Without personal names, the letters of the elliptic clause yield an allusion to *Daniel* (αἰνω).690

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>l</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>l</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ὃ γράψα</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>α</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>α</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σ τὴν ἐπι</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>σ</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>σ</td>
<td>τ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>στολὴ ἐν</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>σ</td>
<td>ν</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>ο</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

689 See Pss 12:6, 103:33.
690 Dn 2:23 and 4:37.
Distributing the text in 22 lines of two syllables, in a trisected column, connects κύριος and ξένος and emphasizes “ἐἰς κύριος”.  

The letter to the Romans is one of the sources of “ἀνακεφαλαιοῦσθαι” in 13.1—which aligns “ἡ ἱστορία τοῦ Ἀδάμ” (13.1) to “τις ἐτέρα ἐντολή” and both to “ἡ ἱστορία αὐτῆ” (25.1), which, in turn, is implicitly compared to “ἡ ἐπιστολή” (in Romans and Esther).  “JO gravya~ th;ν iJstorivan tauvthn” (the writer and the iJstoriva) is defined through all of these references, and linked to the sources connecting them as intertext.

“περὶ τούτων” and “ταύτα”

The second ending of the gospepl according to John—which features the substantivized participle ὁ γράφας—is linked to the first ending in two ways—through an

---

691 See Dn (LXX) 3:17.
692 See Rm 13:9
intertext (chapter 1 of the first book of *Esdras*) and through a sentence with “περὶ τούτων” in *John* 17:20.

**Esdras in John**

Each ending of the Gospel according to *John* features an allusion to a different section of the first chapter of *1 Esdras*. In chapter 20 of *John*, this connection rests on the juxtaposition of a participle and a prepositional phrase—“γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τούτῳ”.

Through the position of the participle relative to the prepositional phrase, the phrase “γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τούτῳ” aligns the clause in *John* 20 to a statement in the first chapter of *1 Esdras* on how sacrifices were offered.

The manner and (recipient) of *προσφέρειν* “κατὰ τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐν βιβλίῳ Μωυσῆ” is clarified through an allusion to a contrary example—the phrase “ὡς καθήκει”, in conjunction with the mention of *χαλκεῖον* and *λέβης*, points to Eli’s sons.

In *1 Esdras*, the words “γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ” are bound together through a preposition and set apart from the next clause through a conjunction. In the sentence with the
reference to “γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ” in chapter 20 of John (92 syllables) the position of the prepositional phrase leaves it open whether “ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦτο” is to end the first part of the sentence (36+7 or 9×4 +7 syllables) or be added to the second (7+49, or 7+7², 14×4). Only dividing the text into lines of four syllables allows combining the two parts of the sentence into one (25×4).

To make possible a division of the text into lines of equal length (other than 4 syllables), the number of syllables of the three sections (36+7+49) requires adding “ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦτο” to the second half (36+56)—i.e., dividing the sentence into a section with 36 syllables (I) and another with 56 syllables (II).697

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1a</th>
<th>7x2</th>
<th>6x2</th>
<th>5x2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>πολλα</td>
<td>α</td>
<td>ὁ Ι</td>
<td>ν αὐτοῦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μ.ERROR</td>
<td>μέν οὐ</td>
<td>ησοῦς</td>
<td>ἀ οὐκ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ν</td>
<td>ν</td>
<td>ἐνώπι</td>
<td>ἕστιν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α</td>
<td>α</td>
<td>σή</td>
<td>ιο</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μ</td>
<td>μεία</td>
<td>ἐποί</td>
<td>ν τῶν μαθ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ησεν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ητῶ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1b</th>
<th>6x3</th>
<th>6x3</th>
<th>6x6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>πολλα μέν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>πολλα μέν οὖν καί ἀ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οὖν καί ἀλλ</td>
<td>ἐνώπι</td>
<td></td>
<td>λλα σημεία ἐποί</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α σημεί</td>
<td></td>
<td>οὖν τῶν μαθ</td>
<td>ἡσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α ε ποί</td>
<td></td>
<td>ητῶν αὐ</td>
<td>ἐνώπιον τῶν μα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ησεν ὁ</td>
<td>τοῦ ἀ οὐκ</td>
<td>θητῶν αὐτοῦ ἀ οὐκ</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ιησοῦς</td>
<td>ἕστιν γε</td>
<td>ἔστιν γεγραμμένα</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

697 Separating the phrase into “ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ” and “τοῦτο” and dividing the passage in this manner results in in two groups of syllables whose numbers are prime numbers—41 and 51.
In II A, γέγραπται (l. 6) and πιστεύων (ll. 7-8) are doubled.

In the second ending of the Gospel according to John (Jn 21), the element pointing to 1 Esdras 1 is the prepositional phrase “καθ’ ἐν”. In 1 Esdras 1:31, the sentence with this phrase—the last sentence of the account on Josiah698—includes two references to a “βιβλος”,699 “ιστορεῖν” is the finite verb.

In contrast to the ending in John 20—in which “ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τούτῳ” blurs the boundaries of the two parts of the sentence—the sentence with the prepositional phrase in

---

698 The two last sentences of the account are preceded by a description of the mourning for Josiah, a lament by Jeremiah, and the institution of a lament for the king (see 1 Esdr 1:30). In PJ, this lament is one of the sources underlying a reference to “ἐπένθησαν αὐτόν” in 24.3.

699 In Codex Alexandrinus.
John 21 is set apart from the sentence by which it is preceded through the repetition of the verb ἔστιν. The full text of the second ending of John (Jn 21:24-25) has 88 syllables.  

The referent(s) of the pronoun—and the diction of the sentence—can be clarified through the drawing of analogies with other instances, in John or elsewhere, of those syntactical patterns in the body of the text that are present in “synoptic” and contracted, abstract form in the sentence with “ὁ γράφας” in John 21:24 (and PJ 25.1). For example, the prepositional phrase “περὶ τοῦτων”, can be read with either “ὁ μαρτυρῶν” or “ὁ γράφας”. Similarly, because of its position between two verbs, “ταῦτα” in John 21:24 can be read as the direct object of the participle by which it is preceded (γράφας) or of the finite verb by which it is followed (οἶδαμεν).

700 The number of syllables of the last sentence—which is the sentence with “καθ’ ἐν”—is a square number (7^2).
“Περὶ τοῦτων”, the prepositional phrase placed in John 21:24 between the two participles “ὁ μαρτυρῶν” and “ὁ γράψας”, is one of only two instances of this phrase in the Gospel according to John. The other sentence with “περὶ τοῦτων”, in John 17:20, is part of Jesus’ prayer at sanctifying himself.

καθώς ἐμὲ ἀπέστειλας εἰς τὸν κόσμον, κἀγὼ ἀπέστειλα αὐτοῦς εἰς τὸν κόσμον· καὶ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἔγω ἁγιάζω ἐμαυτόν, ἵνα ὁ σῖν καὶ αὐτοὶ ἡγιασμένοι εἰς ἁληθείαν. οὐ περὶ τοῦτων δὲ ἐρωτᾷ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τῶν πιστεύων τινὶ τοῦ λόγου αὐτῶν εἰς ἐμὲ, ἵνα πάντες ἐν ὑμῖν, καθὼς σύ, πάτερ, ἐν ὑμῖν κἀγὼ ἐν σοί, ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ὑμῖν, ἵνα ὁ κόσμος πιστεύῃ ὅτι σὺ με ἀπέστειλας.

“Οὐ περὶ τοῦτον δὲ ἐρωτᾷ μόνον”, in John 17:20, echos a phrase in John 17:9 with a definition of the genitive of “περὶ”.

The participial phrase “πιστεύωντες διὰ τοῦ λόγου αὐτῶν” associates the sentence with “περὶ τοῦτων” (i.e., Jn 17:20) on the one hand with the μαρτυρία of John περὶ τοῦ φωτός, in John 1:7 (σὺν ἔστω εἰς μαρτυρίαν ἵνα μαρτυρήσῃ περὶ τοῦ φωτός ἵνα πάντες πιστεύσωσιν δι’ αὐτοῦ), and, on the other hand, with the first ending of John, through the purpose stated there.

The phrase “ταῦτα καὶ οἶδαμεν” (Jn 21:24) has two syntactical counterparts in the text of the gospel—“οὕτω οἶδαμεν ἃ εἶπον ἐγώ”, in John 18:21 (with the relative pronoun in the position of “ὅτι ἁληθῆς ἐστιν αὐτοῦ ἡ μαρτυρία”) and “εἰ ταῦτα ὑμεῖς ἔδατε”, in John 13:17 (with “ταῦτα” in the same position relative to the verb as in John 21:24). The two passages are connected through an intertext—“οὐκ ἐστιν δοῦλος μείζων τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ”, in John 15:20.

In John 18:21, the phrase “εἶδειν (pl.) +acc. (pl. n.)” belongs to Jesus’ answer to the highpriest’s inquiry “περὶ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ περὶ τῆς διδαχῆς αὐτοῦ”. After
telling the highpriest how and where he (Jesus) spoke and taught, Jesus ends with the words “καὶ ἐν κρυπτῷ ἐλάλησεν οὐδὲν”. 701 This allusion to Isaiah is followed by an order and its reason (30 syllables). Then the third person narrative resumes with a genitive absolute.

6x5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>l</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>l</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἐπερώτησον</td>
<td>ε</td>
<td>ν</td>
<td>ε</td>
<td>ν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τοὺς ἀκηκοότ</td>
<td>τ</td>
<td>τ</td>
<td>τ</td>
<td>τ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ας τι ἐλάλη</td>
<td>α</td>
<td>η</td>
<td>α</td>
<td>σ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σα αὐτοῖς ἴδε</td>
<td>σ</td>
<td>ε</td>
<td>α</td>
<td>ε</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οὗτοι οἶδασι</td>
<td>ο</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>ο</td>
<td>i</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ν ἃ εἶπον ἐγὼ</td>
<td>ν</td>
<td>ω</td>
<td>ν</td>
<td>ω</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Ἐτασοῦ” (A l), does have Scriptural referent in Psalm 138(139):28 with relevance for the allusion to Isaiah; the same holds true for “σείω” (B r). 702

The words “τί ἐλάλησα αὐτοῖς” contain an allusion to John 12:48 (τί ἐλάλησα) and an allusion to John 15:22 (ἐλάλησα αὐτοῖς). The presence of acrostics (I σκλά, II παύση) 703 reinforces these two potential word-divisions.

I 4x4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>II 6x3</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>επερωτήσο</td>
<td>σ</td>
<td>ἐλάλη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ον τοὺς ακηκ</td>
<td>κ</td>
<td>σα αὐτοῖς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οοτας τι</td>
<td>ι</td>
<td>ἴδε ου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ελαλησα</td>
<td>α</td>
<td>τοι οἶδα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σιν ἃ εἰπ</td>
<td>π</td>
<td>ον ἐγὼ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Τί ἐλάλησα” associates Jesus’ answer with John 12:48, a passage in which λέγειν and λαλεῖν are both preceded by the interrogative pronoun “τί;”.

701 Jn 18:19. This allusion to Is 45:19 places the words with “acc. (n. pl.) + εἰδεῖν (pl.)” in a discussion on γλυπτά, γλύμα, ῥυμίζειν, τεχνάζεσθαι, etc. In John 18:21-23, “ἐλάλησα” is repeated two more times—first in Jesus’ description of those who heard him, then in his exchange with one of the assistants who slaps him stresses assessing how Jesus spoke (κακῶς or καλῶς).

702 See Agg 2:21.

703 See Jer 28:63.
"'Εντολή" suggests a link to the “ Embassy καινή” (and its counterpart in Deuteronomy).

“και ἐμνήσθη τοῦ πατριάρχου Ἀβραάμ ...”

The fourth book of Maccabees harbors models for the phrases “ἡ ἱστορία τοῦ Ἰσαμ’ (13.1) and “τοῦ γράφαι τὴν ἱστορίαν ταύτην” (25.1).

The term ἱστορία, followed by a genitive singular (in 13.1 “τοῦ Ἰσαμ’”), occurs in a sentence in chapter three of the fourth book of Maccabees—“ἡδὴ δὲ καὶ ὁ καιρὸς ἥμας καλεῖ ἐπὶ τὴν ἀπόδειξιν τῆς ἱστορίας τοῦ σωφρόνος λογισμοῦ.” The sentence is preceded by an argument that “οὖ ... ἐκριζωτὴς τῶν παθῶν ὁ λογισμός ἔστων, ἀλλὰ ἀνταγωνιστής”, “reckoned over more clearly” through the story of king David’s thirst.

The genitive σωφρόνος in the phrase “τοῦ σωφρόνος λογισμοῦ” limiting “ἱστορία” in 4 Maccabees 3:19 is either an attribute in agreement with the genitive “λογισμοῦ” or a genitive limiting “λογισμός”. In PJ, indirect allusions to Eleazar’s choice in 1.1 and

704 4 Mcc 3:19.
705 See 4 Mcc 3:6ff. ἐστιν γοῦν τούτῳ διὰ τῆς Δαυίδ τοῦ βασιλέως δύσῃ σαφέστερον ἐπιλογίσασθαι ...
The story is implied, in PJ, through a reference to Mary’s drawing of water in 11.1 (γημίσαι ὑδαί)...
706 I.e., in the nominative, ὁ σωφρόνος λογισμός—by analogy with to ὁ εὐσεβής λογισμός (4 Mcc 1:1, 6:31, 7:16, 13:1, 15:23, 16:1, 18:1) and ὁ παγγέλλων λογισμός (4 Mcc 1:29; notice 4 Mcc 2:21) or ὁ σωφρόνος νοοῦ (see 4 Mcc 2:16, 18, 3:17 ὁ σωφρόνος νοοῦ; for an instance of the genitive, see 1 Mcc 1:35 ὑπὸ τοῦ σωφρόνου νοοῦ).
708 See 4 Mcc 6:7 ὁ ... τοῦ μετ’ εὐκλείας βάνατον ... ἄναδεξιέμονος.
his λογισμός in 1.1 (ὁρθὸς and ἀκλινής)709 and 1.3 (εὐθεῖας)710 emphasize the latter interpretation of the syntax, which aligns (by analogy) “ὁ σώφρονος λογισμός” to “ὁ τοῦ πατρὸς ἢμῶν Ελεαζαροῦ λογισμός”.711 Eleazar is also suggested through indirect allusions to ὑποδείγματα in 25.1, since the latter highlight the references to “ὑπόδειγμα” in the first account on Eleazar, in the second book of Maccabees.

The fourth book of Maccabees is also among the three sources712 of the reference to “γράψαι τὴν ἱστορίαν ταύτην” in 25.1. The phrase with the infinitive in 25.1 points to two consecutive sentences in a speech addressed to the mother of seven in 4 Maccabees, both with an infinitive of a composite of the verb γράφειν. One of these is the aorist infinitive “ζωγραφήσαι”, identical with “γράψαι” in 25.1 in tense but not in letters; similar to the infinitive in 25.1, ζωγραφήσαι has as direct object “τὴν ἱστορίαν”. The other is “ἀναγράψαι” (identical in letters); similar to γράψαι in 25.1, the direct object (a participial phrase) includes a demonstrative pronoun—“ταύτα τοῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔθνους εἰς μνείαν λεγόμενα”.713

709 See 4 Mcc 7:1, 12.
710 Through the phrase “ὁ πατριάρχης "Αβραάμ"”; see 4 Mcc 7:19, 16:25 (linked through emphasis on εὐθείας and ὑπομένειν).
711 4 Mcc 7:1.
712 4 Mcc 17:7 ζωγραφήσαι τὴν ... ἱστορίαν, Sir prol. 12 συγγράψαι τι, and 2 Cor 9:1 περὶ +gen. ... τὸ γράφειν.
713 In both sentences, the verb γράφειν is preceded by a prepositional phrase with ἐπὶ +gen. (respectively ἐπὶ τινος and ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἐπιταφίου); this parallelism suggests that “τινος” corresponds to “αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἐπιταφίου”. With “ἐνταῦθα”, the paragraph has 2x3 syllables.
The two sentences in the fourth book of Maccabees singled out in 25.1 through the phrase “γράφαι τὴν ἱστορίαν” are linked through the composites of “γράφειν” to passages in the second book of Maccabees with the same verbs, and through “ἀν ἐφριπτοῦ” to what is said in 2 Maccabees 6:12-17 for παράκλησις and ὑπόμνησις.

Both passages feature allusions to theoretical statements. Independent from the syntax of “σώφρονος”, the noun “λογισμός” associates the phrase “ἡ ἱστορία τοῦ σώφρονος λογισμοῦ” with a definition of “λογισμός” at the beginning of book four of Maccabees. This definition includes one of several classical definitions of φιλοσοφία, according to which φιλοσοφία is “γνώσις θείων καὶ ἀνθρωπίνων πραγμάτων”. The ἱστορία is placed in the context of φιλοσοφία. Before speaking of “ζωγραφεῖν”, the authors of the word explain the purpose of their work as ψυχαγωγία (an allusion to Plato’s Phaedrus)—emphasizing πειθοῦς, but also writing and reading, as well as a threefold speaking of a λόγος (negation, confirmation, metaphor).

The allusions to references to ἱστορία in 4 Maccabees (in 13.1 and 25.1) are connected to each other through a brief summary (36 syllables) of the birth of Isaac in 1.3.

καὶ ἔμνήσθη τοῦ πατριάρχου Ἀβρααμ ὅτι ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ αὐτοῦ ἡμέρᾳ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν Ἰσαὰκ

714 On ζωγραφεῖν, in addition to 4 Mcc 17:7, see 2 Mcc 2:29; on ἀναγράφαι, see 4 Mcc 17:8, 2 Mcc 4:9.
715 See 4 Mcc 1:15-19 λογισμός μὲν ὅτι τοῖς ἐστὶν νοῦς μετὰ ὀρθοῦ λόγου προτιμῶν τὸν σοφίας βίων σοφία δὲ τοῖς ἐστὶν γνώσις θείων καὶ ἀνθρωπινῶν πραγμάτων καὶ τῶν τούτων αἰτίων. αὕτη δὲ τοῖς ἐστίν ὁ νόμος παιδεία, δι’ ἐς τὰ θεία σεμνὰς καὶ τὰ ἀνθρώπινα συμφερόντως μεταθάνωσον, τῆς δὲ σοφίας ἰδίᾳ καθαστήσας φύσης καὶ δικαιοσύνης καὶ ἀνδρείας καὶ σωφροσύνης, κυριωτάτη δὲ πάντων ἡ φύσης, ἔξ ἐς δὴ τῶν παθῶν ὁ λογισμὸς ἐπικρατεῖ.
For, in addition to pointing to the paraphrase, in the letter to the *Hebrews*, of the story of Melchizedek’s blessing in chapter 14 of the book of *Genesis*\(^\text{716}\) and Abraham’s giving of a “tenth of everything”, the title “πατριάρχης” for Abraham associates the first part of the sentence with commentaries on two descriptions of Eleazar in the fourth book of *Maccabees*.\(^\text{717}\)

In 4 *Maccabees* 7, Abraham “ὁ πατριάρχης” is adduced as example in the answer to a hypothetical objection\(^\text{718}\) to the argument that

\[\varepsilon\iota\delta ΤΟΙΩΝ ΕΓΡΩΝ ΆΝΗΡ [ι.ε., Ελεάζαρος] ΤΩΝ ΜΕΧΡΙ ΒΑΝΑΤΟΝ ΒΑΣΑΝΩΝ ΠΕΡΙΕΦΡΟΝΕΙ ΔΙ ΕΥΣΕΒΕΙΑΝ ΟΜΟΛΟΓΟΥΜΕΝΟΣ ΑΓΓΈΛΩΝ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΤΩΝ ΠΑΘΩΝ Ο ΕΥΣΕΒΗΣ ΛΟΓΙΣΜΟΣ ...\]

Countering the assertion that this action is based on a flawed reasoning, the authors defend the conclusion by declaring how and for whom only it is possible to overcome the πάθη of the flesh:

\[\varepsilonιλλ\varepsilonις ΤΗΣ ΕΥΣΕΒΕΙΑΣ ΠΡΟΝΟΟΥΣΙΝ ΕΞ ΟΛΗΣ ΚΑΡΔΙΑΣ ΟΥΤΟΙ ΜΟΝΟΙ ΔΩΝΑΝΤΑΙ ΚΡΑΤΕΙΝ ΤΩΝ ΤΗΣ ΣΑΡΚΟΣ ΠΑΘΩΝ ΠΙΣΤΕΥΟΝΤΕΣ ΟΤΙ ΘΕΟΙ ΟΥΚ ΑΠΟΘΝΗΣΚΟΙΝ ΩΣΠΕΡ ΟΥΔΕ ΟΙ ΠΑΤΡΙΑΡΧΑΙ ΗΜΩΝ ΑΒΡΑΑΜ ΚΑΙ ΙΣΑΑΚ ΚΑΙ ΙΑΚΩΒ ΆΛΛΑ ΖΩΣΙΝ ΤΩ ΘΕΩ.\]

\[ΟΥΔΕΝ ΟΥΝ ΕΝΑΝΤΙΟΝΤΑΙ ΤΩ ΦΑΙΝΕΣΘΑΙ ΤΙΝΑΣ ΠΑΘΟΚΡΑΤΕΙΣΑΙ ΔΙΑ ΤΩΝ ΆΘΕΝΗ ΛΟΓΙΣΜΩΝ, ΕΠΕΙ ΤΗΣ ΠΡΟΣ ΔΟΝ ΤΩΝ ΤΗΣ ΦΙΛΟΣΟΦΙΑΣ ΚΑΝΟΝΑ ΦΙΛΟΣΟΦΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΠΕΠΙΣΤΕΥΚΩΣ ΘΕΩ ΚΑΙ ΕΙΔΟΣ ΟΤΙ ΔΙΑ ΤΗΝ ΆΡΕΤΗΝ ΠΑΝΤΑ ΠΟΙΟΝ ΥΠΟΜΕΝΕΙΝ ΜΑΚΑΡΙΩΝ ΕΣΤΙΝ, ΟΥΚ ΑΝ ΠΕΡΙΚΡΑΤΗΣΕΙΝ ΤΩΝ ΠΑΘΩΝ ΔΙΑ ΤΗΝ ΘΕΟΣΕΒΕΙΑΝ; ΜΟΝΟΣ ΓΑΡ Ο ΣΟΦΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΑΝΘΡΕΙΟΣ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΤΩΝ ΠΑΘΩΝ ΚΈΡΙΟΣ.\]

In 4 *Maccabees* 16, the reference to the πατριάρχης follow as a conclusion after a fictive speech of the mother’s persuasive words for her sons. The mother of seven, gazing at Eleazar, points her children to different examples—including the Sacrifice of Isaac and the

---
\(^{716}\) See Heb 7:4; Gn 14:20.
\(^{717}\) 4 Mcc 7:19 and 16:25 respectively.
\(^{718}\) See 4 Mcc 7:19.
Three Youths in the Fiery Furnace—to persuade them to endure in the ἀγών for the ancestral law.\textsuperscript{719}

ἀναμνήσθητε ὅτι διὰ τῶν θεῶν τοῦ κόσμου μετελάβετε καὶ τοῦ βίου ἀπελαύσατε, καὶ διὰ τούτο ὁφείλετε πάντα πόνον ὑπομένειν διὰ τῶν θεῶν, δι’ ὄν ... καὶ Ἀνανίας καὶ Ἀζαρίας καὶ Μισαήλ εἰς κάμινον πυρὸς ἀπεσφευγνύθησαν καὶ ὑπέμειναν διὰ τῶν θεῶν

The “λόγοι” attributed to the mother then receive the following comment by the author:

διὰ τοῦτων τῶν λόγων ἢ ἑπταμήτωρ ἐνα ἐκαστὸν τῶν ὦν παρακαλοῦσα ἀποθανεῖν ἐπεισεν μᾶλλον ἢ παραβῆναι τὴν ἑντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐτί δὲ καὶ ταῦτα εἰδότες ὅτι διὰ τῶν θεῶν ἀπονήσκοιτε ζωὴν τῷ θεῷ ὑσπερ Ἀβρααμ καὶ Ἰσαακ καὶ Ἰακὼβ καὶ πάντες οἱ πατριάρχαι.

“Διὰ τῶν θεῶν” takes the place of “διὰ τὴν ἀρετὴν”.

“καὶ ἔδωκεν ἕαυτὸν εἰς ...”

The other models of the phrases “τοῦ γράψας τὴν ἱστορίαν ταῦτην” (in addition to 4 Mcc) are suggested by two parallels to the phrase in the text—the allusion to the letter to the Romans in 25.1 (ὁ γράψας τὴν ἱστορίαν ταῦτην), and the substantivized infinitive τοῦ γράψας (see Dem. De cor. 57 τοῦ γράψας ... τὴν κρίσιν εἶναι νομίζω). Similar to the two passages from the fourth book of Maccabees, these parallels are connected to each other through an intertext incorporated into the first part of the narrative through a phrasal allusion (καὶ ἔδωκεν ἕαυτὸν εἰς) in 1.4, at the beginning of the account on Ἰωακείμ’s making of his vow.

\textsuperscript{719} 4 Mcc 16:18-20.
The words of the vow are preceded by a third person narrative with verbal allusions to the speech “On the Crown” (Περὶ τοῦ στεφάνου) by the Athenian orator and politician Demosthenes, Isaac’s pitching of his tent at the well of the oath after the God of Abraham appears to him (linked to Anna’s lament through the “ἀρουρα” planted there by Abraham), and the version of the Temptation in the Gospel according to Matthew (linked to “ἐν ταῖς ἱστορίαις τῶν δώδεκα φυλῶν” through “οἱ λίθοι οὗτοι” and to “προσέφερε” through “πειραζόμενος” (implied)).

Similar to the words of the narrative frame, the words spoken by Ἰωάκειμ are composed of allusions to a variety of sources.

720 See Gn 26:25.

721 In a few manuscripts (A and Pos; “mixed” in Z and Geo), this allusion is stressed through the position of the nouns “ἡμέρας” and “νύκτας” (preceding the numerals).

722 A οὐκ ἐνεφάνησεν; L οὐκ ἐνεφανιόθη.

723 F9 adds Ἀνων.

724 In F9 τὸν.

725 In F9 ὅρειῳν.

726 οὗτε ἐπὶ 730 βρωτὸν ὅπερ ἐπὶ ποτὸν.

727 In F9 καὶ ἑλπίζει τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ.

728 τῇ γυναικί αὐτοῦ. 729 ἐδωκεν ἑαυτὸν εἰς τὴν ἐρμοῦ. 730 κακές ἐπέμψε τὴν σκηνήν αὐτοῦ.

729 καὶ εἰσῆλθεν ύμέρας τεσσαράκοντα καὶ νύκτας τεσσαράκοντα λέγων ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἵνα καταβῇ σομαί. 730 βρωτὸν ὅπερ ἐπὶ ποτὸν. 731 ἐσού ὑποσκέψεται με κύριος ὁ θεός μου καὶ έσται μου ἡ εὐχή 732 βρώμα καὶ σῶμα.

732 οὗτος τοῦ ποτὸν ὁ πόρος ὁ θεός μου, εἶπεν ὁ θεοῦ μου. 733 οὗτος μου ἡ εὐχή μου.

734 In C and F9 οὕτ’ ἐπὶ (twice).

735 In F9 θεοῦ μου. 736 οὗτος τοῦ ποτὸν.

737 In A δὲ τοῦ ποτὸν; B, C, P μοι ἡ εὐχή, Φ9 μοι ἡ εὐχή, Φ8 μοι ἡ εὐχή Μου.

738 In F9 μοι ἡ εὐχή μου.

739 In B, C, P θεοῦ μου, εἰς τὸν θεοῦ μου, εἰς τὸν θεοῦ μου.

740 D, E, Φ, Fa, L βρώμα καὶ πῶμα Μου. 741 In B, C, P βρώμα καὶ πῶμα Μου. 742 In B, C, P βρώμα καὶ πῶμα Μου.

743 E.g., the phrase “οὐ καταβήσομαι” suggests an allusion to Gn 37:35 (Jacob’s unconsolable grief—one of the sources incorporated in Matthew’s version of the voice heard in Ramah; see Mt 2:18, Jer 38:15, Gn 37:35), the juxtaposition of “βρωτός” and “ποτός” echos words in a sentence in 1 Esd 5:53 on the provisions given to the Sidonians and Tyrians for bringing cedar logs from Lebanon for the rebuilding of the temple (βρωτά καὶ ποτά); the pairing of βρώμα and πῶμα points to 1 Cor 10:3.
Demosthenes

In *De corona*, Demosthenes uses the phrase “διδόναι εαυτὸν εἰς” four times. In two instances—one nearer the beginning of the speech, the other nearer to the end—διδόναι takes the form of a participle. The finite form of the verb in 1.4, the phrase “ἔφανη +dat.”, and the conjunction “ἀλλὰ” indicate that the authors of *PJ*, in alluding to the speech, draw on the other two—*De corona* 179 (ἔφανη +dat.) and 219 (ἀλλὰ’).

In conjunction with the phrase “ἀλλὰ’ ἐδωκεν εαυτὸν εἰς +acc.”, the sentence “οὐκ ἐφάνη τῇ γυναικὶ αὑτοῦ” associates the transition from ἱωακείμ’ς search to his fast in the desert (in 1.4) with a brief section in *De corona* that begins and ends with two imperatives. Demosthenes, concluding a recitation of the speech he gave on the occasion of Philip’s capture of Elateia, asks to bring him the ψήφισμα that “came to be then”, proving that “[ἄλλα’] ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς διὰ πάντων ἀχρι τῆς τελευτῆς διεξῆλθον, καὶ ἐδωκ’ ἐμαυτὸν ὑμῖν ἅπλῶς εἰς τοὺς περιεστηκότας τῇ πόλει κυριάρχους.” Unlike the sentence in 1.4 (which has either no, or the same dative as “ἔφανη”), the sentence in *De Corona* has two datives (ἵμῖν and τῇ πόλει), both of which can be the direct object of “διδόναι”.

The verb “ἔφανη” (as in 1.4 followed by a dative) occurs in a section addressed by Demosthenes to Aischines before ordering “λέγε τὸ ψήφισμά μοι”. Speaking to Aischines, Demosthenes associates his opponent with tragic roles played by him on the stage.

καὶ μοι φέρε τὸ ψήφισμα τὸ τότε γεινόμενον.

---

735 Dem. De cor. 88 “εαυτὸν εἰς τὰ πράγματ’ ἀφειδῶς διδοῦς” and 274-5 “εἰς τὰ πάσι δοκοῦντα συμφέρειν εαυτὸν δοῦμαι”.
736 Dem. De cor. 179.
737 Dem. De cor. 179-80.
kaíto tína boûlei se, Aîxhíni, kai tîv' emauton ékeînîn tîn ëmérai einai ìth; boûlei emauton mèn, òn ìn su lôdorofymenos kai diâstrôn kalêsaìs, Báttalos, se de mià ëhrw tîn tuçounta, allâ tou'tw tînu àpò tîs ëskhîs, Kresfónytîn ë Kréonta ë òn ev Kolliwtoî pot' òynòmaion kakos ëpètrîpîas; tôte tou'tw katoj ékeiûn tîn kaîroj ò Piaiweîs ëgîo Báttalos òynòmac ouî Koukîdou suù plêiouos ëxîos òn ëfahî òtî patrîðì. su mèn ò ouûdeî ouûdamou chrîmîmos ësba; ëgh òpànth òsa prosojke tîn àgavon polîtîn ëprrattou.

lége to ëfîsiôma moi.

The phrase "ëgho ... ëfánî" associates this comparison with an earlier part of Demosthenes' speech. The passage in De corona with the phrase "kaî ëdow' emauton ëmîn ìpîlôs ëîs" is preceded by Demosthenes' recitation of the speech he gave on that day stepping on the ëbîmu when the herald asked many times who would want to speak (so that the polis be saved). Demosthenes stresses that, on that day, the person who was needed (described abstractly by him at first) "ëfánî ... òîtôs ... ëghî." This cross-reference associates the paragraph of De Corona highlighted in 1.4 with two reasons, given by Demosthenes to his audiences, why they should pay attention to the noûs of what they are about to hear. By declaring in this argument that "kaî leógw kai ãráfow ëxîtazóîmîn tà ìeovôî", Demosthenes connects what he says there to two earlier sections of De corona with the same combination of participles—"léógw kai ãráfow" in De corona 86 and "léógw kai ãráfow kai ðrâttw" in De corona 88. Through this, he prepares the

738 See Dem. De cor. 171 ëpî tî ëbîmu' ëbaðîjëte.
739 See Dem. De cor. 171-72.
741 See Dem. De cor. 173 ëfâînî touîn òîtos ën ëkeiînî tî ëmérai ëgh kai parêlduw ëîpîn ëîs ëmîs, ã muø òîwîn ëîk òkoufjastà prosojkontse tîn noûî, ëîs òîs ìen, ìi' ëiðîh' òti ìuûns òîs ëgîwton kai polîteuomeîn ëgh tîn òtîs ënuîas tâjîn ën òîs ìeovôî òûk ëîpîn, allâ kai leógw kai ãráfow ëxîtazóîmîn tâ ìeovôî ûpér ëmîs ën ìuûns òîs ìeovôî òûk ëîpîn, ìtî rôn ìanîlóîastite õrîon noûî ùppûs tà ìeovôî ëîs ìeovôî ðîlîteîas ëîs jëseî ëmpeîvîteîrî.
742 Dem. De cor. 173.
743 See Dem. De cor. 85-86 ñaînomaî touîn ëgh ëhîtoî ðetuykhîwòs tòte kai õî múêîfwiis õûdeî òmîrîas. õûkîuîn mèkîr ìen òîs ãráfîn ëkeiîin ìîs ðîs ëaît ëpêîjè, ëaît' ãîwîlôîyjêmîa tà ìaîstà pràttwî tîî pôlîå, òîs îjkâ, òtî 'ëbîlojûæseî, ëîgîw kai ãráfîw, òîs ðataparôîhîeî tî ãráfînta kai stefânujîs ëxî ìuûnts tîî pôlîå kai ëîmî kai pàsîn geînîsblâ, òîs ðûsîas òîs ðeøîs kai prosojduîs õîs ãgavon òîwîn ìpîlîw ëmîs peînîjësaî.
sentences with the phrase “καὶ ἔδωκ’ ἐμαυτὸν ὑμῖν ... ἔις +acc.” in *De corona* 179\(^{744}\) and “σοῦ πλείονος ἄξιος ὃν ἐφάνη τῇ πατρίδι”\(^{745}\) and “ἔγω δὲ ... τὸν ἄγαθὸν πολιτήν ἐπραττον” in 180.

In *De corona* 219, the second source of the allusion in 1.4, the conjunction ἀλλά is part of an anapher (“ἀλλ’ ὅμως” and “ἀλλ’ ὁ μὲν ...”) used by Demosthenes for paralleling two sentences. Similar to the sentence in 1.4, the conjunction ἀλλά (with elision) is preceded by a dative (fem. sg.)—τῇ πόλει in Demosthenes corresponds to τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ in *PJ* (1.4).

Demosthenes draws here on the earlier two passages with the same phrase. The juxtaposition of γράφειν and πρεσβεύειν associates this passage with the phrase “ἔδωκεν ἐμαυτὸν ἔις” with the sentence with “ἔδωκ’ ἐμαυτὸν ... ἔις” in *De corona* 179, and with εφαν αξιόν and τὸν ἄγαθὸν πολιτήν ἐπραττον. The reference to being ῥήτωρ associates this (through 94) with the passage in 88 with “λέγων καὶ γράφων καὶ πράττων”. Paired with σύμβουλος there, ῥήτωρ is explained with reference to things done from reason and deliberation (212).

Together, these sentences associate the passage in 179-180 centering on “ἔδωκ’ ἐμαυτὸν ... ἔις” with the κρινόμενον of determining whether or not he is ἄξιος τοῦ

---

\(^{744}\) See Dem. *De cor.* 88 τίς ὁ τῇ πόλει λέγων καὶ γράφων καὶ πράττων καὶ ἀπλῶς ἐμαυτὸν ἔις τὰ πράγματ’ ἀφετέρου διδόσει ἔγω.

\(^{745}\) See Dem. *De cor.* 86-94 (discussing στέφανοι and στεφανοῦν in 86, 89, 92, and 94).
The aorist infinitive “γράψαι” is represented four times in *De Corona*. Two of these infinitives are substantivized; one is in the dative (with Solon as writer); the other is in the genitive (as in 25.1). The genitive “τοῦ γράψαι” introduces a paraphrase of Ctesiphon’s motion, made by Demosthenes in defining what he considers the jurors are to judge.

The paraphrase is preceded by a recitation of the γραφή and Demosthenes’ announcement that he will address the topics in the order of the γεγραμμένα, without leaving out anything voluntarily; it is followed by a brief description of the content of the writing and what needs to be established.

In *PJ*, the allusion to passages in *De corona* with links to γράψαι and with references to being ῥήτωρ and σύμβουλος associates “τὴν ἱστορίαν ταύτην” in 25.1, as direct object of γράψαι, with Demosthenes’ paraphrase of Ctesiphon’s γραφή. This aligns “τὴν ἱστορίαν ταύτην” with Demosthenes’ paraphrases of the γραφή and, additionally, provides an analogy for “περὶ τούτων ὁ γράψας ταύτα” in John 21:24 through “περὶ ἐμοῦ γέγραφε ... ταύτα”, thus alluding to Demosthenes’ instructions on what to judge and what to determine (truth and fittingness or falsehood; being ἄξιος τοῦ στεφάνου).

---

746 See Dem. *De cor. 6 and 2.*
747 Dem. *De. cor. 57.*
748 Cf. Dem. *De cor. 59 τὸ λέγειν καὶ πράττειν τὰ ἄριστα με.*
749 A comment on what Aeschines did; see Dem. *De cor. 28* (similar to 57 with an instance of the infinitive γράψαι).
Demosthenes’ speech connects (as intertext) the narrative in 1.4 to two writings of the Old and the New Testaments featuring in later parts of the narrative—the prologue of the Wisdom of Sirach (in 25.1) and the Second Letter to the Corinthians (in 13.1, 14.2, and 25.1). Both texts include a sentence with the phrase “διδόναι εαυτόν εἰς”. In addition to the allusion to De Corona, the two works have references to “ἀνάγνωσις” in common and are linked to the sentence with the substantivized infinitive “τοῦ γράψαι” in 25.1.

**The Prologue of Sirach**

Allusions to the three of the four sentences with the phrase “διδόναι εαυτόν εἰς +acc.” in Demosthenes’ De Corona are incorporated into the first half of the first sentence of the prologue of the Wisdom of Sirach.

The prologue’s first sentence is a long, syntactically complex period. Nevertheless, the main clause is simple—the finite verb is “προηχθη” (a compact allusion portraying...
Joshua as Mardochai,\(^{752}\) the bee of Proverbs 6:8\(^a\)–8\(^c\),\(^{753}\) and one who is “σοφός ἐν λόγοις”\(^{754}\); the verb’s grammatical subject is “ὁ πάππος μου Ἰησοῦς”.

Arranged in fifteen lines of fifteen syllables, the vertical sides of the text block displays short acrostics.

**Sirach prol. (A) 1-14 (15x15 syllables)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Syllables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>π</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ρ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ο</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>είν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5    | μόνον αὐτός τούς ἀναγινώσκοντας δέον ἔστιν ἐπιστήμουνας\(^{757}\) γένεσθαι ἄλλα καὶ τοῖς ἐκτὸς δόν ασθαὶ τοὺς φιλομαθοῦντας χρήσιμοι εἶναι καὶ λέγ

---

\(^{752}\) See Est 2:21; the passage is associated with the story of the census of David through the verb “καταχωρίσαι” in Est 2:23 (see 1 Chr 27:24).

\(^{753}\) See Pr 6:8\(^a\)–8\(^c\) ἐπορευθεὶς πρὸς τὴν μέλισσαν / καὶ μάθε ὡς ἐργάτες ἔστιν / τὴν τε ἐργασίαν ὡς σεμνὴν ποιεῖται, / ἢς τὸν πόνον βασιλεῖς καὶ ἱδώται πρὸς ἕγειραν προσφέρονται, / ποιεῖν δὲ ἔστιν πάσιν καὶ ἐπίδοξος: / καίπερ οὖσα τῇ ρώμῃ ἄσθενής, / τὴν σοφίαν τιμήσασα προσήθη. In Sirach, the bee and her fruit are mentioned in Sir 11:3 μικρὰ ἐν πετεινοῖς μέλισσα, / καὶ ἀρχὴ γλυκασμάτων ὁ καρπὸς αὐτής. The comparison between Joshua and a bee (implied through “προσάθη”) suggests that τι τῶν ... ἀνηκούσων—the direct object of συναγγέλων in Sir prol.—corresponds to the πόνος of the bee (offered “πρὸς ἕγειραν”) and to her καρπὸς; Joshua is led forward “τὴν σοφίαν τιμήσασα”.

\(^{754}\) Sir 20:27.

\(^{755}\) The substantivized participle τῶν ἱκολοουθηκότων associates the beginning of the sentence with Judith’s response to Holofernes’ order to spread out for her from his dainty dishes and to give her from his wine to drink (Jdt 12:1; notice Jdt 7:25, Nm 14:16)—Judith rejects the offer with the words “Οὐ φάγοιμεν ἐξ αὐτῶν, ἓνα μὴ γένηται σκάνδαλον, ἀλλ’ ἐκ τῶν ἱκολοουθηκότων μοι χορηγηθήσεται” (Jdt 12:2; on Judith’s provisions, see Jdt 10:5; 12:9, 19; 13:10). Holofernes’ answer features the verb didοναι (with “ὁμοία αὐτῶν” as direct object).

\(^{756}\) See Hesychius 7.437-50, in FHG 4, ed. K. Müller (Paris: Didot, 1841-70), fr. 7 [l. 415]. Ζήμωνα τῶν Κιττίεα ἐθαίμαζεν Ἀντίγονος ὁ βασιλεὺς: ἐρωτηθεὶς δὲ τι διὰ τὸν βαιμάζει αὐτῶν, <οὔτω, ἐφη, πολλῶν καὶ μεγάλων δεδομένων αὐτῷ ὑπ’ ἐμοὶ οὐδέποτε ἔχαυνδος οὐδὲ ταπεινός ὅφθης.> οὗτος πρὸς τὸν καλὸν εἰπόντα, ὅτι οὐ δοκεὶ [ᵃὐτῷ] ἐρασίθεσθαι ὁ σοφὸς. <οὔτος ἐνθύμοταν ἐφη, ἵμαρτι ἔσται τῶν καλῶν, εἰ μὴ ἡμεῖς ἔφασθησθαι.> τούτων λέγοντος, ὡς οὐ λυπηθήσεται ὁ σοφὸς, διὰ πεποιθήσεις ἐλαβεὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἀντίγονος, ἐποίησεν αὐτῷ πλαστὸς ἄγγελημα, ὡς ἐν τῷ χωρίῳ αὐτοῦ πρὸς τῶν πολέμων ἀδραμένα, καὶ ἦν γυνὴ καὶ οἱ παιδεῖς τοῦ δὲ σκυθρωπάσαντος, <Ορᾶς, ἐφη, ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ πλοῦτος διάλαφος.> The allusion to the χρεία attributed to Antigonus suggests that “ἡμῖν” corresponds to “αὐτῷ” (i.e., σοφὸς). In conjunction with the references to Israel and wisdom (Sir prol. 3) and to becoming “ἐπιστήμους” (Sir prol. 4), this suggests an allusion to Dt 4:6 ἰδοὺ λαὸς σοφὸς καὶ ἐπιστήμων τὸ ἔθνος τὸ μέγα τοῦτο.

\(^{757}\) The juxtaposition of ἀναγινώσκειν and ἐπίστασθαι in Sir prol. 4 suggests an allusion to Is 29:11-12
The grammatical subject of the main clause is limited by two participial phrases, “ἐαυτὸν ἐαυτὸν δοὺς εἰς ... τὴν ... ἀνάγνωσιν”, and “ἐν τούτωι ἴκανην ἔξιν περιποιησάμενος”.

The participial phrase with “δοὺς” is built from elements of several (interconnected) sentences in Demosthenes’ speech De corona. Juxtaposed to the two participles “λέγοντας καὶ γράφοντας”, the phrase “ἐαυτὸν διδόναι εἰς +acc.” in Sir. prol. 7-8 corresponds to a phrase in De cor. 86-88. Ἐπανείν and χρησίμους εἶναι [+dat.] with γράφων leads to De corona 179-80. The tense of the participle—δοὺς instead of διδοὺς—corresponds to the tense of the verb in De corona 274-5.

The second participial phrase associates ὁ περιποιησάμενος with Sphairos (or Kleanthes) and addresses the topic of δοξάζειν (of a σοφός) and of μίμησις.
The allusion to *Sirach* in 1.4 (with *De Corona* as intertext) associates the end of the first part of the narrative with the second sentence with “γράφειν τὴν ἱστορίαν ταὐτὴν” in 25.1.

A verbal allusion to the Wisdom of *Sirach* in the last paragraph of the letter to the *Romans* (στηρίξα) links the sentence with the phrase “ὁ γράφας τὴν ἱστορίαν ταὐτὴν” to the second sentence in 25.1 with a reference to ἱστορία—“γράφαι τὴν ἱστορίαν ταὐτὴν”. “Τὸν δόντα μοι ... σοφίαν”, the phrase preceding the substantivized infinitive, is a double allusion to a paragraph in a prayer at the end of *Sirach* (τῷ διδόντι μοι σοφίαν δόσω δόξαν) and to the last sentence of a λόγος in *Sirach* 43 (καὶ τοῖς εὐσεβέσιν ἔδωκεν σοφίαν). The aorist infinitive “γράφαι” in 25.1 has three main parallels in the writings of the Old and the New Testaments—“ζωγράφησαι τὴν ... ἱστορίαν” in the fourth book of *Maccabees*, “τὸ γράφειν” in the second letter to the *Corinthians*, and “συγγράψαι τι” in the prologue of *Sirach* —the allusions to *Sirach* single out “συγγράψαι” and associate the sentence in 25.1 with the first sentence of the prologue of *Sirach*. The allusions to Demosthenes in the latter (καὶ ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν εἰς ... τὴν ἀνάγωσιν) link 25.1 (τοῦ γράφαι τὴν ἱστορίαν ταὐτὴν) to 1.4 (καὶ ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν εἰς).

---

761 *Rm* 16:25; see *Sir* 42:17.
762 *Sir* 43:33.
763 See *4 Mcc* 17:7.
764 See *2 Cor* 9:1.
765 See *Sir* prol. 12.
The sentence with συγγράψαι in the prologue of Sirach is also implied as one of the sources of the substantivized infinitive “τοῦ γράψαι” in 25.1 through the allusion to the paragraph in Romans 16 with the allusion to Esther, connecting “ό γράψας τὴν ἱστορίαν ταύτην” (1.1) and “ἐν ταῖς ἱστορίαις” (1.1) through Esther 8:12 (σκοπεῖν ... ἐκ τῶν παλαιοτέρων ἱστοριῶν). We have seen that allusions to the prophecy on Ariel in Isaiah 29 are incorporated into the paragraph with “σκοπεῖν” in Romans 16 and into the sentence with “συγγράψαι” in the prologue of Sirach. The implied reference to a “στιγμή” strengthens the link between “τοῦ γράψαι τὴν ἱστορίαν ταύτην” in 25.1 (based on συγγράψαι and ἐδωκεν ἑαυτὸν εἰς) and the allusion to the Temptation in 1.4 by singling out the account in Luke (ἐν στιγμῇ χρόνου). In addition, “στιγμή” (present in 25.1 through allusions to Isaiah 29 in the prologue of Sirach (τοῦ γράψαι) and in Romans 16 (ὅ γράψας)) associates the sentence with the phrase τοῦ γράψαι τὴν ἱστορίαν ταύτην in 25.1 with the account on the ἱστορία τοῦ Ἄδαμ in 13.1, since the latter features an allusion to the sign of the διαστολή (in Ex 8) in Joseph’s question, “τί δὲ εὐξομαί περὶ τῆς κόρης ταύτης;”

2 Corinthians

In the second letter to the Corinthians, the allusion to Demosthenes’ speech De corona is incorporated into an argument made by the apostle Paul, in chapter eight of the letter, for having abundance in the “χάρις ... τῆς διακονίας τῆς εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους”. Paul

766 See Lk 4:5.
exhorts the Corinthians first with the earnestness of others, presenting to them the example of the churches of Macedonia.

γνωρίζομεν δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν δεδομένην ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Μακεδονίας, ὅτι ἐν πολλῇ δοκιμῇ θλίψεως ἤ περισσεῖα τῆς χαρᾶς αὐτῶν καὶ ἢ κατὰ βάθους πτωχεία αὐτῶν ἔπερισσευσεν εἰς τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς ἀπλότητος αὐτῶν ὧστε κατὰ δύναμιν, μαρτυρία, καὶ παρὰ δύναμιν, αὐθαυτῇ μετὰ πολλῆς παρακλήσεως δεόμενοι ἡμῶν τὴν χάριν καὶ τὴν κοινωνίαν τῆς διακονίας τῆς εἰς τοὺς ἄγιους, καὶ οὐ καθὼς ἠλπίσαμεν ἀλλὰ ἐαυτοὺς ἐδωκαν πρῶτον τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ ἡμῖν διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ εἰς τὸ παρακαλέσαι ἡμᾶς Τίτον, ἵνα καθὼς προειρήξατο ὦς καὶ ἐπιτελεῖσθαι εἰς ὑμᾶς καὶ τὴν χάριν ταύτην.

With a personal pronoun in the plural as direct object and limited by a prepositional phrase with διὰ τοῦ + gen., “ἀλλὰ ἐαυτοὺς ἐδωκαν ... εἰς” suggests an allusion to De corona 179.

This paragraph is linked, through the phrase “τῆς διακονίας τῆς εἰς τοὺς ἄγιους ...”, to a sentence with the only infinitive of γράφειν in the writings of the Old and of the New Testaments substantivized with a definite article (τὸ γράφειν).768

περὶ μὲν γὰρ τῆς διακονίας τῆς εἰς τοὺς ἄγιους περισσόν μοι ἐστιν τὸ γράφειν γῆν ...”

This syntactical characteristic associates the sentence in 2 Corinthians 9 with the second sentence in 25.1 with the phrase γράφειν τὴν ἱστορίαν ταύτην.

In the second letter to the Corinthians we also find a link to the ἱστορία τοῦ Ἁδάμ in 13.1. The reference to the “παρθένος” (in περὶ τῆς κόρης ταύτης) and the wording and function of the summary of the “ἱστορία τοῦ Ἁδάμ” associate the text in PJ 13.1 with Paul’s account on his “ἀφροσύνη”, in 2 Corinthians 11:2-3:

767 See 2 Cor 8:8.
768 2 Cor 9:1.
769 The tense of the infinitive “γράφειν” (present) associates “τὸ γράφειν ὑμῖν” with two other sentences in the Second Letter to the Corinthians in which the verb is in the present tense—2 Cor 1:13 and 13:10.
Endings

The last sentence of *P. Bodmer 5* does not seem to be an integral, let alone exegetically necessary part of the text. The only visible link between the sentence and the text block is a verbal and morphological one—the substantivized participle “τῶ γράψαντι” in the second to last line mirrors “ὁ γράψας” in the *second* line of the page. The second participle—“τῶ ἀναγινώσκοντι” (in the last line with letters on the page)—does not have a similar counterpart in the text block; but it, too, is paired with its nominative—“ὁ ἀναγινώσκων”—and through it attached to the preceding text.

*P. Bodmer 5* is the only extant version of PJ with an explicit reference to ἀναγινώσκειν, in a sentence that additionally stands out—and is visually set apart—through its position beneath the last word of the text (αμην) and the last word of the title, at the bottom of the page. In most other versions, the text concludes with ἀμην, preceded by the last sentence. The first part of this sentence is a main clause with some variability in the wording of its beginning (usually ἔσται ἡ χάρις (or χαρά) μετὰ +gen.) and a uniform ending—the participial phrase “τῶν φοβομένων τὸν κυρίον ἡμῶν Ῥησοῦν Χριστόν”.

This part of the sentence corresponds to the “longer” ending of the text block of *P. Bodmer 5*

---

770 Probably an allusion to Sir 26:3 γυνὴ ἡγαθὴ μερίς ἡγαθῆ, ἢ μερίδι φοβομένων κυρίου δοθήσεται.
—“και εσταί η χαρίς μετα πάντων τῶν φοβοῦμενων τοῦ ΚΝ”. The second part, attached to the direct object of “τῶν φοβοῦμενων” through a relative pronoun, is in a larger number of manuscripts either “ὁ ἴδιον καὶ τὸ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας τῶν αἰώνων ἁμὴν” or “ὁ ἴδιον εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας τῶν αἰώνων ἁμὴν”.

The relative clause with “ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος” has two parallels in the writings of the Old and the New Testaments—one in chapter four of the First Letter of Peter, the other in chapter one of the Apocalypse of John. The version with “ἡ δόξα” has more models—it is found one time in the Old Testament and three times in the New. Thus shown to be formulaic and interchangeable, the two relative clauses seem to be of even less exegetical significance than the last sentence of P. Bodmer 5. But this first impression is as deceptive as it is in the case of the last sentence in the papyrus.

“ὁ ἴδιον καὶ τὸ κράτος”

The allusion to the Apocalypse has the same function as the references to ἀποκάλυψις and τὸ ἀναγινώσκοντι in P. Bodmer 5.

The participle “ὁ ἀναγινώσκων” is implied by the noun “ἀποκάλυψις” in the section with the four nouns “γενεσίς μαρίας ἀποκαλυψις Ιακώβ” of the beginning (α´).
and the title (μθ) of \textit{P. Bodmer 5}.\textsuperscript{776} Read as title, the noun suggests an allusion to the \textit{Apocalypse} of John. In the \textit{Apocalypse}, “ἀποκάλυψις” is the first word of the title of the book (’Αποκάλυψις ’Ιωάννου τοῦ θεολόγου) and the first word of the text (ἀποκάλυψις ’Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ).\textsuperscript{777} The dative “τῶν ἀναγινώσκων” in the last line of the last page of the papyrus hints that “ἀποκάλυψις Ιακωβ” in 25.2 refers to the beginning of the work (thus paralleling “Ιακωβ” to “’Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ”), as the preface of the \textit{Apocalypse} ends with a sentence with a reference to “ὁ ἀναγινώσκων”.

In the \textit{Apocalypse}, the sentence with “ὁ ἀναγινώσκων” is preceded by an allusion\textsuperscript{778} to the end of the vision of the μυστήριον of the seven stars and the seven lamps.\textsuperscript{779}

In \textit{Apocalypse} 1:2, the phrase connecting the two paragraphs—“γινέσθαι μετὰ ταῦτα”—is the direct object of “ἐμαρτύρησεν” at the end of a relative clause limiting the name “’Ιωάννης”:

ός ἐμαρτύρησεν τῶν λόγων τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τῆς μαρτυρίας ’Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὁσα εἶδεν καὶ ἀτινὰ εἰς καὶ ἀτινὰ χρῆ γενέσθαι μετὰ ταῦτα

The three clauses with pronouns echo the words addressed to John in \textit{Apocalypse} 1:20.

Γράφων οὖν ἂ εἴδες καὶ ἂ εἶσον καὶ ἂ μέλει γινέσθαι μετὰ ταῦτα. τὸ μυστηρίου τῶν ἐπτὰ ἀστέρων ὄν εἴδες ἐπὶ τῆς δεξιάς μου καὶ τὰς ἐπτὰ λυχνίας τὰς χρυσὰς

\textsuperscript{776}The position behind “Ἰακωβ” (the last of the four words of the title \textit{and} the beginning) aligns the last sentence on page μθ with the words “ἐν ταῖς ἱστορίαις τῶν ἤ β’ φυλῶν Ἰωάκειμ ηῷ” on page α’, which are in the same position relative to the four nouns as “εἰρήνη τῷ γραφαίτι καὶ τῷ ἀναγινώσκοντι” on page μθ (and of the same number of syllables).

\textsuperscript{777}In \textit{P. Bodmer 5}, the name “Ἰακωβ” takes the place of either “Ἰωάννου” or “’Ἰησοῦ”.

\textsuperscript{778}In \textit{M}³.

\textsuperscript{779}Apoc 1:19.
This connection between μαρτυρεῖν780 and γράφειν781—which rests on an allusion to Daniel 2 (See Dn 2:29, 45 δὲ εἷς γενέσθαι μετὰ ταῦτα)—is a first link to the second ending of the Gospel according to John,782 represented in almost all versions of PJ through the phrase “ὁ γράφας” in 25.1. This link is strengthened through other sources incorporated in the Apocalypse into the sentence on “ὁ ἀναγινώσκων”.

In Apocalypse 1:2-3, the direct object of ἐμαρτύρησεν (or of ὁ ἀναγινώσκων) underlines that, similar to “τῷ ἀναγινωσκοντι” in P. Bodmer 5 25.2, the participle in the Apocalypse does not have a clearly defined direct object. To be sure, “ὁ ἀναγινώσκων” seems to have the same direct objects as “οἱ ἀκούοντες ... καὶ περιοῦντες”—“τοὺς λόγους τῆς προφητείας” and “τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ γεγραμμένα”—and the pronoun “ἐν αὐτῇ” seems to refer to “τῆς προφητείας”, the nearest noun in the same number and gender. But whether this is actually the case (rather than merely an assumption) needs to be demonstrated first, by searching for analogies in the writings of the Old and the New Testaments in which the verb “ἀναγινώσκειν” and the direct objects fit the syntactical patterns present in the sentence.

Added to the text in P. Bodmer 5 through the combination of the noun (title) “ἀποκάλυψις” and the participle “τῷ ἀναγινωσκοντι” and in a number of manuscripts through the relative clause “ὁ ή δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας τῶν αἰώνων

---

780 Apoc 1:2.
781 Apoc 1:13.
The substantivized participle “ο ἀναγινώσκων” in *Apocalypse* 1:3 is an allusion to an answer by the Lord in the book of *Habakkuk*. In *Habakkuk*, the reference to “ο ἀναγινώσκων” is preceded by a clause with the imperative “γράφων”, similar to the parallel between γράφων and ο ἀναγινώσκων in *Apocalypse* 1:19 and 1:1-2. The allusion, in *Apocalypse* 1:3, to the word addressed to the prophet Habakkuk aligns “α ἐδεις καὶ α εἰσίν καὶ α μέλλεις γινέσθαι μετὰ ταύτα” (Apoc 1:3) with “ὁρασιν” (Hb 2:2) as direct objects of γράφων.

\[\text{γράφων ὄρασιν καὶ σαφῶς ἐπὶ πυξίοιν, ὅπως διώκῃ ὁ ἀναγινώσκων αὕτα, διότι ἐτί ὀρασις εἰς καρδίαν καὶ ἀνατελεί εἰς πέρας καὶ οὐκ εἰς κενὸν· ἐὰν ὑστερήσῃ, ὑπόμειναι αὐτῶν, ὅτι ἐρχόμενος ἥξει καὶ οὐ μὴ χρονίζῃ. ἕαν ὑποστείληται, οὐκ εὐδοκεῖ ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἐν αὐτῷ· ὃ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεώς μου ζησεται.}\]

The prediction on “ὁ δίκαιος” answers a question raised by the prophet in the “λῆμμα” seen by him—“ινα τι ἐπιβλέπεις ἐπὶ καταφρονοῦντας; παρασιωπήσῃ ἐν τῷ καταπίνειν ἀσέβη τῶν δίκαιων;”

The sentence on the just one is an intertext linking the paragraph with “ὁ ἀναγινώσκων” in *Apocalypse* 1:3 to the letters to the Romans and the Hebrews—“ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεώς μου ζησεται” is quoted in *Romans* 1:17 and in *Hebrews* 10:38.

---

783 The sentence in the *Apocalypse* has these cross-connections independent from the text to which is it attached. It can thus be used by an author to point readers to these sources (and the argument), and by readers to inform themselves about the author’s theory-related reference texts.
784 Hb 2:2-4.
785 Hb 1:4.
786 See Rm 10:5, 1 Esdr 19:29.
Both letters are incorporated into the text of PJ through allusions, in 1.1, 1.3, and 24.4 to the letter to the Hebrews, and in 13.1 and 24.4 to the letter to the Romans. The topic of “ἔνν” is additionally addressed in 1.3 through allusions to the fourth book of Maccabees, in 1.4,787 and in 24.4 through an allusion to Luke 23:47 in the description of Symeon the Elder in Luke 2:25, resting on the phrase ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος δίκαιος.

The paragraph in the book of Habakkuk on “ὁ ἀναγινώσκων” is interpreted in the Gospel according to Matthew and the Gospel according to Mark788 through Jesus’ answer to the question of the disciples about the σημείον τῆς σής παρουσίας καὶ τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος,789 caused by his prediction of the destruction (καταλύειν) of the buildings of the sanctuary. In both Matthew and Mark, the substantivized participle is the grammatical subject of the imperative “νοεῖτω”, in a sentence with a reference to “τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως”.790

οταν οὖν ἰδήτε τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Δανιὴλ τοῦ προφήτου ἐστὸς ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ, ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοεῖτω, τότε οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ φειγέτωσαν εἰς τὰ ὄρη ...

The references to “τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως” in Matthew and in Mark are preceded by the promise that “ὁ δὲ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος σωθῆσεται”,791 it is followed by the prediction of a “θλῆψις μεγάλη ὦ θαυματοποιημένη ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς κόσμου ἐως τοῦ νῦν οὐδ’ ὦ μὴ γένηται”. The sentences surrounding the participle in Matthew and Mark place the phrase “βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως” in chapter 12 of Daniel. The “βδέλυγμα τῆς

787 Through allusions to the quotations of Dt 8:3 in Mt 4:4 and Lk 4:4.
788 See Mt 24:15, Mk 13:14.
789 Mt 24:3; see Mk 13:4.
790 Mt 24:15-16; see Mk 13:14.
791 Mt 24:13, Mk 13:13; see Dn 12:1 θ’ καί ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ σωθῆσεται ὁ λαὸς σου πᾶς ὁ ἐφευρεθεὶς γεγραμμένος ἐν τῇ βιβλίῳ (see Ex 32:33, Rv 20:15), Dn θ’ 12:12.
“ἐρημώσεως” (LXX) (in Theodotion without the definite article) is mentioned at the end of the chapter, preceded by a question by Daniel, who did not understand an exchange of question and answer witnessed by him, and by a prediction. The chapter ends with an exhortation to rest, directed to Daniel, and an explanation

ἐτί γὰρ ἡμέραι εἰς ἀναπλήρωσιν συντελείας, καὶ ἀναστήσῃ εἰς τὸν κληρὸν σου εἰς συντελείαν ἡμερῶν.

The references to a great tribulation (θλὺς) and to being saved (σωθῆσεται) are at the beginning of chapter 12, followed by a prediction concerning those who are understanding, which in turn is followed by instructions for Daniel. (While “θλὺς μεγάλη” points to the description of a θλὺς at the beginning of the chapter in both versions, “σωθῆσεται” occurs only in Theodotion’s translation.)

The finite verb “συνῆκα” and the phrase “βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως” connect Daniel 12 to chapter nine of the book of Daniel, which begins with a reference to a number “ἐν ταῖς ββλοῖς” and the number of seventy years in Jeremiah, and ends with Gabriel’s
prediction on the βδέλυγμα. In Theodotion, the verb “συνῆκα” is part of a sentence on Jeremiah’s prophecy on the seventy years of the desolation of Jerusalem.

In the Septuagint, the verb is διευθήθην (see Dn 9:2, 12:8).

2 Chr 36:21.

1 Esdr 1:55.
grammatical case (the genitive)—two times in the book of Jeremiah,\textsuperscript{801} in a narrative linked to a report in the second book of Chronicles on the reading of a βιβλίον found in the house of the Lord in the reign of Josiah,\textsuperscript{802} and one time in Acts, in the story of Philip and the Ethiopian eunuch.\textsuperscript{803} The narrative in Jeremiah with the two participles leads to a part of the account on Josiah in the fourth book of Kings with the combination of references to λόγοι and γεγράμμενα found in the introduction of the Apocalypse.

Chapter 43 of the book of Jeremiah begins with an order, directed to Jeremiah, to take for himself a “χαρτίον βιβλίου” and write on it λόγοι that the Lord spoke to him (specified by topic and chronologically). The remainder of the chapter is devoted to descriptions of the writing of the λόγοι by Baruch from the mouth of Jeremiah and the reading, before the people and before the king, of the written text. The report on the reading of the χαρτίον in the presence of the king provides detailed information about the situational setting and even about the layout of the text: 804

καὶ εἰσῆλθον πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα εἰς τὴν αὐλήν, καὶ τὸ χαρτίον ἐδωκαν φυλάσσειν ἐν οἴκῳ Ἑλσαμά, καὶ ἀνήγγειλαν τῷ βασιλείᾳ πάντας τοὺς λόγους. καὶ ἀπέστειλεν ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ιουδαίων λαβεῖν τὸ χαρτίον, καὶ ἔλαβεν αὐτὸ ἐκ οἴκου Ἑλσαμά· καὶ ἀνέγγισεν Ιουδαίοι εἰς τὰ ὥτα τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ εἰς τὰ ὥτα πάντων τῶν ἀρχόντων τῶν ἐστηκότων περὶ τὸν βασιλέα.
καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐκάθησεν ἐν οἴκῳ χαιμερινῷ καὶ ἔσχαρα πυρὸς κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔγενε τὴν ἀναγινώσκοντος Ιουδαίων τρεῖς σελίδαι καὶ τέσσαρας, ἀπέτεμεν αὐτὰς τῷ ξυρῷ τοῦ γραμματέως καὶ ἔρριπτεν εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἐπὶ τῆς ἐσχάρας ἐως ἐξέλιπτεν πάς ὁ χάρτης.

\textsuperscript{801} The two references to “ἀναγινώσκοντος” in the Jeremiah are both (causally) linked—through the direct objects of ἀναγινώσκειν—to an order to Jeremiah in the eight year of the reign of king Ioakim of Judah (Jer 43:2), καὶ ἐν τῷ ἑναυτῷ τῷ τετάρτῳ Ιωακιμ οὐδὲ Ἱωα βασιλέως Ιουδαία ἐγεννήθη λόγος κυρίος πρὸς με λέγων Λαβέ σεαυτῷ χαρτίον βιβλίον καὶ γράψων ἐπ’ αὐτοῦ πάντας τοὺς λόγους, ὥσις εἰρημένα πρὸς ἐπὶ ἱεροσαλήμ καὶ ἑπὶ Ιουδαίων καὶ ἑπὶ πάντα τὰ ἐθνὶς ἀρὰ ἡμέρας καὶ ἡμέρας ταυτίς. The reference to the reign of king Josiah of Judah prepares an allusion, in Jer 43:24, to 4 Kgs 22:19, 11.

\textsuperscript{802} Connected to 1 Esdr 1 through a report on the observance of the feast of Passover; see 2 Chr 35:1-19.

\textsuperscript{803} See Acts 8:26-39 at 30.

804 The words written on the χαρτίον are revealed in Jer 43:29.
The account on the χαρτίν in Jeremiah lacks any reference to “ἐν αὐτῇ” or of “γεγράμμενα”. But the text does feature several allusions to etymologies and paradigms of γράφειν. Ξυρόν⁸⁰⁵ is a link to ξεῦειν and to the etymology of γράφαι; χειμερινός points to στοιχεία (cold and hot, wet and dry); the noun χάρτης is linked to χαράσσω⁸⁰⁶ and to χῶ (and thus to χώρα).⁸⁰⁷

The text in Jeremiah is explicitly connected to an account in the second book of Chronicles on two readings of books that took place in the eighteenth year of the reign of king Josiah of Judah—through the reference to the “days of Josiah” and through a comparison between the reactions of the two kings, implied by a description of what Ιωακιμ and his παίδες did not do:

καὶ οὐκ ἐξήτησαν καὶ οὺς διέρρηξαν τὰ ἵματα αὐτῶν ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ οἱ παίδες αὐτοῦ οἱ ἄκοινοις πάντας τοὺς λόγους τούτους.

The two phrases οὐκ ἐξήτησαν and οὖς διέρρηξαν τὰ ἵματα αὐτῶν contrast the event to the reading of a book before king Josiah, recounted in the second book of Chronicles.⁸⁰⁸ In 2 Chronicles, “ἀναγινώσκειν” is a finite verb.

καὶ ἀπήγγειλεν Σαφαν ὁ γραμματέως τῷ βασιλεί λέγων εὐβοίαν ἐδόκειν μοι Χελκίας ὁ λερεύς:
καὶ ἀνέγειρεν αὐτὸ Σαφαν ἐναντίον τοῦ βασιλέως, καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς ἦκουσεν ὁ βασιλεὺς τοὺς λόγους τοῦ νόμου, καὶ διέρρηξεν τὰ ἵματα αὐτοῦ.

⁸⁰⁵ E.g., see Orionis Thebani etymologicicon, ed. F. G. Sturz (Leipzig: Weigel, 1820, repr. 1973), 112.3 <Ξυρόν>.
⁸⁰⁶ E.g., see EG (Ἑλίδωρος - ὄμαι) 563.1-2, 3-7 <χάρτης> παρὰ τὸ χαράσσω ἢ παρὰ τὸ κείρω τὸ κόπτω. <χάρτης> παρὰ τὸ χῶ τὸ χωρ, ὁ μέλλων χήσω, τὸ διαχείμενον, παράγωγων ποιεῖ τὸ χαίρω, οὐκ εἰρήμενον ἐπὶ τούτῳ δοκεῖν μένον, τὸ χωρέον παρὰ δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ χαίρω χάρτης, χωρητικόν ὧν τῶν ἐγγραφομένων.
⁸⁰⁷ The nouns “χάρτης” and “χῶρα” are etymologically linked. E.g., see EM 807.25-27 <χάρτης>: παρὰ τὸ χῶ, τὸ χαῖρω, (ἄφ’ οὐ καὶ τὸ χαῖζω,) γίνεται παράγωγοι χαίρω, (οὐκ ἐπὶ τῆς χαρας,) χάρτης, ὁ χωρητικός τῶν ἐγγραφομένων, ἢ παρὰ τὸ χόρτος. For an example of this analogy in an interpretation of Is 8:1, see Epiphanius of Salamis, Panarion 1.374-76.
⁸⁰⁸ See 2 Chr 34:21, 26 ἐπηεῖν τῶν κυρίων; 34:19, 27 διαρρηγνύειν τὰ ἵματα.
The genitive “τοῦ νόμου” associates τοῦς λόγους—in the makarismos in the *Apocalypse* the direct object of ἀκούειν*—with two references to a “βιβλίου νόμου” in the account on the finding and handing over of a book by Hilkiah, the great priest.  

The combination of “λόγους” and “τὰ γεγραμμένα” in the makarismos in the *Apocalypse* corresponds to two sentences in the account on Josiah’s sending of men to a prophetess for “ζητεῖν τὸν κυρίον” because of the words read to him. The king speaks of the “λόγοι τοῦ βιβλίου τοῦ εὐρεθέντος” and of giving heed to the words of the Lord “τοῦ ποιῆσαι κατὰ πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦτῳ.” In her answer, the prophetess refers to “τοὺς πάντας λόγους τοὺς γεγραμμένους ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τῷ ἀνεγνωσμένῳ ἐναντίον τοῦ βασιλέως Ιουδα” (not specifying which king), followed by two references to λόγοι heard by Josiah (the king who searches for the Lord).

The second reference to reading is part of the making of the covenant, with 2 Chr 34:30 with “λόγους” as direct object of ἀναγινώσκειν. This time the grammatical subject of ἀνέγνω is “ὁ βασιλεύς”

καὶ ἀνέγνω, ἐν ὑστιν αὐτῶν τοὺς πάντας λόγους βιβλίου τής διαθήκης τοῦ εὐρεθέντος ἐν οἷκῳ κυρίῳ.

Unlike the accusative of “ἐν” in the *Apocalypse* (ἐν αὐτῇ), the accusative in *Chronicles* is a neuter singular (τὸ βιβλίον). “Ἐν αὐτῇ” suggests “βιβλίος”. the sentence to the other account on Josiah—in the first chapter of the first book of *Esdras*.

---

809 See Apoc 1:3.

810 2 Chr 34:14-15 καὶ ἐν τῷ ἐκφέρειν αὐτοὺς τὸ ἄργυρον τὸ εἰσοδιασθέν εἰς οἶκον κυρίου εύρεν Χελκίας ὁ ἵερεὺς βιβλίων νόμου κυρίου διὰ χειρὸς Μωσῆς. καὶ ἀπεκρίθη Χελκίας καὶ ἐπεν πρὸς Σαφαν τὸν γραμματέα Βιβλίων νόμου εύρον ἐν οἶκῳ κυρίου καὶ ἔδωκεν Χελκίας τῷ βιβλίον τῷ Σαφαν.

811 2 Chr 34:21.

812 2 Chr 34:24.
“ψ ἡ δόξα”

Brief though it is, and despite its seemingly formulaic character, placed in the last part of PJ and at one of its “ends” the relative clause “ψ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων ἀμήν” does have the same function as the sentence in PJ.

Without drawing on any other material, an analysis of the relative clause begins with assessing whether the text at hand is complete in the number of letters and syllables and “fixed” in the order of the μέρη λέξεως. The written text has 32 letters (i.e., 2x2^3), the spoken text has 15 syllables. Divided into lines with the same number of syllables, this results in two text blocks—3x5 or 5x3.

3x5 Syllables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>l</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>l</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>l</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ψ ἡ δόξα εἰς</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>ω ↓ σ</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>ω τ ↓</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>ω τ ↓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>τ ν</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>σ ω</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>σ ω</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αἰώνων ἀμήν</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>α ν</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>α τ ν</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>ν τ ν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Displaying the text in the shape of a “tile” (πλυνθηδόν, 5x3)\(^\text{813}\) or of a column (κηνονηδόν)\(^\text{814}\) yields additional acrostics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>l</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>l</th>
<th>l</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>l</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ψ ἡ δόξα</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ω</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ω</td>
<td>ω</td>
<td>ω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α εἰς τοὺς</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>α</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>ξ</td>
<td>ξ</td>
<td>σ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σ αἰῶνας</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>σ</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>α τ α</td>
<td>σ</td>
<td>σ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τῶν αἰῶν</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>τ</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>τ τ</td>
<td>ω</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ων ἀμήν</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ω</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>ν</td>
<td>ν</td>
<td>ν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Ξύσω”, the future tense of “ξύειν”, associates the relative clause with grammatical explanations of the etymologies of γράφειν.

\(^{813}\) See Grammatici Graeci 1.3.
\(^{814}\) See Grammatici Graeci 1.3.
15 is a triangular number. The text can, for this reason, be written in lines of reducing “syllabic” width ($\sigma\pi\epsilon\iota\rho\eta\delta\omicron\nu$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5+4+3+2+1</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>l</th>
<th>l</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>l</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\omega\ \eta\ \delta\omicron\xi\alpha\epsilon\iota\varsigma$</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$\omega$</td>
<td>$\omega$</td>
<td>$\sigma$</td>
<td>$\sigma$</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$i$</td>
<td>$i$</td>
<td>$\omega$</td>
<td>$\iota$</td>
<td>$\iota$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\alpha\iota\omega\nu\alpha$</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$\tau$</td>
<td>$\tau$</td>
<td>$\alpha$</td>
<td>$\alpha$</td>
<td>$\sigma$</td>
<td>$\sigma$</td>
<td>$\tau$</td>
<td>$\tau$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\varsigma\tau\omicron\omega\upsilon\alpha\iota\omega\nu$</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$\sigma$</td>
<td>$\sigma$</td>
<td>$\nu$</td>
<td>$\nu$</td>
<td>$\omega$</td>
<td>$\omega$</td>
<td>$\omega$</td>
<td>$\omega$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\omega\nu\alpha$</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$\omega$</td>
<td>$\alpha$</td>
<td>$\alpha$</td>
<td>$\alpha$</td>
<td>$\mu$</td>
<td>$\mu$</td>
<td>$\nu$</td>
<td>$\nu$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$\mu$</td>
<td>$\mu$</td>
<td>$\mu$</td>
<td>$\mu$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$\eta$</td>
<td>$\eta$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\eta$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$\eta$</td>
<td>$\eta$</td>
<td>$\eta$</td>
<td>$\eta$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$\nu$</td>
<td>$\nu$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\nu$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$\nu$</td>
<td>$\nu$</td>
<td>$\nu$</td>
<td>$\nu$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“$\Omega\mu\nu\nu$” occurs on both sides, depending on the “width” of the tip/base; the meaning of the letters “$\nu\omega\tau\omega$” (C) differs with the direction of reading—“$\nu\omega\tau\tilde{\omega}$” ($\nu\omega\tau\omicron\varsigma$) or “$\tilde{\omega}\tau\omega\nu$” ($\alpha\alpha\tau\omicron\nu$); “$\tilde{\iota}\tau\omega$” (C) is represented once in the Old Testament, in the story of the Golden Calf (Ex 32:26); almost as rare (in the OT and NT) is “$\iota\sigma\psi$” (B) (part of the prescription on the composition—$\sigma\upsilon\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$—of the incense).

With decreasing numbers of syllables per line, the appearance of the text is that of a “stable” triangle resting on its base ($\Delta$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1+2+3+4+5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\omega\ \eta\ \delta\omicron\xi\alpha\epsilon\iota\varsigma$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha\epsilon\iota\varsigma\tau\omicron\upsilon\nu\alpha\iota\omega\nu\alpha\varsigma\tau\omega$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\nu\alpha\iota\omega\nu\alpha\mu\eta\nu$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In its different shapes, the text demonstrate the derivation of gramma from grammh—geometrical shapes—and explanations of the term $\sigma\tau\omicron\iota\chi\epsilon\iota\alpha$ through $\sigma\tau\omicron\iota\chi\omicron\sigma$ and $\tau\delta\xi\varsigma$ (“$\tau\delta\xi\omega$”), linked to $\sigma\tau\iota\chi\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ and displaying text $\sigma\tau\iota\chi\eta\delta\omicron\nu$. The acrostics “$\xi\upsilon\sigma\omega$” and “$\xi\upsilon\omega\nu$”

---

815 I.e., it is the sum of the first five numbers: 1+2+3+4+5.
816 See Grammatici Graeci 1.3.
are explained etymologically as base of ξύλον, and linked to ξύω. This points to the
etymological explanations of the term “γράμμα” from “ξυσμα”, and the grammatical
explanation of γράψαι as ξυσαι (with examples from the ancients and from Homer). We
have encountered the relevant texts illustrating this (in Chapter 3); they stress shaving off
marks of aging, writing on plane surfaces, etc.

These acrostics are independent from the text in which the relative clause is included.
Therefore, the addition of the clause at the end of PJ does not have to imply that the text is as
carefully crafted as this clause. The next step for the exegete is, therefore, searching for
sources of the phrase (in the Old and New Testaments), and finding allusions to them in the
text to which the clause is attached.

Summary

Independent from the actual version of PJ, the different references to ἱστορία and a
method of glossing texts with “layered” allusions provide different ways through the text that
lead to common themes and sources (e.g., ξηραίνειν, στιγμή/διαστολή, ζῆν τῷ
θεῷ/ζήσε·ται). “Nested” allusions (to Esther and 1 and 2 Esdras) connect the reference to
the ἱστορίαι of the twelve tribes in 1.1 to “ὁ γράψαι τῇ ἱστορίαιν ταύτην”, a “layered”
allusion to the letter to the Romans and to the Gospel according to John. This link between
the beginning and the end of the narrative points to two related themes—apostasy, manifest

817 E.g., the summary of the deception of Eve in 13.1 is linked to the allusions to Romans and to 2 Corinthians
in 25.1; the reference to the vow “πρὸ τῇ κόρης ταύτης” connects a direct and an indirect allusion to Joshua
in chapter 1 to two indirect allusions in chapter 24.
in idolatry, resulting from intermarriage (the Baal of Phegor and Midian)—and preservation from corruption (the three young men); the latter is emphasized through allusion to ζήν τῆς θείας (etc.) in other parts of the narrative, and through allusions to texts with references to physiological concepts (the four elements, drying or melting, etc.).

Combined with this, we have seen allusions (to Maccabees) contained in the references to ἱστορία in 13.1 and 25.1 that provide a theoretical context by pointing to definitions of φιλοσοφία and to discussions on the relation between the spoken and the written word (Plato); a second pair of allusions led us to works addressing ἀνάγνωσις (and harboring allusions to theoretical works and concepts) (Sirach and 2 Corinthians).

Examples illustrating (and pointing to) teachings of γραμματική are also incorporated into the texts of all versions through the endings. Despite their seemingly formulaic and general appearance, these endings provide concise references to passages in the Old and the New Testaments illustrating reading and writing.

Together the thematic help and the guides to teachings enable the reader to examine and come to a better understanding of the text and its subject matter.
Conclusion

In the course of our discussion of *PJ*, elements of the work have shown themselves to be significant which have received comparatively little attention in modern scholarship—the introductions and endings of the individual manuscripts, and the relationship between the individual references to “ἵστορία” in the narrative.

When we examined the titles of two manuscripts we found that they are very carefully constructed and (numerically) integrated into the text. Acrostics and bisected columns with “shared lines” make it possible to detect changes in word order and interpolations; acrostics point to grammatical concepts or to other instances of the same words in the text, or comment on statements in the text of which they are elements.

A closer look at the references to ἱστορία revealed evidence suggesting that this making the text “unshakeable” aims at assuring that the text is a “synoptic” combination of text and (clarifying) commentary. Morphological and syntactical characteristics of the individual words and phrases bound together in a sentence or embedded in brief narratives, dialogues, or speeches have a *heuristic function*—they point to glosses in the text (such as paraphrases, repetitions, comparisons, or material for analogies) and to external sources.
through which a reader can expand, complete, and clarify concise passages. As part of a sentence, each element of such a concisely written allusion has a place in an argumentative order. The texts (and their counterparts) are additionally glossed through the narrative context and through repeated allusions to the same source at other points in the narrative. While such an interweaving of narrative and commentary helps clarify what is said, it also makes it necessary to transmit the written text without alterations—even when misspellings seem to require correction—since features of the text that may at first seem redundant or incorrect (including omissions or orthographic or syntactic errors) help to make things clear and allow the reader to deduce the narrative’s argument with its proposition.

In *P. Bodmer 5*, abbreviations (numbers are represented through numerals instead of their names), orthographic ambiguities, and corrections (e.g., emendations or cancellations) are used for synoptically displaying several texts on the same page and for pointing to different readings of the same written text. Theoretical discussions (on *στοιχεία* etc.) and technical vocabulary (*προφορικὸς λόγος*) highlight otherwise seemingly insignificant phrases (Anna’s lament). Visually distinctive corrections (*Ζαχαρίας*) help identify cross-references for comparisons and point to examples clarifying the usage of individual terms. Consideration of diction points to different readings of the story of the death of Zechariah.

While cross-references based on graphic features and corrections pointing to alternative readings provide guidance for the reader of *P. Bodmer 5*, the inclusion of help is not limited to a specific document. Elements of the text that provide guidance for the reader are preserved in all versions. To “bundle” the allusions to multiple sources, the authors of
the different versions use intertexts and readings of the same text. We have seen that, in spite of the multitude of examples and allusions, the author(s) rely on relatively few sources to give the narrative a structure and create a frame of reference. The four sentences with references to “ἰστορία” constitute pairs—“ἐν ταῖς ἱστορίαις τῶν δώδεκα φυλῶν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ” (1.1) and “ὁ γράφας τὴν ἱστορίαν ταῦτην” (25.1) are linked through a shared focus on γράμματα; double allusions in 1.1 to the books of Esther and 1 and 2 Esdras are taken up in 25.1 through readings of these texts in writings of the New Testament (John and Romans). Esther and Esdras are incorporated into the text of 2 Maccabees. Determining the referent(s) and subject matters of the reference to “ἰστορία” requires analogy. The other two references—to the “ἱστορία τοῦ Ἀδάμ” and “τοῦ γράφας τὴν ἱστορίαν ταῦτην” are linked through texts connected to each other through allusions to Demosthenes’ speech On the Crown and through references to ἀνάγνωσις. The narrative context provides glosses and points out cross-references. The texts highlighted in these sources include examples of στοιχεία and of technical terminology (e.g., στιγμή, διαστολή, ὀρίσμος).

Perhaps the most surprising elements are the seemingly very generic endings of the work. The one alludes to etymologies of grammata and γράφας (ξύσω) when different types of lines are used to display the text; the other leads to a paragraph at the beginning of the Apocalypse. The ending of P. Bodmer 5 corresponds to the ending in the Apocalypse; but at the same time, it aligns the treatise to works with more explicit treatments of reading and writing. Statements that seem to lack clarity—such as the last sentence of the preface of the Apocalypse—are written with conciseness and can be linked to specific sources.
Because finding a unifying structure has required determining the method (hermeneutics) appropriate to the text and applying it in the reading of the text, this study of *PJ* has become an exploration of the practical application of γραμματική as well as an inquiry into the mechanisms at work in assuring the tradition of *PJ*.

Clarifying the mode of reading and the structure and main sources for reading the text is only a beginning for a more in-depth study of *PJ* and the cultural background of the work. There has been no opportunity to examine the individual sources in depth (e.g., discussions of ekdosis, or determining the Christian examples illustrating usage), or to examine the examples of reading and writing highlighted and incorporated in the text (Lk 4 and Jer), or to assess allusions to Homer in the text (especially of *P. Bodmer 5*), or to discuss (near) contemporary (Origen) or later sources (Epiphanius) who refer to the work and document and demonstrate how it is read. Origen especially is an interesting case, since he is a grammarian and makes a reference to the “βιβλος Ἰακώβου” in a broader argument on reading and παράδοσις, and in commenting on a passage of the gospel followed by a discussion of the death of John the Baptist. Origen puts much emphasis on statements “περὶ τῆς ἀναλέοντος τοῦ προφήτου.” At the same time, the text of Book Ten of his commentary on the Gospel according to Matthew is also “περὶ τῆς γενέσεως”.

For me, a particularly exciting discovery is the cultural (anthropological) implications for the conceptualization of the relationship between the written and the spoken word, and

---

818 E.g., focusing on the structure and on technical and philosophical concepts (the theoretical background), analyzing the text with great attention to details and the subtle differences in wording, determining the boundaries of the different texts “stacked together” and then identifying the sources of the different μερη λέξεως and their shared referent(s).
between reader and text. Such conceptualizations can be inferred from measures taken by
the author to assure the unaltered transmission of the written text and of its meaning, and
from metaphors and comparisons in the grammatical manuals.

Previous discussions of the unity of the work have not sufficiently taken into account
the guides built into the text of the narrative itself and of the models with summaries,
outlines, σκοπός, and titles of the individual editions. This is the outcome of a view of the
written text as a static, silent (i.e., unvoiced) entity, whose accuracy can be measured against
some “ideal” text. This view is mirrored by a distancing (non-synergetic or non-dialogical)
stance towards the written text, on the presupposition that the text is meant to generate only
one reading (in written and spoken form).

The display of the text in a plane (ἐπιφάνεια) rather than in a line (γραμμή)—and
the split lines in which a word is formed from halves in the same lines of adjacent columns
(contrary to the linear, spoken manifestation of the word), as well as the etymological
connections between different parts of the narrative, or the notion of a φωνή ἐγγράμματος
point to a conceptualization of graphic representations and of words (spoken in time) and
images very different from our own.

Reading (clarifying) the text takes place through and in a dialogue between author
and reader and makes possible a “voicing” and making to “shine forth” of a human being’s
utterance, to be taken in by another person without distortions. This makes reading
essentially a process of translation (finding and bringing forth the λόγος appropriate to each
listener’s soul), but one requiring the reader’s purification (and illumination).
The text can be (and remain) opaque and still present to its readers mirror images of themselves, itself remaining silent, and/or it provides the means for generating (and finding) a “helper” (reader) like itself (and vice versa), and the reader is the instrument through which, and within whom, a φωνή comes to be (i.e., is completed as imprint or writing) or exists (in the reader’s movements).

*PJ* can serve as a teaching tool for applying (and thus practicing and remembering) classical and Late Antique principles of exegesis. But this is only one usage—it is also a diagnostic tool for the reader to learn to see what is not clear and to search for guidance and help.

Reading *PJ* and struggling with understanding what its says has taught me to listen and see more intently, to search for and delay judgment until the completion of an utterance and question preconceptions, to recognize and ask/search for explanation when passages are unclear to me, to wait for the revelation of the harmony and order that are always there but requires that I first hear the entire word and then “turn around” and see anew, from the proper distance and with open eyes, understanding how everything fits together in a harmonious, well-proportioned whole, and is simple, luminous, and unchanging, and at the same time manifold, complex, and dynamic.
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