

# Athanasius's Contribution to the Alexandrian Textual Tradition of the Pauline Epistles: An Initial Exploration<sup>1</sup>

**Gerald Donker**  
**Macquarie University**

1. Within the field of New Testament textual criticism there are traditionally three classes of witnesses; the Greek manuscripts, the various language versions and the evidence of patristic citations, particularly those of the Greek Fathers (Metzger 1968: 36ff). The distinct advantage of the Fathers is that they can be located both chronologically and geographically, and therefore they have the potential to supply valuable evidence which can contribute to a better understanding of the complex history of the New Testament text. The fact that the evidence of the Fathers has been an underutilized resource can be attributed to the difficulty in extracting reliable data from their writings. Other complicating factors may also be involved. For example, though a Father may predominantly use a form of text common to one particular location, he may also have used other text-types as a result of travel or permanent relocation, hence the need to analyse carefully the data gathered.<sup>2</sup> Given the importance of Athanasius as a pivotal fourth century Greek Father and his potential value as an important witness to the New Testament text in Alexandria, it may seem surprising that he has not received more attention in this area of research. Apart from numerous studies of Athanasius's theology, only relatively few have focussed on Athanasius's use of the Scriptures from a text-critical perspective, and none have as yet concentrated upon his use of the Pauline Epistles, the specific focus of this article. The closest relevant study is that of Brogan on the gospels text of Athanasius (Brogan 1997). However the results of his research in the gospels cannot be assumed for Athanasius's text of the Pauline Epistles. As noted earlier, the potential for the presence of 'mixed' texts has been recognized as a result of careful work on patristic sources over the last quarter of a century.<sup>3</sup> Indeed failure to take such factors into account in some previous studies has led to faulty conclusions as Fee has ably demonstrated (1971b: 302 ff). Therefore, while Brogan's study provides firm conclusions for the text of the gospels, his findings cannot be confidently extrapolated to the Pauline corpus and indeed the whole of the NT *Apostolos*.<sup>4</sup> For this reason a

---

<sup>1</sup> The present article is derived from a minor dissertation written in partial fulfilment of a Postgraduate Certificate in Research Preparation at Macquarie University, Sydney in 2006.

<sup>2</sup> Origen for example began his career in Alexandria but subsequently relocated to Caesarea (Ehrman et al. 1992: 8-9; Fee 1995: 193).

<sup>3</sup> A 'mixed text' occurs when a manuscript contains a number of different text-types. For example, Codex Alexandrinus (A, 02) witnesses to a Byzantine text-type in the Gospels but an Alexandrian text-type in Acts, the Pauline and Catholic Epistles and Revelation (Greenlee 1964: 39, 117-118).

<sup>4</sup> *Apostolos* refers to the contents of the New Testament apart from the Gospels (Osburn 2004: 1).

lacuna exists concerning text-critical study of Athanasius's use of the New Testament. While a comprehensive analysis is beyond the scope of the present article, it provides a useful preliminary investigation by providing a representative sample of Athanasius's quotations of the Pauline Epistles taken primarily from his most important dogmatic writings, the *Orationes I-III contra Arianos* (*Three Orations Against the Arians*) (Geerard 1974-87: 13; Migne 1857-1866: 12-468).<sup>5</sup> Since Brogan (not surprisingly) identified Athanasius's gospel text to be most closely aligned to the Alexandrian textual tradition, this type provides a logical focus for the current investigation. Therefore, Athanasius's epistolary quotations will be collated against a number of early representative witnesses to the Alexandrian text-type.<sup>6</sup>

2. An extended rehearsal of Athanasius's life is unnecessary here since it is covered adequately elsewhere (Pettersen 1995; Gonzalez 1970; Quasten 1960; Arnold 1991; Kannengiesser 1991); nevertheless, the basic details will provide a context for the following analysis and discussion. Athanasius was born in Alexandria sometime between 295 and 298 CE and was most likely educated in the catechetical school in Alexandria before being appointed a deacon by Bishop Alexander in 319. Athanasius attended the Council of Nicaea in 325 as Alexander's secretary and three years later succeeded him as bishop. Already the Arian heresy had risen as a threat to the unity of the church in Egypt with the potential to spread through the whole of the Eastern church, and Athanasius became the leading defender of Nicene orthodoxy. During his forty-five year tenure as bishop he was involved in the vicissitudes of political and ecclesiastical intrigues and was exiled five times for a total of seventeen years (Quasten 1960: 20 ff). It was during his third exile with the monks in the Egyptian desert (355-362) that he found time to produce a substantial body of writing, among which a general consensus includes his chief dogmatic works, the *Orations I-III contra Arianos*.<sup>7</sup> Their particular suitability for the present study is due

---

<sup>5</sup> Also Bright's reprint of the *Patrologiae Graeca* (Migne) text (Bright 1873). The *Orationes I-III contra Arianos* will hereafter be abbreviated as CA, with I-III being used to refer to the three *Orationes* together or I, II or III used to refer to the individual writings. The text of *Orationes I-II contra Arianos* is taken from the TLG (*Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*) database, which is based on the text of Migne (TLG updated 2 November 2006). Notwithstanding Fee's comments concerning the general (lack of) reliability of dated critical editions such as those of Migne, Kannengiesser notes that as regards the *Orationes*, a scholar can use Volume 26 of MPG (Migne *Patrologiae Graeca*) readily enough 'if he does so prudently' (Fee 1995: 193; Kannengiesser 1982: 982). At the time of analysis, critical editions of these two works were not yet available to the author. Critical editions of the *Orationes* have recently become available however in the Athanasius Werke Series and the text of *Orationes III contra Arianos* was checked and corrected against this edition (Metzler and Savvidis 2000).

<sup>6</sup>  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ ,  $\mathfrak{N}$ , B, 1739; A, C. The first four manuscripts represent the 'Primary Alexandrian' and the latter two the 'Secondary Alexandrian' tradition respectively (Metzger 1968: 216; Metzger and Ehrman 2005: 277 ff; Greenlee 1964: 118).

<sup>7</sup> Robertson posits a date of 356-360 for the *Orationes I-III contra Arianos* (Robertson 1892: 303). This date for the writing of the *Orationes* has however been the focus of some disagreement (Quasten 1960: 26). The primary reason for this is Athanasius's own statement in

to a higher concentration of Pauline references than in any of the other writings of Athanasius.<sup>8</sup> The dogmatic nature and specific focus of these *Orationes* explains the rather high concentration of references since they provide Athanasius with suitable biblical source material to refute the position of the Arians. In the *Orationes*, Athanasius writes an orderly, reasoned defence against Arius and his followers, though intended primarily for his congregations and the eremite monks.<sup>9</sup> Athanasius stepped into the forefront of the Arian controversy when he succeeded to the bishopric in 328. He continued to uphold the Alexandrine theological position he had inherited and became the champion defender of Nicaea while continuing to oppose the Arians. Athanasius, however, remained primarily a pastor, and his scholastic and literary efforts were expended towards safeguarding and encouraging orthodoxy amongst his congregations. Indications are that he had attained only a rudimentary knowledge of rhetoric, and he does not appear to have been trained in the Alexandrian philological and text-critical tradition (Brogan 1997: 14-16). His works are written in deliberate non-technical language, and while he could not be called an exegete as such this does not mean that he fails to employ exegesis in presenting his case. Rather his methodology is essentially hermeneutical, and his opposition to the Arian heretics was based on their flawed theological position rather than exegetical minutiae (Ernest 2004: 24; Gonzalez 1970: 291-92). On the other hand, Athanasius's amazing knowledge of and immersion in Scripture is evident everywhere in his writings, and he makes extensive references to Scripture

---

*Orationes contra Arianos* I.1, where he refers to the Arian heresy as one 'which has now risen as a harbinger of Antichrist ... since she has already seduced certain of the foolish'. It is doubtful that this could be said in the mid to late 50s of a heresy which had existed since the time of Alexander and Nicaea more than twenty years earlier. Therefore Loofs and Stülcken suggested a date around 338/9 (Quasten 1960: 26-27). On the other hand, in his 'First Letter to the Monks', generally considered to have been written in 358, Athanasius refers to the *Orationes contra Arianos* in such a way as to indicate their contemporary provenance rather than to a work produced twenty years before (Quasten 1960: 27). Kannengiesser's analysis of Athanasius's writings led him to deny a late date for the 'Letter to the Monks' and to postulate that Athanasius had first drafted a *Treatise against the Arians* (about 340) that was shortly afterwards (342-343) redacted and enlarged to become the *Orationes contra Arianos* (Kannengiesser 1982: 993-94). The scenario posited by Kannengiesser has not met with widespread support and must be considered tentative only. Nevertheless, even allowing for an early date suggests a maximum twenty year period (340-360) for the writing of the *Orationes*.

<sup>8</sup> Zamagni notes that this equates to approximately 15% of the total, which is about double what is found in other groups of works from Athanasius (Zamagni 2006: 571). This concentration can also be seen from a review of the tabular data provided by Ernest in his recent rhetorical-exegetical review of Athanasius's use of the Bible (Ernest 2004). In an appendix (B) Ernest lists all NT references in the works of Athanasius (as he determined them). For the Pauline Epistles approximately 45% of all references in Ernest's list are from the *Orationes I-III contra Arianos*. For comparison, the next closest, *Vita Antonii (Life of Antony)* contains approximately 12% of the references.

<sup>9</sup> Arianism was one of the early Christological heresies that caused the church to define more clearly the nature and divinity of the person of Christ; cf. Gonzalez 1970: 262ff.

both in refuting the faulty interpretation of his opponents and in providing an orthodox apologetic interpretation.

**3.** Before looking at Athanasius's epistolary quotations, a few issues should be noted concerning this type of textual analysis. Clearly only genuine writings of Athanasius should be used in text-critical studies, and any pseudepigraphic or non-genuine works must be rejected. For example, there has been some debate concerning the authenticity of the third *Oration against the Arians*. Kannengiesser, one of the foremost Athanasian scholars during the last quarter of a century, for a long time held doubts that Athanasius had written CA III, claiming instead that it had been written by his young protégé Apollinarius of Laodicea.<sup>10</sup> Kannengiesser however remained almost alone on this issue and there has been a chorus of scholarly opinion refuting Kannengiesser's exclusion of CA III as a genuine Athanasian writing.<sup>11</sup> The arguments supporting Athanasian authorship of CA III appear to have prevailed since Kannengiesser himself, as recently as 2003 stated in a presentation that he was no longer prepared to deny Athanasian authorship of CA III.<sup>12</sup> Therefore in this analysis of Athanasius's Pauline text, CA III is included as an authentic work. Another issue for consideration is the type of scriptural data that can be extracted from the writings of Athanasius or for that matter the writings of any of the Fathers. A review of Athanasius's writings makes it clear that he refers to the New Testament text in various ways. Sometimes he provides clear indication that what he says is a direct quote from Scripture. For example he might say 'Paul (has) written in his Epistle to the Romans' (ὁ Παῦλος ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ῥωμαίους ... γράφων) or 'as the Apostle has written' (ὡς γὰρ ὁ Ἀπόστολος ἔγραψεν) or 'the Apostle says' (φησὶ γὰρ ὁ Ἀπόστολος). At other times he simply says 'for it is written' (γέγραπται γάρ) or, 'says Scripture' (φησὶν ἡ γραφή). On other occasions there is no explicit indication that what is being quoted is based on or drawn from Scripture, but rather the pattern of words alone provides the clue. Therefore some method of classification is required which provides clarity as to what Pauline text Athanasius actually used. In line with contemporary text-critical studies of the Church Fathers, the three categories of Citation [C], Adaptation [Ad] and Allusion [All] are here used to classify his quotations of Scripture.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> Kannengiesser 1982: 995. His main reason for taking this position was due to perceived differences of structure and style in *CA III* when compared to the first two *Orationes*.

<sup>11</sup> Ernest 2004: 429-30; Appendix G. Brogan also adopted Kannengiesser's position on *CA III*.

<sup>12</sup> This retreat came after Kannengiesser had been 'moved' by the adverse scholarly argumentation (Ernest 2004: 430).

<sup>13</sup> Fee 1971a: 340; Fee 1971b: 304. Note the classifications below following the listing of sources for Athanasius' quotations.

4. Following are a selection of Athanasius's quotations of the Pauline Epistles taken primarily from the *Orationes I-III contra Arianos*.<sup>14</sup> The format of presentation for the data is as follows: each biblical reference is listed by book, chapter and verse. Then follows the Pauline text reproduced from the selected writings of Athanasius. This varies from whole verses to part of a verse only. Then below the text is indicated the source from *Orationes contra Arianos I-III*. Next the classification is indicated as to whether the reference is a Citation [C], Adaptation [Ad] or Allusion [All], presented in that order. A critical apparatus is separated from the verse references by a solid line. Significant variants are preceded by a bullet point • with the numbered readings arranged vertically and contain at least two readings which each have the support of at least two manuscript witnesses. Nonsignificant variants display the reading of Athanasius first, then the collation bracket ], followed by other readings separated by a semicolon.

5. The basis for collation is as follows: when the reference to a verse includes a single Citation, whether or not Adaptations and/or Allusions are also present, collation will be made against the Citation. In cases where there are multiple Citations and the texts conform exactly, then all the Citations collectively form the basis of the collation. Where there are multiple Citations for a verse which are not identical in form and order of the text, then the Citation marked with a double asterisk \*\* is used as the basis for collation. Certain genetically insignificant variants will not be noted. These include movable nu, itacism, nonsense readings and other minor spelling differences including the spelling of proper names (See Ehrman 1986: 34). Specific manuscripts that have significant lacuna and where reliable collation has not been possible will be noted with the symbol 'Lac.'<sup>15</sup>

#### 6. Rom 8.19

ἀπεκδεχομένη τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ  
*Or. II c. Ar. 63 [Ad]*

---

Lac. (P<sup>46</sup>) [τοῦ θεοῦ]<sup>16</sup>

<sup>14</sup> Quotations are also drawn from a number of other authentic works of Athanasius. These do not represent the full range of Athanasius's authentic works.

<sup>15</sup> Where part of a verse is lacunose the symbol 'inc.' (*incipit* = beginning with) followed by a Greek word will show where the witness begins, and the symbol 'expl.' (*explicit* = ending with) followed by a Greek word will show where that witness ends. In instances of lacunae in P<sup>46</sup> and where noted, Kenyon's edited (conjectural) reconstructions for the lacunose words (or parts thereof) will be used as the basis of collation where they are deemed to be plausible. Manuscripts with partial lacunae will be noted in brackets.

<sup>16</sup> θεοῦ is transcribed by Kenyon as *nomina sacra* here in P<sup>46</sup>, though these two words at the beginning of the line are lacunose. In the following collations all *nomina sacra* will be transcribed in full.

ἀπεκδεχομένη τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ Ath] τὴν ... θεοῦ ἀπεκδέχεται  
 P<sup>46</sup> § A B C 1739

### 7. Rom 8.22

αὐτὴ ἢ κτίσις συστενάζει καὶ συνωδίνει<sup>17</sup>  
*Or. II c. Ar. 45 [C]*

---

αὐτὴ Ath<sup>18</sup>] omit P<sup>46</sup> § A B C 1739

- 1. συστενάζει Ath § A B<sup>c</sup> C 1739
- 2. συνστενάζει<sup>19</sup> P<sup>46</sup> B\*

### 8. Rom 9.20

ἢ πῶς ἐρεῖ τὸ πλάσμα τῷ κεραμεῖ, τί με οὕτως ἐποίησας  
*Or. I c. Ar. 29 [Ad]*

---

Lac. (P<sup>46</sup>) [inc. πλάσμα ... expl. τί]; C

κεραμεῖ Ath] πλάσαντι P<sup>46</sup> § A B 1739

οὕτως ἐποίησας Ath] ἐποίησας οὕτως P<sup>46</sup> § A B 1739

### 9. Rom 11.29

ἀμεταμέλητα γὰρ τὰ χαρίσματα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἡ χάρις τῆς κλήσεως  
*Or. III c. Ar. 25 [C]*

---

<sup>17</sup> P<sup>46</sup> has συνωδεινει. However, since this is a clear case of itacism (and as noted above is not considered to be a significant variant) it is not listed as such. All further cases of itacism will be ignored.

<sup>18</sup> While the selection of quotations provided and the accompanying collations include a number of singular variants which, in a quantitative and group profile analysis, would be eliminated as genetically insignificant, they do here serve to demonstrate the scribal habits and inclination evident within the text (cf. Colwell and Tune 1964: 104).

<sup>19</sup> There is lacuna in P<sup>46</sup> for the first part of this word, Kenyon has provided a conjectural reconstruction as follows: συνστ]εναζει, though this appears to be an irregular construction.

---

χαρίσματα Ath] add καὶ ἡ κτίσις  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ ; add καὶ ἡ κλήσις  $\mathfrak{N}$  A B C 1739

καὶ ἡ χάρις τῆς κλήσεως Ath] omit  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$   $\mathfrak{N}$  A B C 1739

### 10. 1 Cor 1.21

ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἔγνω ὁ κόσμος διὰ τῆς σοφίας τὸν θεόν,  
εὐδόκησεν ὁ θεὸς διὰ τῆς μωρίας τοῦ κηρύγματος σῶσαι τοὺς πιστεύοντας  
*Or. de Inc. Verb.* 15.1 [C]<sup>20</sup>

ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἔγνω ὁ κόσμος διὰ τῆς σοφίας τὸν θεόν,  
ἠὲδόκησεν ὁ θεὸς διὰ τῆς μωρίας τοῦ κηρύγματος σῶσαι τοὺς πιστεύοντας  
*Or. II c. Ar.* 81 [C]; *Or. II c. Ar.* 16 [C]

ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἔγνω ὁ κόσμος διὰ τῆς σοφίας τὸν θεόν  
*Or. II c. Ar.* 79 [C]

---

θεοῦ Ath  $\mathfrak{N}$  A B C 1739] κόσμου<sup>21</sup>  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$

### 11. 1 Cor 4.6

ταῦτα δέ μετεσχημάτισα εἰς ἑμαυτὸν καὶ ἀπολλῶ, ἵνα ἐν ἡμῖν μάθητε τὸ μὴ ὑπὲρ  
ἂ γέγραπται φυσιοῦσθαι  
*Or. III c. Ar.* 21 [C]

---

ταῦτα δέ Ath ] ταῦτα δέ ἀδελφοί  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$   $\mathfrak{N}^c$  A B C 1739; ταῦτα ἀδελφοί  $\mathfrak{N}^*$

<sup>20</sup> The following lists the full title and abbreviations for works referred to in the quotations above:

<b>Title of Athanasius's Writings:</b>	<b>Abbreviated Title</b>
<i>Oratio contra Gentes</i> (Thomson 1971; Leone 1965)	<i>Or. c. Gentes</i>
<i>Oratio de Incarnatione Verbi</i> (Kannengiesser 1973)	<i>Or. de Inc. Verb.</i>
<i>Orationes I-III contra Arianos</i>	<i>Or. I, II, III c. Ar.</i>
<i>Epistula ad Epictetum</i> (Ludwig 1911)	<i>Ep. ad Epic.</i>
<i>Epistula ad episcopos Afros</i> (Brennecke et al. 2006)	<i>Ep. ad Afros</i>
<i>Tomus ad Antiochenos</i> (Brennecke et al. 2006)	<i>Tom. ad Ant.</i>

<sup>21</sup> Kenyon notes the error; [κοσμου] sic per errorem pro θεου (Kenyon 1936: 53).

ἀπολλῶ Ath] ἀπολλῶν δι' ὑμᾶς **ℵ\*** A B 1739; ἀπολλῶ δι' ὑμᾶς **℘<sup>46</sup> ℵ<sup>c</sup>** C

γέγραπται Ath] add ἵνα μὴ εἶς ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἑνός **℘<sup>46</sup> ℵ\*** A B C 1739; add φρονεῖν ἵνα μὴ εἶς ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἑνός **ℵ<sup>c</sup>**

### 12. 1 Cor 11.9

οὐ γὰρ ἐκτίσθη (φησὶν ἡ γραφή) ἀνὴρ διὰ τὴν γυναῖκα ἀλλὰ γυνὴ διὰ τὸν ἄνδρα  
*Or. II c. Ar. 30 [C]*

---

οὐ γὰρ Ath] γὰρ οὐκ **℘<sup>46</sup> ℵ** A B C 1739

ἄνδρα Ath **ℵ** A B C 1739] ἄνθρωπον **℘<sup>46</sup>**

### 13. 1 Cor 15.47

ὁ δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ  
*Or. I c. Ar. 44 [C]*

ἐξ οὐρανοῦ<sup>22</sup>  
*Or. III c. Ar. 55 [C]*

- 
- 1. ἄνθρωπος Ath **ℵ\*** B C 1739
  - 2. ἄνθρωπος πνευματικός **℘<sup>46</sup>**
  - 3. ἄνθρωπος ὁ κύριος **ℵ<sup>c</sup>** A

### 14. 2 Cor 5.17

ὥστε εἴ τις ἐν Χριστῷ, καινὴ κτίσις, τὰ ἀρχαῖα παρῆλθεν, ἰδοὺ γέγονεν τὰ πάντα καινά  
*Or. II c. Ar. 65 [C]\*\**

τὰ ἀρχαῖα παρῆλθεν, ἰδοὺ γέγονε καινά +<sup>23</sup>  
*Ep. ad Afros 5.4 [C]<sup>24</sup>*

---

<sup>22</sup> Though there are numerous references to the phrase ἐξ οὐρανοῦ in the New Testament, only 1 Cor 15.47 clearly uses it to refer to Christ, the Second Man over against the First Man (Adam), who was from the earth. Cf. Mt 21.25, 28.2; Mk 11.30, 11.31; Lk 3.22, 11.13, 11.16, 20.4, 20.5; Jn 1.32, 6.58; 2 Cor 5.2; Gal 1.8; 2 Pet 1.18.

ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ καινὴ κτίσις  
*Or. II c. Ar. 69 [Ad]*

---

τὰ πάντα Ath<sup>25</sup>] omit  $\mathfrak{D}^{46}$   $\mathfrak{N}$  A B C 1739

### 15. 2 Cor 5.19

θεὸς ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμον ἑαυτῷ καταλλάσσω  
*Or. III c. Ar. 6 [C]*

---

Lac. A

ἑαυτῷ καταλλάσσω Ath] καταλλάσσω ἑαυτῷ  $\mathfrak{D}^{46}$  B C 1739; καταλάσσω  
 ἑαυτῷ  $\mathfrak{N}$

### 16. 2 Cor 6.16

ἡμεῖς γὰρ ναὸς θεοῦ ἑσμεν ζῶντος  
*Or. I c. Ar. 16 [C]*

ἐνοικήσω ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐμπεριπατήσω  
*Tom. ad Ant. 1.2 [C]*

---

Lac. A

- 1. θεοῦ ἑσμεν Ath  $\mathfrak{N}^*$  B 1739
- 2. θεοῦ ἔστε  $\mathfrak{D}^{46}$  C
- 3. ἔστε θεοῦ  $\mathfrak{N}^c$

---

<sup>23</sup> Where any text is part of a longer uninterrupted reference consisting of multiple verses, this is indicated by the plus symbol + placed at the end of one verse and the beginning of the next.

<sup>24</sup> While he omits here τὰ πάντα, it cannot be reasonably argued that Athanasius knew two versions, one with and one without. Note Fee concerning a similar issue in Origen's text, where he states that 'One surely is not prepared, on the basis of the shortened form of citation, to argue that Origen is using two different texts, one with and one without the clause!' (Fee 1971b: 303). Therefore, the collation is made against the longer text.

<sup>25</sup> Elliott notes Athanasius's reading in mss 440, 216, 1149, 491 (Elliott 1969: 348).

ναὸς Ath  $\mathfrak{D}^{46}$   $\mathfrak{N}$  B C] ναοὶ 1739

### 17. Gal 3.13

ἐξηγόρασεν ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῆς κατάρας  
*Or. II c. Ar. 47 [C]*

Χριστὸς γέγονεν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κατάρα  
*Or. II c. Ar. 47 [Ad]*

ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν γενόμενον κατάραν  
*Or. III c. Ar. 33 [Ad]*

Χριστὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν γέγονε κατάρα  
*Ep. ad Epic. 8.7-8 [Ad]*

ἐγένετο κατάρα  
*Or. de Inc. Verb. 25.2 [All]*

---

ἐξηγόρασεν ἡμᾶς Ath] ἡμᾶς ἐξηγόρασεν  $\mathfrak{D}^{46}$   $\mathfrak{N}$  A B C 1739

### 18. Eph 1.3

εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,<sup>26</sup> ὁ εὐλογήσας  
ἡμᾶς ἐν πάσῃ εὐλογίᾳ πνευματικῇ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ +  
*Or. II c. Ar. 75 [C]*

---

Lac. C

τοῦ κυρίου Ath  $\mathfrak{D}^{46}$   $\mathfrak{N}^c$  A B 1739] τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος  $\mathfrak{N}^*$

ἡμᾶς Ath  $\mathfrak{D}^{46}$   $\mathfrak{N}^c$  A B 1739] omit  $\mathfrak{N}^*$

ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ Ath] ἐν Χριστῷ  $\mathfrak{D}^{46}$   $\mathfrak{N}$  A B 1739

### 19. Eph 1.5

---

<sup>26</sup> εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ omitted in  $\mathfrak{D}^{46}$  per homoioteleuton as noted by Kenyon (Kenyon 1936: 119). Colwell and Tune classify homoioteleuton as an example of a ‘Dislocated Reading’ and claim that such errors cannot be utilized as significant genetic variants (Colwell and Tune 1964: 102).

+ προορίσας ἡμᾶς εἰς υἰοθεσίαν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς αὐτόν  
*Or. II c. Ar. 75 [C]*

κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ  
*Or. III c. Ar. 61 [C]*

ἡμᾶς προώρισεν εἰς υἰοθεσίαν  
*Or. II c. Ar. 76 [Ad]*

εὐδοκία καὶ θελήματι  
*Or. III c. Ar. 64 [All]*

Lac. C

διὰ Ath **§** A B 1739] omit  $\mathcal{P}^{46}$

Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ Ath  $\mathcal{P}^{46}$  **§** A 1739] Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ B

## 20. Eph 1.13

καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐσφραγίσθητε τῷ πνεύματι τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τῷ ἁγίῳ  
*Or. I c. Ar. 47 [C]*

Lac. C

ὑμεῖς Ath] add ἀκούσαντες τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς σωτηρίας  
 ὑμῶν ἐν ᾧ καὶ πιστεύσαντες  $\mathcal{P}^{46}$  **§** A B 1739

ἐσφραγίσθητε Ath  $\mathcal{P}^{46}$  **§** A 1739] ἐσφραγίσθη B

## 21. Eph 2.15

+ τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασι καταργήσας, ἵνα τοὺς δύο κτίσῃ ἐν ἑαυτῷ  
 εἰς ἓνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον, ποιῶν εἰρήνην  
*Or. II c. Ar. 55 [C]*

τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασι καταργήσας, ἵνα τοὺς δύο κτίσῃ ἐν ἑαυτῷ εἰς  
 ἓνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον  
*Or. II c. Ar. 46 [C]*

Lac. C

- 1. ἑαυτῶ Ath **S**<sup>c</sup>
- 2. αὐτῶ **P**<sup>46</sup> **S**\* A B 1739

ἐν δόγμασι Ath **S** A B 1739] omit **P**<sup>46</sup>

καινὸν Ath **S** A B 1739] κοινὸν **P**<sup>46</sup>

## 22. Eph 4.9

τῶν κατωτέρων μερῶν τῆς γῆς  
*Or. I c. Ar. 45 [Ad]\**

---

τῶν κατωτέρων μερῶν Ath] κατώτερα **P**<sup>46</sup>; τὰ κατώτερα μέρη **S** A B C 1739

## 23. Eph 4.10

καταβὰς, αὐτὸς ἐστὶ καὶ ὁ ἀναστάς  
*Or. I c. Ar. 44 [Ad]\**

πεπλήρωκεν αὐτὸς συνῶν τῶ ἑαυτοῦ πατρί  
*Or. de Inc. Verb. 8.1 [All]*

---

ἀναστάς Ath] ναβὰς<sup>27</sup> **P**<sup>46</sup>; ἀναβὰς **S** A B C 1739

## 24. Phil 2.5

τοῦτο φρονείσθω ἐν ὑμῖν ὃ καὶ ἐν Χριστῶ Ἰησοῦ +  
*Or. I c. Ar. 40 [C]*

- 1. τοῦτο Ath **S**\* A B C
- 2. τοῦτο γὰρ **P**<sup>46</sup> **S**<sup>c</sup> 1739

φρονείσθω Ath] φρονεῖτε **P**<sup>6</sup> **S** A B C 1739

## 25. Phil 2.7

---

<sup>27</sup> Kenyon notes ναβας as 'per errorum pro αναβας' (Kenyon 1936: 125).

+ ἀλλ' ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσε μορφὴν δούλου λαβὼν, ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων  
γενόμενος, καὶ σχήματι εὐρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος +  
*Or. I c. Ar. 40 [C]; Or. III c. Ar. 29 [C]*

---

ἀνθρώπων Ath **Σ** A B C 1739] ἀνθρώπου  $\mathcal{P}^{46}$

## 26. Col 1.16

+ ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, τὰ  
ὄρατα καὶ τὰ ἀόρατα, εἴτε θρόνοι εἴτε κυριότητες εἴτε ἀρχαὶ εἴτε ἐξουσίαι· τὰ  
πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἐκτισται +  
*Or. II c. Ar. 45 [C]*

ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα  
*Or. II c. Ar. 62 [C]*

+ ὅτι δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκε τὰ πάντα τὰ τε ὄρατα καὶ τὰ ἀόρατα  
*Or. c. Gentes 41.27-30 [Ad]*

εἴτε ἄγγελοι εἴτε ἀρχάγγελοι εἴτε ἀρχαὶ  
*Or. II c. Ar. 49 [Ad]*

ἀρχάς τε καὶ ἐξουσίας καὶ θρόνους καὶ κυριότητας  
*Or. III c. Ar. 10 [Ad]*

καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα  
*Or. II c. Ar. 31 [Ad]*

---

- 1. πάντα τὰ Ath **Σ**<sup>c</sup> A B

- 2. πάντα  $\mathcal{P}^{46}$  **Σ**\* 1739

- 3. πάντα τὰ τε C

- 1. οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ Ath **Σ**<sup>c</sup> A B C

- 2. οὐρανοῖς καὶ  $\mathcal{P}^{46}$  **Σ**\* 1739

καὶ τὰ ἀόρατα Ath  $\mathcal{P}^{46}$  **Σ** A B C] καὶ ἀόρατα 1739

ἐξουσίαι τὰ Ath **Σ** A B C 1739] ἐξουσίαι ὅτι  $\mathcal{P}^{46}$

## 27. Col 1.18

καὶ αὐτός ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας  
*Or. c. Gentes* 41.30 [C]

αὐτός ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ τοῦ σώματος τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ὅς ἐστιν ἀρχή, πρωτότοκος  
 ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, ἵνα γένηται ἐν πᾶσιν αὐτὸς πρωτεύων  
*Or. II c. Ar.* 65 [C]\*\*

ὅς ἐστιν ἀρχή, πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, ἵνα γένηται ἐν πᾶσιν αὐτὸς  
 πρωτεύων  
*Or. II c. Ar.* 60 [C]

• 1. ἐστιν<sup>bis</sup> Ath **Σ** A B

2. ἐστιν ἡ **ℙ**<sup>6</sup> 1739

• 1. πρωτότοκος ἐκ Ath **Σ**<sup>c</sup> A B 1739

2. πρωτότοκος **ℙ**<sup>46</sup> **Σ**\*

ὅς Ath **Σ** A B 1739] ὁ **ℙ**<sup>46</sup>

## 28. Heb 1.3

ὅς ὢν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ  
*Ep. ad ep. Aeg. et Lib.* 13.22-23 [C]; *Or. I c. Ar.* 12 [C]; *Or. II c. Ar.* 32 [C]; *Or. III c. Ar.*  
 65 [C]; *Ep. ad Afros* 4.3 [C]

δι' ἑαυτοῦ καθαρισμόν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν ποιησάμενος, ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς  
 μεγαλωσύνης ἐν ὑψηλοῖς +  
*Or. I c. Ar.* 55 [C]

ὅς ὢν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης  
*Or. I c. Ar.* 24 [C]; *Or. III c. Ar.* 59 [C]

Lac. C

• 1. δι' ἑαυτοῦ Ath 1739

2. δι' αὐτοῦ **ℙ**<sup>46</sup>

3. αὐτοῦ **Σ** A B

• 1. ἡμῶν Ath **Σ**<sup>c</sup>

2. omit **ℙ**<sup>46</sup> **Σ**\* A B 1739

## 29. Heb 8.6

νυν<sup>28</sup> δὲ διαφορωτέρας τετύχηκε λειτουργίας, ὅσω καὶ κρείττονός ἐστι διαθήκης  
 μεσίτης, ἥτις ἐπὶ κρείττοσιν ἐπαγγελίαις νενομοθέτηται  
*Or. I c. Ar. 59 [C]*

---

Lac. C

- 1. τετύχηκε Ath 1739
- 2. τέτυχεν  $\mathcal{P}^{46}$  A B  $\mathfrak{N}$
- 1. ἐστι διαθήκης Ath  $\mathfrak{N}^*$  A B 1739
- 2. διαθήκης ἐστίν  $\mathcal{P}^{46}$   $\mathfrak{N}^c$

κρείττονός Ath  $\mathcal{P}^{46}$   $\mathfrak{N}$  A B 1739] κρείττονοσιν  $\mathfrak{N}^*$ ; κρείττονό  $\mathfrak{N}^c$ <sup>29</sup>

### Athanasius's Quotation Methods

**30.** Three specific approaches are evident concerning the way in which Athanasius quotes the Pauline Epistles.

**31. a) Accurate quotations from memory.**<sup>30</sup> The variants listed above should not detract attention from the relatively high level of agreement in quotations between Athanasius and  $\mathcal{P}^{46}$ . Many quotations are verbally exact. Most, however, are not long quotations, being one verse or just one part of a verse. While it is possible that in such cases Athanasius has chosen to turn to his exemplar, the minor variants that do exist suggest that it is much more likely that he is quoting from memory and notwithstanding these variants, generally quotes accurately.

**32. b) Adaptation/modification of short quotations from memory.**<sup>31</sup> It is also evident that Athanasius syntactically adapts quotations when necessary to suit the grammatical context. In such cases, however, there is no intent to modify the meaning of the text. On some occasions he

---

<sup>28</sup> The first hand of  $\mathcal{P}^{46}$  also wrote νυν with a (corrected) ι added superlinearly.

<sup>29</sup> A clear case of homoioteleuton here in  $\mathfrak{N}$  with the correction added below the text column.

<sup>30</sup> Citations, no variants: Rom 8.29, 35; 9.5, 32; 12.3; Heb 1.1, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12; 4.12, 13; 7.22; 9.24; 10.20; 1 Cor 1.24; 3.11, 16; 2 Cor 1.10; 2.11; 5.21; 12.2; Eph 1.4, 11; 2.14; 4.4, 24; 5.1, 2, 27; Gal 4.6, 8; Col 1.17.

<sup>31</sup> Adaptations: Rom 8.19, 21; 9.5, 13, 19, 20; 11.34; Heb 1.6, 12; 3.2, 5, 6; 4.12; 6.20; 9.24; 1 Cor 1.10, 24; 2.8; 3.10; 8.6; 11.7; 2 Cor 3.16, 17; Eph 1.5, 18; 2.10; 3.7, 15; 4.9, 10; Gal 3.13; Phil 2.7, 8, 9, 10; 3.13; Col 1.16, 17.

does deliberately ‘mould’ the content. One way this is achieved is by selective omission of specific content so as to shape the remaining text to present a particular theology that may not have been explicit in the biblical text itself.<sup>32</sup> This type of adaptation of the text Brogan refers to as ‘corruption’, though he points out that the term must not be understood as being only pejorative but can have also a value-neutral meaning (Brogan 1997: 261ff).<sup>33</sup>

**33. c) Accurate quotation of longer references by citing from an exemplary text.**<sup>34</sup> There are a number of extended quotations (multiple verses) that show such high and often exact verbal agreement that it would seem more likely that Athanasius has transcribed these references directly from his textual exemplar.<sup>35</sup> It is possible that such was his memorisation of Scripture that even these quotations could be reproduced without reference to his exemplar. The degree of verbal accuracy, however, renders this unlikely, though even were this the case it does not detract from the fact that these longer quotes accurately represent Athanasius’s biblical text. He was far more accurate and consistent in his citations of Scripture than Origen. Metzger claims that Origen was ‘notorious’ in that he ‘seldom quotes a passage twice in precisely the same words’ (Metzger 1968: 87).<sup>36</sup> Athanasius’s far greater consistency is particularly evident where he has multiple citations of the same verse.<sup>37</sup> This suggests that Athanasius has memorized Scripture to a far greater extent than Origen, and as a result his quotations were more accurate. A further factor which must be taken into account is the use of dictation as a means by which the Father’s works were produced. Origen, for example, commonly used amanuenses in the production of his commentaries and would often refer to a Scripture passage by just a few catch-words. Then later the amanuensis would be required to look up the reference in a biblical exemplar and insert it into Origen’s text (Metzger 1968: 88). The different text-types that can be

---

<sup>32</sup> Brogan also notes that Athanasius ‘occasionally “corrupted” his text of the Gospels by omitting portions from his citations’ (Brogan 1997: 264).

<sup>33</sup> Note the further discussion on this aspect following.

<sup>34</sup> E.g., Heb 2.1-3 (46 words- no variants); Heb 2.14-3.2 (103 words- 1 variant); Phil 2.8-11 (47 words- 1 variant).

<sup>35</sup> Nordberg claims that it is ‘obvious’ that Athanasius’s method was to transcribe selected quotations which he intended to use as the basis for his tracts, though Nordberg provides no further justification for this remark (Nordberg 1962: 121). Certainly the evidence indicates this as one likely scenario, but the claim that it is ‘obvious’ appears too ambitious. The process of transcribing the biblical text from an exemplar may not necessarily have occurred as a prior step but rather may have taken place during the writing of his tracts.

<sup>36</sup> Metzger may be overstating the case since Ehrman, Fee and Holmes note that Origen was also capable of quoting a verse ‘in exactly the same way on several occasions’ (Ehrman et al. 1992: 23).

<sup>37</sup> E.g., Heb 1.3; 2.14; 3.1-2; 13.8; 1 Cor 1.21; Phil 2.6-10; Col 1.18..

identified in Origen's longer quotations of Scripture can be explained by assuming that the various amanuenses used multiple exemplars which contained different text-types. Such characteristics do not appear in Athanasius's writings. Though in his early career he acted as secretary to Alexander, when Athanasius became bishop he appears to have maintained more direct control over the writing of his works than Origen. Athanasius's ability to quote copious passages of Scripture from memory ensured general consistency in text-type, and his practice of directly transcribing longer passages explains the extremely high word for word accuracy in many of his quotations.

### Longer Readings and Scribal Activity in Athanasius's Text of the Pauline Epistles

**34.** It is generally recognized that the writings of the Fathers have their own textual history and have not been free from scribal influence (Fee 1995: 193). One of the most common tendencies was for later scribes to conform references to the biblical text in particular to a later text-type with which these scribes were themselves more familiar, specifically that of the Majority (Byzantine/Koine) text-type, which in general was a longer text-type. A review of the variants listed above show that generally Athanasius witnesses to a slightly longer text than that of  $\mathcal{P}^{46}$ .<sup>38</sup> This may involve the addition (in the case of Athanasius's text) of just one word, such as the article.<sup>39</sup> In the majority of cases where Athanasius's text is the longer reading it is more closely aligned to the later Majority text-type.<sup>40</sup> But what does this say about the reliability of Athanasius's quotations as a witness to an early form of the biblical text? In New Testament text-criticism a long held canon has been that of *lectio brevior potior*, that is, the shorter reading is taken to be more likely the original, since, it is argued, scribes generally tended to add material and expand the text rather than omit (Metzger 1968: 120). On the basis of the above principle, in the numerous instances where  $\mathcal{P}^{46}$  witnesses to a shorter text than Athanasius, the text of  $\mathcal{P}^{46}$  would be taken to have more likely preserved the original reading, especially since it is unencumbered by the sort of textual history which the writings of Athanasius have endured. However, a note of caution needs here to be sounded since the principle of the shorter reading has in the last number of decades come under renewed scrutiny.<sup>41</sup> In Colwell's study of three

<sup>38</sup> E.g., Rom 11.29; Heb 1.3, 4; 13.8; 1 Cor 15.21; 2 Cor 5.17; Eph 1.3, 5; 2.15; 4.9; 5.14; Phil 2.6; Col 1.16, 18.

<sup>39</sup> Sometimes Athanasius witnesses to a shorter text, though this is generally due to deliberate action by Athanasius for theological reasons that will be discussed later. Refer to section c) for further discussion on this issue.

<sup>40</sup> E.g., Col 1.16; Phil 2.5. However, not all Majority readings in *CA I-III* can be attributed to later scribal activity. Nordberg claims that as regards Athanasius's writings *CA I-III* and *Vita Ant. (Life of Antony)*, 'they are the only writings investigated in which  $\mathfrak{M}$  [Majority text-type] plays any part.'

<sup>41</sup> For example, Epp notes that the shorter reading argument 'has received the most vigorous reassessment in the past three decades or so' (Epp 2002: 27).

early NT papyri, he noted that the scribes more frequently omitted than added material, challenging the common wisdom (Colwell 1965). Royce expanded the study by adding other papyri and came to the same conclusion (Royce 1995).<sup>42</sup> Therefore, while on the whole Athanasius witnesses to a slightly longer text than  $\mathcal{P}^{46}$ , caution is advised before dismissing these longer readings in Athanasius as secondary. Certainly some of these variants may be due to later scribal conforming activity. On the other hand, certain variants indicate readings that have clearly not been conformed but have been faithfully preserved throughout the textual history of Athanasius's writings.<sup>43</sup> This suggests that while the process of conforming the text by later scribes remained a tendency it was not consistently applied and therefore some of Athanasius's variants may witness to an earlier form of the text than that of  $\mathcal{P}^{46}$ .<sup>44</sup> What is important as regards the influence of the scribes to conform the text to a later form is that instances of modifying activity can sometimes be clearly recognized.<sup>45</sup> Therefore they can be taken into account when attempting to reconstruct a Father's authentic text.

### Athanasius's Direct Influence on the Biblical Text

**35.** A further characteristic evident are the few instances where Athanasius has deliberately influenced the form of the quotations by shaping them in some way.<sup>46</sup> The type of activity evident in some variants includes Athanasius's deliberate omission of some intermediate portion of the text from which he quotes. This is because the meaning of the passage/phrase he has omitted was not conducive to the argument presented, since he was more concerned to focus on the implications of the text he selectively quotes. The issue here is the extent to which this ought to be regarded as a 'corruption' of the text (See Brogan 1997: 261). If the term 'corruption' is taken, as Ehrman and Brogan suggest, as a value-neutral term, then there is no doubt that Athanasius does at times modify his text, and the task then shifts to determining the extent of such modifications, his influence on the form of the text and what may be determined concerning the prior form of his exemplary text. The most appropriate way of dealing with such texts is to

---

<sup>42</sup> Holmes claims that as a result of Royce's study, in terms of the early papyri at least, 'the venerable canon of *lectio brevior potior* is now seen as relatively useless' (Holmes 1995: 343).

<sup>43</sup> It is also too simplistic to claim every instance of Athanasius's agreement with the Majority text-type as evidence of conforming scribal activity. This is because on numerous occasions the reading of the Majority text is aligned with some of the best uncials, which are generally considered to preserve an early form of the text.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. 2 Cor 6.16.

<sup>45</sup> E.g., in Phil 2.5 Athanasius witnesses to  $\phi\rho\nu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\theta\omega$  (as per Maj.) against  $\mathcal{P}^{46}$ , with  $\phi\rho\nu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\epsilon$  supported by  $\aleph$ ABCD $\Gamma$ H. It is (highly) likely that Athanasius also originally had  $\phi\rho\nu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\epsilon$  in his exemplar, but his text has been conformed to the standard text by later scribal activity.

<sup>46</sup> E.g., Heb 1.3; 1 Cor 4.6; Eph 1.13.

reject singular/unique readings when conducting a full quantitative and group profile analysis. This will eliminate the ‘corruptions’ of the exemplary text that would otherwise skew the results. In variants which have multiple attestation and yet where Athanasius may be the earliest witness to a particular variant, then the possibility must remain that Athanasius himself was responsible for introducing the variant. Some specific examples will be instructive here. In order to provide some initial comparison with Athanasius’s use of the text in the gospels and the epistles, the first example is drawn from Matthew’s gospel.

**36.** In his 39th Paschal letter, Athanasius quotes from Matthew 22.29.<sup>47</sup> The text found in NA<sup>27</sup> is as follows: πλανᾶσθε μὴ εἰδότες τὰς γραφὰς μηδὲ τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ θεοῦ (‘You are wrong, because you know neither the Scriptures nor the power of God’). Athanasius quotes the text as: πλανᾶσθε μὴ εἰδότες τὰς γραφὰς μηδὲ τὴν δύναμιν αὐτῶν (‘You are wrong because you know neither the Scriptures nor their power’). Athanasius substitutes αὐτῶν (their) for τοῦ θεοῦ (of God) in the ‘original’ text. Brogan notes that the rhetorical effect of the change is to equate the agent of ‘power’ with the Scripture itself, whereas in the original text a distinction is made. Ironically, Athanasius used this text to support his arguments concerning which books should be included in the canon and that nothing should be added or taken away from the Scriptures (1997: 278)! Brogan also notes it is likely this change originated with Athanasius since it is only found in his text and in no other witness before or after him. Further, Athanasius did know the original form of the text, since he quotes it elsewhere (1997: 278-79). It remains, however, simply an interesting variant, since it never enters into the ‘mainstream’ textual tradition.

**37.** Before discussing the variants from the Epistles, it is worthwhile noting that Athanasius is capable of quoting Scripture accurately—for example, he quotes from Heb 2.1-3 and agrees with P<sup>46</sup> (as a leading representative of the Primary Alexandrian text-type) exactly for forty-six words, and he also quotes Heb 2.14-3.2 with only one variant against P<sup>46</sup> in one hundred and six words.

**38.** The first example from the Pauline Epistles comes from 1 Corinthians 4.6. Athanasius’s quotation and collation of this verse from the *Orationes I-III contra Arianos* is shown again for convenience:

1 Cor 4.6

ταῦτα δὲ μετεσχημάτισα εἰς ἑμαυτὸν καὶ ἀπολλῶ, ἵνα ἐν ἡμῖν μάθητε τὸ μὴ ὑπὲρ  
 ἃ γέγραπται φυσιοῦσθαι  
*Or. III c. Ar. 21 [C]*

---

ταῦτα δέ Ath ] ταῦτα δέ ἀδελφοί P<sup>46</sup> S<sup>c</sup> A B C 1739; ταῦτα ἀδελφοί S\*

---

<sup>47</sup> This example is drawn from Brogan’s study of Athanasius’s text of the gospels.

ἀπολλῶ Ath] ἀπολλῶν δι' ὑμᾶς **S\*** A B 1739; ἀπολλῶ δι' ὑμᾶς **ℙ<sup>46</sup> S<sup>c</sup> C**

γέγραπται Ath] add ἵνα μὴ εἰς ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἐνός **ℙ<sup>46</sup> S\*** A B C 1739; add φρονεῖν ἵνα μὴ εἰς ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἐνός **S<sup>c</sup>**

**39.** In the early chapters of 1 Corinthians Paul has to correct the wrong judgment by the Corinthians on the basis of worldly wisdom. The NRSV reads as follows: 'I have applied all this to Apollos and myself for your benefit, brothers and sisters, so that you may learn through us the meaning of the saying, "Nothing beyond what is written," so that none of you will be puffed up in favor of one against another.'

**40.** Athanasius's text reads: 'These things I have in a figure transferred to myself and to Apollos, that you may learn in us not to be puffed up above what is written.' The range of variants for this verse gives the initial impression that Athanasius is quoting the Scripture, but only from memory and imperfectly, since he leaves out important elements, as noted above. Indeed this is a case which challenges categorisation, since the quotation of this verse may better be classified as a loose citation tending towards adaptation. Athanasius appears to have adapted the text, not simply in terms of necessary grammatical structure but in content as well. Clearly Athanasius's text is significantly shorter. The most likely explanation is that he has 'moulded' the text to suit his hermeneutic and in order to avoid elements within the text which may detract from the main point he is trying to make. One should keep in mind the hermeneutical and homiletical context for the writings of Athanasius. As such his quotation of Scripture here may be compared to the way a preacher may handle Scripture when quoting 'loosely' from the text to make a point, without engaging in a direct exposition of the passage. It would appear that Athanasius has deliberately omitted ἀδελφοί since he does not want to give even a hint of association with the Arians in any sort of fraternal relationship or a legitimisation of their position that the term may imply. A theological motivation may also explain the absence of ἵνα μὴ εἰς ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἐνός, since read on its own it may detract from Athanasius's stance against the Arians. One may also note in passing that the previous two examples display Athanasius's high regard for Scripture, since in both cases the variants serve to reinforce, from Athanasius's perspective, its inherent authority.

**41.** The second epistolary example comes from Hebrews 1.3.<sup>48</sup> In this case Athanasius provides multiple attestations for this verse. The text reads: 'When he had made purification for sins, he sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high.' Athanasius's Citation reads: 'When he had by himself purged our sins, he sat down at the right hand of the Majesty in heaven.' Athanasius has here modified and added some words to the text (ἐαυτοῦ whereas **ℙ<sup>46</sup>** has αὐτοῦ, and he includes ἡμῶν after τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν) to clarify the nature of Christ's ministry. Taken together they serve to reinforce Athanasius's Christology over against the position of his Arian opponents. In this case, however, Athanasius's variants are known in the textual tradition, though it is possible that Athanasius is the earliest witness. This does not in itself prove that Athanasius was personally responsible for introducing these variants into an earlier text that did not have

<sup>48</sup> Athanasius considered Hebrews part of the Pauline Epistolary corpus.

them, but the possibility is left open. However, these particular variants do appear to be later ‘orthodox’ insertions (corrections in the case of some major early uncial manuscripts); therefore, a reason for caution is the possibility that Athanasius’s text has itself been ‘conformed’ to a later text-type, since scribes are known to have conformed earlier texts to later (especially Byzantine/Majority) forms. Therefore, these conclusions must be considered tentative only.

### Athanasius’s New Testament Text-Type

**42.** Brogan identified Athanasius’s Gospels text as Alexandrian, and more specifically ‘Secondary’ on the basis of a full quantitative and comprehensive group profile analysis (1997: 183ff, cf. esp. 257). His results contradicted the earlier and somewhat spurious study of Nordberg, who concluded that Athanasius made use of several distinct Bible manuscripts during his career but particularly an A text-type, represented primarily by Codex Alexandrinus, and a B text-type, represented primarily by Codex Vaticanus. Of the two, Nordberg claimed that A readings dominated (Nordberg 1962: 137). Brogan on the other hand clearly showed that in the Gospels Athanasius’s text aligned more closely with the Alexandrian text-type of which B is a major witness but having much less affinity with the Byzantine text-type of which Codex A is a primary witness in the gospels.<sup>49</sup> A further complication is that Codex A has differing text-type alignment in the Gospels (Byzantine) and Pauline Epistles (Alexandrian), a factor ignored by Nordberg (cf. Greenlee 1964: 117-18). These results again underline the necessity of a comprehensive analysis with all the data presented before any firm conclusions can be drawn.<sup>50</sup> This suggests that conclusions concerning Athanasius’s text-type in the Pauline epistles on the basis of the present research be considered tentative only, pending a more comprehensive analysis. Further, the review of Athanasius’s text here is predicated primarily on a comparison with  $\mathcal{P}^{46}$ . Kenyon concluded that  $\mathcal{P}^{46}$  generally witnessed to an Alexandrian text-type, though he also identified a ‘respectable minority of agreements with the Western group’ (Kenyon 1936: xvii). The general impression gained is that Athanasius’s text of the Pauline Epistles has been preserved in a relatively pure form with only minimal corruption towards a Majority text-type and as a result witnesses to an authentic early form of the text in Alexandria.<sup>51</sup> The high level of

---

<sup>49</sup> Brogan noted that in Matthew the Byzantine manuscript A appears at the top of the list of witnesses showing proportional agreement with Athanasius of 91.7%. However this is an anomaly, since A in Matthew is largely lacunose, beginning only at chapter 25, verse 6. Therefore, its witness in Matthew must be discounted. In Luke and John (Mark is hardly cited by Athanasius) A shows significantly less affinity to Athanasius than do the main Alexandrian witnesses (Brogan 1997: 183ff, esp. 89).

<sup>50</sup> Nordberg also fails to present his data in full. His evidence consists essentially of long lists of variant readings consisting for the most part of one word. The reader is therefore required to reconstruct Athanasius’s text.

<sup>51</sup> For example, in 1 Cor 1.24 Athanasius witnesses to  $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma \dots \delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\mu\iota\varsigma \dots \sigma\omicron\phi\iota\alpha$  along with  $\mathcal{P}^{46}$  and Clement against the rest which have  $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\nu \dots \delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\mu\iota\nu \dots \sigma\omicron\phi\iota\alpha\nu$ . There are also instances where  $\mathcal{P}^{46}$  witnesses to the same form as the Majority text, whereas Athanasius witnesses to a form that has escaped scribal intervention (e.g., 2 Cor 6.16).

agreement with  $\mathcal{P}^{46}$  also provides an initial confirmation that Athanasius's text of the Pauline Epistles belongs to the Alexandrian text-type, though without a full quantitative and comprehensive group profile analysis it is not possible to determine with any further accuracy whether Athanasius's text of the Pauline Epistles belongs to the 'Primary' or 'Secondary' Alexandrian text-type (Ehrman 1986: 265-66). This concurs at a preliminary level with Brogan's conclusions concerning the nature of Athanasius's text in the Gospels. On the other hand, the variants do suggest that their textual histories (i.e., Ath and  $\mathcal{P}^{46}$ ) are not identical.<sup>52</sup> Certainly some variants show that Athanasius's writings particularly in terms of his biblical references have suffered some assimilation or conforming activity to the later Majority text-type by scribes. Other variants however witness to the preservation of a text that has often resisted such conforming influences and provides evidence of a textual tradition that is contemporary with, if not earlier than, the great uncials. Athanasius's text of the Pauline Epistles therefore has value as an important patristic witness to an early stage in the history of the Alexandrian text-type.

### **Bibliography**

Arnold, D. W. H. 1991. *The Early Episcopal Career of Athanasius of Alexandria*. Vol. 6. Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity, ed. C. Kannengiesser. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.

Brennecke, H. C., U. Heil, and A. V. Stockhausen, eds. 2006. *Athanasius Werke: Die "Apologien" - Apologia ad Constantium, Epistula ad Joannem et Antiochum, Epistula ad Palladium, Epistula ad Dracontium, Epistula ad Afros, Tomus ad Antiochenos, Epistula ad Jovianum, Epistula Joviani ad Athanasium, Petitiones Arianorum*. Vol. 2, no. 8. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter.

Bright, W., transl. 1873. *The Orations of Saint Athanasius against the Arians according to the Benedictine Text, with an Account of His Life*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Brogan, J. J. 1997. "The Text of the Gospels in the Writings of Athanasius." Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Religion, Duke University.

Colwell, E. C. 1965. "Scribal Habits in Early Papyri: A Study in the Corruption of the Text." In *The Bible in Modern Scholarship: Papers Read at the 100th Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, December 28-30, 1964*, ed. J. P. Hyatt, 370-89. Nashville: Abingdon. Reprinted as "Method in Evaluating Scribal Habits: A Study of P<sup>45</sup>, P<sup>66</sup>, P<sup>75</sup>," chap. in *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, NTTS 9, 106-24.

---

<sup>52</sup> A preliminary analysis of the variants in terms of agreements and disagreements of Athanasius with  $\mathcal{P}^{46}$  for all variants collated and which have multiple attestation on the basis of the apparatus in Kenyon's *Text* edition of  $\mathcal{P}^{46}$  (which in turn is essentially based on Tischendorf) produced the following figures: Athanasius's agreements with  $\mathcal{P}^{46}$  = 26; disagreements = 24; singular variants in Athanasius or  $\mathcal{P}^{46}$  for which there is no other support = 41 (Kenyon 1936: xv).

Colwell, E. C., and E. W. Tune 1964. "Variant Readings: Classification and Use." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 86: 253-61. Reprinted as "Method in Classifying and Evaluating Variant Readings," chap. in *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, NTTS 9, 96-105.

Ehrman, B. D. 1986. *Didymus the Blind and the Text of the Gospels*. NTGF 1. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

Ehrman, B. D., G. D. Fee, and M. W. Holmes 1992. *The Text of the Fourth Gospel in the Writings of Origen*. NTGF 3. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

Elliott, W. J. 1969. "An Examination of Von Soden's IB<sup>2</sup> Group of Manuscripts." M.A. thesis, Department of Theology, University of Birmingham.

Epp, E. J. 2002. "Issues in New Testament Textual Criticism." In *Rethinking New Testament Textual Criticism*, ed. D. A. Black, 17-76. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Ernest, J. D. 2004. *The Bible in Athanasius of Alexandria*. The Bible in Ancient Christianity, v. 2. Boston: Brill Academic.

Fee, G. D. 1971a. "The Text of John in *The Jerusalem Bible*: A Critique of the Use of Patristic Citations in New Testament Textual Criticism." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 90: 163-73. Reprinted in E. J. Epp and G. D. Fee, *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism*. SD 45, 335-43.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1971b. "The Text of John in Origen and Cyril of Alexandria: A Contribution to Methodology in the Recovery and Analysis of Patristic Citations." *Biblica* 52: 357-94. Reprinted in E. J. Epp and G. D. Fee, *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism*, SD 45, 301-34.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1995. "The Use of the Greek Fathers for New Testament Textual Criticism." In *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*, ed. B. D. Ehrman and M. W. Holmes. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Geerard, M. 1974-87. *Clavis Patrum Graecorum: qua optima quaeque scriptorum patrum Graecorum recensione a primaevis saeculis usque ad octavum commode recluduntur*. Vol. 2. Corpus Christianorum. Turnhout: Brepols.

González, J. L. 1970. *A History of Christian Thought*. Vol. 1. Revised ed. Nashville: Abingdon.

Greenlee, J. H. 1964. *Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Holmes, M. W. 1995. "Reasoned Eclecticism in New Testament Textual Criticism." In *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*, ed. B. D. Ehrman and M. W. Holmes, 336-60. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Kannengiesser, C., ed. 1973. *Athanase d'Alexandrie: Sur l'incarnation du Verbe: Introduction, Texte Critique, Traduction Notes et Index*. Sources Chretiennes 199. Paris: Editions du Cerf.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1982. "Athanasius of Alexandria, *Three Orations Against the Arians: A Reappraisal*." *Studia Patristica* 18: 981-95. Reprinted in *Arius and Athanasius*, Chapter IX.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1991. *Arius and Athanasius: Two Alexandrian Theologians*. Collected Studies Series 353. Hampshire: Variorum.

Kenyon, F. G. 1936. *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri, fasc. 3, supp. 3.1, Pauline Epistles, Text*. London: Emery Walker.

Leone, L., ed. 1965. *Sancti Athanasii, Archiepiscopi Alexandriae: Contra Gentes - Introduzione, Testo Critico, Traduzione*. Collana di Studi Greci 43. Naples: Libreria Scientifica Editrice.

Ludwig, G., ed. 1911. *Athanasii Epistula ad Epictetum*. Jenae: Typis H. Pohle.

Metzger, B. M. 1968. *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption and Restoration*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon.

Metzger, B. M., and B. D. Ehrman 2005. *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption and Restoration*. 4th ed. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Metzler, K., and K. Savvidis, eds. 2000. *Athanasius Werke: Die Dogmatischen Schriften - Oratio III Contra Arianos*. Vol. 1, pt. 1, no. 3. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter.

Migne, J.-P., ed. 1857-1866. *Patrologiae Cursus Completus: Series Graeca*. Vol. 26. Paris: Migne.

Nordberg, H. 1962. "On the Bible Text of St. Athanasius." *Arctos: Acta Philologica Fennica*, n.s., 3: 119-41.

Osburn, C. D. 2004. *The Text of the Apostolos in Epiphanius of Salamis*. NTGF 6. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Pettersen, A. 1995. *Athanasius*. London: Geoffrey Chapman.

Quasten, J. 1960. *Patrology*. Vol. 3. Utrecht: Spectrum.

Robertson, A., ed. 1892. *Select Writings and Letters of Athanasius*. NPNF, Second Series, 4. New York: Christian Literature Company. Reprint, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.

Royce, J. R. 1995. "Scribal Tendencies in the Transmission of the Text of the New Testament." In *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Questionis*, ed. B. D. Ehrman and M. W. Holmes, 239-52. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

T.L.G. (updated 2 November 2006). *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*. Irvine: University of California. Database online, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu.simsrad.net.ocs.mq.edu.au>.

Thomson, R. W., ed. 1971. *Athanasius: Contra Gentes and De Incarnatione*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Zamagni, C. 2006. Review of *The Bible in Athanasius of Alexandria*, by James D. Ernest. *Review of Biblical Literature* 8: 569-73. Atlanta,: Society of Biblical Literature.

© TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism, 2008.