

11. THE TEXTUAL STABILITY OF PATRISTIC CITATIONS: ROMANS 8:33–35 IN JOHN CHRYSOSTOM'S *HOMILIES ON ROMANS* AS A TEST CASE

PETER MONTORO

INTRODUCTION¹

As Gordon Fee puts it, the particular value claimed for patristic citations, as opposed to versions and continuous text manuscripts of the New Testament, is that, '[W]hen properly evaluated ... the Church Fathers have the potential of offering datable and geographically certain evidence'.² The contention of this article is that

¹ Certain portions of this introductory section have been adapted from my unpublished dissertation, Peter Montoro, 'The Lemmata of the Homilies on Romans of John Chrysostom as a Text-Critical Source: A Preliminary Investigation' (BD diss., University of London, 2018), and have some overlap with material in Peter Montoro, "Invariablement byzantin?" Le texte de la *Lettre aux Romains* dans le *Sabatius* 20 et la transformation textuelle de l'héritage exégétique de Chrysostome,' in *La source intarissable: la Bible chez Jean Chrysostome*, ed. and tr. Guillaume Bady (Turnhout: Brepols, forthcoming). I would like to thank Elijah Hixson and Jeremiah Coogan for their helpful feedback on an earlier draft of this article.

² Gordon D. Fee and Roderic L. Mullen, 'The Use of the Greek Fathers for New Testament Textual Criticism', in *The Text of the New Testament in Con-*

such ‘proper evaluation’ is incomplete without a careful examination of the manuscript transmission of the patristic work from which the citation is being drawn. As I will demonstrate using the citations of Romans 8:33–35 in Chrysostom’s *Homilies on Romans*, in the absence of such an examination, no set of criteria, no matter how otherwise stringent, can ensure that a given patristic citation provides ‘dateable and geographically certain evidence’.

Among the Greek fathers utilized in the textual criticism of the New Testament, Chrysostom has long held a place of particular importance.³ In Tischendorf’s eighth edition, Chrysostom is cited over 2,300 times.⁴ More recently, in the much sparser apparatus of UBS5, Chrysostom is still cited over 900 times.⁵ The ECM, as might be expected, continues to make extensive use of Chrysostom. In the recently-published ECM of Acts, Chrysostom is cited more than 3,500 times, accounting for more than 40% of the patristic citations used in the volume.⁶

There are a number of reasons for such extensive use, beginning with the massive prestige of Chrysostom himself.⁷ *Prima facie*, one would expect that whatever text-form Chrysostom used would not only have had a significant place in the history of the text but also a significant impact on that history. Another factor is simply the enormous bulk of Chrysostomic material that has been preserved.

temporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis, ed. Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes, 2nd ed., NTTSD 42 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 351–73, here 351–2.

³ Gordon D. Fee, ‘The Text of John and Mark in the Writings of Chrysostom’, *NTS* 26 (1980): 525–47, here 525.

⁴ Constantin Tischendorf, ed., *Novum Testamentum Graece: Editio Octava Critica Maior*, vols 1–2 (Leipzig: Giesecke & Devrient, 1869–72). Search conducted using the Logos Bible Software module of this work.

⁵ Search conducted using the Accordance Bible Software module of this work.

⁶ Gunnar Büsch, ‘The “Western” Text of Acts Evidenced by Chrysostom?’ in *Novum Testamentum Graecum: Editio Critica Maior III/3: Studies*, ed. Holger Strutwolf, Georg Gäbel, Annette Hüffmeier, Gerd Mink, and Klaus Wachtel (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2018), 186–220, here 186.

⁷ Among other distinctions, Chrysostom is one of the Three Hierarchs revered in Eastern Christianity.

Furthermore, unlike other fathers (e.g. Didymus), whose quotations must often be painstakingly reconstructed from works on other subjects, the nature of Chrysostom's exegetical works make it relatively easy to locate deliberate, precise, and consecutive citations of vast swathes of the text of the New Testament.

Yet another reason is an assumption that has been made regarding the stability of Chrysostom's New Testament text. For many early Christian commentators, there is clear evidence that the lemmata, the running texts upon which the comments are based, have often suffered extensive contamination and can only be used with great care.⁸ In the case of Chrysostom's exegetical series, however, the lemmata are so integrated into the text and so interwoven into the exegetical discussion itself that it is often assumed that we can have greater confidence that they have not been tampered with.⁹ In giving out his lemma, Chrysostom frequently goes so far as to make explicit reference to the precise wording of the text under discussion, first making clear how the text does not read by saying, *καὶ οὐκ εἶπε(ν)* and then following up with an *ἀλλά*, giving how it does. Though these are typically exegetical comments rather than text-critical ones,¹⁰ they still show the concern that Chrysostom had for the precise wording of the text he was explaining.

According to Barbara Aland, the researchers at the INTF have concluded that the stability of Chrysostom's text is so great that:

⁸ Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland, *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 171.

⁹ Barbara Aland, 'Trustworthy Preaching: Reflections on John Chrysostom's Interpretation of Romans 8', in *Romans and the People of God: Essays in Honor of Gordon D. Fee on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, ed. Sven K. Soderlund and N. T. Wright (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 271–80, here 272.

¹⁰ Maria Konstantinidou, 'St John Chrysostom's Homilies on the Letter of St. Paul to Titus: A Critical Edition with Introduction and Notes on Selected Passages' (DPhil diss., Lincoln College, University of Oxford, 2006), 97 *contra* Aland, 'Trustworthy Preaching', 273. For a broader contextualization of the use of this phrase see Susan Griffith, "'It doesn't say": Metatextual Observations in Greek Patristic Commentaries on *Galatians*', *Studia Patristica* C (2020): 303–13.

[F]or textual matters it is of no consequence if one looks at Migne's text or at one of the critical editions. In all of these editions, the scriptural quotations follow the Byzantine text of Chrysostom's time to the same degree.¹¹

It is likely because of this conclusion that Migne's edition, though by no means a critical one, was allowed to serve as the source for the citations from the Acts Homilies for the ECM of Acts.¹² There are nearly 2,200 of these citations, constituting over a quarter of the entire number of patristic citations included in the edition.¹³

Nonetheless, despite the confidence expressed by Aland, the use of Chrysostom's exegetical works for text-critical purposes poses significant methodological challenges, challenges that have been ignored in the past and are continuing to be ignored by ongoing projects, such as the ECM, that cite the text of Chrysostom.¹⁴ The largest and least escapable of these challenges is that the textual 'stability' of Chrysostom's citations seems to be more apparent than real, a result of flawed methodology rather than textual actuality. While it is true that Chrysostom's lemmata are thoroughly integrated into his exegesis, as will be demonstrated below, both his lemmata *and* his exegesis are subject to significant textual instability. Until and unless the process of textual transmission that has led to this instability is better worked out, the exegetical homilies of Chrysostom cannot be used by New Testament text critics as a source of 'dateable and geographically certain evidence' (Fee). Given the extremely influential role that 'Chrysostom's text' has played in the development of

¹¹ Aland, 'Trustworthy Preaching', 272. I challenge this assumption more directly in Montoro, "Invariablement byzantin?"

¹² Though a full examination of the complexities involved in the editorial history of this text would be out of place here, Migne's edition ultimately depends on the eighteenth-century edition of Montfaucon.

¹³ Büsch, 'The "Western" Text of Acts', 186–7.

¹⁴ Though Büsch's article does not ignore these challenges, the edition itself does not seem to have taken them into account. The tiny number of additional citations from only two manuscripts in only those places that have been posited by others as 'Western' variants, while perhaps adequate to refute claims that Chrysostom used such a 'Western' text, do not sufficiently address the larger methodological issues I am raising here.

theories of textual history (e.g. Hort),¹⁵ the potential implications of this instability could prove to be quite significant. Without a reasonable degree of confidence that the citations being offered reproduce the text-form actually used by Chrysostom, the information they provide can neither be dated to the fourth century nor located in Antioch.

It is vital that I explain precisely what I mean by ‘stability’, as the somewhat distinctive way in which I am using it is crucial to all that follows. As is well known, patristic writers are rather frequently cited for more than one reading in a single variant unit. In such cases, the standard practice has been to judge that the father in question knew and used both readings. As the preface to the UBS5 states,

Superscript fractions indicate the statistics for variant readings in multiple instances of a passage. The second number of the fraction indicates the number of times the passage occurs in the Church Father’s writings; the first number indicates how many times the reading attested is supported.¹⁶

While it is true that some fathers used more than one form of a text throughout their career or even within a single work, it is also true that there are many cases in which the text found in a single location of a single work itself provides instances of textual variation in the manuscript tradition of the work in question. When we find multiple forms of a single citation in a single location, the citation cannot be taken as ‘dateable and geographically certain evidence’ until and unless a definitive conclusion—one that gives confidence that one of the textual forms does indeed go back to the father whose form of the text is being analyzed—has been reached about the textual history of the work in question.

The *usability* of a patristic citation is therefore directly dependent upon the *stability* of that citation within the manuscript tradition of the work in which it is found. For some patristic texts, such as the commentaries of Didymus found at Toura, which survive

¹⁵ F. J. A. Hort and B. F. Westcott, *Introduction to the New Testament in the Original Greek* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1882), 91.

¹⁶ UBS5, 44*, emphasis original.

in only a single manuscript each,¹⁷ this point is of little practical significance. Much as we might like, we do not have access to enough manuscripts of Didymus's commentaries to perform such an investigation. With other fathers, the critical editions of their works provide, or are at least intended to provide, the evidence for analysing textual stability. As a modern critical edition of the *Homilies on Romans* does not yet exist (the same problem applies, more or less, to all of Chrysostom's series of exegetical homilies¹⁸), the only way to gain clarity about their textual stability is by the study of sample passages in the manuscript tradition of the work itself.

In the present contribution, I provide a full collation of each of the eight places at which Chrysostom cites some portion of Romans 8:33–35 throughout the entirety of the *Homilies on Romans* in every extant and catalogued manuscript of this work copied in or before the fifteenth century.¹⁹ The results of this collation raise serious questions about the stability of the Romans text found in this work and therefore about the usability of citations derived from it.²⁰

¹⁷ Bart D. Ehrman, *Didymus the Blind and the Text of the Gospels*, Ed. Gordon D. Fee, *The New Testament in the Greek Fathers 1* (Atlanta: Scholars Press: 1986), 28–29.

¹⁸ As I intend to provide a detailed overview of the preliminary work that has been done on these series in a future publication, I will not go into the details here. Some of the shorter series have been edited in various unpublished dissertations. To my knowledge, nothing has been published on the textual transmission of the *Homilies on Romans* themselves. Legée's unpublished dissertation, while helpful in some respects, does not provide an adequate starting point for the text-critical use of Chrysostom's citations. Jacqueline Legée, 'Saint Jean Chrysostome: 10 Homélie Sur L'Épître Aux Romains' (PhD diss., Université de Toulouse Le Mirail, 1986).

¹⁹ As detailed below, I have taken Pinakes as a guide to which manuscripts are extant and catalogued. It is of course possible that there are additional manuscripts which will be identified in the future! If a particular manuscript was included in the eight available volumes of the *Codices Chrysostomici Graeci*, I cross-referenced it against the data provided there.

²⁰ While I focus on the Romans text of the *Homilies on Romans* in this paper, the same problem of textual stability affects also the illustrative quotations found in this work from other biblical books.

THE MANUSCRIPT TRADITION OF THE HOMILIES ON ROMANS²¹

According to Pinakes, Chrysostom's *Homilies on Romans* are extant, in whole or in part, in more than 100 manuscripts.²² When fragments, derivative works (ethica collections, extracts in catenae, etc) and manuscripts that date to the sixteenth century or later are excluded, 38 manuscripts remain, produced between the ninth and the fifteenth centuries. Unless otherwise noted, all dates below are taken from the Pinakes database and should be considered provisional. For ease of reference, I have provided the Diktyon number for each manuscript in square brackets and the *Codices Chrysostomici Graeci* reference number (the first number is the volume, and the second is the manuscript number in that volume), when available, in curly brackets. The manuscript abbreviations used in the data tables that follow have been placed in bold.

Alexandria, Patriarchal Library

001 [32888] 10 c.²³ **AlexPL1**

Athens, National Library of Greece

453 [2749] 11 c. **NLG453**

Mount Athos, Dionysiou Monastery

0113 (Lambros 3647) [20081] 13 c. **Dion113**

Mount Athos, Esphigmenou Monastery

007 (Lambros 2020) [21638] 10 c. **Esphig7**

Mount Athos, Vatopedi Monastery

0322 [18466] 14 c. **Vatop322**

²¹ Some of the manuscript images used in this research were obtained by the CATENA Project, which has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement no. 770816). I would like to thank Hugh Houghton for making this possible.

²² Once obvious duplicates are removed, the total of 108 provided by the database as of the time of writing (30 June 2020) is reduced to 101.

²³ Pinakes does not supply a date for this manuscript. The tenth-century date was kindly provided to me by Georgi Parpulov in a private communication (4 September 2019).

0323 [18467] 14 c. **Vatop323**

0324 [18468] 13 c. **Vatop324**

Mount Athos, Great Lavra Monastery

Γ 128 (Eustratiades 0368) [27300] 14 c. **LavraΓ128**

Jerusalem, Patriarchal Library

Hagiou Saba 20 [34277] 10 c.²⁴ **Saba20**

Mainz, Stadtbibliothek

Cod. II 114 [40419] {8.II,35a} 13–14 c. **Mainz114**

Messina, Biblioteca Regionale Universitaria ‘Giacomo Longo’

S. Salv. 08 [40669] {5.43} 12 c. **MessSS8**

S. Salv. 34 [40695] {5.59} 12 c. **MessSS34**

S. Salv. 35 [40696] {5.60} 12 c. **MessSS35**

Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana

A 172 Sup (Martini–Bassi 065) [42258] {5.85} 12 c.²⁵ **AmbA172s**

Moscow, State Historical Museum

Sinod. gr. 096 (Vlad. 098) [43721] 10 c. **Mosc96**

Sinod. gr. 099 (Vlad. 099) [43724] 10 c. **Mosc99**

Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek

Cod. graec. 457 [44905] {2.88} 9 c. **BSB457**

Napoli, Biblioteca Nazionale Vittorio Emanuele III

II B 04 [46020] {5.193} 11 c. **NapIIB4**

Oxford, Bodleian Library

Cromwell 21 [47811] {1.235} 11–12 c. **BodCrom21**

Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France

gr.0509 [50084] {7.40} 12 c.²⁶ **BNF509**

gr. 0731 [50313] 11 c. **BNF731**

gr. 0732 [50314] 11 c. **BNF732**

²⁴ While Pinakes dates this to the ninth century, Parpulov considers it to date to the tenth. Note that Pinakes incorrectly describes this manuscript as also containing the *Homilies on Matthew*.

²⁵ The portion of this manuscript that contains Chrysostom’s homilies on Galatians is identified as GA 2574 in the *Liste*.

²⁶ The 12 c. date comes from *Codices Chrysostomici Graeci*—Pinakes gives 14 c.

gr. 0733 [50315] 11 c. **BNF733**
 gr. 0734 [50316] 13 c. **BNF734**
 gr. 0735 [50317] 12 c. **BNF735**
 gr. 1016A [50608] 14 c. **BNF1016A**

Patmos, Monastery of St. John the Theologian
 0145, [54389] 12 c. **Patmos145**

Mount Sinai, St. Catharine's Monastery
 Gr. 0372 (Benesevic 381; Kamil 434) [58747] 11 c. **Sinai372**

Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana
 Ottob. gr. 420, [65663] 11 c. **BAVOtt420**
 Reg. gr. 004 (GA 2006) [66174] 10 c. **BAVReg4**
 Ross. 0169 [66419] 10 c. **BAVRoss169**
 Vat. gr. 0550 [67181] {6.64} 11 c. **BAVgr550**
 Vat. gr. 2065 (olim Basilianus 104) [68695] {6.298} 11 c.
BAVgr2065

Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana
 gr. Z. 098 (coll. 0466) [69569] 10 c. **BNMz98**
 gr. Z. 103 (coll. 0571) [69574] 14 c. **BNMz103**
 gr. Z. 564 (coll. 925) [70035] 12 c.²⁷ **BNMz564**

Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek
 theol. gr. 087 [71754] {4.35} 15 c.²⁸ **ONBgr87**
 theol. gr. 170 [71837] {4.52} 12–13 c. **ONBgr170**

ROMANS 8:33–35 IN THE *HOMILIES ON ROMANS*

Introduction

In the text of the *Homilies on Romans*, there are eight places where it seems that Chrysostom intended to recall to his hearers not simply the thoughts but the very words of Romans 8:33–35. For each of these places, I have provided the full sentence context using the text found

²⁷ An extensive number of replacement leaves (none of which overlapped with the portions of text examined in this article) date from the fifteenth century.

²⁸ Pinakes lists this as 16 c.

in Migne, as well as a detailed collation of the portions of the text that either contain the text of Romans 8:33–35 or other material of direct importance for establishing that text. While these collations, unless otherwise noted, include all textual differences, I have not taken account of capitalization, punctuation or accents. For simplicity's sake, *nomina sacra* have been simply indicated by the appropriate abbreviation using standard minuscule script—those few places where a standard *nomen sacrum* is spelled out in a manuscript are noted in the collations. For each citation, I have indicated the location of the citation in the manuscript in question. Manuscripts whose locations do not include a column number have only a single column. The two manuscripts whose locations include *p* rather than *r/v* have been paginated rather than foliated. Manuscripts whose orthography differs from the reading for which they are cited as support are underlined and the deviation is indicated in a footnote.

1. Initial lemma of Romans 8:33a (Homily 15)

60.543.17–18²⁹ Τίς ἐγκαλέσει κατὰ ἐκλεκτῶν Θεοῦ;

(a) τις εγκαλεσει κατα εκλεκτων θυ

AlexPL1 116r. **NLG453** 408pC1. **Dion113** 134C1. **Esphig7** 108v.
LavraΓ128 50rC2. **Vatop322** 152rC1. **Vatop323** 128v.
Vatop324 130vC1. **Saba20** 143vC2. **Mainz114** 68rC1.
MessSS8 113vC2. **MessSS34** 98rC1. **MessSS35** 183rC1. **AmbA172s**
 133vC2. **Mosc96** 163vC1. **Mosc99** 218rC1. **BSB457** 167v. **BodCrom21**
 270pC1. **BNF509** 324r. **BNF731** 120rC1. **BNF732** 157r. **BNF734**
 117vC1. **BNF735** 183rC2–183vC1. **BNF1016A** 196r. **Patmos145** 128v.
Sinai372 138vC2. **BAVOtt420** 173rC1. **BAVReg4** 191vC1. **BAVgr550**
 158vC1. **BAVgr2065** 190v. **BNMz98** 140vC2. **BNMz103** 32r.
BNMz564 250vC1. **ONBgr87** 133vC1. **ONBgr170** 186v

(b) τις εγκαλεσει κατα εκλεκτων του θυ

BAVRoss169 204vC1

²⁹ In this and subsequent instances, the ‘sentence context’ is taken from the version of the Migne text incorporated into the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu>.

(c) Manuscripts not extant in this location.

NapIIB4. BNF733.

By virtue of being Chrysostom's first citation of Romans 8:33, this brief snippet of text serves as his 'lemma' for this portion of the text. As NA28 provides no variation units for this clause, it is unsurprising that no significant variants are found in the manuscript tradition of the *Homilies on Romans*. The singular addition of τοῦ by **BAVRoss169** is in conformity with the subsequent 'flattened'³⁰ repeat of this clause found below—as far as I was able to discover, this addition does not occur in continuous text manuscripts of the New Testament.³¹

2. Repetition of Romans 8:33a (Homily 15)

60.543.22–25 Καὶ οὐκ εἶπε, Τίς ἐγκαλέσει κατὰ τῶν δούλων τοῦ Θεοῦ, οὐδὲ, Κατὰ τῶν πιστῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ, Κατὰ τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ. ἡ γὰρ ἐκλογή ἀρετῆς σημεῖόν ἐστιν.

(a) κατα των εκλεκτων του θυ

AlexPL1 116r. **NLG453** 408pC2. **Dion113** 134C1. **Esphig7** 108v. **LavraI128** 50vC1. **Vatop322** 152rC1–C2. **Vatop323** 128v. **Vatop324** 130vC2. **Saba20** 143vC2. **MessSS8** 114rC1. **MessSS34** 98rC1. **MessSS35** 183rC1. **AmbA172s** 133vC2. **Mosc96** 163vC1. **Mosc99** 218rC1. **BSB457** 167v. **BodCrom21** 270pC1–C2. **BNF509** 324r. **BNF731** 120rC1. **BNF732** 157rC2. **BNF734** 117vC2.

³⁰ While Latin does not of course have variations involving the article, this seems to be very similar to the sorts of textual transformations described in H. A. G. Houghton, "Flattening" in Latin Biblical Citations', *Studia Patristica* XLV (2010): 271–6.

³¹ This and subsequent similar statements are based on a consultation of the apparatus of NA28; Reuben J. Swanson, *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines against Codex Vaticanus: Romans*, (Sheffield: William Carey International University Press, 2002); and a personal collation of the text of Romans 8:33–35 in 38 continuous-text minuscule manuscripts of Romans.

BNF735 183vC1. **BNF1016A** 196r. **Patmos145** 128v. **Sinai372** 138vC2. **BAVOtt420** 173rC1. **BAVReg4** 191vC1. **BAVRoss169** 204v. **BAVgr2065** 190v. **BNMz98** 141rC1. **BNMz103** 32r. **ONBgr170** 186v.

(b) Clause absent without a physical lacuna, most likely due to homeoteleuton caused by the sequence of $\theta\nu$, $\theta\nu$, $\theta\nu$ in the sentence context.

Mainz114 68rC1. **BAVgr550** 158vC1. **BNMz564** 250vC1.

ONBgr87 133vC1.

(c) Manuscripts not extant in this location.

NapIIB4. **BNF733**.

As noted above, continuous-text manuscripts of Romans do not seem to have any variations at this place. Although Chrysostom is indeed emphasizing the precise wording of this clause, it is ἐκλεκτῶν that he is concerned about and the introduction of τοῦ is an understandable and minor adaption of what is otherwise clearly a careful citation.

3. Romans 8:33b, 8:34a, and repetition of 8:33b (Homily 15)

60.543.30–62 Θεὸς ὁ δικαίων, τίς ὁ κατακρίνων; Οὐκ εἶπε, Θεὸς ὁ ἀφείς ἀμαρτήματα, ἀλλ', ὁ πολλῶ μείζον ἦν Θεὸς ὁ δικαίων.

(a) $\theta\varsigma$ ο δικαίων τις ο κατακρίνων... $\theta\varsigma$ ο δικαίων

AlexPL1 116r. **NLG453** 408pC2–409pC1. **Dion113** 134rC2. **Esphig7** 108v. **LavraI128** 50vC1. **Vatop322** 152rC2. **Vatop323** 128v. **Vatop324** 130vC2. **Saba20** 144rC1. **Mainz114** 68rC1. **MessSS8** 114rC1. **MessSS34** 98rC1. **MessSS35** 183rC2. **AmbA172s** 133vC2–134rC1. **Mosc96** 163vC2. **Mosc99** 218rC2. **BSB457** 167v. **BodCrom21** 270pC2. **BNF509** 324r. **BNF731** 120rC1. **BNF732** 157rC2. **BNF734** 117vC2. **BNF735** 183vC1. **BNF1016A** 196r. **Patmos145** 129r. **Sinai372** 138vC2–139rC1. **BAVOtt420** 173rC2. **BAVReg4** 191vC2. **BAVRoss169** 204vC2. **BAVgr550** 158vC2. **BAVgr2065** 190v. **BNMz98** 141rC1. **BNMz103** 32r. **BNMz564** 250vC2. **ONBgr87** 133vC2.³²

³² This manuscript has $\delta\iota\omega\nu$ for $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omega\nu$, undoubtedly a simple scribal error.

(b) θς ο δικαίων τις ο κατακρινών...θς ο δικαίων τις ο κατακρινών

ONBgr170 186v

Although this manuscript repeats the quotation, there is no variation in the text of Romans 8:34a attested.

(c) Manuscripts not extant in this location.

NapIIB4. BNF733.

As before, there are no variations in the sources examined (apart from those solely involving orthography), so it is unsurprising that there are no significant variations in the manuscripts of the *Homilies on Romans*.

4. Romans 8:34b (Homily 15)

60.543.42–45 Χριστὸς γάρ, φησὶν, ὁ ἀποθανὼν, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἐγερθεὶς ἐκ νεκρῶν, ὃς ἐστὶν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὃς καὶ ἐντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν.

(a) χς ις...ο αποθανων μαλλον δε εγερθεις εκ νεκρων ος και εστιν εν δεξια του θυ ος και εντυγχανει υπερ ημων

Dion113 134rC2. **BAVgr550** 158vC2–159rC1.

(b) χς ις...ο αποθανων μαλλον δε εγερθεις εκ νεκρων ος εστιν εν δεξια του θυ ος και εντυγχανει υπερ ημων

Saba20 144rC1–C2. **Mainz114** 68rC1. **Sinai372** 139rC1. **BAVReg4** 192rC1. **BNMz564** 251rC1. **ONBgr87** 133vC2.³³

(c) χς...ο αποθανων μαλλον δε και εγερθεις εκ νεκρων ος και εστιν εν δεξια του θυ ος και εντυγχανει υπερ ημων

NLG453 409pC1–C2. **LavraΓ128** 50vC2. **BodCrom21** 270pC2–271pC1. **BNF734** 118rC1. **BNF735** 183vC2. **BNF1016A** 196r. **BAVOtt420** 173vC1.

(d) χς...ο αποθανων μαλλον δε και εγερθεις εκ νεκρων ος εστιν εν δεξια του θυ ος και εντυγχανει υπερ ημων

AlexPL1 116v. **Vatop323** 128v. **MessSS34** 98rC2. **AmbA172s** 134rC1.

³³ θεου for θυ.

BNF732 157vC1. **Patmos145** 129r. **BNMz103** 32r.³⁴

(e) *χς...ο αποθανων μαλλον δε εγερθεις εκ νεκρων ος και εστιν εν δεξια του θυ ος και εντυγχανει υπερ ημων*

BNF509 324r.³⁵

(f) *χς...ο αποθανων μαλλον δε και εγερθεις ος και εστιν εν δεξια του θυ ος και εντυγχανει υπερ ημων*

Esphig7 108v. **Vatop322** 152vC1. **Vatop324** 131rC1. **MessSS8** 114rC2. **MessSS35** 183vC1. **Mosc96** 164rC1. **Mosc99** 218vC1. **BSB457** 168r. **BNF731** 120rC2. **BAVRoss169** 205rC1. **BAVgr2065** 191r. **BNMz98** 141rC2. **ONBgr170** 187r.

(g) Manuscripts not extant in this location.

NapIIB4. **BNF733**.

This is one of the more significant results of this study. For this portion of 8:34, NA28 provides three variation units for which it cites more than one Greek witness.³⁶ Each of these variation units involves a choice between two readings. For *all three* of these units, manuscripts of the *Homilies on Romans* can be cited for *both* readings in question. Rather than providing ‘datable and geographically certain evidence’, these manuscripts provide a snapshot of almost the entire range of variation found in the direct textual tradition of Romans. To view this matter from a different angle, all six of the readings of Romans 8:34b found in this location in the *Homilies on Romans*, can also be found in the manuscript tradition of Romans itself.

³⁴ The first hand of this manuscript has *εκ νεκρος* for *εκ νεκρων ος*, which has been corrected to *εκ νεκρων ος*. Given the enormous amount of abbreviations in this manuscript, it seems almost certain that an abbreviation in the exemplar was misread and then corrected. It therefore seems best to list it in support of reading (d), rather than creating an additional reading.

³⁵ This has been corrected by the insertion of *και* between *δε* and *εγερθεις*, resulting in reading (c).

³⁶ There is a fourth variation unit, for which P46 is the only Greek witness cited.

- (a) GA 33³⁷
- (b) GA 02
- (c) GA 88, 330
- (d) GA 103
- (e) GA 326
- (f) GA 110, 312, 404, 431, 450, 469, 506, 605, 627, 928, 1175, 1245, 1277, 1390, 1597, 1730, 1753, 1828, 1846, 1896, 1915, 1917, 1958, 1970, 1998, 2001, 2889.³⁸

Until firm conclusions can be reached about the textual transmission of this work, the citation of any one of these forms as the reading of ‘Chrysostom’ (as for instance in UBS5 in support of Χριστός instead of Χριστός Ἰησοῦς) is no more likely to provide the text of Chrysostom than *any* manuscript or edition of the Greek text of Romans.

5. Partial Repetition of Romans 8:34b (Homily 15)

60.543.56–61 Καὶ ἵνα μάθῃς, ὅτι τοῦτό ἐστιν, ὃ κατασκευάσαι βούλεται, πρότερον εἰπῶν, ὅτι Ἐστὶν ἐν δεξιᾷ, τότε ἐπήγαγεν, ὅτι Ἐντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, ὅτι τὴν ὁμοτιμίαν ἔδειξε καὶ τὴν ἰσότητα, ἵνα λοιπὸν τὸ ἐντυγχάνειν οὐκ ἔλαττώσεως, ἀλλ’ ἀγάπης φαίνεται μόνῃς ὄν.

(a) ...εστιν εν δεξια...εντυγχανει υπερ ημων...

AlexPL1 116v. **NLG453** 410pC1. **Dion113** 134vC1. **Esphig7** 109r.
LavraΓ128 51rC1. **Vatop322** 152vC2. **Vatop323** 129r. **Vatop324**
 131rC1–C2. **Saba20** 144rC2–144vC1. **Mainz114** 68rC2. **MessSS8**
 114vC1. **MessSS34** 98rC2–98vC1. **MessSS35** 183vC2–184rC1.
AmbA172s 134rC2. **Mosc96** 164rC2. **Mosc99** 218vC2. **BSB457** 168r.
BodCrom21 271pC1. **BNF509** 324r. **BNF731** 120vC1. **BNF732**
 157vC2. **BNF734** 118rC2. **BNF735** 184rC1. **BNF1016A** 196v.

³⁷ GA 33 reads εντυγχανη for εντυγχανει, but this is almost certainly an itacism. In all other matters it agrees exactly with reading (a) as given above. All of the readings above are given from personal transcriptions.

³⁸ Not surprisingly, the largest grouping of manuscripts of the *Homilies on Romans* agrees exactly with majority of the manuscripts of Romans that I collated for this variation unit. This is, of course, the ‘Byzantine’ reading.

Patmos145 129r–129v. **Sinai372** 139rC2. **BAVOtt420** 173vC2. **BAVReg4** 192rC2. **BAVRoss169** 205rC2. **BAVgr550** 159rC1. **BAVgr2065** 191r. **BNMz98** 141vC1. **BNMz103** 32r. **BNMz564** 251rC2. **ONBgr87** 134rC1. **ONBgr170** 187r.

(b) Manuscripts not extant in this location.

NapIIB4. BNF733.

Despite the huge amount of variation observed above in 8:34b, the snippets of text repeated here do not overlap with any of the points of variation, so it is unsurprising that they present no variation in the textual tradition of the *Homilies on Romans*.³⁹

6. Romans 8:35 (Homily 15)

60.544.23–32 Διὰ δὴ τοῦτο, δείξας πολλὴν τὴν ἄνωθεν πρόνοιαν, μετὰ παρρησίας λοιπὸν ἐπάγει τὰ ἐξῆς, καὶ οὐ λέγει, ὅτι Ὅφειλετε καὶ ὑμεῖς οὕτως αὐτὸν ἀγαπᾶν, ἀλλ', ὥσπερ ἔνθους γενόμενος ὑπὸ τῆς ἀφάτου ταύτης προνοίας, φησί· Τίς ἡμᾶς χωρίζει ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ Χριστοῦ, Καὶ οὐκ εἶπε· Τοῦ Θεοῦ· οὕτως ἀδιάφορον αὐτῷ, καὶ Χριστὸν καὶ Θεὸν ὀνομάζειν. Θλιψίς, ἢ στενοχωρία, ἢ διωγμὸς, ἢ λιμὸς, ἢ γυμνότης, ἢ κίνδυνος, ἢ μάχαιρα;

For reasons that will become obvious, I have in this case included the phrase that appears in between the two clauses of the lemma in the collations which follow. I have not noted the ubiquitous variation between εἶπε/εἶπεν.

(a) τις ημας χωρισει απο της αγαπης του θυ θλιψις η στενοχωρια η διωγμος η λιμος η γυμνοτης η κινδυνος η μαχαιρα

Saba20 145rC1. **Mainz114** 68vC1.⁴⁰ **BAVReg4** 193rC1.

(b) τις ημας χωρηση απο της αγαπης του θυ θλιψις η στενοχωρια η διογμος η λιμος η γυμνοτης η κινδυνος

Sinai372 139vC1.

³⁹ This statement applies only to the brief citations from the text of Romans—there are a number of variations in the comments by Chrysostom in the surrounding sentence context that are not collated here.

⁴⁰ χωρησει for χωρισει.

(c) τις ημας χωρισει απο της αγαπης του χυ και ουκ ειπε του θυ ουτως αδιαφορον αυτω και χν και θν ονομαζειν θλιψις η στενοχωρια η διωγμος η λιμος η γυμνοτης η κινδυνος η μαχαιρα

AlexPL1 117r. **NLG453** 411pC2. **LavraΓ128** 51vC1. **Vatop323** 129v. **MessSS8** 115rC1. **MessSS34** 98vC2-99rC1. **MessSS35** 184vC1. **AmbA172s** 134vC2.⁴¹ **Mosc96** 165rC1-C2.⁴² **Mosc99** 219vC1-C2. **BSB457** 168v. **BodCrom21** 272pC1-C2.⁴³ **BNF509** 324v.⁴⁴ **BNF731** 120vC2-121rC1. **BNF732** 158rC2-158vC1.⁴⁵ **BNF734** 118vC1. **BNF735** 184vC2. **BNF1016A** 197v. **Patmos145** 130r. **BAVOtt420** 174vC1-C2.⁴⁶ **BAVRoss169** 206rC1. **BAVgr2065** 192r. **BNMz98** 142rC1. **BNMz103** 32v. **ONBgr170** 187r.⁴⁷

(d) τις ημας χωρισει απο της αγαπης του χυ και ουκ ειπε του θυ ουτως αδιαφορον αυτω και χν και θν ονομαζειν θλιψις η στενοχωρια η λιμος η κινδυνος η μαχαιρα

Vatop322 153rC2.

(e) τις ημας χωρισει απο της αγαπης του χυ θλιψις η στενοχωρια η διωγμος η λιμος η γυμνοτης η κινδυνος η μαχαιρα

Dion113 135rC1-C2.⁴⁸ **Esphig7** 109r. **Vatop324** 131vC1-C2. **BAVgr550** 159vC2.⁴⁹ **BNMz564** 252rC2.⁵⁰ **ONBgr87** 134vC1

(f) Manuscripts not extant in this location.

NapIIB4. **BNF733**.

⁴¹ χωρησει for χωρισει.

⁴² χωρηση for χωρισει.

⁴³ χωρηση for χωρισει.

⁴⁴ χωρησει for χωρισει.

⁴⁵ χωρησει for χωρισει.

⁴⁶ αυτων for αυτω.

⁴⁷ χωρησει for χωρισει | απο του θυ ουτως for του θυ ουτως.

⁴⁸ και ουκ ειπε του θυ ουτως αδιαφορον αυτω και χν και θν ονομαζειν supplied by a corrector (the hand does not appear to be the same) in the bottom margin.

⁴⁹ και ουκ ειπεν του θυ ουτως αδιαφορον αυτω και χν και θν ονομαζειν supplied in the top margin. The hand seems quite possibly the same as the first.

⁵⁰ The last few letters of γυμνοτης and μαχαιρα are not fully legible.

Once again the manuscripts of the *Homilies on Romans* demonstrate considerable textual instability, and the variation units found in the *Homilies on Romans* (apart from the omission of γυμνότης by **Vatop322** and the omission of μάχαιρα by **Sinai372**) have very substantial overlap with the variation units found in the direct tradition of Romans. Given that, in some manuscripts of the *Homilies on Romans*, the choice between θεοῦ and χριστοῦ is the subject of an explicit comment, this particular variation is of considerable significance and will be discussed in greater detail below.

7. Partial Repetition of Romans 8:35 (Homily 16)

60.551.39–43 Ὁ γὰρ καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν ἀποθνήσκων, καὶ νιφάδας κινδύνων θείας, καὶ εἰπὼν, Τίς ἡμᾶς χωρίσει ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ Χριστοῦ; θλίψις, ἢ στενοχωρία, ἢ λιμὸς, ἢ διωγμός;

(a) τις ημας χωρισει απο της αγαπης του θυ θλιψις η στενοχωρια η διωγμος η λιμος

Dion113 141rC2. **Vatop323** 136r. **Saba20** 152vC2.⁵¹ **Mainz114** 71vC2.⁵² **BNF733** 7vC2–8rC1. **Sinai372** 146rC2.⁵³ **BAVReg4** 202rC2.⁵⁴ **BAVgr550** 167rC2. **BNMz564** 264rC2. **ONBgr87** 141rC1.

(b) τις ημας χωρισει απο της αγαπης του χυ θλιψις η στενοχωρια η διωγμος η λιμος

AlexPL1 123r. **NLG453** 431pC1. **Esphig7** 115v. **Vatop324** 138rC2. **MessSS34** 104vC2. **Mosc99** 230vC1. **BodCrom21** 285pC2. **BNF509** 329r. **BNF732** 166rC2. **BNF1016A** 206v. **Patmos145** 137v.⁵⁵ **BAVgr2065** 200v.

(c) τις ημας χωρισει απο της αγαπης του χυ θλιψις η στενοχωρια η λιμος η διωγμος

LavraΓ128 59rC1. **AmbA172s** 141vC1. **BNF735** 193vC1. **BAVOtt420** 184rC2–184vC1. **BNMz103** 33v.

⁵¹χωρησει for χωρισει

⁵²The last letter of στενοχωρια is illegible.

⁵³χωριση for χωρισει

⁵⁴χωρησει for χωρισει

⁵⁵χωριση for χωρισει

(d) τις ημας χωρισει θλιψις η στενοχωρια η διωγμος η λιμος

Vatop322 160vC2. **MessSS8** 122rC1. **MessSS35** 194rC1. **Mosc96** 175rC1. **NapIIB4** 20vC2. **BNF731** 127rC1. **BAVRoss169** 215vC2. **BNMz98** 148vC1. **ONBgr170** 190v.

(e) τις ημας χωρισει θλιψις η στενοχωρια η λιμος η διμος

BSB457 176v.⁵⁶

(f) Manuscripts not extant in this location.

BNF734.

In this location, we once again find a similar range of variation to that present in the direct tradition of Romans. While readings (d) and (e) provide a ‘flattened’ text, the majority of manuscripts provide a full citation. It is extremely significant that every manuscript which has the reading θεοῦ in the initial lemma of 8:35 in Homily 15 also has that reading in this re-quotation in Homily 16. Furthermore, with the exception of **Esphig7** and **Vatop324**,⁵⁷ each of the other four manuscripts which have χριστοῦ in the first hand of the initial lemma of this verse in Homily 15, but lack the clause καὶ οὐκ εἶπε... (reading e in location 6 above), read θεοῦ in this re-quotation in Homily 16. In other words, the absence of καὶ οὐκ εἶπε... in the first hand of the initial citation of 8:35 in Homily 15 is a relatively reliable indication that θεοῦ will be found in the secondary citation of this verse in Homily—even when the initial citation in Homily 15 has the reading χριστοῦ. This pattern makes it rather likely that these manuscripts ultimately derive from exemplars that originally had θεοῦ in Homily 15 as well. In other words, whether or not the καὶ οὐκ εἶπε clause was added or deleted, its alteration was undoubtedly part of a broader pattern of editing that extended well beyond the primary lemmata. Not only were secondary quotations altered, but even the very exegesis itself was at times modified in order to conform to the textual choices of the revisers. For the purposes of this article, the direction of this change is immaterial—the simple fact that it took place precludes the *Homilies*

⁵⁶ The first-hand reading διμος has been corrected to διωγμος.

⁵⁷ For reasons that will be explained in a future publication, **Vatop324** is beyond reasonable doubt a direct copy of **Esphig7**.

on *Romans* (until and unless it proves possible to unravel the contaminated tangle of its manuscript tradition) from serving as ‘dateable and geographically certain evidence’ for the fourth-century text form used by Chrysostom.

8. Partial Repetition of 8:34 (Homily 24)

60.624.23-25 και πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα συνήγορος. Καὶ γὰρ ἐντυγχάνει, φησιν, ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν.⁵⁸

(a) και...εντυγχανει...υπερ ημων

AlexPL1 187v. **NLG453** 617pC2. **Dion113** 201rC2. **Esphig7** 167r. **LavraΓ128** 116v. **Vatop322** 234vC1. **Vatop323** 200r. **Vatop324** 200vC2. **Saba20** 223vC1. **Mainz114** 104rC1. **MessSS34** 153vC1. **MessSS35** 286vC2. **AmbA172s** 209vC2. **Mosc96** 276vC1. **Mosc99** 338vC2. **BSB457** 261r. **NapIIB4** 75vC1. **BodCrom21** 415pC2. **BNF509** 375r. **BNF731** 186v-187r. **BNF732** 243rC1. **BNF733** 160rC2. **BNF735** 280rC1. **BNF1016A** 293v. **Patmos145** 212v. **Sinai372** 210rC2. **BAVOtt420** 281rC2. **BAVRoss169** 309vC1. **BAVgr550** 243rC1. **BAVgr2065** 293v. **BNMz98** 213vC2. **BNMz103** 48r. **ONBgr87** 200vC2.

There are two additional variants that, while they do not attest a different text of this verse, have reshaped the citation formula in some way. In these instances I provide the reading in full, including the citation formula.

(b) και γαρ και εντυγχανει φησιν υπερ ημων

ONBgr170 223r.

(c) και αυτος φησιν εντυγχανει υπερ ημων

MessSS8 193rC1.

(d) Manuscripts not extant in this location.

BNF734. **BAVReg4**. **BNMz564**.

⁵⁸ The full sentence is so long that I have only provided the relevant portion here. I have also, for reasons of clarity, altered the punctuation to conform to that of Frederick Field, ed., *In Divi Pauli Epistolam ad Romanos Homiliae XXXIII* (Oxford: T. Combe, 1849), 397.

While this citation provides little additional information, it was included for the sake of completeness.

ANALYSIS AND IMPLICATIONS

As discussed at the beginning of this contribution, the particular value claimed for patristic citations is that, in contrast to most continuous-text manuscripts of the New Testament, they provide data that can be dated with relative precision (given that we know at least general dates for most of the fathers) and located geographically (given that we know the outlines of most of their careers). Certainly there is evidence to suggest that there are many cases in which the text form used by a particular father can be demonstrated to have been transmitted with considerable accuracy.⁵⁹ Nevertheless, the constant possibility of the sort of textual instability demonstrated above requires that any ‘proper evaluation’ of patristic citations includes a careful analysis of the manuscript tradition that lies behind them.

While I have focused in this contribution on examining a single cluster of verses in as many manuscripts as possible, this problem extends far beyond Chrysostom’s citations of Romans 8:33–35. As I show in a forthcoming article which examines a much broader range of textual locations in a single manuscript,⁶⁰ even the placement of the doxology, together with Chrysostom’s comments on it, is subject to the same variation that we see in continuous-text manuscripts of Romans.⁶¹ As demonstrated by the repetition of 8:35 in Homily 16, this variation extends well beyond the lemmata.

⁵⁹ See, for example, Houghton, *Augustine’s Text of John*.

⁶⁰ Montoro, “Invariablement byzantin?”

⁶¹ While in other respects, this study confirms and is supported by Steinfeld’s challenge to current methodologies of analyzing patristic citations, the degree to which the variety in the citations of Romans in the *Homilies on Romans* directly reflects the variety found in the manuscript tradition of Romans itself contrasts with his conclusions for the citations of Origen. See Matthew Richard Steinfeld, ‘The Text of Romans, Second Corinthians, and Galatians in the Writings of Origen of Alexandria’ (PhD diss., University of Birmingham, 2015), 309.

Furthermore, there is no feature of, or phrase in, the printed text that is itself secure enough to guarantee that a given reading has not suffered revision in one direction or another. Phrases such as *καὶ οὐκ εἶπε(ν)*... found in some manuscripts at the initial citation of 8:35 have traditionally been considered the 'gold standard' for textual stability in patristic citations. Indeed, Tischendorf thought this phrase so significant that he included the entirety of it in his textual apparatus for this verse.⁶² Yet upon examination of the manuscript tradition of the *Homilies on Romans*, not only is this phrase absent from a significant number of early manuscripts, but also the reading which it is clearly intended to support is itself a point of variation.

Editions 1-3 of the UBS follow Tischendorf in indicating that Chrysostom supports the reading *τοῦ χριστοῦ*. Given their more abbreviated format, they do not include the supporting statement printed by Tischendorf. UBS 4 and 5, however, offer a split reading, indicating that Chrysostom quotes this verse three times, twice with the reading *χριστοῦ* and once with the reading *θεοῦ*.

While these split readings have many possible explanations, in this particular instance it has been claimed that Chrysostom himself knew and used both of these readings. Barbara Aland put it this way:

Chrysostom knows the variant *τοῦ θεοῦ*. He quotes the verse eight times and in seven out of eight instances uses *τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, yet once he uses *τοῦ θεοῦ* (*De laudibus sancti Pauli apostoli* h. 6,1).⁶³

For the citation from *De laudibus*, Migne's edition may now be replaced by that of Piédagnel for *Sources Chrétiennes*.⁶⁴ As it turns out, the editorial text of both Migne and Piédagnel reads *τοῦ θεοῦ* rather than *τοῦ χριστοῦ* in the citation of Romans 8:35. Yet upon consultation of Piédagnel's apparatus, one finds that the manuscript

⁶² Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 2:408

⁶³ Aland, 'Trustworthy Preaching', 273n7. By my count, Chrysostom cites this verse no less than twelve times, including the two instances in the *Homilies on Romans* examined here. Though it was not possible to do so in this article, it would be interesting to examine the manuscript transmission of the other ten citations at some point.

⁶⁴ Auguste Piédagnel, *Jean Chrysostome: Panégyriques de Saint Paul*, SC 300 (Paris: Cerf, 1982), 262.

tradition of this work is also split, with no less than four of the manuscripts reading τοῦ χριστοῦ—in the very place that Aland considered Chrysostom's only use of τοῦ θεοῦ!

The claim that Chrysostom quotes this verse one way at one time and another way at another time ignores the fact that neither of the citations in question are textually stable in the manuscript tradition of the works in which they are found. To put it as straightforwardly as possible, the fact that two readings are preserved in the manuscripts of Chrysostom's works no more necessarily indicates that Chrysostom himself was aware of both of two different forms of this verse than the presence of both readings in continuous-text manuscripts of Romans proves that Paul was aware of two different forms of it.

CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, in order to evaluate patristic citations properly, it is not enough to determine from a printed edition that a citation is actually a citation—one must also go behind the edition to consider the stability of the manuscript tradition of the work itself. In the case of Chrysostom's *Homilies on Romans*, the demonstrated instability of the textform of its biblical citations requires a thorough investigation (and at least a partial resolution) of the complexities of its transmission history before it can be trusted to provide the dateable and locateable evidence that has been claimed for patristic citations. While the manuscripts of this work certainly contain much valuable evidence for the textual history of the New Testament, the evidence that they contain stands fully in the flow of that history. Until and unless the tangled threads of the manuscript transmission of the *Homilies on Romans* have themselves been convincingly unraveled, the evidence they provide should not be used in the larger task of plotting the twists and turns of the textual history of the New Testament.