

# Two-Way Traffic on the Transmissional Highway? Considering Chrysostom's Exegesis as an Explanation for the Reading of GA 104 in Romans 2:26

Peter Montoro and Robert Turnbull

## Introduction<sup>1</sup>

Standard introductions to New Testament textual criticism often refer to three basic sources, or streams, of evidence: the manuscripts, the versions, and the citations. The particular value often claimed for patristic citations is their usefulness in locating particular readings in space and time. As Fee and Mullen put it:

In NT textual criticism, patristic citations are ordinarily viewed as the third line of evidence, indirect and supplementary to the Greek manuscripts and the versions, and are often therefore treated as of tertiary importance. In fact, however, when properly evaluated, patristic evidence is of *primary* importance, for both of the major tasks of NT textual criticism: In contrast to the early Greek manuscripts, the Church Fathers have the potential of offering datable and geographically certain evidence.<sup>2</sup>

Three previous papers, two by Montoro and one by Montoro and Turnbull, have focused on the importance of an often-forgotten step in the “proper evaluation” of patristic evidence.<sup>3</sup> As argued in more detail in those papers, carefully

1. While Montoro is the primary author of this paper, its production would not have been possible without Turnbull's extensive technical assistance, primarily through his D-Codex software suite, portions of which were developed specifically for this paper. We would like to thank Hugh Houghton and Jeremiah Coogan for their thoughtful feedback on previous versions of this paper.

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 Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*, 2nd ed., NTTSD 42, ed. Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 351–52.

3. Peter Montoro, “The Textual Stability of Patristic Citations: Romans 8:33–35 in John Chrysostom's *Homilies on Romans*,” in *At One Remove: The Text of the New Testament in*

distinguishing between citations and allusions is not enough. Using the best editions available, though excellent practice, is not sufficient. Before we can take the evidence offered by citations as “datable and geographically certain,” we must first consider the *textual stability* of those citations within the manuscript tradition of the works from which they are taken. In the case of Chrysostom’s *Homilies on Romans*, not only the text of the lemmata, but even the smallest snippets of re-quotation were extensively and repeatedly revised in the course of transmission.<sup>4</sup> Therefore, before we can speak about or make use of “Chrysostom’s text,” we need to wrestle with the many times and ways in which that text has been transformed by influence from the broader stream of New Testament manuscripts.

This paper builds on this previous work by demonstrating that this sort of textual influence could sometimes be a two-sided coin. In other words, the transmissional highway shows evidence of two-way traffic, not only *from* New Testament manuscripts to patristic texts but also *from* patristic texts *to* New Testament manuscripts. Demonstrating the possibility of such two-way traffic on the transmissional highway is an initial step toward making the case that, rather than being seen as a “third stream” of textual evidence, cordoned off from the main river, the evidence of patristic exegetical works should instead be seen as a current within the river itself, a current that is not only influenced by the river but also has at least some influence on the river—a current that is in fact best seen as a part of the river itself.

While it seems possible that patristic exegesis may be the source for any number of readings in the broader textual stream, it is necessary to begin by demonstrating the *possibility* of such influence, a task which demands the building of a detailed case for a specific and clear example of such influence. Once it has been convincingly demonstrated that there has indeed been two-way traffic on the transmissional highway, the way will be clear to consider such influence as a potential explanation in more ambiguous cases as well. The significance of this paper therefore does not lie primarily in the specific example it considers, but rather in the possibilities of influence that it demonstrates: it opens the door to seeing this sort of influence as a possible explanation for textual transformation in a wide variety of other passages, expanding our understanding of the sources that influenced scribes as they went about the work of copying the scriptural text.

---

*Early Translations and Quotations*, ed. H. A. G. Houghton and Peter Montoro (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2020), 239–62; Peter Montoro, “‘Invariablement byzantin?’: Le texte de l’Épître aux Romains dans le Sabaiticus 20 et la transformation textuelle de l’héritage exégétique de Jean Chrysostome,” in *La source sans fin: la Bible chez Jean Chrysostome*, ed. Guillaume Bady (Turnhout: Brepols, 2021), 177–97; Peter Montoro and Robert Turnbull, “Revising the Repetitions: The Relative Textual Stability of Repeated Patristic Citations as a Window into the Transmission History of Patristic Exegesis—Chrysostom’s *Homilies on Romans* as an Initial Test Case,” *SacEr* 60 (2021): 69–99.

4. Montoro, “Invariablement byzantin?” looks at a large number of readings in a single manuscript, showing how substantial the cumulative impact of these changes can be. Montoro, “Textual Stability,” and Montoro and Turnbull, “Revising the Repetitions,” demonstrate that these changes affect not only the lemmata but even the smallest of snippets of expositional repetition.

## The Reading of GA 104 in Romans 2:26 Is Not a Scribal Creation

As can be seen in Table 1 below, in the last clause of Romans 2:26, GA 104, a minuscule manuscript copied by John Tzutzunas in AD 1087,<sup>5</sup> has a surprising substitution. Instead of λογισθήσεται (“will be regarded or counted”), the reading found in all printed editions of Romans, it has μετατραπήσεται (“will be changed or turned”).

**Table 1: Texts of Romans 2:26**

ἐὰν οὖν ἡ ἀκροβυστία τὰ δικαιώματα τοῦ νόμου φυλάσση, οὐχ ἡ ἀκροβυστία αὐτοῦ εἰς περιτομὴν λογισθήσεται; (NA<sup>28</sup>)

Ἐὰν οὖν ἡ ἀκροβυστία τὰ δικαιώματα τοῦ νόμου φυλάσση, οὐχὶ ἡ ἀκροβυστία αὐτοῦ εἰς περιτομὴν λογισθήσεται; (RP)<sup>6</sup>

εαν ουν η ακροβυστια τα δικαιωματα του νομου φυλασση ουχι η ακροβυστια αυτου εις περιτομην μετατραπησεται (GA 104)<sup>7</sup>

Looking at the word in context, there is no obvious contextual or mechanical explanation for this substitution. For example, the closest word that begins with μετ, μεταξὺ in Romans 2:15, is more than ten verses away. While the endings of the two words are the same (unsurprising, given that the overall grammatical context has not changed), λογισθήσεται and μετατραπήσεται do not otherwise sound or look similar. Even if this shared ending was sufficient to account for such a substitution, one would expect such a change to be from a less common word to a more common word—and yet the reverse is the case. While not exceedingly rare, μετατρέπω is not a common word in the broader corpus of ancient or medieval Greek. A search of the TLG revealed only 707 uses of this word in the entire database, compared to 19,205 uses of λογίζομαι.<sup>8</sup>

Furthermore, harmonization to another passage, that perpetual fountain of textual transformation, seems unlikely in this instance. In the NA<sup>28</sup>, μετατρέπω is

5. “Pinakes Greek Texts and Manuscripts,” *Institute for Research and History of Texts*, <https://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr/notices/copiste-possesseur-autre/1394/>. In addition to GA 104/London, British Library, Harley 5537, Tzutzunas is known to have copied some or all of four additional manuscripts: Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 4. 32 (GA 459); Oxford, Bodleian Library, Cromwell 9; Oxford, Christ Church, Wake 44; and Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek. theol. gr. 57. Irmgard Hutter, “Oxforder Marginalien,” *Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinistik* 29 (1980): 331–54, has a helpful discussion of the work of this scribe.

6. William G. Pierpont and Maurice A. Robinson, eds., *The New Testament in the Original Greek: Byzantine Textform 2018* (VTR Publications, 2018).

7. Transcription taken from “Epistles of Paul in Latin and Greek,” [https://itseweb.cal.bham.ac.uk/epistulae/XML/transcriptions/greek/06/NT\\_GRC\\_104\\_Rom.xml](https://itseweb.cal.bham.ac.uk/epistulae/XML/transcriptions/greek/06/NT_GRC_104_Rom.xml) and checked against the images available at [https://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/Viewer.aspx?ref=harley\\_ms\\_5537\\_f106r](https://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/Viewer.aspx?ref=harley_ms_5537_f106r). The Pinakes page for the manuscript can be accessed at <https://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr/notices/cote/39502/>.

8. Thesaurus Linguae Graecae Digital Library. Ed. Maria C. Pantelia. University of California, Irvine, accessed July 5, 2022, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu.ezproxye.bham.ac.uk>.

found only in James 4:9, and is in a very different context from that of Romans 2:26 (and with a different grammatical form as well). In the text of RP, it does not even appear. In Rahlfs's edition of the Greek Old Testament, the word occurs only four times, all in 4 Maccabees and not once in the grammatical form found in GA 104.<sup>9</sup> This is therefore not the sort of reading that one would expect a scribe to create in the course of copying a text. So, regardless of if he did so intentionally or unintentionally, where did Tzutzunas get this reading? What could have influenced him to make such a strange substitution?

### **This Reading Is Not Found in Any Known Continuous Text Manuscript of the New Testament**

The first step is to see if any other New Testament manuscripts contain this reading. The apparatus of NA<sup>28</sup>, Tischendorf, von Soden, and Swanson did not reveal any such manuscripts.<sup>10</sup> Fortunately, the IGNTP has already made no fewer than 140 full transcriptions of Romans available online, which Turnbull collated using his D-Codex software.<sup>11</sup> A consultation of all the witnesses extant at this location revealed that not one contained this reading, apart from GA 104 itself.

Between the *Hauptliste* and the *Ergänzungsliste*, *Text und Textwert* listed sixty individual witnesses as the closest relatives to GA 104 in Romans.<sup>12</sup> While twenty-five of these witnesses were already included in the IGNTP transcriptions, thirty-five of them were not. Using online images provided by the VMR and CSNTM, Montoro checked the manuscript images of all thirty-five of these witnesses.<sup>13</sup> While eight of them were not extant at this location, the twenty-seven that were all read λογισθήσεται in Romans 2:26. An additional twenty-one witnesses were consulted, all of which also read λογισθήσεται in Romans 2:26.<sup>14</sup> When taken together, the various

---

9. The NA<sup>28</sup> and LXX were searched using the Accordance Bible Software modules of these editions and RP using Logos Bible Software.

10. Constantin Tischendorf, ed., *Novum Testamentum Graece: Editio Octava Critica Maior Volume II* (Leipzig: Giesecke & Devrient, 1872); Hermann von Soden, ed., *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments: II, Teil: Text mit Apparat* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913); Reuben J. Swanson, *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Romans* (Pasadena, CA: William Carey International University Press, 2002).

11. "Epistles of Paul in Latin and Greek," accessed July 5, 2022, <https://itseweb.cal.bham.ac.uk/epistulae/>.

12. Kurt Aland, ed., *Text und Textwert der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments II: Die paulinischen Briefe—Band 1: Allgemeines, Römerbrief und Ergänzungsliste* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1991).

13. "New Testament Virtual Manuscript Room–INTF," New Testament Virtual Manuscript Room–INTF, <https://ntvmr.uni-muenster.de/>. "The Center for the Study of New Testament Manuscripts," The Center for the Study of New Testament Manuscripts, <http://csntm.org/>.

14. As a result of a mix-up in the early research in this paper, the GA 104 *Ergänzungsliste* for 2 Corinthians was also checked. These twenty-one witnesses were the ones found listed for 2 Corinthians and not for Romans. It seems quite striking, and worthy of further examination, that the *Ergänzungsliste* for these two epistles are so entirely different.

editions, transcriptions, and manuscripts consulted account for the readings of over 200 Greek witnesses to the text of Romans 2:26, with GA 104 as the only one that reads μετατραπήσεται, or indeed, anything other than λογισθήσεται, in this location.

Montoro also checked to see if readings corresponding to this variant were found in the manuscript tradition of the early versions. Consulting the COMPAUL transcriptions of Vetus Latina witnesses and the Wordsworth–White edition of the Vulgate didn't include anything that could be a translation of μετατραπήσεται.<sup>15</sup> The Aland–Juckel edition of the Syriac text showed no variation in the verb used to translate λογισθήσεται.<sup>16</sup> Neither of Horner's editions of the Coptic (Sahidic and Bohairic) revealed anything that could be the equivalent of μετατραπήσεται.<sup>17</sup> Finally, the readings found in Abraha's edition of the Ethiopic were unified in their support of λογισθήσεται.<sup>18</sup>

This thorough search of the extant evidence did not turn up a single additional witness to or possible source for the reading of GA 104 in Romans 2:26. GA 104 remains the only known continuous-text New Testament manuscript to provide evidence for any reading other than λογισθήσεται in Romans 2:26. Wherever Tzutunas got this reading, it therefore seems highly unlikely that he copied it from another continuous-text manuscript of Romans.<sup>19</sup>

### This Reading Is Found in Chrysostom's *Homilies on Romans*

As it turns out, however (Tables 2 and 3), this same surprising substitution *is* found in John Chrysostom's fourth-century *Homilies on Romans*. The extensive ITSEE database of Greek and Latin patristic citations reveals that Chrysostom's reading here is unique among patristic witnesses, as it is unique to GA 104 among continuous text manuscripts of the New Testament.<sup>20</sup>

15. The Vetus Latina transcriptions are available at <https://itseeweb.cal.bham.ac.uk/epistulae/>. John Wordsworth and Henry White, eds., *Nouum Testamentum Domini nostri Iesu Christe latine secundum editionem sancti Hieronymi: Partis secundae fasciculus primus: Epistula ad Romanos* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1913).

16. Barbara Aland and Andreas Juckel, eds., *Das Neue Testament in syrischer Überlieferung II: Die Paulinsichen Briefe—Part 1 Römer- und 1. Korintherbrief*, ANTF 14 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1991).

17. George Horner, ed., *The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Northern Dialect, Otherwise Called Memphitic and Bohairic*, vol. 3, (Oxford: Clarendon, 1898); George Horner, ed., *The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Southern Dialect, Otherwise Called Sahidic and Thebaic*, vol. 4 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1920). Christian Askeland kindly assisted Montoro in using these works.

18. Tedros Abraha, *La Lettera ai Romani: Testo e commentari della versione etiopica*, ÄF 57 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2001). As we did not have direct access to this work, Jeremiah Coogan generously consulted it on our behalf.

19. It is, of course, possible that this reading is the result of influence, not on Tzutunas directly, but on the scribe of an exemplar now lost or not yet discovered. While this would push the discussion back a stage, it would not change the basic argument of this paper.

20. *Database of Pauline Epistles*, accessed July 5, 2022, <https://itseeweb.cal.bham.ac.uk/epistulae/citations.html>.

**Table 2: Text and Translation of Chrysostom's Exegesis of Romans 2:26.**

“Ὅταν οὖν ἡ ἀκροβυστία τὰ δικαιώματα τοῦ νόμου φυλάττη, οὐχὶ ἡ ἀκροβυστία αὐτοῦ εἰς περιτομὴν μετατραπήσεται [*First Instance*];” “Ὅρα τί ποιεῖ. Οὐ λέγει, ὅτι ἡ ἀκροβυστία τὴν περιτομὴν νικᾷ· τοῦτο γὰρ σφόδρα ἦν ἐπαχθὲς τοῖς τότε ἀκούουσιν· ἀλλ’ ὅτι ἡ ἀκροβυστία περιτομὴ γέγονε. Καὶ ζητεῖ τί ἐστὶ λοιπὸν περιτομὴ, καὶ τί ἀκροβυστία· καὶ λέγει, ὅτι περιτομὴ πρᾶξις ἐστὶν ἀγαθὴ, καὶ ἀκροβυστία πρᾶξις πονηρά. Καὶ πρότερον μεταστήσας εἰς τὴν περιτομὴν τὸν ἀκρόβυστον τὸν πρᾶξις ἔχοντα χρηστὰς, καὶ τὸν ἐμπερίτομον τὸν ἐν διεφθαρμένῳ βίῳ εἰς τὴν ἀκροβυστίαν ἐξωθήσας, οὕτω τὴν νίκην δίδωσι τῷ ἀκροβύστῳ. Καὶ οὐ λέγει, τῷ ἀκροβύστῳ, ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ τὸ πρᾶγμα μέτεισιν οὕτω λέγων· “οὐχὶ ἡ ἀκροβυστία αὐτοῦ εἰς περιτομὴν μετατραπήσεται [*Second Instance*];” Καὶ οὐκ εἶπε, λογισθήσεται, ἀλλὰ, “τραπήσεται [*Third Instance*];” ὅπερ ἐμφαντικώτερον ἦν· ὡσπερ καὶ ἀνωτέρω οὐκ εἶπεν, ἡ περιτομὴ σου ἀκροβυστία λογίζεται, ἀλλὰ, “γέγονε.” (Field, *In divi Pauli Epistolam ad Romanos*, 77, textual data for instances 1–3 found in table 3.)<sup>21</sup>

“Therefore if the uncircumcision keep the righteousness of the Law, shall not his uncircumcision *be turned* [*First Instance*] into circumcision?” See how he acts. He does not say that the uncircumcision overcomes circumcision (for this was highly grating to those who then heard him), but that the uncircumcision hath become circumcision. And he next enquires what circumcision is, and what uncircumcision is and he says that circumcision is well doing and uncircumcision is evil doing. And having first transferred into the circumcision the uncircumcised, who has good deeds, and having thrust out the circumcised man that lived a corrupt life into the uncircumcision, he so gives the preference to the uncircumcised. And he does not say, To the uncircumcised, but goes on to the thing itself, speaking as follows: “Shall not his uncircumcision *be turned* [*Second Instance*] into circumcision?” And he does not say “reckoned,” but “*turned to*” [*Third Instance*], which was more expressive. As also above he does not say thy circumcision is reckoned uncircumcision, but has been made so. (Translation from NPNF2 11:370–371.)

Though Chrysostom does not seem to have cited this verse in his other works,<sup>22</sup> he does repeat this particular word three times in his paragraph of exegesis on this verse. Table 3 (following page) provides a full collation of all extant witnesses of the *Homilies on Romans* for these three locations.<sup>23</sup> As can be seen in table 2, Chrysostom explicitly comments on the specific word that Paul uses in Romans 2:26. In the earliest textual form of this comment, Chrysostom says this: καὶ οὐκ

21. Frederick Field, ed., *In divi Pauli Epistolam ad Romanos Homiliae XXXIII* (Oxford: T. Combe, 1849).

22. The citation database adds an additional quotation in the *Homilies on Matthew*, but this is an allusion and does not contain the relevant variation unit.

23. This collation is taken from Montoro and Turnbull, “Revising the Repetitions,” 79, which provides details both on the manuscripts collated and on the selection criteria for manuscripts. Manuscripts copied after the printed *editio princeps* of 1529 were excluded.

Table 3

	<i>First Instance</i>	<i>Second Instance</i>	<i>Third Instance</i>
<i>Field/Migne</i>	μετατραπησεται*	μετατραπησεται	τραπησεται
<i>AlexPL1</i>	μετατραπησεται	μετατραπησεται	μετατραπησεται
<i>AmbA172s</i>	περιτραπησεται	μετατραπησεται	τραπησεται
<i>BAVOtt420</i>	μετατραπησεται	μετατραπησεται	μετατραπησεται
<i>BAVReg4</i>	λογισθησεται	λογισθησεται	λογισθησεται
<i>BAVRoss169</i>	λογισθησεται	μετατραπησεται	τραπησεται
<i>BAVgr2065</i>	μετατραπησεται	μετατραπησεται	τραπησεται/ μετατραπησεται
<i>BAVgr550</i>	λογισθησεται	μετατραπησεται	τραπησεται
<i>BnF1016A</i>	μετατραπησεται	μετατραπησεται	μετατραπησεται
<i>BnF509</i>	μετατραπησεται	μετατραπησεται	μετατραπησεται
<i>BnF731</i>	λογισθησεται	μετατραπησεται	τραπησεται
<i>BnF732</i>	μετατραπησεται	μετατραπησεται	μετατραπησεται
<i>BnF733</i>	—	—	—
<i>BnF734</i>	μετατραπησεται	μετατραπησεται	μετατραπησεται
<i>BnF735</i>	μετατραπησεται	μετατραπησεται	μετατραπησεται
<i>BNMz103</i>	περιτραπησεται	μετατραπησεται	τραπησεται
<i>BNMz564</i>	λογισθησεται	λογισθησεται	λογισθησεται
<i>BNMz98</i>	λογισθησεται	μετατραπησεται	τραπησεται
<i>BSB457</i>	λογισθησεται	μετατραπησεται	τραπησεται
<i>BodCrom21</i>	μετατραπισεται	μετατραπησεται	μετατραπησεται
<i>Dion113</i>	λογισθησεται	μετατραπησεται	τραπησεται
<i>Esphig7</i>	τραπησεται	μετατραπησεται	τραπησεται
<i>Fragment</i>	—	—	—
<i>LavraΓ128</i>	—	—	—
<i>Mainz114</i>	λογισθησεται	λογισθησεται	λογισθησεται
<i>MessSS34</i>	μετατραπησεται	μετατραπησεται	μετατραπησεται
<i>MessSS35</i>	λογισθησεται	μετατραπησεται	τραπησεται
<i>MessSS8</i>	λογισθησεται	μετατραπησεται	τραπησεται
<i>Mosc96</i>	λογισθησεται	τραπησεται	τραπησεται
<i>Mosc99</i>	μετατραπησεται	μετατραπησεται	μετατραπησεται
<i>NapIIB4</i>	μετατραπησεται	μετατραπησεται	μετατραπησεται
<i>NLG453</i>	μετατραπησεται	μετατραπησεται	μετατραπησεται
<i>ONBgr170</i>	λογισθησεται	μετατραπησεται	τραπησεται
<i>ONBgr87</i>	λογισθησεται‡	μετατραπησεται	τραπησεται
<i>Patmos145</i>	μετατραπησεται	μετατραπησεται	μετατραπησεται
<i>Saba20</i>	λογισθησεται <sup>o</sup>	λογισθησεται	λογισθησεται
<i>Sinai372</i>	λογισθησεται	λογισθησεται	λογισθησεται
<i>Vatop322</i>	λογισθησεται	μετατραπησεται	τραπησεται
<i>Vatop323</i>	μετατραπησεται	μετατραπησεται	μετατραπησεται
<i>Vatop324</i>	τραπησεται	μετατραπησεται	τραπησεται

\*Migne has περιτραπησεται.

‡ This is indeed the reading, but it is an obvious error for λογισθησεται.

εἶπε, λογισθήσεται, ἀλλὰ, μετατραπήσεται, ὅπερ ἐμφαντικώτερον ἦν (“And he did not say, ‘it will be regarded,’ but ‘it will be changed,’ which was more emphatic”).<sup>24</sup>

While a number of witnesses correct μετατραπήσεται to λογισθήσεται in the initial lemma, and a handful of witnesses even reverse the direction of Chrysostom’s subsequent comment on it, Montoro’s work on the overall stemma<sup>25</sup> has made it obvious that these witnesses have a clear and consistent tendency to update Chrysostom’s biblical text to that found in New Testament manuscripts and that, therefore, this should be seen as an intentional correction.

This external evidence of the manuscript stemma is strongly supported by internal evidence. To begin with, it simply is not true and does not make sense to say that λογισθήσεται is “more emphatic” than μετατραπήσεται. This is confirmed by the sentence that immediately follows: “As also above he does not say thy circumcision is reckoned uncircumcision, but has been made so.” The point of this comment, which is not subject to any meaningful variation in the textual tradition of the *Homilies on Romans*, depends on a reading other than λογισθήσεται in 2:26. While a more detailed stemmatic analysis is needed to sort out the secondary differences between various forms of τρέπω, both internal and external evidence demonstrate that some form of τρέπω, most likely μετατραπήσεται, is the reading found in the initial text of Romans 2:26 in Chrysostom’s *Homilies on Romans*, as well as being the reading most commonly found in the extant manuscripts of this work, and thus is the most likely to be encountered by a Byzantine scribe like John Tzutzunas.

### This Reading Was Almost Certainly Created by Chrysostom

Despite the way it has sometimes been taken, when Chrysostom says, καὶ οὐκ εἶπε(ν), or some similar phrase, he is not making a text critical comment, not giving us his judgment between two different readings he has noticed in manuscripts.<sup>26</sup> As a consideration of Chrysostom’s overall (and very frequent) usage of this phrase makes plain, it is instead a technique for emphasizing an exegetical or exhortational point, without any reference to manuscripts on his part. Given, however, that modern scholars have sometimes understood the phrase as a text-critical comment, it is possible that a medieval scribe such as Tzutzunas could also have taken Chrysostom’s comment in this way. Despite this possibility, in the rare places where Chry-

24. Montoro’s translation.

25. This research will, *Deo volente*, be made available in Montoro’s forthcoming thesis.

26. For an example of a modern scholar taking the phrase in this way, see e.g., 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), 273. For a corrective, see 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. For a helpful exploration of the meaning and use of this and similar expressions, see Susan Griffith, “‘It Doesn’t Say’: Metatextual Observations in Greek Patristic Commentaries on Galatians,” *StPatr* 100 (2020): 303–13.



sostom does mention actual manuscript differences, his language is different. When, for example, he expresses his preference for the reading “Bethabara” in John 1:28, he states that his preferred reading is found in “many of the more accurate copies.”<sup>27</sup>

We therefore have no reason to suppose that Chrysostom was aware of two readings in Romans 2:26 and was by this comment intending to declare his preference for one over the other. This comment, made in the course of his impassioned and extemporaneous preaching, should simply be seen as emphasizing the precise wording of what Chrysostom remembers as the correct text. The homiletic context of this citation is crucial. While there seems to be no good explanation as to why a *copyist*, of either Romans or Chrysostom’s *Homilies on Romans*, would accidentally or intentionally substitute μετατραπήσεται for λογισθήσεται, such an unintentional substitution makes perfect sense in the flow of Chrysostom’s argument (see Table 2).

At this point, we need to consider the biblical text found in Chrysostom’s exegetical homilies from a more general perspective. In these homilies, the common distinction between “lemma text” and “non-lemma text” is somewhat artificial, at least when it is used to refer to the earliest text of Chrysostom’s homilies themselves.<sup>28</sup> While he normally progresses sequentially through the text of a given book, the exegetical portion of each homily<sup>29</sup> moves seamlessly between quotation, exposition, quotation of other passages of Scripture, re-quotation of the text being commented on, and further exposition before moving on to the next verse or group of verses to be explained. As an additional consideration, there are places in Chrysostom’s *Homilies on Romans* where entire pages of dozens of generally precise quotations of Scripture are woven together from widely separated sections of Scripture.<sup>30</sup> Whether occurring individually or in large blocks, these quotations are often not only as long as the so-called lemma but also as accurate when compared to the manuscripts of the Old and New Testament.<sup>31</sup> Consequentially, there is no good reason to suppose that we have one origin for the lemmata and another

27. Amy M. Donaldson, “Explicit References to New Testament Variant Readings among Greek and Latin Church Fathers” (PhD diss., University of Notre Dame, 2009), 120–21.

28. While (as will be detailed in Montoro’s forthcoming thesis) some manuscripts of these homilies do make a formatting distinction between the initial citation of each verse and its subsequent repetitions, these distinctions are often arbitrary, frequently mistaken, and clearly secondary.

29. Chrysostom’s exegetical homilies generally divide into two portions, the first is exegetical, working sequentially through a portion of the text; the second is ethical, providing moral exhortation on a theme that may or may not be derived from the text being exegeted. The divide between these two portions is frequently noted in the manuscript tradition.

30. At the end of *Homily 28* on Romans, for example, there are no fewer than thirty-six separate citations taken from all over the Psalms (some repeated more than once and some of multiple verses each) over the course of only four of Field’s (not very crowded) pages. See Field, *In divi Pauli Epistolam ad Romanos*, 444–47.

31. Montoro’s forthcoming thesis focuses on the biblical citations in the manuscript tradition of the *Homilies on Romans* and will provide a detailed exploration of their correspondence (and occasional lack of correspondence) to the textual forms found in continuous text biblical manuscripts.

for the re-quotations and citations of other scriptural texts. Given how fluidly and frequently Chrysostom shifts between text and exposition, between quotation and re-quotation, between one citation and another, it is unlikely that the stenographers taking down his sermons could have made the appropriate notations to subsequently fill in any but perhaps the longest of block quotations from biblical manuscripts after the event.<sup>32</sup>

While these citations, along with the rest of the homilies, may have been edited and corrected along the way in the course of the manuscript transmission of the work, the original source of the text of the scriptural citations found in Chrysostom's exegetical homilies almost certainly goes back to what Chrysostom said in the course of preaching, and could therefore have been directly influenced by the flow of his own argument (something that continues to take place today). Since Chrysostom is generally agreed to have preached without notes,<sup>33</sup> we should not think of him as bringing a manuscript into the pulpit that included each of the many dozens of snippets of Scripture that he intended to refer to throughout the course of each sermon. The evidence available strongly suggests that Chrysostom's citations of Scripture, precise as so many of them are, were generally given from memory.<sup>34</sup> In his own lifetime, it was precisely for his astonishing mastery of the Scriptures that Chrysostom was admired.<sup>35</sup> Given that we have a good deal of evidence that the ascetics of his day made a habit of memorizing massive sections of Scripture,<sup>36</sup> there is no reason to be skeptical that Chrysostom would have had most or even all of the New Testament, as well as large sections of the Old Testament, on instant and relatively precise recall, especially those sections on which we have extant homilies, such as Paul's letter to the Romans.

This means that the ultimate source of the text of Romans as found in Chrysostom's *Homilies on Romans*, is not any particular biblical manuscript, but rather Chrysostom's own mental text as learned from whatever manuscripts were available to him to memorize in his youth and to review throughout the course of his life. While this text is generally astonishingly precise, only differing on rare occasions from the forms of the text found in New Testament manuscripts, preaching section by section through a memorized text offers a different set of affordances for textual

---

32. While there are some differences between the practice of Augustine and Chrysostom (see below), the discussion found in Hugh Houghton, *Augustine's Text of John: Patristic Citations and Latin Gospel Manuscripts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 36–39, is very useful on this topic.

33. J. N. D. Kelly, *Golden Mouth: The Story of John Chrysostom, Ascetic, Preacher, Bishop* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1995), 57–58.

34. In *Augustine's Text of John*, Houghton (using the inconsistency between the lemma text and its subsequent repetitions) demonstrates that, in the case of Augustine's sermons, a clear distinction should be made between the citations of the lemma (generally taken from the codex used for liturgical reading) and illustrative citations taken from memory. However, in the case of Chrysostom, the apparent *consistency* of lemma and repetition (see Montoro and Turnbull, "Revising the Repetitions") seems to indicate the opposite.

35. Palladios, *Dialogue sur la vie de Jean Chrysostome*, ed. Anne-Marie Malingrey, SC 341 (Paris: Cerf, 1988), 110.

36. As one example among many, see Palladios, *Dialogue*, 340.

transformation than the copying of a text word by word or clause by clause. Because of this, variations that are difficult to understand in terms of scribal habits can be relatively easy to understand in terms of homiletic practice.

It is therefore reasonable to see Chrysostom himself as the ultimate origin of the substitution of μετατραπήσεται for λογισθήσεται. To be clear: We are not arguing that he intentionally changed the text of Romans to support his argument, an idea that undoubtedly would have utterly appalled a man like Chrysostom.<sup>37</sup> We are instead arguing that, caught up in the flow of his argument, he experienced a glitch in his memory that *unintentionally* invented a New Testament reading, a reading that went on to influence the work of a scribe more than six hundred years after Chrysostom's death.

### Chrysostom's Reading Could Easily Have Influenced GA 104

So how could a reading originally created in the course of Chrysostom's preaching in Antioch in the fourth century have entered into the text as copied by John Tzutzunas, a Byzantine scribe living under the rule of the short-lived Emirate of Tzachas, in the region of Smyrna in AD 1087?<sup>38</sup> To begin, it does not appear that this particular reading was mediated via a catena manuscript, though it is probable that many other such readings were. Though the 140 transcriptions so far made available by the IGNTP include no fewer than 34 catena manuscripts, many of them dependent in some way on Chrysostom, not one of them has this reading.<sup>39</sup> As best as we can tell, Tzutzunas, or perhaps the scribe of a now lost exemplar, was directly influenced by the direct tradition of the *Homilies on Romans* themselves. How, then, did this reading make it from Chrysostom's homilies into the text of GA 104? There are at least three possibilities, each of which would be sufficient to account for this proposed influence.<sup>40</sup>

1. Tzutzunas was a prolific scribe, with five of his manuscripts known to be still extant. In addition to copying biblical texts, he also copied patristic texts. Given that more than 90 percent of once extant medieval manuscripts

---

37. Even a brief perusal of his sermons makes very plain the tremendous love that Chrysostom had for the precise wording of Scripture, especially the letters of Paul.

38. See Hutter, "Oxford Marginalien," for these and other details about the career of Tzutzunas.

39. As Houghton pointed out in a personal communication, it is also possible that this change could have been first made in a catena manuscript that has not yet been discovered or that no longer survives. For a possible example of this, see Houghton's paper in chapter 1 of this volume.

40. A fourth possibility would be some other sort of indirect transmission. However, given the inherent oddity of the substitution to begin with, this seems unlikely in this instance. Interestingly enough, GA 459, copied by Tzutzunas in 1092, five years after GA 104, also contains the text of Romans, but does not contain the distinctive reading discussed in this paper. This increases the likelihood that the reading in GA 104 is the result of unintentional influence.

have now perished,<sup>41</sup> it is possible that he had produced a copy of the *Homilies on Romans*, and that, consciously or subconsciously, this influenced his subsequent copying of Romans in GA 104.

2. By this time, it was common for Chrysostom's homilies to be read aloud in their entirety as part of particular liturgies.<sup>42</sup> It is also possible, of course, that he simply read Chrysostom's *Homilies on Romans*, perhaps even that he was reading them as he copied the text of GA 104, and that, consciously or subconsciously, this influenced him as he copied the text of Romans.
3. There are extant manuscripts of the *Homilies on Romans* that are marked for liturgical reading, not as complete homilies, but as a text of Romans in their own right. It is therefore possible that John the scribe had heard John the preacher's lemmas read as the text of Romans and this, consciously or subconsciously, went on to influence his copying of the text.<sup>43</sup>

## Conclusion

Before drawing our final conclusions, let us summarize the points we have made so far:

- GA 104's substitution of μετατραπήσεται for λογισθήσεται in Romans 2:26 is unlikely to have been independently created in the course of copying.
- This reading is not found in any other New Testament manuscript, version, or citation, apart from Chrysostom's *Homilies on Romans*.
- This reading is well established as both the earliest and the majority reading of Romans 2:26 in the manuscript tradition of Chrysostom's *Homilies on Romans*.
- This reading most likely derives from Chrysostom himself, created during the course of preaching, taken down by a stenographer, and left uncorrected in the initial text of his homilies.

---

41. Paolo Trovato, *Everything You Always Wanted to Know about Lachmann's Method: A Non-Standard Handbook of Genealogical Textual Criticism in the Age of Post-Structuralism, Cladistics, and Copy-Text* (Padova, Italy: liberiauniversitaria.it edizioni, 2017), 104–8, discusses the loss rate of medieval manuscripts from which the estimate of 90 percent is extrapolated.

42. Mary Cunningham, "Preaching and the Community," in *Church and People in Byzantium*, ed. Rosemary Morris (Birmingham: Center for Byzantine, Ottoman and Modern Greek Studies, 1990), 37.

43. These markings are present in Paris Bibliothèque nationale de France, gr. 731; Paris Bibliothèque nationale de France, gr. 732; and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Cromwell 21. While more research needs to be done on this point, it seems possible that these manuscripts could have been used, not simply for the liturgical reading of a *homily*, but for the liturgical reading of *Romans*, skipping the commentary and repetitions of Chrysostom and reading only the lemmata in sequence.

- While the chain of influence is impossible to determine with certainty, there are several plausible ways in which this reading could have intentionally or unintentionally migrated from a manuscript of Chrysostom's *Homilies on Romans* to the text of GA 104.

In conclusion, therefore, this reading should be seen as a concrete and specific instance of two-way traffic on the transmissional highway, a demonstration that the current of exegetical manuscripts could indeed make an impact on the broader stream of textual tradition. This is, of course, a preliminary study and more work remains to be done. Yet even this single clear example is enough to enable us to snatch at least a glimpse of a broader possibility.

While the reading of GA 104 discussed in this paper did not enter the broader stream of textual tradition in continuous-text manuscripts of Romans, there is no reason to suppose that Chrysostom's exegesis only influenced manuscripts that were not subsequently copied. Given the tendency of Byzantine scribes to select the smoothest reading,<sup>44</sup> and the tendency of texts to become smoother when they are memorized, it is possible that any number of more widely spread readings, difficult to explain as *scribal* changes in the course of copying, are the result of this sort of influence. If additional research can demonstrate this, it would provide further evidence that, rather than being an independent stream, the homilies of Chrysostom should not be seen as a separate stream of evidence that is useful primarily for dating and locating the readings found in early New Testament manuscripts, but instead as a vital current that is part of the river itself.

---

44. Klaus Wachtel, "Kinds of Variants in the Manuscript Tradition of the Greek New Testament," in *Studies in Stemmatology II*, ed. Pieter van van Reenen et al. (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2004), 87–98.