New Test. Stud. 59, pp. 588–606. © Cambridge University Press, 2013
doi:10.1017/S0028688513000179

Papyrus 32 (Titus) as a Multi-text Codex: A New Reconstruction*

EMILY GATHERGOOD
Dept of Theology and Religious Studies, University of Nottingham, Nottingham NG7 2RD, UK.
email: emily.gathergood@gmail.com

Following the recent emphasis on studying early Christian manuscripts as historical artefacts, whose text *and* meta-textual aspects comprise important embodiments of reception and interpretation, this article re-examines the early Titus fragment $\mathfrak{P}^{32}$ (P.Ryl. Gr. 1.5) with respect to its physical situation within the manuscript. I expand the scope of current reconstructions to consider in detail the lost beginning of the epistle, and argue that Titus was not the first document in the codex: at least one other preceded. Although the identity of the accompanying material cannot be deduced codicologically, patristic evidence suggests that Titus was normally transmitted in a collection of thirteen or fourteen Pauline epistles when the $\mathfrak{P}^{32}$ codex was produced, rendering these the prime candidates.

Keywords: P^{32}, Titus, codex, Pastoral epistles, Pauline canon

1. Introduction

The fragmentary John Rylands papyrus of Titus (P.Ryl. Gr. 1.5), commonly known as $\mathfrak{P}^{32}$, is the only surviving manuscript of this Pauline epistle prior to the mid-fourth-century Bible Codex Sinaiticus. $\mathfrak{P}^{32}$ was acquired by papyrologist Arthur Hunt (the editor) between 1895 and 1907, during which time he and Bernard Grenfell jointly conducted several archaeological excavations at Oxyrhynchus and towns in the Fayûm, but its provenance is unknown.[1]

* Thanks to Elizabeth Gow, Manuscript Curator at the John Rylands Library, for arranging access to $\mathfrak{P}^{32}$ and related archival records. Thanks also to the Arts and Humanities Research Council for funding the research, and to J. K. Elliott, P. M. Head, R. H. Bell, R. Deines and the Informal Biblical Seminar at the University of Nottingham for responding to working drafts of this article.

1 The *editio princeps* is A. S. Hunt, *Catalogue of the Greek Papyri in the John Rylands Library*, vol. I (Manchester, 1911) 10-11. Digital images at The John Rylands University Digital Library, image numbers JRL023046tr (*recto*) and JRL023047tr (*verso*), http://enriqueta.man.ac.uk/luna/servlet/ManchesterDev~93~3 (March 2013).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688513000179 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Presently $\mathfrak{P}^{32}$ is a relatively small fragment (c. 4.9 × 10.5 cm) from the bottom half of a single papyrus leaf, now showing only some of Titus 1.11-15 and 2.3-8. It happens that on the *recto* (→) side only the first 7-9 letters of 13 lines of text are preserved, while on the *verso* (↓) side we have the final 3-9 letters of 14 lines (some letters are partly or wholly effaced). There are inner and lower margins, c. 1.5 and 2.3 cm respectively. It is evident that, as usual for NT manuscripts, the original format of $\mathfrak{P}^{32}$ was that of a codex (a 'book') of gathered leaves rather than a roll, for the flow of writing can be traced as running in a single column *across* the two 'pages', from the *recto* ('front') side (1.11-15) to the *verso* ('back') (2.3-8), though the intervening text is now missing due to the deterioration of the top of the leaf. Rolls were normally written only on the *recto* side (the horizontal fibres being preferred to the vertical fibres of the *verso* side), though occasionally the *verso* could also be used for another document. But in $\mathfrak{P}^{32}$ we have the same text continuing on both sides so as to indicate two consecutive 'pages' of a codex leaf. Since there are no indications that $\mathfrak{P}^{32}$ was excerptive or anything other than a continuous-text manuscript, it is presumed that the immediate literary context of the fragment is the remainder—the whole—of the epistle to Titus.[2]

The script of $\mathfrak{P}^{32}$ is upright, large, well rounded and carefully written, with some cursive formations and occasional ligature. Vertical and horizontal strokes are typically decorated with intentional 'roundels' (ink blobs), and obliques with ornamental curls (finials), which accentuate the generally bilinear arrangement of letters with respect to the notional upper/lower horizontal guide lines. The spacing between letters is slightly uneven, but on two occasions the gap is large enough to suggest intentional word division (between [επιστομι]ζειν and οιτ[ινες], line 1 *recto*, and ψευσται and κ[ακα], line 5 *recto*). Diaereses for ϊδιος (line 4 *recto*) and ϊν[α] (line 8 *recto*; line 2 *verso*) aid reading. The purpose of the short horizontal strokes in the left hand margin at the beginning of lines 2 and 9 *recto* is unclear. Contraction of the *nomen divinum* occurs in the form $\overline{\theta\upsilon}$ (line 7 *verso*), and available space suggests the contraction of ανθρωπων (line 10 *recto*). Overall, the type of presentation may be characterized as the 'reformed documentary' common among early NT papyri—the product of a skilled scribe who was aware of working on a literary text and aimed for, but to some extent fell short of, a professional effect. It is not possible to determine the textual character because only a relatively small amount of text remains.[3]

2 Hence its uncontested place in the Gregory Aland register; cf. K. Aland, *Kurzgefasste Liste der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments* (Zweite, neubearbeitete und ergänzte Auflage, in Verbindung mit M. Welte, B. Köster und K. Junack; ANTF 1; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994), updates at www.uni-muenster.de/NTTextforschung/.

3 At Titus 2.7 $\mathfrak{P}^{32}$ reads [αφ]θονιαν (rather than αφθοριαν or αδιαφθοριαν) in agreement with the 'Western' reading of F G 1881, but at two other points $\mathfrak{P}^{32}$ agrees with the rest of the tradition *against* F and G: at 1.12 it lacks δε and at 1.14 it reads εντολ[αις] rather than

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688513000179 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Before attending to hypothetical reconstruction of the lost text, I reappraise the palaeographical dating of the manuscript, which is important for the ultimate question of content.

1.1. *The Date of the Manuscript*

Hunt palaeographically assigned $\mathfrak{P}^{32}$ to the third century, briefly commenting that its 'round and rather large uncial hand' looks 'decidedly early' and belongs to about the same period as the very similar hand of P.Oxy. 656 (Genesis LXX), which he and Grenfell had assigned to the late second or early third century, though $\mathfrak{P}^{32}$ 'is perhaps the later of the two'. E. Dobschütz listed $\mathfrak{P}^{32}$ as third or fourth century,[4] whilst H. I. Bell and T. C. Skeat sought to push back the date of P.Oxy. 656—and therefore $\mathfrak{P}^{32}$—definitely into the second century, appealing to 'a really striking similarity, both in the general appearance and in the forms of individual letters', with the then newly discovered P.Lond. Christ. 1 ('Egerton' gospel), which they assigned to the middle of the second century using the roughly dateable P.Lond. 130 (a horoscope with introductory letter, I-II) and the documents P.Fay. 110 (94) and P.Berol. 6854 (98-117).[5] Bell and Skeat's earlier placement of $\mathfrak{P}^{32}$ on this basis has been supported by C. H. Roberts, P. W. Comfort and D. Martinez, whilst K. Aland puts it at 'um 200', the date that has been most influential in the wider literature.[6] However, M. Gronewald reassigned P.Lond.Christ. 1 to c. 200, in light of the discovery of another fragment from the same codex, P.Köln 255, that has an oblique apostrophe between two consonants (a feature that was not common until the third

ενταλμαcιν. At 2.7 it is clear from the amount of space available that there was agreement with ℵ A C D² F G K L 81 1739 1881 *pc* in reading cε[μνοτητα] without αφθαρcιαν= D² K L Ψ 𝔐. It seems that the scribe accurately reproduced their exemplar, at least in the text that has been preserved.

4 E. Dobschütz, 'Zur Liste der Neutestamentlichen Handschriften', *ZNW* 23 (1924) 251.

5 H. I. Bell and T. C. Skeat, *Fragments of an Unknown Gospel and Other Early Christian Papyri* (London: Trustees of the British Museum/Oxford University, 1935) 6-7, reporting the support of palaeographers Wilhelm Schubart and Frederic Kenyon; H. I. Bell, 'Evidences of Christianity in Egypt during the Roman Period', *HTR* 37 (1944) 201 n. 23.

6 C. H. Roberts, *Manuscript, Society and Belief in Early Christian Egypt* (London: Oxford University, 1979) 13-14; C. H. Roberts and T. C. Skeat, *The Birth of the Codex* (London: Oxford University for The British Academy, 1987) 40-1, 46; P. W. Comfort, *Encountering the Manuscripts: An Introduction to New Testament Paleography and Textual Criticism* (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2005) 130–1; D. G. Martinez, 'The Papyri and Early Christianity', *The Oxford Handbook of Papyrology* (ed. R. Bagnall; Oxford: Oxford University, 2009) 596; K. Aland, 'Zur Liste der Neutestamentlichen Handschriften VI', *ZNW* 48 (1957) 153; *Liste*, 6; *Repertorium der griechischen christlichen Papyri, I: Biblische Papyri* (PTS 18; Münster: de Gruyter, 1976) 253.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688513000179 Published online by Cambridge University Press

century).[7] This in turn undermines confidence in the second-century datings of P. Oxy. 656 (using P.Lond.Christ. 1) and $\mathfrak{P}^{32}$ (using P.Oxy. 656 and P.Lond.Christ. 1) and highlights a problem of circularity of argument arising from over-reliance on assigned dated *comparanda*. For the same reason, other early Christian manuscripts with which $\mathfrak{P}^{32}$ has close affinities, such as $\mathfrak{P}^{66}$ = P.Bodm. II (John; assigned c. 200, using P.Lond.Christ. 1), $\mathfrak{P}^{90}$ = P.Oxy. 3523 (John; assigned II, using P.Oxy. 656 and P.Lond.Christ. 1), and $\mathfrak{P}^{104}$ = P.Oxy. 4404 (Matthew; assigned late II, using $\mathfrak{P}^{90}$), are of limited independent value for dating.

A more rigorous method for dating an undated literary manuscript such as $\mathfrak{P}^{32}$ is to locate the hand within the historical context of its 'graphic stream' by comparison with dated (or else firmly dateable) hands that are characterized by the same stylistic elements.[8] W. Schubart understood the large, round script with decorative finials and roundels to constitute a single, normative 'decorated style' (Zierstil) prevalent in the period from the last century of the Ptolemaic era to about AD 100,[9] but Turner identified these features in various non-specific calligraphic scripts that persisted into the third century in documents such as P.Oxy. 3030 (c. 207), P.Oxy. 3093 (217) and P.Lund IV.13 (250–275).[10] G. Cavallo places $\mathfrak{P}^{32}$ in the early third century by contextualizing it within a particular stream that appears in dated documents such as *PSI* V.446 (133–37), P.Fay. 87 (155/6), P.Oxy. 473 (138–61) and eventually in the fifth to sixth centuries turns into the normative style known as 'Alexandrian Majuscule' (or Coptic-type Uncial).[11] The broad, rounded forms of θ ε c in $\mathfrak{P}^{32}$ contrast the narrower, oval forms of the later, more fully-fledged versions found in P.Berol. 13418 (V), P.Grenf. II.112 (577), P.Oxy. 1820 (VI/VII), P.Köln 215 (VI/VII), P.Oxy. 2258 (VI/VII), P.Louvre

7 M. Gronewald, 'Unbekanntes Evangelium oder Evangelienharmonie (Fragment aus dem "Evangelium Egerton")', *Kölner Papyri (P.Köln) VI* (Cologne: Westdeutscher, 1987) 136-45.

8 Cf. C. H. Roberts, *Greek Literary Hands. 350 B.C.–A.D. 400* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1955) xi-xv; E. G. Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World: Second Edition Revised and Enlarged* (ed. P. J. Parsons; ICS Bull. Supp. 46; London: Institute of Classical Studies, 1987) 18-20; G. Cavallo, 'Greek and Latin Writing in the Papyri', *The Oxford Handbook of Papyrology* (ed. Bagnall) 101-2 and throughout; D. Barker, 'The Dating of New Testament Papyri', *NTS* 57 (2011) 571-82.

9 W. Schubart, *Paläographie I: Griechische Paläographie* (HAW I.4.1; Munich: Beck, 1925) 111–16.

10 Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*, 21, 38; citing G. Menci, 'Scritture greche librarie con apici ornamentali (III a.C. - II d.C.)', *Scrittura e Civiltà* 3 (1979) 23-53. Cf. Menci, 'Zierstil', *Der Neue Pauly Enzyklopädie der Antike* (ed. H. Cancik, H. Schneider, and M. Landfester; Stuttgart: Metzler, 1996–2003) s.v.

11 G. Cavallo, 'ΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΙΝΑ', *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 24 (1975) 35, 50-1; cf. G. Cavallo and H. Maehler, *Greek Bookhands of the Early Byzantine Period, A.D. 300-800* (London: Institute of Classical Studies, 1987) 22-5; G. Cavallo, *Il calamo e il papiro: La scrittura greca dall'eta` ellenistica ai primi secoli di Bisanzio* (Papyrologica Florentina 36; Florence: Gonnelli, 2005) 175-202; Turner, 'Greek and Latin Writing in the Papyri', 129-31.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688513000179 Published online by Cambridge University Press

E. 7404 (VII/VIII), P.Berol. 10677 (713/719) and P.Heid. 295 (VIII).[12] The two forms of α (looped and arched), curled δ, dish-shaped μ, (sometimes) smaller ο and looped υ are attested already in the late first-century P.Fay. 110 (94) and persist along the continuum through the second-century P.Oxy. 2968 (190) and late third-century P.Oxy. 3183 (292); D. Barker is evidently correct to describe the stream as having a strong 'holding power' in many of its letter formations.[13]

The agreement of Hunt, Turner and Cavallo in narrowing the date of $\mathfrak{P}^{32}$ to the third century is justified by attention to the dimensions of the codex (about 15 × 21 cm; see §2 below), which align it with thirteen similarly sized papyrus codices in Turner's 'Group 7 Aberrants 1', of which only one (P.Yale 1, Genesis) possibly predates the third century.[14] Third- and fourth-century codices predominate, including the Christian manuscripts $\mathfrak{P}^{113}$ = P.Oxy. 4497 (Romans, III), $\mathfrak{P}^{28}$ = P.Oxy. 1596 (John, III–IV), P.Oxy. 1172 (Shepherd of Hermas, IV) and P.Bodm. XXIII (Coptic Isaiah, IV), whilst a couple are as late as the seventh–eighth century. None of the eighteen slightly taller codices in 'Group 7' proper (c. 15 × 25 cm) or 'Group 7 Aberrants 2' predates the third century. The trend of the physical data supports the assignment of $\mathfrak{P}^{32}$ to the third rather than second century.

2. Reconstructing the Beginning of the Epistle to Titus

The missing portions may be conjecturally reconstructed, by supplying the text of a modern critical edition of Titus (Nestle-Aland's 28th), adjusted to reflect the convention of *nomina sacra*, and by assuming reasonably consistent layout of text across each page. The reconstruction in the *editio princeps* aptly completed the broken parts of the twenty-seven extant lines. It is a reasonably straightforward procedure to take the additional step of supplying text for the missing top of each page, to give a fuller sense of the whole. The intervening text (1.15b–2.3a) which must have occupied the top of the *verso* page can be supplied according to the average number of letters per complete line (approximately 23) and average line spacing (c. 0.6 cm) in the extant parts.[15] It is found to fill a further 12 lines and suggests a column of text containing a total of 27 lines (or 622 letters), measuring c. 11 × 16 cm (breadth × height). Assuming that both pages contained

12 Cavallo and Maehler, *Greek Bookhands*, 52-3, 82, 104, 112-15.

13 Barker, 'New Testament Papyri', 574-5. Cf. S. R. Pickering, 'The Dating of the Chester Beatty–Michigan Codex of the Pauline Epistles ($\mathfrak{P}^{46}$)', *Ancient History in a Modern University* (ed. T. W. Hillard et al.; 2 vols.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998) 2.225, appealing to the literary papyri P.Berol.9782 (II) and P.Oxy. 412 (III).

14 Turner, *Typology of the Early Codex*, 19, 147. The editor C. B. Welles's controversially early dating of the Yale Genesis to c. AD 90 was subsequently revised to II (C. H. Roberts and T. C. Skeat) or II/III (E. G. Turner).

15 The mean, median, mode and mid-range number of letters per line (*verso*) are all approximately 24, the range 21-26.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688513000179 Published online by Cambridge University Press

approximately the same amount of text (i.e. a regular column size), the top of the *recto* page can then be projected by working backwards from Titus 1.11b with the slightly different averages of 27 letters per restored line and 0.65 cm line spacing,[16] to produce a column of text about 26 lines (698 letters) that begins at Titus 1.7, as follows:

$\mathfrak{P}^{32}$ *recto*:	$\mathfrak{P}^{32}$ *verso:*
[7]δει γαρ τον επισκοπον ανεγκλητ	[αλλα μεμιανται αυτων και ο
ον ειναι ως $\overline{\text{ΘΥ}}$ οικονομον μη αυθα	νους και η συνειδησις[16] $\overline{\text{ΘΝ}}$ ομο
δη μη οργιλον μη παροινον μη πλη	λογουσιν ειδεναι τοις δε ερ
κτην μη αισχροκερδη [8]αλλα φιλοξε	γοις αρνουνται βδελυκτοι
νον φιλαγαθον σωφρονα δικαιον	οντες και απειθεις και προς
οσιον εγκρατη [9]αντεχομενον του	παν εργον αγαθον αδοκιμοι
κατα την διδαχην πιστου λογου ϊνα	[2:1]συ δε λαλει α πρεπει τη υγια
δυνατος η και παρακαλειν εν τη δι	ινουση διδασκαλια [2]πρεσβυτ
δασκαλια τη υγιαινουση και τους	ας νηφαλιους ειναι σεμνους
αντιλεγοντας ελεγχειν [10]εισιν γαρ	σωφρονας υγιαινοντας τη πι
πολλοι και ανυποτακτοι ματαιο	στει τη αγαπη τη υπομονη [3]πρ
λογοι και φρεναπαται μαλιστα οι	εσβυτιδας ωσαυτως εν κατας
εκ της περιτομης [11]ους δει επιστομι]	τηματι ϊεροπρεπεις μη διαβ
ζειν οιτ[ινες ολους οικους ανατρε	ολους μη οινω πολλω δεδο]**υλω**
¯πουσι διδα[σκοντες α μη δει αισχρου	[μενας καλοδιδασκα]**λους [4]ϊνα**
κερδους χα[ριν [12]ειπεν τις εξ αυτων	[σωφρονιζωσι τας ν]**εας φιλαν**
ϊδιος αυτω[ν προφητης κρητες αει	[δρους ειναι φιλοτεκ]**νους [5]σωφρο**
ψευσται κ[ακα θηρια γαστερες αργαι	[νας αγνας οικουργου]**ς αγαθας**
[13]**η μαρτυρι**[α αυτη εστιν αληθης δι	[υποτασσομενας τοις] **ιδιοις αν**
ην αιτιαν [ελεγχε αυτους αποτομως	[δρασιν ϊνα μη ο λογο]**ς του $\overline{\text{ΘΥ}}$ βλα**
ϊν[α υ]**γιαιν**[ωσιν εν τη πιστει [14]μη	[σφημηται [6]τους νε]**ωτερους**
¯προ[ς]**εχον**[τες ιουδαϊκοις μυθοις	[ωσαυτως παρακαλ]**ει σωφρο**
και εντολ[αις $\overline{\text{ΑΝΩΝ}}$ αποστρεφο	[νειν [7]περι παντα σεαυ]**τον παρε**
μενων τη[ν αληθειαν [15]παντα κα	[χομενος τυπον καλ]**ων εργων**
θαρα τοις [καθαροις τοις δε μεμιαμ	[εν τη διδασκαλια αφ]**θονιαν σε**
μενοις κα[ι απιστοις ουδεν καθαρον	[μνοτητα [8]λογον υγιη] **ακαταγνω**
	[στον ϊνα ο εξ εναντι]**ας εντρα**

This concurs with earlier estimations of E. M. Schofield, E. G. Turner, J. van Haelst, K. Aland, K. Wachtel and K. Witte, P. W. Comfort and D. P. Barrett that the size of the written area (the β measurement) was 26-27 lines or c. 12 × 16 cm, hence the overall size of the codex (the α measurement) was about 15 × 21 cm.[17] The actual division of text across the missing lines cannot be certain, and neither can our manuscript's particular readings at the known points of variation

16 The mean number of letters per line (*recto*) is approximately 27, the median and mode 28, the mid-range 26, the range 23-29.

17 E. M. Schofield, *Papyrus Fragments*, 238; Turner, *Typology of the Early Codex*, 147; van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 189; Aland, *Repertorium*, 253; *NTP* ii/2, XLVIII; Comfort and Barrett, *Text*, 135-7.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688513000179 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in the tradition; yet what is important is that this fuller reconstruction does provide an approximate sense of the overall shape of the text on the two pages.[18]

This stage leads us to consider further the place of Titus 1.1-6 in the codex—the key contribution of this article—by extending the scope of codicological reconstruction to include the previous page. Again, the focus of interest is in determining an overall sense of the physical situation of the epistle within this page of the codex. My approach is similar to that of Skeat in his article, 'The Oldest Manuscript of the Four Gospels?', who identifies the Gospel fragments $\mathfrak{P}^4$ = BnF.Suppl.Gr. 1120/2 (Luke 1.58-59; 1.62–2.1, 6-7; 3.8–4.2, 29-32, 34-35; 5.3-8; 5.30–6.16), $\mathfrak{P}^{64}$ =P.Magd.Gr. 17 (Matt 26.7-8, 10, 14-15, 22-23, 31-33) and $\mathfrak{P}^{67}$ =P.Barc. 1 (Matt 3.9, 15; 5.20-22, 25-28) as originating from the same codex, and seeks to determine by reconstruction and calculation the position of the end of Matthew's Gospel and the beginning of Luke (concluding that the two are incompatible and 'another Gospel or Gospels must have intervened' between them in the codex).[19] Skeat reconstructs the two-column codex leaf from which the three small fragments of $\mathfrak{P}^{64}$ originated, and then, by analogy (assuming a consistent amount of text per leaf, spread evenly across the four columns), extrapolates forwards 10,115 letters (five leaves, nine pages, 18 columns) to find the location of the end of Matthew's Gospel 'just before the foot of col. 2 of the fifth leaf—probably about 3 or 4 lines from the foot', concluding that 'The next Gospel would then have begun overleaf, viz. at the head of col. 3'.[20] Such a procedure of reconstruction and extrapolation is theoretically endorsed by P. M. Head in his response article, although Skeat's particular execution proves unconvincing in this instance for being over-precise in not allowing for a range of possible page sizes (measured in number of letters per page).[21] The same kind of approach to reconstruction is also exemplified by D. Barker, who uses the average number of letters per page to make projections for the lost beginning of the parchment codex 0206=P.Oxy. 1353 (1 Pet 5.5-13). He argues that the extant pagination (either ΩΚΘ, 829, or ΩΙΘ, 819) evidences a large codex, whose preceding pages could have contained NT epistles from

18 Of the known points of variation in the text supplied for the missing lines (i.e. Titus 1.7-11a; 1.15b-2.3a), thirteen alternative readings would marginally affect the length of the text (our particular concern), by a total of plus 29 or minus 18 letters (i.e. plus or minus one line).

19 T. C. Skeat, 'The Oldest Manuscript of the Four Gospels?', *NTS* 43 (1997) 1-34.

20 Skeat also applies a similar argument to the four fragmentary leaves of $\mathfrak{P}^4$, working backwards from Luke 1.58 to find the beginning of the Gospel 'at the beginning of a leaf, i.e. at the top of col. 1', but this time a summary of calculations rather than a detailed reconstruction is given.

21 P. M. Head, 'Is $\mathfrak{P}^4$, $\mathfrak{P}^{64}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{67}$ the Oldest Manuscript of the Four Gospels? A Response to T.C. Skeat', *NTS* 51 (2005) 455, 453. Cf. C. E. Hill, 'Intersections of Jewish and Christian Scribal Culture. The Original Codex Containing P4, P64, and P67, and its Implications', *Among Jews, Gentiles, and Christians in Antiquity and the Middle Ages* (ed. R. Hvalvik and J. Kaufman; Trondheim: Tapir Academic, 2011) 75-91.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688513000179 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Romans to 1 Peter (a total of c. 194,500 letters at an average of 250 letters per page gives about 778 pages).[22]

My own reconstruction of 𝔓[32] works backwards from the restored *recto* page to the page that preceded it, and deals not with tens or hundreds of thousands of letters, but several hundred. Assuming the scribe employed a similar amount of text on this page as on the two that followed, we would expect a total of approximately 660 letters, spread across 26 or 27 lines with an average of c. 25 letters per line. This expectation is calculated using the figures from the reconstructed *recto* and *verso* pages, i.e., 660 is the average number of letters across the two pages (622 + 698 ÷ 2), 25 is the average number of letters per line across all 27 restored lines. One finds, however, that at c. 25 letters per line the 491 letters to beginning of the epistle, Titus 1.1–6, would occupy a space of just 19 lines, as follows:

[[1]Παυλος δουλος $\overline{\Theta\Upsilon}$ αποστολος δε]
[$\overline{\text{ΙΥ}}$ $\overline{\text{ΧΥ}}$ κατα πιστιν εκλεκτων $\overline{\Theta\Upsilon}$ και]
[επιγνωσιν αληθειας της κατ ευς]
[εβειαν [2]επ ελπιδι ζωης αιωνιου]
[ην επηγγειλατο ο αψευδης $\overline{\Theta\text{C}}$ προ]
[χρονων αιωνιων [3]εφανερωσεν δε]
[καιροις ιδιοις τον λογον αυτου]
[εν κηρυγματι ο επιστευθην εγω]
[κατ επιταγην του σωτηρος ημων $\overline{\Theta\Upsilon}$]
[[4]Τιτω γνησιω τεκνω κατα κοινην]
[πιστιν χαρις και ειρηνη απο $\overline{\Theta\Upsilon}$]
[$\overline{\text{ΙΠΡC}}$ και $\overline{\text{ΧΥ}}$ $\overline{\text{ΙΥ}}$ του σωτηρος ημων [5]του]
[του χαριν απελιπον σε εν Κρητη]
[ἵνα τα λειποντα επιδιορθωση και]
[καταστησης κατα πολιν πρεσβυτ]
[ερους ως εγω σοι διεταξαμην [6]ει]
[τις εστιν ανεγκλητος μιας γυνα]
[ικος ανηρ τεκνα εχων πιστα μη εν]
[κατηγορια ασωτιας η ανυποτακτα]

The relevance of this additional stage of reconstruction for the question of the original content of the codex lies in the marked difference between the amount of text on this page and that which we would anticipate by analogy with the two extant pages: the text of Titus would begin seven or eight lines (approximately 169 letters) short of the expected column size of 26-27 lines (660 letters), occupying only the lower part of the available writing space.

The argument that the text of Titus would not have begun at the top of the page is robust across a range of possible amounts of text per page. For instance,

22 D. Barker, 'How Long and Old Is the Codex of which P.Oxy 1353 Is a Leaf?', *Jewish and Christian Scripture as Artifact and Canon* (ed. C. A. Evans and H. D. Zacharias; LSTS 70; London: T&T Clark, 2009) 197.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688513000179 Published online by Cambridge University Press

if we were to assume instead an average of 24 letters per line (i.e. a total of 624–648 letters per page) the text of Titus 1.1-6 would occupy approximately 20 lines and fall six or seven lines short of the top of the column. Assuming a lower average of 23 letters per line (i.e. a total of 598-621 letters per page) the text would occupy approximately 21 lines and fall five or six lines short. Assuming a still lower average of 22 letters per line (i.e. a total of 572-594 letters per page) the text would occupy approximately 22 lines and fall four or five lines short. Conversely, any increase in the average number of letters per line (and total number of letters per page) would serve to strengthen our argument. For instance, assuming an average of 27 letters per line, as in the reconstructed *recto* page (698 letters), the discrepancy would rise to eight or nine lines; assuming an average of 29 letters per line (i.e. a total of 754-783 letters per page), a rise to nine or ten lines. The conclusion more than allows for a normal amount of variation in page size between these three pages of the codex.

A certain proportion of the remaining writing space at the top of our reconstructed page may be accounted for by assuming the presence of an epistolary title at the head of the main text.[23] In keeping with the general convention of concise titles in the form 'author, work, book number', the superscriptions extant in early NT manuscripts are all relatively brief in form, namely: προς εβραιους, προς κορινθιους α, προς κορινθιους β, προς εφεσιους, προς γαλατας, προς φιλιππησιους, προς κολασσαεις, προς θεσσαλονικεις [α?] ($\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ =P.Ch.Beatty II+P.Mich. 6238), ευαγγελιον κατα ιωαννην ($\mathfrak{P}^{66}$ and $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$ =P.Bodm. XIV-XV), πετρου επιστολη α, πετρου επιστολη β and ιοδα επειστολη ($\mathfrak{P}^{72}$ =P.Bodm. VII-VIII). In $\mathfrak{P}^{66}$ and $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ a small aesthetic space equivalent to one or two lines stands between the superscription and the first line of text, but in $\mathfrak{P}^{72}$ and $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$ the first line of text immediately follows that of the superscription. A comparably brief superscription in our manuscript, such as προς τιτον (א² A I K Ψ 0142 0150), αρχεται προς τιτον (D F G) or παυλου επιστολη προς τιτον (P), would still leave a discrepancy of around five or six lines at the top of the column, room enough for a further 125-150 letters.

Why might the scribe have positioned the beginning of Titus a fifth of the way into the column? It is difficult to imagine that s/he would deliberately have done so if there were only empty space beforehand—especially as this would be the *back* side of a leaf.[24] Since para-textual prefatory materials such as the *Euthaliana* belong to the later tradition, the most natural explanation is that

23 The customary location of the title of a literary text in a subscription (at the end) is known to have been carried over from papyrus rolls into early codices ($\mathfrak{P}^{66}$ may be a case in point, since there is reason to suspect its superscription to be a later insertion). Cf. Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*, 13-14.

24 The pertinence of this orientation to my argument was highlighted to me by P. M. Head.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688513000179 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Titus was not the first document on this page of the codex but followed on immediately from another.[25] The early Pauline codex $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ demonstrates that a transition from one epistle to the next could occur even at the very top of a column; folio 21 *recto* has just the final four words of Rom 16.23 on the first line, before commencing Hebrews.[26] My proposal, therefore, is that $\mathfrak{P}^{32}$ should be understood as part of a manuscript which did not contain Titus alone but was a collection of at least two texts—a multi-text codex.

3. The Content of the Manuscript

The contention that $\mathfrak{P}^{32}$ was part of a multi-text codex provokes the intriguing question of content: which text(s) accompanied Titus? Of course, the number and identity of any such text(s) can only ever be a matter of conjecture. It remains possible that in this instance Titus was grouped with some non-Pauline writing(s) in a variegated collection. A number of early Coptic and Greek-Coptic manuscripts have heterogeneous arrangements of Christian writings, including the fourth-century miniature codex P.Mich. 3992 with fragments of John, 1 Corinthians, Titus, Psalms (in that sequence) and Isaiah.[27] Perhaps these reflect the uncoordinated nature of early translation efforts.[28] The third-century Bodmer 'Composite' Codex (P.Bodm. V, VII-XIII, XX) also houses a surprising mix of Christian writings, with the *Protoevangelium of James*, *3 Corinthians*, the 11th *Ode of Solomon*, Jude (=$\mathfrak{P}^{72}$), Melito's *Homily on the Passover*, a liturgical hymn, the *Acts of Phileas*, Psalms 33–34, 1 and 2 Peter (=$\mathfrak{P}^{72}$), but this represents exceptional practice within the unilingual Greek tradition.[29] It is reasonable to base a hypothesis for the $\mathfrak{P}^{32}$ codex on what might *normally* have been transmitted with Titus at the time of its production. An overview of the epistle's

25 The Euthalian apparatus is first attested in the sixth-century Codex Coislinianus (H 015).

26 Cf. the Bodmer 'Composite' Codex, page 62, where the final two lines of the 11th *Ode of Solomon* (P.Bodm. XI) precede the epistle of Jude (P. Bodm. VII= $\mathfrak{P}^{72}$).

27 Other examples include P.Bodm. III (John, Genesis), P.Bodm. XIX (Matthew, Romans) and the Crosby-Schøyen MS 193 (Melito's *Homily on the Passover*, 2 Macc 5.27–7.41, 1 Peter, Jonah, unknown text), all from the same hoard; P.Mich. 3520 (Ecclesiastes, 1 John, 2 Peter), B.M. MS Or. 7594 (Deuteronomy, Jonah, Acts, *Apocalypse of Elijah*), P.Berl. Or. 408 + B.M. Or. 3518 (Revelation, 1 John, Philemon), $\mathfrak{P}^{6}$= P.Strasb.Copt. 371, 372, 375-85 (John, James, 1 Clement); Hamburg Staats- und Universitatsbibliothek Pap. bil. 1 (*Acta Pauli*, Song of Songs, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes); P.Ch.Beatty Ac. 1390 (John; mathematical exercise).

28 F. Wisse, 'The Coptic Version of the New Testament', *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis* (ed. B. D. Ehrman and M. W. Holmes; NTTSD 42; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995) 134–5.

29 Note the Coptic scribe of $\mathfrak{P}^{72}$, and the shared provenance of the Bodmer codex with several diverse Coptic codices from the same monastic library. See also P.Ch.Beatty XV (Psalms, *Acts of Phileas*) and B.M. inv.2468 + P.Montseratt II inv. 84 (Song of Songs, *Apology of Aristides*).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688513000179 Published online by Cambridge University Press

history of reception indicates that at the turn of the third century it was regarded among the proto-orthodox as belonging to the group of Pauline scriptures, whether thirteen (in the West) or with Hebrews fourteen (in the East). This suggests that it was ordinarily being published together with texts in this same authorial (eventually: canonical) group.

In the West, Irenaeus of Lyons (writing c. 180) makes use of Titus (and the epistles to Timothy) in his promotion of a normative reading of Paul, prefacing his quotes with introductory markers that unambiguously attribute it to the apostle and so identify it with his other epistles.[30] The biographically, theologically and pastorally constructive manner in which Irenaeus deploys it shows that it already 'fits comfortably' within the Pauline tradition he inherited.[31] The Muratorian fragment (probably originating in the late second century) counts it among the thirteen esteemed epistles of Paul (over against *Laodiceans*, *Alexandrians* and other Marcionite forgeries which '*in catholicam ecclesiam recepi non potest*').[32] Tertullian of Carthage (fl. c. 200–220) also utilizes it constructively in his development of doctrine and discipline, and in his heresiological battle over the hermeneutical ownership of Paul defends its place in a thirteen-epistle corpus.[33] In the East, Theophilus of Antioch (writing c. 180) in his apology employs Titus and 1 Timothy alongside Romans as 'ὁ θεῖος λόγος', which surely presupposes acceptance of its Paulinicity.[34] Clement of Alexandria (writing c. 200) explicitly receives it as a divine (θεσπέσιον, θείαν) epistle of the apostle, and condemns the rejection of 1 and 2 Timothy by certain 'heretics'.[35] Evidently by the turn of the third century Titus was widely being read by

30 *Adv. Haer.* 1.*Praef.*1 (= 1 Tim 1.4), 1.16.3 (= Titus 3.10-11), 2.14.7 (= 1 Tim 6.20), 3.3.3 (= 2 Tim 4.21), 3.3.4 (= Titus 3.10-11), 3.14.1 (= 2 Tim 4.10–11).

31 C. Looks, *Das Anvertraute bewahren: die Rezeption der Pastoralbriefe im 2. Jahrhundert* (MTB; Munich: Herbert Utz, 1999) 362-6; B. L. White, 'How to Read a Book: Irenaeus and the Pastoral Epistles Reconsidered', *Vigiliae Christianae* 65 (2011) 125-49 (135).

32 II.39-68. The document is traditionally dated to the late second/early third century, but this has been contested by A. C. Sundberg and especially G. M. Hahneman who proposed a fourth-century Eastern origin. However, the case has not proved convincing and the earlier dating stands. See E. Ferguson, 'Canon Muratori: Date and Provenance', *StudPat* 17 (1982) 677-83; C. E. Hill, 'The Debate over the Muratorian Fragment and the Development of the Canon', *WTJ* 57 (1995) 437-52; J. Verheyden, 'The Canon Muratori: A Matter of Dispute', *The Biblical Canons* (ed. J.-M. Auwers and H. J. de Jonge; BETL 163; Leuven: Peeters, 2003) 487-586.

33 E.g., *Adv. Marc.* 5.1.9; 5.21.1 (discussed below); *De praes. haer.* 6.1,3 (= Titus 3.10-11); 16.1 (= 1 Tim 6.4; Titus 3.10); *De idol.* 15 (= Titus 3.1); *De pud.* 1.5 (= Titus 3.5); 2.1 (= 1 Tim 4.10); 13.15,19-21 (= 1 Tim 1.19–20); 14.27 (= Titus 2.7); 18.9 (= 1 Tim 5.22); 18.15–16 (= 1 Tim 1.13, 15). Cf. Looks, *Das Anvertraute bewahren*, 368-75; Mark A. Frisius, *Tertullian's Use of the Pastoral Epistles, Hebrews, James, 1 and 2 Peter, and Jude* (SBL; New York: Lang, 2011) 121-5.

34 *Ad Autol.* 3.14.4 (= 1 Tim 2.1–2; Titus 3.1); cf. 1.1.1 (= 2 Tim 3.8).

35 *Protr.* 1.4.4 (= Titus 3.3-5); 1.7.2 (= Titus 2.11-13); 9.87.1 (= 1 Tim 4.8, 10; 2 Tim 3.15-17); *Strom.* 2.11.5-6 (citing 1 Tim 6.20). Clement's student, Origen, speaks of the apostle's 'fourteen

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688513000179 Published online by Cambridge University Press

mainstream Christians in the theological context of the Pauline epistolary deposit. It formed a constituent part of their conceptual or 'virtual' Pauline collections.[36]

The transmission of Titus in comprehensive fourteen-epistle Pauline collections was standard in the Greek manuscript tradition from the mid-fourth century (the pandect Codex Sinaiticus encompassing the earliest non-fragmentary and therefore unambiguous example), but not necessarily as early as the third.[37] E. Randolph Richards suggests that a thirteen-epistle Pauline 'collection' (minus Hebrews) began in the later first century with the transmission of Paul's own letter-copies to his disciples at his death: he probably followed the ancient letter-writing custom of retaining personal copies of his letters in codex notebooks, to mitigate the risks of loss or damage to the original, and for future reference (hence the early Christian predilection for the codex format).[38] But insofar as the authenticity of the three so-called 'Pastoral epistles' (and other 'deutero-Paulines') constitutes the minority paradigm,[39] few accept the argument as a whole.[40]

Tertullian would have it that the absence of 1–2 Timothy and Titus from the heretic Marcion of Sinope's bipartite 'Bible' of *Euangelion* (Luke) plus *Apostolikon* (Galatians, 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Romans, 1 Thessalonians, 2 Thessalonians, Laodiceans [=Ephesians], Colossians, Philippians, Philemon) constituted their deliberate expulsion from an inherited, i.e. pre-140, Pauline corpus: '*Soli huic epistulae* [sc. Philemon] *brevitas sua profuit ut falsarias manus Marcionis evaderet. Miror tamen, cum ad unum hominem litteras factas receperit,*

epistles' (*Hom. Jesu Nave* 7.1), and Eusebius goes on to classify them as ὁμολογούμενοι (*Hist. eccl.* 3.3.5; 25.2).

36 The language is that of Hurtado, *The Earliest Christian Artifacts*, 39.

37 The Latin tradition also came to include the pseudepigraphon *Laodiceans*, whereas the Syriac tradition omitted Philemon and included the pseudepigraphon *3 Corinthians*.

38 E. R. Richards, *The Secretary in the Letters of Paul* (WUNT 2/42; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1991) 6-7; Richards, 'The Codex and the Early Collection of Paul's Letters', *BBR* 8 (1998) 151-66; Richards, *Paul and First-century Letter Writing* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2004) 210-23.

39 In particular, the recent studies of Luke Timothy Johnson (*The First and Second Letters to Timothy* [AB 35A; New York: Doubleday, 2001]) and Rüdiger Fuchs (*Unerwartete Unterschiede: Müssen wir unsere Ansichten über die Pastoralbriefe revidieren?* [Bibelwissenschaftliche Monographien 12; Wuppertal: Brockhaus, 2003]) give fresh impetus to the case for authenticity.

40 Stanley E. Porter does ('Paul and the Pauline Letter Collection', *Paul and the Second Century* [ed. M. F. Bird and J. R. Dodson; LNTS 314; London: T&T Clark, 2011] 32-5). David Trobisch (*Die Entstehung der Paulusbriefsammlung: Studien zu den Anfängen der christlichen Publizistik* [NTOA 10; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1989], ET *Paul's Letter Collection: Tracing the Origins* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994]) and Harry Y. Gamble (*Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts* [New Haven and London: Yale University, 1995] 100-101) favour an 'authorized recension', but treat the 'Pastorals' and others as second-century pseudonymous supplements.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688513000179 Published online by Cambridge University Press

quod ad Timotheum duas et unam ad Titum de ecclesiastico statu compositas recusaverit. Affectauit, opinor, etiam numerum epistolarum interpolare.'[41] Polycarp of Smyrna's apparent utilization of 1 Tim 6.7, 10 and 2 Tim 4.10 in two 'clusters' of predominantly Pauline allusions (*Epistola ad Philippenses* 3.2–4.1, 9.1–10.1) implies his acceptance of their ostensible Pauline authorship, two decades previous to Marcion, and renders the claim plausible.[42] However, Tertullian's portrayal of Marcion's corruptive editorial enterprise is complicated by his heresiological rhetoric, as well as his temporal distance from Marcion (some fifty years) and his dependence on lost refutations (including those of Justin Martyr and Theophilus).[43] Marcion's redactional activities are now thought to have been far less extensive and tendentious than Tertullian and his other opponents contended; Ulrich Schmid shows that most of the allegedly peculiar Pauline readings are attested elsewhere in the tradition, in an early stratum of the so-called 'Western' text as well as the old-Syriac.[44] Whilst the handful of deliberate omissions

41 *Adv. Marc.* 5.21.1; cf. 5.1.9. Irenaeus also accuses Marcion of 'mutilating' the scriptures, omitting some of them *in toto* (*Adv. Haer.* 3.12.12). Clement (*Strom.* 2.11.5-6), Origen (*In Matt. ser. vet. interp.* 117), Epiphanius (*Pan.* 1.9.3, 11.9-12) and Jerome (*Comm. in Ep. ad Titum, Praef.*) also reproach 'heretics' (Marcion, Basilides, Tatian) for repudiating some or all of the epistles to Timothy and Titus.

42 K. Berding, *Polycarp and Paul: An Analysis of their Literary and Theological Relationship in Light of Polycarp's Use of Biblical and Extra-Biblical Literature* (VCSup 62; Leiden: Brill, 2002) 142-55, 187-8. Recent studies of the literary relationship between Paul and Polycarp discredit the earlier contention of Hans von Campenhausen that Polycarp wrote the Pastorals against Marcion, and argue instead for his dependence on them (at least, on 1 and 2 Timothy). Cf. A. Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum: Das Bild des Apostels und die Rezeption der paulinischen Theologie in der frühchristlichen Literatur bis Marcion* (BhT 58; Tübingen: Mohr, 1979) 221-32; D. K. Rensberger, 'As the Apostle Teaches: The Development of the Use of Paul's Letters in Second-Century Christianity' (PhD dissertation, Yale University, 1981) 120-5; Looks, *Das Anvertraute bewahren*, 153-87; P. Hartog, *Polycarp and the New Testament: The Occasion, Rhetoric, Theme, and Unity of the Epistle to the Philippians and its Allusions to New Testament Literature* (WUNT 2/134; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002) 229–35; A. Merz, *Die fiktive Selbstauslegung des Paulus: intertextuelle Studien zur Intention und Rezeption der Pastoralbriefe* (NTOA 52; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004) 114-40; M. W. Holmes, 'Polycarp's *Letter to the Philippians* and the Writings that Later Formed the New Testament', *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (ed. A. Gregory and C. Tuckett; Oxford: Oxford University, 2005) 125-8.

43 See J. M. Lieu, '"As much my apostle as Christ is mine": The Dispute over Paul between Tertullian and Marcion', *Early Christianity* 1 (2010) 41-59. The same issues surround the corroborative statements of Irenaeus et al. noted above.

44 U. Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos: Rekonstruktion und historische Einordnung der marcionitischen Paulusbriefausgabe* (ANTF 25; Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1995) esp. 260-98, 313-44. Cf. D. T. Roth, 'Marcion's Gospel: Relevance, Contested Issues, Reconstruction', *Expository Times* 121 (2010) 287-94; and 'Marcion and the Early Text of the New Testament', *The Early Text of the New Testament* (ed. C. E. Hill and M. J. Kruger; Oxford: Oxford University, 2012) 302-12, who sees preliminary indications of a similar state of affairs for Marcion's *Euangelion*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688513000179 Published online by Cambridge University Press

with which Marcion can confidently be credited demonstrate a capacity for use of the pen-knife when it suited him, Marcion may simply have appropriated a primitive Pauline collection to which the epistles to Timothy and Titus did not belong.

Jerome Quinn argued for their early circulation with Philemon in an independent Pauline collection conceived as epistles 'to individuals' (i.e. individual co-workers), the companion to a collection of epistles 'to churches' (the two eventually being amalgamated into a single canonical edition).[45] Quinn took Tertullian's complaint that Marcion inconsistently includes only one of the epistles addressed '*ad unum hominem*' to presuppose an 'individuals' collection, from which Marcion plucked Philemon and added it to a nine-epistle 'churches' collection in an explicitly theological move to exclude the 'Pastoral epistles'. Quinn also thought the two sub-collections to be presupposed by the separate treatment of the nine 'church' and four 'personal' epistles in the stichometric arrangements of the later manuscripts (ostensibly marking a 'seam' in the collection), and in an ancient argument for their catholicity in response to a theological problem with their particularity, first attested by the Muratorian fragment: Paul, like John in his Apocalypse, wrote '*nonnisi nominatim septem ecclesiis*' (albeit twice each to the Corinthians and Thessalonians '*pro correptione iteretur*') and thereby addressed the one universal Church (II.47–60); furthermore, he wrote one to Philemon, one to Titus and two to Timothy '*pro affectione et dilectione, in honore tamen ecclesiae catholicae in ordinatione ecclesiasticae disciplinae sanctificatae sunt*' (II.60-63).[46] Quinn quite rightly acknowledged that it is not codicologically demonstrable that $\mathfrak{P}^{32}$ was a leaf from just such an 'individuals' collection, since any number of epistles could have preceded Titus in the first part of the codex. Nevertheless he thought this feasible on the basis of the said principle of aesthetic distinction, supposedly illustrated in practice by the $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ codex of the mid-second to mid-third century.[47]

The magisterial $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ preserves most of Romans, Hebrews, 1-2 Corinthians, Ephesians, Galatians, Philippians, Colossians and 1 Thessalonians in eighty-six leaves of a single quire, and has widely been taken as a 'churches' edition. The outer parts of the codex are defective, with the last surviving page breaking off at 1 Thessalonians 5.28. Frederic Kenyon, one of the editors, inferred from preserved pagination that seven leaves were lost at the beginning (thirteen pages for Rom 1.1-5.17 and a blank cover page) and by implication seven leaves lost

45 J. D. Quinn, 'P^{46}—The Pauline Canon?', *CBQ* 36 (1974) 379-85; Quinn, *The Letter to Titus: A New Translation with Notes and Commentary, and an Introduction to the Pastoral Epistles* (AB 35; New York: Doubleday, 1990) 3, 8, 19-20.

46 Cf. Cyprian *Ad quir.* I.20; *Ad fort.* XI; Victorinus *In Apoc.* I.7; *De fabr. mundi* VIII; Ps-Chrysostom *Op. imperf. in Matt.* I; Jerome *De vir. ill.* 5.9-11; Dionysius bar Salibi *In Apoc.* 1.4 (attributed to Hippolytus of Rome); and the Vulgate '*primum quaeritur*' preface to the epistles.

47 For the dating see Barker, 'New Testament Papyri', 578-82.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688513000179 Published online by Cambridge University Press

at the end, which would be insufficient to accommodate all of 2 Thessalonians, 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus and Philemon. Additional leaves could have been attached at the end so as to house a fourteen-epistle collection, but Kenyon thought this unlikely, and assuming that the 'Pastoral epistles' constituted a group that would not have been split up he favoured a ten epistle hypothesis: 2 Thessalonians occupied two of seven missing leaves and the remaining five were left blank.[48] Kenyon's proposal was reiterated by influential text critics such as Bruce Metzger and (initially) Eldon Epp and became standard.[49]

Jeremy Duff's review essay picks up on earlier observations of the crowding of text in the second half of the $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ codex, and proposes rather that the scribe had intended to copy all fourteen Pauline epistles but miscalculated the space required and finished accidentally part way through 2 Timothy. S/he may then have abandoned the manuscript as incomplete, but more likely did add a few (three) extra leaves or a small quire to complete the edition (as exemplified in some Nag Hammadi codices and the Toura Origen manuscript).[50] Duff concludes that, either way, the scribe 'produced $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ assuming that the Pastorals were a constituent part of the Pauline corpus'.[51] If $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ does witness the assumption that 1–2 Timothy and Titus were components of a fourteen-epistle Pauline collection, one might suppose, given their rough contemporaneity, that the same assumption shaped the formation of the $\mathfrak{P}^{32}$ codex. Aspects of Duff's methodology are questionable, however. Epp thinks Duff exaggerates the scale of textual compression by insufficiently accounting for normal variation arising from the changing widths of pages in a single quire.[52] David Parker criticises his short-cut in calculating the average number of letters per page from an 'adjusted' modern edition rather than actual counts of extant lines, and doubts the appropriateness of his

48 F. G. Kenyon, *Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri, Fasciculus III, Pauline Epistles and Revelation* (London: Emery Walker, 1934) v-vii; Kenyon, *Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri, Fasciculus III Supplement, Pauline Epistles, Text* (London: Emery Walker, 1936) viii-xii.

49 B. M. Metzger, 'Recently Published Papyri of the NT', *Biblical Archaeologist* 10.2 (1947) 25-44; Metzger, *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible: An Introduction to Greek Palaeography* (Oxford: Oxford University, 1981) 64; E. J. Epp, 'The Papyrus Manuscripts of the New Testament', *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research* (ed. Ehrman and Holmes) 37; Epp, 'Textual Criticism in the Exegesis of the New Testament, with an Excursus on Canon', *Handbook to Exegesis of the New Testament* (ed. S. E. Porter; NTTS 25; Leiden: Brill, 1997) 76; but most recently in 'Issues in the Interrelation of New Testament Textual Criticism and Canon', *The Canon Debate* (ed. L. M. McDonald and J. A. Sanders; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002) 485-515, Epp is more cautious and leaves the question open.

50 Examples detailed by Turner, *Typology of the Early Codex*, 73. H. A. Sanders, 'A Fragment of the *Acta Pauli* in the Michigan Collection', *HThR* 31 (1938) 74-5, cites the $\mathfrak{P}^{5}$ codex (P.Oxy. 208) as another possible example of miscalculation leading to the addition of one or more sheets at the beginning/end.

51 J. Duff, '$\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ and the Pastorals: A Misleading Consensus?', *NTS* 44 (1998): 578-90.

52 Epp, 'Issues in the Interrelation of New Testament Textual Criticism and Canon', 498-500.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688513000179 Published online by Cambridge University Press

analogies for the addition of supplementary sheets.[53] Edgar Ebojo observes paratextual features—the constant size of the script, the constant spacing of the lines, the failure to utilize spare lines at points of transition from one book to another, the fact that an increase in the number of lines per page does not necessarily correlate with an increased number of letters per page—and fundamentally questions whether the scribe was really intent on maximising the available space in order to avoid over-running.[54] Ultimately, whether $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ was a late survivor of a 'churches' collection or a larger edition containing some or all of the 'Pastoral epistles' and Philemon cannot be codicologically demonstrated.

The scope of the remaining early Pauline manuscripts is also inconclusive due to their fragmentary state. The $\mathfrak{P}^{30}$ = P.Oxy. 1598 codex, extant only at portions of 1 and 2 Thessalonians, evidently once housed a sizeable collection since it bears the pagination σζ, ση (207, 208) on two surviving pages. There was probably sufficient room in the preceding 206 pages to have accommodated the beginning of 1 Thessalonians and the rest of the 'church' epistles,[55] but there is no way to determine how much (if any) capacity there was at the end of the codex for further texts. The $\mathfrak{P}^{92}$ = P.Narmuthis 69.39a + 69.229a codex must have contained at least three texts because Ephesians and 2 Thessalonians do not appear to be consecutive. The column numeration preserved in $\mathfrak{P}^{13}$ = P.Oxy. 657 + PSI 1292 (με = 47) shows that Hebrews was not the first text on the *verso* of the roll since it would have begun around column 44; Romans would be a good fit (cf. $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$). Possibly $\mathfrak{P}^{15}$ = P.Oxy. 1008 (1 Corinthians) and $\mathfrak{P}^{16}$ = P.Oxy. 1009 (Philippians) belonged to the same codex, $\mathfrak{P}^{49}$ = P.Yale 415 + 531 (Ephesians) and $\mathfrak{P}^{65}$ = PSI 1373 (1 Thessalonians) to another.[56] Most of the rest are, like $\mathfrak{P}^{32}$, highly fragmentary

53 D. C. Parker, *An Introduction to New Testament Manuscripts and their Text* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2008) 253-54, argues that the examples of single-sheet supplements are not convincing analogies since $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ would require four additional sheets to house a fourteen-epistle collection; the Nag Hammadi Codex I may not be a case of under-calculation since it has not one but *two* supplements of eight and six sheets (= *two* miscalculations?); the sixth-century Toura manuscript may have been influenced by the commonplace practice of supplementing parchment codices with single (or half) sheets, and its texts may not derive from a single exemplar.

54 E. B. Ebojo, '$\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ with the Pastorals: A Misleading Proposal? Re-investigating the Evidence of the Missing Last Pages of $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$', paper presented at the Society of Biblical Literature, NT Textual Criticism Section, 19 November 2011, San Francisco.

55 B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, XIII (London: Egypt Exploration, 1919) 12; D. Trobisch, *Die Entstehung der Paulusbriefsammlung: Studien zu den Anfängen der christlichen Publizistik* (NTOA 10; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989) 26, 138–40; K. Wachtel et al., eds., *Das Neue Testament auf Papyrus II. Die paulinischen Briefe, Teil 2* (ANTF 22; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994) xlvi.

56 B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, VII (London: Egypt Exploration, 1910) 8; V. Bartoletti, *Papiri greci e latini*, XVI (Pubblicazioni della Società italiana; Florence: le Monnier, 1957) 5-7; P. W. Comfort, 'New Reconstructions and Identifications of New Testament Papyri', *NovT* 41 (1999) 215-16; but cf. *Das Neue Testament auf Papyrus II/2*, xli, lxi.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688513000179 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and preserve only a single text.[57] None can be pressed as proof of 'churches', 'individuals' or comprehensive Pauline collections.

The main difficulty with Quinn's suggestion is not so much the uncertain scope of the $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ codex as the growing recognition of a pre-Marcionite edition of *ten* epistles 'to seven churches' that counted Philemon with Colossians as addressed to (part of) the same community. Nils Dahl and Harry Gamble detect its vestiges behind an obsolete 'Western' arrangement of epistles which enumerated them according to the principle of decreasing length, counting those to the same church as one unit and so emphasising the number of *churches* rather than the number of epistles.[58] Since Marcion's *Apostolikon* largely followed this order (with the exception of Galatians at the head), it is thought to have been structurally indebted to a 'seven churches' edition that was originally ordered by decreasing length, i.e., Corinthians (1–2), Romans, Ephesians, Thessalonians (1–2), Galatians, Philippians, Colossians–Philemon, but was modified owing to chronological considerations.[59] The textual transmission of the epistles is also explained 'as due to alterations and conflations of two basic editions, one in

57 These are: $\mathfrak{P}^{17}$= P.Oxy. 1078 (Hebrews), $\mathfrak{P}^{27}$= P.Oxy. 1355 (Romans), $\mathfrak{P}^{40}$= P.Heid.G. 645 (Romans), $\mathfrak{P}^{87}$= Köln 12 (Philemon), $\mathfrak{P}^{113}$= P.Oxy. 4497 (Romans), $\mathfrak{P}^{114}$= P.Oxy. 4498 (Hebrews), $\mathfrak{P}^{118}$= Köln 10311 (Romans), $\mathfrak{P}^{123}$= P.Oxy 4844 (1 Corinthians), $\mathfrak{P}^{126}$= PSI 1497 (Hebrews), 0220= Schøyen MS 113 (Romans). In addition, newly discovered apparently early manuscripts of Romans, 1 Corinthians and Hebrews are being prepared for publication in D. Obbink and J. Pattengale, eds., *The Green Scholars Initiative: Papyrus Series* (Leiden: Brill, forthcoming).

58 N. A. Dahl, 'The Origin of the Earliest Prologues to the Pauline Letters', *Semeia* 12 (1978) 233-77; H. Y. Gamble, *The New Testament Canon: Its Making and Meaning* (GBS; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985) 39-41; Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts* (New Haven and London: Yale University, 1995) 59-62. Evidence for the various orders is presented by Herman Josef Frede, 'Die Ordnung der Paulusbriefe und der Platz des Kolosserbriefs im Corpus Paulinum', *Epistulae ad Philippenses et Colossenses* (Vetus Latina 24/2; Freiburg: Herder, 1969) 290-303.

59 The order of the *Apostolikon* is inferred from Tertullian *Adversus Marcionem* 5 (Philemon after Colossians and Philippians) and Epiphanius *Panarion* 42.9.3-4, 11.9-12 (Philemon after Colossians, before Philippians; cf. the Latin stichometric list of biblical books inserted in the sixth-century Codex Claromontanus, which puts Colossians with Philemon, among the epistles 'to individuals'). The so-called 'Marcionite Prologues' also seem to presuppose an edition with the same arrangement as the *Apostolikon* (Dahl's formal analysis finds those to 2 Corinthians, 2 Thessalonians, 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus, Philemon and Hebrews are probably secondary additions to an original, second-century set of seven Prologues = one for each church), but their origin is an ongoing matter of dispute. E. W. Scherbenske, *Canonizing Paul: Ancient Editorial Practice and the Corpus Paulinum* (New York: Oxford University, 2013) 85–93, restates the case for Marcionite content, locating their opposition to 'false apostles' in Marcion's rejection of reversion to Judaism.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688513000179 Published online by Cambridge University Press

which Paul's thirteen (or fourteen) letters and another in which his letters to seven churches were arranged according to the principle of decreasing length'.[60]

As a corollary, most have accepted Peter Trummer's contention that the epistles to Timothy and Titus probably never circulated independently of the ten 'church' epistles, for strategic reasons: as a pseudepigraphal '*Corpus pastorale*', they must have been written and published 'im Zuge einer *Neuedition* des bisherigen Corpus [Paulinum]', because a different origin would have had to face a very perceptive critique and rejection.[61] Their personal address could well be an intrinsic falsification strategy to explain their relatively late appearance in anticipation of their readers' *Echtheitskritik*.[62] But it ought to be noted that the literary unity of a '*Corpus pastorale*' is no longer axiomatic; recent emphasis on their individuality has led to various proposals of diverse authorship—whether distinguishing 2 Timothy from 1 Timothy and Titus (Michael Prior, Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, James Aageson), 1 Timothy from 2 Timothy and Titus (Jens Herzer), or all three from each other (William A. Richards)—which imply some other form of conglomeration.[63]

Yet whatever their origin, there is general agreement (*pace* Quinn) that the bipartite argument of the Muratorian fragment reads more naturally as utilizing the churches–individuals distinction for the purpose of supplying a *post facto* apology for a thirteen-epistle edition, especially since (Eusebius reports that) Gaius of Rome, a contemporary churchman, enumerated thirteen epistles of

60 Dahl, 'The Origin of the Earliest Prologues to the Pauline Letters', 253, appealing to the old Syriac order (Galatians–Corinthians–Romans, etc.) as proof that the initial placement of Galatians is not Marcionite in origin. Cf. Gamble, 'The Canon of the New Testament', *The New Testament and its Modern Interpreters* (ed. E. J. Epp and G. W. MacRae; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989) 207-8; Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos*, 284-303.

61 P. Trummer, 'Corpus Paulinum—Corpus Pastorale. Zur Ortung der Paulustradition in den Pastoralbriefen', *Paulus in den neutestamentlichen Spätschriften* (ed. Karl Kertelge; QD 89; Freiburg: Herder, 1981) 133. Cf. C. K. Rothschild's argument that Hebrews is a Pauline pseudepigraphon which never circulated independently but was composed to be published in a new edition of an existing (late first-century) Pauline letter collection, in *Hebrews as Pseudepigraphon: The History and Significance of the Pauline Attribution of Hebrews* (WUNT 1/235; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009) 139-54.

62 M. Tsuji, 'Persönliche Korrespondenz des Paulus: Zur Strategie der Pastoralbriefe als Pseudepigrapha', *NTS* 56 (2010) 253-72.

63 M. Prior, *Paul the Letter-Writer and the Second Letter to Timothy* (JSNTSup 23; Sheffield: JSOT, 1989); J. Murphy-O'Connor, '2 Tim Compared with 1 Tim and Titus', *RB* 98 (1991) 403-18; J. W. Aageson, *Paul, the Pastoral Epistles and the Early Church* (Library of Pauline Studies; Peabody: Hendickson, 2006); J. Herzer, 'Fiktion oder Tauschung? Zur Diskussion über die Pseudepigraphie der Pastoralbriefe', *Pseudepigraphie und Verfasserfiktion in frühchristlichen Briefen* (ed. J. Frey et al.; WUNT 246; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009) 489-536; W. A. Richards, *Difference and Distance in Post-Pauline Christianity: An Epistolary Analysis of the Pastorals* (SBL 44; New York: Lang, 2002). Cf. the defence of G. Häfner, 'Das Corpus Pastorale als literarisches Konstrukt', *ThQ* 187 (2007) 258-73.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688513000179 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Paul, distinguishing only Hebrews from the rest.[64] Thus the Muratorianum notionally sets a *terminus ante quem* for the inclusion of the epistles to Timothy and Titus at the turn of the third century.

4. Conclusion

This study offers a new, expanded reconstruction of the third-century John Rylands fragment of Titus (𝔓^{32}), working from the two partially extant pages to the preceding page under the assumption that the scribe was reasonably consistent in the design of their written areas. The beginning of the epistle is estimated to fall seven or eight lines short of the top of the column on the preceding page, which leaves five or six lines (a fifth) of the available writing space to be accounted for once a conventional superscription is inferred. The discrepancy indicates that Titus was preceded by at least one other text; 𝔓^{32} belonged to a multi-text codex. The identification of any accompanying text(s) cannot be codicologically deduced, but the canonical reception of Titus at the turn of the third century generates the expectation that it was normally being transmitted in a collection of thirteen or fourteen Pauline scriptures, and the 𝔓^{32} codex was probably no exception.

64 Verheyden, 'The Canon Muratori: A Matter of Dispute', 524-8; cf. Eusebius *Hist. Eccl.* VI.20.3; repeated by Jerome *De vir. ill.* 59.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688513000179 Published online by Cambridge University Press