

# Appendix to Bayesian Phylogenetics and Its Application to the Text of Ephesians

Joey McCollum  
Australian Catholic University  
Institute for Religion and Critical Inquiry

28 August 2025

## **Typesetting Information**

This document was typeset using the Xe<sub>La</sub>TeX typesetting system created by the Non-Roman Script Initiative. It extensively uses the memoir class created by Peter Wilson. The template used for this document is based on the Maggi Memoir Thesis template by Federico Maggi. For the body text, Latin and Cyrillic are set in Georgia Pro, Greek in GFS Porson, Hebrew in SBL Hebrew, Syriac in Estrangelo Edessa, Coptic in Antinoou, Gothic in Pfeffer Mediæval, Armenian in Kelvinch, and text-critical marks in Apparatus SIL. Mathematical formulae and monospaced texts are set in Computer Modern. The dedication page is set in EB Garamond. Citations in SBL format were formatted automatically using David Purton's `biblatex-sbl` package.



### **Funding and Other Support**

This research was supported by an Australian Government Research Training Program (RTP) Scholarship ([doi.org/10.82133/C42F-K220](https://doi.org/10.82133/C42F-K220)). This research was supported by the University of Melbourne's Research Computing Services and the Petascale Campus Initiative.



# Contents

<b>List of Figures</b>	<b>xi</b>
<b>List of Tables</b>	<b>xiii</b>
<b>Abbreviations</b>	<b>xv</b>
<b>A Supplemental Commentary Entries</b>	<b>1</b>
A.1 <b>1:1/2–8:</b> Παῦλος ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ . . . . .	2
A.1.1 Apparatus . . . . .	2
A.1.2 Overview . . . . .	2
A.1.3 Intrinsic Probabilities . . . . .	3
A.1.4 Transcriptional Probabilities . . . . .	4
A.1.5 Post-Analysis Results . . . . .	5
A.2 <b>1:10/26–42:</b> τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς . . . . .	6
A.2.1 Apparatus . . . . .	6
A.2.2 Overview . . . . .	7
A.2.3 Intrinsic Probabilities . . . . .	7
A.2.4 Transcriptional Probabilities . . . . .	9
A.2.5 Post-Analysis Results . . . . .	11
A.3 <b>1:15/26–36:</b> καὶ τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἀγίους . . . . .	12
A.3.1 Apparatus . . . . .	12
A.3.2 Overview . . . . .	13
A.3.3 Intrinsic Probabilities . . . . .	13
A.3.4 Transcriptional Probabilities . . . . .	15
A.3.5 Post-Analysis Results . . . . .	16
A.4 <b>1:20/2–4:</b> ἦν ἐνέργησεν . . . . .	18
A.4.1 Apparatus . . . . .	18
A.4.2 Overview . . . . .	18
A.4.3 Intrinsic Probabilities . . . . .	19
A.4.4 Transcriptional Probabilities . . . . .	19
A.4.5 Post-Analysis Results . . . . .	20
A.5 <b>1:20/20–22:</b> καὶ καθίσας . . . . .	21
A.5.1 Apparatus . . . . .	21

A.5.2	Overview . . . . .	22
A.5.3	Intrinsic Probabilities . . . . .	22
A.5.4	Transcriptional Probabilities . . . . .	24
A.5.5	Post-Analysis Results . . . . .	25
A.6	<b>2:15/28–34:</b> <i>εἰς ἓνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον</i> . . . . .	27
A.6.1	Apparatus . . . . .	27
A.6.2	Overview . . . . .	27
A.6.3	Intrinsic Probabilities . . . . .	28
A.6.4	Transcriptional Probabilities . . . . .	29
A.6.5	Post-Analysis Results . . . . .	30
A.7	<b>2:19/2–4:</b> <i>ἄρα οὖν</i> . . . . .	31
A.7.1	Apparatus . . . . .	31
A.7.2	Overview . . . . .	31
A.7.3	Intrinsic Probabilities . . . . .	32
A.7.4	Transcriptional Probabilities . . . . .	34
A.7.5	Post-Analysis Results . . . . .	35
A.8	<b>3:13/4–8:</b> <i>αἰτοῦμαι μὴ ἐγκακεῖν</i> . . . . .	36
A.8.1	Apparatus . . . . .	36
A.8.2	Overview . . . . .	36
A.8.3	Intrinsic Probabilities . . . . .	37
A.8.4	Transcriptional Probabilities . . . . .	37
A.8.5	Post-Analysis Results . . . . .	39
A.9	<b>3:18/16–32:</b> <i>τί τὸ πλάτος καὶ μῆκος καὶ ὕψος καὶ βάθος</i> . . . . .	40
A.9.1	Apparatus . . . . .	40
A.9.2	Overview . . . . .	41
A.9.3	Intrinsic Probabilities . . . . .	42
A.9.4	Transcriptional Probabilities . . . . .	43
A.9.5	Post-Analysis Results . . . . .	45
A.10	<b>3:19/2–4:</b> <i>γινῶναί τε</i> . . . . .	47
A.10.1	Apparatus . . . . .	47
A.10.2	Overview . . . . .	47
A.10.3	Intrinsic Probabilities . . . . .	47
A.10.4	Transcriptional Probabilities . . . . .	48
A.10.5	Post-Analysis Results . . . . .	49
A.11	<b>5:4/2–12:</b> <i>καὶ αἰσχροτήης καὶ μωρολογία ἢ εὐτραπεία</i> . . . . .	50
A.11.1	Apparatus . . . . .	50
A.11.2	Overview . . . . .	51
A.11.3	Intrinsic Probabilities . . . . .	51
A.11.4	Transcriptional Probabilities . . . . .	53
A.11.5	Post-Analysis Results . . . . .	54
A.12	<b>5:4/14–18:</b> <i>ἃ οὐκ ἀνῆκεν</i> . . . . .	55

A.12.1	Apparatus . . . . .	55
A.12.2	Overview . . . . .	55
A.12.3	Intrinsic Probabilities . . . . .	56
A.12.4	Transcriptional Probabilities . . . . .	56
A.12.5	Post-Analysis Results . . . . .	57
A.13	<b>5:14/18–26:</b> ἔγειρε, ὁ καθεύδων, καὶ ἀνάστα . . . . .	58
A.13.1	Apparatus . . . . .	58
A.13.2	Overview . . . . .	59
A.13.3	Intrinsic Probabilities . . . . .	59
A.13.4	Transcriptional Probabilities . . . . .	60
A.13.5	Post-Analysis Results . . . . .	61
A.14	<b>5:15/2–10:</b> βλέπετε οὖν ἀκριβῶς πῶς περιπατεῖτε . . . . .	62
A.14.1	Apparatus . . . . .	62
A.14.2	Overview . . . . .	63
A.14.3	Intrinsic Probabilities . . . . .	63
A.14.4	Transcriptional Probabilities . . . . .	65
A.14.5	Post-Analysis Results . . . . .	67
A.15	<b>5:17/6–14:</b> μὴ γίνεσθε ἄφρονες, ἀλλὰ συνίετε . . . . .	68
A.15.1	Apparatus . . . . .	68
A.15.2	Overview . . . . .	68
A.15.3	Intrinsic Probabilities . . . . .	69
A.15.4	Transcriptional Probabilities . . . . .	69
A.15.5	Post-Analysis Results . . . . .	70
A.16	<b>5:23/30:</b> σωτήρ . . . . .	71
A.16.1	Apparatus . . . . .	71
A.16.2	Overview . . . . .	71
A.16.3	Intrinsic Probabilities . . . . .	72
A.16.4	Transcriptional Probabilities . . . . .	72
A.16.5	Post-Analysis Results . . . . .	73
A.17	<b>5:31/10–18:</b> τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα . . . . .	74
A.17.1	Apparatus . . . . .	74
A.17.2	Overview . . . . .	74
A.17.3	Intrinsic Probabilities . . . . .	75
A.17.4	Transcriptional Probabilities . . . . .	75
A.17.5	Post-Analysis Results . . . . .	76
A.18	<b>5:31/20–28:</b> καὶ προσκολληθήσεται τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ . . . . .	77
A.18.1	Apparatus . . . . .	77
A.18.2	Overview . . . . .	78
A.18.3	Intrinsic Probabilities . . . . .	78
A.18.4	Transcriptional Probabilities . . . . .	78
A.18.5	Post-Analysis Results . . . . .	80



A.19	<b>6:10/2–4:</b> τοῦ λοιποῦ . . . . .	81
A.19.1	Apparatus . . . . .	81
A.19.2	Overview . . . . .	81
A.19.3	Intrinsic Probabilities . . . . .	82
A.19.4	Transcriptional Probabilities . . . . .	83
A.19.5	Post-Analysis Results . . . . .	84
A.20	<b>6:12/2–12:</b> ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ὑμῶν ἡ πάλῃ . . . . .	85
A.20.1	Apparatus . . . . .	85
A.20.2	Overview . . . . .	85
A.20.3	Intrinsic Probabilities . . . . .	86
A.20.4	Transcriptional Probabilities . . . . .	87
A.20.5	Post-Analysis Results . . . . .	87
A.21	<b>6:21/2–16:</b> 2–4 6–8 10 12–16 . . . . .	89
A.21.1	Apparatus . . . . .	89
A.21.2	Overview . . . . .	89
A.21.3	Intrinsic Probabilities . . . . .	90
A.21.4	Transcriptional Probabilities . . . . .	91
A.21.5	Post-Analysis Results . . . . .	93
<b>B</b>	<b>Notes on External Evidence</b>	<b>95</b>
B.1	<b>1:1/26–42:</b> ἐν Ἐφέσῳ . . . . .	95
B.1.1	Basil of Caesarea . . . . .	95
B.1.2	Marcion . . . . .	95
B.1.3	Tertullian . . . . .	96
B.2	<b>1:10/26–42:</b> τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς . . . . .	97
B.2.1	Cyril of Alexandria . . . . .	97
B.2.2	Marius Victorinus . . . . .	97
B.2.3	Tertullian . . . . .	97
B.2.4	Theodoret . . . . .	98
B.3	<b>1:15/26–36:</b> καὶ τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους . . . . .	99
B.3.1	Chrysostom . . . . .	99
B.3.2	Cyril of Alexandria . . . . .	99
B.3.3	Theodoret . . . . .	99
B.4	<b>1:20/2–4:</b> ἦν ἐνήργησεν . . . . .	100
B.4.1	Gregory of Nyssa . . . . .	100
B.5	<b>1:20/20–22:</b> καὶ καθίσας . . . . .	101
B.5.1	Chrysostom . . . . .	101
B.5.2	Origen . . . . .	101
B.5.3	Procopius . . . . .	101
B.6	<b>2:15/28–34:</b> εἰς ἓνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον . . . . .	102
B.6.1	Procopius . . . . .	102

B.7	<b>2:19/2-4:</b> ἄρα οὖν . . . . .	103
B.7.1	Chrysostom . . . . .	103
B.8	<b>2:21/6-8:</b> πᾶσα οἰκοδομή . . . . .	104
B.8.1	Chrysostom . . . . .	104
B.9	<b>3:3/2-4:</b> κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν . . . . .	105
B.9.1	Origen . . . . .	105
B.9.2	Theodoret . . . . .	105
B.10	<b>3:9/6:</b> πάντας . . . . .	106
B.10.1	Cyril of Alexandria . . . . .	106
B.11	<b>3:9/41:</b> — . . . . .	107
B.11.1	Marius Victorinus . . . . .	107
B.11.2	Theodoret . . . . .	107
B.12	<b>3:13/4-8:</b> αἰτοῦμαι μὴ ἐγκακεῖν . . . . .	109
B.12.1	Chrysostom . . . . .	109
B.13	<b>3:14/19:</b> — . . . . .	110
B.13.1	Valentinus and the <i>Refutatio</i> . . . . .	110
B.14	<b>3:18/16-32:</b> τί τὸ πλάτος καὶ μῆκος καὶ ὕψος καὶ βάθος . . . . .	112
B.14.1	Chrysostom . . . . .	112
B.14.2	Irenaeus . . . . .	112
B.14.3	Cyril of Alexandria . . . . .	113
B.15	<b>3:19/20-34:</b> ἵνα πληρωθῇτε εἰς πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ θεοῦ . . . . .	114
B.15.1	<i>Homiliae spirituales</i> . . . . .	114
B.16	<b>4:8/6-18:</b> ἀναβὰς εἰς ὕψος ἠχμαλώτευσεν αἰχμαλωσίαν, ἔδωκεν δόματα . . . . .	115
B.16.1	Cyril of Alexandria . . . . .	115
B.16.2	Eusebius . . . . .	115
B.16.3	Irenaeus . . . . .	115
B.16.4	Theodoret . . . . .	116
B.17	<b>4:9/12-20:</b> εἰ μὴ ὅτι καὶ κατέβη . . . . .	117
B.17.1	Cyril of Alexandria . . . . .	117
B.17.2	Hilary . . . . .	117
B.17.3	Pelagius . . . . .	117
B.18	<b>4:9/22-30:</b> εἰς τὰ κατώτερα τῆς γῆς . . . . .	119
B.18.1	Eusebius . . . . .	119
B.18.2	Irenaeus . . . . .	119
B.18.3	Origen . . . . .	120
B.19	<b>4:17/22-30:</b> καθὼς καὶ τὰ ἔθνη περιπατεῖ . . . . .	121
B.19.1	Chrysostom . . . . .	121
B.20	<b>5:4/2-12:</b> καὶ αἰσχρότης καὶ μωρολογία ἢ εὐτραπεία . . . . .	122
B.20.1	Basil of Caesarea . . . . .	122
B.20.2	Chrysostom . . . . .	122
B.20.3	Cyril of Alexandria . . . . .	123

B.20.4 Irenaeus . . . . .	123
B.20.5 Theodore . . . . .	123
B.21 <b>5:4/14–18</b> : ἃ οὐκ ἀνῆκεν . . . . .	124
B.21.1 Chrysostom . . . . .	124
B.21.2 Irenaeus . . . . .	124
B.22 <b>5:9/2–10</b> : ὁ γὰρ καρπὸς τοῦ φωτός . . . . .	125
B.22.1 Cyril of Alexandria . . . . .	125
B.22.2 Theodore . . . . .	125
B.23 <b>5:14/18–26</b> : ἔγειρε, ὁ καθεύδων, καὶ ἀνάστα . . . . .	126
B.23.1 Chrysostom . . . . .	126
B.23.2 Cyril of Alexandria . . . . .	126
B.24 <b>5:15/2–10</b> : βλέπετε οὖν ἀκριβῶς πῶς περιπατεῖτε . . . . .	127
B.24.1 Chrysostom . . . . .	127
B.24.2 Theodore . . . . .	127
B.25 <b>5:17/6–14</b> : μὴ γίνεσθε ἄφρονες, ἀλλὰ συνίετε . . . . .	128
B.25.1 Chrysostom . . . . .	128
B.25.2 Origen . . . . .	128
B.26 <b>5:20/24–30</b> : πατρὶ καὶ θεῷ . . . . .	129
B.26.1 Pelagius . . . . .	129
B.27 <b>5:22/6–12</b> : τοῖς ἰδίῳι ἀνδράσιν ὑποτασσέσθωσαν . . . . .	130
B.27.1 Chrysostom . . . . .	130
B.27.2 Clement of Alexandria . . . . .	130
B.27.3 Jerome . . . . .	131
B.27.4 Origen . . . . .	131
B.27.5 Theodore of Mopsuestia . . . . .	131
B.28 <b>5:23/30</b> : σωτήρ . . . . .	132
B.28.1 Basil of Caesarea . . . . .	132
B.29 <b>5:28/2–8</b> : οὕτως ὀφείλουσιν οἱ ἄνδρες . . . . .	133
B.29.1 Chrysostom . . . . .	133
B.29.2 Theodore . . . . .	133
B.30 <b>5:30/14–30</b> : ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὀστέων αὐτοῦ . . . . .	134
B.30.1 Severian . . . . .	134
B.30.2 Tertullian . . . . .	134
B.31 <b>5:31/10–18</b> : τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα . . . . .	135
B.31.1 Chrysostom . . . . .	135
B.31.2 Origen . . . . .	135
B.31.3 Pelagius . . . . .	136
B.32 <b>5:31/20–28</b> : καὶ προσκολληθήσεται τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ . . . . .	137
B.32.1 Chrysostom . . . . .	137
B.32.2 Theodore . . . . .	137
B.32.3 Marcion . . . . .	137

# CONTENTS

B.32.4 Origen . . . . .	138
B.33 <b>6:1/14–16:</b> <i>ἐν κυρίῳ</i> . . . . .	139
B.33.1 Clement of Alexandria . . . . .	139
B.33.2 Pelagius . . . . .	139
B.34 <b>6:9/28–34:</b> <i>καὶ αὐτῶν καὶ ὑμῶν</i> . . . . .	140
B.34.1 Chrysostom . . . . .	140
B.35 <b>6:19/32–38:</b> <i>τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ εὐαγγελίου</i> . . . . .	141
B.35.1 P46 . . . . .	141
B.35.2 06 . . . . .	141
B.35.3 Basil of Caesarea . . . . .	143
B.35.4 Tertullian and Marcion . . . . .	144
B.36 <b>6:21/2–16:</b> <i>2–4 6–8 10 12–16</i> . . . . .	146
B.36.1 Basil of Caesarea . . . . .	146
B.36.2 Chrysostom . . . . .	146
B.36.3 Theodore . . . . .	146
<b>C Index of Patristic Citations</b>	<b>149</b>
<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>165</b>
<b>Index of Terms</b>	<b>173</b>
<b>Index of Names</b>	<b>175</b>
<b>Index of Textual Witnesses</b>	<b>179</b>
<b>Index of Ancient Sources</b>	<b>181</b>



# List of Figures

B.1	Eph 6:19 (Greek) in fol. 325 <sup>v</sup> of 06 . . . . .	142
B.2	Eph 6:19 (Latin) in fol. 326 <sup>r</sup> of 06 . . . . .	142



# List of Tables

A.1	Transcriptional causes for Eph 1:1/2–8 . . . . .	4
A.2	Reading posterior probabilities for Eph 1:1/2–8 . . . . .	5
A.3	Transcriptional causes for Eph 1:10/26–42 . . . . .	10
A.4	Reading posterior probabilities for Eph 1:10/26–42 . . . . .	11
A.5	Transcriptional causes for Eph 1:15/26–36 . . . . .	16
A.6	Reading posterior probabilities for Eph 1:15/26–36 . . . . .	16
A.7	Transcriptional causes for Eph 1:20/2–4 . . . . .	20
A.8	Reading posterior probabilities for Eph 1:20/2–4 . . . . .	20
A.9	Transcriptional causes for Eph 1:20/20–22 . . . . .	25
A.10	Reading posterior probabilities for Eph 1:20/20–22 . . . . .	25
A.11	Transcriptional causes for Eph 1:15/26–36 . . . . .	29
A.12	Reading posterior probabilities for Eph 2:15/28–34 . . . . .	30
A.13	Transcriptional causes for Eph 2:19/2–4 . . . . .	34
A.14	Reading posterior probabilities for Eph 2:19/2–4 . . . . .	35
A.15	Transcriptional causes for Eph 3:13/4–8 . . . . .	38
A.16	Reading posterior probabilities for Eph 3:13/4–8 . . . . .	39
A.17	Transcriptional causes for Eph 3:18/16–32 . . . . .	43
A.18	Reading posterior probabilities for Eph 3:18/16–32 . . . . .	45
A.19	Transcriptional causes for Eph 3:19/2–4 . . . . .	48
A.20	Reading posterior probabilities for Eph 3:19/2–4 . . . . .	49
A.21	Transcriptional causes for Eph 5:4/2–12 . . . . .	53
A.22	Reading posterior probabilities for Eph 5:4/2–12 . . . . .	54
A.23	Transcriptional causes for Eph 5:4/14–18 . . . . .	57
A.24	Reading posterior probabilities for Eph 5:4/14–18 . . . . .	57
A.25	Transcriptional causes for Eph 5:14/18–26 . . . . .	60
A.26	Reading posterior probabilities for Eph 5:14/18–26 . . . . .	61
A.27	Transcriptional causes for Eph 5:15/2–10 . . . . .	66
A.28	Reading posterior probabilities for Eph 5:15/2–10 . . . . .	67
A.29	Transcriptional causes for Eph 5:17/6–14 . . . . .	69
A.30	Reading posterior probabilities for Eph 5:17/6–14 . . . . .	70
A.31	Transcriptional causes for Eph 5:23/30 . . . . .	73
A.32	Reading posterior probabilities for Eph 5:23/30 . . . . .	73



# LIST OF TABLES

A.33	Transcriptional causes for Eph 5:31/10–18 . . . . .	75
A.34	Reading posterior probabilities for Eph 5:31/10–18 . . . . .	76
A.35	Transcriptional causes for Eph 5:31/20–28 . . . . .	79
A.36	Reading posterior probabilities for Eph 5:31/20–28 . . . . .	80
A.37	Transcriptional causes for Eph 6:10/2–10 . . . . .	83
A.38	Reading posterior probabilities for Eph 6:10/2–4 . . . . .	84
A.39	Transcriptional causes for Eph 6:9/28–34 . . . . .	87
A.40	Reading posterior probabilities for Eph 6:12/2–12 . . . . .	87
A.41	Transcriptional causes for Eph 6:21/2–16 . . . . .	92
A.42	Reading posterior probabilities for Eph 6:21/2–16 . . . . .	93

# Abbreviations

AB	Anchor Bible
ABBOTT	Abbott, Thomas Kingsmill. <i>A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians</i> . ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1897
ACO	Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum. Edited by Eduard Schwartz and Johannes Straub. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1914–1940
AGAJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
ANS	Auslegung neutestamentlicher Schriften
ANTC	Abingdon New Testament Commentaries
ANTF	Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung
ASCP	Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology
AW	Athanasius Werke. Edited by Martin Tetz, Hanns Christof Brennecke, and Dietmar Wyrwa. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1934–
BAGL	<i>Biblical and Ancient Greek Linguistics</i>
BARTH	Barth, Markus. <i>Ephesians</i> . 2 vols. AB 34. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974
BDAG	Bauer, Walter, Frederick W. Danker, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich. <i>Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> . 4th ed. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2021
BDF	Blass, Friedrich, and Albert Debrunner. <i>A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> . Translated by Robert W. Funk. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1961
BEST	Best, Ernest. <i>Ephesians</i> . ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998
BIS	Biblical Interpretation Series
BNTC	Black's New Testament Commentaries
BSIELL	Brill's Studies in Indo-European Languages & Linguistics
CBSC	The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges
CCSL	Corpus Christianorum Series Latina. Turnhout: Brepols, 1954–

# ABBREVIATIONS

CGCG	<i>The Cambridge Grammar of Classical Greek</i> . Edited by Evert van Emde Boas, Albert Rijksbaron, Luuk Huitink, and Mathieu de Bakker. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019
CLSLP	Collection linguistique publiée par la Société Linguistique de Paris
COHICK	Cohick, Lynn H. <i>The Letter to the Ephesians</i> . NICNT. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2020
CSEL	Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum. Vienna, 1866–
CWE	Արքայն Եփրեմի Մատենագրութիւնք [Collected Works of Ephrem]. 4 vols. Venice, 1836
DSH	<i>Digital Scholarship in the Humanities</i>
EADIE	Eadie, John. <i>A Commentary on the Greek Text of the Epistle of Paul to the Ephesians</i> . 2nd ed. New York, NY: Robert Carter, 1861
EAGLL	<i>Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics</i> . Edited by Georgios K. Giannakis. 3 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2014
EB	The Expositor's Bible
EGGNT	Exegetical Guide to the Greek New Testament
ELLCOTT	Ellicott, Charles J. <i>St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians: with a Critical and Grammatical Commentary and a Revised Translation</i> . 5th ed. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1884
Exp	<i>The Expositor</i>
ExpT	<i>Expository Times</i>
FGrHist	<i>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</i> . Edited by Felix Jacoby. 5 vols. Berlin: Weidmann; Leiden: Brill, 1923–
FHG	<i>Fragmenta historicorum Graecorum</i> . Edited by Karl Müller. 5 in 6. Paris: Didot, 1841–1870
FINDLAY	Findlay, George Gillanders. <i>The Epistle to the Ephesians</i> . EB. New York, NY: Armstrong, 1892
GAUGLER	Gaugler, Ernst. <i>Der Epheserbrief</i> . ANS 6. Zürich: EVZ, 1966
GCS	Die griechische christliche Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte. Leipzig: J. C. Heinrichs; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1891–
GELNT	<i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Being Grimm's Wilke's Clavis Novi Testamenti</i> . Edited by Joseph Henry Thayer. Corrected. New York, NY: American Book Company, 1889
GNILKA	Gnilka, Joachim. <i>Der Epheserbrief</i> . HThKNT 10.2. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1971
GNO	Gregorii Nysseni opera. Leiden: Brill, 1960–1992

# ABBREVIATIONS

GTJ	<i>Grace Theological Journal</i>
HARLESS	Harless, Gottlieb Christoph Adolf. <i>Commentar über den Brief Pauli an die Ephesier</i> . Erlangen: Heyder, 1834
HAUPT	Haupt, Erich. <i>Der Epheserbrief</i> . KEK 8–9. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1897
HODGE	Hodge, Charles. <i>A Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians</i> . New York, NY: Robert Carter, 1856
HOEHNER	Hoehner, Harold W. <i>Ephesians: An Exegetical Commentary</i> . Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2002
HOUGHTON	Houghton, H. A. G. <i>A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament</i> . Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2025
HS	<i>Horae Semiticae</i>
HThKNT	Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
ICC	International Critical Commentary
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series
JTS	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
KEK	Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament
LBRS	Lexham Bible Reference Series
LINCOLN	Lincoln, Andrew T. <i>Ephesians</i> . WBC 42. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1990
LNTS	Library of New Testament Studies
LSJ	Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott, and Henry Stuart Jones. <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> . 9th ed. with revised supplement. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996
MACDONALD	MacDonald, Margaret Y. <i>Colossians, Ephesians</i> . SP 17. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2000
MERKLE	Merkle, Benjamin L. <i>Ephesians</i> . EGGNT. Nashville, TN: B&H Academic, 2016
METZGER	Metzger, Bruce M. <i>A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament</i> . 2nd ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994
MEYER	Meyer, Heinrich August Wilhelm. <i>Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistle to the Ephesians and the Epistle to Philemon</i> . Rev. and ed. by William P. Dickson. Translated from the 5th German ed. by Maurice J. Evans. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1880
MOULE	Moule, H. C. G. <i>The Epistle to the Ephesians</i> . CBSC. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1891
MUDDIMAN	Muddiman, John. <i>A Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians</i> . BNTC. London: Continuum, 2001

# ABBREVIATIONS

NovTSup	Supplements to <i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NTS	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
NTTSD	New Testament Tools, Studies and Documents
OLA	Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta
OLBT	Old Latin Biblical Texts
OLSHAUSEN	Olshausen, Hermann. <i>Biblical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles to the Galatians, Ephesians, Colossians and Thessalonians</i> . Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1851
OO	Opere di Origene. Rome: Città Nuova, 2002–
PERKINS	Perkins, Pheme. <i>Ephesians</i> . ANTC. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1997
PG	Patrologia Graeca. Edited by J.-P. Migne. 162 vols. Paris, 1857–1886
PGM	<i>Papyri Graecae Magicae: Die griechischen Zauberpapyri</i> . Edited by Karl Preisendanz. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: Teubner, 1973–1974
PL	Patrologia Latina. Edited by J.-P. Migne. 217 vols. Paris, 1844–1855
PO	Patrologia Orientalis. Turnhout: Brepols, 1904–
PTA	Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen. Bonn: Habelt, 1968–
PTS	Patristische Texte und Studien. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1963–
PVTG	Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece. Leiden: Brill, 1964–
RBPH	<i>Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire</i>
Richard	Richard, Marcel. <i>Asterii sophistae commentariorum in Psalmos quae supersunt</i> . SOSup 16. Oslo: Brogger, 1956
ROBINSON	Robinson, J. Armitage. <i>St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians: A Revised Text and Translation with Exposition and Notes</i> . 2nd ed. London: Macmillan, 1909
SacEr	<i>Sacris Erudiri</i>
SALMOND	Salmond, S. D. F. "The Epistle to the Ephesians." Pages 201–395 in <i>The Expositor's Greek Testament</i> . Edited by W. Robertson Nicoll. Vol. 3. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1897
SANT	Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
SBLWGRW	SBL Writings from the Graeco-Roman World. Atlanta, GA: SBL Press, 2001–
Sbordone	Sbordone, F. <i>Physiologus</i> . Rome: Dante Alighieri-Albrighi, 1936. Repr., Hildesheim: Olms, 1991
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology
SC	Sources Chrétiennes. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1941–
SCHLIER	Schlier, Heinrich. <i>Der Brief an die Epheser: Ein Kommentar</i> . 2nd ed. Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1958

## ABBREVIATIONS

SCHNACKENBURG	Schnackenburg, Rudolf. <i>The Epistle to the Ephesians: A Commentary</i> . Translated by Helen Heron. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991
SL	<i>Studies in Language</i>
Smyth	Smyth, Herbert Weir. <i>A Greek Grammar for Colleges</i> . New York, NY: American Book Company, 1920
SNTG	Studies in New Testament Greek
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SOSup	Symbolae Osloenses Fasc. Suppl.
SP	Sacra Pagina
SPV	<i>Studia Philologica Valentina</i>
STUF	<i>STUF: Language Typology and Universals</i>
TECC	Textos y Estudios «Cardenal Cisneros». Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1972–
TextsS	Texts and Studies
TLG	Thesaurus Linguae Graecae
TUGAL	Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1882–
VC	<i>Vigiliae Christianae</i>
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WEISS	Weiss, Bernhard. <i>Textkritik der paulinischen Briefe</i> . TUGAL 14.3. Leipzig: J. C. Heinrichs, 1896
WH	Westcott, Brooke Foss, and Fenton John Anthony Hort. <i>The New Testament in the Original Greek</i> . 2 vols. New York, NY: Harper, 1881–1882
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament



# **Appendix A**

## **Supplemental Commentary Entries**

Word count constraints are imposed on doctoral theses as a gesture of respect (and, perhaps, mercy) to their examiners. To this end, I have limited the coverage in my textual commentary in the main document to variation units that involve major exegetical issues or offer especially decisive or instructive assessments of intrinsic probabilities. For readers interested in seeing more, I have included commentaries on other variation units in this supplemental chapter. Note that the coverage between this chapter and the main textual commentary is by no means comprehensive.



A.1 **1:1/2–8**: Παῦλος ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ

1:1 Παῦλος ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ<sup>1</sup> διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ καὶ  
 2 4 6 8 10 12 14 16 18 20 22 24 26 28  
 πιστοῖς ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.  
 30 32 34 36

A.1.1 *Apparatus*

<i>a</i> : παυλος αποστολος ιησου χριστου	01 02 010 012 018 020 044 049 056 075S 0142 0151 1 6 18 35 38 42 69 81 88 93 94V 102 104 177 181 203 218 234 256V (263) <sup>1</sup> 296 322 326 337 363 365 383 390 398 424 436 442 459 462 467 506 606 629 636 664 665V 912 915 1069 1115 1127 1175 1240V 1241 1245 1311 1319 1490 1509 1573 1617 1678 1718 1721 1729 1739 1751 1831 1834 1836 1837 1838 1840 1851 1860 1863 1877 1881 1886 1893 1896 1908 1910 1912 1913 1918f 1939 1959 1962 1963 1985 1987 1991V 1996 1999 2004 2008 2011 2012f 2085 2127 2138 2180 2243f 2344V 2352 2464 2492 2495 2523 2544 2576 2805 2865S L169 L587 L809 L1159 L1178 L1188V L1440 L2010 L2058; VL51 VL54 VL61 VL64 VL77 VL78 VL89 vg <sup>cl</sup> cop <sup>bo</sup> ; Chr Cyr Hier MVict SynScrSac ThMops Thret; Lach <sup>ms</sup> RP TH TR
<i>b</i> : παυλος αποστολος χριστου ιησου	P46 03 06 025 0150 0278 0319 33 61 330 451 1108 (1398) <sup>2</sup> 1505 1611 2005 2400 2516; VL62 VL65 VL75 VL76 vg <sup>ww</sup> vg <sup>st</sup> syr <sup>h</sup> cop <sup>sa</sup> goth; Ambst Or Pel; Lach <sup>txt</sup> NA <sup>28</sup> SBL Tisch Treg WH
<i>a/b</i> :	syr <sup>p</sup> (ܡܠܟܐ ܕܥܝܠܐ ܡܠܝܚܐ ܡܠܠܐ) <sup>3</sup> Ephr (ܡܠܝܚܐ ܕܥܝܠܐ [...] ܡܠܠܐ) ܡܠܠܐ <sup>4</sup>

A.1.2 *Overview*

The order of Jesus’s double title in the author’s initial identification is a common locus of textual variation. As J. B. Lightfoot notes, “In all those Epistles which St Paul commences in this way (Rom., 1 Cor., 2 Cor., Phil., Col., 1 Tim., 2 Tim., Tit.), the authorities vary between Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ and Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.”<sup>5</sup> In this epistle, the close split in the external evidence has led commentators to different conclusions.<sup>6</sup> In what follows, I will offer a fresh assessment of the variant readings

1. Παῦλος δοῦλος Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ (harmonization to Rom 1:1, Phil 1:1, or Tit 1:1).

2. Παῦλος ἀπόστολος χριστοῦ (loss of Ἰησοῦ after χριστοῦ by homoioteleuton).

3. While the Peshiṭta reads “Jesus Christ,” it consistently normalizes the double title to follow this order, so it cannot be taken as evidence for either reading.

4. While the Armenian version of Ephrem’s commentary reads “Jesus Christ,” the original Syriac may have followed the convention of the Peshiṭta, so it is safer not to take Ephrem’s commentary as support for either reading.

5. J. B. Lightfoot, “The Destination of the Epistle to the Ephesians,” in *Biblical Essays*, 2nd ed. (London: Macmillan, 1904), 375–96, here 309.

6. S. D. F. Salmond states that χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ is to be preferred, presumably on external grounds (SALMOND, 201–395), but he does not elaborate on this. J. Armitage Robinson considers χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ the safest option due to

on intrinsic and transcriptional grounds.

### A.1.3 *Intrinsic Probabilities*

Intrinsically, considerations of the author’s argument are non-probative here. As the New Testament and other early Christian writings amply attest, Jesus’s name and his Messianic title are combined so often that they likely came to form a fixed expression not subject to the usual rules of information structure.<sup>7</sup> So if we hope to make any distinction in intrinsic probably can be established between *χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ* and *Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ*, we must do so on the basis of pragmatic concerns, to the extent that these concerns are operative for our author.

Conveniently, such pragmatic factors inform the author’s usage in this epistle consistently, so they can be taken to confer a slight intrinsic advantage to *χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ*. Because *Ἰησοῦς* declines in both the genitive and dative as *Ἰησοῦ*, it is practical to disambiguate its case somehow. One way to do this, which has been observed in general with indeclinable names in Koine Greek, is to include the article with the name if it is not in the nominative cases, even if its referent has not yet been introduced.<sup>8</sup> Another way is to prefix the name with a preposition that disambiguates its case. In early Christian writings, this solution was crystallized in the common phrase *διὰ Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ*.<sup>9</sup> If the name frequently occurs with titles that are declinable, then another way to disambiguate its case is to place the declinable words first. Thus, when *Ἰησοῦς* occurs with *χριστός* alone, the combined sequence will be *Ἰησοῦς χριστός* in the nominative (where the case of *Ἰησοῦς* is clear) but *χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ* and *χριστῶ Ἰησοῦ* in the genitive and dative, respectively.<sup>10</sup> But if this combination is preceded by the declinable noun *κύριος*, then no disambiguation is needed, and *Ἰησοῦς* can precede *χριστός* regardless of their case.<sup>11</sup> This pragmatic considera-

---

its external support (ROBINSON, 292). Harold W. Hoehner, meanwhile, considers *Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ* preferable because it has a more geographically diverse attestation (HOEHNER 133 n. 2).

7. On this point more generally, see Stéphanie J. Bakker, *The Noun Phrase in Ancient Greek: A Functional Analysis of the Order and Articulation of NP Constituents in Herodotus*, ASCP 15 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 4. On these grounds, Markus Barth’s observation that “certainly before Ephesians was written, *christos* became part of Jesus’ proper name” should have prevented him from inferring an emphasis on Christ’s role as Messiah merely from the word order *χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ* (BARTH 1:66).

8. Stephen H. Levinsohn, *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek: A Coursebook on the Information Structure of New Testament Greek*, 2nd ed. (Dallas, TX: SIL International, 2000), 151.

9. Indeed, the only place in the New Testament where modern critical editions admit *διὰ χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ* instead of *διὰ Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ* is in Rom 2:16, and in that passage it is contested by a variant reading *διὰ Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ* that is probably original. The reading *διὰ χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ* is attested only in two Greek manuscripts. The first is 01, whose first hand reads *χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ* without *διὰ* (in accordance with another pragmatic way of disambiguating the case of *Ἰησοῦ*), while corrector 1a changes this to *διὰ χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ*, and corrector 1b subsequently corrects this to *διὰ Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ*. The second is 03, which exhibits a consistent tendency of normalizing *Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ* to *χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ* throughout the Pauline Epistles (ROBINSON, 292). After the first century, *διὰ χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ* does not appear to be attested again until Origen.

10. Further evidence that this transposition is pragmatic in nature is the fact that versions in languages without a strict case system do not replicate it. The Syriac Peshitta, for instance, consistently maintains the order “Jesus Christ” here and throughout the epistle, even when the Greek tradition unanimously attests to the order “Christ Jesus.”

11. These pragmatic rules are noted by Werner Kramer, *Christ, Lord, Son of God*, trans. Brian Hardy, SBT 50

tion is commended by its explanatory power, as it accounts for all of the genitive and dative forms of “Jesus Christ” and “Christ Jesus” in Ephesians.<sup>12</sup> Consequently, because the genitive phrase in question does not include any feature that would signal that Ἰησοῦ is genitive, the reading with χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ (*b*) is slightly more likely than that with Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ (*a*) on pragmatic grounds:  $b \overset{D}{\gg} a$ .

#### A.1.4 Transcriptional Probabilities

The transcriptional causes of transitions between readings are detailed in Table A.1.

TABLE A.1: Transcriptional causes for Eph 1:1/2–8.

<i>From</i>	<i>To</i>	<i>Tag</i>	<i>Note</i>
<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	Harm	Transposition of χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ to Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ or vice-versa to harmonize to other Pauline openings (or their variants)
<i>b</i>	<i>a</i>		
<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	IntAssim	Assimilation to the order of χριστῶ Ἰησοῦ at the end of this verse
<i>b</i>	<i>a</i>	IntAssim	Assimilation to the occurrences of Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ in 1:2, 3, and 5
<i>b</i>	<i>a</i>	Byz	Byzantine assimilation

(London: SCM, 1966), 84–90, 204–6. He goes so far as to suggest that these patterns of usage arose in pre-Pauline formulae preserved in creeds, invocations, and farewells, but this is an unnecessary hypothesis, as pragmatic factors are sufficient to explain the most common usage patterns. Rudolf Schnackenburg notes that the order Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ “is always encountered after (ὁ) κύριος (ἡμῶν)” (SCHNACKENBURG 40 n. 1). He goes on to concede that “The author might be permitted to follow the way of speaking in Philem. (cf. v. 1 and 3, v. 9 and 25) and Col. (cf. 1.1 and 3),” but this is unnecessary: the instances in Col 1:1 and Phlm 1:1, 9 are textually contested like this one is, and the instances in Col 1:3 and Phlm 1:3, 25 also follow κυρίου.

12. The instances of Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ in 1:2, 3, 15 (*v.l.*), 17; 5:20; 6:23 occur after some form of κύριος. The instances of Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ in 1:5; 3:9 (*v.l.*), and 14 (*v.l.*) occur in διά phrases. The instances of χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ in 1:1; 2:20; and 3:1 are genitive phrases not preceded by any form of κύριος or διά. The instances of χριστῶ Ἰησοῦ in 1:1, 3 (*v.l.*); 2:6, 7, 10, 13; 3:6, 11, 21; and 21 (*v.l.*) are dative phrases not preceded by any form of κύριος. The critical text reading in 2:20 is ὄντος ἀκρογωνιαίου αὐτοῦ χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, but even if one of the variants with Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ is original, it would not constitute an exception, because the case of Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ is already made unambiguous by the genitive predicate ἀκρογωνιαίου that precedes it.

A.1.5 Post-Analysis Results

The posterior probabilities for readings based on sampled stemmata are given in Table A.2.

TABLE A.2: Reading posterior probabilities for Eph 1:1/2–8.

Reading	Significant support	Posterior
a: παυλος αποστολος ιησου χριστου	01 02 012 044 6 81 88 94V 181 256V (263) 442 606 915 1175 1678 1739 1834 1836 1840 1881 1908 1910 1962 1985 1987 1991V 2008 2011 2464 2492 2576 2805 VL61 VL77 VL89 vg <sup>cl</sup> cop <sup>bo</sup> Chr Cyr Hier MVict ThMops Thret RP TH	99.044%
b: παυλος αποστολος χριστου ιησου	P46 03 06 025 0150 0278 33 (1398) VL75 vg <sup>ww</sup> vg <sup>st</sup> syr <sup>h</sup> cop <sup>sa</sup> goth Ambst Or Pel NA <sup>28</sup> SBL WH	0.956%

Here, the slight intrinsic advantage of the reading with *χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ* is washed out by the weight of external evidence. Both readings have support in the Alexandrian, Antiochene, and the Latin traditions, but given the prevalence of the reading with *Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ* in other parts of tradition, it is ultimately more likely that *χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ* arose once or just a few times in some early witnesses than that *Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ* arose many times independently. This result demonstrates the resilience of Bayesian phylogenetics in weighing and combining different types of evidence.

## A.2 1:10/26–42: τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς

1:10 ... ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ χριστῷ, τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς<sup>1</sup>

14 16 18 20 22 24 26 28 30 32 34 36 38 40 42

ἐν αὐτῷ

44 46

## A.2.1 Apparatus

a: τα επι τοις ουρανοις και τα επι της γης	P46V 01* 03 06 020 056 0142 0150 0319 1 6 18 35 93 102 177 203 337 383 398 424 506 629 664 665 1069 1108 1115*f 1115C 1241 1245 1311f 1611 1617 1910/2 1918 1939 1963V 1996 1999 2005 2012 2138 2180 2243 2352 2865S L156 L587 L809 L1159 L1178 L1188V L1440 L2010; syr <sup>h</sup> goth <sup>A</sup> ; Eus Or; Lach <sup>txt</sup> NA <sup>28</sup> RP SBL TH TR Tisch Treg WH
b: τα επι τοις ουρανοις και επι της γης	1505 2495; goth <sup>B</sup> V
c: τα εν τοις ουρανοις και τα επι της γης	02 010 012 018 025 044 075S 0151 33 38 42 61* 81 94 104 181 218 234 256 263 326 330 365 390 (442) <sup>13</sup> 459 467 606 636 912 1127 1175 1398 1509 1573 1678 1718 1729 1739 1751 1834 1836 1837 1838 1851 1863 1877 1893 1896 1908 1910/1 1912 1913 1959 1962 1985 1987 1991V 2004 2008 2011 2085 2127 2344C 2400 2464 2492 2516 2544 2805 L169; cop; Chr Epiph Sev; Lach <sup>mg</sup>
d: τα εν τοις ουρανοις και επι της γης	451; (Marcus) <sup>14</sup>
e: τα εν τοις ουρανοις και τα επι γης	88 363 436 915 1319 1840 1881 2523 2576
f: τα τε εν τοις ουρανοις και τα επι της γης	01C2 61C0 69 322 462 1240 1721 1860 1886 2344*V L2058; TR
g: τα τε εν τοις ουρανοις και τα επι γης	296 (1490*) <sup>15</sup> 1490C 1831
a/b/c/d/e/f/g:	VL65 ([...] [...]ra sunt)
a/c/d/e:	Tert [ <i>a</i> = <i>c</i> = <i>e</i> $\gg$ <i>d</i> ] <sup>16</sup>
a/c/e:	VL51 VL62 VL75 VL76 VL78 VL83 VL89 vg CaesA ( <i>quae in caelis et quae in terra sunt</i> ); VL54 ( <i>que in celis et que in terris sunt</i> ); VL61 Ambst Pel ( <i>quae in caelis sunt et quae in terra</i> ); VL64 ([...] <i>in caelis sunt et quae in terris</i> ); Hier ( <i>quae in caelis et quae in terra</i> ); Mcion ( <i>quae in caelis et quae in terris</i> ); Ephr (ܘܩܝܠ ܝܠܝܕ ܢܦ ܝܬܪܠܝܠܝܘ ܬ ܠ ܢܦ ܝܬܪܠܝܪܝܗ)
a/d:	Thret [ <i>a</i> $\overset{A}{\gg}$ <i>d</i> ] <sup>17</sup>
b/d:	VL77 ( <i>quae in caelis et in terra</i> ); syr <sup>p</sup> (ܩܘܐ ܝܢ ܥܐܠܝܝܬ ܕܝܢ ܬܪܪܐ)

13. τὰ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (assimilation to achieve agreement in number).

14. τὰ ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (paraphrase for commentary).

15. τὰ τε ἐν οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ γῆς (assimilation to make both prepositional phrases anarthrous).

16. The text underlying this patristic citation is uncertain; see §B.2.3.

17. The text underlying this patristic citation is uncertain; see §B.2.4.

c/e:	Iren ( <i>quae in caelis et quae super terram</i> /ⲙⲁⲓⲛ ⲛⲣ ⲓⲉⲣⲗⲏⲛⲁ ⲉⲗ ⲗⲁ ⲛⲣ ⲛ ⲙⲉⲣⲱⲓⲛ ⲉⲣⲗⲏⲛ); ThMops ( <i>quae in caelis sunt quam quae super terram</i> )
c/f:	Cyr [ $f \gg^B c$ ] <sup>18</sup>
f/g:	Ambro ( <i>et quae in terra sunt et quae in caelo</i> ); MVict [ $f = g$ ] <sup>19</sup>

### A.2.2 Overview

Several variations concerning the humbler parts of speech (prepositions, particles, relative pronouns, and articles) co-occur here. The variant readings are divided according to the following subvariations: (1) the choice of ἐπὶ (“on,” “over”) or ἐν (“in”) before τοῖς οὐρανοῖς; (2) the presence or absence of τέ in the “heavens” phrase; (3) the presence or absence of the substantivizing article τὰ in the “earth” phrase; and (4) the presence or absence of the article τῆς before γῆς. Together, these subvariations relate to the author’s usage of the common “heavens-and-earth” idiom and the function of this idiom in his wider argument.

The external evidence is split on multiple fronts. Third- and fourth-century witnesses, joined by the Byzantine majority, support ἐπὶ, while fourth- and fifth-century witnesses have ἐν. The Latin tradition, which for the most part renders both prepositions with *in*, is ambiguous on this matter. Ambrose, however, does supply fourth-century support for the inclusion of τέ. Likely influenced by these considerations, the commentators have variously supported the readings τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, and τὰ τε ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.<sup>20</sup>

In the section that follows, I will organize my discussion of intrinsic evidence according to different dimensions of variation in this unit. I will conclude that section by describing how the intrinsic probabilities for the subvariations bear on the intrinsic probabilities of the readings themselves.

### A.2.3 Intrinsic Probabilities

It will be instructive for the discussion of other subvariants to start with the easiest matter: the inclusion or omission of the article before γῆς. Among the numerous instances of “heaven-and-earth” idioms in the Septuagint, the New Testament, and contemporary literature,<sup>21</sup> the two components both take the article or are both anarthrous nearly without exception. In the rare cases where this does not hold (2 Chr 6:14; Dan 6:27 [6:28 LXX]), γῆς takes the article and οὐρανῶ does

18. The text underlying this patristic citation is uncertain; see §B.2.1.

19. The text underlying this patristic citation is uncertain; see §B.2.2.

20. Τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς is preferred by MEYER, 31; WEISS, 56; ABBOTT, 19; LINCOLN, 34; BEST, 140; HOEHNER 222 n. 2; τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς is preferred by EADIE, 56; ELLICOTT, 24; and τὰ τε ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς is preferred by HARLESS, 45–47.

21. Cf. Deut 3:24; 4:39; Josh 2:11; 1 Kgs 8:23; 1 Chr 29:11; 2 Chr 6:14; Ps 73:25 [72:25 LXX]; Eccl 5:2 [5:1 LXX]; Dan 6:27 [6:28 LXX]; Joel 2:30 [3:3 LXX]; *T. Levi* 13.5 (PVTG 1:18); *T. Jud.* 21.3–4 (PVTG 1:33); *T. Benj.* 9.5 (PVTG 1:84); Matt 6:10; 16:19; 18:18; 28:18; Acts 2:19; 1 Cor 8:5; Col 1:16, 20; Rev 5:3, 13.

not. In terms of his own usage, our author employs this idiom only one other time in this epistle in Eph 3:15, and there, he adheres to the usual pattern with the doubly anarthrous *ἐν οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς*. Based on these observations, we can conclude that whether he intended to make a qualitative statement about “heavenly” and “earthly” beings (as he does with reference to families in Eph 3:15<sup>22</sup>) or a more concrete locative statement about beings “in the heavens” and “on the earth,” he would surely make both nouns anarthrous or articular here. And since the article before *οὐρανοῖς* is virtually uncontested,<sup>23</sup> it is much more likely that the author is making a more concrete locative reference with articles before both nouns.

Regarding the choice between *ἐπὶ* and *ἐν*, considerations of the author’s argument and style are non-probative. In terms of the author’s argument, little can be made of this choice. Whether he describes beings as residing “in” the heavens or “on” the celestial spheres, the locative reference and its relationship to “those on the earth” are the same for the purposes of the author’s argument. In other words, as some commentators have noted, the choice of *ἐπὶ* over *ἐν* is more stylistic than logical in nature.<sup>24</sup> The problem is that the author’s usage could support his choice of either preposition. He adheres to the usual construction in 3:15 with *ἐν οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς*. But his distinctive use of *ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις* throughout this epistle (1:3, 20; 2:6; 3:10; 6:12) could easily have inspired him to adapt this convention to his usage with *ἐπὶ* rather than *ἐν*.<sup>25</sup> Syntactically, the construction with *ἐπὶ* is somewhat jarring, as the two *ἐπὶ* phrases convey the same sense (i.e., beings “on” their respective spheres) while taking different cases.<sup>26</sup> But the construction is grammatically viable,<sup>27</sup> and it is possible that the author stylistically adapted one preposition from the typical construction without similarly adapting the case of “heavens.” In short, *ἐπὶ* and *ἐν* are intrinsically equally likely.

The addition of *τέ* and the omission of the second *τά* are both intrinsically unlikely because they obscure the distinction between the two halves of the author’s adapted “heaven-and-earth” expression. As I have noted above, the phrase in question is probably locative rather than qualitative in nature, expanding on the preceding mention of the universe (*τὰ πάντα*) in terms of its celestial and terrestrial spheres and the things that occupy them. If *τέ* is read or if the second *τά* is not read, then the reference to the celestial and terrestrial spheres becomes a hendiadys

22. A qualitative differentiation makes sense in 3:15, where the author’s point is that all families, whether heavenly or earthly in nature, derive their names from God the father. Similarly, in 6:9, the lord is described as “heavenly” (*ἐν οὐρανοῖς*), which seems to be a qualitative statement about his character to establish that he is not moved by respect for persons.

23. Only two witnesses lack the article before *οὐρανοῖς*. One is Marcus Eremita, who paraphrases this passage with *τὰ ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*. The other is the minuscule 1490, which singularly supports the reading *τά τε ἐν οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ γῆς*. The reading likely originated in this late manuscript as an effort to assimilate the articular first half of the phrase to the anarthrous second half, a point suggested by its subsequent correction to *τά τε ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ γῆς*. For these reasons, both of these readings can safely be dismissed as secondary.

24. C. F. D. Moule, *An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960), 49; Aart van Roon, *The Authenticity of Ephesians*, trans. S. Prescod-Jokel, NovTSup 39 (Leiden: Brill, 1974), 134.

25. WEISS, 56.

26. HARLESS, 45.

27. LSJ, s.v. *ἐπὶ*, A.III.1, B.III.6; see also the examples cited in MEYER, 51.



for the universe as a whole: the sense becomes “both the things in/on heaven and the things on earth” or “the things in/on heaven and on earth,” respectively.<sup>28</sup> Multiple contextual factors militate against this construction. As the author reiterates throughout the epistle (1:20–21; 2:2; 3:15; 6:12), the spheres above the earth are the home of beings distinct in essence and sometimes violently opposed to humans, so the two parts of this “heaven-and-earth” are more suggestive of contrast than uniformity. Indeed, the author employs such a contrast more explicitly in 4:9–10 to make a similar point to the one being made here about the recapitulation of the universe in Christ: the extremes of Christ’s descent and ascent are τὰ κατώτερα [μέρη] τῆς γῆς and ὑπεράνω πάντων τῶν οὐρανῶν, to the end that “he might fill the universe.”<sup>29</sup> It is more likely, then, that the phrase in question is a merism based on opposing extremes rather than a hendiadys emphasizing their totality. Consequently, the absence of τέ is intrinsically more likely than its inclusion, and the inclusion of the second τά is intrinsically more likely than its absence.

We can now sum up what this means for the relative intrinsic probabilities of the individual variant readings. On the basis of my intrinsic assessments of the subvariants involved in this passage, the two most intrinsically suitable readings, τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (a) and τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (c), are equally likely. The readings τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (b), τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (d), and τά τε ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (f) are less likely than either of these readings because they emphasize the uniformity of the two halves of the expression when their opposition is more salient to the author’s point. Finally, the readings τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ γῆς (e) and τά τε ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ γῆς (g) are much less likely than their respective counterparts τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (c) and τά τε ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (f) because, against the general convention attested in contemporary literature, they suggest that one reference is concrete while the other is qualitative. I therefore rate the relative probabilities of the readings as follows:  $a = c \overset{C}{\gg} b = d = f; c \overset{B}{\gg} e; f \overset{B}{\gg} g$ .

#### A.2.4 Transcriptional Probabilities

Despite the popularity and longevity of the ἐπί in the first phrase among Greek scribes, it was probably more difficult to later readers than ἐν for historical reasons that are worth detailing. As we have discussed already, “heaven-and-earth” idioms conventionally employed ἐν with a dative of οὐρανός and ἐπί with a genitive of γῆ. The relative rarity of the phrase ἐπὶ (τοῖς) οὐρανοῖς compared to ἐν (τοῖς) οὐρανοῖς throughout the centuries suggests that this convention continued to hold even for later readers.<sup>30</sup> Historically, ἐπί also became less associated with its spatial meaning over time, with other prepositions like ἐπάνω replacing it for this purpose in Medieval

28. As Gottlieb Christoph Adolf Harless says of the inclusion of τέ, “it suitably emphasizes the uniform” [“sie hebt passend das Gleichmässige hervor”] (HARLESS, 46).

29. This is noted in HARLESS, 45.

30. A TLG textual search (13 October 2022) for ἐπ ουρανοῖς, ἐπὶ ουρανοῖς, and ἐπὶ τοῖς ουρανοῖς returned a total of nine hits, while a search for ἐν ουρανοῖς, and ἐν τοῖς ουρανοῖς returned a total of 5521 hits.



Greek.<sup>31</sup> Even in Koine Greek, the use of the dative was becoming rarer generally, and it was the rarest case used with ἐπὶ.<sup>32</sup> Thus, among later Hellenistic and Medieval Greek scribes who were less accustomed to the general use of ἐπὶ or its use with the dative in particular, the change from ἐπὶ to ἐν could be understood as a “correction” from an old, obscure, and uncommon phrase to a modern, clear, and common one.

This and other potential causes of transitions between readings are detailed in Table A.3.

TABLE A.3: Transcriptional causes for Eph 1:10/26–42.

<i>From</i>	<i>To</i>	<i>Tag</i>	<i>Note</i>
<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	Prag	Deletion of τὰ before ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς to clarify a perceived hendiadys in “heavens” and “earth”
<i>c</i>	<i>d</i>		
<i>a</i>	<i>c</i>	Idio	Change of τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς to τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς according to changing grammatical conventions
<i>b</i>	<i>d</i>		
<i>a</i>	<i>c</i>	Harm	Change of τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς to τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς to harmonize to Col 1:16, 20
<i>b</i>	<i>d</i>		
<i>b</i>	<i>a</i>	Prag	Addition of τὰ before ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς to clarify a perceived merism involving “heavens” and “earth”
<i>d</i>	<i>c</i>		
<i>c</i>	<i>a</i>	IntAssim	Change of τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς to τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς by assimilation (intentional or inadvertent) to τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς
<i>c</i>	<i>f</i>	Prag	Addition of τέ to τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς to clarify a perceived hendiadys in “heavens” and “earth”
<i>e</i>	<i>g</i>		
<i>c</i>	<i>e</i>	PalConf	Loss of τῆς before γῆς by homoioarcton due to the paleographic similarity of both words in majuscule and some minuscule scripts
<i>f</i>	<i>g</i>		
<i>e</i>	<i>c</i>	IntAssim	Addition of τῆς before γῆς to assimilate towards the arthrous τοῖς οὐρανοῖς
<i>g</i>	<i>f</i>		
<i>f</i>	<i>c</i>	Prag	Deletion of τέ to clarify a perceived merism involving “heavens” and “earth”
<i>g</i>	<i>e</i>		
<i>b–g</i>	<i>a</i>	Byz	Byzantine assimilation

31. Pietro Bortone, *Greek Prepositions: From Antiquity to the Present* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010),

232.

32. Bortone, *Greek Prepositions*, 182–84.

#### A.2.5 Post-Analysis Results

The posterior probabilities for readings based on sampled stemmata are given in Table A.4.

TABLE A.4: Reading posterior probabilities for Eph 1:10/26–42.

Reading	Significant support	Posterior
c: τα ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς	02 012 025 044 33 81 94 181 256 263 (442) 606 1175 1398 1678 1739 1834 1836 1908 1910/1 1962 1985 1987 1991V 2008 2011 2464 2492 2805 cop Chr	99.236%
a: τα ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς	P46V 01* 03 06 0150 6 1910/2 syr <sup>h</sup> goth <sup>A</sup> Or NA <sup>28</sup> RP SBL TH WH	0.764%
b: τα ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς	goth <sup>BV</sup>	0.000%
d: τα ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς		0.000%
e: τα ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τα ἐπὶ γῆς	88 915 1840 1881 2576	0.000%
f: τα τε ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς	01C2	0.000%
g: τα τε ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τα ἐπὶ γῆς		0.000%

The posterior probabilities break the intrinsic tie between τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς and τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς decisively in favor of the latter reading. This is a new result, and it suggests a departure from all other collated critical texts. It favors the transcriptional argument that the ἐπὶ in the second phrase was copied into the first phrase in place of ἐν, either as a deliberate assimilation or as a mechanical error. The diversity of external support for τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς has no doubt contributed to its advantage. The result therefore speaks to how my inclusion of versional evidence gives weight to the Western branch of the tradition that other approaches have not.

The inclusion of further transcriptional data in future analyses should result in even more informed posterior probabilities. We might suspect that translations into Latin and other languages would be especially susceptible to changing the first “on” to “in” to produce a more idiomatic locative phrase involving heaven. The use of non-uniform equilibrium frequencies for the variant readings (as described in the conclusions chapter of the main document) can model the higher chance of readings with ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς to survive the “natural selection” of transcriptional and translational processes. This, in turn, will likely increase the posterior probabilities more favorable to readings with ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. Thus, while I tentatively adopt the reading τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς in this study’s critical text, I leave τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς labeled as reading *a* in anticipation of future results.

A.3 **1:15/26–36:** καὶ τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους

1:15 Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ γώ, ἀκούσας τὴν καθ' ὑμᾶς πίστιν ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς  
2 4 6 8 10 12 14 16 18 20 22 24 26 28 30 32 34  
ἀγίους<sup>1</sup>, 16 οὐ παύομαι εὐχαριστῶν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν  
36 2 4 6 8 10

### A.3.1 Apparatus

<i>a: και την εις παντας τους αγιους</i>	P46 01* 02 03 025 33 1739 1881; Hier Or Pel; Lach WH
<i>b: και την αγαπην εις παντας τους αγιους</i>	06* 010 012 0320 1398;
<i>c: και την αγαπην την εις παντας τους αγιους</i>	01C2 06C2 018 020 044 056 075S 0142 0150 0151 0319 1 6 18 35 (38) <sup>33</sup> 42 88 93 94V 102 177 (181) <sup>34</sup> 203 218 223 234 296 322 330 337 363 383 390 398 424 451 506 606 629 636 664 665V 912 915 1069 1108 1115V 1127 1240 1241 1245 1311 1490 1505 1509 1611 1617 1678 1718 1721 1729 1751 1831 1836 (1840) <sup>35</sup> 1851 1860 1863 1877 1886 1893 1896 1908 1912 1918 1939 1962 1963 1985 1987 1991 1996 1999 2004 2005 2008 2011 2012 2085 2138 2180 2243 2352 2400 2492 2495 2516 2523 2544 2576 2805 2865S L156 L169 L587 L809 L1159 L1178 L1188 L1440 L2010V L2058; syr cop <sup>sa</sup> ; (Ephr) <sup>36</sup> EpMag; NA <sup>28</sup> RP SBL TH TR Tisch Treg
<i>d: και την εις παντας τους αγιους αγαπην</i>	61 69 81 104 256V 263 326 365 436 442 459 462 467 1175 1319 1573 1834 1837 1838 1910 1959 2127 2344 (2464V) <sup>37</sup> L60
<i>a/b/c/d:</i>	cop <sup>bo</sup> [ <i>a</i> = <i>b</i> = <i>c</i> = <i>d</i> ] <sup>38</sup>
<i>b/c/d:</i>	ThMops ( <i>et caritatem quam habetis in omnibus sanctis</i> )
<i>b/c:</i>	VL51 VL62 VL65 VL78 vg ( <i>et dilectionem in omnes sanctos</i> ); VL54 VL61 Ambst ( <i>et dilectione in omnes sanctos</i> ); VL75 VL76 VL77 ( <i>et caritatem in omnes sanctos</i> ); VL89 ( <i>et caritate in omnes sanctos</i> ); goth (𐍪𐍲𐍺𐍯𐍯𐍰 𐍲𐍺𐍮𐍯𐍱𐍮𐍰 𐍲𐍺 𐍲𐍺𐍮𐍯𐍱𐍮𐍰 𐍲𐍺𐍮𐍯𐍱𐍮𐍰 𐍺𐍲𐍺𐍮𐍯𐍱𐍮𐍰); (MVic) <sup>39</sup> ; Chr Thret [ <i>c</i> <sup>B</sup> ≫ <i>b</i> ] <sup>40</sup>
<i>c/d:</i>	Cyr [ <i>a</i> = <i>d</i> ] <sup>41</sup>

33. καὶ τὴν ἄμωμον ἀγάπην τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους (gloss, possibly inspired by 1:4).

34. καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην τῆς κοινωνίας αὐτοῦ τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους (gloss, possibly inspired by 2 Cor 13:14).

35. τὴν ἀγάπην τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους (gloss for commentary).

36. և սէրն ձեր որ է առ ծառայսն տեառն մերոյ (Ephrem paraphrases “saints” as “servants of our lord” for his commentary).

37. καὶ εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους ἀγάπη (deletion of τήν to coordinate this phrase and the preceding τήν καθ' ὑμᾶς πίστιν more closely).

38. The tradition of this version is divided. One reading,  $\kappa\epsilon\mu\ \eta\eta\ \epsilon\theta\omicron\gamma\alpha\beta\ \tau\eta\rho\omicron\gamma$ , unambiguously corresponds to the reading  $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\acute{\eta}\nu\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ ; the other reading,  $\kappa\epsilon\mu\ \dagger\alpha\gamma\alpha\pi\eta\ \epsilon\tau\sigma\iota\ \epsilon\theta\omicron\gamma\eta\ \epsilon\theta\omicron\gamma\alpha\beta\ \tau\eta\rho\omicron\gamma$ , corresponds to the text of Col 1:4,  $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\acute{\eta}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\alpha}\pi\eta\eta\ \eta\eta\ \xi\chi\epsilon\tau\epsilon\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$  and could be a paraphrase of any of the readings with  $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\alpha}\pi\eta\eta$ .

39. *dilectione in sanctos* (flattening for commentary).

40. The textual traditions of these fathers are divided; see §§B.3.1 and B.3.3.

41. The text underlying this patristic citation is uncertain; see §B.3.2.

### A.3.2 Overview

The issue is whether the author is referring to his readers' love towards all saints (and if so, which attributive construction, if any, he is using to refer to it) or to their faithfulness towards all saints (with *τὴν* referring back to the *πίστω* of the previous phrase). Externally, the early evidence is divided, with the primary Alexandrian witnesses, Jerome, Pelagius, and part of the Bohairic Coptic version supporting the reading without "love" and the remaining branches of the tradition, including the rest of the early versions, divided over the various readings with "love." Intrinsically, most commentators hold that a reference to faithfulness towards fellow believers without any accompanying reference to love is vague, unprecedented, or conspicuously divergent from the otherwise close parallels in Colossians and Philemon.<sup>42</sup> But appeals to other epistles rely on tenuous assumptions about this epistle's relationship to them, and other commentators have argued that faithfulness or loyalty to other Christians has ample precedent in other Christian writings, even if it conveys the same idea as love towards others.<sup>43</sup> Transcriptionally, it has long been granted that the reading without *ἀγάπην* could have arisen from the reading *καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους* from a skip of the eye from the first *τὴν* to the second.<sup>44</sup> It could also have arisen or from the reading *καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους* by homoioteleuton from the first *τὴν* to the ending of *ἀγάπην*.<sup>45</sup> In the opposite direction, *ἀγάπην* could have been added by harmonization to Col 1:4.<sup>46</sup> The difficulty in resolving this issue is further illustrated in the editions, with most modern critical texts shifting from *τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους* to the Byzantine reading *τὴν ἀγάπην τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους*.

### A.3.3 Intrinsic Probabilities

Intrinsic evidence is not sufficient to discern the probabilities of the three readings with *ἀγάπην*. Even if the author did not place *ἀγάπην* in first attributive position (*τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους ἀγάπην*) or second attributive position (*τὴν ἀγάπην τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους*), it is clear from

42. EADIE, 77; MOULE, 56; WEISS, 82; ABBOTT, 26; SALMOND, 271; ROBINSON, 296; LINCOLN 46 n. a; SCHNACKENBURG 73 n. 8; MACDONALD, 215; MUDDIMAN 84 n. 4; HOEHNER 249 n. 5; COHICK 216 n. 138; HOUGHTON, 465. Similarly worded collocations of faith and love occur in both Col 1:4 and Phlm 1:5.

43. WH 2.2:124; Alexander Souter, "An Interpretation of Eph. i. 15," *ExpT* 19.1 (1907): 44; BARTH 1:146; BEST, 160.

44. MOULE, 56; WEISS, 82; ABBOTT, 26; SALMOND, 272; BARTH 1:147; LINCOLN 46 n. a; SCHNACKENBURG 73 n. 8; METZGER, 533; BEST, 160; MACDONALD, 215; MUDDIMAN 84 n. 4; HOEHNER 249 n. 5; MERKLE, 40; HOUGHTON, 465. Alexander Souter's objection that "No one who has had much experience of the ways of MSS will be ready to maintain that the words *τὴν ἀγάπην* have dropped out accidentally in the parent or parents of our best authorities" (Souter, "Eph. i. 15," 44) has aged poorly in light of James R. Royse's finding that our earliest papyri exhibit a tendency towards such omissions (James R. Royse, *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri*, NTTSD 36 [Leiden: Brill, 2008]).

45. ROBINSON, 297.

46. WH 2.2:124; BEST, 140.

the context that *εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους* modifies *ἀγάπην*. In any case, his argument about his readers' love is unaffected, making all three readings equally intrinsically likely.

Regarding the inclusion or exclusion of *ἀγάπην*, the most immediate contextual detail that has any bearing on it is the preceding reference to *τὴν καθ' ὑμᾶς πίστιν*. As Fenton John Anthony Hort observes, this is a striking choice of wording when *τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν* would suffice for the usual possessive sense, but if it is understood in a reciprocal sense as “your faithfulness to one another,” then it functions clearly as a counterpoint to a broader faithfulness “towards all the saints.”<sup>47</sup> Of course, if this is the comparison the author is making, then it is unchanged whether it is faithfulness (as in the reading without *ἀγάπην*) or love (as in any of the readings with *ἀγάπην*) that the readers are showing to others. Alternatively, *τὴν καθ' ὑμᾶς πίστιν* could have the limiting sense “your own faith.”<sup>48</sup> It is not clear from the context why the author would choose this more emphatic expression over *τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν*. But under the assumption that the epistle was written to a specific church in response to a previous letter,<sup>49</sup> the phrase could be an exophoric reference to this past correspondence. If the epistle's recipients had previously informed the author of their faithfulness and possibly commended him on what they had heard of his, then the *καὶ γὰρ ἀκούσας* at the start of the verse would make sense as, “when I too heard (as you had heard),” and the *τὴν καθ' ὑμᾶς πίστιν* could mean “your own faithfulness (compared to mine)” or “your faithfulness (according to you).” A similar exophoric reference may be at work in the concluding remark of 6:21, where the author employs an otherwise puzzling additive *καί* with reference to his readers and an emphatic *κατά* phrase with reference to himself: *ἵνα δὲ καὶ ὑμεῖς εἰδῆτε τὰ κατ' ἐμέ τί πράσσω πάντα*. In the present verse, the point and counterpoint in this scenario would be between readers' own faithfulness in Jesus (in the practical sense of faithful service suggested by *πίστοις ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ* in 1:1 and *πιστὸς διάκονος ἐν κυρίῳ* in 6:21) and their behavior towards all saints. But again, the inclusion or exclusion of *ἀγάπην* in the second phrase does not change the essential comparison or the author's argument, so even if we accept the assumptions underlying this scenario, we are left with the same intrinsic probabilities. However we read *τὴν καθ' ὑμᾶς πίστιν*, and whether or not we assume that this epistle was written to a specific church in response to a previous letter, the inclusion and exclusion of *ἀγάπην* remain equally intrinsically likely.

Another intrinsic factor worth mentioning is whether the author's wider concerns in the epistle gave him reason not to attribute love to his readers. Jennifer Kay Berenson Maclean has argued that the author of Ephesians, who adapted Colossians into this epistle, excised its reference to the Colossians' love, because the readers of this epistle possessed faith, but not love.<sup>50</sup> The problem is that even if we assume the dependence of Ephesians on Colossians, the author does not explain or address his readers' supposed lack of love in this passage. The distinction between loyalty

47. WH 2.2:124; see also Souter, “Eph. i. 15,” 44.

48. BDAG, s.v. *κατά*, B.7.b; see also HARLESS, 84; EADIE, 76; and HOEHNER, 249.

49. On potential indications of reciprocity in this correspondence, see B. W. Bacon, “St. Paul to the Laodiceans,” *Exp* 8.17 (1919): 19–36, here 23–24.

50. Jennifer Kay Berenson Maclean, “Ephesians and the Problem of Colossians: Interpretation of Texts and Traditions in Eph 1:1–2:10” (PhD diss., Harvard University, 1995), 71–87.

towards other Christians and love for them is already subtle at best, so the author would surely have done more than omit the word “love” if he wanted to inform his readers that they lacked it. Yet he does not even mention love in the prayer that follows, which would be the perfect place for him to express this desire for his readers. For these reasons, it is unlikely that the author’s objectives in the epistle favor the reading without ἀγάπην.

In conclusion, intrinsic considerations do not favor any reading over the others. Since the author’s argument and occasion for writing the epistle have no bearing on the presence or absence of ἀγάπην or the construction used with ἀγάπην, I consider all readings equally likely intrinsically. I rate them as follows:  $a = b = c = d$ .

#### A.3.4 *Transcriptional Probabilities*

Before I detail the full set of potential causes of transitions between readings, I will offer some responses to arguments regarding harmonization. Some commentators have argued that emendators harmonizing towards Col 1:4 would surely have adopted the wording καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην ἣν ἔχετε εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἀγίους,<sup>51</sup> and others have argued that the reading without ἀγάπην could be the result of harmonization to καὶ εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἀγίους in Phlm 1:5.<sup>52</sup> Neither argument is compelling. Regarding the first argument, the addition of ἀγάπην in various places was likely occasioned by parallels other than Col 1:4 and for reasons beyond the desire to make parallel passages agree. Specifically, for scribes and readers who took πίστιν ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ to refer to faith with the Lord Jesus as its object, the corresponding phrase εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἀγίους would not be a suitable object for the same faith, and a different noun would be required. A natural candidate for such a noun would be ἀγάπην, which is suggested not only by the parallel in Col 1:4, but by the parallel in Phlm 1:5 and by various other collocations of “faith” and “love” in the Pauline Epistles.<sup>53</sup> The addition of ἀγάπην, then, is better understood as the result of a general harmonization to Pauline usage than as the result of harmonization to a specific passage. Besides this, more complete harmonizations to Col 1:4 are in fact attested in the tradition of Ephesians. Part of the Bohairic Coptic version and the lemma of Theodore of Mopsuestia’s commentary on Ephesians (preserved in Latin) fully reproduce the wording of Col 1:4 with the equivalent of ἣν ἔχετε. In addition, the Byzantine tradition of Col 1:4 reads καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἀγίους, so the Byzantine reading in Ephesians could be the result of an exact harmonization to the Colossians parallel. Regarding the second argument, the omission of ἀγάπην would only constitute a partial harmonization to Phlm 1:5, as ἀγάπην is present earlier in that verse.<sup>54</sup> We would expect such a partial harmonization—and one towards a shorter reading, at that—to require some

51. Andrew T. Lincoln argues that “if there was a later assimilation to Col 1:4, this would surely have involved the ἣν ἔχετε of Colossians instead of either the second τὴν or simply the absence of any relative expression” (LINCOLN 46 n. a). He is followed by METZGER, 533.

52. SCHNACKENBURG 73 n. 8; MUDDIMAN 84 n. 4.

53. See, e.g., Gal 5:6; Eph 3:17; 6:21, 23; 1 Thess 3:6; 2 Thess 1:3; 1 Tim 1:14; and Tit 3:15.

54. Lincoln’s argument that the second half of Phlm 1:5 would be an unlikely influence on the author of Ephesians also applies to later scribes: such usage of the parallel “would have to assume a much more wooden and insensitive use of Paul’s letters than is the case elsewhere in Ephesians” (LINCOLN 46 n. a).



additional motivation, but the exegetical motivation for the addition of ἀγάπην does not hold for its omission. For these reasons, the only harmonization I consider plausible in this passage is a general harmonization to Pauline usage through the addition of ἀγάπην in various places.

The transcriptional causes of transitions between readings are detailed in Table A.11.

TABLE A.5: Transcriptional causes for Eph 1:15/26–36.

<i>From</i>	<i>To</i>	<i>Tag</i>	<i>Note</i>
<i>a</i>	<i>b–d</i>	Harm	Addition of ἀγάπην (possibly as part of an attributive position construction with εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους) as a general harmonization to Col 1:4 and Phlm 1:5
<i>b</i>	<i>a</i>	HomTelPart	Loss of ἀγάπην after τήν by homoioteleuton
<i>b</i>	<i>c–d</i>	Prag	Change of the construction τήν ἀγάπην εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους to a less syntactically ambiguous first or second attributive position construction (ROBINSON, 296)
<i>c</i>	<i>a</i>	HomArcWord	Shortening of τήν ἀγάπην τήν to τήν by homoioarcton from the first τήν to the second
<i>c</i>	<i>b</i>	HomTelPart	Loss of τήν after ἀγάπην by homoioteleuton
		Idio	Loss of τήν after ἀγάπην through retroversion of the Latin reading <i>et caritatem in omnes sanctos</i>
<i>a–b, d</i>	<i>c</i>	Byz	Byzantine assimilation

### A.3.5 Post-Analysis Results

The posterior probabilities for readings based on sampled stemmata are given in Table A.6.

TABLE A.6: Reading posterior probabilities for Eph 1:15/26–36.

<i>Reading</i>	<i>Significant support</i>	<i>Posterior</i>
<i>a</i> : και την εις παντας τους αγιους	P46 01* 02 03 025 33 1739 1881 Hier Or Pel WH	72.433%
<i>c</i> : και την αγαπην την εις παντας τους αγιους	01C2 06C2 044 0150 6 88 94V (181) 606 915 1678 1836 (1840) 1908 1962 1985 1987 1991 2008 2011 2492 2576 2805 syr <sup>h</sup> NA <sup>28</sup> RP SBL TH	27.163%
<i>b</i> : και την αγαπην εις παντας τους αγιους	06* 012 1398	0.400%
<i>d</i> : και την εις παντας τους αγιους αγαπην	81 256V 263 442 1175 1834 1910 (2464V)	0.004%

On the basis of transcriptional and external evidence, posterior probabilities favor the reading καὶ τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους, with καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους taking a close second place. This result marks a departure from all modern critical editions and a return to the text of Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort. The transcriptional probability of haplography appears to exceed that of harmonization, but the early Greek and Latin external support for καὶ τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους is just strong enough to give that reading an edge in posterior probability. Since the posterior odds ratio of καὶ τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους to καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους is less than the numerical value assigned to *D* ratings in this study, καὶ τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους should be adopted tentatively. In accordance with the principles of Bayesian inference, the future incorporation of new evidence could turn the posterior probabilities back in favor of καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους.



A.4 **1:20/2-4:** ἦν ἐνήργησεν

1:19 ... κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ 20 ᾗ ἐνήργησεν ἐν τῷ χριστῷ ἐγείρας  
26 28 30 32 34 36 38 40 2 4 6 8 10 12  
αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν, καὶ καθίσας ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις  
14 16 18 20 22 24 26 28 30 32 34

#### A.4.1 Apparatus

*a:* ην ἐνηργήσεν

01 06 010 012 018 020 025r 044 056r 075S 0142r 0151 0278 0319 1 6 18 33V  
35 38 42 61 69 93 94V 102 104 177 181r 203 218 223 234T (234A)<sup>55</sup> 256 263  
296 322 326r 330 337 363 365 383 390 398 424 436 442 451 459r 462 467 506  
606 629 636 664 665 912 1069 1108 1115 1127 1175 1240 1241 1245 1311  
1319 1398 1490 1505 1509 1573 1611 1617r 1678 1718 1721 1729 1739 1751  
1831 1836r 1837r 1838 1840\*r 1840C 1851 1860 1863 1877 1881 1886 1893  
1896 1908 1910 1912 1913 1918 1939r 1959 1962r 1963 1985 1987 1991  
1996r 1999 2004 2005 2008 2011 2012 2085 2127 2138 2180 2243 2344 2352  
2400 2464 2492 2495 2516 2523 2544r 2576 2805r 2865 L23 L60r L156 L169  
L587 L809 L1159 L1178 L1188 L1298 L1440 L2010 L2058; syr<sup>h</sup>; Chr CyrJ  
EpMag Eus Or Thret; NA<sup>28</sup> RP TH TR Treg WH<sup>mg</sup>

*b:* ην ἐνηργήκεν

02 03 0150 81r 88 915 1834r; Cyr Proc; Lach SBL Tisch WH<sup>txt</sup>

*a/b*

P46 (ην ἐνηργη[...]); VL51 VL54 VL56 VL61 VL62 VL64 VL65 VL75 VL76 VL77  
VL78 VL89 vg Ambst Hil Hier MVict Pel ThMops (*quam operatus est*); syr<sup>p</sup>  
(ܡܠܬܐ); cop<sup>sa</sup> (ταῖς ἐνεργειαῖς αὐτοῦ); cop<sup>bo</sup> (οἱ ἐνεργεῖαι αὐτοῦ); goth (𐍂𐌶𐍅𐍆𐍂𐍄𐍃𐍂𐍅); Tert (*inoperatus est valentium suam*); GrNy [*b* <sup>C</sup> >> *a*]<sup>56</sup>

### A.4.2 Overview

The question is whether the author spoke of “what God *operated* in Christ” or “what God *has operated* in Christ.” Internal evidence has variously been taken in favor of the perfect ἐνέργηκεν,<sup>57</sup> taken in favor of the aorist ἐνέργησεν,<sup>58</sup> or deemed equivocal.<sup>59</sup> External evidence has generally been judged to favor the aorist,<sup>60</sup> although some commentators have rightly noted that the testimony of the versions and non-Greek fathers is ambiguous.<sup>61</sup> The disagreement of modern critical editions on this matter illustrates its continuing difficulty.

55. ἦν ἐθέλησεν (gloss).

56. The underlying text of this patristic citations is uncertain; see §B.4.1.

57. MEYER, 32; WEISS, 43; ABBOTT, 31; HAUPT 43, esp. n. 2; GAUGLER, 72; GNILKA, 50, 94; LINCOLN 46 n. d.

58. MOULE, 60.

59. SALMOND, 277; BEST 170 n. 20.

60. MOULE, 60; HAUPT 43 n. 2; BEST 170 n. 20; HOEHNER 273 n. 2. Charles J. Ellicott considers ἐνῆργηκεν suspicious because the same witnesses that have it also have καθίσας later in this verse instead of ἐκάθισεν, which he considers original (ELLCOTT, 37).

61. MEYER, 32.

A.4.3 *Intrinsic Probabilities*

Intrinsic evidence does not give an advantage to either reading, as the perfect only makes explicit what is implied by the aorist. Following the sequence of attributes that speak to God's reputation in 1:18–19 (“the hope of his calling ... the wealth of the glory of his inheritance ... the exceeding might of his power”), the perfect ἐνήργηκεν makes explicit that God's past activity with Christ has established his might.<sup>62</sup> As the author indicates in 2:5–6, God's operation in Christ has a present and continuing impact on those who participate in Christ—a point he pauses to make with the perfective χάριτί ἐστε σεσωσμένοι there. Syntactically, the aorist participles ἐγείρας and καθίσας (if the latter is read as a participle) that elaborate on God's activity do not agree with ἐνήργηκεν in tense, but they may simply specify the individual deeds that realized the accomplishment conveyed by ἐνήργηκεν.<sup>63</sup> In contrast, the aorist ἐνήργησεν is both syntactically and logically consistent with these participles and with the related actions described in 1:22 (ὑπέταξεν and ἔδωκεν), as all of these verbs refer to completed actions.<sup>64</sup> It leaves the continuing effects of God's action on his own reputation implicit, but this can already be gathered from the present-tense (τί ἐστιν) references to God's calling, inheritance, and might in 1:18–19. Likewise, the effects on those who participate in Christ are still made explicit in 2:5–6. Since neither reading contributes more to the author's argument than the other, I consider them equally likely:  $a = b$ .

A.4.4 *Transcriptional Probabilities*

A brief discussion of diachronic developments in Greek is necessary to illuminate certain transcriptional possibilities in this passage. Already during the composition of the writings comprising the New Testament, the Greek synthetic perfect was semantically drifting towards the aorist, which culminated in an eventual merger.<sup>65</sup> The aorist won out over the perfect in Byzantine Greek,<sup>66</sup> so later scribes would primarily have been tempted to change the perfect to the more familiar aorist.<sup>67</sup> But prior to the Byzantine period, the change in tense could go either way.

Summary remarks on these and other potential causes of transitions between the readings in

62. The “anterior” category of the perfect describes this “past action, current relevance” function. Robert Crellin has recently made the proposal that the Greek perfect derives a continuing situation specifically for its grammatical subject from its predicate (“The Semantics of the Perfect in the Greek of the New Testament,” in *The Greek Verb Revisited*, ed. Steven E. Runge and Christopher J. Fresch [Bellingham, WA: Lexham, 2016], 430–57, here 451).

63. ABBOTT, 31; HAUPT, 43.

64. SALMOND, 277; MOULE, 60; HOEHNER 273 n. 2.

65. Amelia Moser, “The Changing Relationship of Tense and Aspect in the History of Greek,” *STUF* 61.1 (2008): 5–18, here 13; Crellin, “Semantics of the Perfect,” 453–54. Details of this gradual development are discussed in Alexander Andrason and Christian Locatell, “The Perfect Wave: A Cognitive Approach to the Greek Verbal System,” *BAGL* 5 (2016): 7–121, here 24–26.

66. See BDF §340, and more recently, Klaas Bentein, “Perfect,” *EAGLL* 3:46–49, here 48–49. The classic study of the long-term changes in the use and formulation of the Greek perfect is Pierre Chantraine, *Histoire du parfait grec*, *CLSLP* 21 (Paris: Klincksieck, 1927), 214–52.

67. Heinrich August Wilhelm Meyer offers this transcriptional argument on the basis that the aorist was “more in current use” (MEYER, 32).

this passage appear in Table A.7.

TABLE A.7: Transcriptional causes for Eph 1:20/2–4.

<i>From</i>	<i>To</i>	<i>Tag</i>	<i>Note</i>
<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	Idio	Change in the tense from aorist to perfect due to semantic drift (prior to the Byzantine period)
<i>b</i>	<i>a</i>	Idio	Change in the tense from perfect to aorist due to semantic drift
<i>b</i>	<i>a</i>	Byz	Byzantine assimilation

#### A.4.5 Post-Analysis Results

The posterior probabilities for readings based on sampled stemmata are given in Table A.8.

TABLE A.8: Reading posterior probabilities for Eph 1:20/2–4.

<i>Reading</i>	<i>Significant support</i>	<i>Posterior</i>
<i>a: ην ἐνῆργησεν</i>	01 06 012 025r 044 0278 6 33V 94V 181r 256 263 442 606 1175 1398 1678 1739 1836r 1840C 1840*r 1881 1908 1910 1962r 1985 1987 1991 2008 2011 2464 2492 2576 2805r syr <sup>h</sup> Chr Or Thret NA <sup>28</sup> RP TH WH <sup>mg</sup>	99.212%
<i>b: ην ἐνῆργηκεν</i>	02 03 0150 81r 88 915 1834r Cyr SBL WH	0.788%

On the basis of external evidence, the posterior probabilities break the intrinsic tie between  $\hat{\eta}\nu \epsilon\acute{\nu}\eta\rho\gamma\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu$  and  $\hat{\eta}\nu \epsilon\acute{\nu}\eta\rho\gamma\eta\kappa\epsilon\nu$  decisively in favor of  $\hat{\eta}\nu \epsilon\acute{\nu}\eta\rho\gamma\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu$ . This result favors the judgment of NA<sup>28</sup> and the Tyndale House Greek New Testament over that of the SBL Greek New Testament. It suggests that on one or more early occasions, the aorist was changed to the perfect as a matter of preference or convention during the semantic merger of the two tenses.

## A.5 1:20/20-22: καὶ καθίσας

1:19 ... κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ 20 ἣν ἐνήργησεν ἐν τῷ χριστῷ ἐγείρας  
 26 28 30 32 34 36 38 40 2 4 6 8 10 12  
 αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν, 'καὶ καθίσας' ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ... 22 καὶ πάντα ὑπέταξεν ὑπὸ  
 14 16 18 20 22 24 26 28 30 32 34 2 4 6 8  
 τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ, καὶ αὐτὸν ἔδωκεν κεφαλὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ,  
 10 12 14 16 18 20 22 24 26 28 30

## A.5.1 Apparatus

<i>a: και καθισας</i>	03 075Sr 0150r 0278r 94 104r 256V 263 330 365 442 451 459rV 462 1108 1175 1319 1398 1505 1573 1611 1739 1881 1908 1910/2 1962 2005 2011 2127 2344 2400 2492r 2495 2516r 2523 L60; VL51 VL54 VL56 VL61 VL62 VL65 VL78 vg syr <sup>h</sup> ; Cyr CyrJ GrNy Pel; Lach NA <sup>28</sup> SBL Treg WH
<i>b: και καθισας αυτον</i>	01 02r 33 38 81 218 296 436 1127 1718 1834r 1987 2464r 2805; Eus Hier Mcion MVict Tert; TH Tisch
<i>c: καθισας αυτον</i>	467*r 467C 1959r
<i>d: και εκαθισεν</i>	06 010 012 018 020r 025 056 0142 0151 0319 1 6 18 35 42 61 69 88 93 102 177 181r 203 223 234 322 326 337 363 383 390 398 424 506 606 629 636r 664 665 912 915 1069 1115 1240 1241 1245 1311 1490 1509 1617 1678 1721 1729r 1751r 1831 1836 1837r 1838 1840 1851 1860 1863 1877 1886*r 1886C 1893 1896 1910/1 1912 1913 1918r 1939 1963 1985r 1991 1996r 1999 2004 2008 2012r 2085 2138 2180 (2243) <sup>68</sup> 2352 2544 2576 2865 L23 L156/1r L156/2 L169 L587 L809 L1159 L1178 L1188 L1298 L1440r L2010V L2058; VL64 VL75 VL76 VL89 goth; Ambst Hil ThMops Thret; RP TR
<i>e: και εκαθισεν αυτον</i>	044; VL77 cop <sup>bo</sup>
<i>f: εκαθισεν αυτον</i>	cop <sup>sa</sup>
<i>a/b/c/d/e/f:</i>	Or [ <i>a</i> <sup>C</sup> <i>b</i> = <i>c</i> = <i>d</i> = <i>e</i> = <i>f</i> ] <sup>69</sup>
<i>a/b:</i>	P92 (και καθι[...] [...]); Proc [ <i>b</i> <sup>C</sup> <i>a</i> ] <sup>70</sup>
<i>b/e:</i>	syr <sup>p</sup> (ܡܠܝܟܐ); Ephr (ܠܝ ܠܡܬܝܝܓ ܩܝܡܐ) <sup>71</sup>
<i>d/f:</i>	Chr [ <i>e</i> <sup>C</sup> <i>d</i> = <i>f</i> ] <sup>72</sup>

68. καὶ συνήγειρεν καὶ συνεκάθισεν (harmonization occasioned by 2:6; the first hand of this witness also reads ἀναστήσας where all other witnesses reads ἐγείρας earlier).

69. The text underlying this patristic citation is uncertain; see §B.5.2.

70. The textual tradition of this father is divided; see §B.5.3.

71. Both the Peshitta and Ephrem render the previous participial phrase ἐγείρας αὐτόν with a finite verb as *ܡܠܝܟܐ* ("and he raised him") or *ܡܬܝܝܓ ܩܝܡܐ* ("he raised him"), so their quotations with the sense "and he raised him" could correspond to καὶ καθίσας αὐτόν or καὶ ἐκάθισεν αὐτόν.

72. The text underlying this patristic citation is uncertain; see §B.5.1.

A.5.2 *Overview*

There are multiple interrelated dimensions of variation at play in this variation unit. Intrinsically, most commentators have discussed the choice between *καθίσας* and *ἐκάθισεν* in terms of whether the resurrection alone is God's principal demonstration of his power in Christ,<sup>73</sup> and they have noted that the inclusion or exclusion of *αὐτόν* after the verb depends on whether an explicit object was needed to make the verb transitive.<sup>74</sup> Transcriptional probabilities have been thoroughly covered and debated by the commentators along the same lines.<sup>75</sup> External evidence, meanwhile, is surprisingly fractured, with nearly every reading finding early manuscript, versional, or patristic evidence. The contentious nature of the multiple variations in this unit is illustrated by the fact that even the modern critical editions print different readings here.

A.5.3 *Intrinsic Probabilities*

To start with the most general point of variation, *καθίσας* and *ἐκάθισεν* are equally intrinsically suitable to the author's argument for different reasons. If *καθίσας* is read, then Christ's enthronement is coordinated with his resurrection (*ἐγείρας*) as another facet of God's mighty operation in Christ. This coheres well with 2:5–6, where the author coordinates the same two ideas for those who participate in Christ with *συνήγειρεν καὶ συνεκάθισεν*, and with 4:9–10, where the author infers that Christ's ascent is meaningless without his descent to the grave and that "the one who descended is himself also the one who ascended above all the heavens."<sup>76</sup> More generally, since the resurrection and exaltation are of a piece in early Christian writings,<sup>77</sup> their coordination here would cohere well with the strain of thought attested in these writings.<sup>78</sup> If, on the other hand, *ἐκάθισεν* is read, then Christ's enthronement is coordinated with the subjugation of powers (*ὑπέταξεν*) and the giving of Christ as head to the church (*ἔδωκεν*) in 1:22. From a narrative perspective, this coordination more effectively evokes Ps 110 (LXX 109), which the author undoubtedly has in view here.<sup>79</sup> Whichever reading is followed, the backdrop of Ps 110 and the

73. EADIE, 100–101; ELLICOTT, 37; ABBOTT, 31; HOEHNER, 276; MERKLE, 45.

74. WEISS, 95–96; ABBOTT, 31.

75. WEISS, 95–96; ABBOTT, 31; HAUPT 43 n. 1; BEST, 171.

76. This is the interpretation adopted for this study; see the excursus on 4:7–15 in the main document for a defense of this choice and a survey and assessment of other options.

77. As Lincoln explains, "Two aspects of Christ's victory over death are featured in the NT—his resurrection and his exaltation to a position of power and authority. Sometimes only the resurrection is mentioned as in 1 Thess 1:10; Gal 1:1; 1 Cor 15:3; Rom 1:4. Sometimes it is the exaltation alone which is stressed, as in Phil 2:9. At other times, as here in 1:20, both are mentioned (cf. Rom 8:34; Col 3:1; Acts 2:32, 33), but mention of both need not imply that the writer had two separate episodes of resurrection and then ascension in view as in Luke–Acts" (LINCOLN, 261).

78. When John Eadie concludes that "Power was manifested in Christ's resurrection, visibly and impressively, but not in the same form in His glorification" (EADIE, 101), he may be exaggerating a distinction that was less of a concern to early Christians.

79. The reference to being seated at the right hand and the placement of other powers under one's feet clearly allude to Ps 110:1 (LXX 109:1). But notably, the psalm closes with a reference to another body part: the head. It is possible that the author, following the narrative of the psalm, has interpreted its final statement, *διὰ τοῦτο ὑψώσει κεφαλὴν* (Ps 110:7 [LXX 109:7]), as a reference to God "lifting up a head" for the church in Christ after having

relationship between Christ's resurrection and exaltation can still be inferred from the passage. Since emphasizing either of these points would serve the author's argument well, either reading is as likely as the other on these grounds.

Syntactically, *καθίσας* and *ἐκάθισεν* are also equally matched, as the flow of the author's argument makes good sense either way. If *καθίσας* is read, then God is unambiguously the subject throughout 1:20–23. Yet while the author could continue the subordinate clause from 1:20 through these verses using other participles, he instead begins a new sentence with *καὶ πάντα ὑπέταξεν* in 1:22. The reason seems to be that his long description of the powers and authorities in 1:21 has interrupted his previous thought, and it serves as his point of departure for a new one.<sup>80</sup> If instead *ἐκάθισεν* is read, then a new sentence begins here and continues through 1:23. In this case, the start of a new sentence may signal the author's allusion to Ps 110. Since this may involve a change in subject (depending on the presence or absence of *αὐτόν*, which I will discuss shortly), a break from the previous sentence may even be necessary for grammatical reasons. In short, syntactic considerations do not confer an intrinsic advantage to *καθίσας* or to *ἐκάθισεν*.

Of the readings with *καθίσας*, *καὶ καθίσας* and *καὶ καθίσας αὐτόν* are equally likely, and *καὶ καθίσας αὐτόν* is much more likely than *καθίσας αὐτόν*. The first two readings are equally likely because *καὶ καθίσας αὐτόν* simply makes explicit what *καὶ καθίσας* implies. It is clear that *καθίσας* here is transitive rather than intransitive, since, in accordance with Ps 110:1, the Messiah is sitting at God's right hand, not vice-versa.<sup>81</sup> While this is unusual in the New Testament (where *καθίζω* is virtually always intransitive), the use of *καθίζω* as a transitive verb is amply attested in Greek literature related to or contemporary with the New Testament,<sup>82</sup> and our author in particular uses the related verb *συνεκάθισεν* transitively (with the object *ἡμᾶς*) in 2:5–6. Meanwhile, *καθίσας αὐτόν* is far less suitable than its counterpart with *καί*, because asyndeton suggests an even closer connection—in this case, an apposition—between Christ's resurrection and enthronement.<sup>83</sup> While the author likely sees the two events as complementary (as noted above), the actions of resurrecting and seating someone are clearly semantically distinct, so an apposition through asyndeton is intrinsically much less likely than a simple coordination with *καί*.

Of the readings with *ἐκάθισεν*, *καὶ ἐκάθισεν* and *ἐκάθισεν αὐτόν* are equally likely, and *ἐκά-*

---

subjugated all other powers.

80. Indeed, the author is likely fronting *πάντα* before *ὑπέταξεν* to topicalize it, with the resulting sense being, “and all [of these powers] he subjected.”

81. Indeed, several witnesses change *ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ* (“his right hand”) to *ἐν δεξιᾷ ἑαυτοῦ* (“his own right hand”) in the next phrase to clarify that God is not seating himself, but Christ. Notably, all of them except for Ambrosiaster read the participle here.

82. A TLG textual search (15 January 2024) returned 320 instances of any conjugation of *καθίζω* followed by an accusative pronoun. This includes a variety of examples from the Septuagint, including *ἐκάθισεν αὐτόν* (1 Macc 10:63), *ἐκάθισαν αὐτόν* (2 Kgs 11:19), *καθιεῖ αὐτούς* (Job 36:7), *καθίσει αὐτόν* (Sir 11:1), *καθιῶ αὐτούς* (Jer 32:37 [LXX 39:37]), *καθίσῃς αὐτόν* (Sir 12:12), *καθιεῖς αὐτόν* (Deut 25:2), *ἐκάθισεν αὐτούς* (1 Sam 30:21), and *ἐκάθισέν με* (Ps 143:3 [LXX 142:3]; Lam 3:1), as well as more contemporary instances in Josephus, Lucian of Samosata, the *Martyrdom of Paul*, the *Gospel of Peter*, and the *Shepherd of Hermas*.

83. On this general principle regarding asyndeton, see Levinsohn, *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek*, 118; followed by Steven E. Runge, *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament: A Practical Introduction for Teaching and Exegesis*, LBRs (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2010), 22–23.



*θισεν αὐτόν* is much more likely than *καὶ ἐκάθισεν αὐτόν*. If a new sentence begins here with *καὶ ἐκάθισεν*, then the verb, which cannot share the object of *ἐγείρας* from the previous sentence, must be intransitive. In accordance with Ps 110:1, Christ is the one sitting at God the father's right hand and God is the one subjecting his enemies under his feet, so this new sentence involves an implied change of subject to Christ, with another implied change of subject back to God taking place with *ὑπέταξεν* in 1:22. In both cases, *καί* minimally signals the development of one subject's response to the other's action. To be sure, two unmarked changes in subject do not make the passage particularly easy to follow for readers unaware of the allusion to Ps 110,<sup>84</sup> But since Christ and God the father have both been established as significant figures in the discourse so far, the author could reasonably expect readers to infer which is the subject from context,<sup>85</sup> or he might be leaving some of the ambiguity of Ps 110 intact.<sup>86</sup> Meanwhile, if *αὐτόν* is read after *ἐκάθισεν*, then the sentence beginning here makes essentially the same point, but God the father remains the subject. The asyndeton produced by the reading *ἐκάθισεν αὐτόν* marks a close connection to the preceding subordinate clause, and it suggests an enumeration of how specifically God (has) operated his power in Christ when he raised him from the dead: he enthroned him, he subjugated his enemies, and he appointed him head of the church. For the same reason, the *καί* in *καὶ ἐκάθισεν αὐτόν* is intrinsically unsuitable. No development like a change of subject or a response to an action needs to be marked, and the conjugations of *ἐγείρας* and *ἐκάθισεν* do not allow for their coordination. It is therefore much less suitable to the author's argument than asyndeton or *καί* with an intransitive *ἐκάθισεν*.

We can now assign relative intrinsic probabilities to the individual variant readings. Since  $\kappa\alpha\theta\acute{\iota}\sigma\alpha\varsigma$  and  $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\acute{\alpha}\theta\iota\sigma\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon$  are both equally germane to the author's argument, the most likely readings with the participle will be as likely as the most likely readings with the finite verb. The most likely readings with the participle are  $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \kappa\alpha\theta\acute{\iota}\sigma\alpha\varsigma$  (a) and  $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \kappa\alpha\theta\acute{\iota}\sigma\alpha\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\nu$  (b). The most likely readings with the finite verb are  $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\acute{\alpha}\theta\iota\sigma\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon$  (d) and  $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\acute{\alpha}\theta\iota\sigma\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\nu$  (f). Within their respective groups of readings,  $\kappa\alpha\theta\acute{\iota}\sigma\alpha\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\nu$  (c) and  $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\acute{\alpha}\theta\iota\sigma\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\nu$  (e) are much less likely than their counterparts. We can therefore summarize the relative intrinsic probabilities of the readings in a single chain as follows:  $a = b = d = f \overset{B}{\gg} c = e$ .

#### A.5.4 Transcriptional Probabilities

The transcriptional causes of transitions between readings are detailed in Table A.9.

84. It is evident that some of the ancient translators had this reading but did not perceive the change of subject to Christ. Most of the Old Latin witnesses faithfully render the preceding ἐγείρας as a participle and ἐκάθισεν as a finite verb. But nearly all of them translate ἐκάθισεν not with *sedet*, but with transitive constructions that lack explicit objects, such as *et constituit* (VL75, VL76, VL89), *et conlocavit* (Ambrosiaster, Hilary), or *et sedere fecit* (VL64). The Gothic manuscripts do the same with 𐌲𐌹𐌸𐌰 𐌹𐌸𐌸𐌹𐌸𐌰.

85. Both subjects have what Stephen H. Levinsohn refers to as *very important participant* or *VIP* status in this narrative section, so they would not have to be declared explicitly every time there is a change in subject.

86. In 1 Cor 15:24–28, another passage that seems to draw upon Ps 110, Paul similarly leaves subject changes between God the father and God the son unmarked, even where the new subject is not contextually obvious.

TABLE A.9: Transcriptional causes for Eph 1:20/20–22.

<i>From</i>	<i>To</i>	<i>Tag</i>	<i>Note</i>
<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	Prag	Addition of αὐτόν after καθίσας to make the implied object explicit
<i>a</i>	<i>d</i>	IntAssim	Change of καθίσας to ἐκάθισεν to assimilate to the succeeding finite verbs ὑπέταξεν and ἔδωκεν
<i>b</i>	<i>e</i>		
<i>c</i>	<i>f</i>		
<i>b</i>	<i>c</i>	HomArcPart	Loss of καί before καθίσας by homoioarcton
<i>c</i>	<i>b</i>	Prag	Addition of καί before καθίσας αὐτόν to coordinate it with ἐγείρας
<i>d</i>	<i>a</i>	IntAssim	Change of ἐκάθισεν to καθίσας to assimilate to the preceding participle ἐγείρας
<i>e</i>	<i>b</i>		
<i>f</i>	<i>c</i>		
<i>d</i>	<i>e</i>	Prag	Addition of αὐτόν after ἐκάθισεν to make the transitivity of the verb explicit
<i>e</i>	<i>d</i>	HomTelLetter	Loss of αὐτόν after ἐκάθισεν by homoioteleuton
<i>e</i>	<i>f</i>	Prag	Deletion of καί before ἐκάθισεν αὐτόν to highlight the close relationship between this sentence and the previous clause
<i>f</i>	<i>e</i>	Prag	Addition of καί before ἐκάθισεν αὐτόν to avoid asyndeton
<i>a–c, e–f</i>	<i>d</i>	Byz	Byzantine assimilation

## A.5.5 Post-Analysis Results

The posterior probabilities for readings based on sampled stemmata are given in Table A.10.

TABLE A.10: Reading posterior probabilities for Eph 1:20/20–22.

<i>Reading</i>	<i>Significant support</i>	<i>Posterior</i>
<i>a: και καθισας</i>	03 0150r 0278r 94 256V 263 442 1175 1398 1739 1881 1908 1910/2 1962 2011 2492r VL61 vg syr <sup>h</sup> Cyr Pel NA <sup>28</sup> SBL WH	99.984%
<i>d: και εκαθισεν</i>	06 012 025 6 88 181r 606 915 1678 1836 1840 1910/1 1985r 1991 2008 2576 VL75 VL89 goth Ambst Chr ThMops Thret RP	0.012%
<i>b: και καθισας αυτον</i>	01 02r 33 81 1834r 1987 2464r 2805 Hier MVict TH	0.004%
<i>c: καθισας αυτον</i>		0.000%



SUPPLEMENTAL COMMENTARY ENTRIES

<i>e: καὶ ἐκαθίσεν αὐτον</i>	044 VL77 cop <sup>bo</sup>	0.000%
<i>f: ἐκαθίσεν αὐτον</i>	cop <sup>sa</sup>	0.000%

On the basis of external evidence, the posterior probabilities break the intrinsic tie between *καὶ καθίσας*, *καὶ καθίσας αὐτόν*, and *καὶ ἐκάθισεν* decisively in favor of *καὶ καθίσας*. This result favors the judgment of the NA<sup>28</sup> and SBL Greek New Testaments over that of the Tyndale House Greek New Testament. It suggests that emendators smoothed out the harshness of *καὶ καθίσας* without an explicit object in various ways: some supplied *αὐτόν* directly, and others changed the participle to a finite verb to begin a new sentence with a new implied subject.

A.6 2:15/28–34: εἰς ἓνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον

2:14 αὐτὸς γάρ ἐστιν ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν, ὁ ποιήσας τὰ ἀμφότερα ἐν καὶ τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ  
2 4 6 8 10 12 14 16 18 20 22 24 26 28 30 32  
λύσας, τὴν ἔχθραν ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ, 15 τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασιν καταργήσας, ἵνα  
34 36 38 40 42 44 46 2 4 6 8 10 12 14 16  
τοὺς δύο κτίσῃ ἐν αὐτῷ ‘εἰς ἓνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον’ ποιῶν εἰρήνην,  
18 20 22 24 26 28 30 32 34 36 38

A.6.1 Apparatus

a: εἰς ἓνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον 01 02 03 06 (018)<sup>87</sup> 020 025 044 049 056r 075 0142r 0150r 0151 0319 0320 1  
6 18 33 35 38 42 61 69 81 88 93 94 102 104 177 181 203 218 223 234 256 263  
296 322 326 330 337 363 365 383 390 398 424 442 451 459 462 467 506 606  
629 636 664 665 912 915 1069 1108 1115 1127 1175 1240 1241 1245 1311  
1319 1398 1490 1505 1509 1573 1611 1617 1678 1718 1721 1729 1739 1751  
1831 1834 1836 1837 1838 1840 1851 1860 1863 1877 1881 1886 1893 1896  
1908 1910 1912 1913 1918 1939 1959 1962 1963 1985 1987 1991 1996\*f  
1996C 1999 2004 2008 2011 2012 2085 2127 2138 2180 2243 2344 2352 2400  
2464 2492 2495 2516 2523 2544 2576 2805 2865 L23 L60 L156 L169 L587  
L809 L1159 L1178 L1188 L1298 L1440 L2010 L2058; VL51 VL54 VL61 VL62  
VL64V VL65 VL75 VL76 VL77 VL78 VL89 vg syr cop goth; Ambr Ambst Ath  
Bas Chr (Cl)<sup>88</sup> Cyr Did Epiph Eus GrNy Hes IsPel Marcellus Mcion MVict Or  
Proclus Socrates Spec ThMops Thret; Lach NA<sup>28</sup> RP SBL TH Tisch Treg WH  
b: εἰς ἓνα κοινὸν ἄνθρωπον P46 (010\*rf 010Cr)<sup>89</sup> 012\*f 012C 436  
a/b: Proc [a  $\overset{D}{\gg}$  b]<sup>90</sup>

A.6.2 Overview

The detail at stake is whether Jesus, in removing the barrier between Jews and gentiles and “making the two into one,” has produced a *new* (καινόν) person or a *common* (κοινόν) one. To my knowledge, no commentator has addressed this textual issue. This is unsurprising, because the reading with κοινόν is almost unattested in the extant tradition. Yet the witnesses that do attest it are traditionally recognized as significant “Eastern” (P46) and “Western” (010 and 012) witnesses in the Pauline Epistles. A fresh analysis of intrinsic and transcriptional probabilities is therefore in order.

87. εἰς ἓνα καὶ μόνον ἄνθρωπον (probably the result of the dittography εἰς ἓνα καινονον ἄνθρωπον being corrected through the change of a single letter).

88. εἰς εἰς καινὸν ἄνθρωπον (gloss for commentary).

89. ἓνα κοινὸν ἄνθρωπον (homioarcton from one *epsilon* to the next or deletion of a seemingly superfluous preposition).

90. The text underlying this patristic citation is uncertain; see the online supplement.

A.6.3 *Intrinsic Probabilities*

Intrinsically, *καινόν* coheres with and develops a theme introduced in 2:10 and expanded in 2:11–18, and it reinforces the connection between these passages and their practical realization in 4:24. In 2:10, the author follows his description of God’s gift of salvation with the remark that “we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus for good works, which God prepared beforehand so that we might walk in them.” The section that follows (2:11–18), marked as it is by *διό* (“wherefore”), elaborates on the first part of this thematic statement. Christians are God’s workmanship (*ποίημα*) because Christ has made (*ποίησας*) Jews and gentiles one, and they are created in Christ Jesus (*κτισθέντες ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*) because his purpose in dissolving the barrier between them was so that he might create the two groups in himself (*ἵνα τοὺς δύο κτίσῃ ἐν αὐτῷ*) into a single person, thereby making peace between them. Semantically, the reading that describes this person as “new” fits perfectly with the language of the two groups being “created.”<sup>91</sup> This reading also advances the argument beyond the previous statement that Christ “made the two one” (2:14), because it clarifies that he has not homogenized the Jews and gentiles by integration or supercession, but created something that is distinct from both.<sup>92</sup> Furthermore, if *καινόν* is read here, then 2:14–15 and 4:24 become linked not only through the language of creation, but also through the language of the “new person” specifically. The author’s reference to his readers putting on “the new person created by God” (*τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν κατὰ θεὸν κτισθέντα*) in 4:24 immediately precedes his enumeration of specific good works that his readers are to do in 4:25–32. Reading *καινόν* here thus makes it clearer that both passages are expounding on the two halves 2:10: this passage expounds on how believers are “created in Christ,” and 4:24 returns to this point (using *τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν κατὰ θεὸν κτισθέντα* as a catch phrase) to detail the good works for which they were created. The reading with *καινόν* is therefore suitable to the immediate context, and it produces a more cohesive connection between the theological and ethical halves of the epistle.

In contrast, the reading with *κοινόν* (reading *b*), though viable in the context, obstructs the development that *καινόν* advances. Surrounded by the imagery of Jews and gentiles being made one (2:14), moving from estrangement to a shared nearness to God (2:12–13), and having mutual access to God the father (2:18), the language of the two being created into “one common person” seems fitting at first glance. But semantically, *κοινόν* better complements the language

91. Whether our author was Paul or someone steeped in his writings, the collocation of these words could also have a basis in Pauline thinking. Paul uses *καινή κτίσις* to refer to the condition of those in Christ in both 2 Cor 5:17 and Gal 6:15.

92. HARLESS, 237; EADIE, 183; MEYER, 133; ELLICOTT, 57; ABBOTT, 65; SALMOND, 296; GAUGLER, 111–12; BARTH 1:310; LINCOLN, 144; SCHNACKENBURG, 115; HOEHNER, 378–79. Martin Wright in particular notes that where the first statement conveys a “horizontal” reconciliation between Jews and gentiles, the second statement conveys a “vertical” reconciliation between both groups and God: “This seems to be conceptually (though not chronologically) a two-stage process: the two parties joined into one, and then in that new, single body, reconciled to God. In fact *τοὺς δύο κτίσῃ* ... *εἰς ἓνα* seems to amplify, rather than to ground, *ποίησας τὰ ἀμφότερα ἓν*, and in that sense may be more consecutive than final, but the real purpose is the completion of reconciliation in the ‘vertical’ relationship” (*The Dividing Wall: Ephesians and the Integrity of the Corpus Paulinum*, LNTS 646 [London: T&T Clark, 2021], 119).

of reconciliation (ἀποκαταλλάξῃ) in 2:16 than it does the language of creation (κτισθέντες) that immediately precedes it. Indeed, if κοινόν is read, then this verse’s statement about Christ creating the two into one common person seems to add nothing to the previous verse’s statement of his making the two one. In addition, it obscures the relationship of this passage to 4:24, as the only semantic connection between the two passages is that involving the language of creation.

We can now sum up what this means for the readings’ relative intrinsic probabilities. Both readings are intelligible in context, but the reading with καινόν (*a*) advances and develops the author’s argument, while the reading with κοινόν (*b*) restates the author’s previous point in the immediate context and obscures a connection to 4:24 in the wider context of the epistle. I therefore consider the former much more likely than the latter:  $a \overset{B}{\gg} b$ .

#### A.6.4 Transcriptional Probabilities

The transcriptional causes of transitions between readings are detailed in Table A.11.

TABLE A.11: Transcriptional causes for Eph 1:15/26–36.

<i>From</i>	<i>To</i>	<i>Tag</i>	<i>Note</i>
<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	Sem	Substitution of κοινόν for καινόν in light of ὁ ποιήσας τὰ ἀμφότερα ἓν and the general language of unity in 2:14
<i>b</i>	<i>a</i>	IntAssim	Substitution of καινόν for κοινόν to assimilate to τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν κατὰ θεὸν κτισθέντα in 4:24
<i>b</i>	<i>a</i>	Byz	Byzantine assimilation

A.6.5 *Post-Analysis Results*

The posterior probabilities for readings based on sampled stemmata are given in Table A.12.

TABLE A.12: Reading posterior probabilities for Eph 2:15/28–34.

<i>Reading</i>	<i>Significant support</i>	<i>Posterior</i>
<i>a: εἰς ἐνα καίων ἀνθρώπων</i>	01 02 03 06 025 044 075 0150r 6 33 81 88 94 181 256 263 442 606 915 1175 1398 1678 1739 1834 1836 1840 1881 1908 1910 1962 1985 1987 1991 2008 2011 2464 2492 2576 2805 VL61 VL75 VL77 VL89 vg syr cop goth Ambst Chr Cyr Ephr Hier MVict Or Pel ThMops Thret NA <sup>28</sup> RP SBL TH WH	99.996%
<i>b: εἰς ἐνα κοῖνον ἀνθρώπων</i>	P46 012*f 012C	0.004%

On the basis of external and transcriptional probabilities, the posterior probabilities decisively confirm my intrinsic judgment in favor of the reading with *καίων*. Despite its early Eastern and Western support, the reading with *κοῖνον* is either a change that was made twice independently or an early interpretive gloss popular enough to influence a different part of the tradition. Under the latter scenario, it is somewhat surprising that only the Greek side of the diglot 012 preserves the reading.

A.7 2:19/2-4: ἄρα οὖν

2:13 νυνὶ δὲ ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ὑμεῖς οἳ ποτε ὄντες μακρὰν ἐγενήθητε ἐγγὺς ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ  
 2 4 6 8 10 12 14 16 18 20 22 24 26 28 30 32  
 χριστοῦ 14 αὐτὸς γάρ ἐστιν ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν ... 19 ἄρα οὖν οὐκέτι ἐστὲ ξένοι καὶ πάροικοι, ἀλλὰ  
 34 2 4 6 8 10 12 2 4 6 8 10 12 14 16  
 ἐστὲ συμπολίται τῶν ἁγίων καὶ οἰκεῖοι τοῦ θεοῦ, 20 ἐποικοδομηθέντες ἐπὶ τῷ θεμελίῳ τῶν ἀποστόλων  
 18 20 22 24 26 28 30 32 2 4 6 8 10 12  
 καὶ προφητῶν, ὅντος ἀκρογωνιαίου αὐτοῦ χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ,  
 14 16 18 20 22 24 26

A.7.1 Apparatus

a: <i>αρα ουν</i>	01 02V 03 04 06 018 020 025 049 056 075 0142 0150 0151 0319 1 6 18 33 35 38 42 61 69 81 88 93 94V 102 104 177 181 203 218 223 234 256 263 296 322 326 330 337 363 365 383*r 383C 390 398 424 436 442 451 459 462 467 506 606 629 636 664 665 912 915 1069 1108 1115 1127 1175 1240 1241 1245 1311 1319 1398 1490 1505 1509 1573 1611 1617 1678 1718 1721 1729 1831 1834 1836 1837 1838 1840 1851 1860 1863 1877 1886 1893 1896 1908 1910 1912 1913r 1918 1939 1959 1962 1963 1985 1987 1991 1996 1999 2004 2008 2011 2012 2085 2127 2138 2180 2344 2352 2464 2492 2495 2516 2523 2544 2576*f 2576C 2805 2865 L23 L60 L156 L169/2 L587/2 L809/2 L1159/2 L1178/2 L1188/2 L1298 L1440/2 L2010/2 L2058/2; syr <sup>h</sup> cop <sup>bo</sup> ; Bas Cyr Did Proc Thret; Lach NA <sup>28</sup> RP SBL TH Tisch Treg WH
b: <i>αρα</i>	P46V 010 012 044 1739 1881; Or
c: <i>αδελφοι</i>	L169/1 L587/1 L809/1 L1159/1 L1178/1 L1188/1 L1440/1 L2010/1 L2058/1
d: <i>αρα ουν αδελφοι</i>	2243V
e: —	1751 2400
a/b:	VL51 VL54 VL61 VL62 VL65 VL75 VL76 VL78 VL89 vg Ambst Hier MVict Pel ( <i>ergo</i> ); VL77 ThMops ( <i>itaque</i> ); syr <sup>p</sup> (ܐܬܐܢܐ); Ephr (ܐܬܐܢܐ ܘܝܘܢܝܬܝܬܝܢ); cop <sup>sa</sup> (ⲉⲓⲉ); goth (𐍂𐍂 𐍋𐍆); Chr [ <i>b</i> <sup>C</sup> >> <i>a</i> ] <sup>93</sup>

A.7.2 Overview

The difference between the two best-attested variants, ἄρα οὖν and ἄρα, is difficult to express in translation. In English, both ἄρα and οὖν have the sense “therefore,” so their combination appears to be emphatic in nature.<sup>94</sup> Ancient translators evidently had the same difficulty with

93. The text underlying this patristic citation is uncertain; see §B.7.1.

94. Speaking of ἄρα οὖν generally, Margaret E. Thrall remarks that “The purpose of the combination is presumably to provide an emphatically inferential connective” (*Greek Particles in the New Testament: Linguistic and Exegetical Studies*, NTTSD 3 [Leiden: Brill, 1962], 10). Her assessment is followed by HOEHNER, 391.

the combination, as most versions simply have an equivalent of either word.<sup>95</sup> Perhaps for this reason, this variant is scarcely addressed by commentators.<sup>96</sup>

Yet the split of the external evidence between the two best-attested readings appears to be significant. Notably, the reading ἄρα is attested by representative “Eastern” and “Western” witnesses, including P46, 010, 012, 044, 1739, and 1881. An assessment of the intrinsic and transcriptional probabilities of these readings (and the others) is therefore in order.

### A.7.3 *Intrinsic Probabilities*

Intrinsically, the presence of a digression in 2:14–18 renders ἄρα οὖν more likely than ἄρα alone. Pragmatically, the γάρ in 2:14 signals a digression, and an οὖν in this verse would mark a resumption of the thought preceding this digression.<sup>97</sup> Three contextual observations speak to a digression and resumption in these places. First, the author shifts from the second-person plural in 2:11–13 (“wherefore remember that *you*”) to the first-person plural in 2:14–18 (“for he is *our* peace”) and then back (“therefore, *you* are no longer strangers”) in 2:19–22.<sup>98</sup> Second, the language of two peoples being reconciled and created into “one new man” occurs exclusively in 2:14–18, while 2:19–22 develops a new point using the distinct imagery of architecture.<sup>99</sup> Third,

95. The only version that can be unambiguously aligned with one Greek reading is the Bohairic Coptic, which has the transliteration ϣαϣα οϣν. The Gothic rendering sū nō, which transliterates nicely as “see now” but is perhaps better understood as “see therefore,” could reflect an attempt on Ulphilas’s part to capture the nuance of both words or just the nuance of ἄρα. The remaining versions have an equivalent to “therefore” (Latin, Sahidic Coptic), or “henceforth therefore” (Peshitta), but they are treated as ambiguous because the nuance of the Greek could easily have been lost in translation.

96. It is noted in BEST 276 n. 71 and HOEHNER 390 n. 4, but in both cases the reading ἄρα is dismissed on external grounds.

97. The classifications of οὖν and γάρ as “inferential” and “elaborative,” respectively, fit within the basic framework of discourse marker theory. A helpful survey of the theory’s essentials and development and a diachronic study of the functional development of οὖν and γάρ in early epistolary sources can be found in Klaas Bentein, “ἔγραψέ μοι γάρ ... τὰ νῦν οὖν γράφω σοι: οὖν and γάρ as Inferential and Elaborative Discourse Markers in Greek Papyrus Letters (I–IV AD),” *RBPH* 94.1 (2016): 67–104. Stephanie L. Black makes a similar functional distinction between γάρ and οὖν, with the former introducing material “off-line” from a main narrative and the latter integrating this “off-line” material back into the main narrative (*Sentence Conjunctions in the Gospel of Matthew: καί, δέ, τότε, γάρ, οὖν and Asyndeton in Narrative Discourse*, JSNTSup 216, SNTG 9 [London: Sheffield Academic, 2002], 254–81). While Black makes this distinction in the context of narrative material, γάρ and οὖν serve the same functions with non-narrative digressions and resumptions (Levinsohn, *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek*, 127; Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 43–45).

98. The ὑμῖν in 2:17 that occurs in 2:14–18 is part of the larger expression “to you far-off and to those near,” which in context is undoubtedly a reference to Jews and gentiles that evokes the language of 2:13. Since, for Paul or a pseudonymous author assuming his identity, these two parties correspond to “you” and “us,” the expression is effectively a more elaborate form of “all of us.” This is confirmed by the pairing of ἔχομεν with the subject οἱ ἀμφοτέροι in 2:18.

99. This difference is noted by BARTH 1:268 and COHICK, 302. The change to household and architectural imagery is signaled emphatically by a sequence of οἰκ- words consisting of πάροικοι (“sojourners”), οἰκέλοι (“household members”), ἐποικοδομηθέντες (“having been built up”), οἰκοδομή (“building”), συνοικοδομεῖσθε (“you are being built up together”), and κατοικητήριον (“dwelling place”), as several commentators have noted (BEST, 277; COHICK, 302;

the statement in 2:19 that “you are no longer strangers and sojourners, but fellow citizens with the saints and members of the household of God” reiterates the statement in 2:13 that “you who formerly were far have become near.”<sup>100</sup> Given the length of the digression, ἄρα οὖν conveys both the inferential and resumptive nature of the present verse.<sup>101</sup> The reading with ἄρα alone, in contrast, signals an inference but not a resumption. Since the author’s reference to God as “the father” in 2:18 coheres with the household imagery of 2:19–22,<sup>102</sup> the present verse could viably serve as a conclusion to 2:14–18. But following the author’s discussion of Jews and gentiles in 2:14–18, a conclusion about the gentiles alone seems less pertinent. For this reason, ἄρα by itself is intrinsically less likely than ἄρα οὖν.

For similar reasons, the exclusion of both particles is much less likely than the inclusion of either. Asyndeton here would suggest that this verse either has a very close connection with what precedes it or is so distinct as to mark a new section in the discourse entirely.<sup>103</sup> But 2:19–22 is not too distinct from 2:14–18, because the point of 2:13 and its elaboration in 2:14–18 is that readers’ status has changed as the result of Christ’s reconciling work. Nor is it particularly close to 2:14–18, as the shift from first-person plural to second-person plural indicates. Asyndeton therefore serves the author’s argument poorly, and the two readings with asyndeton are intrinsically much less likely than those with at least one particle.

Finally, considerations of the author’s argument favor the exclusion of the vocative ἀδελφοί over its inclusion. The author’s shift from first-person plural references to second-person plural references is a shift in subject, not in audience, so this function of the vocative is inapplicable here. It is also unlikely that the author is employing ἀδελφοί to emphasize to his gentile readers that they are members of God’s family, because he does not state that they are “fellow citizens with the saints and members of the household of God” until later in the verse. So the addition of ἀδελφοί preempts the author’s argument more than it adds to it. I therefore consider the inclusion of ἀδελφοί much less likely than its exclusion.

I can now sum up the relative intrinsic probabilities of the individual variant readings. First, ἄρα οὖν (reading *a*) is intrinsically more likely than ἄρα alone (reading *b*), because the combina-

---

Wright, *Dividing Wall*, 130; Benjamin J. Petroelje, *The Pauline Book and the Dilemma of Ephesians*, LNTS 665 [London: T&T Clark, 2023], 142).

100. Elena Redondo Moyano notes that οὖν is commonly used to recapitulate an original point that has just been elaborated (“La articulación textual en los Προγυμνάσματα de Nicolao de Mura,” *SPV* 7.4 [2004]: 157–220, 194, for ἄρα οὖν see 196). Others note that in the present passage, this verse serves as a summary of the previous discussion (LINCOLN, 150; Wright, *Dividing Wall*, 130).

101. Levinsohn instructively notes that “οὖν is most likely to convey some inferential force when used as a resumptive if the amount of intervening material is short” (*Discourse Features of New Testament Greek*, 128). For a digression as long as 2:14–18, οὖν alone would mark a resumption, but it might lack the inferential force the author wanted to convey. The addition of ἄρα supplies this force. Against the stylistic objection that the combination ἄρα οὖν is rare in Greek usage, it is distinctively more common in sources contemporary with this epistle. It occurs multiple times in the Pauline Epistles (HARLESS, 252; EADIE, 193–94; ELLICOTT, 60; and ABBOTT, 68; SALMOND, 298; BEST, 276; HOEHNER, 390–91; MERKLE, 79) as well as in the Hermetic writings and apostolic fathers (Thrall, *Greek Particles*, 11).

102. COHICK, 303.

103. Levinsohn, *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek*, 118; Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 22–23.



tion of both particles better conveys the inferential and resumptive functions of the present verse. These readings in turn are much more likely than the minus (reading *e*), because asyndeton obfuscates the progression of the author's argument to the same extent that one or more particles facilitate it. Likewise,  $\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha\ \sigma\hat{\upsilon}\nu$  (reading *a*) is intrinsically much more likely than  $\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha\ \sigma\hat{\upsilon}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\omicron\iota$  (reading *d*) because the inclusion of  $\acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\omicron\iota$  assumes a point the author has not yet made. For the same reasons, the minus (*e*) is much more likely than  $\acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\omicron\iota$  (*c*). I therefore rate the relative probabilities of the readings as follows:  $a \overset{C}{\gg} b \overset{B}{\gg} e$ ;  $a \overset{B}{\gg} d$ ;  $e \overset{B}{\gg} c$ .

#### A.7.4 Transcriptional Probabilities

Before I list the summary classifications of potential transcriptional causes, a couple transcriptional explanations are worth discussing in detail. First, it is worth noting that the two readings that feature  $\acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\omicron\iota$  (*c*, *d*) would not have been subject to Byzantine assimilation. Byzantine scribes recognized lectionary incipits as adaptations to the text already and would not have felt the need to correct them, unless they were attempting to produce a continuous-text manuscript using a lectionary as a source. This exceptional scenario may explain how the minus (reading *e*) could have arisen from the reading  $\acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\omicron\iota$  (*c*). Specifically, a scribe producing a continuous-text copy from either a lectionary exemplar or a continuous-text exemplar whose text in this passage had been replaced by the lectionary incipit in the margin would have stripped the  $\acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\omicron\iota$  from the text, recognizing it as a lectionary incipit. This is admittedly a complex scenario, but the sparsity of the witnesses to the minus (namely, the minuscules 1751 and 2400) is commensurate with its complexity.

These and other transcriptional causes of transitions between readings are detailed in Table A.13.

TABLE A.13: Transcriptional causes for Eph 2:19/2–4.

<i>From</i>	<i>To</i>	<i>Tag</i>	<i>Note</i>
<i>a–b, e</i>	<i>c</i>	ExtAssim	Replacement of initial particles or asyndeton with $\acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\omicron\iota$ as a lection-related adaptation
<i>a, c</i>	<i>d</i>	Sem	Conflation of common reading $\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha\ \sigma\hat{\upsilon}\nu$ and lectionary incipit $\acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\omicron\iota$
<i>a, d</i>	<i>b</i>	HomArcPart	Loss of $\sigma\hat{\upsilon}\nu$ ( $\acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\omicron\iota$ ) before $\sigma\hat{\upsilon}\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\tau\iota$ by homoioarcton
<i>b</i>	<i>a</i>	Harm	Addition of $\sigma\hat{\upsilon}\nu$ after $\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha$ as a general harmonization to a distinctive phrase in the Pauline corpus
<i>c</i>	<i>e</i>	Clar	Adaptation of the lection-related reading $\acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\omicron\iota$ to continuous text by deletion of the incipit
<i>b, e</i>	<i>a</i>	Byz	Byzantine assimilation

A.7.5 Post-Analysis Results

The posterior probabilities for readings based on sampled stemmata are given in Table A.14.

TABLE A.14: Reading posterior probabilities for Eph 2:19/2-4.

Reading	Significant support	Posterior
a: αρα ουν	01 02V 03 06 025 075 0150 6 33 81 88 94V 181 256 263 442 606 915 1175 1398 1678 1834 1836 1840 1908 1910 1962 1985 1987 1991 2008 2011 2464 2492 2576C 2576*f 2805 syr <sup>h</sup> cop <sup>bo</sup> Cyr Thret NA <sup>28</sup> RP SBL TH WH	100.000%
b: αρα	P46V 012 044 1739 1881 Or	0.000%
c: αδελφοι		0.000%
d: αρα ουν αδελφοι		0.000%
e: —		0.000%

On the basis of external and transcriptional probabilities, the posterior probabilities decisively confirm my intrinsic judgment in favor of ἄρα οὖν. The οὖν after ἄρα was likely dropped by homoioarcton before οὐκέτι on multiple early occasions.

## A.8 3:13/4-8: αἰτοῦμαι μὴ ἐγκακεῖν

3:13 διὸ αἰτοῦμαι μὴ ἐγκακεῖν ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσίν μου ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, ἥτις ἐστὶν δόξα ὑμῶν.

2 4 6 8 10 12 14 16 18 20 22 24 26 28

## A.8.1 Apparatus

a: αἰτοῦμαι μὴ ἐγκακεῖν	P46r 01r 02r 03*r 03C2 06*r 06C1r 33 61 69 81 326 467 1311f 1834 1837 1908 1959 2127 2344; cop; Lach NA <sup>28</sup> SBL TH Tisch Treg WH
b: αἰτοῦμαι μὴ ἐκκακεῖν	04 06C2 010r 012r 018 020 025 044 049r 056 075 0142 0150 0151 0278r 0319 1 6 18 35 38f 42 88 93 94 102 104 177 181 203 218 223 234 256 263 296 322 330 337 365f 363 383 390 398 424 436 442 451 459 462 506 606 629 636 664 665 912 915 1069 1108 1115 1127 1175r 1240 1241f 1245 1398 1490 1505 1509 1573 1611 1617 1678 1718 1721 1739 1751f 1831 1836 1838r 1840 1851 1860 1863 1877 1881 1886 1893 1896 1910 1912 1918f 1939 1962 1963 1985 1987 (1991*f 1991Cf) <sup>104</sup> 1996 1999 2004f 2008 2011 2012 2085 2138 2180 2243 2352 2400 2464r 2492 2495 2516f 2523 2544* (2544C) <sup>105</sup> 2576 2805 2865 L156 L169 L587 L809 L1159 L1178 L1188 L1440 L2010*V L2010C L2058; Chr Or Thret; RP TR
a/b:	ThMops ( <i>postulo non deficere</i> ); VL51 VL54 VL61f VL62 VL65 VL75 VL76 VL77 VL78 VL89 vg Ambst Hier MVict Pel ( <i>peto ne deficiatis</i> ); syr <sup>p</sup> (ܐܝܬܘܡܝ ܡܗ ܐܝܬܘܡܝ ܡܗ ܐܝܬܘܡܝ); syr <sup>h</sup> (ܐܝܬܘܡܝ ܡܗ ܐܝܬܘܡܝ ܡܗ ܐܝܬܘܡܝ); Ephr (ܐܝܬܘܡܝ ܡܗ ܐܝܬܘܡܝ ܡܗ ܐܝܬܘܡܝ); goth (𐌰𐌹𐌸𐌰𐌹𐌸𐌰 𐌹𐌸𐌰𐌹𐌸𐌰 𐌹𐌸𐌰𐌹𐌸𐌰 𐌹𐌸𐌰𐌹𐌸𐌰); Chr [ <i>a</i> <sup>B</sup> <i>b</i> ] <sup>106</sup>

## A.8.2 Overview

As Stephen C. Carlson aptly stated regarding a similar variant in Gal 6:9, “The semantic difference between ἐγκακέω ... and ἐκκακέω ... is about as subtle as their difference in spelling.”<sup>107</sup> Lexicons and commentators offer varying opinions as to whether the two words have any distinction in meaning at all.<sup>108</sup> The at-best subtle semantic distinction between the two words puts

104. μὴ ἐκκακῶμεν (clarification of the intended subject).

105. αἰτοῦμαι ὑμᾶς μὴ ἐκκακεῖν (clarification of the object of αἰτοῦμαι).

106. The textual tradition of this church father is divided; see §B.12.1.

107. Stephen C. Carlson, *The Text of Galatians and Its History*, WUNT 2/385 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 218.

108. On the one hand, LSJ glosses ἐγκακέω as “behave remissly in a thing” and ἐκκακέω as “to be faint-hearted, lose heart, grow weary.” On the other hand, BDAG glosses the words nearly identically: ἐγκακέω is glossed first as “become weary, tired” and second as “lose heart, despair,” and ἐκκακέω is glossed simply as “lose heart.” Norbert Baumert, who investigates the use of both forms in Greek translations of the Old Testament, New Testament apocrypha, and early patristic writings, concludes that “In terms of linguistic history, it is one and the same word” [“Sprachgeschichtlich handelt es sich um ein und dasselbe Wort”] (*Täglich sterben und auferstehen: der Literalsinn von 2 Kor 4,12–5, 10*, SANT 34 [Munich: Kösel, 1973], 329). He is followed by Hoehner, who remarks that “The meaning is not altered because it is the same word with different spellings” (HOEHNER 467 n. 4). Ernest Best likewise

both readings on equal footing with respect to the author’s argument. External evidence has generally been regarded as favoring ἐγκακεῖν, since it is the reading of our earliest manuscripts.<sup>109</sup> But if patristic testimony is included, then both readings can be dated to the third century, since Origen evidently had the reading ἐκκακεῖν.<sup>110</sup> Among the versions, only the Coptic traditions reveal the readings of their *Vorlagen*, because they render the phrase in question using loanwords from the Greek.<sup>111</sup> Consequently, the discussion that follows will be cover what little can be said on intrinsic and transcriptional evidence.

#### A.8.3 *Intrinsic Probabilities*

Like considerations of the author’s argument, general usage in contemporary sources is also of little help in distinguishing intrinsic probabilities. While early commentators considered ἐκκακέω to be restricted to the New Testament,<sup>112</sup> more recent data on ancient sources indicates that both ἐγκακέω and ἐκκακέω were in use before the first century and outside the New Testament and that ἐκκακέω is the dominant form in extant Greek literature after the first century.<sup>113</sup> Notably, the Pauline corpus accounts for all New Testament occurrences of ἐγκακέω but one (in Luke 18:1), but since this study does not assume that the same author was responsible for all of the works in this corpus, this evidence should not be pressed too far. In short, the safest conclusion is that neither αἰτοῦμαι μὴ ἐγκακεῖν (reading *a*) nor αἰτοῦμαι μὴ ἐκκακεῖν (*b*) has an intrinsic advantage: *a* = *b*.

#### A.8.4 *Transcriptional Probabilities*

Before the summary of potential causes for changes between readings, some remarks on one type of change are in order. Transcriptionally, either reading could have given rise to the other by way of a confusion of sounds, or by way of individual or regional preferences for one form or the other. The distinction in sound between ἐγ and ἐκ could easily become blurred before another κ, and the dominance of ἐκκακέω in later sources suggests that ἐκκακέω may have gradually supplanted ἐγκακέω in this way.<sup>114</sup> Given the ubiquity of the reading with ἐκκακεῖν in the Byzantine tradition,

---

regards ἐκκακεῖν as a “variant spelling” of ἐγκακεῖν and asserts that “its acceptance would not change the meaning” (BEST 330 n. 41).

109. SALMOND, 311; BEST 330 n. 41.

110. This is supported not only by the catena manuscripts 1900 and 1910 that contain Origen’s commentary, but also by the testimony of 1739 and its relatives, which are thought to have a text related to the one Origen knew.

111. The Sahidic version reads ⲧⲁⲣⲧⲉ ⲉⲧⲙⲉⲣⲕⲁⲅⲉ, while the Bohairic version reads ⲧⲉⲣⲉⲧⲓⲛ ⲉⲱⲧⲉⲙⲉⲣⲛⲕⲁⲕⲓⲛ.

112. HARLESS, 304; SALMOND, 311.

113. A TLG textual search (accessed 9 July 2023) for the lemma ἐγκακέω returned seventeen hits, one prior to the first century, and a search for the lemma ἐκκακέω returned 369 hits, four prior to the first century. A study tracing the linguistic development of both words from these and other sources can be found in Baumert, *Täglich sterben und auferstehen*, 326–29.

114. Salmond alludes to such a process when he remarks that ἐκκακεῖν “may have had a place in popular, oral use,” while “The written form was ἐγκακεῖν” (SALMOND, 311). Baumert more directly considers the case that “ἐκκακεῖν later on occasionally superseded ἐγκακεῖν” [“ἐκκακεῖν später ἐγκακεῖν gelegentlich verdrängte”] and concludes that

we can reasonably conclude that by 800 CE, idiolectal changes favored this reading over the one with  $\epsilon\gamma\kappa\alpha\kappa\epsilon\hat{\iota}\nu$ .

We can now proceed to the summary of potential causes of transcriptional changes in this passage, which are detailed in Table A.15.

TABLE A.15: Transcriptional causes for Eph 3:13/4–8.

<i>From</i>	<i>To</i>	<i>Tag</i>	<i>Note</i>
<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	AurConf	Confusion between the sounds of $\epsilon\gamma$ - and $\epsilon\kappa$ - before $\kappa$
<i>b</i>	<i>a</i>		
<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	Idio	Individual or regional preference for $\epsilon\kappa\kappa\alpha\kappa\epsilon\hat{\iota}\nu$
<i>b</i>	<i>a</i>	Idio	Individual or regional preference for $\epsilon\gamma\kappa\alpha\kappa\epsilon\hat{\iota}\nu$ (prior to the Byzantine period)
<i>b</i>	<i>a</i>	IntAssim	Change of the verbal prefix from $\epsilon\kappa$ - to $\epsilon\nu$ -/ $\epsilon\gamma$ - to assimilate to the $\epsilon\hat{\iota}\nu$ in the succeeding phrase $\epsilon\hat{\iota}\nu$ $\tau\alpha\hat{\iota}\varsigma$ $\theta\lambda\acute{\iota}\psi\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\nu$ $\mu\omicron\upsilon$ (WEISS, 140)
<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	Byz	Byzantine assimilation

“The later form  $\epsilon\kappa\kappa$ - is the result of assimilation of the nasal sound  $\nu$  ( $\gamma$ ) to the stop sound  $\kappa$ ” [“Die spätere Form  $\epsilon\kappa\kappa$ - ist durch Assimilation des Nasallautes  $\nu$  ( $\gamma$ ) an den Verschlußlaut  $\kappa$  entstanden”] (Baumert, *Täglich sterben und auferstehen*, 326, 329).

#### A.8.5 Post-Analysis Results

The posterior probabilities for readings based on sampled stemmata are given in Table A.16.

TABLE A.16: Reading posterior probabilities for Eph 3:13/4–8.

Reading	Significant support	Posterior
<i>a: αἰτοῦμαι μὴ ἐγκακεῖν</i>	P46r 01r 02r 03*r 03C2 06*r 33 81 1834 1908 cop NA <sup>28</sup> SBL TH WH	84.613%
<i>b: αἰτοῦμαι μὴ ἐκκακεῖν</i>	06C2 012r 025 044 075 0150 0278r 6 88 94 181 256 263 442 606 915 1175r 1398 1678 1739 1836 1840 1881 1910 1962 1985 1987 (1991*f 1991Cf) 2008 2011 2464r 2492 2576 2805 Or Thret RP	15.387%

The posterior probabilities break the intrinsic tie between the readings with ἐγκακεῖν and ἐκκακεῖν in favor of the former reading, though only slightly. The odds ratio of the more-likely reading to the less-likely one is about 5.5, which is between the numerical values assigned to a *D* rating and a *C* rating in this study. This low ratio is probably due to the asymmetry of transcriptional probabilities, which favor the ἐκκακεῖν reading, and perhaps the sparse (though early) external support for the ἐγκακεῖν reading. It also speaks to the weight of the early versions in the stemmata sampled in my analysis. The only versions whose readings can be retroverted in this passage are the Coptic versions, and on the basis of these versions and the Greek manuscripts, the Eastern and Western branches of the tradition are more evenly divided.

## A.9 3:18/16–32: τί τὸ πλάτος καὶ μῆκος καὶ ὕψος καὶ βάθος

3:17 κατοικῆσαι τὸν χριστὸν διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν· ἐν ἀγάπῃ ἐρριζωμένοι καὶ  
 2 4 6 8 10 12 14 16 18 20 22 24 26 28  
 τεθεμελιωμένοι, 18 ἵνα ἐξισχύσητε καταλαβέσθαι σὺν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἁγίοις <sup>1</sup> τί τὸ πλάτος καὶ μῆκος  
 30 2 4 6 8 10 12 14 16 18 20 22 24  
 καὶ ὕψος καὶ βάθος<sup>1</sup>, 19 γινῶναί τε τὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν τῆς γνώσεως ἀγάπην τοῦ χριστοῦ ...  
 26 28 30 32 2 4 6 8 10 12 14 16 18

## A.9.1 Apparatus

a: τι το πλατος και μηκος και υψος και βαθος	P46V 03 04 06 010 012 016V 025 0150 0278 0285V 0319V 33V 38 69 81 218*f 218C0 256 263 330 365*f 365C 442 451 462 1175 1398 1573 1834 2127 2400 2492 2516 2576 2865; VL51r VL54r VL61r VL62 VL65 VL75 VL76 VL77T VL77A VL78 vg cop goth; Ambr Ambst Ath HomiliaeSpirituales MVict Pel; Lach NA <sup>28</sup> SBL TH Treg WH
b: τι το πλατος και μηκος και βαθος και υψος	01 02 018 020 044 049 056 075 0142 0151r 1 6 18 35 42 88*f 88C 93 94V 102 104 177 181r 203 223 234 296 322 337 363 390 398 424 436 459 467 506 629 636r 664 665 912 915 1069 1108 1115 1127 1240 1241 1311 1490 1509 1611 1617 1678 1718 1721 1739 1751rV 1831 1836 (1838r) <sup>115</sup> 1840 1851 1860 1863 1877 1881 1886 1893 1896 1908 1910 1912 1918 1959 1962 1985 (1987*) <sup>116</sup> 1987C 1991 2004r 2008f 2011 2085 2138 2180 2243 2352 2464r 2523 2544 2805 L156 L169 L587 L809 L1159 L1178 L1188 L1440 L2010 L2058; syr <sup>h</sup> ; EpMag Eus GrNy Hier Marcellus Or Proc ThMops
c: τι το μηκος και πλατος και υψος και βαθος	
d: τι το μηκος και πλατος και βαθος και υψος	606 1939 1963 1996 1999 2012; Thret
e: τι το πλατος και βαθος και μηκος και υψος	1505 2495
f: τι το πλατος και υψος και βαθος και μηκος	61 326 1837
g: τι το υψος και μηκος και πλατος και βαθος	
h: τι το υψος και πλατος και μηκος και βαθος	Qu
i: τι το υψος και βαθος και μηκος και πλατος	syr <sup>p</sup> ; Ephr
j: τι το βαθος και πλατος και μηκος και υψος	1245

115. τί τὸ πλάτος, τί τὸ μῆκος καὶ βάθος καὶ ὕψος (dittography or direct incorporation of a marginal τί τὸ πλάτος or τί τὸ μῆκος into the text without further adaptation).

116. τί τὸ πλάτος καὶ μῆκος, βάθος καὶ ὕψος (parablepsis).

k: τι το βάθος και υψος και πλάτος και μήκος	(Sev) <sup>117</sup>
l: τι το πλάτος και μήκος και υψος	383
m: τι το πλάτος και μήκος και βάθος	VL89; (Did) <sup>118</sup>
n: τι το υψος και μήκος και πλάτος	
o: τι το βάθος και πλάτος και μήκος	Ref Val <sup>119</sup>
a/b:	Cyr [ $a \overset{C}{\gg} b$ ] <sup>120</sup>
a/c:	2344 (τῖ τὸ [...] και υ[...] [...] βᾶθος)
b/c:	Chr [ $c \overset{C}{\gg} b$ ] <sup>121</sup>
g/n:	Iren [ $g \overset{C}{\gg} n$ ] <sup>122</sup>

#### A.9.2 Overview

The textual instability of this passage is evident from the diversity of variant readings that have emerged in the tradition. Specifically, of the sixty-four possible sequences involving at least one of the words πλάτος (“breadth”), μῆκος (“length”), ὕψος (“height”), and βάθος (“depth”), no fewer than fifteen occur in the extant tradition of this passage. As the multiple sequences preserved in late manuscripts and early patristic works attest, this passage was liable to change at all stages of the text’s transmission. Intrinsically, commentators have found little, if any, reason to prefer any sequence.<sup>123</sup> Transcriptionally, the loss of parts of the sequence by common mechanical causes followed by their restoration in different places is a plausible explanation for these changes.<sup>124</sup> Externally, the only candidate readings considered by commentators are the first two sequences, πλάτος-μῆκος-ὕψος-βάθος (reading *a*) and πλάτος-μῆκος-βάθος-ὕψος (reading *b*), both of which have widespread support<sup>125</sup> and third-century manuscript or patristic support.<sup>126</sup>

117. βάθος γὰρ καὶ ὕψος καὶ πλάτος καὶ μῆκος (adaptation for commentary).

118. τί πλάτος καὶ μῆκος καὶ βάθος (adaptation for commentary).

119. Reproduced in a quotation in the *Refutatio*.

120. The text underlying this patristic citation is uncertain; see §B.14.3.

121. The textual tradition of this father is divided; see §B.14.1.

122. The textual tradition of this father is divided; see §B.14.2.

123. Hoehner concedes that “The order of the words makes no difference to the interpretation” (HOEHNER 486 n. 1).

124. WEISS, 136.

125. HOEHNER 486 n. 1.

126. Günther Zuntz views 1739 as preserving the lemma of Origen, so he concludes from the presence of the transposed reading in its margin that “Both variants, then, existed in Caesarea in the days of Origen” (*The Text of the Epistles: A Disquisition upon the Corpus Paulinum* [London: The British Academy, 1953; repr., Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2007], 153 n. 5).



A.9.3 *Intrinsic Probabilities*

Considerations of general usage and potential sources of an allusion on the author's part are non-probative with respect to intrinsic probabilities. Since the only other description the author provides of Christ's love is that it "surpasses knowledge," no one term in the sequence is more salient than the others. Commentators have agreed that the sequence is probably a formula of some sort.<sup>127</sup> But extant contemporary literature does not offer a particularly compelling parallel.<sup>128</sup> Parallels that occur in a notably similar context are Job 11:8–9, where the adjectives "high" (ὕψη-λος), "deep" (βαθύς), "long" (μακρός), and "wide" (εὖρος) form two merisms that together convey the boundlessness of God, and Rom 8:38–39, in which "height" (ὑψωμα) and "depth" (βάθος) form one of several merisms describing how insurmountable the love of God in Christ is.<sup>129</sup> A pair of merisms between ὕψος and βάθος and between πλάτος and μῆκος would fit well here, as they would express in the fullest terms the magnitude of what the author wants his readers to grasp. But this observation could be taken as evidence for any of the four-term readings, because any of these readings could be understood as presenting the two merisms in consecutive pairs, in alternating parallels, or in a chiasm. Moreover, since the author could just as easily have employed a single tripartite merism with the three cardinal dimensions ("length," "breadth," and "height/depth") in accordance with the conventions of contemporary scientific literature,<sup>130</sup> the three-term sequences are intrinsically as likely as those with four terms. Consequently, considerations of usage and the author's argument do not favor any reading over the others:  $a = b = c = d = e = f = g = h = i = j = k = l = m = n = o$ .

127. SCHLIER, 171; BEST, 344.

128. The fourth-century Greek magical papyrus PGM IV. 970–979 lists all four dimensions together (PERKINS, 92; MACDONALD, 277), but as Schnackenburg points out, this source lists the four dimensions consistently in the sequence πλάτος-βάθος-μῆκος-ὑψος (SCHNACKENBURG, 151). This particular sequence occurs only in the late and related minuscules 1505 and 2495. In addition, Lincoln and Best observe that the papyrus also adds two other terms, φῶς and ἀνγή, to the sequence (LINCOLN, 209; BEST, 345), making the parallel even more remote. Beyond this, scholars have turned to the Old Testament, wisdom and apocalyptic literature, Stoicism, Hermetic writings, and Philo in search of a parallel to the phrase in question, but as Lincoln concludes, "Valuable as such material is, it has not yet provided such clear parallels as to be decisive in the interpretation of this verse" (LINCOLN, 208).

129. LINCOLN, 212; BEST, 347; MUDDIMAN, 173.

130. Examples of the sequence μῆκος-πλάτος-ὑψος include Gen 6:15; Exod 25:10; 1 Kgs 6:2, 20; 7:14, 39; 2 Chr 3:4; Rev 21:16; fragments of Ctesias (*FGrHist*, 0688 F 1b) and Timaeus (*FGrHist*, 566 F 26a); Biton Mechanicus, *Κατασκευαὶ πολεμικῶν ὀργάνων καὶ καταπαλτικῶν* §§2, 6, 7; *FHG*, Cornelius Alexander Polyhistor F 18; Diodorus Siculus, *Bib. hist.* 2.8.5, 13.82.2, 16.83.2; Josephus, *Ant.* 3.139, 8.65, 8.81; and Heron Mechanicus, *Autom.* 3.1; Heron Mechanicus, *Stereom.* 1.22.1, 1.46.1, 1.48.1, 1.63.1, 1.90.1, 2.4.1, 2.26.1. Examples of the sequence μῆκος-πλάτος-βάθος include Josephus, *Ant.* 1.77, 15.334; Heron Mechanicus, *Stereom.* 1.49.1, 2.5.1, 2.28.1, 2.51.1; and Heron Mechanicus, *Mens.* 2.1, 17.1, 19.1.

Transpositions of these two basic sequences can also be found in contemporary literature. The order πλάτος-μῆκος-ὑψος occurs in Athenaeus Mechanicus, *Mach.* §13. The order πλάτος-ὑψος-μῆκος occurs in Biton Mechanicus, *Κατασκευαὶ πολεμικῶν ὀργάνων καὶ καταπαλτικῶν* §5. The order μῆκος-ὑψος-πλάτος occurs in Biton Mechanicus, *Κατασκευαὶ πολεμικῶν ὀργάνων καὶ καταπαλτικῶν* §7 and *FHG*, Callixenus Rhodius F 2. The order πλάτος-βάθος-μῆκος occurs in *FHG*, Hieronymus Cardianus F 9. The order βάθος-μῆκος-πλάτος occurs in a fragment of Phylarchus (*FGrHist*, 81 F 48).

A.9.4 Transcriptional Probabilities

Before I summarize the potential transcriptional factors at play in this passage, it is worth discussing some of them in detail. As I have noted earlier, an established transcriptional explanation for many of the seemingly arbitrary variations in word order is that one or more phrases were lost by haplography and subsequently restored in a different place in the text. This is applicable for virtually all readings, since homioarcton from one *καί* to the next or homioiteleuton from one -os to another is possible for any of the last three terms in a given sequence. For the sake of space, I will leave these to be enumerated in Table A.17. If this two-step process accounts for much of the variety of sequences attested in this passage, then it would speak to the prominent role that the scribes and readers responsible for marginal notes played in textual traditions.

Similarly, the three-term sequences could have arisen from the four-term sequences either by way of haplography or in an effort to clarify the sequence by removing a superfluous dimension. As above, homioarcton or homioiteleuton would be applicable mechanisms for an accidental omission. A clarifying deletion might be motivated by a difficulty with the inclusion of both ὕψος and βάθος in addition to the other two cardinal dimensions.

Assimilation to a conventions external to this text could also explain the sequences μῆκος-πλάτος-ὕψος-βάθος and μῆκος-πλάτος-βάθος-ὕψος. Literature from the first century and earlier exhibits a marked tendency to list spatial dimensions in the order μῆκος-πλάτος-ὕψος or μῆκος-πλάτος-βάθος.<sup>131</sup> The transposition of μῆκος and πλάτος to the first and second positions in the sequence, respectively, would be straightforward according to this convention, while the order of the remaining two terms would be less clear, since only one was typically included.<sup>132</sup>

These and other potential causes of transitions between readings are summarized in Table A.17.

TABLE A.17: Transcriptional causes for Eph 3:18/16–32.

<i>From</i>	<i>To</i>	<i>Tag</i>	<i>Note</i>
<i>a–b, e–k</i>	<i>c–d</i>	ExtAssim	Assimilation to the conventional ordering of dimensions with μῆκος and πλάτος first
<i>a–b, e</i>	<i>l</i>	Sem	Deletion of βάθος to produce a tripartite merism
<i>g, i</i>	<i>n</i>		
<i>b, e</i>	<i>l</i>	HomArcWord	Loss of καὶ βάθος by homioarcton from καί to καί
<i>i</i>	<i>n</i>		

<sup>131</sup> For examples, see n. 130.

<sup>132</sup> While previous commentators have claimed that assimilation to the “more natural” order accounts for the sequence πλάτος-μῆκος-ὕψος-βάθος (EADIE, 258; ELLICOTT, 79), they do not explain why πλάτος remains before μῆκος in this sequence. In similar fashion, when Best suggests that it may have been the seemingly superfluous inclusion of both “height” and “depth” “which led to the inversion of the two final nouns” (BEST, 344), he does not account for the unusual order of the first two nouns, nor does he explain why a transposition rather than a deletion would solve the problem.

SUPPLEMENTAL COMMENTARY ENTRIES

<i>From</i>	<i>To</i>	<i>Tag</i>	<i>Note</i>
<i>a</i>	<i>l</i>	HomTelPart	Loss of καὶ βάθος by homoioteleuton after another word ending in -os
<i>g</i>	<i>n</i>		
<i>a-b</i>	<i>m</i>	Sem	Deletion of ὕψος to produce a tripartite merism
<i>j-k</i>	<i>o</i>		
<i>a</i>	<i>m</i>	HomArcWord	Loss of καὶ ὕψος by homoioarcton from καί to καί
<i>k</i>	<i>o</i>		
<i>b</i>	<i>m</i>	HomTelPart	Loss of καὶ ὕψος by homoioteleuton after another word ending in -os
<i>j</i>	<i>o</i>		
<i>a</i>	<i>b-c, e-f, h, j</i>	HomArcWord	Loss of a dimension in the sequence by homoioarcton from καί to καί, followed by its restoration in a different part of the sequence
<i>b</i>	<i>a, d-e, h, j</i>		
<i>c</i>	<i>a, d, g</i>		
<i>d</i>	<i>b-c, g</i>		
<i>e</i>	<i>a-b, d, f, j</i>		
<i>f</i>	<i>a, c</i>		
<i>g</i>	<i>h-i</i>		
<i>h</i>	<i>g, k</i>		
<i>i</i>	<i>g</i>		
<i>j</i>	<i>e, k</i>		
<i>k</i>	<i>j</i>		
<i>a</i>	<i>b-c, e-f, h, j</i>	HomTelPart	Loss of a dimension in the sequence by homoioteleuton after another word ending in -os, followed by its restoration in a different part of the sequence
<i>b</i>	<i>a, d-e, h, j</i>		
<i>c</i>	<i>a, d, g</i>		
<i>d</i>	<i>b-c, g</i>		
<i>e</i>	<i>a-b, d, f, j</i>		
<i>f</i>	<i>a, c</i>		
<i>g</i>	<i>h-i</i>		
<i>h</i>	<i>g, k</i>		
<i>i</i>	<i>g</i>		
<i>j</i>	<i>e, k</i>		
<i>k</i>	<i>j</i>		
<i>a, c-o</i>	<i>b</i>	Byz	Byzantine assimilation

#### A.9.5 Post-Analysis Results

The posterior probabilities for readings based on sampled stemmata are given in Table A.18.

TABLE A.18: Reading posterior probabilities for Eph 3:18/16–32.

Reading	Significant support	Posterior
a: τι το πλάτος και μῆκος και ὕψος και βάθος	P46V 03 06 012 025 0150 0278 33V 81 256 263 442 1175 1398 1834 2492 2576 VL61r VL75 VL77T VL77A vg cop goth <sup>A</sup> r goth <sup>B</sup> Ambst MVict Pel NA <sup>28</sup> SBL TH WH <sup>txt</sup>	87.496%
b: τι το πλάτος και μῆκος και βάθος και ὕψος	01 02 044 075 6 88*f 88C 94V 181r 915 1678 1739 1836 1840 1881 1908 1910 1962 1985 (1987*) 1987C 1991 2008f 2011 2464r 2805 syr <sup>h</sup> Hier Or ThMops RP WH <sup>mg</sup>	12.488%
c: τι το μῆκος και πλάτος και ὕψος και βάθος	Chr?	0.004%
d: τι το μῆκος και πλάτος και βάθος και ὕψος	606 Thret	0.004%
e: τι το πλάτος και βάθος και μῆκος και ὕψος		0.004%
g: τι το ὕψος και μῆκος και πλάτος και βάθος		0.004%
f: τι το πλάτος και ὕψος και βάθος και μῆκος		0.000%
h: τι το ὕψος και πλάτος και μῆκος και βάθος		0.000%
i: τι το ὕψος και βάθος και μῆκος και πλάτος	syr <sup>p</sup> Ephr	0.000%
j: τι το βάθος και πλάτος και μῆκος και ὕψος		0.000%
k: τι το βάθος και ὕψος και πλάτος και μῆκος		0.000%
l: τι το πλάτος και μῆκος και ὕψος		0.000%
m: τι το πλάτος και μῆκος και βάθος	VL89	0.000%
n: τι το ὕψος και μῆκος και πλάτος		0.000%
o: τι το βάθος και πλάτος και μῆκος		0.000%

Based on external evidence, the posterior probabilities break the intrinsic tie between the sequences πλάτος-μῆκος-ὕψος-βάθος and πλάτος-μῆκος-βάθος-ὕψος in favor of the former se-

quence, but only slightly. The odds ratio of the more-likely reading to the less-likely one is 7, which is between the numerical values assigned to a *D* rating and a *C* rating in this study. In this case, the relative intrinsic and transcriptional probabilities between these two readings are equal, so the advantage in posterior probability must be due to the weight of the external evidence. This result confirms the judgments of all modern critical editions, which presumably adopt the sequence  $\pi\lambda\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\varsigma\text{-}\mu\eta\grave{\eta}\kappa\omicron\varsigma\text{-}\upsilon\psi\omicron\varsigma\text{-}\beta\acute{\alpha}\theta\omicron\varsigma$  on the same basis.

A.10 3:19/2-4: γνῶναί τε

3:18 ἵνα ἐξισχύσητε καταλαβέσθαι σὺν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἁγίοις τί τὸ πλάτος καὶ μῆκος καὶ ὕψος καὶ  
2 4 6 8 10 12 14 16 18 20 22 24 26 28 30  
βάθος, 19 ᾿γνῶναί τε᾿ τὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν τῆς γνώσεως ἀγάπην τοῦ χριστοῦ, ἵνα πληρωθῇτε εἰς  
32 2 4 6 8 10 12 14 16 18 20 22 24  
πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ θεοῦ.  
26 28 30 32 34

A.10.1 Apparatus

a: γνῶναι τε	P46 01 02 03 04 06C1 016 018 020 025 044 049 056 0142 0150 0151 0278 0285V 0319V 1 6 18 33 35 38 42 61 69 81 88 93 94 102 104 177 181 203 218 223 234 256 263f 296 322 326 330 337 363 365 383 390 398 424 436 442 451 459 462 467 506 606 629 636 664 665 912 915 1069 1108 1115 1127 1175 1240 1241 1245 1398 1490 1505 1509C 1573 1611 1617 1678 1718 1721 1739 1751 1831 1834 1836 1837 1838f 1840 1851 1860 1863 1877 1881 1886 1893 1896 1908 1910 1912 1918r 1939 1959 1962 1963 1985 1987 1991 1996 1999 2004 2008 2011C 2012 2085 2127 2138 2180 2243 2352 2400 2464r 2492 2495 2516 2523 2544 2576 2805 2865 L156 L169 L587 L1159 L1178 L1188 L1440 L2010 L2058; VL51 VL54 VL61 VL62r VL65 VL75 VL76 VL77 VL78 VL89 vg syr; Ambst Ath Chr Cyr Did Ephr EpMag Eus GrNy HomiliaeSpirituales Hier Marcellus MVict Pel Qu ThMops Thret; Lach NA <sup>28</sup> RP SBL TH TR Tisch Treg WH
b: γνῶναι	06* 010 012 075 1311 1509* 2011* L809; cop goth <sup>A</sup> *f goth <sup>A</sup> C goth <sup>B</sup> ; Or
a/b:	2344 (γν[...][...]); Ambr (et)

A.10.2 Overview

Commentators have written little on whether a *τέ solitarium* follows γνῶναι in this verse. This is likely due to the state of the external evidence, which largely supports the inclusion of the particle. But on the same grounds, the exclusion has a surprising diversity of support in the Greek-Latin diglots, the Coptic and Gothic versions, and Origen. To fill the gap in coverage on internal evidence, the following section briefly discusses intrinsic and transcriptional probabilities.

A.10.3 Intrinsic Probabilities

Intrinsically, syntactic considerations favor the inclusion of the *τέ solitarium* over its exclusion. The enclitic τε serves as “punctuation after the fact,”<sup>133</sup> explicitly marking the clause boundary

<sup>133</sup>. Helma Dik, *Word Order in Ancient Greek: A Pragmatic Account of Word Order Variation in Herodotus*, ASCP 5 (Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 1995), 35.

before  $\gamma\hat{\nu}\hat{\omega}\nu\alpha\iota$ . In this way, it facilitates the identification of  $\gamma\hat{\nu}\hat{\omega}\nu\alpha\iota$  as parallel to  $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\alpha\beta\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  (with the sense, “to grasp ... and to know”)<sup>134</sup> rather than subordinate to it (“to grasp ... so as to know”).<sup>135</sup> A parallel seems more likely because the first clause’s reference to “the length and breadth and height and depth” only becomes concrete when it is taken to describe the vastness of Christ’s knowledge-surpassing love, which is the object of the second clause. Both asyndeton and  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}$  *solitarium* would convey a close relationship between the two infinitive phrases, with asyndeton suggesting an apposition and  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}$  *solitarium* indicating that  $\gamma\hat{\nu}\hat{\omega}\nu\alpha\iota$  and  $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\alpha\beta\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  represent different aspects of the same goal,<sup>136</sup> but  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}$  *solitarium* clearly communicates that they are parallel, while asyndeton leaves open the possibility that  $\gamma\hat{\nu}\hat{\omega}\nu\alpha\iota$  is subordinate to  $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\alpha\beta\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ . On syntactic grounds, then, the reading  $\gamma\hat{\nu}\hat{\omega}\nu\alpha\iota\ \tau\epsilon$  (a) is intrinsically more likely than  $\gamma\hat{\nu}\hat{\omega}\nu\alpha\iota$  (b):  $a \overset{C}{\gg} b$ .

#### A.10.4 Transcriptional Probabilities

The transcriptional causes of transitions between readings are detailed in Table A.19.

TABLE A.19: Transcriptional causes for Eph 3:19/2–4.

<i>From</i>	<i>To</i>	<i>Tag</i>	<i>Note</i>
<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	HomArcLetter	Loss of $\tau\epsilon$ before $\tau\eta\nu$ by homoioarcton
<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	Prag	Deletion of $\tau\epsilon$ after $\gamma\hat{\nu}\hat{\omega}\nu\alpha\iota$ to make $\gamma\hat{\nu}\hat{\omega}\nu\alpha\iota$ subordinate to $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\alpha\beta\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$
<i>b</i>	<i>a</i>	Prag	Addition of $\tau\epsilon$ after $\gamma\hat{\nu}\hat{\omega}\nu\alpha\iota$ due to an aversion to asyndeton
<i>b</i>	<i>a</i>	Byz	Byzantine assimilation

134. Best, who sees a parallel between these verses, rightly notes that the “ $\tau\acute{\epsilon}$  which links them implies a somewhat closer connection than  $\kappa\alpha\iota$ ” (BEST, 346).

135. Hoehner interprets the verses in the latter sense, despite assuming the presence of  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}$  (HOEHNER, 488–89).

136. On these functions generally, see Levinsohn, *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek*, 106–7, 188 and Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 22–23. The subtle distinction in function between asyndeton and  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}$  *solitarium* evidently led later scribes and readers to regard the two as virtually indistinguishable, because other New Testament passages that feature  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}$  *solitarium* often have variant readings that omit it (Levinsohn, *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek*, 106).

A.10.5 *Post-Analysis Results*

The posterior probabilities for readings based on sampled stemmata are given in Table A.20.

TABLE A.20: Reading posterior probabilities for Eph 3:19/2-4.

<i>Reading</i>	<i>Significant support</i>	<i>Posterior</i>
<i>a: γνῶναι τε</i>	P46 01 02 03 06C1 025 044 0150 0278 6 33 81 88 94 181 256 263f 442 606 915 1175 1398 1678 1739 1834 1836 1840 1881 1908 1910 1962 1985 1987 1991 2008 2011C 2464r 2492 2576 2805 VL61 VL75 VL77 VL89 vg syr Ambst Chr Cyr Ephr Hier MVict Pel ThMops Thret NA <sup>28</sup> RP SBL TH WH	99.996%
<i>b: γνῶναι</i>	06* 012 075 2011* cop goth <sup>A</sup> *f goth <sup>A</sup> C goth <sup>B</sup> Or	0.004%

Based on external evidence, the posterior probabilities decisively confirm my judgment on intrinsic probabilities.



A.11 **5:4/2–12:** καὶ αἰσχροτής καὶ μωρολογία ἢ εὐτραπεία

5:3 Πορνεία δὲ καὶ ἀκαθαρσία πᾶσα ἢ πλεονεξία μηδὲ ὀνομαζέσθω ἐν ὑμῖν, καθὼς πρέπει ἁγίοις,

2 4 6 8 10 12 14 16 18 20 22 24 26 28

4 ‘καὶ αἰσχροτής καὶ μωρολογία ἢ εὐτραπεία’, τὰ οὐκ ἀνήκοντα, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον εὐχαριστία.

2 4 6 8 10 12 14 16 18 20 22 24

5 τοῦτο γὰρ ἴστε γινώσκοντες ὅτι πᾶς πόρνος ἢ ἀκάθαρτος ἢ πλεονέκτης, ὃ ἐστὶν εἰδωλολάτρης,

2 4 6 8 10 12 14 16 18 20 22 24 26 28

οὐκ ἔχει κληρονομίαν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ.

30 32 34 36 38 40 42 44 46 48

A.11.1 *Apparatus*

<i>a:</i> καὶ αἰσχροτής καὶ μωρολογία ἢ εὐτραπεία	01C1r 03r 06C2 018r 020 049 056 0142 0151 1 6 18 33 35 42 69rV 88r 93 102 177 181r 203S 234 322 337 363 390 398 424 436 442 462 506 636r 664 665 912 915r 1069 1108 1240V 1245 1311 1505 1509 1611 1617 1729r 1751r 1836r 1838*r 1838C 1851 1860 1863 1877 1886 1893r 1896r 1910 1912r 1939 1963 1985 1987 1991V 1996r 1999 2004r 2005 2012 2085 2138V 2180 2243 2344f 2352 2495 (2523) <sup>137</sup> 2544 2865SrV L23 L60/2r L156r L587 L809 L1159 L1178r L1188 L1298V L1440 L2058; syr; Hier; NA <sup>28</sup> RP SBL TH TR Treg WH
<i>b:</i> καὶ αἰσχροτής καὶ μωρολογία καὶ εὐτραπεία	P46 223 629 1115 1490 1721 1831; (Cyp) <sup>138</sup> (Or) <sup>139</sup> ThMops
<i>c:</i> καὶ αἰσχροτής ἢ μωρολογία ἢ εὐτραπεία	01*r 025r 075*r 075C 0278 61C0r 256 263C 326 330 365 383 451 1175 1319 1398r 1573 1678 1739 1837 1840 1908r 1918r 2008 2127 2400 2464r 2492 2516r 2576 2805r; Tisch
<i>d:</i> ἢ αἰσχροτής ἢ μωρολογία ἢ εὐτραπεία	02V 06*r 010 012 0319r 38r 81 104 218r 296 459 467 1127 1241V 1718 1834 1959 1962; VL51 VL54 VL56 VL61r VL62 VL65*r VL65C0 VL75 VL76 VL77 VL78 VL86r VL89r vg cop <sup>sa</sup> (goth <sup>B*</sup> ) <sup>140</sup> goth <sup>B</sup> C; Ambst MVi et Pel; Lach
<i>e:</i> ἢ αἰσχροτής καὶ μωρολογία ἢ εὐτραπεία	044 0150
<i>f:</i> αἰσχροτής καὶ μωρολογία ἢ εὐτραπεία	606 L60/1rf L169; cop <sup>bo</sup> ; Cl
<i>g:</i> αἰσχροτής ἢ μωρολογία ἢ εὐτραπεία	94 2011
<i>a/b/c:</i>	61* (καὶ αἰσχ); L2010 (καὶ αἰσχροτής [...] [...] πῆλεια)
<i>a/b:</i>	P49 (καὶ ἐσ[...] <sup>A</sup> ης καὶ μω[...] <sup>A</sup> [...] [...]]; Chr [b <sup>A</sup> >> a] <sup>141</sup>

137. καὶ αἰσχρολογία καὶ μωρολογία ἢ εὐτραπεία (partial harmonization to Col 3:8).

138. *stultiloquium et scurrilitas* (abbreviation of sequence to the vices specific to speech for the purpose of adapting the quotation to the commentary).

139. καὶ αἰσχροτήτα καὶ μωρολογίαν καὶ εὐτραπείαν (adaptation to commentary).

140. ριφβλην δγλγληρηδαι ριφβλην ςλδβλ (loss of the first part of the sequence, presumably by homoiocaton from ριφβλην ρλγληρηρηδαι [the words restored by the corrector] to ριφβλην δγλγληρηδαι).

141. The text underlying this patristic citation is uncertain, and the textual tradition of this father is divided; see §B.20.2.

a/c:	263* (καὶ αἰσχροῦτης μωρολογία ἢ εὐτραπεία); Cyr [ $c \overset{C}{\gg} a$ ] <sup>142</sup>
a/d:	Iren Thret [ $a = d$ ] <sup>143</sup>
c/d:	Bas [ $c \overset{C}{\gg} d$ ] <sup>144</sup>
†5:3/24–4/18	1881 <sup>145</sup>

### A.11.2 Overview

The textual problem here concerns the sequence of conjunctions separating the three vices in this passage. Intrinsically, commentators have defended the sequence καί ... καί ... ἢ on the grounds that it functions similarly to the mixed sequence of conjunctions in 5:3.<sup>146</sup> Their arguments follow from the observation that the noun αἰσχροῦτης does not strictly refer to speech, while μωρολογία and εὐτραπεία do.<sup>147</sup> Transcriptionally, they note that emendators could have changed all of the conjunctions to καί or ἢ, either to coordinate all three vices<sup>148</sup> or to produce a more consistent sequence.<sup>149</sup> Externally, while some commentators grant the strength of the sequences καί ... ἢ ... ἢ and ἢ ... ἢ ... ἢ,<sup>150</sup> most find the support for καί ... καί ... ἢ decisive.<sup>151</sup>

### A.11.3 Intrinsic Probabilities

Intrinsically, the readings with καί between αἰσχροῦτης and μωρολογία and ἢ between μωρολογία and εὐτραπεία best fit the author’s argument in this passage. As commentators have rightly noted, the well-attested sequence πορνεία ... καὶ ἀκαθαρσία ... ἢ πλεονεξία in 5:3 provides a salient point of comparison. There, the warning against fornication is extended even (καὶ) to any impurity or (ἢ) covetousness, which might otherwise be regarded as “merely” unclean thoughts or desires.<sup>152</sup> That the καί is not functioning as a conjunction is suggested by the author’s choice

142. The textual tradition of this father is divided; see §B.20.3.

143. The textual traditions of these fathers are divided; see §§B.20.4 and B.20.5.

144. The textual tradition of this father is divided; see §B.20.1.

145. This witness skips multiple lines, starting from καθὼς πρόπει in 5:3 and ending just before ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον εὐχαριστία in this verse. The best explanation for this omission, in terms of both transcriptional probabilities and the external evidence of 1881’s closest relatives, is that 1881’s exemplar read ἀνῆκεν here, but the scribe of 1881 lost everything after the ὑμῶν in 5:3 through ἀνῆκεν by homoioteleuton.

146. Erich Haupt regards the καί in both verses as an instance of “καί explicitavum,” marking a progression from the specific (“fornication”) to the general (“all impurity”) in 5:3 and a progression from the general (“shameful conduct”) to the specific (“foolish talk or joking”) in the present verse (HAUPT 200 n. 1). Barth argues that each verse features a disjunction between a hendiadys of two vices (separated by καὶ) and a separate third vice (BARTH 2:562).

147. HARLESS, 453; EADIE, 380; BEST, 478; HOEHNER, 655.

148. WEISS, 65; BEST, 478.

149. ELLICOTT, 119.

150. SALMOND, 353; BEST, 478.

151. HARLESS, 452; EADIE, 380; ELLICOTT, 118; HOEHNER 654 n. 2.

152. Cf. Jesus’s teaching in Matt 5:27–28 and Matt 15:19–20//Mark 7:21–23 and Paul’s former ignorance that coveting was a sin in Rom 7:7.

of the singular verb *ὀνομαζέσθω* (in agreement with *πορνεία* alone) over the plural *ὀνομαζέσθωσαν* (which would agree with two vices in *πορνεία ... καὶ ἀκαθαρσία*). Similarly, in this passage, the author's choice of the more general word *αἰσχρότης* instead of the more explicitly speech-related *αἰσχρολογία* (cf. Col 3:8)<sup>153</sup> suggests a similar progression: shameful behavior extends even to forms of speech like foolish talk or risqué joking. While the readings where the last two conjunctions are both *καί* or *ἢ* are syntactically viable, they obscure this progression of thought and its connection to the previous verse because they place all three vices at the same level. Thus, the readings with *καί* and *ἢ* as the last two conjunctions, respectively, are more suitable to the author's argument.

As for the first conjunction in the sequence, *καί* is intrinsically slightly more likely than *ἢ*, and either conjunction is absolutely more likely than asyndeton. Asyndeton is unsuitable here, because the two vice lists do not have an extremely close relationship (the specific sins in the first list relate to thoughts and desires, while those in the second list relate to speech), and the start of a new sentence with this vice list is impossible (as the *ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον εὐχαριστία* that follows depends on the *μηδὲ ὀνομαζέσθω ἐν ὑμῖν* from 5:3). Grammatically, *ἢ* produces a disjunction between the vice lists' general vices (*πορνεία* and *αἰσχρότης*), and either vice alone would agree in number with *ὀνομαζέσθω*. But given the likelihood that the present vice list is an elaboration on what precedes it (especially in light of the intervening comment *καθὼς πρέπει ἀγίοις*), a conjunction of the general vices with *καί* before *αἰσχρότης* could still be viable. Meanwhile, a conjunction with *καί* agrees with the plural reference to “things which are not fitting” that immediately follows, while a disjunction with *ἢ* does not. Thus, *καί* is intrinsically slightly more likely than *ἢ*, which is absolutely more likely than asyndeton.

We can now assign the relative intrinsic probabilities to all of the variant readings. The most likely reading is *καὶ αἰσχρότης καὶ μωρολογία ἢ εὐτραπεία* (a), as it distinguishes the speech-specific vices *μωρολογία* and *εὐτραπεία* from the more general *αἰσχρότης* and creates a conjunction between *πορνεία* and *αἰσχρότης* that coheres well with the subsequent reference to “things which are not fitting.” It is thus more likely than *καὶ αἰσχρότης καὶ μωρολογία καὶ εὐτραπεία* (b) and *καὶ αἰσχρότης ἢ μωρολογία ἢ εὐτραπεία* (c), which place all of the vices in this list on the same level, and slightly more likely than *ἢ αἰσχρότης καὶ μωρολογία ἢ εὐτραπεία* (e), which produces a disjunction that does not agree in number with the subsequent plural reference. For the same reasons, e is more likely than *ἢ αἰσχρότης ἢ μωρολογία ἢ εὐτραπεία* (d), which places all three vices in the list at the same level, and absolutely more likely than *αἰσχρότης καὶ μωρολογία ἢ εὐτραπεία* (f), whose asyndeton is not viable syntactically. The latter factor renders reading d absolutely more likely than *αἰσχρότης ἢ μωρολογία ἢ εὐτραπεία* (g). As multiple readings have different intrinsic probabilities relative to reading a, it is easiest to describe them with separate chains as follows:  $a \overset{C}{\gg} b = c$ ;  $a \overset{D}{\gg} e$ ;  $e \overset{C}{\gg} d$ ;  $e \overset{A}{\gg} f$ ;  $d \overset{A}{\gg} g$ .

153. EADIE, 380; BEST, 478; HOEHNER, 655. The difference in wording is even more telling if Ephesians and Colossians are contemporaneous writings by the same author or if Ephesians is dependent on Colossians.

A.11.4 *Transcriptional Probabilities*

The transcriptional causes of transitions between readings are detailed in Table A.21.

TABLE A.21: Transcriptional causes for Eph 5:4/2–12.

<i>From</i>	<i>To</i>	<i>Tag</i>	<i>Note</i>
<i>a, c, e</i>	<i>b</i>	IntAssim	Change of one or more instances of <i>καί</i> to <i>ἢ</i> to assimilate to a single <i>καί</i>
<i>a, c, e</i>	<i>d</i>	IntAssim	Change of the first two conjunctions to <i>ἢ</i> to assimilate to the final <i>ἢ</i>
<i>a, e</i>	<i>f</i>	Prag	Deletion of initial <i>καί</i> or <i>ἢ</i> to adapt the text for inclusion in a commentary
<i>b, c</i>	<i>g</i>		
<i>a</i>	<i>b–c</i>	Prag	Change of both of the last two conjunctions to <i>καί</i> or <i>ἢ</i> to put all three vices on the same level
<i>a</i>	<i>e</i>	Prag	Correction of initial <i>καί</i> to <i>ἢ</i> to ensure agreement in number with the singular <i>ὀνομαζέσθω</i> that precedes
<i>c</i>	<i>d</i>		
<i>b–c</i>	<i>a</i>	IntAssim	Change of the last two conjunctions to <i>καί</i> and <i>ἢ</i> to assimilate to the corresponding sequence in 5:3 (MEYER, 261)
<i>d</i>	<i>e</i>		
<i>f</i>	<i>a, e</i>	Prag	Addition of <i>καί</i> or <i>ἢ</i> before <i>αἰσχροτύης καὶ μωρολογία ἢ εὐτραπεία</i> to connect this clause to the preceding sentence
<i>g</i>	<i>c, d</i>	Prag	Addition of <i>καί</i> or <i>ἢ</i> before <i>αἰσχροτύης ἢ μωρολογία ἢ εὐτραπεία</i> to connect this clause to the preceding sentence
<i>b–g</i>	<i>a</i>	Byz	Byzantine assimilation

A.11.5 *Post-Analysis Results*

The posterior probabilities for readings based on sampled stemmata are given in Table A.22.

TABLE A.22: Reading posterior probabilities for Eph 5:4/2–12.

<i>Reading</i>	<i>Significant support</i>	<i>Posterior</i>
<i>a: και αισχροτης και μωρολογια η ευτραπελια</i>	01C1r 03r 06C2 6 33 88r 181r 442 915r 1836r 1910 1985 1987 1991V syr Hier NA <sup>28</sup> RP SBL TH WH	99.984%
<i>c: και αισχροτης η μωρολογια η ευτραπελια</i>	01*r 025r 075C 075*r 0278 256 263C 1175 1398r 1678 1739 1840 1908r 2008 2464r 2492 2576 2805r	0.012%
<i>b: και αισχροτης και μωρολογια και ευτραπελια</i>	P46 Or ThMops	0.004%
<i>d: η αισχροτης η μωρολογια η ευτραπελια</i>	02V 06*r 012 81 1834 1962 VL61r VL75 VL77 VL89r vg cop <sup>sa</sup> goth <sup>B*</sup> goth <sup>B</sup> C Ambst MViet Pel	0.000%
<i>e: η αισχροτης και μωρολογια η ευτραπελια</i>	044 0150	0.000%
<i>f: αισχροτης και μωρολογια η ευτραπελια</i>	606 cop <sup>bo</sup>	0.000%
<i>g: αισχροτης η μωρολογια η ευτραπελια</i>	94 2011	0.000%

Based on external and transcriptional evidence, the posterior probabilities decisively confirm my judgment on intrinsic probabilities, in agreement with all modern critical editions.

## A.12 5:4/14–18: ᾧ οὐκ ἀνῆκεν

5:3 Πορνεία δὲ καὶ ἀκαθαρσία πᾶσα ἣ πλεονεξία μηδὲ ὀνομαζέσθω ἐν ὑμῖν, καθὼς πρέπει ἀγίοις,  
 2 4 6 8 10 12 14 16 18 20 22 24 26 28  
 4 καὶ αἰσχρότης καὶ μωρολογία ἣ εὐτραπεία, ᾧ οὐκ ἀνῆκεν, ἀλλὰ μάλλον εὐχαριστία.  
 2 4 6 8 10 12 14 16 18 20 22 24

## A.12.1 Apparatus

<i>a</i> : α οὐκ ἀνῆκεν	P46V P49V 01 02 03 025 0278 6 (33 Or) <sup>154</sup> 81 104 256 263 330 365 424C1 442 451 459 467* 606 1175 1241 1319 1398 1573 1739 1834 1910 1959 1962 2127 2400 2464r 2492r 2516 2805 L60/2r; VL51 VL54 VL56r VL61 VL62 VL65 VL75 VL76 VL78 VL89f vg <sup>cl</sup> ; Ambst Cl Cyr MVict Pel ThMops; Lach NA <sup>28</sup> SBL TH Tisch Treg WH
<i>b</i> : τα οὐκ ἀνηκοντα	06 010f 012f 018 020 044 049 056 075 0142 0150 0151 0319 1 18 35 38 42 61r 69 88 93 94 102 177 181 203S 218 223 234 296 322 326 337 363 383 390 398 424* 436 462 467Cf 506r 629 636r 664 665 912 915 1069 1108 1115 1127 1240 1245 1311 1490 1505 1509 1611 1617 1718 1721 1729r 1751r 1831 1836r 1837 1838 1851 1860 1863 1877 1886 1893 1896 1908 1912 1918 1939 1963 1985r 1987 1991 1996 1999 2004 2005 2011 2012 2085 2138 2180 2243 2344 2352 2495 2523 2576 2865S L23 L60/1r L156 L169 L587 L809 L1159 L1178 L1188 L1298 L1440 L2010 L2058; syr <sup>h</sup> ; Bas Thret; RP TR
<i>c</i> : τα μη ἀνηκομντα	1678 1840 2008 2544
<i>a/b/c</i> :	VL77T vg <sup>ww</sup> vg <sup>st</sup> Cyp Hier ( <i>quae ad rem non pertinent</i> ); VL86 ( <i>que ad rem non pertinent</i> ); syr <sup>p</sup> (ܬܐ ܠܐ ܢܝܬܝܢ ܠܐܝܬܐ); cop <sup>sa</sup> (наи етемеѡѡѡѡ); cop <sup>bo</sup> (наи етсеѡѡѡѡ наиѡѡѡѡѡѡѡѡ); goth <sup>B</sup> (𐍆𐍂𐍅𐍆𐍂 𐍃𐍆 𐍆𐍕𐍕𐍆𐍂𐍆𐍂𐍆𐍂𐍆𐍂 𐍋𐍆 𐍆𐍕𐍕𐍆𐍂𐍆𐍂𐍆𐍂𐍆𐍂); Iren [ <i>a</i> <sup>C</sup> <i>b</i> = <i>c</i> ] <sup>155</sup>
<i>a/b</i> :	VL77A ( <i>quae ad rem non pertinentia</i> ); Chr [ <i>c</i> <sup>C</sup> <i>b</i> ] <sup>156</sup>
†5:3/24–4/18	1881 <sup>157</sup>

## A.12.2 Overview

The main textual issue is whether the author uses a participial clause (“things not befitting”) or a relative clause (“which are not befitting”) to describe vices like the ones just mentioned. The near equivalence of these English renderings highlights the difficulty of distinguishing the Greek

154. οὐκ ἀνῆκεν (deletion of relative pronoun to render a new sentence starting with καὶ αἰσχρότης, or loss of τὰ after εὐτραπεία by homoioteleuton).

155. The textual tradition of this father is divided; see §B.21.2.

156. The text underlying this patristic citation is uncertain; see §B.21.1.

157. This witness skips multiple lines, starting from καθὼς πρέπει in 5:3 and ending just before ἀλλὰ μάλλον εὐχαριστία in this verse. The best explanation for this omission, in terms of both transcriptional probabilities and the external evidence of 1881’s closest relatives, is that 1881’s exemplar read ἀνῆκεν here, but the scribe of 1881 lost everything after the ὑμῖν in 5:3 through ἀνῆκεν by homoioteleuton.

readings on intrinsic grounds.<sup>158</sup> Transcriptionally, earlier commentators regard ἀ οὐκ ἀνῆκεν as “an obvious explanation of the participial clause.”<sup>159</sup> In terms of external evidence, some early commentators prefer τὰ οὐκ ἀνήκοντα,<sup>160</sup> but later commentators who address this textual issue generally favor ἀ οὐκ ἀνῆκεν.<sup>161</sup>

#### A.12.3 *Intrinsic Probabilities*

Considerations of syntax and the author’s argument are non-probative. The difference between the participial readings τὰ οὐκ ἀνήκοντα and τὰ μὴ ἀνήκοντα is subtle at best, and either effectively conveys the author’s point about the unsuitability of the vices listed in 5:3–4. Syntactically, the participial readings may facilitate a connection between εὐχαριστία and the earlier verb ὀνομαζέσθω, while the finite verb in the relative clause ἀ οὐκ ἀνῆκεν serves as a more immediate predicate for εὐχαριστία.<sup>162</sup> But the author’s point is unchanged in either case. I therefore assign all three readings equal intrinsic probabilities:  $a = b = c$ .

#### A.12.4 *Transcriptional Probabilities*

Language-specific transcriptional factors in the Latin tradition are worth discussing in more detail before we summarize all transcriptional factors at play here. Specifically, either of the readings *quae ad rem non pertinet* (which appears to be a literal rendering of ἀ οὐκ ἀνῆκεν) and *quae ad rem non pertinent* (which could correspond to any of the Greek readings) could have given rise to one another because in Latin, the neuter plural and feminine singular relative pronouns are both *quae*. Emendators who read *quae* as feminine singular in reference to the preceding *scurrilitas* rather than neuter plural could have corrected the plural verb to the singular.<sup>163</sup> Since virtually all Latin witnesses read the equivalent of ἡ ἀσυχρότης ἡ μωρολογία ἡ εὐτραπेलία earlier in this verse, the disjunction syntactically lends itself to a reading of the present phrase in reference to the last vice.<sup>164</sup> In the opposite direction, if *quae* was read as neuter plural, then the singular *pertinet* could be changed to *pertinent* accordingly.

These and other transcriptional factors are detailed in Table A.23.

158. Eadie suggests that the participle with οὐ may convey “an objective reality” (EADIE, 382; cf. Smyth §2734). But in any case, the participle, whether with οὐ or μὴ, conveys the same essential idea as the relative clause ἀ οὐκ ἀνῆκεν.

159. “offenbare Erklärung des Partizipialsatzes” (HARLESS, 454; see also MEYER, 261; and HAUPT, 201).

160. HARLESS, 453–54; ELLICOTT, 119.

161. SALMOND, 353; SCHNACKENBURG 219 n. 9.

162. Several commentators note that the parenthetical nature of this phrase, like the καθὼς πρέπει ἀγίοις in 5:3, suggests that ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον εὐχαριστία is in contrast with μὴδὲ ὀνομαζέσθω ἐν ὑμῖν (EADIE, 383; HAUPT, 201; LINCOLN, 322; COHICK, 510). But cf. WEISS, 65, who sees καθὼς πρέπει ἀγίοις as preventing the force of ὀνομαζέσθω from carrying over to the next verse.

163. This is noted by EADIE, 382.

164. Indeed, the division of the text so that *aut scurrilitas quae ad rem non pertinet* begins its own lemma in Pelagius, *Exp. Eph.* 5.4 (Souter, *Pelagius’s Expositions*, 2:373) speaks to such a reading, regardless of whether it was the work of Pelagius himself or a later scribe.



TABLE A.23: Transcriptional causes for Eph 5:4/14–18.

<i>From</i>	<i>To</i>	<i>Tag</i>	<i>Note</i>
<i>a</i>	<i>b–c</i>	Prag	Change of $\hat{a}$ οὐκ ἀνήκεν to a participial clause to connect εὐχαριστία more explicitly to the ὀνομαζέσθω of 5:3
<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	Idio	Change of <i>pertinet</i> to <i>pertinent</i> in the Latin tradition, with <i>quae</i> read as neuter plural
<i>b–c</i>	<i>a</i>	Prag	Change of a participial clause to $\hat{a}$ οὐκ ἀνήκεν to supply a more immediate contrast for εὐχαριστία
<i>b</i>	<i>c</i>	Harm	Change of οὐ to μή before ἀνήκοντα as a partial harmonization to τὰ μὴ καθήκοντα in Rom 1:28 (EADIE, 381; ELLICOTT, 119)
		Idio	Correction of οὐ to μή before ἀνήκοντα based on grammatical convention
<i>b</i>	<i>a</i>	Idio	Change of <i>pertinent</i> to <i>pertinet</i> in the Latin tradition, with <i>quae</i> read as feminine singular
<i>a, c</i>	<i>b</i>	Byz	Byzantine assimilation

A.12.5 *Post-Analysis Results*

The posterior probabilities for readings based on sampled stemmata are given in Table A.24.

TABLE A.24: Reading posterior probabilities for Eph 5:4/14–18.

<i>Reading</i>	<i>Significant support</i>	<i>Posterior</i>
<i>a: a ουκ ανηκεν</i>	P46V 01 02 03 025 0278 6 (33) 81 256 263 424C1 442 606 1175 1398 1739 1834 (1881) 1910 1962 2464r 2492r 2805 VL61 VL75 VL89 vg <sup>cl</sup> Ambst Cyr MVict Or Pel ThMops NA <sup>28</sup> SBL TH WH	99.984%
<i>b: τα ουκ ανηκοντα</i>	06 012f 044 075 0150 88 94 181 915 1836r 1908 1985r 1987 1991 2011 2576 syr <sup>h</sup> Thret RP	0.012%
<i>c: τα μη ανηκοντα</i>	1678 1840 2008	0.004%

The posterior probabilities break the intrinsic tie between all three readings decisively in favor of  $\hat{a}$  οὐκ ἀνήκεν, in agreement with all modern critical editions. Because the transcriptional probabilities are generally symmetric, the posterior probabilities are primarily informed by external evidence. In this case, the support of the earliest Greek witnesses and most of the Latin tradition gives  $\hat{a}$  οὐκ ἀνήκεν the advantage.



## A.13 5:14/18–26: ἔγειρε, ὁ καθεύδων, καὶ ἀνάστα

5:14 πᾶν γὰρ τὸ φανερούμενον φῶς ἐστίν. διὸ λέγει· Ἐγειρε, ὁ καθεύδων, καὶ ἀνάστα ἔκ τῶν  
 2 4 6 8 10 12 14 16 18 20 22 24 26 28 30  
 νεκρῶν, καὶ ἐπιφάνῃ σοι ὁ χριστός.  
 32 34 36 38 40 42

## A.13.1 Apparatus

a: εγειρε ο καθευδων και αναστα	P46 01r 02 03 06 010 012 018 020 025 044 048V 049*V 049C 075 0150*f 0150C 0151 0278 0319 1 38 42 81 88 93 102 104 177 203S 218 263 296 326 330 383 398* 436 442 451 459 467 506 629 636r 665 915 1069 1115 1175 1241 1245 1311 1398 1611 1718 1739 1751r 1834r 1836V 1837 1838 1840* 1877C 1893f 1908 1910* 1912 1918 1939 1942 1959 1962 1963 1996 1999 2004 2005 2011 2012 2180 2243 2464r 2516 2805 L156 L1126 L1178 L1440 L2058; Cl Did Epiph EvPont (Hipp) <sup>165</sup> Mcion Or (Sev) <sup>166</sup> ; NA <sup>28</sup> RP SBL TH Tisch Treg WH
b: εγειραι ο καθευδων και αναστα	056 0142 6 18 33V 35 61*f 61C0 69 94 181 223 234 256 322r 337 363 365 390 398C 424 462 606 664 912 1108 1127 1240 1319 1490 1505 1509 1573 1617 1678 1721 1729 1831 1840C 1851 1860 1863 1881 1886 1896 1910C 1985 1987 1991V 2008 2085 2127 2138 2344 2352 2400 2492 2495 2523 2544 2576 2865S L23 L169 L1159 L1188fV L1298; syr <sup>h</sup> ; Ath GrNaz IsPel Marcus Phys Proc (Ref) <sup>167</sup> Thret; Lach TR
c: αναστα	1877*; MVict
a/b:	VL51 VL61 VL62 VL65 VL77 VL89 vg <sup>ww</sup> vg <sup>st</sup> Ambr Ambst Hier Pel Qu ThMops (surge qui dormis et exsurge); VL54 VL75 VL76 VL78 VL86 vg <sup>cl</sup> (surge qui dormis et exurge); Ephr (ܩܠܝܪܝܬܝܢ ܢܪ ܝܢܪܥܝܬܝܢ ܠܝ ܠܩܝܢܩܝܬܝܢ); syr <sup>p</sup> (ܩܠܝܪܝܬܝܢ ܢܪܥܝܬܝܢ); cor <sup>sa</sup> (χε τωογνιγ πετνηκοτκ νιγλο); cor <sup>bo</sup> (χε τωνκ φη ετενηκοτ ογορ ορι ερατκ); Chr Cyr [a = b] <sup>168</sup>

165. ἔγειρε ὁ καθεύδων καὶ ἐξεγέρθητι (paraphrase made by the commentator).

166. ἔγειρε ὁ καθεύδων (abbreviated quotation made by the commentator).

167. ἔγειραι ὁ καθεύδων καὶ ἐξεγέρθητι (paraphrase made by the commentator). Note that the *Refutatio* is presumably quoting the text as the Naassenes read it.

168. The text underlying these patristic citations is uncertain; see §§B.23.1 and B.23.2.

## A.13.2 Overview

The two best-attested variant readings in this quotation pit the present active imperative ἔγειρε against the aorist middle imperative ἔγειραι. In terms of external evidence, both readings find early attestation in the form of patristic citations,<sup>169</sup> thanks to the historical popularity of this passage. Even the sparsely attested reading *c*, which omits the first three words (“Wake up, sleeper”), was evidently known to Marius Victorinus, although its Greek manuscript support is singular, late, and corrected to the reading with ἔγειρε. But intrinsically, since we do not know the source of this quotation,<sup>170</sup> much less any textual tradition behind it, we cannot discern if the author was quoting a particular form of this source or adapting it to his argument. Commentators have therefore resorted to arguments of general usage, which generally favor ἔγειρε over ἔγειραι.<sup>171</sup> Modern critical texts follow the reading with ἔγειρε, presumably on the basis of its early manuscript support.

## A.13.3 Intrinsic Probabilities

For the reasons outlined above, the inclusion and exclusion of the first half of the phrase are equally intrinsically likely, and on grounds of general usage, the reading with ἔγειρε is slightly more likely than that with ἔγειραι. Extant sources before the first century CE use ἔγειρε exclu-

169. The reading with ἔγειρε enjoys second-century support from Marcion (according to Epiphanius) and Clement of Alexandria. If the traditional second-century date of the *Physiologus* is accurate, then ἔγειραι is just as early. But the date of this work is contested (for a mid-third-century date, see Alan Scott, “The Date of the *Physiologus*,” VC 52.4 [1998]: 430–41).

170. Most commentators who insist on a source from canonical scripture have converged on Isa 60:1, perhaps in combination with other passages (HARLESS, 472–73; HODGE, 296–97; EADIE, 398; ELLICOTT, 125; MOULE, 133). This proposal finds an early precedent in Hippolytus, who attributes the saying to Isaiah (Hippolytus, *Comm. Dan.* 4.55 [GCS 1/7:324]). Another proposal, which goes at least as far back as Epiphanius and Jerome, is to attribute the quotation to an apocryphal source (Epiphanius, *Pan.* 42.12.3 [GCS 1/31:179–80]; Jerome, *Comm. Eph.* 3.5.14 [PL 26:525–26]). Meyer considers this solution best and lists potential apocryphal sources suggested by other commentators (MEYER, 279–80). A third proposal, which finds early precedent in Clement and some Antiochene fathers, is that the source of the quotation was an early Christian saying or hymn (Clement of Alexandria, *Protr.* 9.84.2 [SC 2:151]; Severian of Gabala, *Eph.* 5.14 [Staab, *Pauluskomentare*, 311]; Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Eph.* 5.14b [SBLWGRW 26:266]). This proposal has won the favor of modern scholars (ABBOTT, 158; BARTH 2:574; BEST, 497; HOEHNER, 686–87; LINCOLN, 319; SCHNACKENBURG, 229; MACDONALD, 316; MERKLE, 167; COHICK, 529). Notably, Clement offers a continuation of the lines quoted in this passage: «ἔγειρε,» φησὶν, «ὁ καθεύδων καὶ ἀνάστα ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, καὶ ἐπιφαύσει σοι ὁ Χριστὸς κύριος,» ὁ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἡλῖος, ὁ «πρὸ ἑωσφόρου» γεννώμενος, ὁ ζῶν χαρισάμενος ἀκτίσιν ἰδίαις. It is unclear whether Clement invented the additional content, derived them from oral tradition or memory, or copied them from a written source (SCHNACKENBURG 228 n. 46; LINCOLN, 319).

171. An early argument for ἔγειρε comes from Carl Friedrich August Fritzsche, who sees it as having the interjective sense, “Up!” (Carl Friedrich August Fritzsche, *Evangelium Marci*, vol. 2 of *Quatuor N.T. Evangelia recensuit et cum commentariis perpetuis* [Leipzig: Fleischer, 1830], 56; followed by MEYER, 281; ABBOTT, 158; and SALMOND, 359). More recently, Benjamin L. Merkle has argued that ἐγείρω is a verb whose imperative is conjugated in the present active ἔγειρε by convention (MERKLE, 168; “Verbal Aspect and Imperatives: Ephesians as a Test Case,” in *New Testament Philology: Essays in Honor of David Alan Black*, ed. Melton Bennett Winstead [Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2018], 34–51, here 42–43).

sively, and even after this point, ἔγειρε remains about 1.5 times more frequent than ἔγειραι,<sup>172</sup> so ἔγειρε is slightly better supported by contemporary evidence. Such considerations cannot tell us anything about whether our author's source contained the phrase "Wake up, sleeper," so the shorter reading is intrinsically just as likely as the reading with ἔγειρε ὁ καθεύδων. I therefore rate the relative probabilities of the readings as  $a = c \overset{D}{\gg} b$ .

#### A.13.4 *Transcriptional Probabilities*

A brief word about the possibility of harmonization is in order before I summarize potential transcriptional causes of changes between readings. While harmonization is often a transcriptional factor in other variants involving material quoted from another source, it is unlikely to be a factor in this case. As our patristic sources indicate, later readers of this epistle evidently knew of the quoted source only through its occurrence here, so they would not have a target text towards which to harmonize. I therefore do not include harmonization as a potential cause of changes between readings in this passage.

More plausible transcriptional causes of transitions between readings are detailed in Table A.25.

TABLE A.25: Transcriptional causes for Eph 5:14/18–26.

<i>From</i>	<i>To</i>	<i>Tag</i>	<i>Note</i>
<i>a–b</i>	<i>c</i>	HomArcWord	Homoioarcton from <i>surge</i> to <i>exsurge</i> in Latin
		HomTelLetter	Loss of ἔγειρε ὁ καθεύδων καί or ἔγειραι ὁ καθεύδων καί after λέγει by homoioteleuton from -ι to -ι
		Sem	Flattening of the quoted passage for commentary (on the part of Marius Victorinus)
<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	AurConf	Change from ἔγειρε to ἔγειραι or vice-versa due to confusion of sounds ε and αι
<i>b</i>	<i>a</i>		
<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	Idio	Change from the present active ἔγειρε to the aorist middle ἔγειραι as a <i>construction ad sensum</i> : the aorist middle, while less idiomatic, intuitively suits the sense of awakening oneself, and it agrees with the aorist middle ἀνάστα

172. Diacritic-sensitive searches on TLG (Thesaurus Linguae Graecae© Digital Library, ed. Maria C. Pantelia, University of California, Irvine, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu> [accessed 24 May 2023]) for ἔγειρε and ἔγειραι returned 292 results for ἔγειρε, thirty-three before the first century CE, and 199 for ἔγειραι, none before the first century CE. Apart from one potential first-century source, ἔγειραι is not first attested until the second century CE.

From	To	Tag	Note
<i>b</i>	<i>a</i>	Idio	Change from the aorist ἔγειραι to the present ἔγειρε to conform to the idiomatic usage of the present imperative ἔγειρε as an interjection or to classical usage, in which ἔγειρε is more prevalent
<i>a–b</i>	<i>c</i>	Byz	Byzantine assimilation (the Byzantine tradition is divided between ἔγειρε and ἔγειραι)
<i>a, c</i>	<i>b</i>		

#### A.13.5 Post-Analysis Results

The posterior probabilities for readings based on sampled stemmata are given in Table A.26.

TABLE A.26: Reading posterior probabilities for Eph 5:14/18–26.

Reading	Significant support	Posterior
<i>a</i> : ἐγειρε ὁ καθευδων και αναστα	P46 01r 02 03 06 012 025 044 075 0150*f 0150C 0278 81 88 263 442 915 1175 1398 1739 1834r 1836V 1840* 1908 1910* 1962 2011 2464r 2805 Or NA <sup>28</sup> RP SBL TH WH	99.996%
<i>b</i> : ἐγειραι ὁ καθευδων και αναστα	6 33V 94 181 256 606 1678 1840C 1881 1910C 1985 1987 1991V 2008 2492 2576 syr <sup>h</sup> Thret	0.004%
<i>c</i> : αναστα	MVict	0.000%

Based on the preponderance of external evidence, the posterior probabilities decisively confirm my judgment in favor of the reading with ἔγειρε, in agreement with all modern critical editions.

## A.14 5:15/2-10: βλέπετε οὖν ἀκριβῶς πῶς περιπατεῖτε

5:8 ἦτε γάρ ποτε σκότος, νῦν δὲ φῶς ἐν κυρίῳ· ὡς τέκνα φωτὸς περιπατεῖτε, ... 14 ... διὸ λέγει·

2 4 6 8 10 12 14 16 18 20 22 24 26 14 16

Ἔγειρε, ὁ καθεύδων, καὶ ἀνάστα ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, καὶ ἐπιφάνῃ σοι ὁ χριστός. 15 Ὁ βλέπετε οὖν

18 20 22 24 26 28 30 32 34 36 38 40 42 2 4

ἀκριβῶς πῶς περιπατεῖτε, μὴ ὡς ἄσοφοι ἀλλ' ὡς σοφοί,

6 8 10 12 14 16 18 20 22

## A.14.1 Apparatus

a: βλέπετε οὖν ἀκριβῶς πῶς περιπατεῖτε	(P46r 0150) <sup>173</sup> 01* 03*r 03C2 048V 0278 33V 81 104 436 442 459 915 1175 1241r 1311 1739 1834V 1893 1962 2344V; cop <sup>sa</sup> ; Or; NA <sup>28</sup> SBL TH Tisch WH
b: βλέπετε οὖν ἀκριβῶς ἀδελφοί μου πῶς περιπατεῖτε	cop <sup>bo</sup>
c: βλέπετε οὖν πῶς ἀκριβῶς περιπατεῖτε	06 010r 012r 018 020 025 044 049*V 049CV 056 075 0142 0151 0319V 1 6 18 35 38 42 61 69r 88 93 94V 102 177 181*r 181C 203S 218 223 234 256 263 296f 322 326 330f 337 363 365 383 390 398 424 451 462r 467 506 606 636 664 665 912 1069 1108 1115 1127 1240 1245 1319 1398 1490 1505 1509 1573 1611 1617 1678 1718 1721 1729r 1751r (1831) <sup>174</sup> (1836) <sup>175</sup> 1837 1838V 1840 1851 1860 1863 1877 1881 1886 1896 1908 1910 1912 1918r 1939 1959 1963 1985 1987 1991 1996 1999 2004 2005 2008 2011 2012 2085 2127 2138 2180 2243 2352 2400 2492 2495 2523 2544 2516f 2576 2865S L23 L156 L169 L1159 L1178 L1188 L1298 L1440 L2058/1f L2058/2r L2058/3; VL51 VL77 VL78 VL86*V VL89; syr; Ambst Bas Hier Lcf MVict ThMops; Lach RP TR Treg
d: βλέπετε οὖν ἀδελφοί πῶς ἀκριβῶς περιπατεῖτε	01C2 02 629 1942 (2464rV) <sup>176</sup> L1126; VL54 VL61 VL62 VL65 VL86C2 vg; (CaesA) <sup>177</sup> Pel
e: βλέπετε οὖν ἀκριβῶς περιπατεῖτε	
f: βλέπετε οὖν πῶς περιπατεῖτε	VL75 VL76
a/c/d:	Chr [c $\gg$ a = d] <sup>178</sup>

173. βλέπετε οὖν ἀκριβῶς πῶς περιπατῆτε (itacism or clarification to make explicit the perceived subjunctive force of the indicative περιπατεῖτε after πῶς).

174. βλέπετε οὖν πῶς ἀκριβῶς περιπατῆτε (itacism or clarification to make explicit the perceived subjunctive force of the indicative περιπατεῖτε after πῶς).

175. βλέπετε πῶς ἀκριβῶς περιπατεῖτε (parablepsis, or a reading supplied from a commentary where οὖν had been dropped in a paraphrase).

176. βλέπετε οὖν, ἀδελφοί, πῶς ἀκριβῶς περιπατῆτε (itacism or clarification to make explicit the perceived subjunctive force of the indicative περιπατεῖτε after πῶς).

177. *videte, fratres, quomodo caute ambuletis* (adaptation for commentary).

178. The text underlying this patristic citation is uncertain, and the textual tradition of this father is divided; see §B.24.1.

c/d:

Thret [c  $\overset{B}{\gg}$  d]<sup>179</sup>

#### A.14.2 Overview

This passages features multiple points of variation. The most divisive of these, and the one most discussed by commentators, is the difference in word order between πῶς ἀκριβῶς, with both words adverbially modifying περιπατεῖτε (“walk”), and ἀκριβῶς πῶς, with the first word modifying βλέπετε (“see”) and the second modifying περιπατεῖτε. Two other variant readings, which add either ἀδελφοί (“brothers”) or ἀδελφοί μου (“my brothers”) to each of these main variants, are also occasionally noted by commentators. Finally, the shortest two readings feature πῶς without ἀκριβῶς (a sequence attested only in VL75, VL76, and the Ethiopic version) and ἀκριβῶς without πῶς (a sequence not attested in any collated witness but whose occurrence is assumed under certain two-step transcriptional explanations). Externally, most modern commentators find the early manuscript evidence for βλέπετε οὖν ἀκριβῶς πῶς περιπατεῖτε compelling,<sup>180</sup> and their judgment is reflected in most critical editions. But as at least one other commentator has noted, the reading βλέπετε οὖν ἀκριβῶς πῶς περιπατεῖτε has geographically widespread attestation, with early versional and patristic support.<sup>181</sup>

#### A.14.3 Intrinsic Probabilities

In terms of coherence with the author’s argument, πῶς and πῶς ἀκριβῶς are slightly more likely than ἀκριβῶς πῶς, and syntactically, all three of these sequences are absolutely more likely than ἀκριβῶς. To start with the easiest judgment, ἀκριβῶς alone is not viable because the subordinate clause after βλέπετε would have to be introduced with something like πῶς,<sup>182</sup> ὅτι,<sup>183</sup> or ἵνα,<sup>184</sup> or the verb for “walk” would at least have to be conjugated differently.<sup>185</sup> If πῶς alone is read, then the correspondence between this phrase and the next is straightforward: the πῶς phrase modifies περιπατεῖτε (“how you walk”) and cataphorically refers to the contrastive ὡς phrase that follows (“not as unwise, but as wise”). If πῶς ἀκριβῶς is read, then both phrases still modify περιπατεῖτε, but “unwise” and “wise” now correspond to degrees of “how carefully you walk.” If ἀκριβῶς πῶς is read, then ἀκριβῶς modifies βλέπετε, and the straightforward πῶς-ὡς construction is maintained. The first two of these three sequences exclusively qualify walking, and

179. The textual tradition of this father is divided; see §B.24.2.

180. METZGER, 540; LINCOLN 337 n. a; BEST, 503; MACDONALD, 317; MERKLE, 199; HOUGHTON, 472.

181. HOEHNER 690 n. 1.

182. Cf. βλέπετε οὖν πῶς ἀκούετε in Luke 8:18.

183. Cf. Ἄλλ’ ἐντύχετε μὲν ὑμεῖς καὶ βλέπετε ὅτι, ἃ πεποίηκεν ὁ Χριστός, θεὸν αὐτὸν ἀποδείκνυσιν in Athanasius, *Vit. Ant.* 75.4 (SC 400:328).

184. Cf. βλέπετε ἵνα ἀφόβως γένηται in 1 Cor 16:10.

185. When βλέπετε is followed by a negative injunction, μή or a similar particle followed by a subjunctive verb is typically sufficient (cf. Matt 24:4//Mark 13:5//Luke 21:8; Acts 13:40; 1 Cor 8:9; Gal 5:15; Col 2:8; Heb 3:12; 12:25). Examples with positive injunctions typically have some conjunction following βλέπετε.



they cohere well with the author's concern for how his readers walk, expressed through similar adverbial qualifications involving ἄξιως (4:1), ἐν ματαιότητι (4:17), ἐν ἀγάπῃ (5:1), and ὡς τέκνα φωτὸς (5:8). An injunction that further characterizes the readers' walk as careful or shrewd also anticipates the author's subsequent practical emphasis on "redeeming the time" to please the lord.<sup>186</sup> The sequence ἀκριβῶς πῶς, by contrast, qualifies seeing more than walking, and it thus renders the admonition primarily one of self-examination rather than right conduct, in distinction to the rest of the passage.<sup>187</sup> But since the πῶς and the subsequent ὡς phrase still qualify περιπατεῖτε, I consider this reading only slightly less fitting than πῶς and πῶς ἀκριβῶς.

Stylistic considerations are non-probative in further distinguishing between πῶς, πῶς ἀκριβῶς, and ἀκριβῶς πῶς. In terms of general usage, the ἀκριβῶς in the latter two sequences seems superfluous for different reasons. If πῶς ἀκριβῶς is read, then the περιπατεῖτε already modified by the following ὡς phrase is further modified by ἀκριβῶς. If ἀκριβῶς πῶς is read, then βλέπω ("see to it," "take care," "beware"), which already has the valence of precision or caution, is modified by an adverb meaning "carefully."<sup>188</sup> But in terms of our author's own usage, repetition for emphasis is fully within the bounds of his style, as the ἵστε γινώσκοντες of 5:5 indicates.

Much less can be said regarding the inclusion or exclusion of ἀδελφοί or ἀδελφοί μου. A vocative address is perfectly viable here, as the author has turned from a quotation addressing the "sleeper" of 5:14 back to addressing the readers of the epistle directly. But the shift from the second-person singular of 5:14 to the second-person plural imperative βλέπετε already implies the change in addressee that the vocative makes explicit, and the resumptive οὖν also indicates that the author is returning to the address he was previously giving to his readers. Since an explicit vocative address neither adds to nor detracts from the author's argument, I consider its inclusion as intrinsically likely as its exclusion.

We can now rank the relative intrinsic probabilities of the variant readings in light of these

186. HAUPT, 214–15; SALMOND, 360; HOEHNER, 691.

187. HAUPT, 214–15; SALMOND, 361; HOEHNER, 691; *contra* BARTH 2:577. The idea of "seeing clearly" is probably not suggested by the preceding elaboration about deeds done in darkness and their exposure to the light (5:9–14) for two reasons. First, the conclusive διό in 5:14 and the resumptive οὖν here suggest that the author has ended his elaboration and returned to his main point about the Christian walk (HOEHNER, 690–91). Second, even if the preceding discussion were peripherally in view, it is more concerned with deeds and participating in them than it is with the accurate discernment of light from dark (HAUPT, 214).

188. Thus, John Muddiman calls βλέπετε ἀκριβῶς "a virtual tautology" (MUDDIMAN, 245). No other imperative of βλέπω is adverbially modified in the New Testament (HOEHNER 690 n. 1), and in other contemporary Greek literature, nothing like ἀκριβῶς is used to modify an imperative of βλέπω. Based on a TLG textual search (2 January 2024) for imperative forms of βλέπω followed by an adverb at most two words later, the only remotely comparable instances through the third century CE were βλέψον καθαρῶς καὶ ἡλαρῶς ("look purely and cheerfully"), from the *Apotelesmata* spuriously attributed to Apollonius, and βλέπε αἰσθητῶς ("see literally"), from Origen, *Hom. Pss.* 36.3.3 (GCS 2/19:143). In both cases, the adverbs convey an idea that βλέπω alone could not convey. *Contra* SCHNACKENBURG 234 n. 3, BEST, 503, and HOUGHTON, 472, αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἀκριβῶς οἶδατε in 1 Thess 5:2 is not comparable, because οἶδα ἀκριβῶς is an idiom widely attested in ancient Greek literature. A TLG search (2 January 2024) for any form of βλέπω followed by ἀκριβῶς at most two words later returned thirty-seven results, only two of which predate the New Testament (and which appear to be from different editions of the same work), while a search for any form of οἶδα followed by ἀκριβῶς at most two words later returned 460 results, sixty-nine of which predate the New Testament.

considerations. On the basis of coherence with the author's argument, the readings βλέπετε οὖν πῶς ἀκριβῶς περιπατεῖτε (c) and βλέπετε οὖν πῶς περιπατεῖτε (f) are slightly more likely than βλέπετε οὖν ἀκριβῶς πῶς περιπατεῖτε (a), and on the basis of syntax, all three of these readings are absolutely more likely than βλέπετε οὖν ἀκριβῶς περιπατεῖτε (e). Because considerations of the author's argument are non-probative regarding the inclusion of an explicit vocative address, βλέπετε οὖν πῶς ἀκριβῶς περιπατεῖτε (c) and βλέπετε οὖν ἀκριβῶς πῶς περιπατεῖτε (a) are as likely as their respective counterparts βλέπετε οὖν, ἀδελφοί, πῶς ἀκριβῶς περιπατεῖτε (d) and βλέπετε οὖν ἀκριβῶς, ἀδελφοί μου, πῶς περιπατεῖτε (b). I therefore rate the relative intrinsic probabilities of the readings as follows:  $c = d = f \overset{D}{\gg} a = b \overset{A}{\gg} e$ .

#### A.14.4 *Transcriptional Probabilities*

Before I summarize the potential transcriptional factors at work in this passage, a brief word is in order regarding the readings that include vocative phrases. While ἀδελφοί would be the usual vocative included in a lectionary incipit, none of the lectionaries collated for this study give any indication of a lection beginning at this verse. So on the basis of our sample of the lectionary tradition, we have no reason to suppose that the addition was made for liturgical reasons.<sup>189</sup> It is more likely that an emendator interested in making explicit that the addressee had changed from the “sleeper” of the previous verse back to the readers (and not seeing the resumptive οὖν as sufficient for the task) could have added the vocative most commonly used in the Pauline Epistles. This alternate hypothesis finds support in the reading of the Bohairic Coptic version, βλέπετε οὖν ἀκριβῶς, ἀδελφοί μου, πῶς περιπατεῖτε, because ἀδελφοί alone, and not ἀδελφοί μου, is the standard vocative for lectionary incipits.

It is also worth noting that text-critical suspicions of liturgical interpolation could have motivated the excision of ἀδελφοί or ἀδελφοί μου. While it is commonly argued that the vocative phrases must be secondary because there is no reason why either would be removed if it were original,<sup>190</sup> this epistle already features what is surely an excision of an ἀμήν (in 3:21) by a minority of witnesses.

With those points established, the transcriptional causes of transitions between readings are detailed in Table A.27.

189. Harless may be aware of another part of the lectionary tradition when he claims that “an ecclesiastical lection” [“einer lect. ecclesiast.”] began here (HARLESS, 475), but he does not cite any manuscript evidence to support this claim.

190. METZGER, 540; followed by LINCOLN 337 n. a; BEST, 503; and MERKLE, 200.



TABLE A.27: Transcriptional causes for Eph 5:15/2–10.

<i>From</i>	<i>To</i>	<i>Tag</i>	<i>Note</i>
<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	Sem	Addition of ἀδελφοί (μου) before πῶς to clarify the shift in addressee from the “sleeper” of 5:14 back to the readers
<i>c</i>	<i>d</i>		
<i>a</i>	<i>c</i>	Prag	Transposition of ἀκριβῶς πῶς to πῶς ἀκριβῶς to place ἀκριβῶς more clearly in apposition to μὴ ὡς ἄσοφοι ἀλλ’ ὡς σοφοί (WEISS, 135)
<i>a</i>	<i>e</i>	HomArcLetter	Loss of πῶς after ἀκριβῶς by homoioarcton from πῶς to περιπατεῖτε
		HomTelPart	Loss of πῶς after ἀκριβῶς by homoioteleuton
<i>c</i>	<i>a</i>	Prag	Transposition of πῶς ἀκριβῶς to ἀκριβῶς πῶς to associate each of βλέπετε and περιπατεῖτε with a different adverbial phrase (MOULE, 134) or to associate ἀκριβῶς with βλέπετε, which has a more intellectual valence (MUDDIMAN, 245)
<i>c</i>	<i>f</i>	HomTelPart	Loss of ἀκριβῶς after πῶς by homoioteleuton
<i>b</i>	<i>a</i>	Sem	Deletion of ἀδελφοί (μου) as a perceived intrusion from the lectionary tradition
<i>d</i>	<i>c</i>		
<i>e</i>	<i>a, c</i>	Prag	Addition of πῶς before or after ἀκριβῶς to render the phrase syntactically viable
<i>f</i>	<i>a, c</i>	Sem	Addition of ἀκριβῶς before or after πῶς
<i>a–b, d–f</i>	<i>c</i>	Byz	Byzantine assimilation

A.14.5 Post-Analysis Results

The posterior probabilities for readings based on sampled stemmata are given in Table A.28.

TABLE A.28: Reading posterior probabilities for Eph 5:15/2–10.

Reading	Significant support	Posterior
a: βλέπετε οὖν ἀκριβῶς πῶς περιπατεῖτε	(P46r) 01* 03*r 03C2 (0150) 0278 33V 81 442 915 1175 1739 1834V 1962 cop <sup>sa</sup> Or NA <sup>28</sup> SBL TH WH	98.420%
c: βλέπετε οὖν πῶς ἀκριβῶς περιπατεῖτε	06 012r 025 044 075 6 88 94V 181*r 181C 256 263 606 1398 1678 (1836) 1840 1881 1908 1910 1985 1987 1991 2008 2011 2492 2576 VL77 VL89 syr Ambst Hier MVict ThMops RP	1.548%
f: βλέπετε οὖν πῶς περιπατεῖτε	VL75	0.024%
b: βλέπετε οὖν ἀκριβῶς ἀδελφοὶ μου πῶς περιπατεῖτε	cop <sup>bo</sup>	0.008%
d: βλέπετε οὖν ἀδελφοὶ πῶς ἀκριβῶς περιπατεῖτε	01C2 02 (2464rV) VL61 vg Pel	0.000%
e: βλέπετε οὖν ἀκριβῶς περιπατεῖτε		0.000%

The slight intrinsic advantage of the reading βλέπετε οὖν πῶς ἀκριβῶς περιπατεῖτε is neutralized in the posterior probability distribution, which strongly favors βλέπετε οὖν ἀκριβῶς πῶς περιπατεῖτε. The latter reading likely comes out ahead on external grounds, as it enjoys the support of the earliest Greek witnesses, and on transcriptional grounds, as πῶς is doubly at risk of being dropped by haplography if it is between ἀκριβῶς and περιπατεῖτε. This result demonstrates the resilience of Bayesian phylogenetics in weighing and combining different types of evidence. It also confirms the judgment of all modern critical editions.

A.15 **5:17/6-14:** μὴ γίνεσθε ἄφρονες, ἀλλὰ συνιέτε

5:17 διὰ τοῦτο ἴμῃ γίνεσθε ἄφρονες, ἀλλὰ συνίετε ὅτι τὸ θέλημα τοῦ κυρίου.

2      4      6      8      10      12      14      16 18      20      22      24

#### A.15.1 Apparatus

<i>α: μη γινεσθε αφρονες αλλα συνιετε</i>	P46r 01 02r 03r 025 0278 6 33 81 256 263 330 365 424C1 442 451 1241r 1319 1398 1573r 1739 1834 1877 1962 2127r 2400 2492 2516r 2523; syr <sup>p</sup> cop; Hier; Lach NA <sup>28</sup> SBL Tisch Treg TH WH
<i>β: μη γινεσθε αφρονες αλλα συνιεντες</i>	06C2 018 020 044 049 056 075 0142 0150 0151 0319C0 1 18 35 38*r 38Cr 42 61 69 88r 93 94V 102 104 177 181r 203S 218 223 234 296 322 326 337 363 383 390 398 424* 436 459 462r 467 506 606 629 636 664 665 912 915 1069 1108 1115 1127 1175r 1240V 1245 1311 1490 1505 1509 1611 1617 1678 1718 1721 1729r 1751r 1831 1836 1837 1840 1851 1860 1863 1881 1886 1893 1896 1908 1910 1912 1918r 1939 1942 1959 1963 1985 1987f 1991 1996 1999 2004 2005 2008 2011 2012 2085 2138 2180 2243r 2344 2352 2464r 2495 2544r 2576 2865Srf L23 L156 L169 L1126r L1159 L1178 L1188r L1440r L1298 L2058; syr <sup>h</sup> ; Bas Thret; RP TR
<i>γ: μη γινεσθε αφρονες αλλα συνιοντες</i>	06*r 010r 012r 0319*
<i>α/β/γ:</i>	048 (μη γινεσθε [...] συν[...])
<i>β/γ:</i>	VL61 VL75 VL86 Ambst Lcf MVict Pel ( <i>nolite effici imprudentes sed intelligentes</i> ); VL76 ( <i>nolite effici imprudentes sed intelligentes</i> ); VL62 VL65 VL89 vg <sup>ww</sup> vg <sup>st</sup> Caesa ( <i>nolite fieri imprudentes sed intelligentes</i> ); VL78 ( <i>nolite fieri imprudentes sed intelligentes</i> ); VL51 VL54 ( <i>nolite fieri imprudentes sed intelligentes</i> ); VL77 vg <sup>cl</sup> ( <i>nolite fieri imprudentes sed intelligentes</i> ); ThMops ( <i>nolite fieri insipientes sed intelligentes</i> ); goth <sup>A</sup> (𐌺𐌹 𐌶𐌹𐌸𐌹𐌸𐌹𐌺 𐌽𐌹𐌶𐌹𐌸𐌹𐌺 𐌶𐌹𐌸𐌹𐌸𐌹𐌺𐌹𐌸𐌹𐌺)
<i>α/β:</i>	Chr [b <sup>D</sup> ≫ a] <sup>191</sup> Or [a = b] <sup>192</sup>

### A.15.2 Overview

The primary question in this passage is whether the author implies contrasting instructions with two predicate adjectives (“do not become become senseless, but understanding”) or explicitly offers two contrasting imperatives (“do not become senseless, but understand”). Intrinsically, commentators have acknowledged that the choice of reading has little bearing on the author’s argument.<sup>193</sup> They have also judged, probably correctly, that the participle *συνιόντες* attested in some witnesses is just a less-common form of the *συνιέντες* found in most witnesses.<sup>194</sup> In terms

191. The textual tradition of this father is divided; see §B.25.1.

192. The text underlying this patristic citation is uncertain; see §B.25.2.

193. BEST, 506.

194. For this very reason, it is preferred on transcriptional grounds by HARLESS, 477 and MEYER, 261. While the underlying verb can have the sense “attending to, taking part in” (LSJ, s.v. *σύνεμι*, A.II.5), it expects a dative

of the author’s style, the most comparable contrastive phrase in this epistle occurs in 2:19, and there, the textual tradition is similarly divided between οὐκέτι ἐστὲ ξένοι καὶ πάροικοι, ἀλλὰ ἐστὲ συμπολίται and οὐκέτι ἐστὲ ξένοι καὶ πάροικοι ἀλλὰ συμπολίται. Since transcriptional evidence is similarly undecisive, the predominance of the reading with συνίετε in modern editions is seemingly due to its early Greek manuscript support.

#### A.15.3 Intrinsic Probabilities

As noted above, intrinsic considerations of the author’s argument and style are non-probative regarding all points of variation in this passage. I therefore regard all of the readings as equally likely:  $a = b = c$ .

#### A.15.4 Transcriptional Probabilities

The transcriptional causes of transitions between readings are detailed in Table A.29.

TABLE A.29: Transcriptional causes for Eph 5:17/6–14.

<i>From</i>	<i>To</i>	<i>Tag</i>	<i>Note</i>
<i>a</i>	<i>b–c</i>	Idio	Change from συνίετε to a participle as a stylistic improvement to produce two contrasting predicate adjectives after γίνεσθε
		IntAssim	Change from συνίετε to a participle to assimilate to the participial phrase δοκιμάζοντες τί ἐστὶν εὐάρεστον τῷ κυρίῳ in 5:10 (HOEHNER 697 n. 1)
<i>b–c</i>	<i>a</i>	Idio	Change from a participle to the imperative συνίετε as a stylistic improvement to contrast a positive imperative with the negative imperative μὴ γίνεσθε ἄφρονες or as a grammatical clarification that τί τὸ θέλημα τοῦ κυρίου is the argument of συνίημι, but not ἄφρων (which does not take an argument)
		IntAssim	Change from a participle to the imperative συνίετε to conform to the other imperatives in this passage (EADIE, 404)

argument in this case, and neither τί τὸ θέλημα τοῦ κυρίου nor any of its variants is a dative noun phrase. A TLG textual search (27 February 2024) for any forms of σύνεμι (from εἰμι) followed by an accusative noun at most three words later returned seventeen results through the third century CE. In all cases, the accusative noun is not the object of σύνεμι, but the object of another verb later in the sentence or part of a prepositional phrase modifying σύνεμι (typically headed by εἰς, ἀνά, or κατὰ to indicate where or how people meet together).

<i>From</i>	<i>To</i>	<i>Tag</i>	<i>Note</i>
<i>b</i>	<i>c</i>	Idio	Change from <i>συνιέντες</i> to <i>συνιόντες</i> or vice-versa due to local orthographic conventions or crystallizing orthographic conventions, respectively (in favor of the latter view, see HARLESS, 477; MEYER, 261)
<i>c</i>	<i>b</i>		
<i>a, c</i>	<i>b</i>	Byz	Byzantine assimilation

A.15.5 *Post-Analysis Results*

The posterior probabilities for readings based on sampled stemmata are given in Table A.30.

TABLE A.30: Reading posterior probabilities for Eph 5:17/6–14.

<i>Reading</i>	<i>Significant support</i>	<i>Posterior</i>
<i>a</i> : μη γινεσθε αφρονες αλλα συνιετε	P46r 01 02r 03r 025 0278 6 33 81 256 263 424C1 442 1398 1739 1834 1962 2492 syr <sup>p</sup> cop Hier NA <sup>28</sup> SBL TH WH	99.896%
<i>c</i> : μη γινεσθε αφρονες αλλα συνιοντες	06*r 012r	0.072%
<i>b</i> : μη γινεσθε αφρονες αλλα συνιεντες	06C2 044 075 0150 88r 94V 181r 606 915 1175r 1678 1836 1840 1881 1908 1910 1985 1987f 1991 2008 2011 2464r 2576 syr <sup>h</sup> Thret RP	0.032%

The posterior probabilities break the intrinsic tie between all three readings decisively in favor of the reading with *συνιετε*. Since the transcriptional probabilities between the readings are largely symmetric, this reading apparently wins out on the strength of external evidence. My analysis thus confirms the judgment of all modern critical editions regarding the support of external evidence for the reading with *συνιετε*.

## A.16 5:23/30: σωτήρ

5:23 ὅτι ἀνὴρ ἐστὶν κεφαλὴ τῆς γυναικὸς ὡς καὶ ὁ χριστὸς κεφαλὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, αὐτὸς ὡς σωτήρ  
 2 4 6 8 10 12 14 16 18 20 22 24 26 28 30  
 τοῦ σώματος. 5:24 ἀλλὰ ὡς ἡ ἐκκλησία ὑποτάσσεται τῷ χριστῷ, οὕτως καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες τοῖς  
 32 34 2 4 6 8 10 12 14 16 18 20 22 24  
 ἀνδράσιν ἐν παντί.  
 26 28 30

## A.16.1 Apparatus

a: σωτηρ	01C2 03 06 010*r 010C 012 018 020 025 044 048V 049 056 075 0142 0150 0151 0278 0319 1 6 18 35 42 61 69 81 88 93 94 102 104 177 181 203S 223 234 256 263 322 326 330 337 363 365 383 390 398 424 442 436 451 459 462 506 606 629 636 664 665 915 1069 1108 1175 1240 1241 1245 1311 1319 1398 1490 1505 1509 1573 1611 1617 1678 1718 1721 1729 1751 1831 1834 1837 1840C 1851 1860 1863 1877 1886 1893 1896 1908 1910 1912 1918 1939 1942 1962 1963 (1985 2492) <sup>195</sup> 1987 1991 1996 1999 2004 2008 2011 2012 2085 2127 2138 2180 2243 2344 2352 2400 2495 2516 2523 (2544*) <sup>196</sup> 2544C0 2576 2865S L156 L169 L587 L809 L1159 L1178 L1188 L1440 L2010 L2058; syr <sup>h</sup> ; Bas <sup>197</sup> ; Lach NA <sup>28</sup> RP SBL TH Tisch Treg TR WH
b: ο σωτηρ	01* 02 33 38 218 296 467 1115 1127 1739 1836* 1836Cf 1881 1959 2005 2464V; cop; Cl ThMops
a/b	P46 ([...] [...]ηρ); 1840* (-) <sup>198</sup> ; VL <sub>51</sub> VL <sub>54</sub> VL <sub>61</sub> VL <sub>62</sub> VL <sub>65</sub> VL <sub>75</sub> VL <sub>76</sub> VL <sub>77</sub> VL <sub>78</sub> VL <sub>86</sub> VL <sub>87</sub> VL <sub>89</sub> vg; Ambst Hier MVict Pel ( <i>salvator</i> ); syr <sup>p</sup> (ܣܠܘܬܐ) goth <sup>A</sup> (𐌺𐌹𐌸𐌹𐌸𐌹𐌺𐌾𐌹𐌸𐌹𐌺𐌹)

## A.16.2 Overview

The question is whether the author refers to Christ as “savior” of “the savior” of the body in his twofold description of Christ’s relationship to the church. This question has received virtually no attention in the commentaries, despite an early split in the external evidence, probably due to the subtlety of the difference between the reading with the article and the reading without it.<sup>199</sup> Perhaps most salient to intrinsic probabilities is the judgment of some commentators that this second half of the twofold description of Christ is parenthetical and meant to clarify that Christ

195. πατήρ (paleographic confusion of *nomen sacrum*).

196. κεφαλὴ (dittography or harmonization; this witness reads ἐστι just before this unit, and it reads ἐστι κε-  
 φαλή earlier in the verse).

197. See §B.28.1.

198. The first hand of 1840 seems to have skipped over σωτήρ by an oversight of its three-letter *nomen sacrum*.

199. Eadie and Robinson mention the reading ὁ σωτήρ in passing, but they only note its manuscript support (EADIE, 420; ROBINSON, 301). Meyer assumes the reading ὁ σωτήρ here (MEYER, 290), but he does not explain why.

himself (αὐτός) has power with respect to the church that a husband does not have with respect to his wife.<sup>200</sup> The discussion that follows will assess this argument and other evidence in the passage.

#### A.16.3 *Intrinsic Probabilities*

Considerations of information structure and the relationship of this phrase to the preceding one favor σωτήρ over ὁ σωτήρ. As a predicate noun relating to αὐτός, σωτήρ has an identifying function if it takes the article and a classifying or qualitative function if it does not.<sup>201</sup> In the preceding phrase that describes Christ as κεφαλὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, the anarthrous κεφαλὴ has a classifying function describing Christ's role with respect to the church.<sup>202</sup> A parallel classifying predicate in this phrase is fitting in light of the close connection between that phrase and the present one, which is suggested by their shared “head-body” language<sup>203</sup> and the probable asyndeton separating them.<sup>204</sup> While the identification of Christ as “the savior” with ὁ σωτήρ is both grammatically viable and coherent with the author's view of Christ, it less effectively conveys the parallel between Christ's role as “head” and his role as “savior.” I therefore consider σωτήρ (a) intrinsically more likely than ὁ σωτήρ (b):  $a \overset{C}{\gg} b$ .

#### A.16.4 *Transcriptional Probabilities*

A brief word is in order before I offer a summary of potential transcriptional factors in this passage. For Christian readers, the unique association of Christ with the title “savior” would have been cemented through theology and liturgy. Such an association could have inspired a change from the anarthrous σωτήρ, which has a classifying function, to ὁ σωτήρ, which has an identifying function.<sup>205</sup>

This and other potential causes of transitions between readings are summarized in Table A.31.

200. SCHNACKENBURG, 247; J. Paul Sampley, “And the Two Shall Become One Flesh”: A Study of Traditions in Ephesians 5:21–33, SNTSMS 16 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971), 122–25.

201. Levinsohn, *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek*, 148–49; Bakker, *Noun Phrase in Ancient Greek*, 190–95; for an illustrated introduction to the distinction between qualitative and definite nouns, see Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996), 244–45.

202. Remarkably, all of the Greek witnesses collated for this study agree that the preceding κεφαλὴ is anarthrous.

203. Gregory W. Dawes sees this semantic link as indicating a dependent relationship between this phrase and the previous one, and he notes that this parenthetical remark in the current discussion of headship anticipates the author's subsequent discussion of the church as Christ's body in 5:28–32 (*The Body in Question: Metaphor and Meaning in the Interpretation of Ephesians 5:21–33*, BIS 30 [Leiden: Brill, 1998], 151–52).

204. The presence or absence of καί before this phrase is textually contested, but early Eastern and Western witnesses lack the conjunction.

205. As Bernhard Weiss has noted, the addition of the article in places where it would be syntactically permissible or found in other passages is a common error (WEISS, 76).

TABLE A.31: Transcriptional causes for Eph 5:23/30.

<i>From</i>	<i>To</i>	<i>Tag</i>	<i>Note</i>
<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	ExtAssim	Addition of <i>ὁ</i> before <i>σωτήρ</i> informed by the common identification of Christ as “the savior” in liturgy and catechesis
<i>b</i>	<i>a</i>	IntAssim	Deletion of <i>ὁ</i> before <i>σωτήρ</i> to assimilate to the preceding <i>κεφαλὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας</i>
<i>b</i>	<i>a</i>	Byz	Byzantine assimilation

A.16.5 *Post-Analysis Results*

The posterior probabilities for readings based on sampled stemmata are given in Table A.32.

TABLE A.32: Reading posterior probabilities for Eph 5:23/30.

<i>Reading</i>	<i>Significant support</i>	<i>Posterior</i>
<i>a: σωτηρ</i>	01C2 03 06 012 025 044 075 0150 0278 6 81 88 94 181 256 263 442 606 915 1175 1398 1678 1834 1840C 1908 1910 1962 (1985) 1987 1991 2008 2011 (2492) 2576 syr <sup>h</sup> Thret NA <sup>28</sup> RP SBL TH WH	83.341%
<i>b: ο σωτηρ</i>	01* 02 33 1739 1836* 1836Cf 1881 2464V cop ThMops	16.659%

Based on the preponderance of external evidence, the posterior probabilities confirm my judgments on intrinsic probabilities in favor of *σωτήρ*, though only slightly. The odds ratio of the more-likely reading to the less-likely one is about 5, which is between the numerical values assigned to a *D* rating and a *C* rating in this study. The reading *ὁ σωτήρ* has early support, but it appears to have arisen in multiple branches of the tradition independently. Given the transcriptional factors I detail above, this is an expected scenario, and Bayesian phylogenetics produces results in accordance with this scenario. In future analyses, the use of non-uniform equilibrium frequencies for readings (as described in chapter ??) to model the perceived superiority of the arthrous reading to emendators would likely confer an even greater advantage to the anarthrous reading.



## A.17 5:31/10–18: τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα

5:31 ἀντὶ τούτου καταλείψει ἄνθρωπος ἃ τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα<sup>1</sup> καὶ προσκολληθήσεται τῇ  
 2 4 6 8 10 12 14 16 18 20 22 24  
 γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν.  
 26 28 30 32 34 36 38 40 42

## A.17.1 Apparatus

a: τον πατερα και την μητερα	P46 01* 6 33 81 218 424C1 442 1115 1241 1739* 1834 1840 1910 2008 2464; Or; NA <sup>28</sup> txt SBL TH Tisch WH <sup>txt</sup>
b: πατερα και μητερα	03 06* 010 012; Lach NA <sup>28</sup> mg Treg WH <sup>mg</sup>
c: τον πατερα αυτου και την μητερα	01C2 02 06C2 018 020 044 049 056 0142 0151 0278 0319 1 18 35 42 61 69 88 93 94 102 177 181 203S 223 234 263 322 326 330 337 363 365 383 390 398 424* 436 451 462 506 636 664 665 912 1069 1127 1240 1245 1311 1319 1398 1490 1509 1617 1678 1718V 1721 1729 1739C 1751 1831 1834 1836 1837 1851 1860 1863 1877 1881 1886 1893 1896 1912 1918f 1942 1962 1985 1987 1991 2004 2011 2085 2127 2180 2344 2352 2400 2492 2516 2523 2544 2576 L156 L169 L587 L809 L1159 L1178 L1188 L1440 L2010 L2058; Meth; RP TR
d: τον πατερα και την μητερα αυτου	0150 296 1108 1505 1611 2005 2138 2495; VL51 VL62 VL65 VL86C2 VL87 vg syr <sup>h</sup>
e: τον πατερα αυτου και την μητερα αυτου	025 075 38 104 459 467 606 629 915 1175 1573 1908 1939 1959 1963 1996 1999 2012 2243 2865; syr <sup>p</sup> cop; Epiph ThMops Thret
a/b/d:	Pel [a = b $\overset{C}{\gg}$ d] <sup>206</sup>
a/b:	VL54 VL61 VL75 VL76 VL77 VL78 VL86* VL89; Ambr Ambst Cyp Hier Mcion MVict Tert ( <i>patrem et matrem</i> )
a/c/d/e:	Chr [a = e $\overset{C}{\gg}$ c = d] <sup>207</sup>
a/c:	048 (τον πατερα [...] την μητερα)
a/d:	0285 ([...] πατερα [5–7 letters] μητερα [...]); Or [a $\overset{A}{\gg}$ d] <sup>208</sup>

## A.17.2 Overview

This part of the author's quotation of Gen 2:24 features small variations on the presence and absence of articles and possessive pronouns with “father” (πατέρα) and “mother” (μητέρα). Here, as in other variation units involving quotations of another source, internal evidence is less informative. Because the author is quoting a text whose own textual variants overlap with the ones in this

206. The manuscript tradition of this father is divided; see §B.31.3.

207. The text underlying this patristic citation is uncertain, and the textual tradition of this father is divided; see §B.31.1.

208. The text underlying this patristic citation is uncertain; see §B.31.2.

passage,<sup>209</sup> because we lack external data on which Hebrew or Greek text of Genesis was familiar to the author, and because no variant reading in this passage suggests that the author adapted the source text for his own purposes, intrinsic probabilities are balanced. Similarly, since scribes and readers could have conformed this quotation to their Greek or Latin text of Gen 2:24 or to quotations of it in other New Testament passages familiar to them (e.g., Matt 19:5 and Mark 10:7), and since these source passages themselves are subject to textual variation, any of the variant readings under consideration could be explained by harmonization. On external grounds, most critical editions narrow the possibilities down to the readings τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα and πατέρα καὶ μητέρα, but since important witnesses traditionally regarded as “Alexandrian” and “Western” stand behind both readings and either reading could underlie the Old Latin version, the textual problem has remained difficult to solve. Its lingering difficulty is illustrated by the NA<sup>28</sup> and Westcott-Hort editions, both of which bracket the articles.

#### A.17.3 *Intrinsic Probabilities*

For the reasons outlined above, the safest judgment is to set all intrinsic probabilities equal. I therefore rate the relative probabilities of the readings as  $a = b = c = d = e$ .

#### A.17.4 *Transcriptional Probabilities*

The potential causes of transitions between readings are summarized in Table A.33.

TABLE A.33: Transcriptional causes for Eph 5:31/10–18.

<i>From</i>	<i>To</i>	<i>Tag</i>	<i>Note</i>
<i>a–e</i>	<i>a–e</i>	Harm	Harmonization to Gen 2:24, Matt 19:5, or Mark 10:7
<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	Prag	Addition of articles to make πατέρα and μητέρα concrete references to the father and mother of the preceding ἄνθρωπος
<i>b</i>	<i>a</i>	Prag	Deletion of articles to yield a general reference to πατέρα and μητέρα, like the anarthrous ἄνθρωπος that precedes
<i>a–b, d–e</i>	<i>c</i>	Byz	Byzantine assimilation

209. ABBOTT, 174.

A.17.5 *Post-Analysis Results*

The posterior probabilities for readings based on sampled stemmata are given in Table A.34.

TABLE A.34: Reading posterior probabilities for Eph 5:31/10–18.

<i>Reading</i>	<i>Significant support</i>	<i>Posterior</i>
<i>a: τον πατέρα και την μητέρα</i>	P46 01* 6 33 81 424C1 442 1739* 1834 1840 1910 2008 2464 NA <sup>28</sup> txt SBL TH WH <sup>txt</sup>	99.836%
<i>e: τον πατέρα αυτου και την μητέρα αυτου</i>	025 075 606 915 1175 1908 syr <sup>p</sup> cop ThMops Thret	0.092%
<i>b: πατέρα και μητέρα</i>	03 06* 012 NA <sup>28</sup> mg WH <sup>mg</sup>	0.048%
<i>c: τον πατέρα αυτου και την μητέρα</i>	01C2 02 06C2 044 0278 88 94 181 256 263 1398 1678 1739C 1836 1881 1962 1985 1987 1991 2011 2492 2576 RP	0.020%
<i>d: τον πατέρα και την μητέρα αυτου</i>	0150 vg syr <sup>h</sup>	0.004%

On the basis of external evidence, the posterior probabilities break the intrinsic tie decisively between the readings in favor of *τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα*. This result agrees with the judgment of the SBL and Tyndale House Greek New Testaments. By quantifying the strength of the posterior probability of *τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα*, my analysis makes an additional contribution in this connection: it indicates that this reading merits more confidence, and the brackets in the NA<sup>28</sup> edition are not warranted.

**5:31/20–28:** καὶ προσκολληθήσεται τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ

**A.18 5:31/20–28:** καὶ προσκολληθήσεται τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ

5:31 ἀντὶ τούτου καταλείψει ἄνθρωπος τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα ἵ καὶ προσκολληθήσεται τῇ

2 4 6 8 10 12 14 16 18 20 22 24  
γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ<sup>1</sup>, καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν.

26 28 30 32 34 36 38 40 42

**A.18.1 Apparatus**

<i>a:</i> καὶ προσκολληθήσεται τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ	P46 01C1 02 0285V 0319* 33 61A 69 81 462 1241f 1311f 1573 1834V 1985 2344V; VL51 VL54f VL61 VL62 VL65* VL65C2 VL75 VL76 VL77 VL78 VL86 VL87f VL89 vg; Ambr Ambst Hier MVict Meth Pel; Lach SBL Treg WH <sup>mg</sup>
<i>b:</i> καὶ κολληθήσεται τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ	06 010*f 010C 012
<i>c:</i> καὶ προσκολληθήσεται πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ	01C2 03 06C2 018 020 025f 044 049*V 049CV 056 075 0142 0150 0151 0278 1 18 35 38 42 61T 88 93 94V 102 104 177 181 203S 218 223 234 256 263 296 322 326 330 337 363 365 383 390 398 424* 424C2 436 442 451 459 467 506 606 629 636 664 665 912 915 1069 1108 1115f 1127 1175 1240 1245 1319 1398 1490 1505 1509 1611 1617 1678 1718 1721 1729f 1739C 1751f 1831 1836 1837 1840 1851 1860 1863 1877 1881 1886 1893 1896 1908*fV 1908C 1910 1912 1939 1942 1959 1962 1963 1987 1991 1996 1999 2004 2005 2008 2011 2012 2085 2127 2138 2180 2243 2352 2400 2464f 2492f 2495 2516 2523 2544 2576 2865 L156 L169 L587 L809 L1159 L1178 L1188V L1440 L2010 L2058; syr <sup>h</sup> ; ThMops; NA <sup>28</sup> RP TR TH WH <sup>txt</sup>
<i>d:</i> καὶ προσκολληθήσεται τῇ γυναικὶ	01*; Tisch
<i>e:</i> καὶ προσκολληθήσεται πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα	1918f
<i>f:</i> –	6 424C1 1739* 1910; Cyp Tert
<i>a/b/c:</i>	syr <sup>p</sup> (ܡܠܟܝܬܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ); cor <sup>sa</sup> (мѣтѡѡе нѣмѡ етеѡѡѡе); cor <sup>bo</sup> (оѡѡѡ еѡѡѡѡѡѡ етеѡѡѡѡѡѡ)
<i>a/b:</i>	048 (κα[...][...]ληθήσεται [...] [...]κι αὐτοῦ)
<i>a/c:</i>	0319C0 (καὶ προσκολληθήσεται πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ); Chr Thret [ <sup>D</sup> c >> a] <sup>210</sup>
<i>b/f:</i>	Mcion [ <sup>B</sup> b >> f] <sup>211</sup>
<i>c/f:</i>	Or [ <sup>A</sup> f >> c] <sup>212</sup>

210. The textual traditions of these fathers are divided; see §§B.32.1 and B.32.2.

211. The text underlying this patristic citation is uncertain; see §B.32.3.

212. The text underlying this patristic citation is uncertain; see §B.32.4.

### A.18.2 *Overview*

The next part of the author's quotation of Gen 2:24 features minor variations involving prepositions and prepositional prefixes. As with the previous passage, the Greek tradition of the source text features similar variants. Likewise, we lack external data on which Hebrew or Greek form of this text was familiar to our author, and no variant reading containing this phrase suggests that he adapted the source text for his own purposes. For these reasons, intrinsic probabilities based on rhetorical concerns and style cannot reasonably be determined for these readings. Only the reading that excludes the phrase in question entirely can be assessed on the intrinsic evidence of the immediate context.

### A.18.3 *Intrinsic Probabilities*

On the grounds of syntax and the nature of the author's quotation, the shorter reading is much less likely than the longer readings to be authorial. First, despite its minor differences in wording, which can be attributed to translation (if the author was working from the Hebrew text) or recitation from memory, the author's quotation of Gen 2:24 is otherwise complete and does not leave out or rephrase any portion for clarity, even where this might have been helpful.<sup>213</sup> If the author did not omit any part of the quotation that is more incidental to his point about Christ and the church being united as in one flesh, he surely would not omit a phrase like "and he will be joined to his wife," which is more salient. Second, the omission of the phrase that introduces "his wife" to the discourse leaves the next phrase, "and the two shall be one flesh," without its obvious referent, and it leaves the immediately preceding "father and mother" as the only explicit referent.<sup>214</sup> Since the readers' assumed knowledge of the quotation's context would be sufficient for them to supply the correct referent from memory, this latter point does not completely rule out the shorter reading. But on the balance of intrinsic evidence, all of the longer readings are much more likely than the shorter reading:  $a = b = c = d = e \overset{B}{\gg} f$ .

### A.18.4 *Transcriptional Probabilities*

The potential causes of transitions between readings are summarized in Table A.35.

213. The mention of a man leaving behind both father and mother in connection with Christ is probably the best evidence for this claim. Meyer interprets the phrase "a man will leave his father and mother" mystically as saying of Christ that "He will leave His seat at the right hand of God," but even he remarks that the phrase *καὶ τὴν μητέρα* "is doubtless taken up along with the rest as a constituent part of the words of Adam, but is *not destined for a special exposition* in the typical reference of the passage to Christ" (MEYER, 305, 308).

214. Bruce M. Metzger notes this problem with a variant reading in Mark 10:7 concerning the absence of the same phrase in a quotation of Gen 2:24 (METZGER, 89). It is worth noting that Tertullian, whose text lacks this phrase, may have resolved the resulting ambiguity by changing the "because of this" at the start of the quotation to "because of her" (Tertullian, *Marc.* 5.18.9 [Evans, *Adversus Marcionem*, 626]). But this distinctive reading, *propter hanc*, is only present in some witnesses of Tertullian's work, with others attesting to the standard reading *propter hoc*.

TABLE A.35: Transcriptional causes for Eph 5:31/20–28.

<i>From</i>	<i>To</i>	<i>Tag</i>	<i>Note</i>
<i>a–f</i>	<i>a–f</i>	Harm	Harmonization to Gen 2:24, Matt 19:5, or Mark 10:7
<i>a–e</i>	<i>f</i>	HomArcWord	Loss of the phrase by homoioarcton from καί to the καί of the next phrase; cf. the same omission in Mark 10:7 (METZGER, 89)
<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	IntAssim	Change of προσκολληθήσεται to κολληθήσεται to ensure agreement between the prefix of the verb and the prepositional phrase that follows it
<i>a</i>	<i>d</i>	IntAssim	Deletion of αὐτοῦ to assimilate to the absence of αὐτοῦ in the previous phrase (the witnesses to the readings without αὐτοῦ here lack αὐτοῦ after μητέρα)
<i>c</i>	<i>e</i>		
<i>a</i>	<i>c</i>	IntAssim	Change of τῇ γυναικί to πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα to ensure agreement between the prefix of the verb and the prepositional phrase that follows it
<i>d</i>	<i>e</i>		
<i>c</i>	<i>e</i>	IntAssim	Deletion of αὐτοῦ after τὴν γυναῖκα to assimilate to the preceding τὴν μητέρα without αὐτοῦ (as the sole witness to this reading has)
<i>b–f</i>	<i>a</i>	Byz	Byzantine assimilation

A.18.5 *Post-Analysis Results*

The posterior probabilities for readings based on sampled stemmata are given in Table A.36.

TABLE A.36: Reading posterior probabilities for Eph 5:31/20–28.

<i>Reading</i>	<i>Significant support</i>	<i>Posterior</i>
<i>a: και προσκολληθῆσεται τη γυναικι αυτου</i>	P46 01C1 02 33 81 1834V 1985 VL61 VL75 VL77r VL89 vg Ambst Hier MVict Pel SBL WH <sup>ms</sup>	99.744%
<i>c: και προσκολληθῆσεται προς την γυναικα αυτου</i>	01C2 03 06C2 025f 044 075 0150 0278 88 94V 181 256 263 442 606 915 1175 1398 1678 1739C 1836 1840 1881 1908C 1908*fV 1962 1987 1991 2008 2011 2464r 2492f 2576 syr <sup>h</sup> ThMops NA <sup>28</sup> RP TH WH <sup>txt</sup>	0.252%
<i>d: και προσκολληθῆσεται τη γυναικι</i>	01*	0.004%
<i>b: και κολληθῆσεται τη γυναικι αυτου</i>	06* 012	0.000%
<i>e: και προσκολληθῆσεται προς την γυναικα</i>		0.000%
<i>f: –</i>	6 424C1 1739* 1910	0.000%

On the basis of external evidence, the posterior probabilities break the intrinsic tie between the longer readings decisively in favor of *καὶ προσκολληθήσεται τῇ γυναικί αὐτοῦ*. This result marks a departure from the NA<sup>28</sup> and Tyndale House Greek New Testaments, both of which read *καὶ προσκολληθήσεται πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ*, in agreement with the SBL Greek New Testament. My analysis likely arrives at this result due to the combined Eastern and Western support for *καὶ προσκολληθήσεται τῇ γυναικί αὐτοῦ* thanks to the Old Latin tradition. In this way, the result highlights the importance of including early versional evidence in a text-critical analysis. The other long readings, for their part, have negligible posterior probabilities due to their sparse external support. While the minus has early and important witnesses, these witnesses consistently belong to the same clade in the sampled stemmata, which makes it likely that their common ancestor dropped one of the longer readings by homoioteleuton. Between these considerations and the low intrinsic probability of the minus relative to longer readings, the negligible posterior probability of this reading is what we would expect, and it coheres with the judgment behind the SBL Greek New Testament.

## A.19 6:10/2-4: τοῦ λοιποῦ

6:10 'Τοῦ λοιποῦ', ἐνδυναμοῦσθε ἐν κυρίῳ καὶ ἐν τῷ κράτει τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ.

2 4 6 8 10 12 14 16 18 20 22 24

## A.19.1 Apparatus

<i>a</i> : του λοιπου	P46 01* 02 03 016 0150 0278 33 81 436 442 467 1175 1241 1739 1834 1881 1910 1942 1959 1962 2464r 2805; Cyr Or; Lach NA <sup>28</sup> SBL TH Tisch Treg WH
<i>b</i> : το λοιπον	01C2 06 010 012 018 020 025 044 049 056 075 0142 0151 0319 1 6 18 35 38 42 61 69 88 93 94V 102 104 177 181 203S 218 223 234 256 263 296 322 326 330 337 363 365 383 390 398 424 451 459 462 506 606 629 636 664 665 912 915 1069 1108 1115 1127 1240 1245 1311 1319 1398 1490 1505 1509 1573 1611 1617 1678 1718 1721 1729r 1751r 1831 1836 1837 1840 1851 1860 1863 1877 1886 1893 1896 1908 1912 1918 1939 1963 1985 1987 1991 1996 1999 2004 2005 2008 2011 2012 2085 2127 2138 2180 2344 2352 2400 2492 2495 2516 2523 2544 2576 2834 2865 L156/1; syr <sup>h</sup> ; Chr Thret; RP TR
<i>a/b</i> :	VL51 VL54 VL62 VL65 VL75 VL76 VL77 VL78 VL86 VL89 vg Ambst Lcf Pel Spec ThMops ( <i>de cetero</i> ); VL61 Hier ( <i>de caetero</i> ); syr <sup>p</sup> (ܬܠܝܬܐ); cop <sup>sa</sup> (ⲭⲓⲛ ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ); cop <sup>bo</sup> (ⲡⲥⲉⲡⲓ ⲛⲁⲉ ⲛⲛⲁⲓ); goth (𐍂𐍅𐍂𐍅 𐍋𐍅 𐍂𐍅𐍂𐍅)
†6:10/2-14	2243 L23 L60 L156/2 L169 L587 L809 L1126 L1159 L1178 L1188 L1298 L1440 L2010 L2058 <sup>215</sup>

## A.19.2 Overview

The difference in meaning between the accusative τὸ λοιπόν and the genitive τοῦ λοιποῦ has been a subject of scholarly dispute. Commentators and Greek lexicons agree that the latter form, a shortening of τοῦ λοιποῦ χρόνου, generally has a temporal sense like “henceforth,” “from now on,” or “in the future.”<sup>216</sup> It clearly has this sense in Gal 6:17, which is the only other place in the New Testament epistles where it occurs. The accusative form τὸ λοιπόν (or simply λοιπόν) is often used in introductory formulae for concluding remarks, where it has the sense “finally” or “as for the rest” (2 Cor 13:11; Phil 3:1; 4:8; 1 Thess 4:1; 2 Thess 3:1), but it can also take the temporal sense of “henceforth” (as in 1 Cor 7:29 and Heb 10:13).<sup>217</sup> The accusative form’s flexibility in meaning has led some commentators to suggest that conversely, the genitive form can be used interchangeably with the accusative for the logical expression.<sup>218</sup> But this claim does not appear to be borne out by evidence from extant sources contemporary with this epistle. Thayer’s lexicon, drawing on usage patterns established by these sources, explicitly states that “τὸ λ. may be used

215. These witnesses omit this phrase entirely as part of a larger adaptation for a lectionary incipit.

216. BDAG, s.v. λοιπός, 3.a.β; see also COHICK 616 n. 746.

217. BDAG, s.v. λοιπός, 3.a.α.

218. HAUPT, 243; LINCOLN, 441.



for τοῦ λ., but not τοῦ λ. for τὸ λ.”<sup>219</sup> In references that offer “finally” as a gloss for τοῦ λοιποῦ, the present verse is the only text cited in support of this usage.<sup>220</sup> In the absence of documentary evidence to the contrary, the safest tentative assumption to make regarding general usage is that τοῦ λοιποῦ has an exclusively temporal sense.

This distinction and its ramifications for the present variation unit have led commentators to various conclusions. Intrinsically, several commentators who accept the distinction in meaning have defended τὸ λοιπόν, with the sense “finally,” as more suitable.<sup>221</sup> Others have defended τοῦ λοιποῦ, with the sense “henceforth,” arguing that it refers to the interim period before the eschaton in which the spiritual warfare of 6:10–20 is to take place.<sup>222</sup> Most, however, have asserted, on their assessment of the external evidence, that the author must have used τοῦ λοιποῦ with the logical sense generally associated with τὸ λοιπόν.<sup>223</sup> Transcriptionally, most commentators agree that τὸ λοιπόν is easily explained as a harmonization to the common concluding formula found elsewhere in the Pauline Epistles, especially Phil 3:1 and 4:8,<sup>224</sup> although one has argued that τοῦ λοιποῦ could be a mechanical repetition of the same phrase from Gal 6:17.<sup>225</sup> Externally, most of the same commentators favor τοῦ λοιποῦ on the basis of its early manuscript support, although some have been more impressed by the breadth of support for τὸ λοιπόν.<sup>226</sup> All modern critical editions print τοῦ λοιποῦ in their texts, probably on the combined weight of transcriptional and external evidence.

#### A.19.3 *Intrinsic Probabilities*

Given the above observations about general usage regarding τὸ λοιπόν and τοῦ λοιποῦ, τὸ λοιπόν is much more suitable as a discourse marker here. As other commentators have noted, a “henceforth” statement with τοῦ λοιποῦ highlights the eschatological urgency of the author’s call to preparation for spiritual battle. The cosmic nature of the enemy described in 6:12 and the reference to “the evil day” in 6:13 certainly suggest an eschatological element.<sup>227</sup> The problem is that where τοῦ λοιποῦ (or, for that matter, τὸ λοιπόν) is used with the sense “henceforth,” it is typically occasioned either by a previous reference to time (cf. 1 Cor 7:29 and Heb 10:11–13) or by the implication that up until now, the opposite of what is being stated has been the case (cf. Gal 6:17). But the household instructions that precede this section say nothing about the shortness of time

219. GELNT, s.v. λοιπός, α; see also SALMOND, 381.

220. Moule, *Idiom-Book*, 161; BDAG, s.v. λοιπός, 3.a.β.

221. HARLESS, 531; OLSHAUSEN, 274; MEYER, 312. Other commentators who do not explicitly prefer τὸ λοιπόν still note that is the expected reading given the sense (ABBOTT, 180; LINCOLN, 441).

222. FINDLAY, 397; SCHLIER, 289; BARTH 2:759–760; COHICK, 616–17.

223. LINCOLN, 441; SCHNACKENBURG 271 n. 1; HAUPT, 243; HOEHNER, 820; MERKLE, 210.

224. FINDLAY, 397; ABBOTT, 180; HAUPT, 243; ROBINSON, 303; Zuntz, *Text of the Epistles*, 176; BEST, 589; MERKLE, 210.

225. MEYER, 312. It is worth noting that in the predominant order of the Pauline corpus, Galatians immediately precedes Ephesians, so τοῦ λοιποῦ would be the last form of λοιπός encountered by most scribes copying this epistle.

226. HARLESS, 531; EADIE, 465; ELLICOTT, 147; HOEHNER 819 n. 1.

227. This is noted by MUDDIMAN, 286, though he ultimately considers the logical sense “finally” to be more likely.

or the readers' former lack of spiritual preparation.<sup>228</sup> Meanwhile, the reading τὸ λοιπόν, with the logical sense of “finally,” serves as a fitting point of departure for the final verses of the epistle. It signals the end of the *Haustafel* and calls all of the readers together again for the author's concluding admonitions.<sup>229</sup> While we might expect the conclusion to begin with the author's request for prayers in 6:18 or 19, the continuation of the sentence describing the armor of God into these verses precludes this possibility.<sup>230</sup> Since the present verse necessarily marks the start of the author's concluding injunctions, τὸ λοιπόν with its usual sense well-suited to introduce it. Ultimately, these conclusions hinge on an assumed distinction between τὸ λοιπόν and τοῦ λοιποῦ that is based on evidence of general usage, so it remains possible that our author idiosyncratically used τοῦ λοιποῦ with the logical sense of τὸ λοιπόν. As we will see, the combination of transcriptional and external evidence may support such a conclusion. But absent any assumptions about our author's identity and any other evidence of his usage involving these phrases, I tentatively consider the reading τὸ λοιπόν (*b*) intrinsically much more likely than τοῦ λοιποῦ (*a*):  $b \gg^B a$ .

#### A.19.4 Transcriptional Probabilities

The transcriptional causes of transitions between readings are detailed in Table A.37.

TABLE A.37: Transcriptional causes for Eph 6:10/2–10.

<i>From</i>	<i>To</i>	<i>Tag</i>	<i>Note</i>
<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	Sem	Change from τοῦ λοιποῦ to τὸ λοιπόν to make the logical sense explicit
		Harm	General harmonization to (τὸ) λοιπόν elsewhere in the corpus (cf. 1 Cor 7:29; 2 Cor 13:11; Phil 3:1; 4:8; 1 Thess 4:1; 2 Thess 3:1; Heb 10:13)
<i>b</i>	<i>a</i>	Harm	Harmonization by mechanical repetition of the τοῦ λοιποῦ of Gal 6:17 (MEYER, 312)
<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	Byz	Byzantine assimilation

228. As H. C. G. Moule observes, “Had the Epistle dwelt on spiritual weakness as a previous characteristic of Ephesian Christian life, the other alternative might have been preferable; but it has not” (MOULE, 149).

229. Cf. 2 Cor 13:11; Phil 3:1; 4:8; 1 Thess 4:1; 2 Thess 3:1, where (τὸ) λοιπόν is used to introduce a final imperative or set of imperatives (sometimes indirectly).

230. SALMOND, 381; LINCOLN, 430–31; SCHNACKENBURG, 267–68; BEST, 589; MERKLE, 210. Specifically, the participial clauses with προσευχόμενοι and ἀγρυπνοῦντες in 6:18 are dependent on what precedes them, and the indirect request καὶ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ in 6:19 is coordinated with the reference to all the saints that precedes it.

A.19.5 *Post-Analysis Results*

The posterior probabilities for readings based on sampled stemmata are given in Table A.38.

TABLE A.38: Reading posterior probabilities for Eph 6:10/2–4.

<i>Reading</i>	<i>Significant support</i>	<i>Posterior</i>
<i>a: του λοιπου</i>	P46 01* 02 03 0150 0278 33 81 442 1175 1739 1834 1881 1910 1962 2464r 2805 Cyr Or NA <sup>28</sup> SBL TH WH	99.148%
<i>b: το λοιπον</i>	01C2 06 012 025 044 075 6 88 94V 181 256 263 606 915 1398 1678 1836 1840 1908 1985 1987 1991 2008 2011 2492 2576 syr <sup>h</sup> Chr Thret RP	0.852%

The intrinsic advantage of *τὸ λοιπόν* is neutralized in the posterior distribution in favor of *τοῦ λοιποῦ*. Transcriptional probabilities and the external support of the earliest Greek witnesses are sufficient to overrule the intrinsic probability of *τὸ λοιπόν*. Based on my earlier discussion of intrinsic probabilities, the results of this analysis indicate that our author likely used *τοῦ λοιποῦ* idiosyncratically with the sense “finally.” At some stage of transmission, an emendator who deemed this usage incorrect changed *τοῦ λοιποῦ* to *τὸ λοιπόν*, in accordance with Pauline usage in other epistles’ concluding remarks.

A.20 6:12/2-12: ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ὑμῶν ἢ πάλη

6:11 ἐνδύσασθε τὴν πανοπλίαν τοῦ θεοῦ πρὸς τὸ δύνασθαι ὑμᾶς στήναι πρὸς τὰς μεθοδείας τοῦ  
2 4 6 8 10 12 14 16 18 20 22 24 26 28  
διαβόλου· 12 ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ὑμῶν ἢ πάλη<sup>1</sup> πρὸς αἷμα καὶ σάρκα ... 13 διὰ τοῦτο ἀναλάβετε τὴν  
30 2 4 6 8 10 12 14 16 18 20 2 4 6 8  
πανοπλίαν τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα δυνηθῇτε ἀντιστῆναι ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ πονηρᾷ καὶ ἅπαντα κατεργασάμενοι  
10 12 14 16 18 20 22 24 26 28 30 32 34 36  
στήναι.  
38

A.20.1 Apparatus

a: ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ὑμῶν ἢ πάλη	P46r 03 06* 010 012 044 (61*) <sup>231</sup> 81 363 636 1175 1509 1729 1831 (1834) <sup>232</sup> 2008 2180 L1440 L2058/2; VL75 VL76 VL77C VL78 VL86 VL89T syr <sup>p</sup> goth; Ambst Ephr Lcf Pel Prisc Spec; Lach <sup>txt</sup> WH <sup>mg</sup>
b: ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμῶν ἢ πάλη	01 02 06C2 016V 018 020 025 049 056 075 0142 0150 0151 0230V 0278 0319 1 6 18 33 35 38 42 61C1 69 88 93 94V 102 104 177C0 181 203S 218 223 234 256 263 296 322 326 330f 337 365 383 390 398 424 436 442 451 459 462 467 506 606 629 664 665 912 915 1069 1108 1115 1127 1240 1241*f 1241Cf 1245 1311 1319 1398 1490 1505 1573 1611 1617 1678 1718 1721 1739 1751 1836 1837 1840 1851 1860 1863 1877 1881 1886 1893 1896 1908 1910 1912 1918f (1939 1996) <sup>233</sup> 1942 1959 1962 1963 1985 1987 1991 1999 2004 2005 2011 2012 2085 2127 2138 2243 2344 2352 2400 2464 2492 2495 2516f 2523 2544 2576 2805 2834 2865 L23 L60r L156 L169 L587 L809 L1126 L1159 L1178 L1188 L1298 L2010f L2058/1; VL51 VL54 VL61 VL62 VL65 VL77* VL89K vg syr <sup>h</sup> cop; Ambr (AstS Bas Cyr Eus Homiliae Spirituales Marcus) <sup>234</sup> Ath Chr Cl Cyp Did (Epiph) <sup>235</sup> (Hil) <sup>236</sup> Hier Nil Or ThMops Thret; Lach <sup>mg</sup> NA <sup>28</sup> RP SBL TH TR Tisch Treg WH <sup>txt</sup>
a/b:	177* (ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν [7–9 letters illegible])

A.20.2 Overview

The textual question is whether the author is telling his audience that “*your* struggle” or “*our* struggle” is not against mere human adversaries. Intrinsically, some commentators have granted that ὑμῶν better fits the context immediately preceding and following 6:12, which is dominated by

231. ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ὑμῶν ἢ πάλη (constructio ad sensum).  
232. ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ὑμῶν πάλη (parablepsis).  
233. ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμῶν ἢ πάλη (constructio ad sensum).  
234. οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμῶν ἢ πάλη (commentary).  
235. ὅτι μὴ ἔστιν ἡμῶν ἢ πάλη (commentary).  
236. non enim nobis ... pugna est (commentary).

second-person verbs and references.<sup>237</sup> Transcriptionally, however, the same observation could have led scribes to assimilate this passage to the surrounding context by changing ἡμῖν to ὑμῖν.<sup>238</sup> Externally, the evidence is balanced, with early and widespread manuscript, versional, and patristic support on both sides.<sup>239</sup>

### A.20.3 *Intrinsic Probabilities*

Intrinsically, coherence with the surrounding context favors the reading with ὑμῖν over that with ἡμῖν. The author makes it clear in the description of his ministry in 3:8–10 that he himself plays a role in God’s use of church with respect to spiritual powers. The question is whether an all-inclusive reference with ἡμῖν is more rhetorically effective than a reference to the subjects of the surrounding imperatives with ὑμῖν. Whether the present ὅτι clause elaborates on the agents that enact the “schemes of the devil”<sup>240</sup> or explains that putting on the armor of God is necessary because spiritual equipment is needed to combat spiritual enemies,<sup>241</sup> it is elaborating on a direct address to the readers (ἐνδύσασθε, 6:11) and anticipating another direct address to the readers (ἀναλάβετε, 6:13). The reading with ὑμῖν maintains the urgency of these concerns to the readers and seamlessly connects the two commands. Rhetorically, the reading with ἡμῖν adds a subtle note of edification to this phrase, as it suggests that all believers, the author included, are engaged in the same struggle together.<sup>242</sup> Similar changes to the first-person plural in elaborations occur elsewhere in the epistle, such as ὅτι ἐσμὲν ἀλλήλων μέλη (4:25) and ὅτι μέλη ἐσμὲν τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ (5:30). But in both of these instances, the author makes it clear that he has the church in mind by alluding to the body of Christ with μέλη. Moreover, in other passages where he has the unity or common state of all believers in mind, he makes this explicit with a word for “all” or “every” (cf. ἡμεῖς πάντες in 2:5; ἐνὶ δὲ ἐκάστῳ ἡμῶν in 4:7, possibly preceded by καὶ ἐν πάσιν ἡμῖν in 4:6; and μέχρι καταντήσωμεν οἱ πάντες in 4:13). Since none of these elements is present in this passage, the reading with ἡμῖν lacks the emphasis to convey the author’s solidarity with his readers and at worse generalizes their struggle in a way that lessens this statement’s immediacy to them. I therefore consider the reading with ὑμῖν (a) intrinsically more probable than the reading with ἡμῖν (b):  $a \overset{C}{\gg} b$ .

237. Hermann Olshausen prefers ὑμῖν on intrinsic grounds because “both in what preceded and what follows the second person constantly stands” (OLSHAUSEN, 274).

238. EADIE, 468; MEYER, 312; WEISS, 26; ABBOTT, 181; BARTH 2:763; LINCOLN 429 n. a; METZGER, 542; BEST, 592–93; MACDONALD, 344; HOEHNER 824 n. 2; MERKLE, 212.

239. ELLICOTT, 149; SALMOND, 383; LINCOLN 429 n. a; BEST, 592; HOEHNER 824 n. 2; MERKLE, 212. Eadie claims that ἡμῖν is supported by “preponderant authority,” and he also defends it on internal grounds (EADIE, 468). Margaret Y. MacDonald, meanwhile, remarks that “There is actually greater manuscript evidence for the alternate reading ‘your (*hym*in) battle,’” but she ultimately finds ἡμῖν to have stronger internal evidence (MACDONALD, 344).

240. Specifically, if the author anticipates his readers underestimating “the schemes of the devil” as the work of evil human actors, then the present οὐκ ... ἀλλά construction corrects this expectation. Such a construction is described as a marker of *replacing focus* in Dik, *Word Order in Ancient Greek*, 39–40.

241. OLSHAUSEN, 274–75.

242. HARLESS, 534–35; BEST, 593; HOEHNER, 825; MERKLE, 212.

A.20.4 *Transcriptional Probabilities*

The potential causes of transitions between readings are summarized in Table A.39.

TABLE A.39: Transcriptional causes for Eph 6:9/28–34.

<i>From</i>	<i>To</i>	<i>Tag</i>	<i>Note</i>
<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	AurConf	Confusion of ὑμῶν for ἡμῶν or vice-versa by itacism
<i>b</i>	<i>a</i>		
<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	Sem	Change of ὑμῶν to ἡμῶν for commentary or liturgical purposes
<i>b</i>	<i>a</i>	IntAssim	Change of ἡμῶν to ὑμῶν to assimilate to the second-person injunctions that precede and follow this passage
<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	Byz	Byzantine assimilation

A.20.5 *Post-Analysis Results*

The posterior probabilities for readings based on sampled stemmata are given in Table A.40.

TABLE A.40: Reading posterior probabilities for Eph 6:12/2–12.

<i>Reading</i>	<i>Significant support</i>	<i>Posterior</i>
<i>b</i> : ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμῶν ἢ πάλη	01 02 06C2 025 075 0150 0278 6 33 88 94V 181 256 263 442 606 915 1398 1678 1739 1836 1840 1881 1908 1910 1962 1985 1987 1991 2011 2464 2492 2576 2805 VL61r VL77*r VL89K vg syr <sup>h</sup> cop Chr Cyr Hier Or ThMops Thret NA <sup>28</sup> RP SBL TH WH <sup>txt</sup>	99.776%
<i>a</i> : ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ὑμῶν ἢ πάλη	P46r 03 06* 012 044 81 1175 (1834) 2008 VL75r VL77Cr VL89T syr <sup>p</sup> goth Ambst Ephr Pel WH <sup>mg</sup>	0.224%

The intrinsic probability of the reading with ὑμῶν is washed out in the posterior distribution, which decisively favors the reading with ἡμῶν. The primary contributing factor to the latter reading's advantage is probably its widespread external support. This result demonstrates the resilience of Bayesian phylogenetics in challenging intrinsic priors on the basis of other types of evidence. It also confirms the judgment of all modern critical editions.

Future innovations in the transcriptional model adopted in this study will likely result in more balanced posterior probabilities. With heterogeneous rates for variation units based on the classes of scribal changes possible in them (as described in the conclusions chapter of the main docu-

ment), the common aural confusions responsible for changes in this passage will make changes in this passage more frequent, which in turn will give both readings more similar explanatory power along individual stemma branches. The explanatory power of both readings at the origin may not be so close that the intrinsic advantage of the reading with  $\acute{\upsilon}\mu\hat{\iota}\nu$  tips the scales of posterior probability in that reading's favor, but there will probably be a smaller gap between the two readings' posterior probabilities. Thus, while I tentatively adopt the reading with  $\acute{\eta}\mu\hat{\iota}\nu$  in this study's critical text, I leave the reading with  $\acute{\upsilon}\mu\hat{\iota}\nu$  labeled as reading *a* in anticipation of future results.

## A.21 6:21/2-16: 2-4 6-8 10 12-16

6:21 Ἵνα δὲ καὶ ὑμεῖς εἰδῆτε τὰ κατ' ἐμέ, τί πράσσω, πάντα, γνωρίσει ὑμῖν Τυχικὸς ὁ ἀγαπητὸς  
 2 4 6 8 10 12 14 16 18 20 22 24 26 28 30 32  
 ἀδελφὸς καὶ πιστὸς διάκονος ἐν κυρίῳ,  
 34 36 38 40 42 44

## A.21.1 Apparatus

a: 2-4 6-8 10 12-16	01 02 06 010 012 025 049 0319 38 61 81 88 102 203 218 326 363 442 506 606 915 1240 1241 1490 1718 1721 1831 1834 1837 1886 1939 1942 1962 1963 1996 1999 2012 2464 2495 2544 2805; VL51 VL54 VL61 VL62 VL65 VL75 VL76 VL77 VL78 VL86 VL89 vg goth <sup>B</sup> ; Ephr MVict Pel; Lach TH Tisch Treg WH <sup>mg</sup>
b: 2-4 10 6-8 12-16	03 018 020 044 056 075 0142 0150 0151 0278 1 6 18 35 42 69 93 94 104 177 181 223 234 256 263 296 322 330 337 365 390 398 424 436 451 459 462 467 629 636 664 665 912 1069 1108 1115 1127 1175 1245 1311 1319 1398 1505 1509 1573 1611 1617 1678 1729 1739 1751 1836 1840 1851 1860 1863 1877 1881 1896 1908 1910 1912 1918 1959 1985 1987 1991 2004 2005 2008 2011 2085 2127 2138 2180 2243 2344 2352 2400 2492 2516 2523 2576 2834 2865 L156 L169 L587 L809 L1159 L1178 L1188 L1440 L2010 L2058; syr cop; Ambst Hier Or ThMops; NA <sup>28</sup> RP SBL TR WH <sup>txt</sup>
c: 2-4 6-8 12-16 10	1893
d: 2-4 10 12-16	P46 33 383
a/b:	Bas [a = b] <sup>243</sup> ; Chr [b <sup>B</sup> >> a] <sup>244</sup> ; Thret [a <sup>B</sup> >> b] <sup>245</sup> ;

## A.21.2 Overview

The variant readings in this passage concern the presence and placement of the phrases καὶ ὑμεῖς and τὰ κατ' ἐμέ in the Ἵνα clause.<sup>246</sup> Intrinsically, the purpose of the καί before ὑμεῖς, which relates to the degree and character of its emphasis, has long divided commentators.<sup>247</sup> Transcriptionally, the same question evidently led scribes and readers to transpose καὶ ὑμεῖς, but commen-

243. The textual tradition of this father is divided; see §B.36.1.

244. The textual tradition of this father is divided; see §B.36.2.

245. The text underlying this patristic citation is uncertain; see §B.36.2.

246. Some of the constituent phrases transposed in this unit individually feature their own variants—the most notable being the variant ἰδῆτε (“see”) for εἰδῆτε (“know”)—but since these matters are independent of the word order, they are allocated their own variation units. For the sake of clarity in referencing the variant readings in question, I will ignore variants involving the individual constituents and refer to the present variant readings using καὶ ὑμεῖς, τὰ κατ' ἐμέ, and εἰδῆτε.

247. Some, assuming that the epistle is an introductory communication to a church with which the author was not personally acquainted, interpret the phrase καὶ ὑμεῖς inclusively as “even you” (ABBOTT, 190; BARTH 2:809). Others, assuming that the epistle was intended for multiple churches, interpret it additively as “you too” (HARLESS,



tators have disagreed over the direction of the transposition.<sup>248</sup> Externally, the evidence is split three ways, with early Eastern and Western witnesses reading *καὶ ὑμεῖς* before *εἰδῆτε*, 03 and the majority of manuscripts and other versions reading *καὶ ὑμεῖς* after *εἰδῆτε*, and P46 and 33 omitting *καὶ ὑμεῖς* entirely.<sup>249</sup> The difficulty of the textual issue is illustrated by the disagreement between our modern editions, with the Tyndale House Greek New Testament printing *καὶ ὑμεῖς* before *εἰδῆτε* and the SBL and NA<sup>28</sup> editions printing it after *εἰδῆτε*.

### A.21.3 *Intrinsic Probabilities*

Coherence with the structure of the epistle slightly favors the reading *ἵνα δὲ καὶ ὑμεῖς εἰδῆτε τὰ κατ' ἐμέ* over the other readings with both *καὶ ὑμεῖς* and *τὰ κατ' ἐμέ*, and it slightly favors these readings over the reading without *καὶ ὑμεῖς*. The present passage, which opens the commendation of Tychicus, has a conspicuous counterpart in the statement of the epistle's occasion in 1:15. There, the textually stable phrase *διὰ τοῦτο ἀγὼν ἀκούσας τὴν καθ' ὑμᾶς πίστιν* shares several distinctive features with the present phrase: a subject preceded by *καί*; an object modified not by the simple genitive, but by a more emphatic *κατά* phrase in attributive position; and a verb of perception linking the two. The similarity in the structure of both phrases makes their correspondence clear: they frame the body of the epistle in the practical terms of received and outgoing information. For this reason, the reading *ἵνα δὲ καὶ ὑμεῖς εἰδῆτε τὰ κατ' ἐμέ*, which most precisely echoes the structure and emphases of the statement in 1:15, communicates this correspondence effectively and is therefore the most intrinsically suitable reading. Of course, while the readings *ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ κατ' ἐμέ* and *ἵνα δὲ καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ κατ' ἐμέ εἰδῆτε* are less precise counterparts to the statement in 1:15, they contain all of the same pieces, so they are only slightly less suitable. Finally, the reading *ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε τὰ κατ' ἐμέ*, which does lack one of these pieces, corresponds even less precisely to 1:15 and is therefore slightly less likely still.

Without additional information about the compositional circumstances of the epistle, pragmatic considerations are non-probative for further distinguishing the intrinsic probabilities of readings with both *καὶ ὑμεῖς* and *τὰ κατ' ἐμέ*. As the various arguments of commentators have shown, the discursive functions of these two phrases depend on the circumstances of the epistle's composition and dispatch. The hypothesis that best explains the wording of these two phrases is that of a response to an earlier letter from the readers (either in reality or, if the epistle is pseudepigraphal, in conceit). If this earlier letter presumably mentioned the author's faithfulness and informed him of the readers' practices, then he could speak reciprocally of *also* hearing of *their own* faithfulness and of them *also* knowing about *his own* practices more fully.<sup>250</sup> In this case,

liii–lx; HODGE, 395; MEYER, 348; 257 ELLICOTT, 158–59; MOULE, 161; ABBOTT, 190; HAUPT, 257; SALMOND, 392; ROBINSON, 217; LINCOLN, 464; HOEHNER, 869; MERKLE, 224; for a dedicated discussion, see Lightfoot, “Destination,” 393). Other more modern commentators have concluded that the *καί* should be treated as modifying the whole phrase or dismissed as a trivial idiosyncrasy of the author (SCHNACKENBURG, 288; LINCOLN, 464–65; BEST, 615).

248. See, e.g., WEISS, 128 and HAUPT 257 n. 1.

249. So SALMOND, 392. Ellicott stands out among commentators in that he considers the external evidence strong enough to favor the placement of *καὶ ὑμεῖς* after *εἰδῆτε* (ELLICOTT, 159).

250. Bacon, “Laodiceans,” 23–24; GAUGLER, 231; BARTH 2:809.

one or both of these phrases would be exophoric references to the previous correspondence, and, as established information, they could logically precede the verb according to the principle of natural information flow.<sup>251</sup> The hypothesis of a general or circular letter could also explain the *καὶ ὑμεῖς*, either as an emphatically inclusive reference to readers who had not yet met the author or as a reference to the letter's encyclical character, although it does not explain the use of *κἀγώ* in 1:15 or the use of *κατά* phrases in attributive position in place of simple genitive pronouns. Under this hypothesis, the additive *καὶ ὑμεῖς* ("you also (in addition to others)") would be newer information, so its placement after *εἰδῆτε* would be logical. Since these pragmatic factors are dependent upon hypotheses that are not assumed in this study, they cannot be brought to bear on intrinsic probabilities.

We can now assign relative intrinsic probabilities to the individual readings. Since pragmatic factors are non-probative, only coherence with the structure of the epistle is informative for our purposes. On the basis of this criterion, the reading *ἵνα δὲ καὶ ὑμεῖς εἰδῆτε τὰ κατ' ἐμέ* (a) is slightly more likely than both *ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ κατ' ἐμέ* (b) and *ἵνα δὲ καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ κατ' ἐμέ εἰδῆτε* (c), which are slightly more likely than *ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε τὰ κατ' ἐμέ* (d). I therefore rate the relative probabilities of the readings as  $a \gg b = c \gg d$ .

#### A.21.4 Transcriptional Probabilities

The transcriptional factors at play in this passage require some detailed discussion, so I will address them fully before summarizing them. Any of the variant readings in this passage could have arisen as an effort to make sense of the emphatic *καὶ ὑμεῖς*, whose purpose may not have been clear to some scribes, readers, and translators.<sup>252</sup> Some early emendators may have addressed the issue bluntly by deleting the phrase entirely, resulting in the reading *ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε τὰ κατ' ἐμέ*. Others, puzzled by the emphatic placement of *καὶ ὑμεῖς* before the verb or the separation of the corresponding phrases involving *ὑμεῖς* and *ἐμέ* in the reading *ἵνα δὲ καὶ ὑμεῖς εἰδῆτε τὰ κατ' ἐμέ*, could have transposed both phrases to their default post-verbal position.<sup>253</sup> In the opposite direction, emendators might transpose the sequence with both phrases in post-verbal position to

251. On this principle, see Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 187. The phrase *καὶ ὑμεῖς* in this case could also be an instance of a contrastive topic, which typically takes an initial position in its clause (Dejan Matić, "Topic, Focus, and Discourse Structure: Ancient Greek Word Order," *SL* 27.3 [2003]: 573–633, here 588–91; David Goldstein, *Classical Greek Syntax: Wackernagel's Law in Herodotus*, BSIELL 16 [Leiden: Brill, 2016], 123–40; CGCG, 714–16). Similarly, the placement of both this phrase and *τὰ κατ' ἐμέ* before the verb could be an instance of complex focus, in which a salient relationship between both phrases is emphasized (Matić, "Topic, Focus, and Discourse Structure," 576; for a more detailed treatment, see Dik, *Word Order in Ancient Greek*, 29, 71–73). Syntactically, whether *τὰ κατ' ἐμέ*, *τί πράσσω*, and *πάντα* are closely related objects separated by asyndeton or whether *τὰ κατ' ἐμέ τί πράσσω πάντα* is an attributive construction modifying *τὰ πάντα*, the reading *ἵνα δὲ καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ κατ' ἐμέ εἰδῆτε* results in hyperbaton. But hyperbaton can be used to juxtapose similar or contrasting terms (Smyth §3028.d), so its occurrence in the reading that joins the corresponding *ὑμεῖς* and *ἐμέ* phrases would be viable.

252. This cause for transcriptional change is noted by BEST, 614.

253. Harless prefers the reading *ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ κατ' ἐμέ* because of "its rhetorical basis in the proximity of the *ὑμεῖς* and *ἐμέ*" ["ihren rhetorischen Grund in der Annäherung des *ὑμεῖς* und *ἐμέ*"] (HARLESS, 563). Scribes and readers might well have seen the same appeal in juxtaposing these corresponding terms.

ἵνα δὲ καὶ ὑμεῖς εἰδῆτε τὰ κατ' ἐμέ, either to highlight the additive focus of καὶ ὑμεῖς or to mark καὶ ὑμεῖς as a point of departure following the preceding reference to the author speaking to others.<sup>254</sup> Finally, at least one other emendator could have transposed either of the other readings with both phrases to ἵνα δὲ καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ κατ' ἐμέ εἰδῆτε, either to mark καὶ ὑμεῖς as a point of departure and τὰ κατ' ἐμέ as a focus or to place both phrases in complex focus.

These and other causes of transitions between readings are summarized in Table A.41.

TABLE A.41: Transcriptional causes for Eph 6:21/2–16.

<i>From</i>	<i>To</i>	<i>Tag</i>	<i>Note</i>
<i>a–b</i>	<i>d</i>	Sem	Deletion of καὶ ὑμεῖς by an emendator who found the purpose of the emphatic phrase unclear
<i>a–b</i>	<i>c</i>	Prag	Transposition to ἵνα δὲ καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ κατ' ἐμέ εἰδῆτε, either to render the ὑμεῖς and ἐμέ phrases a point of departure and focus, respectively, or to mark them for complex focus
<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	Prag	Transposition of καὶ ὑμεῖς to the default position after εἰδῆτε by an emendator who found its emphasis unclear
<i>b</i>	<i>a</i>	Prag	Transposition of καὶ ὑμεῖς before εἰδῆτε to render it a point of departure following the author's reference to speaking to others
<i>a, c–d</i>	<i>b</i>	Byz	Byzantine assimilation

254. Schnackenburg remarks that the fronting of καὶ ὑμεῖς in some manuscripts “betrays a certain doubt” on the part of scribes and readers about where the emphasis in the clause belongs (SCHNACKENBURG 288 n. 5). Harless says of a pre-verbal καὶ ὑμεῖς that “One would expect the placement according to the sense” [“Man würde die Stellung dem Sinne nach eher erwarten”] (HARLESS, 563). Scribes and readers may have shared this expectation. The same observations and further comments on scribal habits are made in WEISS, 128.

## A.21.5 Post-Analysis Results

The posterior probabilities for readings based on sampled stemmata are given in Table A.42.

TABLE A.42: Reading posterior probabilities for Eph 6:21/2-16.

Reading	Significant support	Posterior
<i>b</i> : 2-4 10 6-8 12-16	03 044 075 0150 0278 6 94 181 256 263 1175 1398 1678 1739 1836 1840 1881 1908 1910 1985 1987 1991 2008 2011 2492 2576 syr cop Ambst Hier Or ThMops NA <sup>28</sup> RP SBL WH <sup>txt</sup>	66.997%
<i>a</i> : 2-4 6-8 10 12-16	01 02 06 012 025 81 88 442 606 915 1834 1962 2464 2805 VL61 VL75 VL77 VL89 vg goth <sup>B</sup> Ephr MVict Pel TH WH <sup>mg</sup>	33.003%
<i>c</i> : 2-4 6-8 12-16 10		0.000%
<i>d</i> : 2-4 10 12-16	P46 33	0.000%

The posterior probabilities overrule the intrinsic probability of the reading *ἵνα δὲ καὶ ὑμεῖς εἰδῇτε τὰ κατ' ἐμέ* (*a*) in favor of *ἵνα δὲ εἰδῇτε καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ κατ' ἐμέ* (*b*), but the advantage of the latter reading is tenuous. The posterior odds ratio of the latter reading to the former is just under 2, which is below the numerical value assigned to *D* ratings in this study. Here, the results of my analysis cohere with the conclusions of the three modern critical editions collated for this study, even reproducing their support proportionally: the NA<sup>28</sup> and SBL Greek New Testaments read *ἵνα δὲ εἰδῇτε καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ κατ' ἐμέ*, while the Tyndale House Greek New Testament reads *ἵνα δὲ καὶ ὑμεῖς εἰδῇτε τὰ κατ' ἐμέ*. Given the symmetry of transcriptional probabilities between the two most likely readings, the slight advantage of *ἵνα δὲ εἰδῇτε καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ κατ' ἐμέ* seems to be due to its external evidence. Based on these results, future editors and commentators should be open to the originality of either reading.

Future innovations in the transcriptional model employed in this study will likely increase the posterior probability of *ἵνα δὲ καὶ ὑμεῖς εἰδῇτε τὰ κατ' ἐμέ*. The use of non-uniform equilibrium frequencies for readings (as described in the conclusions chapter of the main document) should better account for the higher stability of the readings *ἵνα δὲ εἰδῇτε καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ κατ' ἐμέ* and *ἵνα δὲ εἰδῇτε τὰ κατ' ἐμέ*, which avoid the seemingly puzzling emphasis of *καὶ ὑμεῖς* in the readings that place it before the verb. Thus, while I tentatively adopt the reading *ἵνα δὲ εἰδῇτε καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ κατ' ἐμέ* in this study's critical text, I leave *ἵνα δὲ καὶ ὑμεῖς εἰδῇτε τὰ κατ' ἐμέ* labeled as reading *a* in anticipation of future results.



# Appendix B

## Notes on External Evidence in the Textual Commentary

### B.1 1:1/26–42: ἐν Ἐφέσῳ

#### B.1.1 *Basil of Caesarea*

Basil of Caesarea quotes the address in 1:1 as *τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσιν, καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ* and justifies this wording on external evidence known to him as follows: “For those who came before us handed it down in this form, and we have found it in the old copies.”<sup>1</sup> By “those who came before us” he is probably referring to Origen, and like Origen, he proceeds to expound upon the shorter reading in an ontological sense. While Basil’s wording suggests that he was familiar with more recent copies in his time that had another reading,<sup>2</sup> his exposition does not give us any information on what that other reading was, and in any event, it is clear that he prefers the shorter reading for his purposes.

#### B.1.2 *Marcion*

It is unclear whether Marcion only had a different superscription for the epistle or had a different prescript in 1:1, as well. Both Tertullian and Epiphanius note that he identifies the destination of the epistle as Laodicea.<sup>3</sup> While Epiphanius expresses this point generally without dwelling on it, Tertullian asserts that Marcion has falsified the “title” (*titulus*). The question is what Tertullian means by this.<sup>4</sup> Some commentators have argued that this term could plausibly refer to the pre-

---

1. Οὕτω γὰρ καὶ οἱ πρὸ ἡμῶν δι’ παραδεδώκασιν, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν τοῖς παλαιοῖς τῶν ἀντιγράφων εὐρήκαμεν (Basil of Caesarea, *Eun.* 2.19 [SC 305:76]; translated by Amy M. Donaldson, “Explicit References to New Testament Variant Readings among Greek and Latin Church Fathers” [PhD diss., University of Notre Dame, 2009], 501, <https://curate.nd.edu/show/5712m615k50>).

2. Lightfoot, “Destination,” 379–80.

3. Epiphanius, *Pan.* 42.12.3, 13.4 (GCS 1/31:182–83); Tertullian, *Marc.* 5.17.1 (Evans, *Adversus Marcionem*, 612).

4. David Alan Black, “The Peculiarities of Ephesians and the Ephesian Address,” *GTJ* 2.1 (1981): 59–73, 60 n. 2.

script in 1:1.<sup>5</sup> This possibility cannot be ruled out entirely, but since Tertullian goes on to argue that “the title is of no concern, since when the apostle wrote to some he wrote to all,”<sup>6</sup> it is highly more likely that by *titulus* he means the paratextual feature of the epistle’s superscription than a reading in the main text. Moreover, since Tertullian regularly accuses Marcion of mutilating the text, we would expect him to do so here if Marcion’s text differed along with his title. I therefore assign the relative likelihoods for Marcion’s reading as  $d \gg^B b$ .

### B.1.3 *Tertullian*

As with Marcion’s reading, the issue at hand is what Tertullian means by *titulus*. If Tertullian was criticizing Marcion’s text of the prescript in 1:1 rather than his superscription for the epistle, then it would stand to reason that Tertullian himself had a text with ἐν Ἐφεσῶν and considered it to be in accordance with “the church’s truth” (*veritas ecclesiae*).<sup>7</sup> But multiple commentators have countered that if Tertullian had had a text with an Ephesian address, then he would simply have appealed to the text itself rather than church tradition in refuting Marcion.<sup>8</sup> Since he instead brushes aside the issue with his remark that “the title is of no concern,” it is highly more likely that he is dismissing a paratextual superscription than a part of the sacred text.<sup>9</sup> I therefore assign the relative likelihoods for Tertullian’s reading as  $d \gg^B a$ .

5. Bacon, “Laodiceans,” 26–27; van Roon, *Authenticity*, 74.

6. *Nihil autem de titulis interest, cum ad omnes apostolus scripserit dum ad quosdam* (Tertullian, *Marc.* 5.17.1 [Evans, *Adversus Marcionem*, 612–13]).

7. Tertullian, *Marc.* 5.17.1 (Evans, *Adversus Marcionem*, 612–13); this possibility is noted by van Roon, *Authenticity*, 75.

8. Lightfoot, “Destination,” 382–83; ABBOTT, ii; Bacon, “Laodiceans,” 26.

9. WH 2.2:123; ABBOTT, ii; Bacon, “Laodiceans,” 27.

B.2 1:10/26–42: τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς

B.2.1 Cyril of Alexandria

Cyril reproduces this passage with different readings in different works. In the vast majority of cases, he reproduces the reading *τά τε ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς* (*f*),<sup>10</sup> but in two cases, he reproduces it with the reading *τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς* (*c*).<sup>11</sup> Neither reading is associated with the Byzantine tradition, so neither can be explained as the result of assimilation towards the popular text. Nevertheless, the overwhelming prevalence of the reading with *τέ* in Cyril's works strongly favors this reading as a candidate for the text known to him. I therefore assign the relative likelihoods for Cyril's reading as  $f \overset{B}{\gg} c$ .

B.2.2 Marius Victorinus

In his commentary on Eph 1:4, Marius Victorinus references the passage in question with *quae et in caelis sunt et in terra*,<sup>12</sup> and in the lemma for 1:10 he has *et quae in caelis sunt, et quae super terram sunt*.<sup>13</sup> Both quotations evidently support the presence of *τέ* in the Greek text, and the survival of a non-Vulgate reading in the lemma suggests that it was copied faithfully.

B.2.3 Tertullian

Tertullian cites the passage in question differently in two works.<sup>14</sup> In *Adversus Marcionem*, he reads it as *quae in caelis et quae in terris*,<sup>15</sup> which could be derived from any of the Greek readings *τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς* (*a*), *τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς* (*c*), or *τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ γῆς* (*e*). In *De monogamia*, he reads *quae sunt super caelos et super terras*,<sup>16</sup> which corresponds almost exactly to the reading *τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς* (*b*). Because Tertullian paraphrases Eph 1:9–10 more freely in the latter work, the form of the passage quoted in the former work seems more reliable. I therefore assign the relative likelihoods for Theodoret's reading as  $a = c = e \overset{C}{\gg} b$ .

Curiously, in both quotations, he has both “heaven” and “earth” in the plural, a reading found in some Old Latin witnesses, but not in any Greek ones.<sup>17</sup> Given the nature of the manuscript

10. Cyril of Alexandria, *Glaph. Gen.* 1 (PG 69:31–32); Cyril of Alexandria, *Exp. Pss.* 9.15 (PG 69:773–74); Cyril of Alexandria, *Comm. Isa.* 4.1.43.1–2 (PG 70:883–84); Cyril of Alexandria, *Mic.* 2.5.2 (Pusey, *Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli Archiepiscopi Alexandrini in XII prophetas* 1:675); Cyril of Alexandria, *Hag.* 2.23 (Pusey, *Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli Archiepiscopi Alexandrini in XII prophetas* 2:281); Cyril of Alexandria, *Quod Unus* (SC 97:508).

11. Cyril of Alexandria, *Glaph. Gen.* 1 (PG 69:27–28); Cyril of Alexandria, *Comm. Isa.* 4.2.45.13 (PG 70:967–68).

12. Marius Victorinus, *Ep. Eph.* 1.1.4 (CSEL 83.2:7).

13. Victorinus, *Ep. Eph.* 1.1.10 (CSEL 83.2:17).

14. Benjamin Douglas Haupt, “Tertullian's Text of the New Testament outside the Gospels” (PhD diss., University of Birmingham, 2019), 263, <https://etheses.bham.ac.uk/id/eprint/9608>.

15. Tertullian, *Marc.* 5.17.1 (Evans, *Adversus Marcionem*, 612–15).

16. Tertullian, *Mon.* 5.2 (SC 343:148).

17. The minuscule 442 does harmonize the two phrases to achieve agreement in number, but it makes them



evidence and our present lack of evidence for common usage of this idiom with both terms in the plural, it is best for us to assume that either Tertullian or a scribe responsible for the Old Latin text familiar to him harmonized the second half of the merism to the first in this way.

#### B.2.4 *Theodoret*

Theodoret's commentary on Ephesians cites this passage twice, both times with the wording of reading *a*, τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.<sup>18</sup> Theodoret also references the passage in one of his epistles, but there, he uses the wording of reading *d*, τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.<sup>19</sup> While the substitution of ἐν for ἐπὶ is well-attested in the manuscript tradition, the combination of this substitution and the omission of τὰ before ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς is found in only one other witness collated for this study, GA 451. Given the rarity of this reading and the variance in precision we would expect for scriptural quotations in personal communication versus those in formal commentary, it seems entirely likely that Theodoret independently paraphrased this passage for clarity and succinctness in his letter and more carefully reproduced the text of his exemplar for his commentary. Ultimately, even if both of these readings came from manuscripts known to Theodoret, his commentary on Ephesians is more immediately relevant to its text than a personal letter would be, so the text of the commentary should take precedence. I therefore assign the relative likelihoods for Theodoret's reading as  $a \overset{A}{\gg} d$ .

---

both singular.

18. Theodoret, *Eph.* 1.10 (PG 82:511–12).

19. Theodoret, *Ep.* 147 (SC 111:230).

B.3 1:15/26–36: καὶ τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους

B.3.1 Chrysostom

The Greek and Latin traditions of Chrysostom's homilies follow different readings. The Greek text of his lemma reads καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους (reading c), while the Latin text reads *et dilectionem in omnes sanctos* (which could correspond to reading b or c).<sup>20</sup> The wording of the Greek tradition could be the result of assimilation to the Byzantine text, and that of the Latin tradition could be the result of assimilation to the Vulgate. But as the majuscule 044 and the Harklean group both support the reading καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους, I consider it much more likely on external grounds that Chrysostom's text had this reading. I therefore rate the readings as  $c \overset{B}{\gg} b$ .

B.3.2 Cyril of Alexandria

Cyril's testimony here is uncertain because he quotes two variant readings for the passage in question in different works. In one work, he quotes the text with the reading καὶ τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους (reading a),<sup>21</sup> while in another, he quotes the text with the reading καὶ τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους ἀγάπην (reading d).<sup>22</sup> Since neither work directly concerns Ephesians, and since neither of Cyril's attested readings can be explained as an assimilation to the Byzantine standard, I assign equal probabilities to both readings for the text familiar to him ( $a = d$ ).

B.3.3 Theodoret

The Greek and Latin traditions of Theodoret's commentary follow different readings. The Greek text of his lemma reads καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους (reading c), while the Latin text reads *et dilectionem in omnes sanctos* (which could correspond to reading b or c).<sup>23</sup> The wording of the Greek tradition could be the result of assimilation to the Byzantine text, and that of the Latin tradition could be the result of assimilation to the Vulgate. But as all of the collated manuscripts of Theodoret's commentary agree on the reading καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους, I consider it much more likely on external grounds that Theodoret's text had this reading. I therefore rate the readings as  $c \overset{B}{\gg} b$ .

20. Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 3.lem (PG 62:23).

21. Cyril of Alexandria, *Trin. dial.* 6 (SC 246:60).

22. Cyril of Alexandria, *Comm. Ioh.* 10.14.25–26 (*Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli Archiepiscopi Alexandrini in D. Joannis evangelium*, ed. Philip Edward Pusey, 3 vols. [Oxford: Clarendon, 1872], 2:507).

23. Theodoret, *Eph.* 1.15–16 (PG 82:513–14).

## B.4 1:20/2-4: ἦν ἐνὶργησεν

B.4.1 *Gregory of Nyssa*

Two different works by Gregory quote this passage with different readings. The first has the perfect ἐνὶργηκεν,<sup>24</sup> while the second has the aorist ἐνὶργηκεν.<sup>25</sup> Since the aorist could be the result of assimilation towards the Byzantine text, the perfect is more likely to be the reading of the text known to Gregory. I therefore rate the relative probabilities of his reading as  $b \overset{C}{\gg} a$ .

---

24. Gregory of Nyssa, *Adv. Ar. et Sab.* (GNO 3.1:77).

25. Gregory of Nyssa, *Inst. Chr.* (GNO 8.1:58).

## B.5 1:20/20–22: καὶ καθίσας

## B.5.1 Chrysostom

Chrysostom quotes this passage with different readings in different works. In his homilies on Ephesians, his lemma for the passage reads καὶ ἐκάθισεν (reading *d*).<sup>26</sup> But in a separate work, he attributes this passage to Paul and quotes it beginning with ἐκάθισεν αὐτόν,<sup>27</sup> which could indicate familiarity with a text that read either καὶ ἐκάθισεν αὐτόν (reading *e*) or ἐκάθισεν αὐτόν (reading *f*). To be sure, Chrysostom could easily have adapted the text for the beginning of a quotation by removing the conjunction and supplying an object. But later scribes could also have conformed the lemma of his homily on Ephesians to the Byzantine text. Given the support of 044 for the reading καὶ ἐκάθισεν αὐτόν (reading *e*) and the potential support of the Old Syriac tradition for the same reading, I consider it more likely than the other two readings to be the text known to Chrysostom:  $e \overset{C}{\gg} d = f$ .

## B.5.2 Origen

The lemma for Origen's commentary and his paraphrase of the passage in the commentary differ in their wording. Specifically, the lemma reads καὶ καθίσας (reading *a*),<sup>28</sup> while the commentary begins an extended paraphrase of 1:20–21 with ὅθεν ὁ ἐγγίρας ἐκ νεκρῶν τὸν Χριστὸν ἐκάθισεν αὐτόν.<sup>29</sup> Since this latter phrase has been adapted in multiple ways to begin a new sentence, Origen's rendering could have been derived from any other reading just as easily as it could have been derived verbatim from the reading ἐκάθισεν αὐτόν (*f*). The reading of the lemma, καὶ καθίσας, is not a Byzantine reading, so it is unlikely that a scribe changed the lemma to conform to a popular text. In light of these considerations, I consider καὶ καθίσας more likely than the other readings to represent the text known to Origen:  $a \overset{C}{\gg} b = c = d = e = f$ .

## B.5.3 Procopius

The Greek and Latin traditions of Procopius's work follow different readings. The Greek tradition reads καὶ καθίσας αὐτόν (reading *b*), while the Latin tradition reads *et constituens* (reading *a*).<sup>30</sup> While the Greek reading could not be the result of assimilation towards the Byzantine text, the Latin reading coincides with the reading of the Vulgate and therefore may have been conformed that text. For these reasons, I consider it more likely that the text known to Procopius read καὶ καθίσας αὐτόν:  $b \overset{C}{\gg} a$ .

26. Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 3.1 (PG 62:23).

27. Chrysostom, *Incomp.* (SC 28bis:236).

28. Origen, *Comm. Eph.* 1.19 (OO 14.4:262).

29. Origen, *Comm. Eph.* 1.19 (OO 14.4:266).

30. Procopius, *Comm. Isa.* 9.1–7 (PG 87.2:2009–10).

## B.6 2:15/28–34: εἰς ἕνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον

## B.6.1 Procopius

The identification of Procopius's text is complicated by the appearance of different readings between and within different works in which he cites this passage. In two of three quotations of this passage in his commentary on Genesis and in all four quotations of this passage in his commentary on Isaiah, he reproduces the reading with *καινόν*.<sup>31</sup> But in one quotation of this passage in his commentary on Genesis, he reproduces the reading with *κοινόν*, and three manuscripts to his commentary still read *καινόν* instead.<sup>32</sup> Transcriptionally, a single scribal error producing the one instance of *κοινόν* seems more likely than multiple changes of *κοινόν* to *καινόν*. But given the ubiquity of *καινόν* in the Byzantine tradition and in many earlier parts of the tradition, a thoroughgoing correction of *κοινόν* to *καινόν* could very well have been possible. On balance, I consider it slightly more likely that the reading with *καινόν* (*a*) was the one familiar to Procopius:  $a \overset{D}{\gg} b$ .

31. Procopius, *Comm. Gen.* 25.32, 27.41 (GCS 2/22:321, 339); Procopius, *Comm. Isa.* 32.9–20, 53.1–12, 54.1–17, 57.15–21 (PG 87.2:2287–88, 2529–930, 2535–36, 2545–46, 2585–86).

32. Procopius, *Comm. Gen.* 49.4 (GCS 2/22:445).

B.7 2:19/2-4: ἄρα οὖν

B.7.1 Chrysostom

The identification of Chrysostom's text is complicated by the appearance of different readings in different works in which he cites this passage. In his *Homilies on Ephesians*, he reads ἄρα οὖν,<sup>33</sup> while in his *Expositions on the Psalms*, he reads ἄρα alone.<sup>34</sup> It is unlikely that the latter quotation lacks οὖν due to an adaptation of conjunctions for the commentary, because the ἄρα itself would also be removed for this purpose. Given this observation, the textual instability of Chrysostom's homilies generally, and the observation that assimilation towards the Byzantine text of Ephesians would be more likely in a work on Ephesians more readily than in a short quotation from a work on the Psalms, I consider it more likely that Chrysostom was familiar with the reading ἄρα. I therefore assign the likelihoods  $b \overset{C}{\gg} a$  for Chrysostom's reading.

33. Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 6.1 (PG 62:43–44).

34. Chrysostom, *Exp. Pss.* 143.3 (PG 55:461).

B.8 **2:21/6–8**:  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\ \omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\delta\omicron\mu\acute{\eta}$

B.8.1 *Chrysostom*

The identification of Chrysostom's text is complicated by the appearance of different readings in the lemma and commentary of his homily and differences in the textual tradition of his homilies. His lemma for this passage has the reading  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\ \eta\ \omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\delta\omicron\mu\acute{\eta}\ (b)$ .<sup>35</sup> In the sources that underlie Migne's edition, the commentary that follows quotes the passage three times with the reading  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\ \omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\delta\omicron\mu\acute{\eta}\ (a)$ .<sup>36</sup> In the Codex Coxianus, however, the commentary consistently follows the lemma in reading  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\ \eta\ \omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\delta\omicron\mu\acute{\eta}\ (b)$  all three times.<sup>37</sup> Given the probability of Byzantine assimilation resulting in the omission of the article, and given Codex Coxianus's preservation of early readings in Chrysostom's homilies, I consider the reading with the article much likelier than the reading without the article to be the one that Chrysostom used in his commentary:  $b \overset{B}{\gg} a$ .

---

35. Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 6.lem (PG 62:43).

36. Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 6.1 (PG 62:44).

37. Wesley Lynn Hemphill, *Codex Coxianus of the Homilies of Chrysostom on Ephesians and His Commentary on Galatians* (Norwood, MA: Norwood, 1916), 31.

## B.9 3:3/2-4: κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν

## B.9.1 Origen

The lemma of Origen’s commentary on Ephesians reads ὅτι κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν, but Origen paraphrases the passage as τούτου χάριν ἐγὼ Παῦλος δέσμιος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν ἐγνωρίσθη μοι τὸ μυστήριον in his commentary.<sup>38</sup> The anacoluthon occasioned by the digression in 3:2–13 has caused Origen some anguish in making sense of the text. After expressing that the author *should* have written a complete sentence to the effect of “For this reason, I, Paul, prisoner of Jesus Christ on behalf of you gentiles *have made known* the mystery,” he gives a short recap of what the author *did* write, including only the phrases necessary for the comparison. Because Origen omits 3:2 from his paraphrase completely a ὅτι or γάρ, if present in his text, would no longer be necessary, and he may well have removed it to adapt the text for his paraphrase. Due to this uncertainty, and due to the fact that the lemma does not specifically belong to Origen’s commentary in the catena, it is best to treat all possibilities for Origen’s reading as equally likely:  $a = b = c$ .

## B.9.2 Theodoret

Both the Greek and Latin traditions of Theodoret’s commentary have ὅτι κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν (*quoniam secundum revelationem*) in the lemma, but they disagree on his quotation of the text in his commentary proper.<sup>39</sup> In the Greek tradition, his commentary reads, Τοῦτο γὰρ ἔφη, ὅτι κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν; it is ambiguous whether the quotation includes the ὅτι or is introduced by it. In the Latin tradition, the introductory formula is altered, and nothing equivalent to the ὅτι is present: *Hoc enim est quod ait, per revelationem* [“For this is what he says: ‘By revelation’”]. Transcriptionally, the lemmata could have been conformed to the Byzantine and Vulgate traditions. But intrinsically, Theodoret could easily have dropped the conjunction as part of a typical adaptation in quoting a text. Since all of the collated witnesses to Theodoret’s commentary have a text with ὅτι, it is more likely than not that Theodoret’s text had this reading:  $b = a$ .

---

38. Origen, *Comm. Eph.* 2.28 (OO 14.4:284).

39. Theodoret, *Eph.* 3.1–4 (PG 82:525–26).



B.10 **3:9/6:** *πάντας*B.10.1 *Cyril of Alexandria*

Cyril quotes this text with different readings in different works. In one work, he includes the word *πάντας* (as in reading *a*),<sup>40</sup> but in two others, his quotation lacks it (as in reading *b*).<sup>41</sup> Between the higher frequency of the shorter reading in his works and the probability of the longer reading being the result of assimilation towards the Byzantine text, it is far more likely that the text of Ephesians familiar to Cyril lacked *πάντας*. I therefore assign the relative likelihoods for Cyril's reading as  $b \overset{B}{\gg} a$ .

---

40. Cyril of Alexandria, *Comm. Luc.* 10.21 (PG 72:669–70).

41. Cyril of Alexandria, *Arcad.* §209 (ACO 1.1.5:115); Cyril of Alexandria, *Ths.* §34 (PG 75:611–12).

## B.11 3:9/41: –

## B.11.1 Marius Victorinus

Marius Victorinus, who quotes this passage in his commentary, faithfully reproduces everything but the equivalent of διὰ Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ. It is nevertheless noteworthy that he goes to great lengths in his exposition to assert that God created all things through Christ: *Ergo creator licet Deus accipiatur, sed per Christum tamen creator Deus. Creator enim non convenit Deo, sed convenit Christo, et sic per Christum Deo. Ille enim genuit Christum: Christus creavit omnia ipso Deo operante et per se creante. Ita unum est quod creata sunt omnia, et ab uno creata sunt.*<sup>42</sup> Since, if he possessed a text with the longer reading, he could easily have quoted it to support his argument as he does elsewhere in his commentary on this verse, we can conclude that he did not possess a text with the longer reading.

## B.11.2 Theodoret

Theodoret quotes this passage with the shorter reading (a) and the longer reading (b) in three works. In two commentaries on other biblical books, he quotes the shorter reading.<sup>43</sup> In his commentary on Ephesians, meanwhile, the lemma for this passage, in both its Greek and Latin traditions, adds διὰ Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ at the end of the verse,<sup>44</sup> and Theodoret's commentary, despite paraphrasing the entire passage, includes a statement reminiscent of the longer reading: Πάσαι γὰρ τοῦτο ἦν καὶ μόνῳ τῷ θεῷ γνώριμον ὃς τὰ πάντα πεποίηκε συνεργῶ χρησάμενος τῷ Ὑιῷ.<sup>45</sup> Theodoret's imprecise reference to the son's role in creation could suggest that he had a text with the shorter reading and supplied this connection by interpretation.<sup>46</sup> But the fact that the whole passage is paraphrased rather than quoted precisely undermines this argument. Theodoret could also have had the longer reading before him and was expounding on what it meant. In terms of external evidence, all of the collated Theodoret commentaries have the longer reading, so it is much more likely that he reproduced the longer reading in his commentary on Ephesians. The presence of the shorter reading in his other works could be explained by his use of Chrysostom's homilies on the Pauline Epistles as a source for his commentaries.<sup>47</sup> Theodoret

42. "Therefore God may be taken as the creator, but it is through Christ that God is the creator. For the Creator does not correspond to God, but corresponds to Christ, and so through Christ to God. For he begat Christ: Christ created all things by working with God himself and creating by himself. Thus it is that all things were created, and that they were created by one" (Victorinus, *Ep. Eph.* 1.3.9 [CSEL 83.2:1266, translation mine]).

43. Theodoret, *Rom.* 1.17 (PG 82:57–58); Theodoret, *Dan.* 10.13 (PG 81:1497–98).

44. Theodoret, *Eph.* 3.9 (PG 82:527–28); Robert C. Hill, trans., *Theodoret of Cyrus: Commentary on The Letters of St Paul*, 2 vols. (Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2001), 43.

45. "[O]f old it was hidden, and was known only to God, who created everything by employing the Son as fellow worker" (Theodoret, *Eph.* 3.9 [PG 82:528]; Hill, *Theodoret of Cyrus*, 43).

46. This is suggested by the editor at PG 82:528 n. 42.

47. Evidence for this dependence is discussed at length in Peter J. Montoro, "Revision and Reference: The Transformations of the Biblical Text of Chrysostom's Homilies on Romans and Their Significance for the Transmission of the New Testament" (PhD diss., University of Birmingham, 2024), 964–96.

likely quoted a local text of Ephesians with the shorter reading (either from a manuscript or from memory) in his other works, but for his commentary on Ephesians, he adopted the longer reading from Chrysostom's homilies and then expounded on it extensively. I therefore assign the relative likelihoods for Theodoret's reading as  $b \overset{B}{\gg} a$ .

B.12 3:13/4-8: αἰτοῦμαι μὴ ἐγκακεῖν

B.12.1 Chrysostom

The Greek tradition of Chrysostom's homilies in this passage is divided. While the sources underlying Migne's edition have the Byzantine reading αἰτοῦμαι μὴ ἐκκακεῖν (*b*), the Codex Coxianus of his homilies has αἰτοῦμαι μὴ ἐνκακεῖν (an orthographic subvariant of reading *a*).<sup>48</sup> Given the likelihood that Byzantine assimilation resulted in the substitution of ἐκκακεῖν for ἐνκακεῖν and Codex Coxianus's fidelity in preserving earlier readings, I consider the non-Byzantine reading much more likely than the Byzantine reading to have been the one known to Chrysostom:  $a \overset{B}{\gg} b$ .

---

48. The passage in question is Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 7.1 (PG 62:50). Codex Coxianus's reading is noted in Hemphill, *Codex Coxianus*, 17, 33.

## B.13 3:14/19: –

B.13.1 *Valentinus and the Refutatio*

The anonymous author of the *Refutatio omnium haeresium* quotes a version of Eph 3:14–18 that has the longer reading τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, but he is technically not quoting his own text of Ephesians. To the contrary, he is quoting a text that he attributes to his opponent, the second-century teacher Valentinus. Given the extent of the differences between the text he attributes to Valentinus and the texts of all manuscripts of Ephesians collated for this study, the quotation in the *Refutatio* and the NA<sup>28</sup> text of Eph 3:14–18 are printed in parallel below.

<i>Ref.</i> 6.34.7 (SBLWGRW 40:428)	Eph 3:14 (NA <sup>28</sup> )
«τούτου χάριν κάμπτω τὰ γόνατά μου πρὸς τὸν θεὸν καὶ πατέρα καὶ κύριον τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ»,	14 τούτου χάριν κάμπτω τὰ γόνατά μου πρὸς τὸν πατέρα,
«ἵνα δώῃ ἡμῖν ὁ θεὸς	15 ἐξ οὗ πᾶσα πατριὰ ἐν οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς ὀνομάζεται, 16 ἵνα δῶ ὑμῖν
«κατοικῆσαι τὸν Χριστὸν» «εἰς τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον», τουτέστι τὸν ψυχικόν, οὐ τὸν σωματικόν,	κατὰ τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ δυνάμει κραταιωθῆναι διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον, 17 κατοικῆσαι τὸν Χριστὸν
«ἵνα ἐξισχύσητε νοῆσαι»,  «τί τὸ βάθος» ὅπερ ἐστὶν ὁ Πατὴρ τῶν ὅλων, «καὶ τί τὸ πλάτος» ὅπερ ἐστὶν ὁ Σταυρός, ὁ Ὅρος τοῦ πληρώματος, «καὶ τί τὸ μῆκος» τουτέστι τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν αἰώνων	διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, ἐν ἀγάπῃ ἐρριζωμένοι καὶ τεθεμελιωμένοι, 18 ἵνα ἐξισχύσητε καταλαβέσθαι σὺν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἁγίοις τί τὸ πλάτος  καὶ μῆκος  καὶ ὕψος  καὶ βάθος

We might wonder if this quotation was conformed to the more common text by the addition of the longer reading, but the general nature of the quotation makes this highly unlikely. In particu-

lar, the quoted text also differs from the common text in major ways that remain unchanged: the phrase *πρὸς τὸν πατέρα* has been expanded to *πρὸς τὸν θεὸν καὶ πατέρα καὶ κύριον*, a change not found in the manuscript tradition; the entirety of 3:15, which establishes the *πατέρα-πατριά* connection, is omitted; and multiple portions of 3:16–18 are omitted or transposed. It seems unlikely that a later scribe, or the author of the *Refutatio*, would only change a minute detail in the quotation while leaving the larger variations intact.

Intrinsic features of the quoted text also indicate that the longer reading was originally part of it. Given some of the major changes introduced in the quotation—specifically, the omission of 3:15 in particular and the expansion of God’s title from “father” to “God and father and lord,” which reduces the emphasis on his fatherhood—the addition of *τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* in this quotation serves to establish a parallel between 3:14 and 3:15: the author of Ephesians prays to God, the father and lord of Jesus, so that God will give Jesus to dwell in the inner person of the readers. The reference to the “lord of our lord” might also have been intended as an echo of Ps 110:1. These features are better explained by the presence of the longer reading in Valentinus’s text than by its absence.

At the same time, the paraphrastic and interpretive nature of the quotation suggests that it does not reflect some lost part of the manuscript tradition of Ephesians. It is more likely that Valentinus or the author of the *Refutatio* rearranged large portions of the text freely to highlight the salient points of Valentinian interpretation, a hypothesis that finds confirmation in the *τουτέστι* and *ὅπερ ἐστὶν* interjections scattered throughout the latter half of the quotation.

Ultimately, we have no indication that Valentinus or the author of the *Refutatio* was unfamiliar with the longer reading, and its extensive support in the manuscript tradition coupled with its appearance in this quotation is sufficient evidence that they were familiar with it. But the creative rereading of the passage presented in this quotation shows us how interpretation on the part of other readers and scribes might have given rise to the longer reading in the manuscript tradition.

B.14 **3:18/16–32:** *τί τὸ πλάτος καὶ μῆκος καὶ ὕψος καὶ βάθος*

B.14.1 *Chrysostom*

Chrysostom's text is difficult to ascertain because the reading quoted in his homily differs in the Greek and Latin traditions. In Greek, his lemma and commentary both read the sequence *πλάτος-μῆκος-βάθος-ὕψος* (reading *b*) in agreement with the Byzantine tradition, but in Latin, his lemma and commentary both read the sequence *longitudo-latitudo-sublimitas-profundum*, corresponding to the Greek sequence *μῆκος-πλάτος-ὕψος-βάθος* (reading *c*).<sup>49</sup> The sequence found in the Greek tradition could easily be the result of assimilation to the Byzantine standard, while the sequence found in the Latin tradition is not attested in any of the manuscripts collated for this study. But given the sheer variety of sequences of preserved by extant witnesses to Ephesians in this passage, it is entirely plausible that Chrysostom arrived at the distinctive sequence attested in the Latin text of his commentary in the same way that other branches of the tradition of Ephesians arrived at their own sequences. Between this and the likelihood of Byzantine influence in the Greek tradition of his homilies, I consider it best to assign the likelihoods  $c \overset{C}{\gg} b$  to the reading of Chrysostom's text.

B.14.2 *Irenaeus*

Irenaeus's testimony here is uncertain because the reading he quotes differs in the Greek and Latin traditions. A Greek fragment of *Adversus haereses* has the sequence *ὕψος-μῆκος-πλάτος-βάθος* (reading *g*), while the Latin tradition has *altitudinem-longitudinem-latitudinem* (*n*).<sup>50</sup> The Armenian tradition of his work agrees with the Latin with the sequence *զրարծրութիւն-զերկայնութիւն-զլայնութիւն*.<sup>51</sup> Neither reading conforms to the Byzantine or Vulgate standard. Since the shorter reading of the Latin and Armenian traditions is equivalent to the Greek sequence *ὕψος-μῆκος-πλάτος*, the reading of the Greek fragment could be the result of a corrector appending the missing dimension *βάθος* at the end, possibly from memory. Conversely, the shorter reading of the Latin and Armenian traditions could be the result of haplography or an omission intended to remove a superfluous element in the longer sequence. Since the shorter reading could be explained as arising from the longer reading by multiple causes, I consider the longer reading of the Greek fragment more likely to reflect the text known to Irenaeus:  $g \overset{C}{\gg} n$ .

It is also worth noting that while other passages in this work contain distinct sequences of dimensions, the passage above is the only one likely to allude to Ephesians. In one book of *Adversus haereses*, Irenaeus appears to have Ephesians in view, as he subsequently makes a reference to “gathering together two peoples to one God” that is reminiscent of Eph 2:14–18, and he concludes with a close paraphrase of Eph 4:6, *ὅτι εἰς ὁ Θεός, ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων καὶ διὰ πάντων καὶ ἐν*

49. Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 7.1–2 (PG 62:51).

50. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 5.17.4 (SC 153:234).

51. Irenaeus, *Haer. (Arm.)* 5.17.4 (TUGAL 35.2:195).

παῶν ἡμῶν.<sup>52</sup> In another book of the same work, he lists the sequence *profundum-longitudinem-altitudinem*,<sup>53</sup> apparently in reference to the creator, but he does not make any other reference to Ephesians in the surrounding context to suggest that the present passage is in view. In yet another book of the same work, he lists the sequences *latitudinem-longitudinem-altitudinem* and *latitudinem-longitudinem-profundum-altitudinem*,<sup>54</sup> but in both cases, he is referring to the vastness of the universe in the palm of God's hand (expounding on Isa 40:12), and no other reference to Ephesians occurs in the surrounding context to suggest that he has the present passage in mind. Thus, I consider only readings *g* and *n* as candidates for the reading of this passage familiar to Irenaeus.

#### B.14.3 Cyril of Alexandria

Cyril's testimony here is uncertain because he quotes two variant readings for the passage in question in different works. In one work, he quotes the text with the sequence πλάτος-μῆκος-ὕψος-βάθος (reading *a*),<sup>55</sup> while in two others, he quotes the text with the sequence πλάτος-μῆκος-βάθος-ὕψος (reading *b*).<sup>56</sup> Neither work directly concerns Ephesians, but since the sequence πλάτος-μῆκος-βάθος-ὕψος could be the result of assimilation to the Byzantine standard, I consider the sequence πλάτος-μῆκος-ὕψος-βάθος found in two of Cyril's works more likely (*a* <sup>C</sup> *b*).

52. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 5.17.4 (SC 153:234).

53. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 2.25.4 (SC 294:254).

54. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 4.19.2 (SC 100.2:618, 620).

55. Cyril of Alexandria, *Ador.* 1 (PG 68:167–68); Cyril of Alexandria, *Glaph. Gen.* 2.5 (PG 69:65–66).

56. Cyril of Alexandria, *Comm. Ioh.* 10.14.27 (*Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli Archiepiscopi Alexandrini in D. Joannis evangelium*, 2:508).



B.15 **3:19/20–34**: ἵνα πληρωθῇτε εἰς πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ θεοῦ

B.15.1 *Homiliae spirituales*

The pseudo-Macarian *Homiliae spirituales* quote this passage twice, each time with a different reading. Specifically, one quotation has the common reading ἵνα πληρωθῇτε εἰς πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ θεοῦ (reading *a*),<sup>57</sup> while another has the sparsely attested reading ἵνα πληρωθῇτε εἰς πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χριστοῦ (reading *f*).<sup>58</sup> The quotation featuring the wording with θεοῦ is a more extensive quotation of this portion of Ephesians and as such is less likely to be a paraphrase, but this longer quotation, if it had originally read χριστοῦ for θεοῦ, could more easily have tipped off a scribe or reader that the quotation was not in agreement with the predominant Byzantine tradition of Ephesians. At the same time, the shorter quotation featuring the wording with χριστοῦ is strung together with quotations from 4:13, which culminates in a reference to “the fullness of Christ” (τοῦ πληρώματος τοῦ χριστοῦ), so the author of the homily could have altered the wording of the quotation of 3:19 to agree with the quotations that followed it. With only two quotations to serve as a basis for a judgment, the evidence is hardly decisive, so I rate the relative likelihoods of the readings as *a* = *f*.

57. *Homiliae spirituales* 46.5 (PTS 4:303).

58. *Homiliae spirituales* 18.11 (PTS 4:182).

4:8/6–18: ἀναβὰς εἰς ὕψος ἡχμαλώτευσεν αἰχμαλωσίαν, ἔδωκεν δόματα

B.16 4:8/6–18: ἀναβὰς εἰς ὕψος ἡχμαλώτευσεν αἰχμαλωσίαν, ἔδωκεν δόματα

B.16.1 Cyril of Alexandria

The Greek and Latin traditions of Cyril's work differ on his wording of this passage. His quotation of the passage in the Greek tradition reads ἀναβὰς εἰς ὕψος ἡχμαλώτευσεν αἰχμαλωσίαν ἔδωκε δόματα (reading a), while his quotation in the Latin tradition has the more paraphrastic *cum ascendisset in altum, captivam duxisse captivitatem, dedisseque dona*, whose closest Greek equivalent is ἀναβὰς εἰς ὕψος ἡχμαλώτευσεν αἰχμαλωσίαν καὶ ἔδωκεν δόματα (reading b).<sup>59</sup> The explanation of vulgatization is not at hand for either reading, as the reading of the Greek tradition does not conform to the Byzantine reading, and the reading of the Latin tradition does not conform to the reading of the Vulgate. I therefore consider it safest to regard the two choices as equally likely candidates for the reading of Cyril's text:  $a = b$ .

B.16.2 Eusebius

Eusebius quotes this passage with different readings in different works. In one work, his quotation reads ἀναβὰς εἰς ὕψος ἡχμαλώτευσεν αἰχμαλωσίαν ἔδωκε δόματα (reading a),<sup>60</sup> and in the other work, his quotation reads ἀναβὰς εἰς ὕψος ἡχμαλώτευσεν αἰχμαλωσίαν καὶ ἔδωκε δόματα (reading b). Since the text of the latter quotation could have been assimilated to the Byzantine text, it is best to give preference to the text of the former quotation as representative of the text known to Eusebius. I therefore rate the relative probabilities of the candidates for Eusebius's reading as  $a \overset{C}{\gg} b$ .

B.16.3 Irenaeus

Irenaeus quotes this passage with different readings in different works. In one work, preserved only in Latin, he writes, *ascendens enim in altitudinem Dominus per passionem, captivam duxit captivitatem, dedit dona hominibus*, which corresponds to the Greek reading ἀναβὰς ... ἡχμαλώτευσεν ... ἔδωκεν (a) adapted to incorporate his comments.<sup>61</sup> It is unclear whether he is quoting Ps 68:18 or Eph 4:8, as he does not even signal that he is quoting anything. In another work, preserved only in Armenian, his text reads ել ի բարձունս գերեաց զգերութիւնս ւն եւ տուրս մարդկան, which corresponds to ἀνέβη ... ἡχμαλώτευσεν ... ἔδωκεν (reading e), except that ւն (ἐλαβεν) is added before եւ (ἔδωκεν).<sup>62</sup> In this work, he clearly quoting the psalm, as he attributes it to David and quotes Ps 68:17–18 together. But the fact that his text conflates ἐλαβεν, which is closer to the psalm's Septuagintal text, with ἔδωκεν, which is found in Eph 4:8, could indicate that Irenaeus himself incorporated parts of the text of Eph 4:8 known to him into his

59. Cyril of Alexandria, *Ador.* 13 (PG 68:873–74).

60. Eusebius, *Ecl. proph.* 3.3 (Gaisford, *Eclogae propheticae*, 102).

61. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 2.30.3 (SC 294:204).

62. Irenaeus, *Dem.* §83 (PO 12.5:719).

extended quotation of the psalm.<sup>63</sup> The Latin reading in his first work could be the result of assimilation towards the Vulgate text, but the reading in his second work could depend more on Irenaeus's text of Psalms than his text of Ephesians. Since the text of the first work is more likely to be based on Eph 4:8 than the text of the second work is, I tentatively consider its reading slightly more likely as a candidate for the text known to Irenaeus. I therefore rate the relative probabilities of the candidates for Irenaeus's reading as  $a \overset{D}{\gg} e$ .

#### B.16.4 *Theodore*

The Greek manuscripts of Theodore disagree on his wording here, and the Latin tradition of his work agrees with some of these manuscripts over others. Of the Theodore manuscripts consulted for his edition, 606 reads ἀναβὰς εἰς ὕψος ἡχμαλώτευσας αἰχμαλωσίαν, ἔδωκε δόματα (a), while the rest support the reading ἀναβὰς εἰς ὕψος ἡχμαλώτευσας αἰχμαλωσίαν καὶ ἔδωκε δόματα (d). The Latin tradition agrees with 606 on the reading *ascendens in altum captivam duxit captivitatem, dedit dona hominibus* (a). Transcriptionally, the Latin reading can be explained by assimilation to the Vulgate, but neither of the Greek readings can be explained by assimilation to the Byzantine text. For these reasons, I rate the relative probabilities of the candidates for Theodore's reading as equally likely:  $a = d$ .

---

63. This is suggested by W. Hall Harris III, although he also notes that Irenaeus may be remembering ἔδωκεν not from Ephesians, but from an earlier tradition. He grants that the conflation could be a scribal emendation, but he considers this less likely (*The Descent of Christ: Ephesians 4:7–11 and Traditional Hebrew Imagery*, AGAJU 32 [Leiden: Brill, 1996], 117). Yet it is noteworthy that in Ephrem's commentary, which is also preserved in an Armenian translation, the same conflation occurs with a conjunction supplied between the two verbs. This parallel development indicates that Armenian translators or scribes may have been inclined to harmonize the two versions of this quotation in their texts or to make a marginal note of their most substantial difference in wording (with later scribes copying these notes into the text).

B.17 4:9/12-20: εἰ μὴ ὅτι καὶ κατέβη

B.17.1 Cyril of Alexandria

Cyril's quotation of this passage follows different readings in different works. In one work, he reads εἰ μὴ ὅτι καὶ κατέβη (reading *a*),<sup>64</sup> while in another, he reads εἰ μὴ ὅτι καὶ κατέβη πρῶτον (reading *c*).<sup>65</sup> Since the inclusion of *πρῶτον* could be the result of subsequent scribes conforming Cyril's quotation to the Byzantine text, the quotation with εἰ μὴ ὅτι καὶ κατέβη<sup>C</sup> is more likely to reflect the form of the text familiar to Cyril. I therefore assign the likelihoods  $a \gg c$  to the reading of Cyril's text.

B.17.2 Hilary

Hilary's quotation of this passage follows different readings in different works. At two places in one work, he reads *nisi quia et descendit* (corresponding to reading *a*),<sup>66</sup> while in another work, he reads *nisi qui descendit* (corresponding to reading *b*). Neither reading agrees with the Vulgate, so it is best to regard both reading as equally likely candidates for the text known to Hilary. I therefore assign the likelihoods  $a = b$  to the reading of Hilary's text.

B.17.3 Pelagius

The manuscript tradition of Pelagius's commentary on Ephesians is divided on his reading in this passage. The manuscript B, one of the primary witnesses to the commentary,<sup>67</sup> as well as the secondary manuscripts R and V, agree with the Vulgate in reading *primum* after *nisi quod et descendit* (reading *c*); the remaining manuscripts only have *nisi quod et descendit* (reading *a*).<sup>68</sup> Two details speak against the originality of *primum* in Pelagius's text. First, in the manuscripts that include it, it is placed at the start of the lemma containing the second half of the verse, *in inferiora terrae*, rather than in its expected place at the end of the lemma containing the first half, *quod autem ascendit, quid est nisi quod et descendit*. This placement could hardly have been by design, and it is more easily explained as a poorly executed interpolation. Second, Pelagius does not expound on the order of the descent in his commentary on either half of the verse. His comment after the lemma that begins with *primum* in some witnesses is simply, *infernum sub terra esse nemo iam ambigat* ["now no one doubts hell to be under the earth"]. In addition to this evidence, the support of the other primary manuscripts in the tradition for the absence of *primum* and the scribal temptation to gravitate towards the Vulgate text strongly favors the hypothesis that

64. Cyril of Alexandria, *Arcad.* (ACO 1.1.5:105).

65. Cyril of Alexandria, *Exp. Pss.* 46.6–7 (PG 69:1055–56).

66. Hilary, *Tract. Pss.* 56.6 (SC 565:220); Hilary, *Tract. Pss.* 67.19 (SC 605:88).

67. Alexander Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions of Thirteen Epistles of St. Paul*, TextsS 1/9.2 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1922; repr., Nedeln: Krauss, 1967), 1:201, 213.

68. Pelagius, *Exp. Eph.* 4.9 (Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions*, 2:364).

Pelagius's text read *nisi quod et descendit*. I therefore assign the likelihoods  $a \overset{B}{\gg} c$  to the reading of Pelagius's text.

B.18 4:9/22–30: εἰς τὰ κατώτερα τῆς γῆς

B.18.1 Eusebius

Eusebius's quotations of this passage have different readings in different works. He reads εἰς τὰ κατώτερα τῆς γῆς in one work<sup>69</sup> and εἰς τὰ κατώτατα τῆς γῆς in another,<sup>70</sup> while in a third work, he reads εἰς τὰ κατώτερα μέρη τῆς γῆς.<sup>71</sup> Obviously, assimilation towards the Byzantine text would suggest the addition of μέρη. Indeed, in other parts of this last work where Eusebius refers to “places lower than the earth” or “lower parts of the earth,” but is not obviously quoting the passage in question, the shorter phrase εἰς τὰ κατώτερα τῆς γῆς remains intact,<sup>72</sup> which suggests that emendators have brought his quotation of 4:9 into agreement with the Byzantine text when they identified it as a quotation. Finally, even if this is not the case, it is evident that Eusebius is being looser with the text here than he is in his other writings, as he transposes the phrase in question after ὁ ἀναβάς in 4:10.<sup>73</sup> For these reasons, it is far more likely that the text known to Eusebius read εἰς τὰ κατώτερα τῆς γῆς (*a*) than that it read εἰς τὰ κατώτερα μέρη τῆς γῆς (*c*). I therefore assign the likelihoods  $a \overset{B}{\gg} c$  to the reading of Eusebius's text.

B.18.2 Irenaeus

Irenaeus's quotations of this passage differ in different traditions of his work. One of his quotations of this passage lacks the equivalent of μέρη in the Latin and Armenian traditions.<sup>74</sup> In another quotation, however, the Latin tradition reads *in inferiora terrae* (which corresponds to reading *a* or *b*),<sup>75</sup> while the Armenian tradition reads ի ստորև կողմս երկրի (which corresponds to reading *c* or *d*).<sup>76</sup> Transcriptionally, the inclusion of the equivalent of μέρη in this quotation could be the result of assimilation towards the Byzantine or Vulgate traditions or a natural gloss in translation. Between these factors and the agreement of the Latin and Armenian traditions on the absence of μέρη in the other quotation, I consider the readings without μέρη much more likely to reflect the text familiar to Irenaeus:  $a = b \overset{B}{\gg} c = d$ .

69. Eusebius, *Comm. Pss.* 62.7–9 (PG 23:611–12).

70. Eusebius, *Dem. ev.* 6.2.6 (GCS 1/23:253).

71. Eusebius, *Ecl. proph.* 3.3 (Gaisford, *Eclogae propheticae*, 101).

72. Eusebius, *Ecl. proph.* 2.14, 3.8 (Gaisford, *Eclogae propheticae*, 90, 108).

73. Incidentally, the same transposition occurs in the Sahidic Coptic version. In both cases, it was probably intended to place the two halves of the “lower than the earth”–“above all the heavens” merism in closer correspondence.

74. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 5.31.1 (SC 153:390) (Irenaeus, *Haer. [Arm.]* 5.31.1 [TUGAL 35.2:229]).

75. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 4.22.1 (SC 100.2:688).

76. Irenaeus, *Haer. (Arm.)* 4.36.1 (TUGAL).

B.18.3 *Origen*

Origen's references to this passage have different readings between and within his works. In his commentary on Ephesians, he paraphrases this passage with εἰς τὰ κατώτατα τῆς γῆς,<sup>77</sup> which is presumably a gloss for the reading εἰς τὰ κατώτερα τῆς γῆς (a). Meanwhile, his commentary on John features this gloss,<sup>78</sup> the more precise reproduction εἰς τὰ κατώτερα τῆς γῆς,<sup>79</sup> and the longer reading εἰς τὰ κατώτερα μέρη τῆς γῆς.<sup>80</sup> Since his commentary on Ephesians takes precedence, and since the reading with μέρη could very well be a clarification on Origen's part or a Byzantine assimilation, I consider it far more likely that the text known to Origen read εἰς τὰ κατώτερα τῆς γῆς (a) than that it read εἰς τὰ κατώτερα μέρη τῆς γῆς (c). I therefore assign the likelihoods  $a \overset{B}{\gg} c$  to the reading of Origen's text.

---

77. Origen, *Comm. Eph.* 2.35 (OO 14.4:292).

78. Origen, *Comm. John* 19.21.140 (SC 290:132).

79. Origen, *Comm. John* 19.21.141 (SC 290:132).

80. Origen, *Comm. John* 19.20.137, 19.21.140 (SC 290:128, 132).

B.19 4:17/22–30: καθὼς καὶ τὰ ἔθνη περιπατεῖ

## B.19.1 Chrysostom

Chrysostom cites this passage in multiple works, and the tradition of the most relevant work is divided. In one work, the Greek tradition features a paraphrase of the text with *μὴ καθὼς τὰ λοιπὰ ἔθνη περιπατεῖτε* (corresponding to reading *b*), and the Latin reads *non sicut caeterae gentes ambulant*, which reproduces the equivalent of *λοιπά*, although it differs in the conjugation of the verb.<sup>81</sup> Likewise, in one of his homilies on 1 Corinthians, the Greek reads *καθὼς καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἔθνη*, and the Latin tradition reads *sicut reliquae gentes ambulant*, which agrees with the Greek apart from the lack of a conjunction.<sup>82</sup> But in one of his homilies on Ephesians, the Greek reads *καθὼς καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἔθνη*, while the Latin has *sicut et gentes ambulant* (reading *a*).<sup>83</sup> His comments in all three works are illuminating. In all three, he cites 1 Thess 4:5 as a point of comparison. In one, he follows the wording *μὴ ἐν πάθει ἀτιμίας, καθάπερ ἔθνη* (*non in passione ignominiae, sicut gentes*), which has *καθάπερ* instead of *καθὼς* and lacks *λοιπά* in agreement with most of the manuscript tradition, including the Byzantine majority.<sup>84</sup> But in the other two, he consistently quotes this passage with the wording *μὴ ἐν πάθει ἐπιθυμίας, καθὼς καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἔθνη* (*non in passione desiderii, sicut et ceterae gentes*).<sup>85</sup> Chrysostom's uncommon wording of 1 Thess 4:5 in the latter works suggests that he or the text he knew conformed it to the same wording in Ephesians. So while the inclusion of *λοιπά* in the Greek tradition of these works could be the result of assimilation to the Byzantine standard, the inclusion of *λοιπά* in the quotation of 1 Thess 4:5 cannot be explained in the same way. The more likely alternative, on the basis of the above observations, is that the Latin tradition was conformed to the text of the Vulgate, which lacks the equivalent of *λοιπά*. In light of these considerations, I consider it much more likely that Chrysostom's text had *λοιπά* than that it lacked it: *b* <sup>B</sup>  $\gg$  *a*.

---

81. Chrysostom, *Laz.* 5.3 (PG 48:1021).

82. Chrysostom, *Hom. 1 Cor.* 15.1 (PG 61:121).

83. Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 12.lem, 12.1, 13.lem (PG 62:87, 88–89, 93).

84. Chrysostom, *Laz.* 5.3 (PG 48:1021).

85. Chrysostom, *Hom. 1 Cor.* 15.1 (PG 61:121); Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 12.1 (PG 62:89).



B.20 5:4/2–12: καὶ αἰσχροτύτης καὶ μωρολογία ἢ εὐτραπεία

#### B.20.1 Basil of Caesarea

The manuscript tradition of the work in which Basil quotes this passage is divided. The Greek tradition has the reading καὶ αἰσχροτύτης ἢ μωρολογία εὐτραπεία, which presumably arose from καὶ αἰσχροτύτης ἢ μωρολογία ἢ εὐτραπεία (reading *c*) by the oversight of a single letter, while the Latin tradition has the reading *aut turpitudine aut stultiloquium aut scurrilitas*, which corresponds most closely to the sequence of conjunctions ἢ ... ἢ ... ἢ (reading *d*).<sup>86</sup> While the Latin reading could simply be the result of assimilation to the Vulgate, the Greek reading could not be the result of assimilation to the Byzantine text, as it does not have the Byzantine reading. On the basis of these transcriptional concerns, the reading of the Greek tradition is more likely to reflect the text familiar to Basil: *c*  $\gg$  *d*.

#### B.20.2 Chrysostom

One quotation in the Greek tradition of Chrysostom's homilies on Ephesians follows a different reading than every other quotation he makes of this passage. According to Migne's edition, this quotation takes the form καὶ αἰσχροτύτης γὰρ, φησὶ, καὶ μωρολογία, ἢ εὐτραπεία, which agrees with the Byzantine reading (*a*) outside of the words added to fit the quotation to its context in the homily.<sup>87</sup> But the Codex Coxianus, an important witness to Chrysostom's homilies that preserves earlier readings elsewhere, reads καὶ αἰσχροτύτης γὰρ, φησὶ, καὶ μωρολογία, καὶ εὐτραπεία, which agree with the sequence καί ... καί ... καί found in reading *b*.<sup>88</sup> Its reading here is vindicated by the Latin tradition of Chrysostom's homilies (also reproduced in Migne's edition), which features the wording *et turpitudine et stultiloquium et scurrilitas*, in disagreement with the equivalent of ἢ ... ἢ ... ἢ preserved in the Vulgate tradition (reading *d*). This finding is extensively corroborated by the Greek and Latin traditions of several other works by Chrysostom that quote this passage: all of them feature a καί between μωρολογία and εὐτραπεία.<sup>89</sup> The magnitude and consistency of this body of evidence leaves virtually no room for doubt that Chrysostom's text of Ephesians read καὶ αἰσχροτύτης καὶ μωρολογία καὶ εὐτραπεία. In terms of external evidence, Chrysostom's text lacks its usual affinities to 044, the Harklean group, and the early Syriac tradition, but it does appear to be part of a local Antiochene text rather than an innovation made by Chrysostom himself, because it is also attested in Theodore of Mopsuestia's commentary.<sup>90</sup> Between these considerations and the likelihood that Migne's witnesses to Chrysostom's homilies

86. Basil of Caesarea, *Mor.* 69.1 (PG 31:809–10).

87. Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 17.1 (PG 62:118).

88. Hemphill, *Codex Coxianus*, 49.

89. Chrysostom, *Hom. 1 Cor.* 7.7 (PG 61:64); Chrysostom, *Hom. Col.* 12.6 (PG 62:389); Chrysostom, *Hom. Heb.* 15.4, 24.3 (PG 63:122, 172); Chrysostom, *Laz.* 1.12 (PG 48:980); see also the allusion to this passage in Chrysostom, *Oppugn.* 3.14 (PG 47:373).

90. Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Eph.* 5.4 (SBLWGRW 26:262).

were conformed to the Byzantine text, I consider the reading καί ... καί ... καί (b) absolutely more likely to represent Chrysostom's text than καί ... καί ... ἢ (a):  $b \overset{A}{\gg} a$ .

### B.20.3 Cyril of Alexandria

The manuscript tradition of the work in which Cyril quotes this passage is divided. The Greek tradition has the reading καὶ αἰσχροτής καὶ μωρολογία ἢ εὐτραπεία (a), while the Latin tradition has the reading *nec turpitudine aut stultiloquium aut scurrilitas*, which corresponds most closely to the sequence of conjunctions καὶ ... ἢ ... ἢ (reading c).<sup>91</sup> While the Greek reading could simply be the result of assimilation to the Byzantine text, the Latin reading could not be the result of assimilation to the Vulgate, as it disagrees with the reading of the Vulgate. On the basis of these transcriptional concerns, the reading of the Latin tradition is more likely to reflect the text familiar to Theodoret:  $c \overset{C}{\gg} a$ .

### B.20.4 Irenaeus

The manuscript tradition of the work in which Irenaeus quotes this passage is divided. The Latin tradition features the reading *aut turpitudine aut vaniloquium aut scurrilitas*, corresponding to the sequence of conjunctions ἢ ... ἢ ... ἢ (reading d).<sup>92</sup> The Armenian tradition, meanwhile, reads և կամ ամալթալի ինչ և կամ տալաբանութիւն մորսութեան կամ խեղկատակութիւն, which has և կամ (literally “and or,” but probably better rendered “nor” here) for the first two conjunctions and կամ (“or”) alone for the last conjunction, which most closely corresponds to the sequence καί ... καί ... ἢ (reading a).<sup>93</sup> While the Latin tradition could have been assimilated to the Vulgate text, the Greek *Vorlage* of the Armenian tradition could also have been assimilated to the Byzantine text. For these reasons, I consider both of these readings equally likely as candidates for the text familiar to Irenaeus:  $a = d$ .

### B.20.5 Theodoret

The manuscript tradition of the work in which Theodoret quotes this passage is divided. The Greek tradition has the reading καὶ αἰσχροτής καὶ μωρολογία ἢ εὐτραπεία (a), while the Latin tradition has the reading *aut turpitudine aut stultiloquium aut scurrilitas*.<sup>94</sup> The Greek reading could be the result of assimilation to the Byzantine text, while the Latin reading could be the result of assimilation to the Vulgate text. For these reasons, either reading is as likely as the other to reflect the text familiar to Theodoret:  $a = d$ .

91. Cyril of Alexandria, *Hom. pasch.* 22.1 (PG 77:915–16).

92. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 4.37.4 (SC 100.2:930).

93. Irenaeus, *Haer. (Arm.)* 4.60.2 (TUGAL 35.2:134).

94. Theodoret, *Eph.* 5.4 (PG 82:543–44).

B.21 5:4/14–18:  $\hat{a}$  οὐκ ἀνῆκεν

### B.21.1 Chrysostom

Chrysostom's two quotations of this passage differ in their wording. In an initial quotation of the entire verse, he reproduces the common reading  $\tau\acute{\alpha}$  οὐκ ἀνῆκοντα (reading *b*),<sup>95</sup> but he subsequently quotes the segment of text in question (with the introductory formula *εἰπὼν*) as  $\tau\acute{\alpha}$  μὴ ἀνῆκοντα (*c*).<sup>96</sup> Transcriptionally, the former quotation is extensive enough to be distinguished as the lemma for Chrysostom's commentary and is therefore more liable to have been conformed to the Byzantine standard. Externally, both 044 and the Harklean group read  $\tau\acute{\alpha}$  οὐκ ἀνῆκοντα, so this could well have been the reading circulating in Antioch. But the commentaries of Zigabenus, who used Chrysostom as one of his sources, all read  $\tau\acute{\alpha}$  μὴ ἀνῆκοντα, so they also could preserve his original reading. This evidence suggests that Chrysostom's local text read  $\tau\acute{\alpha}$  οὐκ ἀνῆκοντα, but Chrysostom altered the wording to  $\tau\acute{\alpha}$  μὴ ἀνῆκοντα in his comments, and this was the reading that Zigabenus followed. On these grounds, I consider  $\tau\acute{\alpha}$  μὴ ἀνῆκοντα more likely to reflect Chrysostom's own text:  $c \overset{C}{\gg} b$ .

### B.21.2 Irenaeus

The manuscript tradition of the work in which Irenaeus quotes this passage is divided. In the Latin tradition, one witness reads *quae ad rem non pertinent*, which could correspond to any of the Greek variant readings, while all other witnesses read *quae ad rem non pertinet*, which corresponds most closely to the Greek reading with a singular verb,  $\hat{a}$  οὐκ ἀνῆκεν (*a*).<sup>97</sup> Since different editions of the Vulgate attest to both of these readings, either could be the result of assimilation towards a popular Latin text. The Armenian tradition of the same work reads *որք ոչ վայել են* ("which are not seemly"),<sup>98</sup> which could correspond to any of the Greek readings, so it is non-probative. On the basis of the agreement of most of the Latin tradition,  $\hat{a}$  οὐκ ἀνῆκεν is more likely than either of the other readings to correspond to the text known to Irenaeus:  $a \overset{C}{\gg} b = c$ .

95. Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 17.1 (PG 62:118).

96. Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 17.1, 17.2 (PG 62:118).

97. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 4.37.4 (SC 100.2:930). For collation details for the Latin tradition, see William Sanday and Cuthbert Hamilton Turner, eds., *Novum Testamentum Sancti Irenaei Episcopi Lugdunensis*, OLBT 7 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923), clxxxvi–clxxxvii, 167.

98. Irenaeus, *Haer. (Arm.)* 4.60.2 (TUGAL 35.2:134).

B.22 5:9/2-10: ὁ γὰρ καρπὸς τοῦ φωτός

B.22.1 *Cyril of Alexandria*

Where Cyril of Alexandria quotes the passage in question, the Greek and Latin traditions of his commentary follow different readings. The Greek follows the reading with πνεύματος (reading *b*), while the Latin reads *lucis* (in agreement with reading *a*).<sup>99</sup> The Greek may have been conformed to the Byzantine standard text, while the Latin may have been conformed to the Vulgate. The rest of the commentary does not favor a specific wording in either language. Externally, however, the Alexandrian witnesses that typically align with Cyril's text all read φωτός. On these grounds, I consider this reading to be the more likely candidate for Cyril's reading:  $a \overset{C}{\gg} b$ .

B.22.2 *Theodoret*

The Greek and Latin traditions of Theodoret's lemma follow different readings, but his commentary makes clear that his text read πνεύματος (reading *b*). The Greek lemma reads πνεύματος (reading *b*), while the Latin reads *lucis* (reading *a*).<sup>100</sup> But Theodoret's comment on the passage is, "the one who partakes of the all-holy Spirit brings forth the fruits of the Spirit" [ὁ τοῦ παναγίου μετέχων Πνεύματος τοὺς τοῦ Πνεύματος φερέτω καρπούς], which indicates that his text almost certainly read πνεύματος rather than φωτός. The lemma of the Latin tradition was clearly conformed to the text of the Vulgate. I therefore consider the reading with πνεύματος to be absolutely more likely than the reading with φωτός to reflect the text known to Theodoret:  $b \overset{A}{\gg} a$ .

99. Cyril of Alexandria, *Ths.* §35 (PG 75:623–24).

100. Theodoret, *Eph.* 5.9 (PG 82:543–44).

B.23 5:14/18–26: ἔγειρε, ὁ καθεύδων, καὶ ἀνάστα

### B.23.1 Chrysostom

Chrysostom's text of this passage alternates between the readings with ἔγειρε (*a*) and ἔγειραι (*b*) in various works and manuscripts. In his homilies on Ephesians, the textual tradition is divided between both readings.<sup>101</sup> In another work, he reads ἔγειραι,<sup>102</sup> but in a third work, he reads ἔγειρε.<sup>103</sup> Given his ambiguity in these sources and the fact that either reading could be the result of assimilation to the Byzantine tradition, I assign an equal likelihood to both readings (*a* = *b*) in Chrysostom's testimony.

### B.23.2 Cyril of Alexandria

Cyril of Alexandria quotes the passage in question in several of his works, but his text alternates between the readings with ἔγειρε and ἔγειραι, sometimes within the same work.<sup>104</sup> Since Cyril may have been consulting different texts of Ephesians for different works or may have been recalling the passage from memory, it is ambiguous which text was most familiar to him. Given this ambiguity, and given the attestation of both of these readings in the predominant Byzantine tradition, I assign an equal likelihood to both readings (*a* = *b*) in Cyril's testimony.

---

101. According to Migne's edition, he reads ἔγειραι in *Hom. Eph.* 18.1 (PG 62:122). The Codex Coxianus, however, has ἔγειρε here (Hemphill, *Codex Coxianus*, 50).

102. Chrysostom, *Coem.* §1 (PG 49:394).

103. Chrysostom, *Hom. Matt.* 67.4 (PG 58:638).

104. The present active imperative ἔγειρε occurs in Cyril of Alexandria, *Comm. Isa.* 4.5.61.9 (PG 70:1121); Cyril of Alexandria, *Ths.* §32 (PG 75:479–80); and Cyril of Alexandria, *Hom. pasch.* 2.7 (PG 77:445–46); the aorist middle ἔγειραι occurs in Cyril of Alexandria, *Comm. Luc.* 5.35 (PG 72:743–46); Cyril of Alexandria, *Comm. Isa.* 4.5.61.17–18 (PG 70:1133); Cyril of Alexandria, *Ioel.* 1.1.5 (Pusey, *Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli Archiepiscopi Alexandrini in XII prophetas* 1:294); Cyril of Alexandria, *Soph.* 2.3.3 (Pusey, *Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli Archiepiscopi Alexandrini in XII prophetas* 2:214); Cyril of Alexandria, *Zach.* 1.3.8–9 (Pusey, *Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli Archiepiscopi Alexandrini in XII prophetas* 2:322); and Cyril of Alexandria, *Ths.* §20 (PG 75:335–36).

B.24 5:15/2-10: βλέπετε οὖν ἀκριβῶς πῶς περιπατεῖτε

B.24.1 Chrysostom

Chrysostom's lemma for this passage has a different reading than the two quotations of it in his homilies, and the Latin version of his homilies features still another reading. According to Migne's edition, in the Greek tradition, the lemma reads βλέπετε οὖν ἀκριβῶς πῶς περιπατεῖτε (reading a), and the first quotation in his comments reads βλέπετε ἀκριβῶς πῶς περιπατεῖτε (reading c).<sup>105</sup> The Codex Coxianus, however, has the Byzantine reading βλέπετε οὖν πῶς ἀκριβῶς περιπατεῖτε (reading c) in both places.<sup>106</sup> Meanwhile, subsequent quotations in his homilies read βλέπετε πῶς ἀκριβῶς περιπατεῖτε (a contextual adaptation of reading c).<sup>107</sup> According to Migne's edition, in the Latin tradition, the lemma reads *videte itaque, fratres, quomodo caute ambuletis* (reading d),<sup>108</sup> while the subsequent adaptations in Chrysostom's comments read *videte quomodo caute ambuletis* and *videte quomodo exacte ambuletis* (corresponding to reading c).<sup>109</sup> The reading of the lemma in the Latin tradition is clearly the result of assimilation towards the Vulgate. While the reading found in Codex Coxianus and Chrysostom's commentary proper could similarly be the result of Byzantine assimilation,<sup>110</sup> it is more likely, based on its preservation in the Latin tradition (outside of the lemma) and its attestation in witnesses with known textual proximity to Chrysostom (Codex Coxianus, 044, and the Harklean group), that this was in fact the reading that Chrysostom knew. I therefore assign the likelihoods  $c \overset{C}{\gg} a = d$  to the reading of Chrysostom's text.

B.24.2 Theodoret

The Greek and Latin traditions of Theodoret's lemma have different readings. Specifically, the Greek lemma reads βλέπετε οὖν πῶς ἀκριβῶς περιπατεῖτε (reading c), while the Latin lemma reads *videte itaque, fratres, quomodo caute ambuletis* (reading d) Theodoret, *Eph.* 5.15–16 (PG 82:545–46). While either tradition's reading could be the result of assimilation toward that tradition's respective popular text, the Byzantine reading is supported by all of the collated witnesses to Theodoret's commentary, so it is much more likely that this was the reading he knew. I therefore assign the likelihoods  $c \overset{B}{\gg} d$  to the reading of Theodoret's text.

105. Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 19.lem, 19.1 (PG 62:127).

106. Hemphill, *Codex Coxianus*, 51.

107. One such quotation occurs in *Hom. Eph.* 19.1 (PG 62:127) in Migne's edition, although the text of the Codex Coxianus lacks this quotation entirely (Hemphill, *Codex Coxianus*, 52). A later quotation where this wording is shared by Migne's edition and Codex Coxianus occurs in *Hom. Eph.* 24.2 (PG 62:170).

108. Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 19.lem (PG 62:127).

109. Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 19.1, 24.2 (PG 62:127, 170).

110. So ABBOTT, 159.

B.25 5:17/6-14: μὴ γίνεσθε ἄφρονες, ἀλλὰ συνίετε

B.25.1 *Chrysostom*

The Greek tradition of Chrysostom's homilies in this passage is divided. In Migne's edition, two passages have the Byzantine reading μὴ γίνεσθε ἄφρονες, ἀλλὰ συνιέντες (*b*).<sup>111</sup> In the first of these passages, the Codex Coxianus has the reading μὴ γίνεσθε ἄφρονες, ἀλλὰ συνίετε (*a*),<sup>112</sup> but it has the Byzantine reading in the second passage. Coxianus typically preserves early readings in Chrysostom's text. In this case, however, its text in the lemma—the location that a scribe would most easily conform to a different text—may reflect a correction of Chrysostom's text towards a local text, with the quotation in his comments preserving the earlier form. To be sure, the latter passage could have been assimilated towards the Byzantine text, but we would expect to see such influence in the lemma, where the text was more clearly marked. On external grounds, all other collated witnesses with known affinities to Chrysostom's text—044, the Harklean tradition, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Theodoret—agree on the reading with συνιέντες. For these reasons, I consider the reading with συνιέντες slightly more likely to have been the one known to Chrysostom:  $b \overset{D}{\gg} a$ .

B.25.2 *Origen*

Origen's reading is doubtful because it may be falsely attributed to him and because another potential witness to his text offers a different reading. The commentary fragment attributed to him has the reading with συνιέντες (reading *b*),<sup>113</sup> but J. A. F. Gregg brackets the commentary fragment as doubtful on the grounds that “the style here seems to savour of Severian rather than of Origen”.<sup>114</sup> Meanwhile, Jerome breaks from the rest of the Latin tradition in reading *intelligite*, the equivalent to συνίετε (reading *a*),<sup>115</sup> so he could be dependent here on a part of Origen's commentary not preserved in the catenae, although he could also have gotten the reading from one of the Greek codices he cites in other passages. Since we cannot discern Origen's reading without further evidence, I tentatively assign an equal likelihood to both readings ( $a = b$ ) for Origen's testimony.

111. Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 19.lem, 19.1 (PG 62:127, 128).

112. Hemphill, *Codex Coxianus*, 17, 51.

113. Origen, *Comm. Eph.* §27 (OO 14.4:3:563–564).

114. J. A. F. Gregg, “The Commentary of Origen upon the Epistle to the Ephesians,” *JTS* 1/3.10 (1902): 233–244; 1/3.11 (1902): 398–420; 1/3.12 (1902): 554–576, 564, note on §27 l. 19; followed by Francesco Pieri, ed. and trans., *Esegesi paolina: i testi frammentari*, OO 14.4 (Rome: Città Nuova, 2009), 338 n. 153.

115. Jerome, *Comm. Eph.* 3.5.17 (PL 26:527).



B.26 5:20/24-30: πατρὶ καὶ θεῶ

B.26.1 Pelagius

The tradition of Pelagius's commentary is divided here. Some of the primary witnesses to the commentary lack this portion of the verse entirely, but the primary witnesses that have it read *deo et patri* (reading *b*) in agreement with the Vulgate.<sup>116</sup> The manuscript (E), which is a witness to a secondary shorter form of the commentary,<sup>117</sup> has only *deo patri* (reading *c*). While the reading *deo et patri* could be the result of assimilation towards the Vulgate, *deo patri* could be an isolated skip of the eye or gloss, and given the secondary status of the manuscript that contains it, it is best to regard its reading as less likely. The absence of any reference to God the father in some primary witnesses could mean that Pelagius's text of Ephesians could have had any of the attested sequences (including reading *a*, *patri et deo*). Nevertheless, it is better to give preference to either of the readings that are explicitly attested in the tradition of Pelagius's commentary, so I assign the likelihoods  $b \overset{C}{\gg} c \overset{C}{\gg} a$  to the reading of Pelagius's text.

116. Pelagius, *Exp. Eph.* 5.20 (Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions*, 2:376).

117. Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions*, 1:272.



B.27 5:22/6-12: τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν ὑποτασσέσθωσαν

### B.27.1 Chrysostom

Chrysostom's text is difficult to ascertain because the reading quoted in his homily differs in the Greek and Latin traditions. In both traditions, the text of his lemma is the same: τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν ὑποτάσσεσθε in Greek and *viris vestris subditae estote* in Latin.<sup>118</sup> In the text of the homily proper, the same reading is quoted in Greek, but the distinct reading *viris suis subditae sint* (the equivalent of the Greek reading τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν ὑποτασσέσθωσαν) appears in Latin. It is possible, then, that the Greek text in the commentary has been conformed to the Byzantine text or that the Latin text has been conformed to the Vulgate. But given the consistent attestation of the reading τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν ὑποτάσσεσθε in the lemma of both traditions, I consider this to be more likely as the reading of Chrysostom's text:  $c \overset{C}{\gg} a$ .

### B.27.2 Clement of Alexandria

Clement quotes the passage in question in two works using different readings in both cases. Once, he uses τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν ὑποτασσέσθωσαν,<sup>119</sup> and the other time, he uses τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν.<sup>120</sup> It is likely that the extent of the quotation had some bearing on Clement's particular wording in each case. Maegan Chloe Marie Gilliland argues that the latter quotation with the shorter reading "is part of a larger citation and is therefore a preferred reading,"<sup>121</sup> but Peter J. Gurry correctly notes that both readings are long.<sup>122</sup> J. Armitage Robinson makes the case for the shorter reading more precisely: in the *Paedagogus*, Clement begins his quotation with Eph 5:22, while in the *Stromata*, he is in the middle of quoting 5:21–25.<sup>123</sup> In the latter work, Clement could include the shorter reading as it made sense with the preceding verse included, while in the former work, he may have supplied the verb ὑποτασσέσθωσαν because he wanted to complete the thought of the verse.

Since these quotations occur in separate works, neither of which is a dedicated commentary on Ephesians, and since both readings are attested outside Clement in the manuscript and patristic traditions, there is a possibility that Clement was directly copying readings from different manuscripts in both works. But given his probable cause for adapting the text on one occasion, it seems highly likely that he knew the shorter reading. I therefore assign the likelihoods  $f \overset{B}{\gg} a$  to the reading of Clement's text.

118. Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 20.1 (PG 62:135).

119. Clement of Alexandria, *Paed.* 3.12.94.5 (SC 158:178).

120. Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 4.8.64.1 (SC 463:162).

121. Maegan Chloe Marie Gilliland, "The Text of the Pauline Epistles and Hebrews in Clement of Alexandria" (PhD diss., University of Edinburgh, 2016), 362 n. 293, <http://hdl.handle.net/1842/22015>.

122. Peter J. Gurry, "The Text of Eph 5.22 and the Start of the Ephesian Household Code," *NTS* 67.4 (2021): 560–81, 569 n. 42.

123. ROBINSON, 301.

### B.27.3 Jerome

In his commentary on this passage, Jerome expresses knowledge of and passes judgment on the textual variant in this passage. The lemma of his commentary reads *viris suis subditae sint*, corresponding to the Greek reading *τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν ὑποταστέσθωσαν*, but in his commentary, he remarks that the verb “is added in the Latin copies,” while “it is not found in the Greek codices.”<sup>124</sup> Since his language indicates that he viewed the verb as an addition to a shorter Greek *Vorlage*, Jerome should be taken as a witness to the shorter reading.

### B.27.4 Origen

Pinpointing the reading of the text Origen used for his commentary on Ephesians is difficult. The difficulty arises from two factors: first, Origen does not quote this passage in his commentary or remark on it in any way that assumes a particular wording; and second, as Gurry has noted,<sup>125</sup> one of the two manuscripts that preserve Origen’s commentary (GA 1910) prints Origen’s lemma as *τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν ὑποταστέσθωσαν*, while the other (GA 1900) prints it as *τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν ὑποτάσσεσθε*. Further complicating matters is the possibility that Jerome’s identification of the shorter reading being in Greek codices, like other parts of his commentary on Ephesians, is based on his text of Origen’s commentary.<sup>126</sup> In this case, his remarks were presumably inspired either by similar remarks in Origen’s commentary or by a lemma to Origen’s commentary with the shorter reading—neither of which is preserved in the surviving manuscripts of Origen’s commentary. Lacking further evidence with which to weigh these possibilities, the most conservative judgment is to consider all three equally likely. I therefore assign the likelihoods  $a = c = f$  to the reading of Origen’s text.

### B.27.5 Theodore of Mopsuestia

While Theodore’s lemma for this passage reproduces a longer reading, his commentary suggests that this was the result of a scribal emendation. The lemma, which is preserved only in Latin, reads *mulieres propriis maritis sicut Domino subditae sint*, but in his commentary, Theodore adds, *hoc est, subiectae sint*.<sup>127</sup> While *subditae* and *subiectae* are distinct (albeit synonymous) terms in Latin, in the Greek tradition that Theodore originally used, both terms correspond to *ὑποτάσσω*. Since Theodore’s comment is unintelligible if he is clarifying a longer reading with another synonymous or identical longer reading, it follows that Theodore’s Greek lemma contained the shorter reading.<sup>128</sup>

<sup>124</sup> in *Latinis exemplaribus additum est ... in Graecis codicibus non habetur* (Jerome, *Comm. Eph.* 3.5.22–23 [PL 26:530, translation mine]).

<sup>125</sup> Gurry, “Text of Eph 5.22,” 569.

<sup>126</sup> ROBINSON, 301.

<sup>127</sup> Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Eph.* 5.22 (SBLWGRW 26:270–71).

<sup>128</sup> This is in agreement with the assessments of Rowan A. Greer, trans., *Theodore of Mopsuestia: The Commentaries on the Minor Epistles of Paul*, SBLWGRW 26 (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012), 271 n. 63

B.28 **5:23/30:** σωτήρ

B.28.1 *Basil of Caesarea*

Basil's text as printed in the *Patrologia Graeca* edition reads ὁ σωτήρ,<sup>129</sup> but Migne's footnote following these words states that "From the ancient books we put the article before the word σωτήρ."<sup>130</sup> If "ancient books" referred to manuscripts of Basil's work, then the editor could have listed the manuscripts in the note or could have simply included the article in the text without further comment; the presence and nature of the note suggests that the inclusion of ὁ was an editorial revision based on "ancient books" (i.e., codices) of Ephesians. Under the presumption that the extant witnesses to Basil's text have an anarthrous σωτήρ, I take this to be the reading he quotes.

---

and Gurry, "Text of Eph 5.22," 570 n. 45.

129. Basil of Caesarea, *Mor.* 73.4 (PG 31:852).

130. *Posuimus ex libris antiquis articulum ante vocem σωτήρ* (PG 31:852 n. 2).

B.29 5:28/2-8: οὕτως ὀφείλουσιν οἱ ἄνδρες

B.29.1 *Chrysostom*

The Greek and Latin traditions of Chrysostom's homilies feature different readings. In the Greek tradition, he quotes the passage with οὕτως ὀφείλουσι, φησὶν, οἱ ἄνδρες (corresponding to reading *a*), while the Latin has the Vulgate reading *ita et viri, inquit, debent* (corresponding to reading *c*).<sup>131</sup> Either tradition could therefore have been conformed to its respective popular tradition. But in two of Chrysostom's other works, the Greek and Latin traditions agree on readings identical or equivalent to οὕτως ὀφείλουσι, φησὶν, οἱ ἄνδρες (*a*).<sup>132</sup> The consistent testimony of Chrysostom's other works corroborates the external support for the reading οὕτως ὀφείλουσιν οἱ ἄνδρες, which includes 044, a witness with textual affinities to the Antiochene text, and the Codex Coxi-anus, a text of Chrysostom's homilies that preserves many of his early readings. Since the reading of the Latin tradition of Chrysostom's homilies is best explained as the result of Vulgate assimilation, I consider οὕτως ὀφείλουσιν οἱ ἄνδρες (reading *a*) much more likely than οὕτως καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες ὀφείλουσιν (*c*) to represent Chrysostom's text:  $a \overset{B}{\gg} c$ .

B.29.2 *Theodoret*

The Greek and Latin traditions of Theodoret's lemma have different readings. Specifically, the Greek lemma reads οὕτως ὀφείλουσιν οἱ ἄνδρες (reading *a*), while the Latin lemma reads *ita et viri debent* (reading *c*) Theodoret, *Eph.* 5.25–28 (PG 82:547–48). Either tradition's reading could be the result of assimilation toward that tradition's respective popular text. Since all of the collated Greek manuscripts of Theodoret's commentary read οὕτως ὀφείλουσιν οἱ ἄνδρες, it is more likely that the Latin translation was conformed to the Vulgate text. I therefore assign the likelihoods  $a \overset{C}{\gg} c$  to the reading of Theodoret's text.

131. Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 20.3 (PG 62:138–39).

132. In *Laud. Max.* §3 (PG 51:229), Chrysostom quotes the passage twice with οὕτως ὀφείλουσιν οἱ ἄνδρες (*sic debent viri*). In *Non desp.* §6 (PG 51:369), he reorders the clause containing this passage with the paraphrase οἱ ἄνδρες οὕτως ὀφείλουσιν ἀγαπᾶν τὰς γυναῖκας (*viri diligere uxores sic debent*).

B.30 5:30/14-30: ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὀστέων αὐτοῦ

#### B.30.1 Severian

In his exegesis of 5:29 5:32–33, Severian alludes to Gen 2:23 twice,<sup>133</sup> suggesting that his text of the present verse in Ephesians has the longer reading. He relates the “nourishing of the body” in Eph 5:29 to the Eucharist, and then alludes to the text of 5:30 as σὰρξ ἐκ τῆς σαρκός, καὶ ὀστοῦν ἐκ τῶν ὀστέων αὐτοῦ. Here, the order of “flesh” followed by “bone” matches that of the longer reading, and it is appropriate, as the reference to “flesh” is more relevant to the Eucharist. In his exegesis of 5:32–33, where he explains that the marital union of Adam and Eve “has become a type of Christ and the church” (τύπος γέγονε τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας), he quotes the text in a different form: ὀστοῦν ἐκ τῶν ὀστέων αὐτοῦ ἐσμὲν, καὶ σὰρξ ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ. Here, the order with “bone” first is informed by the connection to Gen 2:23. While neither quotation matches the common form of the longer reading, the presence of some form of the longer reading in Severian’s text of Ephesians best explains the repeated references to Gen 2:23 in his commentary.

#### B.30.2 Tertullian

Tertullian does not quote this verse directly, but it is likely, based on how he alludes to the passage, that he was accustomed to its text having the longer reading. Twice in *De anima*, he quotes the entirety of Gen 2:23–24 and prefaces it with a statement that it prophesies “that great mystery concerning Christ and the church.”<sup>134</sup> This phrase recalls Eph 5:31, which speaks of a “great mystery” addressed “unto Christ and the church.” Moreover, while he could easily have quoted only the verse containing the institution of marriage (Gen 2:24), Tertullian reproduces both verses from Genesis, which suggests that he also had the content of Eph 5:30 in mind.

But this is as far as the evidence takes us. The longer reading is certainly more reminiscent of Gen 2:23, so it is more likely that Tertullian was inspired to quote both verses from Genesis because he knew a text of Ephesians with the longer reading. But it remains distinctly possible that Tertullian knew Eph 5:30 with the shorter reading and simply interpreted its reference to Christ’s body as referring to the “bone” and “flesh” of Gen 2:23. Without any more precise quotation or discussion of the quoted material on Tertullian’s part, this conservative assessment of relative probabilities is probably safest.

I therefore assign the likelihoods  $a \overset{C}{\gg} b$  to the reading of Tertullian’s text.

133. Severian of Gabala, *Eph.* 5.29, 5.32–33 (Staab, *Pauluskommentare*, 311–12).

134. *magnum illum sacramentum in Christum et ecclesiam* (Tertullian, *Anim.* §§11, 21 [SC 601:208, 266]).

## B.31 5:31/10-18: τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα

## B.31.1 Chrysostom

Even where Chrysostom is evidently quoting this passage from Ephesians, his wording differs within and across different works. In his homilies on Ephesians, the Greek and Latin traditions differ in nearly all of the five places where he quotes this passage. In the first place, the Greek reads τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ (reading *e*), while the Latin reads *patrem et matrem suam* (reading *d*).<sup>135</sup> In the second, the Greek tradition is divided between τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν μητέρα (reading *c*) and the otherwise-unattested reading τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸν πατέρα, while the Latin reads *patrem et matrem* (probably corresponding to reading *a*, in light of Chrysostom's other potential support for this reading, detailed below).<sup>136</sup> In the third and fourth, both traditions agree on reading *a* with τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα (*patrem et matrem*).<sup>137</sup> In the fifth, the Greek tradition is divided between τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν μητέρα (reading *c*) and τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα (reading *a*), while the Latin again reads *patrem et matrem* (again, probably corresponding to reading *a*).<sup>138</sup> In another work, where Chrysostom is discussing the “great mystery” of marriage as interpreted in Ephesians, he quotes this passage twice, consistently with reading *c*, τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν μητέρα (*patrem suum et matrem*).<sup>139</sup> In two other works, where he quotes this passage with the text of Ephesians that follows it, he consistently follows reading *e*, τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ.<sup>140</sup> Transcriptionally, the reading τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν μητέρα (reading *c*) could be explained as the result of assimilation to the Byzantine tradition. The reading *patrem et matrem suam* (*d*), attested only in the Latin tradition of Chrysostom's work, could similarly be explained as the result of assimilation to the Vulgate. Externally, the reading τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ (*e*), is found multiple times across different works. Likewise, τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα (*a*) occurs multiple times in the Greek and Latin traditions of Chrysostom's homilies on Ephesians. On these grounds, I consider the readings with both or neither αὐτοῦ more likely to reflect Chrysostom's text than the readings with only one αὐτοῦ:  $a = e \gg^C c = d$ .

## B.31.2 Origen

Origen is clearly working with a text that reads τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα in his commentary on Ephesians, but he quotes this passage with a different reading in another work. In his commentary

135. Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 20.4 (PG 62:139).

136. Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 20.5 (PG 62:141). Migne's edition reads τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸν πατέρα, but the Codex Coxiianus reads τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν μητέρα (Hemphill, *Codex Coxiianus*, 55–56).

137. Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 20.5 (PG 62:141–42).

138. Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 20.8 (PG 62:147). Migne's edition reads τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν μητέρα, but the Codex Coxiianus reads τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα (Hemphill, *Codex Coxiianus*, 56).

139. Chrysostom, *Laud. Max.* §3 (PG 51:229).

140. Chrysostom, *Catech. illum.* 1.11, 1.13 (SC 50bis:114, 115); Chrysostom, *Catech. ult.* (Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Varia graeca sacra*, 167).

on Ephesians, Origen expressly says of the author that in addition to introducing other minor changes in wording to his quotation of Gen 2:24, “He has also failed to mention ‘his’ after both ‘father’ and ‘mother’.”<sup>141</sup> But in his commentary on Matthew, Origen quotes this passage as τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ.<sup>142</sup> Naturally, for our purposes, a commentary on Matthew is less relevant than a commentary on Ephesians, but an explanation is also at hand for why Origen has a different reading in his commentary on Matthew. His quotation of this passage begins with ἔνεκεν τούτου rather than ἀντὶ τούτου (which he also expressly notes as the wording of Ephesians in his commentary on Ephesians), so Origen may very well be quoting Gen 2:24 from memory directly rather than its reworded form in Ephesians.<sup>143</sup> The “great mystery” of Christ and the church could readily be associated with Gen 2:24 to readers familiar with the teachings of Ephesians, so the quotation of one text, even outside of Ephesians, would easily call the other to mind. Thus, the text of Ephesians used by Origen for his commentary is virtually certain to be the text of Ephesians with which he was familiar.

I therefore assign the likelihoods  $a \overset{A}{\gg} d$  to the reading of Origen’s text.

### B.31.3 Pelagius

The manuscript tradition of Pelagius’s commentary on Ephesians is divided on his reading in this passage. The manuscript A, one of the five primary witnesses to the commentary,<sup>144</sup> as well as the secondary manuscripts G and V and most of the secondary witnesses in the group of Pseudo-Jerome manuscripts, agree with the Vulgate in reading *patrem et matrem suam*; the remaining manuscripts read *patrem et matrem* alone.<sup>145</sup> Pelagius’s commentary does not quote this passage, so we must rely on transcriptional and external evidence to assign likelihoods to the different options. The support of the primary manuscripts in the tradition and the scribal temptation to gravitate towards the Vulgate text favor the reading *patrem et matrem*. I therefore assign the likelihoods  $a = b \overset{C}{\gg} d$  to the reading of Pelagius’s text.

141. παραλέλοιπέν τε τὸ μετὰ τὸν πατέρα εἰρημένον αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ μετὰ τὴν μητέρα δεύτερον εἰρημένον αὐτοῦ (Origen, *Comm. Eph.* 3.76 [OO 14.4:346]; translation by Ronald E. Heine, *The Commentaries of Origen and Jerome on St. Paul’s Epistle to the Ephesians* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002], 659). As Heine’s two-column comparison of Jerome’s commentary with Origen’s makes clear, Jerome (*Comm. Eph.* 3.5.31 [PL 26:534]) is deriving his comments on the same variants from Origen. Origen also quotes the text as τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα in *Cels.* 4.49 (SC 136:310).

142. Origen, *Comm. Matt.* 17.34 (GCS 1/40:695). It appears that he is quoting Ephesians rather than Genesis directly, because after he quotes this passage, he offers some comments and then quotes the beginning of Eph 5:32.

143. ROBINSON, 302.

144. Souter, *Pelagius’s Expositions*, 1:201.

145. Pelagius, *Exp. Eph.* 5.31 (Souter, *Pelagius’s Expositions*, 2:378).



B.32 5:31/20–28: καὶ προσκολληθήσεται τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ

B.32.1 Chrysostom

The Greek and Latin traditions of Chrysostom's works differ on his reading here. In the works where he is evidently quoting Ephesians, the Greek tradition consistently follows the reading καὶ προσκολληθήσεται πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ.<sup>146</sup> But where the Latin tradition is represented in editions of these works, it consistently follows the reading *et adhaerebit uxori suae*.<sup>147</sup> The Greek reading could be the result of assimilation to the Byzantine text, while the Latin reading could be the result of assimilation to the text of the Vulgate. Since the Latin reading could plausibly be an idiomatic rendering of the Byzantine reading, I consider the reading καὶ προσκολληθήσεται πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ (c), which is consistently attested in the Greek texts, to be a slightly more plausible source for the Latin reading than καὶ προσκολληθήσεται τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ (a), which is not attested in the Greek traditions of these texts. I therefore assign the likelihoods  $c \overset{D}{\gg} a$  to the reading of Chrysostom's text.

B.32.2 Theodoret

The Greek and Latin traditions of Theodoret's works differ on his reading here. In his commentary on Ephesians, the Greek tradition consistently follows the reading καὶ προσκολληθήσεται πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, while the Latin tradition follows the reading *et adhaerebit uxori suae*.<sup>148</sup> A quotation of this passage in one of his letters also reads καὶ προσκολληθήσεται πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ.<sup>149</sup> The Greek reading could be the result of assimilation to the Byzantine text, while the Latin reading could be the result of assimilation to the text of the Vulgate. Since the Latin reading could plausibly be an idiomatic rendering of the Byzantine reading, I consider the attested Greek reading καὶ προσκολληθήσεται πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ (c) to be a slightly more plausible source for the Latin reading than the unattested reading καὶ προσκολληθήσεται τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ (a). I therefore assign the likelihoods  $c \overset{D}{\gg} a$  to the reading of Theodoret's text.

B.32.3 Marcion

Marcion's text in this passage is quoted with different wording in his interlocutors' works. Tertullian quotes his text with the minus,<sup>150</sup> while Epiphanius quotes his text with the wording καὶ κολληθήσεται, attributing only the excision of the words τῇ γυναικὶ to Marcion.<sup>151</sup> It is noteworthy

146. Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 20.4, 20.8 (PG 62:139, 147); Chrysostom, *Catech. illum.* 1.11, 1.13 (SC 50bis:114, 115); Chrysostom, *Catech. ult.* (Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Varia graeca sacra*, 167); Chrysostom, *Laud. Max.* §3 (PG 51:229).

147. Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 20.4, 20.8 (PG 62:139, 147); Chrysostom, *Laud. Max.* §3 (PG 51:229).

148. Theodoret, *Eph.* 5.31 (PG 82:547–48).

149. Theodoret, *Ep.* 147 (SC 111:220).

150. Tertullian, *Marc.* 5.18.9 (Evans, *Adversus Marcionem*, 626).

151. Epiphanius, *Pan.* 42.11.8, 42.12.3 (GCS 1/31:119, 180–81).



thy that Tertullian, unlike Epiphanius, does not observe any textual problem with the wording of this phrase. Indeed, given that Cyprian also supports the minus, it is more likely that that reading was local to Carthage and had already been part of the text familiar to Tertullian, in which case Tertullian may have been quoting his own text rather than Marcion's. Between this likelihood and Epiphanius's explicit discussion of a textual difference in Marcion's text, I consider it much more likely that Marcion's text read *καὶ κολληθήσεται* (whose closest equivalent is reading *b*) than that it had the minus (*f*): *b*<sup>*B*</sup>  $\gg$  *f*.

#### B.32.4 Origen

Origen is clearly working with a text that has the shorter reading in his commentary on Ephesians, but he quotes a longer reading in his other references to this verse. In his commentary on Ephesians, Origen notes that the author, besides introducing other minor changes in wording in his quotation of Gen 2:24, "has omitted the words, 'he shall be joined to his wife'."<sup>152</sup> In two other works, however, he quotes this passage with the phrase *καὶ προσκολληθήσεται πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ* included.<sup>153</sup> These other works are, for our purposes, secondary in relevance to a commentary on Ephesians, but an explanation is also at hand for why they supply the phrase that is missing in Origen's text for the commentary. In both works, the quotation begins with *ἐνεκεν τούτου* rather than *ἀντὶ τούτου* (which Origen in his commentary expressly notes as the wording of Ephesians), so Origen may very well be quoting Gen 2:24 from memory directly rather than through its rewording in Ephesians.<sup>154</sup> The association of the "great mystery" of Christ and the church with Gen 2:24 would likely be impressed on the mind of anyone who had studied Ephesians closely, so the quotation of one text would easily call the other to mind for a thinker like Origen. Thus, the text of Ephesians used by Origen for his commentary is virtually certain to be the text of Ephesians he had before him when he wrote the commentary. I therefore assign the likelihoods *f*<sup>*A*</sup>  $\gg$  *c* to the reading of Origen's text.

---

152. [ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ προσκολληθήσεται πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ] (Origen, *Comm. Eph.* 3.76 [OO 14.4:346]; translation by Heine, *Origen and Jerome*, 659). As Heine's two-column comparison of Jerome's commentary with Origen's makes clear, Jerome (*Comm. Eph.* 3.5.31 [PL 26:534]) derives his comments on the same omission from Origen.

153. *Cels.* 4.49 (SC 136:310); *Comm. Matt.* 17.34 (GCS 1/40:695). It appears that he is quoting Ephesians rather than Genesis directly in these two works, because in the former, he proceeds to Eph 5:32 in his quotation, and in the latter, he quotes the beginning of Eph 5:32 after his commentary on this verse.

154. ROBINSON, 302.

## B.33 6:1/14–16: ἐν κυρίῳ

## B.33.1 Clement of Alexandria

Clement's quotation of 6:1 is uncertain because he skips over a large portion of the passage, and the end of this verse either could be part of what he skipped or could have been absent in his text. He quotes the latter portion of the *Haustafel* as follows: Τὰ τέκνα, ὑπακούετε τοῖς γονεῦσιν ὑμῶν. Οἱ πατέρες, μὴ παροργίζετε τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν, ἀλλ' ἐκτρέφετε αὐτὰ ἐν παιδείᾳ καὶ νοουθεσίᾳ κυρίου. Οἱ δοῦλοι, ὑπακούετε τοῖς κατὰ σάρκα κυρίοις μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου ἐν ἀπλότητι τῆς καρδίας ὑμῶν ὡς τῷ Χριστῷ, ἐκ ψυχῆς μετ' εὐνοίας δουλεύοντες. Καὶ οἱ κύριοι, εὖ ποιεῖτε τοὺς οἰκέτας ὑμῶν, ἀνιέντες τὴν ἀπειλήν, εἰδότες ὅτι καὶ αὐτῶν καὶ ὑμῶν ὁ κύριός ἐστιν ἐν οὐρανοῖς, καὶ προσωποληψία οὐκ ἔστιν.<sup>155</sup> He clearly truncates the addresses to children and slaves, omitting 6:2–3 and most of 6:6. A short phrase similar in form to ἐν κυρίῳ also seems to be dropped out at the end of the address to masters: Clement cuts off his quotation after καὶ προσωποληψία οὐκ ἔστιν, where the manuscripts have παρ' αὐτῷ, ἐν αὐτῷ, παρὰ θεῷ, παρὰ τῷ θεῷ, or παρὰ τῷ κυρίῳ. It is possible, then, that he omitted the phrase ἐν κυρίῳ at the end of 6:1 with the rest of 6:2–3. But he includes references to “the lord” and “Christ” in the other quotations (κυρίου, ὡς τῷ Χριστῷ, ὁ κύριός), so it is unlikely that he would omit it if it were present in his text of 6:1. For these reasons, I consider it highly likely that Clement knew the shorter reading rather than the longer reading:  $b \overset{B}{\gg} a$ .

## B.33.2 Pelagius

Ascertaining Pelagius's reading in this passage is complicated by a division in the manuscript tradition of his commentary. Three manuscripts of Pelagius's commentary on Ephesians, of which one (A) is considered one of five primary witnesses to the commentary,<sup>156</sup> add *in domino* at the end of his lemma for this verse, in agreement with the Vulgate.<sup>157</sup> The remaining manuscripts extant in this passage have the shorter reading. Since Pelagius's commentary does not quote this verse, the support of the manuscript tradition and the scribal temptation to gravitate towards the Vulgate text suggest that the shorter reading is more likely than the longer reading to be original to Pelagius's text of Ephesians. I therefore assign the likelihoods  $b \overset{C}{\gg} a$  to the reading of Pelagius's text.

155. Clement of Alexandria, *Paed.* 3.12.95.1 (SC 158:180).

156. Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions*, 1:201.

157. Pelagius, *Exp. Eph.* 6.1 (Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions*, 2:379).

B.34 **6:9/28–34**: καὶ αὐτῶν καὶ ὑμῶν

B.34.1 *Chrysostom*

Chrysostom's text is difficult to place because the reading quoted in his homily differs in the Greek and Latin traditions. In the Greek tradition as reproduced in Migne's edition, he quotes καὶ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν (reading *d*) twice with identical wording, while in the Latin tradition, he first quotes this phrase with *et vester et illorum* (reading *b*) and then paraphrases the latter part of the verse as *scientes quod vester quoque Dominus est in caelis* (which corresponds most closely to reading *d*).<sup>158</sup> But in the Codex Coxianus, the first quotation has the wording καὶ ὑμῶν καὶ αὐτῶν (reading *b*) and the second quotation reads καὶ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν (reading *d*), in agreement with the Latin.<sup>159</sup> Neither of the readings in the Latin tradition agrees with the Vulgate, so they cannot be explained as the result of assimilation to the text of the Vulgate. It is therefore likely that the Latin tradition and the Codex Coxianus preserve Chrysostom's original wording.

All that remains to be explained is why Chrysostom alters his wording between the two quotations. As I have noted already, the second quotation with the wording καὶ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν (*vester quoque*) is a paraphrase of the latter part of this verse. It is probably borrowed from the καὶ ὑμεῖς of the parallel in Col 4:1. If Chrysostom's text read καὶ ὑμῶν καὶ αὐτῶν, as the external evidence for the first quotation suggests, then he could very well have been illuminating the emphasis on masters in this reading by appealing to the καὶ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν of the Colossians parallel. Between the considerations detailed above and the external support of both 044 and the earliest part of the Harklean group (namely, the Harklean Syriac version), I consider the reading καὶ ὑμῶν καὶ αὐτῶν far more likely than καὶ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν to reflect the text known to Chrysostom: *b*<sup>B</sup> >> *d*.

158. Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 22.2 (PG 62:157–58).

159. Hemphill, *Codex Coxianus*, 59.

B.35 6:19/32–38: τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ εὐαγγελίου

B.35.1 P46

The three-line lacuna on fol. 80<sup>v</sup> of P46 (a common problem throughout the papyrus as a result of its having frayed at the bottom) is an especially painful loss from the perspective of the external evidence at this variation unit. Nevertheless, by using Edgar Battad Ebojo’s data for the Ephesians folios<sup>160</sup> with a dynamic programming-based approach that accounts for all possible segmentations of a given text over a given number of lines,<sup>161</sup> we can calculate how much more likely one reconstruction of the lacunose text is than another. In this case, the number of lines is  $L = 3$ , the textual sequence assuming the longer reading is

$\mathcal{T}_1$  = *υ-περ ε-μου ι-να μοι δο-θη λο-γος εν α-νοι-ξει του στο-μα-τος μου εν παρ-ρη-σι-α γνω-ρι-σαι το μυσ-τη-ρι-ον του ευ-αγ-γε-λι-ου υ-περ ου πρε-σβευ-ω εν α-λυ-σει,*

and the textual sequence assuming the shorter reading is

$\mathcal{T}_2$  = *υ-περ ε-μου ι-να μοι δο-θη λο-γος εν α-νοι-ξει του στο-μα-τος μου εν παρ-ρη-σι-α γνω-ρι-σαι το μυσ-τη-ρι-ον υ-περ ου πρε-σβευ-ω εν α-λυ-σει.*

The two textual sequences are tokenized according to the standard Greek word-breaking conventions observed by the scribe of P46.

The probability that P46 had the longer sequence  $\mathcal{T}_1$ , accounting for the possibility of minor subvariations like the omission of *τοῦ* or *μου* around *στόματος*, is about 0.0002, while the probability that it had the shorter sequence  $\mathcal{T}_2$  (up to the same subvariations) is about 0.0104. Thus, P46 is roughly fifty-two times more likely to have had the shorter reading than it was to have had the longer reading.


B.35.2 06

In most treatments of the external evidence at this variation unit, 06 is assumed to support the reading *τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ εὐαγγελίου*. An examination of the Greek text on fol. 325<sup>v</sup> (pictured in Fig. B.1)<sup>162</sup> brings three details to our attention immediately: first, the word at the end of the line is *ἄγγελίου*, and a distinctly later corrector changed this to *εὐαγγελίου*; second, the phrase in question appears to share the ink and letterforms of the codex’s first hand; and third, this phrase extends the line almost an entire word beyond the usual limit.

160. Edgar Battad Ebojo, “A Scribe and His Manuscript: An Investigation into the Scribal Habits of Papyrus 46 (P. Chester Beatty II – P. Mich. Inv. 6238)” (PhD diss., University of Birmingham, 2014), <https://etheses.bham.ac.uk/id/eprint/4838>.


161. Joey McCollum, “Likelihood Calculations for Reconstructed Lacunae and Papyrus 46’s Text of Ephesians,” *DSH* 38.2 (2023): 647–57.

162. Source: gallica.bnf.fr / Bibliothèque nationale de France, <http://archivesetmanuscrits.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cc21107b>.

FIGURE B.1: Eph 6:19 (Greek) in fol. 325<sup>v</sup> of O6.

The second observation is all the more surprising because the codex's usual division of the text into sense units would make placing τοῦ εὐαγγελίου on its own line a natural choice given the space per line. True, the scribe often groups genitive phrases with their subjects where possible, but there are several places where genitive phrases receive their own lines.<sup>163</sup> We must consider it distinctly possible that τοῦ εὐαγγελίου was not present in the text of O6's exemplar and that the first hand, aware of the longer reading from some other source, wanted to add it, but had to fit it on the same line to maintain a constant number of lines per page and perhaps to avoid changing the total number of sense units in Ephesians. Under this scenario, the defective reading τοῦ ἀγγελίου could be explained as the result of a hasty correction, as could the scribe's evident reinking of the pen partway through the addition instead of before writing any of it.

The Latin text on fol. 326<sup>r</sup> (pictured in Fig. B.2)<sup>164</sup> further supports these proposed scenarios. While the ink and letterforms again appear to match those of the first hand, the letters of *euangeli* are noticeably smaller—another potential indication that these words were a hasty correction. Whatever happened in the Greek text was clearly echoed in the Latin text.

FIGURE B.2: Eph 6:19 (Latin) in fol. 326<sup>r</sup> of O6.

Of course, the proposed scenario is not certain. The longer reading may have been crammed on this line because the scribe wanted to complete Ephesians by the bottom of the next Greek page and knew that space would be tight.<sup>165</sup> This reasoning also accounts for the long lines containing  $\overline{\theta\upsilon}$  πατρος και  $\overline{\kappa\upsilon}$   $\overline{\omega}$   $\overline{\chi\upsilon}$  η χαρις μετα παντων and των αγαπωντων τον  $\overline{\kappa\upsilon}$  ημων  $\overline{\omega}$   $\overline{\chi\upsilon}$  on fol. 326<sup>v</sup>. The first hand's apparent responsibility for the longer reading and delayed reinking partway through writing it would also make sense in this case, as the addition would have been a part of the line in the first place.

163. Just in this chapter of Ephesians, we have fol. 322<sup>v</sup>, line 5 (τῆς καρδίας ὑμῶν); fol. 323<sup>v</sup>, lines 11 (τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ) and 15 (τοῦ διαβόλου); fol. 324<sup>v</sup>, lines 1 (τούτου) and 3 (τῆς πονηρίας); and fol. 325<sup>v</sup>, line 6 (τοῦ σωτηρίου; a corrector adds δέξασθαι afterwards).

164. Source: gallica.bnf.fr / Bibliothèque nationale de France, <http://archivesetmanuscrits.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cc21107b>.

165. I am grateful to Amy Myshrall (personal communication, 19 April 2022) for this suggestion.

But the lengthening of the two lines just before the last line of Ephesians gives the impression that the scribe did not see the need to compress the text until partway down fol. 326<sup>v</sup>, well after the line containing the variant in question. Other external evidence also favors the proposal that 06, or at least its exemplar, had the shorter reading. Specifically, the other Greek-Latin diglot majuscules 010 and 012, which David C. Parker identifies as descendants of a sibling of 06,<sup>166</sup> read τὸ μυστήριον here. The longer reading does appear in 0319, but this is because its scribe copied the corrected longer reading of 06.<sup>167</sup>

H. J. Vogels judges the longer reading to be a later addition in both the Greek and Latin text. He writes, “In the overlong final line of the page, the last word *του εὐαγγελίου* resp. *evangelii* is a later addition. It is lacking in B F<sup>87</sup> G and, it seems, in Marcion.”<sup>168</sup> Between this confirmation and the evidence already detailed, it is likely that both the Greek and Latin sides of 06 originally read τὸ μυστήριον. The correction in both cases seems to have been by the first hand, which would indicate that the scribe of 06 was aware of the longer reading from a source other than 06’s exemplar.

### B.35.3 Basil of Caesarea

While Basil introduces this verse with the citation formula τοῦ ἀποστόλου γράψαντος αὐτοῖς, he does not specify which of the apostle’s writings is the source of the words that follow. The writing in question is προσεύχεσθε καὶ περὶ ἐμοῦ, ἵνα μοι δοθῇ λόγος ἐν ἀνοίξει τοῦ στόματός μου, μετὰ παρρησίας λαλῆσαι τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ θεοῦ.<sup>169</sup> The first half of the quotation follows Ephesians more closely at the start, but even here it departs from the epistle’s wording, and as it proceeds, it harmonizes more to Col 4:3. Given the deviations throughout the reference, the genitive phrase τοῦ θεοῦ, found in none of the collated manuscripts in Ephesians (but found in some early manuscripts in Colossians), is best taken as an indication that Basil was not citing his text verbatim from a manuscript of Ephesians.

166. David C. Parker, *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and Their Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 260.

167. It is known that “The scribe [of 0319] copied sometimes the original text and sometimes the corrections in Clarmontanus, most often both” (Nils Alstrup Dahl, “0230 [= PSI 1306] and the Fourth-Century Greek-Latin Edition of the Letters of Paul,” in *Studies in Ephesians: Introductory Questions, Text- & Edition-Critical Issues, Interpretation of Texts and Themes*, ed. David Hellholm, Vemund Blomqvist, and Tord Fornberg, WUNT 1/131 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000], 211–30, here 213).

168. “In der überlangen Schlusszeile der Seite ist das letzte Wort *του εὐαγγελίου* bezw. *evangelii* spätere Ergänzung. Es fehlt in B F<sup>87</sup> G und, wie es scheint, bei Marcion.” (H. J. Vogels, “Der Codex Clarmontanus der paulinischen Briefe,” in *Amicitiae Corolla: A Volume of Essays Presented to James Rendel Harris, D. Litt., on the Occasion of His Eightieth Birthday*, ed. H. G. Wood [London: University of London Press, 1933], 274–99, 296, translation mine).

169. Basil of Caesarea, *Ascet. magn.* response 312 (PG 31:1305–6).



B.35.4 *Tertullian and Marcion*

Tertullian is not found in the NA<sup>28</sup> apparatus for this variation unit, but he is cited in support of the shorter reading τὸ μυστήριον by Ellicott,<sup>170</sup> by Robinson,<sup>171</sup> and tentatively by Salmond<sup>172</sup> and Zuntz.<sup>173</sup> To clarify the matter, we must examine Tertullian's comments on this passage, which follow: *Et quale erat ut ambiguitatibus et per aenigmata nescio quae creatorem taxaret, qui in catenis iam constitutus ob libertatem praedicationis constantiam manifestandi sacramenti in apertione oris, quam ibi expostulare a deo mandabat, ecclesiae utique praestabat?*<sup>174</sup>

While Tertullian does not introduce the referenced passage as a formal citation, it would be unusual for him to omit mention of the gospel if it were present in his text. The point he is trying to make, after all, is that Paul had no need to speak against the Creator in subtleties, since it was his openness in preaching that had led to his imprisonment in the first place and since he is now asking his readers to pray for God to give him still more boldness. If the “mystery” to be preached by Paul were explicitly connected with “the gospel,” then this would be germane to Tertullian's point. It follows that if Tertullian were aware of a text that explicitly made this connection, he would have included this detail. Since he did not, we can conclude that he was not aware of the longer reading and that his text mentioned only “the mystery.”

Since Tertullian is arguing against Marcion, it is natural to suspect, with Vogels, Zuntz, and the UBS<sup>5</sup> apparatus,<sup>175</sup> that Marcion himself had the shorter reading in his text. Schmid records nineteen explicit references by Tertullian to variant readings in Marcion's text<sup>176</sup> that “range from a non-polemically approving note to bitter exclamations about the omission of longer passages.”<sup>177</sup> So if Marcion's text had had the longer reading here, we have precedent to expect that Tertullian would either note it if he disapproved of it or mention it and possibly even adopt it if he approved of it.

The points made in the previous paragraph and the fact that Tertullian offers no remark on Marcion's text rule out the possibility that Tertullian had the longer reading and approvingly adopted the shorter reading from Marcion. Only the two following alternatives remain: (1) Marcion and

---

170. ELLICOTT, 155.

171. ROBINSON, 304.

172. SALMOND, 390.

173. Zuntz, *Text of the Epistles*, 95.

174. “And what need had the apostle to lay complaint against the Creator in ambiguous terms and by any kind of figurative language, when he was already in bonds for the liberty of his preaching, and was in fact putting at the church's disposal that boldness in making known the mystery by the opening of his mouth, for which he now enjoined them to make supplication to God?” (Tertullian, *Marc.* 5.18.14 [Evans, *Adversus Marcionem*, 628–29])

175. Vogels, “Codex Claramontanus,” 296; Zuntz, *Text of the Epistles*, 95.

176. Ulrich Schmid, *Marcion und Sein Apostolos: Rekonstruktion und Historische Einordnung der Marcionitischen Paulusbriefausgabe*, ANTF 25 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1995), 105–14.

177. “Sie reichen von einem unpolemisch-zustimmenden Vermerk bis hin zu bitteren Ausrufen über die Auslassung längerer Passagen” (Schmid, *Marcion und Sein Apostolos*, 105, translation mine). The only reference that falls into the category of a non-polemical approval is the one in 1 Cor 15:49, which Schmid describes as “die zustimmende Aufnahme einer marcionitischen Lesart” [“the approving inclusion of a Marcionite reading”] (Schmid, *Marcion und Sein Apostolos*, 109).

Tertullian both had texts with the shorter reading, so no comment on Tertullian's part was necessary; and (2) Marcion had the longer reading, but Tertullian passed over it without commenting on it. Unfortunately, we have no way of knowing how frequently Tertullian saw a textual variant in Marcion's text and said nothing about it, so we must deal in approximate probabilities. Given how arresting and conducive to Tertullian's point the addition of τοῦ εὐαγγελίου would be, possibility (2) seems highly unlikely. I therefore assign the likelihoods  $b \overset{B}{\gg} a$  to Marcion's reading.



## B.36 6:21/2-16: 2-4 6-8 10 12-16

## B.36.1 Basil of Caesarea

Basil quotes this passage in the *Moralia*,<sup>178</sup> but the Greek and Latin traditions of his quotation follow different readings. Specifically, the Greek text reads ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ κατ' ἐμέ (following the word order of reading *b*), while the Latin text reads *Ut autem et vos sciatis quae circa me sunt* (following the word order of reading *a*). Since the Greek text agrees with the Byzantine tradition and the Latin text agrees with the Vulgate, Basil's original reading could have been conformed to the predominant text in either language. Given this ambiguity, I assign an equal likelihood to these two readings (*a* = *b*) in Basil's testimony.

## B.36.2 Chrysostom

Chrysostom quotes this passage with different wording in different works and between different traditions of the same work. In his homilies on Ephesians, the Greek tradition consistently follows the reading ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ κατ' ἐμέ (*b*), and the Latin tradition consistently follows the reading *ut autem et vos sciatis quae circa me sunt* (*a*).<sup>179</sup> But in a quotation of this passage in his homilies on 2 Corinthians, both traditions agree on the wording ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ κατ' ἐμέ (*ut autem sciatis et vos quae circa me sunt*).<sup>180</sup> Transcriptionally, the Greek and Latin traditions of the Ephesians homilies could be the result of assimilation to the Byzantine text and the Vulgate text, respectively. Since ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ κατ' ἐμέ is consistently attested in both traditions of the homilies on 2 Corinthians, and since 044 and the Harklean group, witnesses known to have an affinity to Chrysostom's Antiochene text, both support this reading, this reading is much more likely to reflect the text known to Chrysostom: *b* <sup>B</sup> >> *a*.

## B.36.3 Theodoret

Theodoret quotes this passage with different wording in different portions of his commentary on the Pauline Epistles. In his commentary on this passage, both the Greek and Latin agree on reading *a*, ἵνα δὲ καὶ ὑμεῖς εἰδῆτε τὰ κατ' ἐμέ (*ut autem et vos sciatis quae circa me sunt*).<sup>181</sup> In his preface to the entire commentary, Theodoret notes that Paul ends each of Ephesians and Colossians in the same way.<sup>182</sup> In the Greek tradition, the phrase he quotes is ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ κατ' ἐμέ (reading *b*), but in the Latin tradition, it is *ut autem et vos sciatis quae circa me sunt* (reading *a*). Similarly, in the hypothesis to Ephesians, Theodoret quotes this passage with the

178. Basil of Caesarea, *Mor.* 70.15 (PG 31:829–30).

179. Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 24.1, 24.4 (PG 62:169–70, 173–74).

180. Chrysostom, *Hom. 2 Cor.* 2.2 (PG 61:394).

181. Theodoret, *Eph.* 6.21–22 (PG 82:555–56).

182. PG 82:41.

same two readings in the Greek and Latin traditions.<sup>183</sup> The reading of either tradition in these last two instances could be the result of assimilation to the corresponding popular text, so the testimony of the preface and hypothesis is non-probative. Since the Greek text of the commentary on this passage specifically has survived the impulse of Byzantine assimilation, and since all collated witnesses to Theodoret's commentary share this reading, I consider the evidence as strongly in favor of the reading ἵνα δὲ καὶ ὑμεῖς εἰδῇτε τὰ κατ' ἐμέ: <sup>B</sup>*a* >> *b*.

---

183. Theodoret, *Eph. hyp.* (PG 82:507-8).



# Appendix C

## Index of Patristic Citations

1:1/2–8

Ambrosiaster, *Comm. Eph.* 1.1 (CSEL 81.3:71); Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 1.1 (PG 62:9); Cyril of Alexandria, *Ths.* §32 (PG 75:475–76); Ephrem, *Eph.* §1 (CWE 3:139) (*S. Ephraem Syri commentarii in epistolas D. Pauli* [Venice: Typographia Sancti Lazari, 1893], 141); Jerome, *Comm. Eph.* 1.1.1 (PL 26:443); Victorinus, *Ep. Eph.* 1.1.1 (CSEL 83.2:2); Origen, *Comm. Eph.* 1.1 (OO 14.4:230); Pelagius, *Exp. Eph.* 1.1 (Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions*, 2:344); *Syn. scr. sac.* §3 (PG 28:293–94); Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Eph.* 1.1 (SBLWGRW 26:178); Theodoret, *Eph.* 1.1–2 (PG 82:509–10).

1:1/24–26

Ambrosiaster, *Comm. Eph.* 1.1 (CSEL 81.3:71); Basil of Caesarea, *Eun.* 2.19 (SC 305:76); Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 1.1 (PG 62:9); Cyril of Alexandria, *Ths.* §32 (PG 75:475–76); Ephrem, *Eph.* §1 (CWE 3:139) (*S. Ephraem Syri commentarii*, 141); Epiphanius, *Pan.* 42.12.3, 13.4 (GCS 1/31:182–83); Jerome, *Comm. Eph.* 1.1.1 (PL 26:443–44); Victorinus, *Ep. Eph.* 1.1.1 (CSEL 83.2:2–3); Origen, *Comm. Eph.* 1.2 (OO 14.4:232); Pelagius, *Exp. Eph.* 1.1 (Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions*, 2:344); *Syn. scr. sac.* §3 (PG 28:293–94); Tertullian, *Marc.* 5.17.1 (Evans, *Adversus Marcionem*, 612); Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Eph.* 1.1 (SBLWGRW 26:178); Theodoret, *Eph.* 1.1–2 (PG 82:509–10).

1:10/26–42

Ambrose, *Ep.* 16.3, 5 (CSEL 82.1:115–16); Ambrosiaster, *Comm. Eph.* 1.10 (CSEL 81.3:74); Ambrose, *Exp. Apoc.* 3.8 (SC 636:60); Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 1.4 (PG 62:15); Cyril of Alexandria, *Glaph. Gen.* 1 (PG 69:27–28, 31–32); Cyril of Alexandria, *Exp. Pss.* 9.15 (PG 69:773–74); Cyril of Alexandria, *Comm. Isa.* 4.1.43.1–2, 4.2.45.13 (PG 70:883–84, 967–68); Cyril of Alexandria, *Mic.* 2.5.2 (Pusey, *Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli Archiepiscopi Alexandrini in XII prophetas* 1:675); Cyril of Alexandria, *Hag.* 2.23 (Pusey, *Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli Archiepiscopi Alexandrini in XII prophetas* 2:281); Cyril of Alexandria, *Quod Unus* (SC 97:508); Ephrem, *Eph.* §1 (CWE 3:140) (*S. Ephraem Syri commentarii*, 142); Epiphanius, *Anc.* 65.7 (GCS 1/25:78); Epiphanius, *Pan.* 74.2.7 (GCS

1/37:315); Eusebius, *Eccl. theol.* 3.2.16 (GCS 1/14:142); Irenaeus, *Haer.* 5.20.2 (SC 153:260) (Irenaeus, *Haer. [Arm.]* 5.20.2 [TUGAL 35.2:201]); Jerome, *Comm. Eph.* 1.1.10 (PL 26:453–54); Marcus Eremita, *Nest.* §30 (SC 455:286); Victorinus, *Ep. Eph.* 1.1.4, 1.1.10 (CSEL 83.2:7, 17); Origen, *Comm. Eph.* 1.13 (OO 14.4:250); Pelagius, *Exp. Eph.* 1.10 (Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions*, 2:346); Severian of Gabala, *Eph.* 1.10 (Staab, *Pauluskommentare*, 306) (conflated with elements of Col 1:20); Tertullian, *Marc.* 5.17.1 (Evans, *Adversus Marcionem*, 612, 614); Tertullian, *Mon.* 5.2 (SC 343:148); Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Eph.* 1.10b (SBLWGRW 26:194–96); Theodoret, *Eph.* 1.10 (PG 82:511–12); Theodoret, *Ep.* 147 (SC 111:230).

1:11/16–22

Ambrosiaster, *Comm. Eph.* 1.11 (CSEL 81.3:74); Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 2.1 (PG 62:17); Cyril of Alexandria, *Glaph. Gen.* 1 (PG 69:27–28); Eusebius, *Comm. Pss.* 57.7–8 (PG 23:525–26); Jerome, *Comm. Eph.* 1.1.11 (PL 26:454); Victorinus, *Ep. Eph.* 1.1.11 (CSEL 83.2:17); Origen, *Hom. Josh.* 23.2 (GCS 1/30:441); Pelagius, *Exp. Eph.* 1.11 (Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions*, 2:347); Severian of Gabala, *Eph.* 1.11 (Staab, *Pauluskommentare*, 306); Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Eph.* 1.11–12 (SBLWGRW 26:196); Theodoret, *Eph.* 1.11 (PG 82:513–14); Theodoret, *Quaest. Oct.* 46 (TECC 17:223).

1:15/26–36

Ambrosiaster, *Comm. Eph.* 1.15 (CSEL 81.3:75); Basil of Caesarea, *Bap.* 1.2.22 (SC 357:172); Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 3.1 (PG 62:23); Cyril of Alexandria, *Comm. Ioh.* 10.14.25–26 (*Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli Archiepiscopi Alexandrini in D. Joannis evangelium*, 2:507); Cyril of Alexandria, *Trin. dial.* 6 (SC 246:60); Ephrem, *Eph.* §1 (CWE 3:140) (*S. Ephraem Syri commentarii*, 142); *Ep. mag.* (Jaeger, *Two Rediscovered Works*, 248); Jerome, *Comm. Eph.* 1.1.15–18a (PL 26:458); Victorinus, *Ep. Eph.* 1.1.15 (CSEL 83.2:20); Origen, *Comm. Eph.* 1.17 (OO 14.4:258); Pelagius, *Exp. Eph.* 1.15 (Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions*, 2:348); Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Eph.* 1.15–16 (SBLWGRW 26:202); Theodoret, *Eph.* 1.15–16 (PG 82:513–14).

1:20/2–4

Ambrosiaster, *Comm. Eph.* 1.19–21 (CSEL 81.3:77); Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 3.1 (PG 62:23); Cyril of Alexandria, *Comm. Ioh.* 10.14.25–26 (*Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli Archiepiscopi Alexandrini in D. Joannis evangelium*, 2:507); Cyril of Alexandria, *Arcad.* §71 (ACO 1.1.5:80); Cyril of Alexandria, *Quod Unus* (SC 97:478); Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catech. illum.* 14.29 (Reischl and Rupp, *Cyrilli Hierosolymorum archiepiscopi opera quae supersunt omnia* 2:147–48); *Ep. mag.* (Jaeger, *Two Rediscovered Works*, 249); Eusebius, *Comm. Isa.* 1.54 (GCS 1/60:67); Gregory of Nyssa, *Adv. Ar. et Sab.* (GNO 3.1:77); Gregory of Nyssa, *Inst. Chr.* (GNO 8.1:58); Hilary, *Trin.* 11.31 (SC 462:350); Jerome, *Comm. Eph.* 1.1.21 (PL 26:460); Victorinus, *Ep. Eph.* 1.1.20–23 (CSEL 83.2:23, 25); Origen, *Comm. Eph.* 1.18 (OO 14.4:262); Pelagius, *Exp. Eph.* 1.20 (Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions*, 2:350); Procopius, *Comm. Isa.* 9.1–7 (PG 87.2:2009–10); Tertullian, *Marc.* 5.17.6 (Evans, *Adver-*

*sus Marcionem*, 616); Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Eph.* 1.20a (SBLWGRW 26:206); Theodoret, *Eph.* 1.20–22 (PG 82:515–16).

#### 1:20/20–22

Ambrosiaster, *Comm. Eph.* 1.19–21 (CSEL 81.3:77); Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 3.1 (PG 62:23); Chrysostom, *Incomp.* (SC 28bis:236); Cyril of Alexandria, *Comm. Ioh.* 10.14.25–26 (*Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli Archiepiscopi Alexandrini in D. Joannis evangelium*, 2:507); Cyril of Alexandria, *Arcad.* §71 (ACO 1.1.5:80); Cyril of Alexandria, *Quod Unus* (SC 97:478); Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catech. illum.* 14.29 (Reischl and Rupp, *Cyrilli Hierosolymorum archiepiscopi opera quae supersunt omnia* 2:147–48); Ephrem, *Eph.* §1 (CWE 3:141) (*S. Ephraem Syri commentarii*, 143); Eusebius, *Comm. Isa.* 1.54 (GCS 1/60:67); Eusebius, *Dem. ev.* 5.3.26 (GCS 1/23:223); Gregory of Nyssa, *Adv. Ar. et Sab.* (GNO 3.1:77); Hilary, *Trin.* 11.31 (SC 462:350); Jerome, *Comm. Eph.* 1.1.21 (PL 26:460); Victorinus, *Ep. Eph.* 1.1.20–23 (CSEL 83.2:23, 25); Origen, *Comm. Eph.* 1.18, 19 (OO 14.4:262, 266); Pelagius, *Exp. Eph.* 1.20 (Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions*, 2:350); Procopius, *Comm. Isa.* 9.1–7 (PG 87.2:2009–10); Tertullian, *Marc.* 5.17.6 (Evans, *Adversus Marcionem*, 616); Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Eph.* 1.20b (SBLWGRW 26:206–8); Theodoret, *Eph.* 1.20–22 (PG 82:515–16).

#### 2:15/28–32

Ambrose, *Exp. Luc.* 7.141 (CCSL 14:263); Ambrosiaster, *Comm. Eph.* 2.15 (CSEL 81.3:84); Athanasius, *Hom. Matt.* 11:27 §3 (PG 25:213–14); Athanasius, *C. Ar.* 2.46.1, 2.55.5 (AW 1.2); Athanasius, *Ep. Serap.* 1.9.9 (AW 1.4:475); Basil of Caesarea, *Hom. Pss.* 32.6, 33.5, 33.10, 45.8 (PG 29:339–40, 361–62, 375–76, 431–32); Basil of Caesarea, *Auct. mal.* §4 (PG 31:335–36); Basil of Caesarea, *Bap.* 1.2.22 (SC 357:172); Chrysostom, *Exp. Pss.* 117.5 (PG 55:336); Chrysostom, *Hom. Ioh.* 70.2 (PG 59:330); Chrysostom, *Hom. 1 Cor.* 20.3 (PG 61:164); Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 5.3, 6.1, 6.3 (PG 62:40, 44, 46); Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 3.10.70.2 (SC 608:42); Cyril of Alexandria, *Glaph. Gen.* 2, 3, 4, 7 (PG 69:85–86, 159–60, 201–2, 359–60); Cyril of Alexandria, *Glaph. Num.* (PG 69:613–14); Cyril of Alexandria, *Exp. Pss.* 32.9, 39.2, 44.1, 45.17 (PG 69:875–76, 981–82, 1025–26, 1045–46); Cyril of Alexandria, *Comm. Isa.* 2.1.11.12, 3.3.32.20, 4.4.49.14–15, 5.1.53.10–12, 5.2.54.4–5, 5.2.54.16–17, 5.3.57.17–21, 5.4.60.4–7, 5.6.66.10–12 (PG 70:333–34, 717–18, 1065–66, 1189–90, 1199–200, 1215–16, 1277–78, 1325–26, 1437–38); Cyril of Alexandria, *Hos.* 2.2.19 (Pusey, *Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli Archiepiscopi Alexandrini in XII prophetas* 1:74); Cyril of Alexandria, *Mic.* 2.3.9–10, 2.5.4–5, 2.7.14–15 (Pusey, *Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli Archiepiscopi Alexandrini in XII prophetas* 1:653, 679, 731); Cyril of Alexandria, *Soph.* 2.3.19–20 (Pusey, *Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli Archiepiscopi Alexandrini in XII prophetas* 2:239); Cyril of Alexandria, *Zach.* 2.4.11–12, 2.6.9–15, 3.9.7 (Pusey, *Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli Archiepiscopi Alexandrini in XII prophetas* 2:344, 368, 411); Cyril of Alexandria, *Comm. Luc.* 2.7, 12.51, 20.17 (PG 72:493–94, 755–56, 887–88); Cyril of Alexandria, *Comm. Ioh.* 7.11.49–52, 9.13.35, 11.11.17.20–21 (*Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli Archiepiscopi Alexandrini in D. Joannis evangelium*, 2:295, 390, 733); Cyril of Alexandria, *C. Jul.* 3.45 (SC 582:278); Cyril of Alexandria, *Ador.* 3, 17 (PG 68:279–80, 1089–90); Cyril of

Alexandria, *Hom. pasch.* 23.2 (PG 77:877–78); Cyril of Alexandria, *Ths.* §15 (PG 75:263–64, 273–76); Didymus, *Comm. Gen.* 7.2–3 (SC 244:94); Didymus, *Comm. Pss.* 31.2, 32.15 (PTA 8:154–56, 174); Didymus, *Comm. Pss.* 88.12–13, 101.19b–20a (PTS 15:170, 225); Didymus, *Comm. Prov.* 8.22 (PG 39:1631–32); Didymus, *Comm. Zach.* 1.259 (SC 83:328); Didymus, *Comm. Zach.* 3.144, 3.198 (SC 84:692, 714); Didymus, *Comm. Zach.* 4.142, 5.151 (SC 85:872, 1056); Didymus, *Comm.* 2 Cor. 5.17–19 (Staab, *Pauluskommentare*, 29); Ephrem, *Eph.* §2 (CWE 3:143) (*S. Ephraem Syri commentarii*, 145); Epiphanius, *Anc.* 65.8 (GCS 1/25:78); Epiphanius, *Pan.* 74.2.8 (GCS 1/37:315); Eusebius, *Eccl. theol.* 3.2.12 (GCS 1/14:141); Eusebius, *Quaest.* 7.3 (PG 22:907–8); Gregory of Nyssa, *Cant.* §7 (GNO 6:201); Gregory of Nyssa, *Ref.* 178 (GNO 2.2:387); Gregory of Nyssa, *Perf.* (GNO 8.1:184); Gregory of Nyssa, *Diem. nat.* (GNO 10.2:258); Hesychius, *Fr. Pss.* 101.19 (PG 93:1277–78); Isidore of Pelusium, *Ep.* 1608 (SC 454:330); Jerome, *Comm. Eph.* 1.2.15–18 (PL 26:473–74); Marcellus, *Inc. et c. Ar.* §6 (PG 26:993–94); Victorinus, *Ep. Eph.* 1.2.15 (CSEL 83.2:37); Origen, *Hom. Pss.* 80.2.7 (GCS 2/19:506); Origen, *Fr. Luc.* 212 (GCS 1/49:319); Origen, *Comm. Eph.* 2.26 (OO 14.4:282); Pelagius, *Exp. Eph.* 2.15 (Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions*, 2:355); Proclus, *Arm.* (ACO 4.2:193); Procopius, *Comm. Gen.* 25.32, 27.41, 49.4 (GCS 2/22:321, 339, 445); Procopius, *Comm. Isa.* 32.9–20, 53.1–12, 54.1–17, 57.15–21 (PG 87.2:2287–88, 2529–930, 2535–36, 2545–46, 2585–86); Socrates, *Hist. eccl.* 2.21.20 (SC 493:94); Tertullian, *Marc.* 5.17.15 (Evans, *Adversus Marcionem*, 620); Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Eph.* 2.14–16 (SBLWGRW 26:224); Theodoret, *Ezek.* 48.35 (PG 81:1253–54); Theodoret, *Eph.* 2.15b–16 (PG 82:523–24).

2:19/2–4

Ambrosiaster, *Comm. Eph.* 2.19 (CSEL 81.3:85); Basil of Caesarea, *Bap.* 1.2.22 (SC 357:172); Basil of Caesarea, *Mor.* 80.21 (PG 31:867–68); Chrysostom, *Exp. Pss.* 143.3 (PG 55:461); Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 6.1 (PG 62:43–44); Cyril of Alexandria, *Ths.* §§32, 34 (PG 75:477–78, 611–12); Didymus, *Comm. Pss.* 145.8c–9 (PTS); Ephrem, *Eph.* §2 (CWE 3:143) (*S. Ephraem Syri commentarii*, 146); Jerome, *Comm. Eph.* 1.2.19–22 (PL 26:475); Victorinus, *Ep. Eph.* 1.2.19 (CSEL 83.2:40); Origen, *Comm. 1 Cor.* §16 (OO 14.4:86); Origen, *Comm. Eph.* 2.27 (OO 14.4:282); Pelagius, *Exp. Eph.* 2.19 (Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions*, 2:355); Procopius, *Comm. Isa.* 60.1–22 (PG 87.2:2619–20); Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Eph.* 2.19–20a (SBLWGRW 26:228); Theodoret, *Eph.* 2.19 (PG 82:523–24).

2:21/6–8

Ambrosiaster, *Comm. Eph.* 2.21 (CSEL 81.3:86); Basil of Caesarea, *Bap.* 1.2.22 (SC 357:174); Basil of Caesarea, *Eun.* 3.5 (SC 305:164); Basil of Caesarea, *Fid.* §5 (PG 31:689–90); Basil of Caesarea, *Mor.* 80.21 (PG 31:867–68); Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 6.1 (PG 62:43–44); Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 6.11.95.2 (SC 446:250); Cyril of Alexandria, *Ths.* §34 (PG 75:611–12); Ephrem, *Eph.* §2 (CWE 3:143) (*S. Ephraem Syri commentarii*, 146); Jerome, *Comm. Eph.* 1.2.19–22 (PL 26:475); Victorinus, *Ep. Eph.* 1.2.21 (CSEL 83.2:41); Origen, *Comm. 1 Cor.* §16 (OO 14.4:86); Origen, *Comm. Eph.* 2.27 (OO 14.4:284); Pelagius, *Exp. Eph.* 2.21 (Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions*,



2:356); Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Eph.* 2.20b–22 (SBLWGRW 26:228); Theodoret, *Eph.* 2.21–22 (PG 82:525–26).

3:3/2–4

Ambrosiaster, *Comm. Eph.* 3.3 (CSEL 81.3:87); Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 6.2 (PG 62:45); Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 1.28.179.1 (SC 30:174); Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 5.10.60.1 (SC 278:124); Cyril of Alexandria, *Arcad.* §208 (ACO 1.1.5:115); Cyril of Alexandria, *C. Nest.* 4 (ACO 1.1.6:86); Ephrem, *Eph.* §3 (CWE 3:144) (*S. Ephraem Syri commentarii*, 146); Jerome, *Comm. Eph.* 2.3.1–4 (PL 26:477–78); Victorinus, *Ep. Eph.* 1.3.3 (CSEL 83.2:43); Origen, *Comm. Eph.* 2.28 (OO 14.4:284); Pelagius, *Exp. Eph.* 3.3 (Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions*, 2:357); *Ref.* 7.26.7 (SBLWGRW 40:528); Severian of Gabala, *Eph.* 3.2–3 (Staab, *Pauluskommentare*, 310); Severian of Gabala, *Inc. dom.* (Regtuit, *Homily on the Incarnation of Christ*); Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Eph.* 3.2–4 (SBLWGRW 26:230, 232); Theodoret, *Eph.* 3.1–4 (PG 82:525–26).

3:9/6

Adamantius, *Dial.* 2.20 (GCS 1/4:106); Ambrosiaster, *Comm. Eph.* 3.9 (CSEL 81.3:89); Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 7.1 (PG 62:49–50); Cyril of Alexandria, *Comm. Luc.* 10.21 (PG 72:669–70); Cyril of Alexandria, *Arcad.* §209 (ACO 1.1.5:115); Cyril of Alexandria, *Ths.* §34 (PG 75:611–12); Ephrem, *Eph.* §3 (CWE 3:144) (*S. Ephraem Syri commentarii*, 147); Hilary, *Tract. Pss.* 9.3 (SC 515:302); Jerome, *Comm. Eph.* 2.3.8–9 (PL 26:482); Victorinus, *Ep. Eph.* 1.3.9 (CSEL 83.2:47–48); Pelagius, *Exp. Eph.* 3.9 (Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions*, 2:359); Tertullian, *Marc.* 5.18.1 (Evans, *Adversus Marcionem*, 622); Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Eph.* 3.6b–9 (SBLWGRW 26:234); Theodoret, *Eph.* 3.9 (PG 82:527–28).

3:9/27

Adamantius, *Dial.* 2.20 (GCS 1/4:106); Ambrosiaster, *Comm. Eph.* 3.9 (CSEL 81.3:89); Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 7.1 (PG 62:49–50); Cyril of Alexandria, *Comm. Luc.* 10.21 (PG 72:669–70); Cyril of Alexandria, *Arcad.* §209 (ACO 1.1.5:115); Cyril of Alexandria, *Ths.* §34 (PG 75:611–12); Ephrem, *Eph.* §3 (CWE 3:144) (*S. Ephraem Syri commentarii*, 147); Hilary, *Tract. Pss.* 9.3 (SC 515:302); Jerome, *Comm. Eph.* 2.3.8–9 (PL 26:482–83), identified as a reuse of Origen's commentary in Ronald E. Heine, "Recovering Origen's Commentary on Ephesians from Jerome," *JTS* 2/51.2 (2000): 478–514, here 498–500; Victorinus, *Ep. Eph.* 1.3.9 (CSEL 83.2:47–48); Nilus, *Comm. Cant.* 5.1 (Rosenbaum, *Kommentar zum Hohelied*, 15); Pelagius, *Exp. Eph.* 3.9 (Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions*, 2:359); *Spec.* §56 (CSEL 12:540); Tertullian, *Marc.* 5.18.1 (Evans, *Adversus Marcionem*, 622); Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Eph.* 3.6b–9 (SBLWGRW 26:234); Theodoret, *Eph.* 3.9 (PG 82:527–28).



3:9/41

Adamantius, *Dial.* 2.20 (GCS 1/4:106); Ambrose, *Exp. Luc.* 2.14 (CCSL 14:37); Ambrosiaster, *Comm. Eph.* 3.9 (CSEL 81.3:89); Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 7.1 (PG 62:49–50); Cyril of Alexandria, *Comm. Luc.* 10.21 (PG 72:669–70); Cyril of Alexandria, *Arcad.* §209 (ACO 1.1.5:115); Cyril of Alexandria, *Ths.* §34 (PG 75:611–12); Ephrem, *Eph.* §3 (CWE 3:144) (*S. Ephraem Syri commentarii*, 147); Jerome, *Comm. Eph.* 2.3.8–9 (PL 26:483), identified as a reuse of Origen’s commentary in Heine, “Recovering Origen’s Commentary,” 498–500; Victorinus, *Ep. Eph.* 1.3.9 (CSEL 83.2:47–48); *Occ. dom.* (PG 46:1155–56); Pelagius, *Exp. Eph.* 3.9 (Souter, *Pelagius’s Expositions*, 2:359); *Spec.* §56 (CSEL 12:540); Tertullian, *Marc.* 5.18.1–4 (Evans, *Adversus Marcionem*, 622); Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Eph.* 3.6b–9 (SBLWGRW 26:234); Theodoret, *Eph.* 3.9 (PG 82:527–30).

3:13/4–8

Ambrosiaster, *Comm. Eph.* 3.13 (CSEL 81.3:91); Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 7.1 (PG 62:50); Ephrem, *Eph.* §3 (CWE 3:145) (*S. Ephraem Syri commentarii*, 148); Jerome, *Comm. Eph.* 2.3.13 (PL 26:485); Victorinus, *Ep. Eph.* 1.3.13 (CSEL 83.2:50–51); Origen, *Comm. Eph.* 2.31 (OO 14.4:286–88); Pelagius, *Exp. Eph.* 3.13 (Souter, *Pelagius’s Expositions*, 2:359); Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Eph.* 3.13 (SBLWGRW 26:234); Theodoret, *Eph.* 3.13 (PG 82:529–30).

3:14/19

Ambrosiaster, *Comm. Eph.* 3.14–16 (CSEL 81.3:91); Basil of Caesarea, *Bap.* 1.2.21 (SC 357:170); Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 7.1 (PG 62:51); Cyril of Alexandria, *Comm. Ioh.* 2.4.3.36, 10.14.27 (*Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli Archiepiscopi Alexandrini in D. Joannis evangelium*, 1:259, 2:508); Cyril of Alexandria, *Arcad.* §78 (ACO 1.1.5:80); Cyril of Alexandria, *Quod Unus* (SC 97:380); Cyril of Alexandria, *Ths.* §32 (PG 75:477–78); Ephrem, *Eph.* §3 (CWE 3:145) (*S. Ephraem Syri commentarii*, 148); *Ep. mag.* (Jaeger, *Two Rediscovered Works*, 249); Gregory of Nyssa, *Inst. Chr.* (GNO 8.1:59); Jerome, *Comm. Eph.* 2.3.14 (PL 26:487); Marcus Eremita, *Bap.* §5 (SC 445:340); Victorinus, *Ep. Eph.* 1.3.14 (CSEL 83.2:51); Methodius, *Symp.* 8.8 (SC 95:220); Origen, *Comm. Eph.* 2.31 (OO 14.4:288); Origen, *Or.* 31.3 (GCS 1/3:396); Pelagius, *Exp. Eph.* 3.14 (Souter, *Pelagius’s Expositions*, 2:360); Quodvultdeus, *Prom.* 1.7.11 (CCSL 60:19); *Ref.* 6.34.7 (SBLWGRW 40:428); Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Eph.* 3.14–15 (SBLWGRW 26:236); Theodoret, *Eph.* 3.14 (PG 82:529–30).

3:18/16–32

Ambrose, *Exp. Luc.* 1.27 (CCSL 14:20); Ambrosiaster, *Comm. Eph.* 3.17b–18 (CSEL 81.3:92–93); Athanasius, *Inc.* 16.2 (SC 199:322); Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 7.1–2 (PG 62:51); Cyril of Alexandria, *Comm. Ioh.* 10.14.27 (*Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli Archiepiscopi Alexandrini in D. Joannis*

*evangelium*, 2:508); Cyril of Alexandria, *Ador.* 1 (PG 68:167–68); Cyril of Alexandria, *Glaph. Gen.* 2 (PG 69:65–66); Didymus, *Comm. Gen.* 12.6 (SC 244:150); Ephrem, *Eph.* §3 (CWE 3:146) (*S. Ephraem Syri commentarii*, 149); *Ep. mag.* (Jaeger, *Two Rediscovered Works*, 249); Eusebius, *Eccl. theol.* 2.20.10 (GCS 1/14:129); Gregory of Nyssa, *Inst. Chr.* (GNO 8.1:59); Gregory of Nyssa, *Or. catech.* 32 (SC 453:290); Gregory of Nyssa, *Trid.* (GNO 9.1:300); *Homiliae spirituales* 46.5 (PTS 4:303); Irenaeus, *Haer.* 5.17.4 (SC 153:234) (Irenaeus, *Haer. [Arm.]* 5.17.4 [TUGAL 35.2:195]); Jerome, *Comm. Eph.* 2.3.16–19 (PL 26:490–91); Marcellus, *Inc. et c. Ar.* §1 (PG 26:985–86); Victorinus, *Ep. Eph.* 1.3.18–19 (CSEL 83.2:53–55); Origen, *Hom. Jer.* 18.2 (SC 238:182); Origen, *Comm. Rom.* 3.25–26 (Scherer, *Origène sur Rom. III.5–V.7*, 158); Origen, *Comm. Eph.* 2.35 (OO 14.4:292); Pelagius, *Exp. Eph.* 3.18 (Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions*, 2:360–361); Procopius, *Comm. Gen.* 12.1 (GCS 2/22:237); Quodvultdeus, *Prom.* 1.7.11 (CCSL 60:19); *Ref.* 6.34.7 (SBLWGRW 40:428); Severian of Gabala, *Eph.* 3.18–19 (Staab, *Pauluskommentare*, 311); Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Eph.* 3.18–19a (SBLWGRW 26:238); Theodoret, *Eph.* 3.18–19 (PG 82:531–32).

### 3:19/2–4

Ambrose, *Exp. Luc.* 1.27 (CCSL 14:20); Ambrosiaster, *Comm. Eph.* 3.19a (CSEL 81.3:93); Athanasius, *Inc.* 16.2 (SC 199:322); Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 7.1–2 (PG 62:51–52); Cyril of Alexandria, *Comm. Ioh.* 10.14.27 (*Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli Archiepiscopi Alexandrini in D. Joannis evangelium*, 2:508); Cyril of Alexandria, *Glaph. Gen.* 2 (PG 69:65–66); Didymus, *Comm. Gen.* 12.6 (SC 244:150); Ephrem, *Eph.* §3 (CWE 3:146) (*S. Ephraem Syri commentarii*, 149); *Ep. mag.* (Jaeger, *Two Rediscovered Works*, 249); Eusebius, *Eccl. theol.* 2.20.10 (GCS 1/14:129); Gregory of Nyssa, *Inst. Chr.* (GNO 8.1:59); Gregory of Nyssa, *Trid.* (GNO 9.1:300); *Homiliae spirituales* 46.5 (PTS 4:303); Jerome, *Comm. Eph.* 2.3.16–19 (PL 26:490–91); Marcellus, *Inc. et c. Ar.* §1 (PG 26:985–86); Victorinus, *Ep. Eph.* 1.3.18–19 (CSEL 83.2:55); Origen, *Comm. Eph.* 2.35 (OO 14.4:292); Pelagius, *Exp. Eph.* 3.19 (Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions*, 2:361); Quodvultdeus, *Prom.* 1.7.11 (CCSL 60:19); Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Eph.* 3.18–19a (SBLWGRW 26:238); Theodoret, *Eph.* 3.18–19 (PG 82:531–32).

### 3:19/20–34

Ambrosiaster, *Comm. Eph.* 3.19b (CSEL 81.3:94); Athanasius, *Inc.* 16.2 (SC 199:322); Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 7.2 (PG 62:52); Cyril of Alexandria, *Comm. Ioh.* 10.14.27 (*Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli Archiepiscopi Alexandrini in D. Joannis evangelium*, 2:508); Ephrem, *Eph.* §3 (CWE 3:146) (*S. Ephraem Syri commentarii*, 149); *Ep. mag.* (Jaeger, *Two Rediscovered Works*, 249); Gregory of Nyssa, *Inst. Chr.* (GNO 8.1:59); Gregory of Nyssa, *Trid.* (GNO 9.1:300); Hilary, *Tract. Pss.* 60.6 (SC 565:316); *Homiliae spirituales* 18.11, 46.5 (PTS 4:182, 303); Jerome, *Comm. Eph.* 2.3.16–19 (PL 26:490–91); Marcellus, *Inc. et c. Ar.* §1 (PG 26:985–86); Victorinus, *Ep. Eph.* 1.3.18–19 (CSEL 83.2:55); *De Charitate* §7 (PG 34:913–14); Pelagius, *Exp. Eph.* 3.19 (Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions*, 2:361); Severian of Gabala, *Eph.* 3.18–19 (Staab, *Pauluskommentare*, 311); Theodore of

Mopsuestia, *Eph.* 3.19b (SBLWGRW 26:240); Theodoret, *Eph.* 3.18–19 (PG 82:531–32).

4:8/12–18

Ambrosiaster, *Comm. Eph.* 4.8 (CSEL 81.3:97); Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 11.2 (PG 62:81); Cyril of Alexandria, *Ador.* 13 (PG 68:873–74); Cyril of Alexandria, *Arcad.* §172 (ACO 1.1.5:105); Diadochus, *Serm.* §2 (SC 5ter:165); Ephrem, *Eph.* §4 (CWE 3:147) (*S. Ephraem Syri commentarii*, 149–50); Eusebius, *Comm. Pss.* 59.8–9 (PG 23:565–66); Eusebius, *Ecl. proph.* 3.3 (Gaisford, *Eclogae prophetae*, 102); Evagrius of Pontus, *Sch. Pss.* 67.19 (SC 614:740); Hesychius, *Fr. Pss.* 107.7 (PG 93:1311–12); Hilary, *Tract. Pss.* 56.6 (SC 565:220); Irenaeus, *Dem.* §83 (PO 12.5:719); Irenaeus, *Haer.* 2.20.3 (SC 294:204); Jerome, *Comm. Eph.* 2.4.8 (PL 26:497); Justin Martyr, *Dial.* 39.4, 87.6 (Goodspeed, *Die ältesten Apologeten*, 136, 201); Lucifer, *Athan.* 2.29 (CCSL 8:125); Victorinus, *Ep. Eph.* 1.4.8, 2.4.8 (CSEL 83.2:59, 60); Origen, *Comm. Eph.* 2.35 (OO 14.4:292); Pelagius, *Exp. Eph.* 4.8 (Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions*, 2:363–364); *Physiologus* §3 (Sbordone, 14); Quodvultdeus, *Prom.* 3.31.32 (CCSL 60:175); Tertullian, *Marc.* 5.8.5, 5.18.5 (Evans, *Adversus Marcionem*, 558, 624); Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Eph.* 4.8 (SBLWGRW 26:246); Theodoret, *Eph.* 4.8 (PG 82:533–34).

4:9/12–20

Ambrosiaster, *Comm. Eph.* 4.9 (CSEL 81.3:97); Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 11.2 (PG 62:81–82); Clement of Alexandria, *Exc.* 3.43.5 (SC 23:152); Cyril of Alexandria, *Exp. Pss.* 46.6–7 (PG 69:1055–56); Cyril of Alexandria, *Arcad.* §172 (ACO 1.1.5:105); Ephrem, *Eph.* §4 (CWE 3:147) (*S. Ephraem Syri commentarii*, 150); Eusebius, *Dem. ev.* 6.2.6 (GCS 1/23:253); Eusebius, *Ecl. proph.* 3.3 (Gaisford, *Eclogae prophetae*, 101); Hilary, *Tract. Pss.* 56.6 (SC 565:220); Hilary, *Tract. Pss.* 67.19 (SC 605:88); Hilary, *Trin.* 10.65 (SC 462:278); Irenaeus, *Haer.* 5.31.1 (SC 153:390) (Irenaeus, *Haer. [Arm.]* 5.31.1 [TUGAL 35.2:229]); Jerome, *Comm. Eph.* 2.4.9 (PL 26:498); Lucifer, *Athan.* 2.29 (CCSL 8:125); Victorinus, *Ep. Eph.* 2.4.9 (CSEL 83.2:60–61); Pelagius, *Exp. Eph.* 4.9 (Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions*, 2:364); Severian of Gabala, *Ascens.* §35 (Bishop and Rambault, “In ascensionem et in principium Actorum,” 220); Tertullian, *Anim.* 55.2 (SC 601:436); Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Eph.* 4.9 (SBLWGRW 26:248); Theodoret, *Pss.* 67.19 (PG 80:1387–88); Theodoret, *Eph.* 4.9 (PG 82:533–34).

4:9/22–30

Athanasius, *C. Ar.* 1.45.2 (AW); Ambrosiaster, *Comm. Eph.* 4.9 (CSEL 81.3:97); Chrysostom, *Ascens.* §2 (PG 50:447); Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 11.2 (PG 62:81–82); Clement of Alexandria, *Exc.* 3.43.5 (SC 23:152); Cyril of Alexandria, *Exp. Pss.* 46.6–7 (PG 69:1055–56); Cyril of Alexandria, *Arcad.* §172 (ACO 1.1.5:105); Ephrem, *Eph.* §4 (CWE 3:147) (*S. Ephraem Syri commentarii*, 150); Eusebius, *Comm. Pss.* 62.7–9 (PG 23:611–12); Eusebius, *Dem. ev.* 6.2.6 (GCS 1/23:253); Eusebius, *Ecl. proph.* 3.3 (Gaisford, *Eclogae prophetae*, 101); Hilary, *Tract. Pss.* 56.6 (SC 565:220);

Hilary, *Tract. Pss.* 67.19 (SC 605:88); Hilary, *Trin.* 10.65 (SC 462:278); Irenaeus, *Haer.* 4.22.1 (SC 100.2:688) (Irenaeus, *Haer. [Arm.]* 4.36.1 [TUGAL]); Irenaeus, *Haer.* 5.31.1 (SC 153:390) (Irenaeus, *Haer. [Arm.]* 5.31.1 [TUGAL 35.2:229]); Jerome, *Comm. Eph.* 2.4.9 (PL 26:498–99); Lucifer, *Athan.* 2.29 (CCSL 8:125); Victorinus, *Ep. Eph.* 2.4.9 (CSEL 83.2:60–61); Origen, *Comm. John* 19.20.137, 19.21.140–141 (SC 290:128, 132); Origen, *Comm. Eph.* 2.35 (OO 14.4:292); Pelagius, *Exp. Eph.* 4.9 (Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions*, 2:364); Severian of Gabala, *Ascens.* §35 (Bishop and Rambault, “In ascensionem et in principium Actorum,” 220); Tertullian, *Anim.* 55.2 (SC 601:436); Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Eph.* 4.9 (SBLWGRW 26:248); Theodoret, *Cant.* 1.2.1 (PG 81:85–86); Theodoret, *Pss.* 67.19 (PG 80:1387–88); Theodoret, *Eph.* 4.9 (PG 82:533–34).

4:17/22–30

Ambrosiaster, *Comm. Eph.* 4.17–18 (CSEL 81.3:103); Chrysostom, *Hom. 1 Cor.* 15.1 (PG 61:121); Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 12.lem, 12.1, 13.lem (PG 62:87, 88–89, 93); Chrysostom, *Laz.* 5.3 (PG 48:1021); Cyril of Alexandria, *Hom. pasch.* 23.1 (PG 77:875–76); Ephrem, *Eph.* §4 (CWE 3:148) (*S. Ephraem Syri commentarii*, 151); Jerome, *Comm. Eph.* 3.4.17 (PL 26:504); Lucifer, *Athan.* 2.31 (CCSL 8:127); Victorinus, *Ep. Eph.* 2.4.17 (CSEL 83.2:66–67); Origen, *Comm. Eph.* 2.41 (OO 14.4:304); Pelagius, *Exp. Eph.* 4.17 (Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions*, 2:367); *Spec.* §103 (CSEL 12:629); Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Eph.* 4.17b–18 (SBLWGRW 26:252–54); Theodoret, *Eph.* 4.17 (PG 82:537–38); Theodoret, *Haer. fab. comp.* 5.27 (PG 83:544).

5:4/2–12

Ambrosiaster, *Comm. Eph.* 5.4 (CSEL 81.3:111); Basil of Caesarea, *Mor.* 69.1 (PG 31:809–10); Chrysostom, *Hom. 1 Cor.* 7.7 (PG 61:64); Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 17.1 (PG 62:118); Chrysostom, *Hom. Col.* 12.6 (PG 62:389); Chrysostom, *Hom. Heb.* 15.4, 24.3 (PG 63:122, 172); Chrysostom, *Laz.* 1.12 (PG 48:980); Chrysostom, *Oppugn.* 3.14 (PG 47:373); Clement of Alexandria, *Paed.* 2.6.50.1 (SC 108:104); Cyprian, *Test.* 3.41 (CCSL 3:133); Cyril of Alexandria, *Hom. pasch.* 22.1 (PG 77:915–16); Irenaeus, *Haer.* 4.37.4 (SC 100.2:930) (*Haer. [Arm.]* 4.60.2 [TUGAL 35.2:134]); Jerome, *Comm. Eph.* 3.5.3–4 (PL 26:519); Victorinus, *Ep. Eph.* 2.5.4 (CSEL 83.2:76); Origen, *Comm. Eph.* 3.54 (OO 14.4:326, 328); Pelagius, *Exp. Eph.* 5.4 (Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions*, 2:373); Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Eph.* 5.4 (SBLWGRW 26:262); Theodoret, *Eph.* 5.4 (PG 82:543–44).

5:4/14–18

Ambrosiaster, *Comm. Eph.* 5.4 (CSEL 81.3:111); Basil of Caesarea, *Mor.* 69.1 (PG 31:809–10); Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 17.1 (PG 62:118); Clement of Alexandria, *Paed.* 2.6.50.1 (SC 108:104); Cyprian, *Test.* 3.41 (CCSL 3:133); Cyril of Alexandria, *Hom. pasch.* 22.1 (PG 77:915–16); Irenaeus, *Haer.* 4.37.4 (SC 100.2:930) (*Haer. [Arm.]* 4.60.2 [TUGAL 35.2:134]); Jerome, *Comm. Eph.* 3.5.3–4 (PL 26:519); Victorinus, *Ep. Eph.* 2.5.4 (CSEL 83.2:76); Pelagius, *Exp. Eph.* 5.4 (Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions*, 2:373); Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Eph.* 5.4 (SBLWGRW 26:262);



Theodoret, *Eph.* 5.4 (PG 82:543–44).

5:9/2–10

Ambrosiaster, *Comm. Eph.* 5.8–9 (CSEL 81.3:113); Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 18.1 (PG 62:121); Cyril of Alexandria, *Ths.* §35 (PG 75:623–24); Ephrem, *Eph.* §5 (CWE 3:149) (Mekhitarist Fathers, *S. Ephraem Syri commentarii*, 152); Gregory Thaumaturgus, *Ep. canon.* 2 (PG 10:1027–28); Jerome, *Comm. Eph.* 3.5.9 (PL 26:523–24); Lucifer, *Conv.* §14 (CCSL 8:190); Victorinus, *Ep. Eph.* 2.5.7–9 (CSEL 83.2:78); Origen, *Comm. Eph.* 3.59 (OO 14.4:330–32); Pelagius, *Exp. Eph.* 5.9 (Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions*, 2:374); Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Eph.* 5.9 (SBLWGRW 26:264); Theodoret, *Eph.* 5.9 (PG 82:543–44).

5:14/18–26

Ambrose, *Exp. Luc.* 5.115, 7.229 (CCSL 14:174, 293); Ambrosiaster, *Comm. Eph.* 5.14 (CSEL 81.3:115); Athanasius, *C. Ar.* 3.46.2 (AW 1.3:416); Chrysostom, *Coem.* §1 (PG 49:394); Chrysostom, *Hom. Matt.* 67.4 (PG 58:638); Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 18.1 (PG 62:122); Clement of Alexandria, *Protr.* 9.84.2 (SC 2:151); Cyril of Alexandria, *Comm. Isa.* 4.5.61.9, 17–18 (PG 70:1121, 1133); Cyril of Alexandria, *Ioel.* 1.1.5 (Pusey, *Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli Archiepiscopi Alexandrini in XII prophetas* 1:294); Cyril of Alexandria, *Soph.* 2.3.3 (Pusey, *Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli Archiepiscopi Alexandrini in XII prophetas* 2:214); Cyril of Alexandria, *Zach.* 1.3.8–9 (Pusey, *Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli Archiepiscopi Alexandrini in XII prophetas* 2:322); Cyril of Alexandria, *Comm. Luc.* 5.35 (PG 72:743–46); Cyril of Alexandria, *Hom. pasch.* 2.7 (PG 77:445–46); Cyril of Alexandria, *Ths.* §§20, 32 (PG 75:335–36, 479–80); Didymus, *Comm. Zach.* 5.143 (SC 85:1050); Ephrem, *Eph.* §5 (CWE 3:150) (Mekhitarist Fathers, *S. Ephraem Syri commentarii*, 153); Epiphanius, *Pan.* 42.11.8, 42.12.3, 46.5.9, 64.71.19 (GCS 1/31:119, 179–80, 209, 521); Evagrius of Pontus, *Sch. Pss.* 138.10 (SC 615:554); Evagrius of Pontus, *Sch. Eccl.* §35 (SC 397:118); Gregory of Nazianzus, *Orat. theol.* 40.13 (PG 36:376); Hippolytus, *Antichr.* §65 (GCS 1/1.2:45); Hippolytus, *Comm. Dan.* 4.55 (GCS 1/7:324); Isidore of Pelusium, *Ep.* 1463 (SC 454:104); Jerome, *Comm. Eph.* 3.5.14 (PL 26:525–26); Marcus Eremita, *Causid.* §7 (SC 455:46); Victorinus, *Ep. Eph.* 2.5.14 (CSEL 83.2:79–80); Origen, *Comm. Eph.* 3.64 (OO 14.4:334–36); Pelagius, *Exp. Eph.* 5.14 (Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions*, 2:375); *Physiologus* §33 (Sbordone, 108); Procopius, *Comm. Isa.* §52 (PG 87.2:2504); Quodvultdeus, *Symb.* 2.6.18 (CCSL 60:344); *Ref.* 5.7.33 (SBLWGRW 40:222); Severian of Gabala, *Eph.* 5.14 (Staab, *Pauluskommentare*, 311); Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Eph.* 5.14b (SBLWGRW 26:266); Theodoret, *Eph.* 5.14 (PG 82:543–44).

5:15/2–10

Ambrosiaster, *Comm. Eph.* 5.15 (CSEL 81.3:115); Basil of Caesarea, *Mor.* 9.1 (PG 31:715–16); Caesarius of Arles, *Reg. mon.* 19.16 (SC 398:216); Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 19.1, 24.2 (PG 62:127, 170); Jerome, *Comm. Eph.* 3.5.15 (PL 26:526); Lucifer, *Athan.* 2.28 (CCSL 8:123); Victorinus, *Ep.*

*Eph.* 2.5.15 (CSEL 83.2:80); Origen, *Comm. Eph.* 3.65, 67 (OO 14.4:336, 338); Pelagius, *Exp. Eph.* 5.15 (Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions*, 2:375); Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Eph.* 5.15–17 (SBLWGRW 26:266); Theodoret, *Eph.* 5.15–16 (PG 82:545–46).

5:17/6–14

Ambrosiaster, *Comm. Eph.* 5.17 (CSEL 81.3:116); Basil of Caesarea, *Ascet. magn.* response 260 (PG 31:1255–56); Basil of Caesarea, *Mor.* 9.1 (PG 31:715–16); Caesarius of Arles, *Reg. mon.* 19.16 (SC 398:216); Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 19.1 (PG 62:127–28); Jerome, *Comm. Eph.* 3.5.17 (PL 26:527); Lucifer, *Athan.* 2.28 (CCSL 8:124); Victorinus, *Ep. Eph.* 2.5.17 (CSEL 83.2:80); Origen, *Comm. Eph.* 3.67 (OO 14.4:336); Pelagius, *Exp. Eph.* 5.17 (Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions*, 2:376); Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Eph.* 5.15–17 (SBLWGRW 26:266); Theodoret, *Eph.* 5.17 (PG 82:545–46).

5:20/24–30

Ambrosiaster, *Comm. Eph.* 5.20–21 (CSEL 81.3:117); Caesarius of Arles, *Reg. mon.* 19.20 (SC 398:218); Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 19.2 (PG 62:129); Jerome, *Comm. Eph.* 3.5.20 (PL 26:529–30); Victorinus, *Ep. Eph.* 2.5.19b–20 (CSEL 83.2:117); Origen, *Comm. Eph.* 3.70 (OO 14.4:340); Pelagius, *Exp. Eph.* 5.22 (Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions*, 2:376); Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Eph.* 5.18–20 (SBLWGRW 26:268); Theodoret, *Eph.* 5.20 (PG 82:545–46); Theodoret, *Ep.* 147 (SC 111:230).

5:22/6–12

Ambrosiaster, *Comm. Eph.* 5.22–24 (CSEL 81.3:117); Basil of Caesarea, *Mor.* 73.4 (PG 31:851–52); Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 1.1, 20.1 (PG 62:9, 135–36); Clement of Alexandria, *Paed.* 3.12.94.5 (SC 158:178); Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 4.8.64.1 (SC 463:162); *Did. apost.* §3 (Gibson, *Didascalia Apostolorum*, 12); Ephrem, *Eph.* §5 (CWE 3:150) (*S. Ephraem Syri commentarii*, 153); Jerome, *Comm. Eph.* 3.5.22–23 (PL 26:530); Victorinus, *Ep. Eph.* 2.5.22 (CSEL 83.2:82); Origen, *Comm. Eph.* 3.72 (OO 14.4:342); Pelagius, *Exp. Eph.* 5.22 (Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions*, 2:376); Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Eph.* 5.22 (SBLWGRW 26:270); Theodoret, *Eph.* 5.22–23 (PG 82:545–46).

5:23/30

Ambrosiaster, *Comm. Eph.* 5.22–24 (CSEL 81.3:117); Basil of Caesarea, *Mor.* 73.4 (PG 31:851–52); Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 20.1 (PG 62:135–36); Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 4.8.64.1 (SC 463:162); Jerome, *Comm. Eph.* 3.5.22–23 (PL 26:531); Victorinus, *Ep. Eph.* 2.5.23 (CSEL 83.2:82); Pelagius, *Exp. Eph.* 5.23 (Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions*, 2:377); Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Eph.* 5.23 (SBLWGRW 26:270); Theodoret, *Eph.* 5.22–23 (PG 82:545–46).

5:28/2–8

Ambrosiaster, *Comm. Eph.* 5.25–28 (CSEL 81.3:118); Basil of Caesarea, *Mor.* 73.3 (PG 31:851–52); Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 20.3 (PG 62:138–39); Chrysostom, *Laud. Max.* §3 (PG 51:229); Chrysostom, *Non desp.* §6 (PG 51:369); Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 4.8.64.2 (SC 463:162); Didymus, *Comm. Zach.* 2.17 (SC 83:282); Epiphanius, *Pan.* 64.54.10 (GCS 1/31:486); Jerome, *Comm. Eph.* 3.5.28 (PL 26:533); Victorinus, *Ep. Eph.* 2.5.28 (CSEL 83.2:83); Nilus, *Comm. Cant.* 21.6 (Rosenbaum, *Kommentar zum Hohelied*, 61); Pelagius, *Exp. Eph.* 5.28 (Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions*, 2:378); Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Eph.* 5.28a (SBLWGRW 26:272); Theodoret, *Eph.* 5.25–28 (PG 82:547–48).

5:30/14–30

Ambrose, *Ep.* 16.4 (CSEL 82.1:116); Ambrose, *Exp. Luc.* 2.86, 5.92 (CCSL 14:70, 165); Ambrosiaster, *Comm. Eph.* 5.30 (CSEL 81.3:119); Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 20.3 (PG 62:139); Irenaeus, *Haer.* 5.2.3 (SC 153:34) (Irenaeus, *Haer. [Arm.]* 5.2.3 [TUGAL 35.2:156]); Jerome, *Comm. Eph.* 3.5.30 (PL 26:534); Victorinus, *Ep. Eph.* 2.5.30 (CSEL 83.2:84–85); Methodius, *Symp.* 3.1 (SC 95:92); Pelagius, *Exp. Eph.* 5.30 (Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions*, 2:378); Severian of Gabala, *Eph.* 5.29, 5.32–33 (Staab, *Pauluskommentare*, 311–12); Tertullian, *Anim.* §§11, 21 (SC 601:2:208, 266); Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Eph.* 5.30 (SBLWGRW 26:274); Theodoret, *Eph.* 5.30 (PG 82:547–48).

5:31/10–18

Ambrose, *Ep.* 16.4 (CSEL 82.1:116); Ambrose, *Exp. Luc.* 2.86 (CCSL 14:70); Ambrosiaster, *Comm. Eph.* 5.31 (CSEL 81.3:119); Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 20.4, 20.5, 20.8 (PG 62:139, 141–42, 147); Chrysostom, *Catech. illum.* 1.11, 1.13 (SC 50bis:114, 115); Chrysostom, *Catech. ult.* (Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Varia graeca sacra*, 167); Chrysostom, *Laud. Max.* §3 (PG 51:229); Cyprian, *Ep.* 52.1.3 (CCSL 3B:244–45); Epiphanius, *Pan.* 42.11.8, 42.12.3 (GCS 1/31:119, 180–81); Epiphanius, *Pan.* 66.86.4 (GCS 1/37:129); Jerome, *Comm. Eph.* 3.5.31 (PL 26:534); Victorinus, *Ep. Eph.* 2.5.31 (CSEL 83.2:85); Methodius, *Symp.* 3.1, 3.10 (SC 95:92, 114); Origen, *Cels.* 4.49 (SC 136:310); Origen, *Comm. Matt.* 17.34 (GCS 1/40:695); Origen, *Comm. Eph.* 3.76 (OO 14.4:346); Pelagius, *Exp. Eph.* 5.31 (Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions*, 2:378); Tertullian, *Marc.* 3.5.4, 5.18.9 (Evans, *Adversus Marcionem*, 180, 626); Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Eph.* 5.31 (SBLWGRW 26:274); Theodoret, *Eph.* 5.31 (PG 82:547–48); Theodoret, *Ep.* 147 (SC 111:220).

5:31/20–28

Ambrose, *Ep.* 16.4 (CSEL 82.1:116); Ambrose, *Exp. Luc.* 2.86 (CCSL 14:70); Ambrosiaster, *Comm. Eph.* 5.31 (CSEL 81.3:119); Chrysostom, *Catech. illum.* 1.11 (SC 50bis:114); Chrysostom, *Catech. ult.* (Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Varia graeca sacra*, 167); Chrysostom, *Laud. Max.* §3 (PG 51:229);

Cyprian, *Ep.* 52.1.3 (CCSL 3B:244–45); Epiphanius, *Pan.* 42.11.8, 42.12.3 (GCS 1/31:119, 180–81); Epiphanius, *Pan.* 66.86.4 (GCS 1/37:129); Jerome, *Comm. Eph.* 3.5.31 (PL 26:534–35); Victorinus, *Ep. Eph.* 2.5.31 (CSEL 83.2:85); Methodius, *Symp.* 3.1, 3.10 (SC 95:92, 114); Origen, *Cels.* 4.49 (SC 136:310); Origen, *Comm. Matt.* 17.34 (GCS 1/40:695); Origen, *Comm. Eph.* 3.76 (OO 14.4:346); Pelagius, *Exp. Eph.* 5.31 (Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions*, 2:378); Tertullian, *Marc.* 3.5.4, 5.18.9 (Evans, *Adversus Marcionem*, 180, 626); Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Eph.* 5.31 (SBLWGRW 26:274–76); Theodoret, *Eph.* 5.31 (PG 82:547–48); Theodoret, *Ep.* 147 (SC 111:220).

#### 6:1/14–16

Ambrosiaster, *Comm. Eph.* 6.1–2 (CSEL 81.3:119–20); Basil of Caesarea, *Mor.* 76.1 (PG 31:857–58); Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 21.1 (PG 62:149); Clement of Alexandria, *Paed.* 3.12.95.1 (SC 158:180); Jerome, *Comm. Eph.* 3.6.1 (PL 26:537); Origen, *Comm. Eph.* 3.77 (OO 14.4:346); Pelagius, *Exp. Eph.* 6.1 (Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions*, 2:379); Tertullian, *Marc.* 5.18.11 (Evans, *Adversus Marcionem*, 626); Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Eph.* 6.1 (SBLWGRW 26:276); Theodoret, *Eph.* 6.1 (PG 82:549–50).

#### 6:9/28–34

Ambrosiaster, *Comm. Eph.* 6.9 (CSEL 81.3:122); Basil of Caesarea, *Mor.* 75.2 (PG 31:855–56); Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 22.2 (PG 62:157–58); Clement of Alexandria, *Paed.* 3.12.95.1 (SC 158:180); Jerome, *Comm. Eph.* 3.6.9 (PL 26:542); Pelagius, *Exp. Eph.* 6.9 (Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions*, 2:382); Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Eph.* 6.9b (SBLWGRW 26:280); Theodoret, *Eph.* 6.9 (PG 82:551–52).

#### 6:10/2–4

Ambrosiaster, *Comm. Eph.* 6.10 (CSEL 81.3:122); Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 22.2 (PG 62:157–58); Chrysostom, *Sanct. Anast.* §1 (PG 63:494); Cyril of Alexandria, *Zach.* 5.12.5 (Pusey, *Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli Archiepiscopi Alexandrini in XII prophetas* 2:481); Cyril of Alexandria, *Ador.* 4 (PG 68:303–4); Cyril of Alexandria, *Hom. pasch.* 26.1 (PG 77:913–14); Jerome, *Comm. Eph.* 3.6.10 (PL 26:542); Lucifer, *Mor. esse Dei Fil.* §§5, 8 (CCSL 8:277, 283); Origen, *Comm. Eph.* 3.79 (OO 14.4:350); Pelagius, *Exp. Eph.* 6.10 (Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions*, 2:382); *Spec.* §133 (CSEL 12:632); Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Eph.* 6.10 (SBLWGRW 26:280); Theodoret, *Eph.* 6.10 (PG 82:551–52).

#### 6:12/2–12

Ambrose, *Exp. Luc.* 4.9, 10.19 (CCSL 14:109, 351); Ambrosiaster, *Comm. Eph.* 6.12 (CSEL 81.3:123); Asterius, *Comm. Pss.* 2.6, 18.23 (Richard); Athanasius, *Exp. Pss.* 56.3 (PG 27:255–56); Athanasius, *Vit. Ant.* 21.3 (SC 400:192); Basil of Caesarea, *Auct. mal.* §9 (PG 31:351–52); Chrysostom,



*Hom. Gen.* 3.5 (PG 53:37); Chrysostom, *Hom. Gen.* 44.6 (PG 54:413); Chrysostom, *Comm. Iob* 1.9 (SC 54:112); Chrysostom, *Exp. Pss.* 6.5, 144.1 (PG 55:78, 457); Chrysostom, *Hom. Matt.* 23.6 (PG 58:315); Chrysostom, *Hom. Act.* 31.3, 44.2 (PG 60:230–31, 310); Chrysostom, *Hom. Rom.* 32.4 (PG 60:681); Chrysostom, *Hom. 1 Cor.* 39.4 (PG 61:337); Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 4.1, 22.3, 22.4 (PG 62:32, 159, 160); Chrysostom, *Hom. 1 Thess.* 3.4 (PG 62:411); Chrysostom, *Hom. 2 Tim.* 4.1 (PG 62:618–19); Chrysostom, *Hom. Heb.* 5.5 (PG 63:52); Chrysostom, *Incomp.* (SC 28bis:240); Chrysostom, *Laud. Barlaam* §1 (SC 595:300); Chrysostom, *Laud. Paul. Dec.* 28 (Uthemann, “Enkomion zum Fest des hl. Paulus,” 127); Chrysostom, *Sac.* 2.3 (SC 272:108); Chrysostom, *Sanct. Anast.* §1 (PG 63:494); Chrysostom, *Stag.* 1.4 (PG 47:433); Chrysostom, *Stat.* 3.3 (PG 49:51); Chrysostom, *Stud.* 5.2 (PG 63:487–88); Chrysostom, *Vir.* 27.2, 49.1 (SC 125:178, 274); Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 3.16.101.3 (SC 608:312); Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 5.14.93.2 (SC 278:178); Cyprian, *Ep.* 58.8.1–9.1 (CCSL 3C:331–32); Cyril of Alexandria, *Comm. Isa.* 1.2.3.1–2 (PG 70:97–98); Cyril of Alexandria, *Amos* 1.2.10 (Pusey, *Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli Archiepiscopi Alexandrini in XII prophetas* 1:410); Cyril of Alexandria, *Zach.* 5.12.5 (Pusey, *Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli Archiepiscopi Alexandrini in XII prophetas* 2:481); Cyril of Alexandria, *Comm. Luc.* 5.28 (PG 72:795–96); Cyril of Alexandria, *Hom. pasch.* 4.2, 26.1 (PG 77:453–54, 913–14); Didymus, *Comm. Gen.* 6.10, 12.9 (SC 244:58, 176); Didymus, *Comm. Pss.* 38.5 (PTA 6:226); Didymus, *Comm. Zach.* 2.1–2 (SC 83:234); Didymus, *Comm. Zach.* 10.3b–5 (SC 84:255); Didymus, *Man.* §9 (PG 39:1097–98); Ephrem, *Eph.* §6 (CWE 3:151) (*S. Ephraem Syri commentarii*, 154); Epiphanius, *Pan.* 64.59.3 (GCS 1/31:494); Eusebius, *Comm. Pss.* 58.2–5 (PG 23:535–36); Eusebius, *Comm. Isa.* 2.7 (GCS 1/60:221); Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 11.26.7, 13.13.9 (GCS 43.2:58, 201); Hilary, *Tract. Pss.* 55.3 (SC 565:192); Hilary, *Tract. Pss.* 118.samech.5, 124.6 (SC 625:158, 230); *Homiliae spirituales* 21.1 (PTS 4:192); Jerome, *Comm. Eph.* 3.6.12 (PL 26:544); Lucifer, *Mor. esse Dei Fil.* §§5, 8 (CCSL 8:277, 283); Marcus Eremita, *Bap.* §11 (SC 445:364); Nilus, *Ep.* 3.33 (PG 79:393–94); Origen, *Comm. Matt.* 12.13 (GCS 1/40:93); Origen, *Comm. Rom.* §52 (Ramsbotham, “Origen on Romans,” 3:21); Origen, *Comm. 1 Cor.* §28 (OO 14.4:128); Origen, *Comm. Eph.* 3.77 (OO 14.4:346–48); Origen, *Cels.* 8.34 (SC 150:250); Pelagius, *Exp. Eph.* 6.12 (Souter, *Pelagius’s Expositions*, 2:382); Priscillian, *Tract.* 1, 10 (CSEL 18:13, 96); *Spec.* §133 (CSEL 12:632); Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Eph.* 6.12 (SBLWGRW 26:280); Theodoret, *Eph.* 6.12 (PG 82:551–52); Theodoret, *Hist. rel. prol.* 4 (SC 234:130).

6:19/32–38

Ambrosiaster, *Comm. Eph.* 6.18–20 (CSEL 81.3:124–25); Basil of Caesarea, *Ascet. magn.* response 312 (PG 31:1305–6); Basil of Caesarea, *Mor.* 56.5 (PG 31:787–88); Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 24.1, 4 (PG 62:169, 173); Ephrem, *Eph.* §6 (CWE 3:152) (*S. Ephraem Syri commentarii*, 156); Jerome, *Comm. Eph.* 3.6.20 (PL 26:552–53); Victorinus, *Ep. Eph.* 2.6.19 (CSEL 83.2:92); Origen, *Comm. Eph.* 3.88 (OO 14.4:362); Pelagius, *Exp. Eph.* 6.19 (Souter, *Pelagius’s Expositions*, 2:385); Tertullian, *Marc.* 5.18.14 (Evans, *Adversus Marcionem*, 628); Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Eph.* 6.19 (SBLWGRW 26:286); Theodoret, *Eph.* 6.19 (PG 82:556–57).

Ambrosiaster, *Comm. Eph.* 6.21–22 (CSEL 81.3:125); Basil of Caesarea, *Mor.* 70.15 (PG 31:829–30); Chrysostom, *Hom. 2 Cor.* 2.2 (PG 61:394); Chrysostom, *Hom. Eph.* 24.1, 24.4 (PG 62:169–70, 173–74); Ephrem, *Eph.* §6 (CWE 3:153) (*S. Ephraem Syri commentarii*, 156); Jerome, *Comm. Eph.* 3.6.21–22 (PL 26:553–54); Victorinus, *Ep. Eph.* 2.6.21 (CSEL 83.2:93); Origen, *Comm. Eph.* 3.89 (OO 14.4:362); Pelagius, *Exp. Eph.* 6.21 (Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions*, 2:385); Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Eph.* 6.21–22 (SBLWGRW 26:286); Theodoret, *Eph. hyp.*, 6.21–22 (PG 82:507–8, 555–56).



# Bibliography

- Abbott, Thomas Kingsmill. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1897.
- Andrason, Alexander, and Christian Locatell. “The Perfect Wave: A Cognitive Approach to the Greek Verbal System.” *BAGL* 5 (2016): 7–121.
- Bacon, B. W. “St. Paul to the Laodiceans.” *Exp* 8.17 (1919): 19–36.
- Bakker, Stéphanie J. *The Noun Phrase in Ancient Greek: A Functional Analysis of the Order and Articulation of NP Constituents in Herodotus*. ASCP 15. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Barth, Markus. *Ephesians*. 2 vols. AB 34. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974.
- Bauer, Walter, Frederick W. Danker, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 4th ed. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2021.
- Baumert, Norbert. *Täglich sterben und auferstehen: der Literalsinn von 2 Kor 4,12–5, 10*. SANT 34. Munich: Kösel, 1973.
- Bentein, Klaas. “Perfect.” *EAGLL* 3:46–49.
- . “ἔγραψέ μοι γάρ ... τὰ νῦν οὖν γράφω σοι: οὖν and γάρ as Inferential and Elaborative Discourse Markers in Greek Papyrus Letters (I–IV AD).” *RBPH* 94.1 (2016): 67–104. DOI:10.3406/rbph.2016.8875.
- Best, Ernest. *Ephesians*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.
- Bishop, Richard W., and Nathalie Rambault. “In ascensionem et in principium Actorum (CPG 4187): Introduction and Critical Edition.” *SacEr* 56 (1992): 113–236. DOI:10.1484 / J.SE.5.114772.
- Black, David Alan. “The Peculiarities of Ephesians and the Ephesian Address.” *GTJ* 2.1 (1981): 59–73.
- Black, Stephanie L. *Sentence Conjunctions in the Gospel of Matthew: καί, δέ, τότε, γάρ, οὖν and Asyndeton in Narrative Discourse*. JSNTSup 216; SNTG 9. London: Sheffield Academic, 2002.
- Blass, Friedrich, and Albert Debrunner. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Translated by Robert W. Funk. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

- Bortone, Pietro. *Greek Prepositions: From Antiquity to the Present*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Carlson, Stephen C. *The Text of Galatians and Its History*. WUNT 2/385. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015.
- Chantraine, Pierre. *Histoire du parfait grec*. CLSLP 21. Paris: Klincksieck, 1927.
- Cohick, Lynn H. *The Letter to the Ephesians*. NICNT. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2020.
- Crellin, Robert. "The Semantics of the Perfect in the Greek of the New Testament." Pages 430–57 in *The Greek Verb Revisited*. Edited by Steven E. Runge and Christopher J. Fresch. Bellingham, WA: Lexham, 2016.
- Dahl, Nils Alstrup. "0230 (= PSI 1306) and the Fourth-Century Greek-Latin Edition of the Letters of Paul." Pages 211–30 in *Studies in Ephesians: Introductory Questions, Text- & Edition-Critical Issues, Interpretation of Texts and Themes*. Edited by David Hellholm, Vemund Blomqvist, and Tord Fornberg. WUNT 1/131. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.
- Dawes, Gregory W. *The Body in Question: Metaphor and Meaning in the Interpretation of Ephesians 5:21–33*. BIS 30. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Dik, Helma. *Word Order in Ancient Greek: A Pragmatic Account of Word Order Variation in Herodotus*. ASCP 5. Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 1995.
- Donaldson, Amy M. "Explicit References to New Testament Variant Readings among Greek and Latin Church Fathers." PhD diss., University of Notre Dame, 2009. <https://curate.nd.edu/show/5712m615k50>.
- Eadie, John. *A Commentary on the Greek Text of the Epistle of Paul to the Ephesians*. 2nd ed. New York, NY: Robert Carter, 1861.
- Ebojo, Edgar Battad. "A Scribe and His Manuscript: An Investigation into the Scribal Habits of Papyrus 46 (P. Chester Beatty II – P. Mich. Inv. 6238)." PhD diss., University of Birmingham, 2014. <https://etheses.bham.ac.uk/id/eprint/4838>.
- Ellicott, Charles J. *St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians: with a Critical and Grammatical Commentary and a Revised Translation*. 5th ed. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1884.
- Evans, Ernest, ed. and trans. *Tertullian, Adversus Marcionem*. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972.
- Findlay, George Gillanders. *The Epistle to the Ephesians*. EB. New York, NY: Armstrong, 1892.
- Fritzsche, Carl Friedrich August. *Evangelium Marci*. Vol. 2 of *Quatuor N.T. Evangelia recensuit et cum commentariis perpetuis*. Leipzig: Fleischer, 1830.
- Gaisford, Thomas, ed. *Eusebii Pamphili episcopi Caesariensis Eclogae propheticae*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1842.
- Gaugler, Ernst. *Der Epheserbrief*. ANS 6. Zürich: EVZ, 1966.
- Gibson, Margaret Dunlop, ed. *The Didascalia Apostolorum in Syriac*. HS 1. London: C. J. Clay & Sons, 1903.

- Gilliland, Maegan Chloe Marie. "The Text of the Pauline Epistles and Hebrews in Clement of Alexandria." PhD diss., University of Edinburgh, 2016. <http://hdl.handle.net/1842/22015>.
- Gnilka, Joachim. *Der Epheserbrief*. HThKNT 10.2. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1971.
- Goldstein, David. *Classical Greek Syntax: Wackernagel's Law in Herodotus*. BSIELL 16. Leiden: Brill, 2016.
- Goodspeed, Edgar J., ed. *Die ältesten Apologeten: Texte mit kurzen Einleitungen*. 1914. Repr., Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984.
- Greer, Rowan A., trans. *Theodore of Mopsuestia: The Commentaries on the Minor Epistles of Paul*. SBLWGRW 26. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012.
- Gregg, J. A. F. "The Commentary of Origen upon the Epistle to the Ephesians." *JTS* 1/3.10 (1902): 233–244; 1/3.11 (1902): 398–420; 1/3.12 (1902): 554–576.
- Gurry, Peter J. "The Text of Eph 5.22 and the Start of the Ephesian Household Code." *NTS* 67.4 (2021): 560–81. DOI:10.1017/S002868852100014X.
- Harless, Gottlieb Christoph Adolf. *Commentar über den Brief Pauli an die Ephesier*. Erlangen: Heyder, 1834.
- Harris III, W. Hall. *The Descent of Christ: Ephesians 4:7–11 and Traditional Hebrew Imagery*. AGAJU 32. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Haupt, Benjamin Douglas. "Tertullian's Text of the New Testament outside the Gospels." PhD diss., University of Birmingham, 2019. <https://etheses.bham.ac.uk/id/eprint/9608>.
- Haupt, Erich. *Der Epheserbrief*. KEK 8–9. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1897.
- Heine, Ronald E. *The Commentaries of Origen and Jerome on St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- . "Recovering Origen's Commentary on Ephesians from Jerome." *JTS* 2/51.2 (2000): 478–514. DOI:10.1093/jts/51.2.478.
- Hemphill, Wesley Lynn. *Codex Coxianus of the Homilies of Chrysostom on Ephesians and His Commentary on Galatians*. Norwood, MA: Norwood, 1916.
- Hill, Robert C., trans. *Theodoret of Cyrus: Commentary on The Letters of St Paul*. 2 vols. Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2001.
- Hodge, Charles. *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians*. New York, NY: Robert Carter, 1856.
- Hoehner, Harold W. *Ephesians: An Exegetical Commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2002.
- Hort, Fenton John Anthony. *Prolegomena to St. Paul's Epistles to the Romans and the Ephesians*. London: Macmillan, 1895.
- Houghton, H. A. G. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2025.

- Jaeger, Werner. *Two Rediscovered Works of Ancient Christian Literature: Gregory of Nyssa and Macarius*. Leiden: Brill, 1954.
- Kramer, Werner. *Christ, Lord, Son of God*. Translated by Brian Hardy. SBT 50. London: SCM, 1966.
- Levinsohn, Stephen H. *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek: A Coursebook on the Information Structure of New Testament Greek*. 2nd ed. Dallas, TX: SIL International, 2000.
- Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott, and Henry Stuart Jones. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th ed. with revised supplement. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.
- Lightfoot, J. B. "The Destination of the Epistle to the Ephesians." Pages 375–96 in *Biblical Essays*. 2nd ed. London: Macmillan, 1904.
- Lincoln, Andrew T. *Ephesians*. WBC 42. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1990.
- MacDonald, Margaret Y. *Colossians, Ephesians*. SP 17. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2000.
- Maclean, Jennifer Kay Berenson. "Ephesians and the Problem of Colossians: Interpretation of Texts and Traditions in Eph 1:1–2:10." PhD diss., Harvard University, 1995.
- Matić, Dejan. "Topic, Focus, and Discourse Structure: Ancient Greek Word Order." *SL* 27.3 (2003): 573–633. DOI:10.1075/sl.27.3.05mat.
- McCollum, Joey. "Likelihood Calculations for Reconstructed Lacunae and Papyrus 46's Text of Ephesians." *DSH* 38.2 (2023): 647–57. DOI:10.1093/lc/fqac078.
- Mekhitarist Fathers, trans. *S. Ephraem Syri commentarii in epistolas D. Pauli*. Venice: Typographia Sancti Lazari, 1893.
- Merkle, Benjamin L. *Ephesians*. EGGNT. Nashville, TN: B&H Academic, 2016.
- . "Verbal Aspect and Imperatives: Ephesians as a Test Case." Pages 34–51 in *New Testament Philology: Essays in Honor of David Alan Black*. Edited by Melton Bennett Winstead. Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2018.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994.
- Meyer, Heinrich August Wilhelm. *Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistle to the Ephesians and the Epistle to Philemon*. Rev. and ed. by William P. Dickson. Translated from the 5th German ed. by Maurice J. Evans. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1880.
- Montoro, Peter J. "Revision and Reference: The Transformations of the Biblical Text of Chrysostom's Homilies on Romans and Their Significance for the Transmission of the New Testament." PhD diss., University of Birmingham, 2024.
- Moser, Amelia. "The Changing Relationship of Tense and Aspect in the History of Greek." *STUF* 61.1 (2008): 5–18. DOI:10.1524/stuf.2008.0003.
- Moule, C. F. D. *An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960.



- Moule, H. C. G. *The Epistle to the Ephesians*. CBSC. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1891.
- Muddiman, John. *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians*. BNTC. London: Continuum, 2001.
- Olshausen, Hermann. *Biblical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles to the Galatians, Ephesians, Colossians and Thessalonians*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1851.
- Opere di Origene. Rome: Città Nuova, 2002–.
- Papadopoulos-Kerameus, Athanasios, ed. *Varia graeca sacra*. Saint Petersburg: Kirschbaum, 1909. Repr., Leipzig: Zentralantiquariat der deutschen demokratischen Republik, 1975.
- Parker, David C. *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and Their Texts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Perkins, Pheme. *Ephesians*. ANTC. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1997.
- Petroelje, Benjamin J. *The Pauline Book and the Dilemma of Ephesians*. LNTS 665. London: T&T Clark, 2023.
- Pieri, Francesco, ed. and trans. *Esegesi paolina: i testi frammentari*. OO 14.4. Rome: Città Nuova, 2009.
- Pusey, Philip Edward, ed. *Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli Archiepiscopi Alexandrini in XII prophetas*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1868.
- Ramsbotham, A. “The Commentary of Origen on the Epistle to the Romans.” *JTS* 1/13.50 (1911): 209–224; 1/13.51 (1912): 357–368; 1/14.1 (1912): 10–22; 1/10.37 (1908): 29–51.
- Redondo Moyano, Elena. “La articulación textual en los Προγυμνάσματα de Nicolao de Mura.” *SPV* 7.4 (2004): 157–220.
- Regtuit, Remco F. *Severian of Gabala, Homily on the Incarnation of Christ (CPG 4204)*. Amsterdam: Vrije University Press, 1992.
- Reischl, Wilhelm Karl, and Joseph Rupp, eds. *Cyrilli Hierosolymorum archiepiscopi opera quae supersunt omnia*. 2 vols. Munich: Lentner, 1848–1860.
- Richard, Marcel. *Asterii sophistae commentariorum in Psalmos quae supersunt*. SOSup 16. Oslo: Brogger, 1956.
- Robinson, J. Armitage. *St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians: A Revised Text and Translation with Exposition and Notes*. 2nd ed. London: Macmillan, 1909.
- Rosenbaum, Hans-Udo, ed. *Kommentar zum Hohelied*. Vol. 1 of *Nilus von Ancyra: Schriften*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2004.
- Royse, James R. *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri*. NTTSD 36. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Runge, Steven E. *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament: A Practical Introduction for Teaching and Exegesis*. LBRS. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2010.



- Salmond, S. D. F. "The Epistle to the Ephesians." Pages 201–395 in *The Expositor's Greek Testament*. Edited by W. Robertson Nicoll. Vol. 3. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1897.
- Sampley, J. Paul. "And the Two Shall Become One Flesh": A Study of Traditions in Ephesians 5:21–33. SNTSMS 16. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971.
- Sanday, William, and Cuthbert Hamilton Turner, eds. *Novum Testamentum Sancti Irenaei Episcopi Lugdunensis*. OLBT 7. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923.
- Sbordone, F. *Physiologus*. Rome: Dante Alighieri-Albrighi, 1936. Repr., Hildesheim: Olms, 1991.
- Scherer, Jean. *Le commentaire d'Origène sur Rom. III.5–V.7*. Cairo: L'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, 1957.
- Schlier, Heinrich. *Der Brief an die Epheser: Ein Kommentar*. 2nd ed. Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1958.
- Schmid, Ulrich. *Marcion und Sein Apostolos: Rekonstruktion und Historische Einordnung der Marcionitischen Paulusbriefausgabe*. ANTF 25. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1995.
- Schnackenburg, Rudolf. *The Epistle to the Ephesians: A Commentary*. Translated by Helen Heron. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991.
- Scott, Alan. "The Date of the *Physiologus*." *VC* 52.4 (1998): 430–41. DOI:10.2307/1584835.
- Smyth, Herbert Weir. *A Greek Grammar for Colleges*. New York, NY: American Book Company, 1920.
- Souter, Alexander. "An Interpretation of Eph. i. 15." *ExpT* 19.1 (1907): 44. DOI:10.1177 / 0014524607019001.
- . *Pelagius's Expositions of Thirteen Epistles of St. Paul*. TextsS 1/9.2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1922. Repr., Nedeln: Krauss, 1967.
- Staab, Karl. *Pauluskommentare aus der Griechischen Kirche*. 2nd ed. Münster: Aschendorff, 1984.
- Thayer, Joseph Henry, ed. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Being Grimm's Wilke's Clavis Novi Testamenti*. Corrected. New York, NY: American Book Company, 1889.
- Thrall, Margaret E. *Greek Particles in the New Testament: Linguistic and Exegetical Studies*. NTTSD 3. Leiden: Brill, 1962.
- Uthemann, Karl-Heinz. "Ein Enkomion zum Fest des hl. Paulus am 28. Dezember: Edition des Textes (CPG 4850) mit Einleitung." Pages 103–34 in *Philohistôr: Miscellanea in honorem Caroli Laga septuagenarii*. Edited by Antoon Schoors and Peter van Deun. OLA 60. Louvain: Peeters, 1994.
- Van Emde Boas, Evert, Albert Rijksbaron, Luuk Huitink, and Mathieu de Bakker, eds. *The Cambridge Grammar of Classical Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- Van Roon, Aart. *The Authenticity of Ephesians*. Translated by S. Prescod-Jokel. NovTSup 39. Leiden: Brill, 1974.
- Vogels, H. J. "Der Codex Claramontanus der paulinischen Briefe." Pages 274–99 in *Amicitiae Corolla: A Volume of Essays Presented to James Rendel Harris, D. Litt., on the Occasion of His Eightieth Birthday*. Edited by H. G. Wood. London: University of London Press, 1933.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996.
- Weiss, Bernhard. *Textkritik der paulinischen Briefe*. TUGAL 14.3. Leipzig: J. C. Heinrichs, 1896.
- Westcott, Brooke Foss, and Fenton John Anthony Hort. *The New Testament in the Original Greek*. 2 vols. New York, NY: Harper, 1881–1882.
- Wright, Martin. *The Dividing Wall: Ephesians and the Integrity of the Corpus Paulinum*. LNTS 646. London: T&T Clark, 2021.
- Zuntz, Günther. *The Text of the Epistles: A Disquisition upon the Corpus Paulinum*. London: The British Academy, 1953. Repr., Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2007.



# **Index of Terms**

additive focus .....	92	natural information flow .....	91
complex focus .....	91, 92	replacing focus .....	86
contrastive topicalization .....	91	very important participant (VIP) .....	24
discourse marker theory .....	32		



# Index of Names

- Adamantius ..... 153, 154  
 Ambrose .. 149, 151, 154, 155, 158, 160, 161  
 Ambrosiaster ..... 149–163  
 Andrason, Alexander ..... 19  
 Asterius ..... 161  
 Athanasius ..... 63, 151, 154–156, 158, 161  
 Athenaeus Mechanicus ..... 42
- Bacon, B. W. .... 14, 90, 96  
 Bakker, Stéphanie J. .... 3, 72  
 Barth, Markus ..... 3, 51  
 Basil of Caesarea ... 95, 122, 132, 143, 146,  
 149–152, 154, 157–163  
 Baumert, Norbert ..... 36–38  
 Bentein, Klaas ..... 19, 32  
 Best, Ernest ..... 36, 42, 43, 48  
 Bishop, Richard W. .... 156, 157  
 Biton Mechanicus ..... 42  
 Black, David Alan ..... 95  
 Black, Stephanie L. .... 32  
 Bortone, Pietro ..... 10
- Caesarius of Arles ..... 158, 159  
 Carlson, Stephen C. .... 36  
 Chantraine, Pierre ..... 19  
 Chrysostom ... 99, 101, 103, 104, 109, 112,  
 121, 122, 124, 126–128, 130, 133,  
 135, 137, 140, 146, 149–163  
 Clement of Alexandria ..... 59, 130, 139,  
 151–153, 156–162  
 Crellin, Robert ..... 19  
 Cyprian ..... 157, 160–162
- Cyril of Alexandria .. 97, 99, 106, 113, 115,  
 117, 123, 125, 126, 149–158, 161, 162  
 Cyril of Jerusalem ..... 150, 151
- Dahl, Nils Alstrup ..... 143  
 Dawes, Gregory W. .... 72  
 Diadochus ..... 156  
 Didymus ..... 152, 155, 158, 160, 162  
 Dik, Helma ..... 47, 86, 91  
 Diodorus Siculus ..... 42  
 Donaldson, Amy M. .... 95
- Eadie, John ..... 22, 56, 71, 86  
 Ebojo, Edgar Battad ..... 141  
 Ellicott, Charles J. .... 18, 90  
 Ephrem ..... 149–159, 162, 163  
 Epiphanius ..... 59, 95, 137, 149, 152, 158,  
 160–162  
 Eusebius . 115, 119, 150–152, 155, 156, 162  
 Evagrius of Pontus ..... 156, 158  
 Evans, Ernest ..... 78, 95–97, 137, 144,  
 149–154, 156, 160–162
- Fritzsche, Carl Friedrich August ..... 59
- Gaisford, Thomas ..... 115, 119, 156  
 Gibson, Margaret Dunlop ..... 159  
 Gilliland, Maegan Chloe Marie ..... 130  
 Goldstein, David ..... 91  
 Goodspeed, Edgar J. .... 156  
 Greer, Rowan A. .... 131  
 Gregg, J. A. F. .... 128  
 Gregory of Nazianzus ..... 158  
 Gregory of Nyssa . 100, 150–152, 154, 155

- Gregory Thaumaturgus ..... 158
- Gurry, Peter J. .... 130–132
- Harless, Gottlieb Christoph Adolf .. 9, 65,  
91, 92
- Harris III, W. Hall ..... 116
- Haupt, Benjamin Douglas ..... 97
- Haupt, Erich ..... 51
- Heine, Ronald E. .... 136, 138, 153, 154
- Hemphill, Wesley Lynn .... 104, 109, 122,  
126–128, 135, 140
- Heron Mechanicus ..... 42
- Hesychius ..... 152, 156
- Hilary .... 117, 150, 151, 153, 155–157, 162
- Hill, Robert C. .... 107
- Hippolytus ..... 59, 158
- Hoehner, Harold W. .... 3, 36, 41, 48
- Hort, Fenton John Anthony ..... 14, 17
- Irenaeus .. 112, 113, 115, 119, 123, 124, 150,  
155–157, 160
- Isidore of Pelusium ..... 152, 158
- Jaeger, Werner ..... 150, 154, 155
- Jerome ... 59, 128, 131, 136, 138, 149–163
- Josephus ..... 42
- Justin Martyr ..... 156
- Kramer, Werner ..... 3
- Levinsohn, Stephen H. .. 3, 23, 24, 32, 33,  
48, 72
- Lightfoot, J. B. .... 2, 90, 95, 96
- Lincoln, Andrew T. .... 15, 22, 42
- Locatell, Christian ..... 19
- Lucifer ..... 156–159, 161, 162
- MacDonald, Margaret Y. .... 86
- Maclean, Jennifer Kay Berenson ..... 14
- Marcellus ..... 152, 155
- Marcus Eremita ..... 150, 154, 158, 162
- Matić, Dejan ..... 91
- McCollum, Joey ..... 141
- Mekhitarist Fathers ... 149–159, 162, 163
- Merkle, Benjamin L. .... 59
- Methodius ..... 154, 160, 161
- Metzger, Bruce M. .... 78
- Meyer, Heinrich August Wilhelm .. 19, 59,  
71, 78
- Montoro, Peter J. .... 107
- Moser, Amelia ..... 19
- Moule, C. F. D. .... 8, 82
- Moule, H. C. G. .... 83
- Muddiman, John ..... 64
- Nilus ..... 153, 160, 162
- Olshausen, Hermann ..... 86
- Origen .... 64, 101, 105, 120, 128, 136, 138,  
149–163
- Papadopoulos-Kerameus, Athanasios 135,  
137, 160
- Parker, David C. .... 143
- Pelagius ... 56, 117, 129, 136, 139, 149–163
- Petroelje, Benjamin J. .... 33
- Pieri, Francesco ..... 128
- Priscillian ..... 162
- Proclus ..... 152
- Procopius .... 101, 102, 150–152, 155, 158
- Pusey, Philip Edward ... 97, 126, 149, 151,  
158, 161, 162
- Quodvultdeus ..... 154–156, 158
- Rambault, Nathalie ..... 156, 157
- Ramsbotham, A. .... 162
- Redondo Moyano, Elena ..... 33
- Regtuit, Remco F. .... 153
- Reischl, Wilhelm Karl ..... 150, 151
- Robinson, J. Armitage ..... 2, 71, 130
- Rosenbaum, Hans-Udo ..... 153, 160
- Royse, James R. .... 13
- Runge, Steven E. .... 23, 32, 33, 48, 91
- Rupp, Joseph ..... 150, 151
- Salmond, S. D. F. .... 2, 37

# INDEX OF NAMES

Sampley, J. Paul .....	72	149–163	
Sanday, William .....	124	Theodoret . . . . .	98, 99, 105, 107, 123, 125, 127, 133, 137, 146, 147, 149–163
Scherer, Jean .....	155	Thrall, Margaret E. ....	31, 33
Schmid, Ulrich .....	144	Turner, Cuthbert Hamilton .....	124
Schnackenburg, Rudolf .....	4, 42, 92	Ulfilas .....	32
Scott, Alan .....	59	Uthemann, Karl-Heinz .....	162
Severian of Gabala .....	59, 134, 150, 153, 155–158, 160	Van Roon, Aart .....	8, 96
Socrates .....	152	Victorinus, Marius .....	97, 107, 149–163
Souter, Alexander 13, 14, 56, 117, 129, 136, 139, 149–163		Vogels, H. J. ....	143, 144
Staab, Karl 59, 134, 150, 152, 153, 155, 158, 160		Wallace, Daniel B. ....	72
Tertullian .....	78, 95–97, 134, 137, 144, 149–154, 156, 157, 160–162	Weiss, Bernhard .....	72
Theodore of Mopsuestia .....	59, 122, 131,	Westcott, Brooke Foss .....	17
		Wright, Martin .....	28, 33
		Zuntz, Günther .....	41, 82, 144





# Index of Textual Witnesses

01 .....	3	1739 .....	32, 37, 41
03 .....	3, 90	1751 .....	34
06 .....	141–143	1840 .....	71
010 .....	27, 32, 143	1881 .....	32, 51, 55
012 .....	27, 30, 32, 143	1900 .....	37, 131
33 .....	90	1910 .....	37, 131
044 ...	32, 99, 101, 122, 124, 127, 128, 133, 140, 146	2400 .....	34
0319 .....	143	2495 .....	42
442 .....	97	P46 .....	27, 32, 90, 141
451 .....	98	VL64 .....	24
606 .....	116	VL75 .....	24, 63
1490 .....	8	VL76 .....	24, 63
1505 .....	42	VL89 .....	24



# Index of Ancient Sources

## Old Testament

### Genesis

2:23 .....	134
2:23–24 .....	134
2:24 ...	74, 75, 78, 79, 134, 136, 138
6:15 .....	42

### Exodus

25:10 .....	42
-------------	----

### Deuteronomy

3:24 .....	7
4:39 .....	7
25:2 .....	23

### Joshua

2:11 .....	7
------------	---

### 1 Samuel

30:21 .....	23
-------------	----

### 1 Kings

6:2 .....	42
6:20 .....	42
7:14 .....	42
7:39 .....	42
8:23 .....	7

### 2 Kings

11:19 .....	23
-------------	----

### 1 Chronicles

29:11 .....	7
-------------	---

### 2 Chronicles

3:4 .....	42
6:14 .....	7

### Job

11:8–9 .....	42
36:7 .....	23

## Psalms

68:17–18 .....	115
68:18 .....	115
73:25 .....	7
110 .....	22–24
110:1 .....	22–24, 111
110:7 .....	22
143:3 .....	23

## Ecclesiastes

5:2 .....	7
-----------	---

## Isaiah

40:12 .....	113
60:1 .....	59

## Jeremiah

32:37 .....	23
-------------	----

## Lamentations

3:1 .....	23
-----------	----

## Daniel

6:27 .....	7
------------	---

## Joel

2:30 .....	7
------------	---

## New Testament

### Matthew

5:27–28 .....	51
6:10 .....	7
15:19–20 .....	51
16:19 .....	7
18:18 .....	7
19:5 .....	75, 79
24:4 .....	63
28:18 .....	7

### Mark

# INDICES

7:21–23 .....	51	1:2 .....	4
10:7 .....	75, 78, 79	1:3 .....	4, 8
13:5 .....	63	1:4 .....	12, 97
Luke		1:5 .....	4
8:18 .....	63	1:9–10 .....	97
18:1 .....	37	1:10 .....	6–12, 97, 97–99
21:8 .....	63	1:15 .....	4, 12–18, 90, 91, 99–100
Acts		1:17 .....	4
2:19 .....	7	1:18–19 .....	19
2:32 .....	22	1:20 .....	8, 18–27, 100–102
2:33 .....	22	1:20–21 .....	9, 101
13:40 .....	63	1:20–23 .....	23
Romans		1:21 .....	23
1:1 .....	2	1:22 .....	19, 22–24
1:4 .....	22	1:23 .....	23
1:28 .....	57	2:2 .....	9
2:16 .....	3	2:5 .....	86
7:7 .....	51	2:5–6 .....	19, 22, 23
8:34 .....	22	2:6 .....	4, 8, 21
8:38–39 .....	42	2:7 .....	4
1 Corinthians		2:10 .....	4, 28
7:29 .....	81–83	2:11–13 .....	32
8:5 .....	7	2:11–18 .....	28
8:9 .....	63	2:12–13 .....	28
15:3 .....	22	2:13 .....	4, 32, 33
15:24–28 .....	24	2:14 .....	28, 29, 32
15:49 .....	144	2:14–15 .....	28
16:10 .....	63	2:14–18 .....	32, 33, 112
2 Corinthians		2:15 .....	27–31, 102–103
5:17 .....	28	2:16 .....	29
13:11 .....	81, 83	2:17 .....	32
13:14 .....	12	2:18 .....	28, 32, 33
Galatians		2:19 .....	31–36, 69, 103–104
1:1 .....	22	2:19–22 .....	32, 33
5:6 .....	15	2:20 .....	4
5:15 .....	63	2:21 .....	104–105
6:9 .....	36	3:1 .....	4
6:15 .....	28	3:2 .....	105
6:17 .....	81–83	3:2–13 .....	105
Ephesians		3:3 .....	105–106
1:1 .....	2–6, 14, 95–97	3:6 .....	4

# INDEX OF ANCIENT SOURCES

3:8–10 .....	86	5:22 .....	130–132
3:9 .....	4, 106–109	5:23 .....	71–74, 132–133
3:10 .....	8	5:28 .....	133–134
3:11 .....	4	5:28–32 .....	72
3:13 .....	36–40, 109–110	5:29 .....	134
3:14 .....	4, 110–112	5:30 .....	86, 134–135
3:14–18 .....	110	5:31 .....	74–81, 134, 135–139
3:15 .....	8, 9, 111	5:32 .....	136, 138
3:16–18 .....	111	5:32–33 .....	134
3:17 .....	15	6:1 .....	139–140
3:18 .....	40–47, 112–114	6:2–3 .....	139
3:19 .....	47–50, 114–115	6:6 .....	139
3:21 .....	4, 65	6:9 .....	8, 140–141
4:1 .....	64	6:10 .....	81–85
4:6 .....	86, 112	6:10–20 .....	82
4:7 .....	86	6:11 .....	86
4:7–15 .....	22	6:12 .....	8, 9, 82, 85–89
4:8 .....	115–117	6:13 .....	82, 86
4:9 .....	117–121	6:18 .....	83
4:9–10 .....	9, 22	6:19 .....	83, 141–146
4:10 .....	119	6:21 .....	14, 15, 89–94, 146–148
4:13 .....	86, 114	6:23 .....	4, 15
4:17 .....	64, 121–122	Philippians	
4:21 .....	4	1:1 .....	2
4:24 .....	28, 29	2:9 .....	22
4:25 .....	86	3:1 .....	81–83
4:25–32 .....	28	4:8 .....	81–83
5:1 .....	64	Colossians	
5:3 .....	51–53, 55–57	1:1 .....	4
5:3–4 .....	56	1:3 .....	4
5:4 .....	50–58, 122–125	1:4 .....	12, 13, 15, 16
5:5 .....	64	1:16 .....	7, 10
5:8 .....	64	1:20 .....	7, 10, 150
5:9 .....	125–126	2:8 .....	63
5:9–14 .....	64	3:1 .....	22
5:10 .....	69	3:8 .....	50, 52
5:14 .....	58–62, 64, 66, 126–127	4:1 .....	140
5:15 .....	62–68, 127–128	4:3 .....	143
5:17 .....	68–71, 128–129	1 Thessalonians	
5:20 .....	4, 129–130	1:10 .....	22
5:21–25 .....	130	3:6 .....	15

# INDICES

4:1 .....	81, 83	1:25 .....	4
4:5 .....	121	Hebrews	
5:2 .....	64	3:12 .....	63
2 Thessalonians		10:11–13 .....	82
1:3 .....	15	10:13 .....	81, 83
3:1 .....	81, 83	12:25 .....	63
1 Timothy		Revelation	
1:14 .....	15	5:3 .....	7
Titus		5:13 .....	7
1:1 .....	2	21:16 .....	42
3:15 .....	15	Deuterocanonical Books	
Philemon		Sirach (Ecclesiasticus)	
1:1 .....	4	11:1 .....	23
1:3 .....	4	12:12 .....	23
1:5 .....	13, 15, 16	1 Maccabees	
1:9 .....	4	10:63 .....	23