

CLARE K. ROTHSCHILD

New Essays on the  
Apostolic Fathers

*Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen  
zum Neuen Testament*

375

---

**Mohr Siebeck**

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen  
zum Neuen Testament

Herausgeber / Editor

Jörg Frey (Zürich)

Mitherausgeber / Associate Editors

Markus Bockmuehl (Oxford) · James A. Kelhoffer (Uppsala)  
Hans-Josef Klauck (Chicago, IL) · Tobias Nicklas (Regensburg)

J. Ross Wagner (Durham, NC)

375





Clare K. Rothschild

# New Essays on the Apostolic Fathers

Mohr Siebeck

CLARE K. ROTHSCHILD, born 1964; 1986 BA University of California, Berkeley; 1992 MTS Harvard University; 2003 PhD University of Chicago; currently Professor of Scripture, Department of Theology, Lewis University, IL.

e-ISBN PDF 978-3-16-155196-3

ISBN 978-3-16-155134-5

ISSN 0512-1604 (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament)

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data is available on the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2017 by Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, Germany. [www.mohr.de](http://www.mohr.de)

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was typeset by Martin Fischer in Tübingen, printed by Gulde Druck in Tübingen on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Spinner in Ottersweier.

Printed in Germany.

For Abraham J. Malherbe †

*Rest in peace*



οὐκ ἔστιν μαθητὴς ὑπὲρ τὸν διδάσκαλον·  
κατηρτισμένος δὲ πᾶς ἔσται ὡς ὁ διδάσκαλος αὐτοῦ.

*Luke 6:40*





## Acknowledgements

The foundational ideas in this book are traced to a seminar on the Apostolic Fathers I taught at Lewis University in spring 2015. These ideas were initially formulated as observations I had while teaching a group of students exposed to this literature for the first time. I am grateful to this courageous, smart, and patient group of eight seminar participants. Our semester together was a profound experience of creative thinking about interesting but often ignored texts. It not only reminded me of why I love to teach but why I also love to do research and write. I have dedicated the better part of the last year to exploring the ideas that came from this seminar experience. For the time and wherewithal to do so, I must thank Lewis University, in particular President Brother James Gaffney, Provost Stephany Schlachter, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences Bonnie Bondavalli, and Department Chair Karen Trimble-Alliaume. The Sabbatical leave granted in February 2015 provided me with the time and resources to do serious research. As always, my readers will judge the value of the results.

Different from prior research projects, this collection of essays delves into numerous different topics. Although all belong under the auspice of the Apostolic Fathers, today each text has a cadre of experts dedicated to it alone. To avoid reckless dilettantism, I have consulted with these experts, many of whom gave generously of both their time and expertise to read and comment on my essays. In particular, I wish to thank Larry Welborn, Michael Holmes, James Carleton Paget, Clayton Jefford, Christopher Tuckett, and James A. Kelhoffer. Justin R. Howell edited the entire manuscript. R. Matthew Calhoun, and Trevor W. Thompson also read many sections, offering advice in their areas of expertise. I also wish to extend sincere gratitude to participants of the various societies of which I am a member, including the Society of Biblical Literature, the Chicago Society of Biblical Research, and the Midwest SBL. Over the past few years, I have delivered versions of some of the essays in these colloquia. I always learn so much from those presenting in these sessions. Finally, I am ever in the debt of Dr. Henning Ziebritzki at Mohr Siebeck for his continuing interest in my work, as well as to colleague and friend, Prof. Dr. Jörg Frey, for his recommendation of my manuscripts to the WUNT series. The editorial support team at Mohr Siebeck also ably assisted in the production of this work.

I dedicate this book to Abraham J. Malherbe, who would, no doubt, have been disappointed with the final product. As one of my most ardent supporters, he

adamantly exhorted me to find one narrow interest and pursue it unwaveringly. He wanted me to be the best on one narrow topic. As this collection of essays attests, I have flagrantly ignored Abe's advice – not deliberately of course – but as a result of my own undoubtedly self-aggrandizing assessment of the value of its ideas. I would never have asked Abe to approve such a project, because I know that he never would have. That said, I am fairly certain that he would have shared my enthusiasm for the ideas because, however much he disagreed with me, he always supported my projects. I have missed him since the day he died and still have every intention of taking his good advice to follow one narrow topic, before that time when we meet each other again.

## Table of Contents

Acknowledgements .....	IX
<i>Chapter One: Introduction</i> .....	1
<i>Chapter Two: On the Invention of <i>Patres Apostolici</i></i> .....	7
A. Introduction .....	7
B. History of Research .....	8
C. From Book Fair to Catalog .....	12
I. Frankfurt Book Fair .....	12
II. From Fair to Bookseller .....	13
III. From Bookseller to Library .....	14
1. Thomas James .....	14
2. Thomas Hyde .....	19
3. Bookbinders and the Bodleian Catalog .....	20
D. From Library to Papacy and Beyond .....	22
I. Roman Catholics and Patristic Texts .....	22
II. Protestants and Patristic Texts .....	24
E. Conclusion .....	30
Appendix A. ....	30
Appendix B. ....	31
Appendix C. The Hyde-Fysher Catalog 1738 .....	32
<i>Chapter Three: Reception of First Corinthians in First Clement</i> .....	35
A. Introduction .....	35
B. History of Scholarship .....	38
C. Exegetical Analysis .....	41
D. Style – Epistolary Elements .....	43
E. Content – Literary Allusions .....	45
I. 1 Corinthians as Rhetorical Artifact .....	46
II. Parallels .....	46

1. Allusions to 1 Corinthians in 1 Clement .....	47
a. Single Allusions .....	48
i. 1 Clement 13:1 .....	48
ii. 1 Clement 34:8 .....	49
iii. 1 Clement 42:4 .....	50
b. Allusion Clusters .....	51
i. 1 Clement 37:3, 5 .....	51
ii. Two Allusions to 1 Corinthians 4 .....	52
1 Clement 3:3 .....	53
1 Clement 7:1 .....	54
iii. Three Allusions to 1 Corinthians 12 .....	54
1 Clement 38:1 .....	54
1 Clement 48:5 .....	55
iv. Two Allusions to 1 Corinthians 13 .....	56
1 Clement 55:2 .....	56
1 Clement 49:5 .....	57
v. Three Allusions to 1 Corinthians 15 .....	58
1 Clem. 24:1, 5 .....	58
F. Conclusion .....	60
<i>Chapter Four: 1 Clement as Pseudepigraphon</i> .....	61
A. Introduction .....	61
B. Occasion .....	64
C. Historical Circumstances .....	65
D. Form and Function .....	66
E. Conclusion .....	68
<i>Chapter Five: Παιδεία as Solution to Στάσις in 1 Clement</i> .....	69
A. Introduction .....	69
B. Proof-texts and Commentary .....	70
I. Proof-texts .....	71
II. Authorial Commentary .....	74
C. Conclusion .....	79
<i>Chapter Six: Golden Calf Incident in 1 Clement</i> .....	81
A. Introduction .....	81
B. Background .....	82

C. Exempla in the Peroratio .....	86
I. Exempla Supporting Recommended Action .....	87
1. Exhortation to Repent .....	87
2. Exhortation to Accept Voluntary Exile .....	89
3. Exhortation that Reward is Outcome of Repentance .....	90
D. Exempla in the Probatio .....	90
I. Comparison of <i>Exempla</i> .....	92
E. Conclusion .....	93

*Chapter Seven: “Where Their Worm Dieth Not”:*

The Phoenix Legend in 1 Clement 25 .....	97
A. Introduction .....	97
B. Greek Text and English Translation .....	97
C. Parallel Literature .....	98
D. Evidence .....	99
E. Analysis .....	107
F. Conclusion .....	109

*Chapter Eight: “Belittling” or “Undervaluing” in 2 Clem. 1:1–2? ....* 111

A. Introduction .....	111
B. Greek Text .....	111
C. History of Interpretation .....	112
D. Recent Investigations .....	117
E. Prologue in Context .....	119
F. Proposed Translation .....	121
G. Conclusion .....	123

*Chapter Nine: Two dispositiones in 2 Clement 2 .....* 125

A. Introduction .....	125
B. History of Scholarship .....	127
C. 2 Clement 2:1–7 .....	129
D. Summation .....	134
E. The “Two Dispositions” Motif .....	134
I. Marcion .....	135
II. Justin Martyr .....	137
III. Tertullian .....	140
F. Conclusion .....	140

<i>Chapter Ten: Sailing Past the Competition:</i>	
Euergetism in 2 Clement 7 .....	143
A. Introduction .....	143
B. History of Research .....	143
I. Running .....	144
II. Sailing .....	144
C. Analysis .....	147
I. <i>Aeneid</i> 5 – Introduction .....	148
II. <i>Aeneid</i> 5 – Overview .....	149
III. <i>Aeneid</i> 5 – 2 Clement 7 .....	151
D. Prizes for Liturgists .....	154
E. Conclusion .....	156
 <i>Chapter Eleven: Evaluating Masculinity:</i>	
The Quintus Incident in Light of the Second Sophistic .....	159
A. Introduction .....	159
B. History of Scholarship .....	161
C. Evidence .....	164
D. Art of Antithesis: Polycarp <i>versus</i> Quintus .....	165
E. Creating the Antitype .....	166
I. Elitism .....	166
II. Phrygia .....	167
III. Public Performance .....	171
F. Conclusion .....	172
 <i>Chapter Twelve: Travelers and Christ-Mongers in Didache 12:1–5 ..</i>	
A. Introduction .....	175
B. History of Scholarship .....	175
C. Structural Analysis of Didache 11–13 .....	178
D. Παρόδιος .....	184
E. Conclusion .....	188
 <i>Chapter Thirteen: Epistle of Barnabas and Secession</i>	
through Allegory .....	191
A. Introduction .....	191
B. History of Research .....	194
C. Ὑπερβολή .....	196

D. Ἀλληγορία .....	198
E. Typology .....	198
F. Allegory versus Typology .....	199
G. Summation .....	201
H. Barnabas and the Allegorical Method .....	201
I. Knowledge .....	203
J. Knowers or “Gnostics” .....	204
K. Epistemology .....	205
L. Allegorical Approach and the Historical Continuum Controversy ..	207
I. Barnabas 4:6b–8 .....	207
II. Barnabas 14:4b–5 .....	210
M. Conclusion .....	211

*Chapter Fourteen: Diognetus and the Topos of the Invisible God* . . . 213

A. Introduction .....	213
B. Ancient <i>Topos</i> .....	214
C. History of Scholarship .....	215
D. Exegetical Analysis .....	217
I. Cleanthes’s Hymn to Zeus .....	217
II. Pseudo-Aristotle, <i>De mundo</i> .....	218
III. Wisdom of Solomon .....	219
IV. Romans 1:18–32 .....	220
V. Acts 17:23–31 .....	220
VI. Summation .....	220
E. Exegetical Analysis .....	221
I. Epistle to Diognetus .....	221
II. Comparative Analysis .....	225
F. Conclusion .....	226

*Chapter Fifteen: Somatic Effects of Irascibility in Hermas,*

Mandates 5.1.3 (33.3) .....	227
A. Introduction .....	227
B. <i>Status Quaestionis</i> .....	228
C. Ancient Medical Texts and Mandates .....	230
D. Anger .....	231
E. Mandates of Hermas .....	233
F. Mandate 5 (33.1) .....	236
G. Mandate 10 (41.2): Function of λύπη .....	241
H. Mandate 10.3 (42) .....	242



I. Summation .....	242
J. Conclusion .....	243
Bibliography .....	245
Index of References .....	267
Index of Modern Authors .....	288
Index of Subjects .....	295

## Abbreviations and References

The Greek New Testament is cited from *Novum Testamentum Graece*, the Nestle-Aland 28th edition. Abbreviations correspond to *The SBL Handbook of Style*, 2nd edition (2014); the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (<sup>3</sup>1996); Liddell, Scott, Jones, and McKenzie, *A Greek-English Lexicon*; and G. W. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*.



## Chapter One

### Introduction

This volume comprises fifteen new essays on the Apostolic Fathers. In the last two years, two were originally published elsewhere. Both were moderately reworked and updated for inclusion in this volume. The first essay addresses a question concerning the collection as a whole. In his article entitled, “The Paratextual Invention of the Term ‘Apostolic Fathers,’” David Lincicum argues that the technical term originated as an abbreviation made by sixteenth-century bookbinders of the longer title of Cotelier’s 1672 collection of texts (*JTS* 66 [2015]: 139–48). Lincicum’s study substantially furthers the conversation concerning the expression “Apostolic Fathers,” insofar as it becomes a technical term for certain writers and writings. His conclusion, however, elicits questions about the place of bookbinders in the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century development and proliferation of printed books, as well as about the relevance of Cotelier’s collection to theological disputes of the day. Building on the evidence Lincicum brings to the discussion, this essay explores the role of seventeenth-century libraries and librarians, in discussion with theologians, in the origination of this technical term. It demonstrates that bookbinders were only middlemen working in the booming book industry of that day. In determining spine titles, librarians – in their capacity as the catalogers of rapidly increasing collections – played a more important role than binders, particularly librarians of the most important collections who, as it happens, were frequently trained theologians. Cotelier himself was one such individual. Affirming the traditional hypothesis concerning the technical term, the present essay differs from Lincicum, ascribing primary responsibility to Cotelier.

The next five essays concern 1 Clement. The central argument of the opening article (Chapter 3) addresses the relationship between 1 Clement and 1 Corinthians. It is clear that the author of 1 Clement appeals to 1 Corinthians, but the nature of its appeal is enigmatic. In some respects, Clement seems to revere his Pauline precursor – in others, he seems to openly refute him. This essay discusses the precise nature of the correspondences for what they reveal about 1 Clement’s overall purpose.

Chapter 4 undertakes the question of generic classification. Specifically, it explores the origin and implications of 1 Clement’s two epistolary prescript references (a) from the church “sojourning” in Rome and (b) to the church “sojourning” in Corinth. Although these references are not unique, they are rare

and, different from the canonical letters, were rejected as the titles of the works in which they occur. This essay argues that the city names of Rome and Corinth in 1 Clement should be interpreted symbolically. Like the participle παροικουσα with which they comprise a literary unit, these epistolary elements are theological rather than geographical, characterizing the sender(s) as proto-orthodox and the addressees as schismatic. They were rejected as titles because first readers correctly interpreted this meaning.

Chapter 5 addresses the question of “Christian education,” first mentioned in 1 Clem. 21:8: “Let our children receive the παιδεία in Christ” (Τὰ τέκνα ἡμῶν τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ παιδείας μεταλαμβάνέτωσαν) (cf. 21:6; 62:3). While Henri-Irénéé Marrou may be correct that a few early Christian authors were preoccupied with the raising of children (cf. Eph 6:4; Col 3:21; Heb 12:5, 7–11), the question for this essay is whether he was correct in placing 1 Clem. 21:8 at the beginning of such a catechetical trajectory. As a deliberative letter, 1 Clement exhorts its audience to a specific course of action. Similar to 1 Corinthians, the point to be adjudicated is restoration of peace from στάσις. Παιδεία is the recommended solution. In this context, therefore, παιδεία refers to “punishment” in the form of voluntary exile. Paul appropriates παιδεία as punishment in 1 Cor 11:32 and 2 Cor 6:9. Although παιδεία rarely refers to exclusively punitive measures (discipline is a feature of most ancient pedagogy), the argument of this essay is that, as in 1 and 2 Corinthians, παιδεία in 1 Clement denotes punishment *as opposed to* education, dissociating 1 Clem. 21:8 from the trajectory of Christian education, with which it has long been associated. Insofar as punishment often has an educative, restorative goal, the instructional sense never entirely recedes. Nevertheless, this essay draws a stark contrast in order to emphasize that by demanding the ouster of certain presbyters 1 Clement sentences these opponents “to life,” the eschatological implications of which were hardly educational.

Chapter 6 examines Clement’s version of the golden calf tradition. Although nearly all recipients of this tradition employed it as a negative example of the behavior of the Jews in the wilderness, 1 Clement uses it positively to portray Moses as leader par excellence. What is more, in the context of 1 Clement, the golden calf tradition constitutes the climax in a list of historical *exempla*, themselves the central proofs in the argument of the letter. This essay investigates the idea that such positioning of the golden calf tradition is no accident. Marcion esteemed Moses’s self-sacrificial behavior over God’s “zero tolerance” policy in the golden calf incident, suggesting that although the letter was composed to have enduring and universal application, its original historical occasion was anti-Marcionite.

Chapter 7 is the fifth and final study of the collection devoted to 1 Clement. 1 Clement 25 recounts the widely known legend of the regeneration of the phoenix to support an argument for Christian resurrection. This essay offers an

exegetical analysis of this presentation, highlighting distinctive emphases and suggesting how they might have contributed to second-century debates.

The eighth essay takes up a detail in the introduction to 2 Clement. The introductory exhortation employs the common Greek adjective μικρά – alone and with the verb φρονεῖν – four times in its first two verses. In the modern period, this passage suffers a history of translation disconnected from the exhortation comprising most of the rest of the tractate. Few if any quotations of these verses remain from antiquity, ruling out the possibility of consulting early readers for guidance. Moreover, recent translations rely on prior ones, employing expressions long out of date today (e. g., “belittle”). Convincing new research by James A. Kelhoffer suggests that 2 Clement borrows the Roman patron-client model to exhort its listeners. This essay proposes an update of the translation of 2 Clem. 1:1–2 in keeping with recent discoveries concerning the text’s original purpose, values, and assumptions.

The ninth essay addresses the motif of the barren woman in 2 Clement 2. Paul reads the accounts in Genesis 16 and 21 in combination with Isa 54:1 as a polemical ἀλληγορία (Gal 4:22–31). The Isaianic oracle promises the restoration of the city of Jerusalem: although the city is currently “barren,” she will experience burgeoning growth when God rescues the Jews from Exile. On Paul’s argument, the barren woman is the heavenly Jerusalem, and the oracle predicts that believers (both Jew and Gentile) will one day populate it, whereas those “boasting in the flesh” (i. e., circumcision) will not. Without any clear allusion to Galatians, 2 Clem. 2:1–3 also cites Isa 54:1, contrasting the author’s church (the barren woman) with the woman “with a husband.” The paradigm of two opposing *dispositiones* (“institutions”) seems to be in view. The most common proposal is that the opponents are “gnostics” – a claim based on the subsidiary assumption of “gnostic” terminology elsewhere in the text. The present essay explores whether the reception history of the “two *dispositiones* tradition” has the potential to sharpen present theories about the opponent’s identity favoring the traditional theory that the opponent was Marcionite.

Chapter 10 takes up the precise meaning of the exhortation in 2 Clement 7 that Christian faith is like a race. The Pauline inspiration for this athletic metaphor is not in doubt, but, surprisingly, the customary footrace is interspersed with references to a sailing competition. As noted, James A. Kelhoffer has proposed a patron-client model to explain the central motifs in 2 Clement. This essay argues that the metaphor of the sailing race echoes Virgil and, as such, broadens the context in which Clement’s use of the patron-client model can be understood.

Chapter 11 probes the Quintus incident in Martyrdom of Polycarp 4, viewed by some as a later interpolation reflecting the practice of voluntary martyrdom by second-century Montanists. Based on the episode’s tight integration into the larger narrative, current consensus accepts it as an original part of the narrative.

However, its role in the text's larger thematic program has not been convincingly established. Informed in part by the new essay of Matthijs den Dulk and Andrew Langford situating Mart. Pol. in the milieu of the Second Sophistic, the present investigation attempts to add the Quintus incident to the narrative elements enumerated by Den Dulk and Langford as emblematic of the literary and cultural conventions of second-century sophism.

By placing strict limits on at least one Christian community's treatment of visitors, Didache 12 describes reasonable protection against exploitation of the Christian code of ethics requiring generosity to strangers. The integrity of this chapter in the overall work has, somewhat like the Quintus incident in Mart. Pol. 4 (described above), long been a matter of debate. The twelfth chapter of this volume explores the history of interpretation of this section, focusing on the two neologisms, *παρόδιος* and *χριστέμπορος*. Ultimately it concludes that a new translation of *παρόδιος*, in keeping with the literary context, dissolves questions concerning the section's integrity and sheds important new light on the hospitality of this community of Christ-followers.

Today, most interpreters view the Epistle of Barnabas – the topic of Chapter 13 – as supersessionist. Twice highlighting Moses as tablet-breaker, Barn. 4:6–7 interprets Christianity as a replacement for Judaism: “Do not become like some people by piling up your sins, saying that the covenant is both theirs and ours. For it is ours (ἡμῶν μὲν).” On this reading, Christians supplant Jews in their own salvation history. Yet Barnabas is a highly allegorical text. This essay thus asks how supersessionism is to be reconciled with the allegorical method. If the past can be read as an allegory of the future, can the future at the same time replace the past? Exploring the precise nature of allegory in this epistle, the essay proposes that the method itself constitutes Barnabas's response to the two dispositions *topos* (discussed vis-à-vis 2 Clement 2 in Chapter 9 of the present volume). Rather than approaching Jewish history as a compendium of historical exempla (1 Clement), a genealogically-related group (2 Clement, Justin), or a different group altogether (Marcion), Barnabas postulates a sophisticated Platonic alternative: namely, that Judaism is a “shadow” of the Gospel reality – a position remarkably similar to the one reflected in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

In connection with Cleanthes's *Hymn to Zeus*, Johan Thom investigates the ancient moral-philosophical *topos* of the invisible God, according to which the divine is invisible and known in the world by its actions. As Thom shows, an important sub-*topos* is the consequence of human failure to recognize divine actions in the world – a failure that leads to mistakes such as the assumption that God needs anything, a motif of the sub-*topos*. Thom demonstrates that this *topos*, sub-*topos* and *motif* are at work not just in Cleanthes's *Hymn*, but Paul's letter to the Romans, Paul's Areopagus speech in Acts 17, and the Wisdom of Solomon. Chapter 14 simply welcomes the Epistle of Diognetus into this discussion, arguing that the *topos*, sub-*topos*, and *motif* are also at work in this letter.

Chapter 15 examines yet another neologism in the AF (cf. Chapter 9 on the *Didache*). Hermas, Mand. 5.1.3 (33.3) describes a process by which ὄξυκολία (“irascibility”) enters Christian believers, cramping, polluting, and, in extreme cases, expunging their spirits. Curiously, the word, ὄξυκολία is not attested prior to its appearance in the *Mandates*, in which it occurs seventeen times. By contrasting it with a “spirit” (πνεῦμα) of μακροθυμία (“patience”), Hermas implies that it is a hot-blooded, impulsive, and/or volatile “spirit.” According to Carolyn Osiek, the best parallel for this mechanism is the urban metaphor of ancient apartment buildings. The text itself offers the example of a drop of wormwood in a vat of honey. This paper attempts to show that a popular second-century medical theory lies behind Hermas’s presentation of ὄξυκολία, also touching briefly on the exegetical implications of this background and interpretation.

While these essays delve in a few different directions, they are united in their focus on a single collection and consistent reliance on the historical-critical methods as the best means to greater understanding. As with any new work, I am grateful to readers willing to spend time exploring the ideas. My hope is that the essays will contribute to the discussions about the texts and the collection already underway in our guild.





## Chapter Two

# On the Invention of *Patres Apostolici*

### A. Introduction

Origin of the expression “Apostolic Fathers” has been the subject of recent debate. In his article entitled, “The Paratextual Invention of the Term ‘Apostolic Fathers,’” David Lincicum argues that the technical term originated as an abbreviation made by sixteenth-century bookbinders of the longer title of Cotelier’s 1672 collection of texts, *SS. Patrum qui temporibus apostolicis floruerunt, Barnabae, Clementis, Hermae, Ignatii, Polycarpi Opera, Vera, et Suppositicia* to *Patres Apostolici*.<sup>1</sup> Lincicum observes that, in particular, British seventeenth-century bookbindings of Cotelier’s book use this or a similar abbreviation with some degree of frequency, inferring that these binders first coined the technical term. Lincicum’s study substantially furthers the conversation concerning the expression “Apostolic Fathers,” especially insofar as it becomes a technical term for certain writers and writings. His conclusion, however, elicits questions about the place of bookbinders in the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century development and expansion of the printed book as well as about the perceived relevance of Cotelier’s collection to theological questions of the day.<sup>2</sup> Building on the evidence that Lincicum brings to the discussion, this essay explores the role of seventeenth-century libraries and librarians, in discussion with theologians, in the origination of this technical term. It demonstrates that bookbinders were only middlemen working in the booming book industry of that day. In determining

---

<sup>1</sup> For assistance in the composition of this essay, I wish to express sincere gratitude to Robert Matthew Calhoun, Angela Kinney, Francesca Galligan (Bodleian Library), and Oliver House (Bodleian Library). Lincicum’s essay: *JTS* 66 (2015): 139–48. Cotelier’s volume: J. B. Cotelier, *SS. Patrum qui temporibus apostolicis floruerunt; Barnabae, Clementis, Hermae, Ignatii, Polycarpi; Opera edita et inedita, vera et suppositicia. Una cum Clementis, Ignatii, Polycarpi Actis atque Martyriis* (Paris: Petri le Petit, 1672).

<sup>2</sup> Bart Ehrman refers to the discussion of Cotelier’s precise meaning as vanity: “There has been some (rather pointless) discussion over whether Cotelier actually referred to these early authors as ‘Apostolic Fathers.’ He obviously did not do so in the title (‘Holy Fathers who Flourished during the Apostolic Times’), but he does do so on two occasions in his Preface, where he refers to his ‘Apostolicorum Patrum collectio’ (pp. vii and x)” (*The Apostolic Fathers*, vol. 1: *I Clement, II Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp, Didache* [2 vols. LCL; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004], 1:8). Robert M. Grant notes that the expression “apostolic fathers” appears as early as the seventh century (*Formation of the New Testament* [Hutchinson University Library; New York: Harper & Row, 1965], 62).

spine titles, librarians, in their capacity as catalogers for rapidly increasing collections, played an arguably more important role than binders – particularly those of the most important collections who, as it happens, were frequently trained theologians. Cotelier himself was one such individual, and it is thus to him – while taking advantage of the latest research in the field of library science – that the present essay attributes the expression and so affirms the traditional hypothesis that he invented the technical term.

### B. History of Research

In 1672, Jean-Baptiste Cotelier published a collection of Christian texts entitled, *SS.<sup>3</sup> Patrum qui temporibus apostolicis floruerunt opera* (“Works of the holy fa-

---

<sup>3</sup> Cotelier’s title is of significantly more interest than scholars typically acknowledge. Four points are salient. First, he refers to the authors represented in his collection as having “flourished in apostolic times.” Similar temporal references appear in both the Muratorian Fragment and Irenaeus. 1 Clem. 5:1 too makes a similar reference (i.e., τῆς γενεᾶς ἡμῶν τὰ γενναῖα). On the division between our own and apostolic times, see Albert C. Sundberg, Jr., “Canon Muratori: A Fourth-Century List,” *HTR* 66 (1973): 1–41. Second, the adjective, *sacrosanctum* occurs prior to the word, *patrum* in Cotelier’s title. Although the abbreviation “SS” often refers to *Scriptores* (Writers) in this instance, the genitive plural adjective indicates simply “Sanctus” (“Holy” or possibly “Saints”). The abbreviation comes from Latin palaeography. In late antiquity and the Middle Ages, “sanctus” was applied both to Scripture (*sancta scriptura*) as well as to God/Jesus/Spirit, saints, martyrs, prominent clergy, churches, shrines, and anything associated with the aforementioned holy materials (e.g., holy wounds), making it difficult to determine genre based solely on the presence of this word in a title. With regard to writings, aside from Scripture, the adjective frequently applies to *people* (be it hagiography, theology, etc.). See *Dictionnaire latin-français des auteurs chrétiens* (ed. Albert Blaise, Henri Chirat; Turnhout: Brepols 1954). I wish to express my sincere gratitude to Angela Kinney for her expertise on this point. Third, the word, *opera* implies a collection of writings, while avoiding specific reference to epistles, tractates, or worse, homilies (see n. 72). Finally, the title acknowledges not just that some of the texts are *unedited*, but that only some are *vera*, whereas others are *suppositicia*. Questions concerning the precise meaning of these elements of Cotelier’s title have been almost completely overlooked in scholarship. In the discussion following the paper and recorded after it in the collected volume, F.-X. Cuhe asks about the difference between the first occurrence of the expression “apostolic fathers” and the first such title for a collection of texts. He also notes that the title is not *Apostolic Fathers* (“Pères apostoliques”), but *Fathers flourishing in Apostolic Times* (“Temps Apostoliques”), an expression used by other seventeenth-century writers. Finally, he asks what is implied by “apostolic times” and whether such a phase is distinguishable from “time of the apostles” (“temps des Apôtres”); see Dominique Bertrand, “Jean-Baptiste Cotelier et les Pères Apostoliques?” in *Les Pères de l’église au XVII<sup>e</sup> Siècle* [ed. E. Bury and B. Meunier; Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf], 175–89, here: 191). For Bertrand, Cotelier packs his purpose for the collection into his title: not just that the writers should be considered *fathers*, but that they flourished in a crucially important *era*. Such a title deemphasized authorship of the collected texts per se, a point about which Cotelier is openly dubious. Bertrand writes: “À mon sens, Cotelier a concentré son ambition d’érudit et d’écrivain dans ceci: conférer toute sa force à l’expression qui rend avantage sa pensée que celle de ‘Pères apostoliques’: ‘Sanctorum Patrum qui apostolicis temporibus floruerunt.’ Il s’agit de toute une

thers who flourished in apostolic times”). His criteria for the inclusion of texts were authorship and antiquity. All writers were “either companions or disciples of the apostles” (*apostolorum partim comites exstitere, partim discipuli*). Included in his collection, with the texts we have come to expect (i. e., Barnabas, Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp), were the following: the Apostolic Constitutions, the Apostolic Canons, the Pseudo-Clementine Recognitions and Homilies, the pseudonymous letter from Peter to James, the pseudonymous letter of James, the Greek Epitome of the Homilies, the Martyrdom of Clement, and a report attributed to Ephraem of Cherson describing a miracle that allegedly occurred on the commemoration of Clement’s death (see Appendix B).<sup>4</sup> Since this volume was the first collection of these writings in printed form, in the centuries since its publication it has been considered the source of the technical term for these and related groups of writings. As scholars have pointed out, however, this collection was hardly unique in its interest in the publication of such texts.<sup>5</sup> In fact, it was one of a number of concurrent attempts to make these texts available to scholars and the interested public.<sup>6</sup> For example, prior to this publication in 1645, Cotelier contributed to the *editio princeps* of the Epistle of Barnabas with Hugh Menard and Isaac Voss.<sup>7</sup>

In 1699, Thomas Ittig abbreviated this title to *Bibliotheca Patrum Apostolicorum* in an edition of a similar group of writings published in Leipzig.<sup>8</sup> J. B. Lightfoot notes that whereas Cotelier’s title (i. e., *SS. Patrum qui temporibus apostolicis floruerunt ... opera*) only approximates the expression “Apostolic Fathers,” Ittig’s

---

époque, les ‘temps apostoliques,’ et, dans cet environnement, des Écrivains ecclésiastiques reconnus comme tels qui y ont ‘fleuri.’ Or, du simple point de vue des textes – celui qui pour l’auteur est dirimant –, l’environnement qui se nomme ‘temps apostoliques’ est complexe. C’est pourquoi, gouvernant le génitif pluriel, ‘Sanctorum Patrum’ et les cinq noms qui en dépendent, Barnabé, Hermas, Clément, Ignace et Polycarpe, le titre affiche ces mots: ‘opera edita et inedita, vera et supposititia.’ Bref, Cotelier n’estime pouvoir regrouper ce qui nous reste des Pères apostoliques qu’en opérant un tri tel que ce qui est retiré à leur paternité n’en reste pas moins important pour faire sentir le contexte des textes fondamentaux” (“Jean-Baptiste Cotelier et les Pères Apostoliques?” 175–89, here: 183).

<sup>4</sup> Jean LeClerc’s second edition (1698) provided the same texts. Thomas Ittig used different criteria for inclusion in his edition (1699). Cf. Ehrman, *Apostolic Fathers*, “General Introduction,” 1:8–9; Paul Foster, “Preface,” in *The Writings of the Apostolic Fathers* (ed. Foster; London: Continuum, 2007), vii–viii; Bertrand, “Jean-Baptiste Cotelier et les pères apostoliques?” 175–89.

<sup>5</sup> E. g., Ehrman, *Apostolic Fathers*, 1:7–14.

<sup>6</sup> A number of important scholars were at work on the publication of these texts in both Britain and France, including Hugh Menard, Archbishop Ussher, Isaac Voss. The race to publication was complicated by a number of extenuating circumstances not least a great fire in London. See J. H. Backhouse, *The Editio Princeps of the Epistle of Barnabas* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1883).

<sup>7</sup> Backhouse, *Editio Princeps*, vii–xx.

<sup>8</sup> Thomas Ittig, *Bibliotheca Patrum Apostolicorum Graeco-Latina* (Leipzig: J. H. Richter, 1699), 1–298. Cf. J. A. Fischer, “Die ältesten Ausgaben der Patres Apostolici: Ein Beitrag zu Begriff und Begrenzung der Apostolischen Väter,” *Historisches Jahrbuch* 94 (1974): 159–90; 95 (1975): 88–119.

title (i. e., *Bibliotheca Patrum Apostolicorum*) reflects it exactly.<sup>9</sup> On Lightfoot's reading, it is thus with Ittig that the technical term is born. In 1978, Henk Jan de Jonge pointed out that, prior to Ittig, Jean-Baptiste LeClerc used the expression *Patrum Apostolicorum* to refer to his 1698 reprinting of Cotelier's edition.<sup>10</sup> De Jonge also showed that in 1693 the expression appears in William Wake's *The Genuine Epistles of the Apostolical Fathers S. Barnabas, S. Clement, S. Ignatius, S. Polycarp. The Shepherd of Hermas, and the Martyrdoms of St. Ignatius and St. Polycarp*.<sup>11</sup> Wake was, in turn, influenced by William Cave's 1677 edition, *Apostolici: or, the History of the Lives, Acts, Death, and Martyrdoms of those who were Contemporary with, or immediately succeeded the Apostles*.<sup>12</sup> Neither Wake nor Cave, however, uses the expression as a title. Concerning the expression apart from a collection of texts, Lincicum points out that Cotelier himself refers to *patres apostolici* in his preface, but only broadly with reference to authoritative Christian teachers. In 1546, William Peryn also used the expression in this way, as does H. P. de Cressy approximately one hundred years later.<sup>13</sup> The oldest occurrence of the expression that anyone has traced is in the writings of the Monophysite Severus of Antioch (sixth c.), who used it albeit without reference

<sup>9</sup> J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers, Part 1: S. Clement of Rome: A Revised Text with Introductions, Notes, Dissertations, and Translations* (London: Macmillan, 1890), 1:3.

<sup>10</sup> Both LeClerc's 1698 Antwerp and the 1724 Amsterdam reprints retain Cotelier's original title; see Lincicum, "Paratextual Invention," 141. However, Bertrand's article emphasizes differences between Cotelier's and LeClerc's projects. According to Bertrand, LeClerc harbors "nervousness" with regard to Cotelier's project, noting LeClerc's two references to aspects of the work as "absurd" (179). He, thus, deliberately obscures the original work: "Même si Le Clerc a tout gardé de son devancier, la disposition adoptée par lui occulte complètement cette donnée. Un esprit différent anime un matériau fondamentalement identique. Nous tentons maintenant d'élucider celui qui a présidé à l'agencement de 1672" (180). Bertrand sums up the two projects as works by two very different people: "Certes, les deux hommes sont différents, et le calviniste d'Amsterdam ne présente guère de traits communs avec le fils de pasteur converti de Nîmes, boursier de l'Assemblée du clergé, sorbonnard, chargé des catalogues à la Bibliothèque royale et professeur de grec à l'Académie de Paris, un tempérament véhément, quoique maladif, mais surtout un homme en qui l'attachement à l'Église et l'amour des lettres sont intimement joints" ("Jean-Baptiste Cotelier et les Pères Apostoliques?" 187).

<sup>11</sup> Wake refers to "Coteler. Patr. Apostol. Tom. I" in the margin of his 1693 edition and mentions Cotelierus and his collection of the *Apostolical Fathers* (William Wake, *The Genuine Epistles of the Apostolical Fathers S. Barnabas, S. Clement, S. Ignatius, S. Polycarp. The Shepherd of Hermas, and the Martyrdoms of St. Ignatius and St. Polycarp* [London, 1693]).

<sup>12</sup> William Cave refers to Cotelier's edition as: "J. Bapt. Cotelierus. *Patres Apostolici* gr. lat. cum notis, Par. 1672. f." As Lincicum ("Paratextual Invention," 141) acknowledges: "Wake makes reference to 'Coteler. Patr. Apostol. Tom. I' in the margin of his own 1693 edition of the *Apostolical Fathers*, 9 and mentions 'Cotelierus' in his *Collection of the Apostolical Fathers*. Before Wake in 1685, Cotelier's work was referred to by William Cave as 'J. Bapt. Cotelierus. *Patres Apostolici* gr. lat. cum notis, Par. 1672. f.'" Both Cave and Wake use the precise reference for Cotelier's volume that Hyde provides in the 1674 Bodleian catalog.

<sup>13</sup> Hugh-Paulinus de Cressy restricts the term to the earliest period of the church, but without clear definition or use as a *terminus technicus*.

to a collection of writings.<sup>14</sup> Conversely, related groups of writings were collected under other titles, such as Thomas Elborowe's translations of Ignatius, Polycarp, and Barnabas (London, 1668), entitled *A Prospect of the Primitive Christianity, As It Was left by Christ to His Apostles, by the Apostles to Their Disciples Saint Polycarp and Holy Ignatius, Both Contemporaries with and Disciples to the Holy Evangelist and Apostle Saint John*.

David Lincicum argues that the designation owes its origin as a *terminus technicus* to bookbinders abbreviating the title of Cotelier's 1672 edition on their bindings – one such binding firmly dated to 1674 (i. e., prior to Ittig). Since pre-bound books were the exception in this period, binding styles and, thus, spine titles varied. Yet Lincicum observes coherence among the abbreviated titles of British copies of Cotelier's book. With greater diversity on the Continent, British bindings often labeled the book, *Patres Apostolici*.<sup>15</sup> Since both Cave and Wake were also British, Lincicum concludes that the hermeneutical effect of this overall coherence of references in Britain gave rise to the consideration of this group as a discrete set of writings (i. e., *terminus technicus*).<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> Robert M. Grant, "The Apostolic Father's First Thousand Years," *CH* 31 (1962): 421–29. Lincicum does not cite this article.

<sup>15</sup> Although binding titles varied, they had to be "correct": "It remains to urge that particular attention be paid to the lettering of books being their right titles, as the contrary will present to the judicious an effect the most disagreeable, and may be the cause of producing dissatisfaction with the whole of the binding in the mind of the owner" (James Bartram Nicholson, *A Manual of the Art of Bookbinding: Containing Full Instructions in the Different Branches of Forwarding, Gilding, and Finishing* [Philadelphia: Henry Carey Baird & Co., 1878], 197). Binding was in some demand, since libraries received many books in quires; cf. I. G. Philip, "Letter from Thomas Hyde, Bodley's librarian, 1665–1701," *The Bodleian Library Record* 3 (1950–51), 40–5. On spine-titles: "The idea was well established, but not universal, by the turn of the eighteenth century; it is not unusual to find a spine of 1700 with no title label, but much more unusual to find this on a middling quality or upmarket binding of 1720. Lettering directly on the spine quickly gave way to separate labels as the standard practice (Graham Pollard, *Changes in the Style of Bookbinding: 1550–1830* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1956], 107).

<sup>16</sup> Problems for Lincicum's earliest binding date of Cotelier's volume are David Pearson's three observations: (1) "As a general rule, it is safe to assume that any English binding made before 1660 which carries a tooled leather spine label will have had the label added some time after the original date of binding. Dating labels themselves relied principally on contemporary typographic conventions" (David Pearson, *English Bookbinding Styles 1450–1800* [London: British Library; New Castle, DE: Oak Knoll, 2005], 105–11, here: 111). (2) "The idea [of title labels] was well established, but not universal, by the turn of the eighteenth century; it is not unusual to find a spine of 1700 with no title label, but much more unusual to find this on a middling quality or upmarket binding of 1720" (107); and (3) "Much spine labeling work has been carried out retrospectively in both institutional and private collections, and spine labels are not necessarily contemporary with the bindings to which they are attached" (107). Concerning the impermanent quality of spine labels: "In Durham Cathedral Library, in 1691, a binder was paid 6d. apiece 'for titling of 167 folios in Turkey leather and gold letters,' which meant working through the existing Library collection and applying the new style of spine labeling" (Pearson, *English Bookbinding Styles 1450–1800*, 107).