



Theses and Dissertations

2015-03-01

Reevaluating the New Testament Text of Didymus the Blind: An Examination of the New Testament References in P. BYU 1

Michael Robert Trotter
Brigham Young University - Provo

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Classics Commons](#), and the [Comparative Literature Commons](#)

BYU ScholarsArchive Citation

Trotter, Michael Robert, "Reevaluating the New Testament Text of Didymus the Blind: An Examination of the New Testament References in P. BYU 1" (2015). *Theses and Dissertations*. 5853.
<https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd/5853>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact scholarsarchive@byu.edu, ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.

Reevaluating the New Testament Text of Didymus the Blind:

An Examination of the New Testament

References in P. BYU 1

Michael R. Trotter

A thesis submitted to the faculty of
Brigham Young University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Michael Pope, Chair
Stephen Bay
Lincoln Blumell

Department of Comparative Arts & Letters

Brigham Young University

March 2015

Copyright © 2015 Michael R. Trotter

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

Reevaluating the New Testament Text of Didymus the Blind: An Examination of the New Testament References in P. BYU 1

Michael R. Trotter
Department of Comparative Arts & Letters, BYU
Master of Arts

In 1941 a large cache of papyri preserving the writings of Origen and Didymus the Blind were discovered in Tura, Egypt. 43 years later 22 signatures from the Tura papyri containing Ps. 26:10–29:2, 36:1–3 from Didymus the Blinds' commentary on Psalms were acquired by Brigham Young University. These signatures remain unpublished at present. This paper examines Didymus' use of the New Testament in this hitherto unpublished section of his commentary and seeks to reevaluate past scholarship on the New Testament text of Didymus in light of this new data. In addition to providing an inventory of all the New Testament references and significant textual variants used by Didymus in this section of his commentary, this paper will also analyze the consistency, or lack thereof, with which Didymus referenced the New Testament throughout his five Tura commentaries. This analysis will show that previous conclusions on the New Testament text of Didymus the Blind need to be reevaluated in a manner that takes into account the significant lack of consistency with which he referenced the New Testament in his classroom lectures as opposed to his published works that were intended for circulation.

Keywords: Didymus the Blind, textual criticism, patristic, classroom, Tura

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
Overview of the Life and Works of Didymus the Blind.....	4
P. BYU 1 and the Tura Papyri	5
Previous Scholarship on the New Testament Text of Didymus the Blind	7
The Nature of the New Testament References in P. BYU 1	9
The New Testament Text in P. BYU 1	13
Potential Applications of the New Testament References in P. BYU 1	35
The Consistency of Didymus the Blind in P. BYU 1	36
Conclusions.....	40
Bibliography	43

ABBREVIATIONS

- EcclT *Didymos der Blinde, Kommentar zum Ecclesiastes (Tura-Papyrus). Teil I.1: Kommentar zu Eccl. Kap. 1,1 – 2,14.* Ed. G. Binder and L. Liesenborghs. Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen XXV. Bonn, 1979.
- Didymos der Blinde, Kommentar zum Ecclesiastes (Tura-Papyrus). Teil II: Kommentar zu Eccl. Kap. 3 – 4,12.* Ed. M. Gronewald. Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen XXII. Bonn, 1977.
- Didymos der Blinde, Kommentar zum Ecclesiastes (Tura-Papyrus). Teil III: Kommentar zu Eccl. Kap. 5 und 6.* Ed. J. Kramer. Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen XIII. Bonn, 1970.
- Didymos der Blinde, Kommentar zum Ecclesiastes (Tura-Papyrus). Teil IV: Kommentar zu Eccl. Kap. 7 – 8,8.* Ed. J. Kramer and B. Krebber. Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen XVI. Bonn, 1972.
- Didymos der Blinde, Kommentar zum Ecclesiastes (Tura-Papyrus). Teil V: Kommentar zu Eccl. Kap. 9,8 – 10,20.* Eds. G. Binder and M. Gronewald. Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen XXIV. Bonn, 1979.
- Didymos der Blinde, Kommentar zum Ecclesiastes (Tura-Papyrus). Teil VI: Kommentar zu Eccl. Kap. 11 – 12.* Eds. G. Binder and L. Liesenborghs. Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen IX. Bonn, 1969.
- GenT *Sur la Genèse (Tome I). Texte inédit d'après un papyrus de Toura: Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes.* Par P. Nautin. Sources chrétiennes No. 233. Paris, 1976.
- Sur la Genèse (Tome II). Texte inédit d'après un papyrus de Toura: Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes.* Par P. Nautin. Sources chrétiennes No. 244. Paris, 1978.
- IobT *Didymos der Blinde, Kommentar zu Hiob (Tura-Papyrus). Teil I: Kommentar zu Hiob Kap. 1 – 4.* Ed. A. Henrichs. Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen I. Bonn, 1968.
- Didymos der Blinde, Kommentar zu Hiob (Tura-Papyrus). Teil II: Kommentar zu Hiob Kap. 5,1 – 6,29.* Ed. A. Henrichs. 1968. Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen II. Bonn, 1968.
- Didymos der Blinde, Kommentar zu Hiob (Tura-Papyrus). Teil III: Kommentar zu Hiob Kap. 7, 20c – 11.* Eds. U. Hagedorn, D. Hagedorn, L. Koenen. Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen III. Bonn, 1968.

Didymos der Blinde, Kommentar zu Hiob (Tura-Papyrus). Teil IV.1: Kommentar zu Hiob Kap. 12,1 – 16,8a. Eds. U. Hagedorn, D. Hagedorn and L. Koenen. Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen XXXIII.1. Bonn, 1968.

NA²⁸

Novum Testamentum Graece, Nestle-Aland, 28th ed.

PsT

Didymos Der Blinde: Psalmenkommentar (Tura-Papyrus). Teil I: Kommentar zu Psalm 20 – 21. Ed. M. Gronewald. Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen VII. Bonn, 1969.

Didymos Der Blinde: Psalmenkommentar (Tura-Papyrus). Teil II: Kommentar zu Psalm 22 – 26,10. Ed. M. Gronewald. Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen IV. Bonn, 1968.

Didymos Der Blinde: Psalmenkommentar (Tura-Papyrus). Teil III: Kommentar zu Psalm 29 – 34. Ed. M. Gronewald. Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen VIII. Bonn, 1969.

Didymos Der Blinde: Psalmenkommentar (Tura-Papyrus). Teil IV: Kommentar zu Psalm 35 – 39. Ed. M. Gronewald. Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen VI. Bonn, 1969.

Didymos Der Blinde: Psalmenkommentar (Tura-Papyrus). Teil V: Kommentar zu Psalm 40 – 44,4. Ed. M. Gronewald. Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen XII. Bonn, 1970.

ZecT

Sur Zacharie (Tome I). Texte inédit d'après un papyrus de Toura: Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes. Par L. Doutreleau. Sources chrétiennes No. 83. Paris, 1962.

Sur Zacharie (Tome II). Texte inédit d'après un papyrus de Toura: Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes. Par L. Doutreleau. Sources chrétiennes No. 84. Paris, 1962.

Sur Zacharie (Tome III). Texte inédit d'après un papyrus de Toura: Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes. Par L. Doutreleau. Sources chrétiennes No. 85. Paris, 1962.

Introduction

The writings of Didymus the Blind have long been a subject of interest in the field of New Testament textual criticism. Didymus was an influential teacher at a pivotal time in Alexandrian Christianity. The general persecutions under Diocletian had ended, Christianity was enjoying newfound political acceptance, and manuscripts of the New Testament were being produced at an unprecedented rate.¹ It is because of his place within the larger historical context of this era that Didymus' writings are important to New Testament textual criticism. Because he quoted the New Testament text at Alexandria when some of our most important Alexandrian New Testament manuscripts were being produced, Didymus' references to the New Testament are of particular significance for understanding the development of the Alexandrian New Testament textual tradition in the fourth century.²

Although the scriptural references found in the writings of patristic authors, like Didymus the Blind, have commonly been acknowledged as beneficial to New Testament Textual criticism, it is often difficult to gauge the value of the contributions that patristic writings bring to this discipline. While there is little disputation over the value of patristic scriptural references in confirming previously established readings contained in seemingly more important biblical manuscripts or the importance of such references in establishing the history of a textual tradition in a particular place and time, the tendency of patristic writings to preserve unique scriptural readings, and our inability to effectively explain the emergence of these readings, has left textual

¹ Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland, *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism* (2d ed.; Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1995), 65.

² Bart Ehrman, *Didymus the Blind and the Text of the Gospels* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 19.

critics hesitant to rely on the scriptural references contained in patristic texts for anything except matters of “tertiary importance.”³

Because of our inadequacy to account for these unique scriptural variants, they are often overlooked or even deliberately omitted in patristic scholarship. For example, when examining the New Testament text of Didymus the Blind, Kevin MacDonald expounded on the value of analyzing the unique New Testament variants in patristic authors, nevertheless, he included a footnote at the end of that exposition which stated that he decided to omit an analysis of every unique textual variant in Didymus’ writings due to “extrinsic limitations.”⁴ My point here is not to diminish MacDonald’s work nor the limitations under which he labored, but rather to highlight how detailed analyses of variant readings that are unique to a patristic author sometimes suffer from neglect in scholarship.

Even when unique variant readings are examined, they are often simply identified and listed and subsequently set aside having been deemed as possessing no significant value for New Testament textual criticism. Such was the case in Bart Ehrman’s analysis of the gospel passages in the writings of Didymus the Blind. After identifying every reference Didymus made to the gospels in the Tura writings available at the time, Ehrman finished his study by performing a comprehensive analysis that used only those references that supported one side or another in any previously established instances of “genetically significant variation” among the more important biblical manuscripts, while “other differences between Didymus and the representative witnesses are not listed.”⁵

³ Gordon Fee, “The Use of Patristic Citations in NT Textual Criticism: The State of the Question,” *ANRW* 26.1 (1992): 247.

⁴ Kevin MacDonald, “The Text of Paul in the Writings of Didymus of Alexandria” (M.A. diss., McGill University, 2005), 8.

⁵ Ehrman, *Didymus the Blind and the Text of the Gospels*, 32.

I do not mean to imply that Ehrman and MacDonald should have used Didymus' unique readings of New Testament passages as part of the data included in their comprehensive profile analyses of the New Testament references in Didymus' writings, since their shared goal was to determine to which previously established textual tradition was most similar to the New Testament references used by Didymus. Such an exercise would prove pointless for this purpose since the unique readings would necessarily not match any New Testament textual tradition. However, it is clear that both Ehrman and MacDonald operated under the assumption that the New Testament references in Didymus' commentary on the Psalms and those in his commentaries on Genesis, Job, Ecclesiastes, and Zechariah reflect the text of his New Testament manuscript with *equal* accuracy and one commentary does not preserve more accurate readings of Didymus' New Testament manuscript than another. While the unique readings may not be directly beneficial in determining the textual tradition of Didymus' New Testament manuscript, a thorough analysis of both the unique and non-unique New Testament references in his writings can help in evaluating whether or not the scriptural references in *all* of Didymus' Tura works are equally representative of his New Testament text, which in turn can determine if any of his works are not useful, or less useful than others, for determining the textual tradition of his New Testament manuscript.

In an effort to better understand the nature of the available evidence for determining the textual tradition of Didymus' New Testament text, I propose to analyze all of the New Testament references in P. BYU 1, the as-yet-unpublished portion of the Didymean Tura papyri containing a transcription of Didymus' lecture on Ps. 26:10–29:2 and 36:1–3. This examination will have three significant outcomes: (1) it will make a list of every reference to the New Testament in this unpublished portion of Didymus' commentary on the Psalms available for future scholarship as

well as provide additional evidence that will allow for a more complete textual critical analysis of his New Testament text; (2) the additional New Testament references found in P. BYU 1 will make it possible to suggest additions and, if need be, corrections to the critical apparatus of NA²⁸; (3) since P. BYU 1 preserves a significant portion of one of Didymus' *lectures* (as opposed to his works that were intended for widespread publication), there is now sufficient evidence to examine Didymus' New Testament references based on the context in which each of his works were composed, and thereby reevaluate what each work can, or more importantly cannot, reveal about the New Testament text of Didymus. These outcomes will enable future scholarship on Didymus the Blind to be conducted with a new level of accuracy.

Overview of the Life and Works of Didymus the Blind

Didymus the Blind (c. 313–398) was an immensely influential Christian teacher at Alexandria whose career spanned the better part of the fourth century. Rufinus of Aquileia, a disciple of Didymus, informs us that the Alexandrian teacher lost his eyesight as a young boy (Rufinus of Aquileia, *Eccl. Hist.*, 11.7). However, notwithstanding this limitation, Didymus devoted himself to intense religious and secular study. It is clear from Didymus' works that he had extensive training in rhetoric and the philosophy, and although his philosophic ideas were typically unoriginal regurgitations of Philo of Alexandria and Origen, Rufinus asserted that “he was well trained in the other disciplines, whether of dialectic or geometry, astronomy, and arithmetic, that no philosopher could ever defeat or reduce him to silence” (Rufinus of Aquileia, *Eccl. Hist.*, 11.7).⁶

⁶ Translation taken from *The Church History of Rufinus of Aquileia: Books 10 and 11* (trans. Philip R. Amidon, S.J.; New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 69.

Although Didymus was skilled in secular thought, he rose to prominence on account of his exposition of his brand of Christian theology. It appears that Didymus caught the attention of the Alexandrian Bishop Athanasius at the pivotal time when Orthodox Christianity was wading through a sea of perceived heretical doctrines (Rufinius of Aquileia, *Eccl. Hist.*, 11.7), and the blind teacher eventually seems to have been appointed as the head of a catechetical school at Alexandria.⁷

As a teacher Didymus was heavily influenced by Origen and Philo, and he quickly gained a reputation as a champion of orthodoxy, even meriting visits from esteemed Christian figures such as Antony (Rufinus, *Eccl. Hist.*, 1.7; cf. Jerome, *Ep.* 68.2). Didymus continued to be an influential figure in Alexandrian Christianity until his death in c. 398.

Didymus' writings were well regarded after his death until the reign of Justinian when some of his teachings, particularly his insistence of a bodiless resurrection and the pre-mortal existence of the soul, began to be criticized as "Origenism."⁸ Questions continued to be raised about Didymus' theology until his works were formally anathematized just prior to the second council of Constantinople, significantly stifling the influence of Didymus' teachings in mainstream Christianity.

P. BYU 1 and the Tura Papyri

Because of Didymus' anathematization under Justinian, his only works that survived after the sixth century were revised so that they better conformed to the teachings of the orthodox church. This orthodox revision resulted in Didymus' teachings being passed down in a

⁷ For more on the relationship between Didymus and Athanasius, as well as the existence of a catechetical school at Alexandria see Richard Layton, *Didymus the Blind and His Circle in Late-Antique Alexandria* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2004), 15–18.

⁸ Layton, *Didymus the Blind and His Circle*, 1, 166.

fragmented state for well over a millennium. As Layton explains, “This censorship effectively veiled the aims and purpose of [Didymus] . . . until the discovery and publication of the corpus of texts . . . known as the Tura papyri.”⁹

The situation changed in 1941 when the British military began to establish a greater presence in Egypt to assist in the North African campaign of World War II. While completing their assignment of clearing out the caves of a decommissioned limestone quarry in Tura, Egypt, a group of British military workers came across a large number of papyri preserving eight sizable manuscripts containing some writings by Origen and Didymus the Blind, which included five commentaries from Didymus that had not been altered to better conform to orthodox teachings. Suspecting that they might have found something valuable, the military workers dismantled and divided the papyri among themselves presumably to be sold on the black market. In this way the Tura papyri disappeared once again, until portions of them began turning up in universities in the United States and Europe.¹⁰ In 1984 Brigham Young University acquired one quire consisting of 20 codex pages from Didymus’ commentary on the Psalms which had remained in the attic of one of the military worker’s relatives since 1959. BYU added this quire to two other codex pages from the same work that they had acquired the previous year, forming what has come to be known as P. BYU 1.¹¹ Since its acquisition in 1984, P. BYU 1 has remained in the special collections of the Harold B. Lee Library at BYU, and after a prolonged delay now nears publication.

⁹ Layton, *Didymus the Blind and His Circle*, 1.

¹⁰ For more on the history of the Tura papyri see Layton, *Didymus the Blind and His Circle*, 1–4; cf. Dave Nielsen, “The History, Provenance, and Importance of BYU’s Didymus Papyri,” n.p. [cited 16 May 2014]. Online: <http://hdl.lib.byu.edu/1877/1224>.

¹¹ For more on the history and provenance of P. BYU 1 see Dave Nielsen, “The History, Provenance, and Importance of BYU’s Didymus Papyri,” n.p. [cited 16 May 2014]. Online: <http://hdl.lib.byu.edu/1877/1224>.

Previous Scholarship on the New Testament Text of Didymus the Blind

The first studies on the New Testament text of Didymus the Blind were performed by Wilhelm Linss and Carlo Martini in 1955 and 1978 respectively;¹² however, neither of these works was widely accepted by the academic community because the methodologies employed by both were not able to adequately analyze Didymus' New Testament text. It was not until Ehrman's 1986 doctoral dissertation, *Didymus the Blind and the Text of the Gospels*, that a study on the New Testament text of Didymus met with widespread approval. As there was some concern over the authenticity of some works attributed to Didymus at the time, such as *On the Trinity*, Ehrman's study focused on the references to the gospels found in the Didymean works that have been recovered from Tura,¹³ namely, portions of Didymus' commentaries on Genesis, Job, Psalms, Ecclesiastes, and Zechariah.¹⁴ In his dissertation Ehrman used what has been termed the "comprehensive profile method," which entails a quantitative analysis of the textually significant gospel references of Didymus as well as the incorporation of both inter-group and intra-group profiles. The quantitative analysis is designed to calculate the "proportional agreements" of a New Testament witness with "carefully selected textual representatives" by tabulating the percentage of agreement between the New Testament witness and the textual representatives in every unit of genetically significant variation.¹⁵ Ehrman then supplemented the quantitative analysis by performing a comprehensive group profile analysis, which compares a

¹² Wilhelm Cahill Linss, "The Four Gospel Text of Didymus" (PhD diss., Boston University, 1955); Carlo M. Martini, "Is There a Late Alexandrian Text of the Gospels?" *NTS* 24 (1977–78): 285–96.

¹³ Ehrman, *Didymus the Blind and the Text of the Gospels*, 23.

¹⁴ Over the decades scholars have disputed at length about whether or not *On the Trinity* is an authentic work of Didymus. Although when Ehrman wrote his dissertation, *On the Trinity* was commonly thought to be of dubious authenticity. More recent scholarship has swung away from this belief and *On the Trinity* is currently considered to be an authentic work of Didymus; cf. John Behr, ed., *Works on the Holy Spirit: Athanasius and Didymus* (trans. Mark DelCogliano, Andrew Radde-Gallwitz, and Lewis Ayres; in *Popular Patristics Series* vol. 43; ed. John Behr; Yonkers, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2011), 34. Notwithstanding the current view regarding the authenticity of *On the Trinity*, this paper will only focus on Didymus' works from the Tura papyri because the findings of this paper will be most significant in the context of previous Didymean scholarship, scholarship which has only analyzed Didymus' writings contained in the Tura papyri.

¹⁵ Ehrman, *Didymus the Blind and the Text of the Gospels*, 188–90.

New Testament witness' readings to readings preserved by the New Testament textual groups, specifically to readings "preserved extensively among members of a group and those unique to each of the groups."¹⁶ Based on his analysis, Ehrman concluded that Didymus' gospel manuscripts overwhelmingly represented the Alexandrian textual tradition, and more specifically they best represent "secondary Alexandrian witnesses," which Ehrman defines as an Alexandrian New Testament witness that exhibits "a relative contamination of the distinct Alexandrian text, without presupposing either the relative inferiority of this kind of text or its late date of origin."¹⁷ For his designation that Didymus' manuscripts represent secondary Alexandrian witnesses Ehrman relied primarily on his group profile analyses since the quantitative analysis actually designated Didymus' gospel manuscripts as primary Alexandrian witnesses by a narrow margin of 1.3%, a margin that showed that the quantitative analysis alone had difficulty discerning between Alexandrian sub-groups. Ehrman subsequently ignored the results of the quantitative analysis stating simply that the margin difference between was "negligible."¹⁸

The next important study on the New Testament text of Didymus was in 2005, when MacDonald extended the research on Didymus' New Testament usage by analyzing the Alexandrian teacher's references to the canonical Pauline epistles as part of his Master's thesis, "The Text of Paul in the Writings of Didymus of Alexandria." Like Ehrman, MacDonald confined his analysis to Didymus' works that were recovered from Tura, and he likewise employed the same general methodology, i.e. a quantitative textual analysis with inter- and intra-group profiles. MacDonald concluded that Didymus' manuscripts of the Pauline epistles were decidedly Alexandrian and best represented the "secondary Alexandrian tradition."¹⁹ However,

¹⁶ Ehrman, *Didymus the Blind and the Text of the Gospels*, 226.

¹⁷ Ehrman, *Didymus the Blind and the Text of the Gospels*, 263–67.

¹⁸ Ehrman, *Didymus the Blind and the Text of the Gospels*, 263.

¹⁹ MacDonald, "Text of Paul in the Writings of Didymus of Alexandria," 127.

in spite of this conclusion, he expresses some puzzlement regarding the unusually large amount of variation that exists between Didymus and the Alexandrian manuscripts, which ranged anywhere from approximately 84% agreement to 57% agreement.²⁰

Finally, the most recent work done on the New Testament references in the writings of Didymus the Blind is Mike Arcieri's doctoral dissertation entitled "The Text of Didymus the Blind in the Book of Acts, the Catholic Epistles, and the Apocalypse." Arcieri, like MacDonald before him, followed in the footsteps of Ehrman by using the same text sample (i.e. Didymus' writings contained in the Tura papyri) and the same methodology. In the end Arcieri concludes that Didymus' texts for Acts, the Catholic epistles, and Revelation are unequivocally of the Alexandrian tradition, although he does not attempt to further classify them into a primary or secondary subcategory.²¹

While Ehrman, MacDonald, and Arcieri greatly augmented our understanding of the New Testament texts used by Didymus, they were all forced to labor under a distinct disadvantage: they did not have access to the New Testament references that Didymus used in his commentary on Ps. 26:10–29:2 and 36:1–3.

The Nature of the New Testament References in P. BYU 1

The classification of New Testament references in patristic writings seems to be constantly evolving. In their analyses of the New Testament references in the writings of Didymus the Blind, Ehrman, MacDonald, and Arcieri adopted Gordon Fee's method of classification for New Testament references in patristic writings, a method which entails

²⁰ MacDonald, "Text of Paul in the Writings of Didymus of Alexandria," 133.

²¹ Mike Acieri, "The Text of Didymus the Blind in the Book of Acts, the Catholic Epistles, and the Apocalypse" (PhD diss., McGill University, 2007), 106.

categorizing each reference as a “citation,” “adaptation,” or “allusion.”²² In this system of classification a citation “consists of accurate quotations of the Biblical passage,”²³ adaptations are New Testament references “which have been significantly modified for one reason or another;”²⁴ and allusions are “scriptural reminiscences that have only a distant verbal correspondence to the text.”²⁵ More recently Carroll Osburn has sought to modify the inherent weaknesses of this classification system by adding two more categories: reminiscence, an “echo of the biblical text,” and locution, “use of biblical language in a more general way.”²⁶ However, this expansion has been criticized as being overly detailed, leading Arcieri to point out, “As valuable as these classifications might be, one questions whether or not they will make a real practical difference in the evaluation of patristic citations. For example, is there really *that* much difference between (at least, a practical difference) a ‘Reminiscence’ and a ‘Locution’?”²⁷ Because of the difficulties involved in classifying the New Testament references found in the writing of patristic authors, as well as the lack of scholarly consensus on the matter, this study has adopted the trenchant and straightforward system put forth by Malcolm Choat in his article “Echo and Quotation of the New Testament in Papyrus Letters to the End of the Fourth Century.” This system classifies New Testament references into “citations,” “quotations,” and “echoes.” Therefore, in this paper a citation is any reference “in which a biblical author or work

²² Ehrman, *Didymus the Blind and the Text of the Gospels*, 13; MacDonald, “Text of Paul in the Writings of Didymus of Alexandria,” 19–20; Acieri, “The Text of Didymus the Blind in the Book of Acts, the Catholic Epistles, and the Apocalypse,” 28–29 n. 73; cf. Gordon Fee, “The Text of John in the Jerusalem Bible: A Critique of the Use of Patristic Citations in New Testament Textual Criticism,” *JBL* 90 (1971): 163–73.

²³ Ehrman, *Didymus the Blind and the Text of the Gospels*, 13.

²⁴ Ehrman, *Didymus the Blind and the Text of the Gospels*, 14.

²⁵ Ehrman, *Didymus the Blind and the Text of the Gospels*, 14.

²⁶ Acieri, “The Text of Didymus the Blind in the Book of Acts, the Catholic Epistles, and the Apocalypse,” 28.

²⁷ Acieri, “The Text of Didymus the Blind in the Book of Acts, the Catholic Epistles, and the Apocalypse,” 28.

is specifically cited, or, more generally, where [terms such as] ‘the scriptures’ are invoked.”²⁸

Quotations are to be understood as “instances when it is demonstrable that the writer is actually quoting scripture, although without identifying it as such.”²⁹ Finally, an echo is a scripture reference that has a context that is “at all related to the purported biblical locus (including coming in a religious context).”³⁰

Of the 77 references to the New Testament in P. BYU 1, Didymus employs 28 citations, making up approximately 36% of his total New Testament references in this section of his commentary on the Psalms. These citations are all attributed either to a figure from the New Testament, such as Jesus or Paul, said to be taken from a specific book of the New Testament, or introduced generally by terms such as ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ (e.g. PsT 242.25–26). Moreover, Didymus’ citations vary in the degree to which they accurately preserve known New Testament textual traditions. For example, in PsT 120C.23–24 when Didymus cites John 1:23a, he renders it exactly as it appears in every known New Testament manuscript that contains this verse; however, in PST 126.26–28 when he cites the letter Paul wrote Φιλήμονι περὶ Ὀνησίμου he proceeds to give a detailed summary of Phlm. 1:13–14 that does not conform to any known textual tradition of these verses.

Besides the 28 citations of the New Testament in P. BYU 1, there are also 49 instances where Didymus attempts to quote the New Testament without giving a specific citation.

Didymus’ New Testament quotations make up approximately 64% of his total New Testament references in this portion of his commentary. When he quotes the New Testament without

²⁸ Malcolm Choat, “Echo and Quotation of the New Testament in Papyrus Letters to the End of the Fourth Century,” in *New Testament Manuscripts: Their Texts and Their World* (eds. Thomas J. Kraus and Tobias Nicklas; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 268.

²⁹ Choat, “Echo and Quotation of the New Testament in Papyrus Letters to the End of the Fourth Century,” 268.

³⁰ Choat, “Echo and Quotation of the New Testament in Papyrus Letters to the End of the Fourth Century,” 268.

specifically citing the passage, it appears that he typically expects his audience to recognize the reference as a scripture. For example, when commenting on Ps. 27:9b he attempts to explain that there are two different definitions of “forever.” He quotes Paul’s hypothetical vow to abstain from meat in 1 Cor. 8:13b in order to demonstrate the difference. He says, “The residents of Pelusium desiring exaltation only here, take [forever] to mean ‘their whole lives,’ as in ‘I will not eat meat forever;’ but others say it means ‘for eternity,’ the age befitting you, that eternal period” (οἱ δὲ Πηλουσιῶται ὧδε μόνον βουλόμενοι τὴν ἔπαρσιν ὅτι διὰ βίου ὡς τὸ οὐ φάγω κρεῖ[α]ς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, οἱ δὲ ἄλλοι λέγουσιν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τόν σοι οἰκειοῦντα αἰῶνα τὸν μακραιῶνα ἐκείνον). It is apparent here that Didymus assumed his audience knew the context behind 1 Cor. 8:13b otherwise he probably would have explained that Paul was referring to his temporal existence when he wrote this statement. Thus, even though Didymus did not specifically identify his New Testament quotations as scripture, the contexts of many of these quotations suggest that he believed his audience was sufficiently well versed in the New Testament to recognize when he was quoting it.

There are also quotations in Didymus’ writings which clearly preserve the idea of a New Testament scripture, but were deliberately referenced without preserving the exact wording of the passage. These types of quotations of the New Testament typically preserve readings that are unique to his writings, and they usually serve to convey the idea contained in the scripture being referenced while better accommodating the grammar and syntax of his commentary. For example, when referencing 1 Cor. 15:24b Didymus writes, *πᾶσα ἀρχὴ καὶ πᾶσα ἐξουσία καταργεῖται*, while all New Testament manuscripts preserving this passage read, *καταργήσῃ πᾶσαν ἀρχὴν καὶ πᾶσαν ἐξουσίαν*. Didymus changes *ἀρχὴν* and *ἐξουσίαν* from direct objects to subjects, and he also changes *καταργήσῃ* from an aorist active verb to a present passive verb.

While Paul's original reading emphasized that Jesus is the one who will abolish every principality and power, Didymus sought to emphasize the *time* when every principality and power will be abolished rather than the one who will do the abolishing. Emphasizing this time period was important for Didymus, because he was arguing that the psalmist was referring to this time when he wrote Ps. 28:10, which says, καὶ καθιέται κύριος βασιλεὺς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. As this example illustrates, some of Didymus' quotation of the New Testament tended to significantly alter the assumed original manuscript readings to better fit the grammar and syntax of his commentary without sacrificing the overall scriptural meaning.

The New Testament Text in P. BYU 1

In the following presentation of the New Testament references in P. BYU 1, each reference will be given in its entirety. For each reference listed the reading will be compared to the New Testament manuscript readings as found in NA²⁸ and its critical apparatus; any significant variation will be briefly discussed.

In cases where a reference has been significantly altered by Didymus to better accommodate the grammar and syntax of his commentary, the grammatical and syntactical context will be provided with the reference, and the reference itself will be italicized.

This study will also point out instances when Didymus referenced a scripture differently elsewhere in his Tura writings in order to better gauge the level of consistency with which he referenced the New Testament. In any instances where Didymus referenced one scripture in multiple ways, the differences from each reading will be noted, and it will be stated if any of these alternate readings conform to any New Testament manuscripts.

Matt. 3:9a–10a (PsT 121.9–10 [citation]):

μη δόξητε λέγειν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς πατέρα ἔχ[ομεν τ]ὸν Ἀβραάμ· ἦδη ἡ ἀξίνη πρὸς τὴν ῥίζαν.

Didymus' reading here differs from the text given in κ, B, C, D^s, W, Δ, f¹, and 700 in that it omits the particle δέ following ἦδη. When Didymus cites this scripture in PsT 121.7–8 he includes the δέ.

Matt. 3:11 (PsT 123.3 [citation]):

ἐγὼ βαπτίζω ἐν ὕδατι, ἐκεῖνος δὲ ἐν πν(εύματ)ι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί.

In this instance Didymus only quoted the first and last part of the verse. It should not be thought here that he either inadvertently omitted some portion of this verse or that he was quoting some variant form since the context of the citation demonstrates that he was only including select portions that were relevant to the immediate context of his commentary. Additionally, Didymus' use of ἐκεῖνος in place of αὐτὸς and his omission of ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει immediately before ἐν πνεύματι, both of which are not attested in any manuscript, suggest that Didymus was not attempting to quote the verse exactly.

Matt. 3:17b (PsT 120C.26 [citation]):

οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα.

Didymus' reading here conforms to the text in NA²⁸; however, D, a, and sy^{s,c} read σου εἶ instead of οὗτός ἐστιν.

Matt. 5:5 (PsT 114.6–7 [citation]):

μακάριοι γὰρ οἱ πραεῖς ὅτι αὐτοὶ κληρονομήσουσιν τὴν γῆν.

Didymus' reading here conforms to every known New Testament manuscript that contains this passage.

Matt. 5:16 (PsT 120B.16–17 [citation]):

λαμψάτω γὰρ τὸ φῶς ὑμῶν ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀν(θρώπ)ων ὅπως ἴδωσιν οἱ ἄν(θρωπ)οὶ τὰ ἔργα καὶ δοξάσωσιν τὸν π(ατέ)ρα τὸν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

In this reference Didymus inserts the particle γάρ, although this was most likely done simply to introduce the citation. In NA²⁸ ὑμῶν follows ὅπως ἴδωσιν as well as τὸν π(ατέ)ρα, and the adjective καλὰ precedes ἔργα; the omission of these words are unique to Didymus; although he will include καλὰ when he cites this verse in PsT 231.24–25.

Matt. 10:28b (PsT 242.26 [citation]):

φοβήθητε τὸν δυνά[μενο]ν ψυχὴν καὶ σῶμα ἀπολέσαι ἐν γεέννῃ.

Didymus' reading here is supported by B, D, N, W, Θ, *f*¹, 33, 892, and 1424, however, all other manuscripts include δὲ μάλλον after φοβήθητε.

Matt. 23:2a (PsT 125.21 [quotation]):

ἐπὶ τῆς καθέδρας Μωϋσεως ἐκάθισαν.

Didymus' ordering is attested by D, Θ, *f*¹³, *l* 844, and Ir^{lat}, although every other manuscript reads Μωϋσεως καθέδρας instead of καθέδρας Μωϋσεως.

Matt. 24:35a (PsT 242.31 [quotation]):

εἰ καὶ ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ π[α]ρ[ε]λεύσεται.

Didymus' reading here is attested in κ^c, B, D, L, 33, 892, and e. He quotes this scripture differently in PsT 337.8 and EcclT 340.20, 87, 23 (although in these instances he only changes the mood of the verb from an indicative to a subjunctive because he is quoting this scripture in subordinate clauses). It is also possible that Didymus quotes this scripture differently by using the plural verb παρελεύσονται in PsT 114.11–12, although it is equally possible that he simply

meant to quote Mark 13:31a or Luke 21:33a in this instance, since both Mark and Luke use the plural *παρελεύσονται* in place of the singular *παρελεύσεται*.

Mark 3:17b (PsT 120C.29 [quotation]):

υἱοὶ βροντῆς.

Didymus' reading here conforms to every known New Testament manuscript that contains this passage.

Luke 5:8b (PsT 124.26 [quotation]):

ἁμαρτωλός εἰμι.

Didymus' reading here conforms to every known New Testament manuscript that contains this passage.

Luke 10:19b (PsT 124.6–7 [quotation]):

ἐπάνω ὀφείων καὶ σκορπίων καὶ ἐπὶ πάσαν τὴν δύναμιν π[ερὶ] ἐχθρῶν.

Didymus' reading here conforms to every known New Testament manuscript that contains this passage.

Luke 16:16a (PsT 120D.27 [quotation]):

ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται μέχρις Ἰωάννου.

Didymus' reading is supported by \mathfrak{B}^{75} , \mathfrak{K} , B, L, $f^{1.13}$, 579, 892, 1241, and 2542. However, A, D, K, N, P, W, Γ, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 565, 700, 1424, and \mathfrak{M} have ἕως instead of μέχρις.

Luke 19:10b (PsT 128.17–18 [quotation]):

ὁ ταύτην τὴν βλάβην διορθούμενος σωτὴρ ἐλήλυθεν γὰρ ζητῆσαι καὶ σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός.

NA²⁸ reads ἦλθεν γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ζητῆσαι καὶ σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός. Didymus uses ἐλήλυθεν instead of ἦλθεν and omits ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. However, he references this scripture differently throughout his writings; he cites it as it appears here in PsT 267.18, 286.25; in IobT 355.20–21 it reads ζητῆσαι καὶ σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός ἐλήλυθεν; PsT 168.17 and ZecT 38.21–22 read ζητῆσαι καὶ σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός; ZecT 96.25 reads ἐληλυθότος ζητῆσαι καὶ σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός; and ZecT 220.9–10 reads ἦλθεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ζητῆσαι καὶ σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός.

Luke 20:38a (PsT 114.2 [citation]):

ὁ θεός οὐκ ἔστιν νεκρῶν ἀλλὰ ζώντων.

In this citation Didymus includes the article ὁ before θεός. The inclusion of ὁ is only found in W, Θ, and 124, while every other manuscript lacks the article.³¹

John 1:22a (PsT 120C.22–23 [citation]):

ποιᾶν ἀπόκρισιν, φησίν, δώμεν τοῖς πέμψασιν ἡμᾶς.

The New Testament manuscript evidence that contains this passage has τίς εἶ; ἵνα ἀπόκρισιν δώμεν τοῖς πέμψασιν ἡμᾶς. Didymus has slightly modified this verse by substituting τίς εἶ; ἵνα with ποιᾶν to better fit the context of his commentary.

John 1:23a (PsT 120C.23–24 [citation]):

ἐγὼ φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ.

Didymus' reading here conforms to every known New Testament manuscript that contains this passage.

³¹ Reuben J. Swanson, ed., *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Luke* (Pasadena, CA: William Carey International University Press, 1995), 346.

John 1:23a (PsT 120D.27 [citation]):

ἐγὼ φωνὴ βοῶντος.

Didymus' reading here conforms to every known New Testament manuscript that contains this passage.

John 1:25b (PsT 120C.23 [citation]):

εἰ μὴ ὁ χριστὸς μηδὲ ὁ προφήτης τίς εἶ;

All other New Testament manuscripts that contain this passage read τί οὖν βαπτίζεις εἰ σὺ οὐκ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς οὐδὲ Ἡλίας οὐδὲ ὁ προφήτης; Although Didymus has obviously reworked this verse to fit the context of his commentary, he clearly cites this as a conversation that John had while he was preaching.

John 2:19a (PsT 116.23 [citation]):

λύσατε τὸν ναὸν το[ῦτ]ον.

Didymus' reading here conforms to every known New Testament manuscript that contains this passage.

John 5:23a (PsT 120B.9 [quotation³²]):

καὶ τὸ ἓν θεολογία, οὕτω *τειμᾶν τὸν υἱὸν ὡς τιμᾶ τὸν π(ατέ)ρα* τιμῶμεν τὸν π(ατέ)ρα.

In every other New Testament manuscript containing this verse it reads τιμῶσιν τὸν υἱὸν καθὼς τιμῶσιν τὸν πατέρα. It seems as though Didymus was not attempting to preserve a word-for-word representation of this passage, yet it is very likely that he had John 5:23 in mind here.

³² I have tentatively classified this reference as a quotation instead of a citation because the context of the reference is ambiguous in regards to who originally said it and from what work the reference was taken. Didymus does say that this reference encompasses “the one theology” (τὸ ἓν θεολογία), however, because he also discusses elements of the Nicene Creed immediately following this reference, it is unclear if “the one theology” refers to the New Testament or to the Nicene Creed.

John 8:52 (PsT 114.3 [quotation]):

Ἄβραάμ γὰρ ἀπέθανεν καὶ οἱ προφήται.

The particle γάρ is included merely to introduce the quotation; otherwise Didymus' reading here conforms to every known New Testament manuscript that contains this passage.

John 14:23 (PsT 128.23–24 [citation]):

καὶ πάλιν ὁ σωτὴρ λέγει ὅτι *ἐάν τις ἀγαπᾷ με, τὸν λόγον τὸν ἐμὸν τηρήσει καὶ ἐλευσόμεθα παρ' αὐτῷ ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατήρ, καὶ μονὴν παρ' αὐτῷ ποιήσομεν.*

NA²⁸ reads: ἐάν τις ἀγαπᾷ με τὸν λόγον μου τηρήσει, καὶ ὁ πατήρ μου ἀγαπήσει αὐτόν, καὶ πρὸς αὐτόν ἐλευσόμεθα καὶ μονὴν παρ' αὐτῷ ποιησόμεθα. Didymus uses τὸν ἐμὸν instead of μου, a variant that is otherwise unattested in the manuscript evidence. He also omits καὶ ὁ πατήρ μου ἀγαπήσει αὐτόν. Didymus has ἐλευσόμεθα παρ' αὐτῷ ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατήρ instead of καὶ πρὸς αὐτόν ἐλευσόμεθα, another reading otherwise unattested in the manuscript evidence. In addition, he uses the word ποιήσομεν in place of ποιησόμεθα, although ποιήσομεν is attested in A, K, Γ, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 700, 892^s, 1241, 1424, l 844, and ℣. Didymus does not quote this scripture consistently throughout his writings; in ZecT 16.30–33 it reads: ἐάν τις ἀγαπᾷ με, τὸν λόγον τὸν ἐμὸν τηρήσει, καὶ ἐγὼ ἀγαπήσω αὐτόν, καὶ ἐλευσόμεθα καὶ ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατήρ μου καὶ μονὴν παρ' αὐτῷ ποιησόμεθα (this reading is unique to Didymus); in ZecT 166.14–16 it reads: ἐάν τις ἀγαπᾷ με, τὸν λόγον τὸν ἐμὸν τηρήσει, καὶ ὁ Πατήρ μου ἀγαπήσει αὐτόν, καὶ ἐλευσόμεθα, ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ Πατήρ μου, καὶ μονὴν παρ' αὐτῷ ποιησόμεθα (this reading is also unique to Didymus).

John 14:23b (PsT 116.20–21 [quotation]):

καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἀγαπῶντα αὐτοὺς Ἰ(ησοῦ)ν ἔρχονται καὶ μονὴν παρὰ τῷ πατρὶ ποιεῖται.

NA²⁸ reads: ἐάν τις ἀγαπᾷ με τὸν λόγον μου τηρήσει, καὶ ὁ πατήρ μου ἀγαπήσει αὐτόν, καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐλευσόμεθα καὶ μονὴν παρ’ αὐτῷ ποιησόμεθα. Although Didymus makes no attempt to accurately quote John 14:23 since his reference is in indirect discourse and he omits several words, he seems to be alluding to this scripture. John 14:23 and Didymus both describe Jesus loving others by using a form of ἀγαπάω, and both express the idea of making an abode with the Father by using the word μονήν and a form of ποιέω.³³

Matt. 3:3b, Mark 1:3a, Luke 3:4b, or John 1:23a (PsT 123.14 [citation]):

φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ.

Didymus’ reading here conforms to every known New Testament manuscript that contains this passage.

Matt. 3:7b or Luke 3:7b (PsT 120D.20–21 [citation]):

γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν, τίς ὑμῖν ὑπέδειξεν φυγεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς μελλούσης ὀργῆς.

NA²⁸ has τίς ὑπέδειξεν ὑμῖν φυγεῖν instead of τίς ὑμῖν ὑπέδειξεν φυγεῖν. Interestingly,

Didymus’ placement of ὑμῖν is attested in Luke 3:7b of A and D.³⁴

Matt. 3:7b or Luke 3:7b (PsT 124.9 [citation]):

γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν.

Didymus’ reading here conforms to every known New Testament manuscript that contains this passage.

Matt. 3:10 or Luke 3:9 (PsT 121.7–8 [citation]):

³³ See the preceding description of Didymus’ reference to John 14:23 in PsT 128.23–24 for information on Didymus’ inconsistency in referencing this passage.

³⁴ Swanson, *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Luke*, 48.

ἤδη δὲ ἡ ἀξίνη πρὸς τὴν ρίζαν τῶν δένδρων κεῖται. πᾶν δένδρον μὴ ποιῶν καλὸν καρπὸν ἐκκόπτεται καὶ εἰς πῦρ βάλλεται.

Didymus' reading differs from the reading given in \aleph , B, C, D^s, W, Δ , f^1 , and 700 in that he omits the οὖν between πᾶν and δένδρον, and he also reverses the order of καρπὸν καλὸν. When Didymus references this scripture in ZecT 79.24–26 his reading matches the one given in \aleph , B, C, D^s, W, Δ , f^1 , and 700 exactly.

Matt. 3:10a or Luke 3:9a (PsT 124.11 [citation]):

ἤδη ἡ ἀξίνη πρὸς τὴν ρίζαν τῶν δένδρων κεῖται.

Didymus' reading here differs from the text in \aleph , B, C, D^s, W, Δ , f^1 , and 700 in that it omits the particle δὲ following ἤδη. When Didymus cites this scripture in PsT 121.7–8 he includes the δὲ.

Matt. 3:12b or Luke 3:17b (PsT 120D.13–14 [quotation]):

τὸν μὲν σίτον εἰσάγει εἰς τὴν ἀποθήκην, τὸ δὲ ἄχυρον παραδίδωσιν πυρὶ ἀσβέστω.

Matt. 3:12b in NA²⁸ reads τὸν μὲν σίτον αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν ἀποθήκην, τὸ δὲ ἄχυρον κατακαύσει πυρὶ ἀσβέστω, while Luke 3:17b reads τὸν σίτον εἰς τὴν ἀποθήκην αὐτοῦ, τὸ δὲ ἄχυρον κατακαύσει πυρὶ ἀσβέστω. Didymus is the only author to use εἰσάγει, although he omits this word when he quotes this verse in IobT 157.5–6. He also omits αὐτοῦ, although this omission in Matthew is attested in 788* and 788^c, and in Luke the omission is attested in D. He also uses παραδίδωσιν instead of κατακαύσει, a variant otherwise unattested in any New Testament manuscript.

Interestingly, when Didymus quotes this verse in IobT 157.5–6 he uses κατακαύσει.

Matt. 4:10b or Luke 4:8b (PsT 120C.16 [quotation]):

κύριον τὸν θεόν σου προσκυνήσεις καὶ αὐτῷ μόνῳ λατρεύσεις.

Didymus' reading here conforms to every known New Testament manuscript that contains this

passage.

Matt. 23:37b or Luke 13:34b (PsT 126.25 [quotation]):

ποσάκις ἠθέλησα καὶ οὐκ ἠθελήσατε.

Here Didymus only includes the first and last part of either Matt. 23:37b or Luke 13:34b.

However, the portions of this scripture that Didymus quotes here are the same as the readings of these portions of Matt. 23:37b or Luke 13:34b in the manuscript evidence.

Matt. 24:35a, Mark 13:31a, or Luke 21:33a (PsT 114.11–12 [quotation]):

ὁ γὰρ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ παρελεύσονται.

Didymus adds the particle γὰρ to introduce the quotation. Additionally, in Matt. the verb is in the singular (παρελεύσεται) in κ^c , B, D, L although the plural is attested in κ^{2a} , K, W, Γ, Δ, Θ, *f*^{1.13}, 565, 579, 700, 1241, 1424, and \mathfrak{M} . In both Mark and Luke this verb is plural (παρελεύσονται) as Didymus renders it here. He renders this scripture differently elsewhere in his Tura writings; he uses the singular of παρέρχομαι in PsT 337.8 and EcclIT 340.20, 87, 23, while he uses the plural in the present instance and in ZecT 55.26–27 (although he changes the mood of the verb from an indicative to a subjunctive in PsT 337.8; EcclIT 340.20, 87 23; ZecT 55.26–27 where he references this scripture in subordinate clauses).

Acts 13:10 (PsT 113.13–14 [quotation]):

οὐ παύση διαστρέφων τὰς ὁδοὺς τοῦ θεοῦ τὰς εὐθείας.

Didymus' reading here is unique. \mathfrak{B}^{74} , κ^2 , A, C, D, E, L, Ψ, 33, 81, 323, 614, 945, 1175, 1241, 1505, 1739, and \mathfrak{M} read ὁδοὺς κυρίου instead of ὁδοὺς τοῦ θεοῦ, while κ^* and B have ὁδοὺς τοῦ κυρίου. Although the present reading is otherwise unattested, Didymus quotes this scripture with κυρίου (without the article τοῦ) elsewhere in his writings: PsT 233.7, EcclIT 336.2–3, and ZecT

82.18–19 read οὐ παύη διαστρέφων τὰς ὁδοὺς κυρίου τὰς εὐθείας; and ZecT 141.6–7 and ZecT 322.1 read οὐ παύση διαστρέφων τὰς ὁδοὺς κυρίου τὰς εὐθείας (although ZecT 141.6–7 preserves the itacism παύσει).

Rom. 2:24a (PsT 120B.29 [quotation]):

δι' ὑμᾶς τὸ ὄνομά μου βλασφημεῖται.

All other New Testament manuscripts that contain this passage read: τὸ γὰρ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ δι' ὑμᾶς βλασφημεῖται. It is possible that Didymus changed ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ to ὄνομά μου because he had Ezek. 26:22b in mind which has ὄνομά μου without τοῦ θεοῦ. However, all that can be said with any certainty is that Didymus preserved the idea contained in Rom. 2:24a without preserving the precise wording.

Rom. 7:14 (PsT 113.11 [quotation]):

ὁ νόμος πνευματικός ἐστιν.

Didymus' reading here conforms to every known New Testament manuscript that contains this passage.

Rom. 8:15b (PsT 122.5 [quotation]):

ὁ ὑπὲρ πάντας τοὺς υἱοὺς τοῦ θ(εο)ῦ τῷ ἐκείνους ἐκ πν(εύματος)ς υἰοθεσίας ἔχειν τὸ εἶναι υἱοί.

Didymus most likely was not intending to quote Rom. 8:15b exactly because he deliberately changed the case of πνεῦμα to the genitive so that it would better fit the syntax of his sentence; whereas every other New Testament manuscript that contains this passage reads πνεῦμα υἰοθεσίας.

Rom. 8:15b (PsT 127.2 [quotation]):

οἱ λόγον σοφίας ἔχοντες καὶ τὸ τῆς υἰοθεσίας πνεῦμα εἰληφότες υἰοὶ εἰσιν προσταττόμενοι ποιεῖν ἃ θεὸς διαγορεύει.

All other New Testament manuscripts that contain this passage read ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα υἰοθεσίας.

Didymus changed ἐλάβετε to the perfect passive participle εἰληφότες for syntactical purposes.

The phrase τὸ τῆς υἰοθεσίας πνεῦμα is not attested by any New Testament manuscript, although

Didymus also used the phrase in PsT 45.2 and ZecT 131.13.³⁵

Rom. 8:24b (PsT 114.18 [quotation]):

ἐλπὶς δὲ βλεπομένη οὐκ ἔστιν ἐλπίς.

Didymus' reading here conforms to every known New Testament manuscript that contains this passage.

Rom. 10:10a (PsT 117.20 [quotation]):

καρδία πιστεύεται εἰς δικαιοσύνην.

Every other New Testament manuscript that contains this passage includes the particle γάρ after καρδία. Didymus most likely omitted this particle in order to better accommodate the syntax of his passage.

Rom. 11:5b (PsT 123.20 [quotation]):

ἡ ἔρημος δὲ Κάδης δύναται εἶναι τὸ λείμμα τὸ κατ' ἐκλογὴν χάριτος μεῖναν.

Didymus slightly alters the passage by inserting the definite article τὸ after λείμμα, while the article is not attested in any New Testament manuscript that contains this passage. This addition was likely made so that the citation could be readily incorporated into the commentary. When he cites this verse later in PsT 123.25 and PsT 241.31–32, he does not include the definite article τό.

³⁵ Origen also used the phrase 4 times (*Commentary of John* [PG 14.533.G], [PG 14.652.B]; *On Prayer* [PG 11.468.B], [PG 11.484.B]), and Basil of Caesarea used it twice (*Against Eunomius* [PG 29.692.A], [PG 29.754.C]).

Didymus also changes the verb to *μεῖναν*, while the manuscript evidence has the verb *γένονεν*. However, when Didymus quotes this scripture in ZecT 175.16, he uses the verb *γένονεν* and does not include the article *τό*.

Rom. 11:5b (PsT 123.26 [quotation]):

τοῦτο νομίζεις ὅτι τὸ λείμμα κατ' ἐκλογὴν χάριτος μεῖναν.

Every New Testament manuscript that preserves this passage uses the verb *γένονεν* instead of *μεῖναν*. Didymus retains the use of *μεῖναν* when he quotes this verse in PsT 123.20, but he uses the verb *γένονεν* when he quotes this passage in ZecT 175.16.

Rom. 11:5b (PsT 241.31–32 [quotation]):

λείμμα κατ' ἐκλογὴν χάριτος.

Didymus' reading here conforms to every known New Testament manuscript that contains this passage.

Rom. 11:30a (PsT 242.7–8 [citation]):

ὥσπερ γὰρ ποτε ὑμεῖς ἠπειθήσατε τῷ θεῷ.

Didymus' word order of *ποτε ὑμεῖς* is unique; every known New Testament manuscript that contains this passage has *ὑμεῖς ποτε* instead (although \aleph^2 , D¹, L, Ψ, 33, 104, 630, 1175, 1241, 1505, and \aleph contain the reading *καὶ ὑμεῖς ποτε*).

Rom. 11:30b–32 (PsT 242.8–9 [citation]):

νῦν δὲ ἠλευθερώθητε τῇ τούτων ἀπειθείᾳ, οὕτω καὶ νῦν ἠπειθήσαν ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐλευθερωθῶσιν. συνέ[κλε]ισεν γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τοὺς πάντας εἰς ἀπειθειαν ἵνα τοὺς πάντας ἐλεήσει.

Didymus uses the verb ἠλευθερώθητε while every New Testament manuscript that contains this passage uses ἠλεήθητε. He also uses οὕτω instead of οὕτως and omits the word οὗτοι which all other manuscripts put between καὶ and νῦν. Likewise, Didymus also omits the phrase τῷ ὑμετέρῳ ἐλέει and uses the verb ἐλευθερωθῶσιν instead of ἐλεηθῶσιν. Didymus does retain τοὺς πάντας, the reading used by every manuscript except $\mathfrak{P}^{46\text{vid}}$ and D^* , which use τὰ πάντα instead. When he quotes this passage in PsT 206.36–207.4 he conforms to the reading given in every other manuscript (excluding $\mathfrak{P}^{46\text{vid}}$ and D^*) with the exception that he retains the unique use of ἠλευθερώθητε instead of ἠλεήθητε.

1 Cor. 3:9b (PsT 118.30 [citation]):

θ(εο)ῦ οἰκοδομὴ ἐστίν.

Every known New Testament manuscript that preserves this passage reads θεοῦ οἰκοδομὴ ἐστε. Although Didymus cited this reference as having come from the scriptures, he seems to have deliberately changed the verb to the third person singular ἐστίν so that it would better fit the context of the discourse.

1 Cor. 3:16a (PsT 116.16 [quotation]):

οὐκ οἶδατε ὅτι ναὸς θ(εο)ῦ ἔστε.

Didymus' reading here conforms to every known New Testament manuscript that contains this passage.

1 Cor. 3:17a (PsT 242.22–23 [quotation]):

εἴ τις τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θ(εο)ῦ φθείρει, φθερεῖ τοῦτον ὁ θ(εός).

Didymus' reading here is attested by \mathfrak{P}^{46} , κ , B, C, Ψ , 104, 365, 630, 1505, 1506, 1739, 1881, and \mathfrak{M} .

1 Cor. 4:8b (PsT 122.21–22 [citation]):

ὄφελόν γε καὶ ἐβασιλεύσατε, ἵνα καὶ ἡμεῖς ὑμῖν συνβασιλεύσωμεν.

Didymus' inclusion of καὶ following γε is unusual; however, this variant is attested in 1734.³⁶

When Didymus quotes this scripture in IobT 72.31–32 he omits the καὶ following γέ. Every manuscript that preserves this passage also uses the verb συμβασιλεύσωμεν instead of συνβασιλεύσωμεν, although this alteration was probably a scribal error that arose from the close similarity in the pronunciation of the two words, and therefore should not be considered a genuine variant.

1 Cor. 6:20b (PsT 120B.18–19 [citation]):

δοξάσατε τὸν θεὸν ἐν τῷ σώματι ὑμῶν.

The vast majority of the manuscript evidence includes the particle δή after δοξάσατε; however, its omission is attested in κ*, 2495, and d.

1 Cor. 7:9b (PsT 123.11 [citation]):

εἶπεν γὰρ ὁ Παῦλος τισιν· γαμεῖτε καὶ μὴ πυροῦσθαι.

Although Didymus cited Paul as the author of this reference, he has drastically altered this passage. While every New Testament manuscript that contains this passage uses γαμηῖσαι as the complimentary infinitive of κρεῖττον,³⁷ Didymus changed it to an imperative injunction omitting the κρεῖττον entirely.

1 Cor. 8:13b (PsT 120.10–11 [quotation]):

³⁶ Reuben J. Swanson, ed., *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: 1 Corinthians* (Pasadena, CA: William Carey International University Press, 2003), 50.

³⁷ κ*, A, C*, 33, 81, 945, and 1505 have γαμεῖν instead of γαμηῖσαι, but since they are both infinitives the point remains unchanged.

οἱ δὲ Πηλουσιῶται ὧδε μόνον βουλόμενοι τὴν ἔπαρσιν ὅτι διὰ βίου ὡς τὸ οὐ φάγω κρέ[α]ς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

NA²⁸ reads οὐ μὴ φάγω κρέα εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. Didymus differs from the manuscript evidence in that he omits μὴ; however, when he quotes this verse in PsT 80.7–8, 137.23 and IobT 77. 7–8 he includes the μὴ. Didymus' use of κρέας is attested in only in \mathfrak{P}^{46} , κ^* , 1505, 1611, and 2495,³⁸ but vast majority of manuscripts (e.g. B, κ^c , A, D, L, Ψ , 056, 1, 6, 33, 69, 88, 104, 131, 205, 209, 1646*) read κρέα instead. Interestingly, Didymus is inconsistent in his use of this word when he quotes 1 Cor. 8:13b elsewhere in his Tura writings; in PsT 80.7–8 and IobT 77.7–8 he uses κρέας, while he uses κρέα in PsT 137.23.

1 Cor. 10:31 (PsT 120B.19 [citation]):

εἴ τι ἐσθίετε, εἴ τι πίνετε, πάντα εἰς δόξαν θ(εο)ῦ ποιεῖτε.

NA²⁸ reads: εἴτε οὖν ἐσθίετε εἴτε πίνετε εἴτε τι ποιεῖτε, πάντα εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ ποιεῖτε. The reading of εἴ τι could be also taken as εἴτε, so it should not be considered a variant. It is unclear why Didymus omitted εἴτε τι ποιεῖτε; although this omission is attested in 1881 and C1 II 13.2;³⁹ there is a fair probability that the omission was the result of a scribal error, possibly homioteleuton, or that Didymus only intended it to be a loose rendition of the verse, since when quoting this passage in GenT 120.4–5 he agrees with the reading given in NA²⁸.

1 Cor. 15:24b (PsT 125.27–28 [quotation]):

πᾶσα ἀρχὴ καὶ πᾶσα ἐξουσία καταργεῖται.

³⁸ Swanson, *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: 1 Corinthians*, 50.

³⁹ Swanson, *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: 1 Corinthians*, 158.

Almost all New Testament manuscripts that contain this passage read καταργήση πᾶσαν ἀρχὴν καὶ πᾶσαν ἐξουσίαν.⁴⁰ Didymus clearly did not attempt a word-for-word quotation of this verse since he altered the passage considerably to better fit the syntax of his commentary.

1 Cor. 15:28b (PsT 120.30 [quotation]):

τότε ὁ θεὸς πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν γίνεται.

Didymus' reading here is attested by A, B, D*, 0234, 6, 33, 81, 1241, and 1739.

2 Cor. 6:16b (PsT 128.22–23 [citation]):

ἐνοικήσω ἐν αὐτοῖς.

Didymus' reading here conforms to every known New Testament manuscript that contains this passage.

2 Cor. 6:16b (PsT 241.34–242.1 [quotation]):

τότε δὲ θεὸς αὐτῶν εἶμι, ὅταν αὐτοὶ λαός μου ᾶσιν.

NA²⁸ reads ἔσομαι αὐτῶν θεὸς καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔσονται μου λαός. It is possible that this is a reference to 2 Cor. 6:16b; however, it is clear that it was not intended to be an exact quotation. Didymus changed both the verbs to the present tense, and the second verb changed from the indicative to the subjunctive mood because he added ὅταν in the middle of the verse.

2 Cor. 10:6a (PsT 124.5 [quotation]):

οἱ δυνάμενοι εἰπεῖν ἐτοίμως ἔχομεν ἐκδικῆσαι πᾶσαν παρακοήν, ἔλαφοί εἰσιν ἀναιροῦντες τοὺς ὄφεις τῆς κακίας.

⁴⁰ There are only a handful of manuscripts that offer alternative readings, and these differ significantly from Didymus' rendition of the scripture here: 365, 629, 1319, and 1573 omit the πᾶσαν that normally immediately precedes ἐξουσίαν; and 547 reads βασιλείαν instead of ἐξουσίαν (Swanson, *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: 1 Corinthians*, 251).

This reading is not attested in any New Testament manuscript; rather every manuscript that contains 2 Cor. 10:6a reads ἐν ἐτοίμῳ ἔχοντες ἐκδικῆσαι πᾶσαν παρακοήν. Didymus only conveyed the main idea of the scripture; however, it is obvious that he was referring to 2 Cor. 10:6a. He was somewhat inconsistent when he referenced this verse elsewhere in his works; in PsT 297.8 wherein the adverb ἐτοίμως is retained, but ἔχοντες is used instead of ἔχομεν.

2 Cor. 13:8 (PsT 113.25–26 [quotation]):

οὐ γὰρ δυνάμεθά τι κατὰ τῆς ἀληθείας, ἀλλὰ ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀληθείας.

Every New Testament manuscript that includes this passage reads: οὐ γὰρ δυνάμεθά τι κατὰ τῆς ἀληθείας ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀληθείας. It is clear that Didymus' omission of ἀληθείας ἀλλ' was accidental because he included these words when he cited 2 Cor. 13:8 earlier in his Psalms commentary (PsT 99.12). The reading as it stands here is most likely the result a scribal error since the sentence is incoherent without a noun to modify the first τῆς.

Eph. 2:12b (PsT 123.18–19 [quotation]):

δύναται ἔρημος συσσειομένη εἶναι ἢ κλησῖς τῶν ἐθνῶν ἢ ἐλπίδα μὴ ἔχουσα καὶ ἄθεος ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ.

All New Testament manuscripts that preserve this passage read: ἐλπίδα μὴ ἔχοντες καὶ ἄθεοι ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ. Didymus significantly altered this passage by adding the article ἢ before ἐλπίδα, changing ἔχοντες to ἔχουσα and ἄθεοι to the singular ἄθεος so that the passage would better fit the context of his commentary.

Eph. 5.8a (PsT 120B.13 [quotation]):

ἦτε γὰρ σκότος, νῦν δὲ φῶς ἐν κυρίῳ.

Every New Testament manuscript that contains this reading has ποτέ between γὰρ and σκότος which forms a contrast with νῦν, while Didymus omits ποτέ. Although Didymus quotes this scripture without variation in ZecT 105.25–26, he quotes it with the ποτέ before σκότος in IobT 334.15–16. He also references it as ἦτε γὰρ σκότος, νῦν δὲ ἐν φωτὶ κυρίου in IobT 24.5 (a reading which is unique to Didymus).

Phil. 4:13 (PsT 120D.23 [citation]):

πάντα ἰσχύω ἐν τῷ ἐνδυναμοῦντί με.

Didymus' reading here conforms to every known New Testament manuscript that contains this passage.

Col. 1:16a (PsT 118.12 [quotation]):

τὰ ἐν χ(ριστ)ῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ ὄρατὰ καὶ ἀόρατα.

The reading in NA²⁸ is ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, τὰ ὄρατὰ καὶ τὰ ἀόρατα. It is unclear why Didymus omitted the word πάντα, although its meaning could arguably be implied by the article τὰ. It seems probable that Didymus intend to render an exact quotation of Col. 1:16b here since he modified the word order and used ἐν χ(ριστ)ῷ instead of ἐν αὐτῷ; however when he quotes this passage in PsT 140.13–14 his reading matches the one given in NA²⁸.

2 Tim. 4:7–8a (PsT 241.7 [quotation]):

τὸν καλὸν ἀγῶνα ἠγώνισμαι, τὸν δρόμον τετέλεκα, τὴν πίστιν τετήρηκα· λοιπὸν ἀποκεῖται μοι [ὁ τῆς δι]καιοσύνης στέφανος.

D, K, L, P, Ψ, 365, 630, 1241, 1505, 1739, 1881, and ℣ have τὸν ἀγῶνα τὸν καλὸν instead of τὸν καλὸν ἀγῶνα. However, Didymus' reading is attested by κ, A, C, F, G, 33, 81, 104, 629, and

1175. Didymus references this scripture differently elsewhere in his commentary. He cites 2 Tim. 4:7a the same way he does here in EcclT 43.13; however, in ZecT 99.25–26 he writes τὸν καλὸν ἀγῶνα ἠγωνίσαστο, ἐτέλεσε τὸν δρόμον, and in ZecT 100.6–8 he writes τὸν καλὸν ἀγῶνα ἀγωνίσασθαι, τελέσαι τε τὸν δρόμον καὶ τηρῆσαι τὴν πίστιν.

Phlm. 1:13–14 (PsT 126.27–28 [citation]):

τοῦτο καὶ ὁ θεσπέσιος ἀπόστολος εἰδὼς γράφει Φιλήμονι περὶ Ὀνησίμου ὅτι ἠδυνάμην αὐτὸν κατέχειν παρ' ἐμαυτῶ, ἀλλὰ ἄνευ τῆς σῆς γνώμης οὐκ ἠθέλησα ἵνα μὴ τὸ ἀγαθόν σου ἀναγκαστὸν ἦ καὶ μὴ ἐκούσιον.

Every New Testament manuscript containing Phlm. 1:13–14 reads ὃν ἐγὼ ἐβουλόμην πρὸς ἐμαυτὸν κατέχειν, ἵνα ὑπὲρ σοῦ μοι διακονῆ ἐν τοῖς δεσμοῖς τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, χωρὶς δὲ τῆς σῆς γνώμης οὐδὲν ἠθέλησα ποιῆσαι, ἵνα μὴ ὡς κατὰ ἀνάγκην τὸ ἀγαθόν σου ἦ ἀλλὰ κατὰ ἐκούσιον. At best, this reference can only be regarded as a general summary of Phlm. 1:13–14 that touches on some of its essential features while omitting others. Although Didymus makes no attempt to preserve the wording of this scripture, he specifically cites this reference as coming from a letter Paul wrote Φιλήμονι περὶ Ὀνησίμου.

Heb. 2:14b (PsT 125.27 [quotation]):

τότε τὸ κράτος ἐ[χρ]ο]ντα τοῦ θανάτου καταλυθῆναι.

Didymus' use and placement of καταλυθῆναι is unattested in the manuscript evidence; every manuscript of the New Testament that preserves this passage instead has καταργήση and places it immediately before τὸ κράτος. However, when he quotes this scripture in PsT 41.16, his reading matches the manuscript rendition of this passage exactly.

Heb. 3:6a (PsT 127.30 [quotation]):

Χ(ριστὸ)ς δὲ ὡς υ(ιὸ)ς ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ· οὐ οἶκός ἐσμεν ἡμεῖς.

Didymus' reading is supported by \mathfrak{B}^{13} , κ , A, B, C, D¹, I, K, L, P, Ψ , 0278, 81, 104, 365, 630, 1175, 1241, 1505, 1881, 2464, and \mathfrak{M} , while \mathfrak{B}^{46} , D*, 0243, 6, and 1739 have $\delta\varsigma$ instead of $\omicron\delta$.

Heb. 7:3a (PsT 120.28 [quotation]):

ἀμήτωρ καὶ ἀπάτωρ.

Every known New Testament manuscript that contains this passage reads ἀπάτωρ ἀμήτωρ.

Didymus quotes this scripture as ἀπάτωρ ἀμήτωρ in PsT 120A.1, 11; PsT 260.1; and ZecT 109.15. However, ἀμήτωρ καὶ ἀπάτωρ is attested in Basil of Seleucia (CPG 3.6656; PG 85:444.B); Nilus Ancyranus, (CPG 6043; PG 79.156.B); and the Council of Ephesus (ACO 1.104.25).

Heb. 7:3a (PsT 120A.1, 11 [quotation]):

ἀπάτωρ ἀμήτωρ.

Didymus' reading here conforms to every known New Testament manuscript that contains this passage; however, he references this passage differently elsewhere in his Psalms commentary; he writes it as ἀμήτωρ καὶ ἀπάτωρ in PsT 120.28 and as ἀπάτωρ καὶ ἀμήτωρ in PsT 120A.3.

Heb. 7:3a (PsT 120A.3 [quotation]):

ἀπάτωρ καὶ ἀμήτωρ.

Didymus also uses this exact phrase in GenT 183.26. The manuscript evidence renders this passage as ἀπάτωρ ἀμήτωρ. As was previously mentioned, Didymus quotes this scripture as ἀπάτωρ ἀμήτωρ in 120A.1, 11; PsT 260.1; and ZecT 109.15. However, ἀπάτωρ καὶ ἀμήτωρ is attested in John Chrysostom (PG 56.171; PG 56.260).

Heb. 7:3a (PsT 120A.11 [quotation]):

ἀπάτωρ ἀμήτωρ.

Didymus' reading here conforms to every known New Testament manuscript that contains this passage; however, as previously mentioned, he references this passage differently elsewhere in his Psalms commentary: he writes it as ἀμήτωρ καὶ ἀπάτωρ in PsT 120.28 and as ἀπάτωρ καὶ ἀμήτωρ in PsT 120A.3.

1 Pet. 1:25a (PsT 242.31–32 [quotation]):

τὸ δὲ ῥῆμα κυρίου μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

Didymus' reading here conforms to every known New Testament manuscript that contains this passage.

2 Pet. 3:9b (PsT 115.6–7 [quotation]):

ἀλλὰ μακροθυμεῖ.

Didymus' reading here conforms to every known New Testament manuscript that contains this passage.

1John 2:29b (PsT 120A.19–20 [quotation]):

πᾶς γὰρ ὁ ποιῶν δικαιοσύνην ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ γεγέννηται.

Every New Testament manuscript that contains this reference renders it: πᾶς ὁ ποιῶν τὴν δικαιοσύνην ἐξ αὐτοῦ γεγέννηται. Didymus references this scripture differently throughout his writings. He references it exactly as it appears here in GenT 213.18–19; PsT 247.3–4; and ZecT 99.2–3; he references it as ὁ γὰρ ποιῶν τὴν δικαιοσύνην ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ γεγέννηται in GenT 210.2–3 and IobT 18.12–14; and ὁ γὰρ ποιῶν δικαιοσύνην ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ γεγέννηται in PsT 45.2–3.

1 John 3:9a (PsT 120A.21–22 [quotation]):

πᾶς γὰρ ὁ γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἁμαρ|τίαν οὐ ποιεῖ.

With the exception of the particle γάρ, Didymus' reading here conforms to every New Testament manuscript that contains this passage. He likely added the γάρ simply to introduce the quote, and it should not be seen as a variant.

1 John 5:1a (PsT 120A.20 [quotation]):

πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστός, ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ γεγέννηται.

Didymus' reading here conforms to every known New Testament manuscript that contains this passage.

1 John 5:18b (PsT 120A 20–21 [quotation]):

ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ γεννηθεὶς.

Almost every New Testament manuscript that contains this passage reads: ὁ γεννηθεὶς ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ. However, ἐγεννήθη ὁ δὲ γεννηθεὶς ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ is attested in 33, and ἡ γέννησις ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ in 1852, latt, sy^h, and bo.

Rev. 14:7a (PsT 120B.18 [citation]):

φοβήθητε τὸν θεόν καὶ δότε αὐτῷ δόξαν.

The vast majority of important manuscripts that contain this passage attest Didymus' reading here, although 046, ℣^K, and gig have κύριον instead of θεόν, and ℞⁴⁷ has δοξάσατε αὐτὸν instead of δότε αὐτῷ.

Potential Applications of the New Testament References in P. BYU 1

Now that the New Testament references from P. BYU 1 have been identified future studies will be able to incorporate them into the previous analyses performed by Ehrman,

MacDonald, and Acieri. Additionally, these previously unpublished New Testament citations and quotations will enable us to suggest several additions and corrections for the critical apparatus of the next edition of Nestle and Aland's Greek New Testament.⁴¹

The Consistency of Didymus the Blind in P. BYU 1

Another issue regarding Didymus' New Testament references in P. BYU 1 that warrants further examination is the inconsistency with which he sometimes references the New Testament. Of the 77 New Testament references that Didymus makes in this section of his commentary on the Psalms, 38, approximately 49%, do not conform to any known New Testament manuscript. This high percentage of unique readings shows that, at least in P. BYU 1, Didymus departed from known New Testament manuscript traditions almost as often as he followed them.

However, a more interesting aspect of these unique New Testament references in Didymus' commentary on Ps. 26:10–29:2 and 36:1–3 is that when the Alexandrian teacher referenced one New Testament scripture multiple times in his works that have been recovered from Tura, he did so inconsistently. Naturally, some of this inconsistency is due to scribal errors. For example, when Didymus attempted to quote 2 Cor. 13:8, which is supposed to read: οὐ γὰρ δυνάμεθα τι κατὰ τῆς ἀληθείας ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀληθείας, the scribe seemingly left out the noun ἀληθείας following the article τῆς which serves as the object of the preposition κατὰ. Additionally, he left out the conjunction ἀλλά, which results in the reference being almost incomprehensible as it stands. However, Didymus' unique readings of the New Testament that

⁴¹ While this information will enable significant emendations to be made to the apparatus of NA²⁸, such a detailed undertaking cannot be attempted here as it is outside the scope of this paper.

were caused by evident scribal errors account for only a small minority of the unique New Testament references found in this section of his commentary.

There are also many scriptural inconsistencies that do not appear to be scribal errors. For example, when referencing either Matt. 3:12b or Luke 3:17b Didymus appears to have simply misquoted the scripture. He renders the passage as: τὸ δὲ ἄχυρον παραδίδωσιν πυρὶ ἀσβέστω. Here Didymus uses the verb παραδίδωσιν while all other known manuscripts of Matthew and Luke that record this passage use the verb κατακαύσει, thus rendering it τὸ δὲ ἄχυρον κατακαύσει πυρὶ ἀσβέστω. The meaning of the passage is more or less unchanged, and there is also no indication that Didymus deliberately altered the passage for rhetorical purposes. It also seems unlikely that this was the result of a scribal error since παραδίδωσιν and κατακαύσει do not sound similar enough for the scribe to have mistakenly written one in place of the other. However, when Didymus quotes this same passage in his commentary in IobT 157.5–6 he uses the verb κατακαύσει instead of παραδίδωσιν. Since we know that Didymus was at some point aware that the verb should have been κατακαύσει, it becomes apparent that he most likely was quoting from a faulty memory with the result that he preserved the meaning of the scripture without preserving the exact wording.

Another example of this inconsistent referencing can be found by comparing P. BYU 1 to a portion of Didymus' same commentary on the Psalms that has previously been published. In P. BYU 1 Didymus references Acts 13:10 by using the word θεὸν, while all New Testament manuscripts that have this passage use the word κυρίον. However, when Didymus quotes the same passage elsewhere in his Tura writings (PsT 233.7; EcclT 336.2–3; ZecT 82.18–19; ZecT 141.6–7; and ZecT 322.1) he uses the word κυρίον instead of θεὸν. Once again Didymus' alteration does not significantly change the meaning of the passage in question, nor does it add

any rhetorical significance to his thought, but as in the previous example, it is very likely that this alteration was due to a faulty memory of the passage.

This situation is by no means uncommon or unique to Didymus. Bruce M. Metzger and Bart Ehrman have stated, “if a Father quotes the same passage more than once, it often happens that he does so in divergent forms.”⁴² For example, Acieri points out that in one section of Eusebius of Caesarea’s work, the bishop “quotes Galatians 1:8–9 three times within a few lines of text, yet never the same way twice.”⁴³ However, unlike with some other patristic writers, there is significant information available regarding the intended audiences of Didymus’ Tura commentaries, and interesting patterns emerge when considering his inconsistent New Testament references in light of these different intended audiences.

It has long been acknowledged that of Didymus’ five commentaries from Tura, his commentaries on the Psalms and Ecclesiastes are vastly different from his commentaries on Genesis, Job, and Zechariah. Ehrman states that “of these five commentaries, those on Genesis, Job, and Zechariah appear to represent actual literary productions, dictated and revised by Didymus with the intention of publication, while those on Psalms and Ecclesiastes appear to have been produced by Didymus’s students from lecture notes taken while sitting at their master’s feet.”⁴⁴ Anne Nelson went a step further in her doctoral dissertation, “The Classroom of Didymus the Blind,” by stating, “The other three commentaries [i.e. those on Genesis, Job, and Zechariah] represent different stages of publication; therefore some of the difference between these writings and Didymus’ treatises [i.e. his commentaries on Psalms and Ecclesiastes] may

⁴² Bruce M. Metzger and Bart D. Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration* (4th ed.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 128.

⁴³ Acieri, “The Text of Didymus the Blind in the Book of Acts, The Catholic Epistles, and the Apocalypse,” 14

⁴⁴ Ehrman, *Didymus the Blind and the Text of the Gospels*, 26–27.

reflect the different audiences and environment in which these other works were produced.”⁴⁵

Likewise, MacDonald asserts that the “less finished character” of Didymus’ commentaries on Psalms and Ecclesiastes can be explained by the fact that these works were classroom lectures rather than thoroughly revised works intended for widespread publication.⁴⁶

Although it is commonly accepted that Didymus’ commentaries on Genesis, Job, and Zechariah represent edited, more polished works while his commentaries on Psalms and Ecclesiastes represent less refined, unedited lectures, no one has determined whether these varied levels of refinement extend to his New Testament references.

Using the scriptures referenced in P. BYU 1 as a sample, I have attempted to examine scriptures that Didymus referenced multiple times with varying degrees of consistency throughout his Tura writings to ascertain if there is any difference between the New Testament references in his more polished commentaries on Genesis, Job, and Zechariah and those in his less refined lectures on Psalms and Ecclesiastes.⁴⁷ As was previously mentioned, of the 77 New Testament references made in this section of his commentary on the Psalms, 38 are unique to Didymus, and therefore do not conform to any New Testament textual tradition. However, of these 38 scripture references which do not conform to any New Testament textual tradition, I have identified 16 passages that Didymus referenced a total of 34 times throughout his Tura writings, however, he referenced them inconsistently with the result that when he referenced a single scripture he presented a unique reading of it in one instance, but rendered it in a way that conforms to an established New Testament textual tradition in another instance. For example,

⁴⁵ Nelson, “The Classroom of Didymus the Blind,” (PhD diss., University of Michigan, 1995), 7.

⁴⁶ MacDonald, *Text of Paul in the Writings of Didymus of Alexandria*, 12.

⁴⁷ The scope of this thesis necessitates limiting my sample of Didymus’ New Testament references to those references contained in P. BYU.1; however, because Didymus referenced a wide array of New Testament passages while discussing a variety of topics in P. BYU 1, this sample should be sufficient to determine any general trends in the New Testament references contained in Didymus’ five Tura commentaries.

when Didymus referenced Matt. 3:10 or Luke 3:9 on codex page 121 of his commentary on the Psalms, he omitted the οὐν between πᾶν and δένδρον which is attested in every known New Testament manuscript; he also inverts the order of κάρπον κάλον, a reordering that is also unattested in the manuscript evidence. However when he references Matt. 3:10 or Luke 3:9 on codex page 79 of his commentary on Zechariah, he renders it exactly as it appears in every known New Testament manuscript. Upon analyzing the aforementioned sample of Didymus' unique New Testament readings that he elsewhere renders in conformity with an established textual tradition, I found that of the 34 New Testament readings that are unique to Didymus, 25, or approximately 74%, have come from his lectures on the Psalms and Ecclesiastes.

Conclusions

The findings from the sample of New Testament references found in P. BYU 1 suggest that the New Testament text in Didymus' lectures on the Psalms and Ecclesiastes conforms significantly less to any known New Testament textual tradition than the New Testament text found in his commentaries on Genesis, Job, and Zechariah does. These differences between the works of Didymus can most likely be attributed to the slightly different natures of his lectures and his published works. As was mentioned above, past scholarship on Didymus the Blind suggests that his Genesis, Job, and Zechariah commentaries were intended to be published works and therefore were most likely edited and revised for accuracy; on the other hand, it is uncertain if his lectures were likewise revised and checked for accuracy. It is not even clear if Didymus intended his lectures to be written down word for word. It is likewise possible that he was more concerned with accurately expressing the meanings of New Testament scriptures he referenced in a lecture than he was with accurately reproducing the exact wording of a scriptural passage. While these undeveloped theories must remain conjecture until a more detailed analysis

can be performed, they highlight the need for a reevaluation of Didymus' New Testament text. If the quality of his New Testament references differs according to whether they appear in his lectures or his published works, then the New Testament references in his lectures and published works should not necessarily be seen as equal textual representatives of the New Testament manuscript that Didymus used. Such a reexamination will also be able to determine if a correlation exists between the respective genres of Didymus' commentaries and the unusual results of the quantitative analyses that were performed by Ehrman and MacDonald; namely that the quantitative analyses had difficulty in identifying Alexandrian sub-groups. Therefore, an examination that treats the New Testament references in Didymus' lectures separately from the references in his more refined publications must be undertaken before we can definitively classify the textual tradition of Didymus' New Testament text. Because such an examination encompassing all of Didymus' Tura works is, unfortunately, outside the scope of this Master's thesis, no designation of the textual tradition of Didymus' New Testament manuscript will be attempted here. However, we now know that any secure designation of Didymus' New Testament text cannot be made without accounting for the intended mode and audience of each of his commentaries.

While P. BYU 1 not only adds 77 New Testament references, consisting of citations and quotations to the data previously compiled on the Didymus' New Testament text compiled by Ehrman, MacDonald, and Acieri, it also provides much needed data on Didymus' lectures, as opposed to his more refined publications. Since the present analysis of Didymus' New Testament references in P. BYU 1 has shown there is reason to believe Didymus' lectures preserve more unique scriptural readings that he elsewhere quotes in conformity with established textual traditions, the New Testament references in his writings need to be reexamined by building on

past Didymean scholarship in a way that accounts for the different modes of reference in his lectures and his more finely-revised publications.

Bibliography

- Acieri, Mike. "The Text of Didymus the Blind in the Book of Acts, the Catholic Epistles, and the Apocalypse." Ph.D. diss., McGill University, 2007.
- Aland, Kurt and Barbara Aland. *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism*. 2d ed. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1995.
- Amidon, Philip R., S.J. *The Church History of Rufinius of Aquileia: Books 10 and 11*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Behr, John ed., *Works on the Holy Spirit: Athanasius and Didymus*. Translated by Mark DelCogliano, Andrew Radde-Gallwitz, and Lewis Ayres. Vol. 43 of *Popular Patristics Series*. Edited by John Behr. Yonkers, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2011.
- Choat, Malclom. "Echo and Quotation of the New Testament in Papyrus Letters to the End of the Fourth Century." Pages 267–292 in *New Testament Manuscripts: Their Texts and Their World*. Edited by Thomas J. Kraus and Tobias Nicklas. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Ehrman, Bart. *Didymus the Blind and the Text of the Gospels*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.
- Fee, Gordon. "The Text of John in the Jerusalem Bible: A Critique of the Use of Patristic Citations in New Testament Textual Criticism." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 90 (1971): 163–73.
- Fee, Gordon. "The Use of Patristic Citations in NT Textual Criticism: The State of the Question." *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung* 26.1 (1992): 246–265.
- Layton, Richard. *Didymus the Blind and His Circle in Late-Antique Alexandria*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2004.
- Linss, Wilhelm Cahill. "The Four Gospel Text of Didymus." PhD diss., Boston University, 1955.
- MacDonald, Kevin. "The Text of Paul in the Writings of Didymus of Alexandria." MA diss., McGill University, 2005.
- Martini, Carlo M. "Is There a Late Alexandrian Text of the Gospels?" *New Testament Studies* 24 (1977–78): 285–96.
- Metzger, Bruce M. and Bart D. Ehrman. *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*. 4th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Nielsen, Dave. "The History, Provenance, and Importance of BYU's Didymus Papyri." No pages. Cited 16 May 2014. Online: <http://hdl.lib.byu.edu/1877/1224>.

Patrologia graeca. Edited by J.-P. Mingne. 162 vols. Paris, 1857–1886.

Swanson, Reuben J., ed. *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Luke*. Pasadena, CA: William Carey International University Press, 1995.

Swanson, Reuben J., ed. *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: I Corinthians*. Pasadena, CA: William Carey International University Press, 2003.