



**HAL**  
open science

# The Hand of the Slave and the Hand of the Martyr: Pamphilus of Caesarea, Autography, and the Rise of Textual Relics

Sabrina Inowlocki

► **To cite this version:**

Sabrina Inowlocki. The Hand of the Slave and the Hand of the Martyr: Pamphilus of Caesarea, Autography, and the Rise of Textual Relics. *Journal of Late Antiquity*, 2023, 16 (2), pp.289-323. 10.1353/jla.2023.a906771 . hal-04384308

**HAL Id: hal-04384308**

**<https://hal.science/hal-04384308v1>**

Submitted on 13 Jan 2024

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# The Hand of the Slave and the Hand of the Martyr: Pamphilus of Caesarea, Autography, and the Rise of Textual Relics

*This paper analyzes a specific reconfiguration of the text as body in the framework of martyrdom and the retrieval and preservation of the Origenian textual corpus. In this context, I suggest that autographic copies and corrections (that is, textual gestures performed in one's own hand) took on a new meaning. I will focus on the subscriptions left by Pamphilus of Caesarea and his students, and on Jerome's notice 75 of the *De uiris illustribus* to trace a shift in the cultural and religious significance of autography. From the hand of the enslaved copyist at the beginning of the Roman empire to the hand of the martyr in Late Antiquity, such a shift ultimately led to a process of "relicization" in which the martyr's handwritten text was conceptualized as a physical relic.*

## *Introduction*

Since the pioneering work of Peter Brown, significant scholarship has been devoted to hagiography, the cult of the relics, and the cult of the martyrs in Late Antiquity in relation to art, architecture, and image.<sup>1</sup> While objects and narratives have been extensively analyzed, one aspect of the "material turn" in the fourth century, as defined by Patricia Cox Miller,<sup>2</sup> deserves more atten-

I extend my sincere thanks to Joseph Verheyden, Yoni Moss, Peter Gentry, Jeremiah Coogan, Bradley Marsh, Andrew Cain, and the two anonymous reviewers for their most useful comments. All errors remaining are mine.

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No. 101025412.

<sup>1</sup> The bibliography is vast. See, for example, Delehaye 1933; Brown 1981, 1983; Frank 2000; Leemans, Mayer, Allen, and Dehandschutter 2003; Grig 2004; Cox Miller 2009; Hahn and Klein 2012; Frank, Holman, and Jacobs, 2020; Corke-Webster and Gray, 2020.

<sup>2</sup> Cox Miller 2004, 391–411; 2017.

tion, namely, the relationship between the cult of the saints, the martyrs and their relics,<sup>3</sup> and the material production of texts and manuscripts.<sup>4</sup>

Researchers have noted how the use of parchment appealed to the trope of the text as body through the Johannine metaphor of the Word made flesh (John 1.14). In this paper, I take a different direction. I argue that a specific reconfiguration of the text as body took place in relation to martyrdom, in the framework of the reception of the martyr Pamphilus of Caesarea, and of the retrieval and preservation of the Origenian textual corpus. In this context, I suggest that autographic copies and corrections—that is, textual gestures performed in one’s own hand—took on a new meaning. Focusing on the subscriptions left by Pamphilus and his students and the later subscriptions in which they are embedded, as well as on Jerome’s notice 75 of the *De uiris illustribus*, I trace a shift in the cultural and religious significance of autography,<sup>5</sup> in which writing in one’s own hand becomes intertwined with concepts of martyrdom and relic. Before tackling the texts that are central to this paper, however, I will provide some background about Pamphilus.

### *Pamphilus, Scribe and Martyr at Caesarea*

Pamphilus of Caesarea (died in 309 CE)—teacher, collaborator, and companion of Eusebius of Caesarea—has attracted relatively little attention in modern scholarship.<sup>6</sup> The fact that the various facets of his work are compartmentalized in different disciplines (patristics, New Testament and Septuagint studies, and so on) has contributed to this neglect.

Pamphilus was active as a teaching scholar working on textual projects related to Origen’s corpus, as well as on Scriptures. Born and raised in Berytus in an aristocratic family around the middle of the third century CE,<sup>7</sup> Pamphilus apparently studied in Alexandria under the presbyter Pierius, known as “the Younger Origen.”<sup>8</sup> From there, he seems to have come to Caesarea,

<sup>3</sup> On the definition of relics and general bibliography, see, for example, Walsham 2010. On relics in Late Antiquity, see James and Webb 1991, 1–17; Cox Miller 2000, 213–36; 2004, 391–411; 2005, 25–52.

<sup>4</sup> See, for Late Antiquity, Grafton and Williams 2006 and more recently, De Bruyn 2017. On the materiality of texts, see Gamble 1995; Johnson 2004; Hurtado 2006; Klingshirn and Safran 2007; Johnson 2010; Houston 2014; Steinhauser 2014; Stok et al. 2017.

<sup>5</sup> On autography, see the authoritative works of Dorandi 1991 and 2000, 51–75; Petrucci 1984 and 2006.

<sup>6</sup> On his biography, see most recently Carriker 2003, 12–16; Kofsky 2006, 53–62; Morlet 2011, 208–19; Hartog 2021, 22–34. Studies include Amacker-Junod 2002; Carriker 2003, Grafton-Williams 2006, and Schott 2013.

<sup>7</sup> Eus. *Mart. Pal.* (rec. long.) 11.1e, 2. The English translations used in this article are taken from Oulton and Lawlor 1927–1928; the text is from Bardy 1955.

<sup>8</sup> *Jer. de vir. ill.*, 76, and Phot. Cod. 119. For more on the dating, see Carriker 2003, 12, note 37, referring to Kannengiesser 1992, 438, note 7, who dates his career around “the late 280s.”

where he opened a Christian “philosophical” school and created the famous library, in fact a book collection centered on Origen’s works.<sup>9</sup> There was, however, no continuous succession of teachers at Caesarea between Origen and Pamphilus, although Eusebius implied otherwise in Book 6 of his *Historia ecclesiastica*. During the Diocletianic persecutions, Pamphilus did not interrupt his work, even from prison, while he awaited death as a martyr.

Although his own persona has been overlooked in the secondary literature, Pamphilus’s subscriptions, signed in his name and that of his collaborators and found in different biblical manuscripts, have received a great deal of attention from scholars of the Septuagint.<sup>10</sup>

Several scholars have noted Pamphilus’s contribution to the emergence of a specific form of textual culture and education at Caesarea.<sup>11</sup> Elizabeth Penland studied Pamphilus’s school at Caesarea through an in-depth analysis of Eusebius’s *Martyrs of Palestine*, and Jeremy Schott considered it in the Platonic context of the *Phaedrus*.<sup>12</sup> Anthony Grafton and Megan Williams devoted a small part of their investigation on book culture at Caesarea to Pamphilus, showing the “textual apprenticeship” he set up in his school.<sup>13</sup> Alan Cameron, in *The Last Pagans of Rome*, which focuses partly on late antique subscriptions, also included Pamphilus in his analysis, mainly for comparative purposes.<sup>14</sup> However, in the learned studies of Grafton and Williams, Cameron, and others, the numerous references to Pamphilus’s autography have not been the focus of a specific analysis. In what follows, I argue that autographic claims play an important role in the reception of Pamphilus’s work, which allows for the representation of his books as martyrial relics. Before delving into the relevant texts, I will contextualize autography in the wider framework of the Roman empire.

---

Bibliography on Pierius includes Radford 1908; Geerard 1974, no 1630; Dictionnaire des [Philosophes](#) under “Pierius.”

<sup>9</sup> Eus. [HE](#) 7.32.25. The library of Caesarea founded by Pamphilus has been assessed according to both maximalist and minimalist views. Among the maximalists, I would include, for instance, Carriker 2003 and Grafton and Williams 2006, who tend to aggrandize the size and importance of this library. Among the minimalists, who question the continuity, importance, and institutionalization of the library, I would include Frenschkowski 2006, 53–104 and Morlet 2021, 461–69. I consider the mythologization of the library by Jerome and its influence in my current research on Pamphilus (in progress).

<sup>10</sup> The text of reference used to be that of Mercati 1941, also used by Devreesse 1974 and Nautin 1977. However, Peter Gentry has now established a more complete list of these colophons as well as a better edition; see Gentry [forthcoming](#); see also Gentry 2006 and Marsh 2023.

<sup>11</sup> The textual innovations originating from Caesarea have been the subject of different new studies that illuminate the scholarship typical of this “lieu de savoir”: apart from Grafton and Williams 2006, which has been tremendously influential, see [more recently](#) Crawford 2019; Coogan 2021a, 2022c.

<sup>12</sup> Penland 2010, 2011, 2013; Schott 2013.

<sup>13</sup> Grafton and Williams 2006, 179–87.

<sup>14</sup> Cameron 2011, 421–97.

## *Cultural and Religious Significance of Autography in the Roman World*

In the Roman world, scribal activity was generally considered menial labor. Copyists were mostly enslaved individuals and freedmen who had been educated in letters and could perform technical as well as non-technical textual tasks.<sup>15</sup> Recent work on the exploitation of the enslaved body in the literary context has shed new light on the conceptualization by Roman elites of the agency of enslaved workers.<sup>16</sup> In the early empire, the hand of the enslaved worker was literally considered an extension of the enslaver's own body.<sup>17</sup> Even in the instances in which authors claimed to have written a text, a caveat is in order for there is often a gap between the rhetoric of autography and its practice.

In spite of the prevalence of enslaved copyists, many authors did write in their own hand and mentioned it.<sup>18</sup> They would add a subscription as a way of signing a letter. Paul is the most famous instantiation.<sup>19</sup> The emperor himself would mention writing a letter in his own hand as a sign of special favor.<sup>20</sup> Ancient scholars also prided themselves on having seen autographs of famous authors. Gellius says he has seen an autograph of *Aeneid* Book 2;<sup>21</sup>

<sup>15</sup> Habinek 2005; Winsbury 2009, 79–85; Blake 2016, 89–108; and Joshel 2011, 214–40. For Cicero, Atticus, and their scribes, see Haines-Eitzen 1998, 634.

<sup>16</sup> See Winsbury 2009, 197 who has called slavery the “enabling infrastructure of Roman literature”; Geue 2022; Howley 2020; and [C. Moss 2021](#).

<sup>17</sup> See, for example, Reay 2005; On the broader phenomenon of “masterly extensibility,” see Blake 2016, 89–108 and [W. Fitzgerald 2021](#).

<sup>18</sup> For instance, people took notes for themselves *sua manu*; see, for example, Achtemeier 1990, 13–15. References to autography allowed the authors of letters to emphasize their affection or the confidentiality of the letter (Cic. *Att.* 5. 14. 1). The poet Martial, for example, shows that this is relevant even concerning corrections. Commenting on correcting copies of his works himself, he says: “you make me correct my little books with my own pen and hand, Pudens. Oh, how excessively you approve and love me, wanting to have an original of my trifles” (7.11). See also Cic. *Att.* 11.24.4, 13.28, and 8.1.1; Amb. *Ep.* 3 and 37.21; Symm. *Ep.* 2.30–31, 6.16 (from 397). References in Ganz 1997, 281. It was known that personal handwriting had its own unique characteristics: for example, Cic. *Ad Att.* 11.16.1; *Gal* 6.11; Suet. *Aug.* 64.3; and 2 Thess 3.17. When a secretary wrote the letter, his duty was to imitate the enslaving master's hand (see Ganz 1997, 282). Plotinus also wrote in his own hand (Porph. *V. Plot.* 8).

<sup>19</sup> 1 Cor 16.21; Phlm 19; 2 Thess 3.17; Col 4.18. His references to his own handwriting at the end of the epistle authenticate the text. ~~This is also found in Col and 2 Thess, which critical scholarship considers to be pseudigraphic.~~ Apparently, Paul had his letters written by a secretary but then added his signature as a sign of authenticity and also of sympathy with the addressees. The bibliography on the subject is vast. See, for example, Porter and Adams 2010; Reece 2016. See also Julius Victor, *Ars rhetorica*, cap. 27 *De epistolis* 27 (ed. Giomini and Celentano, Teubner): *Observabant veteres karissimis sua manu scribere, vel plurimum subscribere*, as cited by D. Ganz 1997, 281–82, note 4.

<sup>20</sup> See Fronto, *Ep.* 2.6.

<sup>21</sup> Gell. *NA* 9. 14.7.

the elder Pliny records that he has seen autographs of the Gracchi, Cicero, and Virgil;<sup>22</sup> and Quintilian discusses the spelling of Cicero and Virgil allegedly on the basis of their autographs.<sup>23</sup> While it has been argued that many of these famous autographs were in fact forgeries destined to be commercialized, the debate about their authenticity need not concern us here.<sup>24</sup> The point relevant to the current discussion is that the practice of autography could be endowed with prestige in a social and intellectual context even when such work was paradoxically mostly performed by invisible slave workers. Even though their hands, conceptually appropriated as the enslaver's own hands, performed the work, autography was associated with the idea that handwriting embodied the presence of the absent author.<sup>25</sup> It was also thought to provide direct access to his style and speech habits, perceived as part and parcel of his personality. Autography was considered a form of unique signature, which made the historical narrative of Latin grammar possible.<sup>26</sup>

Discourses on autography also concerned corrections and secondary autographs. Martial, for instance, claims that books corrected by the pen of their authors gained value.<sup>27</sup> Price and prestige were associated with copies handwritten by famous freedmen and enslaved scholars such as Tiro and Staberius, even when, like Pamphilus, they were not the authors of the text. Gellius claimed to have seen works by Cicero copied by Tiro,<sup>28</sup> as well as a copy of Ennius corrected by the grammarian Lampadio.<sup>29</sup> In the *Chronicon*, Jerome claims that Cicero himself corrected (*emendavit*) books of Lucretius.<sup>30</sup> This is also occasionally the case in the context of master-disciple relationships. In a letter, Fronto praises Marcus Aurelius for declaiming his speech in the presence of the emperor, after he had copied it in his own hand. Fronto expresses his joy at the love evinced in his young pupil's act and provides, on the same occasion, multiple examples of books made famous by the scribes who penned them *sua manu*.<sup>31</sup>

<sup>22</sup> Plin. *HN* 13.83.

<sup>23</sup> Quint. *Inst.* 1.7.20.

<sup>24</sup> In his classical studies, Zetzel 1973, 225–43; 1981, 14, claims that these were forgeries; he was contradicted by Pecere 1982, 101–13. See also Kaster 1995, 111–112; Hendrickson 2018, 122–30; Howley in McGill and Hopkins 2023.

<sup>25</sup> See, for example, Zetzel 1973; Geue 2020 and 2022; Blake 2013 and 2017; and Howley in McGill and Hopkins 2023. Texts were occasionally burnt in lieu of the execution of their authors; see Howley 2017; Coogan 2018.

<sup>26</sup> See, for example, Howley 2018 on Gellius.

<sup>27</sup> Mart. 17 (“To the Library of Julius Martialis”).

<sup>28</sup> Gell. *NA* 18.5.11, with Holford-Strevens 2019, 139–41.

<sup>29</sup> Gell. *NA* 1.7; 13.21, with Zetzel 1973, 227–45 and McDonnell 1996, 469–91.

<sup>30</sup> Jer., *Chron.* (ed. Helm, GCS) 94 bc. See Butler 2011, 37–38.

<sup>31</sup> Fronto, Ep. 1.7.4: “Enimuero quibus ego Gaudium meum verbis exprimere possim, quod orationem istam meam tua manu descriptam misisti mihi? . . . Quot litterae istic sunt, totidem

Crucial information on “book editing” and textual culture has been provided by Galen’s *De indolentia*, discovered in 2005.<sup>32</sup> In it, the physician/philosopher bemoans the loss of “corrected versions, copies by my hand [of the works] of ancient men, and those [works] composed by me” (ὡςπερ οὐδὲ τὰ βιβλία τὰ τε ἐπηνωρθωμένα [καὶ] διὰ τῆς ἐμῆς χειρὸς ἀνδρῶν παλαιῶν [τὰ] συγγράμματα τὰθ’ ὑπ’ ἐμοῦ συντεθέντα),<sup>33</sup> as well as “the books named after the men who wrote them or transcribed them” (ἢ ἔγραψαν ἢ ἀν(τ)εγράψαντο οἱ ἄνδρες ὧν ἦν ἐπώνυμα τὰ βιβλία)<sup>34</sup> that were lost in the burning of the Palatine. Among them, he lists books in demand “because of the accuracy of their text” (διὰ δὲ τὴν τῆς γραφῆς ἀκρίβειαν): “the Callinia, the Atticana, the Peducinia, the Aristarcheia that include two Homers as well as Panaetius’ Plato.”<sup>35</sup>

The case of these secondary autographs suggests that former enslaved scholars such as Tiro could occasionally benefit from the rhetoric of autography. Because it could confer authority on manuscripts on which it had left its mark, the hand of the “writer” (taken literally as the hand writing down the text) became eponymous with them. However, the nature of the prestige and authority associated with authors was different from that associated with these scribes, whose expertise and accuracy were valued, *and* not their *ingenium*.

---

consulatus mihi, totidem laureas, triumphos, togas pictas arbitror contigisse. Quid tale M. Porcio aut Quinto Ennio, C. Graccho aut Titio poetae, quid Scipioni aut Numidico, quid M. Tullio tale usuvenit? Quorum libri pretiosiores habentur et summam gloriam retinent, si sunt Lampadionis aut Staberii, Plautii aut D. Aurelii, Autriconis aut Aelii manu scripta exempla aut a Tirone emendata aut a Domitio Balbo descripta aut ab Attico aut Nepote” (“With what words could I express my delight at your sending me that speech of mine copied out with your own hand? . . . For every letter of your letter I count myself to have gained a consulship, a victory, a triumph, a robe of honour. Did anything like this ever happen for Cato or Ennius, for Gaius Gracchus or Titius the poet? What about for Scipio or Metellus Numidicus, or for Cicero? Their books are reckoned to be more valuable and to retain the highest fame if they have been handwritten by Lampadio or Staberius, Plautius or Aurelius, Autrico or Aelius, or if they have been corrected by Tiro, or copied out by Domitius Balbus or by Atticus or Nepos”). Text and translation by Haines 1919, 166.

<sup>32</sup> See Petit 2018; translation in Rothschild and Thompson 2011, 110–29; text edition: V. Boudon-Millot 2007, 72–123 and 2010; Rothschild 2021.

<sup>33</sup> Gal. *Ind.* 6.

<sup>34</sup> Gal. *Ind.* 13. On the reading ἀν(τ)εγράψαντο versus ἀνεγράψαντο, see Boudon-Millot and Jouanna 2010, 53–55.

<sup>35</sup> ~~It is, therefore, neither possible to find any of the rare books and the ones ‘nowhere else kept’, nor [possible to find] the common ones sought out for the accuracy of the text, the Callinia, Atticana, Fedoucinia and certainly the Aristarcheia, which include two Homeric works, the Plato of Panaetius, and many other such works, since those writings which, in the case of each book, the men after whom the books were named either wrote them or had them copied were preserved inside [the libraries].~~ Translation in Rothschild and Thompson 2011, 110. See also Gourinat 2008, 139–51. On the identification of Callinius, see Jones 2009, 390–97. On the *Atticana* and *Peducinia* see Boudon-Millot and Jouanna 2010, 50–53; Gourinat 2008, 145–48; Jones 2009, 393; Hendrickson 2018, 128.

In Late Antiquity, the situation was similar. According to Cameron, “as in the age of Cicero, texts were normally copied by professionals of low status . . . only in the most pressing of circumstances would they [“late antique gentlemen”] play the humble role of copyist.”<sup>36</sup> Haines-Eitzen agrees with this view but observes a change from the middle of the fourth century, when there is an increase in material on text transmission. She suggests that the change is a byproduct either of Constantine’s conversion or of the emergence of asceticism and monasticism, writing that “. . . we find that these movements effected a change in the notion of a scribe/copyist as low class: copying texts, and writing more generally, becomes an ascetic practice that raises one’s religious stature.”<sup>37</sup> Strikingly, as time went by, calligraphy seems to have become a hobby for the aristocrats. Filocalus, a calligrapher, was a personal friend of Pope Damasus, and Theodosius II, nicknamed “the calligrapher,” was an emperor.<sup>38</sup> In this context, the copying of Origenian texts ascribed to Pamphilus by Jerome is certainly significant but nevertheless difficult to decode. It is hard to ascertain the exact nature of this work. Is it ascetic practice or manual labor? Did the Christian martyr really copy these texts *sua manu* or was this part of the “rhetoric of autography” mentioned earlier? No ready answers present themselves but, given the social status of Pamphilus and Eusebius’s testimony on his asceticism and on the preparation of codices, it is likely that he was involved personally in biblical copying activities as a form of asceticism. As Eusebius remains the most important source for Pamphilus’s activity, his testimony needs to be revisited.

### *Eusebius’s Description of Pamphilus’s Scribal Activities*

In his extant works, Eusebius never mentions that Pamphilus copied texts *sua manu*. He did, however, imply a connection between scholarship and martyrdom in his representation of Pamphilus’s Caesarean school in the *Martyrs of Palestine*.<sup>39</sup> As Grafton and Williams have noted, “the truest form of discipleship [in Pamphilus’s school] would have led Eusebius [. . .] not to the episcopal throne, but to the fire.”<sup>40</sup> For instance, in the *Martyrs of Palestine*, Pamphilus’s enslaved worker, Porphyry, a man “experienced in the skill of

<sup>36</sup> Cameron 2011, 491.

<sup>37</sup> Haines-Eitzen 2000, 38–39.

<sup>38</sup> See more in Cameron 1992; Cameron 2011, 434 and note 77; and Haines Eitzen 2012, 30–31.

<sup>39</sup> See Grafton and Williams 2006, 189–94; Schott 2013, 348. Recent bibliography on the **Mart. Pal.** includes, in addition to the various above-cited works by Penland, Corke-Webster 2012, 51–78 and ~~Corke-Webster~~ 2013, 191–202; Barnes 2010, 119–24 and 387–92; Verheyden 2010, 353–91; Waldner 2020, 177–92. It is regrettable that Waldner is completely unaware of E. Penland’s fruitful work on the Martyrs.

<sup>40</sup> Grafton and Williams 2006, 194.



penmanship,” is described as a “true nursling of Pamphilus” (Πορφύριος ἦν ὁ μακάριος, θρέμμα γνήσιον Παμφίλου) when his martyrdom is being narrated (Eus. *Mar. Pal.* 11.15, *rec. long.*). This suggests that being a “true nursling of Pamphilus” included both scribal activity and martyrdom.

Moreover, in the only surviving fragment of Eusebius’s lost *Vita Pamphili*, cited in Jerome’s *Apologia adversus Rufinum*, in which Pamphilus is glorified as a martyr, he is also presented as involved in scribal activities:

Who among the zealous students was not a friend of Pamphilus? If he saw them in need of the necessities of life, he provided them with as much as he could. He would not only lend them copies of the Holy Scriptures to read, but also give them away to them most readily, and that not only to men, but also to women he had seen involved in reading. He therefore prepared in advance many codices, so that whenever necessity demanded it, he could generously provide those who wished for them.<sup>41</sup>

Though Eusebius was keen to portray Pamphilus the martyr as being busy with scribal and editorial practices, he did not attest to his copying books in his own hand, only to his preparing manuscripts (*codices praeparabat*).<sup>42</sup> ~~It is only from Jerome that~~ explicit mention of Pamphilus’s autography ~~can be found.~~

### *Jerome’s Description of Pamphilus’s Manuscripts*

Jerome devotes one entry of his *De viris illustribus* (from 392/393 CE) to Pamphilus (75). Diverging from his general trend of following Eusebius’ *Historia Ecclesiastica*, in this entry, Jerome makes reference to his personal experience with the martyr’s manuscripts. It is worth quoting the text in full:

Pamphilus the presbyter, close friend of Eusebius bishop of Cæsarea, was burning with such love for the divine library, that he transcribed in his own hand the greatest part of the works of Origen which are extant to this day in the library at Cæsarea. I have found twenty-five volumes of commentaries of Origen, traced in his hand, on the twelve prophets which I hug and preserve with such joy, that I believe I own the wealth of Croesus. And if it is such joy to have one epistle of a martyr, how much more to have so many thousand lines which seem to me to have been written with the traces of his blood. He

<sup>41</sup> Jer., *Apol. ad Ruf.* 1.9: “Quis studiosorum amicus non fuit Pamphili? Si quos uidebat ad uicium necessariis indigere, praebebat large quae poterat. Scripturas quoque sanctas non ad legendum tantum, sed et ad habendum tribuebat promptissime, nec solum uiris, sed et feminis quas uidisset lectioni deditas. Vnde et multos codices praeparabat, ut, cum necessitas poposcisset, uolentibus largiretur” (the translation is mine).

<sup>42</sup> On Pamphilus’s and Eusebius’s scribal economy, see Schott 2013.

wrote an *Apology for Origen* before Eusebius had written his and was martyred at Caesarea in Palestine in the persecution of Maximinus.<sup>43</sup>

How did Jerome know these codices were autographs? Possibly, the manuscripts he saw bore subscriptions that established this fact. However, as we shall see below, none of the preserved citations of such colophons support Pamphilus's self-proclaimed autography. It is possible, however, that Jerome derived this piece of information from the library of Caesarea or inferred it from the now lost *Vita Pamphili* written by Eusebius. The important point here, however, is that Jerome deliberately chose to emphasize Pamphilus's autography. In this respect, *De viris illustribus*,<sup>75</sup> appears as the affirmation of an association between martyrdom and scribalism that was only sketched by Eusebius in the *Historia Ecclesiastica* and the *Martyrs of Palestine*.

Although this association may appear atypical in the Hieronymian landscape, Pamphilus is not the only martyr associated with scribal activities by Jerome. The three attributions of the *trifaria uarietas* made in his *Praefatio in Paralipomena* to Hesychius, Lucian, and Eusebius and Pamphilus suggest the linkage of each text to a martyr.<sup>44</sup> While scholars have questioned this association<sup>45</sup>—and there is no certainty that this Hesychius is the martyr of 303 CE mentioned by Eusebius—<sup>46</sup> the parallel with Lucian remains nevertheless striking.<sup>47</sup>

The association of martyrdom with scribalism and its embodiment in Pamphilus the scribe-martyr produced a new concept. Jerome suggested that Pamphilus's handwritten copy was no less than the relics of a martyr.<sup>48</sup> This representation led Jerome to a visual and tactile experience of the text. In what follows, I will expand on this idea, contextualizing and interpreting the

<sup>43</sup> Jer., *de vir. ill.* 75 (ed. Ceresa-Gastaldo 1988, 181-182): "Pamphilus Presbyter, Eusebii Caesarensis episcopi necessarius, tanto bibliothecae divinae amore flagravit ut maximam partem Origenis voluminum sua manu descriperit, quae usque hodie in Caesarensi bibliotheca habetur. 2. Sed In duodecim prophetas viginti quinque exegeseon Origenis volumina manu eius exarata repperi, quae tanto amplector et servo gaudio ut Croesi opes habere me credam. 3. Si enim laetitia est unam epistulam habere martyris, quanto magis tot milia versuum quae mihi videtur sui sanguinis signasse vestigiis. 4. Scripsit, antequam Eusebius scriberet, Apologeticum pro Origene et passus est Caesareae Palaestinae sub persecutione Maximini" (translation is mine).

<sup>44</sup> Jer., *Praef. in Paralipomena*: "Alexandria et aegyptus in septuaginta suis hesychium laudat auctorem constantinopolis usque antiochiam luciani martyris exemplaria probat, mediae inter has prouinciae palestinos codices legunt, quos ab origine elaboratos eusebius et pamphilus uulgauerunt, totus que orbis hac inter se trifaria uarietate conpugnat" (see also Jer., *Apol. adv. Ruf.* 2.27.17). He proves to be critical of the Lucianic and Hesychian recensions at *Praef. in Evangel.* 23-27.

<sup>45</sup> See most recently Kharanauli 2020.

<sup>46</sup> Eus. *HE* 8.13.7.

<sup>47</sup> I am currently investigating the parallels between these two contemporary scholars in my monograph on Pamphilus (work in progress).

<sup>48</sup> Grafton and Williams 2006, 192.

new connection established by Jerome between secondary autographs, the cult of the martyrs, and the cult of the relics.

### *Jerome's Relic-Book*

The veneration of relics developed quickly from the middle of the fourth century.<sup>49</sup> The legalization of Christianity by Constantine and Licinius in 313 CE was pivotal for the way in which the religious significance of the material world was revalued in this period.<sup>50</sup> As Patricia Cox Miller has pointed out, this revaluation manifested a shift in the signifying potential of the material world that reconfigured the relation between materiality and meaning.<sup>51</sup> In this context, the idea of the incarnation of the Logos had allowed for a new approach to the material world. The metaphor of the Word turned flesh, which permeates Christian texts almost from the beginning, provided the principle for the shift of the text from copy to object/body.<sup>52</sup> Moreover, the destruction of books during the great persecution, along with the experience of martyrdom, probably also influenced thinking about books as relics or objects of theological significance.<sup>53</sup> Yet regardless of the theological aspects, texts in general are inseparable from the carnal envelope of the book which contains them, and they are always, to some extent, instances of embodiment.<sup>54</sup> It is against this background that Jerome's own views of the relationship between martyrdom, relics, and textuality should be understood.

In *De viris illustribus* 75, the physicality of Pamphilus's copy is emphasized through the references to Pamphilus's handwriting, the number of lines

<sup>49</sup> Although there is earlier evidence, as in the *Martyr of Polycarp* (see translation Ehrman 2003, 355–401), yet the dating of this work is problematic; see C. Moss 2012, 49–76.

<sup>50</sup> Ashbrook Harvey 2006, 122, referenced in Cox Miller 2009, 4.

<sup>51</sup> Cox Miller 2009, 4.

<sup>52</sup> See, for example, Rapp 2007, 196.

<sup>53</sup> I am grateful to the anonymous reviewer for drawing my attention to this. The connection between text and relic is clear for the end of Late Antiquity and the early Middle Ages. Rapp 2007, 201, note 28, and 202 has collected evidence; she refers to Petrucci 1995, 30, and he shows how in Western art, the closed book acquires “the image of the closed reliquary, glowing with gems, rigidly presented for the veneration but not the comprehension of the faithful.” Another instance is the codex of the Gospel of John owned by Peter the Iberian, the fifth-century Miaphysite bishop of Maiouma in Palestine, whose cover included a relic of the True Cross that miraculously oozed oil. Jerome complains that it was a custom among “superstitious womenfolk” to carry both these items on their bodies (*Comm. in Mt.* 4.23.5 [CCSL 77: 212]). In the sixth century, Gregory the Great congratulated the Lombard Queen Theodelinda on the birth of her son by sending her a gift consisting of “a cross with holy wood from the cross of the Lord, and a reading from the holy Gospel, in a Persian box” (Greg. *Ep.* 14.12 [PL 77: 1316a]). On the destruction of books in lieu of individuals, see Coogan 2018.

<sup>54</sup> For a theoretical perspective, see McGann 1991; Genette 1997; Jansen 2014. I owe these references to Coogan 2018, 376, note 8. See also Keane 2013; Cavanaugh and Shankar 2017; and Dickison 2017.

copied, and the library at Caesarea.<sup>55</sup> The mention of these physical elements allows for a shift from a semantic dimension of the text in Jerome's hands (that of Origen) to its iconic dimension. James Watts calls such texts "relic-texts." These are "some specific copies of texts that tend to be ritualized only in the iconic dimension . . . [and] are not ritualized in either the semantic or the performative dimensions very much."<sup>56</sup> As we shall see now, although Jerome only metaphorically and subjectively—note *credam*—"ritualizes" Pamphilus's text, he clearly ascribes to it a new status.

Various allusions in Jerome's text suggest that Pamphilus's secondary autograph is represented as a relic. These typify an enduring tradition that would flourish in medieval times as "incarnational aesthetics" and enable the potential interaction between word, text, and the material world.<sup>57</sup> Notably, in the *Martyrdom of Polycarp*, a connection—albeit a more tenuous one—had already been established between martyrdom, text, and relic: in the colophon of the Pseudo-Pionius, "Pionius" is presented as the final link of the textual transmission of the martyrdom, and his discovery of the text written down by a certain Gaius is fashioned using the conventions of relic invention.<sup>58</sup> However, the identification between text and relic is only allusive. Jerome provides a much clearer association. Mentioning the finding (*repperi*) of the manuscripts is an implicit reference to relic narratives of *inventio*, but there are many more elements:<sup>59</sup> First, the joy of owning and hugging the relic is also typical of relic discourses. Thus, the terms *laetitia* and *gaudium* are frequently used in relation to relics.<sup>60</sup> Jerome himself asks rhetorically in the *Adversus*

<sup>55</sup> The text raises a host of questions: how did Jerome come into possession of the Pamphilian autographs? Were they duplicates made for some friend or strays from the library, as Grafton-Williams also asked? See Grafton and Williams 2006, 184. Likewise, was Pamphilus's copy of Origen's text a transfer of the master's (perhaps damaged) writings to parchment or to codex, as Acacius and Euzoius's writings were of the contents of Pamphilus's library? No easy answers present themselves.

<sup>56</sup> Watts 2006, 135–59 and 2010, 329–38; Watts 2012.

<sup>57</sup> See Chaganti 2008, 37–38.

<sup>58</sup> As C. Moss 2012, 66 points out, the same mechanism is present in the Apocryphon of John and the Apocryphon of James. The most cited example of relic invention is Lucian's *Revelatio Sancti Stephani*. Moss also notes (note 51) that "in scholarship on martyrdom, relics often stand as ciphers for the cult of the saints, references to relics being understood as references to the cult of the martyr. In this way, many interpret *Mart. Pol.* 17–18 as the earliest reference to the cult of the saints."

<sup>59</sup> See Mroczek 2016a and b and 2018. Other texts include the *inventio* of textual relics, for example, the prologue of Acts of Pilate and the Vision of Paul 1–2, in which Theodosius himself opens the box/reliquary including the text, the *Laudatio Barnabas*. For a general overview of the discovery of texts in antiquity, see Speyer 1970, and Maraval 1985, 41–47. The classic example of relic invention is found in *Lucian's Revelatio Sancti Stephani*. Lucian discovers the body of Stephen after being visited three times in a dream by Rabbi Gamaliel, a teacher of the Apostle Paul (Acts 22).

<sup>60</sup> For example, Victricius of Rouen, a contemporary of Jerome and an ardent promoter of the relic cult, in his homily *Laud. sanct.* 1.8, 1.16, 12.8, 12.11, 12.22, 12.25, 12.38, and 12.40 etc. See the translation and commentary by Gillian Clark 1999, 36599 and Hunter 1999, 401–30.

*Vigilantium* 5: “Are the people of all the Churches fools, because they went to meet the sacred relics, and welcomed them with as much joy as if they beheld a living prophet in the midst of them?” The “hugging” and the “joy” introduce into the text the affective appeal expressed in figurative language around relics in late ancient and early Byzantine hagiography.<sup>61</sup> Second, the hugging of the relics is also mentioned in hagiographic texts.<sup>62</sup> Third, the high price of the copy, which Jerome compares to the wealth of Croesus, is a motif that recurs, notably in *Martyrdom of Polycarp* 18.<sup>63</sup> This points not only to the connection between the spiritual and the material embodied in the relic but also to the erasure between the two. Victricius of Rouen, calling relics “spiritual jewels” at the end of the fourth century, expresses a similar idea.<sup>64</sup> Last but not least, like relics, the autograph involves the presence of blood.<sup>65</sup> This is where the translation becomes both central and tricky.

Blood relics were quite popular in the West at the time of Jerome.<sup>66</sup> Jerome himself made the connection between object and blood particularly explicit in a letter to Theophilus in 405 CE,<sup>67</sup> in which his veneration for material

<sup>61</sup> As Cox Miller 2009, 14 has argued, “especially in the literature about martyrs that arose in connection with the cult of relics, the reader/hearer was situated as an active participant in the martyrial drama by the force of emotionally charged rhetoric.” She quotes Augustine who, preaching about the trials of Saint Cyprian, exclaimed: “I’m watching him [Cyprian], I’m delighted by him, as far as I can I embrace him with the arms of my mind” (*Specto, delector, quantum valeo lacertis mentis amplector* at Aug. *Serm.* Denis 14).

<sup>62</sup> See Chrys. *an. Bern.* 7.24, as well as his *pan. Juv.* 3.10. The mention of the hugging of the text and its preservation is a reminiscence of Tac. *Ann.* 16.10: “*cruentamque cervicem eius amplexa servabat sanguinem et vestis respersas, vidua inpecha luctu continuo nec ullis alimentis nisi quae mortem arcerent*” (“She had clasped his bleeding neck, and still kept by her the blood-stained apparel, clinging in her widowhood to perpetual sorrow, and using only such nourishment as might suffice to avert starvation” (translation in Church 1864, 322). In Tacitus, Politta, daughter of Lucius Antistius Vetus, is said to have preserved the bloody clothing of her husband, Rubellius Plautus, assassinated by Nero; together with his daughter and mother-in-law, Vetus committed suicide on the news of his impending judgement by the senate. Therefore, even in the Christian context of a relic metaphor, Jerome borrows from his classical readings.

<sup>63</sup> See also Hilary of Arles, *Vita Honorati* 34: any thread pulled out of the clothing of the martyr was “as valuable as the most precious gift” (translation in Lambert 2020).

<sup>64</sup> Victricius of Rouen, *De laude* 12.25–33 (CCL 64: 89). On Victricius, see Hunter 1999, 401–30.

<sup>65</sup> The reference to blood used as ink was common in magical Graeco-Roman papyri; see Blanco Cesteros 2021. Red ink was used already by Egyptian scribes. Eusebius and Jerome after him used colored inks in the Chronicle (see Grafton and Williams 2006, 344–45, note 54. Does Jerome’s metaphor in *de vir. ill.* 75 indicate that the texts, or parts of them, were copied in red? We know from Eusebius’s Letter to Carpianus that he wrote the number of each canon with vermilion. One wonders if Pamphilus did so as well. Notably, in early modern printed Bible calendars, red ink was used to denote the anniversary of the death of a martyr; see Jacobson 2014, 108.

<sup>66</sup> Wisniewski 2019, 170 but see Greg. Naz. *Or.* 4.69 (= *contra Iulianum* 1; translation in Rizos 2021).

<sup>67</sup> *Jer.* Ep. 114.2: “. . . et cetera, quae ad cultum dominicae pertinent passionis, non quasi inania et sensu carentia sanctimoniam non habere, sed ex consortio corporis et sanguinis domini eadem, qua corpus eius et sanguis, maiestate ueneranda” (“and other things which are used for the cult

objects is connected to the idea of relics. Cultic objects are imbued with holiness because it is as if they had been in physical contact with the blood of Christ (through the eucharist).

A similar idea is at play in *De viris illustribus* 75, where we are told that the many lines written by Pamphilus seem to Jerome to have been “signed” (*signasse*) with “traces of blood” (*uestigiis sanguinis*). *Signare* is well attested as “to seal,” as in the sealing of a book, and it is attested as a seal in relation to the cult of the martyrs’ relics.<sup>68</sup> However, *signasse* may also refer to the signature or to the writing of the signed subscription at the end of the work, possibilities we will analyze below.<sup>69</sup> At any rate, both translations associate the blood of Pamphilus’s martyrdom with the conclusion of his work as a copyist. I would like to suggest that in the context of the passage, which emphasizes Pamphilus’s autographic copies of Origen’s texts, *signare* is to be understood as “to mark with writing; ~~inscribe; to inscribe, imprint (words), so many thousand lines which seem to me to be traced in his blood.~~”<sup>70</sup> According to the *OLD*, Festus (285 M) states: *signare enim antiqui pro scribere interdum ponebant*: “indeed the ancients occasionally used *signare* instead of ‘to write.’” In several passages, Jerome himself uses *signare* in the sense of marking in writing.<sup>71</sup>

Moreover, the term *uestigia* can suggest handwriting, as a passage from Jerome indicates: “The faces which I hold so dear, *the traces left by a well-known hand* bring them back to me.”<sup>72</sup> In the same passage, Jerome claimed, as in the *De viris illustribus*, to have embraced (*amplexor*) the letters

---

of the Lord’s passion are not, as it were, empty and senseless things devoid of sacredness, but that rather, from their association with the body and blood of the lord, they are to be venerated with the same splendor as his body and blood”); my translation.

<sup>68</sup> This is how Ceresa-Castaldo 1988 translates the word. See also Victricius of Rouen, *De laude* 9–12 (CCL 64: 83–84): “aeternitatis insignia edita esse etiam sanguis ostendit, qui ignem Spiritus Sancti adhuc signat in ipsis corporibus reliquiis que membrorum,” which Clark 1999, 397 translates as “even the blood shows that they are presented as signs of eternity, the blood which is still the sign of the fire of the holy spirit in the very bodies and relics of the limbs.”

<sup>69</sup> This is how it is translated by Halton 1999, 107.

<sup>70</sup> Translation in Schaff 1892, 377.

<sup>71</sup> *Jer.*, *Apol. adv. Ruf.* (CPL 0613) 1.25.25: “superfluum erat per singula apostoli testimonia eorum nomina ponere, quorum me opuscula translaturum in praefatione signaueram” (“But it was needless at each separate testimony of the apostle to posit that the names of those whose works I was going to translate, I had written in the Preface.” *Ep.* 18A 54.1 p. 75.9 (CPL 0620): “quam in ezechiel dominus iubet tau litterae inpressione signari” (“ . . . that the Lord in Ezekiel ordered to be engraved with the impression of the letter Tau”). *Ep.* 22, 54.38, p. 204 (CPL 0620): “accipe tibi tomum magnum, nouum et scribe in eo stilo hominis uelociter spolia detrahentis . . . ille, quem in latitudine pectoris tui paulo ante descriperas, quem in nouitate cordis stilo uolante signaueras . . .” (“Take yourself a great new roll and write in it with this style of a man who is swiftly carrying off the spoils . . . and he whom just before you had described in the largess of your chest, and whom you had traced with a flying pen in the novelty of your heart . . .”

<sup>72</sup> *Jer.* *Ep.* 7.2: “carissimos mihi uultus notae manus referunt inpressa uestigia” (my translation).

in question out of affection, because they represent an embodiment of the sender. In his prologue to Obadiah, the term *uestigia* designates a text in the context of the emendation of a letter (*per uetera uestigia rursum ingrediar, emendans, si fieri potest, curuos apices litterarum*). Therefore, I would argue here that Jerome, telescoping the time of Pamphilus's martyrdom and that of the copy of the manuscripts, suggests that the text looks to him *as if* it had been written by Pamphilus with his own martyr's blood. The blood of the martyr invites his presence, making explicit the narrative of his death, which transcends temporal gaps between the actual time of martyrdom and the time of the text.<sup>73</sup>

Before Jerome, Cicero and Quintilian had analyzed the *uestigium* in relation to blood in a judicial context, where blood is the sign of a murder.<sup>74</sup> Jerome Christianized these classical rhetorical *topoi* by merging in the word *uestigia* the reference to blood with that of the foot tracks. Herein, Jerome suggests not only that the blood is the *uestigium* of the murdered martyr but also that his blood letters traced a path that could be followed. Understood figuratively, *uestigium* also denotes "a mode of behaviour regarded as an object of imitation or example."<sup>75</sup> I would tentatively suggest that Jerome—who lived after the time of persecutions—subtly presents scribal work as a potential alternative to martyrdom. In the larger context of Hieronymian propaganda for asceticism by use of martyrological themes, this passage deserves close attention.<sup>76</sup>

An additional metaphor of blood as ink became widespread during the Middle Ages in relation to Jesus's blood.<sup>77</sup> It appears ~~for the first time~~ in the context of late antique martyrdom, ~~notably~~ in Prudentius's *Peri Stephanon*, which is roughly contemporary to Jerome's text. Prudentius ~~even~~ describes a painting in which the martyr Cassian's pupils hurl their *styli* and tablets at him and wound his face until "blood flows across wet pages crimson from the blow" (*rubetque ab ictu curta et umens pagina*).<sup>78</sup> At the beginning of the *Peristephanon*, Jesus himself is writing the name of a martyr in characters of blood: "Heaven has written down two martyrs' names—a pair that Christ,

<sup>73</sup> On this phenomenon, see more in M. Roberts 1993, 12–13, 40–41, and Kuhlmann 2012, 135–54.

<sup>74</sup> Cic. *Part. or.* 114; Quint. *Inst.* 5.9. Compare with Giraud 2011, 251–74. The examples that follow are mainly derived from this study.

<sup>75</sup> See entry on *uestigium* (5c) in OLD.

<sup>76</sup> On which see, for example, Coppieters, Praet, Bossu, and Taveirne 2014.

<sup>77</sup> It appears first in Romanos the Melodist, Hymn 18 (SC 24). See also Pollock Renck 2021, 228–50; Krueger 2004, 161; Henessy 2013, 17–52.

<sup>78</sup> Prud. *Perist.* 9.50; translation and discussion by Ross 2008, 331.

inscribing them in golden letters there, has noted in bright characters of blood on earth.”<sup>79</sup> In the martyrdom of Hippolytus, the tracks left by the blood of the martyr on the rocks and thorn bushes on which he was dragged are described with the very words used by Prudentius to refer to letters (*apices, notas*).<sup>80</sup> The fact that Prudentius uses the same trope of martyr blood as ink in the same period as Jerome provides additional support for the translation of *signasse* as “marking in letters of blood.”

The comparison with Prudentius also suggests that the graphic trace of Pamphilus’s hand, his ductus, functions like Prudentius’s paintings. It graphically—albeit implicitly—reproduces the narrative of the martyr’s death. Jerome hints that overwritten on Origen’s text is Pamphilus’s narrative of martyrdom. The term *uestigia*, used, for instance, by Augustine in the framework of the discourse on the image, supports this interpretation.<sup>81</sup> In our passage, I would argue, Jerome too uses the term *uestigia* in relation to the theology of the image. By referring to the text copied by the martyr as the traces left by his own blood, Jerome suggests that the textual relic is not only the copy of Origen’s exemplar but also the image of Pamphilus’s martyrdom. The manuscript is a palimpsest, reproducing both Origen’s text, with, as it were, Pamphilus’s martyrdom narrative in watermark. Yet beyond the similarities between Prudentius’s and Jerome’s texts, Jerome also reverses the prevailing process of the textualization of martyrs found in Prudentius. While, as Jill Ross has shown, the poet develops the metaphor of the martyr’s body as text further than any previous author,<sup>82</sup> Jerome turns the text into a body and, more specifically, into the relics of the martyr Pamphilus.<sup>83</sup> Whether this description reflects Jerome’s reception of Pamphilus’s persona as martyr-scribe or whether he proves to be the impresario of this specific representation is unclear.

<sup>79</sup> Prud. *Perist.* 1.1–3: “Scripta sunt caelo duorum martyrum uocabula, aureis quae Christus illic adnotauit litteris, sanguinis notis eadem scripta terris tradidit.” Translation in Krisak 2020; text in Lavarenne 1963.

<sup>80</sup> Prud. *Perist.* 11.121–22, 127–28. See also M. Roberts 1993, 155.

<sup>81</sup> In Late Antiquity, *uestigium* plays an important role at the intersection of the rhetorical and theological discourse and visual signs. In Augustine, the *uestigium*, the trace, needs to be understood in relation to the signum; see Lavertujon 1899, 2: 76. Augustine, for instance, in *Serm.* 52.17 identifies in the soul the *imago trinitatis* and the *uestigium trinitatis*. In addition, Augustine uses the term *uestigium* to refer to a footprint, or a print, bearing the resemblance/image of the foot or the seal. Likewise, the word *exarata* that Jerome uses in order to describe the writing of Origen’s *volumina* in Pamphilus’s hand evokes the imprint of letters on a tablet.

<sup>82</sup> Ross 2008, 56.

<sup>83</sup> We find a precedent in the famous letter of Christ to King Abgar mentioned by Eusebius and presented by Egeria as protecting the city of Edessa: Eus. HE 1.13; Egeria, *Itiner.* 19.8–13.



## *Pamphilus's Manuscripts as Textual Reliquary*

The shift from textuality to materiality, which I have attempted to decipher from *De viris illustribus* 75, has turned Pamphilus's manual copy of Origen into the *locus* where conceptions of scribalism and the cult of the martyrs and their relics intersect.<sup>84</sup> However, the textual exercise through which Origen's textual body is "enshrined" in the hand and the blood of the martyr also calls for a comparison with the dynamics between relic and reliquary.<sup>85</sup> Seeta Chaganti's characterization of medieval reliquaries as "a principle of complex enclosure" might be useful to help us understand what is at play in Jerome's text.<sup>86</sup> According to her, medieval reliquaries can be "considered objects that actively blur the boundaries between interior and exterior, container and contained, thus providing aesthetic as well as epistemological structure to apprehend the paradox inherent in the Christian notion of sacred or spirited matter."<sup>87</sup> If we apply this logic to Pamphilus's handwritten copy of Origen, we see that early on, the text is considered as an object which can speak its own non-verbal language, dissociated from its semantic dimension. The Pamphilian handwritten copy can be interpreted both as a relic and its reliquary because it also blurs the line between container and contained. The materiality of Pamphilus's hand and the metaphoric use of his blood as ink turn the text copied into a relic of Pamphilus, yet the same materiality turns the copy into the reliquary of Origen's textual presence.

The dynamics generated by the relationship between relic and reliquary is a win-win proposition for both Origen and Pamphilus. Pamphilus benefits from Origen's authorial authority by proxy, and Origen from the status of Pamphilus's martyrdom by proxy. The textual reliquary ultimately succeeds in protecting its contents. E. Junod has pointed out that, in Photius's notice on Pamphilus's *Apology for Origen*, Origen receives much more lenient treatment than in other notices where he is mentioned, due to the prestige of martyrdom assigned to the Caesarean presbyter.<sup>88</sup> In this case, it is not the manual copy of Origen's text by the hand of the martyr that shelters it but Pamphilus's *Apology*, in which, through the citation process, Origen's excerpts are also "enshrined" as if they lay in a reliquary.

While relics participate in a late antique "aesthetics of the fragment,"<sup>89</sup> Pamphilus's literary *habitus* is also one of fragmentation, as he initiated an apologetic practice that fragmented texts into citations, notably in the *Apology*

<sup>84</sup> On the concept of *uestigium* in relation to relics and reliquaries, see Chaganti 2008, 38–39.

<sup>85</sup> On book as *reliquary*, see also Coogan 2018.

<sup>86</sup> Chaganti 2008, 19.

<sup>87</sup> Chaganti 2008, 19.

<sup>88</sup> Junod 2003, 1101–2. See also Schott 2103, 358.

<sup>89</sup> Cox Miller 2008, 42. See also Chin 2008.

for Origen.<sup>90</sup> However, as is the case in late ancient attempts to gather relics, his literary practice also aims at reunification. Pamphilus re-collected Origen's dispersed corpus, gathered his works, listed them in the *Pinakes*, and made handwritten copies of his texts. In the passage we have been analyzing, holiness is produced neither by bodily relics nor by textual fragments but through the making of lengthy handwritten textual copies. Jerome himself proclaims his joy at owning not a single martyr's epistle alone but rather thousands upon thousands of lines. Ultimately, it is the poetics of the copy (both as image and textual copy), not of the relic, that impart holiness to the Christian text.<sup>91</sup> This is especially striking in later colophons in which Pamphilus's hand is also emphasized.

### *Pamphilus's Signed Subscriptions*

The motif of the scribe-martyr applied to Pamphilus by Jerome re-appears in the sixth century, in a series of colophons in Greek and Syriac. Although well known to Septuagint scholars,<sup>92</sup> they have never been studied in the context of Pamphilus's reception. Among the thirty-two colophons inventoried by Gentry related to the Hexapla and Tetrapla, nine mention Pamphilus (always with a collaborator: seven with Eusebius, two with Antoninus).<sup>93</sup> Among the nine Pamphilan ones, five mention autography explicitly.

These colophons, which have mainly been studied by scholars of the Septuagint and the Christian New Testament, received an in-depth treatment by the classicist Alan Cameron in his *Last Pagans of Rome*. Pamphilus, Cameron concludes, seems to have innovated in two respects. First, compared to other late antique subscribers, Pamphilus manifests unusually careful attention to textual accuracy in his work as a corrector of biblical copies.<sup>94</sup> Second, Pamphilus provided the first testimony of a "gentleman" signing his performance of textual tasks usually saved for enslaved workers. By doing so, Cameron argues, Pamphilus may have set an important precedent for late antique Latin subscriptions such as those signed by the Nicomachi.<sup>95</sup>

None of the original Pamphilan subscriptions have survived. What has come down to us are citations of these colophons, which are embedded in later colophons in Greek and Syriac biblical manuscripts from the sixth and seventh centuries CE. Each of them includes at least two layers, occasionally

<sup>90</sup> As Schott 2013 points out.

<sup>91</sup> On themes of the copy and the mimetic, see Stefaniw 2019.

<sup>92</sup> See note 9.

<sup>93</sup> See Gentry forthcoming. I wish to thank here Peter J. Gentry for guiding me through the Syriac during productive conversations.

<sup>94</sup> Apart from subscriptions, other authors carefully corrected their texts, as Galen, for instance. See Johnson 2010 and Bubb and Peachin 2022.

<sup>95</sup> Cameron 2011, 470–75. On these subscriptions, see González Marín 2016; Wallenwein 2017.

more:<sup>96</sup> 1) Pamphilus's subscription, and 2) a later subscription in which that of Pamphilus is embedded. In the latter layer, the significance of the autographic reference changes. As we shall see, the physical imprint of Pamphilus, now referred to as a "holy martyr," becomes central. There is much to say about these paratextual constructions,<sup>97</sup> but this analysis focuses on the mentions of Pamphilus's autography.

### *References to Handwriting in Pamphilus's Subscriptions*

The text of the colophons is often difficult to interpret, as it does not always clearly show where the citation of Pamphilus's subscription starts and where it ends. For instance, in the colophon to Evagrius's *Scholia on Proverbs*, it is unclear whether the reference to Pamphilus and Eusebius's hand belongs to the later scribes' colophon or to that of Pamphilus: "They were taken from the Hexapla we found and again Pamphilus and Eusebius corrected with their own hand."<sup>98</sup>

A visual presentation of a whole colophon might clarify the complexity of its construction. This is the sixth-century colophon in Esther of Codex Sinaiticus (BL Add 43725 [Sinaiticus] Q 37 fol. 3r):

Collated against a most ancient copy corrected by the hand of the holy martyr Pamphilus. At the end of the same very ancient book which goes from the first book of Reigns and stops towards Esther lies a handwritten signature in large (characters) of the martyr himself reading thus:

[*Pamphilus's colophon:*]

Transcribed and corrected against Origen's Hexapla which have been corrected by himself. Antoninus the confessor collated, I, Pamphilus, corrected the book in jail.

[A later addition?]

Through the abundant grace and largess of God, were it not pompous to say, it would not be easy to find a copy close [in quality] to this copy<sup>99</sup>

[Later addition?]

Now the same very old book disagrees with this volume in respect to certain proper names.<sup>100</sup>

<sup>96</sup> As is the case with Esther in Sinaiticus. See below.

<sup>97</sup> I provide a more detailed analysis in the monograph I am currently writing on Pamphilus, under contract with Cambridge University Press.

<sup>98</sup> Codex Patmiacus 270 (f. 260v): Μετελήφθησαν ἀφ' ὧν εὐρομεν ἑξαπλῶν. καὶ πάλιν αὐταχειρὶ [sic] Πάμφιλος καὶ Εὐσέβιος διορθώσαντο. See Géhin 1987, and Gentry [forthcoming](#).

<sup>99</sup> It is unlikely that this was written by Pamphilus, who was praised as a paragon of humility by Eusebius according to [Jer., Apol. adv. Ruf. 1.9](#). However, the appreciation of a subscriber for a text is rarely expressed with such enthusiasm.

<sup>100</sup> Text and translation in Gentry [forthcoming](#): Ἀτεβλήθη πρὸς παλαιώτατον λίαν ἀντίγραφον δεδιωρωμένον χειρὶ τοῦ ἁγίου μάρτυρος παμφίλου· Πρὸς δὲ τῷ τέλει τοῦ αὐτοῦ παλαιωτάτου βιβλίου

As Peter Gentry kindly pointed out to me, in similar Syriac colophons, the punctuation in the manuscripts clearly indicates that autographic references were *not* part of the original Pamphilian subscriptions.<sup>101</sup> They mention only that Pamphilus copied, corrected, or annotated a text, as is also the case, for instance, in the Sinaiticus, in which a subscription to 2 Esdras reads as follows:<sup>102</sup>

[It was] collated against a very old copy *corrected by the hand of the holy martyr Pamphilus*. Concerning that copy, at the end, was appended a certain signature, *in the very hand of the same martyr*, as follows:

copied and corrected by the Hexapla of Origen, Antoninus collated, I, Pamphilus corrected.

While in Pamphilus's colophon the autography might be implied by the mention of the correction, it is not specifically emphasized. The later subscription emphasizes it, mentioning it twice (italicized above). It is worth noting that in one other subscription, Pamphilus mentions the hand of Origen.<sup>103</sup> In codex Marchalianus (from the sixth century), in the book of Ezekiel, a subscription reads as follows:

Transmitted from a copy belonging to the Abbot Apolinarius, head of the monastery, in which these things were appended as a signature: Transmitted from the Hexapla according to the editions/versions, and corrected from the Tetrapla of Origen himself; **which also by his own hand was corrected with marginalia added**. From which I, Eusebius, added the marginal notes. Pamphilus and Eusebius corrected.<sup>104</sup>

ὅπερ ἀρχὴν μὲν εἶχεν ἀπὸ τῆς πρώτης τῶν βασιλείων· Εἰς δὲ τὴν Εσθηρ ἔληγεν. τοιαύτη τις ἐν πλάτει ἰδιόχειρος ὑποσημείωσις τοῦ αὐτοῦ μάρτυρος ὑπέχειτο ἔχουσα οὕτως:

<sup>Me</sup>τελήμφθη καὶ διορθώθη πρὸς τὰ ἐξαπλᾶ ὠριγένους ὑπ' αὐτοῦ διορθώμενα. Ἀντωνίνος ὁμολογητῆς ἀντέβαλεν, πάμφιλος διώρθωσα τὸ τεῦχος ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ διὰ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ πολλὴν καὶ χάριν καὶ πλατυσμόν. [καὶ εἶγε μὴ βαρὺ εἰπεῖν, τούτῳ τῷ ἀντιγράφῳ παραπλήσιον εὑρεῖν ἀντίγραφον οὐ ῥάδιον.]  
>>>>>

διεφάνει δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ παλαιώτατον βιβλίον πρὸς τὸδε τὸ τεῦχος εἰς τὰ κυρία ὀνόματα

>>>>>

<sup>101</sup> Personal communication. See, for example, the case of Bibl. Ambrosiana, C 313 inf., fol. 66r in Gentry 2006, and [forthcoming](#).

<sup>102</sup> BL Add 43725 (Sinaiticus) Q 36 fol. 5r; text from Gentry forthcoming: Ἀντεβλήθη πρὸς παλαιώτατον λιάν ἀντίγραφον δεδιορθωμένον χειρὶ τοῦ ἁγίου μάρτυρος παμφίλου ὅπερ ἀντίγραφον πρὸς τῷ τέλει ὑποσημείωσις τις ἰδιόχειρος αὐτοῦ ὑπέχειτο ἔχουσα οὕτως: Μετελήμφθη καὶ διορθώθη πρὸς τὰ ἐξαπλᾶ ὠριγένους. Ἀντωνίνος ἀντέβαλεν· πάμφιλος διώρθωσα: >>>

<sup>103</sup> Another instance of the mention of Origen's autograph is found in Pall. *Hist. Laus.* 6 (ed. Butler 2015, 160). There is a parallel story at Eus. *HE* 6.17, and see also [Jerx](#) *Commentariol. in Ps.* 4 (*cum uetustum origenis hexaplum psalterium reuoluerem, quod ipsius manu fuerat emendatum*) 1.80 in which he stresses that Origen had corrected the text of Psalms in his own hand: "*cum vetustum Origenis Hexaplum Psalterium revolverem, quod ipsius manu fuerat emendatum.*"

<sup>104</sup> Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 2125; (Marchalianus 6), fol. 568: "Μετελήφθη δὲ ἀπὸ ἀντιγράφου τοῦ ἀββᾶ ἀπολιναρίου τοῦ κοινοβιάρχου ἐν ᾧ καθυπε<τέ>τακτο ταῦτα: Μετελήφθη ἀπὸ τῶν κατὰ τὰς

Pamphilus, who was most likely born in the middle of the third century, never studied under Origen. Eusebius, however, in his biographic sketch of Origen's life in Book 6 of the *Historia Ecclesiastica*, seemed to draw a lineage that connected him and his master, Pamphilus, directly to the Alexandrian theologian.<sup>105</sup> The above subscription and others, I would suggest, had the same goal—that is, they were used by Pamphilus in order to establish himself as Origen's heir. Indeed, Pamphilus, together with Eusebius, seems to have legitimated his own scholarly and textual genealogy by emphasizing his access to (and probably his ownership of) Origen's autograph. Later testimonies show that bequeathing autographic manuscripts became a method of establishing spiritual succession.<sup>106</sup> I would suggest that by collecting Origen's works at Caesarea and by manifesting, through the subscriptions, a textual lineage connecting him and his students directly to Origen, Pamphilus was not only claiming a place in the Origenian *diadoche*; he was claiming a specific role in it, namely that of *textual* heir and continuator.<sup>107</sup>

Interestingly, Photius claims that Pamphilus believed that Origen died a martyr in Caesarea.<sup>108</sup> The combination of this testimony and the mention of Origen's handwriting intriguingly echoes the later portrayal of Pamphilus as a martyr-scribe. If Photius was correct, Pamphilus's own death would have been the final step of the *imitatio magistri* that guided his life.<sup>109</sup>

### *Reception of Pamphilus's Subscriptions in Later Subscriptions*

Later scribes, writing around the sixth and seventh centuries, who embedded Pamphilus's original subscriptions in their own, strongly emphasized the handwriting of the Caesarean presbyter. They followed in Jerome's footsteps and turned Pamphilus's copy, to which they claimed to have had direct access, into relic-texts.

For instance, some New Testament subscriptions mention the hand of the martyr. Some are in Syriac, some in Greek, but all are related to the Pauline corpus. A Syriac text found in a manuscript from Cambridge (Add. 1700, f. 216), and reported and translated by Devreesse,<sup>110</sup> reads:

---

ἐκδόσεις ἐξαπλῶν καὶ διόρθωθη ἀπὸ τῶν ὠριγένους αὐτοῦ τετραπλῶν ἅτινα καὶ αὐτοῦ χειρὶ διόρθωτο καὶ ἐσχολιογράφητο ὅθεν εὐσέβειος ἐγὼ τὰ σχόλια παρέθηκα· πάμφιλος καὶ εὐσέβειος διορθώσαντο” (edition and translation in Gentry *forthcoming*.)

<sup>105</sup> Penland 2013; Ramelli 2011; Grant 1980, 73–74.

<sup>106</sup> See the examples provided by Rapp 2007, 207–8.

<sup>107</sup> I develop this idea further in my work on Pamphilus (in progress).

<sup>108</sup> Phot. *Bibl.* 118, and compare 92b14 in Henry 1959. On the importance of martyrdom in Photius's notice on Pamphilus's *Apology for Origen*, see Junod 2003, 1101–2.

<sup>109</sup> On Pamphilus's self-conscious imitation of Pamphilus, see Penland 2013, 151.

<sup>110</sup> Devreesse 1954, 160. From what Devreesse mentions, it can be reconstructed that this Pauline book was collated against a copy from the city of Mabbug, which refers to the translations of the

This book of Paul the apostle was written and collated against the exemplar in the city of Mabbug ; this one was also collated against the codex that was in the city of Caesarea in Palestine, among the books of St. Pamphilus, **written in his own hand.**<sup>111</sup>

In 2 Esdras (codex Sinaiticus), as we have seen, a subscription dated to the sixth century and embedding the Pamphilan colophon mentions the autography twice: “Collated against a most ancient copy *corrected by the hand of the holy martyr Pamphilus*. At the end of his copy is an *autograph* subscription, reading as follows.”<sup>112</sup> ~~Although the subscription of 2 Esdras is briefer,~~ the terms used in this paratext are remarkably similar to those used in the Esther colophon examined above:<sup>113</sup>

*Colophon 2 Esdras (S)*

Ἀντεβλήθη πρὸς παλαιώτατον λίαν ἀντίγραφον δεδιορθωμένον χειρὶ τοῦ ἁγίου μάρτυρος Παμφίλου, ὅπερ ἀντίγραφον πρὸς δὲ τῷ τέλει ὑποσημείωσῖς τις ιδιόχειρος τοῦ αὐτοῦ μάρτυρος ὑπέκειτο ἔχουσα οὕτως·

Μετελήμφθη καὶ διορθώθη πρὸς τὰ Ἐξαπλᾶ Ὠριγένους, Ἀντωνίνου ἀντέβαλεν, Πάμφιλος διώρθωσα.

*Colophon Esther (S)*

Ἀντεβλήθη πρὸς παλαιώτατον λίαν ἀντίγραφον δεδιορθωμένον χειρὶ τοῦ ἁγίου μάρτυρος Παμφίλου. **πρὸς δὲ τῷ τέλει τοῦ αὐτοῦ παλαιωτάτου βιβλίου ὅπερ ἀρχὴν μὲν εἶχεν ἀπὸ τῆς πρώτης τῶν βασιλείων εἰς δε τὴν ἔσθη ἔληγεν** τοιαύτη τις ἐν **πλάτει** ιδιόχειρος ὑποσημείωσῖς τοῦ αὐτοῦ μάρτυρος ὑπέκειτο ἔχουσα οὕτως·

Μετελήμφθη καὶ διορθώθη πρὸς τὰ Ἐξαπλᾶ Ὠριγένους **ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ διορθώμενα**· ἀντωνίνου ὁμολογητῆς ἀντέβαλεν· Πάμφιλος διώρθωσα **τὸ τεῦχος ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ**·

A closer look at these two colophons suggests that Esther’s subscription was interpolated to further “hagiographize” Pamphilus. A reference to a “most ancient” manuscript is inserted, the *hyposemeiosis* is said to have been written in large characters (ἐν πλάτει), reminiscent of Paul’s Galatians

New Testament in Syriac made in this city around 507/508 at Philoxenus’s request. This copy was itself collated against one of Pamphilus’s autographic codices.

<sup>111</sup> Translation into English from the Latin retroversion by Zuntz 1945, 13: “**Descriptus est liber hic liber Pauli Apostoli et collatus. cum exemplari quod scriptum erat in urbe Mabbug; illud autem collatum erat com exemplari quod erat in Caesarea urbe Palestinae: (in) domo librorum (i.e. bibliotheca Sancti Pamphili): quod etiam scriptum erat manu propria eius.**”

<sup>112</sup> “Ἀντεβλήθη πρὸς παλαιώτατον λίαν ἀντίγραφον δεδιορθωμένον χειρὶ τοῦ ἁγίου μάρτυρος Παμφίλου, ὅπερ ἀντίγραφον πρὸς δὲ τῷ τέλει ὑποσημείωσῖς τις ιδιόχειρος τοῦ αὐτοῦ μάρτυρος ὑπέκειτο ἔχουσα οὕτως· Μετελήμφθη καὶ διορθώθη πρὸς τὰ Ἐξαπλᾶ Ὠριγένους, Ἀντωνίνου ἀντέβαλεν, Πάμφιλος διώρθωσα”(text in Gentry [forthcoming](#)).

<sup>113</sup> See the translation above.

6.11, even though the terms used by Paul are different (πηλίκοις γράμμασιν). Although the use of large letters by the author was not unusual, the explicit reference to it, as Reece has noted, is particular to Paul. And if Paul had been following a convention, as Reece has proposed, once it was put in writing by him, it became non-conventional for later Christians to repeat this claim.<sup>114</sup> In the colophon of Esther (S), Pamphilus may have been intentionally fashioned as a second Paul, writing in his prison cell. Pamphilus's own colophon in Esther asserts that he was collating texts while in jail together with a confessor (Antoninus), two details that are absent from 2 Esdras. The colophon in Esther certainly aimed to highlight the Pamphilus martyr persona and his exemplar more visibly than the one in 2 Esdras.

In this martyrial context, the reference to Pamphilus's autography clearly served as an authenticating device. I would suggest that it also served to protect the text's authority at a time when the Origenist controversies were either still raging or had left their mark on the reception of the Alexandrian scholar's works. The hand of the martyr could vouchsafe the theological status of the hexaplaric recension, which after all was derived from Origen. Indeed, the holy hand of the saint strongly contrasts with the improperly used hands of the heretics, notably in Eusebius's *Historia Ecclesiastica*.<sup>115</sup> This is most clearly expressed in Eusebius's citations of the *Little Labyrinth*, which he claimed to have reproduced literally.<sup>116</sup> The anonymous author attacks the heresy of Artemon, saying that his group "laid their hands" on the sacred text (διὰ τοῦτο ταῖς θεαῖαις γραφαῖς ἀφόβως ἐπέβαλον τὰς χεῖρας),<sup>117</sup> and zealously implemented many scriptural corrections (κατωρθωμένα).<sup>118</sup> After some sharp criticism, he focuses on the disagreement between their copies and the revisions they inflicted upon the text, as well as the fact that they are unable to produce the exemplars from which they made their copies. The anonymous author himself apparently collated the different texts of this "heretic" community, claiming that the exemplars of Asclepiades differ from those of Theodotus the cobbler.<sup>119</sup>

Returning to our colophons, it is worth mentioning that the scribe decides to quote the autographic Pamphilan subscription. This implies that the "oldest manuscript" is in fact Pamphilus's original, namely, the manuscript bearing

<sup>114</sup> Reece 2016.

<sup>115</sup> Later, scribes considered to be heretics could be given severe punishment: in 536, Justinian ordered a novella punishing scribes found copying Severus of Antioch's works with having their hands amputated; see Y. Moss 2016, 785–808.

<sup>116</sup> Eus. HE 5.28.7.

<sup>117</sup> Eus. HE 5.28.17.

<sup>118</sup> Eus. HE 5.28.17. On the *Little Labyrinth*'s date and author, see J. Fitzgerald 1998, 120–46.

<sup>119</sup> Eus. HE 5.28.12–17.

his autographic corrections (and thus presumably Origen's own text). It is unlikely, however, that the colophon which the scribe copied was Pamphilus's copy and that the old manuscript bore Pamphilus's autographic editorial corrections. Colophons could be copied and appended to texts regardless of the connection between the text and the colophon, and the scribe could not know with certainty that this one was an autograph, since the subscription itself apparently did not say so. The corrections in the manuscript were not necessarily those of Pamphilus. Yet by claiming to look at the martyr's own handwriting, I would argue, the scribe deploys a strategy of fictional "scribeship" which allows him or her to subtly cast the exemplar as a textual relic. This fiction benefits not only the text but also their own copy and status, even if they remain anonymous.<sup>120</sup> Interestingly, a case has been made in favor of the authenticity of a subscription in a manuscript of Augustine kept in St. Petersburg.<sup>121</sup> The alleged signature of Augustine is partially illegible and notably worn in comparison to the rest of the manuscript. Kenneth Steinhauser deduced that "obviously the signature was considered authentic by some individuals who used the manuscript since they wore it away by touching it reverently."<sup>122</sup> In this case, as in ours, the authenticity of the signature is not of concern. What matters is that individuals thought—or suggested—it was. This example nicely captures the value attached to textual relics, whose veneration anticipates narratives of miracle-working signatures of holy men in the early Middle Ages.<sup>123</sup>

## *Conclusion*

This cultural and theological survey has shown how autography, in the school of Pamphilus, merged the Roman idea of authoritative secondary autograph with a specifically Christian understanding of the complex relationship between body and text in the context of martyrdom. The connection between practices of elite scholarly networks such as those of Atticus or Fronto and the new Christian understanding of handwritten textual work, martyr cult, and relics is what gives the reception of Pamphilus's autographs in Jerome and later scribes its distinctive character.

<sup>120</sup> I would even argue that the close physical contact between the copy, the exemplar, and the scribe as the mediator between them is what allows him or her to launch (fictitiously or not) this process of "relicization."

<sup>121</sup> Codex Leningradensis Q.v.I.3, Saint Petersburg, National Library of Russia, fol. 152r. See Steinhauser 2013.

<sup>122</sup> Steinhauser 2013, 18–19.

<sup>123</sup> Compare Rapp 2007, 220, and Rapp 2009. Cavallo and Rapp have recorded numerous instances of handwritten manuscripts of both women and men imbued with holiness: Cavallo 1994, 1: 31–62; Rapp 2007, 208–15. See also the examples provided by Nautin 1977, 355, note 122.



Notably, while this connection was only sketched in Eusebius's works, it was fully materialized not in Caesarea but in the reception of Pamphilus in Jerome and in later scribal contexts. Put differently, it contributed to a later designation of Caesarea as place where Christian holiness and textual work intertwined. It would suggest that the unfolding of the reception of Pamphilus's handwritten copies proceeded as follows. Pamphilus (often together with Eusebius) corrected, transmitted, and continued Origen's textual work on the biblical text. Pamphilus signed his subscriptions, thereby authenticating his copies and creating a textual lineage linking himself and his students to Origen. After his death, Eusebius "marketed" Caesarea as a martyrial center in the *Martyrs of Palestine*, the *Vita Pamphili*, and the *Historia Ecclesiastica*, emphasizing more specifically Pamphilus's role as the school head of the Christian group of martyrs. He thereby put the city on the Christian map, endowing it (and therefore also the intellectual genealogy of Caesarea) with the holiness of the martyr. Eusebius introduced the association between Pamphilus the martyr and Pamphilus the scholar/scribe without fully intertwining the two. As Pamphilus's copies of the hexaplaric recension and the subscriptions he appended to them were received in the next generations, his fame both as a scholar and a martyr were further crystallized. Subsequently, Jerome's own entry was shaped in accordance with Eusebius's works and especially the *Vita Pamphili*. Its contents remain largely unknown to us, one fragment mentions the preparation of codices.<sup>124</sup> In turn, Jerome's entry on Pamphilus in the *De viris illustribus* proved to be influential on the reception of Pamphilus. Yet, because of the shadow cast by the controversies over Origen, both at the end of the fourth century and in the sixth, his textual authority was somehow preserved through transfer to his "textual heir," Pamphilus. Origen's labor in the Hexapla could be protected and used through the sanctification of his scribe, the martyr Pamphilus. In this context, a phenomenon we might call the "scribe-function" (in reference to Foucault's author-function)—namely, a proliferation of discourses of holiness around the person of the scribe—emerges and contributes to the preservation of the text.

Furthermore, the rise of the cult of the martyrs and of their relics led to a shift in the reception of Pamphilus's manuscripts, from a semantic to an iconic reading. In this context, the hand of the martyr embodied in his ductus started to acquire a new meaning—that of a textual relic. Jerome, I would conclude, is not only a witness to this process in the *De viris illustribus*,<sup>75</sup> but also its agent. In the later subscriptions in Greek (dated to the sixth century) and in Syriac (dated to the seventh century and based on a Greek *Vorlage*),

<sup>124</sup> Jer. Apol. adv. Ruf. 1.9.

scribes continued to copy Pamphilan colophons, promoting the scribal fiction of his autograph, in order to endow their own copies with authority and holiness and protect them from the consequences of anti-Origenism. Thus, Pamphilus's martyrdom and the rise of the cult of the martyrs impacted not only the significance of the handwritten document but also the perception of the connection between text and body. The hand was no longer the extension of the enslaved body or the seal of authority of the grammarian but rather the relic of the martyr-scribe.

Comparable narratives intertwining scribal activity and martyrdom can be found in later periods. In the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, it has been shown, manuscripts could be identified with holy individuals, and real books were put in reliquaries.<sup>125</sup> This phenomenon was not limited to the West. In early medieval Japan, sacred texts replaced or equated the Buddha's relic and took its place within the stupa.<sup>126</sup> In pre-modern Islam, autograph manuscripts were sought after and even collected.<sup>127</sup> From the sixteenth century on, relic-books such as the autographs from Thomas Aquinas had to be protected from attempts to divide them in order to multiply "the relics."<sup>128</sup> Such objects were thought to safeguard against heresy. In light of these developments, Pamphilus and his reception provide valuable evidence of the early beginnings of the trope of the scribe-martyr and of textual relics in Roman Late Antiquity.

*KU Leuven, Belgium*  
*sinowloc@gmail.com*

## References

- Achtemeier, Paul. 1990. "Omne verbum sonat: The New Testament and the Oral Environment of Late Western Antiquity." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 109.1: 3–27.
- Amacker, René, et Éric Junod, eds. 2002. *Pamphile et Eusèbe de Césarée, Apologie Pour Origène, Suivi de Rufin d'Aquilée, Sur la falsification des livres d'Origène*. 2 vols. Sources Chrétiennes 464–65. Paris: Cerf.
- Ashbrook Harvey, Susan. 2006. *Scenting Salvation: Ancient Christianity and the Olfactory Imagination*. Transformation of the Classical Heritage 42. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bardy, Gustave, ed. and trans. 1955. *Eusèbe de Césarée: histoire ecclésiastique, livres V–VII*. Paris: Cerf.

<sup>125</sup> Räsänen 2020, 64–65.

<sup>126</sup> Max Moerman 2010, 71–90.

<sup>127</sup> Chartier 2014, 8 and Bauden and Franssen 2019, 15.

<sup>128</sup> Räsänen 2020, 89–91.

- Barnes, Timothy D. 2010. *Early Christian Hagiography and Roman History*. Tria Corda 5. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Bauden, Frédéric, and Elise Franssen. 2019. *In the Author's Hand: Holograph and Authorial Manuscripts in the Islamic Handwritten Tradition*. Leiden: Brill.
- Bettenson, Henry, and Chris Maunder. 2011. *Documents of the Christian Church*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Blake, Sarah. 2013. "Now You See Them: Slaves and Other Objects as Elements of the Roman Master." *Helios* 39:193–211.
- . 2016. "In Manus: Pliny's Letters and the Arts of Mastery." In *Roman Literary Cultures*, edited by Alison Keith and Jonathan Edmondson, 89–108. University of Toronto Press.
- Blanco Cesteros, Miriam. 2021. "Written in Blood? Decoding Some Red Inks of the Greek Magical Papyri." In *Traces of Ink. Experiences of Philology and Replication*, edited by Lucia Raggetti. Nuncius Series 7, 33–56. Leiden: Brill.
- Boudon-Millot, Véronique. 2007. "Un traité perdu de Galien miraculeusement retrouvé, *Sur l'inutilité de se chagriner* : texte grec et traduction française." In *La science médicale antique, nouveaux regards: études réunies en l'honneur de Jacques Jouanna*, edited by V. Boudon-Millot, A. Guardasole, and C. Magdeleine, 72–123. Paris: Beauchesne.
- Boudon-Millot, Véronique, and Jacques Jouanna. 2010. *Galenus, Claudius: ne pas se chagriner*. Paris: Belles Lettres.
- Bourgain, Pascale. 2013. "À la recherche des caractères propres aux manuscrits d'auteur médiévaux latins." *Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes* 171: 185–198.
- Brown, Peter R. L. 1981. *The Cult of the Saints: Its Rise and Function in Latin Christianity*. London: SCM Press.
- . 1983. "The Saint as Exemplar in Late Antiquity." *Representations* 2: 1–25.
- Butler, Dom Cuthbert, ed. 2015. *The Lausiac History of Palladius*. Vol. 2, *Introduction and Text*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cameron, Alan. 1993. *The Greek Anthology from Meleager to Planudes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2011. *The Last Pagans of Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bubb, Claire, and Michael Peachin. 2023. *Medicine and the Law Under the Roman Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Burton-Christie, Douglas. 1993. *The Word in the Desert: Scripture and the Quest for Holiness in Early Christian Monasticism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 1997. "Oral Culture and Biblical Interpretation in Early Egyptian Monasticism." In *Papers Presented at the Twelfth International Conference on Patristic Studies Held in Oxford, 1995*, edited by Elizabeth A. Livingstone, 2: 144–150. Leuven: Peeters.
- Butler, Shane. 2011. *The Matter of the Page: Essays in Search of Ancient and Medieval Authors*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin University Press.
- Bynum, Caroline Walker. 2020. *Dissimilar Similarities: Devotional Objects in Late Medieval Europe*. Brooklyn, NY: Zone Books.
- Carriker, Andrew J. 2003. *The Library of Eusebius of Caesarea*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

- Cavallo, Guilelmo. 1994. "Testo e immagine una ambigua." In *Testo e immagine nell' alto Medioevo: 15-21 aprile 1993*. Settimane di studi del Centro Italiano di Studi sull'alto Medioevo 41, 31-64. Spoleto: Presso la sede del Centro.
- Cavanaugh, Jillian R., and Shalini Shankar, eds. 2017. *Language and Materiality: Ethnographic and Theoretical Explorations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ceresa-Castaldo, Aldo, ed. 1988. *Gerolamo: Gli Uomini Illustri = De viris illustribus*. Bologna: EDB.
- Chaganti, Seeta. 2008. *The Medieval Poetics of the Reliquary: Enshrinement, Inscription, Performance*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Chartier, Roger, and Lydia G. Cochrane. 2014. *The Author's Hand and the Printer's Mind*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Clark, Gillian. 1999. "Victricius of Rouen: Praising the Saints." *J ECS* 7. 3: 365-399.
- Coogan, Jeremiah. 2018. "Divine Truth, Presence, and Power: Christian Books in Roman North Africa." *Journal of Late Antiquity* 11:375-95.
- . 2021a. "The Material Gospel." *Early Christianity* 12:1.
- . 2021b. "Transforming Textuality." *Studies in Late Antiquity* 5: 6-27. <https://online.ucpress.edu/SLA/article/5/1/6/116691/Transforming-TextualityPorphyry-Eusebius-and-Late>.
- . 2022a. *Eusebius the Evangelist: Rewriting the Fourfold Gospel in Late Antiquity*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- . 2022b. "The Ways That Parted in the Library: The Gospels According to Matthew and According to the Hebrews in Late Ancient Heresiology." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*: 1-18.
- . 2022c. "Transforming Textuality: Porphyry, Eusebius, and Late Ancient Tables of Contents." *Studies in Late Antiquity* 5, no. 1: 6-27.
- Corke-Webster, James. 2012. "Author and Authority: Literary Representations of Moral Authority in Eusebius of Caesarea's *The Martyrs of Palestine*." In *Christian Martyrdom in Late Antiquity (300-450 AD): History, Discourse, and Religious Identity*, edited by Peter Gemeinhardt and Johan Leemans, 51-78. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- . 2013. "A Literary Historian: Eusebius of Caesarea and the Martyrs of Lyons and Palestine." *Studia Patristica* 66: 191-202.
- Corke-Webster, James, and Christa Gray. 2020. "Introduction." In *The Hagiographical Experiment*, edited by James Corke-Webster and Christa Gray, 1-26. Leiden: Brill.
- Cox Miller, Patricia. 2000. "The Little Blue Flower Is Red: Relics and the Poetizing of the Body." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 8.2: 213-36.
- . 2004. "Visceral Seeing: The Holy Body in Late Ancient Christianity." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 12.4: 391-411.
- . 2005. "Relics, Rhetoric, and Mental Spectacles." In *Seeing the Invisible in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, edited by G. de Nie, K. F. Morrison, and M. Mostert. Utrecht Studies in Medieval Literacy 14, 25-52. Turnhout: Brepols.
- . 2009. *The Corporeal Imagination: Signifying the Holy in Late Ancient Christianity*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. Crawford, Matthew

- R. 2019. *The Eusebian Canon Tables: Ordering Textual Knowledge in Late Antiquity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- De Bruyn Theodore. 2017. *Making Amulets Christian: Artefacts, Scribes, and Contexts*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Delehaye, Hippolyte. 1913. *Les origines du culte des martyrs*. Brussels: Bureau de la société des Bollandistes.
- . 1940. *Propylaeum ad Acta sanctorum Decembris: martyrologium Romanum ad formam editionis typicae scholiis historicis instructum*. Brussels: Meester Fratres.
- Devreesse, Robert. 1954. *Introduction à l'étude des manuscrits grecs*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Dickinson, Jennifer. 2017. "Physicality and Texts: Rematerializing the Transparent." In *Language and Materiality: Ethnographic and Theoretical Explorations*, edited by Jillian R. Cavanaugh and Shalini Shankar, 265–69. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dorandi, Tiziano. 1991. "Den Autoren über die Schulter geschaut: Arbeitsweise und Autographie." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 87: 11–33.
- . 2000. *Le stylet et la tablette: dans le secret des auteurs antiques*. Paris: Belles lettres.
- Dorival, Gilles. 2005. "L'apport des Synopses transmises sous le nom d'Athanase et de Jean Chrysostome à la question du Corpus Littéraire de la Bible?" In *Qu'est-ce qu'un Corpus Littéraire? Recherches sur le corpus biblique et les corpus patristiques*, edited by Gilles Dorival, 53–59. Peeters: Paris-Louvain.
- Ehrman, Bart D., trans. 2003. *The Apostolic Fathers*. Vol. 1. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Fitzgerald, John T. 1998. "Eusebius and the Little Labyrinth." In *The Early Church in Its Context: Essays in Honor of Everett Ferguson*, edited by Abraham Malherbe et al., 120–46. Leiden: Brill.
- Fitzgerald, William. 2021. "The Slave, Between Absence and Presence." In *Unspoken Rome*, edited by Tom Geue and Elena Giusti, 239–49. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Frank, Georgia. 2000. *The Memory of the Eyes: Pilgrims to Living Saints in Christian Late Antiquity*. Transformation of the Classical Heritage 30. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Frank, Georgia, Susan R. Holman, and Andrew Jacobs, eds. 2019. *The Garb of Being: Embodiment and the Pursuit of Holiness in Late Ancient Christianity*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Freese, John Henry. 1920. *Translations of Christian Literature Series I: Greek Texts*. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.
- Fremantle, W. H., G. Lewis, and W. G. Martley. 1893. *From Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*. Second Series, Vol. 6, edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co.
- Frenschkowski, Marco. 2006. "Studien Zur Geschichte der Bibliothek von Cäsarea." In *New Testament Manuscripts: Their Texts and Their World*, edited by Thomas J. Kraus and Tobias Nicklas, 53–104. Leiden: Brill.

- Gamble, Harry Y. 1995. *Books and Readers in the Early Church*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Ganz, David. 1997. “‘Mind in Character’: Ancient and Medieval Ideas about the Status of the Autograph as an Expression of Personality.” In *Of the Making of Books: Medieval Manuscripts, Their Scribes and Readers—Essays Presented to M. B. Parkes*, edited by P. R. Robinson and Rivkah Zim, 280–99. Aldershot: Scholar Press.
- Geerard, Mauritius. 1974. *Clavis Patrum Graecorum*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Genette, Gerard. 1997. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gentry, Peter J. 2006. “The Septuagint and the Text of the Old Testament.” *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 16: 193–218.
- . *Forthcoming*. “Text and Translation of All Known Colophons Relating to Origen’s Hexapla.” *The Forerunners and Heirs of Origen’s Hexapla*. Leiden: Brill.
- Giomini, Remo, and Maria Silvana Celentano, eds. and trans. 1980. *Victor, Ars rhetorica, cap. 27: de epistolis*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Gourinat, Jean-Bastien. 2008. “Le Platon de Panétius: à propos d’un témoignage inédit de Galien,” *Philosophie antique* 8: 139–51.
- Géhin, Paul, ed. 1987. *Évagre le Pontique, Scholies aux Proverbes: introduction, texte critique, traduction, notes, appendice et index*. Sources Chrétiennes 340. Paris: Éditions de Cerf.
- Gemeinhardt, Peter, and Johan Leemans, eds. 2012. *Christian Martyrdom in Late Antiquity (300–450 AD): History and Discourse, Tradition and Religious Identity*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Geue, Tom. 2022. “Rush Job: Slavery and Brevity in the Early Roman Principate.” *Cambridge Classical Journal* 68: 83–111.
- Giraud, Vincent. 2011. “*Signum et vestigium* dans la pensée de saint Augustin.” *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 95.2: 251–74.
- González Marín, Susana. 2016. “La evolución de un paratexto singular: las subcripciones Latinas.” *Cuadernos de filología clásica, estudios Latinos* 36.1: 9–25.
- Grafton, Anthony, and Megan Williams. 2006. *Christianity and the Transformation of the Book: Origen, Eusebius, and the Library of Caesarea*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Grant, Robert M. 1980. *Eusebius as Church Historian*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Grig, Lucy. 2004. *Making Martyrs in Late Antiquity*. London: Duckworth.
- Guzmán, Antonio, and Javier Martínez, eds. 2018. *Animo Decipiendi? Rethinking Fakes and Authorship in Classical, Late Antique, and Early Christian Works*. Groningen: Barkhuis.
- Habinek, Thomas. 2005. “Slavery and Class.” In *A Companion to Latin Literature*, edited by Stephen Harrison, 385–93. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Hahn, Cynthia and Klein, Holger A. eds. 2012. *Saints and Sacred Matter the Cult of Relics in Byzantium and Beyond*. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 65–66. Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection.

- Haines, Charles Reginald, ed. and trans. 1919. *The Correspondence of Marcus Cornelius Fronto with Marcus Aurelius Antonius, Lucius Verus, Antonius Pius and Various Friends*. London: Heinemann.
- Haines-Eitzen, Kim. 1998. "Girls Trained in Beautiful Writing: Female Scribes in Roman Antiquity and Early Christianity." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 6: 629–46.
- . 2000. *Guardians of Letters: Literacy, Power, and the Transmitters of Early Christian Literature*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- . 2007. "Engendering Palimpsests: Reading the Textual Tradition of the Acts of Paul and Thecla." In *The Early Christian Book*, edited by William E. Kling-shirn and Linda Safran, 177–93. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press.
- Halkin, François. 1987. "Les trois frères martyrs de Lentini." In *Six inédits d'hagiologie Byzantine*, <page numbers here>. Brussels: Société des Bollandistes.
- Halton, Thomas P., trans. 1999. *Saint Jerome: On Illustrious Men*. Fathers of the Church 100. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press.
- Hartog, Paul A. 2021. "Pamphilus the Librarian and the Institutional Legacy of Origen's Library in Caesarea," *Theological Librarianship* 14: 22–34.
- Hendrickson, Thomas G. 2018. "Spurious Manuscripts of Genuine Works: The Cases of Cicero and Virgil." In *Animo Decipiendi? Rethinking Fakes and Authorship in Classical, Late Antique, and Early Christian Works*, edited by Antonio Guzmán and Javier Martínez, 125–38. Groningen: Barkhuis.
- Hennessy, Marlene V. 2013. "The Social Life of a Manuscript Metaphor: Christ's Blood as Ink." In *The Social Life of Illumination: Manuscripts, Images, and Communities in the Late Middle Ages*, edited by Joyce Coleman, Mark Kruse, and Kathryn A. Smith, 17–52. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Henry, René. 1959. *Photius: Bibliothèque*. Paris: Belles Lettres.
- Holford-Strevens, Leofranc, ed. 2019. *Auli Gelli Noctes Atticae*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hopkins, John North, and Scott McGill, eds. 2023. *Forgery beyond Deceit: Fabrication, Value, and the Desire for Ancient Rome*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Houston, George W. 2014. *Inside Roman Libraries: Book Collections and Their Management in Antiquity*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Howley, Joseph. 2017. "Book-Burning and the Uses of Writing in Ancient Rome: Destructive Practice between Literature and Document." *Journal of Roman Studies* 107: 213–36.
- . 2018. *Aulus Gellius and Roman Reading Culture: Text, Presence, and Imperial Knowledge in the Noctes Atticae*. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2020. "In Ancient Rome." In *Further Reading*, edited by Matthew Rubery and Leah Price, 15–27. Oxford University Press.
- Hunter, David G. 1999. "Vigilantius of Calagurris and Victricius of Rouen: Ascetics, Relics, and Clerics in Late Roman Gaul." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 7.3: 401–30.

- Hurtado, Larry W. 2006. *The Earliest Christian Artifacts: Manuscripts and Christian Origins*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing.
- Jacobson, Miriam. 2014. *Barbarous Antiquity: Reorienting the Past in the Poetry of Early Modern England*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- James, Liz, and Ruth Webb. 1991. "To Understand Ultimate Things and Enter Secret Places": *Ekphrasis* and Art in Byzantium." *Art History* 14: 1–17.
- Jansen, Laura, ed. 2014. *The Roman Paratext: Frame, Texts, Readers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Johnson, William A. 2016. *Bookrolls and Scribes in Oxyrhynchus*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Jones, Christopher. 2009. "Books and Libraries in a Newly Discovered Treatise of Galen," *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 22: 390–97.
- Joshel, Sandra R. 2011. "Slavery and Roman Literary Culture." In *The Cambridge World History of Slavery*. Vol. 1, *The Ancient Mediterranean World*, edited by K. Bradley and P. Cartledge, 214–40. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Junod, Eric. 2003. "Origène et la tradition alexandrine vus par Photius dans sa Bibliothèque (1089–1102)." In *Origeniana Octava*. Vol. 2, *Origen and the Alexandrian Tradition: Papers of the 8th International Origen Congress, Pisa, 27–31 August 2001*. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum Lovaniensium 164B, edited by L. Perrone in collaboration with P. Bernardino and D. Marchini, 1089–1102. Leuven: Leuven University Press and Peeters.
- Kamesar, Adam. 1993. *Jerome, Greek Scholarship, and the Hebrew Bible: A Study of the Quaestiones Hebraicae in Genesim*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Kaniecka, Mary S., ed. and trans. 1928. *Vita sancti Ambrosii*. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America.
- Kannengiesser, Charles. 1992. "Eusebius of Caesarea, Origenist." In *Eusebius, Christianity, and Judaism*, edited by H. Attridge and G. Hata, 435–66. Leiden: Brill.
- Kaster, Robert A., trans. 1995. *Suetonius, De Grammaticis et Rhetoribus*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Keane, Webb. 2013. "On Spirit Writing: Materialities of Language and the Religious Work of Transduction." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 19:1–17.
- Klingshirn, William E., and Linda Safran, eds. 2007. *The Early Christian Book*. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press.
- Kofsky, Aryeh. 2006. "Pamphilus and the Christian Library of Caesarea" [Hebrew]. *Cathedra* 122: 53–62.
- Krisak, Len, trans. 2020. *Prudentius' Crown of Martyrs: Liber Peristephanon*. Routledge: London.
- Krueger, Derek. 2004. *Writing and Holiness: the Practice of Authorship in the Early Christian East*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Kuhlmann, Peter. 2012. "Christliche Märtyrer als Träger römischer Identität: Das *Peristephanon* des Prudentius und sein kultureller Kontext." In *Christian Martyrdom in Late Antiquity (300–450 AD): History and Discourse, Tradition and Religious Identity*, edited by Peter Gemeinhardt and Johan Leemans, 135–54. Berlin: De Gruyter.



- Lambert, David. 2020. "Hilary of Arles, *Vita Honorati*." In *The Cult of Saints in Late Antiquity*, 00727. <http://csla.history.ox.ac.uk/record.php?recid=E07186> ; access date 26.6.2023.
- Lardet, Pierre, ed. 1983. *Jerome: Apologie contre Rufin*. Sources chrétiennes 303. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.
- Lavarenne, Maurice, ed. and trans. 1963. *Prudence: le Livre des Couronnes*. Paris: CUF Les Belles Lettres.
- Lavertujon, André, ed. 1899. *La chronique de Sulpice Sévère: texte critique, traduction et commentaire*. 2 vols. Paris: Hachette.
- Leemans, Johan, Wendy Mayer, Pauline Allen, and Boudewijn Dehandschutter, eds. 2003. "Let us die that we may live": *Greek homilies on Christian martyrs from Asia Minor, Palestine and Syria (c. AD 350–AD 450)*. London: Routledge.
- Maraval, Pierre. 1985. *Lieux saints et pèlerinages d'Orient: histoire et géographie des origines à la conquête arabe*. Paris: Cerf.
- Marganne, Marie-Hélène. 2019. "Comment reconnaître un autographe parmi les papyrus littéraires grecs? L'exemple du P. Oxy. 74.4970." In *In the Author's Hand: Holograph and Authorial Manuscripts in the Islamic Handwritten Tradition*, edited by Bauden, F. and Franssen, E., 38–54, Leiden: Brill.
- Marsh, Jr., Bradley. 2022. *Early Christian Scripture and the Samaritan Pentateuch: A Study in Hexaplaric Manuscript Activity*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- McDonnell, Myles. 1996. "Writing, Copying, and Autograph Manuscripts in Ancient Rome." *Classical Quarterly* 46.2: 469–91.
- McGann, Jerome J. 1991. *The Textual Condition*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Mercati, Giovanni. 1941. *Nuove note di letteratura biblica e cristiana antica*. Studi e Testi 95. Città Del Vaticano: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana.
- Meyer, Elizabeth A. 2004. *Legitimacy and Law in the Roman World: Tabulae in Roman Belief and Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Metzger, Bruce M. 1992. *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*, 3rd edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Miller, Peter N. 2017. *History and Its Objects: Antiquarianism and Material Culture since 1500*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Moerman, D. Max. 2010. "The Death of the Dharma: Buddhist Sutra Burials in Medieval Japan." In *The Death of Sacred Texts: Ritual Disposal and Renovation of Texts in World Religions*, edited by K. Myrvold, 71–90. Burlington, VT: Ashgate.
- Morlet, Sébastien. 2011. "La formation d'une identité intellectuelle et son cadre scolaire: Eusèbe de Césarée à l'"école" de Pamphile." *Adamantius* 17: 208–19.
- . 2021. "Les recherches sur Philon et Eusèbe de Césarée depuis 1967." In *Les études philoniennes: regards sur cinquante ans de recherche (1967–2017)*, edited by S. Morlet and O. Munnich, 441–72. Leiden: Brill.
- Moss, Candida R. 2012. *Ancient Christian Martyrdom: Diverse Practices, Theologies, and Traditions*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- . 2021. "Between the Lines." *Studies in Late Antiquity* 5:432–52.
- Moss, Yonatan. 2016. "Saving Severus: How Severus of Antioch's Writings Survived in Greek." *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 56: 785–808.

- Motta, Daniela. 2004. *Percorsi dell'agiografia: società e cultura nella Sicilia tardo-antica e bizantina*. Catania: Prisma.
- Mroczek, Eva. 2016a. "True Stories and the Poetics of Textual Discovery." *BSOR* 45:21–31. <https://journal.equinoxpub.com/BSOR/article/view/14611>.
- . 2016b. *The Literary Imagination in Jewish Antiquity*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- . 2018. "Truth and Doubt in Manuscript Discovery Narratives." *Rethinking 'Authority' in Late Antiquity*. Routledge.
- Nau, François. 1913. "Histoire Des Solitaires Égyptiens (Suite, Ms. Coislin 126, Fol. 241)." *Revue de l'Orient Chrétien* 18: 43–69.
- Nautin, Pierre. 1977. *Origène: sa vie et son oeuvre*. Christianisme Antique 1. Paris: Beauchesne.
- Oulton, John, and Hugh J. Lawlor. 1927–1928. *Eusebius: The Ecclesiastical History and The Martyrs of Palestine*. 2 vols. London: SPCK.
- Pecere, Oronzo. 1982. "La 'subscriptio' di Statilio Massimo e la tradizione delle 'Agrarie' di Cicerone,." *Italia Medioevale e Umanistica* 25:73–123.
- Penland, Elizabeth C. 2010. "Martyrs as Philosophers: The School of Pamphilus and Ascetic Tradition in Eusebius's Martyrs of Palestine." PhD diss., Yale University.
- . 2011. "Eusebius Philosophus? School Activity at Caesarea through the Lens of the Martyrs." In *Reconsidering Eusebius: Collected Papers on Literary, Historical and Theological Issues*, edited by S. Inowlocki and C. Zamagni, 87–97. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2013. "The History of the Caesarean Present: Eusebius and Narratives of Origen." In *Eusebius of Caesarea: Tradition and Innovations*, edited by A. Johnson and J. Schott. Washington, DC: Center for Hellenic Studies. <http://chs.harvard.edu/CHS/article/display/5870>.
- Petit, Caroline ed. 2018. *Galen's Treatise Peri Alupias (De indolentia) in Context*. Leiden: Brill.
- Petrucci, Armando. 1984. "Minuta, Autografo, Libro d'autore." In *Atti del convegno internazionale Il libro e il testo, Urbino, 20–23 settembre 1982*, edited by C. Questa Cesare and R. Raffaelli, 397–414. Urbino: Università degli studi di Urbino.
- . 2006 "Autografi." *Quaderni di Storia* 63: 111–25.
- Pollock Renck, Anneliese. 2021. "(Christ's) Blood as Ink: Affective Secular Reading in Late Medieval France." *Digital Philology* 10.2: 228–50.
- Porter, Stanley E., and Sean A. Adams. 2010. *Paul and the Ancient Letter Form*. Leiden: Brill.
- Radford, L. B. 1908. *Three Teachers of Alexandria: Theognostus, Pierius and Peter: A Study in the Early History of Origenism and Anti-Origenism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ramelli, Ilaria L. E. 2011. "The Birth of the Rome-Alexandria Connection: The Early Sources on Mark and Philo, and the Petrine Tradition." *Studia Philonica Annual* 23: 69–95.
- Rapp, Claudia. 1991. "Christians and Their Manuscripts in the Greek East during the Fourth Century." In *Scritture, libri e testi nelle aree provinciali di Bisanzio*, edited by G. Cavallo and G. de Gregorio, 127–48. Spoleto: M. Maniaci.

- . 2007. “Holy Texts, Holy Men, and Holy Scribes: Aspects of Scriptural Holiness in Late Antiquity.” In *The Early Christian Book*, edited by W. E. Klingshirn and L. Safran, 194–222. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press.
- . 2009. “Safe-Conducts to Heaven: Holy Men, Mediation, and the Role of Writing.” In *Transformations of Late Antiquity: Essays for Peter Brown*, edited by P. Rousseau and E. Papoutsakis, 187–203. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Räsänen, Marika. 2020. “Books of Golden Rays and Ripped Folios: Thomas Aquinas’s Book-Relics in Religious Reforms.” In *Golden Leaves and Burned Books: Religious Reform and Conflict in the Long European Reformation*. Cultural History 16, edited by T. Immonen, 61–96. Turku: Finnish Society for Cultural History.
- Reay, Brendon. 2005. “Agriculture, Writing, and Cato’s Aristocratic Self-Fashioning.” *Classical Antiquity* 24: 331–61.
- Rebenich, Stephan. 2002. *Jerome*. London: Routledge.
- Reece, Steve. 2016. *Paul’s Large Letters: Paul’s Autographic Subscription in the Light of Ancient Epistolary Conventions*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Rizos, Efthymios. 2021. “Gregory of Nazianzus, *Contra Iulianum* I.” In *The Cult of the Saints in Late Antiquity*, E01904. <http://csla.history.ox.ac.uk/record.php?recid=E01235>; access date: 26.6.2023.
- Roberts, Colin H. 1979. *Manuscript, Society and Belief in Early Christian Egypt*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Roberts, Michael. 1993. *The Liber Peristephanon of Prudentius*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Ross, Jill. 2008. *Figuring the Feminine: The Rhetoric of Female Embodiment in Medieval Hispanic Literature*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Rothschild, Clare K., and Trevor W. Thompson. 2011. “Galen’s *On the Avoidance of Grief*.” *Early Christianity* 2: 110–29.
- Rouët de Journel, Marie-Joseph, trans. 1946. *Jean Moschus: le pré spirituel*. Paris: Cerf.
- Routh, Martin-Joseph. 1974. *Reliquiae Sacrae, sive auctorum fere iam perditorum secundi tertiiue saeculi post Christum natum ad codices mss. recensuit, notisque illustravit, quae Supersunt*. Hildesheim: Olms.
- Saenger, Paul. 1997. *Space Between Words: The Origins of Silent Reading*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Schott, Jeremy M. 2013. “Plotinus’s Portrait and Pamphilus’s Prison Notebook: Neoplatonic and Early Christian Textualities at the Turn of the Fourth Century C.E.” *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 21.3: 329–62.
- Speyer, Wolfgang. 1970. *Bücherfunde in der Glaubenswertung der Antike*. Hypomnemata 24. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.
- Squire, Michael, and Johannes Wienand. 2017. *Morphogrammata / The Lettered Art of Optatian: Figuring Cultural Transformations in the Age of Constantine*. Morphomata 33. Paderborn: Wilhelm Fink Verlag.
- Stefaniw, Blossom. 2019. *Christian Reading: Language, Ethics, and the Order of Things*. Oakland: University of California Press.

- Steinhauser, Kenneth B. 2014. "2013 NAPS Presidential Address From Russia with Love: Deciphering Augustine's Code." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 22: 1–20.
- Verheyden, Joseph. 2010. "Pain and Glory: Some Introductory Comments on the Rhetorical Qualities and Potential of the Martyrs of Palestine by Eusebius of Caesarea." In *Martyrdom and Persecution in Late Ancient Christianity: Festschrift Boudewijn Dehandschutter*, edited by J. Leemans and J. Verheyden, 353–91. Peeters: Leuven.
- Vessey, Mark. 2016. "From Cursus to Ductus: Figures of Writing in Western Late Antiquity (Augustine, Jerome, Cassiodorus, Bede)." In *European Literary Careers: The Author from Antiquity to the Renaissance*, edited by P. Cheney and F. A. de Armas, 47–103. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Waldner, Katharina. 2020. "When the City Cries: The Spacetime of Persecution in Eusebius' Martyrs of Palestine." In *Desiring Martyrs: Locating Martyrs in Space and Time*, edited by H. O. Maier and K. Waldner, 177–92. Berlin: De Gruyter Oldenbourg.
- Walsham, Alexandra. 2010. "Introduction: Relics and Remains." *Past and Present* 206: 9–36.
- Watts, James. 2006. "The Three Dimensions of Scriptures." *Postscripts* 2: 135–59.
- . 2010. "Ancient Iconic Texts and Scholarly Expertise." *Postscripts* 6: 329–38.
- . 2012. "Relic Texts." The Iconic Books Blog. <http://iconicbooks.blogspot.com/2012/06/relic-texts.html>; access date: 26.6.2023.
- Winsbury, Rex. 2009. *The Roman Book: Books, Publishing, and Performance in Classical Rome*. London: Duckworth.
- Wisniewski, Robert. 2019. *The Beginnings of the Cult of Relics*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Zahn, Theodor. 1890. *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*. Band 2, Hälfte 1. Erlangen: Deichert.
- Zetzel, James. 1973. "Emendavi ad Tironem: Some Notes on Scholarship in the Second Century A.D.!" *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 77: 225–43.
- . 1981. *Latin Textual Criticism in Antiquity*. New York: Arno Press.
- Ziolkowski, Eric. 2017. *A Handbook of Biblical Reception in Jewish, European Christian, and Islamic Folklores*. Vol. 1. Berlin: De Gruyter.