

Archiving Paul: Manuscripts, Religion, and the Editorial Shaping of Ancient Letter Collections



GREGORY FEWSTER

RÉSUMÉ Dans « *Archiving Paul* », l'auteur tente de « penser de façon archivistique » au sujet de ce qu'on appelle maintenant le *corpus Paulinum* – une collection d'environ treize lettres attribuées à Paul de Tarse, qui est reconnu comme l'une des figures fondatrices de la chrétienté. Cet article examine les pratiques archivistiques liées aux anciennes lettres, surtout celles de Paul, dans le but de montrer comment de telles pratiques se servent de différentes stratégies de rédaction qui ont comme résultat de produire des interprétations variantes de l'authenticité et de l'originalité. Après avoir présenté son argument que l'histoire textuelle du *corpus Paulinum* peut être considérée comme un document d'archives, l'auteur généralise trois façons par lesquels les rédacteurs ont formé le matériel archivistique : collection, corpus et canon. Alors que ces façons ne sont pas nécessairement destinées à être applicables à toutes les archives, leur pertinence spécifique au *corpus Paulinum* facilite une prise de conscience des différentes formes que peut prendre la modification archivistique et la manière dont de tels façonnages servent d'intermédiaire lorsque de subséquents utilisateurs s'y engagent.

ABSTRACT In “Archiving Paul,” the author attempts to “think archivally” about what has come to be called the *corpus Paulinum* – a collection of 13 (or so) letters attributed to Paul of Tarsus, who is commemorated as one of the founding figures of Christianity. This article looks to archiving practices associated with ancient letters, primarily Paul's letters, in an effort to expose how such practices employ different editorial strategies with the effect of producing varying construals of authenticity and originality. After arguing that the textual history of the *corpus Paulinum* can be considered as an archive, the author generalizes three modes by which editors have shaped that archival material: collection, corpus, and canon. While these modes are not necessarily meant to be applicable for all archival study, their relevance specifically to the *corpus Paulinum* facilitates an awareness of the different forms that archival alteration can take and the way in which such shaping mediates the engagement of subsequent users.

Introduction

Archival theory increasingly looks outside of itself for theoretical and methodological advancement, in some cases influenced by growing critical trends in adjacent disciplines. Cross-disciplinary work of this sort has the potential to enrich both archival studies proper and the disciplines it encounters. In this article, I enter into this productive mutuality through a nascent connection between archival study and textual scholarship initiated by Heather MacNeil.¹ MacNeil participates with some other archival scholars in a postmodern turn based on which positivist archival description is being replaced with an interest in the influence of archival shaping on conceptions of the authenticity and originality of a fonds. This impulse toward the effects and motivations of textual editors is shared among textual scholars of antiquity, including those who study ancient letter collections. Alongside these efforts, I propose to “think archivally” about what has come to be called the *corpus Paulinum* – a collection of 13 (or so) letters attributed to Paul of Tarsus, who is commemorated as one of the founding figures of Christianity.²

The benefits of treating the *corpus Paulinum* in this way are twofold. First, Paul’s letters have enjoyed a lengthy history of transmission, allowing for many instances of editorial manipulation of those texts. Second, the history of the Pauline textual tradition has been propelled by the letters’ attributed significance as religious texts.³ The influence of religion on these texts adds a dimension to archival strategies that has received limited attention. In a recent article, Michelle Caswell draws from the study of religion in an effort to promote the practice of archival pluralism. While the primary direction of insight moves from religious studies to archival studies, Caswell justifies her attention to discourse about religion based on the liminality of both fields and

- 1 Heather MacNeil, “Archivalterity: Rethinking Original Order,” *Archivaria* 66 (Fall 2008): 1–24; Heather MacNeil, “Picking Our Text: Archival Description, Authenticity, and the Archivist as Editor,” *American Archivist* 68, no. 2 (Fall/Winter 2005): 264–78, esp. 268–71.
- 2 These letters are commonly called Romans, 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, 1 Thessalonians, 2 Thessalonians, 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus, and Philemon, and are attributed to Paul of Tarsus, having been sent to a number of groups, households, or individuals with whom he had some affiliation. As we will see, the precise number and order of letters included in a Pauline collection depends on historical and geographical location.
- 3 I am careful to use “religion” as a re-descriptive term in this case, rather than one that describes a quality inherent to the texts and their users. Thus, “religion” and “religious” re-describe the politics of Paul’s letter archive based on ideological propensities that modern scholarly discourse has constructed and explicated. See Jonathan Z. Smith, *Relating Religion: Essays in the Study of Religion* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004), 179, 193–94; Brent Nongbri, “Dislodging ‘Embedded’ Religion: A Brief Note on a Scholarly Trope,” *Numen* 55, no. 4 (2008): 440–60.

especially the potential for religion to serve as a site for violent difference.⁴ Caswell rightly highlights the liminality of these fields as beneficial, but her interest in religious pluralism in particular limits the opportunity to appreciate how archival strategies are always plural and contested, and that religion is a forceful component of such plurality.⁵

In contrast, this article looks to archiving practices associated with ancient letters, primarily Paul's letters, in an effort to expose how such practices employ different editorial strategies with the effect of producing varying construals of authenticity and originality. After arguing that the textual history of the *corpus Paulinum* can be considered an archive, I generalize three modes by which editors have shaped that archival material: collection, corpus, and canon. While these specific modes are not necessarily meant to be applicable for all archival study, their relevance specifically to the *corpus Paulinum* facilitates an awareness of the different forms that archival alteration can take and the way in which such shaping mediates the engagement of subsequent users.

Who Is Paul and What Is the *Corpus Paulinum*?

Contemporary scholarship (and popular religious imagination) tends to remember Paul of Tarsus as a founding personality of the movement known now as Christianity.⁶ Extensive interest in Paul arises through numerous biographical as well as mystical writings that were composed and copied between the second century CE and following, and through a rigorous exegetical tradition arising in Europe during the Reformation. Both of these traditions affirm Paul as a letter writer: the generator of the *corpus Paulinum*, which

4 Michelle Caswell, "On Archival Pluralism: What Religious Pluralism (and Its Critics) Can Teach Us about Archives," *Archival Science* 13, no. 4 (December 2013): 275.

5 Caswell promotes four principles of "energetic engagement, understanding, strengthened commitment, and dialog," while warning against "claims of universality, inattention to power, silencing dissent, and collapsing of difference." *Ibid.*, 273, 281, 288. However, I am not sure whether these pitfalls can be avoided wholesale, insofar as, as Tomoko Masuzawa argues, the language of pluralism inherently reifies a Western Christian paradigm of religion; see Tomoko Masuzawa, *The Invention of World Religions, or, How European Universalism Was Preserved in the Language of Pluralism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005). Especially for this study, the dominance of post-Enlightenment forms of Christianity risk anachronism in the study of ancient Christian textual and archival practice (see note 3).

6 My language here is a little obtuse since I think it is at best anachronistic to call Paul or those groups to whom he wrote "Christian," and at worst the use of "Christian" tends to underappreciate the ethnic, social, and ideological complexity of the early movement. The strength of the term "Christian" also adds a teleological element to the life and writing of Paul, such that it is common for scholars to refer to Paul as a founder of Christianity. See, for example, John Ashton, *The Religion of Paul the Apostle* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000), 3; cf. Daniel Boyarin, *A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 12.

makes up a significant portion of the New Testament.⁷ The idea that a person named Paul wrote a number of letters to some communities scattered throughout Greece and Asia Minor during the middle part of the first century CE, and that these letters have been collected and preserved over time, forms the basis for a mass of textual and exegetical scholarship. Here the biographical and historical study of Paul interfaces with biblical textual scholarship. Paul's letters have a rich manuscript tradition, and their significance for this article can be divided into two types of concerns: textual and methodological. Textual concerns involve the extant manuscript evidence of the *corpus Paulinum*, and methodological concerns involve the goals of and approaches taken in studying those manuscripts. I will begin with the textual concerns before moving on to the ways in which the textual tradition has been evaluated by scholars.

The fourth century CE marks an important stage in the transmission of early Christian literature. With the advent of Imperial Christianity in the fourth century CE, scribes began to make use of highly developed codex technology as a means of gathering Christian sacred literature into single deluxe codices.⁸ By the fourth century, complete manuscripts of Paul's letters had begun to be collected together and included alongside other documents of the New Testament, and were found in a variety of languages, including Greek, Latin, Coptic, and Armenian.⁹ Prior to the fourth century, however, the witnesses to Paul's letters are much more fragmentary. These include extensive citation by early Christian writers such as Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp, but more importantly they come in the form of papyrus fragments. James R. Roysse lists 20 fragments of Paul's letters that remain from between the second and fourth centuries CE. Some of these are very small pieces of a single letter

- 7 The modern scholarly consensus views seven of these letters as originating from Paul, while the other six may have been written later by other people. Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, 1 Thessalonians, and Philemon fit the first category. Colossians, Ephesians, 2 Thessalonians, 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, and Titus fit the latter category, called pseudepigraphal or pseudonymous. Other letters like 3 Corinthians and Letter to the Laodiceans are included in some New Testament collections but have never received wide acceptance.
- 8 Eusebius's *Life of Constantine* 4.36 recounts Constantine's commission of 50 deluxe parchment biblical codices. Some have attempted to link the extant *Codex Sinaiticus* and *Codex Vaticanus* to Constantine's commission, though this is a difficult claim to make on historical grounds. See T.C. Skeat, "The Codex Sinaiticus and the Codex Vaticanus and Constantine [1999]," in *The Collected Biblical Writings of T.C. Skeat*, ed. J.K. Elliott (Leiden, NL: Brill, 2004), 193–237. However, it is safe to assume that our extant deluxe fourth-century codices come out of that Imperial milieu given the expense that would have been required to produce them.
- 9 For discussion of the versions, see Bruce M. Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968), 67–85; Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland, *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism*, trans. Erroll F. Rhodes (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1987), 181–217.

and include only a few verses or portions of chapters.¹⁰ Probably the most important of these manuscripts is P46, dating to the late second or early third century CE.¹¹ It contains almost all of Paul's letters, but stops near the end of 1 Thessalonians (leaving out 2 Thessalonians, 1 and 2 Timothy, Titus, and Philemon) while including the letter to the Hebrews (which is anonymous).¹² P46 is indeed remarkable given its relatively early date and comprehensive contents. However, in spite of the fragmentary nature of the remaining early manuscript witnesses, there is reason to believe that some of these originated in larger codices, perhaps of an entire Pauline letter collection.¹³

As I noted above, this textual data sits between general interest in the textual history of early Christianity and biographical interest in the person of Paul, both of which have traditionally been oriented around the categories of authenticity and originality.¹⁴ The quest for authentic and original Pauline letters can operate on a variety of scales, from small variation units between manuscripts to issues of which texts ought to be included in the *corpus Paulinum* and in what order. Prior to a recent paradigm shift in biblical textual scholarship, textual critics have occupied their time with the search for the "original text" of the New Testament, or of Paul's letters in this case. Deviation from a

- 10 See the comprehensive chart in James R. Royse, "The Early Text of Paul (and Hebrews)," in *The Early Text of the New Testament*, ed. Charles E. Hill and Michael J. Kruger (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 176–77.
- 11 See James R. Royse, *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri* (Leiden, NL: Brill, 2008), 199–201; Stanley E. Porter, "Paul and the Pauline Letter Collection," in *Paul and the Second Century*, ed. Michael F. Bird and Joseph R. Dodson (London: T&T Clark, 2011), 19–36, esp. 20; Jeremy Duff, "P46 and the Pastorals: A Misleading Consensus?" *New Testament Studies* 44, no. 4 (October 1998): 578. But see also Yung Kyu Kim, "Paleographical Dating of P46 to the Later First Century," *Biblica* 69, no. 2 (1988): 248–57, who suggests that it may be as early as the late first century. Barker's recent reassessment of the codex's paleography by placing it in "graphic stream" confirms resistance to Kim's proposal and reaffirms the late second/early third century dating. Don Barker, "The Dating of New Testament Papyri," *New Testament Studies* 57, no. 4 (September 2011): 578–82.
- 12 The codex itself is not in pristine form, with several leaves missing throughout and on either end. It is difficult to make definitive statements regarding the contents of those missing leaves. See Royse, "The Early Text of Paul (and Hebrews)," 180–81. See also Duff, "P46 and the Pastorals"; Duff, in particular, urges that the pseudepigraphy of the Pastoral letters should not be argued on the basis of their absence from P46 (pp. 578–90).
- 13 Royse, "The Early Text of Paul (and Hebrews)," 184–99. See also Emily Gathergood, "Papyrus 32 (Titus) as a Multi-Text Codex: A New Reconstruction," *New Testament Studies* 59, no. 4 (October 2013): 588–606. Gathergood has also argued that P32 (P. Ryl. Gr. 1.5), which contains a fragment of the probably pseudepigraphal letter to Titus, was part of a larger multi-work codex. She goes on to suggest that the multi-work codex was most like a collection of Paul's letters.
- 14 See Calvin J. Roetzel, *Paul: The Man and the Myth* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999), 69–92. Roetzel's treatment of Paul as a letter writer provides an illustrative example of the way in which Paul's letter-writing practice forms an integral part of Pauline biography. Accordingly, categories of authenticity and originality drive text-critical interest in the Pauline letters.

hypothesized original, such as small-scale variants, interpolations, inclusion of pseudepigraphal letters, or variation in letter ordering, each represent corruptions from the “Pauline original.”¹⁵ However, in a now somewhat older study, Eldon Epp enumerated four major ways in which the notion of “original text” could be conceived, ranging from predecessor text-forms, which would exist prior to the autographic text-form, then followed by canonical text-forms and interpretive text-forms.¹⁶ Such reconfiguration of the traditional goal of textual criticism opens the door for more nuanced treatments of the *corpus Paulinum* that do not necessarily require us to trace a linear textual tradition in service of authenticity or originality. It is here that the intersection of textual scholarship and archival scholarship appears promising.

Ancient Letter Collections and the Archival Impulse

Paul’s letter collection is by no means the only collection of letters from antiquity, and considering additional types of collections will help throw the archival politics surrounding Paul’s letter archive into greater relief. Each of these collections has received varied reception and editorial curation by modern scholars and has left a different documentary footprint. Letter writing was a common activity in antiquity. However, only some of the letters, usually written by prominent leaders and intellectuals, were gathered into literary collections, leaving others lost or to be discovered hundreds of years later.

15 The two major modern editions of the Greek New Testament reflect what Aland and Aland, in *The Text of the New Testament*, call the “standard text,” which “approximates the original form of the New Testament as closely as possible” (p. 218). Traditional text-critical introductions such as Metzger’s and Aland and Aland’s provide lists of standard variant types and the methods used to correct them. See Aland and Aland, 186–246; Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament*, 279–91. For a history of the “canons” of text-critical methodology, see also Eldon Jay Epp, “Traditional ‘Canons’ of New Testament Textual Criticism: Their Value, Validity, and Viability – or Lack Thereof,” in *The Textual History of the Greek New Testament: Changing Views and Contemporary Research*, ed. Klaus Wachtel and Michael W. Holmes (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), 79–128.

While some other studies have challenged the long-standing consensus regarding the possibility and desirability of the goal of establishing the original text, some recent critics continue to value that goal, even if revising it slightly. See Holger Strutwolf, “Original Text and Textual History,” in *The Textual History of the Greek New Testament: Changing Views and Contemporary Research*, Text-Critical Studies 8, ed. Klaus Wachtel and Michael W. Holmes (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), 23–41; Charles E. Hill and Michael J. Kruger, “Introduction: In Search of the Earliest Text of the New Testament,” in *The Early Text of the New Testament*, ed. Charles E. Hill and Michael J. Kruger (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 3–5; Stanley E. Porter, *How We Got the New Testament: Text, Transmission, Translation* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Exegetical, 2014), 12–35. Porter’s history of the goals of biblical textual scholarship is highly informative.

16 Eldon Jay Epp, “The Multivalence of the Term ‘Original Text’ in New Testament Textual Criticism,” *Harvard Theological Review* 92, no. 3 (July 1999): 276–77.

Relating Archivists and Editors

Recent treatments of these letter collections display what I consider to be an archival impulse, raising the additional question of the relation between editorial activity and archival activity. The relationship between modern archivists and modern textual editors bears a striking affinity.¹⁷ Kaplan identifies that archival thinking has maintained a strong grasp on an intellectual positivism native to the 19th century.¹⁸ From that point of view, alterations from the original order are deemed corruptions that ought to be reversed.¹⁹ However, some archival scholars demonstrate a commitment to deconstructing some of the fundamental categories upon which the discipline has traditionally rested, particularly originality and authenticity. These categories are no longer being taken as self-evidently objective goals of archivists, but as socially constructed and politically deployed. Relative to such formulations, the role of the archivist has shifted from representation and preservation to editorial activity.²⁰ MacNeil, in particular, looks at how the discipline of textual criticism has become less interested in recovering an original text and more interested in appreciating the editorial interests that went into producing scholarly editions of literary works.²¹ This is an important connection, since the language of textual corruption finds traction among traditional New Testament textual critics, as discussed above. Perhaps unknown to MacNeil, her observations about the textual criticism of modern literature mirror a paradigm shift in biblical textual criticism as well. Biblical textual critics study so-called corruptions

- 17 See MacNeil, "Picking Our Text," 268–70. MacNeil has drawn out this affinity based on traditional goals and techniques and more contemporary developments. Both practices are historically anchored in philological criticism, such that the textual critic's interest in the "original form" matches up with the archivist's interest in the "original order"; the former is supported by a critical apparatus while the latter is supported by archival description. Further, both practitioners assemble fragments and scraps to produce an idealized whole.
- 18 Elisabeth Kaplan, "'Many Paths to Partial Truths': Archives, Anthropology, and the Power of Representation," *Archival Science* 2, no. 3–4 (January 2002): 209–20, esp. 210. Archival theory has continued to find itself in a struggle for the validation of theoretical reflection in relation to the application of theory. This debate is well represented in several essays in volume 37 (Spring 1994) of *Archivaria*: see Heather MacNeil, "Archival Theory and Practice: Between Two Paradigms," 6–20; John W. Roberts, "Practice Makes Perfect, Theory Makes Theorists," 111–21; Terry Eastwood, "What Is Archival Theory and Why Is It Important," 122–30; John W. Roberts, "What Is Archival Theory and Why Is It Important: Response to Terry Eastwood's Paper," 131–33.
- 19 See MacNeil, "Archivalterity," 9–14.
- 20 See Heather Marie MacNeil and Bonnie Mak, "Constructions of Authenticity," *Library Trends* 56, no. 1 (Summer 2007): 26–52; MacNeil, "Archivalterity," 3; Chris Duncan, "Authenticity or Bust," *Archivaria* 68 (Fall 2009): 97–118. As Derrida conceives it, archival practice in the present construes the experience of the past but also remediates the archive for future researchers. Jacques Derrida, *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), 16–20.
- 21 MacNeil, "Archivalterity," 2–6; MacNeil, "Picking Our Text," 270.

as opportunities for inquiring into the social and theological values of the copyists themselves.²² Although MacNeil's treatment of textual scholarship does not deal with biblical textual scholarship, her concern for archival thinking alongside textual criticism takes an important step in connecting the two fields. Rather than disparaging variation in archival shaping, the dynamics of archival intervention and the power structures enabling it – what MacNeil calls *archivalterity* – are precisely what I am interested in analyzing.

While editorial and archival activity should not necessarily be equated, I suggest that the affinity between editors and archivists can be pressed further by collapsing the distinction between modern editorial practice and ancient editorial practice. Modern textual editing involves the preservation, presentation, and collation of previously existing manuscripts, and that is precisely what ancient textual editors did as well. Ancient scribes often described their efforts in comparing (ἀντιβάλλω, *antiballō*) and correcting (διόρθοσις, *diorthosis*) manuscripts against exemplars in the production of new and improved editions (ἔκδοσις, *ekdosis*).²³ This activity resulted in the diffusion of multiple editions and even lineages of the same textual record, something quite distinct from the way we think about non-duplicate materials housed in a rare books library, or something similar. However, the multiplication and accumulation of that editorial activity constructs an archive that is located in the abstract: at the level of cultural memory.²⁴ This entails that the texts and the editorial activity that shaped those texts can also be considered on the basis of their collective contribution to archivization. In what follows, I will explore the connection between ancient letter collections, editorial curation, and archivization.

22 The growing consensus appreciates that manuscripts are not repositories of readings but are material artifacts useful in doing social history. See especially the important work by Roger S. Bagnall, *Reading Papyri, Writing Ancient History*, Approaching the Ancient World (London: Routledge, 1995). Additional contributions to this shift in the study of early Christianity include Bart D. Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993); D.C. Parker, *The Living Text of the Gospels* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), esp. 209–10; Larry W. Hurtado, “Early Christian Manuscripts as Artifacts,” in *Jewish and Christian Scriptures as Artifact and Canon*, ed. Craig A. Evans and H. Daniel Zacharias (London: T&T Clark, 2009), 66–81; Eric W. Scherbenske, *Canonizing Paul: Ancient Editorial Practice and the Corpus Paulinum* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 6–9.

23 Note the helpful discussion of the production of editions in antiquity in Scherbenske, *Canonizing Paul*, 15–69.

24 This approaches Foucault's use of “archive” to describe abstract systems of discursive practice that enable and limit what can be said. Michel Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*, trans. A.M. Sheridan Smith (New York: Pantheon, 1972), 128–29.

Literary and Documentary Letter Archives from Antiquity

Two recent articles by classical scholars Mary Beard and Roy Gibson investigate the collection and representation of a variety of ancient letter collections, including those of Cicero, Seneca, Pliny the Younger, Augustine, and Ambrose. The subtitle of Beard's essay, "Making a Book out of Letters," raises questions about who is doing this "book making" and what does it matter? Beard draws attention to the propensity among 19th-century English and German scholars toward original order, and the continued insistence in classical scholarship that such ordering is superior to alternate arrangements. According to this view, original, chronological order provides the best context for correctly interpreting Cicero's letters, unless one is interested in issues like textual criticism and history.²⁵ However, Beard counters this modern propensity by advocating reading according to "traditional ordering," which identifies four ancient Ciceronian letter collections arranged according to a variety of principles (order, theme, addressee, etc.). Studying the ancient editors and the choices that went into editing, selecting, and assembling the book of Cicero's letters are worthwhile pursuits.²⁶ While this raises questions about the theoretical distinction between "original order" and "traditional order," Beard's point that original ordering obscures alternative histories of the Ciceronian correspondence is picked up by Gibson, who confirms that modern editorial practice has rearranged ancient ordering in the interest of facilitating (linear) biography or historical narrative. In contrast, he proposes a number of alternative ancient organizing principles. These letter collections were not meant to provide insight into the narrative life of the letter writer, but were organized based on addressees, letter topic, or often artistically. This reflects a conscious desire by the compiler to valorize the letter writer as an artistic and literary figure and to facilitate a literary experience operating at a scale greater than the individual letter, or it bears similarities with *ancient* biography, which unlike modern biography was not as confined to the chronological ordering of events.²⁷

25 Mary Beard, "Ciceronian Correspondences: Making a Book out of Letters," in *Classics in Progress: Essays on Ancient Greece and Rome*, ed. T.P. Wiseman (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 107–15. Note that here the textual critic's interest in the original form of the text is completely aligned with the archivist's "original order."

26 *Ibid.*, 115. Beard makes the insightful comment that original order tacitly affirms that chronology enables privileged access to the "real Cicero," as if something like that exists to be discovered. Gibson adds that ancient collections were almost never ordered chronologically, not to mention that their establishment as fixed collections (canonization) occurred at various times in relation to the author's lifetime and not usually by a singular editor. Roy Gibson, "On the Nature of Ancient Letter Collections," *Journal of Roman Studies* 102 (2012): 57–61.

27 Gibson, 56, 64–77. This begins to take on a flavour akin to ancient biography. This genre was not necessarily chronological and often encomiastic, which was meant to valorize the subject. Cf. Scherbenske, *Canonizing Paul*, 55–60; Scherbenske discusses ancient biography

The shift away from chronological ordering reflects new interest in the agents involved in letter collection. Beard argues that previous scholarship placed a greater value upon Cicero as an author than on the ancient editors involved in compilation and copying.²⁸ However, modern interest in the authorial figure is conditioned by the letters' "marginal status *between* documents and literature."²⁹ These were real letters, meant to serve as personal correspondence, and it was only because some later scholars were interested in preserving Cicero's letters that they were published as a collection. For Beard, Gibson, and earlier classical scholars, interpretation of Cicero and other letter writers has depended upon whether they place more value on the contribution of Cicero and other letter writers or on the letters' editors.

Unlike literary works that have been preserved and transmitted over centuries, archives of personal and official documents (occasionally including letters) are fortuitously unearthed.³⁰ The arrangement, preservation, and scholarly use of these documents rests in tension between the circumstances of their discovery and their perceived value for socio-historical research. This tension can be illustrated effectively with the Bar Kokhba letters, a series of letters associated with Simon bar Kokhba, the leader of the Second Jewish Revolt (132–35 CE), most of which were discovered in the so-called Cave of Letters in the Nahal Hever, just west of the Dead Sea, with others discovered at the Wadi Murabba'at.³¹ These documents were never copied or transmitted as a collection, like those of Cicero. Instead, historical circumstance – in this case a war with Rome – resulted in their storage in a cave alongside other personal belongings.

Delineating the Bar Kokhba archive is actually a difficult task. In his recent study of literacy in Roman Judaea, using the Bar Kokhba documents, Wise has looked to the archive to help him assess the relationships and significance of

(βίoi, *bioi*) as a literary genre in comparison with short βίoi that were often added to some ancient editions of letter collections.

28 Beard, "Ciceronian Correspondences," 121–24. Beard writes, "If we believed Cicero himself to be the editor of the correspondence, we would surely hesitate before destroying his arrangement (however inconvenient it was); we are much less concerned to preserve the intervention of an editor who was not himself an author, and whose identity (or identities) and exact date we do not know" (122–123).

29 Ibid., 123.

30 See the thorough discussion of papyrological archives in Katelijin Vandorpe, "Archives and Dossiers," in *The Oxford Handbook of Papyrology*, ed. Roger S. Bagnall (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 216–55.

31 Several other documents have been found in the cave, including other documentary archives called the Babatha and Salome archives. I am not treating them explicitly here, since they do not contain letters. See Y. Yadin, "Expedition D – The Cave of Letters," *Israel Exploration Journal* 12, no. 3–4 (1962): 235–47; Hannah M. Cotton, "The Archive of Salome Komaise Daughter of Levi: Another Archive from the 'Cave of Letters,'" *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 105 (1995): 171–208.

documentary texts from the First and Second Jewish Revolts. His treatment depends upon both literal archives discovered *in situ* and conceptual archives reconstructed from documentary clues.³² Ironically, such socio-historical scholarship depends upon the use of documentary archives while remaining ambivalent to foundational archival notions of original order and authenticity of the fonds. However, these traditional interests feature more prominently in papyrological editing. Yigael Yadin's excavation report of the Cave of Letters provides a brief edition of each letter in the order in which it was stored.³³ The official published editions of the letters from Nahal Hever and Wadi Murabba'at also display the documents in the context of their location of discovery. Yet, the edition of the Nahal Hever documents arranges the letters according to language, grouping the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek documents together.³⁴ To my knowledge, no one has attempted to isolate the letters from Bar Kokhba and arrange them chronologically in the same way the modern classical scholars have done with the Ciceronian collection. Instead, location of discovery and language grouping are two guiding concerns in their scholarly treatment. Scholars seem to appreciate documentary archives for their contribution to questions of historical context rather than the literary activity of the letter writer.³⁵

- 32 See Michael Own Wise, *Language and Literacy in Roman Judaea: A Study of the Bar Kokhba Documents* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2015), 75–80. In fact, the most recent treatments of the Bar Kokhba letters depend upon a conceptual archive because the letters were discovered in two different locales. See also Lutz Doering, *Ancient Jewish Letters and the Beginning of Christian Epistolography* (Tübingen, DE: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 58–80, esp. 61, 64. In Doering's treatment of Jewish documentary letters, he studies the Bar Kokhba letters from both locations and calls them each an archive. The letters he looks at are not exclusively from Bar Kokhba.
- 33 See Y. Yadin, "Expedition D," *Israel Exploration Journal* 11, no. 1–2 (1961): 36–52. Yadin also reports on other findings in the cave, including a fragment of the book of Psalms. Most of the letters were delivered on behalf of Simon Bar Kokhba. They were sent to his military commanders, predominantly Jonathan and Masabala, who may have stored the letters, though Yadin thinks that they were stored not based on sentiment, but pragmatically for later use (p. 50). See Stanley E. Porter, "The Greek Papyri of the Judaean Desert and the World of the Roman East," in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years On*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Craig A. Evans (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 308; Wise, *Language and Literacy in Roman Judaea*, 78. Both Porter and Wise suggest that the Bar Kokhba letters from Nahal Hever belonged to Jonathan.
- 34 See P. Benoit, J.T. Milik, and R. de Veux, *Les Grottes de Murabba'at*, Discoveries in the Judaean Dessert 11 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1961); Yigael Yadin et al., *The Documents from the Bar Kokhba Report in the Cave of Letters: Hebrew, Aramaic and Nabatean-Aramaic Papyri*, Judean Desert Studies 3.1 (Jerusalem, Israel Exploration Society, 2002), 277–368. Doering also lists the Bar Kokhba documents according to language; see Doering, *Ancient Jewish Letters*, 59–60.
- 35 Some scholars are indeed interested in Bar Kokhba himself, but his letters contribute only part of the story, while other literary sources from antiquity help fill out the discussion. See, for example, Peter Schäfer, ed., *The Bar Kokhba War Reconsidered: New Perspectives on the Second Jewish Revolt against Rome* (Tübingen, DE: Mohr Siebeck, 2003); Richard

Assessing Editorial Tendencies

On a very basic level, these two examples show that ancient letters are subject to different editorial strategies. More than that, we can see that editorial strategies differ depending on the status of letters as literary or documentary texts. The modern scholarly attention to Cicero's letters and their arrangement as a collection has much to do with the fact that the ancient collectors preserved Cicero's letters, something that Bar Kokhba's letters did not enjoy. In addition to the literary/documentary distinction, ancient archiving strategies have mediated the reception and re-editing of the texts. The ancient and modern editors of the Ciceronian letters, in particular, were driven by different and conflicting values; thus the modern editors did their work by changing the received ordering of the ancient collectors. However, the modern editors of both Ciceronian and Bar Kokhba letters seem to have acted in accord with what they think best reflects the authentic circumstances of those letters' production and use. These are not neutral value judgments, however. Instead, the history of these letter archives is a history of reproduction and alteration, pivoting on editorial judgments of authenticity and authorship.

Compared with both of the examples, the modern and ancient editing of the Pauline letters have followed very different patterns. On one hand, similar to Beard's description of Cicero's letters, the Pauline letters fall in between the literary/documentary distinction: most of them probably began as occasional letters but were gathered and transmitted as literature. Like the Bar Kokhba letters, the *corpus Paulinum* is both a literal and conceptual archive. There are physical collections of Paul's letters, whose location of discovery and historical context are important. Yet, the *corpus Paulinum* also becomes a conceptual archive when these distinct physical remains are collated and analyzed together. On the other hand, it is curious that the Pauline collection itself seems to have avoided the modern impulse toward chronology.³⁶ Like the letter archives surveyed above, the *corpus Paulinum* consists of a rich and shifting history of editorial intervention. But unlike those letter archives, their transmission has the added dimension of the attribution of a great deal of religious significance, especially perceptions of their religious authority. For the remainder of this article, I will pursue the archival impulse that is already at play in the study of ancient letters. The *corpus Paulinum* is an especially

G. Marks, *The Image of Bar Kokhba in Traditional Jewish Literature: False Messiah and National Hero* (University Park, PA: Penn State Press, 2004). One exception might be Yigael Yadin's *Bar-Kokhba: The Rediscovery of a Legendary Hero of the Second Jewish Revolt against Rome* (New York: Random House, 1971), which gives a larger treatment of the letters themselves.

36 This does not discount scholarly attempts to construct a Pauline chronology with help from his letters and other ancient data.

interesting opportunity to inquire into the shifting values and motivations of editors and their concomitant effects upon archiving Paul, especially because of the religious significance of those texts.

Contested Definitions

Archival scholarship demonstrates a penchant for tight definitions that complement the attention to detail required for archival work. Classical handbooks like Jenkinson's *Manual of Archive Administration* or Schellenberg's *Modern Archives* devote considerable effort to the precise definition and explanation of the "archive," often relative to its corollary – the "document" – and in contrast to the term "records."³⁷ Even these foundational works admit a degree of ambiguity associated with the term "archive," considering a discrepancy between technical and ordinary use.³⁸ Jenkinson's effort to set a trajectory from document to archive through the custodianship of the documents' producer illustrates some archivists' penchant for a strictly circumscribed definition of archives, while simultaneously prescribing a theoretical apparatus for constructing a relationship of authenticity between an archive and its producer.³⁹ Schellenberg's assessment of regional definitions of the archive, on the other hand, led him in the direction of a more values-based definition: what are the reasons for the production and storage of the materials and the reasons for preservation beyond those that instigated production?⁴⁰ Such interest in valuations of archival materials necessarily invites consideration of the agents involved in their production and preservation, leading to more use-based approaches.⁴¹

37 See distinctions between "archive" and "record" in Hilary Jenkinson, *A Manual of Archival Administration*, new and revised ed. (London: Percy Lund & Humphreys, 1937), 2–5; T.R. Schellenberg, *Modern Archives: Principles and Techniques* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956), 16; H.G.T. Christopher, *Palaeography and Archives: A Manual for the Librarian, Archivist and Student* (London: Grafton, 1938), 5. See also Michael Cook, *Archives Administration: A Manual for Intermediate and Smaller Organizations and for Local Government* (Folkstone, UK: Dawson, 1977), 1. Cook is not confident that any considerable distinction should be made between "archive" and "record." See also the discussion in Marlene Manoff, "Theories of the Archive from Across the Disciplines," *Portal: Libraries and the Academy* 4, no. 1 (2004): 9–25.

38 These writers frequently appeal to the *Oxford English Dictionary* and the term's Greek etymology (from ἀρχή, *archē*). See Jenkinson, *A Manual of Archival Administration*, 2–3; Christopher, *Palaeography and Archives*, 51; Schellenberg, *Modern Archives*, 11; J.H. Hodson, *The Administration of Archives* (Oxford: Pergamon, 1972), 3. Derrida's own appeal to the ambiguity of the Greek etymology provides an interesting juxtaposition; see Derrida, *Archive Fever*, 1–5.

39 See Jenkinson, *A Manual of Archival Administration*, 5–11. Hodson, *The Administration of Archives*, 5–12, documents Jenkinson's responses to critiques of his formulation.

40 Schellenberg, *Modern Archives*, 13.

41 See Lawrence Dowler, "The Role of Use in Defining Archival Practice and Principles: A

Textual scholarship of the *corpus Paulinum* and the New Testament more broadly displays less obvious but perhaps equally important terminological discrepancies, particularly in the use of the terms “collection,” “corpus,” and “canon.” Such scholarship frequently places collection and canon as two temporally distinct poles that together contain the evolution of the *corpus Paulinum*. Within this formulation, the collection represents a period of the letters’ circulation and compilation and the canon represents the fixity and finality of those collections as a religiously authoritative body of literature. Thus, scholars like Stanley E. Porter, David Trobisch, and Richard I. Pervo describe different stages in the canonizing process, which include writing, collecting, communal use, transmission, and collation into authoritative editions.⁴² There is a certain logic to this formulation. However, as I will argue, the emphasis upon a temporal evolution from an agglomerated collection to a fixed canon binds these terms together as though that development were a historical inevitability. Even for scholars who wish to shy away from such determinism, the temporal approach raises, but does not answer, the question of how to understand the transition from collection to canon. Harry Y. Gamble, on the other hand, raises the issue of degrees of purpose and editorial activity in order to distinguish between collections and published editions.⁴³ Gamble may have in mind temporal development, but his criteria

Research Agenda for the Availability and Use of Records,” *American Archivist* 51, no. 1–2 (Winter/Spring 1988): 74–86. In fact, Dowler emphasizes how such researchers consider the use of archival material to be of greater concern than the physical form of the materials themselves.

42 Porter argues for “three periods in the development of the Pauline *canon*,” which include a period of writing, a period of *collecting* the letters together into a *corpus*, and a period of transmission and establishing use within early Christian groups. Stanley E. Porter, “When and How Was the Pauline Canon Compiled? An Assessment of Theories,” in *The Pauline Canon*, ed. Stanley E. Porter (Leiden, NL: Brill, 2004), 95; also Stanley E. Porter, “Paul and the Process of Canonization,” in *Exploring the Origins of the Bible: Canon Formation in Historical, Literary, and Theological Perspective*, Acadia Studies in Bible and Theology (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2008), 174. Trobisch delineates three periods, including (1) an authorized recension by the author himself; (2) expanded editions after the author’s death, which may include previously unpublished letters; and (3) comprehensive editions in which expanded editions have been collated into a single authoritative collection. David Trobisch, *Paul’s Letter Collection: Tracing the Origins* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994), 50. Porter admits that his three periods are not discrete but likely overlapping to some degree, and Pervo deems these periods to be coordinate, while Trobisch’s are necessarily insulated from one another. Richard I. Pervo, *The Making of Paul: Constructions of the Apostle in Early Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2010), 23. See also Lewis Foster, “The Earliest Collection of Paul’s Epistles,” *Bulletin of the Evangelical Theological Society* 10 (1967): 44–55; Robert W. Wall, “The Function of the Pastoral Letters within the Pauline Canon of the New Testament: A Canonical Approach,” in *The Pauline Canon*, ed. Stanley E. Porter (Leiden, NL: Brill, 2004), 27–44.

43 Harry Y. Gamble, “The New Testament Canon: Recent Research and the Status Questionis,” in *The Canon Debate*, ed. Lee Martin McDonald and James A. Sanders (Peabody, MA:

remind us that this process involves variegated editorial effort. In line with Gamble's prompting, I wish to reconsider the terms "collection," "corpus," and "canon" – not as stages in a temporal process, but as modes of editorial activity. This reconsideration is helped along when placed in the context of archival theory.

Thomas Osborne makes the welcome suggestion that the theory of the archive is well suited to the types of questions being asked in the humanities, insofar as it allows the archivist to "oscillate between literalism and idealism."⁴⁴ This oscillation refers to the negotiation of idealized views about the archive as an objective representation of historical reality and the material features of that archive and its storage. Schellenberg's insistence upon value as a crucial consideration in the definition of an archive adds to this picture. Archives thus facilitate a convergence of traces of authorship, editorship, and the negotiation of power, such that archives function as what Osborne calls a "*centre of interpretation*."⁴⁵ This point must not be made at the expense of appreciating the materiality of the archive as a repository of artifacts. As Osborne points out, archival reason is a devotion to the details of "a finite deposit of materials" from which significance can be drawn meticulously.⁴⁶

Consequently, I propose to consider Paul's letters as a letter archive, that is, a conceptual and material centre of interpretation. From here, collection, corpus, and canon can describe different modes or strategies of editorial activity enacted upon that letter archive. This formulation resists treating the *corpus Paulinum* on the basis of a temporal evolution and instead emphasizes and correlates the diversity of both ancient and modern treatments of those documents. From here, I will briefly sketch how I understand these editorial modes.

As a nominalization of the verb *to collect*, collection gestures toward a process in which previously separate documents are gathered into a compiled unit, encouraging us to ask who was involved in the act of collection and why.⁴⁷ This period is actually the most difficult to reconstruct since the gathering and

Hendrickson, 2002), 286. Gamble suggests that "collection" is more tenuous and open to development and agglomeration, whereas "publication" indicates a higher level of purpose and editorial activity.

44 Thomas Osborne, "The Ordinarity of the Archive," *History of the Human Sciences* 12, no. 2 (May 1999): 51. See also Kaplan, "Many Paths to Partial Truths." Kaplan embraces cross-disciplinary work between archival studies and anthropology.

45 Osborne, "The Ordinarity of the Archive," 52.

46 *Ibid.*, 58.

47 My use of the term "collection" finds some touching points with Geoffrey Yeo's description of collection. For example, "collection" often implies conscious actions by a collector and the setting up of boundaries. Geoffrey Yeo, "The Conceptual Fonds and the Physical Collection," *Archivaria* 73 (Spring 2012): 44–47. Yeo does note some issues with the term as it is used in archival discourse, particularly the distinction between fonds as organic and collection as artificial. However, his article sufficiently problematizes that distinction. In any case, "collection" is an important and thus worthwhile term with reference to Paul's letters.

distribution of letters can only be inferred based on extant manuscripts or through vague comments in the letters themselves. For example, Galatians was written to a number of local groups dispersed throughout the region of Galatia, and in Colossians 4:16 Paul encouraged trading letters with the church in Laodicea.⁴⁸ This difficulty in reconstruction, however, highlights the changing shape of the Pauline letters as a compilation of documents and the type of editorial intervention that characterizes the collection mode. Editorial intervention associated with collection thus involves any activity that determines which letters are collected together and the order of their arrangement.⁴⁹ Approaching Paul's letter archive as a collection includes consideration of the activity of gathering letters together and the significance of such activity.

The second term, "corpus," is used rather frequently by Pauline scholars generally to talk about the letters of Paul as a compiled unit. "Corpus" should be distinguished from "collection" insofar as "corpus" describes the finished product, after the letters have gone through the process of being gathered.⁵⁰ That Paul's letters are part of a corpus implies that they are to be understood as a unit and according to the shape and texture of that unit. Accordingly, I consider "corpus" to be a hermeneutical designation, functioning as a context for interpretation. The hermeneutical value of the corpus is more specifically appropriate for studying authorial archives. The author and the corpus relate to one another dialectically, as Foucault points out with his notion of the author-function. From a hermeneutical perspective, the corpus defines the author while the author simultaneously defines the corpus.⁵¹ This insight produces a

48 See Harry Y. Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995), 97.

49 A first example might involve the composite editing of formerly distinct letters. This may have been the case for 2 Corinthians. The level of intentionality that went into such composite editing remains open, as Nongbri's recent study shows. See Brent Nongbri, "2 Corinthians and Possible Material Evidence for Composite Letters in Antiquity," in *Collecting Early Christian Letters: From the Apostle Paul to Late Antiquity*, ed. Bronwen Neil and Pauline Allen (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 54–68. A second example involves the shift from smaller to larger collections as additional letters were written in Paul's name. Gamble suggests the existence of smaller collections later added to with pseudonymous letters, manifesting in 10-, 13-, and 14-letter collections in the second century CE. Gamble, *Books and Readers*, 99–100.

50 Pervo is dissatisfied with confusion between "collection" and "corpus," suggesting that "corpus" marks a collection as more "official," implying completeness. He also states that the existence of a letter collection should not be confused with "canon," which is, for Pervo, coterminous with "scripture." Pervo, *The Making of Paul*, 57. This attempt to distinguish these terms is appreciable, though does not entirely match up with the distinctions I am proposing.

51 See Michel Foucault, "What Is an Author?," in *Textual Strategies: Perspectives in Post-Structuralist Criticism*, trans. Josué V. Harari (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1979), 146. For Foucault this author-function is not necessarily connected to a biographical subject but is a principle that emerges within textual structures and relations. For application of this principle to Paul as author, see Gregory P. Fewster, "Hermeneutical Issues in Canonical

conception of authorship that shifts in accordance with the texts that make up the author's corpus, and one that does not necessarily invoke hermeneutical appeals to authority. The corpus not only affects the way in which modern scholars interpret and understand Paul, but also the way in which ancient interpreters may have appropriated Paul as well. A corpus construes authorship as a functional principle of unity. It concerns the effects upon the users of a letter archive when it is apprehended or experienced as an undifferentiated unit.

"Canon" is probably the most contentious term used here. It often refers to a static catalogue or ordering of texts, evoking teleological connotations of an authoritative final product.⁵² The classical (and etymological) definition of *canon* as "standard" or "rule" reflects the authority attributed to the seemingly inevitable texts deemed canonical and their arrangement.⁵³ I suggest instead, and will illustrate below, that canon is an authorizing strategy that construes textual ordering and arrangement as though it were inevitable. Aichele describes canon as a semiotic mechanism that places constraints on meaning vis-à-vis authority, pointing to the codex as an example of a material feature generating interpretive constraint as it promotes a politics of inclusion and exclusion.⁵⁴ Placing canon in the context of the archive, its authoritative function can be understood on the basis of the agents involved in the production, selection, and arrangement of texts within it, with attention to the strategies used to promote those features. In contrast to collection and corpus, these strategies explicitly and directly position the selection and arrangement of archived texts as natural and necessary. As such, canon authorizes itself by elevating the authorial figure in a way that co-opts authorial authenticity and intention in service of the canonical apparatus.⁵⁵ Analyzing the *corpus Paulinum* as a canon involves examining the particular strategies and conditions that obscure the values and motivations of editorial activity by positioning such activity as appropriate to the authorial figure and his historical circumstances.

Pseudepigrapha," in *Paul and Pseudepigraphy*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Gregory P. Fewster (Leiden, NL: Brill, 2013), 101–2.

52 On the canonical process and the final canonical product, see Wall, "The Function of the Pastoral Letters," 27–35.

53 Eugene Ulrich, "The Notion and Definition of Canon," in *The Canon Debate*, ed. Lee Martin McDonald and James A. Sanders (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2002), 25–29.

54 George Aichele, *The Control of Biblical Meaning: Canon as Semiotic Mechanism* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2001), 15–60.

55 This point parallels MacNeil's connection of archival description and formulations of authenticity in light of the third objective of the Canada–U.S. Task Force on Archival Description, which states: "to establish grounds for presuming records to be authentic by documenting their chain of custody, their arrangement, and the circumstances of their creation and use." MacNeil, "Picking Our Text," 264; Heather MacNeil, "Trusting Description: Authenticity, Accountability, and Archival Description Standards," *Journal of Archival Organization* 7, no. 3 (September 2009): 89–107. The mechanisms of canon serve to obscure the very processes that CUSTARD seeks out.

Pauline scholarship can benefit from considering Paul's letters as an archive insofar as doing so invites questions about the relation between the archive and its producers along with other circumstances and power dynamics surrounding the storage and transmission of the archival materials. These are complex questions, and the existing scholarship on the *corpus Paulinum* has made inroads primarily into the collection and canonization of Pauline letters along a chronological axis. The terms "collection," "corpus," and "canon" are useful for a more pointed analysis of editorial dynamics, but these are only useful when anchored by a conception of a Pauline letter archive, a deposit of textual materials that undergoes manipulation and alteration.

Authorship, Editorship, and Representations of Authenticity

Collecting Paul, Commemorating the Author

Recalling positivist interest in the letter collection as biography, Paul's letter collection does not avoid biographical interest in modern scholarship, if only because his letters remain the primary avenue into his life.⁵⁶ The significance of collection has not escaped scholarly notice, and numerous theories have been proposed for how and why the Pauline letters were initially collected.⁵⁷ Some of these theories involve speculation about whether Paul himself played a substantive role in the initial collecting, appealing to the practice of ancient letter writers maintaining copies of their works.⁵⁸ This theory sees the author

56 See, for example, Roetzel, *Paul*, 92.

57 Several early collection theories oscillate between a gradual collection of letters over time and a sudden interest in Paul's letters following a period of disinterest. Alternatively, more recent theories have tended to explore the involvement of individuals in the collection, including Paul himself or close co-workers. Good surveys can be found in Porter, "When and How?" 95–128; Porter, "Paul and the Process of Canonization," 173–202; Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, *Paul the Letter-Writer: His World, His Options, His Skills* (Collegeville, MN: Michael Glazier, 1995), 114–18; Pervo, *The Making of Paul*, 55–56; Ian J. Elmer, "The Pauline Letters as Community Documents," in *Collecting Early Christian Letters: From the Apostle Paul to Late Antiquity*, ed. Bronwen Neil and Pauline Allen (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 37–53.

58 Trobisch suggests that the first collection of Paul's letters included the recension of four letters (Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, and Galatians). If Paul produced this authorized recension, he did so by compiling smaller letters together. For example, 1 and 2 Corinthians were originally seven letters now arranged in chronological order. Trobisch, *Paul's Letter Collection*, 48–96; cf. development of this theory in Murphy-O'Connor, *Paul the Letter-Writer*, 118–30. Porter asserts that Trobisch's theory does not actually require Paul's own involvement (Porter, "When and How?," 117–21). However, Porter follows E. Randolph Richards' insistence that Paul maintained copies of his own letters, while other copies publicly circulated. Porter, "Paul and the Process of Canonization," 196–97; cf. E. Randolph Richards, *The Secretary in the Letters of Paul* (Tübingen, DE: Mohr Siebeck, 1991), 165; E. Randolph Richards, *Paul and First Century Letter Writing: Secretaries, Composition, and Collection* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2004), 211–20.

investing in his own archival construction.⁵⁹ The appeal of seeing Paul as the initial collector is great, and probably has something to do with the significance modern scholars already place on Paul as a literary figure and less to do with the material evidence itself.⁶⁰ It would be a mistake, however, to think that the shape of the collection only has significance if Paul was the one who did the shaping. Regardless of who was involved, the act of collecting is an act of alteration that derives from certain intentions and interests. Collection is a particular formation of interests and intentions that can be accomplished based on the transformation of the shape of an archive.

While the precise circumstances of Paul's letter collection remain shrouded in a historical fog, there are some features of collection deserving of attention. Collection certainly may be an accident of history or the result of eminently practical concerns, as in the case of the Bar Kokhba letters from Nahal Hever. However, except for a few letters directed to the same community or individual, the collection of all the Pauline documents cannot be explained by a common recipient. Pervo observes that the letter collection indicates an inclination toward universality.⁶¹ While the majority of Paul's letters are addressed to specific individuals or local groups and replete with occasion-specific injunctions, the collecting together of letters implies a certain utility as a larger compilation of formerly distinct texts. Based on scanty evidence, I am not interested in hypothesizing micro-collections connected to specific local communities.⁶² However, recent attention to memory and the archive by some archival theorists is a striking reminder that the collection of materials serves

59 In this case, Paul's letter archive could be considered a personal archive. Interestingly, Jennifer Meehan proposed reframing notions of original order based on the personal archive, understanding personal records as they are left for us "in all their complexity and on their own terms." Jennifer Meehan, "Rethinking Original Order and Personal Records," *Archivaria* 70 (2010): 27–44, esp. 29. However, the use of the term "original" continues to bear connotations that do not quite fit with the view being developed here. Note Jennifer Douglas's observation that definitions and uses of original order remain contentious among archivists, to the extent that the term's use is virtually arbitrary. Jennifer Douglas, "What We Talk about When We Talk about Original Order in Writers' Archives," *Archivaria* 76 (Fall 2013): 7–25, esp. 15. See also Jennifer Douglas, "Original Order, Added Value? Archival Theory and the Douglas Coupland Fonds," in *The Boundaries of the Literary Archive: Reclamation and Presentation*, ed. Carrie Smith and Lisa Stead (Surrey, UK: Ashgate, 2013), 46–49. Douglas and MacNeil also identify how reconstruction of authorship based on archival material is mediated by the author's own activity in shaping the material. Jennifer Douglas and Heather MacNeil, "Arranging the Self: Literary and Archival Perspectives on Writers' Archives," *Archivaria* 67 (Spring 2009): 25–39.

60 Compare this with Beard's suggestion that classical scholars would be more interested in ancient ordering of Cicero's letters if they thought that he was the one who collected them. Beard, "Ciceronian Correspondences," 122–23.

61 Pervo, *The Making of Paul*, 61.

62 As do Trobisch and Pervo, who connect an early/initial collection to the church in Ephesus, which was supposedly a centre of Paulinism. See Trobisch, *Paul's Letter Collection*, 94–96; Pervo, *The Making of Paul*, 58–61.

a commemorative function.⁶³ This observation is in keeping with Gibson's suggestion, noted above, that the goals of some ancient letter collections included an encomiastic function. Organizing and reading Paul's letters as a collection would alter the primary means for constructing a remembered Paul.

A collection indicates that Paul wrote several letters over the course of his life, a fact that would be emphasized through the repetition of epistolary features like the Pauline signature. Keith has argued that Paul's signatures at the end of many letters serve to advertise whatever literate skill he possessed, a feature that would only be accentuated through collection.⁶⁴ In fact, early Christians frequently engaged in the commemoration and valorization of their early leaders as literate, Paul in particular. For example, 2 Peter 3:15–16 recalls Paul as a letter writer, while 2 Timothy 4:13 presents Paul as a figure with literary skill.⁶⁵ Whatever else could or would be remembered about Paul, a letter collection guarantees his memorialization as a literate and published letter writer.⁶⁶ Remembering Paul as a literate figure mirrors the values of emerging urban Christian communities who prized literacy and aspired to a high literate culture.

The question of Paul's involvement still looms over speculation about the effects of and motivation for the collection. However, the spectral nature of

63 See especially Trond Jacobsen, Ricardo L. Punzalan, and Margaret L. Hedstrom, "Invoking 'Collective Memory': Mapping the Emergence of a Concept in Archival Science," *Archival Science* 13 (2013): 217–51; Terry Cook, "Evidence, Memory, Identity, and Community: Four Shifting Archival Paradigms," *Archival Science* 13 (2013): 95–120. Cook includes memory as one of the recent trends in archival studies. See also Benjamin L. White, *Remembering Paul: Ancient and Modern Contests over the Image of the Apostle* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014). White draws upon social memory theory in his study of Paul. It is significant that this treatment resists, as I do, notions of authenticity attributed to a historical Paul based on an approved set of documents in favour of seeing Paul constructed and negotiated with respect to the texts attributed to him.

64 See Chris Keith, "'In My Own Hand': Grapho-Literacy and the Apostle Paul," *Biblica* 89, no. 1 (2008): 58. These signatures are found in 1 Corinthians 16:21, Galatians 6:11, Colossians 4:18, 2 Thessalonians 3:17, and Philemon 19, and each indicates that Paul (or possibly pseudo-Paul) writes a small greeting at the end of the letter and explicitly references his "own hand."

65 See John S. Kloppenborg, "Literate Media in Early Christ Groups: The Creation of a Christian Book Culture," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 22, no. 1 (Spring 2014): 323–35. Both documents are considered to be pseudepigraphal. A precise interpretation of Paul's request for his books (τὰς μεμβράνας, *tas membranas*) is debated. Regardless of whether Paul is asking for Torah scrolls, notebooks of his personal thoughts, or a collection of his own letters, Paul is constructed by the pseudepigrapher as possessing a considerable degree of scribal literacy.

66 Gamble notes a proclivity for elites in antique Greco-Roman society to participate in the collecting, sharing, and reading of literary texts. With some qualification, he suggests that early Christian reading practices were modelled somewhat on these elite reading groups. Gamble, *Books and Readers*, 96; Harry Y. Gamble, "The Book Trade in the Roman Empire," in *The Early Text of the New Testament*, ed. Charles E. Hill and Michael J. Kruger (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 29–32. See also Kloppenborg, "Literate Media," 40–44.

this question may actually be a result of the effects of collection itself. Since the commemoration of Paul as a letter writer occurs partly because of the collection, it encourages modern scholars to emphasize (or maybe overemphasize) his literary capabilities or interests. Collection is the most basic archival activity. It enacts a transition from separate to gathered texts and innocuously alters the way in which the collected materials will be received by the next users. The effects of such reception, however, are features of a corpus.

Pauline Corpus, Textual Difference, and the Author-Function

A corpus of Pauline letters provides a context for interpretation, whereby the arrangement of an archive facilitates a dialectical relationship between authorial construction and textual interpretation. Corpora encourage the reading of texts in light of other texts in the corpus. This dynamic has an interesting application if there are pseudonymous letters included in a corpus. There continues to be debate among Pauline scholars whether or not all the letters attributed to Paul were actually written by him, though the general consensus is that there are a few that were not. Accordingly, some scholars suggest that certain pseudonymous letters within the Pauline corpus construct a Paul who engages in self-interpretation by transforming themes from earlier letters. Fictitious self-interpretation plays off difference in textual content between individual letters but is simultaneously constrained by the unified authorial persona that is implied by a corpus.⁶⁷ Because a corpus unites a set of documents under the name Paul, interpreters are compelled to expect a degree of conceptual unity between the individual texts.

The notion of self-interpretation is perhaps better framed as corpus reading, since fictitious authorship is not required for thematic transformation constrained by an author-function nor is the interpretive relation between texts one-directional. For many Pauline scholars, perceived inconsistencies between letters may result in proposing that an “inconsistent” sentence or paragraph was a later interpolation and not original to the text. For example, 1 Corinthians 14:33–35 has Paul silencing women in communal gatherings, an

67 See especially Annette Merz, “Why Did the Pure Bride of Christ (2 Cor. 11.2) Become a Wedded Wife (Eph. 5.22–33)? Theses about the Intertextual Transformation of an Ecclesiological Metaphor,” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 23, no. 79 (January 2001): 131–47; Annette Merz, “The Fictitious Self-Exposition of Paul: How Might Intertextual Theory Suggest a Reformulation of the Hermeneutics of Pseudepigraphy,” in *The Intertextuality of the Epistles: Explorations of Theory and Practice*, ed. Thomas L. Brodie et al. (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2006), 113–32; Hanna Roose, “2 Thessalonians as Pseudepigraphic ‘Reading Instruction’ for 1 Thessalonians: Methodological Implications and Exemplary Illustration of an Intertextual Concept,” in *The Intertextuality of the Epistles: Explorations of Theory and Practice*, ed. Thomas L. Brodie et al. (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2006), 133–51.

attitude that some scholars suggest is at odds with statements made elsewhere in 1 Corinthians and in Galatians.⁶⁸ The corpus acts as a high-level system of authentication, accentuating and levelling textual difference along conceptual or chronological lines based on the shared authorial claims by the texts in a corpus. As such, the corpus influences interpretation and determinations of authenticity and originality, but it does so only through the very subtle means of ordering and inclusion.

As the contents of the *corpus Paulinum* became more stable in the second century and following, its shape and ordering were still subject to change. Our earliest material example of a Pauline letter archive is P46 (see above). It includes the letter to the Hebrews, which actually makes no explicit claim to Pauline authorship but was frequently considered to be Pauline by some early Christian writers.⁶⁹ The inclusion of Hebrews in this particular archive emphasizes the significance of a corpus upon the interpretation of particular letters. Clare K. Rothschild takes the position of Hebrews in P46 very seriously, suggesting that it may never have circulated independently of a Pauline collection.⁷⁰ Further, she infers a hermeneutical goal regarding Hebrews' placement immediately following Romans: Hebrews functions to develop or clarify some important themes from Romans.⁷¹ The extent to which this editorial move affects subsequent constructions of Pauline authorship is striking, considering that contemporary New Testament scholarship continues to debate the relationship between a historical Paul and the writing of Hebrews.⁷²

While the question of how Hebrews became included in the *corpus Paulinum* is a concern related to the collection of letters, the interpretive significance of its inclusion concerns its status in a corpus. The question shifts from the activity of letter collectors to the effects of a corpus upon

68 See Winsome Munro, "Women, Text and the Canon: The Strange Case of 1 Corinthians 14:33–35," *Biblical Theology Bulletin: Journal of Bible and Culture* 18, no. 1 (February 1988): 26–31; E.P. Sanders, "Did Paul's Theology Develop?" in *The Word Leaps the Gap: Essays on Scripture and Theology in Honor of Richard B. Hays*, ed. J. Ross Wagner et al. (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008), 325–26. Walker also engages a similar dynamic in 1 Corinthians 11:2–16. William O. Walker, "1 Corinthians 11:2–16 and Paul's Views Regarding Women," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 94, no. 1 (March 1975): 94–110.

69 Rothschild claims that acceptance of the Pauline authorship of Hebrews was consistent, with only a few notable exceptions, until the Reformation. Clare K. Rothschild, *Hebrews as Pseudepigraphon: The History and Significance of the Pauline Attribution of Hebrews* (Tübingen, DE: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 5–6, 15–44.

70 *Ibid.*, 154. Roysse is agnostic about this proposal in Roysse, "The Early Text of Paul (and Hebrews)," 201.

71 Clare K. Rothschild, "Hebrews as a Guide to Reading Romans," in *Pseudepigraphy und Verfasserfiktion in frühchristlichen Briefen: Pseudepigraphy and Author Fiction in Early Christian Letters*, ed. Jörg Frey et al. (Tübingen, DE: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 537–74.

72 See the discussion in Andrew W. Pitts and Joshua F. Walker, "The Authorship of Hebrews: A Further Development in the Luke-Paul Relationship," in *Paul and His Social Relations*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Land (Leiden, NL: Brill, 2013), 143–84.

those who experience the letters as such. Rothschild's interest in the relationship between Hebrews and Romans is prompted by the fact that they appear in tandem in P46. That Hebrews was included in Pauline collections may help to explain why its attribution to Paul was so widely held in antiquity and why it continues to be an occasional topic of concern for New Testament scholars. The value of considering the Pauline letter archive as a corpus has little to do with editorial activity upon the archived texts. Instead, considering Paul's letters as a corpus articulates how subsequent users receive and react to previous traces of editorial intervention.

Canon, Control, and Authorial Slippage

The hermeneutics of a Pauline corpus does not necessarily make any claims to authority in the same way as a Pauline canon. Whereas from the perspective of corpus, the letter archive participates in a negotiation of textual difference and authorial unity, canon attributes authority to the preceding traces of editorial curation. Authoritative editorial activity in service of canon actually operates at the expense of authorial authenticity, insofar as canon becomes self-preserving and self-authorizing. While P46 evidences a self-contained Pauline letter archive, the advent of deluxe codices that contain numerous sacred texts propelled a politics of exclusion and inclusion. Placement of Paul's letters alongside other scriptures recontextualizes their value and interpretation, especially in terms of promoting harmonizing interpretations.⁷³ This is not to suggest that notions of scripture or sacred text cannot exist outside of a canonical apparatus, but it does highlight the power dynamics at play in producing and reading state-sanctioned scriptural codices that function as a doctrinal standard for a state religion. Politics of exclusion and competing canons further elucidate this dynamic.⁷⁴

73 Increase in value may be perceived as flowing from Paul's letters to others, given the importance of these texts among early Christians. For example, Neinhuis argues that a collection of pseudepigraphal letters attributed to other early Christian leaders (James, 1 and 2 Peter/Titus, and 1, 2, and 3 John) were included in Christian canons as a way of mediating the influence of Paulinism. David R. Neinhuis, *Not By Paul Alone: The Formation of the Catholic Epistle Collection and the Christian Canon* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2007). Wall also notes how canon legitimizes textual difference between authentic and pseudepigraphal Pauline letters. Wall, "The Function of the Pastoral Letters," 27, 35. I would draw a distinction between this canonical function and the way in which corpus negotiates textual difference and authorship.

74 As Aichele points out, exclusion often takes the form of extra-canonical commentary, in which ecclesiastic leaders make pronouncements about the scriptural status of certain documents. Aichele, *The Control of Biblical Meaning*, 21. Eusebius's canon lists are particularly important given his connection with Imperial Christian government led by Constantine. See the discussion in Everett R. Kalin, "The New Testament Canon of Eusebius," in *The Canon Debate*, ed. Lee Martin McDonald and James A. Sanders (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2002), 386–404.

The Protestant biblical canon is not the only catalogue of Pauline texts, and a number of biblical codices include other texts attributed to Paul. For example, most modern scholars agree that the letters called 3 Corinthians and Laodiceans were not written by Paul, and they do not appear in many New Testament codices from the fourth century onward. However, both Laodiceans and 3 Corinthians seem to have been considered by some as authentic to Paul and even canonical, given their placement in some biblical codices. Some Syrian and Armenian churches counted 3 Corinthians as an authentic 14th letter of Paul, at least until the seventh century, when it was relegated to deutero-canonical status.⁷⁵ Some Latin Bibles include both 3 Corinthians and Laodiceans, though their disputed status may be reflected in their inclusion at the end of the Pauline letters, at least in one Latin manuscript (M).⁷⁶ The Epistle to the Laodiceans has been included without 3 Corinthians in a variety of Latin Bibles, including the earliest witness of the Vulgate, Codex Fuldensis (sixth century).⁷⁷ While these may be appropriately considered as marginal examples against a consistent canon of Pauline texts, they still illustrate regional canonical politics among the educated leaders of Christian churches.

Canonical form and shape is, however, insufficient to preserve its own authority.⁷⁸ As noted above, Christian biblical codices rely in part on an institutional apparatus.⁷⁹ Another mode, consistent with canonical strategies, appears in the form of paratextual material. I will briefly note the function of prologues to Pauline canons as well as an additional set of paratextual material found in Euthalian editions of the *corpus Paulinum*.⁸⁰

75 See Vahan Hovhannessian, *Third Corinthians: Reclaiming Paul for Christian Orthodoxy* (New York: Peter Lang, 2000), 5–13. This status is assessed based on inclusion in biblical codices and through its authoritative use by major Syrian theologians. A brief outline of the contexts and manuscripts of 3 Corinthians can be found in Glenn E. Snyder, *Acts of Paul: The Formation of a Pauline Corpus* (Tübingen, DE: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 150–55.

76 See Hovhannessian, *Third Corinthians*, 6–7. The Latin manuscript L also explicitly labels 3 Corinthians as inauthentic and places it at the end of the codex.

77 See Philip L. Tite, *The Apocryphal Epistle to the Laodiceans: An Epistolary and Rhetorical Analysis* (Leiden, NL: Brill, 2012), 132.

78 See Aichele, *The Control of Biblical Meaning*, 21–22.

79 I do not wish to overstate the connection between canon and Empire – especially church councils. Wyrick notes that canon formation is not the result of decisive moments as such. Instead, canon functions to endorse collective textual practice and traditions that have preceded the codification of a canon through codex or authoritative lists. Jed Wyrick, *The Ascension of Authorship: Attribution and Canon Formation in Jewish, Hellenistic and Christian Traditions* (Harvard, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004), 12–13. I think this article sufficiently demonstrates these types of collective and preceding textual practices involved in canonical negotiation.

80 Other Euthalian editions include the entire New Testament. However, Codex Coislinianus – the earliest Greek version – only contains some letters of Paul. See the discussion in Harold S. Murphy, “On the Text of Codices H and 93,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 78, no. 3 (September 1959): 228–37; and Vemund Blomkvist, *Euthalian Traditions: Text, Translation and Commentary* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2012), 5.

Scherbenske states that “introductions provide unparalleled access to editorial interpretation.”⁸¹ An important early example of this introductory practice is found in Marcion’s so-called *Antitheses* and *prologues/argumenta*. These paratextual materials likely served to direct the reading and interpretation of Marcion’s edition of the *corpus Paulinum*.⁸² Much of what we know about Marcion and his beliefs derives from antagonistic sources, such as Tertullian’s *Adversus Marcionem*.⁸³ In fact, we have no extant edition of Marcion’s text or paratextual materials that is not embedded in antagonistic commentary or reworked into later editions of the Bible. For example, de Bruyne and Harris suggest that the *argumenta* of Codex Fuldensis and other Vulgate editions derive from Marcion’s *argumenta*.⁸⁴ Conversely, Dahl argues that the Vulgate *argumenta* do not necessarily originate in the Marcionite *argumenta* and could reflect another “orthodox” set of *argumenta* attached to a seven-letter collection of Paul’s letters in the second century CE.⁸⁵ Argument

81 Scherbenske, *Canonizing Paul*, 60.

82 Scherbenske has recently argued that these *Antitheses* should be classified as isogogic, such that they would guide the reading of the corresponding text in a way that would correlate with Marcion’s theological leanings. See Eric W. Scherbenske, “Marcion’s *Antitheses* and the Isogogic Genre,” *Vigiliae Christianae* 64 (2010): 255–79; Scherbenske, *Canonizing Paul*, 74–78. He has also argued convincingly that the *Antitheses* may have been physically attached to the texts being introduced.

83 Marcion is well known for his rejection of the Hebrew God and preference for a particular construal of a Pauline anti-Judaism. See, for example, Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament*, 91–99; Paul Foster, “Marcion: His Life, Works, Beliefs, and Impact,” *Expository Times* 121, no. 6 (March 2010): 273–74. Marcion’s canon also only included 10 letters, rejecting 1 and 2 Timothy and Titus, as well as placing Galatians at the head of the collection. Moll argues that Marcion’s reading of Paul made little impact upon his rejection of the Hebrew God. Instead, his reading of the Hebrew Bible influenced the way he appreciated Paul. Sebastian Moll, “Marcion: A New Perspective on his Life, Theology, and Impact,” *Expository Times* 121, no. 6 (March 2010): 281–86.

84 See especially D. de Bruyne, “Prologues bibliques d’origine marcionite,” *Revue bénédictine* 14 (1907): 1–16; de Bruyne was followed strongly by J. Rendell Harris, “Marcion and the Canon,” *Expository Times* 18, no. 9 (January 1907): 392–94. The wording of the Vulgate prologues betray an ordering of the letters that follows Marcion’s (i.e., Galatians and 1 Corinthians preceding Romans) and the identification of Ephesians as Laodiceans. Further, the Latin prologues imply a Greek original owing to inconsistent translation or transliteration, while several of the letters that would not have been included in Marcion’s canon appear to be secondary additions.

85 See Nils A. Dahl, “The Origin of the Earliest Prologues to the Pauline Letters,” *Semeia* 12 (1978): 233–77. Dahl considers the claim of a Marcionite origin “extremely unlikely” (p. 234) for a variety of reasons. He points to wide variation in the texts of the *argumenta* in Vulgate editions, which supports their wide circulation, and suggests that the evidence for a Marcionite ordering simply affirms a chronology of the letters’ composition. Dahl considers one of his major contributions to be to theories of Paul’s letter collection, suggesting that our current collection and ordering is the result of combining two early archetypes of 7 and 13 letters (p. 263). While Dahl uses the language of collection, I would prefer to use the language of canon given the presence of competing letter archives and the use of paratextual material. Scherbenske recently disputed Dahl’s claim of a non-Marcionite origin, based on

for either claim is speculative, even if principled, since judgments must be made indirectly based on polemics against Marcion or much later Latin codices. What we can see is that there is good evidence for early paratextual material introducing Pauline canons, which encouraged either their subsequent modification or the production of alternative Pauline prologues. While the inclusion or exclusion of particular texts evokes a politics of authority, the discursive character of prologues produces a heightened sense of conflict between canons. Regardless of the “orthodox” or Marcionite origin of the Fuldensian prologues, it appears that they did develop from a smaller and earlier set. This development is itself evidence that editors of the *corpus Paulinum* were involved in contesting the historical truth of Pauline authorship and the proper interpretation of his letters.

Euthalian editions evidence an explicit interest in the Pauline letters as pedagogically useful, employing paratextual material to facilitate these goals. By engaging in common paratextual forms, including a prologue, *kephalaia*, and *argumenta*, the editors of Euthalian editions were able to place their particular canon in dialogue with other Pauline prologues, biography, and authorized interpretations found in other texts.⁸⁶ Various Euthalian editions inserted numbers, similar in some ways to modern chapter/verse notations, in the margins or into the text itself, which served as a cross-reference system in relation to the *kephalaia* headings. Because of this cross-reference system, readers could work through the text, being led according to an authorized system of interpretation.⁸⁷ Scherbenske argues that these chapter headings betray a hermeneutical logic aimed at instruction and moral exhortation/paraenesis, i.e., aimed at a more general application of the audience-contingent injunctions in the Pauline texts themselves. This is evident in the repeated use of paraenetic, instructional, and exhortational language that begins many of

oversimplification of evidence while positing a more complicated solution that includes some Marcionite influence (Scherbenske, *Canonizing Paul*, 239–42).

- 86 Blomkvist, *Euthalian Traditions*, 4–5, identifies three elements to the Euthalian apparatus: the prologue is an introduction to the entire collection, including brief biography and summaries of the letters; *hypotheses* or *argumenta* are summaries of each individual letter; and the *kephalaia/titloi* are summarizing titles for various chapter divisions. Cf. Scherbenske, *Canonizing Paul*, for additional description of these paratextual elements (pp. 55–67) and for explication of the Euthalian paratexts (pp. 122–46) in particular. Louis Charles Willard, *A Critical Study of the Euthalian Apparatus* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009), 147–55, provides a translation of the Greek prologues of the Pauline epistles in Euthalian editions. Blomkvist, *inter alia*, provides extensive discussion of the prologues, *argumenta*, and the individual *kephalaia*.
- 87 See Scherbenske, *Canonizing Paul*, 141–42. Scherbenske notes that Euthalius attributes some of these *kephalaia* to some people other than himself. However, the thematic similarity with the prologue suggests that the *kephalaia* were used because they fit with Euthalius’s editorial goals. See also Blomkvist, *Euthalian Traditions*, 124.

the *kephalaia*.⁸⁸ The idea of universal applicability was already mentioned as a function of collection. However, paratextual apparatus provides a much more heavy-handed set of applications that marginalizes competing interpretations.

Textual emendation through paratextual material participates in a canonical mechanics, whereby interpretation is directed and authorized. The editorial activity that can be understood as canonical is not more or less value-driven than other archival modes. However, canonical activity is insidiously self-authorizing in a way that acts of collection and the effects of corpus are not. Editors deploy widely different archiving strategies insofar as the selection and rejection of a text is supported by a powerful institutional apparatus and often makes use of paratextual material to make implicit claims to authority explicit. Through the dynamics of canon, Paul's authorial authenticity is reduced to a persona subservient to larger institutional structures of self-preservation and the maintenance of correct teaching.⁸⁹

Conclusion: Paul's Letter Archive and the Politics of Authenticity

Influenced by MacNeil's notion of *archivalterity* and the theoretical affinities between archival study and textual scholarship, this article has described and analyzed a number of ways in which editorial activity plays on conceptions of authenticity and originality of textual materials. Rather than asking how editorial activity corrupts the *corpus Paulinum*, I have directed my attention to the editorial curation of individual manuscripts of Paul's letters and the contribution of such activity to the larger cultural project of archiving Paul. I proposed three modes of archiving Paul: collection, corpus, and canon. Each of these modes captures distinct ways in which authenticity and originality are constructed as users interact with and manipulate the letter archive. "Collection" describes the gathering together of previously separate materials and assumptions and motivations that encourage such gathering. "Corpus" describes the interpretive influence that a body of texts associated with a single author has upon the user of those texts. Finally, "canon" describes implicit and explicit strategies that direct the interpretation, significance, and use of gathered texts, whereby authorized understandings of the authorial persona are constructed in support of institutionalized power. These various modes of curation and control participate in an interpretive politics surrounding authorship, authority, and institutional investment, a politics that is propelled by the religious significance ascribed to Paul's letters.

88 See Scherbenske, *Canonizing Paul*, 143. See also Blomkvist, *Euthalian Traditions*, for delineation of five classes of this "meta-terminology" (pp. 124–42).

89 It is also worth noting that, as Blomkvist identifies, the Euthalian *kephalaia* for the Pauline letters rarely draw attention to Paul's status as an apostle. Blomkvist, *Euthalian Traditions*, 140.

Gregory Fewster is a PhD student at the University of Toronto, in the Department for the Study of Religion, and he works in collaboration with the Program in Book History and Print Culture. His research inquires about the developing book cultures of early Christianity, with special attention to the production and reception of literary forgeries (called pseudepigraphy) and other modes of textual alteration. His interest in this area has resulted in two recent articles, “Can I Have Your Autograph? On Thinking about Pauline Authorship and Pseudepigraphy,” in the *Bulletin for the Study of Religion* 43, no. 3 (September 2014), and “Hermeneutical Issues in Canonical Pseudepigraphy: The Head/Body Motif in the Pauline Corpus as a Test Case,” in *Paul and Pseudepigraphy* (Leiden, NL: Brill, 2013). He has done pioneering work in lexicographical data collection for the digitized archive *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*, developing corpus linguistic theories appropriate for Greek-language research. He published the results of this study in a monograph titled *Creation Language in Romans 8: A Study in Monosemy*, also published by Brill (2013).