Article

"If You Can Change Your Name, You Can Write": Pseudepigraphy in Antiquity and Its Function in *1 Apocryphal Apocalypse of John*

Cristian Daniel Cardozo Mindiola [1,2]

1 Department of Theology, Adventist University of Colombia, Carrera 84, No. 33 AA-1, Medellín 050032, Colombia; ccardozo@unac.edu.co
2 Inter-American Adventist Theological Seminary, Mayaguez, PR 00681-0118, USA

Abstract: This article attempts to answer the following question: why did the author of the apocryphon called *1 Apocryphal Apocalypse of John* choose to efface himself and adopt John as his pseudonym? Why not Peter or Paul? This paper argues that the author of *1 Apocryphal Apocalypse of John* intended to harness the audience attached to John, the seer of Revelation, by taking his name as a pseudonym. This paper sustains this claim by demonstrating that, in antiquity, each author had a specific pool of readers, often made out of friends and accolades of the author. Thus, authors' names evoke an audience attached to them. When an author takes another person's name to write under, he does so out of necessity, because he does not have an audience. But, when he takes another's person name, he does so hoping to trick the audience of the impersonated into reading him. Based on this insight, this article concludes that the author of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* wanted the readers of canonical Revelation to engage with his work and that he achieved his purpose as evinced by the fact that the titles of both works share an uncanny resemblance, ranging from identical titles to similar wording. Since titles in antiquity were given to the works by their readers, the most logical explanation for canonical Revelation and *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* having the same titles is that they both shared the same readers. Finally, this article argues that, in line with recent research on the use of pseudepigraphy in Jewish, Christian, and Roman contexts, the author of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* wanted to be read by CR's readers because he wanted to expand, criticize, rework, and update CR's eschatological discourse, exemplified by a close reading of how *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* criticized, reworked, and updated CR's presentation of the resurrection to bring it in harmony with late Christian reflection on the subject.

Keywords: pseudepigraphy; Revelation; Apocalypse; audience; paratexts; John

1. Introduction

1 Apocryphal Apocalypse of John (hereafter, 1 Apocr. Apoc. John) is a work of uncertain date, written in the question-and-answer genre, that purports to be John the apostle's report of a conversation between God and him about the end times' events on Mount Tabor.[1] Its opening chapters mirror Canonical Revelation (hereafter, CR), clarifying that John, he who stood on Mount Tabor, is the seer of CR and that *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* had to be read as a work of the same author, that is, in relationship with CR and the Johannine corpus.[2] Consequently, *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* makes use of pseudepigraphy—writing under someone else's name,—a practice well known in antiquity, because by the time of its composition, John, the seer of CR, was long dead. While the phenomenon of pseudepigraphy has been widely studied in Jewish, Greek, and Christian contexts, little has been done regarding its function in *1 Apocr. Apoc. John*.[3] This issue has great importance because, of all the names available that could have been chosen to write under, the author of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* chose John.[4] Why did he not choose to write under the name of Peter or Paul? What is at stake with the name John that the author of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* had to assume his persona? Is *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* an exercise of speech-in-character representative of ancient rhetorical

education? Or, was the name John chosen because it could grant authority to the work?[5] Is it possible that John was chosen to placate bibliographical anxieties? (Wyrick 2004).

This essay addresses these questions and intends to tackle the issue of pseudonymity in *1 Apocr. Apoc. John*. Particularly, it seeks to ascertain what the author intended to accomplish by taking the name John as his pseudonym. As such, it builds on recent works dealing with pseudepigraphy in Jewish, Christian, and classical literature to argue that the author of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* wanted to harness the audience of John, the seer of CR. In late antiquity, authors had a specific pool of readers who often were members of the intellectual community to which the author belonged. Belonging to these networks was restricted to the elite. Thus, not anyone could have been an author in antiquity. The alternative for many who wanted to write but did not reside in elite intellectual spaces was to adopt the name of someone who was indeed a member of these groups, because by harnessing the audience of the impersonated, an author could have an audience. This paper argues, considering this context, that *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* adopted John as a pseudonym to tap into the readers of CR. This would explain why the author of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* chose John as a pseudonym and not Peter or Paul. The former was interested in the reading communities of John, not just any apostle.

To do so, this paper tackles the issue of pseudepigraphy from another perspective and avoids the perennial questions that have dominated the field for so long. This paper will not address the issue of whether pseudepigraphy was innocent, transparent, or deceptive nor its implications for canonicity.[6] Instead, this paper tries to contextualize the phenomenon of pseudepigraphy within the literary culture of antiquity, asking how could a pseudonymous writing have been produced in the bookish culture of antiquity, and what could such a book have accomplished? This paper tries to answer this question by taking a step back to wonder why names are so important that people go to great lengths to appropriate one? If pseudepigraphy is taking someone else's name to write under, we must first look at why names are important and which conditions might drive someone to give up his name and adopt another one. In other words, this paper attempts to peek behind the curtain and discover a glimpse of the motivations underlying the practice of pseudepigraphy. Therefore, this paper first explores what names are and why they are important. Then, it addresses the question of why a person would give up his name and take someone else's name. Finally, there is an attempt to apply these previous findings to *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* to ascertain why the real author decided to efface his identity and adopt John as his pseudonym.

2. Authors and Reading Communities

In ancient and modern times, names matter. A name is much more than a combination of letters designed to distinguish people from each other. A name represents the person who carries it and, as such, conveys notions of status, class, gender, place of origin, ethnicity, and family relations, among others.[7] Names describe persons and their value according to the parameters established by the communities to which they belong.[8] To rehash a common joke in the English-speaking world, if the author of this paper, Bill Gates, and Warren Buffet walk into a bar, who do you think people will run to greet and tend to? Bill Gates and Warren Buffet for sure. Why? Their names describe who they are and what they are worth, which in this case relates to a number put forth by Forbes each year. The value of Warren Buffet and Bill Gates outweigh the value of the author of this paper because they are billionaires, but I am not. Bill Gates or Warren Buffet, as names, evoke a characterization of the persons involved. Thus, names are not neutral, as they carry power-related descriptions.

In the context of ancient book production, a name mattered even more. Intellectual activity in antiquity often took place in communal contexts, surrounded by friends.[9] Writing and reading, as a sociological system embedded in a more complex network of relations, representation, and value, were not solitary affairs.[10] People involved in intellectual activity usually got together with friends to read, dine, and discuss topics that they considered

valuable[11]. Each group or community gravitated around an individual or a couple of persons to whom the group granted authority.[12] The members of the group were like-minded, which means that the topics dealt with within the group were usually of mutual interest and perceived as enhancing the social standing of the community.[13] Communities such as the one where Pliny the Younger stood at the center concerned themselves with oratory and rhetoric, since their members belonged to the ruling class and therefore were habitually involved in delivering speeches, pleading cases, or speaking at public events (Johnson 2010, pp. 32–62). Communities such as the one where Aulus Gellius dominated found discussions about grammar and philology exhilarating, and what they read and wrote about went in that direction (Johnson 2010, pp. 98–136). Thus, each community negotiated which interests would drive them based on socially constructed standards of capital and determined the boundaries by which their members had to abide.[14] What is striking is that these authors are never alone; they are frequently depicted with a community gathered around them to pursue literary activities.[15]

When a member of any intellectual group decided to write a book, the group's dynamics often shaped the entire project.[16] Sometimes, the book came as a result of an inquiry from a friend or patron to the author on a particular topic.[17] Thus, often, but not always, the motivation for writing antique books lay in the desire of a friend or patron to read something on a specific subject by a given person.[18] At other times, the book responded to discussions or questions that a given text might have sparked when read in the community.[19] In either case, the primary audience for authors in antiquity was the intellectual community to which they belonged, because books were frequently born out of the group's interests.[20] As Raymond Starr rightly puts it, "the first recipients were the dedicatee of the work and other friends intimately connected with it" (Starr 1987, p. 214). But this audience was not a passive recipient of the book it wanted to read; rather, it participated heavily in the production of the book itself, since not only reading but also writing was a communal phenomenon.[21] Communities could correct the grammar, improve the style of the text, or correct the tone of a draft presented to them by the author, often at the *recitatio* or by sending a copy of the manuscript to a group of selected friends.[22] Since they were heavily involved in the process of writing, it is only logical that they would be the first to receive a final copy of the text they helped edit (Starr 1987, p. 214).

The communal dynamics of reading and writing in antiquity explain that although books could be "published" in antiquity by depositing a copy in a public library or giving the "final" edition to a bookseller, the principal way to publish books in antiquity consisted of distributing copies of the document among the inner circle of the author, that is, his intellectual community.[23] By giving copies of the final manuscript to the author's intellectual community, the primary audience could now engage in detailed reading and promotion of the book.[24] From that moment on, if someone wished to secure a copy of the manuscript in question, they needed to contact one of the first recipients to borrow the book and make a copy or for a copy to be made by one of the first recipients and then be sent to the one who requested it; either way, this was only possible if you were friends with someone who received a copy.[25] Through private book-lending channels among friends, the original manuscript intended for close friends acquired greater diffusion (Marshall 1976, pp. 252–64). Not only did the author's intellectual community constitute his first audience, but they also controlled the distribution of the book outside the inner circle. Therefore, not everyone had access to the books published by a person (Starr 1987, p. 217). People needed to be in the right circles and have proper friends so that they could obtain access to the right books.[26] In fact, access to books was so restrictive for the majority of people in antiquity that they became perfect objects for gift-giving among the elite.[27] However, publication constitutes the last step in a long stairway, beginning with reading and discussing texts in a communal setting. Publication is communal because the underlying process is communal.

Furthermore, as we have seen, reading and writing as systems are all about networks. Writing outside one's communal intellectual activity was seldom done; authors often wrote

for their friends and acquaintances.[28] As an author, if you wanted readers, you needed to belong to a network of like-minded people who will be interested in your book and will make copies of it. In other words, if you want an audience, you need an intellectual community. However, who belongs to these networks? Ancient authors such as Pliny the Younger, Aelius Gellius, and Fronto have described what it took to be in an intellectual community. First, you needed to be highly educated so that you could participate in the communal activities of proper reading and discussion of texts.[29] Second, you needed to have leisure time (*otium*) and adhere to a particular way of life.[30] For instance, Pliny's regimen of literary pursuits and political preoccupations combined with exercise was considered ideal for the Roman author. These activities were necessary because they provided a foil to the leisure time, moments when authors engaged in writing.[31] At night, you needed to attend dinners and banquets, given that books would be read and discussions would be held there.[32] All these imply that you needed to be elite to be an author, since only they would have the amount of time needed to invest in literature. Third, you needed to possess a complex machinery for the production of your own books as well as for copying the books you needed for your intellectual life. In antiquity, you needed scribes for everything related to the production of literature (Moss 2021). Slaves usually fulfilled this role—not just any slave, but literate and educated slaves, whose cost implied that whoever owned them had money.[33] Besides slaves, you would have also needed to cover the materials needed for the production of books, which were not inexpensive and could even be scarce in certain regions of the Empire (Turner 1980; Bagnall 2009). Moreover, since intellectual life was communal, it often took place at dinners, which you, as an author, needed to host. This meant food, a triclinium, and entertainment needed to be provided —the cost of which amounted to several sesterces, which even for the elite was something considerable.[34] We could enumerate more aspects of the system behind reading and writing in antiquity, but the general picture is clear: the environments, albeit ideal, where reading and writing occur are spaces of power inhabited by the antique elite.[35]

We must acknowledge that not every person who wrote in antiquity belonged to the elite. In antiquity, many people wrote for everyday purposes: commercial dealings, deeds, contracts, letters, etc.[36] However, the fact that elites and non-elites could produce literature does not mean that both groups could write the same type of literature. While elites and non-elites could write a letter—either by their own hand or through a secretary—non-elites could probably not write an encyclopedia like the Pliny's *Natural History* because they did not have the time required (*otium*), the means, the intellectual formation, etc. What I want to posit is that although a literary culture existed among non-elites in early and late antiquity, this culture could not be equated with the same literary culture that existed among elites because the two groups shared different interests, which inevitably shaped the subject matter of the literature written. For instance, a soldier could write a letter to his parents and a merchant could keep records of his dealings, but they probably could not write nor would they be interested in reading something like Aullus Gellius' *Attic Nights*, because Gellius' project was of significance to grammarians but useless to a soldier.

Furthermore, while non-elites could access literature through public readings of books, the expertise gained through these events is limited, and the scope of literature disseminated in this way was not broad. That is, a person could familiarize themselves, through public reading events, with a certain kind of literature but not enough to compose, for instance, a technical treatise on medicine. Thus, while a merchant could attend to the public recitation of poetry, this would not mean that he could master the art of poetry or have written poetry to disseminate. The kind of books needed in order to write a certain kind of literature were only available through private channels established with friends that belonged to elite circles. Moreover, writing materials were also expensive and prohibitive for many in antiquity. It is clear that non-elite people could obtain access to papyrus or even write on scraps of discarded documents (Luijendijk 2008, pp. 144–51). Yet, it is one thing have access to papyrus or scraps to write a letter, and another to have access to the material necessary to write and make copies of a philosophical treatise. The latter seems

to be reserved for those who had the means to acquire greater amounts of writing material. Non-elites could, indeed, copy portions of literature in scraps of discarded documents, but it is another different thing altogether to write a new literary composition on this kind of material. Moreover, the difference between a letter by a soldier and a book by Galen is that the latter required ample expertise and training on a subject, gained through an expensive education, access to the kind of books that were not read aloud publicly to the general population, extensive writing materials to cover a large quantity of literature, and slaves to make copies of the book produced. These conditions suggest that a certain kind of literature was reserved for the elite, like scientific treatises, grammar books, and philosophical instructions, among others. This does not deny the fact that literature could be read and produced by non-elites, it just asserts that non-elites and elites produced different kind of literature. This is of extreme importance, since Christian writings have lately been categorized as products of highly educated people, and *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* is no exception (Reece 2022; Walsh 2021).

If being elite is so important for the production of certain kind of literature, then who can access these elite networks? Those with a proper place of birth, gender, status, class, wealth, education, power, political position, military career, etc. Which ubiquitous element in antiquity encodes the aforementioned and describes it in simple terms? Names. As Foucault writes so elegantly "[an author's name] it has other than indicative functions: more than indication, a gesture, a finger pointed at someone, it is the equivalent of a description".[37] It is not the same to be named Marcus Cornelius Fronto or Gaius Plinius Caecilius Secundus as it is to be named simply Phaedrus. The former convey elite status, which implies that they belong to intellectual communities (i.e., they have an audience), while the latter is just a common name that might imply belonging to a community but probably not being learned or literate.[38] Thus, to have an audience, you need to belong to the elite (because this is where writing and reading happen), and to be elite, you need to have the right status, which condenses itself in a name. Therefore, a name indicates whether you have an audience or not, because it betrays that you are elite and belong to an intellectual community. Consequently, names evoke an audience, a very particular and selective one. When we ask why names matter in the ancient book production system, the answer is that the author's names elicit specific reading communities.

Consider, for instance, Galen, the philosopher and the court physician of Marcus Aurelius.[39] Who read and was interested in Galen's writings? Galen's literary output was huge, and his readers ranged from elite members of society to students who wanted to have a record of their teacher's lecture (Mattern 2008). Initially, all readers of Galen's works belonged to his inner circle: friends as well as students who had a close relationship with the physician because they attended his lectures and demonstrations or were interested in medicine.[40] Galen's inner circle asked questions about the medical arts or required further explanation of a given topic.[41] Galen would send them his notes on the subject or an unfinished composition addressing these questions, without the intention of reaching wider distribution.[42] Johnson noted "Galen's focus on an exclusive set of actively engaged readers, in some sense his 'followers' or at least explicitly under his notional direction" (Johnson 2010, p. 85). However, we learn that friends from the inner circle, the original recipients of Galen's work, made copies of the original books, and from these, more copies were made by others, so that people detached from the author had access to them.[43] This is how the literary output of the man from Pergamum reached a wider audience and even appeared on the shelves of bookshops.[44] When we talk of Galen's readers, we include the initial, familiar, close readers—Galen's coterie—and those who never heard of the man but their interest in medicine made them seek the books he wrote.[45]

Since Galen's literary output dealt mostly with medical matters, we can safely assume that students and medical professionals made up most of his intended audience.[46] However, Galen's students of medicine encompass a broad network of people and include many individuals.[47] First, Galen, in his *On My Own Books*, clarifies that he wrote many works with medical practice beginners in mind. A selection of these compositions covered sects,

bones, and pulse for beginners.[48] In fact, in many of his more complex and advanced treatises, he included sections specifically addressed to amateurs just taking their first steps into the art of medicine. Galen not only focused on skilled physicians, but as a good pedagogue he also supported those trainees who aspired to become doctors.[49]

Second, Galen wrote for well-trained doctors and people familiar with the Hippocratic corpus, a sine qua non to read Galen's most advanced tracts. These doctors went beyond the sixth-month course offered to many medical practitioners at the time. They had advanced knowledge of anatomy, botanic, pharmacy, and so on. Yet, they looked up to Galen as one of the lead physicians of the time and as a teacher who surpassed them in medical knowledge; hence, he would always have something to teach, whether in books, lectures, or demonstrations.[50] These trained doctors would look to Galen with specific inquiries, such as how to interpret particular passages from the Hippocrates corpus, the influence of diet on health, and how to treat a fever, among others. Galen considered these doctors as friends and wrote at their behest, answering their questions.[51] Moreover, these trained doctors would frequently become involved in disputes with other medical teachers and their disciples, since in second-century Rome there was no single way to approach the study of anatomy or how to treat certain diseases (Walsh 1927). As Galen's friends, they would advocate for the accuracy and truthfulness of their mentor's teaching, yet they would often find themselves without the book necessary to prove their point.[52] In addition, Galen involved himself in many of these controversies with other teachers in demonstrations and dissections, trying to prove that he was right (von Staden 1989; Walsh 1927). Many of Galen's books were transcriptions of these encounters and aimed to provide these friends with the tools necessary for the defense and promotion of his teaching.[53] To these trained physicians, though still Galen's students, tractates such as *The Motion of the Chest and Lungs*, *The Usefulness of the Parts of the Body*, and many others were sent.

Moreover, Galen also wrote treatises not directed towards his students or fellow doctors but his friends. For instance, Galen composed treatises dealing with highly technical discussions of anatomy. However, the addressee was Flavius Boethus, a friend of Galen, of the equestrian rank and consul of the empire.[54] Boethus could not be a doctor, given his political occupations, yet Galen portrayed him as a learned man with great interest and knowledge of the medical arts.[55] Undoubtedly, Galen took advantage of Boethus and shaped his characterization to promote his agenda: medical knowledge was essential to the elite toolkit. Medical knowledge should logically follow the study of classics, philosophy, and logic, because these provide the theoretical foundation for the practical application of medicine. Galen composed at Boethus' behest *The Opinions of Hippocrates and Plato*, the first volume of *The Usefulness of the Parts of the Body*; *The Causes of Breathing*; the four volumes on *The Voice*; *Hippocrates' Anatomy*; and *Erasistratus' Anatomy*.[56] These compositions characterize Boethus as a man of advanced medical knowledge, even though he was not a doctor, and prove that Galen was able to write for friends with shared passions. Furthermore, Boethus is a sample of many friends—doctors and non-doctors—that Galen wrote for.

In a nutshell, Galen attracted readers—medical students, doctors, accolades, and strangers—from a wide pool of people interested in medicine. Galen's reading community was primarily made up of those who gravitated around him—students, colleagues, and friends interested in medicine—and those whose love for medicine made them secure copies of Galen's writings through private or public channels due to their acute passion for the medical arts.[57] This trait unites Galen's readers as a diverse but integral reading community; all of them were interested in medicine and perceived medical knowledge as part of the ideal Roman elite. From the perspective of the modern publishing industry, we might get the impression that, in antiquity, everybody had access to or was interested in all the books distributed at the time. The mechanics of ancient book production and distribution prove that this assumption was incorrect.[58] Galen's readers were those closely tied to him (his intellectual community)—friends, students, and colleagues and their friends. Thus, not just anyone would read Galen. That is, Galen exemplifies that each author had a specific pool of readers, a highly selective and exclusive audience.

Galen's name indicated he belonged to an intellectual community where medicine stood at the center. Galen, as a name, implies an audience of like-minded people who received, read, copied, and distributed his writings. Galen, as a name, encodes an audience. Therefore, authors become icons for their audiences. In other words, authors' names are not neutral; they come with an audience attached to them. Galen is not just five letters that distinguish him from other people; this name also represents a group interested in the physician's literary output. Paraphrasing Shakespeare, what it is in a name is the audience attached to it.

3. Pseudepigraphy: What Motivates It?

Now that we have explored how authors and audiences are inextricably tied to each other, we could ask why anybody would write a book impersonating someone else? What is the necessity of adopting a name that is not yours?[59] Tom Geue, in his book "Author Unknown: The Power of Anonymity in Ancient Rome", proposes that the process involved in naming or not naming someone is never neutral but rather involves complex power dynamics (Geue 2019). As he succinctly puts it "To have a name is to have power, and to lose one is to lose it" (Geue 2019, p. 55). Names encode identities; they represent iconic social value and power or a lack thereof.[60] Thus, those whose names defeated the forgetful nature of history controlled the narrative so that their names were inscribed in the annals of history, while those names suppressed from the record did not have enough power to secure their places in historical memory.[61] Therefore, the presence or absence of names in historical records or book inscriptions does not happen out of chance but rather indicates the power dynamics within which a person is present or absent.

Names are so important that their presence or absence became vehicles through which ancient people exerted power over others to the degree that some individuals tried hard to erase their enemies' names from history, as Augustus does in *Res Gestae* and Octavia in her eponymous play.[62] In this way, elite members of society hoped to defeat their enemies as, by erasing their names, they effaced their entire existence (Martelli 2010). This was a powerful political strategy, given that stripping off the name of one's enemies opened the possibility of redefining their identity, because "what this denial of name does is take away the general condition of personhood from the agents it blocks" (Geue 2019, p. 37). The enemies became malleable, and the person in power decided how to showcase them (Krasne 2012). They stop being who they are and start playing the character created for them: it is no longer Nero in Octavia's play, now he is the tyrant; it is no longer Octavia, she becomes the tyrant's wife or Claudius' daughter (Geue 2019, pp. 36–38, 94–100). In a society preoccupied with transcendence, self-promotion, and fame, losing the power to define how you are going to be remembered and instead be left at the mercy of your enemy amounted to a cruel political death, because your enemy would strive to eliminate your name, so you would not be remembered; if you would be remembered at all, you would be a nobody.[63] To lose a name is to lose a legacy (fame), and losing your legacy is losing everything you lived for, because death is no more than oblivion—*damnatio memoriae*.[64] That is why not naming was such a powerful and obliterating political move: it allowed you to reduce your enemies to the ashes of non-existence and to relegate them to forgetfulness; the victor keeps on living on the memory of the people; the defeated is the dust that the wind carries away. Ancient elite members outmaneuvered their enemies by killing them, not physically, but by erasing their memory, reputation, and fame from historical records.[65] The dynamics at play in erasing one enemies' names evince that the presence or absence of names in the historical record often is tied up with power dynamics: the powerful decide who is allowed to keep a name or rather who can be redefined according to his desires.

What the evidence above demonstrates is that in early and late antiquity, the presence or absence of names is tied to power dynamics. The aforementioned context deals mostly with political power as reflected in literature. In this case, to have power means to have greater social and political status than own's enemies so as to be in a position to determine whether to include or exclude names. However, when an author writes, which power dy-

namics influence his decision of including or excluding his own name? An author decides to include or exclude his name from his works depending on whether he thinks his name will secure an audience or not. Thus, power, in this case, is bidirectional: on one hand, it refers to who the author is, whether he is well educated, and whether he has the means to produce the kind of literature his friends would be interested in; on the other hand, it refers to the audience, whether they will accept, read, and circulate the author's writing.[66] Therefore, for a writer to have power, he must have an audience. But, for him to have an audience, he must have the standing necessary to belong to an intellectual community. Power, then, does not belong uniquely to the audience or to the author; rather, power is the result of an interrelated number of factors involved in the process of writing and reading in early and late antiquity.

Take, for instance, Sulpicius Severus' prologue to his *Life of St Martin*.[67] In early and late antiquity, readers expected literary works to be of the utmost quality.[68] Therefore, a writer who met the standards of what a good literary work looked like would surely have readers—friends and acquaintances—governed by the same literary standards. However, what happens when you cannot produce elite literary works? If you produce something below the expectations of the readers, who will engage with such work? Nobody. This is the fear Sulpicius must deal with in his book. He argues that the style and grammar of his work are defective.[69] He understands that, because of his self-perceived precarious writing skills, his book will not have a wide readership.[70] The book will not have an impact, and he will have no audience. Notwithstanding, Sulpicius considers the book of the utmost importance because it will teach those who read it virtue.[71] So, he decides to vanish; he prefers the book to be copied and distributed even if his name is not attached to it.[72] However, if to have a name is to have fame, and this is so important for self-representation, why does he renounce it? Because, from his standpoint, he has no audience, and it is preferable to attempt a coup d'état against himself and strip himself of fame than to hinder the circulation of the book because of the standing of its author.[73] Only those with insufficient power (audience) renounce their names to draw an audience by becoming nobody or someone else.[74]

In other words, in antiquity, a name (identity) is the currency of fame (Geue 2019, p. 36). In a culture in which fame is essential to the innerworkings of society, it is imperative to have a name. When someone else tried to strip off your name, this was a violent act equivalent to a coup d'état (Geue 2019, p. 36). The person trying to confiscate someone else's name was off to erase the confiscated's entire existence and contributions.[75] In the context of elite competition in antiquity, it is understandable why certain persons tried to send others into oblivion; it was about asserting one's authority over another (Todisco 2007). However, pseudepigraphy required the voluntary abandonment of one own's name. Why would someone voluntarily renounce his name? If to have a name is to have power, who would strip himself of power in a culture in which the powerless did not exist? Who would do such violence to themselves? As we have seen from the context, this decision is not neutral. Instead, it is deeply linked to power dynamics. One logical answer to these questions is that only those who are not powerful would be interested in effacing their names, because it does not matter to them whether they are remembered in or erased from history.[76] You only give up power if you do not have anything to lose to begin with. Only those who lack what it takes to have power would be willing to erase their names from the historical record because it is inconsequential to them.

Moreover, where does the writer's power reside? In his audience. As we have seen, a writer with an audience has power because such a writer will be read, and a writer without an audience will be forgotten since nobody will copy his works, preserving them for posterity. When ancient book producers lacked an intellectual community within which they could pursue literary activities, they did not have an audience. If they did not belong to any of these intellectual communities, it was because they lacked power as represented by the standards that regulated who had a place among the elite. They could not control the narrative to preserve their names for posterity. This scenario creates conditions

that drive writers to abandon their names because they long for reading communities, but their names, as a representation of who they are, do not allow them to have any. How do they procure an audience? Some, like Sulpicius Severus, decided to self-efface,[77] but others were even smarter; they scanned the literary society of their times and identified who had an audience.[78] They then seized the names of the authors who had an audience and appropriated them as their own. Since authors had very specific reading communities attached to them in antiquity, author names and audiences were inextricably tied.[79] By taking the names of these authors, powerless writers with no audience now had a reading community—one tied to the names the impersonators took. This is, in short, is pseudepigraphy. In other words, if you do not have an audience, how do you obtain one? By tattooing on yourself the identity of someone who has an audience.[80] By becoming someone else, writers now have access to the audience attached to the someone else they have decided to become. Why? To appropriate the name of a writer is tantamount to having his power, status, and audience. Therefore, as Karen King succinctly states, "Attribution was not neutral" (King 2016, p. 40).

Despite the scarcity of ancient discussions about the motives of pseudepigraphy, the few we have point out that people traded their names hoping to draw a bigger audience for their writings. Aelius Gellius criticizes Pliny the Elder for accepting as authentic certain declarations by Democritus that Gellius considers not to match the general tenor of his works. Gellius then claims that "many fictions of this kind seem to have been attached to the name of Democritus by ignorant men who used his reputation and authority as a refuge".[81] That is, many people decided to expunge their names from their writings and adopt Democritus as a pseudonym; in this way, they would have a broader readership, since Democritus was considered an authority and had secured an audience, while the actual authors of the fragments attributed to him had not. Peirano rightly comments, "The name of the author, 'Democritus', is a label that enhances the value of the writings, allowing the circulation of material that might otherwise be rejected because of prejudice against the author or the subject" (Peirano 2012, p. 51).

A scholion to Dionisyus Thrax also contains a discussion of pseudepigraphy by someone who took Hesiod's name to write a poem entitled *Aspis*. The *scholion* explains that "for it was written [*Aspis*] by someone else who used the title and name of Hesiod so that it would be judged worth reading because of the trustworthiness of the poet".[82] This *scholion* demonstrates that what people chose to read in antiquity was tied to the identity of the author.[83] Therefore, since the author of *Aspis* did not have an audience, he chose to become someone who did have one, in this case, Hesiod. Hesiod was much more popular than the actual author of the *Aspis*, and authors prefer to disappear from what they write if, by doing this, they secure an audience that otherwise would be impossible to have.[84] The authors of the *Aspis* harnessed Hesiod's reading community and took advantage of them so that they could read and diffuse their work. Peirano, once again, aptly comments, "the surreptitious use of someone else's name—Hesiod's in this case—is motivated by a desire to be read even if that is achieved at the price of anonymity" (Peirano 2012, p. 53).

Another example that powerfully illustrates this motivation for pseudepigraphy is the story of Salvian and Salonius. Salvian served as the presbyter of Marseille and published a book entitled "*Timothei ad Ecclesiam Libri IV*".[85] Timothy was a pseudonym, of course. Salonius, bishop of Geneva and a former student of Salvian, discovered that Timothy was, in fact, his teacher. As a bishop, Salonius wrote a letter asking Salvian to explain himself.[86] Salvian replied that the subject matter of *Ad Ecclesiam* was of the utmost importance because Christians behaved poorly at the time and considered God as less important than worldly affairs.[87] As such, Salvian continued, he was afraid that people would not heed to the actual author of *Ad Ecclesiam* because they would value him so low that they would not want to listen to him. The Church, claims Salvian, would only listen to one with authority, and he does not fit the requirement.[88] The problem with the name Salvian is that it has a small pool of readers, and what he expected to accomplish—to be read widely so that Christians would alter their behavior—would be hindered because his name was not fa-

mous.[89] Therefore, Salvian wrote under a pseudonym because he thought that everybody would listen to Timothy, since the audience of the apostle's companion encompassed all Christians.[90] In this way, Salvian guaranteed that people would heed his work since, as we have said, a name equals an audience. As Salvian himself writes:

> Hence, rightly thinking that others must also evaluate him as he evaluates himself, he rightly inserted a strange name on his books, lest the insignificance of his person detract authority from his salutary statements. In a way, all things said are esteemed as much as is he who says them. Indeed, so weak are the judgments of our day and almost so meaningless that they who read do not consider so much what they read as whom they read, nor so much the force and strength of what is said as the reputation of him who speaks. For this reason, the writer wished to be completely hidden and to keep out of the way, lest writings which contained much helpfulness should lose their force through the name of the author. This is the reason for anyone who inquires why the author assumed another's name.[91]

In other words, Salvian had something important to say, but he was not sufficiently important. He wondered who the church would listen to if the subject of avarice was at hand? The answer was Timothy.[92] Thus, Salvian took Timothy's persona so he could also appropriate his audience. Even if personal fame and ego had to be sacrificed to the altar of pseudepigraphy, what mattered for Salvian was for his message to be disseminated, for his book to have an audience (Ehrman 2014, pp. 94–96; Brakke 2016). Ehrman aptly condensed the discussion, arguing that "his explanation [Salvian's] for why he could not write the book orthonymously is of considerable value: it shows that one of the motivations for producing pseudepigraphic works was to get a hearing for one's views, by claiming to be someone who deserved to be heard" (Ehrman 2014, p. 96).

A similar phenomenon occurred throughout the transmission of the Pythagorean school writings. In ancient times, there was great discussion regarding the number of works Pythagoras had written and how many had been attributed to him by his students.[93] However, Porphyry believed that many writings circulating under the name of Pythagoras had been falsely composed by his students and, consequently, they needed to be considered fakes. Porphyry did not have in mind the publication of lecture notes by some teachers' students, a common phenomenon in antiquity. Rather, he was thinking of people purposely composing and publishing books under Pythagoras' name. Concerning this practice, in an Arabic fragment found in a book by Ibn Abi Usaybi'a (*Kitab 'uyun al-anba' fi tabaqat al-atibba*), Porphyry comments:

> The criminal individuals who fabricated these lying books that we have mentioned, according to traditions that have reached us, are Aristotle the Younger, Nikos known as the essentially erroneous, one of the Cretans called Konios, Megalos, and Fukhajawaqa, along with others even more reprehensible than they. And that was who proposed to them the fabrication of these lying books with the tongue of the philosopher Pythagoras and his name, so that would be accepted among the moderns because of him, so they would honor, prefer, and share them.[94]

Again, we see that people impersonating somebody else are after their reading community. Aristotle the Younger and his allies understood that Pythagoras' audience had a penchant for philosophical discussions. If they were to write under their own names, few would be interested in reading their manuscripts. If they were to publish under Pythagoras' name, many would be attracted, since the Greek philosopher had already accrued a group of loyal readers. The usurpers conveniently composed many books under Pythagoras' name so that they would appeal to and be read by his audience. As Ehrman notices, "they [books] were written pseudepigraphically because by putting Pythagoras' name on them, the books were more likely to be accepted by their readers" (Ehrman 2014, p. 110). That is, the books had more of a chance to be read if they were thought to be written by

Pythagoras, because his reading community was bigger and broader than his students'. Therefore, they capitalized on the network of readers belonging to Pythagoras by taking his name and persona.

What the examples above conceptualize is that authors are looking for audiences to engage with and hear what they have to say. However, many authors do not have an audience, given that their lack of power precludes them from belonging to literary networks where their works could be disseminated. How do they attract an audience? By becoming someone who already has one. Giving up one's name and adopting another is a calculated and intentional effort. By analogy, pseudepigraphy resembles the trade of goods: someone gives up something hoping to attain another thing. An author gives up his name and takes the name of another person to have an audience.

Genette rightly captures the phenomenon of pseudepigraphy as uniting "a taste for masks and mirrors, for indirect exhibitionism, and for controlled histrionics with delight in invention, in borrowing, in verbal transformation, in onomastic fetishism" (Genette 1997, p. 54). Writers long for reading communities; they value histrionics and are exhibitionists.[95] However, they give up their names because they are not important enough to spark the attention of the people they want to read their work; that is, they do not have a reading community.[96] That is why they must wear a mask and become someone else.[97] They need to become someone their expected readers would be interested in; this decision is tailor-made; they identify which reading community they want to be heard by and then wear the mask that allows them to attract the attention of said community.[98] At the risk of redundancy, people did not choose the name of just anyone to write under. They were careful and target-oriented. Since each author had a specific pool of readers, by becoming x or y, they would be read by the x or y reading communities. Genette aptly points out and summarizes the essence of pseudepigraphy: "If you can change your name, you can write", because that would give you access to a very specific audience—the one attached to the name of the person you changed your name to (Genette 1997, p. 54).

For instance, what is at stake if someone writes pretending to be Galen? If only a handful of people in antiquity read Galen—those with access or interest—and someone assumes Galen's persona and writes pretending to be him, who does that person expect to read his work? Certainly, it would not appeal to those who had never heard of the name Galen, but it would attract interest among those who had already read Galen and were interested in his writings. If you write pretending to be Galen, you do not hope for readers of Aelius Gallus or Pliny the Younger to read your work; you hope for Galen's readers (Nutton 1984). The choosing of a pseudonym is not random; it is tailored.[99] Behind the assumption of Galen's persona lies the desire to be read by Galen's readers. Thus, what is at stake when writing under a pseudonym is the reading community associated with the author's name.

An episode reported by Galen in *De libris propis* illustrates this dynamic.[100] Some unnamed man bought a book because it bore the name Galen, only to be reprimanded by a bystander who read the first lines of the book and determined it to be fake.[101] Why did that man buy the book? Because he was already familiar with Galen's writing (i.e., had access) and had an interest in what new things he might say in this unknown book.[102] The bookseller knew how popular Galen was; it only took a step to wrongly and falsely attribute a book to him knowing that someone from his reading audience would surely buy it.[103] This episode proves how false attribution preys upon the readers of the person involved.

Another work that exemplifies how ancient authors chose whom to impersonate based on the audience they wanted to target is Paul's pastoral letters. A good number of scholars argue that 1–2 Timothy and Titus were not written by Paul himself but rather by someone pretending to be Paul.[104] While a minority of scholars argue for the authenticity of the pastorals, they row against the stream and do not represent the academic consensus.[105] However, since the authenticity of the pastorals does not concern this paper, let us take the pastorals as fakes for the sake of the argument. When Pseudo-Paul decided to write the pastorals to Paul's associates, who did Pseudo-Paul think would read his fakes? The

only ones who would read something written by Paul were those who were already familiar with him and were reading his previous works. In other words, his audience. Paul's habitual readers would have been readily attracted to any book that carried the name of the apostle as its author. This made them gullible and the perfect audience for Pseudo-Paul to target since they offered what Pseudo-Paul wanted: an audience. This reveals Pseudo-Paul's intelligence; he knows who his target audience will be, but he knows he cannot reach them by revealing his true identity. He needs to become someone that would attract the interest of his intended audience. Paul is the answer. Did Pseudo-Paul succeed? Did his fakes reach Paul's audience? Yes. Ancient transmission of Paul's letters evinces that the pastorals circulated alongside the genuine letters of Paul in the same manuscripts, even as a collection (Laird 2014). This means that Paul's audience, those who read Romans, 1 Corinthians, etc., also read the pastorals by Pseudo-Paul (Laird 2014, pp. 169–70; Scherbenske 2013). Therefore, Pseudo-Paul achieved what he intended: to be read by Paul's audience.[106] If he would have chosen another name, he probably would have not been read by Paul's readers. Thus, Pseudo-Paul chose Paul as his pseudonym because that would give him access to a specialized audience; Paul was chosen as a pseudonym with an eye for a particular effect.

What we have seen so far applies as well to the Virgilian pseudepigrapha. When Pseudo-Virgil decided to take Virgil as his pseudonym, who did he expect would read his fakes? Virgil's readers. Some poems of the *Catalepton* as well as the *Ciris* intended to offer a portrait of what kind of works a young Virgil would have written (Peirano 2012, pp. 173–204). Therefore, the perfect audience for the *Catalepton* and the *Ciris* were those Virgil readers who became curious about the gap left by the poet regarding his poetic activity in his youth (Fraenkel 1952). The *Catalepton* and the *Ciris* provided answers to questions posed by Virgil's readers. Did Pseudo-Virgil accomplish his goal? He did, since, in the end, his fakes were read by the same readers of the Aeneid and were transmitted and circulated as authentic works of Virgil (*Appendix Vergiliana*) (Peirano 2012, p. 79). Once again, an impersonator chose who to become based on the audience he expected to reach.

Moreover, pretending to be someone else is an act of borrowing, and in literary pseudepigraphy, the impersonator borrows the name of an author and the audience attached to it (Genette 1997, pp. 53–54). As David Meade long ago established, "Another distinction that needs to be made is between an invented pseudonym and a borrowed one. In modern literature, pseudonyms are often invented to mask the author's real identity. The motives range from pure whimsy to a desire to avert certain prejudices, such as sexism. In antiquity, however, pseudonyms were mostly borrowed, not invented. That is, works were deliberately and falsely attributed to other, recognized figures" (Meade 1986, pp. 1–2). Behind the assumption of a fake name to publish a book is the fear of being irrelevant.[107] In a world where a name was an icon of social value, to appropriate a name counted as assuming the social value (power) represented by it.[108] Thus, if an author has already established himself as someone of importance, has built a reading community, and has accrued social capital among his readers, it is easier to impersonate him than to try to build a reputation on your own, especially when your name would not accomplish the same because it has no power (Genette 1997, pp. 53–54). Therefore, pseudepigraphy is a strategy for survival and relevance (Foucault 1998, p. 206). As Karen King has noted, "For others without friends in high places, it may be that their only realistic recourse was pseudepigraphy. Taking on a pseudonym may very well be one kind of strategic response to exclusionary practices, which limited who could occupy these positions" (King 2016, p. 39). By harnessing the reading community of the impersonated, the impersonator achieves what every writer wants: an audience. Just as pseudepigraphy has been defined as authors in search of discourses, in this case, it might be conceptualized as authors looking for audiences.

What we have asserted so far might seem simple and obvious. But, as obvious as it may seem now, it is often overlooked in most discussions about pseudepigraphy in antiquity, given that what is obvious becomes invisible and taken for granted. What we aim to do here is to unpack the undergirding logic of what is essential to pseudepigraphy: taking

the name of someone to get the attention of that someone's audience because it would be impossible to catch their attention with your proper name (Donelson 1986, p. 22). I am not saying that this is the only reason why someone resorts to pseudepigraphy, but it is behind most of the reasons people write under another name.[109] Whether a person was trying to slander someone by taking their name and articulating positions that the real person would have never taken, extending the discourse tied to the name an impersonator takes, or writing under a fake with the hope of selling many copies of their book, the reasons for pseudepigraphy are pointless unless the idea of reaching the audience attached to the pseudonym is involved.

4. Pseudepigraphy in 1 Apocr. Apoc. John

4.1. Intention and Pseudepigraphy in 1 Apocr. Apoc. John

Now, we have a privileged position to explore the question that is central to this paper. Why did the author of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* write pretending to be John, the author of the Apocalypse? What is at stake with the name "John"? As we demonstrated above, what is at stake is the audience attached to John, the writer of the Apocalypse. The author of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* endeavored to pass himself off as the author of the canonical Apocalypse.[110] If what we said above is true, he did so to tap into the readership of John, the seer of Patmos.[111] We must remember that each author in antiquity had a pool of specific readers. If someone writes as John the seer of Revelation, who will read text by that someone? Those that were already reading CR. Now, not everybody in antiquity had interest in what John the seer of Patmos had written. Only some found CR interesting and compelling.[112] Initially, CR found many readers in early Christianity (Boxall 2020; Hill 2020). However, early Christian writers criticized CR heavily on account of its millennialism—strongly rejected by many—and its dubious authorship.[113] This led to a generalized decrease in the interest of early Christians in CR in the Greek-speaking world, while in the West, CR was still met with enthusiasm, as interpreters such as Tyconius, Augustine, Primasius, and many others exemplified its usefulness for the church as a template of its internal struggles throughout history (Steinhauser 1987; Hoover 2018; 2020; Matter 1992). Nonetheless, in the Greek-speaking world, the interest in CR was revived sometime around the fifth century. By the time we reach the mid–late sixth century, we have a community of readers so invested in understanding CR that some of them were likely the target of Oecumenius' commentary (Castagno 1981; Fernández Jiménez 2013; De Groote 1996; De Villiers 2007; Cardozo Mindiola 2023). The same could be said about Andrew's commentary, since it was addressed to a fellow bishop so that he could explain the contents of CR to many interested people, and in this way, dissuade expectations about an imminent end (Constantinou, Eugenia Scarvelis; Hernández 2012; Cardozo Mindiola 2023). Therefore, we can safely conclude that, in Late Antiquity, CR had many readers—readers that the author of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* wanted to capitalize on.[114]

In a world where the author of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* could have become anyone, he chose to wear the mask of John, the seer of Revelation, so that he would draw the attention of his readers.[115] He could have chosen to adopt Paul or Peter's persona if he had wanted to be read by Paul or Peter's reading community.[116] In other words, the author of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* wanted to be read by those who already were reading CR, and that explains why he chose to impersonate John, the seer of Revelation.[117] He wanted to get the attention of those interested in CR, and the best way to do so was to hide his identity and impersonate someone who had already built rapport among his readers (King 2016, pp. 39–40). John the seer of Patmos already had an audience, and it was up for the taking. It was much easier to encroach on his reading community rather than build one from scratch. Thus, as Genette rightly said, "If you can change your name, you can write" (Genette 1997, p. 54).

The author of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* surely had the resources to try to furnish an audience for himself. He knew how to write in Greek, which implies a level of education beyond the basics. He had access to different biblical manuscripts, which places him near a library (whether he owned it or was part of a group having access) and once again implies

resources. He seemed to be aware of many eschatological traditions, which he echoes in his book—how he could have become acquainted with them involves scenarios from oral transmission to copies of texts. This implies he is well connected. Thus, the author of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* apparently had the basic toolkit to be a writer in antiquity. This raises the question: why did he decide to efface himself? Probably out of humility.[118] Early Christian writers cultivated humility as performative asceticism. This chasing of virtue led them to truly believe that they were not capable of writing, which often took the shape of criticism of their style or simply self-effacement. The author of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John*, due to his cultivation of humility, likely perceived himself—wrongly—as incapable of securing an audience for himself, and this led him to write under a pseudonym instead. On one hand, the author of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* could have furnished an audience for himself based on his skills/competence, but this audience would probably not have been CR's readers. On the other hand, the author of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* could have decided not to use a pseudonym and just circulate his writing anonymously, as Sulpicius did. In this way, he could have also gained an audience for himself, even if anonymity was the price. Thus, the fact that he employed a pseudonym instead points out that the profit lay in the audience attached to John, thereby connecting his eschatological book to an ongoing discourse about the topic. As we have argued, the pseudonym's selection was tailor-made; he wanted to be read by CR's readers because he intended to update, expand, and rework CR's discourse.[119]

Furthermore, books are not only vehicles for the transmission of texts but instruments of social value.[120] In late antiquity, to have books amounted to social status and money. Therefore, books granted to whoever possessed them honor and reputation.[121] In late antiquity, early Christianity took deliberate steps to become a bookish movement, even to the point where to possess a book in late antiquity was tantamount to a confession of being a Christian (Kloppenborg 2014). Books became the symbol of Christianity (Sarefield 2007). To have books purportedly written by apostles conferred even more special status to the holders, since they had direct access to Jesus's teaching, mediated through the apostles (Kloppenborg 2014, p. 35; King 2016, p. 25). A community would place special value on a book written by an apostle, securing the means to make copies and distribute such books in order to broaden the readership.[122] Thus, if you did not have an audience and desired to secure one, taking the name of an apostle to write under would guarantee readers and mechanisms to copy and distribute your book (Brakke 2011). Consequently, the author of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* chose to impersonate the apostle, hoping for the readers of CR to read his work and guarantee its transmission.[123]

In fact, the author of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* accomplished his goal. As we will see, his work was indeed received, read, and commented upon by the same community that engaged and valued CR. How can we know this? At least one argument can be put forward to sustain this claim: the titles given to *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* during its textual transmission.

Titles as Reception and Tradition

Titles are, as Genette said, "an artificial object, an artifact of reception or of commentary" (Genette 1997, pp. 55–56; Wallraff and Andrist 2015). They are allographic by nature insofar as the reading community ascribes them to the work, revealing what the community thinks about the author, genre, and addresses, among others, and how they receive the work in general (Ballester 1990; Jansen 2014). Thus, titles as tokens of reception instantiate tradition.[124] This declaration rings true particularly as it applies to the titles given to CR. Hoskier compiled 46 Greek titles for Revelation, while Allen carried the number up to 53 (Hoskier 1929; Allen 2019). But, as Allen points out, "it is not the sheer quantity of titles that is primarily interesting, but the quality of the components and their varied usage that illuminate the ways that particular communities conceived of Revelation's authorship, John's situation, and the message of his opaque work" (Allen 2019, p. 609). In other words, the information conveyed in the titles of CR reflects the engagement and hermeneutical process of CR's reading communities.

Most of the information conveyed in the titles of Revelation deal with the author (John) and how he is perceived by his readers: holy, theologian, beloved, praised, dear, evangelist, apostle, disciple, etc. (Allen 2019, pp. 610–11). Some information in the titles relates to the content of the work (mysteries of God) as well as its significance (Allen 2019, pp. 612–13). Furthermore, some titles contain an allusion to the place of composition (Patmos), and almost everyone mentions the genre of the text (Apocalypse) (Allen 2019, p. 613). This information reflects the commentary tradition of Oecumenius and Andrew of Caesarea, since almost every adjective that appears in the titles of revelation concerning this author also appears in the commentaries of Oecumenius and Andrew (Allen 2019, p. 612). Thereby, we have a reading community, heavily influenced by Oecumenius and Andrew—especially Andrew—that, based on their commentary tradition, assigned titles to the book of Revelation reflecting on the author, message, and location. Thus, Allen rightly concluded that "the diachronic growth of the titles is direct evidence of engagement with the Apocalypse by reading communities" (Allen 2019, pp. 614–15) and "that Revelation's titles matured in length and spatial emphasis indicates a rather active and engaged group of readers and scribal craftspeople". Genette drives the point home when he argues that "For the main agent of titular drift is probably neither the author nor even the publisher but in fact the public, and more precisely the posthumous public, still and very properly called posterity".[125]

What is interesting is that the titles of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* and CR share a striking number of commonalities (see Table 1), suggesting, at least in my view, that some of the reading communities of CR overlapped with the reading communities of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John*.

Table 1. Comparison between titles of CR and 1 Apocr. Apoc. John.

1 Apocr. Apoc. John[126]		Canonical Revelation of John[127]	
Titles	Manuscript	Titles	Manuscript
Αποκαλυψις ιωαννου του θεολογου	Cambridge, Trinity College, O.8.33, fols. 98r–102r (16th cent.) (James 1902) [12022][128]	Ιωαννου του θεολογου αποκαλυψις	93[inscr] 314
Αποκαλιψις του Ιωαννου του θεολογου και περι της ελεσεως του αντιχριστου[129]	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, suppl. gr. 136, fols. 28v–40v (16th cent.) (Ehrhard 1937) [52906]		
Αποκαλυψις του αγιου ιωαννου του θεολογου Απόκαλυψις του αγιου Ιωαννου του θεολογου	Athens, Ethnikē Bibliothēkē, gr. 1098, fols. 15r–17v (1506–1507) (Halkin 1983) [3394] Jerusalem, Patriarchikē bibliothēkē, Panagiou Taphou 66, fols. 378v–385r (15th cent.) (Ehrhard 1937, vol. 3, p. 345) [35303]	Αποκαλυψις του αγιου ιωαννου του θεολογου[130]	18 35 42[sub] 93[sub] 149 218 256 296 325[sub] 367 368 386[inscr] 456 468[inscr] 517[sub] 664 757[tel sub] 808 1094 1424[sub] 1678 1732[tel sub] 1876 1893 1903 1948 2016 2020 2025 2038[arx] 2076 2080 2138 2196 2200 2258 2323 2351
Αποκαλυψις του αγιου Ιωαννου του θεολογου	Mount Athos, Monē Dionusiou, 206 (Lampros 3740), no fol. numbers provided (17th cent.) (Lampros 1895)		

Table 1. *Cont.*

1 Apocr. Apoc. John		Canonical Revelation of John	
Η Αποκαλυψις του αγιου Ιωαννου του θεολογου	[D] Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, gr. 1034, fols. 120r–134v (15th cent.) (Omont 1886) [50627]		
Αποκαλυψις του αγιου ιωαννου του θεολογου	[C] Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, gr. II.42, fols. 285r–291r (13th century).		
Αποκαληψις του αγιου Ιωαννου του θεολογου περι της δευτερας παρουσιας και της συντελειας[131]	Athens, Ethnikē Bibliothēkē, gr. 346, fols. 36r–41v (15th cent.) (Halkin 1983, p. 43) [2642]		
Αποκαλυψις του αγιου και πανεφημου αποστολου και ευαγγεληστου Ιωαννου του θεολογου ευλογου	[B]Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, gr. 947, fols. 26v–32v (1574 CE) (Omont 1886, vol. 1, p. 181) [50536]	Αποκαλυψις του αγιου και πανευφημου αποστολου και ευαγγεληστου Ιωαννου του θεολογου[132]	1849[inscr] 2845[133] 2846
Αποκαλυψις του αγιου αποστολου και ευαγγελιστου Ιωαννου του θεολογου Αποκαλυψις του αγιου αποστολου και ευαγγελιστου Ιωαννου του θεολογου περι του αντιχριστου[134] Αποκαλυψις του αγιου αποστολου και ευαγγελιστου Ιωαννου του θεολογου περι του αντιχριστου και περι της δευτερας παρουσιας του κυριου ημων Ιησου Χριστου[135]	[F]Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Pal. gr. 364, fols. 110r–116v (15th cent.) (Ehrhard 1937, vol. 3, p. 803) [66096] [G]Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, hist.gr. 119, fols. 108r–115v (15th century) London, Highgate School, II. 29, fols. 112v–120v (15th cent.) (van de Vorst and Delehaye 1913)	Αποκαλυψις του αγιου αποστολου και ευαγγελιστου Ιωαννου του θεολογου[136]	432 1064 1328 1384 1685 1732[inscr] 1733 1740 1768 1771 1865 2051 2066 2723 2759
Αποκαλυψις του αγιου αποστολου και ευαγγελιστου παρθενου Ιωαννου του θεολογου	Mount Athos, Monē Dionusiou, 298 (Lampros 3832), fols. 136v–145r (17th cent.) (Lampros 1895, vol. 1, pp. 406–7)	Αποκαλυψις του αγιου και ευαγγελιστου αποστολου Ιωαννου παρθενου του θεολογου[137]	2638

Table 1. *Cont.*

1 Apocr. Apoc. John		Canonical Revelation of John	
Αποκαλυψις του κυριου ημων Ιησου Χριστου προς τον αγιον Ιωαννην τον θεολογον	Athens, Ethnikē Bibliothēkē, gr. 1007, fols. 238r–243v (15th–16th cent.) (Berendts 1904) [3303]	There is no direct equivalence. Notwithstanding, the title below paraphrases the title of 1 Apocr. Apoc. John: Ιησου χριστου αποκαλυψις δοθησα τω θεολογω ιωαννη	203 506
Αποκαλυψις του αγιου ιωαννου αποστολου και ευαγγελιστου επιστηθειου ηγαπημενου παρθενου του θεολογου περι της συντελειας και περι του αντιχριστου	[A] Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, gr. XI. 20, fols. 303r–313r (16th cent).	There is no direct equivalence to this title. Yet, many of its constituents are represented throughout the titles of the canonical Revelation of John. For instance, Επιστηθειου—1775 Ηγαπημενου—2058, 2077, 91, 1934, 2061, 1859	
Ερωτησις του αγιου Ιωαννου του θεολογου περι της παρουσιας του κυριου ημων ιησου χριστου και περι της συντελειας	[E] Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, gr. II.90, fols. 249r–255r (16th century) (Mioni 1967).	There is no direct equivalence.[138] Yet, some constituents belong to the CR title tradition, such as αγιου Ιωαννου του θεολογου	
Του αγιου αποστολου και ευαγγελιστου παρθενου επιστηθειου ιωαννου του θεολογου λογος εις την δευτεραν παρουσιαν του κυριου ημων Ιησου Χριστου και περι αντιχριστου	Athens, Ethnikē Bibliothēkē, gr. 355, fols. 30r–37v (15th cent.) (Halkin 1983, p. 45) [2651]	There is no direct equivalence, but some of its constituents belong to the CR title tradition. Elements such as "αγιου αποστολου και ευαγγελιστου παρθενου επιστηθειου ιωαννου του θεολογου" found equivalents in many CR titles, as described above	
Η α[π]οκαλιψην του αγιου ενδοξου και πανεφημου αποστολου επιστηθιου φηλου του ιγαπημενου και παρθενου Ιωαννου του θεολογου περι της συντελιας του αιωνος	Athens, Ethnikē Bibliothēkē, gr. 356, fols. 300v–306r (1633–1634) (Halkin 1983, p. 46) [2652]	There is no direct equivalence to this title. Yet, many of its constituents are represented throughout the titles of the canonical Revelation of John. For instance, ενδοξου—(παν) ενδοξου 1775 φηλου—2061	

Table 1. *Cont.*

1 Apocr. Apoc. John		Canonical Revelation of John
Ομιλια του κυριου ημων Ιησου Χριστου και Ιωαννου του θεολογου περι της κακοπραγιας του μιαρου δρακοντος και περι της δευτερας παρουσιας [139]	Sofia, C'rkovnoistoriceskija i archiven Institut, 887, fols. 130r–157v (16th cent) (Getov 2014) [62054]	There is no equivalence
Λογος περι της ελευσεως του κυριου ημων Ιησου Χριστου	Meteora, Mone Metamorphoseos, 382, fols. 58v–65v (15th cent.) (Ehrhard 1937, vol. 3, p. 768) [41792]	There is no equivalence
Ιωαννης του θεολογου περι της δευτερας παρουσιας του Ιησου	Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, L113 sup., fols. 167r–170r (15th cent.) (Martini and Bassi 1906) [42972]	There is no equivalence
Αποκαλυψις και διηγησις Ιωαννου του θεολογου και περι της δευτερας παρουσιας	Mount Athos, Mone Batopediou, 422, fols. 83-88 (13th cent.) (Eustratiadès and Vatopédinos 1924) [18566]	There is no equivalence

We glean from the table above that *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* and CR have the same titles in a considerable number of manuscripts, while in others both works share similar wording and structure. *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* and CR not only share the common designation "Αποκαλυψις του αγιου ιωαννου του θεολογου" but more complex forms like "Αποκαλυψις του αγιου και πανεφημου αποστολου και ευαγγελησον Ιωαννου του θεολογου ευλογου" or "Αποκαλυψις του αγιου αποστολου και ευαγγελιστου Ιωαννου του θεολογου", including "Αποκαλυψις του αγιου και ευαγγελιστου αποστολου Ιωαννου παρθενου του θεολογου". The resemblances between these two titular traditions indicates intentional mimesis from *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* of CR, not just mere chance or accident.

Now, as we have said before, the titles of CR reflect the direct engagement of the reading community during its transmission history; as time passed by, readers and scribes managed to expand the titles of CR to include descriptors from the commentary tradition that clarify the identity, genre, and content of the work.[140] What is striking is that the same descriptors of author and genre present in CR are also present in some titles of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John*. Therefore, this would suggest that if the reading community of CR is responsible for the content of its titles, and some of the same titles appear in *1 Apocr. Apoc. John*, some reading communities of the latter must overlap with some reading communities of the former. In fact, if titles are ascribed by the reading community to the manuscript,[141] what are the odds that two different texts received the same title from two audiences independent of each other? Few indeed, considering that the titles of CR reflect the tradition of Oecumenius and Andrew's commentaries, which accompany the biblical text in many manuscripts, whereas no commentary tradition was transmitted along *1 Apocr. Apoc. John*.[142] Moreover, of all the manuscripts where shared titles between CR and *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* appear, those transmitting CR are older than those containing *1 Apocr. Apoc. John*, suggesting that the latter must depend on the former. Now, it is possible that both CR and *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* received the same titles from two different reading communities. However, this would

be a unique fortuity; unique even for most of the works of early and late antiquity. If we understand the implications of the fact that the reading communities assigned and shaped the titular tradition of ancient works,[143] then it is more likely that some reading communities of CR were also some of the reading communities of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* and, at some point in the transmission history, decided to transfer the titular designation of the former to the latter. In fact, we have seen, through the diachronic development of the titular tradition of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John*, how some reading communities wittingly fashioned its title to make it look like the title of CR, which is only possible if some audiences of the former are identical to some audiences of the latter. This indicates that, in the end, the author of the *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* was successful and attracted the attention of the readers of the canonical Revelation.

Moreover, I think the dynamic described above explains the comment found in a ninth-century *scholio* of the Grammar of Dionysius Thrax, which contains the following declaration: "And there is another called the Apocalypse of the Theologian. We are not speaking of the one in the island of Patmos—God forbid, for that one is supremely true—but of a pseudonymous and spurious one".[144] I think the comment reveals that the circulation of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* among the readers of CR was so wide that something had to be said to distinguish between the two works and grant the canonical Revelation a more prominent place. Yet, this *scholio* reveals that both CR and *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* had the same readers in antiquity, proving that the latter accomplished its goal of being read by the CR reading community.

4.2. Motivation and Pseudepigraphy in 1 Apocr. Apoc. John

The previous discussion leads us to ask why the author of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* needed to harness the readership of canonical Revelation? Two possible answers can be given. On one hand, there is a possibility that the author of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* wrote this text to replace canonical Revelation, due to its complex and trampled reception in the Eastern Greek-speaking churches in early and late antiquity (Kaestli 2010). If this is so, it is only logical that the author of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* would have wanted to be read by CR's readers, given that to replace Revelation he would have needed its readers to stop engaging with the text altogether and to adopt *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* in its place. The author of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* hoped that CR's readers would adopt *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* as the book that presents the sanctioned eschatological end-time scenario by presenting them with an alternative account of end-time events that was more explicit and coherent with early and late Christian eschatology.[145] Thus, CR's readers were the natural addresses of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John*. On the other hand, the author of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* could have written the text to rework, extend, update, harmonize, and fill gaps in the eschatological discourse associated with John's Apocalypse (Weinel 1923, p. 23). In this case, the author of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* wanted to be read by CR's readers because he perceived some inconsistencies, interpretative problems, incoherence, and outdated material in CR and aimed, out of respect for CR, at resolving these issues for its audience. Thus, given that *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* would rework CR, the audience most interested in reading *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* would be CR's readers because, otherwise, *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* would not be as relevant as for those familiar with CR. That is, *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* is like a footnote to Revelation. Reading a footnote without engaging with the main text is pointless. Either way, the reason why the author of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* wanted to be read by CR's readers is because the purpose of his work hinges upon CR — either to replace it or to extend it.

Moreover, recent research on the motivations behind pseudepigraphy in Jewish, Christian, and Roman texts suggests that, in antiquity, authors chose another name to write under, with the purpose of reworking, updating, extending, or filling gaps in the discourse associated with that name and ascribing to it the new ideas. Najman points out that, "in some ancient cultures, the way to continue or return to the founder's discourse was precisely to ascribe what one said or wrote, not to oneself, but rather to the founder".[146] In this way, the discourse tied to its founder is reworked and updated, but the resulting mod-

ifications present themselves not as something new but as an authentic expression of the original discourse. Najman, considering expansions to the legal Mosaic discourse, writes, "on this understanding of a discourse tied to a founder, to rework an earlier text is to update, interpret and develop the content of that text in a way that one claims to be an authentic expression of the law already accepted as authoritatively Mosaic" (Najman 2003, p. 13). To take someone else's name to write amounts to interpreting, developing, and expanding the discourse already tied to that someone.[147]

Further, Mroczek, building on Najman's insights, argues that the choice of a pseudonym also has an aesthetic cause. Mroczek argued that an ancient author chose to use a name to extend the discourse tied to it probably because that name was associated with a particular genre. For instance, David was so thoroughly associated with the genre of psalms that this led some scribes to ascribe certain psalms to David in their superscription, to enrich and expand David's narrative.[148] David was such a beloved character in Jewish culture that curiosity about him drove scribes to imagine scenarios where details about his life could be clarified.[149] Thus, the desire to fill in some lacunae in certain episodes of his life inspired Jewish interpreters to establish David as a colonizer of new textual territories, that is, making him the speaker of psalms that previously were prayed individually and collectively in Israel in a generic form.[150] The psalm headings' composers reflected about David, particularly in his lowest moments, including in his grief, in his despair, in his contrition, and in being overpowered by his son (Mroczek 2016, pp. 61–63). How did he feel during those moments? What did he pray about? By making David perform psalms dealing with these issues via their superscriptions, readers and curious persons alike had answers; people now knew what David prayed like. Thus, they filled the biographical gaps in David's story; when David did not have anything more to say, they gave him more things to say (Mroczek 2016, p. 63). After the expansion made by the psalms headings, David's character was enriched; he was the model of prayer and worship, aspects that before the psalms heading composers' intervention might not have been clear (Mroczek 2016, pp. 61–63). So, Mroczek agrees with Najman that pseudonymous attribution is about expansion, development, and interpretation.[151] As she concludes, pseudepigraphy is about characters in search of stories.

Finally, Peirano, working with Roman fakes, also argues that pseudepigraphy is about "a broader desire to prolong the life of the author by, in some way, countering the finality that his death imposes on his literary production" (Peirano 2012, p. 76). She argues that pseudepigraphy enabled ancient readers to fill in gaps left in the previous works of an author or expand his literary corpus so as to address some issues that might have arisen after an author's death. Thus, pseudepigraphy was born out of intense love for an author as a desire to hear his voice through the composition of new texts. For instance, Peirano argues that some poems of the *Catalepton* and the *Ciris* intended to offer Virgil's readers a window into the literary work of the young poet, thus extending his corpus for those who loved him enough to desire to hear his voice in such an irrecuperable period (Peirano 2012, pp. 173–204). Further, she also argued that the *Catalepton* and the *Ciris* meant to rework some of the authentic Virgilian poems, where contradictions were uncovered by later interpreters. Peirano colorfully explains pseudepigraphy as placing a footnote in the main text of a work to expand on an idea, rework it, or even expose alternatives.[152]

The aforementioned research on pseudepigraphy suggests that instead of replacing CR, *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* sought to rework, update, criticize, amplify, and/or modify CR's discourse. Therefore, the author of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* used John's persona because he did not want to initiate a new type of eschatological discourse but rather modify an already existing one—tied to John, the seer of Revelation. Further, following Mroczek's arguments above, the author of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* chose John as a pseudonym for aesthetic reasons. Just as David was the perfect character to attribute individual and corporal psalms because of his close association with the genre, thereby filling gaps and enriching his persona, John is the perfect candidate to whom to attribute a development of an apocalyptic discourse, since he is the only name tied to the genre in NT. The results of choosing John

as a pseudonym for *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* are the same as delineated above by Najman, Mroczek, and Peirano: *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* reworks Revelation by interpreting it, modifying it, extending it, and filling gaps in it, as well as by giving John more things to say about topics left unaddressed in CR and by keeping his voice active, and in this way, countering the finality of his death. Therefore, John's name functions in *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* like a hashtag in modern social media (Breu 2019). The hashtag allows you to connect what you want to say to an undergoing discourse and, at the same time, to expand such discourse to include new information. In the same way, *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* links its discourse to the CR's eschatology via John's name and develops what was already attached to it.

Why would CR need to be reworked, expanded, and updated? There are many ambiguities in CR, due to its highly symbolic language, that could undoubtedly generate the desire in its readers to have them resolved. At the same time, when CR was penned, debates and topics such as the physical appearance of the antichrist or the characteristic of the resurrected body were not as intensely discussed as in later centuries. CR then ignores what would become classic *topoi* in eschatological Christian discourse in antiquity, rendering CR obsolete. *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* updates canonical Revelation by bringing its eschatological discourse into alignment with traditional early Christian reflection on eschatological issues such as the antichrist, final judgment, and the second coming, among others.[153] *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* fills the lacunae perceived by later readers of canonical Revelation and calms the mind of those curious and asking questions about topics that canonical Revelation met with silence.[154] In other words, *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* places a footnote in CR's discourse. For instance, *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* picks up CR's discourse about the resurrection and criticizes it, expands it, and updates it by discussing topics that would become relevant in late-antique Christianity but were not addressed in CR. To this, we dedicate the next section.

The Resurrection of the Dead

One example of the expansion of CR's eschatological discourse can be found when the author of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* develops the tradition surrounding the resurrection of the dead found in CR. CR scantly describes the resurrection of the dead in Rev 20. John splits in two the event of the resurrection. Contrary to the tenet of most of the NT, John considers that the righteous and unrighteous come back to life not in a single eschatological event located at the end of times but rather on two different occasions. The righteous resurrect at the beginning of the millennium (Rev 20,4), and the unrighteous at the end (Rev 20,5).[155] The righteous come back to life to reign with Jesus for a thousand years; the unrighteous, to be judged and punished.[156] However, John the seer does not explain the event of the resurrection itself. Even though Rev 21,13 presumes material continuity at the resurrection, CR does not detail the nature of the body of the resurrected or which aspects of the body evince continuity and discontinuity, etc.[157] All these topics are left unaddressed. Thus, the author of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* expands the canonical book of Revelation by dealing with these unaddressed questions, which were highly discussed and contested among early Christians. The answers *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* gives to these issues were by no means standard but reflect the ongoing conversation around them.[158] Though *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* did not handle these topics in a popular and mainstream way as others might have done, at least it offered a treatment of them by incorporating bits of different traditions regarding the resurrection. Where CR stayed silent, *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* made it speak; *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* utilized the name John as a mouthpiece to engage with the CR discourse about the resurrection and to elaborate on it, bringing it into alignment with what early Christians discussed about this topic yet CR remained silent about.[159] *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* made CR's eschatological discourse relevant by making it speak for a new audience about new topics.

1 Apocr. Apoc. John conceives the resurrection as a single event, and it is placed after a period of generalized death on Earth.[160] Here, *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* critiques and reworks CR, given that the idea of two resurrections separated by a thousand years was not popular among early Christians. Instead, the idea of a single resurrection was more compelling; *1*

Apocr. Apoc. John incorporates this, thereby aligning John's discourse with early Christian eschatology. Additionally, in *1 Apocr. Apoc. John*, the resurrection does not happen at the second coming of Christ but before, contrary to what the NT taught about the subject.[161] *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* reads against the grain of NT teaching about the subject of resurrection, probably because it wanted to propose an alternative eschatological scenario where the resurrection must precede the second coming, because the Parousia will bring the end of everything, and before that, *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* needed to address taking the resurrected to heaven, cleansing the earth, and then initiating the end of the world. In this case, *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* reworks CR and presents an alternative version of how the end will take place.

Moreover, in *1 Apocr. Apoc. John*, as result of the three years' reign of the antichrist, "the whole human race will die and there will not be a living human upon the entire earth".[162] After this intermediary moment, Michael and Gabriel, coming out of heaven, will raise the ram's horns and, using them as trumpets, will sound the blast that will rise up all the human race—righteous and unrighteous.[163] While *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* does not detail the event of resurrection, it at least includes traditional elements belonging to the eschatological discourse surrounding the resurrection, namely that it will happen through angelic mediation, at the sound of a trumpet/horn, and will involve the voice of an archangel.[164] By doing this, *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* already gives more information about the resurrection than CR, which does not mention angels or trumpets in the description of this event. Consequently, *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* expands the eschatological discourse of canonical Revelation by bringing the eschatological scenario about the resurrection in line with NT traditional depictions of this event.

As we previously mentioned, CR is rather scant in terms of a description of the resurrected body. *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* took this as its cue to fill the gap left by CR on this issue.[165] Christians had been asking how the resurrected will rise since the times of Paul.[166] Early Christians answered it variedly, but at least three main ways could be discerned.[167] First, most Christians believed that the same earthly body people had on Earth will be resurrected, stressing material continuity, matter conservation (same atoms will rise), and even organ equivalency.[168] This is not to say that they deny change and transformation. Deformities and illness will be healed, and harmony and proportion restored; the mortal body will dress itself with immortality and glory to prevent decay (Moss 2011, 2019). The resurrection involves both the adequacy of the body for the angelic life and conservation of what make us identifiable individuals in this life. Second, Origen and some thinkers akin to him constructed a view of the resurrection body as preserving what makes us unique and individuals but at the same time denying that the earthly flesh and bones will rise.[169] Rather, they thought that the resurrected will have bodies but made of spiritual matter—the nature of which is unspecified. Third, with the coming of martyrdom, Christians needed to rethink the resurrection. Some early Christians proposed that immediately after death, the righteous souls went to heaven to share in the communion of the Father (Gonzalez 2013). Since soul had form in antiquity, those souls in heaven retained the markers of bodily identity: facial gestures, scars, bodily form, etc. (Gonzalez 2013, pp. 496–98). However, these Christians did not expect an eschatological event where the bodies of the dead will be resurrected. They assumed the dead already were alive in their post-mortem state, and bodies were not needed for this mode of existence (Lehtipuu 2015a, pp. 164–73).

CR did not address these debates, so *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* gave voice to John so that he could speak about them. *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* contrasts starkly with what early Christians believed about the resurrection of the dead, since its position transits between the blurry lines of options one and two described above. *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* poses that everybody will resurrect being 30 years old.[170] Moreover, all differences between persons are washed away, since they will be like bees, that is, undistinguishable from each other.[171] Therefore, at the eschaton, there will not be gender or age differences;[172] the resurrected will have one form/shape and one stature.[173] If everybody looks the same, it follows that there will not be race either.[174] Thus, it will be impossible to distinguish among people or even have memories of past things.[175] In a nutshell, *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* imagines the resurrected

life as the angelic life, except for the fact that *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* still believes that the earthly bodies will be resurrected, albeit in an improved and markedly different form.[176] In an ideological context where early Christians argued for the continuity of the person in the afterlife, whether by fleshly or spiritual bodies, as well as continued soulish existence, *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* envisions an eschatological scenario wherein God obliterates any personal traits that might allow people to have an identity. *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* reads against the grain of Christian tradition in order to ascertain a world where everybody has equality of condition, where the only distinction remaining between humans is their eternal fate based on God's judgment upon them.[177]

Candida Moss has correctly argued that resurrected bodies are constructions of those who imagine them, reflecting the values society places on sex, gender, and beauty, among others (Moss 2011, p. 993). Given that *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* totally disregards the value of the experiences, forms, and shapes from the previous life of the resurrected, it imagines perfection in the resurrected body as self-effacement. *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* puts more weight on what God could create in the resurrection than what humans were before being resurrected. Accordingly, what you do while in the earthly body apparently does not matter, despite the fact that you will be judged by your works on the earthly body. Thus, if perfection is self-effacement for *1 Apocr. Apoc. John*, the resurrected body it depicts escapes human achievement; the resurrected body becomes an icon of supra-human existence, of assimilation into the divine.[178] What Candida Moss wrote about early Christian views on the resurrection rings true of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* as well.

> As representations of divine affairs, these constructions can be used to reorganize the world and exert power over others. In the case of resurrected bodies, the characterization of heavenly bodies as "perfected" communicates something about the relative values placed on gender, race, and disability and non-disability. The depictions of resurrected bodies in the early church do more than reinscribe culturally relative norms about the body; they offer a promise. They present a vision of a future in which the identities of existing bodies—actual people—will be reconfigured "perfectly"; an approaching future in which individual identity will be overwritten and difference will be eradicated from the heavenly kingdom. (Moss 2011, p. 993)

Perhaps Moss's contextualization explains why *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* holds such a radical position on the continuity of the earthly body in the resurrection. If the resurrection symbolizes the reconfiguration of the world order into something better, humans cannot be or look like they used to in the previous world.[179] If humans were part of the landscape that characterized the old world, those who enter the new world must cease to be human; they must be like gods if they are to inhabit God's world.

In summary, *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* takes a complex stance towards the traditional tenets of the early Christian reflection on the resurrection of the dead.[180] On one hand, *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* seems to agree with the Cristian kerygma that there will be a resurrection of the dead and takes from predecessors some details related with the appearance of the resurrected bodies at the eschaton. On the other hand, *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* contradicts the traditional reflection on the topic of material continuity and identity.[181] Its portrait of the resurrection bodies is one that, in general, looks unorthodox, though its components are completely orthodox. In lieu of the absence of information in the canonical Revelation about the resurrection bodies, the author of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* takes this as a chance to fill the gap with his own opinion and Christian tradition about how this key event will happen. In other words, *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* placed a footnote on CR's addressing of the issue of the resurrection of the dead. By taking John as his name, the author of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* extends the discourse associated with him, thereby ensuring the tradition of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* remained Johannine, even if reimagined creatively. That is why the author of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* was so adamant regarding his intention of attracting CR's readers, since the extension of CR's discourse was meant to be read by them. In this case, Johannine pseudepigraphy is reception, expansion, commentary, and critique.

5. Conclusions

In conclusion, authors had to renounce their names when they did not have power, which in their case meant having an audience. But they did not just give up their name, they adopted the name of someone else. Why? Because that name did have power, or in other words, an audience. By trading names, authors exchanged fame and glory for the possibility to be read. This strategic move built upon a particular dynamic in antiquity. Each author had a specific pool of readers. When you did not have an audience in antiquity and changed your name to someone else's, you gained access to that someone's particular audience. Many ancient examples confirm this as a motive for pseudepigraphy. Therefore, the author of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* had no other choice but to give up his name because he did not have an audience. By taking the name John, the seer of Revelation, he secured the audience of the latter. Further, the comparison of the titular tradition evinces that the author of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* did accomplish what he wanted: he was read by the audience of CR. Finally, this article argues that, in line with recent research on the use of pseudepigraphy in Jewish, Christian, and Roman contexts, the author of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* wanted to be read by CR's readers because he wanted to expand, criticize, rework, and update CR's eschatological discourse, making CR's readers the ideal audience for *1 Apocr. Apoc. John*; they would be naturally interested in reading an alternative presentation of the end-time scenario that improves upon the one presented by CR. Thus, the article shows that *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* criticized CR's presentation of the resurrection of the dead and proposed an alternative version that stood in continuity and discontinuity with Christian reflection on the issue.

Data Availability Statement: No new data were created or analyzed in this study. Data sharing is not applicable to this article.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflict of interest.

Notes

[1] "After the ascension of our Lord Jesus Christ, I, John, found myself alone upon Mount Tabor. There he made even his undefiled deity manifest to us. And as it was impossible for me to stand, I fell to the earth and I prayed to the Lord and said…When do you intend to come to the earth? What will happen? The heaven and the earth and the sun and the moon, what will happen (to them) in those times? Reveal it all to me, for I am confident that you hear your servant" (1 Apocr. Apoc. John 1:1–15 [Brannan, 388]). English translations come from (Brannan 2020). Greek text comes from (Court 2000). On the genre, see (Tóth 2017; Volgers and Zamagni 2004). On the date of composition, see (Brannan 2020, pp. 383–84; Kaestli and Picard 2005; Court 2000, pp. 25–28; Whealey 2002; Valeriani 2013).

[2] 1 Apocr. Apoc. John mostly resembles chapters 1–5 of CR. The similitudes include the "Ἐγὼ Ἰωάννης" in CR 1:9 and 1 Apocr. Apoc. John 1:1, the use of "[παρα]γίνομαι" in CR 1:9 and 1 Apocr. Apoc. John 1:1, the fact that John falls after contemplating Jesus' glory in both accounts ("ἔπεσα πρὸς" [CR 1:17]; "ἔπεσα ἐπὶ" [1 Apocr. Apoc. John 1:2]), John's designation of himself as a slave ("τῷ δούλῳ αὐτοῦ Ἰωάννη" [CR 1:1]; "τῷ δούλῳ σου" [1 Apocr. Apoc. John 1:5]), the vision of the heaven as opened ("ἰδοὺ θύρα ἠνεῳγμένη ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ" [CR 4:1]; "εἶδον ἀνεῳγότα τὸν οὐρανόν" [1 Apocr. Apoc. John 2:3]), and the mention of the book with seven seals inaccessible to human beings ("Καὶ εἶδον ἐπὶ τὴν δεξιὰν τοῦ καθημένου ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου βιβλίον γεγραμμένον κατεσφραγισμένον σφραγῖσιν ἑπτά" [CR 5:1]; "εἶδον βιβλίον κείμενον… τὸ δὲ μῆκος αὐτοῦ νοῦς ἀνθρώπων οὐ δύναται καταλαβεῖν, ἔχοντα σφραγῖδας ἑπτά" [1 Apocr. Apoc. John 3:1–2]). All these similitudes point out that the author of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* did not want to be just any John, he wanted to become John the seer of CR. On the issue of the imitation of the pseudepigraphon of the true work, cf. Virgil's Ciris; (Peirano 2012).

[3] Classical treatments include (Speyer 1971; Baum 2001; Brox 1975). On Jewish pseudepigraphy, see (Yoshiko Reed 2008; Collins 2015; Najman 2003; Najman et al. 2012; Mroczek 2016). On Christian pseudepigraphy, see (Donelson 1986; Meade 1986; Ehrman 2014). On pseudepigraphy in classical literature, see (Peirano 2012).

4   "The effect of a pseudonym is not in itself different from the effect of any other name, except that in a given situation the name may have been chosen with an eye to the particular effect" (Genette 1997, p. 49).

5   On pseudepigraphy as an instrument to grant authority, see (Wyrick 2004). Karen King, however, analyzing the use of John as a pseudonym in the Apocryphon of John and the canonical Revelation of John, has argued that if the purpose of using John to write a fake text is to grant authority to the text, any name from the apostles would have served. Therefore, a more profound and complex intention is at play, cf. (King 2016).

6   As it is usually discussed, cf. (Wilder 2004). See how a recent work still dedicates time to go through these issues, cf. (Horrell and Williams 2023).

7   Understanding that names play more vital roles than distinguishing one person from another, Anne Marie proposes that names can be markers of identity, cf. (Luijendijk 2008). She suggests that names also describes a person's religion, cf. (Luijendijk 2008, pp. 40–46).

8   Foucault states "[an author's name] it has other than indicative functions: more than indication, a gesture, a finger pointed at someone, it is the equivalent of a description" (Foucault 1998, p. 209).

9   For friendship to have existed between two persons in antiquity, they had to share common values and interests in the same things. In other words, their souls had to be intertwined as they pursued virtue and the good life. For the intellectual, friends were those who deemed literary pursuits important and relevant for their cultural attainment. Therefore, intellectual friends read the same authors, sought the same literature that enabled them to be educated, practiced the same lifestyle, and shared dinners, among other activities. Intellectual activities were just one of the many things friends shared among each other in antiquity, as they were part of a larger system, cf. "All these things point to the moral that we should increase the affection we bear one another, since we are linked together by so many ties, by our literary tastes, characters, and reputations, and above all, by the final judgments of dying men" (Pliny, *Ep.* 7.20). For other examples of shared literary activity rooted in friendship, see Fronto's relationship with Marcus Aurelius, cf. (Williams 2012). See also (Starr 1987). One further example that illustrates the aforementioned is Pliny the Younger, when he claims that his friends are those who love to pursue literary matters, cf. *Ep.* 1.13. This means that he considers friends those who share his penchant for literary pursuits, which include reading, writing, revising, recitation, and publication of texts. In other words, Pliny feels a friendship connection with those who share his values, and therefore his communal activities with his friends gravitate around the mastery of language, cf. *Ep.* 9.36; cf. "Literature is not, in short, simple entertainment, but rather a critical element in the proper construction of a well-balanced and worthwhile elite life" (Johnson 2010). Since literary activities happen among friends, the obligations inherent to friendship in antiquity explain why Pliny would read the works of his associates expecting them to do the same, since they are bound by the reciprocity woven into friendship in antiquity. This also applies to revising, attending to dinners and recitations, and the lending of books, among others. Another aspect of intellectual activity that took place in a communal context was the exchange of books between friends, cf. *P. Oxy* 18.2192; *P.MilVogl* 11; (Johnson 2010, pp. 180–85; Starr 1987, pp. 217–18). Now, since reading fulfills a generative role for writing, having access to the right books was a sine qua non for the book producers, and since they did not possess all the books they needed, they depended on their groups and their libraries for scholarship to happen. This explains why book lending and borrowing happened in a communal context and as a part of a larger system of intellectual activity, cf. (Marshall 1976).

10   On reading as a system, see (Johnson 2000, 2010, pp. 57–58).

11   "While I am at dinner, if I am dining with my wife or a few friends, a book is read to us, and afterwards we hear a comic actor or a musician; then I walk with my attendants, some of whom are men of learning. Thus the evening is passed away with talk on all sorts of subjects, and even the longest day is soon done" (Pliny, *Ep.* 9.36); (Johnson 2010, pp. 58–62); Cicero, *Att.* 16.3; (Murphy 1998). Fronto also allows us to get a glimpse of what elite learned discussions were about. Aulus Gellius records in NA 2.26 how Fronto and Favorinus engaged in a discussion on how Greek and Latin languages dealt with colors. In NA 13.29, Gellius also tells us that books were read to Fronto and his friends. Furthermore, Johnson interlocks papyrological evidence with descriptions of elite intellectual activities in classical literature to suggest that not only reading resulted in a collective endeavor but also the annotation of texts, the collation of editions, and discussions of the grammar and style of texts, cf. (Johnson 2010, p. 192).

12   See the discussion of Galen's reading community below.

13   Pliny fashions his community as one invested seriously in literary affairs. They prefer to read at dinner than to have Spanish girls dancing, they attend recitations and behave properly (participating though comments or bodily gestures), they often compose speeches to be delivered or even write poetry nuggets. As Johnson, quoting Duppont, concludes, "The community is characterized by a reciprocity that mutually recognizes common values 'of which the most important is the rhetorical mastery of language'" (Johnson 2010, p. 52; 2000).

14   Aulus Gellius, for instance, realized that the members of his community produced cultural value when they were willing to spend the nights in diligent study of the classical grammarians, when they could recite from memory passages and discussions of a philological nature, and when they could produce books and memorize excerpts from them in such a way that they could easily defeat expert grammarians in public spaces. So, to belong to this community, a member should follow all these

14   rules. However, if that same member wished to belong to Pliny's community, the rules would be different, cf. (Baldwin 1975; Howley 2018).

15   See Fronto's literary activities with his *conturbenales*, cf. (Johnson 2010, pp. 141–48).

16   (Johnson 2010, p. 53; Walsh 2021). Megan Williams writes eloquently on the impact of elite networks on Jerome's writing projects when she says, "The relations among these men reveal particularly well the power of elite networks in shaping Jerome's literary production. Jerome often had to defer a cherished project in order to meet the demands of a correspondent" (Williams 2014).

17   A perfect example to illustrate this trend is how Jerome's writing projects often were derailed by his friends in Gaul who constantly requested from him comments on the proper interpretation of certain passages of scripture or demanded that Jerome responded to attacks by people such as Vigilantius. Megan Williams, summarizing this dynamic, captures the phenomenon quite well: "In general, Jerome's readers knew what they wanted him to write, and it was not what he had planned for…To be linked to the elite networks that supported his scholarship and disseminated his works meant also to satisfy the demands of their members" (Williams 2014, pp. 247, 251).

18   It is entirely possible to write literature for reasons other than to be sent to patrons and friends in one's intellectual community. Herodotus (*Hist.* 1.1), Thucydides (*Hist.* 1.22), and others explicitly state that they write not only for their contemporaries but for future generations. Thus, historians and other intellectuals often wrote with a wider public in mind. Thus, other motivations were at play when writing a book in antiquity. However, cases like Herodotus or Thucydides must not be read as if the only audience they had in mind was future generations, since their books were not locked and secured until those future generations engaged with them. Herodotus and Thucydides wrote for a contemporary audience who read, discussed, copied, and preserved their books, and they also wrote for future generations. This is a situation in which both scenarios are true. The genre of their writing certainly influenced their choice, since the authors wrote history for the education required for political life, cf. Polybius, *Hist.* 1.1–2. Thus, books like histories demanded future generations to engage with them; yet, this does not mean that certain reading communities that were contemporaries with the historians were not part of the initial intended audience. Furthermore, while Pliny writes to Octavius (*Ep.* 2.10) that he should publish his work broadly, including aiming at future generations, Pliny reprimands Octavius for keeping such books from "us" (Quousque et tibi et nobis invidebis), which clearly means his friends. Moreover, Octavius seems to be unwilling to publish his books and rather is expecting his friends to do it after he dies, thus attaining post-mortem fame (Dices, ut soles: 'Amici mei viderint'). Thus, Octavius was not thinking of a broader public as the intended audience for his poems but rather his friends. It is Pliny's thinking that after Octavius' friends read his poems first, they must reach a wider audience. Once again, this is a situation in which two audiences are intended. Finally, Galen's debates and demonstrations certainly were intended to increase the number of students, acolytes, and patients seeking him out. However, when he wrote or dictated the results of the debates and demonstrations, he did so to send them to his friends. In *My Own Books* 14, Galen reports that, on one occasion, he was speaking in public about Erasistratus' work on *The Bringing up of Blood*. Galen's argument was so good that a friend of his begged for the debate to be transcribed and sent to him. This means that although the public debate could garner more followers for Galen, the writing of the debate itself was intended for a friend. A distinction must be made between the event of the demonstration itself, which by its very nature is public, and the writing of the debates, which most often were sent to the members of his community and only later reached a wider audience.

19   Pliny, Ep. 9.13; 9.33; (Iddeng 2006, p. 59).

20   Cicero, *Att.* 13.48; (Murphy 1998, p. 495).

21   "After receiving sufficient training to try their hand at an original piece of writing, authors required the aid of a network of other literate specialists who might sponsor the production of a particular text, circulate writings for critique, gather for recitations or other private readings, and ultimately publish works… As such, the most important social network for an individual writer was other writers and associated groups that participated in the interpretation and circulation of literature" (Walsh 2021, pp. 119–20). On Pliny's expectation for his friends to make his book better, cf. *Ep.* 8.21.

22   Pliny, *Ep.* 1.2; 2.5; 5.3; 5.12; 7.17; 7.20; (Starr 1987, p. 213; Iddeng 2006, p. 60; Dupont 1997; Heilmann 2022).

23   For the private publication of books among friends and acquaintances, see Pliny, *Ep.* 5.10; 2.10; 9.13; Cicero, *Att.* 13.12; 13.21; 13.48; 16.2; 16.3; (Starr 1987, pp. 213–18; Murphy 1998, pp. 495–97; Iddeng 2006; Kenney 1982; Gamble 2014; Heilmann 2021). The most likely author to have published his books through booksellers was Martial, cf. *Epigr.* 13.3; (Sage 1919). Nonetheless, Pliny also mentions the bookseller as agent in the publication of his works, cf. *Ep.* 1.2. For publication by placing a copy of the manuscript at the library, see (Iddeng 2006, p. 68).

24   "The path a book followed from its author's hands to its wider readership was to a large extent regulated by the ties of friendship and social obligation" (Murphy 1998, p. 495).

25   Pliny, *Ep.* 5.10; (Starr 1987, pp. 215–16; Murphy 1998, p. 495). The rare exception seems to be Martial who, when asked for a copy of his publications, directs the interested person to booksellers, cf. Martial, *Epigr.* 4.72; 13.3; (Iddeng 2006, p. 70). Yet, he seems to be the exception not the rule.

26   "Romans circulated texts in a series of widening concentric circles determined primarily by friendship, which might, of course, be influenced by literary interests, and by the forces of social status that regulated friendship" (Starr 1987, p. 213).

27   Martial, *Epigr.* 14.183–196; *P.MilVogl* 11; (Iddeng 2006, p. 170).

28   (Walsh 2021, p. 120; Murphy 1998, pp. 500–5). See also footnote 21 for further discussion.

29   On late-antiqity education, see (Morgan 1998; Cribiore 2001). On the education of cultural producers [authors], see (Walsh 2021, pp. 113–19; Bond 2020). In antiquity, it was not sufficient to identify words in a text or even read it aloud. Reading encompassed far more. Reading, properly understood, involved applying the art of grammar to a text, for which you needed to have been under the tutoring of a good *gramaticus*, cf. (Schironi 2018). What Lucian's ignorant book collector lacks is proper education on how to read correctly. Throughout Lucian's treatise, the narrator mocks the ignorant book collector because the latter spends substantial amounts of money on buying books as luxury items, but he does not know what to do with them. The book collector does not know how to evaluate the style and grammar of the books he reads, a common expectation of what reading correctly entails (*adv. Ind*. 2). Another element of reading correctly is textual criticism and, through this, distinguishing the copies which preserve a better and accurate text from those which comprise a corrupted version, cf. (Coogan 2023b). This criterion would have an impact on the value of the books, since good copies of certain texts cost more money. The ignorant book collector is not a text critic, and the value of the books he buys does not correlate with their content and correctness but rather with their beauty (*adv. Ind*. 1). Mocking the ignorant book collector, Lucian reveals what a good reader looks like: "You are well enough educated; you have learning to spare; you have all the works of antiquity almost at the tip of your tongue; you know not only all history but all the arts of literary composition, its merits and defects, and how to use an Attic vocabulary" (*adv. Ind.* 26, trans. (Lucian 1960, p. 3:207). This critique betrays the standard for which the ignorant book collector fell short, cf. Aulus Gellius, Fronto. The lack of education on reading properly showcases the ignorant book collector's lack of ability to discuss the books he reads; he can only mention the author or title of the book he holds, but he can make no assessment of its quality, which any good reader in antiquity would have been equipped to do (*adv. Ind.* 18). The ignorant book collector also fails in his reading process because he missed the second most important reason for reading: the improving of one's own character (*adv. Ind.* 17). He has not improved his way of speaking nor his life. Therefore, books are useless to him. The mere possession of them does not grant him the status and place among the elites he was looking for (*adv. Ind.* 5). Lucian's ignorant book collector showcases that having books and reading them aloud was not enough to be educated in antiquity. A correct way of reading existed, one that embodied elite values and training: active discussion of the text through textual criticism, grammatical criticism, rhetorical criticism, and especially ethical criticism. For a thorough study on Lucian and the reading culture of antiquity, see (Johnson 2010, pp. 158–70).

30   Johnson writes eloquently, "The positioning of literary pursuits strictly within the boundaries of *otium* is critical for the dutiful Roman" (Johnson 2010, p. 44).

31   Pliny, *Ep*. 4.14; 8.21.

32   Pliny, *Ep*. 9.36.

33   See, for instance, Atticus' slaves, cf. (Sommer 1926; Moss 2023).

34   See Pliny, *Ep*. 1.15, where Pliny holds a grudge against an invited guest for not attending his dinner and even goes as far as to request from him a refund for the food he bought for him, for which he claims, "you will find the sum no small one" (Pliny, *Ep*. 1.15). Not every building in the Roman Empire would be able to host a dinner for the elite. Elite people lived in *domus* or villas, cf. (Storey 2013; George 2004). Managing *Domus* or villas required greater resources than those needed to sustain an apartment in an *Insulae*. The number of resources involved in the maintenance of *domus* or villas restricted the access to these buildings to the elite members of society or at least to the richest.

35   Not all elite communities engaged in intellectual pursuits. Many of them were dedicated to fine dining, drinking, and amusement, among others. They were often critiqued because they did not have more noble aspirations for themselves, aspirations that many constructed as sine qua non for the elite, cf. Pliny, *Ep*. 9.17; (Johnson 2010, p. 60). Another powerful example of those elites who do not interest themselves on literary matters is Lucian's *de mercede conductis potentium familiaribus,* which clearly exemplifies that intellectual pursuits were thought of as essential for the elites, up to the point that they fake their intellectualism by associating themselves with people of renown, cf. (Johnson 2010, pp. 174–75). Nonetheless, those elites who do engage in intellectual pursuits exemplify how writing performs power (Habinek 1998; Rawson 1985).

36   On everyday writing, see (Bagnall 2011).

37   (Foucault 1998, p. 209). Richard D. Alford, from a cross-cultural anthropological perspective, captures well the notion that names are tied to identities. Though he studied child naming, his insights also apply to the dynamics involved in author's names. For example, He writes, "A name child has, in a sense, a social identity. To know a child's name, in, a sense, is to know who that child is" (Alford 1988). Alford then conceptualizes what we described above: names are portraits of who the person is. Therefore, Alford rightly concludes, "An economical theory of naming might suggest that names are bestowed upon children as a direct and pragmatic means of distinguishing one individual from another. But naming typically does much more than this… Naming the child often symbolically brings him or her into the social sphere" (Alford 1988, p. 30). That is, by the name of the person, an unknown could decipher a number of constituents of the identity of the person, including gender, social position, status, etc. On naming in the Roman empire, Egypt specifically, see (Hobson 1989).

38   That explains why Phaedrus, the fable writer, repeatedly harnessed Aesop's authority and audience, cf. Phaedrus, *Fabulae* 5. Prol. Phaedrus was a nobody who had no standing and, therefore, no reading community.

39   Among the many Graeco-Roman authors of antiquity, Galen offers a unique opportunity to understand the complex process of the writing–distribution–reading of a book. Many ancient authors did not offer a sustained reflection on why they wrote what they wrote and who were the original addressees of their books and tractates. Galen does otherwise in his *My Own Books* and

40   *The Order of my Own Books*. He is one of the few who explicitly tells us which of his books were intended for publication and which ones were just sent to friends because they requested it. Nonetheless, what is most valuable about Galen is that he can tell us his audience was. This is the reason why he is the object of study in this section rather than authors like Pliny the younger, Aulus Gellius, etc. A detailed biography of Galen is provided by (Nutton 2020). See also (Mewaldt 1912).

40   Galen, *De libris propis*, 12,15. The numeration and text from Galen's *My Own Books* and *The Order of my Own Books* come from (Galen 1997).

41   Galen, *De libris propis* 22.

42   "As you know, some were written at the request of friends, and are geared purely towards their particular level; others were aimed at the young beginner. In neither case was it my intention that they should be handed on or preserved for posterity, since I had observed that even books written in previous ages are understood by a very small number of individuals" (Galen, *De ord.* 1 [Singer, 23]); Galen, *De libris propis*, 10;12–13;22–23;33–35;41–43; *in Hipp. Epid. III comment.* 17A576; (Johnson 2010, p. 86; Mattern 2008, pp. 26–27). Galen was often the victim of accidental publication, where notes he wrote for himself were published without him knowing, cf. "The origin of the third was a two-day debate between Pelops and Philip the Empiric, in which the former aimed to demonstrate that the art of medicine could not be composed of experience alone, and the latter that it could. I transcribed the arguments that were given on both sides, laying them out in order as an exercise for myself; and I have no idea how this work came to leave my possession without my knowledge" (Galen, *De libris propis* 17 [Singer, 7]); Ibid, 42–43. On accidental publication in antiquity and Galen, see (Larsen 2018). Nonetheless, Galen also declares that he composed certain works with an eye for ample distribution, cf. "After I had composed the above works, I heard someone praising a false interpretation of one of the Aphorisms. From that point on, whenever I gave one of these works to anybody, it was composed with an eye to general publication, not just to the attainments of that individual" (Galen, *De libris propis* 35 [Singer, 16]). It must be noted that the latter were the exception rather than the rule, because most of his works addressed individual concerns.

43   "By now *The usefulness of the parts*, too, had reached quite a wide readership, on account of the enthusiasm of virtually every doctor with a training in traditional medicine, as well as that of philosophers of the Aristotelian persuasion" (Galen, *De libris propis,* 21 [Singer, 9]).

44   Galen, *De libris propis,* 10; (Houston 2003).

45   Some books experienced more diffusion than others. "Advice to an Epileptic Child" was widely circulated, while "*de compositione medicamentorum per genera*" perished in the fire at the Temple of Peace, and it became impossible for Galen and his friends to find a copy, cf. *De libris propis*, 31; *de comp. med. per. gen.* 1.1; (Johnson 2010, pp. 87–88). See also *De libris propis* 21.

46   (Johnson 2010, p. 74). From *De libris propis*, we conclude that Galen wrote a great deal that might not be related with medicine at first sight. For instance, Galen composed many books on the philosophy of Plato, Aristotle, Stoics, and Epicurus (46–48). He also dealt in his writings with logic, mathematics, and geometry, as well as with grammar and philology (39–45). In Galen's mind, all these sciences bear directly on medicine. Logic and geometry enable a physician to know how to get to the truth and evaluate other claims of truth by his colleagues or contenders (39–45). Philosophy helps physicians to mold the soul of their patients, which inextricably impacts the physical health of a person. Additionally, grammar and philology came in handy to doctors since, in this way, they could understand the Attic style in which their colleagues talked and wrote in those days (Galen, *De ord.* 5). Thus, at first sight, these sciences might not be related to medicine, but Galen envisioned a different kind of physician, where anatomy was as integral to medical formation as logic, cf. (Boudon 1993). Therefore, we can safely assume medical practitioners and students made up most of Galen's readers.

47   Regardless of the degree of medical knowledge possessed by the reader, Galen fashions an ideal to which everyone interested in reading his works should aspire to. Among the main characteristics Galen expects are time, dedication, memory, intelligence, and discipline, among others, cf. Galen, *De ord.* 4. For the ideal reader of Galen's work, see (Johnson 2010, pp. 83–84).

48   Galen, *De propis libris*, 12. See also *De libris propis* 23–24, where Galen lists beginner books on anatomy.

49   (Mattern 2008, pp. 16–17). See the detailed analysis on these works in (Boudon 1994).

50   "By now *The usefulness of the parts*, too, had reached quite a wide readership, on account of the enthusiasm of virtually every doctor with a training in traditional medicine, as well as that of philosophers of the Aristotelian persuasion" (Galen, *De libris propis,* 21 [Singer, 9]); (Mattern 2008, pp. 18–19).

51   See, for instance, *De libris propis* 33–34.

52   Galen, *De propis libris*, 22; (Mattern 2008, p. 15).

53   Galen, *Anat. admin.* 7.16; *De libris propis* 15; (Walsh 1927).

54   Galen, *De libris propis*, 13.

55   Galen describes Boethus as a practitioner of Aristotelian philosophy and well acquainted with Hippocrates' anatomy as well as Erasistratus' anatomy, since Galen sent him two volumes where he criticized the aforementioned works on anatomy, establishing Boethus as a man learned in medicine because only one with advanced training would be able to follow such a complicated discussion, cf. Galen, *De libris propis*, 13.

56   Galen, *De libris propis*, 13, 16.

57   Galen, *De libris propis*, 21.

58 See note 22.

59 On the importance of looking for the motives of the impersonator, see "In these books about which I am speaking there are three things which can be asked. Why did the author address his book To the Church? Did he use a borrowed name or his own? If not his own, why a borrowed name? If a borrowed name, why in particular did he choose Timothy as the name to be written? Here is the reason for writing the books To the Church" (Salvian, *Ep.* 9 [FC 3:257]); (Speyer 1971, p. 9).

60 This explains why Augustus was so keen to attach his name to everything he had done for the empire in the *Res Gestae*. His identity comprised his actions, and his name was tied to his identity. *Res Gestae*, as a political project, sought to inscribe, in the collective memory of Rome, the name Augustus. By remembering the name Augustus, Rome was remembering what he had done or, in other words, who he was. Augustus planned in this way to extend his fame for posterity; cf. (Geue 2019, pp. 32–34).

61 Of course, to have power in antiquity was tied to your family name, whether you were free or a slave, your gender, your place of birth, your wealth, your social status, your political connections, your military career, your accomplishments, and your legacy. Therefore, power was not available to everyone in antiquity. Power quintessentially belonged to the elite. Therefore, to understand what it meant to have power in antiquity, one needs to define what it meant to be elite. Thankfully, we have plenty of documentary evidence of the conceptualization of what it meant to be "elite", cf. (Flower 2011).

62 Augustus does not name the killers of his father; they are turned into their actions, and they exist no longer, depersonalized and erased from history; cf. Augustus, *Res. gest. divi Aug.* 2; 10. Octavia does the same, refraining from naming herself as proof of the impoverished situation she is in, deprived of any control over her life; cf. Seneca, *Octavia* 57–71. Rarely does a character address Octavia by her name, rather employing substitutes to highlight her condition; cf. Seneca, *Octavia* 75–78. Even Nero does not retain his name; he comes to be substituted by the word tyrant or his familial relationships (husband, son, etc.); cf. Seneca, *Octavia* 83–87. All of this is a political strategy; cf. (Geue 2019, pp. 36–38, 94–100).

63 Geue powerfully captures this dynamic at play in *Res Gestae* by stating that Augustus' enemies "are relegated to history's dark relative clauses" while Augustus "runs the syntactical show" (Geue 2019, p. 37).

64 In poetry, to have a name was equal to having fame. As Geue claims "the name is the currency of fame" (Geue 2019, p. 55). Therefore, "Poet and poetry have the ability to grant and withhold power, precisely by giving or confiscating the name" (Geue 2019, p. 55). Thus, not naming is the ability to strip someone of his fame.

65 One of the most powerful examples of this reality is Ovid's Ibis; cf. (Geue 2019, pp. 53–79).

66 An aspect tied to the idea of the author's fittingness to write and be received by an audience is the concept of skill/competence. Yet, when we evaluate the skills exhibited in ancient literature, we see that for someone to have the ability to write poems, a treatise like Quintilian's *Rhetoric*, or Galen's medical treatises, such person needed to be highly educated; writing letters or keeping commercial records was not enough. Thus, for someone's writing to have wide circulation, the person writing it needed to have access to elements proper to high socio-economic standing, thereby tying the writing process to the identity of the author and his power—which resided in his standing.

67 For a thorough commentary on the prologue, see (Sévère 1968).

68 Ancient readers were expected to be able to engage with a text at a deeper level than just reading. They were expected to critically evaluate the grammar and style of the book according to literary conventions applicable to each case. Where a passage in a book was found faulty, readers were expected to provide a hypothesis for the origin of the defectiveness of the passage, such as interpolation, an untrustworthy copyist, etc. This means ancient writers had to produce works of high quality because their readers would judge them accordingly. Aullus Gellius displays these dynamics and expectations throughout his *Attic Nights*, cf. (Johnson 2010, pp. 98–136).

69 "You will beg them not to be offended if the style chances unpleasantly to affect their ears, because the kingdom of God consists not of eloquence, but faith… For my part, indeed, when I first applied my mind to writing what follows, because I thought it disgraceful that the excellences of so great a man should remain concealed, I resolved with myself not to feel ashamed on account of solecisms of language. This I did because I had never attained to any great knowledge of such things; or, if I had formerly some taste of studies of the kind, I had lost the whole of that, through having neglected these matters for so long a course of time" (Sulpicius Severus, *Vit. Martin*, Prologue [NPNF² 11:3]). Surely this could be read as following the conventions of the *loci modestiae*'s topos, which many late-antiquity works made use of in their prologues; cf. (Sévère 1968, pp. 360–93; Castelli 2018; Klein 1988; Skeb 2007). However, Sulpicius' conversion and ascetic training could have made him truly humble, thus making his statements about his style and grammar true insofar as his subjective value of them is concerned. The ascetic life demanded total denial and rejection of earthly desires. This means that Sulpicius no longer measured himself against pagan standards of value, but rather he employed a new scale of values rooted in Christian ethics. In this new scale, what mattered was Christ' judgment of the person. From this standpoint, Sulpicius would truly consider his writing skills lacking, since they did not contribute to ascetic self-construction, and thus he would consider them despicable. Ironically, the very place where Sulpicius argues against grammar and style as something of value is one where the characteristics that ancient literary critics appraised as proper of an elite text are displayed.

70 "Severus to his dearest brother Desiderius sendeth greeting. I had determined, my like-minded brother, to keep private, and confine within the walls of my own house, the little treatise which I had written concerning the life of St. Martin. I did so, as I am not gifted with much talent, and shrank from the criticisms of the world, lest (as I think will be the case) my somewhat unpolished

style should displease my readers, and I should be deemed highly worthy of general reprehension for having too boldly laid hold of a subject which ought to have been reserved for truly eloquent writers" (Sulpicius Severus, *Vit. Martin*, Prologue [NPNF[2] 11:3]).

71 Sulpicius Severus, *Vit. Martin* 1.

72 "But, after all, that I may not have in future to adopt such an irksome mode of self-defense, the best way will be that the book should be published, if you think right, with the author's name suppressed. In order that this may be done, kindly erase the title which the book bears on its front, so that the page may be silent; and (what is quite enough) let the book proclaim its subject-matter, while it tells nothing of the author" (Sulpicius Severus, *Vit. Martin*, Prologue [NPNF[2] 11:3]). This could not be associated with ancient rhetorical convention, cf. "Se dunque né retorica né emulazione dei classici bastano a chiarire l'affermazione di Severo, vuol dire che bisogna riconoscere l'*originalità*. E questa originalità consiste in un deciso, anzi clamoroso rifiuto di gloria letteraria" (Castelli 2018, p. 26). Sulpicius' declaration goes against everything ancient literary authors held dear: fame and transcendence. Even though Sulpicius follows an ancient rhetorical technique in his prologue to emulate the humility a writer needs to have—at least in appearance—few persons in antiquity were willing to be humble enough as to renounce to the fame and glory a good book could bring to their names. Here, Sulpicius breaks the matrix.

73 It is important to highlight that Sulpicius has no audience from his standpoint and his valuation of himself. The reality might be different, but we do not have access to the appraisal of Sulpicius by his audience. Also, we cannot overlook that Sulpicius saw himself as worthless because of his ascetic training. He does not look for fame, because fame is worthless in his new scale of values. Thus, since he considers himself worthless and that fame is vain, looking for fame is futile. Therefore, self-effacement is the only solution to Sulpicius' conundrum. Indeed, this transformation of cultural value is not unique to Sulpicius but shared by many in antiquity; cf. (Bequette 2010).

74 Severus hopes for the readers of his book to focus on its subject matter. He would rather his book be read widely than achieve personal glory. He decides to become no one. Yet, he decides to become no one because he considers himself already a no one, since he places himself along with the fisherman that proclaim the gospel's message, not with the powerful orators who have an audience and have good standing before their crowd. The power dynamics involved in the appearance of the name of the authors in their books explain why the work of stenographers, writing assistants, and slaves do not feature in the literary productions that elite members of society commissioned them to do, cf. (Moss 2023). The powerless do not get to use their names as currency of fame. Sulpicius, by associating himself with those of no standing, places himself in the power dynamics that require those of no fame to expunge themselves of attribution of literary work.

75 Ovid, *Ibis*.

76 Unless you are a nobody who invents a nobody to obtain access to the power that was unavailable to you in the first place when you were just a historical nobody; cf. Phaedrus' Fables; (Geue 2019, pp. 117–18). Phaedrus' case does not occur very often.

77 Sulpicius Severus, *Vit. Martin*. Prol.

78 Those who do had an audience rank among the highest levels of society, those with the proper education, gender, and wealth, which enable networks and channels for the distribution of their works; cf. (King 2016, pp. 34, 39).

79 See the section entitled "Authors and Reading Communities" above.

80 Just as Augustu's *Res Gestae* tattooed his authority all over the empire, an impersonator tattoos all over himself the identity of someone else with authority; cf. (Geue 2019, p. 31).

81 Aelius Gellius, NA 10.12.8, trans. (Peirano 2012, p. 51).

82 *Schol. Dion. Thrax*, 3.30–4.4; ed. (Hilgard 1901). Trans., (Peirano 2012, p. 53).

83 For example, Phaedrus complains in the prologue to the fifth book of his Fables that people prefer an artistic work if they have attached to them a popular name, which means that known names have bigger audiences; cf. "That's the way things are: there are artist today who get much more money for their modern works if they sign their statues 'Praxiteles' their silverware 'Mys' or their paintings 'Zeuxis'" (Phaedrus, *Fabulae* 5. Prol.; trans. (Phaedrus 1992). He proceeds to exemplify this declaration with a fable where Menander presents himself dressed as a prostitute before King Demetrius without him knowing the real identity of the man before him. This prompts King Demetrius' reaction of reprimanding this man only to discover that the man dressed as a prostitute is in fact Menander, whom King Demetrius had read and admired. When King Demetrius discovers the identity of Menander, he stops reprimanding him and rather praises his beauty, cf. Phaedrus, *Fabulae* 5.1. This fable proves the assumption of Phaedrus: people judge the same action differently depending on who performs it. In terms of literary or artistic activity, a book or a statue changes its value depending on the name attached to it as responsible for its creation. Books with famous names attached to them attain greater diffusion and readership.

84 For instance, Phaedrus recognizes in several places of the Fables his debt to Aesop. However, in the prologue to the fifth book of the Fables, he recognizes explicitly that "if anywhere I insert his name again, I am doing it purely to profit from his prestige" (Phaedrus, *Fabulae* 5. Prol; trans. (Phaedrus 1992, p. 120).

85 "The thesis of *Ad Ecclesiam* is a strong exhortation for alms-giving to the Church as a means of acquiring merit in the future life. Man owes a debt to God and he must repay this debt. The donation of property to the Church is an excellent way of repaying

this debt, in part, provided it is given with the proper intention. Only in this way will it be acceptable to God" (Salvianus 1962, p. 15).

86 This is inferred by the beginning of the response letter written by Salvian, cf. Salvian, *Ep.* 9.

87 On the behavior of Christians and pagans at the time, see "Because today instead of these pristine virtues, avarice, greed, plunder, and whatever is associated with them have replaced them. To these vices are joined, as by sisterly unity, envy, enmity, cruelty, lust, shamelessness, and destruction, because the former vices fight by using the latter" (Salvian, *Ad Ecclesiam* 1.1 [FC 3:270]); (Salvianus 1962, pp. 9–15).

88 Salvian, *Ep.* 9.

89 "For this reason, the writer wished to be completely hidden and to keep out of the way, lest writings which contained much helpfulness should lose their force through the name of the author" (Salvian, *Ep.* 9 [FC 3:261]).

90 Salvian, *Ad Ecclesiam* 1.1.

91 Salvian, *Ep.* 9 (FC 3:261).

92 Besides Salvian's explanation on why he chose Timothy as a pseudonym, it is also important to highlight that the letter written to Timothy dealt with the issue of avarice and widows, the same topics Salvian deals with in *Ad Ecclesiam*. If Timothy was tied to the discourse against avarice in early Christianity, Salvian chose Timothy as a pseudonym because the church was already listening to him on the topic he wanted to address.

93 "Of the writings that are now circulating, some were written by Pythagoras himself, but others consist of what he was heard to say; for this reason the authors do not attach their own names to these books but attribute them to Pythagoras as being his" (Iamblichus, *Life of Pythagoras* 29 [translation by (Ehrman 2014, p. 111)]).

94 (Usaybi'a 2001). Translation in (Ehrman 2014, pp. 109–10).

95 Horace, *Ars Poetica* 345; (Iddeng 2006, p. 77).

96 Salvian, whom we have met before, adduces his insignificance as one of the reasons why he chose to write under a pseudonym, cf. "nevertheless, it must be confessed that the main reason [for writing under a pseudonym] lies in the fact that the writer, in his own words, is humble in his own sight, self-effacing, thinking only of his own utter insignificance; and, what is more, he is this by pure faith, not by virtue of any false humility but simply as a matter of plain fact" (Salvian, *Ep.* 9 [FC 3:261]).

97 Just as the faceless ones became whomever they wanted in the popular TV show *Game of Thrones* just by putting on the face of that person, an impersonator becomes who they want by appropriating a name.

98 Mroczek has identified that what drives a person to create literature is the affection for a character, cf. (Mroczek 2016, p. 57). Likewise, Peirano arrives the same conclusion, cf. (Peirano 2012, pp. 76, 86). Consequently, when an author becomes someone else, he not only considers which audience he wants to reach, but also, his love for a given character is what determines who he chooses to become, cf. (Nasrallah 2015). The affection many people in antiquity had for a character might explain why they were considered as exemplars in late antiquity. Authors esteemed these characters as so worthy that they decided to emulate them via pseudepigraphy. Therefore, when an author loved a character and considered it an exemplar, he decided to become that person so that he could be read by the beloved's reading community. On the relationship between pseudepigraphy and exemplarity, see (Rodenbiker 2023).

99 "The effect of a pseudonym is not in itself different from the effect of any other name, except that in a given situation the name may have been chosen with an eye to the particular effect" (Genette 1997, p. 49).

100 Galen, *De libris propis* 8–9.

101 Ibid.

102 Ibid.

103 Galen, *In Hippocratis de natura hominum* 15.104–105; (Higbie 2017, pp. 132–185).

104 For classics arguments, their analysis, and bibliography, see (Ehrman 2014, pp. 191–222).

105 See, for instance, (Johnson 2001; 2020, pp. 85–87).

106 The pastorals were read by the majority of Paul's audience. Nonetheless, readers like Marcion excluded the pastorals from his edition due to theological concerns, cf. (Scherbenske 2013, pp. 71–115).

107 Foucault details the modern transformation of the book. They previously gave immortality to its author but now kill him. The idea that underlines the argument, however, is that writing defies death, cf. (Foucault 1998, p. 206).

108 "As for the pseudonym-effect, it assumes that the fact of the pseudonym is known to the reader" (Genette 1997, p. 49).

109 On the reasons for which many people relied on pseudepigraphy in antiquity, see (Speyer 1971, pp. 44–84; Donelson 1986, pp. 9–23; Metzger 1972; Ehrman 2014, pp. 93–147; Stang 2012).

110 See footnote n.2.

111 Scholars have argued that CR itself is pseudonymous and builds upon the traditions that placed John the apostle in Asia Minor. If these traditions are true, then the apostle would have been deemed in Asia Minor as an important figure worthy of being heard/read. The author of CR would have taken advantage of this and writes under the pseudonym John so that he could be read by the audience of the apostle. On the pseudepigraphic nature of Revelation, cf. (Eurell 2021; Frey 1993, 2015). In such

case, *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* is a pseudepigraphon that builds upon the audience of another pseudepigraphon that exploited the reading communities associated with the apostle John in Asia Minor. For alternative proposals of John as a pseudonym in CR, cf. (DiTommaso 2014; Eurell 2021).

112   The most thorough and up-to-date discussion of the reception of Revelation in antiquity is (Schmidt 2021).

113   On millennialism, see (Hill 1992; Wainwright 1993). On the authorship issue, see Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 7.25.2; (Hill 2004; Kruger 2016).

114   By the late seventh and early eight century, we can evince the profusion of Greek manuscripts of CR, witnessing the many readers it had, cf. (Nicklas 2012; Lembke et al. 2017; Schmid 2018). See also (Kretschmar 1985; Maier 1981; Helms 1991; Stonehouse 1929).

115   "The effect of a pseudonym is not in itself different from the effect of any other name, except that in a given situation the name may have been chosen with an eye to the particular effect" (Genette 1997, p. 49). If the only reason why the author of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* impersonated John, the seer of Revelation, was to authorize his document, any name from one of the apostles would have been useful. Something particular and unique to John must be the reason why the author of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* decided to write under this pseudonym, cf. (King 2016, p. 26).

116   This could explain why Petrine and Pauline pseudepigrapha circulated among the readers of the 'canonical' writings of Paul and Peter.

117   Scholars have proposed two motives behind the writing of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John*. On one hand, Kaestli argued that *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* intended to replace CR, cf. (Kaestli 2010). On the other hand, Weinel and Court put forward the thesis that *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* wanted to complement and expand CR, cf. (Weinel 1923; Court 2000, p. 23). The idea that underpins both proposal, however, is that *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* would be read by the audience of CR whether to provide them with an alternative rendition of the end-time events or to complement what CR already said on the subject. In both cases, *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* demanded his reading audience to be acquainted with CR, that is, to be CR's readers.

118   On humility and writing in antiquity, see (Krueger 2004).

119   On this point, see below the section entitled "Motivation and Pseudepigraphy in 1 Apocr. Apoc. John".

120   To see how books are valued as tokens of social prestige and how they could be abused and misused, cf. (Coogan 2022).

121   Lucian's ignorant book collector does not deny this fact. Lucian critiques in his satire the wrong use of books, that is, using them as vehicles to achieve upward mobility without the education necessary to inhabit those spaces. Books alone do not concede this. In other words, books do grant their holders status and reputation as long as their users have proper education (not just reading aloud but textual and grammatical criticism), cf. (Johnson 2010, pp. 158–70).

122   On literature distribution in early Christianity, cf. (Haines-Eitzen 2000).

123   Karen King has already identified this as one of the reasons why people chose John as a pseudonym in antiquity, cf. (King 2016, pp. 15–42).

124   Titles as well as paratexts in general are the vehicles through which tradition creates thresholds so that readers have a framework under which to read a text. As such, paratexts are the product of tradition but at the same time create tradition, as they become inseparable from the reading experience of the text. An illustrative example of the role of the paratexts as reception, interpretation, and tradition is the Eusebian Apparatus, which accompanies the material gospels' transmission, cf. (Coogan 2017, 2023a).

125   (Genette 1997, p. 70). See how the titles for Philo's literary work evolved throughout time by the direct participation of its copyists and translators, cf. (Alexandre 1997).

126   This table by no means encompasses all the titles from the Greek manuscript tradition of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* since it was impossible to access every witness of the work. This table is rather selective and presents a selection of the titles of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* from those manuscripts to which the researcher had access (22 out of 33). Nonetheless, there are some manuscripts where the title is missing. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Coislin 121, fols. 6,17,5 does not have a title page. Furthermore, Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, graec. Quart. 22 (320), fols. 80v–88v is presumed lost during WWII, cf. (Allison 2003). The beginning of Jerusalem, Patriarchikē bibliothēkē, Panagiou Taphou 97, fols. 121v–131v is illegible. Finally, the catalogue where Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, gr. II. 172 fols. 477r–483r is located does not list a title but only the beginning of the work, cf. (Mioni 1972). That would result in the number of manuscripts presented here being 26 out of the 33 possible, giving a comprehensive sense of the title of this work in the Greek tradition. For a complete list of Greek manuscripts of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John*, see (Brannan 2020, pp. 379–82).

127   All the information concerning the titles from the manuscripts transmitting CR comes from (Allen 2019, pp. 627–32). For codicological information about the manuscripts of the canonical Revelation, see (Lembke et al. 2017, pp. 151–72).

128   The number in brackets for all manuscripts corresponds with the dyktion number from the Pinakes database.

129   Except for the subject line "καὶ περὶ τῆς ἐλεσεως τοῦ ἀντιχριστου" and the addition of του before Ιωαννου, this manuscript has the same title as O.08.33. Therefore, the equivalents in the titular tradition of the manuscripts of the canonical Revelation of John might still apply, taking into account the caveats just mentioned.

130   This title has some minor variations. For instance, a group of manuscripts (2352vid 2493 2672 2681 2814 2909 2926 2256) reports the same title, except for a variation in one letter at the end of the word Αποκαλυψις, where the η replaces ι (Αποκαλυψης του

αγιου ιωαννου του θεολογου). This intercalation of letters is common in Greek manuscripts. Another group of manuscripts (42[inscr] 522[tel]) contains the same title, except for its word order, where the word Αποκαλυψις takes the last place in the sentence instead of the first (του αγιου ιωαννου του θεολογου αποκαλυψις).

131 Except for the subject line "περι της δευτερας παρουσιας και της συντελειας", this manuscript has the same dominant title "Αποκαληψις του αγιου Ιωαννου του θεολογου". Therefore, the equivalents in the titular tradition of the manuscripts of the canonical Revelation of John might still apply, taking into account the caveats just mentioned.

132 Another group of manuscripts (2078 2436) follow 1849[inscr] 2846 closely, except for the references to John as an evangelist, cf. "Αποκαλυψις του αγιου και πανευφημου αποστολου ιωαννου του θεολογου".

133 The 2845 has the same constituents of 2846, but arranged in different order, cf. "Αποκαλυψις του αγιου ιωαννου του ευαγγελιστου και πανευφημου αποστολου θεολογου".

134 Except for the subject line "περι του αντιχριστου", this manuscript has the same title as Vatican 364 "Αποκαλυψις του αγιου αποστολου και ευαγγελιστου Ιωαννου του θεολογου". Therefore, the equivalents in the titular tradition of the manuscripts of the canonical Revelation of John might still apply, taking into account the caveats just mentioned.

135 This manuscript adds "περι του αντιχριστου και περι της δευτερας παρουσιας του κυριου ημων Ιησου Χριστου" to Vatican 364, but in essence has the same title as the latter.

136 Many manuscripts overlap partially with this title. For instance, 1828 omits Αποκαλυψις but preserves the rest of the title, cf. "του αγιου αποστολου και ευαγγελιστου Ιωαννου του θεολογου". A large group of manuscripts (757[inscr] 824 986 1072 1075 1503 1551 1617 1637 1745 1864 2041 2431 2434 2656 2669 2821[vid] 2824) transposes Ιωαννου from "ευαγγελιστου Ιωαννου του θεολογου" to "Αποκαλυψις του αγιου Ιωαννου του αποστολου", making the title look like this: "Αποκαλυψις του αγιου Ιωαννου του αποστολου και ευαγγελιστου θεολογου". Another group of manuscripts (468[tel sub] 699 1746) omits του θεολογου after Ιωαννου, cf. "Αποκαλυψις του αγιου και ευαγγελιστου Ιωαννου". Furthermore, a single manuscript (385) places Ιωαννου του θεολογου in the middle of αποστολου και ευαγγελιστου instead of placing it at the end as do most of the titles, cf. "Αποκαλυψις του αγιου αποστολου Ιωαννου του θεολογου και ευαγγελιστου". Three manuscripts (2055 2064 2067) add the end of the title δηλωσις αυτη των θεου μυστηριων, cf. "Αποκαλυψις του αγιου αποστολου και ευαγγελιστου Ιωαννου του θεολογου δηλωσις αυτη των θεου μυστηριων". This likely has to do with an attempt by the scribe to clarify the content of the book of Revelation. Moreover, 1248 adds η των κρυπτων μυστηριων δηλωσις καταυγαζιμενου του ηγεμονικου in apposition to Αποκαλυψις to make explicit the content of the book of Revelation as well as what happens in the mind of the reader when he encounters the text, cf. "Αποκαλυψις του αγιου αποστολου και ευαγγελιστου Ιωαννου του θεολογου η των κρυπτων μυστηριων δηλωσις καταυγαζιμενου του ηγεμονικου". Aditionally, 2050 transposes Ιωαννου from the end of the regular title to right after του αγιου. Additionally, the manuscript adds ην ιδεν εν πατμω τη νεσω. Κε ευλογ to specify that the book of Revelation was given at the island of Patmos, cf. "Αποκαλυψις του αγιου Ιωαννου του αποστολου και ευαγγελιστου του θεολογου ην ιδεν εν πατμω τη νεσω. Κε ευλογ".

137 Regarding the title of the manuscript of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John*, 2368 differs from it in that it displaces Ιωαννου and locates it after αποστολου instead of παρθενου. In addition, 2368 intercalates ευαγγελιστου and αποστολου. Therefore, 2368 contains the same information as Lampros 3832 but in a different order. Many titles from the canonical book of Revelation partially overlap with Lampros 3832; 2061 adds φιλου ηγαπημενου and places παρθενου before ευαγγελιστου instead of Ιωαννου, cf. "Αποκαλυψις του αγιου αποστολου φιλου ηγαπημενου και παρθενου ευαγγελιστου Ιωαννου του θεολογου", and 2027 omits αγιου αποστολου και and connects παρθενου to θεολογου through a και, cf. "Αποκαλυψις του ευαγγελιστου παρθενου και θεολογου ιωαννου".

138 This is expected since the manuscript begins with Ερωτησις, encapsulating the genre of the work differently than all the manusucripts of the canonical Revelation of John.

139 While this manuscript appears in the lists where witnesses for *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* are numbered, I believe, based on a cursory reading of the incipit and its initial lines, that this manuscript preserves a Johannine pseudepigraphon different from *1 Apocr. Apoc. John*. If this manuscript does preserve *1 Apocr. Apoc. John*, it contains a heavily redacted version of the pseudepigraphon that deviates greatly from other manuscripts.

140 See, in comparison, the role of the Latin scribes as they coined the word *eptaticus* to use as a title for the first seven books of the Bible (leaving Ruth out of the picture). This process reflected the tradition surrounding the Latin scribes and at the same time influenced how later readers interacted with the text itself, cf. (Bogaert 1997).

141 On the co-authorial role of the reading community assigning titles to manuscripts in late antiquity, see (Caroli 2007; Schironi 2010; del Mastro 2014; Schröder 1999). See also (Houston 2014, pp. 111–112; Zetzel 1980). It has been long recognized that readers in antiquity did not assume a passive role but rather engaged with the text, making corrections, annotations, and even changes in the text according to the discourses they inhabited, cf. (Konstan 2006). Christian manuscripts (canonical and non-canonical works) are no exception, cf. (Haines-Eitzen 2000, pp. 105–27). Therefore, it is safe to assume that the titles from many Christian works come from the reading community and not from the authors/scribes. In the case of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John*, this rule seems to apply as well.

142 Fragments from Oecumenius' commentary on Revelation often went along with the text of Revelation in manuscripts, albeit in the marginalia, cf. (Sigismund 2017; Sigismund and Müller 2020). Yet, Andrew's commentary shaped the paratextual fea-

tures of an entire tradition of Greek manuscripts of Revelation. Often, titles, kephalaia, and running commentary found on the manuscripts of Revelation originated with Andrew. On this topic, see (Schmid 2018, pp. 45–54; Hernández 2011; Allen 2020).

143   "As features that are the product of anonymous scribes and readers, not of authors, the New Testament's titles reflect readerly engagement with these works, communal perceptions of their content, relationship to other works and the personae affiliated with their production… What, then, can we say about the titular traditions of the New Testament in the papyri, as reflected in Table 1, and their value for textual scholarship? The first thing to note is that these titles show that readers were tolerant towards paratextual variation and that scribes did retain some level of freedom to develop paratextual traditions" (Allen 2022). See also (Dolbeau 1997).

144   (Hilgard 1901, pp. 565–86). Translation from (Court 2000, p. 30).

145   On the alternative end-time scenario presented by *1 Apocr. Apoc. John*, see (Valeriani 2013, 2015).

146   (Najman 2003, p. 12). Najma provides as evidence Iamblichus' report of Pythagorean pseudepigraphy, Tertullian's comments on the authorship of Mark and Plato writing in Socrates' name. For a sustained critique on the use of these sources, see (Ehrman 2014, pp. 29–68).

147   Therefore, pseudepigraphy is a interpretative construct to engage with and use to elaborate an established tradition, cf. (Najman et al. 2012, pp. 325–30).

148   "[Psalm titles] are interested in filling in details in the life of David and enriching his character, and it is in this interest that they must have their starting point. The composers of the psalm headings were not 'interpreting' the psalms, but animating and dramatizing them in the voice of a beloved character" (Mroczek 2016, p. 67).

149   "An interest in David—especially David the penitent and David the sufferer—leads to an effort to place more texts in his mouth" (Mroczek 2016, p. 67).

150   "In this tradition of hagiographic expansion, the royal hero colonizes more textual territories" (Mroczek 2016, p. 67).

151   "Besides claiming authority, linking a text to a figure also extends and enriches narratives about him, transforming the character to make him speak to a new audience" (Mroczek 2016, p. 55).

152   On the use of a footnote, cf. (Grafton 1999).

153   It is the love for the apostle John that makes the author of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* resurrect the apostle so that he could keep speaking to Christian communities about topics that he left unaddressed in his previous writings. Pseudepigraphy here functions similar to Virgilian pseudepigrapha; it is about "a broader desire to prolong the life of the author by in some way countering the finality that his death imposes on his literary production" (Peirano 2012, p. 76). Paraphrasing Mroczek, *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* gives voice to John so he has more things to say, cf. (Mroczek 2016, p. 63).

154   See (Peirano 2012, p. 87).

155   The unrighteous are "the rest of the dead (οἱ λοιποὶ τῶν νεκρῶν)" who will resurrect when the millennium ends. These dead are the ones who later appear before the throne, cf. Rev 20,12.

156   Compare Rev 20,4 with 20,12–15.

157   John simply states as a fact that there will be two resurrections but ignores Paul's discussion about the signs surrounding it (cf. 1 Thess 4,16–17) or the nature of the resurrected bodies (cf. 1 Cor 15).

158   For a general overview on the subject, cf. (van Eijk 1997).

159   On the idea that authors composing a pseudepigraphic work weave old material with new developments, see (Najman 2003, pp. 1–30).

160   1 Apocr. Apoc. John 9

161   1 Apocr. Apoc. John 9.1–2. 1 Thessalonians 4,16–17 explicitly links the event with the second coming of Christ. 1 Corinthians 15,51ff does not mention the second coming, but the language it uses is reminiscent of it. On the order of the events in *1 Apocr. Apoc. John*, see chapter 9 and compare it with chapter 17, where resurrection and the second coming are separated by the taking up of everything in Earth to heaven and the cleansing of the Earth.

162   1 Apocr. Apoc. John 9,2. This description "ne s'accorde pas avec le scénario apocalyptique évoqué dans le Nouveau Testament" (Kaestli and Picard 2005, p. 1001.). Why do people die? It seems *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* reflects a common ancient eschatological trope in which humanity dies as a result of the severe conditions on Earth in the time of the antichrist's reign, cf. Pseudo-Hippolytus, *Consum. Mundi* 34–37.

163   1 Apocr. Apoc. John 9,4–8. There is uncertainty as to what is the meaning of the "ram's horns that lie among the clouds". The author of *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* seems to be more interested in the use of the horns as trumpets. Michael and Gabriel blow the trumpet with the ram's horns. The resulting sound (ἡ φωνὴ τῆς σάλπιγγος) will be heard throughout the Earth and will shake the whole planet as well (ἀκουτισθήσεται ἕως περάτων τῆς οἰκουμένης· καὶ… σαλευθήσεται πᾶσα ἡ γῆ). The focus of the passage lies in the sound produced by the horns and its effects rather than the identity of the ram. This might be related to the fact that the NT often links the resurrection with the sound of the trumpet. As Kaestli notes, "Le motif de la sonnerie de trompette à l'heure de la resurrection des morts appartient à l'imagerie apocalyptique traditionnelle" (Kaestli and Picard 2005, p. 1002.). Therefore, *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* takes as its task to describe with precision where this trumpet sound comes from and develop

the idea of a horn from a ram based on Psa 98,6. The sound of the trumpet (ἡ φωνὴ τῆς σάλπιγγος) turns into the sound of the sparrow (ὑπὸ τὴν φωνὴν τοῦ στρουθίου) through a citation of Eccle 12,4. The sound of the sparrow represents the voice of the archangel through which the dead will rise from their graves (ὑπὸ τὴν φωνὴν ἀρχαγγέλου ἀναστήσεται πᾶσα φύσις ἀνθρωπίνη). Here *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* follows the eschatological interpretation of Eccle 12,4 found in many church fathers, cf. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Cathe*. 15.21. While it is not clear why *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* transitions between the mention of the sound of the trumpet and the sound of the sparrow (voice of the archangel), it is clear that both motives (trumpets and archangels) belong the picture of eschatological resurrection. Therefore, the connection between the trumpets and the voice of the archangel is thematic rather than exegetical. The sound of the trumpet launches the event of the resurrection; the voice of the archangel performatively consummates it.

[164] *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* alludes to the traditional NT material related to the resurrection: Matt 24,29.31; 1 Cor 15,51–52; and 1 Th 4,16–17. The mention of the Lord sending his angels at the eschaton (τότε ἀποστελῶ ἀγγέλους μου [1 Apocr. Apoc. John 9,4]) echoes Matt 24,31 (καὶ ἀποστελεῖ τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ). Also, the fact that the angels will sound the trumpet (σαλπίσουσιν Μιχαὴλ καὶ Γαβριὴλ μετὰ τῶν κεράτων ἐκείνων [1 Apocr. Apoc. John 9,5]) alludes to Matt 24,31 (μετὰ σάλπιγγος μεγάλης), 1 Cor 15,52 (ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ σάλπιγγι σαλπίσει γὰρ), and 1 Thess 4,16–17 (ἐν σάλπιγγι θεοῦ). Moreover, Earth will be shaken by the trumpetlike sound of the horns (σαλευθήσεται πᾶσα ἡ γῆ [1 Apocr. Apoc. John 9,7]), which seems similar to Matt 24,29, where heavens will be shaken at the eschaton (καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν σαλευθήσονται). Finally, that all humanity will be risen by the voice of an archangel (ὑπὸ τὴν φωνὴν ἀρχαγγέλου ἀναστήσεται πᾶσα φύσις ἀνθρωπίνη [1 Apocr. Apoc. John 9,7]) is reminiscent of 1 Thess 4,16 (ἐν φωνῇ ἀρχαγγέλου… καὶ οἱ νεκροὶ ἐν Χριστῷ ἀναστήσονται πρῶτον).

[165] "What form (will they take) when they arise [ποταποὶ ἀναστήσονται]?" (1 Apocr. Apoc. John 10,1 [Brannan, 391]). Ποταπός comes from the earlier spelling ποδαπός which interrogates the kind of result the verb it modifies, cf. (Montanari 2015). Paired with ἀνίστημι, it asks what state those resurrected will have.

[166] 1 Cor 15,35.

[167] For a good overview of the subject, see (van Eijk 1997).

[168] Among the great defenders of this point of view were the apostolic fathers, Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Jerome, cf. (Setzer 2004; Bynum 1995).

[169] Origen, *Princ*. 2.10.3; (Chadwick 1948; Lehtipuu 2015a).

[170] "Listen, righteous John. The whole of humanity will rise in the form of thirty years old (ἄκουσον, δίκαιε Ἰωάννη πᾶσα φύσις ἀνθρωπίνη τριακονταετὴς ἀναστήσεται)" (1 Apocr. Apoc. John 10,2 [Brannan, 391]). Probably, the author of 1 Apocr. Apoc. John thought of 30 years as the peak of maturity for human beings, cf. 1 Apocr. Apoc. John 20,4; "à la resurrection, tous les humains seront dans la force de l'âge" (Kaestli and Picard 2005, p. 1002.). *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* excludes body development in the resurrected life. Therefore, the resurrected bodies are represented as mature enough to not be too young but neither too old. Something similar appears in Augustine's city of God, where he argues that the age of thirty is the standard accepted age for the bloom of youth. Therefore, he asserts that everybody will resurrect with the age of Christ, i.e., 30, so that nobody should be too young or old, cf. Augustine, *Civ*. 22.15.1. Ephrem, while he does not identify a specific age, states that everybody will rise as adults, cf. Ephrem, *Sermons* I, 517–24 (Sermones III, ed. Beck vol. 321.139, 14). In contrast, Gregory of Nyssa thinks there will not be age in the resurrected body, cf. Gregory, *An. et. res* (FC 58:266).

[171] "For even as the bees are, and are no different one from another, but are all one appearance and one stature, in the same way, even those in the resurrection will all be human (ὥσπερ γάρ εἰσιν αἱ μέλισσαι καὶ οὐ διαφέρουσι μία τῆς μιᾶς, ἀλλ' εἰσὶ πᾶσαι μιᾶς εἰδέας καὶ μιᾶς ἡλικίας, οὕτως καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει ἔσονται πᾶς ἄνθρωπος)" (1 Apocr. Apoc. John 11,2–3 [Brannan 391]). *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* seems to contradict what ancient scholars wrote on bees. As for bees having the same age (μιᾶς ἡλικίας), this proposition disputes Aelian, who argues that a man could distinguish between younger and older bees by their color and softness/toughness, cf. Aelian, *De Natura* 1.11; Pliny, *Natural History* 11.10. Aelian, at the same time, also disproves that bees have the same form (μιᾶς ἡλικίας) and are undistinguishable from each other, since he recognizes differences in color and size between younger and older bees. Moreover, Pliny proposes that king bees are structurally different than worker bees, cf. Pliny, *Natural History* 11.16. In short, *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* ignores the majority discourse about bees in antiquity and decides to articulate an analogy between them and the resurrected based on unreliable information about the former, cf. (Ebert 2013). It seems that *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* builds on the common assumption that, for the untrained eye, bees look the same. At the end, bees are just the proof that illustrates the author's main point: all resurrected humanity will look the same as their bodily forms and characteristics are equal. This declaration seems to contradict what most of early Christians thought about the resurrection or the afterlife, cf. Cyril, *Cathe*. 18,19. Even those who allow major changes in the resurrected body do not deny that what makes a person different and particular in this life will also be present in the resurrection. Even if God erases gender, disability, stature, or weight differences, parents will recognize their children, or the saved ones will see martyrs and their scars, cf. (Bynum 1995, pp. 19–114). That is, what the body communicates about the self and identity will be preserved.

[172] "Lord, they die male and female. And others [die] old and others [die] young, and others [die as] infants. In the resurrection, what form [will they take] when they arise? And I heard a voice saying to me 'Listen, righteous John. For even as the bees are, and are no different one from another, but are all one appearance and one stature, in the same way, even those in the resurrection will all be human' (κύριε, ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ τελευτῶσιν, καὶ ἄλλοι γηραλέοι, καὶ ἄλλοι νεώτεροι, καὶ ἄλλοι βρέφη ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει ποταποὶ ἀναστήσονται; ὥσπερ γάρ εἰσιν αἱ μέλισσαι καὶ οὐ διαφέρουσι μία τῆς μιᾶς, ἀλλ' εἰσὶ πᾶσαι μιᾶς εἰδέας καὶ μιᾶς

ἡλικίας, οὕτως καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει ἔσονται πᾶς ἄνθρωπος)" (1 Apocr. Apoc. John 11,1–2 [Brannan, 391]). (i). That there will not be gender differentiation in the resurrection seems to be the opinion of a few early Christian writers. It seems that those who followed Origen of Alexandria thought so, cf. Jerome, *Contra Joannem* 30; *Comm. Eph.* 3.5.28 [PL 26:533]. However, the Syriac author, Apharat, also proposes genderless existence in heaven without Origenian's influence, cf. Apharat, *Demonstrations* 22.13. Gregory of Nyssa also believed that bodies in heaven will have no gender or sex because they will rise without genitals, cf. *An.et Res.* (FC 58:266); (Danielou 1953, p. 170). Yet, the Latin tradition strongly held to the idea of sex differentiation in heaven, cf. Jerome, *Contra Joannem* 31; Augustine, *Civ.* 22.17. See also Pseudo-Justin, *Res.* 3. (ii). As we have seen previously, *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* expects everybody to resurrect with the same age (30 years). This means that babies (βρέφος) and children (νεώτερος) will grow until they reach their maturity at 30 years old, and elderly people (γηραιός) will rejuvenate, going back to the same age. Ephrem envisions a similar scenario where babies who died and never met their mother will grow up at the resurrection and encounter their mothers as adults, cf. Ephrem, *Sermon* I, 517–24 (Sermones III, ed. Beck, vol 321.139, 14). Gregory of Nyssa tries to shed all that implies change and flux from the resurrected body. Accordingly, he claims there will not be growing up or growing old in the resurrection, agreeing with *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* that there will not be age differences in heaven, cf. Gregory of Nyssa, *An. et res.* (FC 58:266); (Danielou 1953, p. 170). Likewise, although Augustine lacks consistency and coherence in this thinking about the resurrection, he is certain that babies will grow up in the resurrection to the perfect stature of their body (30 years), cf. *Civ.* 22.14.1.

[173] "But all will rise in one appearance and one stature (ἀλλὰ πάντες ἀναστήσονται μιᾶς εἰδέας καὶ μιᾶς ἡλικίας)" (1 Apocr. Apoc. John 11,5 [Brannan, 391]). εἰδέα seems to be a misspelling of εἶδος, which means external form or appearance. This is the lexical sense being employed here, cf. (Adrados 2002). Gregory of Nyssa seems to agree partially with *1 Apocr. Apoc. John*, because he states that aspects such as weight, height, age, and sexual difference, among others, will disappear in the resurrected body. Therefore, we all will resurrect with one figure, the one of Jesus Christ, cf. "ὅταν ἐν σῶμα Χριστοῦ οἱ πάντες γενώμεθα τῷ ἑνὶ χαρακτῆρι μεμορφωμένοι" (*De mortius non esse dolendum* [GNO 9:62]); (Danielou 1953, p. 170). This statement is fitting of Gregory's general vision of human beings, through asceticism, becoming assimilated into the divine. However, this should not lead us to think the Cappadocian renounces all that makes us different on Earth. He hopes for his sister Macrina to be herself, even if she has a more glorious body. The tension that arises out of the desire to stress both continuity and change has not gone unnoticed, cf. (Dennis 1981). Once again, *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* argues for indistinguishableness in the resurrection, against all Christian tradition, which suggests that while admitting change does not posit that what makes us different individuals on Earth will be lost, cf. (Bynum 1995, pp. 19–114). (ii). On ἡλικία as stature, see (Liddell et al. 1994). *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* seems to echo a tradition also found in Augustine when it argues that everybody will have the same height at the resurrection, cf. Augustine, *Enchiridion* XXIII. 90. On the other hand, Augustine also thinks all will rise up with the height we had or would have had in the prime of life, namely at 30 years, cf. *Civ.* 22,15. He even acknowledges the possibility that everybody will resurrect with the height they had when they died, as long as there are no deformities, cf. *Civ.* 22,20.3. Ephrem also envisions that all the resurrected will be adults, cf. *Sermons* I, 517–24 (Sermones III, ed. Beck vol. 321.139, 14). Since Gregory of Nyssa excludes growth and development in the resurrected life, it is safe to assume that he also imagines the resurrected as being of the same stature, cf. *An.et Res.* (FC 58:266). *1 Apocr. Apoc. John*, however, pushes this reasoning to the limit, since it proposes total discontinuity; *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* denies any sense of continuity with the former life.

[174] "They will be neither fair of skin, nor red of skin, nor black of skin; neither will they be [like the] Ethiopian with different facial features (οὐκ ἔστιν οὔτε ξανθὸς οὔτε πύρρος οὔτε μέλας, ἀλλ' οὔτε αἰθίοψ ἢ διάφορα πρόσωπα)" (1 Apocr. Apoc. John 11,4 [Brannan, 391]). Gregory of Nyssa reasons that if humans' goal is assimilation into the divine, race distinction is only temporary and must be transformed once the resurrection is effected. Therefore, all humanity will be one "race", cf. "πάντως ὅτι καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν ἰδιωμάτων τοῦ σώματος πρός τι τῶν θεωτέρων συμμετατίθεται· τὸ χρῶμα τὸ σχῆμα ἡ περιγραφὴ καὶ τὰ καθ' ἕκαστον πάντα... τούτου χάριν οὐδεμίαν ἀνάγκην ὁρῶμεν τοῖς ἀλλαγεῖσι διὰ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἐνθεωρεῖσθαι τὴν τοιαύτην διαφορὰν ἣν νῦν διὰ τὴν τῶν ἐπιγινομένων ἀκολουθίαν ἀναγκαίως ἔσχεν ἡ φύσις... ἀλλ' ὅτι μὲν γένος ἔσται τῶν πάντων ἕν, ὅταν ἐν σῶμα Χριστοῦ οἱ πάντες γενώμεθα τῷ ἑνὶ χαρακτῆρι μεμορφωμένοι" (*De mortius non esse dolendum* [GNO 9:62]). *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* disagrees on this issue with canonical Revelation, which portrays the great multitude in heaven as composed of people "ἐκ παντὸς ἔθνους καὶ φυλῶν καὶ λαῶν καὶ γλωσσῶν" (Rev 7,9).

[175] (i). "And again I said 'Lord! Is it [possible] in that world to know one another—a sibling [one's] sibling, or a friend one's friend, or a father his own child, or children their own parents?' And I heard a voice saying to me 'Listen, John. Recognition is for the righteous, but not at all for sinners. In the resurrection they are unable to recognize each other' (Καὶ πάλιν εἶπον· κύριε, ἔστιν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐκείνῳ γνωρίσαι ἀλλήλους, ἀδελφὸς ἀδελφόν, ἢ φίλος τὸν φίλον, ἢ πατὴρ τὰ ἴδια τέκνα, ἢ τὰ τέκνα τοὺς ἰδίους γονεῖς; καὶ ἤκουσα φωνῆς λεγούσης μοι· ἄκουσον Ἰωάννη· τοῖς μὲν δικαίοις γνωρισμὸς γίνεται, τοῖς δὲ ἁμαρτωλοῖς οὐδαμῶς, οὔτε ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει δύνανται γνωρίσαι ἀλλήλους)" (1 Apocr. Apoc. John 12,1–2 [Brannan, 391–392]). Recognition (γνωρισμὸς) is not something that is natural to the resurrected body but rather something that is given (γίνεται – passive voice). This reasoning follows suit to what has been described before by *1 Apocr. Apoc. John*, because if everybody looks the same, it will be impossible to distinguish between fathers and sons (since there will not be age, body, or sex differences) or among friends, unless God intervenes and grants the resurrected the ability to do so. In 2 Baruch, the topic of recognition is linked with the eschatological fate of the righteous and wicked (2 Bar 50,3–4). There, the motif serves as a group boundary marker: the resurrected could recognize each other because they must acknowledge that their actions have led them to their fate, whether salvation or destruction. In 2 Baruch, recognition comes naturally, since death does not change the physical

appearances of the resurrected, at least not before God's judgement, cf. 2 Bar 51,1–2. Yet, recognition also has a symbolic value: the condemned must be able to ascertain that the table has been turned and that they, who before God's judgment oppressed and ruled over the righteous, are now demoted, whereas the righteous are exalted. In short, humanity's appearance uncovers eschatological destiny, and the ability to recognize such destinies enforces the idea that the rhetorical force of the recognition motif is about eschatological differentiation, cf. (Lied 2009). In *1 Apocr. Apoc. John*, it seems that recognition is given as a privilege to the righteous so that they can know they are saved. Thus, in *1 Apocr. Apoc. John*, the recognition motif also serves as a boundary marker: if you recognize others, you are righteous and saved, but if you do not, you are among the wicked and doomed. (ii). "And again, I myself John said, 'Lord, is there even a thought of the things here – fields or vineyards or other things' And I heard a voice saying to me. 'Listen, righteous John. The prophet David affirms [this] saying 'I remembered that we are dust. As for man, his days are like grass, like a flower of the field, so it will bloom because a breath passed through it and it will be gone, and it will no longer recognize its place' And again, the same one said 'his breath will deapart, and he will return to his earth; in that very day all their designs will perish'' (καὶ πάλιν εἶπον ἐγὼ Ἰωάννης· κύριε, ἔστιν ἐκεῖ ἐνθύμησις τῶν ὧδε ἢ ἀγρῶν ἢ ἀμπελώνων ἢ ἄλλων τῶν ἐνθάδε; καὶ ἤκουσα φωνῆς λεγούσης μοι· ἄκουσον, δίκαιε Ἰωάννη· ὁ προφήτης Δαυὶδ φάσκει λέγων· ἐμνήσθην ὅτι χοῦς ἐσμέν· ἄνθρωπος ὡσεὶ χόρτος αἱ ἡμέραι αὐτοῦ· ὡσεὶ ἄνθος τοῦ ἀγροῦ, οὕτως ἐξανθήσει, ὅτι πνεῦμα διῆλθεν ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ οὐχ ὑπάρξει, καὶ οὐκ ἐπιγνώσεται ἔτι τὸν τόπον αὐτοῦ. καὶ πάλιν ὁ αὐτὸς εἶπεν· ἐξελεύσεται τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐπιστρέφει εἰς τὴν γῆν αὐτοῦ· ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἀπολοῦνται πάντες οἱ διαλογισμοὶ αὐτοῦ)" (1 Apocr. Apoc. John 12,3–6 [Brannan, 392]). To my knowledge, neither Psa 102,14–16 (LXX) or Psa 145,4 (LXX) are employed in resurrection discussions outside *1 Apocr. Apoc. John*. Early Christian interpreters often took these texts as proof of the mortal condition of humankind, and they did not pay attention to the issue of remembrance, cf. (Wesselschmidt 2014). *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* seems to use these texts for their rhetorical value, since they state explicitly that "it will no longer recognize its place" and "all their designs will perish", phrases that, taken at face value, indicate that there will not be memory for humans. *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* applies these texts to the resurrected bodies and generates a new reading of them.

[176] On the angelic life in early Christianity, see (Litwa 2021).

[177] *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* even goes against the descriptions of the resurrection found in the apocryphal literature, cf. (Lehtipuu 2015b).

[178] This explains why *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* summarizes the entire experience of the resurrection as being transformed into angels, cf. 1 Apocr. Apoc. John 11.6.

[179] John asks in 1 Apocr. Apoc. John 12,1 if there will be recognition in that world (ἔστιν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐκείνῳ γνωρίσαι ἀλλήλους), which implies that the world of the resurrected differs from the current.

[180] Most of the early Christian authors took the resurrection of Jesus and his body as the model after which his followers' resurrection will pattern. Jesus' resurrection was bodily, marked by continuity of identity, including the preservation of scars. Yet, his body was glorified, assuming immortality. *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* seems to disregard all this information as well as Paul's discussion of the topic, including all subsequent interpreters in early Christianity who grappled with these issues as controversies ranging throughout time. On the subsequent interpreters of Paul's passage dealing with the resurrection, see (Strawbridge 2017; Lehtipuu 2015b, pp. 130–56).

[181] The Christian writer who most resembles *1 Apocr. Apoc. John's* portrait of the resurrected body is Gregory of Nyssa. The Cappadocian shares the vision of a resurrected body that "sheds much of what seems specific to its selfhood here" (Bynum 1995, p. 85). However, despite the inconsistencies that will come as a result, Gregory also emphasizes that the same body who died will resurrect; even the same atoms who once were part of the earthly body will be present in the resurrected body, cf. *An. et Res*. (PG 46:107–108); "Grégoire affirme fermement à la suite de Méthode, que le corps qui ressuscitera est notre corps individuel, dans sa matière et dans sa forme" (Danielou 1953, p. 162; Bynum 1995, p. 85). *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* denies any idea of continuity between the earthly and resurrected body. It is almost as *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* suggests that we would resurrect in another body, in a similar fashion to what Origen had proposed centuries earlier. In contrast, Gregory considers the earthly and spiritual body "deux états du même corps" (Danielou 1953, p. 170). All early Christian writers preserved something of the traits specific to selfhood of the earthly body in their descriptions of the resurrection or even soulish bodily continuity. That is why we propose that *1 Apocr. Apoc. John* reads against the grain of Christianity, since it proposed a picture of the resurrection that, taken as a whole, is unorthodox.

References

Adrados, Francisco Rodríguez, ed. 2002. *Diccionario griego-español*. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, vol. 6, p. 1280.

Alexandre, Monique. 1997. Du grec au latin: Les titres des oeuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie. In *Titres et articulations du texte dans les ouvres antiques. Actes du Colloque International de Chantilly 13-15 décembre 1994*. Edited by Jean-Claude Fredouille, Marie-Odile Goulet-Cazé, Philippe Hoffmann and Pierre Petitmengin. Collection des études augustiniennes 152. Paris: Institut d'études augustiniennes, pp. 255–86.

Alford, Richard D. 1988. *Naming and Identity: A Cross-Cultural Study of Personal Naming Practices*. New Haven: Hraf Press, p. 29.

Allen, Garrick V. 2019. Paratexts and the Reception History of the Apocalypse. *The Journal of Theological Studies* 70: 600–32. [CrossRef]

Allen, Garrick V. 2020. *Manuscripts of the Book of Revelation: New Philology, Paratexts, Reception*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 74–120.

Allen, Garrick V. 2022. Titles in the New Testament Papyri. *New Testament Studies* 68: 156–71. [CrossRef]

Allison, Dale C. 2003. *The Testament of Abraham*. Berlin: De Gruyter, p. 6.

Bagnall, Roger S. 2009. *Early Christian Books in Egypt*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp. 50–69.

Bagnall, Roger S. 2011. *Everyday Writing in the Graeco-Roman East*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Baldwin, Barry. 1975. *Studies in Aulus Gellius*. Lawrence: Coronado Press.

Ballester, Xaverio. 1990. La titulación de las obras en la literatura romana. *Cuadernos de Filología Clásica* 24: 135–56.

Baum, Armin. 2001. *Pseudepigraphie und literarische Fälschung im frühen Christentum*. WUNT 138. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Bequette, John P. 2010. Sulpicius Severus's Life of Saint Martin: The Saint and His Biographer as Agents of Cultural Transformation. *Logos: A Journal of Catholic Thought and Culture* 13: 56–78. [CrossRef]

Berendts, Alexander. 1904. *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung der Zacharias- und Johannes-Apokryphen*. TU, N. F. 26.3. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, p. 3.

Bogaert, Pierre-Maurice. 1997. Eptaticus: Le nom des premiers livres de la Bible dans l'ancienne tradition chrétienne grecque et latine. In *Titres et articulations du texte dans les ouvres antiques. Actes du Colloque International de Chantilly 13-15 décembre 1994*. Edited by Jean-Claude Fredouille, Marie-Odile Goulet-Cazé, Philippe Hoffmann and Pierre Petitmengin. Collection des études augustiniennes 152. Paris: Institut d'études augustiniennes, pp. 313–37.

Bond, Helen K. 2020. *The First Biography of Jesus: Genre and Meaning in Mark's Gospel*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, pp. 78–90.

Boudon, Verónique. 1993. Médecine et enseignement dans l'Art médical de Galien. *Revue des Études Grecques* 106 504–505: 120–41. [CrossRef]

Boudon, Verónique. 1994. Les oeuvres de Galien pour les débutants ('De sectis', 'De pulsibus ad tirones', 'Ad Glauconem de methodo medendi', et 'Ars medica'): Médecine et pédagogie au IIe siècle ap. J.-C. *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* 2: 1421–67.

Boxall, Ian. 2020. Reception History and the Interpretation of Revelation. In *The Oxford Handbook on Revelation*. Edited by Craig R. Koester. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 377–93.

Brakke, David. 2011. Scriptural Practices in Early Christianity: Towards a New History of the New Testament Canon. In *Invention, Rewriting, Usurpation: Discursive Fights Over Religious Traditions in Antiquity*. Edited by Jörg Ulrich, Anders-Christian Jacobsen and David Brakke. Early Christianity in the Context of Antiquity 11. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, pp. 263–80.

Brakke, David. 2016. Early Christian Lies and the Lying Liars Who Wrote Them: Bart Ehrman's Forgery and Counterforgery. *The Journal of Religion* 96: 378–90. [CrossRef]

Brannan, Rick. 2020. 1 Apocryphal Apocalypse of John: A New Translation and Introduction. In *New Testament Apocrypha: More Noncanonical Scriptures*. Edited by Tony Burke. Grand Rapids: Eerdmanns, pp. 378–98.

Breu, Clarissa. 2019. #John: Author-Names in Revelation and Other New Testament Texts. In *Biblical Exegesis without Authorial Intention? Interdisciplinary Approaches to Authorship and Meaning*. Edited by Clarissa Breu. Biblical Interpretation Series 172. Leiden: Brill, pp. 126–48.

Brox, Norbert. 1975. *Falsche Verfasserangaben: Zur Erklärung der frühchristlichen Pseudepigraphie*. Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 79. Stuttgart: Katolisches Bibelwerk.

Bynum, Caroline Walker. 1995. *The Resurrection of the Body in Western Christianity: 200–1336*. Lectures on the History of Religions 15. New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 21–58.

Caroli, Menico. 2007. *Il titolo iniziale nel rotolo librario greco-egizio: Con un catalogo delle testimonianze iconografiche greche e di area vesuviana*. Pinakes 6. Bari: Levante.

Cardozo Mindiola, Cristian. 2023. Fabricating the Fall of Satan: Revelation 12:7-9 and Its Interpretation in Early Christianity. *The Journal of Theological Studies* 74: 240–73. [CrossRef]

Castagno, Adele Monaci. 1981. I commenti di Ecumenio e di Andrea di Cesarea: Due letture divergenti dell'Apocalisse. *Memorie della Accademia delle scienze di Torino II, Classe di scienze, morali, storiche e filologiche V* 4: 303–424.

Constantinou, Eugenia Scarvelis. In *Guiding to a Blessed End: Andrew of Caesarea and His Apocalypse Commentary in the Ancient Church*. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press.

Castelli, Emanuele. 2018. Sulpicio Severo contro Girolamo. Per una nuova interpretazione della lettera prefatoria e del primo capitolo della Vita Martini. *Revue d'études augustiniennes et patristiques* 64: 17–20. [CrossRef]

Chadwick, Henry. 1948. Origen, Celsus, and the Resurrection of the Body. *Harvard Theological Review* 41: 83–102. [CrossRef]

Collins, John J. 2015. *Apocalypse, Prophecy, and Pseudepigraphy: On Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, pp. 219–70.

Coogan, Jeremiah. 2017. Mapping the Fourfold Gospel: Textual Geography in the Eusebian Apparatus. *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 25: 337–57. [CrossRef]

Coogan, Jeremiah. 2022. Misusing Books, Material Texts, and Lived Religion in the Roman Mediterranean. *Religion in the Roman Empire* 8: 301–16. [CrossRef]

Coogan, Jeremiah. 2023a. *Eusebius the Evangelist: Rewriting the Fourfold Gospel in Late Antiquity*. Cultures of Reading in the Ancient Mediterranean. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Coogan, Jeremiah. 2023b. Meddling with the Gospel: Celsus, Early Christian Textuality, and the Politics of Reading. *Novum Testamentum* 65: 400–22. [CrossRef]

Court, John M. 2000. *The Book of Revelation and the Johannine Apocalyptic Tradition*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 190. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Cribiore, Raffaella. 2001. *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Danielou, Jean. 1953. La résurrection des corps chez Grégoire de Nysse. *Vigiliae Christianae* 7: 154–70. [CrossRef]

De Groote, Marc. 1996. Die Quaestio Oecumeniana. *Sacris Eruditi* 36: 67–105. [CrossRef]

De Villiers, Pieter G. R. 2007. History, Mysticism and Ethics in Oecumenius: A Hermeneutical Perspective on the Earliest Extant Greek Commentary on Revelation. *Studia Historiae Ecclesiasticae* XXXIII: 315–36.

del Mastro, Gianluca. 2014. *Titoli e annotazioni bibliologiche nei papiri greci di Ercolano*. Naples: Centro internazionale per lo studio dei papiri ercolanensi.

Dennis, T. J. 1981. Gregory on the Resurrection of the Body. In *The Easter Sermons of Gregory of Nyssa: Translation and Commentary*. Edited by Andreas Spira and Christoph Klock. Cambridge: Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, pp. 55–80.

DiTommaso, Lorenzo. 2014. Pseudonymity and the Revelation of John. In *Revealed Wisdom: Studies in Apocalyptic in Honour of Christopher Rowland*. Edited by John Ashton. Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity 88. Leiden: Brill, pp. 305–15.

Dolbeau, Francois. 1997. Les titres des sermons d'Agustin. In *Titres et articulations du texte dans les ouvres antiques. Actes du Colloque International de Chantilly 13-15 décembre 1994*. Edited by Jean-Claude Fredouille, Marie-Odile Goulet-Cazé, Philippe Hoffmann and Pierre Petitmengin. Collection des études Augustiniennes 152. Paris: Institut d'études augustiniennes, pp. 447–49.

Donelson, Lewis R. 1986. *Pseudepigraphy and Ethical Argument in the Pastoral Epistles*. Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie 22. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Dupont, Florence. 1997. Recitatio and the Space of Public Discourse. In *The Roman Cultural Revolution*. Edited by Thomas Habinek and Alessandro Schiesaro. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 44–59.

Ebert, Adam. 2013. Bees. In *The Encyclopedia of Ancient History*. Edited by Roger S. Bagnall, Kai Brodersen, Craige B. Champion and Sabine R. Huebner. Malden: Wiley, pp. 1–2.

Ehrhard, Albert. 1937. *Überlieferung und Bestand der hagiographischen und homiletischen Literatur der griechischen Kirche von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des 16. Jahrhunderts*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs Verlag, vol. 3, pp. 771–72.

Ehrman, Bart D. 2014. *Forgery and Counterforgery: The Use of Literary Deceit in Early Christian Polemics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Eurell, John-Christian. 2021. Reconsidering the John of Revelation. *Novum Testamentum* 63: 505–18. [CrossRef]

Eustratiadès, Sophronios, and Arcadios Vatopédinos. 1924. *Catalogue of the Greek Manuscripts in the Library of the Monastery of Vatopedi on Mt. Athos*. Harvard Theological Studies 11. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, p. 82.

Fernández Jiménez, Francisco María. 2013. *El comentario sobre el Apocalipsis de Ecumenio en la controversia cristológica del siglo VI en Bizancio*. Toledo: Instituto teológico San Ildefonso.

Flower, Harriet I. 2011. Elite Self-Representation in Rome. In *The Oxford Handbook of Social Relations in the Roman World*. Edited by Michael Peachin. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 270–85.

Foucault, Michael. 1998. What Is an Author? In *Aesthetics, Method, and Epistemology*. Edited by James D. Faubion. New York: The New Press, pp. 205–22.

Fraenkel, Eduard. 1952. The Culex. *JRS* 42: 1–9. [CrossRef]

Frey, Jörg. 1993. Erwägungen zum Verhältnis der Johannesapokalypse zu den übrigen Schriften des Corpus Johanneum. In *Die johanneische Frage: Ein Lösungsversuch*. Edited by Martin Hengel. WUNT 67. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, pp. 326–429.

Frey, Jörg. 2015. Das Corpus Johanneum und die Apokalypse des Johannes: Die Johanneslegende, die Probleme der johanneischen Verfasserschaft und die Frage der Pseudonymität der Apokalypse. In *Poetik und Intertextualität der Johannesapokalypse*. Edited by Stefan Alkier, Thomas Hieke and Tobias Nicklas. WUNT 346. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, pp. 71–133.

Galen. 1997. *Galen: Selected Works*. Translated by P. N. Singer. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gamble, Harry. 2014. The Book Trade in the Roman Empire. In *The Early Text of the New Testament*. Edited by Charles Hill and Michael Kruger. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 23–36.

Genette, Gérard. 1997. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Translated by Jane E. Lewin. Literature, Culture, Theory 20. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 49.

George, Michele. 2004. Domestic Architecture and Household Relations: Pompeii and Roman Ephesos. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 27: 7–25. [CrossRef]

Getov, Dorotei. 2014. *A Catalogue of the Greek Manuscripts at the Ecclesiastical Historical and Archival Institute of the Patriarchate of Bulgaria. Volume 1: Backovo Monastery*. Turnhout: Brepols, vol. 1, p. 260.

Geue, Tom. 2019. *Author Unknown: The Power of Anonymity in Ancient Rome*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, pp. 31–32.

Gonzalez, Eliezer. 2013. Anthropologies of Continuity: The Body and Soul in Tertullian, Perpetua, and Early Christianity. *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 21: 479–502. [CrossRef]

Grafton, Anthony. 1999. *The Footnote: A Curious History*. Boston: Harvard University Press.

Habinek, Thomas N. 1998. *The Politics of Latin Literature: Writing, Identity, and Empire in Ancient Rome*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp. 103–21.

Haines-Eitzen, Kim. 2000. *Guardians of Letters: Literacy, Power, and the Transmitters of Early Christian Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Halkin, Francois. 1983. *Catalogue des manuscrits hagiographiques de la Bibliothèque nationale d'Athènes*. Bruxelles: Société des Bollandistes, p. 106.

Heilmann, Jan. 2021. *Lesen in Antike und frühem Christentum: Kulturgeschichtliche, philologische sowie kognitionswissenschaftliche Perspektiven und deren Bedeutung für die neutestamentliche Exegese*. Texte und Arbeiten zum neutestamentlichen Zeitalter 66. Tübingen: Narr Francke Attempto, pp. 271–90.

Heilmann, Jan. 2022. Ancient Literary Culture and Meals in the Greco-Roman World: The Role of Reading During Ancient Symposia and Its Relevance for the New Testament. *The Journal of Theological Studies* 73: 104–25. [CrossRef]

Helms, Charles Robert. 1991. The Apocalypse in the Early Church: Christ, Eschaton and Millenniu. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Oxford University, Oxford, UK.

Hernández, Juan, Jr. 2011. The Relevance of Andrew of Caesarea for New Testament Textual Criticism. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 130: 183–96. [CrossRef]

Hernández, Juan, Jr. 2012. Andrew of Caesarea and His Reading of Revelation: Catechesis and Paranesis. In *Die Johannesapokalypse: Kontexte—Konzepte—Rezeption*. Edited by Jörg Frey, James Kelhoffer and Franz Tóth. Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, pp. 755–74.

Higbie, Carolyn. 2017. *Collectors, Scholars, and Forgers in the Ancient World: Object Lessons*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 132–85.

Hilgard, Alfred. 1901. *Scholia in Dionysii Thracis artem grammaticam*. Leipzig: B.G. Teubneri.

Hill, Charles. 1992. *Regnum Caelorum: Patterns of Future Hope in Early Christianity*. Oxford Early Christian Studies. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hill, Charles. 2004. *The Johannine Corpus in the Early Church*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 173–75.

Hill, Charles. 2020. The Interpretation of the Book of Revelation in Early Christianity. In *The Oxford Handbook of the Book of Revelation*. Edited by Craig R. Koester. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 395–412.

Hobson, Deborah W. 1989. Naming Practices in Roman Egypt. *The Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 26: 157–74.

Hoover, Jesse A. 2018. *The Donatist Church in Apocalyptic Age*. Oxford Early Christian Studies. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hoover, Jesse A. 2020. Exegeting the Apocalypse with the Donatist Communion. In *The Cambridge Companion to Apocalyptic Literature*. Edited by Colin McAllister. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 79–98.

Horrell, David G., and Travis B. Williams. 2023. *1 Peter A Critical and Exegetical Commentary: Volume 1: Chapters 1–2. vol. 1 of International Critical Commentary*. London: T&T Clark, pp. 163–72.

Hoskier, Hermann C. 1929. *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse*. London: Quaritch, vol. 2, pp. 25–26.

Houston, George W. 2003. Galen, His Books, and the Horrea Piperataria at Rome. *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 48: 45–51. [CrossRef]

Houston, George W. 2014. *Inside Roman Libraries: Book Collections and Their Management in Antiquity*. Studies in the History of Greece and Rome. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, pp. 111–12.

Howley, Joseph A. 2018. *Aulus Gellius and Roman Reading Culture: Text, Presence, and Imperial Knowledge in the Noctes Atticae*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Iddeng, Jon W. 2006. Publica Aut Peri! The Releasing and Distribution of Roman Books. *Symbolae Osloenses: Norwegian Journal of Greek and Latin Studies* 81: 58–84. [CrossRef]

James, Montague Rhodes. 1902. *The Western Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge: A Descriptive Catalogue. Volume 3*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, vol. 3, p. 430.

Jansen, Laura. 2014. Introduction: Approaches to Roman Paratextuality. In *The Roman Paratexts: Frame, Texts, Readers*. Edited by Laura Jansen. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 1–18.

Johnson, Luke Timothy. 2001. *The First and Second Letters to Timothy: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. The Anchor Bible. New York: Doubleday, pp. 55–90.

Johnson, Luke Timothy. 2020. *Constructing Paul: The Canonical Paul*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, vol. 1, pp. 85–87.

Johnson, William A. 2000. Toward a Sociology of Reading in Classical Antiquity. *American Journal of Philology* 121: 593–627. [CrossRef]

Johnson, William A. 2010. *Readers and Reading Culture in the High Roman Empire: A Study of Elite Communities*. Classical Culture and Society. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 51.

Kaestli, Jean Daniel. 2010. La Figure de l'Antichrist dans l'Apocalypse de Saint Jean le Théologien (Première Apocalypse Apocryphe de Jean). In *Les Forces du Bien et du Mal dans les Premiers Siècles de l'Église: Actes du colloque de Tours, septembre 2008*. Edited by Y. M. Blanchard, Bernard Pouderon and Madeleine Scopello. ThH 118. Paris: Beauchesne, pp. 277–90.

Kaestli, Jean–Daniel, and Jean–Claude Picard. 2005. Première apocalypse apocryphe de Jean. In *Écrits Apocryphes Chrétiens*. Edited by Pierre Geoltraint and Jean–Daniel Kaestli. Paris: Gallimard, pp. 93–1018.

Kenney, E. J. 1982. Books and Readers in the Roman World. In *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature: II Latin Literature*. Edited by E. J. Kenney and W. V. Clausen. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 3–32.

King, Karen. 2016. 'What Is an Author?': Ancient Author-Function in the Apocryphon of John and the Apocalypse of John. In *Scribal Practices and Social Structures among Jesus Adherents: Essays in Honour of John S. Kloppenborg*. Edited by William E. Arnal, Richard S. Ascough, Robert A. Derrenbacker and Phillip A. Harland. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 285. Leuven: Peeters, pp. 15–42.

Klein, R. 1988. Die Praefatio der Martinsvita des Sulpicius Severus. Form, Inhalt und überzeitliche Bedeutung. *Der Altsprachliche Unterricht* 31: 5–32.

Kloppenborg, John S. 2014. Literate Media in Early Christ Groups: The Creation of a Christian Book Culture. *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 22: 21–59. [CrossRef]

Konstan, David. 2006. The Active Reader in Classical Antiquity. *Argos* 30: 5–16.

Krasne, Darcy. 2012. The Pedant's Curse: Obscurity and Identity in Ovid's Ibis. *Dictynna* 9. [CrossRef]

Kretschmar, Georg. 1985. *Die Offenbarung des Johannes: Die Geschichte ihrer Auslegung im 1. Jahrtausend*. Calwer theologische Monographien Band 9. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag.

Krueger, Derek. 2004. *Writing and Holiness: The Practice of Authorship in the Early Christian East*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, pp. 94–109.

Kruger, Michael. 2016. The Reception of the Book of Revelation in the Early Church. In *Book of Seven Seals: The Peculiarity of Revelation, Its Manuscripts, Attestation, and Transmission*. Edited by Thomas J. Kraus and Michael Sommer. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 363. Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, pp. 159–74.

Laird, Benjamin. 2014. The Formation, Publication, and Circulation of the Corpus Paulinum in Early Christianity. Doctoral dissertation, University of Saint Andrews, St Andrews, UK; p. 83.

Lampros, Spyridōn Paulou. 1895. *Catalogue of the Greek Manuscripts on Mount Athos*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, vol. 1, p. 362.

Larsen, Matthew D. C. 2018. *Gospels Before the Book*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 11–58.

Lehtipuu, Outi. 2015a. *Debates Over the Resurrection of the Dead: Constructing Early Christian Identity*. Oxford Early Christian Studies. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 139–40.

Lehtipuu, Outi. 2015b. Eschatology and the Fate of the Dead in Early Christian Apocrypha. In *Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Apocrypha*. Edited by Andrew Gregory and Christopher Tuckett. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 343–60.

Lembke, Markus, Darius Müller, Ulrich B. Schmid, and Martin Karrer, eds. 2017. *VI Die Apokalypse: Teststellenkollation und Auswertungen*. Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung 49. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott, Henry Stuart Jones, and Roderick McKenzie. 1994. *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 9th ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, p. 768.

Lied, Liv Ingeborg. 2009. Recognizing the Righteous Remnant? Resurrection, Recognition and Eschatological Reversals in 2 Baruch 47-52. In *Metamorphoses: Resurrection, Body and Transformative Practices in Early Christianity*. Edited by Turid Karlsen Seim and Jorunn Økland. Ekstasis: Religious Experience from Antiquity to the Middle Ages 1. Berlin: De Gruyter, pp. 311–36.

Litwa, M. David. 2021. Equal to Angels: The Early Reception History of the Lukan Ἰσάγγελοι (Luke 20:36). *Journal of Biblical Literature* 140: 601–22. [CrossRef]

Luijendijk, Anne Marie. 2008. *Greetings in the Lord: Early Christians and the Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. Harvard Theological Studies 60. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, p. 41.

Lucian. 1960. *Lucian with an English Translation*. Translated by A. M. Harmon. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, vol. 3, p. 207.

Maier, Gerhard. 1981. *Die Johannesoffenbarung und die Kirche*. WUNT 25. Tübingen: Mohr.

Marshall, Anthony J. 1976. Library Resources and Creative Writing at Rome. *Phoenix* 30: 252–64. [CrossRef]

Martelli, Francesco. 2010. Signatures Events Contexts: Copyright at the End of the First Principate. *Ramus* 39: 130–59. [CrossRef]

Martini, Aemidius, and Dominicus Bassi. 1906. *Catalogus Codicum Graecorum Bibliothecae Ambrosianae*. Milan: Impensis U. Hoepli, vol. 2, p. 601.

Matter, E. Ann. 1992. The Apocalypse in Early Medieval Exegesis. In *The Apocalypse in the Middle Ages*. Edited by Richard Emmerson and Bernard McGinn. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, pp. 38–50.

Mattern, Susan P. 2008. *Galen and the Rhetoric of Healing*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, pp. 14–21.

Meade, David G. 1986. *Pseudonymity and Canon: An Investigation into the Relationship of Authorship and Authority in Jewish and Early Christian Tradition*. WUNT 39. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Metzger, Bruce M. 1972. Literary Forgeries and Canonical Pseudepigrapha. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 91: 3–24. [CrossRef]

Mewaldt, J. 1912. Galenos (2). In *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*. Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler, pp. 578–91.

Mioni, Elpidius. 1967. *Bibliothecae Diui Marci Venetiarum Codices Graeci Manuscripti. Volume 1: Codices in Clases A Prima usque ad Quintam Inclusi. Classis I- Classis II, Codd. 1-120*. Roma: Istituto Poligrafico dello Stato, vol. 1, p. 270.

Mioni, Elpidius. 1972. *Bibliothecae Diui Marci Venetiarum Codices Graeci Manuscripti. Volume 1: Codices in Clases A Prima usque ad Quintam Inclusi. Classis II, Codd. 121–198—Classes III, IV, V*. Roma: Istituto Poligrafico dello Stato, vol. 1, p. 101.

Montanari, Franco. 2015. *The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek*. Leiden: Brill, p. 1691.

Morgan, Teresa. 1998. *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Moss, Candida R. 2011. Heavenly Healing: Eschatological Cleansing and the Resurrection of the Dead in the Early Church. *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 79: 991–1017. [CrossRef]

Moss, Candida R. 2019. *Divine Bodies: Resurrecting Perfection in the New Testament and Early Christianity*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Moss, Candida. 2021. Fashioning Mark: Early Christian Discussions about the Scribe and Status of the Second Gospel. *New Testament Studies* 67: 181–204. [CrossRef]

Moss, Candida R. 2023. The Secretary: Enslaved Workers, Stenography, and the Production of Early Christian Literature. *The Journal of Theological Studies* 74: 20–56. [CrossRef]

Mroczek, Eva. 2016. *The Literary Imagination in Jewish Antiquity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Murphy, T. 1998. Cicero's First Readers: Epistolary Evidence for the Dissemination of His Works. *The Classical Quarterly* 48: 492–505. [CrossRef]

Najman, Hindy. 2003. *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 77. Atlanta: SBL Press, pp. 1–12.

Najman, Hindy, Itamar Manoff, and Eva Mroczek. 2012. How to Make Sense of Pseudonymous Attribution: The Cases of 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch. In *A Companion to Biblical Interpretation in Early Judaism*. Edited by Matthias Henze. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, pp. 308–36.

Nasrallah, Laura Salah. 2015. 'Out of Love for Paul': History and Fiction and the Afterlife of the Apostle Paul. In *Early Christian and Jewish Narrative: The Role of Religion in Shaping Narrative Forms*. Edited by Ilaria Ramelli and Judith Perkins. WUNT 348. Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, pp. 73–96.

Nicklas, Tobias. 2012. The Early Text of Revelation. In *The Early Text of the New Testament*. Edited by Charles Hill and Michael Kruger. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 225–38.

Nutton, Vivian. 1984. Galen in the Eyes of His Contemporaries. *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 58: 315–24.

Nutton, Vivian. 2020. *Galen: A Thinking Doctor in Imperial Rome*. Routledge Ancient Biographies. New York: Routledge.

Omont, Henri. 1886. *Inventaire sommaire des manuscrits grecs de la Bibliothèque nationale et des autres bibliothèques de Paris et des Départements. Vol 1*. Paris: Alphonse Picard Libraire, vol. 1, p. 207.

Peirano, Irene. 2012. *The Rhetoric of the Roman Fake: Latin Pseudepigrapha in Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 173–204.

Phaedrus. 1992. *The Fables of Phaedrus*. Translated by P. F. Widdows. Austin: University of Texas Press, p. 120.

Rawson, Elizabeth. 1985. *Intellectual Life in the Late Roman Republic*. London: Duckworth, pp. 38–53.

Reece, Steve. 2022. *The Formal Education of the Author of Luke-Acts*. Library of New Testament Studies 669. London: T&T Clark.

Rodenbiker, Kelsie G. 2023. The Second Peter: Pseudepigraphy as Exemplarity in the Second Canonical Petrine Epistle. *Novum Testamentum* 65: 109–31. [CrossRef]

Sage, Evan T. 1919. The Publication of Martial's Poems. *TAPA* 50: 168–76. [CrossRef]

Salvianus. 1962. *The Writings of Salvian, the Presbyter*. Translated by Jeremiah F. O'Sullivan. The Fathers of the Church 3. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, p. 15.

Sarefield, Daniel. 2007. The Symbolics of Book Burning: The Establishment of a Christian Ritual of Persecution. In *The Early Christian Book*. Edited by William E. Klingshirn and Linda Safran. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, pp. 159–75.

Scherbenske, Eric W. 2013. *Canonizing Paul: Ancient Editorial Practice and the Corpus Paulinum*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 126.

Schironi, Francesca. 2010. *To Mega Biblion: Book-Ends, End-Titles, and Coronides in Papyri with Hexametric Poetry*. American Studies in Papyrology 48. Durham: American Society of Papyrologists.

Schironi, Francesca. 2018. *The Best of the Grammarians: Aristarchus of Samothrace on the Iliad*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Schmid, Josef. 2018. *Studies in the History of the Greek Text of the Apocalypse: The Ancient Stems*. Translated by Juan Hernández, and Garrick Allen. Text-Critical Studies 11. Atlanta: SBL Press.

Schmidt, Thomas. 2021. *The Book of Revelation and Its Eastern Commentators: Making the New Testament in the Early Christian World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 159–204.

Schröder, Bianca-Jeanette. 1999. *Titel und Text: Zur Entwicklung lateinischer Gedichtüberschriften. Mit Untersuchungen zu lateinischen Buchtiteln, Inhaltsverzeichnissen und anderen Gliederungsmitteln*. Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 54. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Setzer, Claudia. 2004. *Resurrection of the Body in Early Judaism and Early Christianity: Doctrine, Community, and Self-Definition*. Leiden: Brill, pp. 71–98.

Sévère, Sulpice. 1968. *Vie de Saint Martin*. Translated by Jacques Fontaine. vol. 2 of *Sources Chrétiennes* 134. Paris: Les Éditions du cerf, pp. 360–93.

Sigismund, Marcus. 2017. Marginales aus GA 627 Analyse der bislang unbeachteten Marginalnotizen zur Apk und die Frage nach ihrer textkritischen und textgeschichtlichen Bedeutung. In *Studien zum text der Apokalypse II*. Edited by Marcus Sigismund and D. Müller. Berlin: De Gruyter, pp. 455–75.

Sigismund, Marcus, and Darius Müller. 2020. Marginalglossen in GA 2323: Edition und Übersetzung. In *Studien zum Text der Apokalypse III*. Edited by Matthias Geigenfeind. Berlin: De Gruyter, pp. 371–416.

Skeb, M. 2007. *Exegese und Lebensform: Die Proomien der antiken griechischen Bibelkommentare*. Leiden: Brill.

Sommer, Richard. 1926. T. Pomponius Atticus und die Verbreitung von Ciceros Werken. *Hermes* 61: 389–422.

Speyer, Wolfgang. 1971. *Die literarische Fälschung im heidnischen und christlichen Altertum: Ein Versuch ihrer Deutung*. Munich: Beck.

Stang, Charles M. 2012. *Apophasis and Pseudonymity in Dionysius the Areopagite: "No Longer I"*. Oxford Early Christian Studies. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 41–51.

Starr, Raymond J. 1987. The Circulation of Literary Texts in the Roman World. *Classical Quarterly* 37: 213–23.

Steinhauser, Kenneth B. 1987. *The Apocalypse Commentary of Tyconius: A History of Its Reception and Influence*. Publications Universitaires Européennes 23. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Stonehouse, Ned Bernard. 1929. *The Apocalypse in the Ancient Church*. Goes: Oosterbaan & Le Cointre.

Storey, Glenn. 2013. Housing and Domestic Architecture. In *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Rome*. Edited by Paul Erdkamp. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 151–68.

Strawbridge, Jennifer. 2017. *The Pauline Effect: The Use of the Pauline Epistles by Early Christian Writers*. Berlin: De Gruyter, pp. 97–124.

Todisco, Elisabetta. 2007. Il nome 'Augustus' e la 'fondazione' ideologica del principato. In *"Antidoron": Studi in onore di Barbara Scardigli Forster*. Edited by Paolo Desideri. Pisa: ETS, pp. 441–62.

Tóth, Péter. 2017. New Wine in Old Wineskin: Byzantine Reuses of the Apocryphal Revelation Dialogue. In *Dialogues and Debates from Late Antiquity to Late Byzantium*. Edited by Averil Cameron and Niels Gaul. New York: Routledge, pp. 77–93.

Turner, E.G. 1980. *Greek Papyri: An Introduction*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. 1–16.

Usaybi'a, Ibn Abi. 2001. *Kitab 'uyun al-anba' fi tabaqat al-atibba*. Edited by Amir al-Najjar. Cairo: Al-Hay'a al-Misriyya al-'Amma lil–Kitab, vol. 1, pp. 244–45.

Valeriani, Emanuela. 2013. L'artifice di iniquità nell'Apocalisse apocrifa di Giovanni. In *L'ultimo nemico di Dio. Il ruolo dell'anticristo nel cristianesimo antico e tardoantico*. Edited by Emanuela Valeriani and Alberto D'Anna. Bologna: Edizioni Dehoniane Bologna, pp. 89–90.

Valeriani, Emanuela. 2015. Simbolismo ed escatologia nell'Apocalisse apocrifa di Giovanni: Un confronto con l'Apocalisse canonica. *Apocrypha* 26: 79–101. [CrossRef]

van de Vorst, Charles, and Hippolyte Delehaye. 1913. *Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum germaniae, Belgii, Angliae*. Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, p. 389.

van Eijk, H.C. 1997. *La Résurrection des morts chez les pères apostoliques*. Théologie historique 25. Paris: Beauchesne.

Volgers, Annelie, and Claudio Zamagni, eds. 2004. *Erotapokriseis: Early Christian Question-and-Answer Literature in Context*. Contributions to Biblical Exegesis & Theology 37. Leuven: Peeters.

von Staden, Heinrich. 1989. Anatomy as Rhetoric: Galen on Dissection and Persuasion. *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences* 50: 47–66. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

Wainwright, Arthur William. 1993. *Mysterious Apocalypse: Interpreting the Book of Revelation*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Wallraff, Martin, and Patrick Andrist. 2015. Paratexts of the Bible: A New Research Project on Greek Textual Transmission. *Early Christianity* 6: 237–43. [CrossRef]

Walsh, Joseph. 1927. Galen Clashes with the Medical Sects at Rome. *Medical Life* 35: 408–44.

Walsh, Robyn Faith. 2021. *The Origins of Early Christian Literature: Contextualizing the New Testament within Greco-Roman Literary Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 120.

Weinel, Heinrich. 1923. Die spätere christliche Apocalyptik. In *ETXAPIZTHION (Gunkel Festschrift)*. Edited by H. Schmidt. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, p. 149.

Wesselschmidt, Quentin, ed. 2014. *Psalms 51-150*. Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture OT 8. Downers Grove: IVP Academic, pp. 224–25, 410.

Whealey, Alice. 2002. The Apocryphal Apocalypse of John: A Byzantine Apocalypse from the Early Islamic Period. *The Journal of Theological Studies* 53: 534–36. [CrossRef]

Wilder, Terry L. 2004. *Pseudonymity, the New Testament, and Deception: An Inquiry into Intention and Reception*. Lanham: University Press of America.

Williams, Craig A. 2012. *Reading Roman Friendship*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 240.

Williams, Megan Hale. 2014. *The Monk and the Book: Jerome and the Making of Christian Scholarship*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, p. 247.

Wyrick, Jed. 2004. *The Ascension of Authorship: Attribution and Canon Formation in Jewish, Hellenistic, and Christian Traditions*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, pp. 1–110.

Yoshiko Reed, Annette. 2008. Pseudepigraphy, Authorship, and the Reception of 'the Bible' in Late Antiquity. In *The Reception and Interpretation of the Bible in Late Antiquity. Proceedings of the Montréal Colloquium in Honour of Charles Kannengiesser, 11–13 October 2006*. Edited by Lorenzo DiTommaso and Lucian Turcescu. Leiden: Brill, pp. 467–90.

Zetzel, J. E. G. 1980. The Subscriptions in the Manuscripts of Livy and Fronto and the Meaning of Emendatio. *Classical Philology* 75: 38–59. [CrossRef]