

AN EARLY COMMENTARY ON THE PAULINE CORPUS:
THE CAPITULATION OF CODEX VATICANUS

Greg Goswell

Presbyterian Theological College, Melbourne, Australia

An examination of the system of chapters in Codex Vaticanus (B 03) of the early fourth century reveals that the divisions present in the Pauline epistles represent an evaluation of what are the sense-units of the biblical passages.¹ The purpose of this article is to study the hermeneutical significance of the ancient chapters demarcated in the Pauline Epistles of this codex. This is the oldest system of capitulation (division into chapters) for the New Testament known to us.² I will use the notation V1, V2, etc. to refer to the different chapters of Vaticanus.

Each successive chapter in the Pauline corpus in Vaticanus is numbered using Greek letters written to the left of the columns (there being three columns per page). A study of the scribal hand shows that the numbers were not written by either of the two scribes of the manuscript, so that these numerals are a later scribal addition.³ Capitulation usually coincides

1. For comments on 'readers' aids' that distinguish sense-unit divisions in papyri, see Larry W. Hurtado, *The Earliest Christian Artifacts: Manuscripts and Christian Origins* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), pp. 177-85.

2. H.K. McArthur, 'The Earliest Divisions of the Gospels', in F.L. Cross (ed.), *Studia Evangelica III, Part 2* (TU, 88; Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1964), pp. 266-72. For a general introduction to the codex, see H.B. Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek, Appendix Containing the Letter of Aristeas* (ed. H.St.J. Thackeray; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1902; rev. R.R. Ottley; New York: Ktav, 1968), pp. 351-56, and J. Neville Birdsall, 'The Codex Vaticanus: Its History and Significance', in Scott McKendrick and Orlaith A. O'Sullivan (eds.), *The Bible as Book: The Transmission of the Greek Text* (London: The British Library; New Castle, DE: Oak Knoll Press, 2003), pp. 33-41.

3. C.M. Martini (ed.), *Introductio ad Novum Testamentum e codice Vaticano graeco 1209 (Codex B) tertia vice phototypice expressum in civitate Vaticana* (Vatican: Bibliotheca Vaticana, 1968), p. xiii; T. Skeat, 'The Codex Sinaiticus, The Codex Vaticanus and Constantine', *JTS* NS 50.2 (1999), pp. 583-625 (601).

with a paragraph division, which is indicated in an otherwise unbroken line of text (*scriptio continua*) by a blank space of (usually) one or two letters at the close of the preceding section, a short horizontal line above the first letter of the first whole line of the new section marking the close of the preceding one (*paragraphos*),⁴ a punctuation point (a high stop or raised dot [*punctus elevatus*]) after the last letter of the preceding section, and, rarely, by a letter protruding into the left margin (*ekthesis*).⁵ The fourth-century system of capitulation in Vaticanus is replicated in Codex Zacynthius (040), extant only in portions of Luke (sixth to eighth centuries), and in codex minuscule 579 (thirteenth century), but it apparently did not prove popular, for the alternative divisions (*kephalaia*), of which Codex Alexandrinus (A 02) is the first witness, are much more widely attested.⁶ The traditional *kephalaia* (which sometimes slightly diverge from those in Alexandrinus) are marked and numbered on the inside margins of the Nestle-Aland, *Novum Testamentum Graece* (NTG²⁷). I will use the notation A1, A2 etc. to refer to the *kephalaia* of Alexandrinus. Two factors, however, make the chapters of the Pauline Epistles found in Vaticanus of special interest. First, as stated above, they are the oldest system of capitulation of which we are aware, and, secondly, the chapters are continuously numbered through the Pauline corpus rather than beginning afresh with each successive apostolic letter.

The Continuous Numbering of Chapters

The chapters in the Pauline corpus of Vaticanus are continuously numbered (with one major disruption) as though the letters were accounted one

4. H.J.M. Milne and T.C. Skeat assign the *paragraphos* sign to hand B, the scribe of the New Testament in Vaticanus (*Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus* [London: British Museum, 1938], p. 88).

5. In the case of the Pauline Epistles, the only example of *ekthesis* is found in Rom. 12.1 (V15). For a fuller explanation of how the paragraphs are marked in the codices, see Dirk Jongkind, *Scribal Habits of Codex Sinaiticus* (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2007), pp. 95-97; cf. Stanley E. Porter, 'Pericope Markers in Some Early Greek New Testament Manuscripts', in Marjo Korpel and Josef Oesch (eds.), *Layout Markers in Biblical Manuscripts and Ugaritic Tablets* (Pericope: Scripture as Written and Read in Antiquity, 5; Assen: Van Gorcum, 2005), pp. 161-76 (171); Jean Vezin, 'La division en paragraphes dans les manuscrits de la basse antiquité et du haut Moyen Age', in Roger Laufer (ed.), *La notion de paragraphe* (Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1985), pp. 14-51.

6. McArthur, 'Earliest Divisions', p. 266.

larger composition. This is in contrast to the four Gospels, which, so far as the numeration of chapters is concerned, are treated as four separate books (Matthew V1–170; Mark V1–62; Luke V1–152; John V1–80). Likewise, the chapters in the Petrine (1 Peter V1–8; 2 Peter V1–2) and Johannine epistles (1 John V1–11; 2 John V1–2; 3 John V1) are individually numerated. This feature would add support to the suggestion of Robert W. Wall that a canonical reading of the Pauline corpus should posit a Pauline ‘Letter’ (singular) addressed to the whole church through space and time rather than thirteen (or fourteen?) separate letters viewed as occasional.⁷ It should be noted, however, that the individual epistles start at the head of a new column (see the table below) and the beginning of each epistle always coincides with a chapter division (e.g. 1 Cor. 1.1 = V22; Gal. 1.1 = V54), so that the integrity of individual letters is acknowledged and preserved by the scheme of capitulation.

In the case of the Pauline epistles, Vaticanus only preserves Romans through to Heb. 9.14, with Hebrews coming after 2 Thessalonians. In Vaticanus, there are twenty-one chapters in Romans (numbered 1–21), twenty-one in 1 Corinthians (22–42), eleven in 2 Corinthians (43–53), five in Galatians (54–58), six in Ephesians (70–75), four in Philippians (76–79), six in Colossians (80–85), four in 1 Thessalonians (86–89), four in 2 Thessalonians (90–93), and five in the extant portion of Hebrews (59–64) (which breaks off at 9.14 in the middle of the word καθαρῆι), with the implication that Hebrews had five more divisions (65–69).⁸ The remaining portion of Hebrews and the book of Revelation are appended in a cursive script of the fifteenth century (pp. 1519-1536).⁹ We cannot be absolutely certain whether the codex originally contained the Pastoral Epistles, Philemon and Revelation, but the presumption is that it did,

7. See Robert W. Wall and Eugene E. Lemcio, ‘The Problem of the Multiple Letter Canon of the New Testament’, in their *The New Testament as Canon: A Reader in Canonical Criticism* (JSNTSup, 76; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), pp. 161-83.

8. David Trobisch, *Paul’s Letter Collection: Tracing the Origins* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994), pp. 21-22; Jean Duplacy, ‘Les divisions du texte de l’Épître de Jacques dans B (03) du Nouveau Testament (Vatic. Gr. 1209)’, in J.K. Elliot (ed.), *Studies in New Testament Language and Text: Essays in Honour of George D. Kilpatrick on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (NovTSup, 64; Leiden: Brill, 1976), pp. 122-36 (129).

9. Stephen Pisano, ‘III. The Text of the New Testament’, in *Bibliorum sacrorum graecorum Codex Vaticanus B: Bibliothecae apostolicae Vaticanae Codex Vaticanus Graecus 1209. I. Prolegomena* (Rome: Istituto Poligrafico e Zecca dello Stato, 1999), pp. 27-41.

given what is found in codices Sinaiticus (§ 01) and Alexandrinus.¹⁰

A younger alternate system of capitulation was applied to Acts and the epistles, and this is usually dated sometime between the seventh and ninth century.¹¹ This alternative schema is indicated in the margins of the columns of Vaticanus by Greek letters of larger size than those used in the older system of chapter numbering. It divides Acts into 69 sections. For the Catholic Epistles the divisions are: James (5 chapters), 1 Peter (3), 2 Peter (2), 1 John (3), 2 John (2) and none for 3 John and Jude. For the Pauline Epistles the divisions are: Romans (8), 1 Corinthians (11), 2 Corinthians (8) (the chapter numeration is continuous [1–19] over the Corinthian correspondence), Galatians (4), Ephesians (3), Philippians (2), Colossians (3), 1 Thessalonians (2), 2 Thessalonians (2), and Hebrews as far as it is extant (5). Often, but not always, the placement of chapter divisions coincides with the divisions in the earlier scheme (see the table below). Later again, Langton's system of capitulation was added (using Arabic numerals) in the margins for the entire New Testament.

The Unique Position of Hebrews

In the exemplar from which the chapter divisions and their numbering in Vaticanus were copied, chapters V1–58 cover Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians and Galatians, but Ephesians, instead of beginning with section 59, begins with section 70, and it is Heb. 1.1–9.14a that has sections 59–64 (there were presumably five more chapters covering the remaining portion of Hebrews). The apparent cause of this numerical deformation is that the model from which the numbering for Vaticanus was taken had Hebrews between Galatians and Ephesians.¹² This is odd, for it disrupts the otherwise regular arrangement of the letters according to their respective lengths, from longest to shortest. The assigned title in Vaticanus: '[Paul's letter] to the Hebrews' implies Pauline authorship (as indicated by the

10. According to Christian-Bernard Amphoux ('Codex Vaticanus B: Les points diacritiques des marges de Marc', *JTS* NS 58.2 [2007], pp. 440–66 [441 n. 8]), the absence of the Pastorals and Philemon is probably accidental. See also Skeat, 'Codex Sinaiticus', p. 600.

11. Pisano, 'III. The Text of the New Testament'.

12. See C. Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece: Ad antiquissimos testes denuo recensuit, apparatus criticum apposuit*. III. *Prolegomena* (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1884), pp. 159–60.

words I supply in brackets)¹³ or at the very least reflects its inclusion in the Pauline corpus, for its title appears to be modelled on those of other letters in the same corpus.¹⁴ According to W.H.P. Hatch, no other manuscript, canonical list or ecclesiastical writer shows an awareness of what is the unique positioning of Hebrews alluded to by the numbering of the chapters in Vaticanus.¹⁵ The implied placement of Hebrews after Galatians and before Ephesians could possibly be explained by thematic considerations, namely, the theme of faith in Galatians or its discussion of the law, both of which are given extensive treatment in Hebrews. In the other direction, one thematic link between Hebrews and Ephesians is their common teaching on the heavenly session of Christ (Heb. 1.3; 8.1; Eph. 2.6).

The actual order of the Pauline Epistles in Vaticanus, as far as the corpus is extant, parallels that in Sinaiticus and Alexandrinus, with Hebrews following 2 Thessalonians, so that Hebrews is treated as one of Paul's letters to congregations,¹⁶ though when placed after *other* Pauline letters written to congregations, it breaks the sequence of letters in decreasing length, for on that basis it would come between 1 and 2 Corinthians. So far as early texts are concerned,¹⁷ apart from the Chester Beatty Papyrus

13. David Trobisch, *The First Edition of the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 39-40; Pamela M. Eisenbaum, 'Locating Hebrews within the Literary Landscape of Christian Origins', in Gabriella Gelardini (ed.), *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods—New Insights* (Biblical Interpretation Series, 75; Leiden: Brill, 2005), pp. 213-37 (223-24). For Hebrews written by an unnamed follower of Paul, see F.J. Badcock, *The Pauline Epistles and the Epistle to the Hebrews in their Historical Setting* (London: SPCK, 1937), pp. 115-33.

14. Charles P. Anderson argued for Hebrews' longstanding link with Paul, perhaps due to its early association with a Pauline letter (or letters) prior to the formation of the Pauline corpus as a whole ('The Epistle to the Hebrews and the Pauline Letter Collection', *HTR* 59 [1966], pp. 429-38). In a follow-up article (Charles P. Anderson, 'Hebrews among the Letters of Paul', *SR* 5.3 [1975-76], pp. 258-66 [258-60]), he identified that letter with Colossians and argued that Hebrews is the (non-Pauline) letter alluded to in Col. 4.16 ('the letter from Laodicea').

15. W.H.P. Hatch, 'The Position of Hebrews in the Canon of the New Testament', *HTR* 29 (1936), pp. 133-51 (135).

16. D.C. Parker, *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and their Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), p. 254; Trobisch, *First Edition*, pp. 24-25.

17. For a more comprehensive summary and evaluation, see Hatch, 'Position of Hebrews', pp. 133-51.

II (P⁴⁶) (c. 200 CE) (wherein Hebrews comes after Romans)¹⁸ and the position implied by the chapter numeration in Vaticanus, Hebrews is only ever placed between letters to churches and letters to individuals or at the end of the Pauline corpus as a whole. The usual treatment of Hebrews in the manuscript tradition reflects either the undecided question of its authorship¹⁹ or a perception of its non-epistolary character,²⁰ both of which suggest a closer connection to the Catholic (General) Epistles.

The Effects of Textual Divisions

The breaking up of an epistolary text written in *scriptio continua* into paragraphs and spaces within paragraphs provides much needed assistance to the reader, in part due to the challenges of making sense of such a text.²¹ The division of a text by physical demarcation into smaller units has a number of interrelated effects, for the subdivision of a text influences the reading process and inevitably helps to shape the reader's understanding of a particular passage.²² The habits of readers in trying

18. Frederic G. Kenyon, *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible: Fasciculus III Supplement, Pauline Epistles* (London: Emery Walker, 1936), pp. xi, xii. Hebrews is placed between Romans and 1, 2 Corinthians on account of its size (being shorter than 1 Corinthians but longer than 2 Corinthians). Trobisch, among others, has suggested that the stichometric principle was compromised due to a desire to keep the Corinthian correspondence together (*Paul's Letter Collection*, p. 17). As noted by Anderson ('The Epistle to the Hebrews', p. 432 n. 3), in the Sahidic version of Athanasius's 39th Festal Letter (367 CE), an alternate solution is followed, and Hebrews is placed after 2 Corinthians.

19. Stanley E. Porter, 'When and How Was the Pauline Canon Compiled?', in Stanley E. Porter (ed.), *The Pauline Canon* (Pauline Studies, 1; Leiden: Brill, 2004), pp. 95-127 (124); Stanley E. Porter, 'Paul and the Process of Canonization', in Craig A. Evans and Emanuel Tov (eds.), *Exploring the Origins of the Bible: Canon Formation in Historical, Literary, and Theological Perspective* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), pp. 173-202 (200 n. 129).

20. Wall and Lemcio, 'Problem of the Multiple Letter Canon', p. 178.

21. According to M.B. Parkes, a text written in *scriptio continua* 'required careful preparation before it could be read aloud with appropriate pronunciation and expression' (*Pause and Effect: An Introduction to the History of Punctuation in the West* [Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1992], p. 10).

22. Cf. John W. Olley, *Ezekiel: A Commentary Based on Iezekiël in Codex Vaticanus* (Septuagint Commentary Series; Leiden: Brill, 2009), p. 39, who says, 'The physical layout of a text reflects a reading tradition and influences all subsequent readings'.

to make sense of texts suggest four possible effects (or functions) of any given division.²³

The most obvious effect of a textual break is to separate one section of a text from what precedes or follows it. For an epistle, this may serve to demarcate discrete stages of an argument or differentiate successive topics dealt with by the writer of a letter. For example, in 1 Corinthians 8–10 (8.1 = V30) the apostle tackles the vexed issue of food offered to idols. The division at 9.1 (V31) signals a new stage in the argument, namely apostolic rights and the duty of sometimes giving up one's rights for the benefit of others. Likewise, in 10.1 (V32) the apostle turns to Old Testament examples illustrating the danger of idolatry. Soon after, two chapters in Vaticanus (V34–35) cover two other matters where instruction is needed: head covering (11.2-17) and social abuses at the Lord's Supper (11.18-34).

A second function of divisions (the inverse of the first function) is to join material together. They demarcate units (longer or shorter), suggesting that the material within a unit is closely related in meaning.²⁴ A literary portion is assumed by the reader to be a unit of meaning. For example, the first chapter break in Hebrews (V60) comes at 3.1, and this assists the reader in noticing that Hebrews 1–2 (= V59) is united by the theme of the status of Jesus relative to the angels: 1.5-14 (his superiority to the angels), 2.1-4 (an exhortation that builds on the preceding argument) and 2.5-18 (at the incarnation he was 'made lower than the angels').

A third function (or effect) of a division is to highlight certain material in a text, making it more prominent in the eyes of the reader.²⁵ Material is accentuated by placing it at the beginning or end of a physically

23. For more details, see G.R. Goswell, 'The Divisions of the Book of Daniel', in Raymond de Hoop, Marjo C.A. Korpel and Stanley E. Porter (eds.), *The Impact of Unit Delimitation on Exegesis* (Pericope: Scripture as Written and Read in Antiquity, 7; Leiden: Brill, 2009), pp. 89-114 (89-91); G.R. Goswell, 'Early Readers of the Gospels: The *kephalaia* and *titloi* of Codex Alexandrinus', *JGRChJ* 6 (2009), pp. 134-74 (139-42).

24. This function (effect) fits in with James Muilenburg's stress on the importance of correctly discerning the boundaries of a pericope as an essential first step in interpretation ('Form Criticism and Beyond', *JBL* 88 [1969], pp. 1-18 [9]).

25. Olley's commentary on Ezekiel in Vaticanus proceeds on the assumption that the location of divisions suggests 'reading foci' (*Ezekiel*, p. 231). See also the comments of David J. Clark, 'Delimitation Markers in the Book of Numbers', in Korpel and Oesch (eds.), *Layout Markers in Biblical Manuscripts and Ugaritic Tablets*, pp. 1-20 (9-10).

demarcated section. The reader's tendency is to see what is put at the beginning as indicating what a section is about. As well, the reader tends to look to the end of a section for a summary statement or the resolution of an argument. For example, at or near the end of the first three chapters of Galatians as subdivided in Vaticanus (V54–56), the same theme recurs, namely, Paul's concern that his ministry to the Galatians (and to other Gentiles) be not 'in vain' (2.2-3; 3.4; 4.11), suggesting that the apostle wrote this letter in an attempt to ensure that his ministry among them was not in vain.

The inverse of the third function is the fourth function to downplay or ignore certain textual features. It is not as easy for the reader to notice this effect on the reading process simply because of the character of the function itself. For example, the theme of Christ's high priesthood is highlighted by the placement of a number of chapter divisions in Hebrews (Heb. 3.1; 4.14; 9.11 [= V60, 61, 64]), but other important themes are not so highlighted (e.g. the new covenant, for there is no chapter division in Vaticanus at 8.1).

When analyzed in this fashion, the status of such epistolary text-divisions as commentary on a text is revealed. I will make use of these four possible effects of textual divisions as an interpretive grid in analyzing the chapter divisions in the Pauline corpus of Vaticanus.²⁶

26. The following table is based on Angelo Mai (ed.), Η ΠΑΛΑΙΑ ΚΑΙ Η ΚΑΙΝΗ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ. *Vetus et Novum Testamentum ex antiquissimo codice Vaticano*, 5 vols. (Rome: Joseph Spithöver and E.F. Steinacher, 1857), as well as photographs of the codex provided on microfilm from the Vatican Library (*Vat Greg 1209 Part II*) and C. Vercellone, *Bibliorum sacrorum graecus codex Vaticanus. V. Novum Testamentum* (ed. Joseph Cozza; Rome: S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide, 1868) available at www.csntm.org/Manuscripts/GA%2003. It was finally checked and corrected against *Exemplum quam simillime phototypice expressum codicis Vaticani B (Vat. Gr. 1209) praestantis humanitatis operis rei publicae italicae officina typographica et argentaria sumptibus suis comparavit (25 Dec 1999) Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae*.

Table of Chapter Divisions

| | Fourth century chapter no. | Seventh to ninth century chapter no. | Bible reference commencing the chapter | New column | Start of a new line | Raised dot | Paragraphos | Gap (no. of letters) | <i>Ekthesis</i> | Comments |
|----|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|------------|---------------------|------------|-------------|----------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|
| 1 | 1 | | Rom. 1.1 | x | x | | | N/A | | |
| 2 | | | Rom. 1.18 | | | x | | 1 | | |
| 3 | | | Rom. 2.12 | | x | x | | 2 | | |
| | 2 | | Rom. 2.25 | | | x | | 0 | | |
| 4 | | | Rom. 3.1 | | | x | x | 2 | | |
| 5 | | | Rom. 4.1 | | | x | | 1 | | |
| | 3 | | Rom. 4.23 | | | x | x | 0 | | |
| 6 | | | Rom. 5.1 | | | x | x | 2 | | |
| 7 | | | Rom. 5.20 | | x | x | x | 0 | | |
| | 4 | | Rom. 6.1 (?) | | | x | x | 2 | | Chapter no. not visible |
| 8 | | | Rom. 6.12 | | x | | | 4 | | |
| 9 | | | Rom. 7.1 | | x | x | x | 0 | | |
| 10 | | | Rom. 8.12 | | | x | x | 1 | | |
| 11 | | | Rom. 8.28 | | | x | x | 1 | | |
| | 5 | | Rom. 9.1 | | | x | x | 2 | | |
| 12 | | | Rom. 9.6 | | | x | x | 1 | | |
| 13 | | | Rom. 10.4 | | x | x | x | 2 | | Not marked in Mai |
| | 6 | | Rom. 11.1 | | | x | | 0 | | |
| 14 | | | Rom. 11.13 | | | x | x | 1 | | |
| 15 | | | Rom. 12.1 | | | x | x | 0 | x | |
| 16 | 7 | | Rom. 13.1 | | x | x | x | 0 | | |
| 17 | | | Rom. 14.1 | | | x | x | 1 | | |
| 18 | | | Rom. 15.1 | | x | x | x | 0 | | |
| 19 | 8 | | Rom. 15.25 | | | x | x | 0 | | |
| 20 | | | Rom. 15.30 | | | x | x | 2 | | |
| 21 | | | Rom. 16.17 | | x | x | x | 0 | | |
| 22 | 1 | | 1 Cor. 1.1 | x | x | | | N/A | | |
| 23 | | | 1 Cor. 2.1 | | x | x | x | 0 | | |
| 24 | | | 1 Cor. 3.1 | | | x | x | 0 | | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|----|----|---------------|---|---|---|---|-----|--|-----------------------------|
| | 2 | 1 Cor. 3.16 | | | x | x | 1 | | |
| 25 | | 1 Cor. 3.21 | | | | x | 1 | | |
| 26 | | 1 Cor. 4.16 | | | | x | 2 | | |
| 27 | 3 | 1 Cor. 6.1 | | | x | x | 3 | | Not marked in Mai |
| 28 | 4 | 1 Cor. 7.1 | | x | x | x | 0 | | |
| 29 | | 1 Cor. 7.25 | | x | x | x | 11 | | |
| 30 | 5 | 1 Cor. 8.1 | | x | x | x | 10 | | |
| 31 | | 1 Cor. 9.1 | | x | x | x | 0 | | |
| 32 | | 1 Cor. 10.1 | | x | x | x | 1 | | |
| 33 | | 1 Cor. 10.14 | | x | x | x | 3 | | |
| 34 | | 1 Cor. 11.2 | | | x | x | 2 | | |
| | 6 | 1 Cor. 11.3 | | x | x | x | 1 | | |
| 35 | | 1 Cor. 11.18 | | x | x | x | 1 | | |
| 36 | 7 | 1 Cor. 12.1 | | x | x | x | 10 | | |
| | 8 | 1 Cor. 12.31b | | | x | x | 1 | | |
| 37 | | 1 Cor. 14.5 | | | x | x | 1 | | No. 37 also marked 12.31b |
| 38 | | 1 Cor. 14.18 | | | x | x | 2 | | |
| 39 | 9 | 1 Cor. 15.1 | | x | x | x | 4 | | |
| 40 | | 1 Cor. 15.21 | | | x | x | 1 | | |
| | 10 | 1 Cor. 15.39 | | x | x | x | 0 | | |
| 41 | | 1 Cor. 15.44 | | | x | | 1 | | |
| 42 | 11 | 1 Cor. 16.1 | | x | x | x | 1 | | |
| 43 | 12 | 2 Cor. 1.1 | x | x | | | N/A | | Chapter no. 43 obscured |
| 44 | 13 | 2 Cor. 2.12 | | x | x | x | 0 | | |
| 45 | | 2 Cor. 4.5 | | | x | x | 1 | | |
| | 14 | 2 Cor. 4.7 | | x | x | x | 0 | | |
| 46 | | 2 Cor. 5.11 | | x | x | x | 2 | | |
| 47 | | 2 Cor. 6.14 | | | x | x | 0 | | |
| | 15 | 2 Cor. 7.1 | | x | x | x | 0 | | |
| 48 | 16 | 2 Cor. 8.1 | | | x | x | 2 | | |
| 49 | 17 | 2 Cor. 9.1 | | | x | x | 2 | | |
| 50 | | 2 Cor. 10.1 | | | x | x | 2 | | |
| 51 | 18 | 2 Cor. 11.1 | | x | x | x | 0 | | |
| 52 | | 2 Cor. 11.16 | | x | x | x | 0 | | |
| | 19 | 2 Cor. 12.11 | | | x | | 0 | | |
| 53 | | 2 Cor. 12.19b | | | | x | 0 | | Starting at τὰ δὲ πάντα κτλ |
| 54 | 1 | Gal. 1.1 | x | x | | | N/A | | |
| | 2 | Gal. 1.6 | | | x | x | 2 | | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|----|---|---------------|---|---|---|---|-----|--|---|
| 55 | | Gal. 2.4 | | | x | x | 0 | | |
| | 3 | | | | | | | | Chapter no. 3 not visible |
| 56 | | Gal. 3.5 | | x | x | x | 0 | | |
| 57 | | Gal. 4.12b | | | x | x | 2 | | Starting at ἀδελφοί κτλ |
| | 4 | Gal. 4.21 | | x | x | x | 0 | | |
| 58 | | Gal. 5.16 | | | x | x | 1 | | Mai chapter no. 59 = Gal. 6.1 |
| 70 | 1 | Eph. 1.1 | x | x | | | N/A | | Mai chapter no. 60 etc. |
| 71 | | Eph. 2.8 | | x | x | x | 2 | | |
| 72 | 2 | Eph. 4.1 | | x | x | x | 1 | | |
| 73 | | Eph. 4.17 | | x | x | x | 0 | | |
| 74 | | Eph. 5.15 | | x | x | x | 0 | | |
| | 3 | Eph. 5.22 | | | x | x | 2 | | |
| 75 | | Eph. 6.10 | | x | x | x | 0 | | |
| 76 | 1 | Phil. 1.1 | x | x | | | N/A | | Not marked in Mai |
| 77 | | Phil. 2.12 | | x | x | x | 0 | | |
| | 2 | Phil. 2.19 | | | x | x | 1 | | |
| 78 | | Phil. 3.1 | | | x | x | 2 | | |
| 79 | | Phil. 4.4 | | x | x | x | 4 | | |
| 80 | 1 | Col. 1.1 | x | x | | | N/A | | |
| 81 | | Col. 1.12 | | | | x | 0 | | |
| 82 | | Col. 2.6 | | | x | x | 1 | | |
| | 2 | Col. 2.8 | | | | x | 0 | | |
| 83 | | Col. 3.1 | | | x | x | 1 | | |
| 84 | | Col. 3.16 | | | x | x | 0 | | |
| | 3 | Col. 3.18 | | x | x | x | 2 | | |
| 85 | | Col. 4.2 | | | x | x | 0 | | |
| 86 | 1 | 1 Thess. 1.1 | x | x | | | N/A | | |
| 87 | | 1 Thess. 2.13 | | | | x | 0 | | |
| 88 | 2 | 1 Thess. 4.1 | | x | x | x | 0 | | |
| 89 | | 1 Thess. 5.5 | | | x | | 0 | | |
| 90 | 1 | 2 Thess. 1.1 | x | x | | | N/A | | |
| 91 | | 2 Thess. 2.1 | | | x | x | 0 | | |
| 92 | 2 | 2 Thess. 2.15 | | | x | x | 0 | | |
| 93 | | 2 Thess. 3.1 | | | x | x | 1 | | Not marked in Mai |
| 59 | 1 | Heb. 1.1 | x | x | | | N/A | | Mai chapter no. 83 etc. Chapter no. 59 obscured by large initial Π. |
| 60 | 2 | Heb. 3.1 | | | x | x | 3 | | |
| 61 | 3 | Heb. 4.14 | | | x | x | 2 | | Not marked in Mai |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|----|---|-----------|--|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| 62 | | Heb. 6.9 | | | x | x | 2 | | |
| | 4 | Heb. 7.11 | | x | x | x | 0 | | |
| 63 | | Heb. 7.19 | | | x | x | 0 | | |
| | 5 | Heb. 9.1 | | | x | x | 1 | | |
| 64 | | Heb. 9.11 | | | x | x | 2 | | |

Romans

In order to assist in the analysis and evaluation of the fourth-century capitulation in Vaticanus, at times I will compare it with Stephen Langton's chapter divisions, the *kephalaia* in Alexandrinus, the paragraphing in Sinaiticus,²⁷ and the paragraph breaks in some modern versions (RSV, NIV). When it is noted that a number of the chapter divisions within Romans in Vaticanus coincide with the later system of Langton (cf. 13.1 [V16]; 14.1 [V17]; 15.1 [V18]), it becomes clear that neither scheme of delimitation is careless or arbitrary.²⁸

The beginning of the second chapter of Romans in Vaticanus (V2 = A1) is placed at 1.18, which the editors of *NTG*²⁷ (who place a blank line after 1.17) view as the start of the body of the book. The next chapter in Vaticanus commences at 2.12 (V3 = A2). This division has the effect of making the final statement of the preceding chapter a punch line (2.11: 'For God shows no partiality').²⁹ This way of dividing the text suggests that 2.11 summarizes the opening argument of the letter.³⁰ It also makes

27. For Stanley E. Porter's analysis of the triggers in Romans (Sinaiticus), see 'Pericope Markers and the Paragraph: Textual and Linguistic Implications', in de Hoop, Korpel and Porter (eds.), *The Impact of Unit Delimitation on Exegesis*, pp. 175-95 (187-88).

28. Langton's chapter divisions in Romans are often triggered by a significant question (3.1 [= V4]; 4.1 [= V5]; 6.1; 7.1 [= V9]; 11.1) or 'therefore' (διό/οὖν/ἄρα; 2.1; 3.1; 4.1; 5.1 [= V6]; 6.1; 8.1; 11.1; 12.1 [= V15]) or both. Questions regularly punctuate the argument of Romans and announce its stages (3.9, 27; 4.9, 10; 6.15; 7.7, 13; 8.31; 9.19, 30; 10.14). The paragraphs indicated by the editors of *GNT*⁴ a number of times begin with διό (1.24; 15.7, 22) or οὖν (e.g. 3.9, 27; 6.12, 15; 7.7, 13; 8.12, 31; 11.11; 14.13). These divisions have the virtue of bringing to the fore the way in which the apostle is concerned to set forth the faith rationally, and, of all his letters, Romans is the most treatise-like.

29. Unless otherwise indicated, quotations are taken from the RSV.

30. Jouette M. Bassler, *Divine Impartiality: Paul and a Theological Axiom* (SBLDS, 59; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1982). She makes reference to the chapter division in Vaticanus (p. 122), noting that the codex regards 1.18–2.11 'as a single

the first sentence of the next chapter (2.12) a statement of theme for the new chapter. As noted by Bassler, the statement about divine impartiality rounds off the argument, and 2.11 is a restatement and refinement of the thought in 2.6 ('For [God] will render to every man according to his works').³¹ The viability of the demarcated section in Vaticanus is supported by the *inclusio* of the motif of divine wrath (1.18; 2.8-9),³² with the section demonstrating that both Jew and Greek are subject to God's judgment and reward. According to Bassler, 'the statement that God is impartial functions as a terse summary of the entire preceding unit',³³ which does not explicitly mention Jews or Gentiles (as noted by Bassler) and so applies equally to both groups. Bassler argues for the unity of 2.12-29 (= V3) on the basis of the word chain *ἀνόμος–νόμος–περιτομή–ἀκροβυστία*,³⁴ and because vv. 28-29 is a general restatement (albeit in different terms) of the opening statement of the unit in vv. 12-13,³⁵ namely, that God ignores all external distinctions and is only interested in deeds. This thesis can be understood as a development of the thematic statement at 2.11.³⁶

In the light of this, the opening of the fourth chapter in Vaticanus at 3.1 (V4 = A3) raises the obvious question of Jewish advantage (picked up again at 3.9 [= A4]), and this is the topic that Paul begins to deal with in a chapter whose dimensions coincide with Langton's third chapter of Romans. Does divine impartiality cancel the special privileges of the Jews? At the end of V4, again no distinction is allowed, for both Jews and Gentiles are justified on the same basis, namely, that of faith (3.29-30).³⁷ Likewise, V5 coincides with Langton's fourth chapter (4.1-25), for this section is thematically unified by its focus on the example of the justification of Abraham, whose experience anticipated the justification

thought unit' and that the *kephalaia* (A1, A2) also begin at 1.18 and 2.12 (cf. H.F. von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments: In ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt hergestellt auf Grund ihrer Textgeschichte*. I. *Untersuchungen* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1911], Part 1, p. 461).

31. Bassler, *Divine Impartiality*, p. 126.

32. On indications of textual sections in Pauline letters, see J.A. Fischer, 'Pauline Literary Forms and Thought Patterns', *CBQ* 39 (1977), pp. 209-23.

33. Bassler, *Divine Impartiality*, p. 135.

34. Bassler, *Divine Impartiality*, p. 137.

35. Bassler, *Divine Impartiality*, p. 139.

36. Jouette M. Bassler, 'Divine Impartiality in Paul's Letter to the Romans', *NovT* 26 (1984), pp. 43-58, esp. p. 53.

37. Bassler, 'Divine Impartiality', p. 55.

of Jews and Gentiles on the same basis (faith).

Almost all modern outlines of the structure and contents of Romans mark 5.1 (V6 = A5), 9.1 (A14), 12.1 (V15 = A17) and 16.1 as major transitions (e.g. a blank line precedes all four in the RSV), though there are no chapter divisions in Vaticanus at 9.1 or 16.1. Vaticanus has a new chapter at 5.20 (V7) rather than at 6.1 (= A7), interpreting 5.19 as a summation of the apostolic argument that compared and contrasted Christ and Adam. As noted by Joseph A. Fitzmyer, the climax of the comparison made in this paragraph is reached at v. 19, which formally states the basic contrast of Adam and Christ.³⁸ Likewise, the capitulation in Vaticanus makes the ethical injunction in 6.11 ('So [οὕτως] you also must consider yourselves dead to sin and alive to God in Christ Jesus') a summarizing inference from the preceding argument of its seventh chapter,³⁹ and the instruction to Paul's readers not to allow sin to reign in their lives (6.12) is made the topic sentence of this new chapter (V8).

There is no chapter division at 8.1 in Vaticanus,⁴⁰ so that Paul's discussion of the law in Romans 7 is not isolated from his teaching about life in the Spirit.⁴¹ The dimensions of V9 encompass 7.1–8.11. Romans 8.1-11 connects back to and elaborates on 7.1-6,⁴² and, in the process, provides the resolution of the dilemma concerning the keeping of the law portrayed in 7.7-25. Picking up 7.22-23, Rom. 8.3 speaks of the law rendered ineffective by the flesh. Paul's teaching about the Spirit concludes at 8.27, coinciding with the close of a chapter in Vaticanus (V10).

In the same way, the lack of a chapter division in Vaticanus at 9.1 shows a recognition of the logical connection of 9.1-5 with what is said

38. J.A. Fitzmyer, *Romans* (AB, 33; New York: Doubleday, 1993), p. 421.

39. Cf. Douglas Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), p. 380.

40. The division in Alexandrinus comes at 8.3 (= A11). The only evidence of a break in Vaticanus at 8.1 is a small gap (the space of one letter).

41. Cf. David B. Capes, Rodney Reeves and E. Randolph Richards, *Rediscovering Paul: An Introduction to his World, Letters and Theology* (Nottingham: Apollos, 2007), pp. 188-89, who state, 'Romans 8 completes the answer to the problem of sin and its exploitation of the law. There is no transition in Paul's thinking here. The Romans 8 life in the Spirit provides the alternative to the Romans 7 life under sin and death'.

42. C.E.B. Cranfield, *The Epistle to the Romans* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1975), p. 372.

in 8.28-39 (V11).⁴³ By this means, God's good purposes as stated in 8.28-39 are brought into relation to the issue of Jewish resistance to the gospel. Too often, exegetical treatments have failed to see the relation of the argument of Romans 9–11 with what precedes. This is exacerbated by the fact that multi-volume commentaries of Romans regularly assign chapters 1–8 and 9–11 to different volumes. As commented by James Dunn, Paul's contemplation of being 'cut off from Christ' (ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ) (9.3) is in sharp contrast to the position of believers as portrayed in 8.38-39, since it is 'in Christ' that God's love is experienced (8.39).⁴⁴ The division at 9.6 (V12) makes that verse a statement of theme for the chapter that it heads, namely, that 'the word of God' (= God's promises to Israel) has not failed. This anticipates the Old Testament exposition to follow. Romans 10.1-3 continues the exposition of Israel's failure begun in 9.31-33.⁴⁵ The start of a new chapter in Vaticanus at 10.4 (V13) makes this verse a topic sentence.⁴⁶ If, with Badenas, we understand 10.4 as contributing to the argument that is defined by 9.6, its sense must be that the law (Torah), understood as the promise of righteousness to whoever believes, pointed to Christ, and 10.5 onward is designed to prove the truth of 10.4, namely, that Christ is the goal (τέλος) of the Torah.⁴⁷ The division at 11.13 (V14) coincides with a turn in the argument (from exposition to exhortation), for now Paul specifically addresses Gentile readers about what God's dealings with Israel mean for them.

It is hardly surprising to find a division at 12.1 (V15 = A17), for this is the opening of the paraenetic section of the letter. Both a longer (V18) and shorter section (V19) close with an announcement of Paul's hope and

43. Note, however, that the younger system of capitulation places a division at 9.1.

44. J.D.G. Dunn, *Romans 9–16* (WBC, 38B; Dallas: Word Books, 1988), p. 525. Thomas H. Tobin views 8.31–9.5 as a transitional passage that contrasts Paul's expression of confidence in nothing separating us from God's love in 8.38-39 and the apostle's sorrow over his fellow Jews in 9.1-5 (*Paul's Rhetoric in its Contexts: The Argument of Romans* [Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004], pp. 322-26).

45. Robert Badenas, *Christ the End of the Law: Romans 10.4 in Pauline Perspective* (JSNTSup, 10; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985), p. 108.

46. It is more usual to commence a new paragraph at 10.5 (cf. *GNT*⁴, *NTG*²⁷, RSV).

47. Badenas, *Christ the End of the Law*, pp. 117-18. He says, 'Paul clearly states in Rom. 10.4 what he had only hinted in the previous verses, namely that Christ embodies that righteousness which the law promised, that righteousness which some Gentiles obtained through faith and which Israel rejected' (p. 118).

plan to visit Rome on his way to Spain (15.24, 28-29). The final chapter division comes at 16.17 (V21), after Paul's extended list of greetings.

First Corinthians

Several of the early chapters in Vaticanus coincide with Langton's divisions, namely, 2.1 (V23), 3.1 (V24) and 6.1 (V27). Where the capitulation differs from the one with which we are familiar, in both cases the opening of the chapter is presumably a topic sentence for that particular chapter: 'So let no one boast of men' (3.21 [V25]), and 'I urge you, then, be imitators of me' (4.16 [V26]). The topic of boasting was previously highlighted by the summarizing theological principle placed at the end of the first chapter in Vaticanus (1.31: 'therefore, as it is written, "Let him who boasts, boast of the Lord"').⁴⁸ In the case of V26, this way of dividing the text places 1 Corinthians 5 under the topic of imitating Paul, with Paul instructing the Corinthians to give up their arrogance and to pronounce judgment on the incestuous man, since that is what Paul himself has already done (5.3-4). V26 ends with the climactic mandate: 'Drive out the wicked person from among you' (5.13b),⁴⁹ and the division at 6.1 (V27) coincides with the switch to the topic of litigation between believers.

At 1 Cor. 7.1 (V28), Paul turns to matters about which the Corinthians wrote to him, as opposed to issues that he raises because of reports received about the church via 'Chloe's people' (1.11; 5.1), and the 'Now concerning [topic]' (Περὶ δέ) formula is found at 7.1 (V28), 25 (V29); 8.1 (V30), 12.1 (V36), 16.1 (V42) and 16.12. This formula has clearly influenced a number of chapter divisions. The editors of the RSV view the chapter division at 1 Cor. 11.1 as unfortunate and place this verse ('Be imitators of me, as I am of Christ') with what precedes rather than with what follows, as the close of the extended discussion of the issue of food offered to idols (8.1-11.1),⁵⁰ and in line with this understanding, the next chapter in Vaticanus commences at 11.2 (V34).⁵¹

48. According to John Paul Heil, 'The scriptural exhortation in 1.31...reverberates in its negative counterpart in 3.21' (*The Rhetorical Role of Scripture in 1 Corinthians* [Studies in Biblical Literature, 15; Atlanta: SBL, 2005], p. 45).

49. See Heil, *Rhetorical Role*, pp. 89-101.

50. So, too, for example, C.K. Barrett, *A Commentary of the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (BNTC; London: A. & C. Black, 2nd edn, 1971), pp. 245-46.

51. The younger system of capitulation starts a section at 11.3, where the specific

In 1 Corinthians 9 (= V31) the apostle sets forth his own behaviour as a model for the nature and limitations of Christian freedom (cf. 10.32). The chapter divisions at 9.1 (V31) and 10.1 (V32) may obscure for the reader the continuity in argument over the three chapters dealing with the vexed issue of food offered to idols (1 Corinthians 8–10). On the other hand, the final sentence of V30 can be understood as a summary of Paul's policy with regard to eating (8.13), and this is supported by the logical connector *διόπερ* (therefore) in 8.13a.⁵² The chapter division at 9.1 signals a new stage in the same argument, namely, apostolic rights and the requirement to sometimes give up one's rights for the sake of others. Likewise, in 10.1, the apostle turns to Old Testament examples as cautionary tales, and 10.14 (the start of V33) is made an important topic sentence ('Therefore, my beloved, shun the worship of idols'), with v. 15 onward giving reasons for this forceful prohibition. The next two chapters in Vaticanus (V34–35) cover two other matters where instruction is needed: head covering (11.2-17) and social abuses at the Lord's Supper (11.18-34).⁵³

Paul's instructions on spiritual gifts (1 Corinthians 12–14) are given a tripartite division by Langton, with the separate identity given to 1 Corinthians 13 in part responsible for the popular decontextualized understanding of it as the sentimental 'chapter about love' rather than it being understood as a highly critical response to the unloving behaviour of the Corinthians in their practice of the gifts.⁵⁴ Properly interpreted, 1 Corinthians 13 is a phase in a larger argument, as is clear from the summarizing command ('Make love your aim') and the resumptive imperative ('and earnestly desire the spiritual gifts') in 14.1 (an almost verbatim repetition of 12.31a). These features show the nature of 1 Corinthians 13 as a highly relevant digression in Paul's argument about the use of spiritual gifts.⁵⁵ Paul's teaching about love is no separate topic. In Vaticanus the chapter division (V36) extends without interruption from 12.1 to 14.4. We are allowed to disagree with the usual versification and

topic of head covering actually commences.

52. Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), p. 389.

53. However, the division at vv. 17/18 rather than at vv. 16/17 is an oddity.

54. Fee makes this complaint in *First Corinthians*, p. 626.

55. For the argument that ch. 13 is a non-Pauline interpolation, see Eric L. Titus, 'Did Paul Write 1 Corinthians 13?', *JBR* 27 (1959), pp. 299-302, and more fully, William O. Walker, Jr, *Interpolations in the Pauline Letters* (JSNTSup, 213; London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), ch. 7.

may prefer with many versions and commentators to align 12.31b ('and I will show you a still more excellent way') with ch. 13 that expounds the way of love.⁵⁶ At the very least, 12.31 is a transitional verse, connecting 1 Corinthians 13 with the wider argument about gifts.⁵⁷

Another case of inadequate versification is 14.33b ('As in all the churches of the saints') that appears to belong with what follows (cf. RSV, NIV, *GNT*⁴),⁵⁸ and this evaluation is supported by 14.36, which condemns the Corinthians for thinking they could go it alone and be out of step with other churches in their practices ('What! Did the word of God originate with you, or are you the only ones it has reached?'). First Corinthians 15.1 (V39) signals the new topic of the resurrection, which is another tradition about which they were in need of being reminded (cf. 11.2, 23). In the same way, 16.1 (V42) indicates that a new subject (their query about the collection) is to be discussed. It is difficult to discern a rationale for the divisions in Vaticanus at 15.21 (V40) and 15.44 (V41).

Second Corinthians

In 2 Corinthians, Langton's division at 2.1 is often viewed as inept and placed in modern versions in the midst of a paragraph (1.23–2.4) (e.g. RSV, *GNT*⁴, *NTG*²⁷), however not all commentators follow such an arrangement. Margaret Thrall exegetes 2.1–13 under the heading: 'The painful letter and its aftermath'.⁵⁹ It is only from 2.1 onward that Paul makes mention of sending a letter instead of visiting them in person. The capitulation of Vaticanus sees a new section of the letter beginning at 2.12 (V44 = A3), apparently written in response to news brought by Titus (cf. 7.6). The description of his anguished withdrawal from a promising evangelistic field in Troas (2.12–13) is taken up in the metaphor of Paul as a prisoner in a triumphal procession (2.14–17).⁶⁰ Second Corinthians 2.14–7.4 is commonly viewed by scholars as an almost self-contained

56. Note the division at 12.31b in the younger scheme of capitulation in Vaticanus and the duplicate placement of V37 at this point in the older scheme.

57. Anthony C. Thiselton prefers to see it in this way (*The First Epistle to the Corinthians* [NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000], p. 1024).

58. Fee is one who disputes this (*First Corinthians*, pp. 697, 698).

59. E.g. Margaret E. Thrall, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians: Introduction and Commentary on II Corinthians* (ICC; 2 vols.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1994), I, p. 163.

60. As noted by David R. Hall, *The Unity of the Corinthian Correspondence* (JSNTSup, 251; London: T. & T. Clark, 2003), p. 122.

defence of his apostolic ministry, though it is not necessary to view it as a separate letter.⁶¹ At 7.5 the apostle resumes the account about what happened in Macedonia, which was interrupted after 2.14b. Langton's chapter divisions at 3.1, 4.1, 5.1 and 6.1 fail to carry conviction, and none coincide with the divisions made in Vaticanus.⁶² The metaphor of the veil and the related topic of spiritual blindness (3.12-18) continue down at least as far as 4.4 (there is no paragraph break at 4.1 in the RSV). The effect of a chapter division in Vaticanus at 4.5 (V45) is to highlight what Paul says about his preaching of Christ, but the division in Alexandrinus at 4.7 (A6) is probably more convincing as a topic sentence for the section running down to 5.10 ('But we have this treasure in earthen vessels'), the topic being the fragility of physical existence.⁶³ At 5.11 (V46), Paul resumes his discussion of the character of the apostolic ministry.⁶⁴ Second Corinthians 7.1 goes with what precedes (6.14–7.1), as this section is about relations with unbelievers. A chapter division in Vaticanus starts at 6.14 (V47) and runs through to the end of ch. 7, and 7.2-4 picks up and completes the appeal made in 6.11-13. In Alexandrinus, a new section is marked at 7.2 (A8), but, as noted by Paul Barnett, 7.2-4 (especially v. 4) effects a transition to Paul's comfort and rejoicing due to the repentance of the Corinthians (7.5-16).⁶⁵

Second Corinthians 8.1 (V48) coincides with the new topic of the collection (chs. 8–9),⁶⁶ with the chapter division at 9.1 (V49) perhaps due to Paul's mention of (now) writing to them, suggesting a change in the line of argumentation on the same topic. Second Corinthians 10–13

61. See Hall, *Unity of the Corinthian Correspondence*, pp. 120-24, who rejects the theory that this section is an interpolation.

62. E.g. A.A. Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1915), p. 109: 'the division of the chapters [3 and 4] is unintelligently made'.

63. According to Paul Barnett, the general statement in 4.7 'should be seen as an introduction to the whole section 4.7–5.10' (*The Second Epistle to the Corinthians* [NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997], pp. 230-31). The younger scheme of capitulation in Vaticanus places the division at 4.7.

64. For the credibility of 5.11–6.13 as a literary unit, see Mark Gignilliat, *Paul and Isaiah's Servants: Paul's Theological Reading of Isaiah 40–66 in 2 Corinthians 5.14–6.10* (LNTS, 330; London: T. & T. Clark, 2007), pp. 55-57.

65. Barnett, *Second Corinthians*, pp. 358-64.

66. On the essential unity of these two chapters, see Ivar Vegge, *2 Corinthians: A Letter about Reconciliation* (WUNT, 2.239; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), pp. 234-42.

is an affirmation by Paul of his apostolic authority and has a strongly polemical tone. The chapter divisions in Vaticanus coincide with those of Langton at 10.1 (V50) and 11.1 (V51). The divisions at 11.1 and 11.16 (V52) highlight the theme of Paul playing the fool (sounded at the start of each section),⁶⁷ and the last verse of V52 clarifies Paul's true motive for speaking in this unusual way (12.19a), lest it be misinterpreted (his primary aim is not self-defence). As noted by Brian K. Peterson, Paul asks that his readers bear with a little foolishness (11.1), but this talk of foolishness only re-emerges with his 'Foolish Boast' starting in 11.16,⁶⁸ marking all of 11.2-15 as a digression that gives reasons why they should bear with his boasting. The topic that unites the final chapter (12.19b–13.14) (V53) is Paul's impending third visit to Corinth. All that he has written has aimed at their 'upbuilding' (οἰκοδομή) (12.19b), and he has written the present letter in the hope that his planned visit will not require a severe use of his authority, 'which the Lord has given [him] for building up (οἰκοδομή) and not for tearing down' (13.10).

Galatians

In his analysis of the structure of Galatians, G. Walter Hansen understands it as a rebuke-request letter,⁶⁹ with 1.6–4.11 being the 'rebuke' section and 4.12–6.10 the 'request' section. The opening of the second section basically coincides with the start of V57 at 4.12b (ἀδελφοί, δέομαι ὑμῶν).⁷⁰ The autobiographical section (1.13–2.21) serves the purpose of rebuking the Galatians for deserting the gospel, and Langton's chapter division at 2.1 draws attention to Paul's account of his second visit to Jerusalem that is given extensive coverage (2.1-10). It was at this meeting with those 'reputed to be pillars' (James, Cephas and John) that the validity of Paul's mission to the Gentiles was acknowledged. There is debate over

67. So, too, the younger scheme of division in Vaticanus places a division at 12.11 ('I have been a fool!').

68. Brian K. Peterson, *Eloquence and the Proclamation of the Gospel in Corinth* (SBLDS, 163; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), p. 105.

69. G. Walter Hansen, *Abraham in Galatians: Epistolary and Rhetorical Contexts* (JSNTSup, 29; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989), chs. 1–3 (see the outline of his analysis on pp. 53-54).

70. For a similar bipartite division, see Nils A. Dahl, 'Paul's Letter to the Galatians: Epistolary Genre, Content and Structure', in Mark D. Nanos (ed.), *The Galatians Debate: Contemporary Issues in Rhetorical and Historical Interpretation* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2002), pp. 117-42.

where Paul's rebuke and correction of Cephas (= Peter) comes to an end and passes into his general exposition of the gospel principle at stake (the RSV confines Paul's speech to just one verse [2.14]). Galatians 3.1 with its direct address to the erring Galatians ('O foolish Galatians') certainly marks its furthest possible limit.⁷¹ Galatians 3.1 comes after Paul has defended his apostleship (and his gospel) as given to him 'through a revelation of Jesus Christ' (1.12; cf. 1.1). There is no obvious break in the train of thought at 4.1, seeing that the following verses continue the theme of the believer as an 'heir' (cf. 3.29).

It is not likely to be coincidental that at or near the end of the first three chapters of the letter as divided in Vaticanus (V54–56) the same theme recurs, namely, Paul's concern that his ministry to the Galatians (and to other Gentiles) be not 'in vain' (note 2.2-3 [εἰς κενόν]; 3.4 [εἰκῆ]; 4.11 [εἰκῆ]). The letter was presumably written in an attempt to ensure that his ministry among them was not in vain.⁷² This way of dividing the material (though not the only credible way of doing so), contains an exegetical insight in that it highlights a recurring theme in the letter and possibly throws light upon the apostle's purpose in writing to the erring Galatians.

Galatians 5.1 follows the allegory of Sarah and Hagar (4.21-31) as a kind of motto, summing up and applying the lesson of the preceding allegory in non-allegorical language, so that it is possibly the final verse in its section.⁷³ The self-identification of the writer ('I Paul') and his appeal to the addressees in 5.2 favours the view that this verse commences a new section (as in *GNT*⁴ and Alexandrinus [A10]). On the other hand, a hortatory tone unites 5.1–6.10,⁷⁴ and Langton's chapter division would seem to favour such an evaluation. The placement of a chapter division in Vaticanus at 5.16 (V58) is perhaps triggered by the saying formula (λέγω δέ) that calls attention to what follows, in this case an important statement about walking in the Spirit, that is elaborated on and applied

71. Hansen designates it a transitional use of the vocative (*Abraham in Galatians*, p. 53).

72. James D.G. Dunn, *The Epistle to the Galatians* (BNTC; London: A. & C. Black, 1993), p. 157, commenting on 3.4, states: 'The "in vain, to no avail", as in iv.11 and the equivalent in ii.2, indicates a real concern on Paul's part that his work in Galatia could still "come to nothing" (REB)'.

73. This is the view of F.F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Exeter: Paternoster, 1982), p. 226. The RSV and NIV make 5.1 a (transitional?) paragraph on its own.

74. Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), pp. 253-55.

to his readers in 5.17–6.10.⁷⁵ This way of dividing the text coincides with the end of the apostle's exposition of the law and Christian freedom (4.21–5.15) and the change of focus to walking by the Spirit (5.16–6.10). Langton's division at 6.1 is apparently triggered by the renewed address to the readers ('Brethren'), which is a regular marker of a new paragraph in Pauline letters (cf. 1.11; 3.15; 4.12b, 28, 31) but not necessarily of a new major section. In Vaticanus, there is a paragraph break at 6.1 (marked by a raised dot and *paragraphos*), but no chapter division.⁷⁶ In 6.1 Paul turns from general exhortation to more specific situations, but without entirely leaving behind generalities.

Ephesians

Langton's chapter division at 2.1 comes at the end of a long thanksgiving and intercession (1.15-23). The alternative division in Vaticanus at 2.8 (= V71) coincides with a new sentence,⁷⁷ and the close of the first chapter (V70) (2.7) echoes the theme with which the chapter commenced, the believer's heavenly blessings in Christ (cf. 1.3). The next major division in Ephesians is found at 4.1 (= V72), and the editors of the RSV leave a blank line before it. At this point the tenor of the letter changes from doctrinal teaching (though including extensive liturgical passages) to paraenesis. This produces a basic two-part division of the letter into doctrine (chs. 1–3) and ethics (chs. 4–6), though it would be a grave misunderstanding of Pauline thought to think that doctrine and ethics (the indicative and the imperative) could be neatly separated,⁷⁸ as 4.1 makes immediately clear, with the apostle urging his readers 'to lead a life worthy of the calling to which [they] have been called'. The logical connector in the same verse ('therefore' [οὖν]) makes the same point,⁷⁹ and is found a number of times at the beginning of the hortatory second parts of Pauline letters (cf. Rom. 12.1; 1 Thess. 4.1; Col. 2.12 or 3.5).

75. See Richard N. Longenecker, *Galatians* (WBC, 41; Dallas: Word Books, 1990), p. 244.

76. Note, however, that Mai marks Gal. 6.1 as V59.

77. Ernest Best, *Ephesians* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1998), p. 225.

78. See Robert C. Tannehill, *Dying and Rising with Christ: A Study in Pauline Theology* (BZNW, 32; Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1967), especially his comments on p. 78; and William D. Dennison, 'Indicative and Imperative: The Basic Structure of Pauline Ethics', *CTJ* 14 (1979), pp. 55-78.

79. See Markus Barth, *Ephesians: Translation and Commentary on Chapters 4–6* (AB, 34A; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1960), p. 426.

The apostolic writer's self-identification and self-description in 4.1 ('I therefore, a prisoner for the Lord') (cf. 3.1) also supports the notion that this is a major point of transition in the letter.

Ephesians 5.21 ('Be subject to one another out of reverence for Christ') provides a heading for the *Haustafel* that follows,⁸⁰ but in Vaticanus the chapter division is placed earlier at 5.15 (V74). This chapter continues as far as 6.9 and contains instructions about Christian behaviour.⁸¹ The opening verse (5.15) uses the metaphor of the ethical 'walk' ('Look carefully then how you walk'), with this being the final use of what is a key word in the letter (περιπατέω, found at 2.2, 10; 4.1, 17; 5.2, 8, 15). The capitulation in Vaticanus effectively highlights this theme, for the occurrence of this term coincides with several of the chapter divisions (4.1, 17; 5.15 [V72–74]).⁸² In this way, the scheme of division stresses the ethical implications of the plan of salvation as outlined by the apostle. In the *Haustafel*, areas of voluntary subjection are specified within the husband–wife relationship (5.22–33), the parent–child relationship (6.1–4) and the master–slave relationship (6.5–9). A new section is signalled by the adverbial phrase τοῦ λοιποῦ ('finally') (6.10a) (= V75) and by the abrupt change in subject to that of 'the whole armour of God'. Langton's chapter division at 6.1 can scarcely be justified. By way of contrast, Vaticanus does not break into the household code and nominates 6.10 as the start of the final chapter in the letter.⁸³

Philippians

In Philippians, Paul opens the body of the letter with a discussion of his present imprisonment (1.12–26).⁸⁴ Philippians 1.27–4.3 is the next major literary unit, indicated by the *inclusio* of 1.27 and 3.20–4.3. The church community was disturbed by rivalries and disputes (1.27–30),

80. The younger scheme of capitulation in Vaticanus places a division at 5.22.

81. Peter T. O'Brien views 5.15–6.9 as a unit, putting it under the heading: 'Be careful how you live: generally and within the Christian household' (*The Letter to the Ephesians* [Pillar New Testament Commentaries; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999], p. 378).

82. Also, 2.10 is close to the start of the second chapter division at 2.8 (V71).

83. The paragraph breaks in Sinaiticus are at Eph. 5.22, 25, 28b, 32; 6.1, 4, 5, 9, 10, and in Alexandrinus they are found at 5.22, 25, 31; 6.1, 5, 9, 10.

84. For this and what follows I acknowledge my substantial dependence upon David E. Garland, 'The Composition and Unity of Philippians: Some Neglected Literary Factors', *NovT* 27 (1985), pp. 141–73.

and what follows is an exhortation to humility and self-abnegation. The apostle provides four positive examples of the selfless attitude that he wants the community to emulate, namely, the examples of Jesus (2.1-11), Paul himself (2.12-18), Timothy (2.19-24) and Epaphroditus (2.25-30). Langton's division at 2.1 highlights the first (and supreme) example of Jesus himself (2.1-11), and the four examples are encompassed within the boundaries of Philippians 2. The positioning of 2.1-11 at the end of the first chapter in Vaticanus (its second chapter for Philippians starting with 2.12 [= V77]), has the same effect of highlighting the peerless example of humility in the person of Jesus.

Philippians 3.1 (= V78) signals the beginning of the next phase of the argument,⁸⁵ with 3.1-11 presenting the negative example of Jewish boasting. There is not much difference if we, like Jeffrey T. Reed, view the preceding section as ending with and including 3.1.⁸⁶ Properly understood, βλέπετε in 3.2 ('consider, take note of [the dogs]'; cf. RSV) holds up the Judaizers for consideration as a cautionary example.⁸⁷ Paul has abandoned his Jewish boasts, and even as a Christian makes no claims to superiority (3.12-16). Paul comes to the culmination of his argument in 4.1-3 (signalled by ὥστε ['Therefore'] in 4.1a), and, in Vaticanus, these verses are shown to be a climax by their placement at the end of its third chapter in the letter (V78). All leads up to the entreaty to Syntyche and Euodia 'to agree in the Lord' (4.2). For this reason, the final chapter division in Vaticanus at 4.4 (V79) is to be preferred to the one with which we are more familiar (4.1).

Colossians

The first division in Colossians in Vaticanus is at 1.12 (V81), at the transition from intercession back to thanksgiving (1.12a: '[with joy,] giving thanks...'). The capitulation is not supported by any evidence of a paragraph division other than a *paragraphos*. A division at this juncture

85. Duane F. Watson views 3.1 as a transitional verse ('A Rhetorical Analysis of Philippians and its Implications for the Unity Question', *NovT* 30 [1988], pp. 57-88, esp. p. 86).

86. Jeffrey T. Reed, *A Discourse Analysis of Philippians: Method and Rhetoric in the Debate over Literary Integrity* (JSNTSup, 136; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), pp. 219-28.

87. See, for example, Marvin R. Vincent, *Epistles to the Philippians and to Philemon* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1897), p. 92.

highlights what is in fact, for the Pauline epistles, an unprecedented return to thanksgiving after intercession.⁸⁸ In 2.6, Paul begins his direct interaction with the ‘philosophy’ (φιλοσοφία) of the false teachers,⁸⁹ and Vaticanus makes this verse the beginning of its third chapter for Colossians (V82). Colossians 2.6-7 summarize much of the argument up to this point and lays the foundation for the attack on the Colossian heresy that immediately follows (the editors of the RSV place a blank line after 2.7 and a division is made at this point in the younger scheme of capitulation in Vaticanus). Langton’s chapter division at 2.1 is triggered by Paul’s direct address to his readers and the use of the disclosure formula ‘For I want you to know’, but the theme of the apostle’s ‘striving’ (ἀγωνιζόμενος) continues from 1.29, so that 2.1 represents only a minor turn in the argument.

As noted by Ian K. Smith,⁹⁰ most scholarly attempts at defining the nature of the aberrant philosophy merely deal with chs. 1–2, focusing primarily on 2.8-23. Smith shows that the paraenesis of the letter also relates directly to the challenge represented by the heresy. A chapter division at 3.1 (= V83) at first appears inappropriate in that 3.1-4 (‘If then you have been raised with Christ’) matches and is the inverse of 2.20-23 (‘If with Christ you died’), but there is now no mention of the false teaching of the heretics, though the passage from 3.1 onward presumably still has the heresy in view even if less obviously.⁹¹ Colossians 3.1-4 is, in fact, a bridge section, marking the transition to the hortatory section of the letter. The fourth chapter division for Colossians in Vaticanus (V83) ends at 3.15 with the words ‘and be thankful’. Langton’s division at 4.1 is untenable, for it breaks into the household code (*Haustafel*) of 3.18–4.1, wherein Paul gives rules to wives (3.18), husbands (3.19), children (3.20), fathers (3.21), slaves (3.22-25) and masters (4.1).⁹² The final chapter division for Colossians in Vaticanus at 4.2 (V85) is better

88. Noted by Peter T. O’Brien, *Colossians, Philemon* (WBC, 44; Waco, TX: Word Books, 1982), p. 63.

89. O’Brien, *Colossians, Philemon*, p. 102. As noted by E. Lohse, *Colossians and Philemon* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), p. 92, the connective particle ‘then’ (οὖν) at v. 6a signals a transition and the start of a new section.

90. Ian K. Smith, *Heavenly Perspective: A Study of the Apostle Paul’s Response to a Jewish Mystical Movement at Colossae* (LNTS, 326; London: T. & T. Clark, 2006).

91. See Smith, *Heavenly Perspective*, pp. 173-84, for the relation of 3.1-4 to 2.6-23.

92. A division is made at 3.18 in the younger scheme of capitulation in Vaticanus.

placed.⁹³ Colossians 4.2-6 gives final general admonitions and 4.2 ('with thanksgiving') recalls the opening thanksgiving (1.3-8) and appeals for the Colossians themselves to be thankful (cf. 1.12; 2.7; 3.15-17).⁹⁴ This is an improvement on the accustomed division at 4.1. Then 4.7-18 is an epistolary postscript, occupied with final greetings and instructions about coworkers.

The perception of ancient readers represented by the divisions of Vaticanus draws attention to and highlights the theme of thanksgiving in the letter and the significance of this theme is noted by P.T. O'Brien ('Thanksgiving plays an important role in the Epistle to the Colossians').⁹⁵

1 Thessalonians

In 1 Thess. 1.2-3 there is the question of the placement of the Greek adverb ἀδιαλείπτως ('constantly') with the usual versification placing it in v. 2, but the punctuation provided by the *GNT*⁴ and *NTG*²⁷ editors suggests that it be connected with v. 3. A break in Vaticanus (indicated only by a raised dot) likewise places ἀδιαλείπτως with what follows.⁹⁶ In Vaticanus, the second chapter starts at 2.13 (V87), the commencement of Paul's second thanksgiving (2.13-16), a thanksgiving that repeats some of the themes of the first thanksgiving (e.g. their reception of the word in 2.12-13; cf. 1.5-6). This division in Vaticanus shows a perception of the importance of the thanksgivings in the structuring of the first half of the letter (1.2-10; 2.13-16; 3.9-10).⁹⁷ A division at 2.17 (= A2) is to be preferred to 3.1, for 2.17 no longer reminiscences of the original visit to Thessalonica (1.2–2.16) but a return visit (2.17–3.13) is the concern,

93. The paragraph breaks in Sinaiticus are at Col. 3.18, 19, 20, 21, 22; 4.1, 2, coinciding with the different household members addressed, and in Alexandrinus the breaks occur at 3.16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24b and 4.1.

94. These connections are noted by Walter I. Wilson, *The Hope of Glory: Education and Exhortation in the Epistle to the Colossians* (NovTSup, 88; Leiden: Brill, 1997), pp. 249, 251.

95. P.T. O'Brien, *Introductory Thanksgivings in the Letters of Paul* (NovTSup, 49; Leiden: Brill, 1977), pp. 62-67, esp. p. 62.

96. See the brief discussion in F.F. Bruce, *1 and 2 Thessalonians* (WBC, 45; Waco, TX: Word Books, 1982), p. 11.

97. This insight is confirmed by Jan Lambrecht, 'Thanksgivings in 1 Thessalonians 1–3', in Karl P. Donfried and Johannes Beutler (eds.), *The Thessalonians Debate: Methodological Discord or Methodological Synthesis?* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), pp. 135-62.

with Timothy sent to them and news now brought back by him. Langton's third chapter closes with a prayer-wish for the Thessalonian believers (3.11-13). These three verses close the preceding unit and function as a bridge, for the themes of the prayer-wish (love, holiness, the Lord's coming) become the topics of the exhortations that immediately follow.⁹⁸

First Thessalonians 4.1 (V88 = A4) begins a new section ('finally') (Λοιπὸν) in which there are apostolic instructions concerning a number of vital topics: holiness (4.1-8), brotherly love (4.9-12), the Lord's coming (4.13-5.11) and final exhortations (5.12-22). Langton's capitulation at 5.1 breaks into the sequence of topics, and the introductory formula at 5.1a (= A6) ('Now concerning [Περὶ δέ] the times and the seasons' [my translation]) is similar to the opening of earlier subsections at 4.9, 13 (both of which have *περί* plus genitive). Langton's division has the effect of elevating the importance of the topic of the timing of 'the Day of the Lord' compared to the other issues discussed. It is not clear that Paul himself would label this as the major issue addressed; however, it is true that particular emphasis is placed upon it if the subsection is viewed as covering all of 5.1-11, making it the longest subsection of exhortation (cf. 1.10; 3.13). The chapter division in Vaticanus at 5.5 (V89), which only has a raised dot to otherwise indicate a break in the text, has the effect of highlighting what is said in 5.4 and 5 (the first as the summarizing verse of a section, and the second as the topic sentence of a new section), suggesting that the main point of Paul's instructions about the times and seasons is, in fact, to reassure his readers 'that they should not dread sudden destruction on the Day of the Lord'.⁹⁹

Second Thessalonians

The chapter division in Vaticanus at 2.1 (V91) comes after Paul's thanksgiving (1.3-4), encouragement (1.5-10) and prayer-report (1.11-12), and coincides with the announcement of the major topic dealt with in the short letter (2.1),¹⁰⁰ namely, the timing and signs of 'the coming of the

98. Ben Witherington III, *1 and 2 Thessalonians: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), p. 101.

99. Colin R. Nicholl, *From Hope to Despair in Thessalonica: Situating 1 and 2 Thessalonians* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), p. 68. Nicholl concludes that the main pastoral need of the Thessalonian believers was reassurance, not the dampening of irresponsible eschatological enthusiasm.

100. M.J.J. Menken, 'The Structure of 2 Thessalonians', in Raymond F. Collins,

Lord Jesus and our assembling to meet him'. Second Thessalonians 2.1-12 is a refutation of the heretical eschatology that threatens to trouble the Thessalonians.¹⁰¹ Langton's second chapter ends with another sequence of thanksgiving (2.13-14), encouragement (2.15) and prayer-wish (2.16-17), but Vaticanus closes the chapter begun at 2.1 with v. 14. As noted by Menken, 2.13-14 takes up the topic announced at the beginning of the chapter (2.1), albeit using different terminology: God chose them, 'so that [they] may obtain the glory (δόξης) of the Lord Jesus Christ',¹⁰² so that 2.1-14 is a credible division (supported by this *inclusio*). In fact, the capitulation in Vaticanus highlights the 'glory' theme that runs through the letter: at the end of the first chapter, Paul states that the aim of his prayer is the mutual glorification (ἐνδοξασθῆ) of the Lord Jesus and the Thessalonian believers (1.12); the close of the second chapter has already been noted (2.14); and at the opening of the fourth chapter in Vaticanus, the aim of the prayer that Paul requests from his readers is that the word of the Lord may be 'glorified' (RSV: 'triumph' [δοξάζηται]).

A short chapter in Vaticanus (V92) unites the second encouragement and prayer-wish of the letter (2.15-17). The last chapter starts at 3.1 (V93 = A4), with 'finally' (τὸ λοιπόν) signalling that the closing section of the letter begins at this point, and the section commences with a request for prayer (3.1-2) that is a typical part of the final section of a letter. The specific warnings against idleness in 3.6-15 are different from the general exhortations of 3.1-5, but the passage starting at v. 6 need not be viewed as a major new section,¹⁰³ for Paul's confidence that his readers 'will do the things which we command' (3.4) is put to the test with a specific command (3.6: 'Now we command you' [παραγγέλλομεν in both cases]).

Hebrews

In his discussion of the structure of Hebrews, George H. Guthrie includes brief mention (one paragraph) of the *kephalaia*, stating (incorrectly) that

The Thessalonian Correspondence (Leuven: Leuven University Press/Uitgeverij Peeters, 1990), pp. 373-82.

101. Witherington, *1 and 2 Thessalonians*, p. 206.

102. Menken, 'Structure of 2 Thessalonians', p. 377.

103. M.J.J. Menken, *2 Thessalonians* (New Testament Readings; London: Routledge, 1994), p. 73; Frank Witt Hughes, *Early Christian Rhetoric and 2 Thessalonians* (JSNTSup, 30; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989), pp. 63-66.

they are ‘the earliest extant witness to formal divisions in the text of Hebrews’.¹⁰⁴ Of the 22 *kephalaia* for Hebrews,¹⁰⁵ only two coincide with the (earlier) divisions in Vaticanus, namely 3.1 and 9.11. The first break in Hebrews (V60) comes at 3.1, and Hebrews 1 and 2 are united by the theme of the status of Jesus relative to the angels: 1.5-14 (superior to the angels), 2.1-4 (an exhortation that builds on the preceding argument, note 2.2: ‘if the message declared by angels...’) and 2.5-18 (at the incarnation he was ‘made lower than the angels’). The effect on the reader is to assist in the recognition that the material in Hebrews 1–2 (= V59) is thematically unified.¹⁰⁶ Near the close of the first division is the description of Jesus as ‘a merciful and faithful high priest’ (2.17), and the following division (V60) starts with the thematic statement in 3.1: ‘consider Jesus, the apostle and high priest of our confession’. The next mention of his high priesthood in Hebrews comes at the start of the third chapter (V61), namely, at 4.14 (‘we have a great high priest’).¹⁰⁷ The editors of the RSV leave a blank line before 3.1 and 4.14. The last chapter division in the extant portion of Hebrews in Vaticanus (V64) is at 9.11 and highlights the same theme of Christ as high priest. The effect of these three chapter divisions in Vaticanus is to place a special focus on this high priesthood. This is, indeed, an important theme in Hebrews, and yet it is not the only theme that might have been so highlighted.

The second chapter in Hebrews (V60) builds on the description of Jesus as ‘faithful’ in 2.17 and contrasts the faithful ‘son’ with Moses, who was faithful as ‘a servant’ in God’s house (3.1–4.13).¹⁰⁸ Langton’s division at 4.1 is disruptive, seeing that the theme of ‘rest’ and the exhortation to be faithful continue as far as 4.13.¹⁰⁹ The readers are exhorted to be

104. George H. Guthrie, *The Structure of Hebrews: A Text-Linguistic Analysis* (NovTSup, 73; Leiden: Brill, 1994), p. 3.

105. For the *kephalaia* (and the later *titloi* assigned to them), see von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, I, Part 1, pp. 468-69.

106. Cf. David A. deSilva, *Perseverance in Gratitude: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on the Epistle ‘to the Hebrews’* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), p. 72.

107. As noted by Guthrie, *Structure of Hebrews*, p. 78, four similar terms are found in 3.1 and 4.14, namely, ‘Jesus’, ‘high priest’, ‘heaven(ly)’ and ‘confession’.

108. James Swetnam, ‘Form and Content in Hebrews 1–6’, *Bib* 53 (1972), pp. 368-85.

109. Paul David Landgraf, ‘The Structure of Hebrews: A Word of Exhortation in Light of the Day of Atonement’, in Richard Bauckham *et al.* (eds.), *A Cloud of Witnesses: The Theology of Hebrews in its Ancient Contexts* (LNTS, 387; London: T. & T. Clark, 2008), pp. 19-27 (20); Steve Stanley, ‘The Structure of Hebrews from

faithful, with the exhortation supported by the cautionary example of the unbelieving wilderness generation. The use of Psalm 95 in Hebrews is confined to this chapter in Vaticanus.

Langton's chapter division at 6.1 (like those at 2.1, 3.1, 4.1) accentuates the presence of hortatory material in Hebrews. The letter can be viewed as consisting of alternating sections of doctrine and exhortation.¹¹⁰ The most important feature of Hebrews' literary structure is the interchange (and interrelation) of dogmatic and paraenetic sections. Doctrine is put to the service of exhortation and the exhortation is rooted in the doctrine. Given the close relation of these two, Vanhoye can perhaps be faulted in making too hard and fast a distinction between doctrine and paraenesis.¹¹¹ In an important sense the whole of the letter is exhortation (note 13.22), namely, it is a homily in written form whose doctrinal arguments serve this practical end.¹¹²

There is a marked topic shift at 4.14,¹¹³ so that the theme of the third chapter in Vaticanus (V61) (4.14–6.8) is the high priesthood of Jesus and the need for believers to hold fast (4.14: 'let us hold fast our confession'). Hebrews 4.14 is a more credible starting point for the next section than Langton's chapter division three verses later at 5.1. This section concerns Jesus as high priest after the order of Melchizedek, a theme that runs through to the end of Hebrews 7 (7.28). A division at 6.1 (the RSV editors place a blank line before it) is not all that convincing.¹¹⁴ The next chapter division in Vaticanus (V62) highlights the confidence of the writer in the ultimate salvation of his readers (6.9). As noted by Guthrie, 6.9-12 follows the severe warnings of 6.1-8 with mitigation, expressing confidence in the readers.¹¹⁵ Hebrews 7.1 returns to the theme of the Son as a high priest 'after the order of Melchizedek' (that was broken off after 5.10) and the argument is based on Ps. 110.4 (quoted in 5.6; 7.17, 21).¹¹⁶

Three Perspectives', *TynBul* 45.2 (1994), pp. 245-71 (265-66).

110. There have been many adaptations of the basic schema worked out by Albert Vanhoye, *La structure littéraire de l'Épître aux Hébreux* (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1963).

111. Barnabas Lindars, 'The Rhetorical Structure of Hebrews', *NTS* 35 (1989), pp. 382-406 (392 n. 2).

112. William L. Lane, *Hebrews 9–13* (WBC, 47B; Dallas: Word Books, 1991), p. 568.

113. Guthrie, *Structure of Hebrews*, p. 68.

114. The nearest *kephalaia* in Alexandrinus are at 5.11 (A7) and 6.13 (A8).

115. Guthrie, *Structure of Hebrews*, p. 70.

116. George B. Caird, 'The Exegetical Method of the Epistle to the Hebrews',

The perfection theme in Hebrews is sounded in 7.19,¹¹⁷ being the verse that commences V63. This chapter begins with the words, ‘for the law made nothing perfect (ἐτελείωσεν)’ (7.19), and the section ends at 9.9-10, where it is stated that the sacrifices under the old covenant ‘cannot perfect (τελειῶσαι) the conscience of the worshipper’ (9.9-10) (*inclusio*). Section V62 begins with an expression of confidence by the author of the ‘better things (κρείσσων) that belong to salvation’ (6.9), and the next section (V63) appears to be triggered by mention of the ‘better hope’ (7.19), so that these divisions reflect another recurring motif in Hebrews (cf. 7.22 ‘better covenant’; 8.6 ‘better promises’; 9.23 ‘better sacrifices’; 10.34 ‘a better possession’; 11.16 ‘a better country’ etc.). Hebrews 8–10 is an argument based on the new covenant prophecy of Jer. 31.31-34, of which there is full citation in Heb. 8.8-12 and a second, abbreviated citation in 10.16-17 (= Jer 31.33-34).¹¹⁸ It is within this wider section that the text of Vaticanus breaks off at 9.14a. There is no chapter break in Vaticanus at 8.1. By contrast, the next chapter (V64) commences at 9.11 and outlines the better arrangements brought about through Christ.¹¹⁹

Conclusions

I have investigated the effects of a textual break, making use of an interpretative grid of four possible effects (functions), namely to separate or join material, and to highlight or downplay features of the text, and I have provided multiple examples of each effect (function) through an examination of the capitulation in the Pauline corpus of Vaticanus.

The functions of a textual break in separating or joining material at times provide the modern reader with access to ancient exegetical insights; for

CJT 5 (1959), pp. 44-51, esp. p. 48. Caird views the treatment of Melchizedek as solely concerned with the exegesis of Psalm 110 (and to that end the author draws upon Genesis 14). This view has been recently supported by Gareth Lee Cockerill, ‘Melchizedek without Speculation: Hebrews 7.1-25 and Genesis 14.17-24’, in Bauckham *et al.* (eds.), *A Cloud of Witnesses*, pp. 128-44.

117. For an exposition of this theme, see David Peterson, *Hebrews and Perfection: An Examination of the Concept of Perfection in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (SNTSMS, 47; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982). The alternative division at 7.11 in the younger scheme of capitulation in Vaticanus also highlights this theme.

118. See David Peterson, ‘The Prophecy of the New Covenant in the Argument of Hebrews’, *RTR* 38 (1979), pp. 74-81.

119. Louis Dussaut, *Synopse structurelle de l’Épître aux Hébreux: Approche d’analyse structurelle* (Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1981), pp. 73-79.

example, there is no chapter division at Rom. 8.1 in Vaticanus, so that Paul's discussion of the law in Romans 7 is not isolated from his teaching about life in the Spirit. This assists the reader to notice that Rom. 8.1-11 provides a resolution to the dilemma concerning the keeping of the law portrayed in 7.13-25 in one thematically unified section (V9). In the same way, the lack of a chapter division in Vaticanus at Rom. 9.1 shows a recognition of the logical connection of 9.1-5 with what is written in the verses that precede (8.28-39) since they are part of the same chapter (V11). First Corinthians 13 is shown to be a phase in a larger argument, rather than offering teaching about love as a discrete topic, for in Vaticanus, the chapter division (V36) extends without interruption from 12.1 to 14.4. This way of dividing the material connects what 1 Corinthians 13 says about love with the wider argument about gifts and suggests that it corrects the original recipients' loveless use of the gifts whose divine purpose was the mutual upbuilding of believers.

So too, different themes are highlighted or downplayed according to where divisions are placed in the text. For example, the placement of the third chapter in Romans at 2.12 (V3) suggests that 2.11 summarizes the opening argument of the letter ('For God shows no partiality') and also makes the first sentence of the next chapter (2.12) a statement of theme for the new chapter. In line with this, Jouette Bassler has demonstrated the importance of the theme of divine impartiality in the opening chapters of this Pauline epistle. Likewise, the recurring themes of the ethical 'walk' (Ephesians), thanksgiving (Colossians) and the high priesthood of Christ (Hebrews) are highlighted by the divisions in the respective letters.

This study has sought to demonstrate that the study of divisions in ancient texts has the potential of generating new exegetical insights (or recovering old ones long forgotten) and of helping us to scrutinize and re-evaluate contemporary exegetical and homiletical practice.