

# Pamphilus the Librarian and the Institutional Legacy of Origen's Library in Caesarea

by Paul Hartog

**ABSTRACT** Pamphilus of Caesarea Maritima (who died around 310) managed the Caesarean library that was rooted in the book collection of Origen. Pamphilus's significant library rivaled other collections of late antiquity, causing several modern scholars (cf. Carriker, Grafton, Williams, and Vleeschauwer) to investigate the nature and contents of his book collection. This article, however, will initially focus upon the roles and responsibilities of Pamphilus as a librarian, rather than upon the nature and contents of his library. Although scholarly accounts of the history of librarianship have not properly recognized Pamphilus's dedicated librarianship, he and his Caesarean successors fulfilled seven roles that have persisted in librarianship. With this initial examination in hand, the essay will secondarily draw some conclusions regarding the sustained institutional legacy of Origen (beyond his literary, philological, exegetical, and theological legacies). Viewed through this institutional legacy, Pamphilus, Eusebius, Constantine, and Jerome appear in a new light.

Origen was an author, linguist, teacher, and theologian, but he was also a librarian. The thirty-thousand-volume Caesarean library that eventually grew out of his private collection endured throughout late antiquity (McGuckin 2004, 16). After Origen's death, Pamphilus of Caesarea curated and developed the collection. Gregory Thaumaturgus recounted some of the holdings, and Eusebius's *Life of Pamphilus* shared a catalog list (Gregory Thaumaturgus, *Panegyric to Origen* 13; cf. Grafton and Williams 2006, 68; Cadiou 1936, 478). Jerome (*On Illustrious Men* 113.1) still referred to the *bibliotheca Origenis et Pamphili*, named after both the collection's creator (Origen) and developer (Pamphilus).<sup>1</sup>

Although the Caesarean library rivaled other collections of late antiquity, modern scholarship has often overlooked or downplayed Pamphilus's dedicated work of librarianship. For example, Levine's (1975, 113–14) study of Caesarea under Roman rule highlights "the prominence and prolific literary activity of two church fathers," as "the presence of Origen and Eusebius drew students and scholars to the city." Such statements highlight the dual Caesarean presence of Origen and Eusebius, but neglect the third yet significant role of Pamphilus.<sup>2</sup>

A similar twofold emphasis upon Origen and Eusebius, implicitly downplaying the role of Pamphilus, appears in the title of a noteworthy work by Grafton and Williams (2006): *Christianity and the Transformation of the Book: Origen, Eusebius, and the Library of Caesarea*. To be sure, despite the narrowed reference to Origen and Eusebius alone in its title, the book does bring Pamphilus into the broader discussion. Within their first chapter, Grafton and Williams cite Johannes Trithemius' *In Praise of Scribes*, printed in the 1490s, which claimed the threefold heritage of Origen, Pamphilus, and Eusebius.<sup>3</sup> Grafton and Williams's last chapter commences with this statement: "Origen, Pamphilus, and Eusebius, we have argued, forged their innovations in producing and designing works of Christian learning in different historical contexts" (233).<sup>4</sup> Nevertheless, the final sentence of the monograph declares, "In many respects, we are still the heirs of Origen and Eusebius" (243). As in the volume's title, Pamphilus has faded from mention. By contrast, I wish to embed Pamphilus

firmly into the Caesarean library's legacy. In order to do so, I will examine specific librarian roles that Pamphilus fulfilled. I will then conclude with some final reflections upon the institutional legacy of Origen's Caesarean library.

Library and information science (LIS) literature examining the history of the profession has not properly recognized Pamphilus or his Caesarean collection. For example, Pamphilus does not receive any "hits" in the Library Literature & Information Science Index (LLISI), in the Library & Information Science Source database (LISS), or in the Library, Information Science & Technology Abstracts database (LISTA). This present investigation will fill this astounding research gap by describing how Pamphilus fulfilled seven roles that parallel important responsibilities within academic librarianship today. Through these seven roles as a librarian, Pamphilus continued the institutional legacy of Origen and greatly influenced succeeding generations of Christian scholars in subtle but significant ways.

### **PAMPHILUS AND HIS LIBRARY**

Pamphilus was born in Berytus (Beirut) of a noble family, and he studied in Alexandria's Didaskaleion under Pierius, who was also known as "the little" or "the younger" Origen (Photius, *Library* 118; cf. Schaff and Wace (1979), 321 n. 42; Soligniac 1984, 150–4). Eusebius of Caesarea (*Martyrs of Palestine* 11.2) described Pamphilus as "a man who through his entire life was celebrated for every virtue, for renouncing and despising the world, for sharing his possessions with the needy, for contempt of earthly hopes, and for philosophic deportment and exercise."<sup>5</sup> In 307, Pamphilus was imprisoned during an intensified persecution of Palestinian Christians under the governor Urbanus (during the imperial reign of Maximinus Daia), and he was martyred around 310 by decapitation (Eusebius, *Martyrs of Palestine* 7; Jerome, *On Illustrious Men* 75.4; cf. Amacker and Junod 2002, vol. 1, 77–8).

Pamphilus's "life-long dedication was the amassing of a library of scope and quality" (Casson 2001, 139), and he eventually assembled a collection of around 30,000 volumes (*triginta volumina milia*) (Isidore of Seville, *Etymologies* 6.6.1; cf. Humphreys 1994, 138).<sup>6</sup> Jerome (*On Illustrious Men* 75; cf. Isidore of Seville, *Etymologies* 6.6.1) described Pamphilus as being "on fire with such love" for his "sacred library."<sup>7</sup>

The library of Caesarea probably inherited most of its earliest volumes from Origen, who died in 251 of complications resulting from injuries suffered during the Decian persecution (Staikos 2007, 107; cf. Crouzel 1989, 33–6; Frenschkowski 2006, 81). An original core of Origen's library probably came from or was copied from his hometown of Alexandria, a city famous for its repositories of texts (Jacob 2003, 13–22).<sup>8</sup> While Origen began his career by purportedly giving away "all the books of ancient literature that he possessed" (Eusebius, *Church History* 6.8–9),<sup>9</sup> he evidently turned again to collecting literary sources (Grafton and Williams 2006, 67–8). McGuckin (1992, 20) theorizes that Origen procured some of his library collection while on his frequent travels.<sup>10</sup> He reasons that Origen acquired books throughout Palestine, in Athens, and probably from Rome (126). In turn, surmises Carriker (2003, 11), "Pamphilus was probably drawn to settle at Caesarea because of the reputation the city enjoyed as the home of Origen's library." With the death of Origen, Pamphilus came into "direct control" of the collection (Gamble 1995, 159).

Jerome (*On Illustrious Men* 113.1; Tanner 1979, 318) jointly labeled the library as the *bibliotheca Origenis et Pamphili*, "the library of Origen and Pamphilus." Staikos (2007, 150 n. 54; cf. Isidore of

Seville, *Etymologies* 6.6.1) reasons that Pamphilus “undertook the task of reconstituting the library, a task to which he devoted so much energy that he was later thought to be its founder.” Vleeschauwer (1963, 146) concurs—although Origen formally started the collection, “the real founder” was Pamphilus. Tanner (1979, 418) similarly argues that Pamphilus “deserves the real credit for making the Caesarean library the greatest academic library of the ancient Christian world.”

Eusebius preserved Pamphilus’s memory in his *Life of Pamphilus* (now lost except for a few fragments) which included a catalog of his library, and by inclusion within his *Martyrs of Palestine* 26–7; 38–48 (Tanner 1979, 418). According to Jerome, Pamphilus and Eusebius exhibited such a harmony it was as if they shared a single soul (Jerome, *Epistle* 84.10). Eusebius even called himself *Eusebius Pamphili* (“Pamphilus’s Eusebius”) after his venerated mentor, whom he called “a man threefold dear to me,” “my dearest friend,” “a most eloquent man of truly philosophical living,” and “the great glory of the Caesarean church” (Jerome, *On Illustrious Men* 81.3; Eusebius, *Martyrs of Palestine* 7.4, 11.1–2; Eusebius, *Church History* 7.32.25; 8.13.6; cf. Scheck 2010, 5). Moreover, argues McGuckin (2004, 89), Pamphilus probably trained Eusebius in “transcribing, cataloguing, and editing texts, introducing him to issues of literary criticism and historiography.”

Although Pamphilus was martyred during the reign of Maximinus Daia around 310 (Jerome, *On Illustrious Men* 75.4), the Caesarean library was not destroyed or confiscated during the “Great Persecution” of 303–313 (Bruce 1980, 127–37).<sup>11</sup> Laing (2017, 180; cf. 174, 179) maintains that Eusebius’ access to “the document-rich library at Caesarea” set his historical work apart, providing an advantage over his predecessors. Although the library may have existed as late as the sixth century (Röwekamp 2005, 51), nothing is known with certainty concerning its ultimate demise (Gamble 1995, 160). “One can only assume,” reasons Tanner (1979, 419), “that it probably suffered the same fate as the Jerusalem library likely did in the Persian invasion of 614.”<sup>12</sup> The Caesarean library may have already been steadily waning, due to gradual neglect. Frenschkowski (2006, 64, 103–104) points to a progressive loss of the original writings of Origen in the fourth and fifth centuries.

## THE NATURE OF THE CAESAREAN LIBRARY

It is difficult to apply modern library terminology to ancient libraries without inadvertently importing anachronistic connotations (Vleeschauwer 1963, 142; Grafton and Williams 2006, 12). Nevertheless, in the broader categories of modern “library and information science” nomenclature, Pamphilus was the director of what some consider to be an ancient prototype of an “academic” or “research” library (Lapin 1996, 496–512). For example, Tanner (1979, 408–9, 415–19) classified the Caesarean library as an “academic or school” library functioning as a “reference and research library”; and Gamble (1995, 159; cf. McGuckin 2003, 126) has described it as “an actual research library.” Frenschkowski (2006, 102–3), however, wisely cautions against overstating any modern parallel: “Under no circumstances should the Caesarean library be presented according to the model of today’s larger organized libraries,” since the “holdings were manageable and primarily shaped by the owners’ personal research interests.”

The impetus of the original collection arose from Origen’s catechetical school and his personal scholarship.<sup>13</sup> According to Gregory Thaumaturgus (*Panegyric to Origen* 13.150–3; cf. Levine 1975, 116–17), who was a student of Origen, “We were allowed to make ourselves familiar with all kinds of doctrine, from Greek and Eastern sources, or spiritual or secular subjects, ranging freely over the whole field of learning.”<sup>14</sup> Using Gregory’s *Panegyric*, one can reconstruct a curriculum beginning

with grammar and rhetoric, progressing to math and sciences (physics, mathematics, geometry, and astronomy), moving on to philosophy and ethics, and culminating in theology and biblical studies (Levine 1975, 123–4). As a corollary, Origen’s library collection was “large and varied,” although not necessarily comprehensive (Grafton and Williams 2006, 56, 63).

The Caesarean library continued to house religious and philosophical works, and it may have been the home of a New Testament critical text (Cadiou 1936; Carriker 2003, 15; Grafton and Williams 2006, 179–80). The growing collection rivaled not only Christian but also pagan libraries of the era (Leclercq 1910, 857). Jerome (*Epistle* 34.1) even described Pamphilus as “a man who in zeal for the acquisition of a library wished to take rank with Demetrius Phalereus and Peisistratus.”<sup>15</sup>

Gamble (1995, 160) concludes, “The importance of the Caesarean library is difficult to overestimate.” He adds, “Many early Christian works now lost are known only through notices of their presence there, and many others probably owe their perseverance to having been disseminated from it. It played an especially prominent role in the transmission of scriptural literature” (160; cf. Grafton and Williams 2006, 7).

### SEVEN ROLES AS LIBRARIAN

With this general understanding of Pamphilus and his library in place, we now turn to Pamphilus’s fulfillment of seven roles that parallel important responsibilities within academic librarianship. First, Pamphilus acted as an acquisitions and cataloging librarian. Pamphilus committed himself to hunting down and gathering books (Grafton and Williams 2006, 21). Jerome (*Epistle* 34.1) claimed that Pamphilus “searched the whole world for images of the true intellects, and their eternal monuments.”<sup>16</sup> Pamphilus even dedicated his personal funds to the acquisition of materials (Grafton and Williams 2006, 231; Gamble 1995, 155). Beyond amassing the resources, Pamphilus arranged and cataloged them (Gamble 1995, 156; Tanner 1979, 427 n. 12). This catalog was later shared in Eusebius’s *Life of Pamphilus* and was mentioned by Jerome (*Epistle* 34; Grafton and Williams 2006, 68, 182; Cadiou 1936, 478). Pamphilus also developed lending policies, requiring patrons to leave a lending form when borrowing books for copying (Tanner 1979, 409).

Second, Pamphilus collected and stored “rare” (exceptional and valuable) books and manuscripts. In a general sense, all books were “rare” in late antiquity, but the Caesarean Library included some truly remarkable treasures. As Casson (2001, 139; cf. Jerome, *On Illustrious Men* 3.2 and *Preface to Chronicles*; Wendel 1954, 247–8; Tanner 1979, 418–19) explains, “Jerome mentions a copy of the supposed Hebrew original of the Gospel of Matthew as well as the manuscripts from which Origen made up his Hexapla, his edition of the Old Testament with six versions of the text in parallel columns.”<sup>17</sup> In fact, claims Williams (2014, 146), the treasure of the library was “undoubtedly the original copy of the Hexapla.” Through its valuable collection of manuscripts, “a veritable gold mine of information,” the Caesarean library played an important role in the textual history of both the Old and New Testaments (Tanner 1979, 419; cf. Murphy 1959, 119–31; Hernández 2015, 26–8). As an example, a colophon of the extant, fourth-century *Euthaliana* manuscript of the Book of Acts and Paul’s epistles claims that the manuscript was compared with a copy in Pamphilus’s Caesarean library (Parker 2008, 268–70).

Third, Pamphilus became involved in the production and publication of works (and thus facets of “scholarly communication”), as a scriptorium was associated with his library (Casson 2001, 139; Gamble 1995, 158; Röwekamp 2005, 51; Jacob 2003).<sup>18</sup> Therefore, according to Wilken (2009, 314),

“the library was more than a repository of books; it was also a scholarly center for the copying of books”. In Origen’s day, female scribes were commonly employed for the task (Haines-Fitzen 2000, 42–3). When the Emperor Constantine desired fifty copies of the Bible in the early fourth century, he contacted the Caesarean library (Tanner 1979, 418; Levine 1975, 125). “That Constantine’s order was promptly met, and with magnificently produced volumes, bespeaks the efficiency and technical capacity of the Caesarean library’s scriptorium in the early fourth century” (Gamble 1995, 428 n. 18).

Fourth, Pamphilus engaged in the preservation and conservation of library materials. Casson (2001) surmises that Pamphilus “transferred texts from codices of papyrus that had suffered severe damage over the years to codices of parchment, which would be more durable” (131; cf. Staikos 2007, 186). Eventually, by the end of the fourth century, all of the works kept in the Caesarean library were transcribed onto parchment codices (*in membranis instauere*), largely through the dedicated work of Akakios and Euzoios (Jerome, *On Illustrious Men* 113.1; cf. Jerome, *Epistle* 34; Humphreys 1994, 138; Gamble 1995, 159). The exact processes, however, remain somewhat unclear. Carriker explains, “One scholar envisions the replacement of papyrus rolls with parchment codices, another, thinking the codex to have already supplanted the roll, envisions the replacement of papyrus codices with parchment codices” (Carriker 2003, 23; cf. Vleeschauwer 1963, 165–73).

More specifically, to Pamphilus we owe the preservation of Origenian materials, which would have been lost without Pamphilus’s bibliographical care (Jerome, *On Illustrious Men* 75; Photius, *Library* 118; cf. McGuckin 2004, 90). Eusebius (*Church History* 6.32.3) provided a catalog list of the Caesarean library in his *Life of Pamphilus*, and he declared that “from this [Caesarean] collection anyone who pleased could gather the fullest knowledge of the works of Origen that have reached us.”<sup>19</sup> According to Jerome (*On Illustrious Men* 75.1), “The presbyter Pamphilus burned with so great a love for the divine library [*bibliotheca divina*] that he copied out in his own hand the greatest part of Origen’s works, which to this day are contained in the library at Caesarea.”<sup>20</sup> Jerome took personal pride in owning twenty-five volumes of Origen’s *Commentary on the Twelve Minor Prophets* that had been hand-copied by Pamphilus himself (Scheck 2010, 4). Jerome (*On Illustrious Men* 75.2-3) proclaimed, “I believe I am in possession of the riches of Croesus,” and he rejoiced that he had thousands of lines of text written down by the martyr, as if “signed by the traces of his blood.”<sup>21</sup> Photius’s study of Origen’s writings, encapsulated in the one-hundred-eighteenth chapter of his *Library* stands in this same tradition of preservation as well (McGuckin 2004, 2).

Fifth, Pamphilus developed an ancient equivalent of a library research fellows program. Pamphilus provided not only personal support for researchers but also a pre-technological parallel to modern photocopies. According to Jerome (*Apology Against Rufinus* 1.9; cf. Schott 2013, 329–62), “Pamphilus was a friend to all who studied. If he saw that some lacked the basic necessities of life, he generously gave as much as he could. He also eagerly distributed copies of the sacred scriptures, not only to be read, but also to be kept, and not only to men but also to those women who had shown him that they were devoted to reading. Accordingly, he prepared many codices, so that he could give them out to those who wanted them whenever the need arose.”<sup>22</sup> As Jerome built up his personal library’s holdings, he maintained a lively “barter trade” with Caesarea, seeking to procure the *opera omnia* of Origen in exchange for his own holdings (Vleeschauwer 1963, 149; cf. Grafton and Williams 2006, 242). The interchange of books between Caesarea and Bethlehem has even been described as an early “loan service” (Vleeschauwer 1963, 163).<sup>23</sup>

Sixth, Pamphilus was an influential author and scholar in his own right. He addressed his *Apology for Origen* (likely composed between 308 and 310) to Christians who had been condemned to the mines (Photius, *Library* 118), complete with an accompanying preface letter (Amacker and Junod, 2002, vol. 2, 82; Junod 1987, 128–35). The *Apology for Origen* is no longer extant, except for a Latin translation of Book 1, probably translated by Rufinus but of disputed accuracy, and two (perhaps reworked) fragments found in Socrates Scholasticus's *Church History* (Beinert 1987, 123–7; Reymond 1987, 136–45; Williams 1993, 151–69; Van Nuffelen 2005, 103–114). Amacker and Junod (2002, vol. 1, 53–74) have gathered the few ancient testimonies to the work.

Even with the limited available evidence, “we can uncover with some confidence an original Pamphilian theological agenda” (Williams 1993, 151). Pamphilus perceived himself to be “In a situation of serious crisis where the thought and texts of the Alexandrian were the subject of virulent and numerous criticisms, a situation characterized by anti-Origenism” (Junod 1993, 296; cf. Junod, 1999, 215–23). Pamphilus addressed the issues of the Trinity, the Incarnation, the historicity of the scriptures, the resurrection of the dead, the punishment of the wicked, human souls, and metempsychosis (Amacker and Junod 2002, vol. 2, 88; Ramelli 2011, 27, 42–3, 46). The *Apology for Origen* stands as a testimony to Pamphilus’s “intense admiration” for his teacher, and one could even argue that the work was more of a “eulogy” than an “apology” (Amacker and Junod 2002, vol. 12, 99, 104). Junod maintains, “The learned librarian Pamphilus stood as a defender of an exegetical and theological heritage that he himself worked to reunify and to disseminate” (Junod 1993, 286).

Pamphilian scholarship lived on through his protégé, Eusebius of Caesarea, the “research librarian, apologist, and bishop” (Laing 2017, 164). Eusebius caught his master’s enthusiasm for Origen, and he seems to have added or completed the sixth book to the *Apology for Origen* (Photius, *Library* 118; cf. Junod 1992, 519–27; Junod 1992b, 165–79).<sup>24</sup> Because of the difficulties involved in reconstructing the manner of composition, Eusebius’s collaboration and contribution to the final work are difficult to ascertain with exactitude (Junod 1987, 128; Amacker and Junod 2002, vol. 2, 81; Junod 2004, 184–6). According to Louth (2004, 358), Pamphilus’s work praising Origen “was almost certainly” a source for the sixth book of Eusebius’s *Church History*, “which is mainly concerned with the life of the great Alexandrian.” Junod, however, has argued that an earlier edition of the sixth book of *Church History* may have preceded the *Apology for Origen* and only later incorporated knowledge from the *Apology for Origen* (Junod 2004).

Seventh, Pamphilus exhibited effective administrative leadership, by managing his collection during one of the most transformative eras in the history of librarianship—an era associated with the revolutionary transition from scrolls to codices (Gamble 1995, 42–81; Roberts and Skeat, 1983). Between the first and fourth centuries, literary culture faced a bibliographic revolution. According to Roberts and Skeat (1983, 37; as summarized in Carriker 2003, 24, n. 72), “the surviving evidence demonstrates that in the first and second centuries about 98% of works were in rolls, while by the time of the late third and early fourth century the distribution was 52% rolls, 48% codices, and in the fourth century the distribution was 26.5% rolls, 73.5% codices.” This general transition from scroll to codex changed the manner of both copying and storing library materials (O’Donnell 1998, 50–7).

By the time Eusebius composed his influential *Church History* in the second decade of the fourth century, “tables of contents are prefixed to each of the ten books, again showing with certainty the influence of the codex on the arrangement of materials in the work” (Too 2010, 76). With the continuing rise of the codex, Eusebius’ own genius was “to unite an innovative form of layout and

book production with an innovative way of describing the past,” including the use of documentary evidence (Grafton and Williams 2006, 6–7, 143). The codex reigned, and librarianship would never be the same (O’Donnell 1998, 98). Although we do not know the details of an assumed “scroll to papyrus codex to parchment codex” (or perhaps a more direct “scroll to parchment codex”) progression in Caesarea, we do know that Pamphilus led the Caesarean library through the early portion of this revolutionary era of librarianship (cf. Carriker 2003, 23; Vleeschauwer 1963, 165–73).

### **EPILOGUE: ORIGEN’S INSTITUTIONAL LEGACY**

In conclusion, as Trigg (2007, 397) notes, Caesarean scholarship “pushed the limits of the information technology of the time, the codex, to create research tools with an open-ended capacity to further future scholarship.” According to Grafton and Williams (2006, 15), Origen, Pamphilus, and Eusebius, as “pioneering Christian scholars,” creatively “devised new genres of learned literature.” At the same time, Origen and Pamphilus “created new settings for book production and consumption: scriptoria that could turn out complex and even unprecedented works of technical literature and libraries where the sources they drew upon were assembled.” Origen passed the baton, and Pamphilus finished the next leg of the race. Caesarea had become “the most famous center of Christian scholarship in antiquity” (Grafton and Williams 2006, 9).

In fulfilling his responsibilities in Caesarea in an era of great transition within classical culture, Pamphilus served seven roles of a librarian that continue in developed and modified forms to this day. He therefore stands as an influential Christian scholar and pioneer in the venerable profession of librarianship. Moreover, as the early Christians considered the life-transforming powers of their sacred and religious texts, the collection and preservation of these texts in the Caesarean library were influential in the construction and continuation of Christian identity (Chin 2010, 645).

Yet the roots of the Caesarean collection commenced with Origen himself, thus reflecting his institutional legacy, as his library continued to influence succeeding generations of early Christian authors and leaders. Trigg (1983) highlighted the influential legacy of Origen as a prolific writer, skilled teacher, preacher, debater, scholar, theologian, interpreter of the Bible, contemplative ascetic, and spiritual guide (245–6). I would contend that the institutional legacy of Origen’s Caesarean library, as sustained and developed by Pamphilus, should be highlighted as well. McGuckin (2004, 16) maintains that Origen’s “important library” reflected “the first exemplar of how the church ought to be vested as a major center of learning,” an educational vision that flourished “for centuries following.”

Scholars have investigated how later authors borrowed from Origen’s writings (literary legacy), how later translators interacted with his Hexapla (philological legacy), how later interpreters appropriated his hermeneutics (exegetical legacy), and how later thinkers reacted to his theological ideas (theological legacy). Scholarship, however, has generally neglected the long-term legacy of Origen’s library (Grafton and Williams 2006, 17). Like other ancient libraries, the Caesarean library could be described as “a privileged locus for the accumulation and storage of influence” (Grafton and Williams 2006, 14).

Viewed through this institutional lens, one gains new insights into key figures of the patristic period. Pamphilus becomes a collection caretaker as well as an Origenian apologist. Eusebius becomes a bibliographical researcher as well as an historian and biographer. The Emperor Constantine becomes a customer of the library’s scriptorium as well as a political restructurer of the reli-

gious landscape. Jerome becomes the recipient of “interlibrary loans” as well as an anti-Origenist intellectual. And we are all reminded that the highly talented and multi-faceted Origen was also a librarian, whose collection was delivered into the competent hands of Pamphilus his successor.

## WORKS CITED

- Amacker, René, and Eric Juno, eds. 2002. *Pamphile et Eusèbe de Césarée, Apologie pour Origène*, 2 vols. Sources chrétiennes 464. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.
- Baghos, Mario. 2015. “The Conflicting Portrayals of Origen in the Byzantine Tradition.” *Phronema* 30, no. 2: 69–104.
- Barney, Stephen A., W. J. Lewis, J. A. Beach, and Oliver Berghof, eds. 2006. *The Etymologies of Isidore of Seville*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bienert, Wolfgang A. 1987. “Die älteste Apologie für Origenes?” In *Origeniana Quarta*, edited by Lothar Lies, 123–7. Innsbrucker theologische Studien 19. Innsbruck: Tyrolia-Verlag.
- Bruce, Lorne D. 1980. “A Note on Christian Libraries during the ‘Great Persecution,’ 303–305 A.D.” *Journal of Library History* 15, no. 2: 127–37.
- Cadiou, René. 1936. “La bibliothèque de Césarée et la formation des chaînes.” *Revue des sciences religieuses* 16, no. 4: 474–83.
- Carriker, Andrew James. 2003. *The Library of Eusebius of Caesarea*. Leiden, Brill.
- Casson, Lionel. 2001. *Libraries in the Ancient World*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Cavallo, Guglielmo. 1989. “Scuola, ‘scriptorium,’ biblioteca a Cesarea.” In *Le Biblioteche nel mondo antico e medievale*, edited by Guglielmo Cavallo, 65–78. Bari: Laterza.
- Chin, Catherine M. 2010. “Rufinus of Aquileia and Alexandrian Afterlives: Translation as Origenism.” *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 18, no. 4: 617–47.
- Crouzel, Henri. 1989. *Origen*. Translated by A. S. Worrall. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- Ellens, J. Harold. 1993. *The Ancient Library of Alexandria and Early Christian Theological Development*. Claremont: Institute for Antiquity and Christianity.
- Frenschkowski, Marco. 2006. “Studien zur Geschichte der Bibliothek von Cäsarea.” In *New Testament Manuscripts: Their Texts and Their World*, edited by Thomas J. Kraus and Tobias Nicklas, 53–104. Texts and Editions for New Testament Study 2. Leiden, Brill.
- Gamble, Henry Y. 1995. *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Grafton, Anthony, and Megan Williams. 2006. *Christianity and the Transformation of the Book: Origen, Eusebius, and the Library of Caesarea*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Haines-Fitzen, Kim. 2000. *Guardians of Letters: Literacy, Power, and the Transmitters of Early Christian Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Halton, Thomas P., ed. 1999. *Saint Jerome: On Illustrious Men*. Fathers of the Church 100. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press.
- Hernández, Juan, Jr. 2015. “The Legacy of Wilhelm Bousset for the Apocalypse’s Textual History: The Identification of the Andreas Text.” In *Studien zum Text der Apokalypse*, edited by Marcus Sigismund, Martin Karrer, and Ulrich Schmid, 19–32. Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung 47. Berlin: De Gruyter.

- Humphreys, Kenneth W. 1994. "Christian Libraries, Early." In *Encyclopedia of Library History*, edited by Wayne A. Wiegand and Donald G. Davis, 138–9. New York: Garland.
- Jacob, Christian. 2003. "Bibliothèque, livre, texte: Formes de l'érudition Alexandrine." In *Origeniana Octava*, vol. 1, edited by Lorenzo Perrone, 13–22. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 164. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
- Junod, Eric. 1987. "Origène vu par Pamphile dans la lettre-préface de l'Apologie." In *Origeniana Quarta*, edited by Lothar Lies, 128–35. Innsbrucker theologische Studien 19. Innsbruck: Tyrolia-Verlag.
- . 1992. "L'Apologie pour Origène par Pamphile et Eusèbe: critique des principales hypothèses de P. Nautin et perspectives nouvelles." In *Origeniana Quinta*, edited by Robert J. Daly, 519–27. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 105. Leuven: Peeters.
- . 1992b. "L'auteur de l'Apologie pour Origène traduite par Rufin: Les témoignages contradictoires de Rufin et de Jérôme à propos de Pamphile et d'Eusèbe." In *Recherches et tradition: Mélanges patristiques offerts à Henri Crouzel*, edited by André Dupleix, 165–79. Théologie historique 88. Paris: Beauchesne.
- . 1993. "L'Apologie pour Origène de Pamphile et la naissance de l'origénisme." In *Studia Patristica*, vol. 26, edited by Elizabeth A. Livingstone, 267–86. Leuven: Peeters.
- . 1999. "Controverses autour de l'héritage Origénien aux deux extrémités du IVE siècle Pamphile et Rufin." In *Origeniana Septima*, edited by Wolfgang A. Bienert and Uwe Kühneweg, 215–23. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 137. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
- . 2004. "L'Apologie pour Origène de Pamphile et Eusèbe et les Développements sur Origène dans le livre VI de l'Histoire ecclésiastique." In *La biografia di Origene fra storia e agiografia*, edited by Adele Monaci Castagno, 183–201. Villa Verucchio: Pier Giorgio Pazzini.
- Laing, Stefana Dan. 2017. *Retrieving History: Memory and Identity Formation in the Early Church*. Evangelical Ressourcement. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.
- Lapin, Hayim. 1996. "Jewish and Christian Academies in Roman Palestine: Some Preliminary Observations." In *Caesarea Maritima: A Retrospective after Two Millennia*, edited by Avner Raban and Kenneth G. Holum, 496–512. Leiden: Brill.
- Leclercq, Henri. 1910. "Bibliothèques." In *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*, vol. 2.1, edited by Fernand Cabrol, 842–904. Paris, Letouzey et Ané.
- Levine, Lee I. 1975. *Caesarea under Roman Rule*. Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity 7. Leiden: Brill.
- Louth, Andrew. 2010. "Hagiography." In *The Cambridge History of Early Christian Literature*, edited by Frances M. Young, Lewis Ayres, and Andrew Louth, 358–61. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McGuckin, John A. 2003. "Origen as Literary Critic in the Alexandrian Tradition." In *Origeniana Octava*, edited by Lorenzo Perrone, 121–35. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 164. Leuven, Peeters.
- . 1992. "Caesarea Maritima as Origen Knew It." In *Origeniana Quinta*, edited by Robert J. Daly, 3–25. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 105. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
- . 2004. *The Westminster Handbook to Origen*. Westminster Handbooks to Christian Theology. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.

- Mugridge, Alan. 2016. *Copying Early Christian Texts: A Study of Scribal Practice*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Neuen Testament 362. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Murphy, Harold S. 1959. "The Text of Romans and 1 Corinthians in Miniscule 93 and the Text of Pamphilus." *Harvard Theological Review* 52, no. 2: 119–31.
- Nautin, Pierre. 1977. "L'Apologie pour Origène et ses opinions par Pamphile et Eusèbe." In *Origène: Sa vie et son œuvre*, 134–53. Christianisme antique 1. Paris: Beauchesne.
- O'Donnell, James J. 1998. *Avatars of the Word: From Papyrus to Cyberspace*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Parker, D. C. 2008. *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and Their Texts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ramelli, Ilaria. 2011. "Origen's Anti-subordinationism and Its Heritage in the Nicene and Cappadocian Line." *Vigiliae Christianae* 65, no. 1: 21–49.
- Reymond, Antoine. 1987. "Apologie pour Origène: Un état de la question." In *Origeniana Quarta*, edited by Lothar Lies, 136–45. Innsbrucker theologische Studien 19. Innsbruck: Tyrolia-Verlag.
- Roberts, Colin H., and T. C. Skeat. 1983. *The Birth of the Codex*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Röwekamp, Georg. 2005. *Apologia pro Origene / Apologie für Origenes*. Fathers of the Church 80. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Schaff, Philip, and Henry Wace, eds. 1979. *Eusebius: Church History, Life of Constantine the Great, and Oration in Praise of Constantine*. A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church: Second Series, vol. 1. Grand Rapids, Eerdmans.
- , eds. 1979b. *St. Jerome: Letters and Select Works*. A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church: Second Series, vol. 6. Grand Rapids, Eerdmans.
- Scheck, Thomas P. 2010. *Pamphilus: Apology for Origen; Rufinus: On the Falsification of the Books of Origen*. Fathers of the Church 120. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press.
- Schott, Jeremy M. 2013. "Plotinus's Portrait and Pamphilus's Prison Notebook: Neoplatonic and Early Christian Textualities at the Turn of the Fourth Century C.E." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 21, no. 3: 329–62.
- Solignac, Aimé. 1984. "Pamphile de Césarée." In *Dictionnaire de spiritualité: ascétique et mystique, doctrine et histoire*, vol. 12.1, edited by Marcel Viller, 150–4. Paris, Beauchesne.
- Staikos, Konstantinos. 2007. *From Constantine the Great to Cardinal Bessarion*. The History of the Library in Western Civilization, vol. 3. New Castle, DE: Oak Knoll.
- Tanner, Thomas M. 1979. "A History of Early Christian Libraries from Jesus to Jerome." *Journal of Library History* 14, no. 4: 407–35.
- Too, Yun Lee. 2010. *The Idea of the Library in the Ancient World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Trigg, Joseph Wilson. 1983. *Origen: The Bible and Philosophy in the Third-Century Church*. Atlanta: John Knox.
- Van Nuffelen, Peter. 2005. "Two Fragments from the *Apology for Origen* in the *Church History* of Socrates Scholasticus." *Journal of Theological Studies* 56, no. 1: 103–14.
- Vleeschauwer, Herman J. de. 1963. "The Early Christian Library." *Mousaion* 73: 140–85.
- Wendel, Carl. 1954. "Bibliothek." In *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, vol. 2, edited by Theodor Klauser, 231–74. Stuttgart: Hiersemann.

- Wilken, Robert Louis. 2009. Review of *Christianity and the Transformation of the Book: Origen, Eusebius, and the Library of Caesarea*, by Anthony Grafton and Megan Williams. *Christianity and Literature* 58, no. 2: 312–14.
- Williams, Megan H. 2014. *The Monk and the Book: Jerome and the Making of Christian Scholarship*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Williams, Rowan. 1993. “Damnosa haereditas: Pamphilus’ *Apology* and the Reputation of Origen.” In *Logos: Festschrift für Luise Abramowski*, edited by Hanns Christof Brennecke, Ernst Ludwig Grasmück, and Christoph Marksches, 151–69. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Young, Frances M., and Andrew Teal. 2010. *From Nicaea to Chalcedon: A Guide to the Literature and Its Background*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

**ENDNOTES**

- 1 Jerome noted that the library still existed in his time and possessed Pamphilian autographs (*On Illustrious Men* 75; cf. Frenschkowski 2006, 53–104; Cadiou 1936, 474–83). Cf. Hillary of Poitiers’s use and imitation of Origen in Jerome, *On Illustrious Men* 100.
- 2 Levine (1975) acknowledges, “In the latter part of the third century, Pamphilus continued many of Origen’s activities, while making several contributions of his own to Christian intellectual life” (124). “Pamphilus’ major achievement at Caesarea was the organizing of a large library containing the works of Origen and other Christian writers” (125). Nevertheless, Levine definitely focuses upon Origen and Eusebius (126–7).
- 3 Johannes Trithemius praised Pamphilus’ collecting of the Caesarean library, “so that in all the world, there was no more celebrated library” (see Grafton and Williams 2006, 5).
- 4 Four pages later Grafton and Williams (2006) reference “The model of Christian scholarship that Origen, Pamphilus, and Eusebius had created” (237).
- 5 English translation from Schaff and Wace (1979), 351–2.
- 6 Frenschkowski (2006) maintains that the number does not possess “an intrinsic impossibility” (59; English translations throughout this article are mine unless otherwise noted). He actually considers the number to be fairly modest in comparison with ancient libraries of a similar nature (59). Nevertheless, the chronological distance between Isidore and Pamphilus warrants caution. The number may be too small rather than too large, and in any case should be taken *cum grano salis* (62).
- 7 English translation from Halton 1999, 107.
- 8 Origen may have brought along a collection when he transferred residency from Alexandria to Palestine (Tanner 1979, 417).
- 9 English translation from Williams 2008, 133.
- 10 McGuckin (1993) also theorizes that the Library at Alexandria “dominated Origen’s imagination,” and that he desired the Caesarean library to be an imitation—“a clear mimesis of the Great Library of his hometown” (121; cf. 127 n.24, 134; cf. Ellens 1993). Chin (2010) maintains that Rufinus carried on this project, “a grand attempt to displace classical literary culture with a body of Christian literature built on Alexandrian foundations” (618). In this manner, the literary and theological dimensions of the later Origenist controversies were intertwined (619, 645).
- 11 Frenschkowski (2006) argues that this is more likely if the library was privately owned, as he contends (74, 83). He uses the label *bibliotheca Origenis et Pamphili* as evidence of a primarily personal library collection (83).
- 12 Vleeschauwer (1963, 145–7; cf. McGuckin 2004, 17) believes that the library of Alexander in Jerusalem was directly dependent upon the Alexandrian model of the Christian library. A late thirteenth-century Arabic text reports that the Caesarean Library was destroyed in the Arab invasion of 642 (McGuckin 2003, 124, n. 17).
- 13 A related issue is the nature of the Christian Schola of Caesarea, which McGuckin (2004, 1) calls “the first Christian university.” McGuckin (2003, 125) argues that Origen wanted his Caesarean Schola to differ decidedly from the Catechetical School in Alexandria. See also Cavallo 1989, 65–8.
- 14 English translation from Tanner 1979, 418.
- 15 English translation from Tanner 1979, 418. See also Chin 2010, 620.
- 16 English translation from Grafton and Williams 2006, 208.
- 17 But compare the critical evaluation in Frenschkowski (2006, 68–76).
- 18 Frenschkowski (2006, 102) warns against reading too much into the relationship between the Caesarean library and scriptorium. Mugridge (2016, 15–17) maintains that the word *scriptorium* is misleading when applied to Christian contexts in late antiquity, because the word suggests “copying centres” as found in medieval monasteries.
- 19 English translation from McGuckin 2004, 90.
- 20 English translation from Carriker 2003, 13–14. Jerome attributes more than eight hundred works to Origen, although his extensive catalog is incomplete (see Grafton and Williams 2006, 68).

- 21 English translation from Halton 1999, 107; cf. Carriker 2003, 27.
- 22 English translation from Grafton and Williams 2006, 181.
- 23 Frenschkowski (2006) reads the evidence differently (doubting that Jerome did much direct borrowing from the Caesarean collection) but agrees that he provides evidence of “private scribal networks” (72). According to Frenschkowski, the Caesarean library was not “freely accessible” or “generally usable” (73–4). Frenschkowski further maintains that Caesarean books were borrowed but not necessarily returned (79).
- 24 Contrast Nautin 1977, 134–53. Junod (2004, 183–201) maintains that one cannot conclude with certainty whether Eusebius was the sole author, a co-author, or an editor who completed Pamphilus’s book. The testimonies of Rufinus and Jerome conflict with one another. Chin discusses Jerome’s purposeful removal of Pamphilus from a stated authorial role of the *Apology for Origen*, due to his own personal agenda (Chin 2010, 626, 643). Cf. Schaff and Wace (1979, 36).