APOLOGISTS AND ATHENS
EARLY CHRISTIANITY MEETS ANCIENT GREEK THINKING

Edited by Gunnar af Hällström

Contents

Apologetics and Rhetoric in the *Ad Diognetum*

Jerker Blomqvist

Preliminaries

The following study looks first to characterize the rhetorical practice of one of the apologists who were active in the second century AD. Then it compares the text he wrote to certain others of the same period to determine what degree of familiarity with and what attitudes to rhetorical education these texts reveal.[1]

The text to be discussed has been known, traditionally, as the *Letter to Diognetus*, *Epistula ad Diognetum, Diognetbrief*, etc. Editions of the Greek text and translations of it often appear in volumes that also include the writings of the apostolic fathers.[2] Actually, *Diogn.* – as I will call the text here for short – is not a letter, for the formal characteristics of an ancient letter are not present and the preface, which we will discuss below, belongs to a different literary genre.

Since *Diogn.* has often been classified among the writings of the apostolic fathers, it may surprise some that it will be treated here in a conference that is devoted to the apologists, the other important group of second-century Christian writers. In fact, the content of *Diogn.* clearly differentiates it from the writings of the apostolic fathers. Those early Christian writers addressed themselves to fellow Christians with the intention of confirming and strengthening their faith. *Diogn.* could rather be described either as a pamphlet in which a Christian author defends and explains his own faith to a non-Christian addressee, or, using Jefford's term, as a 'protreptic discourse'.[3] The text therefore belongs rather with the apologists than with the fathers, and that has been recognized by some recent editors and commentators.[4]

The text has been preserved without any indication of the author's name in the manuscript, and the author cannot be identified with any person known from other sources.[5] The attempts that have been made to do so are not convincing. However, two such efforts deserve to be mentioned, since they have evoked the attention of some scholars.

In the 1940s Paul Andriessen argued that the author of *Diogn.* was identical with the earliest known apologist, Quadratus.[6] Both in the *Ecclesiastical History* and in the *Chronicle*, Eusebius states that a certain Quadratus (Κοδρᾶτος) had written an apology, addressed to the emperor Hadrian and presented it to the emperor when he visited Athens

---

[1] I have already discussed these matters in an earlier study (Blomqvist 2014a): some repetitions are unavoidable.

[2] E.g. Lindemann and Paulsen 1992; Wengst 1984; Ehrman 2003.

[3] Jefford 2013, 56.

[4] Cf. Meecham 1949, 1–5; Lona 2001, 27–34; Ehrman 2003; 122, Jefford 2013, 1 (*Diogn.* is "one of the first examples of apologetic literature"), 55–56.

[5] The text is known from a single manuscript that was destroyed by fire in 1870. Since the sixteenth century it had been studied and copied, and reliable collations have been preserved. For that reason, it is mostly possible to reconstruct the readings of the manuscript in detail. Marrou (1965, 5–37) provides a full account of the manuscript and its history; cf. also Lona 2001, 11–17, and Jefford 2013, 5–11.

[6] Andriessen 1947 (a summary of a series of articles published in *Recherches de théologie et philosophie médiévales* 1946–1947).

in AD 124–125 or 128–129.[7] Andriessen also identified Quadratus the apologist with a Quadratus who, according to Eusebius, was bishop of Athens at the time. With these identifications we would have a name of the author of *Diogn.*, a date for its publication and an example of an apologist who was clearly linked to Athens, even as its bishop. Several scholars were impressed by Andriessen's arguments, and it became customary to include 'the Quadratus fragment' – i.e. the isolated sentence that Eusebius quotes from the Quadratus apology – with editions of *Diogn.*[8]

However, decisive arguments to support Andriessen's identifications are missing, and there are circumstances that speak against them: (a) *Diogn.*, as we have it, is not addressed to Hadrian but explicitly to a person with a different name, (b) the sentence quoted by Eusebius from the Quadratus apology does not appear in *Diogn.* as we have it, and (c) the sentence does not display the stylistic characteristics of *Diogn.* Andriessen tried to counter those objections, but with only limited success.[9]

Another candidate for the authorship was suggested by Hill in 2006, viz. Polycarp of Smyrna.[10] Hill produces arguments that may link *Diogn.* to Asia Minor and also constructs a palaeographic scenario that may explain the lacunas in the manuscript. However, although there is comparably much information on the life of Polycarp preserved, no ancient source testifies to the existence of an apology written by him. The only text by Polycarp that has been preserved is his letter to the Philippians, which is very different from *Diogn.*, both in style and content. Thus, this identification too is short on corroborative evidence, although there are no decisive arguments against it.[11]

The addressee's name was Διόγνητος, as appears from the first sentence of the text. That is all we know for certain about this person. In the opening sentence of the letter, he is characterized with the epithet κράτιστε, which may be the Greek equivalent of a Roman title (*egregius* or *clarissimus*) and indicate an elevated position in the imperial society. On the other hand, κράτιστε seems to have been a conventional form of address in prefaces of this sort.[12]

The date of the composition of the text cannot be determined. Content and style indicate a plausible date between the mid-second and the early third centuries.

The concluding chapters, 11–12, present a particular problem. The manuscript indicated a lacuna in the text after ch. 10. Chs. 11–12 are often thought to deviate so much in content, language and style from the preceding chapters that they possibly belong to a different work or were even written by a different person.[13] However, Marrou vigorously defends the authenticity of the two chapters, and Hill's careful investigation of the problem concludes that the arguments used against the authenticity of chs. 11–12 are not decisive.[14] In my view, the divergences in language and style are not great enough to warrant the deduction that chs. 11–12 were not written by the same person as chs. 1–10.

---

[7] Eus. *HE* 4.3.1–2. The Armenian translation shows that Eus. *Chron.* had data on Quadratus *ad annum* 2140. Jerome may have used the same source; cf. *De vir. ill.* 19–20 and *Ep.* 70.4.
[8] Ehrman 2003, 118–119; Jefford 2013, 190–191.
[9] Cf. Meecham 1949, 148–152; Marrou 1965, 256–269; Jefford 2013, 20–22.
[10] Hill 2006.
[11] Cf. Jefford 2013, 22–24.
[12] See *BDAG*, *s.v.* κράτιστος.
[13] Cf., for example, Jefford 2013, 43–51, 109.
[14] Marrou 1965, 219–227; Hill 2006, 106–127.

They could possibly belong to a different treatise by the same author. Here I will use them mostly as a means of comparison for bringing stylistic and linguistic features of chs. 1–10 into higher relief.

The preface

The very opening paragraph of *Diogn.* reveals that its author was acquainted with Greek literary convention:

Ἐπειδὴ ὁρῶ, κράτιστε Διόγνητε,
    ὑπερεσπουδακότα σε τὴν θεοσέβειαν τῶν Χριστιανῶν μαθεῖν
    καὶ πάνυ σαφῶς καὶ ἐπιμελῶς πυνθανόμενον περὶ αὐτῶν,
      τίνι τε Θεῷ πεποιθότες καὶ πῶς θρησκεύοντες αὐτὸν
        <τόν> τε κόσμον ὑπερορῶσι πάντες
        καὶ θανάτου καταφρονοῦσι,
        καὶ οὔτε τοὺς νομιζομένους
          ὑπὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων θεοὺς λογίζονται
        οὔτε τὴν Ἰουδαίων δεισιδαιμονίαν φυλάσσουσι,
      καὶ τίνα τὴν φιλοστοργίαν ἔχουσι πρὸς ἀλλήλους,
      καὶ τί δή ποτε καινὸν τοῦτο γένος ἢ ἐπιτήδευμα
        εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν βίον νῦν
          καὶ οὐ πρότερον,
ἀποδέχομαί γε τῆς προθυμίας σε ταύτης,
καὶ παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ
    – τοῦ καὶ τὸ λέγειν καὶ τὸ ἀκούειν ἡμῖν χορηγοῦντος –
      αἰτοῦμαι δοθῆναι
    ἐμοὶ μὲν εἰπεῖν οὕτως
      ὡς μάλιστα ἂν <ἀκούσαντά> σε βελτίω γενέσθαι,
    σοί τε οὕτως ἀκοῦσαι
      ὡς μὴ λυπηθῆναι τὸν εἰπόντα.[15]

As the typographical arrangement above is intended to show, this long sentence forms a multi-layered syntactical structure. It opens with an ἐπειδή clause with the main verb ὁρῶ and with two participles and their adjuncts (ὑπερεσπουδακότα and πυνθανόμενον) plus a series of interrogative clauses embedded in it. Then follow two coordinated main clauses with the finite verbs ἀποδέχομαι and αἰτοῦμαι, the latter of

---

[15] *Diogn.* 1.1–2. "Since I see, most excellent Diognetus, | that you are extremely eager to learn about the religion of the Christians | and are making such an exacting and careful inquiry about them, wishing to discover, | which God they obey and how they worship him, | so that they all despise the world | and disdain death, | neither giving credence to those thought | to be gods by the Greeks | nor keeping the superstition of the Jews, | and what deep affection they have for one another | and just why this new kin or way of life | came into being now | and not before, | I welcome this eagerness of yours | and ask God | – who enables us both to speak and to hear – | that I may be allowed to speak in such a way | that you derive special benefit by hearing, | and that you hear in such a way | that the speaker not be put to grief." With some minor modifications I throughout reproduce Jefford's (2013) text and Ehrman's (2003) translation of *Diogn.*

which is construed with a complex nominal phrase (τοῦ θεοῦ [...] χορηγοῦντος) and a compound of no less than five hierarchically diversified infinitives.

When the text first became known, the readers immediately noticed that this preface was similar to the preface of Luke's Gospel, which also consists of an ἐπειδή clause and a complex main clause, has a similar content and includes the address κράτιστε. Since its author was obviously a Christian, *Diogn.* was assumed to have been inspired by the preface of *Gospel of Luke*, and it was supposed that the New Testament, in particular the Lukanic writings, had served as a literary and linguistic model for the author. That is hardly true. At least, Luke is not the only model that the author of *Diogn.* may have used for his preface. Luke's prefaces are modelled on prefaces with a similar structure and content in extra-Biblical and pagan texts, especially Greek scientific writings.[16] Some of these contain elements that reappear in *Diogn.* but are absent from Luke's prefaces. According to Luke, it was on his own initiative that he set out to write his account; his addressee Theophilus is not reported (or alleged) to have shown any previous interest. In our text, the opening ἐπειδή clause states that it was Diognetus' interest in the matter that inspired the writer. Prefaces with similar declarations appear in Greek scientific writings from the late fourth century BC onwards; the earliest known example is a medical treatise by Diocles of Carystus, addressed to King Antigonus I Monophthalmos of Macedonia (d. 301 BC), and there are several later examples.[17]

Detailed specifications of the content of the following text were also common in scientific prologues, often in the form of a string of indirect questions, as in the Diognetus preface.[18] That element is absent from Luke's prefaces but appears in the Diocles preface. The address κράτιστε, which was thought to link the Diognetus text with Luke, is not uncommon in comparable contexts either.[19]

Thus, the New Testament was certainly not the author's only model. In fact, the only indubitable traces of New Testament influence on the language of *Diogn.* are a few words that are known previously only from the Septuagint or the New Testament, for example,

---

[16] Alexander 1993.

[17] Diocles frg. 183a.1: Διοκλῆς Ἀντιγόνῳ βασιλεῖ. Ἐπειδή σοι συμβαίνει μουσικωτάτῳ πάντων βασιλέων γεγονέναι καὶ πλεῖστον χρόνον βεβιωκέναι φιλοσοφίας τε πάσης ἔμπειρον ὄντα τυγχάνειν καὶ τοῖς μαθηματικοῖς πρωταγωνίστην, ὑπολαμβάνων βασιλικήν τε καὶ οἰκείαν εἶναι φιλοσοφίαν τὴν περὶ τῶν ὑγιεινῶν ἀκοήν τε καὶ θεωρίαν γέγραφά σοι, πόθεν αἱ νόσοι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις συνίστανται καὶ τίνων προγενομένων σημείων, καὶ πῶς ἄν τις αὐταῖς βοηθῶν ἐπιτυγχάνοι; "Diocles to King Antigonus. Since you happen to have become the most cultured of all kings and to have lived longest and to be experienced in all intellectual activity and to be a forerunner in the sciences, I thought that the learning and theoretical study of matters related to health would be a royal and appropriate intellectual activity, and therefore I write to you [about the questions] whence diseases in human beings originate and what signs precede them and how one might be successful in treating them." Text and translation: van der Eijk 2000-2001 (slightly modified). Later examples: Apollonius of Citium's Περὶ ἄρθρων (prologue of the first book: participle phrase describing the addressee as φιλιάτρως διακείμενον); Artemidorus, *Onirocriticon* (prologue of the third book: ἐπειδή clause referring to τὸ μεγαλεῖον τῆς σῆς σοφίας of the addressee); Diophantus, *Arithmetica* (prologue: τὴν εὕρεσιν τῶν ἐν τοῖς ἀριθμοῖς προβλημάτων, τιμιώτατέ μοι Διονύσιε, γινώσκων σε σπουδαίως ἔχοντα μαθεῖν); Galen, *De constitutione artis medicae ad Patrophilum* (ἐπεί clause praising Patrophilus for a 'divine' quality, i.e. the striving for learning and προθυμία); Melito of Sardis (proem of his *Eclogae*, quoted by Eus. *HE* 4.26.13: σπουδῇ τῇ πρὸς τὸν λόγον χρώμενος). See Alexander 1993, 46–50, 213–214.

[18] Alexander 1993, 46–50, 213–214.

[19] Cf. the proems of Dion. Hal. *De ant. or.* (ὦ κράτιστε Ἀμμαῖε); Joseph. *Ap.* (κράτιστε ἀνδρῶν Ἐπαφρόδιτε); Galen, *De Meth. Med.* (book 2: Ἱέρων κράτιστε), *Libr. Propr.* (κράτιστε Βάσσε); ps.-Galen, *De theriaca ad Pamphilianum* (κράτιστε Παμφιλιανέ); Nepualius, Περὶ τῶν κατὰ ἀντιπάθειαν καὶ συμπάθειαν (κράτιστε Σέκστε, who is said to exemplify τὸ φιλομαθὲς καὶ εἰς πάντα φιλότιμον).

τεκνογονοῦσιν 'produce children' (5.6) and ἀνεξιχνίαστος 'untraceable' (9.3), which are rare words in *NT*. There also a few typically Christian words that appear for the first time in *Diogn.*: παντοκτίστης 'creator of all things'[20] (7.2; later on only in Agathangelus of the fifth century) and προαγαπάω 'love beforehand' (10.3; also in Clement of Alexandria and a few later writers). These words are typically Jewish or Christian and not attested before *Diogn.*

Instead, the author's models are to be traced among extra-Biblical texts. The parallels existing between the prologue of *Diogn.* and the extra-Biblical material indicate that the author was acquainted with the Greek literary tradition and its stylistic conventions. The question is to what extent that acquaintance has influenced his style and language.

Avoidance of hiatus

Avoidance of hiatus can be used of an indication of an author's ambition to live up to the demands of literary norms in the Hellenized society to which *Diogn.* belonged. There is obviously a relative scarcity of hiatus in the Diognetus text. The author does not pedantically avoid hiatus, but allows it, as many writers do, after common words (for example, the article, καί, ἤ, περί), before ἐν and οὐ and at syntactic junctures. If we disregard those cases and also disregard passages where the elision of a final, short vowel would eliminate a hiatus, we find only about 17 hiatuses in the first ten chapters of *Diogn.*[21]

It is also possible to identify certain strategies that the author used in order to avoid a hiatus. In one passage (6.5 [...] ἀδικουμένη διότι [...] ἀδικούμενος ὅτι [...]) he uses two synonyms for the conjunction 'that', obviously preferring διότι when the preceding word ends with a vowel. Other strategies include adding one of the particles γε or μέν (which, however, do not appear at all in chs. 11–12) where they are not necessary, and manipulating the word order.[22]

These observations show that there is a deliberate but incomplete avoidance of hiatus in chs. 1–10, but perhaps not in chs. 11–12. Thus, the author of chs. 1–10 tried to apply a rule of literary Greek, but sometimes failed, which is proof of his ambitions but not of his competence.

Rhythmical clausulae

Another linguistic detail that reveals literary ambitions is the striving for certain rhythmical patterns in the last syllables of the cola. It appears that *Diogn.* favours the same types of rhythmical clausulae that were common in rhetorical prose.[23]

---

[20] Cf. Marrou 1965, 66, n. 10.
[21] Hiatus is more common in chs. 11–12 (about 15 cases in this much shorter text), which is another mark of the divergent character of these chapters.
[22] For details, see Blomqvist 2014a, 207.
[23] As observed by Geffcken 1924, 349–350, and 1928, v. For the identification of significant patterns of prose-rhythm, de Groot's handbook of 1919 is still indispensable. Cf. Päll 2007, 39–42.

An illustrative passage occurs in 5.1–2, where four successive cola end with the combination cretic + trochee (or spondee):[24]

> [...] διακεκριμένοι τῶν λοιπῶν εἰσιν ἀνθρώπων.
> οὔτε γάρ που πόλεις ἰδίας κατοικοῦσιν,
> οὔτε διαλέκτῳ τινὶ παρηλλαγμένῃ χρῶνται,
> οὔτε βίον παράσημον ἀσκοῦσιν.[25]

Cretic + trochee was in particular favoured by the writer of *Diogn.* In chs. 5–7, which I have scrutinized in detail, more than 25 per cent of the cola end with cretic + trochee, and that combination was favoured in both Greek and Latin literary prose. Two other favoured combinations were trochee + trochee and cretic + cretic, which make up c. 14 and c. 7 per cent, respectively, of the cola finals in the chapters that I have investigated. Thus, these three favoured clausula types appear in about 50 per cent of the cola. That frequency indicates that these sequences, especially cretic + trochee, were intentionally sought for by the author. Of the remaining c. fifty cola in the three chapters, ten have a final cretic preceded by varying syllable sequences (e.g. 5.4 διαίτῃ καὶ τῷ λοιπῷ βίῳ, 7.7 παραβαλλομένους θηρίοις). Remarkably enough, the hexameter cadence (dactyl + spondee or trochee), which was generally avoided, occurs in eight cases.

Regarding rhythmical clausulae we arrive at approximately the same conclusion as observed for the avoidance of hiatus: the author strived to comply with the conventions of literary prose, but was not entirely successful.

Rhetorical figures

The most conspicuous stylistic feature of the Diognetus text is the frequency with which easily recognizable figures of speech recur in the text. They exemplify a whole spectrum of devices, most of which are associated, in particular, with the so-called Asianic style of prose writing.

These devices are often skilfully used when the author wants to bring home some important point in his message. The rhetorical figure of polyptoton serves that purpose in this passage, where word elements referring to power (δυνα-) and righteousness (δικαι-), respectively, recur three times each: ἀ**δύνα**τον εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ τῇ **δυνά**μει τοῦ Θεοῦ **δυνα**τοὶ γενηθῶμεν [...] ἵνα ἀνομία μὲν πολλῶν ἐν **δικαί**ῳ ἑνὶ κρυβῇ, **δικαι**οσύνη δὲ ἑνὸς πολλοὺς ἀνόμους **δικαι**ώσῃ.[26]

The author is particularly fond of pairing words or phrases with antithetical content, e.g. in 9.2, where the contrast between the saviour and the humans he saved is enhanced by a series of antitheses. The cola are of equal length, 9–10 syllables, and they

---

[24] Since the last syllable of the line always counted as long in Greek metrics, spondees and trochees were interchangeable in that position.

[25] "[For in terms of their country, language or customs the Christians are no] different from other people; | they nowhere inhabit cities of their own; | nor do they use a strange dialect | or live a life out of the ordinary."

[26] *Diogn.* 9.1–5 "[...] when we are unable to enter the kingdom of God we should be enabled by God's ability [...] that the lawlessness of many should be hidden by the one who was righteous, and the righteousness of one should make righteous the many who were lawless."

all end with the same syllable; in rhetorical terms, they exemplify not only antitheses but also, on the formal level, isocola with homoeoteleuton:

> τὸν ἅγιον ὑπὲρ <τῶν> ἀνόμων,
> τὸν ἄκακον ὑπὲρ τῶν κακῶν,
> τὸν δίκαιον ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδίκων,
> τὸν ἄφθαρτον ὑπὲρ τῶν φθαρτῶν,
> τὸν ἀθάνατον ὑπὲρ τῶν θνητῶν.[27]

The antithetical content of paired phrases and sentences can be enhanced by word-play, i.e. the same word recurs with slightly different meanings in the two successive constituents. The two clearest examples are 5.7 τράπεζαν κοινὴν παρατίθενται, ἀλλ᾽ οὐ κοινήν[28] and 6.4 Χριστιανοὶ γινώσκονται μένοντες ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, ἀόρατος δὲ αὐτῶν ἡ θεοσέβεια μένει.[29] The repetitions, in another passage, of πατρίς (5.5) and σαρκί/σάρκα (5.8) have a similar function.

The commentators have noticed a great variety of other rhetorical devices: strings of exclamations, rhetorical questions, anaphora, chiasmus.[30] Their abundance makes it impossible to conclude anything but that the author had undergone a formal education that included rhetorical training. An analysis of the sentence structure confirms this conclusion and brings to light more artistic qualities of the text.

Sentence structure

The sentence that serves as the preface of *Diogn.* has already been quoted and partly analysed. Syntactically it is one unified sentence, and a long sentence at that (113 words). It is carefully structured with a number of diversified elements: participle phrases, subordinate clauses, infinitives and main clauses. It comes close to a structure that could

---

[27] "[Christ became a ransom for mankind] the holy one for the lawless, | the innocent one for the wicked, | the righteous one for the unrighteous, | the imperishable one for the perishable, | the immortal one for the mortal."

[28] "[the Christians] provide a common table but not ordinary food." κοινήν was the reading of the *codex unicus*. Most recent editors prefer Maran's conjecture κοίτην (in his edition of 1752), which gives the meaning "they provide a common table, not a [common] bed." Maran thought that the antithesis between common table and common bed was intended as a defence against allegations of promiscuity, directed against the Christians. However, the sentence appears in a passage which is not primarily a defence of Christians against particular pagan accusations but which points out a series of paradoxical features of the Christians' own situation in the Roman society. The author has exploited the double meaning of κοινός for a wordplay that highlights one of those paradoxes. By "common table" *Diogn.* here refers to the Eucharist, and also Justin Martyr (*Apology* 66.2) denies that the food and drink served at the Eucharist meal could be classified as something κοινόν: οὐ γὰρ ὡς κοινὸν ἄρτον οὐδὲ κοινὸν πόμα ταῦτα λαμβάνομεν "we do not take this as an ordinary bread or as an ordinary drink." In early Christian literature the adjective κοινός was used about "impure" food and drink (cf. *BDAG*, *s.v.* κοινός 2b), so the readers of *Diogn.* would easily understand its intended meaning here. Cf. Otto 1852, 106; Riggi 1987, 524; Blomqvist and Blomqvist 2017, 412, n. 73.

[29] "Christians are known as residing in the world, but their worship remains invisible." The ms. had μένοντες, but the editors generally print μὲν ὄντες, accepting what Jefford 2013, 176 calls "the adjusted reading of Estienne against the exemplar and Haus". But that 'adjustment' obscures the subtlety of the text. Riggi 1987, 524 and Lona 2001, 178 prefer the ms. reading with its movement between two meanings of the verb μένω.

[30] See Geffcken 1928, 21–22, 24–25; Meecham 1949, 13–15; Marrou 1965, 126–127; Lona 2001, 38–39; Blomqvist 2014a, 209.

be described as a *period*, i.e. a sentence that consists of several hierarchically structured constituents, that forms a syntactically unified whole, and that – ideally – becomes syntactically complete only when the last constituent is in position.

Such sentences are not common in *Diogn.*; the preface diverges stylistically from the main text, as prefaces sometimes do. Elsewhere the author strongly favours short sentences or cola, preferably those with antithetical or even paradoxical content. This is an illustrative example:

πατρίδας οἰκοῦσιν ἰδίας,
                               ἀλλ᾽ ὡς πάροικοι.
μετέχουσι πάντων ὡς πολῖται,
                               καὶ πάνθ᾽ ὑπομένουσιν ὡς ξένοι.
πᾶσα ξένη πατρίς ἐστιν αὐτῶν,
                               καὶ πᾶσα πατρὶς ξένη.
γαμοῦσιν ὡς πάντες, τεκνογονοῦσιν,
                               ἀλλ᾽ οὐ ῥίπτουσι τὰ γεννώμενα.
τράπεζαν κοινὴν παρατίθενται,
                               ἀλλ᾽ οὐ κοινήν.
ἐν σαρκὶ τυγχάνουσιν,
                               ἀλλ᾽ οὐ κατὰ σάρκα ζῶσιν.
ἐπὶ γῆς διατρίβουσιν,
                               ἀλλ᾽ ἐν οὐρανῷ πολιτεύονται.
πείθονται τοῖς ὡρισμένοις νόμοις,
                               καὶ τοῖς ἰδίοις βίοις νικῶσι τοὺς νόμους.[31]

The passage describes the situation of the Christians in the Roman society in a series of short sentences, linked together in antithetical pairs. Eight of those pairs are quoted here; actually the list continues with nine more items. The pairs form antitheses, linked with ἀλλά, or paradoxes, linked with καί.

Thus, short sentences are favoured, and even if a sentence starts with a fairly complex and regular syntactical structure, it normally dissolves into something else, as is exemplified by the long sentence at 9.6. This sentence starts with two participle phrases coordinated by the corresponding particles μέν and δέ: ἐλέγξας οὖν ἐν μὲν τῷ πρόσθεν χρόνῳ τὸ ἀδύνατον τῆς ἡμετέρας φύσεως εἰς τὸ τυχεῖν ζωῆς,[32] and νῦν δὲ τὸν σωτῆρα δείξας δυνατὸν σῴζειν καὶ τὰ ἀδύνατα.[33] Then follows the main verb ἐβουλήθη with an infinitive phrase as its adjunct: ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων ἐβουλήθη πιστεύειν ἡμᾶς τῇ χρηστότητι αὐτοῦ.[34] With that, the sentence becomes complete syntactically. But the author does not

---

[31] *Diogn.* 5.5–10 "They live in their own countries, but as expatriates; | they take part in everything as citizens and endure everything as aliens; | every foreign country is their homeland and every homeland is foreign; | they marry like everyone and have children, but they do not throw away their offspring; | they provide a common table but not common food; | they exist in the flesh but do not live according to flesh; | they spend their lives on earth but are citizens in heaven; | they are obedient to the established laws but surpass the laws with their own ways of life."

[32] "Since he clearly demonstrated in the former time that we could not possibly, by our very nature, obtain life [...]."

[33] "[...] and since he now revealed the saviour who has the power to save even what is powerless [...]."

[34] "[...] for both reasons he wanted us to believe in his kindness."

leave it there but, after the phrase with the main verb, he adds – asyndetically – another infinitive phrase, αὐτὸν ἡγεῖσθαι τροφέα,[35] and the last word of that phrase is expanded into a list of no less than eleven divine epithets: πατέρα, διδάσκαλον, σύμβουλον, ἰατρόν, νοῦν, φῶς, τιμήν, δόξαν, ἰσχύν, ζωήν.[36] Then, the sentence ends with one more infinitive phrase, also attached asyndetically, περὶ ἐνδύσεως καὶ τροφῆς μὴ μεριμνᾶν,[37] and it takes some milliseconds for the reader to realize that the only main verb that infinitive could be construed with is the now distant ἐβουλήθη.

Thus, the author is fond of constructing long strings of short sentences, phrases or even individual words. That does not normally count as a sign of literary skill or linguistic competence. However, even these straightforward and mostly rather monotonous enumerations are not devoid of artistry. The individual items significantly often appear in groups of three, so the author is likely to have deliberately tried to achieve a certain amount of symmetry. In some sentences he creates variation by rounding off an enumeration with a syntactically divergent, longer unit, such as the concluding infinitive phrase περὶ ἐνδύσεως καὶ τροφῆς μὴ μεριμνᾶν in the passage we just discussed. In 7.2 there is an artistic arrangement of short cola; four groups with three members each have been combined into an elaborate structure:

> ᾧ πάντα διατέτακται
>   καὶ διώρισται
>   καὶ ὑποτέτακται,
>   οὐρανοὶ καὶ τὰ ἐν οὐρανοῖς,
>   γῆ καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ,
>   θάλασσα καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ,
>   πῦρ,
>   ἀήρ,
>   ἄβυσσος,
>   τὰ ἐν ὕψεσι,
>   τὰ ἐν βάθεσι,
>   τὰ ἐν τῷ μεταξύ.[38]

To sum up: the author has literary and stylistic ambitions, he has undergone some sort of rhetorical training, his style is characterized by a loose sentence structure, sequences of short cola often artistically arranged, and a wealth of rhetorical devices.

Models and parallels

Diogn. is certainly different, in these respects, both from the New Testament and from most other Christian writings of the first two centuries. The apostolic fathers offered

---

[35] "[...] to consider him our nurse [...]."
[36] "[...] father, teacher, counsellor, physician, mind, light, honour, glory, strength, life [...]."
[37] "[...] to have no concern over what to wear or eat."
[38] "[Christ] by whom all things are set in order | and arranged | and subjected, | the heavens and the things in the heavens, | the earth and the things in the earth, | the sea and the things in the sea, | fire, | air, | abyss, | creatures in the heights, | creatures in the depth, | creatures in between."

nothing like it, and among the apologists the commentators before the mid-twentieth century found no obvious parallels either.

When searching for stylistic parallels of *Diogn.*, earlier commentators often suggested a specific writer of the early third century: Clement of Alexandria.[39] Just like *Diogn.*, Clement's writings reveal the rhetorical schooling of their author. However, Clement is much different from *Diogn.* stylistically.[40] The sentence structures consisting of short cola, more or less artistically arranged, that dominate in *Diogn.*, do not appear with such frequency in Clement. His sentence construction is more varied, and periods are not a rarity in his texts. He is well acquainted with the usual rhetorical figures, but also in that field he is more varied than *Diogn.* and uses such devices with greater moderation.

Clement was also influenced, not only stylistically but also as regards grammatical and lexical details, by the Atticist movement, which *Diogn.* is not. The Atticists strived to reintroduce a number of lexical and morphological elements that belonged to the Attic dialect of the classical period but which had vanished from the standardized variety of Attic that became the common language of the Greek-speaking world in the Hellenistic period.[41] Clement's prose abounds in duals and optatives, but such Atticist niceties are next to absent from *Diogn.*, and other typical characteristics of Atticism do not appear there either. Except for some potential optatives (2.3 [*bis*], 2.4, 2.10 [*bis*], 3.3, 3.4, 7.3, 8.3), the features that were the 'principal markers' of Atticist usage are absent from *Diogn.*[42] On the contrary, *Diogn.* exemplifies a number of those non-Attic features that the second-century Atticist lexicographer Phrynichus denounced as incorrect. These include the lexical-morphological items καθάρας (2.1, for καθήρας), γενηθῶμεν, γεν[ν]ηθείς(?) (9.1, 11.2, with a passive aorist instead of medium γενώμεθα etc.), πάντοτε (11.4, for ἑκάστοτε or διὰ παντός) and τυγχάνουσιν (2.1, 5.8, 10.7, for τυγχάνουσιν ὄντες),[43] and, if we can trust the manuscript in these matters, *Diogn.* always prefers a non-Attic phonology in words like θάλασσα (16 instances), γίνομαι/γινώσκω (6 times) and σήμερον (11.5; for τήμερον). For Attic ἔστω, *Diogn.* has the Hellenistic innovation ἤτω (12.7).[44] Clement, on the other hand, uses the aorist ἐκάθηρα and the imperative ἔστω, writes ἐγενόμην and διὰ παντός or ἑκάστοτε, varies between σσ and ττ, as between γιν and γιγν, and allows ἤτω, σήμερον and πάντοτε only in quotations.[45] Clement at least knew the Atticist rules and mostly respected them. Thus, although both writers had rhetorical education, the author of *Diogn.* does not belong to the same literary and rhetorical tradition as Clement.

It was only in 1960, when the *Papyrus Bodmer XIII* was published, that really relevant material for comparison with *Diogn.* became available.[46] The papyrus contains a sermon for the celebration of Easter, delivered by the bishop Melito of Sardis about AD 200. The same dominant, conspicuous rhetorical devices are manifest in this text, just as

---

[39] Geffcken 1924, 350; Geffcken 1928, v, 13; Meecham 1949, 62–64.

[40] On differences in style and grammar between Clement and the second-century apologists, cf. Wifstrand 1962, 63–64, and Fabricius 1967, 195.

[41] On Atticism and other varieties of Greek in the relevant period, see Blomqvist 2014b.

[42] See Horrocks 2010, 138, for a list of these 'principal markers'.

[43] Cf. Phrynichus, *Eclogae* 15 (καθᾶραι/καθῆραι), 74 (πάντοτε), 79 (ἐγενόμην/ἐγενήθην), 242 (τυγχάνεις ὤν).

[44] On ἔστω/ἤτω, see *BDR* § 98.

[45] These details of Clement's usage have been documented by searches in the *TLG* database.

[46] Testuz 1960. Bonner's reconstruction of the sermon contained only small portions of the text (Bonner 1940). Cf. Perler 1966, 11–15; Hall 1979, xvii–xxii.

in *Diogn.* The sentence structure is dominated by short units, pairs or strings of isocola, homoeoteleuton and antitheses are plentiful, and rhetorical figures embellish the text. Series of exclamations and rhetorical questions occur, anaphora abounds. The general character of the style can be illustrated by sentences such as these:

οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἀμνὸς ὁ φονευόμενος·
οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἀμνὸς ὁ ἄφωνος·
οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τεχθεὶς ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς καλῆς ἀμνάδος·
οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἐξ ἀγέλης λημφθείς,

καὶ εἰς σφαγὴν συρείς,
καὶ ἑσπέρας τυθείς,
καὶ νύκτωρ ταφείς,

ὁ ἐπὶ ξύλου μὴ συντριβείς,
εἰς γῆν μὴ λυθείς,
ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάς,
καὶ ἀναστήσας τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐκ τῆς κάτω ταφῆς.[47]

This style, with its short cola with antithetical content, of equal length and with assonances, belongs to a Greek rhetorical tradition that is often termed Asianism, an expression that seems to have been coined as a deprecatory label for a stylistic school that was much the opposite of Atticism.[48]

The Asianic style originates from the experiments of the earliest known Greek rhetoricians, Gorgias of Leontini and his immediate followers in the fifth century BC.[49] It enjoyed a vogue in the Hellenistic period when it dominated oratory, but its stylistic ideals were condemned by the Atticist movement and gradually went out of fashion. Still, in the second century AD there were Greek writers whose style was clearly influenced by Asianism. They included Maximus of Tyre and Polemo of Laodicea and there are traces of it in the declamations of Lucian and in a couple of orations wrongly attributed to Dio Chrysostom in the manuscript tradition (nos. 37 [probably by Favorinus] and 64 [possibly by Herodes Atticus]).

The adaptation of a Greek, i.e. non-Christian and non-Jewish, rhetorical tradition by second- and third-century Christians illustrates an important fact: the early Christian writers were mostly not strangers to pagan education. The early text that we have discussed here was obviously written by a Christian who had been trained in a Greek rhetorical school. The same applies to his probable contemporary Melito, to his near contemporary Clement of Alexandria, and even more to the writers of the successive centuries. Greek rhetoric was appropriated as a tool by Christian writers, preachers and teachers for their own purposes.

---

[47] *Diogn.* 71.494–504. "He is the lamb being slain. | He is the lamb that is speechless. | He is the one born from Mary, the lovely ewe-lamb. | He is the one taken from the flock, | dragged to slaughter, | killed in the evening, | buried at night; | who was not broken on the tree, | who did not dissolve in the earth, | who rose up from the dead, | and who raised up mankind from the grave below" (text and translation: Hall 1979 [modified]).

[48] The style is recognizable also in the preserved fragments of Melito's other writings, in particular frg. 8b–12.

[49] For a characterization of Asianism, cf. Norden 1915-18, 131–149, 263–270. On Melito's style, see Wifstrand 1948.

Rhetoric: denounced and appropriated

In the early Christian texts it is not difficult to find passages in which the writers distance themselves from the schooling and education of the type that was offered to the elite of the contemporary society. In *First Corinthians* (chs. 2–4), for example, Paul makes it quite clear that he shares this negative view on non-Christian education. He makes a distinction between the wisdom – σοφία – of this world and the wisdom of God, which he claims to be preaching and teaching himself. As regards Paul's view of rhetoric in particular, this utterance seems to be revealing: ὁ λόγος μου καὶ τὸ κήρυγμά μου οὐκ ἐν πειθοῖς ἀνθρωπίνης σοφίας λόγοις (*1 Cor.* 2:4).[50]

There are textual problems in this sentence.[51] The version quoted here is a reconstruction based on the majority of the majuscule manuscripts and largely confirmed by the church fathers. It must have been current at an early date, probably in the second century, even if it was not identical with Paul's original text. The sentence contains one word that is particularly relevant in the context of rhetoric, viz. πειθοῖς 'persuasive' (unanimously preserved by all relevant text witnesses including the Chester Beatty papyrus [p. 46]). Etymologically this word is linked with the substantive πειθώ 'persuasion' and the verb πείθω 'persuade', which are technical terms that denote the objective of rhetoric. The word indicates that Paul explicitly refers to contemporary rhetorical practices, and in this passage he clearly distances himself from such practices,[52] as he does elsewhere.[53] Paul displays a "scorn of rhetoric"[54] and, although theories and concepts that belong to the study of rhetoric have proved useful for the analysis of form and content in his letters, he cannot be proved to have undergone a formal training in rhetoric.[55] His style is much different from that of trained Christian writers such as Tatian or Clement; a number rhetorical devices have been identified in the letters but they are not a dominant and distinctive characteristic of the text, as they are in *Diogn.* and in Melito's sermon. Paul and the other New Testament writers had of course visited schools where they had been taught to read and write Greek but, with the possible exception of Luke, there is no decisive evidence to show that they had enjoyed higher education that included a rhetorical training.

The situation changes in the second century. Christian writers still criticize rhetoric and distance themselves from pagan learning, but the very form and content of their criticism often reveals that they are themselves familiar with the teachings of the disciplines they criticize. Tatian, for example, in a rhetorical question, denounces the Atticist style of oratory and much of Greek learning, including the persuasive powers (πιθανότητες) of syllogisms: τί δ᾽ ἂν ὠφελήσειε λέξις Ἀττικὴ καὶ φιλοσόφων σωρεία καὶ

---

[50] "My word and my message were not by persuasive words of human wisdom" (text according to the majuscules [some of which omit ἀνθρωπίνης (and p46 omits λόγοις)]; my own translation).
[51] Analyses of the problems are to be found in the current commentaries on the text. Cf. also *BDAG, s.v.* πειθός.
[52] For other suggested interpretations of the passage, see Porter 1997, 536–537.
[53] Cf. *Galatians* 5.8 ἡ πεισμονὴ οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ καλοῦντος "the persuasion [that draws you away from the truth] is not from the one who calls you", with another word for 'persuasion', πεισμονή, which is also derived from πείθω. Both πειθός and πεισμονή are extremely rare words, but their meaning is quite clear; cf. *BDAG, s.v.* πειθός.
[54] To use Siegert's phrase (Siegert 1997, 428).
[55] See Porter 1997, 534–537.

συλλογισμῶν πιθανότητες καὶ μέτρα γῆς καὶ ἄστρων θέσεις καὶ ἡλίου δρόμοι.[56] But, as Karadimas and others have shown, with his *Oratio ad Graecos* Tatian has chosen to reveal himself as a competent rhetorician.[57] The sentence quoted here even contradicts itself for, although it denounces Atticist style, it contains a linguistic feature that is characteristic of Atticizing Greek, viz. a verb in the optative mode: ὀφελήσειε. It is a potential optative, with the particle ἄν, in a rhetorical question. This is a usage of classical Attic that the Atticists strived to reintroduce, and Tatian has adopted it. In the non-Atticist Greek of the day, rhetorical questions of this sort (*wh*-questions) were normally construed with subjunctives or future indicatives.[58]

Tatian's *Oratio* reveals, just like *Diogn.*, that its author had undergone rhetorical training, but Tatian had also, just like Clement, adopted some of the teachings of the Atticists, which *Diogn.* had not.

Thus, the early Christian writers criticize rhetoric or Greek education in general, but at least some of them turn out to have a not inconsiderable degree of competence in the field they criticize. It should be observed that rhetoric was used by the Christians not only in texts that were addressed to pagan audiences, who could be assumed to have been educated in the traditional schools, but, as Melito's Easter sermon demonstrates, rhetoric was also used when the audience consisted solely or predominantly of fellow Christians. This ambivalent attitude to rhetoric is typical of the second-century Christian writers.

An ambivalence of that sort is not a Christian prerogative but it is paralleled by attitudes to rhetoric among the pagan intellectuals of the time. Rhetoric and philosophy were often seen as adversaries and as rivals for the same human souls. Plato's dialogue *Gorgias* illustrates that this animosity is of an early date. It continued throughout the Hellenistic period, with, in particular, Epicurean philosophers attacking rhetoric. In the second century AD, the discussion was still lively and manifests itself, as Karadimas has shown, in the writings of the rhetorician Aelius Aristides and the philosopher Sextus Empiricus.[59] In a recent book, Lauwers has shown how the Greek philosophers act in the same way as Tatian and other Christian writers: they criticize rhetoric, but their own texts demonstrate that they had undergone rhetorical training – they employ their competence to criticize rhetoric.[60] Lauwers concentrates on Maximus of Tyre, but he also investigates no less than twelve other intellectuals of the second century (Flavius Philostratus, Dio Chrysostom, Plutarch, Epictetus, Favorinus, Arrian, Aelius Aristides, Marcus Aurelius, Lucian of Samosata, Apuleius, Galen and Sextus Empiricus), many of whom, if to a varying extent, exemplify the same ambivalent attitude to rhetoric.

The case of Marcus Aurelius is illustrative. In a letter, written in AD 146 or 147, to his teacher of Latin eloquence, M. Cornelius Fronto, Marcus declares his dissatisfaction

---

[56] *Oratio* 27.3 "What good could come from an Attic style, from philosophers' sophistries, the probability of syllogisms, the dimensions of Earth, the positions of stars, or the itineraries of the sun?" (text and translation: Whittaker 1982 [modified]).
[57] Kinzig 1997, 642–643; Karadimas 2003; Maràs 2010.
[58] *BDR* § 366:1, 385:1, 496:2. There are several examples in the New Testament (but Luke could use ἄν + optative), and cf. *Diogn.* 7.6, 10.3 and also 4.5, where *Diogn.* adds the particle ἄν to the future (there is no reason to emend ἡγήσεται into ἡγήσαιτο, as Jefford does, for the addition of ἄν to the future is not without parallels; see Otto 1852, 103; Ræder 1953; *BDR* § 380:3).
[59] Karadimas 1996.
[60] Lauwers 2015.

with rhetoric and announces his intention to return to the philosophical studies of his youth.[61] During his reign – from 161 onwards – Marcus was of course expected to display his mastery of conventional oratory on regular occasions when performing his imperial duties, but it is significant that also in his private contemplations (Τὰ εἰς ἑαυτόν, *'To himself'*), which were presumably written during the last two decades of his life and are imbued with his philosophical worldview, there are obvious examples of rhetorical strategies and devices.[62] Just like the Christian writers of the second century, Marcus uses rhetoric as an instrument for conveying his message.

Conclusion

The divide separating rhetoricians, on one hand, from Christian preachers or Stoic thinkers, on the other, was not impermeable. Marcus explicitly marks his distance from rhetoric, but exploits its advantages for expressing his innermost thoughts, and so too do Tatian and other writers, both Christians and pagans. Whether the author of *Diogn.* ever condemned the Hellenized education system of his time, with its emphasis on rhetorical training, must remain unknown. The text here in his hand (that coincidence has preserved) testifies to the fact that, when defending his faith, he chose to make use of the teachings offered by the existing schooling system. In that respect he acts in no wise differently from his contemporaries, irrespective of their religious or philosophical beliefs.

---

[61] Fronto, *Ep. ad M. Caesarem et invicem* 4.13. On Marcus' "second conversion to philosophy" see van den Hout 1999, viii–ix, and his commentary on *Ep.* 4.13 in the same work.
[62] On Marcus Aurelius in particular, cf. Karadimas 2005 (with a detailed analysis of several chapters of book 2 of the *Meditations*); Lozza 2012; Lauwers 2015 81–92.

Bibliography

Alexander 1993 = L. Alexander, *The Preface to Luke's Gospel. Literary Convention and Social Context in Luke 1.1–4 and Acts 1.1* (Monograph Series. Society for New Testament Studies 78), Cambridge 1993.

Andriessen 1947 = P. Andriessen, 'The Authorship of the Epistula ad Diognetum', *VChr* 1 (1947) 129–136.

Blomqvist 2014a = J. Blomqvist, 'The *Ad Diognetum* and Contemporary Rhetorical Practice', in E.K. Emilsson, A. Maravela and M. Skoie (eds.), *Paradeigmata. Studies in Honour of Øivind Andersen* (Papers and Monographs from the Norwegian Institute at Athens. Series 4, vol. 2), Athens 2014, 203–218.

Blomqvist 2014b = J. Blomqvist, 'Atticism and Attic Vernacular in Second-Century Athens', *Melita Classica* 1 (2014) 39–55.

Blomqvist and Blomqvist 2017 = J. Blomqvist and K. Blomqvist, 'Eucharist Terminology in Early Christian Literature. Philological and Semantic Aspects', in D. Hellholm and D. Sänger (eds.), *The Eucharist – Its Origins and Contexts: Contexts. Sacred Meal, Communal Meal, Table Fellowship in Late Antiquity, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity* I. *Old Testament, Early Judaism, New Testament* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 376), Tübingen 2017, 389–421.

Bonner 1940 = C. Bonner (ed.), *The Homily on the Passion, by Melito, Bishop of Sardis and Some Fragments of the Apocryphal Ezekiel* (Studies and Documents 12), London and Philadelphia 1940.

Ehrman 2003 = B.D. Ehrman (ed. and tr.), *The Apostolic Fathers 2. Epistle of Barnabas, Papias and Quadratus, Epistle to Diognetus, Shepherd of Hermas*, Cambridge, Mass. 2003.

van der Eijk 2000–2001 = P.J. van der Eijk (ed., tr. and com.), *Diocles of Carystus. A Collection of the Fragments with Translation and Commentary* I–II, Leiden 2000–2001.

Fabricius 1967 = C. Fabricius, 'Der sprachliche Klassizismus der griechischen Kirchenväter. Ein philosophisches und geistesgeschichtliches Problem', *JbAC* 10 (1967) 187–199.

Geffcken 1924 = J. Geffcken, 'Der Brief an Diognetos', *ZKG* 43 (1924) 348–350.

Geffcken 1928 = J. Geffcken (ed. and com.), *Der Brief an Diognetos* (Kommentierte griechische und lateinische Texte 4), Heidelberg 1928.

de Groot 1919 = A.W. de Groot, *A Handbook of Antique Prose-rhythm* I. *History of Greek Prose-metre*, Groningen 1919.

Hall 1979 = S.G. Hall (ed. and tr.), *Melito of Sardis. On Pascha and Fragments*, Oxford 1979.

Hill 2006 = C.E. Hill, *From the Lost Teaching of Polycarp. Identifying Irenaeus' Apostolic Presbyter and the Author of Ad Diognetum* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 186), Tübingen 2006.

Horrocks 2010 = G.C. Horrocks, *Greek. A History of the Language and its Speakers*, 2nd ed., Chichester 2010.

van den Hout 1999 = M.P.J. van den Hout (ed. and com.), *A Commentary on the Letters of M. Cornelius Fronto* (Mnemosyne Supplements 190), Leiden 1999.

Jefford 2013 = C.N. Jefford (ed. and com.), *The Epistle to Diognetus (with the Fragment of Quadratus)*, Oxford 2013.

Karadimas 1996 = D. Karadimas, *Sextus Empiricus against Aelius Aristides. The Conflict between Philosophy and Rhetoric in the Second Century A.D.* (Studia Graeca et Latina Lundensia 5), Lund 1996.

Karadimas 2003 = D. Karadimas, *Tatian's Oratio ad Graecos. Rhetoric and Philosophy/ Theology* (Scripta minora Regiae Societatis humaniorum litterarum Lundensis 2000/2001:2), Stockholm 2003.

Karadimas 2005 = D. Karadimas, 'Marcus Aurelius' «Meditations» and its Rhetoric', in A. Piltz, J. Akujärvi, V. Sabatakakis, K. Blomqvist, G. Walser and L. Nordgren (eds.), *For Particular Reasons. Studies in Honour of Jerker Blomqvist*, Lund 2005, 165–189.

Kinzig 1997 = W. Kinzig, 'The Greek Christian Writers', in S.E. Porter (ed.), *The Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period, 330 B.C.-A.C. 400*, Leiden 1997, 633–670.

Lauwers 2015 = J. Lauwers, *Philosophy, Rhetoric, and Sophistry in the High Roman Empire. Maximus of Tyre and Twelve Other Intellectuals* (Mnemosyne Supplements 385), Leiden 2015.

Lindemann and Paulsen 1992 = A. Lindeman and H. Paulsen (eds. and trs.), *Die apostolischen Väter. Griechisch-deutsche Parallelausgabe*, *auf der Grundlage der Ausgaben von F.X. Funk, K. Bihlmeyer und M. Whittaker mit* Übersetzungen *von M. Dibelius und D.A. Koch*, Tübingen 1992.

Lona 2001 = H.E. Lona (com. and tr.), *An Diognet* (Kommentar zu frühchristlichen Apologeten 8), Freiburg 2001.

Lozza 2012 = G. Lozza, 'Retorica e antiretorica in Marco Aurelio', in U. Criscuolo (ed.), *La retorica greca fra tardo antico ed età bizantina: idee e forme*, Naples 2012, 51–64.

Maràs 2010 = A.G. Maràs, 'The Issue of Rhetoric for Christian Apologists in the Second Century', *Augustinianum* 50/2 (2010) 409–421.

Marrou 1965 = H.-I. Marrou (ed., tr. and com.), *A Diognète* (*SC* 33 bis), 2nd rev. ed., Paris 1965.

Meecham 1949 = H.G. Meecham (tr. and com.), *The Epistle to Diognetus* (Publications of the University of Manchester 305; Theological Series 7), Manchester 1949.

Norden 1915–18 = E. Norden, *Die antike Kunstprosa vom VI. Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance* I–II. 3rd repr., Leipzig 1915–18.

Otto 1852 = I.C.T. Otto (ed., tr. and com.), *Epistola ad Diognetum Iustini Philosophi et Martyris nomen prae se ferens*, 2nd ed., Leipzig 1852.

Päll 2007 = J. Päll, *Form, Style and Syntax. Towards a Statistical Analysis of Greek Prose Rhythm on the Example of "Helen's Encomium" by Gorgias* (Dissertationes studiorum Graecorum et Latinorum Universitatis Tartuensis 3), Tartu 2007.

Perler 1966 = O. Perler (ed., tr. and com.), *Méliton de Sardes. Sur la pâque et Fragments* (*SC* 123), Paris 1966.

Porter 1997 = S.E. Porter, 'Paul of Tarsus and his Letters', in S.E. Porter (ed.), *The Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period, 330 B.C.-A.D. 400*, Leiden 1997, 532–585.

Ræder 1953 = H. Ræder, *Ein Problem in griechischer Syntax. Die Verbindung der Partikel* ἄν *mit Futurum* (Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab. Historisk-filologiske Meddelelser 33.5), Copenhagen 1953.

Riggi 1987 = C. Riggi, 'Lettura dell'*Ad Diognetum* secondo il codice F', in J. Dummer (ed.), *Texte und Textkritik. Eine Aufsatzsammlung* (TU 133), Berlin 1987, 521–529.

Siegert 1997 = F. Siegert, 'Homily and Panegyrical Sermon', in S.E. Porter (ed.), *The Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period, 330 B.C.-A.C. 400*, Leiden 1997, 421–443.

Testuz 1960 = M. Testuz (ed. and tr.), *Papyrus Bodmer XIII. Méliton de Sardes, Homélie sur la Pâque, manuscrit du IIIe siècle*, Cologny-Genève 1960.

Wengst 1984 = K. Wengst (ed., tr. and com.), *Didache (Apostellehre). Barnabasbrief, Zweiter Klemensbrief, Schrift an Diognet* (Schriften des Urchristentums 2), Munich and Darmstadt 1984.

Whittaker 1982 = M. Whittaker (ed. and tr.), *Tatian, Oratio ad Graecos and Fragments*, Oxford 1982.

Wifstrand 1948 = A. Wifstrand, 'The Homily of Melito on the Passion', *VChr* 2 (1948) 201–223.

Wifstrand 1962 = A. Wifstrand, *L'église ancienne et la culture grecque*, tr. L.-M. Dewailly, Paris 1962.