Raising new hypotheses about patristic authorship is always a hazardous enterprise, and it is particularly hazardous when the works of the author in question have come down to us in as lamentable a state of disarray as those of Hippolytus of Rome. Yet it is precisely this fragmentary, anonymous and misattributed state of his works, or rather pieces of his works, that has made controversy over them almost inevitable. In this century controversy over the works of Hippolytus has been particularly common among French scholars, an admirably brief treatment of which can be found in Robert Butterworth's edition of Contra Noetum. And controversy has not disappeared, as proven by Miroslav Marcovich's introduction to a new critical edition of Refutatio omnium haeresium stoutly defending its Hippolytan authorship. I shall avoid reviving these old controversies for unlike others I accept the current scholarly consensus that Refutatio and other extant major fragments are by Hippolytus. Instead, I will try to prove two new hypotheses about the works of Hippolytus: 1. that the identification of PG 10,796-801, ascribed by modern scholars to Hippolytus, with the work described by Photius in Bibliotheca 48 is questionable; 2. that PG 6,1572D-1592A, a fragmentary work often overlooked and still unattributed to any author, may in fact be by Hippolytus. I offer these two new hypotheses not in the spirit of controversy, but in the hope that they will encourage everyone interested in the Hippolytan corpus, controversialist or otherwise, to reexamine our all too fragmentary evidence.

I

The belief that PG 10,796-801 is part of Hippolytus' peri tou pantos has seldom been examined very critically. This belief is based on its identification with a work described by Photius in Bibliotheca 48 entitled peri tou pantos or peri tis tou pantos aitias or peri tis tou pantos ogias and ascribed to...
Josephus. Because a title like this is included on the famous statue inscribed with his works, there is little doubt that Hippolytus indeed wrote a treatise with such a title. In addition, most scholars accept the theory that the κεφάλαιον τοῦ παντός described by Photius is to be identified with the work of that title by Hippolytus, and that PG 10,796-801, ascribed in some manuscripts to Josephus, is a fragment from that same work. Two scholars who have suggested otherwise are Pierre Nautin and C.E. Hill. The former thought it improbable that a patristic work would have been ascribed to Josephus and argued that it was in fact written by an otherwise unknown Christian named Josephus. However, like scholars before him, Nautin was certain that PG 10,796-801 is part of the work described by Photius in Bibliotheca 48. C.E. Hill argued that PG 10,796-801 is not in fact by Hippolytus because its eschatology is too different from that found in the undisputed works of Hippolytus. Hill seems to have sensed some of the discrepancies between Photius' description and the content of PG 10,796-801, but accepted the identification of the two anyway.

One notable dissenter from the scholarly consensus that PG 10,796-801 is part of the work described by Photius in Bibliotheca 48 was William Whiston, the eighteenth century divine known in the English-speaking world for his exceedingly popular translation of Josephus' works. Whiston was interested in PG 10,796-801 because it is ascribed to Josephus in some manuscripts. Whiston translated the work into English, placing it after Josephus' undisputed works, and in one of the dissertations appended to his translations he argued against identifying it with the work described by Photius in Bibliotheca 48. Whiston's plausible arguments against identification were based on the obvious discrepancies between this work and the κεφάλαιον τοῦ παντός described in Bibliotheca 48. Unfortunately, in the interest of defending his far-fetched thesis that Josephus was not only an Ebionite Christian but even one of the first fifteen Jewish bishops who oversaw the Jerusalem church before the failure of Bar Kochba rebellion, Whiston also made some very implausible arguments in favor of Josephan authorship of this Christian work, a fact which probably explains why his views on the work have never been influential among scholars. Nevertheless, taking my inspiration from Whiston, I shall review some reasons for questioning the work's identity with the κεφάλαιον τοῦ παντός described by Photius. I shall suggest a reason why the work may have been misascribed to Josephus, and I shall briefly consider some alternative hypotheses about the work's identity.

Since the title of PG 10,796-801 varies in manuscripts, I shall assign it a title taken from its opening sentence. It begins "that was the discourse