NOTES AND STUDIES

A PRIMITIVE EDITION OF THE APOSTOLIC CONSTITUTIONS AND CANONS: AN EARLY LIST OF APOSTLES AND DISCIPLES.

The following paper is an enlargement and re-statement of results first formulated in the Journal for July 1912 (pp. 492-514). During the twelve months that have intervened since that publication I have devoted a good deal of time to the further study of the Verona fragment of an early Latin version of the Apostolic Constitutions and Canons to which I there called attention: the texts have been re-examined, and have now appeared in a much more complete and correct form in my Ecclesiae Occidentalis Monumenta Iuris Antiquissima i pp. 32 a-32 nn. The introduction I propose to develop here.

When I began work at the fragment I used Lagarde's edition of the Greek text of the Constitutions. It was the edition of which I had availed myself for many years for purposes of reference, and the name and deservedly honoured reputation of the editor warranted me, as I supposed, in regarding it as an adequate critical text. It was obvious at once, and I pointed it out on pp. 505-510, that Lagarde's Greek represented a very inferior text to that of the Latin fragment, while his citations of the editio princeps of Fr. Turrianus or Torres¹ (Venice 1563) shewed that in some important points the development of the text from Turrianus to Lagarde was not for the better but for the worse. So clear was this in the list of Canonical books—the last of the Apostolic Canons—that I printed in the parallel column (pp. 513, 514) no longer the text of Lagarde, but the text of Turrianus.

Meanwhile I was neglecting the most recent and fullest statement of the evidence for the Greek text of the Constitutions, which would have saved me, if I had consulted it earlier, a good many hours of painful labour. I knew of course of the existence of Funk's great edition (Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum, 2 vols., Paderborn, A.D. 1905): but I supposed that it confined itself to the collocation of the printed texts of the Constitutions with their sources,² and either I did not know or had forgotten that it included a critical apparatus. In order to leave

¹ 'Francisco Torres, S.J., born 1509 at Herrera, present at the Council of Trent, died Nov. 21, 1584. Fifty-eight of his works are fully described in Sommervogel's de Backer Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus.' I owe this information to the kindness of Bodley's Librarian, Mr Falconer Madan.

² As indeed had been the editor's intention; p. xxiii 'sperabam harum textum me ex editionibus recentissimis repetere posse'.
no stone unturned, I examined it before the last stage of the re-edition of the texts for my Monumenta Iuris; and I found at once that the answer to a good many difficult problems was in my hands.

In the first place the secret of the superiority of Turrianus to Lagarde is at once revealed: for whereas Lagarde used no MS earlier than the twelfth century, Funk has utilized four Vatican MSS of the tenth and eleventh centuries, and among these four are to be found, if not all the three MSS of Turrianus, certainly two of them: Vat. 839 is Turrianus's leading MS, obtained from Crete, Vat. 2088 is Turrianus's Sicilian MS, and I can hardly doubt that Vat. 1506 (a Grottaferrata MS) was his third or Calabrian MS from the monastery of Patiro at Rossano. It follows of course that, if we have Turrianus's MSS, we are independent of his edition, and a new edition with more extensive material might even be as much superior to Turrianus as Turrianus is to Lagarde.

And no doubt Funk's text has superseded those of all previous editors: but that does not mean that his text is always right against Turrianus, but rather that his excellent apparatus criticus enables us to control his text. In my previous paper I pressed as the most incontestable indication of the superiority of Turrianus to Lagarde that the former retains far more frequently than the latter the archaic form of doxology δι' οὐ σοι . . . ἐν ἀγίῳ πνεύματι: it is a grave blot on Funk's critical methods or acumen that he systematically prefers what seems to me obviously the secondary reading. Between chapters 12 and 41 inclusive of book viii of the Constitutions I have counted fourteen cases in which he prints the form μεθ' οὐ σοι . . . καὶ τῷ ἀγίῳ πνεύματι, and two in which he prints variations of the καὶ . . . καὶ form, although one of his MSS faithfully reproduces the διὰ . . . ἐν form in every one of the sixteen passages. For the most part the variation does not extend beyond the difference of μετὰ . . . καὶ on the one side as against διὰ . . . ἐν on the other: but in the two remaining instances the variations are worth setting out in parallel columns:

Funk 514. 7 (c. xii § 50)  
Μελίους

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>δι' σοι πᾶσα δόξα σέβας καὶ εὐχαριστία τιμὴ καὶ προσκύνησις, τῷ πατρὶ καὶ τῷ νῦν καὶ τῷ ἀγίῳ πνεύματι.</td>
<td>δι' δι' αὐτὸν σοι πᾶσα ἡ δόξα σέβας καὶ εὐχαριστία, καὶ διὰ σε καὶ μετὰ σε αὐτῶ τιμὴ καὶ προσκύνησις ἐν ἀγίῳ πνεύματι.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The manuscript whose unique readings are here recorded in the right-hand column is Vat. gr. 1506, about which we have already seen that it was in all probability one of the three MSS employed by Turrianus; and no doubt the excellences of the texts of both Turrianus and Funk are in large part due to it. One would have thought that its consistent support of the archaic doxology would already have been enough to put a modern editor on the track: but anyhow, whatever excuses may be made for editors who have worked on the Constitutions hitherto, they will no longer be open to their successors. The discovery of the Latin version contained in the Verona fragment has brought conclusive testimony to the unique value of this Greek MS, and the Greek text that I have printed in Eccl. Occid. Mon. Iur. Ant. at the foot of the page, below the transcription of the Verona Latin, as representing its original, is in all essentials the text of Vat. gr. 1506. The following are some of the readings in which the Verona fragment and Vat. gr. 1506 agree against all previous editors (the references within brackets in the left-hand column are to the pages and lines of Eccl. Occid. Mon. Iur. Ant., but the numbering of the Canons is that of Funk):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>viii 44 (e 18)</td>
<td>ἐπὶ τῶν κληρικῶν</td>
<td>de clericis</td>
<td>ἐπὶ τῶν ἐκλήρῳ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii 46 (j 18)</td>
<td>ἀλλὰ καλούμενος τῶν Χριστιάν όρῶν</td>
<td>sed uocatus</td>
<td>ἀλλ' ὁ καλούμενος ὥς τῶν Χριστιαν ὥρων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(m 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Christum uident</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i (n 5)</td>
<td>χειροτονεῖται</td>
<td>ordinatur</td>
<td>χειροτονεῖσθαι ἐπιμένον δὲ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v (o 6)</td>
<td>ἐπιμένον</td>
<td>perseuerans</td>
<td>τὴν αἰτίαν ... ἐὰν δὲ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii (o 17)</td>
<td>ἠ τὴν αἰτίαν ... ἦταν</td>
<td>aut causam ... aut si</td>
<td>ἠ ὧν τοῦ καταλόγου οἷον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xviii (r 2)</td>
<td>ἡ τοῦ καταλόγου</td>
<td>aut de collegio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxv (s 1)</td>
<td>Κύριος</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxvi (v 12)</td>
<td>τὴν αὐτοῦ γνώμην</td>
<td>ipsius uoluntate</td>
<td>τὴν ἐπανά γνώμην</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xlii (x 25)</td>
<td>σχολάζοντα</td>
<td>uacantem</td>
<td>σχολάζων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xl (y 12)</td>
<td>ἐνεργήσαι</td>
<td>operari</td>
<td>ἐνεργήσατι τι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lvii (z 19)</td>
<td>πεπρωμένων</td>
<td></td>
<td>πεπληγμένων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lviii (s 24)</td>
<td>ἡ ἐπιμένων</td>
<td>uel si perseueret</td>
<td>ἐπιμένων δὲ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lxx (aa 5)</td>
<td>φωνεύς τοῦ ἄκελφον</td>
<td>fratri interfect(ctor)</td>
<td>φονεύτας τῶν ἄκελφων</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Dionysius Exiguus goes with the Verona fragment and Vat. gr. 1506 in these instances.
If this list were extended to include the cases where Turrianus or Funk has adopted a reading on the sole authority of this Vatican MS, it would be still more impressive, because such readings are generally striking ones.

I cannot doubt that Vat. gr. 1506 is not only the best individual witness to the text of the Constitutions and Canons, but that where supported by the Verona fragment it is very rarely wrong. For the text of the greater part of the Apostolic Canons we have now for the first time indubitable testimony to an edition which is both very early and very good. Even those elements of the joint tradition which are not original are likely at least to be very interesting. The remainder of this paper will be devoted to the consideration of two features common to both Vat. gr. 1506 and Verona LI which appear to reflect the work of an editor, though of an editor who worked by addition to the original text rather than by modification of it.

1. Between fol. 151 ² and fol. 152 ² of the Verona MS a leaf must have been lost, for the previous leaf (151) has barely reached the end of canon xlvii, while the next leaf (152) commences in the middle of canon lii. Now as long as I was working on the printed texts of the Greek Canons, a serious difficulty here stood in the way: the amount of matter intervening between the end of canon xlvii and the middle of canon lii was not enough, or nearly enough, to fill a leaf of two pages. It was only when I made the acquaintance of Vat. gr. 1506 that I solved the difficulty. At the end of canon l after the words βαπτιζόντες αὐτοῦς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ νιότο καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος there is added a long dogmatic statement in the following terms:
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Διδασκάλισθω μέντοι ὃ βαπτίζομενος ὅτι πατήρ ὁυκ ἐσταυρώθη ὡς γέννησαν ὑπέμενεν ἀνθρώπουν ὁπτε δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀγιον ἀνθρώπους ἐγένετο, ἀλλ' ὡς τὸ πάθος ὑπέστη, οὐ γὰρ ἐσαρκώθη· ἐλυτρώσατο δὲ τὸν κόσμον τὶς ἐπικειμένης ὀργῆς ὁ μονογενὴς νῦν. ἐνθράπυπτο γὰρ φιλανθρωπία, ἐαυτῷ σώμα ἐκ παρθένου ἀναπλάσας (ἥ γὰρ σοφία φιλόδομηκεν ἐκτεὶ ὡκον ὡς ἰδημιουργός), 5 σταύρον δὲ ὑπέμενεν ἐκώς, ἐξειλατο δὲ τὸν κόσμον τὶς ἐπικειμένης ὀργῆς. βαπτίζομεθα ὅν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρός, οὐχ ὡς ἀνθρώπου γενομένου ἢ παθώντος, εἰς δὲ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ γίος, ὡς ὑποστάντος γεννήσας, ὡς ὑπομείναντος σταυρών, ὡς ἀποθανόντος καὶ ἀναστάντος εἰς τὸ ὄνομα δὲ τὸν ἁγίου πνεύματος, ὡς ὑμοσυνίου πατρὶ καὶ νῦν. οἱ δὲ μὴ ὡς βαπτίζοντες, ὡς ἀγγείοντες τὸ μυστήριον τίς εἰσεβείας, καθισεῖςθωσαν.

Ὁ τὸν πατέρα παρουσιάζει λέγων ἀσεβεΐς Ἰουδαίων βαρύτερα, μετὰ Χριστὸν καὶ τὸν πατέρα προσωπικοῦ δὲ τὸν υἱὸν ἁρωνύμενον τὸν μονογενῆ δὲ ἡμᾶς σαρκωθῆναι καὶ σταυρῶν ὑπομενεικέναι, θεομάχος ἐστί καὶ τῶν ἁγίων τολμημον. δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀγιον πατέρα ἀνομάζων ἡ υἱον ἀνεπεκτήμων 15 ἐστὶ καὶ ἀνόητος. ὁ γὰρ υἱός συνεδριανουργὸς τῷ πατρί καὶ σύνθρων καὶ συνυμβολῆτης καὶ κρίτης καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως αυτοῦ· καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἁγιον ὁμοούσιον θεότητι· ἐφ' ἡμῶν γὰρ Σίμων ὁ μάγος ἐξηρεύζετο σπάσας τῷ λαῷ πλάνον καὶ ἀστατον καὶ πονηρὸν εἰς ἑαυτόν τὸ πνεῦμα, καὶ ἕνα τριῳντὸν εἶναι φιλαρίσσας τὸν θεόν, ποτὲ δὲ καὶ τὸ πάθος τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τὴν γέννησιν 20 περιφέρειας.

Ὑμεῖς οὖν, ὥς εἰπόκοι, εἰς ἑνα πατέρα καὶ υἱόν καὶ ἄγιον πνεῦμα τρίτον βαπτίσατε κατὰ τὴν τοῦ κυρίου γνώμην καὶ τὴν ἡμετέραν εἰς πνεύματα διάσταξιν.


This long statement has nothing in common with the character of the Apostolic Canons, which for the rest are what their name suggests, Canons and not doctrinal definitions. Nor can we attribute to the compiler of the Constitutions and Canons the authorship of any dogmatic passage so definitely orthodox as this—witness the use of the term ὁμοούσιος in relation to the Holy Spirit, lines 10, 18. Neither, on the other hand, is it possible that the lost leaf of the Verona fragment can have contained (besides the four Canons missing, which must have occupied more than a page) an addition anything like as long as that printed above.

As it stands, then, the insertion of the Vatican MS cannot be original. Yet neither can it be other than old, seeing that it appears also in both the Syriac versions cited by Funk, and in the 'systematic' collection published about the middle of the sixth century by John Scholasticus of Antioch, where it constitutes the greater part of 'canon 50 of the holy Apostles' and the whole of 'canon 51 of the same'. Since the
insertion is headed in the Vatican MS τιτλαυ λεον, and since it is actually in the 36th chapter of John’s collection that the corresponding matter is found, it is possible that the Vatican MS may be depending ultimately upon John.

John, however, was certainly not himself the author of the passage. He found it in his copy of the Canons, and incorporated it in his Collection as such. And the Verona fragment, though it cannot have contained all that the Syriac versions and John and the Vatican MS unite in presenting, must have contained something more than the ordinary texts: if I calculate rightly, there was room in the Latin MS for half or almost half of the extra material of the Greek.1 Probably therefore the Latin MS, if we had it complete, would be found to give the nucleus of the insertion, to represent it, in fact, in its first stage. In that form it is even conceivable, though perhaps not probable, that it may have gone back to the compiler of the Constitutions and Canons himself.2

2. A somewhat similar relation exists between the Verona Latin and the Vatican Greek in regard to the matter appended after the last of the Canons. In the Verona MS, after the list of Canonical books (canon 85) and the doxology which follows it and concludes the whole work, there are still left three pages: but they are so badly preserved that it was impossible to decipher them as a whole, and all that could be said with confidence was that the last page of all consisted of some summary statement upon the origin of the Four Gospels. Here again it was the Vatican MS which put into my hands the key that solved the problem: for the greater part of the last three leaves in that MS consist of various appendices, and careful comparison soon showed that foll. 78 a b contained the Greek original of the matter that had been transcribed at the end of the Verona MS. Even in this common matter, however, the Vatican Greek represents a later stage of develope-

1 A page of the Latin of the Verona MS corresponds to from 30 to 36 lines of the Greek of the Vatican MS, and a leaf therefore to from 60 to 72 lines. The ordinary text of the Canons that were contained on the missing leaf amounts to some 41 lines of the Vatican MS: as the insertion we are considering extends to 57 lines of the same MS, it is clear that not more than about half of this (20 to 30 lines) can have been represented in the Verona Latin.

2 Chr. Justel, the editor of John Scholasticus’s collection of Canons, points out the resemblance between the inserted passages and the Epistle to the Philippians of pseudo-Ignatius: compare in § 2 of the Epistle the emphasis on the distinction of Father Son and Holy Spirit, and note the phrases ἐνα τριάκοντα (Lightfoot, ii 774. 14), ἡ γὰρ σωφία φιλοδομούσεν ἐαυτῇ οίκου (ib. 775. 18), ἀρεισθαι τῶν σταυρῶν, τὰ πάνω ἐκαστίνθεσθαι (775. 9), περικύκλωσεν τὴν γίνεσθαι (777. 21). If the Verona MS did represent an original nucleus of the inserted passages as we know them, it is at least quite possible that that original nucleus did go back to the circle which produced the Apostolic Constitutions and the Pseudo-Ignatian letters. Much of the phraseology is undoubtedly similar.
ment than the Verona Latin; it will be noted that with regard to the apostles James the son of Zebedee, Philip, James the son of Alphaeus, Thaddaeus, and Paul, the place of burial, and with regard to Bartholomew the manner of his martyrdom, is given in the Greek but with nothing to correspond in the Latin. Dr Spagnolo has even now not been able to decipher more than fragments of the three pages, so deplorable is their state of preservation; but quite enough is preserved to restore the contents, although not the exact wording, for all but the upper half of the second page, and so I have felt justified in excluding from the Greek text (while recording in the apparatus) clauses that are clearly absent from the Latin.

The Latin in fact presents what is apparently the most primitive form known of the lists of apostles and other early preachers of the Gospel of which so many different specimens are known under the name of Hippolytus or Dorotheus or Epiphanius as authors. A large number of these lists are printed in the very useful collection of Theodor Schermann Prophetarum vitae fabulosae; indices apostolorum discipulorumque Domini; Dorotheo Epiphanio Hippolyto aliisque vindicata (Teubner Series, 1907): but none of Schermann's Greek MSS go back behind the tenth or eleventh century; and though some of his Latin authorities are earlier, the oldest of them are not only two centuries later than our Verona fragment but quite obviously are either not translated from the Greek at all or, if they are, deviate much further from the Greek originals. The Verona fragment—or, to put it otherwise, the Greek text of the Vatican MS after abstraction is made of the clauses not represented in the Latin—gives us in fact for the list of the thirteen apostles the primitive text which lies behind both the Epiphanian and the Hippolytean form (Schermann, pp. 107-115, 164-167).1 If the text printed below be assumed as the original, it becomes at once easy to explain the divergences of 'Epiphanius' and 'Hippolytus' in one or other direction—so easy indeed that it seems rather strange that the editor had not thought of conjecturally restoring the original by simply isolating the common nucleus of the two forms of text from the parts which are peculiar to only one of them. The result would not perhaps have exactly corresponded to the document I am here printing: but it would have been in some cases singularly near to it, as the two examples I proceed to cite will be enough to shew.2

1 The Dorothean form (pp. 153-157) is further removed from the original: yet even that contains some reminiscences of it which do not seem contained in either Epiphanius or Hippolytus. Why Schermann cites our Vatican MS as one of the authorities for the Hippolytean form I am quite unable to say.

2 If Schermann had constructed his Epiphanian text with less regard to his MSS A and B, and more regard to his CDEF, the resemblances would have been still closer.
As a specimen of the result of adopting an alternative text given in a secondary position by Schermann (p. 113), I add the notice of the apostle Simon.

Ps.-Epiphanius

ι' Σίμων ὁ Καναναῖος ὁ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ, ὁ καὶ Ἰουδαῖς, μετὰ ἰάκωβον τῶν δίκαιων ἐπίσκοποις γέγονεν ἐν ἰεροσολύμωι καὶ ζῆσας πρὸ ἡς σήμερον ἐν Χριστῷ.

Ps.-Hippolytus

ι' Πέτρος μὲν ἐν Πόντῳ καὶ Γαλατίᾳ καὶ Καππαδοκίᾳ καὶ Βιθυνίᾳ καὶ Ἰταλίᾳ καὶ Ἀσίᾳ κηρύγας τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὦστερον ἐπὶ Νέρωνος ἐν Ὄρμῃ σταυρώσεται κατὰ κεφαλῆς αὐτῶς αὐτοῦ ἄξιόσαντος παθεῖν.

It seems then sufficiently well established on a comparative treatment of the texts that we have in the document now published for the first time a more primitive form than any yet known of the 'Places of the

1 I omit here words bracketed by Schermann.
preaching and death of the twelve apostles'. Possibly the original appendix stopped here; for as the Apostolic Constitutions and Canons purport to have been delivered to the bishops by the Twelve with St Paul, it is exactly a notice concerned with their lives and deaths which might serve as a fitting close to the whole work. But so far as the evidence of our document takes us, there is no reason for separating from the notice of the Apostles the notices that follow with regard to the other 'Apostolic' men, or indeed these again from the notice about the Four Gospels. Is there such reason to be found on comparison with the related texts?

For the former of these sections parallels appear to be wanting in both Pseudo-Dorotheus and Pseudo-Hippolytus: on the other hand most of the MSS of Pseudo-Epiphanius—not including the one on which Schermann has founded his text—give a text of the 'apostolici' (Schermann, p. 127), which stands in exactly the same relation of expansion to the document now printed as I have shewn above to exist in the notice of the twelve apostles. But with regard to the notice of the Gospels the matter stands quite differently: it is found in no 'Epiphanian' MS at all, and is taken by Schermann (p. 129, lines 6-17) solely from our Vatican MS (gr. 1506) and one other Vatican MS (Vat. 1974, saec. xii-xiii), the latter being of the 'Dorothean' type. As Vat. 1974 is later than Vat. 1506, this piece may actually have been derived by the later MS from the earlier. Speaking generally, it may be said that the notice of the Gospels is peculiar to our document and preserved only in its Greek and Latin representatives.

Comparison of texts, then, does suggest somewhat clearly a separate origin for the third section in our document, the passage about the Gospels: but it does not suggest, or at any rate does not suggest at all definitely, that any break ought to be made between the section on the Apostles and the section on the Apostolici. And this conclusion is rather curiously borne out by the remaining line of investigation on which a word must now be said, namely the sources exploited in our document. For whereas the evidence for the employment of the Church History of Eusebius as a source amounts, in the case of the first two sections, almost to demonstration, no point of contact can, it would seem, be established between the Church History and the section on the Gospels.

Thus H. E. i 12 contains some notes about the Seventy, with names of Barnabas, Sosthenes, Cephas, Matthias (Barsabas), and Thaddaeus, and with reference, in the case of Cephas the δημόσιος Πέτρῳ, to the fifth book of Clement's Hypotyposes: i 13 relates the mission of Thaddaeus, one of the Seventy, to Edessa and the Abgar, and will account for the notice of Thaddaeus the Apostle, just as the words used of
Matthias in the preceding chapter of the History, καὶ Ματθαῖον δὲ τὸν ἀντὶ Ἰουδα τῶν ἀποστόλων συγκαταλεγόντα . . . τῆς αὐτῆς τῶν ο’ κλήσεως, account for the notice of Matthias among the apostles. In ii 1 we hear of the Ethiopian eunuch returning to his own country as a preacher of the Gospel under the phrase κατέχει λόγος. In iii 1 we have Thomas connected with Parthia, Andrew with Scythia, John with Asia, Peter with Pontus and the other provinces of Asia Minor, Paul with Jerusalem, Illyricum, and Rome. In iii 2 to the name Linus is subjoined the note that ‘Paul mentions him in writing to Timothy’: in iii 4 the Γαλατία of 2 Tim. iv 10, to which Crescens departed, is interpreted, as in our document, to mean Gaul. Of Symeon son of Clopas as successor to James the Just we hear in H. E. iii 11 (iv 22), and of his martyrdom under Trajan at the age of 120 in iii 32.

The passage about the Gospels has difficulties of its own, not easy of solution. But for the rest our document is more largely indebted to Eusebius than to any other source: I do not see any reason why it should be much later in date than the Constitutions and Canons to which it is not inappropriately appended.
[Vat. gr. 1506 fol. 78a]
 peri των ι8’ ἀποστόλων ἐν ποιοις τόποις ἐκήρυξαν καὶ ἐν ποιοῖς ἑτελείωθηκαν.

α’ Σίμων Πέτρος Πόντω Γαλατία Καππαδοκία Βιθνία Ἀσία κηρύξας τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἐπὶ Νέρωνος σταυροῦται.

β’ Ἀνδρέας Σκύθαις Οὐδοανοὶ καὶ Σάκαις.

γ’ Ἰάκωβος ὁ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίων ὑπὸ Ὑρμόνου τοῦ τεταράχου ἀναφέρεται μαχαίρᾳ.

δ’ ὘οίμης ἐν Ἀσία ἐξορυσθεὶς ἐν Πάτμῳ διὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦ Κυρίου συνέγραψε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον.

ε’ Φιλίππου ἐν Φρυγίᾳ σταυροῦται κατακέφαλα.

ζ’ Βαρθολομαίων Ἰωάννης, ὡς καὶ τὸ κατὰ Ματθαίον εὐαγγέλιον αὐτοῦ δεδοκεν.

η’ Θωμᾶς Πάρθοις Μήδοις Καρμανοὶ Βάκτροις Μάγαροι.

κ’ Ματθαῖος τὸ εὐαγγέλιον Ἐβραῖθι διαλέκτῳ συγγράφας εὐφόρωκεν ἐν Σιών.

λ’ Ἰάκωβος Ἀλφαίων ἐπικληθεὶς Δίκαιος λίθοι ὑπὸ Ιουδαίων ἐν Ἰεροσολύμων ἀναφέρεται.

θ’ Θαδδαίος ὁ καὶ Δελβαῖος καὶ Ἰουνᾶς Ἐθεσηνίκος καὶ πάση Meσοποταμια ἐπὶ Ἀβγάρου Βασίλεως Ἐθεσηνίων τελευτᾷ.

γ’ μαχαίρας ἐκουσαίρθη δὲ ἐν Ἀκκιμ τῆς Μαρμαροῦς κωδ ἐκατακέφαλα + τεθάναι ἐν Ἰερισολύμαι τῆς Ἀσίας κωδ ζ’ δεδοκεν + πρὸ τῆς σφαγῆς ἐκαταθείς ἀσπίς θῆλας καὶ ἑτερα καραστρομβῆς ὡς ὁ Παύλος κωδ η’ δεδοκεν δεδοκεν κωδ θ’ ἀναφέρεται + καὶ ἕκει δῆπτεται παρὰ τῷ ναῷ κωδ ι’ τελευτᾷ + δῆπτεται δὲ ἐν Βυρτῆς κωδ

Verona LI (49)
fol. 156 b

Dr Spagnolo could only decipher the words or letters printed in roman type; the rest I supply by translation from the Greek, or so much of it as would correspond to the spaces undeciphered in the Latin.

4. Asia: I have placed this word in brackets, as (1) the line is over long, (2) ‘Asia’ is in its wrong place—it should of course precede ‘Bytinia’, (3) as ‘Asia’ is allotted to St John (line 9 infra), there was good ground for not assigning it also to St Peter. 16. The line is too short: but I do not see how to fill it out.
Simon Cananeus filius Cleopa qui et Iudas post Iacobum ius tum episcopus factus hierosolymorum uz'xit annos cxx et cruci fixus est sub Traiano. Matthias ex lxx discipulis con numeratur undecim apostolis pro Iuda Iscariota. Paulus ab hierusalem incipiens praedicate care usque illyricum est pro uectus et italicum et spaniam, ro mae uero praesente Nerone ca put c est. Titus cretis et quae sunt circum insulae. Crescens gallia. eunuchus Can daces reginae ethiopum arabia felici et taprobana insula quae in mare rubro est, et sermo tradit quod martyr ibi fuerit. Ex lxx apostolis Salvatoris facti sunt ut refert Clemens in quinto Informationu — Barnabas Sostenus Cephas cognomine Petri Matthias connu meratus undecim Barsabas et Linus
[Vat. gr. 1506 fol. 78 b]

(o'd mé'mnetai Paulos Tisbécw grafwv), Θαδδαίος, Κλεόταν
kai o'sun a'twv.

To kata Matthaiow evaggléion
'Epérai dívalékta grafén òp' a'tó wv e' Ierousalémph éxe diáthê,
ërmfneúth òp' òp' Iwánwv. to
cata Márrkon evaggléion òp' Pé'ton ërmfneúth òp' 'Pámp.
to kata Iwánwn èn tòus xró-
nous Triaanov yptgorofeúth òp' Iwánwn a'tó wv èpi Komódw
èn Pámpw tì nísw ëgráfhp.
to òp' kata Loukà èn po Loukà
mabhthòu yptárxwntov tòu a'to-
stolov Pauów, o'd mhnmhnèwv
ò a'tó a'tó sostolos èn twi èpi-
stolh grafèi. 'Astoçetai òmáas
Loukàs ò agaphtòs iatrôs' kai
tas Práces dè ò a'tó ev-
agglwsthp tòw [agwv] a'to-
stolov svnegráftato.

Verona LI (49)
fol. 157 b
(cuius mentionem facit Paulus
Timoteo scribens), Thaddeus, Cleo
pas et qui sunt cum eo. secundum
Mattheum auangelium hebraea
lingua conscriptum ab ipso in hie
rusalem aeditum est et trans
latum est ab Iohanne. secundum
Marcum auangelium a Petro
dictatum est Romae. secundum
Iohannem temporibus Traiani
10
dictatum est ab ipso Iohanne sub
Commodo scriptum in Patmo. quod
autem a Luca, discipulo constitu
to apostoli Pauli, cuius mentione-
faciens ipse apostolus quadam
epistula scribit SALVTAT VOS LVCAS
MEDICVS DILECVS : et Actus uero
ipse auangelista conscripsit
apostolorum. amen

Expresserunt canones

apostolorum missi ad

Clementem in quibus sunt
25
canones Nicenorum

9. ërmfneúth cod: read òngyoreúth
as in l. 11; the Latin has 'dictatum'
in both places. 21. ògíov cod:
but the Latin shews that it is an
interpolation.

1. 2 Tim. iv 21 16. Col. iv 14

12. quod autem a Luca cod: read with
the Greek 'quod autem secundum Lucam
a Luca'. 18. aeuangesta cod

C. H. TURNER.