

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.¹ 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' οὗ σοὶ . . . 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' οὗ σοὶ . . . καὶ τῷ ἀγίῳ πνεύματι, and two in which he prints variations of the καὶ . . . καί 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 . . . καί 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)

ὅτι σοὶ πᾶσα δόξα σέβας καὶ εὐχαριστία τιμὴ καὶ προσκύνησις, τῷ πατρὶ καὶ τῷ υἱῷ καὶ τῷ ἀγίῳ πνεύματι.

Melius

ὅτι δι' αὐτοῦ σοὶ πᾶσα ἡ δόξα σέβας καὶ εὐχαριστία, καὶ διὰ σε καὶ μετὰ σε αὐτῷ τιμὴ καὶ προσκύνησις ἐν ἀγίῳ πνεύματι.²

¹ Funk's edition, by an unfortunate confusion, frequently prints 'Vat. 1056' for 'Vat. 1506', and 'Vat. 838' for 'Vat. 839'.

² The genuineness, in this and the following passage, of the phrase διὰ σε καὶ μετὰ σε, is further borne out by the parallel in vii xliii (Funk 448. 14, 19), where the reading is undoubted, εὐλογοῖ καὶ δοξάζει τὸν δεσπότην θεὸν τὸν παντοκράτορα . . . ἐπὶ ταύτοις προσκυνεῖ αὐτὸν τὸν μονογενῆ θεὸν μετ' αὐτὸν καὶ δι' αὐτόν. Note the distinction both there and here between δόξα to the Father and προσκύνησις to the Son: and contrast Origen in *Aproc.* Scholion vii.

ib. 520. 24 (c. xv § 9)

ὄτι σοὶ δόξα αἶνος μεγαλοπρέπεια
σέβας προσκύνησις, καὶ τῷ σῶ παιδί
'Ιησοῦ τῷ Χριστῷ σου τῷ κυρίῳ
ἡμῶν καὶ θεῷ καὶ βασιλεῖ, καὶ τῷ
ἁγίῳ πνεύματι.

ὄτι σοὶ δόξα αἶνος μεγαλοπρέπεια
σέβας προσκύνησις, καὶ μετὰ σε καὶ
διά σε τῷ παιδί σου 'Ιησοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ
ἡμῶν καὶ βασιλεῖ, δι' οὗ σοι ἐπ-
οφείλεται παρὰ πάσης λογικῆς καὶ
ἀγίας φύσεως ἢ ἐπάξιος εὐχαριστία
ἐν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι.

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):

<i>Consti.</i>	Vat. gr. 1506	Verona LI (<i>Eccl. Occid. Mon. Iur. Ant.</i> i pp. 32 a-32 h ^h)	Edd.
viii 44 (e 18)	περὶ τῶν κληρικῶν	de clericis	περὶ τῶν ἐν κλήρῳ
viii 46 (j 18)	ἀλλὰ καλούμενος	sed uocatus	ἀλλ' ὁ καλούμενος
(m 5)	τὸν Χριστὸν ὄρων	Christum uidens	ὁ τὸν Χριστὸν ὄρων
<i>Can.</i>			
i (n 5)	χειροτονεῖται	ordinatur	χειροτονεῖσθω
v (o 6)	ἐπιμένων	perseuerans	ἐπιμένων δέ
viii (o 17)	ἢ τὴν αἰτίαν . . . ἢ ἐάν	aut causam . . . aut si ¹	τὴν αἰτίαν . . . ἐὰν δέ
xviii (r 2)	ἢ τοῦ καταλόγου	aut de collegio	ἢ ὅλος τοῦ καταλόγου
xxv (s 1)	Κύριος	dns ut uid ¹	ομι
xxxvi (v 12)	τὴν αὐτοῦ γνώμην	ipsius uoluntate	τὴν ἐαυτοῦ γνώμην
xlii (x 25)	σχολάζοντα	uacantem	σχολάζων
xlvi (y 12)	ἐνεργῆσαι	operari ¹	ἐνεργῆσαί τι
lvii (z 19)	πεπρωμένον	fracto	πεπληγμένον
lviii (z 24)	ἢ ἐπιμένων	uel si perseueret	ἐπιμένων δέ
lix (aa 5)	φονεὺς τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ	fratris interfe(ctor)	φονεύσας τὸν ἀδελφόν

¹ Dionysius Exiguus goes with the Verona fragment and Vat. gr. 1506 in these instances.

<i>Constit.</i>	Vat. gr. 1506	Verona LI (<i>Ecccl. Occid. Mon. Jur. Ant.</i> i pp. 32 a-32 hh)	Edd.
lxi (cc 3)	παρασκευὴν ἢ τετράδα	sextum diem vel quartum	τετράδα ἢ παρασκευὴν
lxxi (cc 15)	ἢ λύχνους	aut lucernas	ἢ ἐν ταῖς ἑορταῖς αὐτῶν λύχνους ἄψη
lxxiv (<i>dd</i> 1)	ἐπὶ ἀξιοπίστων	praesentibus fide dignis	ὑπὸ } ἀξιοπίστων παρὰ }
(<i>dd</i> 14)	τὰ κατ' αὐτοῦ δόξαντα	quae in eum placuerat	κατ' αὐτοῦ τὰ δοκοῦντα
lxxxv (<i>gg</i> 6)	Μωσέως ἔ	(Moysis) quinque	Μωσέως πέντε Γένεσις Ἐξοδος Λευιτικόν Ἄρθροὶ Δευτερονόμιον
(<i>gg</i> 12)	βίβλος ψαλμῶν	codex psalorum	ψαλμοί
(<i>gg</i> 14)	Σολομώντος βιβλία ἔ	Solomonis libri quinque	Σολομώντος βιβλία τρία Παροιμιαί Ἐκκλησιαστής Ἄισμα ἁσμάτων

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 *b* and fol. 152 *a* of the Verona MS a leaf must have been lost, for the previous leaf (151) has barely reached the end of canon *xlvi*, 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 *xlvi* 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 1 after the words βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος there is added a long dogmatic statement in the following terms:

Διδασκέσθω μέντοι ὁ βαπτιζόμενος ὅτι πατήρ οὐκ ἐσταυρώθη οὔτε γέννησιν ὑπέμεινεν ἀνθρώπου· οὔτε δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἀνθρώπος ἐγένετο, ἀλλ' οὔτε τὸ πάθος ὑπέστη, οὐ γὰρ ἐσαρκώθη· ἐλυτρώσατο δὲ τὸν κόσμον τῆς ἐπικειμένης ὀργῆς ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός. ἐνηθρώπησε γὰρ φιλανθρωπία, ἐαυτῷ σῶμα ἐκ παρθένου ἀναπλάσας (ἡ γὰρ σοφία ὠκοδόμησεν ἑαυτῇ οἶκον ὡς δημιουργός), 5 σταυρὸν δὲ ὑπέμεινεν ἐκῶν, ἐξείλατο δὲ τὸν κόσμον τῆς ἐπικειμένης ὀργῆς. βαπτιζόμεθα οὖν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς, οὐχ ὡς ἀνθρώπου γενομένου ἢ παθόντος, εἰς δὲ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ γιού, ὡς ὑποστάτως γέννησιν, ὡς ὑπομειναντος σταυρῶν, ὡς ἀποθανόντος καὶ ἀναστάντος· εἰς τὸ ὄνομα δὲ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, ὡς ὁμοουσίον πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ. οἱ δὲ μὴ οὕτω βαπτίζοντες, ὡς ἀγνοοῦντες τὸ 10 ΜΥΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ ΤΗΣ ΕΥΧΕΒΕΙΑΣ, καθαιρείσθωσαν.

Ὁ τὸν πατέρα πεπονθέναι λέγων ἀσεβεῖ Ἰουδαίων βαρύτερα, μετὰ Χριστοῦ καὶ τὸν πατέρα προσηλῶν· ὁ δὲ τὸν υἱὸν ἀρνούμενος τὸν μονογενῆ δι' ἡμᾶς σαρκωθῆναι καὶ σταυρὸν ὑπομεμενηκέναι, θεομάχος ἐστὶ καὶ τῶν ἁγίων πολέμιος· ὁ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον πατέρα ὀνομάζων ἢ υἱὸν ἀνεπιστήμων 15 ἐστὶ καὶ ἀνόητος. ὁ γὰρ υἱὸς συνδημιουργὸς τῷ πατρὶ καὶ σύνθρονος καὶ συννομοθέτης καὶ κριτῆς καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως αἰτίος· καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ὁμοουσίον θεότητι· ἐφ' ἡμῶν γὰρ Σίμων ὁ μάγος ἐξηρεύετο σπάσας τῷ λαῷ πλάνον καὶ ἄστατον καὶ πονηρὸν εἰς ἐαυτὸν τὸ πνεῦμα, καὶ ἓνα τριώνυμον εἶναι φλυνάριστας τὸν θεόν, ποτὲ δὲ καὶ τὸ πάθος τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τὴν γέννησιν 20 περικόψας.

Ἦμεῖς οὖν, ὡ ἐπίσκοποι, εἰς ἓνα πατέρα καὶ υἱὸν καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα τρίτον βαπτίσατε κατὰ τὴν τοῦ κυρίου γνώμην καὶ τὴν ἡμετέραν ἐν πνεύματι διάταξιν.

3, 6. Cf. 1 Thess. i 10 5. Prov. ix 1 7-9. Matt. xxviii 19 8. Heb. xii 2 9. 1 Thess. iv 14 10. Rom. xi 25; 1 Tim. iii 16

10. ὁμοουσίον : ὁμοουσίω Vat 12. ἀσεβεῖ Ἰουδαίων : ἀσεβῆ Ἰουδαῖον Vat 18. σπάσας τῷ λαῷ πλάνον Vat. : σπάσας τὸ ἄλαλον πλάνον Joannes Scholasticus, ed. Justel (cf. Mark ix 25) ; perhaps σπάσας τὸ λαοπλάνον Turner

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 *τίτλου λς'*, 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 shewed 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 develop-

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 τριώνυμον* (Lightfoot, ii 774. 14), *ἡ γὰρ σοφία ἀκοδόμησεν ἑαυτῆ ὄικον* (*ib.* 775. 18), *ἀρνεῖσθαι τὸν σταυρόν, τὸ πάθον ἐπαισχύνεσθαι* (775. 9), *περικύπτεις τὴν γέννησιν* (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.

Ps.-Ephraim

δ' Σίμων Πέτρος ὁ τῶν ἀποστόλων κορυφαῖος, ὡς διὰ τῶν ἐπιστολῶν αὐτοῦ φαίνεται δηλῶν, ἐν Πόντῳ καὶ Γαλατία καὶ Καππαδοκίᾳ καὶ Βιθυνίᾳ καὶ ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ¹ ἐκήρυξε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰ. Χ. ὕστερον δὲ ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἐπὶ Νέρωνος βασιλείᾳ σταυροῦται κατὰ κεφαλῆς, αὐτοῦ οὕτως παθεῖν ἀξιώσαντος. θάπτεται δὲ ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ Ῥώμῃ πρὸ τριῶν καλανδῶν Ἰουλίῶν ὃ ἐστὶν Ἐπιφίε.

ιγ' Παῦλος δὲ ὁ ἀπόστολος μετὰ τὴν εἰς οὐρανοῦς τοῦ κυρίου ἀνάληψιν ἤρξατο κηρύσσειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ κυρίου ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων προῆλθεν ἕως τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ καὶ τῆς Ἰταλίας καὶ Ἰσπανίας, οὗ καὶ ἐπιστολαὶ μετὰ σοφίας παρ' ἡμῖν φέρονται. ἐπὶ δὲ Νέρωνος υἱοῦ Κλαυδίου βασιλείᾳ ἐν πόλει Ῥώμῃ τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀπετημήθη. ἐμαρτύρησεν Ἐπιφίε, πρὸ γ' καλανδῶν Ἰουλίῶν καὶ ἐκεῖ ἐτάφη πλησίον τοῦ ἁγίου ἀποστόλου Πέτρου, ἐκεῖ εἰσὶν ἕως σήμερον ἐν Χριστῷ.

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.-Ephraim

ιδ' Σίμων ὁ Καναναῖος ὁ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ, ὁ καὶ Ἰούδας, μετὰ Ἰάκωβον τὸν δίκαιον ἐπίσκοπος γέγονεν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις καὶ ζήσας ρκ' ἔτη σταυρῷ παραδοθεὶς ἐμαρτύρησεν ἐπὶ Τραιανοῦ βασιλείᾳ.

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

Ps.-Hippolytus

δ' Πέτρος μὲν ἐν Πόντῳ καὶ Γαλατία καὶ Καππαδοκίᾳ καὶ Βιθυνίᾳ καὶ Ἰταλίᾳ καὶ Ἀσίᾳ κηρύξας τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὕστερον ἐπὶ Νέρωνος ἐν Ῥώμῃ σταυροῦται κατὰ κεφαλῆς οὕτως αὐτοῦ ἀξιώσαντος παθεῖν.

ιγ' Παῦλος δὲ μετ' ἐνιαυτὸν ἕνα τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀναλήψεως εἰσηλθεν εἰς τὴν ἀποστολὴν καὶ ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ προῆλθεν ἕως τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ καὶ Ἰταλίας καὶ Σπανίας κηρύσσειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἔτη λε'. ἐπὶ δὲ Νέρωνος ἐν Ῥώμῃ τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποτημῆθαι θάπτεται ἐκεῖ.

Ps.-Hippolytus

ιδ' Σίμων ὁ Κανανήτης ὁ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ, ὁ καὶ Ἰούδας, μετὰ Ἰάκωβον τὸν δίκαιον ἐπίσκοπος γενομένος Ἱεροσολύμων ἐκοιμήθη καὶ θάπτεται ἐκεῖ, ζήσας ἔτη ρκ'.

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 *ὁμώνυμος Πέτρος*, 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 Μαθθίαν δὲ τὸν ἀντὶ Ἰούδα τοῖς ἀποστόλοις συγκαταλεγέντα . . . τῆς αὐτῆς τῶν ὀ 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. 78 a]

περὶ τῶν ἑβ' ἀποστόλων ἐν
ποίοις τόποις ἐκήρυξαν καὶ ἐν
ποίοις ἐτελειώθησαν.

- α' Σίμων Πέτρος Πόντῳ Γαλατία
Καππαδοκία Βιθυνία Ἀσία
κηρύξας τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἐπὶ
Νέρωνος σταυροῦται.
β' Ἀνδρέας Σκύθαις Ὀγδοανοῖς
καὶ Σάκαις.
γ' Ἰάκωβος ὁ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου ὑπὸ
Ἡρώδου τοῦ τετράρχου ἀναι-
ρεῖται μαχαίρᾳ.
δ' Ἰωάννης ἐν Ἀσίᾳ ἐξορισθεὶς
ἐν Πάτμῳ διὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦ
Κυρίου συνέγραψε τὸ εὐαγ-
γέλιον.
ε' Φίλιππος ἐν Φρυγίᾳ σταυροῦται
κατακέφαλα.
ς' Βαρθολομαῖος Ἰνδοῖς, ὃς καὶ
τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον εὐαγγέλιον
αὐτοῖς δέδωκεν.
ζ' Θωμᾶς Πάρθοις Μήδοις Καρ-
μανοῖς Ὑρκανοῖς Βάκτροις
Μάργοις.
η' Ματθαῖος τὸ εὐαγγέλιον
Ἑβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ συγγράψας
ἐκδέδωκεν ἐν Σιών.
θ' Ἰάκωβος Ἀλφαινοῦ ἐπικληθεὶς
Δίκαιος λίθους ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων
ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἀναιρεῖται.
ι' Θαδδαῖος ὁ καὶ Λεββαῖος καὶ
Ἰούδας Ἐδεσηνοῖς καὶ πάσῃ
Μεσοποταμίᾳ ἐπὶ Ἀβγαροῦ
βασιλέως Ἐδεσηνῶν τελευτᾷ.

γ'. μαχαίρᾳ] + ἐκοιμήθη δὲ ἐν Ἀκείμ
τῆς Μαρμαρικῆς cod ε'. κατα-
κέφαλα] + τέθαπται ἐν Ἱερσολύμῃ τῆς
Ἀσίας cod ς'. δέδωκεν] + πρὸ τῆς
σφαγῆς ἐκδραθεὶς ὡσπερ θήλαξ καὶ
ἐπειτα καταπονηθεὶς ὡς ὁ Παῦλος cod
η'. ἐκδέδωκεν] δέδωκεν cod θ'.
ἀναιρεῖται] + καὶ ἐκεῖ θάπτεται παρὰ
τῷ ναῷ cod ι'. τελευτᾷ] + θάπτεται
δὲ ἐν Βυριτῷ cod

Verona LI (49)

fol. 156 b

*De xii apostolis in quibus locis
predicauerunt et consummati sunt.*

Simon petrus ponto galatia capa
docia bytinia [asia] praedicans aeu-

gelium praesente Nerone cruci fi
gitur. Andreas scytis ogdoanis

et sacis. Iacobus Zebedei ab Hero
de tetrarca gladio occiditur.

Iohannis in asia deportatus
in patmos propter uerbum dñi

conscripsit aeuangelium. Fi
lippus in frigia cruci figitur

capite pronò. Bartholomeus in
dis qui secundum Mattheum

aeuangelium ipsis dedit. Tho
mas partis medis germa

nis hyrcanis bactris margis.
Mattheus aeuangelium hebrai

ce conscripsit et aedidit in sio⁷.
Iacobus Alpei cognomine ius

tus lapidibus a iudeis in hiero
solyms occiditur. Thaddeus qui

et Lebbeus etdesenis et omni
mesopotamiae: mortuus est

sub Abgaro rege etdesenorum

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.

- [Vat. gr. 1506 fol. 78 a]
- 14 Σίμων ὁ Κανανίτης ὁ τοῦ
Κλεόπα ὁ καὶ Ἰούδας μετὰ
Ἰάκωβον τὸν δίκαιον ἐπίσκοπος
γενομένος Ἱεροσολύμων ζήσας
ἔτη ρκ' σταυρῶ ἔμαρτύρησεν
ἐπὶ Τραϊανοῦ.
- 18 Μαθθίας εἰς ὧν τῶν ὀ μαθητῶν
συγκαταριθμεῖται τοῖς ἕνδεκα
ἀποστόλοις ἀντὶ Ἰούδα τοῦ
Ἰσκαριώτου.
- 17 Παῦλος ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἀρξά-
μενος κηρύσσειν προῆλθεν
ἕως τοῦ Ἰλλυρικῆ καὶ Ἰταλίας
καὶ Ἰσπανίας· ἐπὶ δὲ Νέρωνος
ἐν Ῥώμῃ τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀπε-
τμήθη.
Τίτος Κρήταις καὶ ταῖς πέριξ
νήσοις· Κρίσκης ἐν Γαλλίᾳ·
ὁ εἰνούχος Καρδάκης βασιλίσ-
σης Αἰθιοπῶν ἐν Ἀραβίᾳ τῇ
5 Εὐδαίμονι καὶ ἐν Ταπροβάνῃ
νήσῳ τῇ ἐν τῇ Ἐρυθρᾷ, λόγος
δὲ ἔχει ὡς καὶ μεμαρτυρηκέναι
αὐτὸν ἐκεῖ.
Ἐκ τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ
10 Σωτῆρος τῶν ὀ γεγόνασιν (ὡς
ἱστορεῖ Κλήμης ἐν πέμπτῃ
τῶν Ὑποτυπώσεων) Βαρνάβας,
Σωσθένης, Κηφᾶς δμῶνυμος
Πέτρω, Μαθθίας ὁ συγκατ-
15 αριθμηθεὶς τοῖς ἕνδεκα, Βαρ-
σαβᾶς καὶ Λίνος
- 17'. ἀπετμήθη] + καὶ θάπτεται ἐν
αὐτῇ cod
5. Ταπροβάνῃ] τῇ Προβάνῃ cod
15. ἕνδεκα] + Εὐβουλος Πούδης Κρίσκης
ἐν τῇ β' cod, sc. 2 Tim. iv 10, 21
- Verona LI (49)
fol. 157 a
- Simon Cananeus filius Cleopa
qui et Iudas post Iacobum ius-
tum episcopus factus hieroso-
lymorum uixit annos cxx et
cruci fixus est sub Traiano.*
- Matthias ex lxx discipulis con-
numeratur undecim apostolis
pro Iuda Iscariota. Paulus ab
hierusalem incipiens praedi-
care usque illyricum est pro-
uctus et italiam 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 Saluatoris
facti sunt ut refert Clemens
in quinto Informationu-
Barnabas Sostenus Cephas cog-
nomine Petri Matthias conu-
meratus undecim Barsabas et
Linus*

[Vat. gr. 1506 fol. 78 b]
 (οὐ μέμνηται Παῦλος Τιμοθέω
 γράφων), Θαδδαῖος, Κλεόπας
 καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ.
 Τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον εὐαγγέλιον
 Ἑβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ γραφὲν ὑπ'
 αὐτοῦ ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ ἐξεδόθη,
 ἐρμηνεύθη δὲ ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου. τὸ
 κατὰ Μάρκον εὐαγγέλιον ὑπὸ
 Πέτρου ἐρμηνεύθη ἐν Ῥώμῃ.
 τὸ κατὰ Ἰωάννην ἐν τοῖς χρό-
 νοῖς Τραϊανοῦ ὑπηγορεύθη ὑπὸ
 Ἰωάννου αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ Κομόδου
 ἐν Πάτμῳ τῇ νήσῳ ἐγράφη.
 τὸ δὲ κατὰ Λουκᾶν ὑπὸ Λουκᾶ
 μαθητοῦ ὑπάρχοντος τοῦ ἀπο-
 στόλου Παύλου, οὐ μνημονεύων
 ὁ αὐτὸς ἀπόστολος ἐν τινὶ ἐπι-
 στολῇ γράφει Ἀσπάζεται ἡμᾶς
 Λουκᾶς ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἰατρός· καὶ
 τὰς Πράξεις δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς εὐ-
 αγγελιστὴς τῶν [ἁγίων] ἀπο-
 στόλων συνεγράψατο.

Verona LI (49)

fol. 157 b

(cuius mentionem facit Paulus
 Timotheo scribens), Thaddeus, Cleo-
 pas et qui sunt cum eo. secundum
 Mattheum aeuangelium hebraea
 lingua conscriptum ab ipso in hie
 rusalem aeditum est et trans
 latum est ab Iohanne. secundum
 Marcum aeuangelium a Petro
 dictatum est Romae. secundum
 Iohannem temporibus Traiani
 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 SALVAT VOS LVCAS
 MEDICVS DILECTVS : et Actus uero
 ipse aeuangelista conscripsit
 apostolorum. amen

Explicuerunt canones**apostolorum missi ad****Clementem in quibus sunt
canones Nicenorum**

9. ἐρμηνεύθη *cod*: read ὑπηγορεύθη
 as in l. 11; the Latin has 'dictatum'
 in both places. 21. ἁγίων *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.