NOTES ON THE APOSTOLIC CONSTITUTIONS.

I. THE COMPILER AN ARIAN.

In a paper contributed a year ago to the Journal (October 1913: xv 53-65) under the title 'A primitive edition of the Apostolic Constitutions and Canons', I had occasion to cite, as evidence of the superiority of one Greek MS, Vat. gr. 1506, its peculiar forms of doxology. Since the theological affinities of the compiler have been a matter of dispute, it seems worth while to collect together a larger number of readings of this MS with a view of shewing at once its general excellence and its definite theology. If I am right in accepting this MS as the best witness to the original text of the Constitutions, it would certainly, I think, follow that the fathers of the Quinisextine council in Trullo in their second canon were amply justified in rejecting the book of Apostolic Constitutions on the ground of its unorthodox contents.1

No doubt the Trullan fathers did not go so far as to say that the Constitutions were forged by heretics; they only asserted that they had been interpolated by heretics, and it might seem a tenable view that the clear doctrinal indication of the passages I shall proceed to quote is the result of an Arianizing edition of an originally orthodox or at least colourless work. But it is not very likely that after about the year A.D. 400 there would have been on Greek ground any movement for Arianizing Catholic or non-Arian literature; the movement would have been the other way at that date, just as at the time when the Constitutions were compiled, somewhere about A.D. 360-380, there is a real probability that an Antiochene writer would have been some sort of an Arian. If we were to push back the date of the Constitutions another twenty years, the presumption would be stronger still: if, with Funk, we bring down the date of the compilation to the beginning of the fifth century, the presumption of Arianism would disappear, and this may explain why Funk, the only editor of the Constitutions who has supplied us with adequate materials for reconstructing the original, has refused, in spite of his material, to de-catholicize the traditional text of the book.

1 Επειδὴ δὲ ἐν τούτοις τοῖς κανόνισιν [sc. the Apostolic Canons] ἐντέλεται δέχεται ἡμᾶς τὰς τῶν αὐτῶν ἀγιῶν ἀποστόλων διὰ Κλήμεντος Διατάξεις, αὐτοίς πάλιν ὡς τῶν ἐκτελοῦσι τὸ λόγον τῆς εἰκονίας νόθα τινὰ καὶ εἶνα τῆς εὐσεβείας παρενετθεσθαι, τὸ εὐφημία κάλλος τῶν θείων δογμάτων ἡμῖν ἀμαρωσάτω, τὴν τῶν τοιούτων Διατάξεων προσφοράς ἀνοβολὴν πεποιήθη χάρι ἐκ τοῦ χριστιανοκτατον πομήν τοῖς οἰκοδομῆν καὶ ἀσφαλίσαν.
But Funk's date is unsatisfactory on other grounds (Brightman Liturgies Eastern and Western i pp. xxviii, xxix); and the data that are here offered as to the Vatican codex gr. 1506 go to shew not only that Arian readings are found in it but also I think that its readings approve themselves in non-dogmatic passages. It is not contended that the MS is everywhere a safe guide: it contains perhaps more than its share of blunders, and there are also traces of a definitely catholicizing recension of passages which even the ordinary texts have left untouched. ¹ But the MS appears to represent (in common up to a certain point with its sister MS, Vat. gr. 2089, which I have quoted where 1506 is defective) an independent tradition, and to have preserved sufficient elements of the original text, bowdlerized in the other MSS, to enable us to pronounce clearly upon the doctrinal tendencies of the compiler.

¹ The following passages may be cited in proof of this (the readings of Funk are on the left, those of Vat. gr. 1506 on the right):—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>¹</th>
<th>vi 14 § 2 (Funk 335. 19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>αὐτὸν ... προσκυνεῖν διὰ Θεοῦ Χριστοῦ</td>
<td>αὐτὸν ... προσκυνεῖν καὶ τὸν κύριον τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν εἰς τῷ παναγίῳ πνεύματι.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ii 30 § 1 (Funk 385. 10) |
|---|---|
| δι' οὗ τὸ σέβας τῷ παντοκράτορι θεῷ. | αὐτῷ τὸ σέβας ... σὺν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ τῷ συναίδιῳ πνεύματι. |

| vii 38 § 8 (Funk 440. 5) |
|---|---|
| σοὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ σέβας διὰ Θεοῦ | σοὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ σέβας μετὰ Χριστοῦ καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου. |

| viii 7 § 8 (Funk 482. 27) |
|---|---|
| σοὶ ... σέβας καὶ διὰ σοῦ τῷ σῷ πατρὶ | σοὶ ... σέβας καὶ τῷ πατρὶ καὶ τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι. |

| viii 9 § 10 (Funk 488. 3) |
|---|---|
| δι' οὗ σοὶ δόξα καὶ προσκύνησις ἐν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι. | δι' οὗ σοὶ δόξα, καὶ προσκύνησις τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι. |
The early MSS are all but unanimous against Lagarde's text, which is in effect identical with our own form of the Gloria in excelsis. Funk has the support of good MSS, and in substance he is right: but in the last clause we stumble both against an abrupt change of address and against a really impossible phrase 'Christ of the God of all created nature'. Unfortunately 1506 is defective; but we may presume that its reading is represented by the sister MS, in which the prayer is consistently addressed throughout to the Father, while it is Christ, as we should expect, who is 'God of all created nature and our King': compare the passage numbered 11 below; 

2. viii 5 § 1

Funk 474. 4, 5 | cod. Vat. gr. 1506
---|---
ο ὁμόνοις ψυχηθέντος, ὁ τῇ φύσιν ἄδορατος, ὁ γνώσεως ἀναρχός, ὁ μόνος ἀγάθος καὶ ἀσύγκριτος. | ο ὁμόνοις ψυχηθέντος, ὁ τῇ φύσιν ἄδορατος, ὁ γνώσεως ἀναρχός, ὁ μόνος ἀγάθος καὶ ἀσύγκριτος.

Here the text of the editors speaks of God 'Whose knowledge is without beginning' as in vii 36 § 9 (432. 15), while the Vatican MS speaks of God 'Whose being is knowledge without beginning': and though there may be some doubt whether o ὁ τῇ ἐγνώσει (or o τῷ ἐγνώσει) should be read for o ὁ τῇ ἐγνώσει, there is good reason to suppose that the compiler meant to say 'God is knowledge' rather than 'God has knowledge', in view of the parallel viii 12 § 7 (Funk 496. 22, Brightman 14. 32) σὺ γὰρ ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἐν αὐτῷ ἐγνώσει ἐγνώσει ἀρακάτος καὶ μονοτροπός τῷ ἐγνώσει. So simple a reading as that of the majority of the MSS would hardly have lent itself to a change.

3, 4. viii 6 § 11 (Brightman 5. 17), viii 37 (36) § 2

Lagarde 240. 26–28 | Funk 480. 11–13 with codd. Vat. gr. 839 and 1506
---|---
'O μόνος ἀληθινός θεός, ὁ θεὸς καὶ | 'Ο μόνος ἀληθινός θεός, ὁ θεὸς καὶ
I have included these two passages, although Vat. gr. 1506 is not alone in its reading and although Funk on both occasions follows it, because the phraseology is important in relation to the compiler's doctrine of the Holy Spirit. *proboleus* is apparently not a word that belongs to the compiler's vocabulary: and in his case that argument alone is almost enough to establish the true reading. In vi 11 § 2 (325. 15) I do not doubt that, though Funk's text is correct, his punctuation is not: read ἐνὸς παρακλήτου διὰ Χριστοῦ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ταμάτων ποιήτην.

5, 6. viii 6 § 11; viii 5 § 3

Funk 480. 13 (Brightman 5. 18) cod. Vat. gr. 1506

‘Ο διὰ Χριστοῦ διδασκάλους τοὺς μαθητὰς ἐπιστήμας πρὸς μάθησιν τῆς εὐσεβείας.

The reading of 1506 gives, what the other reading does not, an object to the ἐπι- : it makes μαθηταῖς and μάθησιν correspond to one another, whereas in the other reading the μαθηταί are those who teach, not those who learn: and it is suggested by the natural contrast between 'teacher' and 'disciple', as in viii 12 § 3 (496. 2), where the presbyters stand round the bishop on either side, ὡς ἂν μαθηταὶ παρεστῶτες διδασκάλῳ.

In yet another passage 1506 alone has preserved what appears to be the true reading by retaining the word διδασκάλων, which all other authorities have lost: viii 5 § 3 (474. 11-14) σὺ δὲ δῶς ὄρον ἐκκλησίας διὰ τῆς ἐνσάρκων παρουσίας τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου ὑπὸ μάρτυρι τῷ παρακλήτῳ διὰ τῶν σῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ ἡμῶν τῶν χάριτι σῇ παρεστώτων ἐπισκόπων. This reading is easy and specious at first sight: but the bishops who are speaking—or rather the consecrating bishop speaking in the name of the rest—have really nothing to do with the ἐνσάρκως παρουσία: they are (according to the fiction of the compiler) disciples of the apostles, but not of Christ. If then with 1506 we read instead διὰ τῶν σῶν
ἀποστόλων καὶ ἡμῶν διδασκάλων, τῶν ... ἐπισκόπων, we get exactly the necessary point: 'God who by means of the Incarnation gave laws to the Church through Thy apostles our teachers'—'teachers of us the bishops who by Thy grace are present here.' The article τῶν covers both σῶν ἀποστόλων and ἡμῶν διδασκάλων, 'those who were apostles of Thine and teachers of ours', a trick of style very much, I think, in the manner of our compiler.

7. viii 6 § 12
Funk 480. 17 (Brightman 5. 22)             codd. Vat. gr. 839, 1506
πρὸς τὸ εἰδέναι σε καὶ ποιεῖν τὸ
θέλημά σου.

8. viii 9 § 5
Funk 486. 13 (Brightman 8. 26)             codd. Vat. gr. 1506
κοινωνοῦν γενέσθαι τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ
ιερῶν καὶ μέτοχοι τῶν θείων μνημε-
ρίων ... ἄξιοι ... τῆς νιοθεσίας.

I cannot find the neuter plural ἱερᾶ used as a noun by our author: while conversely the parallel prayer for catechumens (484. 12 = B. 7. 20) uses the three nouns δωρέα, νιοθεσία, μνημή just as in our passage.

9. viii 9 § 8
Funk 486. 19 (Brightman 9. 3)             codd. Vat. gr. 1506
Παντocrάτωρ θεὲ αἰῶνες, δέσποτα
tῶν ὅλων, κτίστα καὶ πρύτανι τῶν
πάντων.

Funk's otherwise excellent index has omitted to collect the uses of the participle ὁ ὄν, τὰ ὄντα, and I have no light to throw on this variation, but the text of 1506 is the more striking.

10. viii 10 § 4
Funk 488. 13 (Brightman 10. 5)             codd. Vat. gr. 1506
ὑπὲρ τῆς ἁγίας καθολικῆς καὶ
ἀποστολικῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἀπὸ
περάτων ἐως περάτων.

The phrase περὶ τῆς οἰκουμενικῆς αὐτοῦ ἐκκλησίας is found once elsewhere vii 30 § 2 (418. 15): the phrase 'the church of God' is common in Book II.
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11, 12. viii 12 § 7, § 27

Funk 498. 4, 504. 26 (Br. 15, 6, 18. 25)

ἀρχιερέα σὸν, βασιλέα δὲ καὶ κύριον πάσης νοητῆς καὶ αἰσθητῆς φύσεως.

σὲ προσκυνοῦσιν ἀνάριθμοι στρατιαὶ ἀγγέλων κτλ.

Parallels can be found for αἰώνος καὶ ἀτελεύτητος viii 38 § 5 (548. 5); for ἀγγελὸς σου viii 12 § 7 (498. 4), for ἀρχιερεὺς σου viii 46 § 12 (560. 23), for τάγμα as used of the ranks of angels vii 11 § 2 (325. 15), vi 30 § 10 (385. 9), vii 35 § 3 (430. 9). The bracketed words are by the second hand over an erasure according to Funk: but I do not doubt that it was some close connexion in the original of the Holy Spirit with angelic spirits which was the motive of the erasure. Similarly in vii 12 § 8 (Funk 498. 10 = Br. 15. 11) ὁ δὲ αὐτὸν πρὸ πάντων ποιήσας τὰ Χεροβίμα 1506 after πάντων inserts τὰς οὐρανίους δυνάμεις and an erasure follows—comparing vii 11 § 2 (325. 15), where the word is also ποιητῆς, I suspect the words erased contained mention of the ‘creation’ of the Holy Spirit.

13, 14. viii 12 § 50, 15 § 9

Funk 514. 7 (= Br. 23. 1)

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

Funk 520. 24 (= Br. 27. 9)

ὅτι σοὶ δόξα αἰνος μεγαλοπρέπεια σέβας προσκύνησις, καὶ τῷ σῷ παιδὶ Ἰησοῦ τῷ Χριστῷ σου τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν καὶ θεῷ καὶ βασιλείᾳ, καὶ τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι.

Funk 514. 7 (= Br. 23. 1)

ὅτι δὲ αὐτοῦ σοὶ πᾶσα ἡ δόξα σέβας καὶ εὐχαριστία, καὶ διὰ σὲ καὶ μετὰ σε αὐτῷ τιμὴ καὶ προσκύνησις εν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι.

Funk 520. 24 (= Br. 27. 9)

ὅτι σοὶ δόξα αἰνος μεγαλοπρέπεια σέβας προσκύνησις, καὶ μετὰ σὲ καὶ διὰ σε τῷ παιδὶ σου Ἰησοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν καὶ βασιλείᾳ, δι' οὗ σοι ἐποθείηται πάρα πάσης λογικῆς καὶ ἁγίας φύσεως ἦ ἐπάξιος εὐχαριστία εν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι.
I repeat these two passages from *J. T. S.* xv 54, with the reference for διὰ σε καὶ μετὰ σε to vii 43 §§ 3 (448. 20), adding that for some minor phrases the text of Funk may be better than that of 1506: τῷ Χριστῷ σοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν καὶ θεῷ καὶ βασιλεῖ looks like the compiler's style.

15. viii 14 § 3

Funk 518. 15 (= Br. 25. 26) | cod. Vat. gr. 1506
--- | ---
ἐαυτοῦς . . . θεῷ καὶ τῷ Χριστῷ | εαυτοῦς . . . θεῷ διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὑτοῦ παραθώμεθα.

I cannot doubt that the reading of 1506 alone corresponds to the use of the compiler: compare e. g. viii 36 § 3 (544. 15) ἐαυτοῦς . . . τῷ ζωτί θεῷ διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὑτοῦ παραθώμεθα.¹

16. viii 15 § 2

Funk 518. 17 (= Br. 25. 30) | cod. Vat. gr. 1506
--- | ---
ὁ πατὴρ τοῦ Χριστοῦ σοῦ τοῦ | ὁ πατὴρ τοῦ Χριστοῦ σοῦ τοῦ εὐλογημένου παιδός.

Curiously enough neither phrase appears to be used elsewhere by the compiler.

17. viii 16 § 3

Funk 522. 5 | cod. Vat. gr. 1506
--- | ---
ὁ διὰ Χριστοῦ τὰ πάντα δημιουργήσας καὶ δι' αὑτοῦ τῶν ὅλων προνοῶν. | ὁ διὰ Χριστοῦ τὰ πάντα δημιουργήσας πρὸ δὲ πάντων αὑτοῦ ὑποστησάμενος καὶ δι' αὑτοῦ τῶν ὅλων προνοῶν.

I presume we ought to read αὐτοῦ ὑποστησάμενος ‘making him to have ὑπόστασις’ ‘to exist’. πρὸ δὲ πάντων occurred in the passages numbered 4 and 12 above, and if it is one of the compiler’s phrases would serve as a good test of the genuineness, which on other grounds I should be prepared to support.

18. vii 27 § 1

Funk 530. 1 | cod. Vat. gr. 1506
--- | ---
Σέμων ὁ Κανανίτης. | Σέμων ὁ Καναναῖος.

Here Funk’s reading has the support of the list of apostles in vi 14 § 1 (335. 11) and of the *Textus receptus* of Matt. x 4, Mark iii 18, in both of which passages, however, Καναναῖος is beyond question the correct reading. If the *Constitutions* had been compiled in any part of the Christian world but Syria, it would have been fairly clear that a fourth-century author must have written Καναναῖος: in Syria the presumption is much smaller. But a later recension would hardly have ousted the ‘Syrian’ in favour of the primitive reading.

¹ Cf. Justin *Ap.* i 49 τῷ ἀγαννήτῳ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐαυτοῦ ἀνίθηκαι: Chrys. *Hom.* ii in 2 Cor. 9 ἐαυτοῦ τῷ ζωτί θεῷ καὶ τῷ Χριστῷ αὑτοῦ παράθισε.
19. viii 28 § 2
Funk 530. 10

Apart from the dogmatic passages, this is certainly the most interesting variant offered by 1506. No phrase in the Constitutions is more familiar than this epigrammatic contrast of the function of bishop and presbyter: and the epigram is heightened, and the clauses are better balanced, if we adopt the striking reading of 1506. It must be admitted that the reconciliation of penitents by χειροθεσία is included among the offices of a bishop described in the earlier Books, and so far the parallels are in favour of the ordinary reading: yet it is so extraordinarily difficult to conceive of the reading being invented that I prefer to regard it as original, and to interpret χειροθεσία of the concurrent imposition of hands in the ordination of presbyters, ‘the bishop ordains, the presbyter lays on hands’.

20. viii 32 § 2
Funk 534. 8
codd. Vat. gr. 1506, 2089

These twenty passages seem to me to be enough to guarantee both the excellence of the text of 1506 and the fundamentally Arian character of its theology. I cannot feel the least doubt that it represents, more faithfully than our other witnesses, the wording of the Constitutions as the compiler published them. If so, the compiler was an Arian pur sang.

I hope in a second Note to examine the genuineness of the group of Apostolic Canons which deal with baptism (nos. 46, 47, 50) and of the addition to canon 50 found in Vat. gr. 1506 (see J. T. S. xv p. 57), with special reference to the discussion—unknown to me a year ago,—by Prof. E. Schwartz of Freiburg in his treatise Ueber die pseudo-apostolischen Kirchenordnungen (Strassburg 1910) pp. 12 ff. Schwartz is always a stimulating writer, though not always a convincing one. In any case the Syriac passage, printed by him in his own Greek rendering, represents quite obviously the original form of the addition to can. 50, which both Vat. gr. 1506 and John Scholasticus give in a catholicized edition. And this original echoes with remarkable closeness the theological language and ideas of the writer of the Apostolical Constitutions.

C. H. Turner.