Fifthly, we shall in the written work of St Paul see more clearly than before the man of action. He writes, in great part, as he preached or talked or argued. We shall no longer wonder at his sudden ‘going off at tangents’ or his anacolutha; they bring us nearer the man and tell us how he spoke and moved, as well as thought, in lecture-room or market-place.

E. Iliff Robson.

FRAGMENTS OF THE DIDASCALIA APOSTO-LORUM IN GREEK.

I owe to two persons the privilege of making known to scholars this valuable addition to our apparatus criticus for the original text of the Didascalia. The first of these is Dr J. Rendel Harris, who years ago gave me a preliminary copy of most of it, when the fragments were his own property, and then, quite recently, helped me to obtain access to these for fuller study. The next is their present owner, Lord Peckover, of Wisbech, who most generously put them at my disposal for leisurely examination. To both I would express sincere thanks, as also to Dr B. P. Grenfell, who gave me liberally of his time and skill in coping with difficulties which the decipherment and conjectural reconstruction of the text at times present.¹

The fragments in question were found by Dr Rendel Harris in the binding of a Syriac copy of the Gospels from the church at Harpout. The Syriac MS he assigned to the fifth century: the fragments themselves he assigned to the fourth. The latter date can hardly be justified palaeographically, to judge by comparison with the biblical specimens of fourth-century writing given in Scrivener-Miller, Introduction to the New Testament, and Dr E. M. Thompson’s Greek and Latin Palaeography. The formation of certain crucial letters points rather to the fifth or earlier sixth century, a conclusion supported by Dr Grenfell’s judgement based on more general grounds. Among Scrivener’s facsimiles of biblical MSS the fragments have affinity chiefly with Cod. Alexandrinus (A) and Cod. Cotton (N), of the fifth and sixth centuries respectively: and a date about A.D. 500 would suit the facts as well as any. As N is one of the purple codices, which as a class von Soden traces to a region where the text of the Great Cappadocians prevailed, we might expect kindred handwriting in a MS once at Harpout.

Our two fragments belong to a single vellum page, written in double

¹ This applies also to the fifth or sixth century fragment of 1 Tim. (iii 16b–iv 2) which the same series of fragments includes. See infra pp. 309 ff.

Die Schriften des N. T. Bd. i pp. 1466 ff.
columns of twenty-four lines, averaging fifteen letters to a line. Dr Rendel Harris deciphered the greater part of the larger fragment, which preserves the half-lines of one column on either side of it (though the bottom line is wanting save for the tops of a few letters); and he identified the text as that of the *Apostolic Constitutions* iii 5. 6 (περὶ ἐνωματῶσεως)–6. 3 (μὴ μετά) touching the ministry of Widows. But further, my own more prolonged study of the smaller fragment (of some ten half-lines), with Dr Grenfell's help in reading its far obscurer writing, shews that it formed the latter part of the companion column of the same page. The text of the *recto* of this fragment led up to that on the *recto* of the larger fragment, while that on its *verso* followed the matter on the latter's *verso*, after a lacuna of fourteen lines. This is itself a useful result. But what is of more importance is the extra evidence thus afforded:—

(1) that the text is not that of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, but rather of the older basis used by its compiler for this part of his work;

(2) that it agrees in the main with the Greek presupposed by the Syriac version (S) of the *Didascalia Apostolorum*, the writing in question.

The one unfortunate thing about this otherwise happy find is that the old Latin (iv–v cent.) version (L) of the work is here lacking, save for a line or so at the very end. Had it been otherwise, we should have been in a position of great advantage for testing yet further, by independent objective evidence, the mutual relations of the two versions of the Greek *Didascalia*, on the one hand, and also the relations of the forms of the original which they represent (possibly at slightly different stages of transmission) to the *Apostolic Constitutions* (AC), and again to the text of the *Didascalia* used by its compiler about A.D. 375. The study of all these relations is now greatly facilitated by the admirable edition of the relevant texts in F. X. Funk's *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum*, where the two works appear on opposite pages, with the additions of the later compiler or 'Constitutor' indicated by underlining. For checking the exact Syriac behind Funk's Latin rendering (where the old Latin version is wanting), the German version in *Die Syrische Didaskalia*, by Hans Achelis and Johannes Flemming, is also at times of service.

After these preliminaries, the text of the fragments as deciphered by Dr Grenfell and myself¹—with aid from the other witnesses which have generally enabled me to reconstruct the missing parts of the lines with practical certainty—may now be presented to the reader, along with the parallel sources for comparison.

[For the notation used in the text see p. 307].

¹ In only a very few cases, chiefly indicated in notes as doubtful, have I ventured on a reading without Dr Grenfell's authority.
The Syriac Didascalia (based on Funk).

adversus vos convertantur ac dirumpant vos. Cum enim gentes
cognoscere volentes (or who are being instructed) audiunt

verbum Dei, si non dicitur firmiter prout
decet, in aedificationem aeternae vitae, et praeertim quia a muliere
eis dicitur de incarnatione Domini nostri
ac de passione Christi, derident et contemnunt potius quam
laudibus celebrant verbum doctrine, et rea
fit magni iudicii peccati.

The Greek Fragments.

υμας . . . .
t . . aρ. [. . . . .
. . . . .
θυ λογον [ουτε δεω

υ τωσ ουτε εις την οι
ekodoμην της αιωνι
on ζωης και μαλισ
τα δια το υπο γυναι
κον λαλησθαι το

λαθέων υπερισχυται
tον περι ενσωματωσεως
η του ταθους αυτου,
μυκτηρισαντες ιλευν
ασουσιν μ[αλλον η
δοξασωσιν τοις λο
γοις της πρεσβυτε
ρασ' ενοχον δε αυτη
εστι 1 αμαρτιαν (και γινο
σεται πολυ [το κριμα ὴ
παρχειν ε[πεν γαρ]

Χριστου λογον ου δεινως,

και μαλιστα

tον περι ενσωματωσεως
η του ταθους αυτου,
μυκτηρισαντες ιλευν
ασουσιν μ[αλλον η
δοξασωσιν,

και ινοχος

εστει της προετειας η πρεσβυτες και
της βλασφημιας, και το ουαλ κληρονομησει.

Ουαλ δε, φησιν, δι' ου

---

1 εστι probably for έσται, as a future follows as well as precedes: so AC.

The Apostolic Constitutions (iii 5. 6–6. 4).

και στραϕέντες ρήξουσιν
ημας. άκουσαντες γαρ
οι άπιστοι
tον περι

άλλε ενδεισ,

και μαλιστα

tον περι ενσωματωσεως
η του ταθους αυτου,
μυκτηρισαντες ιλευν
ασουσιν μαλλον οσ ψευδη η
δοξασωσιν,

και ινοχος

εστει της προετειας η πρεσβυτες και
της βλασφημιας, και το ουαλ κληρονομησει.

Ουαλ δε, φησιν, δι' ου
Non decet ergo neque necessarium est ut mulieres doc-
eant, et presertim de nomine Christi et de redemp-
tione passionis eius.
Nam non ad hoc estis constitutae, O mulieres, ut doc-
eatis, ac maxime viduae, sed ut oretis ac rogetis Dominum Deum :
quia ipse[dominus Deus] Iesus Christus magister noster nos

1 So AC in i 10. 2, where LS have nomen Dei. Here the quotation hangs on τὸ θεὸς βλασφημήσαι above, which is peculiar to AC and probably secondary.

2 A stop probably follows, but is obscured by ink stains. The quotation is Prov. x 19, and the preceding verse is cited in iii 11. 2, both in the Syriac and in the Greek.

3-θ is pretty certain, and υ likely enough; υ is hardly to be made out. Dr Grenfell thinks θ, θ, possible, εἰς τὸ θεὸς rather less so. My restoration is suggested by S here and in vii i 'adloquantur Dominum', προσαλέων τῷ κυρίῳ AC.
duodecim misit
ut doceamus populum et gentes: erant
autem nobiscum discipulae, Maria
Magdalene et Maria filia Iacobi et altera Maria; neque autem nobiscum docerent populum.
Si enim necesse fuissei
ut mulieres docerent,
has ipsas iussisset nobiscum docere (unterweisen).
Sciat autem
vidua se altare
Dei esse, et

dōdeka e]peµψεν
µαθητεύοισι τον λαὸν καὶ τῇ εβνη συν
ηµιν (ἐξε)λὼν καὶ µαθητριάς: µαρίαν την
µαγδαλήνην καὶ µαρίαν αἰκοβοῦ καὶ
tην σαλωµῆν· ου συν
εξεπεµψεν αυτας
ηµιν µαθητευειν η
<σωξεὶν> τὸν κοσµον.
ει γαρ ην αναγκεον
διδασκειν γυναικας
αυτος αίν ηµιον ο δι
dασκαλος ταυταις
eκελευσεν συν ηµιν
cατηχειν:
γνωριζετο συν η
χηρα οτι θυσιαστη
ριον εστιν θυ και
tòus δωδεκα πέµψας
µαθητεύοισι τον λαὸν καὶ τα ἐθνη, γυναίκας οὐδαµῶν ἔξαπεν·
συνή γαρ ηµιν ἣ τε μῆτηρ του κυρίου και αἱ
dιελαβει αὐτοὺ, ἢτι δε Μαρία ἡ
Μαγδαλήνη καί Μαρία η Ἰακώβου και
Μάρθα καί Μαρία . . καὶ Σαλώµη καὶ ἐτεραί τινες. (Cf. above for
gυναίκας οὐδαµῶν ἔξαπεν·)
Ει γαρ ἦν αναγκαίουν
γυναίξειν διδασκειν
αὐτὸς ἄν ἐκέλευα
πρῶτος καὶ ταύταις
συν ηµιν
κατηχεῖν τὸν λαὸν· εἰ γὰρ κτλ. (1 Cor. xi 3).
γνωριζέτω οὖν ἦ
χήρα ὅτι θυσιαστή
ριον οὕτω θεοῦ καὶ

1 The point after Σαλώµη is not really visible; but the space is rubbed, and it seems best to assume it in view of the point after µαθητριάς, where the enumeration begins.
The Syriac Didascalia (based on Funk).

in domo suo sedeat perpetuo, neque aberret nec vagetur in domibus fidelium, ut accipiat.

Quae enim aberrant et inverse-cundae sunt nec quiete in domibus manent, quia non viduae sed viduli, et nil aliud curant nisi ut paratae sint ad accipiendum, et quia sunt [loquaces et] verbosae et detrectatrices, litium commissatrices, impudoratae, impudicae; quaeque si tales fuerint, non sunt dignae eo qui eas vocavit.

The Greek Fragments.

καθησθὼν εν τῇ οίκιᾳ αὐτῆς μη μετα τινὸς προφάσιος εἰς τὸ λαμβάνειν φιλιμαρ ὦς κατὰ ἀλαλόνς... εἰς τὸ λαμβάνειν, φυλαρ-ους, καταλάλους, μαχο συμβουλόνας ἀναί- δείς, ἀναφωχίντων· αἰτίως τουαίται ὑπάρ- χουσαι ὅθ' ἄξιο- αἰ τοῦ καλεσάντος τυγχάνονσαν.

So Dr Grenfell suggests. Possibly it ran αἱ ὑπάρχουσαι τοιαύται.
NOTES AND STUDIES

Words in italics or underlined are peculiar to a single witness.

[ ] in the first column denotes absence from Cod. Harris of the Syriac.

" in the second column denotes the filling of a gap in the fragments where the wording is fairly assured by comparison with the other sources.

⟨ ⟩ means that only the substance can plausibly be supplied as indicated, either from the other sources or from the context itself.

In the following English rendering of our fragments italics mark what is peculiar to the fragments against the other two witnesses.

('For when the Gentiles ... hear) the word of God [neither] as it [ought to be] no[r unto the] building up of [eternal] life, [and especially]ly because by a woman is spoken [that] touching [Christ] incarnate and subject to suffering, in derision they will scoff [rather than] give glory [at the wo]rds of the woman elder; [but she] will be guilty of sin [and] shall [know] that much is [the judgement] in store. [For] the Lord [said], Owing to much [speaking] thou shalt not escape sin(s).

('It is) not, [then, right] either that women be teachers, [especially]ly touching the name of the Lord and [His redemptive] passion. For ye have not been appointed, O women, [in order] to teach, and [especially]ly widows, [but only to importune] God. [For the Teacher himself (when)] He sent us [the twelve] to disciple the People and the Gentiles, having along with [us chosen out] also [female] discip[les]—Mary [Magdal]ene and M[ary of] James and Salome—He did not send them forth with [us] to disciple or (save) the world. [For if it were] needful that women should [teach], our Teacher [himself] would have bidden these along with us to teach.

'Let the [widow], then, [recognize] that she is God's altar, and let her [sit still] in her house; let her not with [any pretext] wander about in the houses of the faithful, in order to receive: for neither does God's altar ever wander about anywhere, but is settled in one spot. The widow, then, ought not to wander about among houses: for they who wander about and are shameless, keep not still in their houses because they are not widows but wallets, (and care for nothing but to be om. AC) ready to [receive], (and because they are talkative and om. AC) tattlers, slanderers... counsellors of strife, [shameless], immodest: [and they that are such] are not [found] worthy [of Him who] called them.'

The general effect of the foregoing is manifest. Our new text is the middle term between the Syriac Didascalia and the Greek of the Apostolic Constitutions. Each of them deviates from it in turns, the latter most

---

1 So AC only. The rest of the gap is supplied mostly in terms of the Syriac, as generally nearer to our MS.
2 Here L joins S after a long lacuna.
widely; each finds some support in it against the other; while their agreements against it are rare and easily explicable. These are in fact reducible to two certain cases, inconsistent with the supposition that either of these authorities for the text had before it the Greek Didascalia as found in our MS. And those two cases are simple interpolations, easily separable from the original text, as not entering into its substance, and not betraying any settled motive or tendency making for systematic change. ‘To disciple or (save) the world’ is a simple gloss, in more conventional terms, on ‘to teach (= ‘disciple’, above) the People’ (S)—with its more historic reference to Israel as the prime sphere of Apostolic activity. As to the larger addition, its first part, ‘and shall know that much is the judgement in store’, merely aims at making clearer a condensed phrase in the Greek lying behind the Syriac, rendered in Funk’s Latin by ‘rea magni iudicii peccati’, in Flemming’s German by ‘des grossen Gerichts der Sünde schuldig’, and in Mrs Gibson’s English by liable to ‘a great condemnation for the sin’. The original was perhaps ἐνοχὸς πολλοῦ κρίματος ἀμαρτίας, an emphatic but undefined expression, which some later reader first analysed into two statements, ἐνοχὸς ἀμαρτίας [καὶ γνῶ] σεται πολὺ τὸ κρίμα ἐπάρχειν—so increasing the emphasis—and then supported it by a Scriptural proof-text from Prov. x 19, defining the nature of the ἀμαρτία by its cause. That the original Greek seemed to be allusive, and so challenged the reader to supply for himself its full meaning, appears from the fact that the Constitutor also defined the sin in his own way; and he likewise added a proof-text in support of that definition as βλασφημία—in keeping with an earlier passage, where he is following the Didascalia.

When, however, we ask whether the Greek text implied by the Syriac—apart from deviations due to the translator and any mere copyist—was purer or not than that of our fragments, a decision is more difficult. There are several points of agreement between the fragments and Apost. Const. which seem to go back to a common text different from that used by the Syriac translator, early as was his date (possibly before Apost. Const., i.e. before c. 375). Of these μετά τῶν προφάσεως, absent from the Syriac, is the best example. Further, the Syriac’s ‘et altera Maria’, instead of καὶ Σαλώμη (supported by iii 16. 4), may go.

1 For their agreement in ‘Erant autem nobiscum discipulae’ and οὐκ θηρ ἡμῶν ἦ τε μήτηρ κτλ., which is only partial in nature, may well be accidental. The Syriac seems to break up a long and complex sentence for greater clearness; while AC changes the whole form of the passage and its context.

2 One must add, however, that this statement applies primarily to the matter in the longer fragment, where the text is clearest. The first four lines of the shorter one, r. 1, so far as the very few certain letters go, rather suggest a different text from that common to S and AC; while in the fifth line of its verso a word came between κατ’ αλαλοὺς and μαχα[σμ]βου]λος for which there is otherwise no evidence.
back to its Greek original; so too may its ‘verbum doctrinae’, which looks less original than our MS’s τοῖς λόγοις τῆς πρεσβυτέρας, supported by the presence of ἡ πρεσβυτέρας in the next clause of Ἀρσ. Const. But in this matter of the relative purity of the text in our fragments and of that presupposed by the Syriac—as also in defining the exact degree of the Syriac translator’s deviation from his Greek—we have to deplore the absence of the old Latin version in the Verona palimpsest, which would have settled some points we must now leave more or less open.

On the whole, however, we have reason to regard our fragments as preserving in their basal text a very ancient and pure form of the Greek Didascalia, of which they are so far the only known extant specimens, apart from the quotations in Epiphanius, and perhaps also in the Opus Imperfectum in Matthaeum. Moreover as a criterion of the degree to which our Syriac version deviates from its Greek original (whatever may have been the relative purity of its text and of that used by our MS), it largely confirms the impression conveyed by the old Latin version. That is a result of no small value.

J. Vernon Bartlet.

A NEW FIFTH–SIXTH CENTURY FRAGMENT OF 1 TIMOTHY.

Along with the fragments of a Greek MS of the Didascalia Apostolorum found by Dr Rendel Harris in the binding of an early Syriac MS (see p. 301 above), there were smaller fragments of a MS written in a similar hand, even more akin than those to Cod. Purpureus N of the Gospels (vi cent.). Only the two larger of the four fragments in question are at all legible, and in these too the letters are extremely indistinct. Indeed it was only by the lucky circumstance that in one of them the letters αὐδιδασκ... ντοκριον were fairly clear in two successive lines, so leading me to suspect that we had here parts of 1 Tim. iv 1 f, that it became possible to decipher the rest with anything like confidence. Armed with this clue, Dr Grenfell perceived that the other fragment fitted on to its companion and helped to complete parts of the same text. The resulting reconstruction is as follows:

σαρκὶ εἴδικαίωθη ἐν πνευματι
ωφθη αγγ[ελίσ] [ἐκηρυχθη (ἐν)'] ἐθνε

1 ἐν would make the line rather too full (26 letters against a maximum of 23 or 24 elsewhere), and is absent from a few cursives (see von Soden’s App. Crit.), as well as apparently from the MSS used by Jerome, praedicatum est gentibus.