

## NOTES AND STUDIES

### NOTES ON THE *APOSTOLIC CONSTITUTIONS*

#### III. THE TEXT OF THE EIGHTH BOOK<sup>1</sup>

FOR a long time the subject of the early Church Orders, and especially of the last and most elaborate of them, the *Apostolic Constitutions*, has had a peculiar fascination for me. Whether or no the opportunity will ever come to put together any general treatment of them, or even to weld into a single whole my separate contributions to particular aspects of the problem, must be more than doubtful: but at least I want to embrace the present opportunity of rounding off what I have to say about the text of the *Constitutions* and above all of the Eighth Book.

I am afraid that the papers on the subject which I wrote for the *JOURNAL* between 1912 and 1915 were a little haphazard in character: I was in fact learning as well as writing: and the problems themselves were of a very varied nature, textual, historical, and theological. It may be well then to recapitulate briefly how the matter stands under each of these three heads. But a word is needed first about the editions.

i. *The editions.* As far back as 1563 the Spanish Jesuit Franciscus Turrianus (Torres) published at Venice the *editio princeps*, and it is perhaps only in quite recent times that we have realized what an admirable edition, unsurpassed till comparatively lately, has been in the hands of scholars for all these centuries. The purpose of the editor was no doubt controversial: it was a contribution to the literature of the Counter-Reformation, based on the assumption that the *Constitutions* were a genuine work of the Apostles, and by their insistence on Episcopacy and similar features excluded the Protestant interpretation of the New Testament. The disproof of the Apostolic origin of this literature was pretty well all that the next two and a half centuries effected in the study of the subject.

The revival of historical interest in the last century saw two new but unimportant editions of the *Constitutions*, that of Ueltzen in 1853 and that of Lagarde in 1862. But all previous work was superseded by the comprehensive and elaborate work in two volumes by Dr F. X. Funk *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum* (Paderborn, 1906), of which the first contains the text with prolegomena, apparatus criticus, and (not

<sup>1</sup> The two previous papers were published fourteen or fifteen years ago: I. 'The Compiler an Arian' October 1914 (xvi 54-61); II. 'The Apostolic Canons' July 1915 (xvi 523-538).

the least valuable part of the work) seventy pages of Greek indices to proper names and to vocabulary, the second 'testimonia et scripturae propinquae'.

ii. *The text.* The discovery which in 1911 was the starting-point of my own work was a sixth-century fragment at Verona, consisting of a Latin version of the last few chapters of the Eighth Book of the *Constitutions*, followed by the 85 Apostolic Canons: before that nothing was known in Latin of the work of the Constitutor except the 50 Canons which Dionysius Exiguus translated and placed at the head of his well-known collection of Canons soon after A. D. 500. The Verona fragment was some four centuries older than any of the extant MSS of the original Greek text of the *Constitutions*, and so supplied an obvious standard of comparison by which to judge between them. The witness of these Greek MSS had for the first time been made fully accessible to scholars in Funk's critical apparatus. And among them one now stood out from the rest as in very close relation to the Verona fragment, namely, Vat. gr. 1506, written in A. D. 1024, and cited by Funk as d. A form of text warranted by d V(erona) goes back at least to the fifth century, and on the ground of its antiquity has a presumptive right to be treated as original; though of course that presumption has to be subjected to any tests that may be applicable.

iii. *The theology.* Now the most striking feature of any text based primarily on the witness of d is its definitely unorthodox theology: it is nakedly and unashamedly Arian. Of course all our MSS of the *Constitutions* were written at a date when the Nicene faith had long been established and by scribes whose own orthodoxy was unquestionable. Naturally therefore there was a steady tendency towards the catholicizing of the text and the removal of any blatant improprieties: d itself has not wholly escaped the traces of this process. Indeed we may be quite certain that it was only the naïve conviction of the apostolic authorship of the work that secured for it a relatively faithful transmission at least in some of our copies: what apostles dictated, however strange it might sound, had a prima facie claim to be accepted as correct. Even if we push the date of the original issue of the work as far back as the middle of the fourth century, still the triumph of the Nicene cause in the Greek-speaking Church followed not more than a generation later, and from that moment onwards any dogmatic influences operating from outside upon the text would have been of a Nicene and not of an opposite character. Therefore it will be a sound general principle that as between two variants, respectively orthodox and Arian, the presumption is definitely in favour of the latter. If this presumption is justified, the witness of d convicts the writer of *Ap. Const.* of being an Arian pure and simple.

iv. *The place and time.* Now there is nothing inconsistent with this conclusion in what we know from history of the writer's date or of the district in which he wrote. It is universally agreed that he is to be placed somewhere in Syria: and Arianism was predominant throughout Syria during the two middle quarters of the century. It may also be said to be agreed that his book is to be dated somewhere in the second half of the fourth century: and at least if it was Syrian of the period 350-375, it was more likely than not to have been Arian. For myself I am rather strongly of opinion that for both date and place some revision is called for of the opinions at present prevalent. The problems that interest the author are those that belong to the middle of the fourth century or to the decade that immediately follows. The literature with which he stands in closest contact is the literature of the Apostolic Church Orders, and, apart from the Roman *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus, the documents that make up this literature appear to be, one and all of them, Palestinian. I believe Zahn was near the truth when he ascribed the authorship of the *Apostolic Constitutions* (all eight books of them) to Acacius, bishop of Palestinian Caesarea, the successor of Eusebius and inheritor of his theological ideas: though no doubt the disciple dotted the i's and crossed the t's of his master's theology.

Now the arguments for the two related conclusions, the textual value of d, and the ingrained Arianism of the author of the *Constitutions*, seem to me to have been already sufficiently cogent, as I expressed them fifteen years ago. But these conclusions are so important, and contradict so fundamentally the results to which Funk himself was led, that I need make no apology for returning to the same problem in order to attack it again from a different angle.

Funk more or less confined himself, in constructing the critical apparatus of his text of the *Constitutions*, to the direct witness of the Greek MSS, though in fact for parts at least of the Eighth Book he had at hand Syriac, Sahidic, and Ethiopic versions, and in Greek an Epitome, besides citations in the enigmatic writer Anastasius: 'mihi versiones orientales, cum liber viii optime codicibus graecis tradita [*lege traditus*] sit, iuste praetermittendae esse videbantur.' But in fact there is an important residue of readings where the Greek MSS do not give concordant testimony; d especially, and de (= Vat. 2089, saec. xi), are not infrequently found to stand alone against the rest. And the special purpose I have set myself in the present paper is to adduce a series of variants, apart from those of a theological character, where the witness of d is borne out by the witness of the versions, of the Epitome, of Anastasius, or of some of them. It will be seen in the sequel how largely I dissent from Funk's text and from the principles on

which he constructs it. But I want to make it quite clear at the outset that it is in the main his own apparatus and his own *index graecitatis*, together with his texts of the Epitome and of Anastasius, that have supplied me with my material. I have added on my own account a recollation of codex d for the Eighth Book—printed at the end of this paper—the ever-ready kindness of Mgr G. Mercati having provided me many years ago with a photograph of the text. The evidence of the Oriental versions is from the excellent editions of Nau and Horner, as will be seen in detail in the paragraphs marked 3, 4, 5, below. The arguments from the usage of the Constitutor—arguments which appear to me to be of special weight in the case of a writer who has so many mannerisms and tricks of speech of his own—are based on Funk's index, though of course I have verified his references. I only wish there was anything comparable in the way of an index to the language of Ps.-Ignatius.

Finally let us equip ourselves with a clear if summary *résumé* of the authorities to be cited: and then proceed to the examination of the readings.

1. The *Epitome*. Funk ii pp. xi-xix, 72-96: for the text ten MSS were used, which differ a good deal among themselves: the oldest are of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. It consists of five sections:

Διδασκαλία τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων περὶ χαρισμάτων = A. C. viii cc. 1, 2.

Διατάξεις τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων περὶ χειροτονιῶν διὰ Ἰππολύτου = A. C. viii 4, 5; 16-28; 30, 31.

Παύλου τοῦ ἁγίου ἀποστόλου διατάξεις περὶ κανόνων ἐκκλησιαστικῶν = A. C. viii 32.

Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων διατάξεις = A. C. viii 33, 34; 42-45.

Περὶ εὐταξίας διδασκαλία πάντων τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων = A. C. viii 46.

It does not admit of doubt that the *Epitome*, although at two points it depends directly on the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus,<sup>1</sup> is in the main derived from the Eighth Book of the *Constitutions* and posterior to it. But its date is sufficiently remote to justify us in ranking it as a primary witness, where extant, to the text of the *Constitutions*.

2. *Fragmenta Anastasiana*. Funk ii pp. vi-xi, 51-71. Citations from the *Constitutions* (all eight books) made by Anastasius in his *Quaestiones* (ed. Gretser, 1617). Funk has re-examined the MS evidence, using nine MSS of which the earliest goes back to about A. D. 900. The date of Anastasius is doubtful, but he is more recent than the Epitomator and his evidence not quite of the same value.

<sup>1</sup> In the prayer for the ordination of a bishop (Funk ii 78) and in the prescription for the appointment of a reader (*ib.* ii 82). See Dom R. H. Connolly *Egyptian Church Order* (Texts and Studies viii 4: 1916) p. 53.

3. Of the Oriental versions that reinforce the Greek evidence, the first place must be assigned to the Syriac if only because of the greater extent of the ground it covers. I have employed Nau's French translation *La version syriaque de l'Octateuque de Clément: traduite . . . par F. Nau*, Paris 1913. Of this Octateuch books i and ii contain the *Testamentum Domini*, book iii the so-called 'Apostolic Church Order', while books iv-vii correspond to the Eighth Book of the *Constitutions*, book viii to the Apostolic Canons. In more detail book iv = A. C. viii 1, 2; book v = A. C. *ib.* 3-5, 16-26; book vi = A. C. *ib.* 27, 28, 30, 31, 32 § 18-34, 42-46, 32 §§ 1-17; book vii = A. C. 29, 6-9, being chapters passed over above in books v, vi.

The Octateuch was apparently known in its complete form to Severus of Antioch who died in A. D. 540: its last five books are therefore a very early witness to the text of A. C. That is at least true of the underlying Greek, even if the extant Syriac version be as late as the end of the seventh century.

4, 5. The Ethiopic and Sahidic versions contain a rather smaller compass of the Eighth Book of the *Constitutions*.<sup>1</sup> The first half of both the Ethiopic and the Sahidic collections (Statutes 1-48 in the Ethiopic, 1-62 in the Sahidic) are based on other and earlier documents than the *Apostolic Constitutions*, and do not concern our present purpose. In the English translation by Mr George Horner (*The Statutes of the Apostles or Canones Ecclesiastici*, 1904), which I have taken as my guide, the portions relevant to book viii of A. C. begin at p. 186 for the Ethiopic, at p. 332 for the Sahidic. The versions run parallel throughout A. C. viii chapters 1 and 2, down to Eth. p. 193 l. 3, Sa. p. 340 l. 2. At that point Eth. makes a long interpolation extending over nearly four pages (the first part of it based on the Didache), while Sa. remains faithful to the text of A. C. viii 3. That already raises the presumption—and the presumption appears to me to be borne out at every step of the comparison of the documents—that the latter half of both the Sahidic and the Ethiopic collections is derived ultimately from the same original, an original based purely on book viii of A. C., but that this original is in detail much more faithfully represented in the Sahidic.

The two versions agree on the main lines of their treatment of A. C. Both omit the whole of the prayers in A. C. viii, some of which of course are of such portentous length that no congregation even in the fourth century could have stood them as the rule of the normal Sunday liturgy.

<sup>1</sup> The longer prayers are omitted in all three versions: but the Ethiopic and Sahidic, while they retain most of the contents of books v and vi of the Syriac, omit the contents of book vii of the Syriac, which is apparently a sort of second thought on the part of the Syriac editor.

Both omit all reference to the division of the different sections of A. C. viii among the different Apostles. At first sight it might be tempting to look on this feature as indicating an earlier stage of development than the arrangement in A. C. But the Syriac version corresponds even here with A. C. viii: and the reason which prompted the omission of the names in the original of Eth. and Sa. is perhaps that both have already made use of this distribution of ordinances between the different Apostles in the earlier part of their collection.

The portions of A. C. viii retained are chapters 1-4; 5 § 9-6 § 2; 11 § 9-12 § 3; 12 § 39 (summary); 13 § 14-14 § 2 a; 15 § 6; 15 § 10; (after an insertion of some ten lines) 15 § 11, 16 § 2; 17 § 2; summary of 21, 22, 19; 23 § 2-28; 30-34; 42-46. At this point the Sahidic ends, while the Ethiopic adds ten pages of divers prayers on its own account.

6. Finally for chapters 41 (from Funk 550. 13 onwards) to 46 we have the evidence of the Latin version discovered by me in the sixth-century MS li (49) of the Chapter Library at Verona and edited by the late Dr Spagnolo, librarian of the Chapter Library, and myself in *Ecclesiae Occidentalis Monumenta Iuris Antiquissima* I ii 1 pp. 32 a sqq. (1913). I cite it under the symbol V: it is of course only available for the last few of the readings here examined.

Having thus summarized the various sources and documents by the help of which we can test the tradition of the text (or parts of the text) of A. C. viii, I proceed to apply this touchstone to various readings where codex d, with or without the support of other MSS of A. C., differs from the text adopted by Funk. In this investigation readings which raise questions of theology will be left practically on one side, simply because, whether or no the compiler of A. C. wrote from an Arian point of view, it is quite certain that the derived documents were all put together by orthodox writers, and any glaring indications of heretical theology would have been altered or omitted by them. But the crucial feature that emerges is that, however much the text of d and the text of the derived documents differ in theological passages, in the whole extent of the material unaffected by doctrinal considerations it is, speaking generally, the text of d and not the text of Funk (where these differ in important readings) which is reproduced in the Greek epitome and in the Syriac, Sahidic, Ethiopic, and Latin versions. The pages now following are devoted to the establishment of this conclusion by the examination of a number of *variae lectiones*. It should be remembered of course that it is in the prayers of A. C. viii that the compiler's theology is most influential and most marked, and the versions systematically omit the prayers, while they retain the framework and the ordinances, of the original work. I am indeed more inclined than I was at first to suspect that the reason for omission of the prayers may have been the

dubious character of the theology underlying them. If so, the versions give a sort of negative support to the Arianizing text of the prayers in d. In any case as they agree, where they are extant, with d against Funk's text, we can certainly not argue that, if they had been extant in the prayers, they would have agreed with Funk's text against d.

*Examination of readings in A. C. viii*

(Ep = Epitome : S = Syriac : Sa = Sahidic : Æ = Ethiopic)

i. c. 2 § 2 (468. 5) δι' ἐκούσιον μοχθηρίαν. But d e Ep δι' ἐκούσιον κακόνοιαν, and compare 468. 11 ἀγνοία ἢ κακονοία, 482. 17 δι' ἐκούσιον αὐτοῦ κακόνοιαν, and so again d in 508. 6 τοῦ τὴν κακόνοιαν νοσήσαντος. κακόνοια is a favourite word of the Constitutor's : in the first six books he adds it three times to his Didascalia ground-text : v 16. 2 (283. 18), vi 5. 1 (309. 16) οὗτοι δὲ κακόνοιαν νοσοῦσιν, vi 27. 6 (373. 8) κακόνοιαν νοσήσας, where as here it is used of the devil, and so also Ps.-Ign. *Philipp.* 12 ὑπαγε Σατανᾶ . . . ἐν οἷς ἠρεθίσθης ἐκ κακονοίας. μοχθηρία is less frequent, and apparently never used of evil spirits.

ii. c. 2 § 4 (468. 13) ὡς Ἀνανίας καὶ Σαμαΐας ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ [Jer. xxxvi (xxix) 31]. But in d Ep S Sa Æ the reading is 'Israel' and not 'Jerusalem' : the abbreviations of the two words, *ιλημ ιηλ*, are sufficiently alike to cause confusion. The MSS of Anastasius are divided between the two readings : in the Epitome, apart from one late MS, the witnesses are solid for 'Israel'.

iii. c. 2 § 5 (468. 19) παντοίας τιμωρίας ἔτισαν. But d e Ep S ('une punition') have the singular παντοίαν τιμωρίαν. τιμωρία occurs in A. C., according to Funk's index, nineteen times : apart from this passage, only once in the plural.

iv. c. 4 § 4 (472. 15) εἰ τὰ κατὰ τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ καλῶς ᾤκονόμηται, εἰ τὰ κατὰ τὸν βίον ἀνεπίληπτως. d f (a Barberini fragment of c. A. D. 800 : now Vat. barb. gr. 336) Ep and apparently S Sa<sup>1</sup> read the adjective ἀνεπίληπτος : Ep makes the construction clear by adding ὑπάρχει. The balance of the sentence, and the use of the word elsewhere in A. C. (three times in book ii), seem decisive for the adjective.

v. c. 5 § 3 (474. 13) διὰ τῶν σῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ ἡμῶν τῶν χάριτι σῆ παρεστῶτων ἐπισκόπων, where d and the Syriac (the only version here extant) insert διδασκάλων after ἡμῶν, διὰ τῶν σῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ ἡμῶν διδασκάλων 'par tes apôtres et nos docteurs'. The reading of d makes it clear that only one class of persons is contemplated, 'those who are

<sup>1</sup> S 's'il a bien dirigé sa maison, si sa conduite est irrépréhensible' : Sa 'that he conducted his house well, and that his whole life is sound, in no way reproachable'.

Thy apostles and our teachers': the reading of the other MSS, with its two classes of persons; the Apostles and the Bishops, would have involved a second *διά, καὶ δι' ἡμῶν τῶν χάριτι σῆ*. . . . There cannot, I think, be a shadow of doubt: d and the Syriac are right.<sup>1</sup>

**vi.** c. 5 § 4 (474. 18) Ἐλεαζάρω. But Ἐλεάζαρ indeclinable in d f h (h is a Jerusalem MS from S. Saba, of about A.D. 1000): and that appears to be the only form in which the name of the son of Aaron is found in the LXX.

**vii.** c. 5 § 12 (476. 29) λόγους παρακλήσεως. In d alone λόγους παρακλητικούς, and that is a phrase (unlike the other) familiar to the Constitutor: ii 15. 1 (59. 9) καὶ μὴ κοινωνεῖν αὐτοῖς λόγων παρακλητικῶν, ii 22. 1 (81. 18) πρὸς νοθεσίαν τῶν στυπτικῶν ἢ παρακλητικῶν δεομένων λόγων, ii 41. 5 (131. 28) καὶ καταβρέχων λόγους παρακλητικοῖς.

**viii.** c. 6 § 11 (480. 13) ὁ διὰ Χριστοῦ διδασκάλους τοὺς μαθητὰς ἐπιστήσας πρὸς μάθησιν τῆς εὐσεβείας. d has 'to the disciples' in the dative, τοῖς μαθηταῖς, and that construction after ἐπιστήσας has a near parallel in vii 34. 6 (428. 10) καὶ νοῦν τὸν τῆς ψυχῆς ἠνώχον ταῖς αἰσθήσεσιν ἐπιστήσας. In this passage it has the advantage of making 'the learners' and those who are taught 'for learning of godliness' the same set of people.<sup>1</sup>

**ix.** c. 7 § 6 (482. 17) οὐ τὸ βλέμμα ξηραίνει ἀβύσσους. From the lost Greek of the Apocalypse of Ezra (= iv Esdras of the Vulgate N.T.) viii 23: Brightman *Litt. E. and W.* i 553 (6. 21): not identified by Funk. d with the Syriac version gives ἄβυσσον in the singular (and so always in N.T., predominantly in LXX, and usually elsewhere in A. C.): the other Greek MSS with the Latin have the plural.

**x.** c. 9 § 5 (486. 13) καταξιοθῶσι κοινωνοὶ γενέσθαι τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ ἱερῶν καὶ μέτοχοι τῶν θείων μυστηρίων ἵνα ἄξιοι ἀποφανθέντες τῆς νιοθεσίας. . . . For ἱερῶν d has δωρεῶν, S apparently ('ses saints prêtres') ἱερέων. Not only is ἱερά neut. pl. apparently a use unknown to the Constitutor, but in the preceding section where the intercession for the φωτιζόμενοι is parallel to the intercession here for those ἐν μετανοίᾳ, the three nouns δωρεά, νιοθεσία, μυστήρια are found in near connexion, just as here in d: τῆς πνευματικῆς σου δωρεᾶς καὶ τῆς ἀληθινῆς σου νιοθεσίας, τῶν πνευματικῶν σου μυστηρίων (484. 12).<sup>1</sup>

**xi.** c. 9 § 8 (486. 19) Παντοκράτορ θεὲ αἰώνιε, δέσποτα τῶν ὄλων, κτίστα καὶ πρῦτανι τῶν πάντων. For the last two words d has τῶν ὄντων with the Syriac 'créateur et gouverneur de tout ce qui est': compare vi 11. 1 (325. 7) τῶν ὄντων δημιουργόν, vii 33. 2 (424. 4) ὁ θεὸς πάντων τῶν ὄντων.<sup>1</sup>

**xii.** c. 10 § 4 (488. 14) ὑπὲρ τῆς ἁγίας καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς ἐκκλησίας. d after ἀποστολικῆς inserts τοῦ θεοῦ. Such an addition is found in connexion with ἐκκλησία some thirty times in A. C., and it is

<sup>1</sup> These variations were already discussed in *J. T. S.* xvi 57, 58 (Oct. 1914).

obviously a favourite locution of the Constitutor: he often adds 'of God' or 'of the Lord' to 'the Church' of the Didascalia in books i-vi. It is probably correct here, though there are not parallels sufficiently close to guarantee it beyond contradiction.

**xiii.** c. 13 § 5 (514. 21) ὑπὲρ βασιλέων καὶ τῶν ἐν ὑπεροχῇ δεηθῶμεν with the text of 1 Tim. ii 2. But d ὑπὲρ τῶν βασιλέων (a reading not recorded by Funk); and the definite article is supported by all the parallels in A. C. which can be referred to the actual situation of the time: ii 57. 18 (167. 3) ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐκκλησίας πάσης . . . ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως καὶ τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ τῆς καθόλου εἰρήνης, viii 12. 42 (512. 1) ἔτι παρακαλούμέν σε κύριε ὑπὲρ τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ τῶν ἐν ὑπεροχῇ καὶ παντὸς τοῦ στρατοπέδου, viii 15. 4 (518. 28) τοὺς ἱερεῖς ἀμόμους διαφύλαξον . . . τοὺς βασιλεῖς διατήρησον ἐν εἰρήνῃ. Whether we can also argue that the use of the singular in book ii suggests a single emperor such as Constantius between 351 and 360, and the use of singular (once) and plural (twice) in book viii suggests a rather later date when there was one emperor on the spot and another or others more remote in the West, as from 364 onwards, is less certain; the plural may only mean 'emperor and empress'.

**xiv.** c. 13 § 13 (516. 21) θεὸς κύριος καὶ ἐπεφάνη ἐν ἡμῖν. For this reading Funk quotes d, possibly by confusion with a: d in fact reads with the LXX of Ps. cxviii [cxviii] 27 θεὸς κύριος καὶ ἐπέφανεν ἡμῖν, and that reading should certainly be restored to the text.

**xv.** c. 13 § 14 (516. 24) ἐν ταῖς γυναῖξιν αἱ διάκοναι. διάκοναι is, I imagine, a vox nihili. d has διάκονοι, and so has Lagarde: Funk's apparatus is silent save for the note 'διακόνισσαι a'. We may charitably suppose διάκοναι to be a misprint, though a very unfortunate one, and restore αἱ διάκονοι to the text with ii 26. 3 (103. 21), iii 8. 1 (197. 19).

**xvi.** c. 16 § 1 (520. 31), and similarly for the opening words of cc. 17, 19, 21, 22, 23, περὶ δὲ χειροτονίας. But the δέ is regularly omitted by d (apparently by f p) Ep and the Syriac, περὶ and whatever word follows being treated as a title, not as part of the text at all. If the other versions still fail us, the evidence in support of d is ample.

**xvii.** c. 16 § 3 (522. 4) ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν. d f Ep S ὁ βασιλεὺς ἡμῶν. βασιλεὺς is not, I think, used of God before the later chapters of the seventh book: but from that point it recurs quite frequently at the beginning of the prayers, vii 33. 2 (424. 3) ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν θεῶν, vii 34. 1 (426. 10) κύριε βασιλεὺ τῶν αἰώνων, vii 42. 3 (448. 8) τὸν βασιλέα πάσης αἰσθητῆς καὶ νοητῆς φύσεως, vii 47. 2 (456. 3) κύριε βασιλεὺ ἐπουράνιε, vii 48. 2 (456. 11) κύριε βασιλεὺ ὁ πατὴρ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, viii 12. 38 (510. 5) προσφερόμέν σοι τῷ βασιλεῖ καὶ θεῷ, viii 37. 2 (544. 20) ὁ τοῦ πνεύματος κύριος καὶ τῶν νοητῶν καὶ αἰσθητῶν βασιλεὺς.

**xviii.** c. 16 § 3 (522. 5) ὁ διὰ Χριστοῦ τὰ πάντα δημιουργήσας καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ τῶν ὄλων προνοῶν. After δημιουργήσας d f insert πρὸ δὲ πάντων αὐτὸν (αὐτοῦ d αὐτῷ f: but the accusative is clearly right with S) ὑποστήσάμενος: and so S 'car tu l'avais engendré avant toutes choses'. With ὑποστήσάμενος compare Ps.-Ign. *Magn.* 8 ὅς κατὰ πάντα εὐαρέστησεν τῷ ὑποστήσαντι αὐτόν, if that is (as I agree with Zahn that it is) the true reading.<sup>1</sup>

**xix.** c. 16 § 5 (522. 20) ἱατικῶν. d f Ep ἱαματικῶν. Both forms are given in Liddell and Scott: ἱατικός has the earlier authority in Greek, but ἱαματικός has the better and earlier authority in our passage. Neither form seems to occur elsewhere in A. C.

**xx.** c. 18 § 3 (524. 8) διὰ τῆς μεσιτείας τοῦ μονογενοῦς σου υἱοῦ. d f Ep S after μεσιτείας insert τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, and this weight of external testimony is reinforced by the parallels viii 5. 5 (474. 22) μεσιτεία τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, viii 13. 3 (514. 16) ὅπως ὁ ἀγαθὸς θεὸς προσδέξῃται αὐτὸ διὰ τῆς μεσιτείας τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ, viii 48. 3 (594. 2) διὰ τῆς μεσιτείας τοῦ ἡγαπημένου παιδὸς αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

**xxi.** c. 21 § 3 (526. 1) δέσποτα θεέ. But d δέσποτα ὁ θεός: and though d here appears to stand quite alone, it is supported by the parallels vii 37. 1 (436. 11) αὐτὸς καὶ νῦν, δέσποτα ὁ θεός, viii 5. 1 (474. 1) Ὁ ὢν, δέσποτα κύριε ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ, viii 15. 2 (518. 16) Δέσποτα ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ. In other words A. C. never uses δέσποτα θεέ in immediate juxtaposition: the nearest approach to the phrase is vii 25. 3 (410. 20) σύ, δέσποτα παντοκράτωρ, θεέ αἰώνιε, but there δέσποτα and θεέ each has its separate adjective. In spite of a writer so profoundly tied up as the Constitutor to characteristic phrases, the balance inclines to the reading of d.

**xxii.** c. 22 § 3 (526. 14) τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν σου διαφυλάττων. d f S ('le nombre de tes élus par tout le monde') after σου add ἐν ὄλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ.

**xxiii.** c. 26 § 1 (528. 16) περὶ ἐπορκιστοῦ. But d f Ep S all have the plural περὶ ἐπορκιστῶν, and so A. C. regularly for all orders from c. 21 onwards, sub-deacons, readers, confessors, virgins, widows.

**xxiv.** c. 27 § 1 (530. 1) Σίμων ὁ Κανανίτης (and so vi 14. 1: the names are not in the Didascalia) with N-Matt. (but not N-Mc.) Chrysostom and later authorities. d f Ep (and apparently S 'Simon le Cananéen')<sup>2</sup> give what is certainly the true reading in the Gospels Σ. ὁ

<sup>1</sup> So already *J. T. S.* (Oct. 1914) xvi 60.

<sup>2</sup> It is of interest to note that we have in Severus of Antioch (A. D. †540) another very early Syriac authority for the text of A. C. viii 27: see Mr E. W. Brooks's admirable edition of the letters (for the 'Text and Translation Society' 1902-1904) *E. T.* i pp. 211, 213: 'This also they say is a canon of Simon the Cananaean, and it has never prevailed in the holy churches and been accepted by

*Καναναῖος*. If the Constitutor wrote at Antioch in the second half of the fourth century, the probabilities are that he would have used the Lucianic recension = *Textus Receptus*. If, as I think more likely, he wrote in Palestine, and not long after A.D. 350, the chances that he used a better text than the Antiochene are considerable. That he should give the inferior reading *Κανανίτης* in book vi and the correct reading *Καναναῖος* in book viii is after all similar to what the codex Sinaiticus (S) does in Matt. x 4, Mc. iii 18 : and my own view is that S and A. C. are not only nearly allied in time but also in place.

**xxv.** c. 28 § 1 (530. 9) Ὁ αὐτὸς περὶ κανόνων. Omitted in the text, so that there is no break between chapters 27 and 28, by d S : but d like Ep has for title in the margin Τοῦ αὐτοῦ Σίμωνος τοῦ Καναναίου κανόνες ἐκκλησιαστικοί.

**xxvi.** c. 29 § 1 (532. 1) ἐγὼ Ματθίας. But both a and d have *Ματθαῖος*, though Matthew has occurred higher up in his proper place. S too has Matthew, in the title both of c. 29 (in its book vii) and of c. 30 (in its book vi). 'Matthias' must certainly be the correct form of the title. Yet d has in l. 11 what looks an indubitably genuine addition οἶκον φυλακτικὴν after *δαιμόνων φυγαδευτικὴν*.

**xxvii.** c. 30 § 2 (532. 21) τῶν ἱερέων καὶ τῶν αὐτοῖς ἐξυπηρετουμένων διακόνων. d Ep S Sa A omit *διακόνων*. Clearly it ought not to stand in the text : but iii 20. 2 (217. 19), τὸν διάκονον ἐξυπηρετεῖσθαι τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ καὶ τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις, serves to shew that it is a true gloss on the meaning.

**xxviii.** c. 32 § 2 (534. 10) οἱ τρόποι. But ὁ τρόπος d e Ep S : and this is a case where the usage of the Constitutor is decisive. ὁ τρόπος is found at least ten times (in vii 2. 9 [390. 14] τῷ βίῳ τῷ τρόπῳ, as here), οἱ τρόποι not once.

**xxix.** c. 41 § 3 (550. 21) ὁ τὸ λογικὸν τοῦτο ζῶον τὸν ἄνθρωπον . . . θνητὸν ἐκ κατασκευῆς ποιήσας. d omits *τοῦτο* in agreement with the Verona Latin fragment, which is henceforth available : with the reading of d V compare viii 37. 5 (546. 4) ὁ τῇ σοφίᾳ σου κατασκευάσας ἄνθρωπον τὸ λογικὸν ζῶον.

**xxx.** c. 42 § 1 (552. 20) ἐν ψαλμοῖς καὶ ἀναγνώσμασιν καὶ προσευχαῖς. The words *καὶ ἀναγνώσμασιν* are absent from d e Ep Anastasius and from

holy synods or been named in them at all . . . However, if agreeable, we will also adduce the canon that is given out as having been enacted by Simon the Cananaean. . . . It is said to be as follows : " I also, Simon the Cananaean, command you by how many the bishop ought to be ordained. A bishop should be ordained by two or by three bishops. But if any one be ordained by one bishop, let both him and the man who ordained him be deprived. But if necessity arise for him to be ordained by one, since a large number cannot come, because there is a persecution or some other cause, let him bring a *psephisma* of authority from several bishops."

every one of the four versions. The mass of evidence is decisive, and gives fresh reason to question Funk's dictum (p. xlv l. 3) as to the excellence of the majority of his Greek MSS of the Eighth Book.

**xxxix.** c. 42 § 1 (552. 20) *διὰ τὸν διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν ἐγεθέντα*. Now *διὰ* 2° is omitted by d e, most MSS of Anastasius, and by the second hand of one of Ep: not to speak of the variant *τριήμερον* in Anast. and Ep. Versions are useless here: but I record the omission with a rather strong suspicion that it is right. I have the impression that I have met not infrequently with a genitive of time in A. C., though the only instances I can lay my hands on at the moment are viii 34. 1 (540. 13, 14) where *ἄρθρον* is read by all MSS and *ἀλεκτοροφωνίας* by d e h p and Anastasius (cf. Mc. xiii 35): viii 1. 10 (464. 9) where Funk reads *τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας*, but d e *τῶν τεσσαράκοντα ἡμερῶν* and Ep *ἕως τεσσαράκοντα ἡμερῶν*: and viii 12. 34 (508. 14) where again d and another MS have the genitive *ἡμερῶν* for the accusative.

**xxxix.** c. 42 § 3 (552. 22) *καὶ τεσσαρακοστὰ κατὰ τὸν παλαιὸν τύπον*. *τύπος* is of course used of O.T. types (ii 25. 5 [95. 16]: ii 57. 10 [163. 11]: iii 16. 3, 4 [211. 4-9]): and what can 'the ancient type' be, as indeed our author himself makes clear, but the mourning for Moses in Deut. xxxiv 8, where not more than one of the mass of MSS used in the Cambridge larger LXX gives *τεσσαράκοντα* for *τριάκοντα*. Add now that d (not cited by Funk), e, some MSS of Ep, and all four versions, read *τριακοστά*, and I do not see how a vestige of doubt can remain: 30, not 40, is the true number in A. C.

**xxxix.** c. 44 § 4 (554. 22) *περὶ τῶν ἐν κλήρω*. To this form the only parallel is vi 17. 3 (341. 8) *οὐδενὶ τῶν ἐν τῷ κλήρῳ* (with the definite article), but to the *περὶ τῶν κληρικῶν* of d there are numerous parallels and in this neighbourhood, especially in the Apostolic Canons. Apparently the Syriac and Sahidic, more certainly the Latin, have the adjective: but Ep sides with the majority of Greek MSS.

**xxxix.** c. 46 § 13 (560. 27) *ἐγὼ Ἰάκωβος καὶ ἐγὼ Κλήμης*. But d in inverse order (and with only one *ἐγὼ*) *ἐγὼ Κλήμης καὶ Ἰάκωβος*. Ep and V *ἐγὼ Κλήμης [καὶ] ἐγὼ Ἰάκωβος*: Sa goes with d. All four versions agree with d in putting Clement first. In viii 35. 1 (542. 16) we have *κἀγὼ Ἰάκωβος*: in viii 47. 85 *αἱ Διαταγαὶ ὑμῶν τοῖς ἐπισκόποις δι' ἐμοῦ Κλήμεντος*: in viii 10. 7 (488. 22-26) the order is James, Clement, Euodius, Annianus. It must be admitted that 'James and Clement' seems the more natural order.

**xxxix.** c. 46 § 17 (562. 25) *Μελχισεδὲκ καὶ Ἰώβ*, and for once in a way the body of Greek MSS have the reading which seems right: cf. viii 5. 3 (474. 14) *ἱερεῖς . . . Νῶε καὶ Μελχισεδὲκ καὶ Ἰώβ*. So in that passage d: but here *Ἰακώβ*, and not only d but Ep V S Sa ('Jacob the Patriarch')  $\mathfrak{A}$ . Yet Melchisedech and Job are so regularly connected

in A. C. (vi 12. 13 [333. 2]: vii 39. 3 [440. 26]: viii 12. 23 [502. 32]), that I conclude 'Job' to be right, and 'Jacob' a very early error perhaps even going back to the archetype.

Here then are thirty-five readings of d, all of them supported either by the versions where extant, or by Greek evidence (the Epitome or the Barberini fragment f) earlier than that of the MSS followed by Funk, or by the usage of the Constitutor. One reading out of the thirty-five, no. **xviii**, though it is certainly right, should perhaps be withdrawn from the list as being, unlike the rest, theological in character. All of them are probably, most of them are certainly, right, with the exception of **xxxv** and perhaps of **xxxiv**. The net result is, I venture to think, impressive and conclusive: whether we tested by the standard of the versions, or by the earliest Greek evidence, or by parallel passages in the *Constitutions* where the text is without variant, it emerges triumphantly from the ordeal. I am not arguing, let it be remembered, that d is always right. It has its share of individual errors: but putting these aside, it seems to me to stand out as beyond question our leading MS alike for the internal excellence of its readings, and for the external support given to it by all the earliest authorities at our disposal.

But if this is so, the prerogative right thus established in non-theological variants may justly be extended in favour of the special group of readings of a theological character in which it stands more nearly alone. These were considered in the first paper of this series 'The Compiler an Arian' (October 1914), and the conclusions I drew then have appeared to me, at every subsequent stage of reconsideration, more and more irrefragable. I hope I may have commended my thesis to my readers as far back as on that occasion. If there are any who are still sceptical, I hope I may in the present paper have convinced them, and for the others may have made certainty one degree more certain. I cannot tell whether any future scholar will one day attempt a new edition of the *Apostolic Constitutions*: if so be that that should be so, I shall at least have made his task appreciably the lighter.

COLLATION OF COD. VAT. gr. 1506 (FUNK'S d) IN COMPLETION OR  
CORRECTION OF FUNK'S APPARATUS FOR A. C. vii 33-viii 46

424. 7 ὁ: om	13 κλῆμα	22 ἀπολαμβάνειν	426. 6 μωσῆν (ita
semper)	17 ἥλιον	30 ἀμβιβόμενοι	428. 2 ἠτόνησε (ita fere semper,
sc sine v ἐφελευστικόν	ante consonantem)	13 ἀρμόνιον	430. 16 λίθω κύβον
20 ἐκφυτεύσαντα	432. 10 ἅπαντας (ita fere semper)	18 τῆς ἀδιαμεσίτου	
24 καὶ μεθ' οὗ καὶ	434. 8 σεαυτῶν	12 τὸν ὑπ' αὐτῶν	17 ἀλλὰ μορφήν
20 ἀνακύκλισιν	24 θελήσει	436. 18 τοῦ ναυῆ	26 σενναχιρείμ
438. 28 ἔρ πόσον μῆκος	440. 23 ἐκόλασεν: sequitur dimidia	fere lineae rasura	

444. 6 *καί* (*ante* ὁ κύριος): *om* 446. 6 ἐπὶ γῆς: *praem* τὰ 15 *παράκλητον*:  
*sequitur longa rasura* 448. 20 *προσκυνεῖν* 450. 17 *τίς*: *τί* 20 *ἑστώς*:  
*praem* ὁ 454. 2 *στρατίας d\** *στράτιος d<sup>2</sup>* *λυδός* (*non* *λυθός*) 4 *κε|χρῶν*  
15 *ἐγῶ*: *om* 458. 10 (*subscriptio*) *βιβλία ζ'*  
460. 1 (*titulus*) *tr* *περὶ χ. καὶ χ. καὶ κ. ἐ. βιβλίον η'* 22 *δυσωπήσει*  
462. 2 *τό*: *τῶ* 7. *εὐνοία*: *ἐννοία* 22, 23 *τὸ μὲν ἀνίστατο . . . τὸ δὲ . . . τό*  
464. 10 ἐπ' ὄψιν 16 *χαρίσματα*: + *τά* 20 *μοῦσης* (*sic semper*) 23 *ναυτ'*  
466. 1 *ἱηλ* (*sc* Ἰσραήλ) *ut* 468. 13 5 *πολέμους* 8 *ὅτι οὐ τῆ*: *οὕτω τῆ | τῆ*  
21 *κατά*: *om d\** 468. 1 (*et* 15) *μάντης* 4 (*et* 11) *πεπεισμέν.* 9 *ἀπολ-*  
*λοίοουσιν* 21 *παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ* 470. 3 *ιουδῆθ* 9 *ταπεινόν*: *πρῶον*  
474. 14 *ἐπίστασιν* 478. 16 *τό*: *τῶ* 23 *τοῦ*: *om* 480. 7 *ὦν*: *om*  
17 *habet* *σέ* 18 *τὰ θελήματα* 482. 3 *οἰκέτας* 6 *καθαρίσει* 22  
*καί 2<sup>o</sup>* (*non* 1<sup>o</sup>): *om* 29 *εὐεργετούμενοι* 484. 3 *ἐνώσει καὶ συγκαταλέξει*  
486. 15 *κύριε*: *om* 32 *παρὰ σοῦ* 488. 14 *περάτων 2<sup>o</sup>*: + *τῆς οἰκουμένης* (*non*  
*τῆς οἰκουμένης*) 16 *καὶ τεθεμελιωμένην* 25 *εὐδὸς υ* 490. 5 *πρέσβιον*  
30 ὁ κύριος d<sup>2</sup>: κύριος ὁ θεός d\* 492. 16 *σε*: *om* 494. 3 *λέγει* 4  
*ἀσπαζέτω* 18 *ἀποκειμένων* 23 *προσλάβεσθε* 496. 3 *ἐκατέρων*:  
*ἑτέρων* 4 *ἐξ ὑμένων λεπτῶν*: *ἐξυσμένον λεπτόν* 5 *ἥρέμα* ? d<sup>2</sup> *ἀποσο-*  
*βείτωσαν ut mihi uideatur* 6 *ἐγχερίπτονται* 498. 3 *λόγον' θεοῦ* 17  
*εἰστολή ut uia* 500. 7 *στωρενῶν* 8 *ἐκμένων* 10 *διασώσας*  
11 *ἀενάοις* 502. 6 *δέ in ras ut uia* 11 *πεπαλιοντος d\** 12 *ὄρφω* (*non*  
*ὄρφω*) 13 *ὄρφω* (*non* ὄρφω) \* 504. 2 *δώδεκα*: *δέδωκας* 19 *γλυκαίνας*  
20 *στῦλον πυρὸς πρὸς φωτισμὸν τὴν νύκτα d<sup>2</sup>* (*om per homoeoarcton d\**) 22 *ἀνέ-*  
*δειξας* 506. 6 *εὐλογητός*: + *εἰ* 508. 3 *ἐζωπύρησε* 24 *τό*: *om*  
25 *τοῦτ' ἔστι* 510. 9 *ἐνώπιόν σου σύ*: *om d\**, *supplet* *ἐνώπιόν σου d<sup>2</sup>* 12  
*Ἰησοῦ*: *om* 13 *καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο αἷμα τοῦ χριστοῦ σου*: *om per homoeotel d\**  
24 *σοί*: *om* 25 *σοφίση d\**, *σοφίση καὶ d<sup>2</sup>?* 514. 7 *καί 2<sup>o</sup>*: *om* 9 *ἀνεκ-*  
*λιπεῖς* (*non* *ἀνελλιπεῖς*) 13 *κηρυττέτω* 21 *ὑπέρ*: + *τῶν* 22 *εἰρηνεύηται* 516.  
16 *οὕτω*: 21 *ἐπέφανεν* (*sine* *ἐν*) 24 *αἱ διάκονοι* 518. 4 ὁ λγ' 520. 20  
*ἐπισυμφέροντα* 522. 6 *ᾧ γὰρ δύναμις διάφορα ποιῆσαι*: *bis d\** 20 *ιατικῶν*:  
*ιαματικῶν* 524. 16 *δεβόραν* (*non* *δεβόρραν*) 526. 3 *νεοκόρους* 6 *τό*:  
*τῶ* 530. 5 *αὐτόν*: *om* 10 *παρὰ ἐπισκόπου* 21 *δέ*: *τε* 26 *τι*: *om*  
28 *οὔτε 2<sup>o</sup>* . . . *οὔτε 3<sup>o</sup>*: *ἦ . . . οὐδέ* 532. 1 *ματθαῖος* 534. 3 *διδασκαλία*  
7 *διακόνων d\**: *κάνον ἕνα ut uia d<sup>2</sup>* 28 ὁ τήν: *om* 536. 4 *μάντης*  
14 *ἐὰν . . . ἀποβαλλέσθω*: *om* 17 *ἱπποδρομίαις* 538. 6 *προτιμησάτω* (*non*  
*-σάτωσαν*) 17 *ἦ*: *om d\** (*suppl* *m p*) 540. 4 *μαρίας τῆς d<sup>2</sup>*: *μα d\**  
14 *ἀλεκτοροφωνίας* 21 *καθημερινῶν* 544. 3 *γεναιμένων* 17 *προσευχό-*  
*μενος* 20 *καὶ τῶν αἰσθητῶν* 22 *σῆ 2<sup>o</sup>*: *σύ* 546. 23 *ἰλέω* 548. 1  
*δέ*: *om* 550. 2 *χιλὸν ποηφάγοις*: *χλοηφάγοις* 552. 6 *εὐθείων* 22  
*τριακαστά* 556. 8 *ἐν αὐτοῖς* 558. 4 *κορίται* 9 *προειδόμενοι* 16  
*πρὸς*: + *τόν* 560. 3 *καταμανεῖς*: *om* 27 *ἐγὼ Κλήμης καὶ Ἰάκωβος*  
562. 8 *προχειρίσαμεν* 11 *τὴν θεοσέβειαν*: *om d\**, *suppl* *in marg* *τὴν θεοσέβειαν*  
*ἐνεδείξατο τῆ πίστει d<sup>2</sup>* 15 ὁ 2<sup>o</sup>: *om*