

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for the *Journal of Theological Studies* (old series) can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[1st page of article]

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 Ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἐν τούτοις τοῖς κανόσιν [sc. the Apostolic Canons] ἐντέταλται δέχεσθαι ἡμᾶς τὰς τῶν αὐτῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων διὰ Κλήμεντος Διατάξεις, αἵσισι πάλοι ὑπὸ τῶν ἑτεροδόξων ἐπὶ λύμῃ τῆς ἐκκλησίας νόθα τινα καὶ ξένα τῆς εὐσεβείας παρενετέθησαν, τὸ εὐπρεπὲς κάλλος τῶν θείων δογμάτων ἡμῖν ἀμανρώσαντα, τὴν τῶν τοιοῦτων Διατάξεων προσφόρων ἀποβολὴν πεποιήμεθα πρὸς τὴν τοῦ χριστιανικωτάτου ποιμνίου οἰκοδομὴν καὶ ἀσφάλειαν.

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.

I. vii 47 § 3

Lagarde 229. 15-21

Funk 456. 4-8

cod. Vat. gr. 2089
(deficit 1506)

Κύριε νιὲ μονογενῆ Ἰησοῦ
χριστέ, καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα·

κύριε ὁ θεὸς ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ
θεοῦ, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ πατρὸς, ὁ
αἴρων τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ κόσ-
μου, ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς· ὁ αἴρων
τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ κόσμου,

Κύριε ὁ θεός, ὁ πα-
τήρ τοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ
ἀμώμου ἀμνοῦ ὃς αἶρει
τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσ-
μου, πρόσδεξαι τὴν

Κύριε, ὁ θεὸς καὶ
πατήρ τοῦ κυρίου τοῦ
ἀμώμου ἀμνοῦ ὃς αἶρει
τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσ-
μου, πρόσδεξαι τὴν

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):—

vi 14 § 2 (Funk 335. 19)

αὐτὸν . . . προσκυνεῖν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ
τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν ἐν τῷ παναγίῳ πνεύματι.

αὐτὸν . . . προσκυνεῖν καὶ τὸν κύριον
ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν καὶ τὸ πανάγιον
πνεῦμα.

vi 30 § 1 (Funk 385. 10)

δι' οὗ τὸ σέβας τῷ παντοκράτορι θεῷ.

αὐτῷ τὸ σέβας . . . σὺν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ τῷ
συναϊδίῳ πνεύματι.

vii 38 § 8 (Funk 440. 5)

σοὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ σέβας διὰ Ἰησοῦ
Χριστοῦ.

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
ἐν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι.

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.

Lagarde 229. 15-21

Funk 456. 4-8

cod. Vat. gr. 2089
(deficit 1506)

πρόσδεξαι τὴν δέησιν ἡμῶν·
ὁ καθήμενος ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ
πατρός, ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς. ὅτι
σὺ εἶ ὁ μόνος ἅγιος, σὺ εἶ
ὁ μόνος κύριος Ἰησοῦς χριστὸς
εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρός· ἀμήν.

δέησιν ἡμῶν, ὁ καθί-
μενος ἐπὶ τῶν Χερου-
βίμ· ὅτι σὺ μόνος
ἅγιος, σὺ μόνος κύριος
Ἰησοῦς, Χριστὸς τοῦ
θεοῦ πάσης γενητῆς
φύσεως τοῦ βασιλέως
ἡμῶν, δι' οὗ σοὶ δόξα
τιμὴ καὶ σέβας.

δέησιν ἡμῶν, ὁ καθί-
μενος ἐπὶ τῶν Χερου-
βίμ· ὅτι σὺ μόνος
ἅγιος, σὺ μόνος κύριος,
ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ
Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ
θεοῦ πάσης γενητῆς
φύσεως τοῦ βασιλέως
ἡμῶν, δι' οὗ σοὶ δόξα
τιμὴ καὶ σέβας.

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, βασιλέα καὶ κύριον πάσης νοητῆς καὶ αἰσθητῆς φύσεως.

2. viii 5 § 1

Funk 474. 4, 5

cod. Vat. gr. 1506

ὁ ὢν μόνος ὑψίστος, ὁ τῆ φύσει
ἀόρατος, οὗ ἡ γνώσις ἀναρχος, ὁ μόνος
ἀγαθὸς καὶ ἀσύγκριτος.

ὁ ὢν μόνος ὑψίστος, ὁ τῆ φύσει
ἀόρατος, οὗ τὸ εἶναι γνώσις ἀναρχος,
ὁ μόνος ἀγαθὸς 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 ὁ τὸ εἶναι (or ὁ τῶ εἶναι) should be read for οὗ τὸ εἶναι, 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 406. 22, Brightman 14. 32) σὺ γὰρ εἶ ἡ ἀναρχος γνώσις ἡ ἀίδιος ὄρασις . . . ὁ πρῶτος τῆ φύσει καὶ μόνος τῶ εἶναι. 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

'Ο μόνος ἀληθινὸς θεός, ὁ θεὸς καὶ

'Ο μόνος ἀληθινὸς θεός, ὁ θεὸς καὶ

Lagarde 240. 26-28.

πατήρ τοῦ χριστοῦ σου τοῦ μονο-
γενοῦς υἱοῦ σου, ὁ τοῦ παρακλήτου
προβολεύς.

id. 272. 5-7

Ὁ τῶν ὄλων ποιητῆς διὰ χριστοῦ
καὶ κηδεμὼν αὐτοῦ δὲ θεὸς καὶ πατήρ,
ὁ τοῦ πνεύματος προβολεύς καὶ τῶν
νοητῶν καὶ αἰσθητῶν βασιλεύς.

Funk 480. 11-13 with codd. Vat.
gr. 839 and 1506

πατήρ τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου τοῦ μονο-
γενοῦς υἱοῦ σου, ὁ θεὸς τοῦ παρα-
κλήτου.

id. 544. 18-20

Ὁ τῶν ὄλων ποιητῆς διὰ Χριστοῦ
καὶ κηδεμὼν πρὸ δὲ πάντων αὐτοῦ θεὸς
καὶ πατήρ, ὁ τοῦ πνεύματος κύριος
καὶ τῶν νοητῶν καὶ αἰσθητῶν βασιλεύς.

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. *προβολεύς* 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 ταγματῶν ποιητήν.

5, 6. viii 6 § 11; viii 5 § 3

Funk 480. 13 (Brightman 5. 18)

Ὁ διὰ Χριστοῦ διδασκάλους τοὺς
μαθητὰς ἐπιστήσας πρὸς μάθησιν τῆς
εὐσεβείας.

cod. Vat. gr. 1506

Ὁ διὰ Χριστοῦ διδασκάλους τοῖς
μαθηταῖς ἐπιστήσας 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) σὺν ὁ δοὺς ὄρους ἐκκλησίας διὰ τῆς ἐνσάρκου παρουσίας τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου ὑπὸ μάρτυρι τῷ παρακλήτῳ διὰ τῶν σῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ ἡμῶν τῶν χάριτι σῆ παρεστῶτων 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 *ἐνσάρκος 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 εἰδέναί σε καὶ ποιεῖν τὸ θέλημά σου.	πρὸς τὸ εἰδέναί καὶ ποιεῖν τὸ θέλημά σου.

8. viii 9 § 5

Funk 486. 13 (Brightman 8. 26)	cod. Vat. gr. 1506
κοινωνοὶ γενέσθαι τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ ἱερῶν καὶ μέτοχοι τῶν θείων μυστη- ρίων . . . ἄξιοι . . . τῆς νιοθεσίας.	κοινωνοὶ γενέσθαι τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ δωρεῶν καὶ μέτοχοι τῶν θείων μυστη- ρίων . . . ἄξιοι . . . τῆς νιοθεσίας.

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

9. viii 9 § 8

Funk 486. 19 (Brightman 9. 3)	cod. Vat. gr. 1506
Παντοκράτορ θεὲ αἰώνιε, δέσποτα τῶν ὄλων, κτίστα καὶ πρῦτανι τῶν πάντων.	Παντοκράτορ θεὲ αἰώνιε, δέσποτα τῶν ὄλων, κτίστα καὶ πρῦτανι τῶν ὄντων.

Funk's otherwise excellent index has omitted to collect the uses of the participle *ὁ ὢν*, *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)	cod. Vat. gr. 1506
ὑπὲρ τῆς ἁγίας καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἀπὸ περάτων ἕως περάτων.	ὑπὲρ τῆς ἁγίας καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἀπὸ περάτων ἕως περάτων τῆς οἰκου- μενικῆς.

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.

II, 12. viii 12 § 7, § 27

Funk 498. 4, 504. 26 (Br. 15. 6,
18. 25)*ἀρχιερέα σόν, βασιλέα δὲ καὶ κύριον
πάσης νοητῆς καὶ αἰσθητῆς φύσεως.**σὲ προσκυνούσιν ἀνάριθμοι στρα-
τιαὶ ἀγγέλων κτλ.*

cod. Vat. gr. 1506

*ἀρχιερέα σόν καὶ προσκυνητὴν
ἀξιοχρέων, βασιλέα δὲ καὶ κύριον
πάσης νοητῆς καὶ αἰσθητῆς φύσεως.**σὲ προσκυνεῖ πᾶν ἀσώματον καὶ
ἅγιον τάγμα, [σὲ προσκυνεῖ ὁ παρ-
κλητος] πρὸ δὲ πάντων ὁ ἅγιός σου
παῖς Ἰησοῦς ὁ χριστὸς ὁ κύριος καὶ
θεὸς ἡμῶν σοῦ δὲ ἄγγελος καὶ τῆς
δυνάμεως ἀρχιστρατηγὸς καὶ ἀρχιε-
ρεὺς αἰώνιος καὶ ἀτελεύτητος, σὲ
προσκυνούσιν εὐρυθμοὶ στρατιαὶ
ἀγγέλων κτλ.*

Parallels can be found for *αἰώνιος καὶ ἀτελεύτητος* viii 38 § 5 (548. 5); for *ἄγγελός σου* viii 12 § 7 (498. 4), for *ἀρχιερεύς σου* viii 46 § 12 (560. 23), for *τάγμα* as used of the ranks of angels vi 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 viii 12 § 8 (Funk 498. 10 = Br. 15. 11) ὁ δι' αὐτοῦ πρὸ πάντων ποιήσας τὰ Χερουβίμ 1506 after πάντων inserts τὰς οὐρανίους δυνάμεις and an erasure follows—comparing vi 11 § 2 (325. 15), where the word is also ποιητής, 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 πνεύ-
ματι.*

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

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

cod. Vat. gr. 1506

*ὅτι δι' αὐτοῦ σοὶ πᾶσα ἡ δόξα
σέβας καὶ εὐχαριστία, καὶ διὰ σε καὶ
μετὰ σε αὐτῷ τιμὴ καὶ προσκύνησις
ἐν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι.**ὅτι σοὶ δόξα αἶνος μεγαλοπρέπεια
σέβας προσκύνησις, καὶ μετὰ σε καὶ
διὰ σε τῷ παιδὶ σοῦ Ἰησοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ
ἡμῶν καὶ βασιλεῖ, δι' οὗ σοὶ ἐποφεί-
λεται παρὰ πάσης λογικῆς καὶ ἁγίας
φύσεως ἡ ἐπάξιος εὐχαριστία ἐν ἁγίῳ
πνεύματι.*

I repeat these two passages from *J. T. S.* xv 54, with the reference for *διά 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 σου 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 αὐτοῦ παραθώμεθα.	ἐαυτοῦς . . . Θεῷ διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ 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 ζῶντι θεῷ διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ παραθώμεθα*.¹

16. viii 15 § 2

Funk 518. 17 (= Br. 25. 30)	cod. Vat. gr. 1506
ὁ πατὴρ τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ παιδός.	ὁ πατὴρ τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου 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 δημιουργή- σας καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ τῶν ὄλων προνοῶν.	ὁ διὰ Χριστοῦ τὰ πάντα δημιουργή- σας πρὸ δὲ πάντων αὐτοῦ ὑποστησάμε- νος καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ τῶν ὄλων προνοῶν.

I presume we ought to read *αὐτὸν 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. viii 27 § 1

Funk 530. 1	cod. Vat. gr. 1506
Σίμων ὁ Καναίτης.	Σίμων 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 ἀγεννήτῳ Θεῷ διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐαυτοῦς ἀνέθηκαν*: Chrys. *Hom.* ii in 2 *Cor.* 9 *ἐαυτοῦς τῷ ζῶντι Θεῷ καὶ τῷ Χριστῷ αὐτοῦ παράθεσε*.

19. viii 28 § 2

Funk 530. 10

ἐπίσκοπος εὐλογεῖ οὐκ εὐλογεῖται·
χειροθετεῖ χειροτονεῖ . . . πρεσβύ-
τερος χειροθετεῖ οὐ χειροτονεῖ.

cod. Vat. gr. 1506

ἐπίσκοπος εὐλογεῖ οὐκ εὐλογεῖται,
χειροτονεῖ οὐ χειροθετεῖ . . . πρεσ-
βύτερος χειροθετεῖ οὐ χειροτονεῖ.

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

τὰς αἰτίας ἐξεταζέσθωσαν, οὐ χάριν
προσῆλθον τῷ κυριακῷ λόγῳ.

codd. Vat. gr. 1506, 2089

τὰς αἰτίας ἐξεταζέσθωσαν, εἰ θεοῦ
χάριν προσῆλθον τῷ κυριακῷ λόγῳ.

21. viii 37 § 3

Funk 544. 27

εἰρηνικὴν παράσχου τὴν ἐσπέραν
καὶ τὴν νύκτα ἀναμάρτητον.

cod. Vat. gr. 1506

εἰρηνικὴν παράσχου τὴν ἐσπέραν
καὶ τὴν νύκτα ἀναμάρτητον καὶ
ἀφαντασίαστον.

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.