

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:



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



<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*.

II. THE APOSTOLIC CANONS.

IN the number of the *JOURNAL* for October 1914, in the first of some 'notes on the Apostolic Constitutions', I tried to emphasize, to a point beyond what previous scholars had done, the ingrained Arianism of the compiler. At the end of that note I expressed the intention of following it up with another on the Apostolic Canons, with special reference to the genuineness of three canons on Baptism; and that intention it is the purpose of the present note to carry out. As I indicated in my former note, the problem with which I am now dealing has been raised, and discussed with his customary brilliance and acuteness, by Prof. Eduard Schwartz¹; and though I do not agree with his conclusions, and indeed am venturing to offer a quite different solution, it is but fair to say that I am largely dependent upon him for my material.

The Apostolic Canons are preserved for us in several different lines of transmission, of which the following are the chief:—

A. GREEK.

(1) In numerous MSS of the Greek Canon Law, among which the oldest are probably the two Patmos MSS POB', POI', of about the year A.D. 800; 85 canons without other prologue than some title like *κανόνες ἐκκλησιαστικοὶ τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων*, but in most or all cases with the same epilogue as is printed just below under no. 2.

(2) In the MSS of the Apostolic Constitutions, at the end of the eighth and last book, but to all appearance as an integral part of it, the same 85 canons, with the same or similar title,² and with the following epilogue or conclusion to the whole work: Ταῦτα καὶ περὶ κανόνων ὑμῖν διατετάχθη παρ' ἡμῶν, ᾧ ἐπίσκοποι ὑμεῖς δὲ ἐμμένοντες [μὲν] αὐτοῖς σωθήσεσθε καὶ εἰρήνην ἔξετε, ἀπειθοῦντες δὲ κολασθήσεσθε καὶ πόλεμον μετ' ἀλλήλων αἰδιον ἔξετε, δίκην τῆς ἀνηκοίας τὴν προσήκουσαν τινύντες. θεὸς δὲ ὁ μόνος ἀγέννητος καὶ τῶν ὄλων διὰ Χριστοῦ ποιητῆς πάντας ὑμᾶς διὰ τῆς εἰρήνης ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ ἐνώσει, καταρτίσει εἰς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἀτρέπτους ἀμέμπτους ἀνεγκλήτους, καταξιώσει τε τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς σὺν ἡμῖν διὰ τῆς μεσιτείας τοῦ ἡγαπημένου παιδὸς αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν· δι' οὗ ἡ δόξα αὐτῷ τῷ ἐπὶ πάντων θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ ἐν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι τῷ παρακλήτῳ, νῦν τε καὶ αἰεὶ καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰῶνων. Ἀμήν.

¹ *Ueber die pseudoapostolischen Kirchenordnungen*: von E. Schwartz. (*Schriften der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft in Strassburg*.) K. J. Trübner, Strassburg, 1910.

² The original title here was probably *κανόνες ἐκκλησιαστικοί*.

(3) In some MSS of the Apostolic Constitutions and in the 'systematic' collection of John Scholasticus—made in the middle of the sixth century and by a long way the earliest form of Greek Canon Law generally accessible¹—the same 85 canons with the same epilogue, but with the addition of another passage, also in some degree partaking of the nature of a concluding address, after the last of the canons on Baptism, no. 50: *Διδασκέσθω μέντοι ὁ βαπτιζόμενος . . . ἡμεῖς οὖν ὡ ἐπίσκοποι εἰς ἓνα πατέρα καὶ υἱὸν καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα τρίτον βαπτίσατε κατὰ τὴν τοῦ Κυρίου γνώμην καὶ τὴν ἡμετέραν ἐν πνεύματι διάταξιν.* This passage I printed in *J. T. S.* xv (Oct. 1913) p. 57, and I do not reprint it here, because I shall have occasion lower down to print what I think is clearly a more original form of it, as rendered by Schwartz from Syriac into Greek.

B. LATIN.

(4) In the version or versions of Dionysius Exiguus, made early in the sixth century, only the first 50 canons are included.² The title in both forms of the version is *INCIPIVNT CAPITVLA CANONVM APOSTOLORVM . . . INCIPIVNT REGVLAE ECCLESIASTICAE SANCTORVM APOSTOLORVM PER CLEMENTEM PROLATAE* [+ *ECCLESIAE ROMANAE PONTIFICEM DION-II*]; the colophon is *EXPLICIVNT CANONES APOSTOLORVM*. There is nothing at all in the nature of either prologue or epilogue.

(5) Not yet known when Schwartz wrote in 1910, because it was first published in *Ecclesiae Occidentalis Monumenta Iuris Antiquissima* (I ii 1) in 1913, a Verona fragment of Book viii of the Apostolic Constitutions contains the complete number of the Apostolic Canons, separated from the preceding part of Book viii only by the title *REGVLA[E] ECCLESIASTICA[E]*, and equipped with the same epilogue as the Greek MSS of the Constitutions. The canons are here not numbered, and perhaps were not numbered in their original form; but after the leaf which ends almost at the end of the second canon on baptism (that ordinarily numbered 47) one or possibly two leaves are lost, the next extant leaf commencing in the middle of the 52nd canon. The intervening canons would not cover a whole leaf, and it is therefore fairly clear that the Verona MS once contained something like the insertion *Διδασκέσθω ὁ βαπτιζόμενος* described above under no. 3. If what is here lost is only one leaf, as I assumed in *J. T. S.* xv pp. 56, 58, then the Verona insertion was decidedly shorter than the one described above

¹ The canonical collection known as that of 'the 14 titles' has been edited by a distinguished Russian scholar, Dr Beneschewitch of Petrograd, but it can hardly be said to be as yet accessible in the West. Schwartz speaks with real enthusiasm of the value of Beneschewitch's work.

² In the first form of Dionysius's version, these 50 canons are, by a slightly different system of numeration, made into 49: see my *Ecclesiae Occidentalis Monumenta Iuris Antiquissima* I 1-32. But the amount translated is exactly the same.

from Greek sources: but now that we know through Schwartz's publication from the Syriac (no. 7 below), that all extant Greek sources give what is only an abbreviated and doctored recension of the original insertion, it becomes likely enough that the loss in the Verona MS was one of two leaves, and that the Latin like the Syriac represented the full and highly unorthodox form which I print below. If so, there is really no need to be surprised that some orthodox reader of the MS took offence and removed these pages as obviously unedifying and, if the document were apostolic or even orthodox, obviously spurious.

C. SYRIAC.

(6) The Apostolic Canons are unfortunately not contained in Schulthess's valuable edition of the Syriac versions of the early Greek Councils. But in fact the collection of early Syriac MSS in the British Museum has preserved three copies of the Apostolic Canons, Add. 12155 fol. 203 *b* (saec. viii), Add. 14526 foll. 4 *b* (saec. vii) and 44 *b* (saec. viii): and I am fortunate enough to possess a series of notes on the text of these copies made for me by the kindness of Mr. E. W. Brooks. In all of these the last three of the four canons which deal with baptism—canons 47, 49, 50—are omitted: and *a fortiori* the passage appended to these canons in no. 3 and probably in no. 5 above, *Διδασκέσθω ὁ βαπτιζόμενος*, is not found either. The title is 'Ecclesiastical canons of the holy apostles', as in Greek MSS of Canon Law: and just as in the Greek MSS, the epilogue *Ταῦτα περὶ κανόνων*, with the following doxology, is found also in the Syriac.

(7) Just as in Greek and Latin, so also in Syriac we find the Apostolic Canons preserved not only in their secondary form as a constituent part of Greek Canon Law, but also in their original position as a constituent part of the Apostolic Constitutions. Funk made use of two Syriac authorities for this purpose, one of which, the Nomocanon of Ebed-Jesu,¹ must apparently have drawn its text of the canons directly from a MS (Syriac or Greek) of the complete Constitutions, while the other, the well-known Paris MS from which Lagarde published the Syriac Didascalia, contains the canons and other parts of the eighth book of the Constitutions as books iv–viii of a 'Clementine Octateuch'. Both these Syriac witnesses give the whole number of 85 canons, including (that is) all the four canons on Baptism: both give the epilogue *Ταῦτα περὶ κανόνων* and doxology: both insert after canon 50 the passage *Διδασκέσθω ὁ βαπτιζόμενος*. From Funk's apparatus one would have concluded that both give this last passage in the form known to us from John Scholasticus, and published by myself in *J. T. S.* xv 57 from cod. Vat. gr. 1506 of the Constitutions. But it is one great merit of

¹ Accessible in Mai's *Scriptorum veterum nova collectio* vol. x.

Schwartz's tractate that he has retranslated literally into Greek the Syriac of Lagarde's text; and it is clear at once on examination both that this Greek differs widely from the Greek text hitherto known, and also that it is beyond doubt the earlier and purer form of text, of which John Scholasticus and the other Greek witnesses give us a shortened and orthodox recension. For proof of this I print, after Schwartz, but with some slight approximations to the known Greek text, the Greek that appears to underlie Lagarde's Syriac.

Διδασκέσθω μέντοι ὁ βαπτιζόμενος ὅτι ὁ ἀγέννητος θεὸς¹ οὔτε ἐσταυρώθη οὔτε γέννησιν ἀνθρώπου ὑπέμεινε,² ἀβασίλευτος³ ὢν οὐδὲ ἄλλου θελήσει ἢ γνώμη⁴ ὑποχείριος· οὔτε δὲ ὁ παράκλητος⁵ ἀνθρώπος ἐγένετο καὶ οὕτως ἦλθεν⁶ [εἰς τόνδε τὸν κόσμον] ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τὸ πάθος ὑπέστη ὁ ἄσαρκος—οὐ γὰρ ἐσαρκώθη⁷ †—[ἐλυτρώσατο δὲ τὸν κόσμον τῆς ἐπικειμένης ὀργῆς] μόνος ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός. ἐνηθρώπησε⁸ γὰρ φιλανθρωπία,⁹ ἑαυτῷ ἐκ παρθένου σῶμα ἀναπλάσας (ἡ σοφία γὰρ ᾠκοδόμησεν ἐγαθή οἶκον⁹) ὡς δημιουργός,¹⁰ σταυρὸν δὲ ὑπέμεινε ἐκὼν συγχωρήσει πατρός,¹¹ ἐξείλετο δὲ τὸν κόσμον τῆς ἐπικειμένης ὀργῆς¹² ὡς ἀρχιερέως.¹³

βαπτιζόμεθα οὖν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρός, οὐχ ὡς ἀνθρώπου γενομένου ἢ παθόντος, οὐδὲ ὡς ἀρχιερέως τινός,¹³ ἀλλ' ὡς αὐθέντου¹⁴ εὐδοκίσαντος μὲν τῇ γεννήσει συγχωρήσαντος δὲ τὸ πάθος¹⁵ προσδεξαμένου δὲ τὴν μεσιτείαν † τοῦ ἀρχιερέως· εἰς δὲ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ υἱοῦ οὐχ ὡς αὐθέντου, οὐχ ὡς προσδεξαμένου, οὐχ ὡς συγχωρήσαντος, ἀλλ' ὡς ὑποστάντος γέννησιν,¹⁶ ὡς ὑπομείναντος σταυρὸν, ὡς ἀποθανόντος καὶ ἀναστάντος¹⁷ εἰς δὲ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ παρακλήτου, οὔτε ὡς πατρός οὔτε ὡς υἱοῦ ἀλλ' ὡς μαρτυρούντος¹⁸ τῇ τε εὐδοκίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τῇ συγχωρήσει καὶ τῇ ἐν πάσιν ὑπακοῇ τοῦ μονογενοῦς.¹⁹

οἱ δὲ μὴ οὕτως βαπτίζοντες ὡς ἀγνοοῦντες τὸ μυστήριον τῆς εὐσεβείας καθαιρέσθωσαν. ὁ γὰρ τὸν πατέρα πεπονημένοι λέγων ἀσεβεῖ Ἰουδαίων βαρύτερα, μετὰ Χριστοῦ καὶ τὸν πατέρα προσηλῶν.²⁰ ὁ δὲ τὸν κύριον ἀρνούμενος²¹ δι' ἡμᾶς σαρκωθῆναι καὶ τὸν σταυρὸν ὑπομείναι θεομάχος²² ἐστὶν καὶ τῶν ἁγίων πολέμιος· ὁ δὲ τὸν παράκλητον πατέρα ὀνομάζων ἢ υἱὸν ἀνεπιστήμων ἐστὶν [καὶ ἀνόητος], τὸν διάκονον τοῦ μονογενοῦς συνδημιουργὸν καὶ συμπρονοητὴν²³ καὶ συνομοθέτην καὶ συγκριτὴν καὶ συναίτιον § τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἢ ἀρχιερέα ὁμότιμον τῷ υἱῷ ἢ τῷ πατρὶ ἀποδεικνύων, ἢ δύο ἀνάρχους δοξάζων ἢ δύο πατέρας λέγων,²⁴ ἀνήκοος τοῦ λέγοντος Κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν κύριος εἰς ἐστίν.²⁵ ταῦτα δὲ ἐφ' ἡμῶν Σίμων ὁ μάγος ἐξηρεύσατο σπάσας τὸ πονηρὸν καὶ λαοπλάνον καὶ ἄστατον εἰς ἑαυτὸν πνεῦμα²⁶ καὶ ἓνα τριώνυμον²⁷ εἶναι φλυαρήσας τὸν θεόν, ποτὲ δὲ καὶ τὸ πάθος τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τὴν γέννησιν περικόψας.²⁸

† I have kept οὐ γὰρ ἐσαρκώθη of the Greek, which suits the context much better than Schwartz's οὐ γὰρ ἦν ἀρχιερέως: and again in the third paragraph I retain σαρκωθῆναι with the Greek, where Schwartz gives ἐνηθρώπησεναι.

‡ I have substituted μεσιτείαν for Schwartz's πρεσβείαν.

§ I have substituted συναίτιον for the μεσίτην of Schwartz: cf. αἴτιον of the Greek.

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

In the above text the words or sentences in heavy type are those which are now for the first time added on the Syriac evidence to the Greek as hitherto known. It is obvious that they completely change the doctrinal complexion of the whole passage, which instead of being orthodox becomes rather definitely Arian. Those who accept the argument of my former Note in *J. T. S.*, 'The compiler an Arian', will not see in this a feature which makes it more difficult to identify the author with the author of the Apostolic Constitutions, but rather the reverse. But in any case it is desirable to shew in some detail the close relationship which exists between the language and thought of both parts of this passage—of the parts common to the Greek and Syriac texts, and of the parts known only from the Syriac—with the language and thought of the Apostolic Constitutions and the pseudo-Ignatian letters. An asterisk distinguishes those words or phrases which are common to the Greek and Syriac texts of our passage.

1. Cf. A. C. vii 41 (Funk 444. 15) βαπτίζομαι εἰς ἓνα ἀγέννητον μόνον ἀληθινὸν θεόν, and *passim*.

*2. Cf. Ps.-Ign. *Phil.* 3 εἰς γὰρ ὁ ἐνανθρωπήσας, οὔτε ὁ πατὴρ οὔτε ὁ παράκλητος ἀλλὰ μόνον ὁ υἱός.

3. Cf. A. C. viii 5 (474. 2) ὁ μόνος ἀγέννητος καὶ ἀβασιλευτος, viii 12 (496. 19) τὸν μόνον ἀγέννητον καὶ ἀναρχον καὶ ἀβασιλευτον καὶ ἀδέσποτον.

4. Cf. Ps.-Ign. *Phil.* 7 ὁ μήτε γνώμη τινὸς μήτε ἐξουσία εἶκων. Perhaps we ought to read εἶκων in our passage, rather than (with Schwartz) ἵποχείριος. γνώμη (= will) is also one of the words selected in Brightman *Liturgies Eastern and Western* p. xxiv as characteristic of the interpolator of the Didascalia, A. C. books i-vi.

5. Cf. A. C. vi 15 (337. 16) θεὸς . . . Χριστὸς . . . παράκλητος, v 7 (263. 10, 11), and Ps.-Ign. *Philad.* 4 εἰς ἀγέννητος ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ, καὶ εἰς μονογενὴς υἱὸς . . . καὶ εἰς ὁ παράκλητος: also *Phil.* 3 quoted above under 2. παράκλητος is a specially characteristic word throughout A. C.: Brightman *op. cit.* p. xxv.

6. A. C. vii 22 (406. 6) τοῦ ἐλθόντος Χριστοῦ.

7. Cf. A. C. viii 12 (506. 27) ἐσαρκώθη ὁ ἄσαρκος.

*8. Cf. A. C. v 5 (245. 6) διὰ τὴν εἰς ἡμᾶς φιλανθρωπίαν ὑπομείνας . . .

*9. Cf. Ps.-Ign. *Trall.* 10 ἐποίησεν ἐαυτῷ σῶμα ἐκ . . . τῆς παρθένου, *Phil.* 3 ἡ γὰρ σοφία ᾠκοδόμησεν ἐαυτῇ οἶκον, καὶ ἐγεννήθη ὡς ἄνθρωπος . . . μετὰ σώματος ἐκ τῆς παρθένου: *Smyrn.* 2.

*10. Cf. A. C. viii 12 (506. 18) εὐδόκησεν . . . ὁ δημιουργὸς ἀνθρώπου ἀνθρώπος γενέσθαι: vii 23 (408. 11, 12): Ps.-Ign. *Hero* 4 (I owe this reference to Schwartz) ἐκ μόνης τῆς παρθένου . . . ὡς δημιουργῷ.

11. Cf. A. C. viii 1 (464. 6) συγχωρήσει θεοῦ σταυρὸν ὑπέμεινεν, and elsewhere. Ps.-Ign. *Phil.* 7 σταυρῷ προσηλωσθαι . . . τίνος συγχωρήσαντος;

*12. Cf. A. C. viii 12 (506. 21) τῷ κόσμῳ κατήλλαξεν καὶ τῆς ἐπικειμένης ὁργῆς τοὺς πάντας ἠλευθέρωσεν.

13. Cf. A. C. viii 46 (560. 30) τῇ φύσει ἀρχιερεὺς ὁ μονογενὴς Χριστός, and with ἀρχιερέως τινός, 'high priest of any one', 560. 23 τὸν τοῦ πατρὸς ἀρχιερέα. Ps.-Ign. *Smyrn.* 9 τὸν . . . μόνον τῇ φύσει τοῦ πατρὸς ἀρχιερέα, *Magn.* 4. Brightman, p. xxv.

14. A. C. v 7 (263. 9) ἐπὶ ἀθθεντία τοῦ θεοῦ τῶν ὄλων ὃς ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ πατήρ.

15. A. C. vii 25 (410. 17) συνεχώρησας παθεῖν . . . εὐδόκησας δοξάσαι : ii 24 (91. 23) συνεχώρησεν παθεῖν.

*16. A. C. vii 36 (434. 2) ὡς δι' ἡμᾶς γένεσιν ὑπέστη.

17. Ps.-Ign. *Magn.* 11 τὸ πάθος ὑποστάντι . . . καὶ σταυρὸν ὑπομείναντι καὶ ἀποθανόντι καὶ ἀναστάντι.

18. The Holy Spirit as witness is a common thought in A. C., cf. Brightman, p. xxv : e.g. iii 17 (211. 22), vii 22 (406. 6), viii 5 (474. 12).

19. A. C. vii 43 (448. 18) ὑπήκοον αὐτὸν γενέσθαι ἐν πᾶσι.

*20. Ps.-Ign. *Phil.* 7 σταυρῷ προσηλωσθαι τὸν ἀναρχον.

*21. A. C. vi 26 (367. 13) ἀρνοῦνται γὰρ καὶ τὴν κατὰ σάρκα αὐτοῦ γέννησιν, τὸν σταυρὸν ἐπαισχύνονται. Ps.-Ign. *Phil.* 3 ὅταν τις ἀρῆται τὸν σταυρόν : *Hero* 2.

*22. A. C. vi 5 (309. 16) ὡς θεομάχοι. Ps.-Ign. *Trall.* 11 τὸν σταυρὸν ἀρνούμενοι καὶ τὸ πάθος ἐπαισχυνόμενοι καλύπτουσι τὴν Ἰουδαίων παρανομίαν τῶν θεομάχων.

23. A. C. vii 36 (434. 28) τὸν μεσίτην τὸν προνοητὴν τὸν νομοθέτην τὸν ἀναστάσεως αἰτιον. For the compounds with σύν compare A. C. vii 43 (450. 4) συσταυρωθῆναι καὶ συναποθανεῖν καὶ συνταφῆναι καὶ συναναστῆναι.

24. A. C. vi 8 (319. 6) οἱ δὲ τρεῖς ἐναντίους ἀνάρχους . . . δοξάζουσιν, vi 10 (323. 9) οἱ δὲ τρεῖς ἀνάρχους, οἱ δὲ δύο ἀγεννήτους : in both contexts Simon is named or implied. Ps.-Ign. *Phil.* 2 εἰς οὖν θεὸς καὶ πατήρ, καὶ οὐ δύο οὐδὲ τρεῖς . . . οὔτε οὖν τρεῖς πατέρες οὔτε τρεῖς υἱοὶ οὔτε τρεῖς παράκλητοι.

25. Quoted A. C. ii 6, vi 23 : Ps.-Ign. *Phil.* 2, *Ant.* 2.

*26. Ps.-Ign. *Philad.* 5 ἐν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ εἰλκυσαν πονηρὸν καὶ ἀπατηλὸν καὶ λαοπλάνον πνεῦμα.

*27. Ps.-Ign. *Phil.* 2 οὔτε εἰς ἓνα τριώνυμον.

*28. A. C. vi 26 (367. 13-16) ἀρνοῦνται καὶ τὴν κατὰ σάρκα αὐτοῦ γέννησιν . . . τὸ πάθος ἀδοξοῦσι . . . τὴν πρὸ αἰώνων αὐτοῦ γέννησιν περικόπτουσιν. Ps.-Ign. *Phil.* 4 τὸ πάθος ἐπαισχύνεσθαι . . . τὴν ἐκ παρθένου γέννησιν περικόπτει : *ib.* 5 τί περίκοπτει τὴν γέννησιν;

When these parallels are digested, there will remain I think no doubt

that the author of the whole passage was one who moved familiarly in the plane of the same ideas and phrases as the editor of the Constitutions and of the interpolated Ignatian epistles. Those who, with myself, believe that the same hand edited the pseudo-Clementine Constitutions and the pseudo-Ignatian epistles, will naturally attribute the same authorship to the passage which has been here under discussion.

D. EGYPTIAN.

Three forms of the Apostolic Canons are known which may be grouped together under this head.

(9) The first of these to be printed was Tattam's *Apostolical Constitutions or Canons of the Apostles in Coptic, with an English translation*, London 1848. The work is what is otherwise known as the Clementine octateuch; it is divided into seven or eight books, each book, from the 2nd to the 7th, bearing an alternative number from 3rd to 8th. The Canons of the Apostles form the last (seventh = eighth) book, under the title 'The Seventh Book of the Canons of our Holy Fathers the Apostles by the hands of Clement, which is the end of the Eighth Book'. The numbering of the canons is not that of the Coptic text, but is borrowed by the editor from the ordinary Greek texts. The four canons 47-50 are omitted: the epilogue and doxology after can. 85 are present. The colophon explains that the whole work has been rendered into the dialect of Lower Egypt from the dialect of Upper Egypt: it is in fact no doubt a translation from the next item on our list. Tattam's MS was acquired by the Royal Library at Berlin (Orient. Q 519).

(10) Lagarde's Sahidic text—printed on p. 209 of his *Aegyptiaca* (Göttingen, 1883), but without any translation into either Latin or German—is taken from a British Museum MS, Or. 1320, to which Lightfoot was the first to call attention: the colophon gives the year 722 of Diocletian, i. e. A. D. 1006. The title implies in Greek something like *κανόνες ἐκκλησιαστικοὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων οἱ διὰ Κλήμεντος*: the epilogue and doxology are represented in full. The canons are 71 in number, partly because the numeration is independent of the ordinary Greek tradition of the text, partly because between the canon on the reception of heretical baptism or eucharist—ordinarily numbered 46, but in this MS 38—and the canon following—ordinarily numbered 51—the same group of four canons, 47-50, is omitted as in Tattam's book. Of these four the first and the two last deal with baptism, the second with laymen and divorce.

(11) Last of all mention may be made of an Ethiopic edition of the canons: *Canones Apostolorum Aethiopice*, ed. Winandus Fell, Leipzig 1871. The title, epilogue, and doxology are all as in the Sahidic. The canons themselves are 56 in number: between the 33rd and 34th—

which are identical with the 37th and 38th of the Sahidic—the same group of four canons drops out. At the end of the edition a Latin translation is given.

These three Egyptian and Ethiopic documents do not really constitute more than one authority: even if the Ethiopic is not derived (as very likely it is) from our extant Sahidic, both derive no doubt from only a single source, whether that source was Greek or Syriac. And it is further to be noted that this Egyptian group omits not three canons but four: canon 48, on laymen and divorce, disappears equally with the three canons 47, 49, 50, on baptism. This does not look as though we had here an original text, expanded in our other witnesses by interpolation, but rather an abbreviated or mutilated text in which what has happened was simply that more has been struck out than was strictly necessary for the purpose of the abbreviator.

The explanation offered by Schwartz of the differences between the different forms of text above enumerated is roughly as follows. He distinguishes four scholars as having been at work on the Apostolic Constitutions, the Apostolic Canons, and the pseudo-Ignatian letters. The eight books of the Constitutions (without the Canons) were published after the year 370—for the Christmas festival of December 25 was not known in the East before that date—but not very long after, since the second writer, who composed the Apostolic Canons, knew the Constitutions and refers to them in the last of the Canons,¹ and he himself wrote long enough before the year 394 to be quoted as an authority in the synod held at Constantinople in October of that year: *μη χρῆναι πρὸς τὸ ἐξῆς μηδὲ παρὰ τριῶν, μήτιγε παρὰ δύο, τὸν ὑπεύθυνον δοκιμαζόμενον καθαιρεῖσθαι, ἀλλὰ γὰρ πλείονος συνόδου ψήφῳ καὶ τῶν τῆς ἐπαρχίας, καθὼς καὶ οἱ ἀποστολικοὶ κανόνες διωρίσαντο*: the reference in these phrases being clearly to Ap. Can. 74. A third writer emerges in the interpolator of the Ignatian letters, who wrote after the triumph of the Nicene cause in the East—between the years, I gather Schwartz to mean, 380 and 400. To a fourth writer again Schwartz attributes the three Apostolic canons on Baptism, numbered in the ordinary texts 47, 49, 50, together with the disquisition *Διδασκέσθω ὁ βαπτιζόμενος* in its original form, as now represented only in the Syriac texts: these additional canons were certainly in their present place in the collection before the Council of Chalcedon, possibly before the Council of Ephesus—on a later page (p. 15) Schwartz takes them even further back, 'into the fifth century, if not into the fourth'.

¹ *Εὐαγγέλια τέσσαρα, ὡς καὶ ἐν τοῖς προλαβοῦσιν εἶπομεν [where the reference is to A.C. ii 57 (163. 1) τὰ εὐαγγέλια & ἐγὼ Ματθαῖος καὶ Ἰωάννης παρεδώκαμεν ὑμῖν καὶ οἱ συνεργοὶ Παύλου παρελιφότες κατέλειψαν ὑμῖν Λουκᾶς καὶ Μάρκος]. . . καὶ αἱ Διαταγαὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς ἐπισκόποις δι' ἐμοῦ Κλήμεντος ἐν ὀκτῶ βιβλίοις προσπεφωνημέναι.*

Schwartz seems to me to have succumbed to a temptation which is not rarely fatal to historical critics. Just as those who approach the history of the early Church from an ecclesiastical point of view tend to regard things centripetally and to overestimate the amount of unity or uniformity that existed between different individuals or schools or generations, so those who approach it from the critical point of view fall into the opposite danger and exaggerate every element of difference. Documents are resolved into component parts: one writer becomes several: divergences are magnified into irreconcilable enmities: emphasis on one aspect of things is treated as denial of every other or complementary aspect. Schwartz is peculiarly liable to this fault: his profoundly anti-ecclesiastical bias combines with an extraordinary acuteness of critical power to produce a temper in which he sees as it were with the multiplying capacity of a pair of field-glasses the least indication of dogmatic difference, and quite similarly in literary problems leans to the solution which brings into play the largest number of contributors. For myself I believe that the pseudo-Clement of the Constitutions, the pseudo-Ignatius of the Epistles, and the author of all the Apostolic Canons are no more than one and the same person: and I think that Schwartz underestimates, if he does not rather entirely forget, the natural differences and changes which mark or may mark the work of the same scholar at different periods of his life. It is likely enough that even the eight books of the Constitutions were not brought into their present shape all at the same moment: and at the end of this paper I shall venture to submit the conjecture that the true explanation of the bewildering difference between our early authorities for the Canons is that the editor composed them and attached them to the Constitutions in two different forms, the one earlier and shorter, the other longer and later.

It will be convenient here to insert the text of all the canons that refer to Baptism, and for the sake of completeness the one canon which breaks the series (no. 48) will be included.

46. Ἐπίσκοπον ἢ πρεσβύτερον αἰρετικῶν δεξαμένους βάπτισμα ἢ θυσίαν, καθαιρεῖσθαι προστάσσομεν· τίς γὰρ συμφώνησις Χριστοῦ πρὸς Βελίαν, ἢ τίς μερὶς πιστῶ μετὰ ἀπίστου;

47. Ἐπίσκοπος ἢ πρεσβύτερος τὸν κατ' ἀλήθειαν ἔχοντα βάπτισμα ἐὰν ἄνωθεν βαπτίσῃ, ἢ τὸν μεμολυσμένον παρὰ τῶν ἀσεβῶν ἐὰν μὴ βαπτίσῃ, καθαιρεῖσθω ὡς γελῶν τὸν σταυρὸν καὶ τὸν τοῦ Κυρίου θάνατον καὶ διακρίνων ἱερέας ψευδιερέων.

48. Εἴ τις λαϊκὸς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα ἐκβαλὼν ἑτέραν λάβοι ἄλλου ἀπολελυμένην, ἀφοριζέσθω.

49. Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος ἢ πρεσβύτερος κατὰ τὴν τοῦ Κυρίου διάταξιν βαπτίσῃ εἰς πατέρα καὶ υἱὸν καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, ἀλλὰ ἢ εἰς τρεῖς ἀνάρχους ἢ εἰς τρεῖς υἱοὺς ἢ εἰς τρεῖς παρακλήτους, ἀφοριζέσθω.

50. *Ἐἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος ἢ πρεσβύτερος μὴ τρία βαπτίσματα μιᾷ μνήσεως ἐπιτελέσῃ ἀλλὰ ἐν βάπτισμα τὸ εἰς τὸν θάνατον τοῦ Κυρίου διδόμενον, καθαιρείσθω· οὐ γὰρ εἶπεν ὁ Κύριος ἡμῖν· Εἰς τὸν θάνατόν μου βαπτίσατε, ἀλλὰ Πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος.*

These canons are given in this order in all extant Greek and Latin authorities: the Verona Latin, in which as we have seen (p. 524) there is a lacuna after canon 47, implies the full text just as clearly as the other witnesses, since if 47 is retained there is no reason at all to suppose that 49 or 50 were absent. Of the Syriac texts, one, and that probably the most important of them, also has all the disputed canons, though with small differences of order and number. The presumption is therefore rather strong on external grounds in favour of the genuineness of the ordinary text. What then are the reasons adduced by Schwartz in favour of the contrary conclusion?

1. A large number of the Oriental witnesses omit these canons—Syriac, Sahidic, and Ethiopic: the Syriac authorities for omission being as ancient as the seventh and eighth centuries. And the omission of genuine canons is less likely than the insertion of spurious ones.

But it is doubtful how far these Eastern texts are independent of one another; and though omission may be in itself less likely than insertion, we have the parallel of the treatment of the last canon of Nicaea in the Latin texts—this canon, against kneeling at Eastertide, is absent from half a dozen of the oldest authorities—to warn us that omission becomes possible enough as soon as there is a motive for it. In the case in point the omission may possibly have been due to the attitude adopted in canon 47 towards heretical baptism.

2. The 48th canon as it stands interrupts very strangely the sequence of the four canons dealing with Baptism—all of them addressed to bishops and presbyters—by a canon dealing with alien subject-matter and addressed to the laity.

This is true enough; but if there is one thing more characteristic than another of the whole code of the 85 Apostolic Canons, it is their extraordinarily haphazard and unsystematic arrangement. It looks as if the author had simply jotted down from time to time, as each new thought struck him, an additional canon or group of canons, regardless of its logical place in the series. Take for instance canons 76–82: the first four of these deal with disqualifications for ordination; the halt and maimed may become a bishop but not the blind or dumb, the demoniac may not become a cleric, the neophyte may not become a bishop: then comes canon 80, to the effect that bishop and presbyter may not undertake public offices, harking back to canon 7: but canon 81 returns to the disqualifications for ordination, forbidding it to slaves

save after emancipation: and canon 82 once more returns to the subject of canon 80, the competing claims of the government service and of clerical duty. The parallel with canons 46-50 is sufficiently close.

And against these arguments of Schwartz there are others to be set based on internal evidence, which converge to the same result as that to which on external evidence alone we should arrive.

I have shewn how intimately intertwined the dogmatic passage *Διδασκέσθω ὁ βαπτίζομενος* is in its whole texture with both the Apostolic Constitutions and the pseudo-Ignatian epistles. The same relation is to be found in the three disputed canons, and common authorship is again the obvious solution. With canon 47 compare the following from A. C. vi 15 (337. 10-25): *βαπτίσματι ἐνὶ ἀρκείσθαι μόνῳ τῷ εἰς τὸν τοῦ Κυρίου θάνατον δεδομένῳ . . . τῷ παρὰ τῶν ἀμέμπτων ἱερέων δεδομένῳ εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος· μήτε δὲ τὸ παρὰ τῶν ἀσεβῶν δεκτὸν ὑμῖν ἔστω, μήτε τὸ παρὰ τῶν ὁσίων ἀκουούσθω διὰ καν. 49] . . . οὐ γὰρ εἰς ὁ θεὸς καὶ εἰς ὁ Χριστὸς καὶ εἰς ὁ παράκλητος [cf. can. 49] . . . οὐ γὰρ εἰς ἐκεῖνοι ἱερεῖς . . . οὔτε μὴν οἱ βαπτισθέντες ὑπ' αὐτῶν μεμύηται ἀλλὰ μεμολυσμένοι ὑπάρχουσιν . . . ἀνασταυροῦσιν τὸν Κύριον . . . γελῶσιν τὰ θεία. For canon 49 compare the parallel phrases about the Eucharist in A. C. viii 12 (510. 5) *κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ διάταξιν*, and about Baptism, with a similar reference to Matt. xxviii 19, A. C. vii 22 (406. 2) *ὡς ὁ Κύριος διετάξατο ἡμῖν*: for the *τρεῖς ἀνάρχους* see the references to A. C. and ps.-Ign. collected under no. 24 on p. 528 above. The matter is a little different with canon 50, since the Constitutions are stuffed full of allusions to baptism as 'baptism into the Lord's death',¹ following Rom. vi 3: but the full baptismal formula of Matt. xxviii 19 is throughout implied and often expressed: A. C. iii 16 (211. 13), vi 15 (337. 12), vii 22 (406. 3), vii 40 (444. 7), and the writer of the Constitutions, though his terminology is that of a school which laid stress on this aspect of baptism and prepared the way for the substitution of a baptism 'into the Lord's death' as the actual formula,² certainly did not contemplate such a substitution*

¹ A. C. ii 7 (43. 15), iii 17 (211. 18), v 7 (263. 9), v 16 (285. 22), vi 15 (337. 17), vi 23 (361. 8), vii 22 (406. 22), vii 25 (412. 6), viii 8 (484. 1). Ps.-Ign. *Phil.* 1. Of all these passages there is only one which even seems to suggest that baptism into the Lord's death had anything to do with the formula, A. C. v 7, but there, too, the Trinitarian formula is obviously implied, and an explanation of it is given on the lines of the writer's theology, *μαθητεύσαι πάντα τὰ ἔθνη καὶ βαπτίσει εἰς τὸν αὐτοῦ θάνατον ἐπὶ αὐθεντία τοῦ θεοῦ τῶν ὄλων, ὅς ἐστιν αὐτοῦ πατήρ, καὶ μαρτυρία πνεύματος, ὅς ἐστιν παράκλητος.*

² This became a practice of the extreme Arians: Conc. Constant. can. 7 (A. D. 382) *Εὐνομανοὺς τοὺς εἰς μίαν κατάδυσιν βαπτίζομενους*: Philostorgius *H. E.* x *ἐβάπτισον οἱ περὶ Εὐνόμον οὐκ εἰς τρεῖς καταδύσεις ἀλλ' εἰς μίαν, εἰς τὸν θάνατον τοῦ Κυρίου βαπτίζοντες, ὃν ἅπαξ μὲν ἀλλ' οὐχὶ δις ἢ τρις ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀνεδέξατο*: Socrates

himself, and could quite honestly condemn it. It should be noted also how fond he is of the use of *μνέω* and *μνήσις* in connexion with baptism.¹

Nor is this dependence upon the Constitutions anything peculiar to the three suspect canons and the dogmatic passage which is bound up with them. With the canons of Antioch and the canons of Laodicea the Constitutions form a third main source of the Apostolic Canons. The following canons appear to depend directly on the Constitutions:—

- can. 1 A. C. iii 20 (217. 12), viii 27 (530. 2).²
 can. 8 A. C. v 17 (287. 10-15).
 can. 17 A. C. vi 17 (339. 29-341. 2).
 can. 18 A. C. vi 17 (341. 7-9).
 can. 26 A. C. vi 17 (341. 3-7).
 can. 33 *δ* A. C. vii 28 (414. 15, 16; 416. 4, 5).
 can. 51 A. C. vi 10 (323. 10, 11), vi 11 (325. 21-24).
 can. 52 A. C. ii 24 (91. 14-16), ii 13 (51. 5-7).
 can. 53 A. C. v 18 (289. 10-12), v 19 (293. 13), v 20 (301. 3-5).
 can. 60 A. C. vi 16 (339. 12-14).
 can. 64³ A. C. v 20 (301. 1, 2), v 14 (281. 2, 3), vii 23 (408. 7-10).
 can. 65 A. C. ii 61 (175. 26).
 can. 69 A. C. v 13 (271. 1), Lent fast; v 20 (299. 20), vii 23 (408. 3), Wednesday and Friday fast.
 can. 79 A. C. viii 32 (534. 20-22).

In some of these instances the resemblance is so close that the parallel text in the Constitutions is of decisive weight in estimating the probabilities of one or another 'varia lectio' in the text of the Canons. Thus in canon 26 the evidence is divided between *τῶν εἰς κλῆρον παρελθόντων* and *τῶν εἰς κλῆρον προσελθόντων* and *τῶν εἰς κλῆρον προελθόντων*: and the MSS are similarly divided in the source from which the canon is derived: but both in vi 17 and in the canon the best MSS agree on *παρελθόντων*. Or again in canon 64 the Greek MSS (except Vat. gr. 1506) read *πλὴν τοῦ ἐνὸς μόνου*, but the Verona Latin 'excepto uno': and we find that the latter reading is demonstrated to be correct by its agreement with the 'source' in A. C. v 20 *πάν σάββατον ἄνευ τοῦ ἐνός*.

But further the phraseology of the Canons is the phraseology of the

H. E. v 24, some Eunomians *τὸ βάπτισμα παρέχαραξαν· οὐ γὰρ εἰς τὴν Τριάδα ἀλλ' εἰς τὸν Χριστοῦ βαπτίζουσι θάνατον*.

¹ In the sixth, seventh, and eighth books of A. C.: vi 15 (337. 22, 24), vii 22 (406. 22), vii 25 (412. 10), vii 39 (440. 12), vii 42 (448. 12), viii 6 (478. 27, 480. 19), viii 8 (484. 1, 9), viii 15 (520. 3), viii 34 (542. 11).

² Note that the 5th canon of Nicaea is not the source, for it speaks of three bishops, whereas both Constitutions and Canons speak of 'two or three'.

³ The older editions give canons 64-66 in wrong order, 65, 66, 64.

Constitutions, even where we cannot say that a particular passage of the one depends directly on a particular passage of the other. With the language of cann. 9, 51, 63, *Εἰ τις ἐπίσκοπος ἢ πρεσβύτερος ἢ διάκονος ἢ [ὄλως] ἐκ τοῦ καταλόγου τοῦ ἱερατικοῦ* compare A. C. iii 15 (209. 3) *μίτε οὖν ἐπίσκοπος μήτε πρεσβύτερος μήτε διάκονος μήτε ἄλλος τις ἐκ τοῦ καταλόγου τοῦ ἱερατικοῦ*. With canon 20 *Κληρικὸς ἐγγύας διδούς καθαιρεῖσθω* compare A. C. ii 6 (39. 11) *ἔστω δὲ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος . . . μὴ ἐγγυώμενός τινα*. With canon 22 *αὐτοφονευτῆς γὰρ ἐστίν* cf. A. C. viii 2 (468. 16) *καὶ Καϊάφας ὕστερον αὐτοφονευτῆς ἑαυτοῦ γέγονεν*. With canon 29 *ὡς Σίμων ὁ μάγος ὑπ' ἐμοῦ Πέτρου* cf. A. C. iv 7 (227. 28) *ἀλλὰ καὶ Σίμων ὁ μάγος ἐμοὶ Πέτρῳ καὶ Ἰωάννῃ*. With canon 30 *κοσμικοῖς ἄρχουσι* cf. A. C. ii 45 (141. 3) *κοσμικοὺς ἄρχοντας*, vi 10 (325. 2) *τοὺς κοσμικοὺς ἄρχοντας*. Of canon 37 the main structure is derived from Antiochene can. 20; but several phrases are independent of the Antiochene canon, and with *τὰ δόγματα τῆς εὐσεβείας* compare A. C. iii 5 (189. 23) *τὰ τῆς εὐσεβείας δόγματα, with ἀντιλογίας διαλύετωσαν* A. C. ii 45 (141. 6) *τὰς ἀντιλογίας διαλύσαι*. So in the next canon the Antiochene model has *τῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας πραγμάτων*, but the copy *τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν πραγμάτων*, and *ἐκκλησιαστικός* is a favourite word of the Constitutions: cf. A. C. ii 35 (121. 14) *διοικητὴν τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν πραγμάτων*. And quite similarly in canon 40 *τὰ κυριακά* is substituted for the Antiochene *τὰ διαφέροντα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ*: cf. A. C. ii 25 (93. 17) *τοῖς κυριακοῖς κεχρήσθω* and (95. 2) *χρῶμενοι ἐκ τῶν κυριακῶν*. In canon 61 use is made of a word *ἀπηγορευμένης (πράξεως)* of which the editor of the Constitutions is very fond in this sort of connexion, e. g. iv 7 (227. 24) *ἐκάτερα γὰρ τοῖς νόμοις ἀπηγόρευται*: i 3 (13. 2) *ἐπεὶ περ καὶ ὁ νόμος ἀπαγορεύει* is very like canon 63 *τοῦτο γὰρ ὁ νόμος ἀπέπειν*. With canon 73 *παράνομον γὰρ* compare the similar turns in which the same word is employed in A. C. ii 49 (145. 26) *παράνομον γὰρ τὸ τοιοῦτον*, iii 9 (201. 1) *ἐπισηφалὲς γὰρ, μᾶλλον δὲ παράνομον καὶ ἀσεβές*: ps.-Ign. *Magn.* 7 *τὸ γὰρ τοιοῦτον παράνομον*. And with the last words of can. 81 *κατὰ τὴν κυριακὴν παρακέλευσιν* compare the last words of a sentence in A. C. ii 44 (139. 12) *κατὰ τὴν κυριακὴν θέσιν*.

Last of the passages belonging to the Canons comes the final epilogue and doxology (see p. 523 above). When the relation between this and the Constitutions is established by the same method of argument as that employed up to this point, we shall have brought every part of the document before us into line.

1. *ταῦτα περὶ κανόνων ὑμῖν διατετάχθη παρ' ἡμῶν*. A. C. viii 15 (520. 28) *ταῦτα περὶ τῆς μυστικῆς λατρείας διατασσόμεθα ἡμεῖς οἱ ἀπόστολοι ὑμῖν*.

2. *Ὁ ἐπίσκοποι*. So in A. C. ii 54 (153. 34), iv 2 (219. 17), vi 1 (303. 3).

3. ἐμμένοντες [*sc. τοῖς κανόσιν*]. A. C. viii 46 (556. 11) ἐμμένειν τῇ τάξει τῇ δοθεισῇ.

4. θεὸς ὁ μόνος ἀγέννητος. A. C. vii 41 (444. 15) εἰς ἓνα ἀγέννητον μόνον ἀληθινὸν θεόν: viii 5 (474. 1) ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ ὁ μόνος ἀγέννητος καὶ ἀβασίλευτος: viii 6 (480. 5) τῷ μόνῳ ἀγεννήτῳ θεῷ.

5. τῶν ὄλων διὰ Χριστοῦ ποιητής. A. C. viii 37 (544. 18) ὁ τῶν ὄλων ποιητής διὰ Χριστοῦ καὶ κηδεμών.

6. ἀτρέπτους ἀμέμπτους ἀνεγκλήτους. A. C. viii 5 (476. 11), viii 11 (492. 18), viii 12 (514. 6), viii 18 (524. 7), viii 41 (552. 16): a favourite tag of the Constitutions.

7. καταξιώσει τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς. A. C. viii 9 (486. 12-14) καταξιώθωσιν . . . τύχωσιν τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς.

8. διὰ τῆς μεσιτείας. A. C. viii 13 (514. 16) διὰ τῆς μεσιτείας τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ.

9. τοῦ ἡγαπημένου παιδὸς αὐτοῦ Ἰ. Χ. A. C. viii 5 (474. 23) τῷ ἡγαπημένῳ σου παιδί Ἰ. Χ.

10. Ἰ. Χ. τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ σωτήρος ἡμῶν. A. C. viii 1 (460. 4) τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ σωτήρος ἡμῶν Ἰ. Χ.

11. δι' οὗ ἡ δόξα αὐτῷ . . . ἐν ἀγίῳ πνεύματι τῷ παρακλήτῳ. A. C. viii 73 (546. 11), corrected in accordance with cod. Vat. 1506 (Funk's *d*), δι' οὗ σοι καὶ ἡ ἐπάξιος ὀφείλεται προσκύνησις . . . ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ τῷ παρακλήτῳ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

12. τῷ ἐπὶ πάντων θεῷ καὶ πατρί. A. C. i 8 (21. 18) τοῦ δὲ Χριστοῦ κεφαλῆ ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ: iii 17 (213. 1) πατὴρ ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεός: vi 26 (369. 2). Ps.-Ign. *Tars.* 2 οἱ δέ, ὅτι αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεός: *Phil.* 7.

The process of argument has been long and perhaps tedious: but it leads to a clear result. All parts and portions of the Apostolic Canons, including the doubtful canons and the two epilogues—both that attached in some authorities to canon 50 and that attached to canon 85—shew everywhere the same intimate relation with the style and language of the Constitutions and, where opportunity of comparison offers itself, of the pseudo-Ignatian letters. The whole body of this literature comes from the same workshop, if not (as I myself prefer to believe) from the same pen.

But how then can we explain the presence in the middle of the series of the 85 canons of the lengthy doctrinal disquisition which follows the group of canons on Baptism? There is no question that it is out of place where it stands: it breaks into the continuous series of canons, while itself partaking rather of the nature of a summary and conclusion. I cannot see that Dr Schwartz has really made any attempt to solve the literary problem: for it is no solution to say that it, together with the three canons which go with it, 'was added in the margin and found its

way into the series of canons'. There is room for a solution which will explain the breach of continuity and at the same time preserve the unity of authorship.

I venture to propose the view that the writer or editor of the Canons (that is, as I think, the editor of the whole book of the Constitutions) drew up the series of canons in two recensions—first a series of 50, closed with the passage *Διδασκέσθω μέντοι*, and later on a larger series of 85, closed with the epilogue and doxology *Ταῦτα περὶ κανόνων*. Whether in the later recension the passage *Διδασκέσθω* was retained or omitted, I should not like to say: if this recension was posterior to the accession of Theodosius and triumph of the Nicene cause, it is possible that the author thought it wise to suppress a profession of faith so highly Arian, particularly as it occupied a position as the conclusion of the whole work where it could hardly escape attention.

Now too for the first time the riddle of the version of Dionysius Exiguus is explained. Why should Dionysius have translated only fifty of the canons, if he had more in his hands? His preface refers expressly to people who refused to admit the authority of these canons, but he speaks throughout as though he was producing a complete translation.¹ Prof. Schwartz indeed considers that he has himself cleared up the difficulty: Dionysius found the passage *Διδασκέσθω* in his Greek MS and broke off the work of translation, because the colour of the passage was too obviously heretical. We should all agree that Dionysius would hardly have served up to the pope a faithful version of *Διδασκέσθω* in its genuine form as a work of the holy apostles. But nothing would have been simpler than just to omit the passage, which after all was in no sense a 'canon', and go on to translate the rest of the series. That Dionysius should have rendered into Latin the canons rejecting heretical baptism—which baptism the Roman Church, as we know, accepted—shews that he was an honest workman: and when he says that he translated 'the canons' of the apostles, I entertain no doubt that he translated the whole series that lay before him. Doubtless the epilogue *Διδασκέσθω* was also before him, and it is certain that he omitted it: but he did exactly the same with regard to non-canonical material for the remaining councils. No Latin canonical collection is so rigid in its limitation of its subject-matter: no other one for instance omits, as Dionysius does, the Nicene Creed. Even if the orthodox recast

¹ Preface to his second edition (Maassen, p. 961) 'In principio itaque canones qui dicuntur apostolorum de graeco transtulimus, quibus quia plurimi consensum non praebuere facilem, hoc ipsum vestram nolimus ignorare Sanctitatem': preface to his third edition (*ib.* p. 965) 'Canones autem qui dicuntur apostolorum, et Sordicensis concilii atque Africanae provinciae, quos non admisit universitas, ego quoque in hoc opere praetermisi, quia . . . et hos in illa prima digessi translatione, et vestra Paternitas auctoritatem qua tenentur ecclesiae orientales quaesivit agnoscere.'

of *Διδασκέσθω* that we meet in John Scholasticus had lain before Dionysius (and it is possible that it did), we may be quite sure that it would have been excluded from his Latin version of the Greek Canon Law.

But I cannot close this paper without expressing once more my sense of the debt under which all students of the subject lie towards Prof. Schwartz for the very remarkable essay, one part of which it has fallen to my lot in this paper to criticize. One may agree with Schwartz, or one may disagree with him; but one can never neglect him. It is safe to say of any work of his that it is not written at second-hand, but that it is original, in the best sense of the word, from beginning to end.

C. H. TURNER.

UN TEXTE PEU REMARQUÉ DE SAINT AUGUSTIN SUR LE CANON DE LA MESSE.

QUE peut-on savoir du contenu du canon de la messe en Afrique au temps de saint Augustin? J'ai touché à cette question dans mon livre *L'Eucharistie* (1913) pp. 430-433. Sans avoir connu le travail de W. C. Bishop, 'The African Rite', publié par le *Journal of Theological Studies* t. xiii (1912) pp. 250-277, j'avais cité les mêmes textes d'Augustin que cite M. Bishop et qui jettent quelque lumière sur le point à éclaircir¹: *De Trinitate* iii 21; *Epistula* cxlix 16; *Sermo* ccxxvii; *Sermo inedit.* vi 3. J'avais cité ailleurs (p. 425) le *Sermo* cclxxii, que cite M. Bishop, mais qui a moins directement trait au canon. De ces divers textes d'Augustin le plus explicite est celui du *Sermo inedit.* vi 3. Augustin y dessine les grandes lignes de l'anaphore africaine: d'abord la salutation *Dominus vobiscum*, le *Sursum cor[da]*, et le *Domino Deo nostro gratias agamus*. A la fin, la 'dominica oratio' pour clôturer l'action, les 'acta', comme s'exprime Augustin. Entre ces préludes et le Pater se place la prière consécrationnaire, qu'Augustin rappelle en termes imprécis, parce qu'il adresse le sermon à des catéchumènes:

Et inde iam (*suppléer*: sequuntur) quae aguntur in precibus sanctis, quas audituri estis, ut accedente verbo fiat corpus et sanguis Christi. Nam tolle verbum, panis est et vinum. Adde verbum, et iam aliud est. Et ipsum aliud quid est? Corpus Christi et sanguis Christi.

¹ Rapprochez Dom Cabrol, article 'Afrique' (Liturgie postnicéenne), du *Dictionn. d'arch. chr. et de liturgie* t. i (1907) pp. 635-636. F. Mone *Lateinische und griechische Messen* (1890) pp. 90-101.