a new numbered section. Elsewhere it does not, e.g. in § 15 (Epiphany), 74 (Ascension), 110 (Vig. Pent.). For similar groups see also §§ 10, 129, 184. As a rule collects *Ad vesperos*, *Ad fontes*, and *Ad S. Andream* are included in one section with the Mass.

5. The mention of the Stations seems to be incomplete, though it is difficult to judge for lack of any standard of comparison. Other books —the Gradual or the Gospel Capitulary—have ways of their own in recording Stations. Here some of the Station names have disappeared at the *Litania Maior*, and the headings *Ad crucem*, *In atrio* have taken their place. The absence of any mention of Station on Easter Sunday (88) can hardly be anything else but a blunder. The Station for Evensong is marked on that day and on the following Monday, Friday, Saturday, and Sunday; but not on the other days of the week. Whether these are omissions here is uncertain; and the other books, since they do not deal with Evensong, throw no light on the question. Again, the omission at Saturday after Whitsunday (117) must probably be a blunder.

6. A second *Ad complendum* is added in § 100, which is also to be found at the end of § 202 (Wilson, p. 132).

These are some small points which seem to make it clear that this specimen of Frankish *Gregorianum* was a somewhat carelessly compiled book in itself, apart from the fact (which may have some other explanation than carelessness) that it made such inadequate provision for the lesser Sundays. Nevertheless it created a type. The numbering of the sections seems to shew that it was regarded as authoritative and entitled to create a type. In any case at the present time it is the best standard of comparison for different forms of *Gregorianum*, Frankish and Italian, and for different stages in the developement; and the official enumeration will help to make comparison easy, even though itself it suffers in one or two places from the imperfections of its archetype.

W. H. FRERE.

THE ORDINATION PRAYERS OF HIPPOLYTUS.

To the JOURNAL of April last (vol. xvii) Dr Bartlet contributed an article entitled 'The Ordination Prayers in the Ancient Church Order'. He drew the conclusion (p. 256) that 'there seems good cause to regard the form of the Ancient Church Order, as it took shape in Syria about the middle of the third century or rather later, and so of Hippolytus's *περὶ χαρισμάτων ἀποστολικὴ παράδοσις* on which it was based, as best

represented by CH in the ordination sections for bishop and presbyter, as well as for deacon'.

As I wholly dissent from Dr Bartlet's conclusion, I had thought of offering some remarks upon his article immediately after its appearance. But I deferred doing so until my own study 'The so-called Egyptian Church Order and derived Documents' (*Texts and Studies* viii 4) should have been published; because it seemed to me that particular sections of the documents involved (such as those on ordination) can only be safely approached after some personal attempt has been made to grapple with the general problem of the inter-relation of the documents as wholes; and I could not undertake to do that within the compass of a short article.

In the volume referred to I have tried to set out the evidence which has led me to certain definite conclusions as to the relationship subsisting between these five documents: the so-called 'Egyptian Church Order' (EgCO), the 'Canons of Hippolytus' (CH), the 'Apostolic Constitutions' book viii (AC viii), the 'Constitutions through Hippolytus' or 'Epitome' of AC viii (Ep), and the 'Testament of our Lord' (Test). These conclusions may be summarized as follows:—

1. That EgCO is the immediate source of all the other documents except Ep; and that even Ep has derived its text of the bishop's ordination prayer and of the section on the reader, together with its ascription of this part of its contents to Hippolytus, directly from EgCO.

2. That Ep is, apart from the items just mentioned, merely a set of extracts from AC viii.

3. That EgCO is itself the Ἀποστολικὴ παράδοσις (but not the Περὶ χαρισμάτων) of Hippolytus.

4. That AC viii chapters 1 and 2 are wholly the personal composition of the compiler of AC, and have only this connexion with the lost Περὶ χαρισμάτων of Hippolytus, that they were written in order to satisfy an allusion to that work which the AC compiler had before him in the prologue of EgCO.[1]

I need not here recapitulate the evidence on which these conclusions rest; but I would draw attention to two salient points in the evidence.

(*a*) I find no satisfactory trace of any immediate literary connexion between CH, AC viii, and Test.

(*b*) So far as I have been able to discover, EgCO is the measure of

[1] The existence of this prologue to EgCO only came to light in 1900 with the publication of the old Latin fragments by E. Hauler. Four years later Mr Horner published the full text of the Ethiopic version (hitherto known only in the extracts given from it by Ludolf); and then it was seen that the prologue was preserved by this version as well—though not in its proper place.

all the matter common to any two of those other three[1] documents: in other words, those documents agree together only in so far as they also agree with EgCO.

These data do not, of course, prove at once that EgCO is the actual source of the other documents; they might result from the circumstance that EgCO stood *second* in a line of descent, and that the other two were derived from it. For it is evident that if there are three documents A, B, C standing in a direct line of descent, C can agree with A only where it has inherited from A *through* B.

That EgCO is not dependent on AC viii, Ep, or Test is generally recognized in this country, and admits in fact of demonstration. No one in England that I know of has accepted Funk's view, that EgCO is derived from AC viii through Ep, though in Germany it has (in combination however with certain correct conclusions of Funk which have been generally ignored in England) won the adherence of (amongst others) Harnack and Bardenhewer. As regards Test, Rahmani, its first editor, is, I believe, alone in placing it before EgCO. The choice, therefore, lies between EgCO and CH as the source of the rest. The hypothesis of a lost original (the 'Lost Church Order') from which all, or at least several, of our documents may be supposed to have been immediately and independently derived, is considered on pp. 33–35 of my book. I cannot entertain it, chiefly for two reasons: (1) It was originated by the late Dr John Wordsworth, Bishop of Salisbury, to account for 'the common matter' in the existing Orders. But, as stated under (*b*) above, EgCO contains all that common matter; and hence there is no call for the suggestion of a lost source. (2) If several of the existing Orders were derived independently from an earlier original, we should confidently expect to find points of agreement between AC and CH, or AC and Test, or CH and Test, not shared by EgCO: some of these pairs would surely have agreed at least in preserving some of the common matter in a different literary, or textual, form from that found in EgCO. But of this I have found, after searching the documents, no trace. The appearance of St Stephen's name in the ordination prayers for a deacon in AC and CH is certainly not an example: it is too easy and obvious an improvement to call for the supposition of its presence in a common source: it is far more likely to have been added in AC and CH than to have been omitted in EgCO and Test if originally present.

The case as between EgCO and CH is considered at length in chapter ii of my book; and that CH is secondary and EgCO primary appears to me to be beyond all doubt. I will instance but one out of

[1] Ep may here be left out of account as merely reproducing AC viii (with the exceptions already noted).

many items in the proof. The long moral and ascetical passage of CH, which since the publication of Achelis's *Canones Hippolyti* has generally been allowed to drop out of sight altogether, is now seen from Riedel's new text to be an integral part of the original CH, belonging not to canon 30, where Haneberg's text has it, but to canon 38, where it forms a conclusion to the whole document, and where the difficulties which justified Achelis in removing it are no longer felt (cf. p. 121 ff of my book). But even Achelis recognized that it was *by the same hand* as the original CH; though he thought that it must have been inserted later from a separate work of the CH compiler. He accordingly relegated it to an appendix, where it rested in peace till its true character was made known, or knowable, by Riedel. There is no trace of this long passage in any of the other Orders; and the nature of its contents will probably be recognized as fatal to the pretensions of CH.

I think it unnecessary to take up here individual points in Dr Bartlet's article. My purpose is merely to emphasize the character of the main problem, under which all such minor questions must fall. The problem is mainly a synoptic one. And when the synoptic evidence of the documents is looked into it is found, as I have insisted, that all their common features are reducible to terms of EgCO. That EgCO purports to be, and is in fact, the original 'Hippolytean Church Order' (the Ἀποστολικὴ παράδοσις of Hippolytus) I am fully convinced[1]; and with this work in our hands (however imperfect the forms in which it survives) we can learn better than by any other means what Hippolytus has to tell us about so many matters in which we are so deeply interested. The hypothesis—I am almost tempted to say myth—of a 'Lost Church Order' helps only to keep everything in the vague and to propagate conjectures that can never be verified.

R. H. CONNOLLY.

[1] I must again refer to my book, chapter iii, for a statement of the evidence on this point.