

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*.

III. THE TEXT OF COD. VAT. 1506.

IN the first of the series of notes bearing the above title (*J. T. S.* October 1914, p. 54) I criticized the text of Funk because of what seemed to me his over-estimate of his codex a (Vat. gr. 839) and his under-estimate of his codex d (Vat. gr. 1506). On that occasion I had specially in view the variations in theological language, and I pressed the conclusion that the author of the *Constitutions* was much more definitely Arian than the printed texts might have led us to suppose.

In returning once more to the question of the true text of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, I propose to approach it from a different side, and to examine a number of the more important non-theological variants in the eighth book, where we have available for the most part both an early Greek recension or epitome and four versions as well, Latin, Syriac, Sahidic, and Ethiopic.

Funk made use of a large number of Greek MSS: but for my present purpose I shall neglect altogether all that are later than the eleventh century. Seven only remain; and of these his b (Vat. 2088) and o (Bodl. Misc. 204) contain no part of the eighth book. Of the remaining five, which alone concern us, his d is Vat. 1506, the codex whose claims to have preserved the true text I am trying to make good, and his e (Vat. 2089) is a sister MS to d, unfortunately only available for small portions of the book: his a, Vat. 839, may be said to be nearly identical with his printed text: the other two are h (Jerusalem III 3), a poor witness, and f (Barberini III 55, now in the Vatican) of about the year 800, containing a text as good as it is ancient, but extant only for chapters 4, 5, 16-27, and the last few *Apostolic Canons* with the concluding doxology.

But besides the direct witness of these Greek manuscripts to the text of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, we have also the indirect witness of the four ancient versions and of the Greek *Epitome*.

The so-called *Epitome* is a parallel text to the greater part of the eighth book, omitting chapters 3, 5 (part of) to 15, 29, 35-41—roughly speaking, the prayers or liturgical part of the book—and the *Apostolic Canons*. What exactly is the true account to be given of its relation to the full text of the *Constitutions* has been a matter of sharp dispute. Its text of the prayer for the ordination of a bishop is undeniably simpler

and more primitive than the text given in *A. C.* viii 5: so much so that one group of critics have seen in the *Epitome* a source, or at least a preliminary sketch by the compiler, of the eighth book.¹ Others have pointed out the difficulties in detail which this interpretation of the *data* involves, and have with no less certainty concluded that the *Epitome* must be an excerpt from the completed text, and is therefore posterior to the completion of the *Constitutions*. Both views are up to a certain point correct. It may now be taken as an acquired result that the *Epitome* is, as a whole, a secondary and dependent text, posterior and not prior to the *Constitutions*: but on the other hand it is no less clear that for the bishop's ordination-prayer, and for one or two smaller passages, the epitomator went back behind the *Constitutions* to their source in the *Church Order* of Hippolytus.² How much later than the *Constitutions* he should be placed we cannot say: but since not only the *Constitutions* but the much earlier work of Hippolytus was at his disposal, the probability is that his date is relatively ancient.³

The fragment of the Latin version discovered by myself and the late Dr Spagnolo in codex li of the Chapter Library at Verona has been published partly in this JOURNAL, but more fully and with a revised text in *Ecclesiae Occidentalis Monumenta Iuris Antiquissima* I iii (1913) pp. 32 a-hh: it commences near the beginning of the 41st chapter of the eighth book, and goes straight on to the end of the *Apostolic Canons* and final doxology, save for a lacuna extending from the middle of the 47th to the middle of the 52nd canon. In age this fragment far exceeds any other extant text in any language of the *Constitutions*, since the manuscript in which it is preserved is of date not later than the end of the sixth century; and the value of the text appears to be fully proportionate to its age.

The Syriac text is now generally accessible through the medium of the French translation by the Abbé F. Nau *La version syriaque de l'Octateuque de Clément* (Paris 1913). This Octateuch is a collection of canonical material, not a single document, and is probably arranged in eight books on the model of our Greek *Apostolic Constitutions*: but the first two books consist of the *Testamentum Domini*, the third of the so-called *Apostolic Church Order*, and it is only the last five books which concern us. The fourth book corresponds to *A. C.* viii chapters 1 and 2: the fifth book represents *A. C.* viii 3-5, 16-26: the sixth contains most of *A. C.* viii 27-34, 42-46: the seventh consists of some of the

¹ I very tentatively adopted this view myself, *J. T. S.* xvi (July 1915) p. 545 n. 1.

² See E. Schwartz *Die pseudo-apostolischen Kirchenordnungen* (1910) pp. 27, 31, and Dom Connolly *The So-called Egyptian Church Order and Derived Documents* (*Texts and Studies* viii 4: 1916) pp. 37-50.

³ The oldest manuscripts that are known to contain the *Epitome* are of the eleventh century.

chapters of *A. C.* viii omitted in the preceding books: the eighth and last gives the *Apostolic Canons*.

The colophon to book 2 of the Octateuch attributes the translation from Greek into Syriac to Jacob (of Edessa) and to the year 687. So far as books 4-8 are concerned, there can be I believe no doubt that they are a direct version of the Greek text of the *Constitutions*.

The other Oriental versions distinguish themselves from the Syriac (a) by not containing the *Testamentum Domini*, or rather by not containing that part of the *Testamentum* which is independent of the *Church Order* of Hippolytus, (b) by not containing the material which the seventh book of the Syriac Octateuch has taken from *A. C.* viii, (c) by being numbered straight through as so many 'canons' instead of being divided into books. These versions have been translated into English by Mr Horner in his invaluable work *The Statutes of the Apostles or Canones Ecclesiastici* (1904): unfortunately he omitted to render into English the *Apostolic Canons*—i. e. the matter corresponding to book 8 of the Syriac—and I am unable therefore to cite evidence from them under this head. In the Sahidic text canons 63-78 contain those chapters of *A. C.* viii which are contained in books 4, 5, and 6 of the Syriac. Substantially the same matter is contained in canons 49-72 of the Ethiopic, but mixed and interpolated with material from extraneous sources.¹

It is likely enough that some of these versions are not ultimately independent of one another, but their divergences in detail are sufficiently large to take their common original, if they had one, back to a date not very far removed from the date of the *Constitutions*. We arrive by another route at the same result, if we bear in mind that all these versions (like the Greek *Epitome*) are derived in other parts directly from the *Church Order* of Hippolytus, and the original collection of Canons or Statutes must therefore have been put together before the *Church Order* went out of circulation—that is to say, hardly later than the fifth or sixth century.

Thus the witnesses whom I propose to cite, the Greek Barberini codex f, the Greek *Epitome*, the Latin version, the Syriac version, the other Oriental versions (or at least the common original of these last), are all older, most of them much older, than Funk's Greek MSS (other than f): and where they agree, the strain of Greek text which they represent is almost certainly the original type. If, further, we remember that most of our authorities contain parts only of the book, and not always the same parts, we shall find the amount of agreement between these early authorities very remarkable indeed. And the text they

¹ I leave the Arabic, as presumably posterior in date, out of account.

represent in substantial variations is, with very rare exceptions, the text of Vat. 1506.

Readings in A.C. Book viii (the reading of Funk's edition is given first with the supporting authorities: then the reading of Vat. 1506, also with the supporting authorities).

1. ch. 2 § 4 (Funk 468. 13) ὡς Ἀνανίας καὶ Σαμαίας ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ, καὶ Σεδεκίας καὶ Ἀχαίας οἱ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι ψευδοπροφήται.

ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ with apparently all extant Greek MSS except d: ἐν Ἰσραήλ d, the Epitome, Syr. Sah. Eth. The reference for the judgment on false prophets is to Jeremiah xxxv (xxviii), xxxvi (xxix), and in xxxvi 23 the variant readings ἐν Ἰσραήλ and ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ (Ἰῆλ and Ἰλῆμ) recur, \aleph^* A giving Ἰσραήλ, \aleph^{ca} and Q giving Ἱερουσαλήμ. Both in LXX and in A. C. the older group of authorities is strong for ἐν Ἰσραήλ.

2. ch. 4 § 2 (Funk 472. 6) ἐν πᾶσιν ἄμεμπτον, ὑπὸ παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ ἐκλελεγμένον.

ἄμεμπτον alone a with most Greek MSS: ἄμεμπτον ἄριστον δέ d, ἄμεμπτον ἄριστον δι f, ἄμεμπτον ἄριστηνδῆ e, ἄμεμπτον ἄριστον Epit., 'ce serait bien s'il était' Syr. The evidence of Sah. and Eth. is more doubtful: but as each of them has three adjectives corresponding to the ἐν πᾶσιν ἄμεμπτον of Funk's text, it is probable that they read ἄριστον like the Epitome, and took it for a qualification of the bishop. It is clear that in some form ἄριστον δέ, ἀριστονδῆ, or something like them, is original: probably it was omitted as unintelligible in the later Greek MSS, for in e and f we already see that the process of depravation of the text has got so far as to produce what is nonsense as it stands ἄριστον δι, ἀριστηνδῆ. What exactly the original reading was is not clear: but the choice seems to lie between (1) ἀριστίνδην 'chosen for his merit',¹ a word perhaps rare enough to have led to corruption of the text, and (2) ἄριστον δέ 'if possible, unanimously elected'. Perhaps the former alternative is supported by vi 23. 5 τοὺς ἀρίστους εἰς ἱερωσύνην προχειρίζεσθαι.

3. ch. 5 § 3 (Funk 474. 13) διὰ τῶν σῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ ἡμῶν τῶν χάριτι σῆ παρεστώτων ἐπισκόπων.

ἡμῶν alone, apparently all extant Greek MSS but d: ἡμῶν διδασκάλων d with Syr., p. 93, 'par tes apôtres et nos docteurs' (the prayer is absent from Epit. Sah. Eth., and f is defective, owing apparently to an accidental loss, for the first part of it). Without knowing the reading of the Syriac I had on internal grounds defended the reading of d (*J. T. S.* xvi [Oct. 1914] p. 57). For the collocation of σῶν and ἡμῶν, both applied to the same persons—'those who were Thy apostles and

¹ Cf. Aristotle *Politics* ii 11. 8 οὐ μόνον ἀριστίνδην ἀλλὰ καὶ πλουτίνδην οἴονται δεῖν αἰρεῖσθαι τοὺς ἀρχοντας.

our teachers'—cf. viii 12 § 7 (498. 4) ἀρχιερέα σόν, βασιλέα δὲ καὶ κύριον πάσης νοητῆς καὶ αἰσθητῆς φύσεως, and the d-text of viii 12 § 27 (504. 26) Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ κύριος καὶ θεὸς ἡμῶν, σοῦ δὲ ἄγγελος καὶ τῆς δυνάμεως ἀρχιστρατηγός.

4. ch. 16 § 3 (Funk 522. 4) Κύριε παντοκράτορ ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν.

ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν a and all MSS save df: ὁ βασιλεὺς ἡμῶν df with Epitome and Syr. (p. 95 'notre roi'). This prayer also is absent from Sah. and Eth. Either reading is in itself satisfactory: but the weight of the ancient evidence is all on the side of d.

5. ch. 22 § 3 (Funk 526. 14) τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν σου διαφυλάσσων.

τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν σου without addition a and all MSS save df: τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν σου ἐν ὄλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ df Syr. ('le nombre de tes élus par tout le monde' p. 97). From the prayer at the laying on of hands on a reader, which is absent from Epit. Sah. and Eth. Probably a case of accidental omission—perhaps of a complete line of 12 letters—in the ancestry of the main group of MSS.

6. ch. 27 § 1 (Funk 530. 1) Σίμων δὲ ὁ Καναίτης.

ὁ Καναίτης a and all MSS save df: ὁ Καναναῖος df Epit. Syr. ('Simon le Cananéen' p. 99), and so the quotation in Severus of Antioch (E. W. Brooks *Select Letters of Severus* pp. 211, 213).¹ The evidence for Καναναῖος here seems overwhelming, and the fact that Καναίτης stands without variant in Funk's apparatus in the list of the Apostles in *A. C.* vi 14 § 1 (Funk 335. 11), though if the issue here were in itself obscure it might be decisive, cannot as things are weigh down the balance.

The title of the apostle Simon is derived of course from Matt. x 4 = Mark iii 18. In both cases Καναναῖος appears to be beyond question the true reading (Mt. B C D L 1 33 Old Latin against ~~NE~~ etc.: Mk. ~~NE~~ B C D L Δ 33 Old Latin against A etc.), and is borne out by the parallel text of St Luke vi 15 τὸν καλούμενον Ζηλωτήν, since καναναῖος is a transliteration of the Hebrew word of which ζηλωτής is a translation.

7. ch. 30 § 2 (Funk 532. 21) αἱ γὰρ ἀπαρχαὶ τῶν ἱερέων εἰσὶν καὶ τῶν αὐτοῖς ἐξυπηρετουμένων διακόνων.

διακόνων a and all Funk's MSS except d (f is not available here, or in any of the readings that follow): om. d with the Epitome and all three versions, Syr. ('les prémices sont pour les prêtres et pour ceux qui les servent' p. 100) Sah. (Horner, p. 349 'to the priests alone and those who do service [hyp.] for them') and Eth. (*ib.* p. 205 'for the priests and their ministers'). The context shews I think that the Jewish

¹ Severus is quoting *A. C.* viii 27 'the canon that is given out as having been enacted by Simon the Cananaean'. He holds strongly to the principle that later enactments repeal earlier ones, and therefore the canon of Nicaea supersedes the canon of Simon. But it looks as if he did not really admit the apostolic authority of the *Constitutions*.

priests are here intended, and therefore *διακόνων* is not really in place.

8. ch. 33 § 2 (Funk 538. 12) *σχολαζέτωσαν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ.*

ἐν a etc. Syr. ('ils seront assidus dans l'église' p. 101): *om. d* Epit. Sah. (Horner, p. 353 'let them devote themselves to the church') Eth. (*ib.* p. 210 'they shall have an opportunity for [going to] church').

9. ch. 41 § 4 (Funk 550. 21) *τὸ λογικὸν τοῦτο ζῶν τὸν ἄνθρωπον.*

τοῦτο a and apparently all Funk's MSS except d: *om. d* Lat-Ver. 'rationabile animal hominem' and the *editio princeps* of Turrianus. The Oriental versions all omit this prayer.

10. ch. 42 § 1 (Funk 552. 19) *ἐν ψαλμοῖς καὶ ἀναγνώμασιν καὶ προσευχαῖς.*

καὶ ἀναγνώμασιν a etc.: *om. d* Epit. Lat-Ver. 'in psalmis et oratione', Syr. ('avec des chants et des prières' p. 103) Sah. (Horner, p. 355 'with psalms [psalms] and prayers') Eth. (*ib.* p. 215 'with psalms and prayers').

11. ch. 42 § 3 (Funk 552. 19-22) *ἐπιτελείσθω τριτὰ τῶν κεκοιμημένων . . . καὶ ἕνατα . . . καὶ τεσσαρακοστά.*

τεσσαρακοστά a etc. Epit-codd: *τριακοστά* e Epit-codd Lat-Ver. Syr. ('la trentaine' p. 103) Sah. (Horner, p. 356 'their month') Eth. (*ib.* p. 216 'the completion of a month'). The evidence of d, if Funk's silence may be trusted, goes on this occasion with a: but its sister MS e retains what I cannot doubt to be the original reading. As the author of the *Constitutions* appeals here to the 'ancient type' of the mourning of the people for Moses, which according to Deut. xxxiv 8 was 30 days and not 40, internal and external evidence combine to recommend the reading *τριακοστά*. On the two periods, 30 and 40, see Père H. Delehaye *Les origines du culte des martyrs* pp. 38-40: he cites the Acts of John for the third day, and on the other side the funeral oration of St Ambrose over the Emperor Theodosius pronounced 40 days after his death. As St Ambrose rather definitely implies¹ that the observation of the third and thirtieth days went together, and alternatively that of the seventh and fortieth, that is a further reason for preferring 'thirtieth' in the present passage. Taken with the evidence of the verse in Deuteronomy, it closes the question.²

¹ *de obitu Theodosii* § 3 'alii tertium diem et trigesimum, alii septimum et quadragimum, observare consueverunt'.

² In c. xxi of the *Lausiac History* we are told the story of a certain Christian *scholasticus* Eulogius and of a mutilated cripple to whom he ministered in the desert. They died within a few days of one another, and the narrator of the story, Cronius, arrived at the monastery 'at the moment when the *τεσσαρακοστά* of the one, and the *τριτὰ* of the other, were being celebrated'. So Abbot Butler prints the text, *Historia Lausiacæ* ii. 68. 15: but in his note, p. 200, he points out that the evidence of the Greek MSS of the *Historia* is in favour of *τριακοστά*. I should not venture

12. ch. 46 § 13 (Funk 560. 27) ἐγὼ Ἰάκωβος καὶ ἐγὼ Κλήμης.

Ἰάκωβος . . . Κλήμης a and one other MS with one MS of Epit. : *tr.* Κλήμης . . . Ἰάκωβος de Epit. (all MSS save one), Lat-Ver. Syr. ('moi Clément et moi Jacques' p. 107) Sah. (Horner, p. 362 'I Klēmēs and Jakōbos') Eth. (*ib.* p. 221 'Klēmētos and Yā'ekob'). In *A. C.* viii 10 § 7 James is named before Clement: but the external evidence for naming Clement first in the present passage is unusually strong.

13. ch. 46 § 17 (Funk 562. 20) Φίλιππον τὸν διάκονον ἡμῶν.

ἡμῶν a etc. Epit-cod: *om.* d Epit. (all MSS save one) Lat-Ver., Syr. p. 107, Sah. p. 363, Eth. p. 222. As in the last case a parallel reading elsewhere in *A. C.* (vi 7 § 2 Φίλιππος ὁ συναπόστολος ἡμῶν) goes to support the reading of Funk: but again we have all the older authorities without exception ranged against him.

14. ch. 46 § 17 (Funk 562. 25) Μελχισεδὲκ καὶ Ἰώβ.

Ἰώβ a and apparently all MSS save d: Ἰακώβ d Epit. Lat-Ver., Syr. p. 107, Sah. p. 363, Eth. p. 222. Melchisedek and Job are named together in ii 55 § 1 διὰ Μελχισεδὲκ καὶ τῶν πατριαρχῶν καὶ τοῦ θεοφιλοῦς Ἰώβ, and in vi 12 § 13 τοῖς πρὸ τοῦ νόμου φυσικοῖς Ἐνὼς Ἐνώχ Νῶε Μελχισεδὲκ Ἰώβ, and next to one another in a long catalogue of O. T. worthies vii 39 § 3, viii 5 § 3, and compare also viii 12 § 23 ὁ τὸν Μελχισεδὲκ ἀρχιερέα σῆς λατρείας προχειρισάμενος, τὸν πολὺτλαν θεράποντά σου Ἰώβ νικητὴν τοῦ ἀρχεκάκου ὄφews ἀναδείξας. It is clear therefore that the collocation of Melchisedek and Job was familiar to the author of the *Constitutions* and would be familiar to attentive readers of his work. But in none of the other instances of collocation is there anything which even remotely suggests that Job had received a priesthood direct from God—while in the last passage cited the priesthood of Melchisedek was emphasized, so that it would have been natural to emphasize also the priesthood of Job, if such a thing was really in the author's mind. True, neither is a priesthood of Jacob mentioned in terms: but on two occasions it is noted that Jacob had seen Christ face to face and received God's message from him, v 20 § 5, vii 33 § 5, and I think that here too the same must be the underlying idea.

If Jacob is right, then it is likely that the alternative reading Ἰώβ was derived by an attentive reader and critic from the apparent parallels in other parts of *A. C.* If so, a similar explanation will account for the to say whether the evidence of these MSS, or the evidence of the Latin and Syriac versions on the other side, should carry preponderant weight in establishing the text of the *Historia*: but the editor was obviously relying in large part on the consideration that 'the Greek practice, ancient and modern, seems to have been to commemorate the departed on the fortieth day'. Since the only Greek witness he cites earlier than the sixth century is the passage in *Ap. Const.*, it is the more important to point out that the 'ancient Greek practice' ought now to be cited not for 'fortieth' but for 'thirtieth'.

corruptions in nos. 12 and 13 *supra*—they are due to an early editor's false assimilation to other passages in the *Constitutions*.

After this point the Sahidic and Ethiopic versions fail us.

15. Can. Apost. 1 (Funk 564. 1) *ἐπίσκοπος τοῖνυν*.

τοῖνυν d e, Lat-Ver. 'episcopus ergo', and John Scholasticus (on this occasion Funk deserts the reading of a for the reading of d): *om.* a etc. The Syriac is cited by Funk for *τοῖνυν*: but Nau's text p. 117 ('L'évêque sera ordonné') gives nothing to correspond. The reading is an important one, because it implies an organic connexion between the *Apostolic Canons* and the eighth book of the *Constitutions*—a connexion which I have not the least doubt does really go back to the common author of both.

16. Can. Apost. 1 (Funk 564. 1) *χειροτονείσθω*.

χειροτονείσθω a etc. Jo. Schol.: *χειροτονείται* d e, Lat-Ver. 'ordinatur'; Syr. 'sera ordonné' (p. 117), but Nau adds in brackets *χειροτονείσθω*. The imperative is supported by the parallel earlier in the book, xxvii 2 (Funk 530. 3) *ἐπίσκοπος ὑπὸ τριῶν ἢ δύο ἐπισκόπων χειροτονείσθω*: the indicative is supported by the sentences immediately preceding—which as the particle *τοῖνυν* shews are to be taken in close connexion—*οὐχ ἕαντῷ τις ἀρπάξει τὸ ἱερατικὸν ἀξίωμα ἀλλὰ . . . λαμβάνει κτλ.*

17. Can. Apost. 3 (Funk 564. 10) *ἔλαιον εἰς τὴν λυχνίαν*.

τὴν λυχνίαν a etc. Jo. Schol.: *τὴν ἀγίαν λυχνίαν* d e Syr. ('pour la sainte lampe' p. 117). Lat-Ver. 'oleum speciosum candellarum', where I half suspect 'speciosum' to be a corruption of *s̄carum* = 'sanctarium' (or 'specie s̄carum'?).

18. Can. Apost. 64 (Funk 584. 1) *σάββατον πλὴν τοῦ ἐνὸς μόνου νηστεύων*.

πλὴν τοῦ ἐνὸς μόνου a and apparently all MSS save d, Jo. Schol., Syr. ('un seul samedi', p. 125): *πλὴν τοῦ ἐνὸς* d Lat-Ver. 'excepto uno', and cf. Ps-Ign. *ad Phil.* 13 *σάββατον νηστεύει πλὴν ἐνὸς σαββάτου*.

19. Can. Apost. 85 (Funk 590. 12) *Μωσέως πέντε Γένεσις Ἐξοδος Λευϊτικὸν Ἀριθμοὶ Δευτερονόμιον*.

Γένεσις . . . Δευτερονόμιον a (and apparently all MSS save d) Jo. Schol.: *om.* (so that *Μωσέως πέντε* stands alone, without the names of the individual books) d Lat-Ver. Syr.

20. Can. Apost. 85 (Funk 590. 16) *Ψαλμοὶ ἑκατὸν πενήκοντα* (or *ρν'*).

Ψαλμοὶ ρν' a etc.: *ψαλτήριον ἔν* Jo. Schol.: *βίβλος ψαλμῶν ρνα' d*, 'codex psalmoreum quinquaginta unus' Lat-Ver., 'le livre des cent cinquante et un psaumes' Syr. p. 128. The combination d Lat. Syr. is decisive for *βίβλος*: but it is not clear whether the right text is '150 psalms one book' or 'book of 151 psalms'. It is certainly possible that the Verona MS (or its archetype) read 'unius' not 'unus'.

21. Can. Apost. 85 (Funk 590. 17) Σολομῶντος βιβλία τρία Παροιμιαί Ἐκκλησιαστῆς Ἄσμα ἄσμάτων.

τρία . . . ἄσμάτων a etc., Jo. Schol. : πέντε (with omission, as in the cases of the books of Moses, of any names) d Lat-Ver. Syr. One cannot but suppose that the books of Solomon would be most naturally ranked as five, by the inclusion of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus—according to the a text the book of Wisdom is altogether excluded from the canon : on the other hand the book of Ecclesiasticus is separately mentioned a line or two further on as a book used in the instruction of the young.

I think it may be fairly claimed that the cumulative effect of these various readings, in most of which d is certainly right against a, creates a strong presumption in favour of revising the principle on which Funk constructed his text. Funk's edition was an enormous improvement upon Lagarde's : and further, so far as I can see, there is not the same amount of serious difference in books iii-vii of the *Apostolic Constitutions* (d is not extant for the first two books) between the readings of the two leading MSS. Nor should I at all assert that, even apart from mere slips, d is always correct where it differs from a. But if I have established my case, it follows at least that its evidence must always be taken into definite account, even where it represents a tradition of the text unrepresented in any of the other MSS. If the variation is one of theological language, the presumption in favour of d is still stronger. I will close by citing one such instance from the earlier books. In v 16. 2 (Funk 283. 20) the reading of a is τὸν πρὸ πάντων αἰώνων ἐξ αὐτοῦ γεννηθέντα, υἱὸν μονογενῆ, that of a second group substitutes ὑπ' for ἐξ and γεννόμενον for γεννηθέντα, the editor with yet another MS gives γεγεννημένον. But d and its sister MS have the shorter reading τὸν πρὸ πάντων αἰώνων υἱὸν μονογενῆ, and this is surely right. On only two other occasions does even the printed text of the *Constitutions* use γενῆσθαι of the Divine generation, and in one of them (vii 41. 5 [446. 3, 4]) the text is suspicious. And for the phrase ὁ πρὸ πάντων αἰώνων υἱὸς μονογενῆς we have an almost exact parallel in viii 1. 10 (464. 3) ὁ πρὸ αἰώνων μονογενῆς.

C. H. TURNER.