

## A PRIMITIVE EDITION OF THE APOSTOLIC CONSTITUTIONS AND CANONS AN EARLY LIST OF APOSTLES AND DISCIPLES

THE following paper is an enlargement and re-statement of results first formulated in the JOURNAL for July 1912 (pp 492-514). During the twelve months that have intervened since that publication I have devoted a good deal of time to the further study of the Verona fragment of an early Latin version of the Apostolic Constitutions and Canons to which I there called attention: the texts have been re-examined, and have now appeared in a much more complete and correct form in my *Ecclesiae Occidentalis Monumenta Iuris Antiquissima* 1 pp 32 a-32 nn. The introduction I propose to develop here.

When I began work at the fragment I used Lagarde's edition of the Greek text of the *Constitutions*. It was the edition of which I had availed myself for many years for purposes of reference, and the name and deservedly honoured reputation of the editor warranted me, as I supposed, in regarding it as an adequate critical text. It was obvious at once, and I pointed it out on pp 505-510, that Lagarde's Greek represented a very inferior text to that of the Latin fragment, while his citations of the *editio princeps* of Fr. Turrianus or Torres<sup>1</sup> (Venice 1563) shewed that in some important points the development of the text from Turrianus to Lagarde was not for the better but for the worse. So clear was this in the list of Canonical books—the last of the Apostolic Canons—that I printed in the parallel column (pp 513, 514) no longer the text of Lagarde, but the text of Turrianus.

Meanwhile I was neglecting the most recent and fullest statement of the evidence for the Greek text of the *Constitutions*, which would have saved me, if I had consulted it earlier, a good many hours of painful labour. I knew of course of the existence of Funk's great edition (*Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum*, 2 vols, Paderborn, A.D. 1905) but I supposed that it confined itself to the collocation of the printed texts of the *Constitutions* with their sources,<sup>2</sup> and either I did not know or had forgotten that it included a critical apparatus. In order to leave

<sup>1</sup> 'Francisco Torres, S.J., born 1509 at Herrera, present at the Council of Trent, died Nov. 21, 1584. Fifty eight of his works are fully described in Sommervogel's *de Backer Bibliothéque de la Compagnie de Jésus*'. I owe this information to the kindness of Bodley's Librarian, Mr Falconer Madan.

<sup>2</sup> As indeed had been the editor's intention, p. xxiii 'sperabam harum textum me ex editionibus recentissimis repetere posse'.

no stone unturned, I examined it before the last stage of the re-edition of the texts for my *Monumenta Iuris*, and I found at once that the answer to a good many difficult problems was in my hands

In the first place the secret of the superiority of Turrianus to Lagarde is at once revealed for whereas Lagarde used no MS earlier than the twelfth century, Funk has utilized four Vatican MSS of the tenth and eleventh centuries, and among these four are to be found, if not all the three MSS of Turrianus, certainly two of them. Vat. 839 is Turrianus's leading MS, obtained from Crete, Vat. 2088 is Turrianus's Sicilian MS, and I can hardly doubt that Vat. 1506 (a Grottaferrata MS) was his third or Calabrian MS from the monastery of Patiro at Rossano.<sup>1</sup> It follows of course that, if we have Turrianus's MSS, we are independent of his edition, and a new edition with more extensive material might even be as much superior to Turrianus as Turrianus is to Lagarde

And no doubt Funk's text has superseded those of all previous editors but that does not mean that his text is always right against Turrianus, but rather that his excellent *apparatus criticus* enables us to control his text. In my previous paper I pressed as the most incontestable indication of the superiority of Turrianus to Lagarde that the former retains far more frequently than the latter the archaic form of doxology δι' οὐ σοὶ . ἐν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι it is a grave blot on Funk's critical methods or acumen that he systematically prefers what seems to me obviously the secondary reading. Between chapters 12 and 41 inclusive of book viii of the *Constitutions* I have counted fourteen cases in which he prints the form μεθ' οὐ σοὶ . καὶ τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι, and two in which he prints variations of the καὶ . καί form, although one of his MSS faithfully reproduces the διὰ ἐν form in every one of the sixteen passages. For the most part the variation does not extend beyond the difference of μετὰ καί on the one side as against διὰ ἐν on the other but in the two remaining instances the variations are worth setting out in parallel columns

Funk 514 7 (c. xii § 50)

ὅτι σοὶ πάντα δόξα σέβας καὶ εὐχα-  
ριστία τιμὴ καὶ προσκύνησις, τῷ πατρὶ  
καὶ τῷ υἱῷ καὶ τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι

*Melius*

ὅτι δι' αὐτοῖ σοὶ πάντα ἡ δόξα  
σέβας καὶ εὐχαριστία, καὶ διὰ σε καὶ  
μετὰ σε αὐτῷ τιμὴ καὶ προσκύνησις  
ἐν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Funk's edition, by an unfortunate confusion, frequently prints 'Vat. 1056' for 'Vat. 1506', and 'Vat. 838' for 'Vat. 839'.

<sup>2</sup> The genuineness, in this and the following passage, of the phrase διὰ σε καὶ μετὰ σε, is further borne out by the parallel in vii xliii (Funk 448 14, 19, where the reading is undoubted, εὐλογεῖ καὶ δοξαζει τὸν δεσποτην θεὸν τὸν παντοκράτορα ἐπὶ τοῖς προσκυνοῦσιν αὐτὸν τὸν μονογενῆ θεὸν μετ' αὐτὸν καὶ δι' αὐτὸν. Note the distinction both there and here between δόξα to the Father and προσκύνησις to the Son and contrast Origen in *Aproc.* Scholion vii

ib 520 24 (c xv § 9)

ὅτι σοὶ δόξα αἶνος μεγαλοπρέπεια  
σέβας προσκύνῃς, καὶ τῷ σῷ παιδὶ  
Ἰησοῦ τῷ Χριστῷ σοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ  
ἡμῶν καὶ θεῷ καὶ βασιλεῖ, καὶ τῷ  
ἁγίῳ πνεύματι

ὅτι σοὶ δόξα αἶνος μεγαλοπρέπεια  
σέβας προσκύνῃς, καὶ μετὰ σε καὶ  
διὰ σε τῷ παιδὶ σοῦ Ἰησοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ  
ἡμῶν καὶ βασιλεῖ, δι' οὗ σοι ἐπ-  
οφείλεται παρὰ πάσης λογικῆς καὶ  
ἁγίας φύσεως ἡ ἐπάξιος εὐχαριστία  
ἐν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι.

The manuscript whose unique readings are here recorded in the right-hand column is Vat gr 1506, about which we have already seen that it was in all probability one of the three MSS employed by Turrianus, and no doubt the excellences of the texts of both Turrianus and Funk are in large part due to it. One would have thought that its consistent support of the archaic doxology would already have been enough to put a modern editor on the track but anyhow, whatever excuses may be made for editors who have worked on the *Constitutions* hitherto, they will no longer be open to their successors. The discovery of the Latin version contained in the Verona fragment has brought conclusive testimony to the unique value of this Greek MS, and the Greek text that I have printed in *Ecdl Occid Mon Iur Ant* at the foot of the page, below the transcription of the Verona Latin, as representing its original, is in all essentials the text of Vat gr 1506. The following are some of the readings in which the Verona fragment and Vat gr 1506 agree against all previous editors (the references within brackets in the left-hand column are to the pages and lines of *Ecdl Occid Mon Iur Ant*, but the numbering of the Canons is that of Funk)

Constit	Vat gr 1506	Verona LI ( <i>Ecdl Occid Mon Iur Ant</i> 1 pp 32 a-32 h)	Edd
viii 44 ε 151	περὶ τῶν κληρικῶν	de clericis	περὶ τῶν ἐν κληρῳ
viii 46 (j 18)	ἀλλὰ καλούμενος	sed uocatus	ἀλλὰ καλούμενος
(mi 5)	τὸν Χριστὸν ὁρῶν	Christum uidens	ὃ τὸν Χριστὸν ὁρᾶν
Can			
i (n 5)	χειροτονεῖται	ordinatur	χειροτονεῖσθω
v o 6)	ἐπιμέναν	perseuerans	ἐπιμέναν δέ
viii 10 17)	ἢ τὴν αἰτίαν ἢ ἐὰν	aut causam aut si <sup>1</sup>	τὴν αἰτίαν, ἐὰν δε
xviii (r 2)	ἢ τοῦ καταλύου	aut de collegio	ἢ ὅλως τοῦ καταλύου
xxv (s 1)	Κύριος	dns ut uid <sup>1</sup>	om
xxxvi (v 12)	τὴν αὐτοῦ γνώμην	ipsius uoluntate	τὴν αὐτοῦ γνώμην
xlii (τ 25)	σχολάζοντα	uacantem	σχολάζων
xlii (y 12)	ἐνεργῆσαι	operari <sup>1</sup>	ἐνεργῆσαι τι
lvii (z 19)	πεπληρωμένον	fracto	πεπληρωμένον
lviii (z 24)	ἢ ἐπιμέναν	uel si perseueret	ἐπιμέναν δέ
lix (aa 5)	φονεὺς τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ	fratris interfector	φονευσας τὸν ἀδελφόν

<sup>1</sup> Dionysius Exiguus goes with the Verona fragment and Vat gr 1506 in these instances

<i>Constit</i>	Vat gr 1506	Verona LI ( <i>Ecccl Occid. Mon Iur Ant</i> 1 pp 32a-32hh)	Edd
lxi (cc 3)	παρασκευὴν ἢ τετραδα	sextum diem vel quartum	τετράδα ἢ παρασκευὴν
lxxi (cc 15)	ἢ λύχνους	aut lucernas	ἢ ἐν ταῖς ἑορταῖς αὐτῶν λύχνους ἄψῃ
lxxiv dd 1)	ἐπὶ ἀξιοπίστων	praesentibus fide dignis	ἐπὶ ἀξιοπίστων
(dd 14)	τὰ κατ' αὐτοῦ δοξαζα	quae in eum placuerat	κατ' αὐτοῦ τὰ δοκοῦντα
lxxxv (gg 6)	Μωσείως ε	(Moysis) quinque	Μωσείως πέντε Γένεσις 'Εξοδος Λευιτικόν 'Αρθεμοὶ Δευτερονόμιον
(gg 12)	βιβλος ψαλμῶν	codex psalmorum	ψαλμοὶ
(gg 14)	Σολομώντος βιβλία ε	Solomonis libri quinque	Σολομώντος βιβλία τρία Παροιμίαι Ἑκ- κλησιαστής Ἀίσμα σμάτων

If this list were extended to include the cases where Turrianus or Funk has adopted a reading on the sole authority of this Vatican MS, it would be still more impressive, because such readings are generally striking ones

I cannot doubt that Vat gr. 1506 is not only the best individual witness to the text of the *Constitutions* and *Canons*, but that where supported by the Verona fragment it is very rarely wrong. For the text of the greater part of the Apostolic Canons we have now for the first time indubitable testimony to an edition which is both very early and very good. Even those elements of the joint tradition which are not original are likely at least to be very interesting. The remainder of this paper will be devoted to the consideration of two features common to both Vat gr 1506 and Verona LI which appear to reflect the work of an editor, though of an editor who worked by addition to the original text rather than by modification of it.

1. Between fol 151 b and fol 152 a of the Verona MS a leaf must have been lost, for the previous leaf (151) has barely reached the end of canon xlvii, while the next leaf (152) commences in the middle of canon lii. Now as long as I was working on the printed texts of the Greek Canons, a serious difficulty here stood in the way: the amount of matter intervening between the end of canon xlvii and the middle of canon lii was not enough, or nearly enough, to fill a leaf of two pages. It was only when I made the acquaintance of Vat. gr 1506 that I solved the difficulty. At the end of canon i after the words βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος there is added a long dogmatic statement in the following terms:

Διδασκέσθω μέντοι ὁ βαπτιζόμενος ὅτι πατήρ οἶκ ἐσταυρώθη οὔτε γέννησιν ὑπέμεινεν ἀνθρώπου οὔτε δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἀνθρώπος ἐγένετο, ἀλλ' οὔτε τὸ πάθος ὑπέστη, οὐ γὰρ ἐσαρκώθη ἐλυτρώσατο δὲ τὸν κόσμον τῆς ἐπικειμένης ὀργῆς ὁ μονογενὴς υἱὸς ἐνηνθρώπησε γὰρ φιланθρωπίᾳ, ἐαυτῷ σῶμα ἐκ παρθένου ἀναπλάσας (ἡ γὰρ σοφία ὠκοδομήσεν ἐαυτὴν οἶκον ὡς δημιουργός), 5 σταυρὸν δὲ ὑπέμεινεν ἑκὼν, ἐξείλατο δὲ τὸν κόσμον τῆς ἐπικειμένης ὀργῆς βαπτιζόμεθα οὖν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς, οὐχ ὡς ἀνθρώπου γεομένου ἢ παθόντος, εἰς δὲ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ γιου, ὡς ὑποστάτως γέννησιν, ὡς ὑπομεινάντος σταυρὸν, ὡς ἀποθανόντος καὶ ἀναστάντος εἰς τὸ ὄνομα δὲ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, ὡς ὁμοουσίου πατρὶ καὶ ἰσῷ οἱ δὲ μὴ οὕτω βαπτίζοντες, ὡς ἀγνοοῦντες τὸ ἱο μυστήριον τῆς εἰσεβείας, καθαιρείσθωσαν

Ὁ τὸν πατέρα πεπονθέναι λέγων ἀσεβεῖ Ἰουδαῖον βαρύτερα, μετὰ Χριστοῦ καὶ τὸν πατέρα προσελθὼν ὁ δὲ τὸν υἱὸν ἀρνοῦμενος τὸν μονογενῆ δι' ἡμᾶς σαρκωθῆναι καὶ σταυρὸν ὑπομεμενηκέναι, θεομάχος ἐστὶ καὶ τῶν ἁγίων πολέμιος ὁ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον πατέρα ὀνομάζων ἢ υἱὸν ἀνεπιστήμων 15 ἐστὶ καὶ ἀνόητος. ὁ γὰρ υἱὸς συνδημιουργὸς τῷ πατρὶ καὶ σύνθρονος καὶ συννομοθέτης καὶ κριτῆς καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως αἴτιος καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ὁμοουσίου θεότητι ἐφ' ἡμῶν γὰρ Σίμων ὁ μάγος ἐξηρεύετο σπάσας τῷ λαῷ πλάνον καὶ ἄστατον καὶ πονηρὸν εἰς ἐαυτὸν τὸ πνεῦμα, καὶ ἓνα τριώνυμον εἶνα φλυνάριστας τὸν θεόν, ποτὲ δὲ καὶ τὸ πάθος τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τὴν γέννησιν 20 περικόψας

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

3, 6 Cf 1 Thess. i 10 5 Prov ix 1 7-9 Matt xxviii 19 8 Heb xii 2 9 1 Thess iv 14 10 Rom xi 25, 1 Tim iii 16

10 ὁμοουσίου ὁμοουσίου Vat 12 ἀσεβεῖ Ἰουδαῖον ἀσεβῆ Ἰουδαῖον Vat 18 σπάσας τῷ λαῷ πλάνον Vat σπάσας τὸ ἅλalon πλάνον Joannes Scholasticus, ed Justel (cf Mark ix 25), perhaps σπάσας τὸ λαοπλάνον Turner

This long statement has nothing in common with the character of the Apostolic Canons, which for the rest are what their name suggests, Canons and not doctrinal definitions. Nor can we attribute to the compiler of the *Constitutions* and *Canons* the authorship of any dogmatic passage so definitely orthodox as this—witness the use of the term ὁμοουσῖος in relation to the Holy Spirit, lines 10, 18. Neither, on the other hand, is it possible that the lost leaf of the Verona fragment can have contained (besides the four Canons missing, which must have occupied more than a page) an addition anything like as long as that printed above.

As it stands, then, the insertion of the Vatican MS cannot be original. Yet neither can it be other than old, seeing that it appears also in both the Syriac versions cited by Funk, and in the 'systematic' collection published about the middle of the sixth century by John Scholasticus of Antioch, where it constitutes the greater part of 'canon 50 of the holy Apostles' and the whole of 'canon 51 of the same'. Since the

insertion is headed in the Vatican MS *τίτλου λς'*, and since it is actually in the 36th chapter of John's collection that the corresponding matter is found, it is possible that the Vatican MS may be depending ultimately upon John

John, however, was certainly not himself the author of the passage. He found it in his copy of the Canons, and incorporated it in his Collection as such. And the Verona fragment, though it cannot have contained all that the Syriac versions and John and the Vatican MS unite in presenting, must have contained something more than the ordinary texts: if I calculate rightly, there was room in the Latin MS for half or almost half of the extra material of the Greek.<sup>1</sup> Probably therefore the Latin MS, if we had it complete, would be found to give the nucleus of the insertion, to represent it, in fact, in its first stage. In that form it is even conceivable, though perhaps not probable, that it may have gone back to the compiler of the *Constitutions* and *Canons* himself.<sup>2</sup>

2 A somewhat similar relation exists between the Verona Latin and the Vatican Greek in regard to the matter appended after the last of the Canons. In the Verona MS, after the list of Canonical books (canon 85) and the doxology which follows it and concludes the whole work, there are still left three pages: but they are so badly preserved that it was impossible to decipher them as a whole, and all that could be said with confidence was that the last page of all consisted of some summary statement upon the origin of the Four Gospels. Here again it was the Vatican MS which put into my hands the key that solved the problem: for the greater part of the last three leaves in that MS consist of various appendices, and careful comparison soon shewed that foll 78 a b contained the Greek original of the matter that had been transcribed at the end of the Verona MS. Even in this common matter, however, the Vatican Greek represents a later stage of develop-

<sup>1</sup> A page of the Latin of the Verona MS corresponds to from 30 to 36 lines of the Greek of the Vatican MS, and a leaf therefore to from 60 to 72 lines. The ordinary text of the Canons that were contained on the missing leaf amounts to some 41 lines of the Vatican MS: as the insertion we are considering extends to 57 lines of the same MS, it is clear that not more than about half of this (20 to 30 lines) can have been represented in the Verona Latin.

<sup>2</sup> Chr. Justel, the editor of John Scholasticus's collection of Canons, points out the resemblance between the inserted passages and the *Epistle to the Philippians* of pseudo-Ignatius: compare in § 2 of the *Epistle* the emphasis on the distinction of Father, Son and Holy Spirit, and note the phrases *ἐνα τριώνυμον* (Lightfoot, ii 774. 14), *ἡ γὰρ σοφία ὑποδόμησεν ἑαυτὴν ὀκτὼ* (ib. 775. 18), *ἀρνείσθαι τὸν σταυρὸν, τὸ παθὼν ἐπαισχυνέσθαι* (775. 9), *περικύπτει τὴν γεννησιν* (777. 21). If the Verona MS did represent an original nucleus of the inserted passages as we know them, it is at least quite possible that that original nucleus did go back to the circle which produced the Apostolic Constitutions and the Pseudo-Ignatian letters. Much of the phraseology is undoubtedly similar.

ment than the Verona Latin, it will be noted that with regard to the apostles James the son of Zebedee, Philip, James the son of Alphaeus, Thaddaeus, and Paul, the place of burial, and with regard to Bartholomew the manner of his martyrdom, is given in the Greek but with nothing to correspond in the Latin. Dr Spagnolo has even now not been able to decipher more than fragments of the three pages, so deplorable is their state of preservation, but quite enough is preserved to restore the contents, although not the exact wording, for all but the upper half of the second page, and so I have felt justified in excluding from the Greek text (while recording in the apparatus) clauses that are clearly absent from the Latin.

The Latin in fact presents what is apparently the most primitive form known of the lists of apostles and other early preachers of the Gospel of which so many different specimens are known under the name of Hippolytus or Dorotheus or Epiphanius as authors. A large number of these lists are printed in the very useful collection of Theodor Schermann *Prophetarum vitae fabulosae, indices apostolorum discipulorumque Domini, Dorotheo Epiphanio Hippolyto alisque vindicata* (Teubner Series, 1907) but none of Schermann's Greek MSS go back behind the tenth or eleventh century, and though some of his Latin authorities are earlier, the oldest of them are not only two centuries later than our Verona fragment but quite obviously are either not translated from the Greek at all or, if they are, deviate much further from the Greek originals. The Verona fragment—or, to put it otherwise, the Greek text of the Vatican MS after abstraction is made of the clauses not represented in the Latin—gives us in fact for the list of the thirteen apostles the primitive text which lies behind both the Epiphanian and the Hippolytean form (Schermann, pp 107–115, 164–167)<sup>1</sup> If the text printed below be assumed as the original, it becomes at once easy to explain the divergences of 'Epiphanius' and 'Hippolytus' in one or other direction—so easy indeed that it seems rather strange that the editor had not thought of conjecturally restoring the original by simply isolating the common nucleus of the two forms of text from the parts which are peculiar to only one of them. The result would not perhaps have exactly corresponded to the document I am here printing but it would have been in some cases singularly near to it, as the two examples I proceed to cite will be enough to shew<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The Dorothean form (pp 153–157) is further removed from the original yet even that contains some reminiscences of it which do not seem contained in either Epiphanius or Hippolytus. Why Schermann cites our Vatican MS as one of the authorities for the Hippolytean form I am quite unable to say.

<sup>2</sup> If Schermann had constructed his Epiphanian text with less regard to his MSS A and B, and more regard to his CDEF, the resemblances would have been still closer.

## Ps-Epiphanius

α Σίμων Πέτρος ὁ τῶν ἀποστόλων κορυφαῖος, ὡς διὰ τῶν ἐπιστολῶν αὐτοῦ φαίνεται δηλῶν, ἐν Πόντῳ καὶ Γαλατίᾳ καὶ Καππαδοκίᾳ καὶ Βιθυνίᾳ καὶ ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ<sup>1</sup> ἐκήρυξε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰ Χ ὕστερον δὲ ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἐπὶ Νέρωνος βασιλείῳ σταυροῦται κατὰ κεφαλῆς, αὐτοῦ οὕτως παθεῖν ἀξιώσαντος θάπτεται δὲ ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ Ῥώμῃ πρὸ τριῶν καλανδῶν Ἰουλίῳ ὁ ἐστὶν Ἐπιφῆι εἶ

ιγ Παῦλος δὲ ὁ ἀπόστολος μετὰ τὴν εἰς οὐρανοὺς τοῦ κυρίου ἀνάληψιν ἤρξατο κηρύσσειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ κυρίου ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων προῆλθεν ἕως τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ καὶ τῆς Ἰταλίας καὶ Ἰσπανίας, οὗ καὶ ἐπιστολαὶ μετὰ σοφίας παρ' ἡμῖν φέρονται ἐπὶ δὲ Νέρωνος υἱοῦ Κλαυδίου βασιλείῳ ἐν πόλει Ῥώμῃ τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀπετμήθη ἐμαρτύρησεν Ἐπιφῆι εἶ, πρὸ γ' καλανδῶν Ἰουλίῳ καὶ ἐκεῖ ἐτάφη πλησίον τοῦ ἁγίου ἀποστόλου Πέτρου, ἐκεῖ εἰσιν ἕως σήμερον ἐν Χριστῷ

As a specimen of the result of adopting an alternative text given in a secondary position by Schermann (p 113), I add the notice of the apostle Simon

## Ps-Epiphanius

13 Σίμων ὁ Καναναῖος ὁ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ, ὁ καὶ Ἰούδας, μετὰ Ἰάκωβον τὸν δίκαιον ἐπίσκοπος γέγονεν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις καὶ ζήσας ρκ' ἔτη σταυρῷ παραδουθεὶς ἐμαρτύρησεν ἐπὶ Τραιανοῦ βασιλεως

## Ps-Hippolytus

α Πέτρος μεν ἐν Πόντῳ καὶ Γαλατίᾳ καὶ Καππαδοκίᾳ καὶ Βιθυνίᾳ καὶ Ἰταλίᾳ καὶ Ἀσίᾳ κηρύξας τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὕστερον ἐπὶ Νέρωνος ἐν Ῥώμῃ σταυροῦται κατὰ κεφαλῆς οὕτως αὐτοῦ ἀξιώσαντος παθεῖν

ιγ Παῦλος δὲ μετ' ἐνιαυτὸν εἰα τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀναλήψεως εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν ἀποστολὴν καὶ ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ προῆλθεν ἕως τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ καὶ Ἰταλίας καὶ Σπανίας κηρύσσειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἔτη λέ' ἐπὶ δὲ Νέρωνος ἐν Ῥώμῃ τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποτμηθεὶς θάπτεται ἐκεῖ

## Ps-Hippolytus

13 Σίμων ὁ Κανανίτης ὁ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ, ὁ καὶ Ἰούδας, μετὰ Ἰάκωβον τὸν δίκαιον ἐπίσκοπος γενομένης Ἱεροσολύμων ἐκοιμήθη καὶ θάπτεται ἐκεῖ, ζήσας ἔτη ρκ'

It seems then sufficiently well established on a comparative treatment of the texts that we have in the document now published for the first time a more primitive form than any yet known of the 'Places of the

<sup>1</sup> I omit here words bracketed by Schermann



preaching and death of the twelve apostles' Possibly the original appendix stopped here, for as the Apostolic Constitutions and Canons purport to have been delivered to the bishops by the Twelve with St Paul, it is exactly a notice concerned with their lives and deaths which might serve as a fitting close to the whole work. But so far as the evidence of our document takes us, there is no reason for separating from the notice of the Apostles the notices that follow with regard to the other 'Apostolic' men, or indeed these again from the notice about the Four Gospels. Is there such reason to be found on comparison with the related texts?

For the former of these sections parallels appear to be wanting in both Pseudo-Dorotheus and Pseudo-Hippolytus on the other hand most of the MSS of Pseudo-Epiphanius—not including the one on which Schermann has founded his text—give a text of the 'apostolici' (Schermann, p. 127), which stands in exactly the same relation of expansion to the document now printed as I have shewn above to exist in the notice of the twelve apostles. But with regard to the notice of the Gospels the matter stands quite differently: it is found in no 'Epiphanian' MS at all, and is taken by Schermann (p. 129, lines 6–17) solely from our Vatican MS (gr. 1506) and one other Vatican MS (Vat. 1974, saec. xii–xiii), the latter being of the 'Dorothean' type. As Vat. 1974 is later than Vat. 1506, this piece may actually have been derived by the later MS from the earlier. Speaking generally, it may be said that the notice of the Gospels is peculiar to our document and preserved only in its Greek and Latin representatives.

Comparison of texts, then, does suggest somewhat clearly a separate origin for the third section in our document, the passage about the Gospels: but it does not suggest, or at any rate does not suggest at all definitely, that any break ought to be made between the section on the Apostles and the section on the Apostolici. And this conclusion is rather curiously borne out by the remaining line of investigation on which a word must now be said, namely the sources exploited in our document. For whereas the evidence for the employment of the *Church History* of Eusebius as a source amounts, in the case of the first two sections, almost to demonstration, no point of contact can, it would seem, be established between the *Church History* and the section on the Gospels.

Thus *H. E.* 1.12 contains some notes about the Seventy, with names of Barnabas, Sosthenes, Cephas, Matthias (Barsabas), and Thaddaeus, and with reference, in the case of Cephas the *δμώνυμος Πέτρω*, to the fifth book of Clement's *Hypotyposes*. 1.13 relates the mission of Thaddaeus, one of the Seventy, to Edessa and the Abgar, and will account for the notice of Thaddaeus the Apostle, just as the words used of

Matthias in the preceding chapter of the *History*, καὶ Μαθίαν δὲ τὸν ἀντὶ Ἰούδα τοῖς ἀποστόλοις συγκαταλεγέντα . τῆς αἰτῆς τῶν οὐ κλήσεως, account for the notice of Matthias among the apostles In 11 1 we hear of the Ethiopian eunuch returning to his own country as a preacher of the Gospel under the phrase κατέχει λόγος. In 11 1 we have Thomas connected with Parthia, Andrew with Scythia, John with Asia, Peter with Pontus and the other provinces of Asia Minor, Paul with Jerusalem, Illyricum, and Rome In 11 2 to the name Linus is subjoined the note that 'Paul mentions him in writing to Timothy' in 11 4 the Γαλατία of 2 Tim iv 10, to which Crescens departed, is interpreted, as in our document, to mean Gaul Of Symeon son of Clopas as successor to James the Just we hear in *HE* 11 11 (iv 22), and of his martyrdom under Trajan at the age of 120 in 11 32

The passage about the Gospels has difficulties of its own, not easy of solution But for the rest our document is more largely indebted to Eusebius than to any other source I do not see any reason why it should be much later in date than the Constitutions and Canons to which it is not inappropriately appended

[Vat. gr 1506 fol 78a]

περι τῶν 18' ἀποστόλων ἐν  
ποιοῖς τοποῖς ἐκνήρξαν καὶ ἐν  
ποιοῖς ἐτελειώθησαν

- Α Σίμων Πέτρος Πόντῳ Γαλατία  
Καππαδοκία Βιθυνία Ἀσία  
κηρύξας τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἐπὶ  
Νέρωνος σταυροῦται  
Β Ἀνδρέας Σκύθαις Ὀγδοανοῖς  
καὶ Σάκαις  
Γ Ἰάκωβος ὁ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου ὑπὸ  
Ἡρώδου τοῦ τετράρχου ἀναι  
ρεῖται μαχαίρᾳ.  
Δ Ἰωάννης ἐν Ἀσίᾳ ἐξορισθεὶς  
ἐν Πάτμῳ διὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦ  
Κυρίου συνέγραψε τὸ εὐαγ  
γέλιον  
Ε Φίλιππος ἐν Φρυγίᾳ σταυροῦται  
κατακέφαλα  
Σ Βαρθολομαῖος Ἰνδοῖς, ὅς καὶ  
τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον εὐαγγέλιον  
αὐτοῖς δέδωκεν  
Ζ Θωμᾶς Πάρθοις Μήδοις Καρ  
μανοῖς Ὑρκανοῖς Βάκτροις  
Μάργοις  
Η' Ματθαῖος τὸ εὐαγγέλιον  
Ἑβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ συγγράψας  
ἐκδεδώκεν ἐν Σιών  
Θ Ἰάκωβος Ἀλφαίου ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς  
Δίκαιος λίθους ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων  
ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἀναιρεῖται  
Ι Θαδδαῖος ὁ καὶ Λεβββαῖος καὶ  
Ἰούδας Ἑδεσηνοῖς καὶ πύσῃ  
Μεσοποταμίᾳ ἐπὶ Ἀβγάρου  
βασιλέως Ἑδεσηνῶν τελευτᾷ

Γ μαχαίρᾳ] + ἐκοιμήθη δὲ ἐν Ἀκείμ  
τῆς Μαρμαρικής cod Ε κατα  
κέφαλα] + τέθαπται ἐν Ἱερσπόλει τῆς  
Ἀσίας cod Σ' δέδωκεν] + πρὸ τῆς  
σφαγῆς ἐκδαρθεὶς ὥσπερ θηλαξ καὶ  
ἐπειτα παρατομήθεῖς ὡς ὁ Παῦλος cod  
Η ἐκδεδώκεν] δέδωκεν cod Η  
ἀναιρεῖται] + καὶ ἐκεῖ θάπτεται παρ  
τῷ ναῷ cod Ι τελευτᾷ] + θάπτεται  
δὲ ἐν Βυρπῷ cod

Verona LI (49)

fol 156 b

*De xii apostolis in quibus locis  
predicauerunt et consummati sunt*  
Simon petrus ponto galatia cap  
docia bytinia [asia] praedicans aeu  
gelium praesente Nerone cruci fi  
gitur Andreas scythis ogdoanis  
et sacis Iacobus Zebedei ab Hero  
de tetrarca gladio occiditur  
Iohannis in asia deportatus  
in patmos propter uerbum dni  
conscript aeuangelium Fi  
lippus in frigia cruci figitur  
capite prono Bartholomeus in  
dis qui secundum Mattheum  
aeuangelium ipsis dedit Tho  
mas partis medis germa  
nis hyrcanis bactris margis  
Mattheus aeuangelium hebrai  
ce conscripsit et aedidit in sio  
Iacobus Alpei cognomine ius  
tus lapidibus a iudeis in hie  
rosolymis occiditur Thaddeus qui  
et Lebbeus et desenis et omni  
mesopotamiae mortuus est  
sub Abgaro rege et desenorum

Dr Spagnolo could only decipher the words or letters printed in roman type, the rest I supply by translation from the Greek, or so much of it as would correspond to the spaces undeciphered in the Latin

4 Asia I have placed this word in brackets, as (1) the line is over long, (2) 'Asia' is in its wrong place—it should of course precede 'Bytinia', (3) as 'Asia' is allotted to St John line 9 *infra* there was good ground for not assigning it also to St Peter 16 The line is too short but I do not see how to fill it out

[Vat gr 1506 fol 78 a]

Verona LI (49)

fol 157 a

- 1<sup>a</sup> Σίμων ὁ Κανανίτης ὁ τοῦ  
Κλεότα ὁ καὶ Ἰούδας μετὰ  
Ἰάκωβον τὸν δίκαιον ἐπίσκοπος  
γενομένος Ἱεροσολύμων ζήσας  
ἔτη ρκ' σταυρῶ ἐμαρτύρησεν  
ἐπὶ Τραιανοῦ.
- 18 Ματθίας εἰς ὧν τῶν ὁ μαθητῶν  
συγκαταριθμεῖται τοῖς ἑνδεκα  
ἀποστόλοις ἀντὶ Ἰούδα τοῦ  
Ἰσκαριώτου
- 15 Παῦλος ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἀρξά-  
μενος κηρύσσειν προῆλθεν  
ἕως τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ καὶ Ἰταλίας  
καὶ Ἰσπανίας ἐπὶ δὲ Νέρωνος  
ἐν Ῥώμῃ τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀπε-  
τμήθη  
Τίτος Κρήταις καὶ ταῖς πέριξ  
νήσοις Κρίσκης ἐν Γαλλίᾳ  
ὁ εὐνοῖχος Κανδάκης βασιλίσ-  
σης Αἰθιοπῶν ἐν Ἀραβίᾳ τῇ  
5 Εἰδαίμονι καὶ ἐν Ταπροβάνῃ  
νήσῳ τῇ ἐν τῇ Ἐρυθρᾷ, λόγος  
δὲ ἔχει ὡς καὶ μεμαρτυρηκέναι  
αὐτὸν ἐκεῖ  
Ἐκ τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ  
10 Σωτῆρος τῶν ὁ γεγόνασιν (ὡς  
ἱστορεῖ Κλήμης ἐν πέμπτῃ  
τῶν Ὑποτιπώσεων) Βαρνάβας,  
Σωσθένης, Κηφᾶς ὁ μώνυμος  
Πέτρῳ, Ματθίας ὁ συγκατα-  
15 αριθμηθεὶς τοῖς ἑνδεκα, Βαρ-  
σαβᾶς καὶ Λίνος
- 17 ἀπετμήθη] + καὶ βαπτίζεται ἐν  
αὐτῇ cod  
5 Ταπροβανῇ τῇ Προβανῇ cod  
15 ἑνδεκα] + Εὐβουλος Πανύδης Κρίσκης  
ἐν τῇ β cod, sc 2 Tim 1v 10 21
- Simon Cananeus filius Cleopa  
qui et Iudas post Iacobum ius-  
tum episcopus factus hieroso-  
lymorum iuxta annos cxx et  
cruci fixus est sub Traiano  
Matthias ex lxx discipulis con-  
numeratur undecim apostolis  
pro Iuda Iscariota Paulus ab  
hierusalem incipiens praedi-  
care usque illyrium est pro-  
uectus et italiam et spaniam, ro-  
mae uero praesente Nerone ca-  
put c est Titus cretis  
et quae sunt circum insulae  
Crescens gallia eunuchus Can-  
daces reginae ethiopum arabia  
felici et taprobana insula  
quae in mare rubro est, et sermo  
tradit quod martyr ibi fuerit  
Ex lxx apostolis Saluatoris  
facti sunt ut refert Clemens  
in quinto Informationu-  
Barnabas Sostenus Cephas cog-  
nomine Petri Matthias connu-  
meratus undecim Barsabas et  
Linus*

5

10

15

20

25

[Vat gr 1506 fol 78 b]  
 (οὗ μέμνηται Παῦλος Τιμοθέῳ  
 γράφων), Θαδδαῖος, Κλεόπας  
 καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ  
 τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον εὐαγγέλιον  
 Ἑβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ γραφέν ὑπ'  
 αὐτοῦ ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐξεδόθη,  
 ἐρμηνεύθη δὲ ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου τὸ  
 κατὰ Μάρκον εὐαγγέλιον ὑπὸ  
 Πέτρου ἐρμηνεύθη ἐν Ῥώμῃ  
 τὸ κατὰ Ἰωάννην ἐν τοῖς χρό-  
 νοῖς Τραϊανοῦ ὑπηγορεύθη ὑπὸ  
 Ἰωάννου αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ Κομοδου  
 ἐν Πάτμῳ τῇ νήσῳ ἐγράφη  
 τὸ δὲ κατὰ Λουκᾶν ὑπὸ Λουκᾶ  
 μαθητοῦ ὑπάρχοντος τοῦ ἀπο-  
 στόλου Παύλου, οὗ μνημονεύων  
 ὁ αὐτὸς ἀπόστολος ἐν τινὶ ἐπι-  
 στολῇ γράφει Ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς  
 Λουκᾶς ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἱατρός καὶ  
 τὰς Πράξεις δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς εὐ-  
 αγγελιστὴς τῶν [ἀγίων] ἀπο-  
 στόλων συνεγράψατο

Verona LI (49)

fol. 157 b

(*curus mentionem facit Paulus*  
*Timotheo scribens*), *Thaddeus, Cleo*  
*pas et qui sunt cum eo secundum*  
*Mattheum aeuangelium hebraea*  
*lingua conscriptum ab ipso in Ie* 5  
*rusalem aeditum est et trans*  
*latum est ab Iohanne secundum*  
*Marcum aeuangelium a Petro*  
*dictatum est Romae secundum*  
*Iohannem temporibus Traiani* 10  
*dictatum est ab ipso Iohanne sub*  
*Commodo scriptum in Patmo, quod*  
*autem a Luca, discipulo constitu*  
*to apostoli Pauli, curus mentione-*  
*faciens ipse apostolus quadam* 13  
*epistula scribit SALVTAT VOS LVCAΣ*  
*MEDICVS DILECTVS et Actius uero*  
*ipse aeuangelista conscripsit*  
*apostolorum amen*

**Expheuerunt canones**

**apostolorum missi ad**

**Clementem in quibus sunt  
 canones Nicenorum**

15

9 ἐρμηνεύθη *cod.* read ὑπηγορεύθη  
 as in l 11; the Latin has 'dictatum'  
 in both places. 21 ἀγίων *cod*  
 but the Latin shews that it is an  
 interpolation.

1. 2 Tim. iv 21 16. Col. iv 14

12 quod autem a Luca *cod* read with  
 the Greek 'quod autem secundum Lucam  
 a Luca' 18 aeuangesta *cod*

C. H. TURNER.