

PROLEGOMENA TO A STUDY OF THE DOMINICAL
LOGOI AS CITED IN THE *DIDASCALIA APOSTOLORUM*
PART II: METHODOLOGICAL QUESTIONS (CONT.)*

JAMES J. C. COX

Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan

Having described the methodologies which, so it seems to me, are necessary for an adequate and responsible "determination" and "evaluation" of the dominical *logoi* as cited in the original text of the Greek *Didascalia Apostolorum*,¹ I now attempt to demonstrate both the adequacy and the validity of those methodologies by applying them (1) to an extra-canonical dominical *logos* and (2) to a canonical dominical *logos* as each occurs in the extant versions of the *Didascalia*. The former is treated herein. The latter will be dealt with in the next article in this series.

At *Didasc.* 2.36.9, the Didascalist cites the extra-canonical dominical *logos* "Be approved money-changers,"² a *logos* which, although not cited in the canonical Gospels, is cited extensively in the Patristic writings (so, for example, Clement of Alexandria,

*Abbreviations employed in this article, which are not spelled out on the back cover of this journal, indicate the following series: *CBM* = *Chester Beatty Monographs*; *CSEL* = *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum*; *GCS* = *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte*; *PS* = *Patrologia syriaca*.

¹ See my article "Prolegomena to a Study of the Dominical *Logoi* as cited in the *Didascalia Apostolorum*, Part II: Methodological Questions," *AUSS* 15 (1977): 1-15.

² In both the Syriac *Didascalia* and the Greek *Constitutiones Apostolorum*, the citation is introduced with the formula *mtl dlhwn 'myr* ("for to them it is said") (Lagarde, *Didascalia Apostolorum*, p. 42.29) = καὶ πάλιν [*sc. εἶρηται αὐτοῖς*] ("and again [to them it is said]") (Funk, *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum*, 1:123.17), which formula, in both witnesses, is essentially equal to *mtl d'mr mry' lhw'n* = ὅτι λέγει κύριος αὐτοῖς ("for to them the Lord says").

Stromata, 1.28, 177.2;³ Origen, *In Johannem*, 19.7;⁴ Dionysius of Rome, *apud* Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica*, 7.7.3;⁵ Pseudo-Clement, *Homiliae*, 2.51.1; 3.50.2; 18.20.4;⁶ Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catecheses*, 1.6.36;⁷ Apelles, *apud* Epiphanius, *Adversus haereses*, 44.2.6;⁸ Socrates, *Historia ecclesiastica*, 3.16;⁹ Cyril of Alexandria, *In Joannis evangelium*, 4.5.407a;¹⁰ *Adversus Nestorium*, 1.2c;¹¹ and John of Damascus, *De fide orthodoxa*, 4.17).¹²

This citation is extant in the Syriac *Didascalia* (Lagarde, *Didascalia Apostolorum*, p. 42.29),¹³ and in the Greek *Constitutiones Apostolorum* (Funk, *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum*, 1:123.17f.).¹⁴ Concerning it several preliminary matters should be noted:

1. In both witnesses (the Syriac *Didascalia*, and the Greek *Constitutiones Apostolorum*), it occurs in essentially the same context: The "laymen" are not to judge. To them "it is said," "Judge not, that you be not judged" (cf. Mt 7.1 = Lk 6.37a). That

³ O. Stählin and L. Früchtel, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, II: *Stromata* 1-6, GCS 52⁸ (Berlin, 1960): 109.12ff.

⁴ E. Preuschen, *Origenes*, *Werke*, IV: *Der Johanneskommentar*, GCS 10 (Leipzig, 1903): 4.307.5.

⁵ E. Schwartz, *Eusebius*, *Werke*, II: *Kirchengeschichte*, GCS 9.1 (Leipzig, 1903): 274.21.

⁶ B. Rehm and F. Paschke, *Die Pseudoklementinen*, I: *Homilien*, GCS 42² (Berlin, 1969): 55.11f.; 75.19f.; 250.12f.

⁷ W. C. Reischl and J. Rupp, *Cyrolli Hierosolymarum*, *Opera omnia*, 1 (Munich, 1848 [reprint, 1967]): 206.13.

⁸ K. Holl, *Epiphanius*, *Werke*, I-III: *Ancoratus und Panarion*, GCS 31 (Leipzig, 1922): 2.192.16f.

⁹ Migne, *PG* 67: 421.30ff.

¹⁰ P. E. Pusey, *Cyrolli Alexandrini: Opera*, 3 (Oxford, 1872 [reprint, 1965]): 596.2f.

¹¹ Pusey, *Cyrolli Alexandrini: Opera*, 6: 55.26ff.

¹² Migne, *PG* 94: 1177.19f.

¹³ There is no Latin parallel because of a rather considerable lacuna in codex *Veronensis*. See Hauler, *Didascaliae Apostolorum*, p. 41; Tidner, *Didascaliae Apostolorum*, p. 46; and Connolly, *Didascalia Apostolorum*, pp. 99-121.

¹⁴ There is no real parallel in either the Arabic or Ethiopic *Constitutiones Apostolorum*. The Ethiopic texts have the following paraphrases: (i) "Be of understanding, and give judgment to every man with discernment" (so Ms P, see Platt, *Ethiopic Didascalia*, p. 73.3f. [text] and p. 73.1f. [translation]);

is the prerogative of the “bishops.” To them “it is said,” “Be approved money-changers” (Lagarde, *Didascalica Apostolorum*, p. 42.25ff.; Funk, *Didascalica et Constitutiones Apostolorum*, 1:123.14ff.).

2. In both witnesses, it is introduced with essentially the same *citation formula*, namely, *mṯl dlhwn’myr* (“for to them it is said”) (Lagarde, *Didascalica Apostolorum*, p. 42.29) = καὶ πάλιν [*sc. εἶρηται αὐτοῖς*] (“and again [to them it is said]”) (Funk, *Didascalica et Constitutiones Apostolorum*, 1:123.17).

3. In both witnesses, it is cited in essentially the same *form*: imperative + noun + adjective (Lagarde, *Didascalica Apostolorum*, p. 42.29; Funk, *Didascalica et Constitutiones Apostolorum*, 1:123.17f.).

4. In both witnesses, it consists of essentially the same *content*: “Be approved money-changers” (Lagarde, *Didascalica Apostolorum*, p. 42.29; Funk, *Didascalica et Constitutiones Apostolorum*, 1:123.17f.).¹⁵

5. And finally, in both witnesses, it fulfills the same *function*, namely, to support the contention that it is the prerogative of the “bishop” alone to “judge.” See the first item above.

It is clear, from the foregoing, that any attempt to “determine” the *form* (in the less technical sense of the term) and the *content*

and (ii) “Be of understanding and judge the great of the people, each one of them” (so Ms A; see Harden, *Ethiopic Didascalica*, p. 57.25f.).

¹⁵ The Syriac term rendered “money-changers” means, literally, those who “separate,” “discriminate,” “judge,” etc. The translation given here is inferred from (a) the context (immediately following the citation, the Didascalist continues *mtb’ lh hkyl l’pysqw’ ’yk bhwr’ dksp’ dnhw’ mprš’ byš’ mn tḅ’* [“it is necessary for the bishop, therefore, as one who evaluates money, that he separate the bad from the good”] [Lagarde, *Didascalica Apostolorum*, p. 42.29ff.]); (b) the parallel in the Greek *Constitutiones Apostolorum* (γίνεσθε τραπεζίται δόκιμοι [“Be approved money-changers”] [Funk, *Didascalica et Constitutiones Apostolorum*, 1:123.17f.]); and (c) the parallels cited in the Patristic literature (for example, Clement of Alexandria [1/1] [*Stromata*, 1.28, 177.2 (Stählin and Früchtel, GCS 52ⁿ: 109.12ff.)]; Pseudo-Clement [3/3] [*Homiliae*, 2.51.1; 3.50.2; 18.20.4 (Rehm and Paschke, GCS 42ⁿ: 55.11f; 75.19f.; 250.12f.)]; Socrates [1/1] *Historia ecclesiastica*, 3.16 (Migne, PG 67: 421.30ff.); etc.). See also Connolly, *Didascalica Apostolorum*, p. 101, n. 6.

of this citation, as it was cited in the original text of the Greek *Didascalia*, must take into consideration both the text of the Syriac *Didascalia* and that of the Greek *Constitutiones Apostolorum*.

A. THE VERSIONS

Didasc. 2.36.9

(a)	(b)	(c)
<i>Didasc. Syr.</i> ¹⁶ (Lagarde, 42.29)	<i>Constit. Apost.</i> ¹⁷ (Funk, 1:123.17f.)	<i>Didasc. Grk.</i> (Reconstruction)
<i>hww</i>	γίνεσθε	γίνεσθε
<i>mḫršn'</i>	τραπεζῖται	τραπεζῖται
<i>bhyr'</i>	δόκιμοι	δόκιμοι
(d)	(e)	(f)
Clem. Alex., <i>Strom.</i> 1.28, 177.2 (Stählin & Früchtel, <i>GCS</i> 52 ³ : 109.12ff.)	Ps-Clem., <i>Hom.</i> 2.51.1 ¹⁸ (Rehm & Paschke, <i>GCS</i> 42 ² : 55.11f.)	Socrates, <i>H.E.</i> 3.16 ¹⁹ (Migne, <i>PG</i> 67: 421.30ff.)
γίνεσθε	γίνεσθε	γίνεσθε
δόκιμοι		
τραπεζῖται	τραπεζῖται	τραπεζῖται
	δόκιμοι	δόκιμοι

B. THE ORIGINAL GREEK FORM

The questions which must be asked at this juncture have to do with the value of the versions (the Syriac version of the *Didascalia*, and the Greek version of the *Constitutiones Apostolorum*) for the determination of the original Greek form.

On the one hand, do the versions represent *ad hoc* translations of their respective Greek exemplars? If they do, they are obviously of real value for our purposes. On the other hand, are they

¹⁶ As noted above, there is no Latin parallel because of a lacuna in codex *Veronensis*. See n. 13, above.

¹⁷ As noted above, there is no real parallel in either the Arabic or Ethiopic *Constitutiones Apostolorum*. See n. 14, above.

¹⁸ This *logos* is cited three times in the Clementine *Homiliae* in precisely the same form: *Homiliae*, 2.51.1; 3.50.2; 18.20.4 (See Rehm and Paschke, *GCS* 42²: 55.11f; 75.19f; 250.12f. respectively).

¹⁹ These citations from Clement of Alexandria, Pseudo-Clement, and Socrates are given as representative of the many citations of the *logos*.

“dubbed in” equivalents of those Greek exemplars drawn on contemporary Gospel traditions? Or, further, are they constructions contrived by the authors of the versions to suit their respective contexts? If either of these, they are patently of little value for our purposes.

Furthermore, if we finally conclude that they do represent *ad hoc* translations of their respective Greek exemplars, how precisely do they represent those Greek exemplars? Do they contain accommodations to contemporary Gospel traditions? If they do, to what extent? Do they contain accommodations to their respective contexts? If so, to what extent?

1. *Evaluation of the Versions as Evidence for the Original Greek Form*

In order to answer these questions I first compare the versions of the *Didascalia* and the *Constitutiones Apostolorum* with their comparable extra-canonical parallels as they occur in the Patristic literature, for example, in Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* 1.28, 177.2, Pseudo-Clement, *Homiliae* 2.51.1, and Socrates, *Historia ecclesiastica*, 3.16; and then analyze them in relationship to their respective contexts (the aim of both processes being to determine whether or not the versions represent *ad hoc* translations of their respective Greek exemplars); and, finally, if it is clear that the versions are, in fact, *ad hoc* translations, I examine them for possible accommodations both to their respective contexts and to their contemporary Gospel traditions.

For a comparison of the Syriac Didascalist's citation with its comparable parallel in the Syriac Gospel traditions, I have been able to find only one parallel of the *logos* under discussion in the Syriac Patristic literature, namely, that found in Cyril of Alexandria's *Contra Diodorum*, 1: *m'rpn' hkym' nhw'* (“Let us be wise money-changers”).²⁰ The following distinctive features should be noted:

²⁰ Pusey, *Cyrilli Alexandrini: Opera*, 5: 493.6.

1. While Cyril of Alexandria employs the noun *m^crpñ'* ("money-changers"),²¹ the Didascalist employs the noun *mpršn'* ("separators," "discriminators," etc.).²² Cf. the Greek Constitutor's *τραπεζίται* ("money-changers") (Funk, *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum*, 1:123.17f.).

2. While Cyril of Alexandria employs the adjective *hkym'*

²¹ Cf. the nouns *nummularii* ("money-changers") (so Origen, *In Matthaeum*, *Comm.* 33 [E. Klostermann, *Origenes, Werke*, XI: *Matthäuserklärung*, 2: *Die lateinische Übersetzung der Commentariorum*, GCS 38 (Berlin, 1933): 11.60.16ff]; and Jerome, *Epistulae*, 119.11 [I. Hilberg, *S. Eusebii Hieronymi, Opera* I. 2: *Epistulae*, 71-120, CSEL 55 (Vienna, 1912): 467.22ff.]), and *trapezitae* ("money-changers") (so John Cassian, *Conlationes*, 1.20; 2.9 [M. Petschenig, *Johannis Cassiani, Conlationes*, CSEL 13 (Vienna, 1886): 29.20f.; 48.1f.]) in the Latin traditions; and the noun *τραπεζίται* ("money-changers") (so, for example, Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata*, 1.28, 177.2 [Stählin and Früchtel, GCS 52^a: 109.12f.]; Origen, *In Jeremiam*, *Hom.* 12.7 [Klostermann, *Origenes, Werke*, III: *Jeremiahomilien; Klagelieder Kommentar; Erklärung der Samuel- und Königsbücher*, GCS 6 (Leipzig, 1907): 3.94.6]; *In Johannem*, 19.7 [Preuschen, GCS 10: 4.307.5]; Dionysius of Rome, *apud* Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica*, 7.7.3 [Schwartz, GCS 9.1: 274.21]; Pseudo-Clement, *Homiliae*, 2.51.1; 3.50.2; 18.20.4 [Rehm and Paschke, GCS 42^a: 55.11f.; 75.19f.; 250.12f.]; Socrates, *Historia ecclesiastica*, 3.16 [Migne, PG 67: 421.30ff.]; Apelles, *apud* Epiphanius, *Adversus haereses*, 44.2.6 [Holl, GCS 31: 2.192.16f.]; Chrysostom, *Opera*, 5.844 [A. Resch, *Agrapha: Aussercanonische Schriftfragmente* (Leipzig, 1906 [reprint, Darmstadt, 1967]), p. 116.3ff.]; Palladius, *Dialogus de vita Joannis Chrysostomi* [Resch, *Agrapha*, p. 114.14f.]; Cyril of Alexandria, *In Joannis evangelium*, 4.5.407a; *Fragmenta homiliarum*, 14; *Adversus Nestorium*, 1.2c [Pusey, *Cyrylli Alexandrini, Opera*, 3:596.2f.; 5: 472.1f.; 6:55.26f.]; Caesarius, *Quaestiones*, 78 [Resch, *Agrapha*, p. 113.30ff.]; *Vita S. Syncreticae*, 100B [Migne, PG 28: 1549.25f.]; John of Damascus, *De fide orthodoxa*, 4.17 [Migne, PG 94: 1177.19f.]; and Nicephorus Gregoras, *Historia Byzantina*, 23.3 [Migne, PG 148:1365.9ff.] in the Greek traditions. Origen, *In Matthaeum*, 17.31 (Klostermann, *Origenes, Werke*, X: *Die Matthäuserklärung*, 1: *Die griechisch erhaltenen Tomoi*, GCS 40 (Berlin, 1935): 10.673.28ff); and Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catecheses*, 1.6.36 (Reischl and Rupp, *Cyrylli Hierosolymarum, Opera omnia*, 1: 206.13) employ the nominative singular *τραπεζίτης*; Cyril of Alexandria, *In Joannis evangelium*, 4.3.374c (Pusey, *Cyrylli Alexandrini, Opera*, 3: 549.4), and Nicephorus Callistus, *Historia ecclesiastica*, 10.26.58 (Migne, PG 146: 513.56ff.) employ the accusative plural *τραπεζίτας* (as the subject of the infinitive εἶναι).

²² That the Didascalist's term, "separators," "discriminators," etc. (*mpršn'*) is to be interpreted as meaning "money-changers" (*m^crpñ'*) is implied by (a) the context, (b) the parallel in the Greek *Constitutiones Apostolorum*, and (c) the parallels cited in the Patristic literature. For the evidence, see n. 15, above.

("wise," "prudent"),²³ the Didascalist employs the adjective *bhyr* ("approved").²⁴ Cf. the Greek Constitutor's δόκιμοι ("approved") (Funk, *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum*, 1:123.17f.).

3. While Cyril of Alexandria employs an exhortatory first person plural form of the verb "to be" (*nhw'*),²⁵ the Didascalist employs the imperatival second person plural of the verb "to be" (*hww*).²⁶ Cf. the Greek Constitutor's γίνεσθε ("be" [imperatival second person plural]) (Funk, *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum*, 1:123.17f.).

The immediate implications of this comparison, as far as our questions are concerned, are that this citation, as employed by the Syriac Didascalist, is, on the negative side, not a "dubbed in" form drawn on contemporary Syriac Gospel traditions, and, on the positive side, either an *ad hoc* translation of the Syriac Didascalist's Greek exemplar, or an *ad hoc* construction contrived by the Syriac Didascalist to suit the special needs of its particular context.

²³ Cf. the adjective *prudentes* ("wise") (so Origen, *In Matthaeum*, *Comm* 33 [Klostermann, *GCS* 38: 11.60.16ff.]) in the Latin traditions.

²⁴ Cf. the adjectival *probati* ("approved") (so Jerome, *Epistula*, 119.11 [Hilberg, *CSEL* 55, 467.22ff.]), and the adjective *probabiles* ("approved") (so John Cassian, *Conlationes*, 1.20; 2.9 [Petschenig, *CSEL* 13: 29.20f.; 48.1f.]) in the Latin traditions; and the adjective δόκιμοι ("approved") (so, for example, Clement of Alexandria (1/1) [*Stromata*, 1.28, 177.2 (Stählin and Früchtel, *GCS* 52³: 109.12ff.)]; Pseudo-Clement (3/3) [*Homiliae*, 2.51.1; 3.50.2; 18.20.4 (Rehm and Paschke, *GCS* 42²: 55.11f.; 75.19f.; 250.12f.)]; Socrates (1/1) [*Historia ecclesiastica*, 3.16 (Migne, *PG* 67: 421.30ff.)], etc.) in the Greek traditions.

²⁵ Cf. the exhortatory first person plural γενόμεθα (so John of Damascus, *De fide orthodoxa*, 4.17 (Migne, *PG* 94: 1177.19f.); and Nicephorus Gregoras, *Historia Byzantina*, 23.3 (Migne, *PG* 148: 1365.9ff.). Cf. Nicephorus Callistus, *Historia ecclesiastica*, 10.26.58 (Migne, *PG* 146: 513.56ff.).

²⁶ Cf. the imperatival second person plural of the verb "to be" *estote* (so Origen, *In Matthaeum*, *Comm.* 33 [Klostermann, *GCS* 38: 11.60.16ff.]; and Jerome, *Epistulae*, 119.11 [Hilberg, *CSEL* 55: 467.22ff.]) in the Latin traditions; and its equivalent γίνεσθε (so Clement of Alexandria (1/1) [*Stromata*, 1.28, 177.2 (Stählin and Früchtel, *GCS* 52³: 109.12ff.)]; Pseudo-Clement (3/3) [*Homiliae*, 2.51.1; 3.50.2; 18.20.4 (Rehm and Paschke, *GCS* 42²: 55.11f.; 75.19f.; 250.12f.)]; Socrates (1/1) [*Historia ecclesiastica*, 3.16 (Migne, *PG* 67: 421.30ff.)], etc.) in the Greek traditions.

As far as the *latter alternative* is concerned (namely, that the Syriac rendering is possibly a construction contrived by the Syriac Didascalist to suit the special needs of its particular context), the following factors are pertinent: (1) The parallel citation in the Greek *Constitutiones Apostolorum* is essentially identical. (2) Of the distinctive features of the citation (as compared with its comparable parallel in the Syriac Gospel traditions), none is determined by its particular context.

These factors, taken together, require the conclusions (a) that this citation is not, on the negative side, an *ad hoc* construction contrived to meet the special needs of its particular context, and (b) that it is, on the positive side, an *ad hoc* translation of the Syriac Didascalist's Greek exemplar.

I turn then to a consideration of the *former alternative* (namely, that the Syriac rendering is an *ad hoc* translation of the Syriac Didascalist's Greek exemplar). The question of possible accommodation calls for immediate attention.

Given the conclusion that the Syriac Didascalist's citation is, in fact, an *ad hoc* translation, one question remains, that of possible accommodation either (a) to the context of the citation itself and/or (b) to the form of the comparable parallel in the contemporary Gospel traditions.

In regard to (a), the factors just considered (namely, that of the distinctive features of the citation [as compared with its parallel in the Gospel traditions], none is determined by its particular context; and that the parallel citation in the Greek *Constitutiones Apostolorum* is essentially identical) imply, not only, as we have argued above, that the Syriac Didascalist did not contrive the form of the citation to suit the special needs of its particular context, but also that, given the conclusion we have now reached (namely, that the Syriac rendering represents an *ad hoc* translation of its Greek exemplar), the Syriac Didascalist has not accommodated his translation to the context in which it occurs.

In regard to (b), the factors noted above (to the effect that the citation we are discussing is distinctly different from the form of its comparable parallel in the contemporary Syriac Gospel traditions) imply not only, as we have contended, that the Syriac Didascalist's citation is not a "dubbed in" equivalent (drawn on contemporary Syriac Gospel traditions) of its Greek exemplar, but also that, given the conclusion that the Syriac rendering is indeed an *ad hoc* translation of its Greek exemplar, the Syriac Didascalist has not accommodated his translation to the form of its parallel in the contemporary Syriac Gospel traditions.

I take up now a comparison of the Greek Constitutor's citation with its parallels in the Greek Gospel traditions.

The Greek Constitutor's citation γίνεσθε τραπεζίται δόκιμοι ("Be approved money-changers") (*Constit. Apost.* 2.36.9) is essentially identical in form and content to its parallels in the Greek Gospel traditions. Compare, for example, (a) Pseudo-Clement (3/3),²⁷ Socrates (1/1),²⁸ Chrysostom (1/1),²⁹ and Caesarius (1/1),³⁰ who render it precisely as does the Greek Constitutor; (b) Clement of Alexandria (1/1),³¹ Origen (1/3),³² Dionysius of Rome (1/1),³³ Apelles (1/1),³⁴ Palladius (1/1),³⁵ Cyril of Alexandria (2/4),³⁶ and *Vita S. Syncreticae* (1/1),³⁷ who render it in the form γίνεσθε δόκιμοι τραπεζίται; and (c) Cyril of Alexandria (1/4),³⁸ who renders it in the form

²⁷ *Homiliae*, 2.51.1; 3.50.2; 18.20.4 (Rehm and Paschke, *GCS* 42²: 55.11f.; 75.19f.; 250.12f.).

²⁸ *Historia ecclesiastica*, 3.16 (Migne, *PG* 67: 421.30ff.).

²⁹ *Opera*, 5.844 (Resch, *Agrapha*, p. 116.3ff.).

³⁰ *Quaestiones*, 78 (Resch, *Agrapha*, p. 113.30ff.).

³¹ *Stromata*, 1.28, 177.2 (Stählin and Früchtel, *GCS* 52²: 109.12ff.).

³² *In Johannem*, 19.7 (Preuschen, *GCS* 10: 4.307.5).

³³ *Apud Eusebium, Historia ecclesiastica*, 7.7.3 (Schwartz, *GCS* 9.1: 274.21).

³⁴ *Apud Epiphanius, Adversus haereses*, 44.2.6 (Holl, *GCS* 31: 2.192.16f.).

³⁵ *Dialogues de vita Joannis Chrysostomi* (Resch, *Agrapha*, p. 114.14f.).

³⁶ *In Joannis evangelium*, 4.5.407a; *Adversus Nestorium*, 1.2c (Pusey, *Cyrolli Alexandrini, Opera*, 3: 596.2f.; 6: 55.26ff.).

³⁷ *Vita S. Syncreticae*, 100B (Migne, *PG* 28: 1549.25f.).

³⁸ *Fragmenta homiliarum*, 14 (Pusey, *Cyrolli Alexandrini, Opera*, 5: 472.1ff.).

δόκιμοι γενέσθε τραπεζίται. Compare also Cyril of Jerusalem (1/1),³⁹ who renders the *logos* under discussion in the same form as (b) but in the singular person, and John of Damascus (1/1),⁴⁰ who renders it in a parallel form but in the first person plural, as does also Nicephorus Gregoras (1/1).⁴¹ Origen (2/3),⁴² Cyril of Alexandria (1/4),⁴³ and Nicephorus Callistus (1/1)⁴⁴ imply forms comparable to either (a), (b), or (c) above.

The immediate implications of this comparison, as far as our questions are concerned, are that this citation, as employed by the Greek Constitutor, is either a "dubbed in" form drawn on contemporary Greek Gospel traditions, or an *ad hoc* copy of the Greek Constitutor's Greek exemplar.

Since the Greek Constitutor is following his exemplar rather closely at this point,⁴⁵ and since the Greek Constitutor's citation is identical with the Greek form presupposed by the Syriac Didascalist's citation,⁴⁶ I conclude that the Greek Constitutor's citation is not a "dubbed in" form drawn on his contemporary Greek Gospel traditions but an *ad hoc* copy of the form which appeared in his Greek exemplar.

Furthermore, I find no evidence of accommodation either to the context in which the citation itself occurs or to its parallels in the contemporary Gospel traditions.

2. Reconstruction of the Greek Original

In view of the fact that, as has been demonstrated, the Syriac

³⁹ *Catecheses*, 1.6.36 (Reischl and Rupp, *Cyrelli Hierosolymarum, Opera omnia*, 1.206.13).

⁴⁰ *De fide orthodoxa*, 4.17 (Migne, *PG* 94: 1177.19f.).

⁴¹ *Historia Byzantina*, 23.3 (Migne, *PG* 148: 1365.9ff.).

⁴² *In Jeremiam*, *Hom.* 12.7 (Klostermann, *GCS* 6: 3.94.6); *In Matthaeum*, 17.31 (Klostermann, *GCS* 40: 10.673.28ff.).

⁴³ *In Joannis evangelium*, 4.3.374c (Pusey, *Cyrelli Alexandrini, Opera*, 3: 549.4).

⁴⁴ *Historia ecclesiastica*, 10.26.58 (Migne, *PG* 146: 513.56ff.).

⁴⁵ Cf. the parallel passage in the Syriac *Didascalia* (Lagarde, *Didascalia Apostolorum*, p. 42.25ff. = Funk, *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum*, 1: 123.16ff.).

⁴⁶ See the discussion, below, on the reconstruction of the Greek original.

Didascalía and the Greek *Constitutiones Apostolorum* represent *ad hoc* renderings of their respective Greek exemplars, we may with some confidence conjecture the form of those exemplars and thereby determine the form of the original Greek text.

The implications of the evidence as set out above, are:

1. That the Greek Didascalist cited the *logos* under discussion in the *form*: imperative + noun + adjective. This is implied by both witnesses: *hww mpršn' bħyr'* ("Be approved discriminators [= money-changers]") (*Didasc. Syr.*) = $\gamma\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$ $\tau\rho\alpha\pi\epsilon\zeta\acute{\iota}\tau\alpha\iota$ $\delta\omicron\mu\iota\omicron\iota$ ("Be approved money-changers") (*Constit. Apost. Grk.*).

2. That the Greek Didascalist employed the present imperative plural of $\gamma\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ ("to be").⁴⁷ This is implied by both witnesses: *hww* (= *hwytwn*) ("be")⁴⁸ (*Didasc. Syr.*) = $\gamma\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$ ("be") (*Constit. Apost. Grk.*); and by the parallel Greek Gospel traditions.⁴⁹

3. That the Greek Didascalist employed the noun $\tau\rho\alpha\pi\epsilon\zeta\acute{\iota}\tau\alpha\iota$ ("money-changers"). This is implied by both witnesses: *mpršn'* (= *m^crpn'*) ("separators," "discriminators," etc. [= "money-changers"])⁵⁰ (*Didasc. Syr.*) = $\tau\rho\alpha\pi\epsilon\zeta\acute{\iota}\tau\alpha\iota$ ("money-changers")

⁴⁷ Rather than the present imperative plural of $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota$ which might be conjectured as lying behind the Latin *estote* (so Origen, *In Matthaeum, Comm.* 33 [Klostermann, *GCS* 38: 11.60.16ff.]; and Jerome, *Epistulae*, 119.11 [Hilberg, *CSEL* 55: 467.22ff.]). But compare the use of the infinitive *feri* in John Casian's *Conlationes*, 2.9 (Petschenig, *CSEL* 13: 48.1f.).

⁴⁸ The perfect of *hw'* is "often used as an imperative" (so J. Payne Smith, *A Compendius Syriac Dictionary founded upon the Thesaurus Syriacus of R. P. Smith* [Oxford, 1903], s.v. *hw'*). Furthermore the verb *hw'* is regularly used to translate $\gamma\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$. See, for example, Mt 10.16 (syr^s p^h); Mt 24.44 (syr^p h; syr^s has *hwytwn*); and Lk 6.36 (syr^s p^h) where the imperative $\gamma\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$ is translated by the perfect *hw'* (intended as an imperative). However, the *Liber graduum*, 17.7; 30.2 (M. Kmosko, *Liber graduum, PS* 3 [Paris, 1926]: 781.23; 864.17f.), citing Mt 10.16, on both occasions employs the imperative *hwytwn*.

⁴⁹ The imperative $\gamma\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$ is employed consistently in the Greek Patristic witnesses. For the evidence, see ns. 27-44, above.

⁵⁰ As has already been pointed out, the Syriac Didascalist's term *mpršn* ("separators," "discriminators," etc.) is to be interpreted as meaning "money-changers" (*m^crpn'*), the equivalent of the Greek Constitutor's $\tau\rho\alpha\pi\epsilon\zeta\acute{\iota}\tau\alpha\iota$ ("money-changers"). For the evidence, see n. 15, above.

(*Constit. Apost. Grk.*); and by the parallel Greek Gospel traditions.⁵¹

4. That the Greek Didascalist employed the adjective δόκιμοι (“approved”).⁵² This is also implied by both witnesses: *bhyr*’ (“approved”) (*Didasc. Syr.*) = δόκιμοι (“approved”) (*Constit. Apost. Grk.*); and by the parallel Greek Gospel traditions.⁵³

Given the above analysis and evaluation of the evidence, I conjecture that the dominical *logos* we are here discussing appeared in the following form in the original text of the Greek *Didascalía*: γίνεσθε τραπεζίται δόκιμοι.

C. COMPARISON OF THE GREEK DIDASCALIST’S CITATION WITH ITS COMPARABLE PARALLELS IN THE GREEK GOSPEL TRADITIONS

1. *The Texts*

(a)	(b)	(c)
<i>Didasc. Grk.</i> 2.36.9 (Reconstruction)	Clem. Alex. <i>Sitom.</i> 1.28, 177.2 ⁵⁴	Ps-Clem. <i>Hom.</i> 2.51.1 ⁵⁵
γίνεσθε	γίνεσθε	γίνεσθε
τραπεζίται	δόκιμοι	τραπεζίται
δόκιμοι	τραπεζίται	δόκιμοι ⁵⁶

⁵¹ The noun τραπεζίται appears consistently in all the Greek Patristic witnesses. For the evidence, see n. 21, above.

⁵² And not, for example, the adjective φρόνιμοι (“wise”) which might be conjectured as lying behind the Syriac *hkyrn*’ (“wise”) (so Cyril of Alexandria, *Contra Diodorum*, 1 [Pusey, *Cyrrilli Alexandrini, Opera*, 5: 493.6]) and the Latin *prudentes* (“wise”) (so Origen, *In Matthaeum, Comm.* 33 [Klostermann, *GCS* 38: 11.60.16ff.]). φρόνιμος is rather consistently translated by *hkyrn*’ in the Syriac Gospel traditions. See, for example, Mt 7.24 (syrc p h); Mt 10.16 (syrc p h); Mt 11.25 (syrc p h); Mt 24.25 (syrc p h); Mt 25.2 (syrc p h); Lk 12.42 (syrc p h); Ephraem (?) (J. S. Assemani, *Sancti Patris nostri Ephraemi Syri, Opera omnia*, I [Rome, 1737]: 189AB); and Ephraem (*Comm. Diatessaron*, 10.14 [L. Leloir, *Saint Ephrem: Commentaire de l’Évangile Concordant. Text Syriaque (Manuscrit Chester Beatty, 709)*, *CBM* 8 (Dublin, 1963): 48:13]). It is also translated by *ryrn*’ (“wise,” “astute”). See Mt 10.16 (syrc); and *Liber graduum*, 17.7; 30.2, (Kmosko, *PS* 3: 781.23; 864.17f.).

⁵³ The adjective δόκιμοι (“approved”) occurs consistently in all the Greek Patristic witnesses. For the evidence, see ns. 27-44, above.

⁵⁴ See Stählin and Früchtel, *GCS* 52³: 109.12ff.

⁵⁵ See Rehm and Paschke, *GCS* 42²: 55.11f. This *logos* is cited on two other occasions in precisely the same form in the Clementine *Homiliae*, namely, *Homiliae*, 3.50.2 and 18.20.4. See Rehm and Paschke, *GCS* 42²: 75.19f. and 250.12f. respectively.

⁵⁶ These citations from Clement of Alexandria and Pseudo-Clement are

2. *The Comparable Parallels in the Greek Patristic Literature*

I take up now an "evaluation" with respect both to the *form* (in the more technical sense of the term) and to the *function* of the parallels in the Greek Patristic literature.

The Form

The *logos* γίνεσθε τραπεζίται δόκιμοι belongs in the major "form-historical" category "wisdom sayings," and, more specifically, the subcategory "exhortations."⁵⁷ The distinctive feature of the *logoi* which belong within the subcategory "exhortations" is that they are formed as "imperatives." Rudolf Bultmann gives, as one illustration (among a number) of the "imperative form," the "exhortation" in Mt 10.16b:

γίνεσθε φρόνιμοι ὡς οἱ ὄφεις ("Be wise as serpents
καὶ ἀβέροι ὡς αἱ περιστέραὶ and harmless as doves").

The *logos* we are discussing, apart from the fact that it has only one "strand,"⁵⁸ is essentially identical, in *form*, to the Matthaean *logos* (Mt 10.16b).

Clement of Alexandria⁵⁹ cites an expanded version: γίνεσθε δόκιμοι τραπεζίται, τὰ μὲν ἀποδοκιμάζοντες, τὸ δὲ καλὸν κατέχοντες ("Be approved money-changers, rejecting those things which are [evil], holding on to that which is good").⁶⁰ If this is a fair indication of how the *logos* was understood in the

given as representative of the many citations of this *logos* in the Patristic literature.

⁵⁷ Rudolf Bultmann (*The History of the Synoptic Tradition* [2d. ed., New York, 1968], pp. 69f.) divides the dominical *logoi* into three major categories: (i) "wisdom sayings" (or "*logia*"); (ii) "prophetic and apocalyptic sayings"; and (iii) "laws and community regulations." The first of these three major categories he divides into three subcategories: (i) "Principles" ("declaratory form"); (ii) "exhortations" ("imperative form"); and (iii) "questions." It is to the second of these subcategories that the *logos* under consideration belongs.

⁵⁸ Bultmann speaks of Mt 10.16b as a "double stranded *mashal*." See *Synoptic Tradition*, p. 81.

⁵⁹ *Stromata*, 1.28, 177.2 (Stählin and Früchtel, GCS 52³: 109.12ff.).

⁶⁰ Cf. 1 Th 5.21-22: πάντα δὲ δοκιμάζετε, τὸ καλὸν κατέχετε· ἀπὸ παντὸς εἴδους πονηροῦ ἀπέχεσθε ("Prove all things; hold on to that which is good; abstain from every form of evil").

early Church, and I believe it is,⁶¹ then we may fairly reformulate it:

γίνεσθε δόκιμοι ὡς τραπεζίται ("Be approved as money-changers").⁶²

As Joachim Jeremias points out,⁶³ the *tertium comparationis* in this *logos* is the ability to distinguish between that which is genuine and that which is false—in his words, "between genuine and valid coins and spurious forgeries."

The Function

In every context in which the extremely popular *logos* γίνεσθε τραπεζίται δόκιμοι is cited,⁶⁴ it is employed, as one might expect, with a purely *paraenetic* function.⁶⁵

3. *The Didascalist's Citation*

Before comparing the Greek Didascalist's *logos* with its comparable parallels in the Greek Patristic literature, it will be necessary to "evaluate" his citation as to both its *form* (in the more technical sense of the term) and its *function*.

⁶¹ Others interpret it similarly, also, no doubt, under the influence of 1 Th 5.21-22. So, for example, Origen (2/2) (*In Matthaeum*, 17.31 [Klostermann, *GCS* 40: 10.673.28ff.]; *In Johannem*, 19.7 [Preuschen, *GCS* 10: 4.307.5]); Cyril of Jerusalem (1/1) (*Catecheses*, 1.6.36 [Reischl and Rupp, *Cyritilli Hierosolymarum, Opera omnia*, 1: 206.13]); Socrates (1/1) (*Historia ecclesiastica*, 3.16 [Migne, *PG* 67: 421.30ff.]); Chrysostom (1/1) (*Opera*, 5.844 [Resch, *Agrapha*, p. 116.3ff.]); and Cyril of Alexandria (2/4) (*In Joannis evangelium*, 4.5.407a; *Adversus Nestorium*, 1.2c [Pusey, *Cyritilli Alexandrini, Opera*, 3: 596.2f.; 6: 55.26ff.]).

⁶² Or, perhaps, γίνεσθε κριτικῶς ὡς τραπεζίται δόκιμοι ("Be discriminators as approved money-changers").

⁶³ *Unknown Sayings of Jesus*, trans. R. H. Fuller (London, 1957), p. 90.

⁶⁴ It is cited more often than any other extra-canonical dominical *logos*.

⁶⁵ See, for example, Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata*, 1.28, 177.2 (Stählin and Früchtel, *GCS* 52^a: 109.12ff.); Origen, *In Matthaeum*, *Comm.* 33 (Klostermann, *GCS* 38: 11.60.16ff.); *In Johannem*, 19.7 (Preuschen, *GCS* 10: 4.307.5); Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catecheses*, 1.6.36 (Reischl and Rupp, *Cyritilli Hierosolymarum, Opera omnia*, 1: 206.13); Socrates, *Historia ecclesiastica*, 3.16 (Migne, *PG* 67: 421.30ff.); Chrysostom, *Opera*, 5.844 (Resch, *Agrapha*, 116.3ff.); Cyril of Alexandria, *In Joannis evangelium*, 4.3.374c; *Adversus Nestorium*, 1.2c (Pusey, *Cyritilli Alexandrini, Opera*, 3: 596.2f.; 6: 55.26ff.); John of Damascus, *De fide orthodoxa*, 4.17 (Migne, *PG* 94: 1177.19f.); and Nicephoras Gregoras, *Historia Byzantina*, 23.3 (Migne, *PG* 148: 1365.9ff.).

The Form

The dominical *logos*⁶⁶ γίνεσθε τραπεζίται δόκιμοι (*Didasc.* 2.36.9) belongs, as do its parallels in the Patristic literature, in the major “form-historical” category “wisdom sayings,” and, more specifically, the subcategory “exhortations.” It has precisely the same “imperative form.”

The Function

As to *function*, the dominical *logos* γίνεσθε τραπεζίται δόκιμοι is employed, in *Didasc.* 2.36.9, *paraenetically*. It is cited in a context in which the “laymen” are exhorted not to judge. To them “it is said,” “Judge not, that you be not judged” (cf. Mt 7.1 = Lk 6.37a). That is the prerogative of the “bishops.” To them “it is said,” “Be approved money-changers.”

4. The Comparison

The Greek Didascalist’s *logos* is essentially identical with its counterpart in the Greek Patristic literature in both structure and content.⁶⁷ It also fulfills the same general function. This

⁶⁶ The *logos* γίνεσθε τραπεζίται δόκιμοι is attributed variously in the Patristic literature—as a saying of “Jesus”: so, for example, Origen (*In Matthaeum, Comm.* 33 [Klostermann, *GCS* 38: 11.60.16ff.]; *In Johannem*, 19.7 [Preuschen, *GCS* 10: 4.307.5]); Pseudo-Clement (*Homiliae*, 2.51.1 [Rehm and Paschke, *GCS* 42²: 55.11f.]); Jerome (*Epistulae*, 119.11 [Hilberg, *CSEL* 55: 467.22ff.]); Socrates (*Historia ecclesiastica*, 3.16 [Migne, *PG* 67: 421.30ff.]); and *Vita S. Syncreticae*, 100B [Migne, *PG* 28: 1549.25f.]; as a word of the “Gospel”: so, for example, Apelles, *apud* Epiphanius (*Adversus haereses*, 44.2.6 [Holl, *GCS* 31: 2.192.16f.]); Caesarius (*Quaestiones*, 78 [Resch, *Agrapha*, p. 113.30ff.]); and John Cassian (*Conlationes*, 2.9 [Petschenig, *CSEL* 13: 48.1f.]); and as a citation from “Scripture”: so, for example, Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata*, 1.28, 177.2 [Stählin and Früchtel, *GCS* 52²: 109.12ff.]); Origen (*In Matthaeum*, 17.31 [Klostermann, *GCS* 40:10.673.28ff.]); and Palladius (*Dialogus de vita Joannis Chrysostomi* [Resch, *Agrapha*, p. 114.14f.]).

In the Didascalia it is clearly a word of the “Lord.” See n. 2, above. It is also attributed to the “Lord” by John Cassian (*Conlationes*, 1.20 [Petschenig, *CSEL* 13: 29.20f.]).

⁶⁷ There is no significant difference between the formulation γίνεσθε δόκιμοι τραπεζίται (with the adjective *preceding* the noun) (so Clement of Alexandria [1/1], Origen [1/1], Dionysius of Rome, *apud* Eusebius [1/1], Cyril of Jerusalem [1/1], Apelles, *apud* Epiphanius [1/1], Palladius [1/1], Cyril

being the case, I turn immediately to the question of sources.

D. THE SOURCES

Regarding the sources, we must speak of both *ultimate* and *immediate* sources.

As far as the *ultimate* source is concerned, it seems to me that the *logos* γίνεσθε τραπεζῖται δόκιμοι roots back into the earliest oral and written traditions—traditions that were transmitted independently of the traditions taken up into, or dependent upon, the canonical Gospels.

This *logos* was probably known already by Paul. His paraenesis in 1 Th 5.21-22: πάντα δὲ δοκιμάζετε, τὸ καλὸν κατέχετε· ἀπὸ παντὸς εἴδους πονηροῦ ἀπέχεσθε ("Prove all things; hold on to that which is good; abstain from every form of evil") is very likely an interpretation of it.⁶⁸ One thing is clear—the early Patristic authors frequently quote the Pauline paraenesis as an interpretation of it.⁶⁹

of Alexandria [2/3], *Vita S. Syncreticae* [1/1], John of Damascus [1/1], and Nicephorus Gregoras [1/1]) and the formation γίνεσθε τραπεζῖται δόκιμοι (with the adjective following the noun) (so Ps-Clement [3/3], Socrates [1/1], Chrysostom [1/1], Caesarius [1/1], and *Constitutiones Apostolorum* [1/1]). For the references, see ns. 27-44, above.

The Didascalist's *logos* is formulated according to the latter pattern—imperative + noun + adjective.

⁶⁸ So also M. R. James (*The Apocryphal New Testament*, [Oxford, 1955], p. 35), G. Kittel (G. Kittel, et al., *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, trans. G. W. Bromiley, 2 [Grand Rapids, 1965]: s.v. εἶδος), and Jeremias (*Unknown Sayings of Jesus*, p. 92). Kittel holds that "this seems very likely in view of the strong verbal similarities and the use of εἶδος for a 'mint.' In this case v.21b and v.22 would be the positive and negative outworking of the main advice in v.21a: '(As good money-changers) test all things: keep the good and reject the bad.'" Cf. Resch, *Agrapha*, p. 125.

⁶⁹ So, for example, Origen, *In Matthaeum*, 17.31 (Klostermann, *GCS* 40: 10.673.28ff.); *In Johannem*, 19.7 (Preuschen, *GCS* 10: 4.307.5); Chrysostom, *Opera*, 5.844 (Resch, *Agrapha*, 116.3ff.); and Cyril of Alexandria, *Adversus Nestorium*, 1.2c (Pusey, *Cyriilli Alexandrini, Opera*, 6.55.26ff.).

Others undoubtedly allude to it. So, for example, Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata*, 1.28, 177.2 (Stählin and Früchtel, *GCS* 52^a: 109.12ff.); Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catecheses*, 1.6.36 (Reischl and Rupp, *Cyriilli Hierosolymarum, Opera omnia*, 1: 206.13); and Socrates, *Historia ecclesiastica*, 3.16 (Migne, *PG* 67, 421.30f.).

And, as far as the *immediate* source is concerned, I have argued elsewhere⁷⁰ that it is highly probable that the Didascalist cited this *logos*, along with many other dominical *logoi* which he quotes, from a collection of dominical *logoi* similar in form to that collection of dominical *logoi* known as the *Gospel of Thomas*.⁷¹

(*To be continued*)

⁷⁰ See my *Studies in the Determination and Evaluation of the Dominical Logoi as cited in the Original Text of the Greek Didascalia Apostolorum* (unpublished dissertation, Harvard University, 1973), especially 2: 564-567.

⁷¹ I will deal more specifically with this point in a future article in this series.