PROLEGOMENA TO A STUDY OF THE DOMINICAL *LOGOI* AS CITED IN THE *DIDASCALIA APOSTOLORUM* PART II: METHODOLOGICAL QUESTIONS[*]

JAMES J. C. COX
Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan

In support of the various theological, liturgical, ethical, apologetical, and polemical propositions which he sets forth, the author of the *Didascalia Apostolorum* cites frequently,[1] usually in brief,[2] though sometimes at length,[3] from both Jewish and Christian traditions, canonical and non-canonical.

As far as the Jewish traditions are concerned, he cites (i) from all three divisions of the *Tanak* (206 times),[4] and (ii) from several as-yet-unidentified sources (5 times).[5]

In addition, he adds to an extensive citation from 2 Ki 21:1-16, 18 (= 2 Chr 33:1-13, 20) an apocryphal story of the repentance

---

[*] Abbreviations employed in this article, which are not spelled out on the back cover of this journal, indicate the following series: *GCS* = *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte; HS* = *Horae Semiticae; SAKDQ* = *Sammlung ausgewählter kirchen- und dogmengeschichtliche Quellenschriften; TU* = *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur.*

[1] The Didascalist cites from Jewish traditions some 211 times, and from Christian traditions some 163 times.

[2] So, e.g., the citations from the Torah (Ex 20:17; *Didasc.* 1.1.2), the Nebi'im (Isa 66:2; *Didasc.* 2.1.5), the Kethubim (Pr 20:22; *Didasc.* 1.2.2), the "Gospel" (Mt 5:27-28; *Didasc.* 1.1.4), and the Acts of the Apostles (Acts 8:20-21; *Didasc.* 6.7.3).

[3] So, e.g., the citations from the Torah (Num 18:1-32; *Didasc.* 2.25.15ff.), the Nebi'im (Ezek 18:1-32; *Didasc.* 2.14.14ff.), the Kethubim (Pr 7:1-14; *Didasc.* 1.7.2ff.), the "Gospel" (Mt 25:34-40 + Mt 25:46; *Didasc.* 5.1.6ff.), and the Acts of the Apostles (Acts 15:13-29; *Didasc.* 6.12.10ff.).

[4] The Didascalist cites from (i) the Torah (52 times), drawing most frequently on Exodus (18 times), Numbers (13 times), and Deuteronomy (13 times); (ii) the Nebi'im (103 times), drawing most often on Isaiah (55 times), Ezekiel (20 times), and Jeremiah (13 times); and (iii) the Kethubim (51 times), drawing most frequently on Proverbs (32 times), and Psalms (15 times).

[5] See (i) *Didasc.* 2.23.3f.; (ii) *Didasc.* 2.44.1; (iii) *Didasc.* 2.62.2; (iv) *Didasc.* 4.1.2; and (v) *Didasc.* 6.18.13.

of Manasseh (*Didasc.* 2.22.10f.),[6] the *Oratio Manassis* (*Didasc.* 2.22.12f.), and some further details concerning Manasseh and Amon (*Didasc.* 2.22.15f.).[7]

All of the citations drawn on Jewish traditions are introduced with citation formulae;[8] all are cited as having the same basic authority;[9] and many are cited under the specific title of the source on which they were drawn.[10]

[6] Drawn on an unidentified source.

[7] Drawn on an unidentified source.

[8] For example, 34 citations (13 drawn on the Torah, 11 on the Nebi'im, and 10 on the Kethubim) are introduced with the citation formula, *"it is written"* (11 with the formula "it is written," alone; 23 with the formula "it is written *in . . .,"* e.g., "it is written in the Law" [Ex 20:17; *Didasc.* 1.1.2]); 12 (5 drawn on the Torah, 3 on the Nebi'im, and 4 on the Kethubim) with the formula *"the Scripture saith/has said"*; 2 (both drawn on the Kethubim) with the formula *"the Holy Word saith"*; 4 with the formula *"it is/was said"*; 14 with the formula *"he saith/said"*; 27 with the formula *"he saith/said in/by,"* e.g., "he saith in Wisdom" (Pr 31:10-31; *Didasc.* 1.8.3ff.), and "he said by Isaiah" (Isa 40:5; 52:10; *Didasc.* 5.7.22); 26 with the formula *"the Lord* (or *Lord God*) *saith/said"*; 6 with the formula *"Moses/Isaiah saith/said"*; etc.

[9] No distinction is made between citations drawn on the *Tanak* and those drawn on sources outside the *Tanak*. For example, the *Oratio Manassis* (*Didasc.* 2.22.12ff.) and other apocryphal details (*Didasc.* 2.22.10f.; 2.22.15f.) are included along with material drawn on 2 Ki 21:1-16, 18 = 2 Chr 33:1-13, 20 (*Didasc.* 2.22.4ff.), without any distinction, the whole being introduced with the citation formula, *"it is written in the fourth Book of Kingdoms, and likewise, in the second Book of Chronicles, thus."* The citation, "If you will be right with me, I also will be right with you; and if you will walk perversely with me, I also will walk perversely with you, saith the Lord of Hosts," drawn on an unidentified source (*Didasc.* 2.44.1), and the citation, "Imitate the ant, O sluggard, and emulate her ways . . .," drawn on Pr 6:6-8 (*Didasc.* 2.63.2), are introduced with one and the same citation formula, namely, *"for the Lord has said."* And the citation, "Jacob shall be blessed among the firstborn," drawn on an unidentified source (*Didasc.* 6.18.13), the citation, "My son, my firstborn (is) Israel," drawn on Ex 4:22 (*Didasc.* 6.18.13), and the citation, "Every male that openeth the womb of his mother is blessed to the Lord," drawn on Ex 13:2, 12 (*Didasc.* 6.18.13), are introduced with one and the same citation formula, namely, *"as the Scripture saith."*

[10] For example, "it is written in *Genesis*" (Gen 4:7; *Didasc.* 2.16.2); "it is written in the *Book of Numbers*" (Num 24:9b[?]; *Didasc.* 1.2.1; Num 18:1-32; *Didasc.* 2.25.15ff.); "it is written in the *first Book of Kingdoms*" (1 Sa 8:10-17; *Didasc.* 2.34.2); "it is written in the *fourth Book of Kingdoms*" (2 Ki 21:1-16, 18 = 2 Chr 33:1-13, 20; *Didasc.* 2.22.4ff.); "it is written in *Proverbs*" (Pr 26:2; *Didasc.* 3.11.2); "it is written in *Isaiah*" (Isa 58:6; *Didasc.* 2.18.1; Isa 53:2-5; *Didasc.* 2.25.10; Isa 49:9a; *Didasc.* 2.34.7; Isa 53:11b; *Didasc.* 3.13.3; Isa 66:5; *Didasc.* 5.14.23; Isa 66:10 [?]; *Didasc.* 5.14.24; Isa 2:6a; *Didasc.* 6.5.4); "it is

As far as the Christian traditions are concerned, he cites (i) from the "Gospel" (134 times),[11] (ii) from Acts of the Apostles (9 times), (iii) from the Epistles (19 times), and (iv) from the *Oracula Sibyllina* (once).

Most of the citations drawn on the "Gospel" are introduced with citation formulae;[12] none of those drawn on the Acts of

written in *Hosea* (Hos 1:10a; *Didasc.* 2.34.3); "it is written in *Zechariah*" (Zech 8:19; *Didasc.* 5.14.15); and "it is written in the *Twelve Prophets*, [in] *Malachi* who is called the Angel" (Mal 2:14f.; *Didasc.* 6.22.7).

[11] The precise definition of the term "Gospel" will be discussed later.

[12] Of the 134 citations drawn on the "Gospel," 118 are introduced with citation formulae, and 16 without. The references are given in *TABLE A*.

Of these 118 citations introduced with citation formulae, the majority are introduced with citation formulae which are formulated with either the verb *"to say"* (80 times; for example, *Didasc.* 1.2.3: *wtwb 'mr b'wnglywn* [P. de Lagarde, *Didascalia Apostolorum Syriace* (Leipzig, 1854 [reprint, Osnabrück/ Wiesbaden, 1967]), p. 2.19] = *nam iterum in evangelio dicit* [E. Tidner, *Didascaliae Apostolorum, Canonum Ecclesiasticorum, Traditionis Apostolicae, versiones Latinae, TU*, 75 (Berlin, 1963), p. 4.18f.] = καὶ γὰρ πάλιν ἐν τῷ Εὐαγγελίῳ λέγει [F. X. Funk, *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum* (Paderborn, 1905 [reprint, Turin, 1964]), 1:9.2f.], "and again in the Gospel he says"), or the verb *"to write"* (12 times; for example, *Didasc.* 1.2.1: *wtwb dyn 'p b'wnglywn ktyb* [Lagarde, *Didascalia Apostolorum*, p. 2.14f] = *propterea similiter et in evangelio scriptum est* [Tidner, *Didascalia Apostolorum*, p. 4.12f.] = ὁμοίως καὶ ἐν τῷ Εὐαγγελίῳ γέγραπται [Funk, *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum*, 1:7.23f.], "similarly also in the Gospel it is written").

The verb *"to say"* is sometimes employed alone (13 times), but most often with an explicit subject (for example, "the/our Lord" [29 times], "the/our Savior" [14 times], "the Lord our Savior" [twice], "our Lord and Savior" [3 times], "our Lord and Savior, Jesus" [once], "our Lord and Teacher" [once], etc.). It is not infrequently qualified by the phrase "in the Gospel" (20 times). The verb *"to write"* is sometimes employed alone (4 times), but more often it is qualified by the phrase "in the Gospel" (8 times).

Sometimes the formulae are quite expansive (for example, *Didasc.* 1.1.4: *'yk d'p b'wnglywn mḥdt wmšrr wmšml' ᶜsr' ptgm' dnmws'* [Lagarde, *Didascalia Apostolorum*, p. 1.22f.] = *dicit enim in evangelio recapitulans et confirmans et conplens decalogum legis* [Tidner, *Didascaliae Apostolorum*, p. 3.7f.] = λέγει γὰρ ἐν τῷ Εὐαγγελίῳ ἀνακεφαλαιούμενος καὶ στηρίζων καὶ πληρῶν τὴν δεκάλογον τοῦ Νόμου [Funk, *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum*, 1:5.17ff], "for he says in the Gospel renewing and confirming and fulfilling the ten words of the Law"; and *Didasc.* 6.23.2: *'p hw gyr mrn wprwqn gzyr'yt m'l l'ylyn dšwyn lḥwyb' w'mr* [Lagarde, *Didascalia Apostolorum*, p. 120.8f.] = *nam et ipse dominus et salvator noster cum severitate respondens his, qui digni erant condemnatione, dixit* [Tidner, *Didascaliae Apostolorum*, p. 101. 2ff.], "for our Lord and Savior himself also spoke with severity to those who were worthy of condemnation and said"); but more often they consist of

the Apostles,[13] nor any of those drawn on the Epistles (with two possible exceptions)[14] are so introduced.[15] All of the citations drawn on the Christian traditions are cited as having the same basic authority;[16] none are cited under the specific title of the

nothing more than the conjunctions *w*, "and," and *wtwb*, "and again," thereby linking the *logos* thus introduced with a previous *logos* introduced with a more formal citation formula (for example, *Didasc.* 6.18.15: "for he said . . . and . . . and . . . and . . ."), or *gyr*, "for," and *mtl hn'*, "wherefore" (for example, *Didasc.* 2.18.6 and 2.38.2, respectively).

[13] See *Didasc.* 6.7.2 (Acts 8:18); 6.7.3 (Acts 8:20-21); 6.12.1 (Acts 15:25a [?]); 6.12.3 (Acts 15:1-2); 6.12.3 (Acts 15:4-5); 6.12.4 (Acts 15:7-8); 6.12.6 (Acts 10:9-16; cf. 11:4-10); 6.12.10f. (Acts 15:8-11); 6.12.12ff. (Acts 15:13-29).

[14] See *Didasc.* 2.3.3 (1 Pet 4:8 [?]; cf. Pr 10:12) and *Didasc.* 2.53.2 (Eph 4:26 [?]; cf. Ps 4:4).

[15] See *Didasc.* I (Introduction) (1 Pet 1:26); 1.8.1 (1 Cor 11:3); 2.1.1 (Tit 1:7a + 1 Tim 3:2a); 2.2.1 (1 Tim 3:2c); 2.2.1 (1 Tim 3:3, 6); 2.2.2 (1 Tim 3.2b, 4a); 2.6.1 (1 Tim 3:8a); 2.18.6 (1 Tim 3:2a); 2.24.4 (Tit 1.7b); 2.24.4 (1 Tim 3:3c; Tit 1:7b); 2.26.1 (1 Pet 2:9a); 2.49.2 (1 Tim 3:8a); 2.63.5 (2 Th 3:10b); 3.1.1 (1 Tim 5:9); 3.7.3 (Php 3:19b); 3.11.5 (1 Pet 3:9); 3.13.1 (1 Tim 3:8).

[16] No distinction is made between the *logoi* with parallels in the canonical Gospels and those without. For example, both the *logos*, μὴ κρίνετε, ἵνα μὴ κριθῆτε, "Judge not, that you be not judged" (Mt 7:1 = Lk 6:37a), and the *logos* γίνεσθε τραπεζῖται δόκιμοι, "Be approved money-changers" (cf. Pseudo-Clement, *Homiliae* 2:51; 3:50; 18:20 [B. Rehm and F. Paschke, *Die Pseudo-klementinen*, 1: *Homilien, GCS*, 42; 2d ed. (Berlin, 1969), pp. 55.17; 75.20; 250.13]; etc.) are introduced with identical citation formulae, namely, λέγεται, "it is said" (*Didasc.* 2.36.7ff.); both the *logos*, οὐαὶ τῷ κόσμῳ ἀπὸ τῶν σκανδάλων ἀνάγκη γὰρ ἐλθεῖν τὰ σκάνδαλα   καὶ σχίσματα, πλὴν οὐαὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ δί οὐ ἔρχεται, "Woe to the world because of scandals, for scandals and schisms must come; yet woe to the man by whom they come" (Mt 18:7 = Lk 17:1), and the *logos*, ἔσονται σχίσματα καὶ αἱρέσεις, "There shall be schisms and heresies" (cf. Justin Martyr, *Dialogus cum Tryphone*, 35.5ff. [J. C. T. Otto, *Corpus Apologetarum christianorum saeculi secundi* (Wiesbaden, 1851-1889 [reprint, 1969]), 2:118.3ff.]) are introduced by one and the same citation formula, namely, ὡς καὶ ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν καὶ σωτὴρ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν, "as our Lord and Savior, Jesus, said" (*Didasc.* 6.5.2); and both the *logos*, ἔσονται οἱ ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι καὶ οἱ πρῶτοι ἔσχατοι, "The last shall be first, and the first last" (Mt 20:16; cf. Mt 19:30 = Mk 10:31; Lk 13:30), and the *logos*, ἰδού, ποιῶ τὰ πρῶτα ὡς τὰ ἔσχατα, καὶ τὰ ἔσχατα ὡς τὰ πρῶτα, "Behold, I make the first things as the last, and the last as the first" (cf. *Barnabas* 6.13 [F. X. Funk and K. Bihlmeyer, *Die apostolischen Väter, SAKDQ*, 2.1.1 (Tübingen, 1956), p. 17.18]; and Hippolytus, *In Daniel*, 6.37 [G. N. Bonwetsch and H. Achelis, *Hippolytus, Werke*, I: *Exegetische und homiletische Schriften*; 1. *Der Kommentar zum Buche Daniel und die Fragmente des Kommentars zum Hohenliede; 2. Kleinere exegetische und homiletische Schriften, GCS*, 1 (Leipzig, 1897), p. 284.12]) are introduced with one and the same citation formula, namely, ὅτι εἶπεν, "for he said" (*Didasc.* 6.18.15).

source on which they are drawn.[17]

Of the 134 citations drawn on the "Gospel," 124 are citations of dominical *logoi*,[18] one is a citation of a non-dominical *logos*,[19] and nine are citations of Gospel narrative materials.[20]

These prolegomena are concerned, in particular, with the 124 citations of dominical *logoi*,[21] and their main aims have to

[17] The one exception, namely, the citation (Mt 28.1f.) at *Didasc.* 5.14.11, which is introduced with the citation formula *b'wnglywn dyn dmty hkn' ktyb*, "but in the Gospel of Matthew it is written thus" (Lagarde, *Didascalia Apostolorum*, p. 88.20f.), is probably a later interpolation (so also R. H. Connolly, *Didascalia Apostolorum: The Syriac Version Translated and Accompanied by the Verona Latin Fragments with an Introduction and Notes* [Oxford, 1929 (reprint, Oxford, 1969)], p. 182, n. 11). First, nowhere else does the Didascalist refer to any one of the Gospels (or, for that matter, any one of the NT writings) by name; second, the citation interrupts, quite awkwardly, the Didascalist's computation of the chronology of the passion; and third, the Didascalist nowhere else employs the adverb *hkn'*, "thus," to qualify the formula *ktyb*, "it is written" (cf. *Didasc.* 1.2.1; 2.16.1; 2.17.2; 2.35.2; 2.38.1; 2.58.3; 3.7.2; 3.10.10; 3.13.4; 5.4.3; 5.14.11). He employs *hkn'*, "thus," only to qualify the formula *'mr*, "he said" (cf. *Didasc.* 2.1.5f. [twice]; 2.8.1; 2.45.3; 5.3.2; 6.15.3f. [twice]).

[18] A complete index of the dominical *logoi* as cited in the *Didascalia*, tabulated, where such exist, according to their closest canonical parallels, is given in *TABLE A*.

[19] *Didasc.* 2.39.2 (Lk 3:13).

[20] See *TABLE B*.

[21] The Didascalist himself, on a number of occasions, refers to the "saying" he is citing as a *"logos,"* and on several occasions, more specifically as a *"logos* of the Lord." For example, in *Didasc.* 2.42.4 he introduces the citation of two dominical *logoi* (to which the closest parallels in the canonical Gospels are Lk 6.37c and Lk 6.37b) with the formula, *hn' ptgm' . . . w [hn' ptgm']* = οὗτος ὁ λόγος . . . καὶ [οὗτος ὁ λόγος], "this *logos* . . . and [this *logos*]" (Lagarde, *Didascalia Apostolorum*, p. 46.21f.); in *Didasc.* 2.46.5 he introduces the citation of a dominical *logos* (to which the closest parallel in the canonical Gospels is Mt 18.21) with the formula, *ptgm' d'myr mn mrn b'wnglywn* = ὁ λόγος ὁ λαληθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ, "the *logos* which was spoken by our Lord in the Gospel" (Lagarde, *Didascalia Apostolorum*, p. 49.21f.); and in *Didasc.* 2.35.1 he introduces the citation of a dominical *logos* (to which the closest parallel in the canonical Gospels is Mt 5:20) with the formula, *ptgm' dmry'* = ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου, "the *logos* of the Lord" (Lagarde, *Didascalia Apostolorum*, p. 41.24f.). Also, on a number of occasions, he employs the noun "Lord" (in the emphatic state: *mry'* = ὁ κύριος, "the Lord" [15 times], and with the first person plural pronominal suffix: *mrn* = ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν, "our Lord" [22 times]) as the subject of the verb "to say" (35 times) or "to speak" (twice), in his introductory citation formulae, and in other dominical titles such as *mry' 'lh'* = [ὁ] κύριος ὁ θεός, "the Lord God"

do with (i) the "determination" and (ii) the "evaluation" of those citations as they occurred in the original text of the Greek *Didascalia*.

1. *The Question of "Determination"*

Heretofore comparatively little has been done to work out an adequate methology for the "determination" of both the *form* (in the less technical sense of the term) and the *content* of said dominical *logoi*. It has been tacitly assumed that by a simple retroversion of the Syriac translation, harmonized with a comparable retroversion of the Latin translation where extant and especially with the extensively edited rendering of the Greek *Constitutiones Apostolorum*, both the *form* (again in the less technical sense of the term) and the *content* of a given *logos* in the original text of the Greek *Didascalia* can be "determined" with a considerable degree of precision.[22]

Furthermore, there has been a tendency to employ this assumption in a rather mechanical way. For example, when two of the witnesses agree and at the same time differ from the third it has been assumed, more often than has been warranted by the evidence, that the reading supported by the majority, regardless of the alignment of the witnesses, represents the more original; and when all three witnesses disagree with one another it has

(6 times), *mry' prwqn* = [ὁ] κύριος ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν, "the Lord our Savior" (twice), *mry' mšyḥ'* = [ὁ] κύριος ὁ χριστός, "the Lord, the Messiah" (once), *mrn wprwqn* = ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν καὶ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν, our Lord and our Savior" (4 times), and *mrn wmlpnn* = ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν καὶ διδάσκαλος ἡμῶν, "our Lord and our Teacher," etc.

[22] Such seems to be implied by the procedures employed by P. Boetticher (P. de Lagarde) (*Constitutiones Apostolicae Graece*, in *Analecta Ante-Nicaena*, 2: *Reliquiae Canonicae*, ed. C. C. J. Bunsen [London, 1854], pp. 225-338), Funk (*Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum*, 1:2-385), and H. Achelis and J. Flemming (*Die ältesten Quellen des orientalischen Kirchenrechts*, 2: *Die syrische Didaskalia*, *TU*, n.f., 10.2 [Leipzig, 1904], pp. 318-354); and by the remarks made by Connolly (*Didascalia Apostolorum*, pp. lxx-lxxv, and here and there in his footnotes), and G. Strecker ("On the Problem of Jewish Christianity," in W. Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*, trans. of *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei in ältesten Christentum* by a team from the Philadelphia Seminar on Christian Origins, ed. by R. A. Kraft and G. Krodel [Tübingen, 1964 (2d ed.); Philadelphia, 1971], pp. 244-257).

been similarly assumed, again more often than has been warranted by the evidence, that the reading supported by the Greek *Constitutiones Apostolorum* is the most original.

This methodology is inadequate. It does not take sufficient cognizance of the fact that neither of the Didascalists (Syriac or Latin), nor any of the Constitutors (Arabic, Ethiopic, or Greek), coming upon a citation of a dominical *logos* in his exemplar, consistently translates, or copies, what he finds in that exemplar: sometimes he translates, or copies, exactly what he finds;[23] sometimes he accommodates it to the context in which it occurs;[24] sometimes he edits it to suit his personal stylistic preferences;[25] sometimes he accommodates it to his contemporary Gospel traditions;[26] and sometimes he replaces it with a "dubbed-in" version drawn on his contemporary Gospel traditions.[27]

A much more complex methodology—more complex in the sense that it takes account of many more variables of the kind just noted—is necessary. Each version (Syriac and Latin; Arabic, Ethiopic, and Greek, where extant) of a given *logos* must first be compared with every other occurence of that particular *logos*, and/or its parallel, or parallels, in its own Gospel traditions—in both the Gospel manuscripts and the Patristic literature—in order to determine whether the translator, or editor, has translated, or rendered, his examplar *ad hoc*, accommodated it to his contemporary Gospel traditions, or replaced it with a "dubbed-in" version drawn on his contemporary Gospel traditions.

Obviously, if it can be shown by this method that he has employed a "dubbed-in" version drawn on his contemporary Gospel traditions, his rendering is of no practical value for the

---

[23] See, e.g., the citations at *Didasc*. 1.1.7 and 3.11.3 (Syriac version).

[24] See, e.g., the citations at *Didasc*. 6.13.3 and 6.14.8 (Greek version).

[25] See, e.g., the citation at *Didasc*. 1.1.4 (Syriac version).

[26] See, e.g., the citations at *Didasc*. 1.6.10; 2.34.7; 6.12.11; and 6.17.6 (Syriac version).

[27] See, e.g., the citations at *Didasc*. 2.16.1 and 6.14.4 (Greek version).

"determination" of the original text of the citation.[28] On the other hand, if it can be shown that he has accommodated his rendering to his contemporary Gospel traditions, those accommodations can be determined and set aside by the comparison proposed here. The basic elements that remain are of significant value for the "determination" of the original text of the citation.[29] Of course, if it can be shown that he has, in fact, translated, or copied, *ad hoc* from his exemplar, his rendering is of the utmost value for the "determination" of the original text of the citation.[30]

If by this process of comparison it can be shown that his rendering is of value for the "determination" of the original text of the citation, the citation itself must then be analyzed (i) in terms of its relationship to its literary context, and (ii) in terms of the stylistic preferences of the translator, or editor.[31]

Only after all the elements that have resulted from accommodation (either to the contemporary Gospel traditions or to the literary context), or from the stylistic preferences of the translator, or editor, have been determined and set aside, is it responsible to compare the versions themselves (Syriac and Latin; Arabic, Ethiopic, and Greek).[32]

I am persuaded that in this second process of comparison (namely, the comparison of the versions—Syriac and Latin; Arabic, Ethiopic, and Greek), the testimony of the Syriac and Latin *Didascaliae* must be considered as *primary*, the testimony of the Greek *Constitutiones Apostolorum* as *secondary*, and the testimony of the Arabic and Ethiopic *Constitutiones Apostolorum* as *tertiary* evidence. In this connection, I am also persuaded that no one witness can be counted on to represent consistently the original reading, and that no particular majority of the wit-

---

[28] See, e.g., the citations at *Didasc.* 2.16.1 and 6.14.4 (Greek version).

[29] See, e.g., the citations at *Didasc.* 1.1.7 and 3.11.3 (Latin version).

[30] See, e.g., the citations at *Didasc.* 6.13.3 and 6.14.8 (Syriac version).

[31] See, e.g., the citations at *Didasc.* 6.13.3 and 6.14.8 (Greek version).

[32] See, e.g., the sections on the *Reconstruction of the Greek Original,* especially in Studies 2, 5, and 7 in my forthcoming book, *The Dominical Logoi in the Greek Didascalia Apostolorum.*

nesses can be counted on to represent necessarily the original reading.[33]

2. *The Question of "Evaluation"*

Heretofore either one of two procedures has been followed:
(1) It has been assumed that the dominical *logoi* cited in the *Didascaliae* (and in the *Constitutiones Apostolorum*) that have parallels in the canonical Gospels have, in fact, been drawn on those Gospels. As a result, an attempt has been made at "evaluating" those *logoi* only in terms of whether or not they have been drawn on manuscripts of this or that particular text tradition; for example, with respect to the Syriac translation, whether they have been drawn on manuscripts of the old Syriac traditions or on manuscripts of the Peshitta traditions.[34] (2) The basic assumption of (1), namely, that the dominical *logoi* cited in the *Didascaliae* (and in the *Constitutiones Apostolorum*) that have parallels in the canonical Gospels have, in fact, been drawn on those Gospels has been questioned. As a result, an attempt has been made at "evaluating" those *logoi* precisely in terms of whether the Greek Didascalist employed as his source, or sources, the canonical Gosples and/or some other source, or sources, such as a "harmony" of the Gospels, or the like.[35]

These prolegomena are not concerned with the former of these

[33] Except, perhaps, where the Syriac and Latin *Didascaliae* stand together and are supported by at least one of the versions of the *Constitutiones Apostolorum,* especially the Greek.

[34] See M. D. Gibson, *The Didascalia Apostolorum in English: Translated from the Syriac, HS,* 2 (London, 1903), pp. xvi-xviii.

[35] The only other really serious study of this question is that of Achelis and Flemming (*Die syrische Didaskalia, TU,* n.f., 10.2, pp. 318-354) who conclude that the Didascalist drew, in the main, directly from all four canonical Gospels. Connolly (*Didascalia Apostolorum,* pp. lxx-lxxv) and Strecker ("On the Problem of Jewish Christianity," in Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy,* pp. 244-257) follow them in this conclusion. A. Harnack (*Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius* [Leipzig, 1904 (reprint, Leipzig, 1958)], 2.2, pp. 492-496) concludes that he drew, in the main, from an *Evangelienharmonie,* and contends that he did not draw from the fourth Gospel. Gibson (*Didascalia Apostolorum, HS,* 2, pp. viii-ix) agrees with Harnack in that she concludes that the Didascalist drew from a "Gospel Harmony," but she differs from him in that she contends that he did draw from the fourth Gospel.

inquiries, important as it may be.[36] They are concerned rather with the latter, and they aim to reach beyond that which has already been attempted and achieved in the search for responsible answers.

Again a more complex methodology—more complex in the sense that it takes into consideration a greater spectrum of relevant questions and consequently anticipates a greater spectrum of responsible answers—is required.

It seems to me altogether necessary to give attention to a sequence of relevant questions: (i) questions concerning both the "immediate" source, or sources, and (for want of a better term) the "ultimate" source, or sources, from which the Greek Didascalist's *logoi* derive, (ii) questions concerning both the *"source-historical," "form-historical," "gattung-historical,"* and *"redaction-historical"* motives involved in the transmission and shaping of those *logoi*, and (iii) questions concerning both the place and the role of said *logoi*, at the point of their citation by the Greek Didascalist, in the development of the ongoing Gospel traditions.

(To be continued)

[36] They do, however, indirectly raise some serious questions about the use of works such as the *Didascaliae* and the *Constitutiones Apostolorum* (which in their present form are once, twice, and thrice removed from their original Greek exemplars) in the critical *apparatus* of editions of the Greek New Testament such as those of E. Nestle and K. Aland (*Novum Testamentum Graece* [Stuttgart, 1963 (25th ed.)]) and K. Aland, et al. (*The Greek New Testament* [Stuttgart, 1975 (3rd ed.)]).

TABLE A

I. *Dominical Logoi cited with Introductory Citation Formulae*

a) *Dominical Logoi with Parallels in one Canonical Gospel: Matthew*

1.	*Didasc.* I.1.4	Mt 5:27f.
2.	*Didasc.* I.6.10	Mt 11:28
3.	*Didasc.* II.1.1	Mt 12:36f.
4.	*Didasc.* II.1.5	Mt 5:5
5.	*Didasc.* II.1.6	Mt 5:7
6.	*Didasc.* II.1.7	Mt 5:9
7.	*Didasc.* II.1.8	Mt 5:8
8.	*Didasc.* II.11.1	Mt 16:19b/18:18a
9.	*Didasc.* II.17.6	Mt 18:10a
10.	*Didasc.* II.18.2	Mt 16:19bc/18:18
11.	*Didasc.* II.34.7	Mt 11:28-30
12.	*Didasc.* II.35.1	Mt 5:20
13.	*Didasc.* II.38.1	Mt 18:16b, 17
14.	*Didasc.* II.42.4	Mt 7:2a
15.	*Didasc.* II.45.2	Mt 6:3b
16.	*Didasc.* II.46.5	Mt 5:9a
17.	*Didasc.* II.48.3	Mt 7:2a
18.	*Didasc.* II.53.1	Mt 5:22a
19.	*Didasc.* II.53.3	Mt 5:23f.
20.	*Didasc.* II.62.2	Mt 10:5b
21.	*Didasc.* III.5.5	Mt 7:6bc
22.	*Didasc.* III.10.6	Mt 6:3
23.	*Didasc.* III.10.10	Mt 6:2
24.	*Didasc.* V.1.6ff	Mt 25:34-40, 46
25.	*Didasc.* V.14.22	Mt 5:4a
26.	*Didasc.* VI.12.11	Mt 11:28-30
27.	*Didasc.* VI.14.2	Mt 10:5b
28.	*Didasc.* VI.15.3	Mt 5:17
29.	*Didasc.* VI.17.6	Mt 11:28
30.	*Didasc.* VI.21.2	Mt 23:18-22
31.	*Didasc.* VI.23.2	Mt 25:41

b) *Dominical Logoi with Parallels in one Canonical Gospel: Luke*

1.	*Didasc.* II.16.1	Lk 23:34a
2.	*Didasc.* II.18.6	Lk 12:48b
3.	*Didasc.* II.21.5	Lk 6:37c-38a
4.	*Didasc.* II.42.4	Lk 6:37b (bis)
5.	*Didasc.* II.42.4	Lk 6:37c
6.	*Didasc.* VI.14.4	Lk 23:34a

c) *Dominical Logoi with Parallels in one Canonical Gospel: John*

1.	*Didasc.* II.24.3	Jn 8:3ff.

d)   *Dominical Logoi with Parallels in two*
     Canonical Gospels: Matthew and Mark[1]

1. *Didasc.* V.6.5 .... Mt 26:41b = Mk 14:38b
2. *Didasc.* VI.12.2 .... Mt 19:4b-6 = Mk 10:6-8

e)   *Dominical Logoi with Parallels in two*
     Canonical Gospels: Matthew and Luke

1. *Didasc.* I.2.1   .... (Mt 5:44b) = Lk 6:28a
2. *Didasc.* I.2.3   .... (Mt 5:44c) = Lk 6:27b
3. *Didasc.* I.2.3   .... Mt 5:44 = Lk 6:27f.
4. *Didasc.* II.2.1   .... Mt 18:4 = Mt 23:12a =
    Lk 14:11a = Lk 18:14b
5. *Didasc.* II.8.1   .... *Mt 5:11f.* = Lk 6:22f.
6. *Didasc.* II.17.2 .... Mt 7:3, 5 = Lk 6:41, 42b
7. *Didasc.* II.20.1 .... Mt 10:40; *Lk 10:16;*
    cf. Mt 18:5 = Mk 9:37 = 9:48a
8. *Didasc.* II.20.8 .... Mt 18:22ff.; Lk 15:4ff.
9. *Didasc.* II.21.5 .... *Mt 6:12* = Lk 11:4
10. *Didasc.* II.32.2 .... Mt 10:40; *Lk 10:16;*
    cf. Mt 18:5 = Mk 9:37 = Lk 9:48a
11. *Didasc.* II.36.7 .... Mt 7:1 = Lk 6:37a
12. *Didasc.* II.38.1 .... Mt 18:15f.; Lk 17:3
13. *Didasc.* II.46.5f. .... *Mt 18:21f.;* Lk 17:4
14. *Didasc.* II.56.1 .... Mt 6:10 = (Lk 11:2e)
15. *Didasc.* II.56.2 .... Mt 12:30 = Lk 11:23
    cf. Mk 9:40 = Lk 9:50
16. *Didasc.* II.59.1 .... Mt 12:30b = Lk 11:23b
17. *Didasc.* III.7.3 .... Mt 6:21 = Lk 12:34
18. *Didasc.* III.10.12 .... (Mt 5:44b) = Lk 6:28a
19. *Didasc.* III.10.12 .... *Mt 10:12f.* = Lk 10:5f.
20. *Didasc.* V.1.4   .... *Mt 10:32* = Lk 12:8
21. *Didasc.* V.3.2   .... *Mt 5:11* = Lk 6:22
22. *Didasc.* V.4.3   .... *Mt 10:37f.* = Lk 14:26f.
23. *Didasc.* V.4.4   .... *Mt 10:28* = Lk 12:4f.
24. *Didasc.* V.6.8   .... *Mt 10:33* = Lk 12:9;
    cf. Mk 8:38 = Lk 9:26
25. *Didasc.* V.6.8   .... *Mt 10:37* = Lk 14:26;
    cf. Mt 10:39a = Lk 17:33a; Jn 12:25a
26. *Didasc.* V.6.9   .... Mt 10:24; *Lk 6:40;*
    cf. Jn 13:16, 15:20a
27. *Didasc.* V.14.3   .... *Mt 12:40b* = Lk 11:30b
28. *Didasc.* V.14.22 .... Mt 5:44d = Lk 6:28b
29. *Didasc.* VI.5.2   .... Mt 18:7 = Lk 17:1
30. *Didasc.* VI.5.4   .... Mt 23:38 = Lk 13:35a
31. *Didasc.* VI.14.7 .... Mt 12:32a = Lk 12:10a

[1] Where there is a significant difference between the parallels in the canonical Gospels, the parallel to which the Didascalist's citation is most closely related is italicized.

32. *Didasc.* VI.15.4 . . . . *Mt 5:18b;* Lk 16:17
33. *Didasc.* VI.16.12 . . . . *Mt 13:15f.* = Lk 10:23b
34. *Didasc.* VI.19.4 . . . . Mt 10:24; Lk 6:40a;
cf. Jn 13:16, 15:20a
35. *Didasc.* VI.21.3 . . . . Mt 12:43ff. = Lk 11:24ff.
36. *Didasc.* VI.23.2 . . . . Mt 8:12 = Lk 13:28a;
Mt 22:13; *25:30;* cf. Mt 13:42, 50; 24:51
37. *Didasc.* VI.23.5 . . . . Mt 7:21; Lk 6:46

f) *Dominical Logoi with Parallels in two*
Canonical Gospels: Mark and Luke

1. *Didasc.* III.7.8 . . . . Mk 12:41ff. = Lk 21:1ff.

g) *Dominical Logoi with Parallels in three*
Canonical Gospels: the Synoptics

1. *Didasc.* II.6.17 . . . . Mt 11:15; Mt 13:9 =
Mk 4:9 = Lk 8:8b; Mt 13:43b; Mk 4:23; Lk 14:35b
2. *Didasc.* II.17.4 . . . . *Mt 21:13* = Mk 11:17 =
Lk 19:46
3. *Didasc.* II.20.10 . . . . Mt 9:12 = Mk 2:17a =
Lk 5:31
4. *Didasc.* II.32.3 . . . . Mt 3:17b = Mk 1:9b =
Lk 3:22c (D, it)
5. *Didasc.* II.35.2 . . . . Mt 19:21a = Mk 10:21a =
Lk 18:22a; cf. Lk 12:33a
6. *Didasc.* II.40.1 . . . . Mt 9:12 = Mk 2:17a =
Lk 5:31
7. *Didasc.* II.46.1 . . . . Mt 22:21b = Mk 12:17 =
Lk 20:25
8. *Didasc.* II.58.3 . . . . Mt 13:57b = Mk 6:4a;
Lk 4:24; cf. Jn 4:44
9. *Didasc.* III.13.2 . . . . *Mt 20:26ff.* = Mk 10:43;
cf. Lk 22:26f.; Mk 9:35 = Lk 9:48b; Mt 23:11
10. *Didasc.* V.4.3 . . . . *Mt 16:25f.* = Mk 8:35ff. =
Lk 9:24f.; cf. Mt 10:39 = Lk 17:33
11. *Didasc.* V.6.7 . . . . *Mt 16:25* = Mk 8:35 =
Lk 9:24f.; Mt 10:39 = Lk 17:33; Jn 12:25
12. *Didasc.* V.7.2 . . . . Mt 24:13 = Mk 13:13b =
Lk 21:18f.; cf. Mt 10:22b; 10:30; Lk 12:7a
13. *Didasc.* V.12.6 . . . . Mt 9:14ff. = *Mk 2:18ff.* =
Lk 5:33f.
14. *Didasc.* VI.14.2 . . . . *Mt 16:6* = Mk 8:15;
Lk 12:1b
15. *Didasc.* VI.14.3f. . . . . *Mt 12:32b* = Lk 12:10b;
Mk 3:29a
16. *Didasc.* VI.14.6 . . . . *Mt 12:31f.* = Lk 12:10;
Mk 3:28f.
17. *Didasc.* IV.15.3 . . . . Mt 8:4 = Mk 1:44 = *Lk 5:14*
18. *Didasc.* VI.18.15 . . . . Mt 20:16; cf. Mt 19:30 =
Mk 10:31; Lk 13:30

19. *Didasc.* VI.21.1 .... Mt 13:12 = Mk 4:24c-25 =
    Lk 8:18bc; Mt 25:29; Lk 19:26
20. *Didasc.* VI.22.3 .... *Mt 22:31f.* = Mk 12:26 =
    Lk 20:37
21. *Didasc.* VI.22.3 .... *Mt 22:32b* = Mk 12:27a =
    Lk 20:38a

h) *Dominical Logoi the Various Components of which*
have Parallels in Differing Contexts
in the Canonical Gospels

1. *Didasc.* II.20.9 .... *Lk 7:48ff.*; cf. Mt 9:2b =
   Mk 2:5b = Lk 5:20b; Mt 9:22a + Mk 5:34a = Lk 8:48;
   Mk 10:52a = Lk 18:42; Lk 17:19
2. *Didasc.* III.7.2 .... *Mt 18:19* + *Mt 21:21b* =
   Mk 11:23; cf. Mt 17:20b; Lk 17:6b
3. *Didasc.* V.4.2 .... Mt 10:33a = Lk 12:9a +
   Mk 8:38a = Lk 9:26a + Mk 8:38c = Lk 9:26b + Mt 10:33b =
   Lk 12:9b + Mk 8:38d = Lk 9:26c + creedal formula
   (*Didasc.* VI.23.8); cf. Mt 24:30
4. *Didasc.* V.14.1 .... Mt 26:34 = Mk 14:30 =
   Lk 22:34; cf. Jn 13:38b + *Mt 26:21ff.* = Mk 14:18ff.; cf. Jn 13:21ff.
5. *Didasc.* V.14.3 .... Synoptic + Johannine type
   material + Jn 16:32 + *Mt 26:31b* = Mk 14:27b
6. *Didasc.* VI.13.3 .... Mt 7:15, 16a (cf. Lk 6:44a)
   + Mt 24:24a = Mk 13:22a + Mk 24:11f.; Mt 24:13 =
   Mk 13:13b = Lk 21:19

i) *Dominical Logoi with*
Parallels outside the Canonical Gospels

1. *Didasc.* I.1.7 (cf. *Did.* 1:2)
2. *Didasc.* I.2.3 (cf. *Did.* 1:3; Justin, 1 *Apol.* 15:9; 2 *Clem.* 13:4;
   Constit. Apost. VII.2.2)
3. *Didasc.* I.10.1 (cf. 2 *Clem.* 13:2) (?)
4. *Didasc.* II.8.2 (cf. Tertullian, *de Bapt.* 20) (?)
5. *Didasc.* II.36.9 (cf. Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 1.28.177)
6. *Didasc.* III.11.3 (cf. *Did.* 1:2)
7. *Didasc.* V.14.22 (cf. *Did.* 1:3; Justin, 1 *Apol.* 15:9; *Pap* Oxy 1224)
8. *Didasc.* VI.18.14 (cf. *Barn.* 15:4)
9. *Didasc.* VI.18.15 (cf. *Barn.* 6:13)

j) *Dominical Logoi with No Known Parallels*

1. *Didasc.* II.25.2 (?)
2. *Didasc.* VI.5.2

II. *Dominical Logoi cited without*
Introductory Citation Formulae

a) *Dominical Logoi with Parallels in one*
Canonical Gospel: Matthew

1. *Didasc.* II.32.3 .... Mt 5:22bc
2. *Didasc.* II.39.5 .... Mt 18:17b

b) *Dominical Logoi with Parallels in two*
Canonical Gospels: Matthew and Mark

1. *Didasc.* VI.14.8 .... Mt 24:24a = Mk 13:22a

c) *Dominical Logoi with Parallels in two*
Canonical Gospels: Matthew and Luke

1. *Didasc.* II.36.5 .... *Mt 6:20*; Lk 12:33b
2. *Didasc.* II.53.7 .... *Mt 18:22*; Lk 17:4
3. *Didasc.* II.54.2 .... Mt 10:12 = Lk 10:5
4. *Didasc.* V.6.8 .... Mt 8:12 = Lk 13:28a;
Mt 22:13; *25:30*; cf. Mt 13:42, 50; 24:51

d) *Dominical Logoi with Parallels in three*
Canonical Gospels: the Synoptics

1. *Didasc.* V.6.2 .... Mt 26:41a = Mk 14:38a =
Lk 22:46b

TABLE B

I. *Gospel Narrative Materials cited with*
Introductory Citation Formulae

1. *Didasc.* III.13.4f. .... Jn 13:4ff.

II. *Gospel Narrative Materials cited without*
Introductory Citation Formulae

a) *Gospel Narrative Materials with Parallels in one*
Canonical Gospel: Matthew

1. *Didasc.* V.17.2 .... Mt 21:46
2. *Didasc.* V.19.4 .... Mt 27:24f.

b) *Gospel Narrative Materials with Parallels*
in one Canonical Gospel: Luke

1. *Didasc.* II.20.9 .... Lk 4:18b

c) *Gospel Narrative Materials with Parallels in two*
Canonical Gospels: i) Matthew and Mark, and ii) Mark and Luke[1]

1. *Didasc.* III.12.4 .... Mt 27:56 = Mk 15:40b
cf. Jn 19:25b
2. *Didasc.* V.17.2 .... Mk 11:18b = *Lk 19:48b*

d) *Gospel Narrative Materials with Parallels*
in three Canonical Gospels: the Synoptics

1. *Didasc.* V.14.14 .... Mt 28:1, 9 = Mk 16:1f.,
(9) = Lk 24:1, 10
2. *Didasc.* V.17.2 .... *Mt 26:3ff.* = Mk 14:1f. =
Lk 22:2; cf. Jn 11:47ff.
3. *Didasc.* V.17.2f. .... Mt 26:6, 15f. = Mk 14:3, 10f.
= Lk 22:3ff.; cf. Lk 7:36

[1] Where there is a significant difference between the parallels in the canonical Gospels, the parallel to which the Didascalist's citation is most closely related is italicized.