

Paul F. Bradshaw

## THE PROBLEMS OF A NEW EDITION OF THE APOSTOLIC TRADITION

The title of this paper is deliberately intended to echo presentations made to the Oxford Patristic Conference in 1979 by Willy Rordorf and André Tuilier with regard to their new edition of the *Didache*.<sup>1</sup> Undoubtedly, that document does present considerable difficulties of one sort and another for a prospective editor, but it is my contention that they are by no means as grave as those that face someone attempting to compile an edition of the so-called *Apostolic Tradition* in the light of the most recent scholarship on that church order, as I and my colleagues Maxwell Johnson and L. Edward Phillips have been trying to do in the last few years.<sup>2</sup> What strikes us now is the amazing confidence with which earlier editors went about the task compared with our own diffidence towards the project.

The first, and perhaps the most daunting, problem that faces us is that of textual reconstruction. The almost complete absence of any part of the document in the original Greek immediately robs us of the sort of security that text-critics of most other ancient works can take for granted. Of course, the *Apostolic Tradition* is not entirely alone in lacking a manuscript in the original language. The *Canons of Hippolytus*, for instance, similarly only exists in an Arabic translation of a presumed Coptic intermediary of a lost original Greek text. But in preparing an edition of this latter church order, one only attempts to recover from the variety of manuscript evidence the true reading of the Arabic version, and largely leaves open the question of the degree to which that faithfully reflects what was in the lost Greek text. In the case of the *Apostolic Tradition*, however, editors have tried to draw on the several extant language versions of the document in order to present what they believed was the reading of the Greek text underlying

<sup>1</sup> Willy Rordorf, "Une nouvelle édition de la Didaché (problèmes exégétiques, historiques et théologiques)," *Studia Patristica* 15 (1984) 26-30; André Tuilier, "Une nouvelle édition de la Didaché (problèmes de méthode et de critique textuelle)," *Studia Patristica* 15 (1984) 31-36. Their edition of the text had been published as *La doctrine des douze apôtres*, SC 248, Paris 1978.

<sup>2</sup> To be published by Fortress Press, Minneapolis, in the Hermeneia series of biblical and patristic commentaries.

them all. This they did with confidence because of their conviction that the Latin version, where it existed, constituted a fairly literal rendering of the Greek. Thus B. S. Easton in his 1934 edition claimed that it was "generally reliable";<sup>3</sup> Gregory Dix in his 1937 edition affirmed that "its readings provide a standard by which we may judge those of other versions";<sup>4</sup> and Bernard Botte asserted that it had retained the order of the words from the original and, for the most part, the identical structure of the phrases: "On ne relève aucune modification systématique qui puisse être attribué au traducteur."<sup>5</sup> While acknowledging that the Latin version was not entirely infallible, yet these scholars believed its errors to be few, easily discernible, and quite simple to correct.

However, even they themselves were willing to go against what appears to be the clear evidence of the Latin on various occasions when its readings did not correspond with what they thought that the document ought to have said, the most well-known example of this being the post-baptismal prayer in chapter 21, where the Latin linked the gift of the Holy Spirit to the water rather than to the laying on of hands, as was the case in the other witnesses.<sup>6</sup> Moreover, in a short paper presented to the Oxford Patristic Conference in 1961, A. F. Walls questioned the reliance usually placed upon the Latin version, and noted the duplication of the concluding chapters and other apparent inconsistencies in the text, which implied that it too may have been subjected to a greater measure of revision than was generally acknowledged.<sup>7</sup> Several other scholars have also challenged the assumption that the reconstructed text represents what the original author wrote, and suggested that at least in parts it was retouched by later hands in order to bring it into line with current doctrine and practice.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>3</sup> B. S. Easton, *The Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus* (Cambridge & New York 1934; reprinted Hamden, CT, 1962) 31.

<sup>4</sup> Gregory Dix, *The Treatise on the Apostolic Tradition of St. Hippolytus of Rome* (London 1937; 2nd edn 1968, with preface and corrections by Henry Chadwick) lvi.

<sup>5</sup> Bernard Botte, *La Tradition apostolique de saint Hippolyte: Essai de reconstitution*, LQF 39 (Münster 1963; 5th edn 1989, with addenda by Albert Gerhards) XXXVI.

<sup>6</sup> See the discussion between Anthony Gelston, "A note on the text of the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus," and G. J. Cumming, "The post-baptismal prayer in the Apostolic Tradition: Further Considerations," JTS 39 (1988) 112-119.

<sup>7</sup> A. F. Walls, "The Latin Version of Hippolytus' Apostolic Tradition," *Studia Patristica* 3 (1961) 155-162.

<sup>8</sup> Edward C. Ratcliff, "Apostolic Tradition: Questions concerning the Appointment of the Bishop," *Studia Patristica* 8 (1966) 266-270; idem, "The Sanctus and the Pattern

Thus, the task of reconstructing the original text is by no means over. This, then, is the first level on which the comparative approach to liturgy needs to be called into service with regard to this church order, an examination of the often very different readings found in the various language versions and in the several other church orders that have used this document as a source for their own work, in order to try to establish the Greek text that lies behind them all. Although in part the standard canons of the text-critical method used to determine the original reading of any ancient text can be employed here, yet the history of liturgically related texts presents special problems that demand the adoption of other criteria. While other ancient manuscripts are subject to occasional attempts by copyists to correct what they perceived to be doctrinal errors on the part of the original authors, such emendations are relatively rare and much easier to detect than in liturgical texts and liturgically related manuscripts. In these cases, in order to decide whether a particular element belongs to the original version of the text or is a later accretion, one has to resort to comparative study: is the element in question consistent in vocabulary, theological content, and liturgical performance with what is said elsewhere in the document and with what we know from other sources concerning liturgical practice in the place and time period from which it is believed to originate?

However, recent questions about the authorship and nature of this particular church order require a significant modification of the methods and criteria to be used in the process of comparison in this case. In a series of articles Marcel Metzger has developed an idea earlier advanced both by Jean Magne and by Alexandre Faivre, that not only is this church order not the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus, it is not the work of any single author at all but rather a piece of "living literature."<sup>9</sup> Metzger has argued that its lack of unity or logical progression, its frequent incoherences, doublets, and contradictions, all point away from the existence of a single editorial hand. Instead, it

of the Early Anaphora." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 1 (1950) 29-36, 125-134 (both reprinted in A. H. Couratin and David Tripp, eds., *E. C. Ratcliff: Liturgical Studies* [London 1976] 18-40, 156-160); Eric Segelberg, "The Ordination Prayers in Hippolytus," *Studia Patristica* 13 (1975) 397-408; Paul F. Bradshaw, "Ordination," in Geoffrey J. Cumming, ed., *Essays on Hippolytus* (Grove Liturgical Study 15; Nottingham 1978) 33-38; idem, "The Participation of Other Bishops in the Ordination of a Bishop in the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus," *Studia Patristica* 18 (1989) 335-338.

<sup>9</sup> Jean Magne, *Tradition apostolique sur les charismes et Diataxis des saints Apôtres* (Paris 1975) 76-77; Alexandre Faivre, "La documentation canonico-liturgique de l'Église ancienne," *Revue des sciences religieuses* 54 (1980) 286.

has all the characteristics of a composite work, a collection of community rules from quite disparate traditions.<sup>10</sup> This judgement has also been supported by Allen Brent, but he would still view the work as belonging to "the school of Hippolytus," even though acknowledging that there is no necessary association between the church order itself and the title "Apostolic Tradition" that is found on the list of works supposedly by Hippolytus inscribed on the statue in Rome.<sup>11</sup>

Taken to its logical conclusion, Metzger's verdict challenges not only the authorship of this church order but also its provenance and traditional dating, since its attribution to Rome and its assignment to the early third century were arrived at by earlier scholars principally on the assumption of Hippolytean authorship and not on the grounds of internal evidence or other factors examined dispassionately. There is after all a paucity of close parallels between the liturgical practices prescribed in this document and the later Roman rites. Apart from the baptismal interrogations and the double post-baptismal anointing, there is nothing distinctively Roman about it,<sup>12</sup> and even these two features could have entered the Roman liturgy at a later date, perhaps even as a result of the influence of the *Apostolic Tradition* itself.<sup>13</sup> This does not amount to compelling evidence that it cannot have originated in Rome, since we have virtually no other sources to inform us what liturgical practices there might have been in the first few centuries, but it does eliminate much of a link with that ancient Christian city in preference to any other place.

Similarly, if the *Apostolic Tradition* is a multi-layered work, it may well contain elements that belong to a very early period of the Chris-

<sup>10</sup> Marcel Metzger, "Nouvelles perspectives pour le prétendue *Tradition apostolique*," *Ecclesia Orans* 5 (1988) 241-259; "Enquêtes autour de la prétendue *Tradition apostolique*," *ibid.* 9 (1992) 7-36; "A propos des règlements ecclésiastiques et de la prétendue *Tradition apostolique*," *Revue des sciences religieuses* 66 (1992) 249-261.

<sup>11</sup> Allen Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church in the Third Century: Communities in Tension before the Emergence of a Monarch-Bishop* (Leiden 1995) 195-196, 301-302.

<sup>12</sup> Aimé-Georges Marinort, "Nouvel examen de la 'Tradition apostolique' d'Hippolyte," *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique* 88 (1987) 21-22, also includes the participation of presbyters in the ordination of another presbyter and the formulas for the blessing of oil as rites in the *Apostolic Tradition* that are distinctive to Rome; but he is mistaken on both counts. The contrasts between the *Apostolic Tradition* and the later Roman baptismal liturgy are most fully discussed by A. Salles, "La 'Tradition apostolique' est-elle un témoin de la liturgie romaine?" *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 148 (1955) 181-213.

<sup>13</sup> See Metzger, "Nouvelles perspectives pour le prétendue *Tradition apostolique*,"

tian tradition as well as elements from a much later time. This perception radically affects any attempt to assign a date to the collection of directives, since the dating of certain parts of it is not necessarily an accurate guide to the dating of the whole. We also need to be alert to the possibility that the major ritual units within the text — such as ordination, baptism, and even the eucharist itself — may themselves be composite literary creations, artificially made up of elements drawn from different local traditions rather than comprising a single authentic rite that was ever celebrated in that particular form anywhere in the world. Thus our investigation of the origin of the components of the church order must extend to examining the individual small parts of rites and not rest content to allow one element within a rite to be treated as determinative of the whole.

This new understanding of the character of the work means that many of the tests normally used to determine the authenticity of a reading in an ancient document can no longer be applied in this case. Asking whether a particular statement would be consistent, for example, with what is said elsewhere in the document cannot be determinative in a composite text as it would be in a work by a single author. Similarly, one can no longer ask whether it coheres with what we know from other sources of liturgical practice in that region or that time period, when we do not know from which region or which time period a particular section of the document actually originates.

Thus, a different approach is required in order to try to assign date and provenance to the constitutive parts of this church order. It is not now simply a matter of trying to determine whether something is part of an authentic original text or an interpolation. One is attempting to chart the sequence in which the different items came together and were then subject to modification in the various linguistic versions of this constantly changing text. In order to undertake this, we need to cast the comparative net much more widely. We need to ask where in the whole realm of ancient Christian liturgy there might be a parallel to something encountered in the text. Exactly where and when is something like this first evidenced in another source? That might well point us in the direction of assigning a date and provenance to a unit of the text, and from that basis we may start to build up a plausible hypothesis for the evolution of the whole document.

Of course, this method is a very rough and ready tool, lacking the precision that we would prefer to have. Liturgical practices may have existed long before they are recorded in an extant source. They may have continued long after our evidence runs out. They may have flourished in other places than those for which we have written testi-

mony. Thus, we could be in danger of assigning elements in this church order to time periods and geographical homes from which they do not come, and so be constructing a quite false picture. But it is the only tool that we possess, and used cautiously, it is better than nothing.<sup>14</sup>

Unfortunately, too much comparative study of the *Apostolic Tradition* with other ancient sources has hitherto been carried out with such superficiality as to render its results virtually worthless. A typical example would be Georg Kretschmar's claim that the ordination prayer for a bishop "clearly draws from the First Epistle of Clement in several places."<sup>15</sup> Upon closer examination, this alleged literary dependency turns out to be little more than the fact that both use such words as "high-priest" and "blamelessly." At best, all that can be claimed is that the two texts derive from the same world of ideas, which would not be surprising if the prayer is indeed of Roman provenance. But what is much more significant here are the major differences between this particular ordination prayer and all others from Christian antiquity, which mark it out as unique in certain important respects. In particular, no other ancient ordination prayer in its primary stratum lists the powers and functions of the episcopate in the way that this one does, and with the exception of the classical Roman prayer, no other ancient prayer in its primary stratum describes the office in sacerdotal terms.<sup>16</sup> A proper comparative method requires us to pay equal attention to such differences as to any similarities.

Another example of excessive superficiality in comparative analysis would be the claim made by many, including both Kretschmar and Enrico Mazza, that the eucharistic prayer bears the marks of the Jewish grace after meals.<sup>17</sup> Even if we prescind from the question as to whether this Jewish prayer existed in the first century in the form

<sup>14</sup> See further Paul F. Bradshaw, "Redating the *Apostolic Tradition*: Some Preliminary Steps," in John Baldovin & Nathan Mitchell, eds. *Rule of Prayer, Rule of Faith: Essays in Honor of Aidan Kavanagh, OSB* (Collegeville 1996) 3-17.

<sup>15</sup> Georg Kretschmar, "Early Christian Liturgy in the Light of Contemporary Historical Research," *Studia Liturgica* 16.3/4 (1986/7) 33.

<sup>16</sup> See further Paul F. Bradshaw, "An Ecumenical Ordination Prayer?" *Studia Liturgica* 26 (1996) 203-204.

<sup>17</sup> Kretschmar, "Early Christian Liturgy in the Light of Contemporary Historical Research," 41; Enrico Mazza, *The Origins of the Eucharistic Prayer* (Collegeville, MN, 1995) esp. 153-161.

in which we know it from later sources,<sup>18</sup> the connection between the two in truth amounts to nothing more than that both offer thanksgiving to God and make petition for something, albeit in very different ways and with very different literary structures. It is rather like the alleged parallels between the Sabbath synagogue service and the early Christian liturgy of the word, which when examined closely, turn out to be nothing more than that in both of them scripture is read and expounded and prayer is offered — hardly something very striking — or between the Jewish and Christian hours of daily prayer, about which Robert Taft has concluded: "the most we can say ... is that Christians, like Jews, adopted the custom of prayer at fixed times."<sup>19</sup>

A second major weakness in the comparison of the *Apostolic Tradition* with other patristic sources has been the common failure to distinguish parallels that may also be found in a number of different authors, and often in different geographical regions and temporal periods, from those that are exclusive to one particular author, or region, or time period. The test of exclusivity is vital to the value of the data adduced.<sup>20</sup> It is not enough, for instance, to show that similar phrases and vocabulary to those in parts of the *Apostolic Tradition* can also be found in the writings of Hippolytus or Irenaeus or whomever. It is essential to demonstrate that they can be found there *and nowhere else* for the data to have some value in determining either authorship or source or region or time period of composition of that section of the church order. Prior to the advent of the computer, making such assertions was always somewhat precarious, since none of us could comb patristic literature with the sort of thoroughness necessary to give those claims real authority. To say that one had never come across such a phrase elsewhere was not the same as saying that it did not exist. However, the computer database of Greek patristic literature known as the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (hereafter *TLG*) helps resolve many of those difficulties.

Yet, in order to use this database to test a hypothesis, one needs to have a Greek text as the basis for comparison, and that of course is what is almost entirely lacking in the case of the *Apostolic Tradition*. It

<sup>18</sup> See Paul F. Bradshaw, *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship* (London & New York 1992) 24-26.

<sup>19</sup> Robert F. Taft, *The Liturgy of the Hours in East and West* (Collegeville, MN, 1986) 11.

<sup>20</sup> See the essay by Robert F. Taft, "The Authenticity of the Chrysostom Anaphora Revisited. Determining the Authorship of Liturgical Texts by Computer," *OCP* 56 (1990) 5-51, & esp. 27ff.

the ages of ages" (18.10). Admittedly, there is also a Latin phrase in a text attributed to Cyprian which connects Holy Spirit with holy church in a doxology, but the parallel is not nearly as close as in *Contra Noetum*; and some manuscripts of the Latin version of the *Acta Antiochena* of Ignatius of Antioch include the phrase in a doxology, although it does not occur in the Greek or Syriac versions.<sup>21</sup>

Second, in *Apostolic Tradition* 38 readers are warned to take care not to spill from the eucharistic cup lest an "alien spirit" lick it up. The *TLG* offered only two matches for the phrase "alien spirit" in the first and second centuries; neither similar to the use in the *Apostolic Tradition*; in third-century literature there were five matches, four of them close parallels: one in the philosopher Iamblicus (*De mysteriis* 2.5), two in *Contra Noetum*, both in a passage where the author talks about the strange spirit which had taken refuge in Noetus, leading him astray (1.2), and one in Hippolytus' *Commentary on Daniel* (4.12.5), which is quite similar to the use in *Contra Noetum*. It is true that there are seven matches in the fourth century, but the *Apostolic Tradition* text appears to belong to the third century or earlier, since the practice there described of taking the cup at home, and especially of blessing it oneself, did not apparently last long. It should also be noted that this is one of the few sections in the church order where there is a shift to the second person from the more usual third person, which Metzger has suggested is a sign of the use of a different source.

Third, the eucharistic prayer contains the unusual phrase "manifest the resurrection." It also appears in Hippolytus, *Refutation of All Heresies*, in a passage that is reminiscent of the themes of this prayer: "He did not protest against his passion, but became obedient unto death and manifested his resurrection" (10.33). Although it is not unique to these two texts, the only other known occurrence of the phrase is in Irenaeus (*Demonstratio* 38), whose theology is often similar to that of Hippolytus' authentic writings in other respects. Enrico Mazza has suggested that the phrase might have been part of a collection of standard *testimonia*, but the parallels he adduces in support of this are not especially close.<sup>22</sup>

Finally, the Sahidic version of *Apostolic Tradition* 21 concludes as follows: "And we have given these things to you in brief concerning the holy baptism and the holy offering, since you have already been instructed concerning the resurrection of the flesh and all the other

<sup>21</sup> See Jean Michel Hanssens, *La liturgie d'Hippolyte: Ses documents, son rituel, ses origines et son caractère*, OCA 155 (Rome 1959) 368-370.

<sup>22</sup> Mazza, *The Origins of the Eucharistic Prayer*, 123-126, esp. n. 122.

is even dangerous to assume that the Greek-loan words used in the Coptic language which are reproduced in Botte's edition of the *Apostolic Tradition* must have stood in the original text and were copied directly from there by the translator. That may well be true in many cases, but it is also possible in other cases that the translator might have chosen to translate a Greek word in the text before him by a quite different Greek loan-word in the Coptic language. A good example of this difficulty can be seen in chapter 19, where the Greek loan-word ἐκἀπαριστῶς occurs in the Sahidic text in the instruction about the imposition of hands on catechumens: "Whether an ecclesiastic is the one who teaches or a layperson, let him do the same." This Greek word is otherwise only found in the sense of the opposite of a lay person from the fourth century onwards, and so would be very unusual in a third-century source, let alone one which may be older still. This raises the possibility that the Greek text before the translator did not contain that word but was simply that still found in *Apostolic Constitutions* 8.32, "the teacher, even if he is a layman..." and that this was expanded by the translator using a Greek loan-word as a natural part of the Coptic language.

Thus, if we are to attempt this sort of comparison, we need to choose with considerable care the Greek words that we allege stood in that original language version, lest we accidentally produce erroneous results. Nevertheless, a judicious choice of words and phrases for comparison may succeed in throwing more light on the true parallels between parts of this church order and other early Christian sources than has hitherto been possible.

It might well appear, in the light of what I have said so far, that I regard the document's association with the name of Hippolytus as a piece of literary fiction having no basis in its actual evolution. That is certainly the direction in which most of the evidence seems to lead. Yet, before concluding my paper, I must record several curious results thrown up by recent research done by Edward Phillips that might seem to point in the opposite direction. He has compared what seems to have been the original Greek text of a few unusual phrases in the *Apostolic Tradition* with what is contained in the *TLG*. This exercise has produced some surprising answers.

First, the strange phrase "with the Holy Spirit in the holy church" (perhaps related to Eph 3:21) occurs in doxologies five times in the *Apostolic Tradition*. The *TLG* revealed only one close parallel to this phrase in Greek patristic literature — in *Contra Noetum*, a work attributed to Hippolytus: "To him be glory and power with the Father and the Holy Spirit in the holy church both now and always and to

things as written...." Although there is a lacuna in the Latin text at this point, the other versions generally support the authenticity of this sentence, and once again, it involves a shift to the second person plural. Interestingly, one of the lost works of Hippolytus is a homily "On the Resurrection of the Flesh." Is this merely a coincidence or a sign of another connection?

Unless an alternative explanation exists for these scraps of evidence, they do seem to open up a new avenue for future research and raise the possibility that Hippolytus may after all have had some involvement in the compilation of the church order, perhaps as one of the author of some of the source material used, or perhaps as one of the hands that actually helped add to the growing collection of material from diverse places. But whatever the truth concerning these particular elements, further comparative investigation along these and other lines should certainly help to fill out the picture and enable us to trace to a greater degree the true story of the gradual evolution of this complex and enigmatic piece of ancient Christian literature.

University of Notre Dame  
Notre Dame  
Indiana 46556  
U.S.A.

Paul F. Bradshaw

The Baumstark Prize-Winning Essay

Hans-Jürgen Feulner

## DAS ANAPHORISCHE FÜRBITTGESETZ UND DIE DIPTYCHEN NACH DER KRITISCHEN EDITION DER ARMENISCHEN ATHANASIUS-ANAPHORA\*

### 1. Einführung<sup>1</sup>

Im vorliegenden Beitrag<sup>2</sup> soll der Versuch unternommen werden, das *anaphorische Fürbittgesetz* und die *Diptychen* der armenischen

#### \* Abkürzungen (in Auswahl)

<i>äg boh Bas</i>	bohairische Basilius-Anaphora (ägyptische Tradition)
<i>äg boh Greg</i>	bohairische Gregorius-Anaphora (ägyptische Tradition)
<i>äg gr Bas</i>	griechische Basilius-Anaphora (ägyptische Tradition)
<i>äg gr Greg</i>	griechische Gregorius-Anaphora (ägyptische Tradition)
<i>äg gr Mark</i>	griechische Markus-Anaphora (ägyptische Tradition)
<i>äg sah Bas</i>	sahidische Basilius-Anaphora (ägyptische Tradition)
<i>Ap Const</i>	Apostolische Konstitutionen
<i>arm Ath</i>	armenische Athanasius-Anaphora
<i>arm Bas I</i>	armenische Basilius-Anaphora (1. Rezension)
<i>arm Bas II</i>	armenische Basilius-Anaphora (2. Rezension)
<i>arm Chrys</i>	armenische Chrysostomus-Anaphora
<i>arm Cyrill</i>	armenische Cyrill-Anaphora
<i>arm Greg</i>	armenische Gregorius-Anaphora
<i>arm Ign</i>	armenische Ignatius-Anaphora
<i>arm Jak</i>	armenische Jakobus-Anaphora
<i>arm Sah</i>	armenische Sahak-Anaphora
<i>äth Bas</i>	äthiopische Basilius-Anaphora
<i>Buz. Pai.</i>	Buzandaran Patmut'wnk
<i>byz Bas</i>	byzantinische Basilius-Anaphora
<i>byz Chrys</i>	byzantinische Chrysostomus-Anaphora
<i>gr Jak</i>	griechische Jakobus-Anaphora
<i>syr Ap I</i>	syrische Zwölf-Apostel-Anaphora I
<i>syr Bas</i>	syrische Basilius-Anaphora
<i>Trad Ap</i>	Traditio Apostolica

<sup>1</sup> Eine Kurzbibliographie der verwendeten Literatur findet sich im Anhang.

<sup>2</sup> Dieser Beitrag entspricht Kap. 8 des liturgievergleichenden Kommentars meiner Doktorarbeit (*Die armenische Athanasius-Anaphora. Kritische Edition, Übersetzung und liturgievergleichender Kommentar*), die in der am Päpstlichen Orientalischen Institut