

REVIEWS

SOME RECENT DISCUSSIONS OF THE CHURCH ORDERS.

The so-called Egyptian Church Order and derived documents, by
DOM R. HUGH CONNOLLY. (*Texts and Studies*, Vol. viii, No. 4,
Cambridge University Press, 1916.)

THIS latest number of *Texts and Studies* will be heartily welcomed by all students who have to deal with that perplexing class of documents known as the Church Orders. The five documents dealt with by Dom Connolly are: (1) The Canons of Hippolytus (= CH); (2) the 'Egyptian Church Order', a title given by Achelis—'merely to give it a name'—to the Church Order found in the Ethiopic, Coptic, and Arabic versions of Horner and in the Latin fragments of Hauler (= Eg CO); (3) the Apostolic Constitutions Book viii (= AC viii), (4) the 'Constitutiones per Hippolytum'—the 'Epitome' of Funk (= Ep); (5) the Testament of our Lord (= Test).

The intricacy of the problems presented by the history and mutual relations of these documents, and the wide divergence of views held with regard to them, are such, that a reviewer may perhaps be justified in taking a wider survey than is usually permitted in dealing with a particular volume; and before attempting to appraise the value of this latest contribution, it will help to clear our minds if we can envisage in a brief review the course which the investigation into these Orders has taken in recent years.

In England the treatment of the problem has been largely dominated by the influence of Achelis's book *Die Canones Hippolyti*, which appeared in 1891. The reception given to that work in Germany by Harnack (though he subsequently modified his views), and by Duchesne and Batiffol in France, led for some time to the over-confident ascription of CH to a period contemporary with Hippolytus. In so well-known a book as Duchesne's *Origines du Culte chrétien* we find it stated (Eng. tr. p. 524), 'Taken as a whole . . . this collection of liturgical and disciplinary prescriptions belongs certainly to a date anterior to the fourth century, and there is nothing to hinder us from assigning it to the time of Hippolytus himself'. In the same year in which Achelis's

work appeared Funk published his book *Die Apostolischen Konstitutionen*, in which he first propounded a view which reversed Achelis's order of priority of the documents, making AC viii the starting-point, and CH the end, of the development represented by the first four documents mentioned above. In 1899 a fresh factor was introduced into the problem by the publication of Rahmani's edition (in a Syriac version) of the Testament of our Lord. Both Achelis and Funk, though still maintaining their original views, were agreed in maintaining (as against the early date assigned to it by its editor) that this new document was a later elaboration or working up of material found in Eg Co (Connolly, p. 35). In 1900 appeared Hauler's *Didascalie apostolorum fragmenta Veronensia Latina*, containing the Latin text of considerable portions of Eg CO, which had been known to Achelis mainly in the Ethiopic version of Ludolf. Finally in 1904 Horner published in his *Statutes of the Apostles* the Ethiopic, Coptic, and Arabic versions of Eg CO. The accession of this new material rendered possible a more thorough investigation of the original Greek text which underlies the different versions of this important but hitherto much neglected Church Order. Lastly, in 1905 appeared Funk's monumental work, *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum*, in which was printed the text of the Apostolic Constitutions (with an *apparatus criticus*), set out in a convenient form so as to shew the parallels with the Didascalia and the Didache, and also containing the text of the 'Constitutiones per Hippolytum' or 'Epitome Constitutionum Apost. viii', as Funk calls it. In the preface to the second volume of this work Funk summarized the history of the discussion upon the Church Orders and restates the view of their relations which he had indicated in his earlier work on the Apostolic Constitutions, and more recently in his book *Das Testament unseres Herrn und die verwandten Schriften* (1901). But Funk's conclusions, though accepted in Germany by Harnack and Bardenheuer, found little or no acceptance in England, where his work has been strangely neglected, partly, no doubt, because of his somewhat paradoxical view as to the priority of AC viii. Yet Funk's method, with its insistence on detailed investigation of the documents themselves in the light of other and more certain sources of knowledge of early Church life, of which his book *Das Testament* was a specimen, is full of instruction, and would have proved a valuable discipline in face of the too ready assumption that in the main Achelis's solution held the field.

The late Bishop Wordsworth's *Ministry of Grace*, published in 1901 after the appearance of Hauler's Latin fragments, but before the publication of Mr Horner's texts, has exercised a considerable influence on the discussion of the Church Orders in England. Its chief characteristic

is the assumption that behind CH and other related documents there lies 'a lost Church Order'. But in other respects the author still shows the influence of Achelis and regards CH as 'the earliest working up of this lost Order', and as a Roman Church Order written before A. D. 199 (*op. cit.* pp. 20 f).

Bishop Maclean's *Ancient Church Orders* (1910), written after the publication of Horner's texts, summarizes in a convenient form in parallel columns the contents of the various Orders, though, as Dom Connolly observes (p. 4 note 2), he somewhat complicates the problem with regard to Eg CO by regarding the Ethiopic, Coptic, and Latin texts as three separate redactions of an original Order, rather than as three versions of 'what is essentially one and the same document'. (Bishop Wordsworth (*Ministry of Grace*, p. 26) similarly speaks of the Verona fragments as *later* than the two Egyptian books.) But in two respects Bishop Maclean advanced upon previous discussions by English writers. (1) He maintained that the Canons of Hippolytus cannot be the original of this group of Orders, on the ground that there is such a large amount of material in it which does not appear in any other Church Order, and he assigned to it a date not before the earlier half of the fourth century. (2) He gave fuller weight to the evidence of Eg CO, though, as we have seen, he regarded the different texts of that Order as separate redactions. He adhered, however, to Bishop Wordsworth's theory of a 'lost Church Order', 'possibly the work of Hippolytus', and regarded this as the ultimate basis of all these Orders (pp. 142 f). One of the grounds which he alleged for postulating a 'lost Original' was that these Orders 'contain obscure and confused passages which it is impossible to understand completely, and which could not with any probability be held to be original in any of the manuals' (p. 144), and he adduces as examples the passage on the communion of the newly-baptized in Eg CO (Ethiopic and Latin) and Test, and that on the honorary presbyterate of confessors (on the former of these see Connolly, pp. 83 f). His conclusion was that the relationship of these Orders to one another is indirect, and that they are connected as 'cousins' rather than as 'parents and children' (p. 147), though he admitted that the authors of AC viii and Test had before them, certainly in some portions of their work, a document like Eg CO in one or other of its versions, and in his table of the contents of the Orders he adopted the arrangement of Eg CO as being 'most in accordance with that of the other manuals', and pointed out that Achelis had rearranged the contents of CH on the same basis (p. 12).

Two recent contributions to the JOURNAL carry us some way further. Dr Frere, in his article 'Early Ordination Services' (*J. T. S.* April 1915,

pp. 323 f), assigns the first place in the historical evolution of this group of documents to Eg CO, which he calls CO¹, using as his authorities for the text the three versions of Horner, the Bohairic of Tattam, and the Latin of Hauler. He places the Canons of Hippolytus second, and AC viii (with the 'Constitutiones per Hippolytum') and Test in the third and fourth rank. He agrees, however, with Wordsworth and Maclean in postulating a 'lost Church Order' as the original source, and with the latter in his remark 'it is quite possible that . . . no one of the existing documents is derived directly from any other' (p. 369). Lastly, Mr C. H. Turner in the JOURNAL for July 1915 (p. 542) maintains the secondary character of the Canons of Hippolytus—'a version of a version', 'certainly not earlier than the fourth century in their substance'. 'They represent Hippolytus at one stage at least further from the original than the Latin and Ethiopic, which are independent renderings of the same third-century original.' Mr Turner expresses his own opinion that this original work is 'traceable to Hippolytus', but whether this is so or not, it was certainly written in Greek and at some time within the third century.

In this latest work in *Texts and Studies* Dom Connolly provides at once the complement and the corrective to these recent discussions. I believe that when his whole presentation of his case is considered it will be found to provide the long-sought-for solution of this vexed question of the history of the Church Orders. He tells us that, though working independently on his own lines, he has since found that, in all essential points, his conclusions had already been anticipated by E. Schwartz of Strassburg in his tract *Ueber die pseudapostolischen Kirchenordnungen* (Strassburg 1910). But the case, which Schwartz had indicated only briefly and, in the main, without detailed statement of the evidence, is in this latest work set forth in full detail and with a clear synopsis of the evidence. What these conclusions are Dom Connolly has himself indicated in outline in the JOURNAL for October 1916 (pp. 55 f). The theory of a 'lost Church Order' is rejected. Justice is done alike to the contributions of Achelis and of Funk, while the most disputable elements in their treatment—on the one hand, the claim for the high antiquity and priority of CH, and on the other, the claim that AC viii represents the starting-point in the historical evolution of this group of Church Orders—are disposed of. Two sets of conclusions, which have in the past been regarded as mutually exclusive, are combined. The view of Achelis that AC viii and Test are derived from Eg CO is accepted, along with the view of Funk that CH is derived from Eg CO, and that the so-called 'Canones per Hippolytum' (the 'Epitome' of Funk) are an excerpt from AC viii, though not, as Achelis maintained, an excerpt from an earlier draft of

that book. The result is that Eg CO is recognized as the direct source of AC viii, Test, and CH, and the ultimate source of Ep.

So far Dom Connolly arrives independently at the same results as Schwartz with regard to the relations of these five Church Orders. In chapter iii he discusses the question how the name of Hippolytus came to be attached to Ep and CH. He points out (p. 135) that the title 'Constitutiones per Hippolytum' given by modern writers to Ep is incorrect, as in the Greek MSS only the second of the five parts into which it is divided is entitled *Διατάξεις τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων περὶ χειροτονιῶν διὰ Ἰππολύτου*, and that neither AC viii nor Ep in the opening section *περὶ χαρισμάτων* claims Hippolytus as author. The name of Hippolytus, on the other hand, is brought in just at the point where Ep begins to run parallel to Eg CO (the ordination of a bishop), and where the author has substituted for the matter found in AC viii the more original form of the bishop's ordination prayer found in Eg CO. (A similar substitution occurs in the passage on the appointment of the reader.) Dom Connolly's conclusion, for which he can claim the support of Achelis, Funk, and Bardenhewer, is that the name of Hippolytus originally occurred in the title of Eg CO, and he finds justification for this opinion in the language of the preface of that work, now recovered since the publication of Hauler's Latin text, and since found misplaced in the Ethiopic text (Connolly, p. 141). That preface, after referring to a preceding book 'de donationibus', describes the work to which it introduces the reader as a treatise on 'traditions' ('producti ad verticem *traditionis*, quae catecizat, ad ecclesias perreximus, ut ii . . . *traditionem* exponentibus nobis custodiant'), and similarly the last words of the Latin of Hauler are: 'universis enim audientibus apostolicam tra(ditionem).' We thus find mentioned at the beginning and end of Eg CO 'the exact titles of the two works of Hippolytus found together in the ancient catalogue' on the statue of Hippolytus, i. e. the two treatises *περὶ χαρισμάτων* and *ἀποστολική παράδοσις*. With regard to the former of these, Dom Connolly refuses to see in the section on *charismata*, with which both AC viii and Ep begin, any connexion with the original source of this whole group of documents, or any 'survival' of a lost Church Order, or, on the other hand, any connexion with the lost work of Hippolytus bearing that name. It is, in his view, a free composition of the AC compiler, suggested to him by the mention of a treatise *περὶ χαρισμάτων* in the preface of Eg CO which he had before him. That preface, in fact, Dom Connolly contends, claims for the treatise which it introduces that it *is* the *ἀποστολική παράδοσις* of Hippolytus. In an appendix (pp. 160 f) some of the more striking parallels between the language and conceptions found in Eg CO and those of the writings of Hippolytus

are adduced in support of the above identification. Similarly the compiler of CH, on this theory, took over the name of Hippolytus direct from the title of Eg CO, though he altered the title in other ways, and omitted the preface. In this conclusion too, so Dom Connolly informs us, he has been anticipated by Schwartz, although the way had been prepared for it by Achelis when he contended that CH was really the *ἀποστολική παράδοσις* of Hippolytus (p. 148).

Of the method of Dom Connolly's work I cannot speak too highly. His book is closely reasoned and at times difficult to read, because of the intricacy of the problems involved, though there is no real obscurity of thought or language, and the argument moves steadily forward. On questions of exegesis and textual criticism his judgement seems to me sound and penetrating, and his analysis of the problems connected with the original text which lies behind the various versions of Eg CO is particularly helpful. In this connexion attention may be directed to his remarks on p. 5: 'The Ethiopic, while representing a good textual tradition, suffers much from obscurity contracted, largely, in the course of successive translations. In any attempt to recover the exact meaning of the original Greek the Latin, which has the appearance of being a very literal version, may be regarded generally as the most useful help, provided that the Ethiopic be in substantial agreement. A special virtue of the Coptic is that it often uses Greek words, many of which are no doubt preserved from the original.' Full use is made also of the collations at the end of Mr Horner's volume in reconstructing the original text.

To the student of Christian worship and beliefs one of the most interesting chapters is chapter ii, in which Dom Connolly discusses the relations of Eg CO and CH. By a careful comparison of selected passages he shews that CH exhibits a late and unskilful redaction of earlier material, and that in the process many early conceptions and primitive customs, which were strange to a later age, have disappeared. The 'obscurity' which the compilers of the later Church Orders found in passages of Eg CO is equally felt by many modern scholars, and not infrequently it proves to them 'an occasion of falling', leading to hasty assumptions that such passages are corrupt or wanting in originality. On this subject Dom Connolly makes the very pertinent remark: 'Is not this [obscurity] a necessary consequence of the fact that . . . we are moving in a cycle of thought that is wholly unfamiliar to us?' It is the merit of this chapter that in it Dom Connolly has unearthed not a few of these unfamiliar conceptions and practices, hitherto unnoticed or glossed over, which lie hidden in Eg CO. In so doing he has thrown into relief the extraordinary interest and value of this document for the reconstruction of 'the worship and regulated working' of an early

Christian Church. As he says, 'it is unique in the first three centuries' and supplements the Didascalia, 'unique on its side as a presentment of the religious life and ideas of an early Christian community' (p. 149). Readers of this deeply interesting chapter will concur in the author's wish to see produced at some future date an adequate edition of this important and precious document of early Christianity.

J. H. SRAWLEY.

The Ministry in the Church in relation to Prophecy and Spiritual Gifts.

By H. J. WOTHERSPOON, M.A., D.D. (Longmans, Green & Co., 1916.)

THE purpose of this book is to examine afresh the theory to which the discovery of the *Didache* gave rise some thirty years ago, that the primitive ministry was twofold, 'charismatic' and itinerant, regular and local. In approaching his subject Dr Wotherspoon, as the preface tells us, 'had taken for granted the genuineness of the *Didache*', which he supposed 'to have issued from some semi-Ebionite eddy lying out of the main currents of Church life'. But, as the result of his investigations, he now holds that the picture of early Church life presented by the *Didache* is untrustworthy, and that no separate charismatic ministry existed in the primitive Church.

Following a suggestion made by Dr Bigg, our author maintains that the *Teaching* had a Montanistic origin, and was a product of Phrygia. Phrygia is an agricultural and mountainous region, and Phrygian Montanism was a village cult. These local conditions appear in the *Didache*. Moreover, the persecution of Christians by Christians, foretold in the closing chapter of the book, recalls the troubles through which Montanism passed in its Phrygian home, in days when Maximilla could complain that she was 'hunted like a wolf', and when anti-Montanists were denounced by the Montanists as *προφητοφόνται* (Eus. *H. E.* v 16).

This is interesting and ingenious. But it would be more to the purpose if the author could shew that the *Didache* speaks of the prophets with the enthusiasm which a Montanist might be expected to manifest. That, however, would not be an easy task. Not only, as the Dean of Wells has pointed out (*J. T. S.* xiii p. 355), is too little said about prophets to encourage the belief that the book was written from the Montanist point of view; but the little that is said is not very appreciative; they are the chief priests of the Christian communities, and may not be criticized, yet the Churches are warned to beware of pretenders,