

“This edition deserves to become the first place scholars and students look to engage this enormously important but still misunderstood text. Taking the latest discoveries and scholarly developments into full consideration, it offers a reliable text and authoritative notes. As usual, Bradshaw’s enormous erudition is clothed in an accessible and straightforward presentation that will become the standard reference for many.”

—Andrew McGowan, Yale Divinity School

“Building upon the joint 1992 *Hermeneia* Commentary on the so-called *Apostolic Tradition* by Paul Bradshaw, L. Edward Phillips, and me, together with updated scholarship and the addition of the new Ethiopic version by Alessandro Bausi, Bradshaw’s excellent study will surely become the standard English text for students and scholars alike. I welcome its publication and the contribution it will make to the field of liturgical history and to the study of early Christianity in general.”

—Maxwell E. Johnson, University of Notre Dame

“Modern scholarship on the *Apostolic Tradition* is intimately connected with the work of Paul Bradshaw. This latest book demonstrates Bradshaw’s gifts both as a scholar and a teacher. Scholarly and informed, yet clearly articulated and straightforward, it appeals both to the scholar and the non-scholar. This commentary, presenting Bradshaw’s interpretation of the *Apostolic Tradition* in a very accessible way, is a must read. This book will definitely energize the scholarly debate around the important Church Order known as the *Apostolic Tradition*.”

—Stefanos Alexopoulos, Associate Professor of
Liturgical Studies and Sacramental Theology,
The Catholic University of America

Apostolic Tradition

A New Commentary

Paul F. Bradshaw



LITURGICAL PRESS
ACADEMIC

Collegeville, Minnesota
www.litpress.org

Apostolic Tradition

A New Commentary

Paul F. Bradshaw



**LITURGICAL PRESS
ACADEMIC**

Collegeville, Minnesota
www.litpress.org

Cover design by Tara Wiese. The cover illustration, part of the recently discovered Ethiopic manuscript of the *Apostolic Tradition*, is reproduced by permission from Alessandro Bausi et al., "The Aksumite Collection . . .," *COMSt Bulletin*, 6/2 (2020), p. 154.

© 2023 by Paul F. Bradshaw

Published by Liturgical Press, Collegeville, Minnesota. All rights reserved. No part of this book may be used or reproduced in any manner whatsoever, except brief quotations in reviews, without written permission of Liturgical Press, Saint John's Abbey, PO Box 7500, Collegeville, MN 56321-7500. Printed in the United States of America.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Bradshaw, Paul F., author.

Title: Apostolic tradition : a new commentary / Paul F. Bradshaw.

Description: Collegeville, Minnesota : Liturgical Press Academic, [2023] | Includes index. | Summary: "A commentary based on the 2011 Ethiopic text of the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus of Rome, suitable for beginner and scholar alike"— Provided by publisher.

Identifiers: LCCN 2022028159 (print) | LCCN 2022028160 (ebook) | ISBN 9780814668467 (trade paperback) | ISBN 9780814668474 (epub) | ISBN 9780814668474 (pdf)

Subjects: LCSH: Hippolytus, Antipope, approximately 170-235 or 236. *Traditio apostolica*. | Canon law—Early church, ca. 30-600. | Church history—Primitive and early church, ca. 30-600—Sources.

Classification: LCC KBR196.2 .B73 2023 (print) | LCC KBR196.2 (ebook) | DDC 270.1—dc23/eng/20220831

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2022028159>

LC ebook record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2022028160>

Contents

Abbreviations	vii
Acknowledgments	ix
Introduction	1
Commentary	13
Epilogue	117
Index of Biblical References	118
Index of Other Ancient Literature	120
Index of Modern Authors	125
Index of Subjects	127

Abbreviations

<i>AC</i>	<i>Apostolic Constitutions</i>
<i>AT</i>	<i>Apostolic Tradition</i>
CE	Common Era
<i>CH</i>	<i>Canons of Hippolytus</i>
E1	the Aksumite Ethiopic version of <i>AT</i>
E2	the later Ethiopic version of <i>AT</i>
ET	English translation
L	The Latin version of <i>AT</i>
LXX	The Greek Septuagint version of the Old Testament
<i>TD</i>	<i>Testamentum Domini</i>
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament

Acknowledgments

The translation of the text used in this commentary originally appeared in Paul F. Bradshaw, *The Apostolic Tradition Reconstructed: A Text for Students*, Alcuin/GROW Joint Liturgical Study 91 (Norwich: Hymns Ancient & Modern, 2021). An interactive version is also available at <https://alcuinclub.org.uk/news/interactive-version-of-jls-91-the-apostolic-tradition-reconstructed/>.

Part of the commentary on chapter 4 originally appeared in an article by the author, “The Formation of the Eucharistic Prayer in the *Apostolic Tradition*,” *Theology* 125 (2022), 101–8, and is reproduced by permission.

Quotations from *AC*, *CH*, and *TD* are from Paul F. Bradshaw, Maxwell E. Johnson, and L. Edward Phillips, *The Apostolic Tradition: A Commentary*, Hermeneia series (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002), and translations of patristic works not otherwise attributed are from *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*.

Particular thanks are due to Nathan Chase for his helpful comments on an earlier draft.

Introduction

The leading twentieth-century liturgical historian Robert Taft was fond of remarking that knowledge advances more by setting existing data within a new matrix than by the accumulation of new data.¹ In the case of the *Apostolic Tradition* (AT), however, both of these have been true.

A New Matrix

The new matrix first appeared more than thirty years ago, challenging what had been the overwhelming belief among scholars for nearly a century that this anonymous and untitled church order was a previously lost work, the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus of Rome, written in the early third century and revealing the practices of the Roman church at that period. Indeed, so sure of the veracity of this theory did many of its supporters become that they claimed to find parallels in theology and vocabulary with other works at-

1. See, for example, Robert F. Taft, *Beyond East and West: Problems in Liturgical Understanding* (Washington, DC: Pastoral Press, 1984, 2nd ed. 1997), 190.

tributed to Hippolytus and downplayed or simply ignored anything that might raise questions about it.²

There had been earlier challenges to this scholarly consensus, but none had succeeded in winning over the majority. These included those by Rudolf Lorenz and Hieronymus Engberding,³ but their views were subjected to heavy criticism. Similarly, E.C. Ratcliff asserted that the eucharistic prayer in the church order had been extensively reworked in the fourth century,⁴ but his reconstruction of the original was so radical that it failed to win widespread support. In a review published in 1964 he claimed that this reworking had applied to the whole church order: it was “not Hippolytus’s original composition, but an edition of it current in the last quarter of the fourth century,”⁵ but again his judgment was largely ignored.

The same fate befell the claims made by Antoine Salles, who questioned the Roman character of its baptismal rite; by Jean Michel Hanssens, who argued at great length that the whole work had originated in Alexandria; and by Jean Magne,⁶ that it was really an anonymous compilation, of

2. See Paul F. Bradshaw, “Conclusions Shaping Evidence: An Examination of the Scholarship Surrounding the Supposed Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus,” in Paul van Geest, Marcel Poorthuis, and Els Rose, eds., *Sanctifying Texts, Transforming Rituals: Encounters in Liturgical Studies* (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 13–30.

3. Rudolf Lorenz, *De Egypt is he Kerkordening en Hippolytus van Rome* (Haarlem: J. Enschedé, 1929); Hieronymus Engberding, “Das angebliche Dokument römischer Liturgie aus dem Beginn des dritten Jahrhunderts,” in *Miscellanea liturgica in honorem L. Cuniberti Mohlborg*, vol. 1 (Rome: Edizioni liturgica, 1948), 47–71.

4. E.C. Ratcliff, “The Sanctus and the Pattern of the Early Anaphora,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 1 (1950): 29–36, 125–34.

5. *Journal of Theological Studies* 15 (1964): 405.

6. Antoine Salles, “‘Tradition apostolique’ est-elle un témoin de la liturgie romaine?,” *Revue de l’histoire des religions* 148 (1955): 181–

which the true title was the *Diataxeis tôn hagiôn apostolôn*, made up of elements from different places and time periods. Unfortunately, as in the case of Ratcliff, Magne's alternative explanation—that this church order had eventually been fused with a passage from a genuine "Tradition apostolique sur les charismes" of Hippolytus—was too unconvincing for his theory to win much consideration from others.

Thus, it was not until Marcel Metzger wrote a series of articles beginning in 1988,⁷ developing an argument originally advanced by Magne and also briefly by Alexander Faivre,⁸ that because of its lack of unity or logical progression, its frequent incoherences, doublets, and contradictions, it was instead a piece of "living literature," a collection of community rules from disparate traditions brought together by various hands, and not reflective of any one single time or place, that serious notice began to be taken of this new matrix in which to view it.

213; Jean Michel Hanssens, *La Liturgie d'Hippolyte: Ses documents, son titulaire, ses origines et son caractère*, vol. 1, *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 155 (Rome, 1959, 2nd ed. 1965); vol. 2 (1970); Jean Magne, "La prétendue Tradition apostolique de Hippolyte de Rome s'appela-t-elle *Ai diataxeis tôn hagiôn apostolôn*, 'Les statuts des saints Apôtres'?", *Ostkirchliche Studien* 14 (1965): 35–67; Magne, *Tradition apostolique sur les charismes et Diataxeis des saints Apôtres* (Paris, 1975); Magne, "En finir avec la 'Tradition' d'Hippolyte!," *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique* 89 (1988): 5–22.

7. Marcel Metzger, "Nouvelles perspectives pour la prétendue Tradition apostolique," *Ecclesia Orans* 5 (1988): 241–59; "Enquêtes autour de la prétendue Tradition apostolique," *Ecclesia Orans* 9 (1992): 7–36; "A propos des règlements ecclésiastiques et de la prétendue Tradition apostolique," *Revue des sciences religieuses* 66 (1992): 249–61.

8. Alexander Faivre, "La documentation canonico-liturgique de l'Eglise ancienne," *Revue des sciences religieuses* 54 (1980): 204–19, 237–97.

Since then, most scholars have come to share this verdict, though generally retaining the name *Apostolic Tradition* for convenience.

This conclusion has required the careful study of the church order to attempt to discern where its various layers begin and end. Often it is vocabulary that provides the guide to dating. Some words were not used by Christians until the third or fourth century; others became archaic and fell out of use after the second century. At other points, evident dislocation or a contradiction in the text suggests an underlying division and the presence of another hand. In some places these different layers can be detected with a high degree of confidence, in other places somewhat more tentatively.

The results of this are displayed in the translation in this volume by the use of different typefaces to mark the approximate historical periods in which it is thought that various elements originated. What is judged to be the oldest material, mostly from the second century, is presented in Roman type. This first layer need not have formed a single collection. It could, for example, have consisted of a set of directions about admission to different offices in the church; another document describing how baptisms were to be performed; and some scattered instructions about the eucharistic meal and other aspects of church life. Whatever their original form, however, it seems probable that they were brought together to constitute the earliest version of the church order some time in the first half of the third century, to which some further additions were made, including the insertion of a number of prayer-texts. This second phase, of third-century material, is marked by italics. Gradually further additions were made to the document mostly during the latter part of the third century and the early part of the fourth. These are marked by underlining.

It is not being suggested that there were only two distinct acts of revision, or that all the changes within a layer were made by a single hand. The different typefaces simply mark broad historical periods in which the material was probably added or altered, almost certainly by several different hands at different times. Only in chapters 20–21, where the baptismal process is described, do the typographical differences indicate the presence of particular emendations made by two specific revisers in order to bring the core text up to date with later liturgical practices.

A New Manuscript

The second major development was the completely unexpected discovery of a new manuscript of the church order not much more than ten years ago. The original Greek had always been missing, except for a few scattered fragments of the text, and so for the rest it was necessary mostly to rely on the Latin (L), a late-fifth-century palimpsest from Verona copied from an unknown translation believed to have been made about a century earlier. It has been thought to provide a very literal rendering, but unfortunately it suffers from several major lacunae, and only chapters 1–8, part of 21, chapters 26–38, the shorter ending, and part of 41, and 42–43 remain.⁹

9. First edited in Edmund Hauler, *Didascalie apostolorum fragmenta Veronensia latina. Accedunt canonum qui dicuntur apostolorum et aegyptiorum reliquiae* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1900); then in Erik Tidner, *Didascalie apostolorum, Canonum ecclesiasticorum, Traditionis apostolicae versiones Latinae*, *Texte und Untersuchungen* 75 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1963).

Previously, in order to fill the substantial gaps, several other linguistic versions had to be used. A manuscript in the Sahidic dialect of Coptic from the year 1006 seemed next closest to the original, although it deliberately omitted the texts of the eucharistic and ordination prayers and some other chapters. This had the advantage of using a number of Greek loan words, but the disadvantage of a different grammatical construction from Greek.¹⁰ An Arabic translation was supposedly made in 1295 from an older Coptic text, but it may actually have been a little earlier than that. It exists now only in manuscripts dating from the fourteenth to the seventeenth centuries, and it moved even further away from a literal rendering than the Sahidic.¹¹ An Ethiopic version, which survives in manuscripts from the fifteenth to the eighteenth centuries, was made from a better Arabic text than is in the extant Arabic manuscripts, including the preservation of the texts omitted in the Sahidic and Arabic and of other chapters not included in any other versions, but it also featured a number of interpolations.¹² Other church orders that made use of *AT*—the *Canons of Hippolytus* (*CH*), the *Apostolic Constitutions* (*AC*), and the

10. Edited in Paul de Lagarde, *Aegyptiaca* (Göttingen, 1883), and later by Walter Till and Johannes Leipoldt, eds., *Der koptische Text der Kirchenordnung Hippolyts*, Texte und Untersuchungen 58 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1954).

11. First published in George Horner, *The Statutes of the Apostles or Canones Ecclesiastici* (London: Williams & Norgate, 1904); then in Jean and Augustin Périer, *Les 127 Canons des Apôtres*, *Patrologia Orientalis* 8, no. 4 (Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1912; repr. Turnhout: Brepols, 1971).

12. Also in Horner, *Statutes of the Apostles*; then by Hugo Duensing, *Der Äthiopische Text der Kirchenordnung des Hippolyt* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1946).

Testamentum Domini (TD)—were also drawn on to help establish the genuine text.¹³

The breakthrough came in 2011 with the publication by Alessandro Bausi of a different Ethiopic translation of the church order apparently made during the Aksumite period (first through tenth centuries CE) some time between the end of the fifth century and the seventh century and preserved in a single manuscript from not later than the fourteenth century.¹⁴ Not only has this furnished another translation besides L that was made at an early date and directly from Greek rather than via an intermediary language but it also corresponds closely to L for a significant part of the church order, indicating that it was made from a similar Greek text. The other translations, on the other hand, apparently all derive from a different textual tradition in which the underlying Greek seems already to have undergone some expansion even before the various translators added their own. In order to distinguish it from the other Ethiopic translation, it is often referred to as E1, with its later companion designated as E2.

13. For further details of these, see Paul F. Bradshaw, *Ancient Church Orders*, Alcuin Club/GROW Joint Liturgical Study 80 (Norwich: SCM—Canterbury Press, 2015).

14. Alessandro Bausi, “La nuova versione Etiopica della Traditio Apostolica: edizione e traduzione preliminare,” in Paola Buzi and Alberto Camplani, eds., *Christianity in Egypt: Literary Production and Intellectual Trends*, *Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum* 125 (Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 2011), 19–69. See also Alessandro Bausi, “The ‘So-called Traditio apostolica’: Preliminary Observations on the New Ethiopic Evidence,” in Heike Grieser and Andreas Merkt, eds., *Volks Glaube im antiken Christentum* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2009), 291–321; Reinhard Messner, “Die angebliche *Traditio Apostolica*: eine neue Textpräsentation,” *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 58/59 (2016): 1–58.

Not only does this enable the gaps in L to be more reliably filled and even sometimes for L to be corrected in the light of it, but it has solved some of the critical problems previously surrounding the church order. It has verified many scholarly conjectures about the text that were made before its discovery and confirmed the presence and sequence of some chapters where their authenticity had been in doubt. It needs to be acknowledged, however, that although E1 appears largely faithful to the Greek behind it and mostly free from the sort of expansions in the other translations, like the other Eastern translations it does omit all the major prayers and has some textual difficulties of its own in various places.

Prayer-Texts

A particular word needs to be said about the prayers in this church order. As a general rule prayer-texts tend to retain vocabulary and idioms that have already become archaic and often fallen out of use in other forms of discourse. They thus preserve the language of an older generation than the one responsible for the surrounding material. This is even the case in this church order, where there are signs that the prayers were actually later insertions into directions that did not originally contain them, shown not only by differences in language but also by occasional mismatches between what the relevant instruction says and what is contained within the prayer itself. Nonetheless, although they may be somewhat later additions to the church order, they appear from their style and vocabulary to have even older roots.

Most notable with regard to these prayers is their form of address. They nearly always refer to Jesus by a word meaning "servant" or "child," *pais* in Greek, *puer* in Latin. In Christian usage this word is reserved almost exclusively for Jesus, with the exception of a reference to King David,

who might also occasionally be called God's child/servant (Acts 4:25; *Didache* 9). For other servants a different word was employed, chiefly *doulos* in Greek, *servus* in Latin. This title for Jesus was already archaic in the New Testament Scriptures (Acts 3:13, 26; 4:27, 30) but is also found in *Didache* 9–10, *1 Clement* 59.2–4, *Barnabas* 9.2, and *Martyrdom of Polycarp* 14, and lingered on in liturgical usage in combination with later and more elevated titles in doxologies until at least the fourth century.¹⁵ In *AT* the title "Lord" is hardly ever used for Jesus in prayer-texts, and where it does occur it seems to be a later updating of the more traditional language, as does the rare replacement of servant/child by "Son" (see, for example, the prayer in chapter 8). Similarly, reference to the Holy Spirit in doxologies has the appearance of a later addition there (see, for example, the end of chapter 3), as certainly does the clumsy and generally ungrammatical inclusion of an address to the Trinity, "Father and Son with the Holy Spirit" (see, for example, the doxology at the end of chapter 4).

Provenance

Although it has been possible to arrive at approximate dates for the composition of the material in *AT*, we are no wiser

15. Although the final form of the *Martyrdom of Polycarp* is now believed to belong to the third century, the two occurrences of *pais* with reference to Jesus in the prayer in its chapter 14 may be the preservation of an older text or deliberate archaisms. Other later instances of the word used in this sense are quotations of earlier sources (*1 Clement* 59.2 in the Barcelona Papyrus; *Didache* 9–10 in *Apostolic Constitutions* 7.26, and in Pseudo-Athanasius, *De virginitate* 12) or in what seem to be traditional doxological forms, again in the Barcelona Papyrus and *De virginitate* 14, as well as several Egyptian prayers. The adjective "beloved" (*agapētos*) occurs uniquely with *pais* in *1 Clement* 59.2, the *Martyrdom of Polycarp* 14, and the Barcelona Papyrus, as well as in *AT* 3 and 4.

about where in the ancient world this might have been. There is so little of it that implies a particular geographical region that most of it could have originated anywhere. The eucharistic prayer (chapter 4), especially in its final form, has been attributed to what is called the West Syrian pattern,¹⁶ but even that description does not necessarily require it to have been composed in precisely that area: it refers to a type of prayer structure rather than a place. This is mostly found in that part of the ancient world but might actually have been developed in a neighboring region.

On the other hand, the core of the baptismal material in chapter 21 with its threefold questions and answers is characteristic of North Africa in the third century, or possibly also Rome, though we know little about the latter at this early date. The use of milk and honey at the first communion of the newly baptized in that same chapter also points to North Africa, or again possibly Rome, as the place where that originated. However, the presence in that baptismal material of a later layer that seems related to Eastern Christianity, and particularly Jerusalem, suggests that it underwent some subsequent revision there. That is probably about as much as can be said.

Display of the Text

Where a Greek version of a chapter exists, it has been used as the basis for the translation. Where both L and E1 are substantially the same, L has usually been used. Where the

16. See Matthieu Smyth, "The Anaphora of the So-called 'Apostolic Tradition' and the Roman Eucharistic Prayer," in Maxwell E. Johnson, ed., *Issues in Eucharistic Praying in East and West* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2011), 71–97.

two versions show significant differences and E1 makes better sense, it has generally been preferred. And where L is missing, E1 has been used in its place. Words in brackets have been added simply to help make sense: they are not necessarily a part of the original text that is missing. L once had titles for each chapter, but being written in red ink, they have completely faded, and so the titles from E1 have been used. The titles are probably later than the text to which they relate.

Different versions also had their individual systems of numbering chapters, but modern editions have created their own. This commentary adopts the numbering system generally used nowadays that was devised by Bernard Botte in his edition and French translation of the text,¹⁷ which divides the church order into forty-three chapters. The church order comprises three distinct parts: (A) a set of instructions for the ordination of bishops, presbyters, and deacons, which were later expanded to include prayers and supplemented to add other ministries, as well as a eucharistic prayer when a bishop was being ordained; (B) a second section containing a more or less continuous account of the process of initiating new Christians, subsequently adapted by at least two editorial hands to incorporate later additions to the rites; and (C) miscellaneous instructions for other liturgical matters appended to these, at the heart of which are directions for the conduct of the Christian supper.

17. Bernard Botte, *La tradition apostolique de saint Hippolyte: Essai de reconstitution*, Liturgiewissenschaftliche Quellen und Forschungen 39 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1963, 5th ed. 1989).

APOSTOLIC TRADITION: SYNOPSIS

I. Prologue

A. ORDINATION AND OTHER MINISTRIES:

2–3. Ordination of a bishop

46. *Eucharistic prayer, and prayers for oil, cheese, and olives*

7–8. Ordination of a presbyter, ordination of a deacon

9–14. *Subdeacon, reader, widow, confessors, [virgin], gift of healing.*

B. INITIATION OF NEW CHRISTIANS:

15–21. Initial examination, *prohibited professions, duration of catechumenate*, separation from the baptized, instruction, final preparation, baptismal rite, first communion, conclusion.

C. MISCELLANEOUS DIRECTIONS:

22. Appendix to 21 on the distribution of communion

23–24. Fasting, ministry to the sick and needy

25–29. The supper: lamplighting, bread and wine, catechumens, *behavior*

30–35. Supper for widows, first fruits, paschal fast, deacons' assembly, morning prayer and instruction

36–38. *Care of the Eucharist at home*

38B. *Shorter ending*

39–41. *Deacons' assembly, cemeteries, daily prayer*

42–43. *Longer ending.*

Commentary

- [1] *We have set down those things that are worthy of note about the gifts that God from the beginning according to his own will bestowed on human beings, presenting that image which had been lost. And now led on by love toward all the saints, we have arrived at the summit of the tradition that is proper for all the churches, so that those who have been well taught by our exposition may guard that tradition which has remained up to now, and being aware [of it] may remain firmer, on account of that fault or error which was recently invented through ignorance and those who are ignorant, since the Holy Spirit bestows perfect grace on those who rightly believe, that they may know how those who preside over the church ought to hand on and preserve all things.*

The translation of this prologue draws chiefly on the better text of E1 rather than the more garbled version in L. There is another version in a Syriac epitome contained in book 5 of the ancient collection of church orders known as the Clementine Octateuch and preserved in the Vatican MS

Borgia syr. 148, folio 91 verso—92 recto, of 1575–1576 CE.¹ This combines the prologue of AC with the above text.

The prologue was probably composed sometime in the third century when the oldest materials had first been brought together in a single document. The apparent references to an earlier work on the subject of “gifts” and to “tradition” were among the factors that previously encouraged the mistaken identification of the work as the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus.² It is not possible to determine the “fault or error which was recently invented” that led the unknown compiler to assemble these instructions as a defense of what are claimed to be traditional practices against innovations. It is possible that the same hand may have been responsible for the epilogue at the end of chapter 38 and in chapters 42–43.

[2] Concerning the Bishop

Let him be ordained³ bishop who has been chosen by all the people, and when he has been named and accepted by all, let him assemble the people

1. Text in R.H. Connolly, “The Prologue to the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 22 (1921): 356–61.

2. But see Christoph Marksches, “Wer schrieb die sogenannte *Traditio Apostolica*? Neue Beobachtungen und Hypothesen zu einer kaum lösbaren Frage aus der altkirchlichen Literaturgeschichte,” in *Taufragen und Bekenntnis: Studien zur sogenannten “Traditio Apostolica,”* ed. Wolfram Kinzig, Christoph Marksches, and Markus Vinzent (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999), 1–74, here at 25–29, for an alternative rendering of these words.

3. The Latin verb *ordinare*, “ordain,” seems to be translating the Greek verb *cheirotoneo*, literally “elect by raising the hand,” throughout the church order (see also *Didache* 15.1). The verb used to denote “lay on” hands is *epithēmi*.

together with the presbytery and those bishops who are present, on the Lord's day. When all give consent, let them lay hands on him and let the presbytery stand by, being still. And let all keep silence, praying in the heart for the descent of the Spirit; from whom let one of the bishops present, being asked by all, laying the hand on him who is being ordained bishop, pray, saying thus:

At first sight L, supported by E1, appears to make sense as it stands. A closer look, however, raises questions. Why is it the new bishop who assembles the people in order to ordain him? Why are the presbytery instructed to stand by and be still? Rubrics usually direct people to do something, not to refrain from doing anything. Why are there apparently two impositions of hands, first by "all" (of the bishops, presumably), and then by one of the bishops? And finally, why is the unusual conjunction "from whom" (Latin, *ex quibus*, probably representing the Greek *aph' ōn*) used, especially if it is to be translated as "after which," as some scholars have proposed?⁴

Of course, scholars in the past came up with ingenious solutions to these problems. So, for example, some understood the supposed second imposition of hands to be merely a continuation of the first, while others claimed that a double imposition of hands was an ancient feature of ordination rites that had not survived in later practice, and they interpreted its significance in different ways, such as the first expressing consent to the ordination or making the

4. Gregory Dix, *The Treatise on the Apostolic Tradition of St. Hippolytus of Rome* (London: SPCK, 1937), 3, n. 5; Botte, *Tradition apostolique*, 7, n. 1.

candidate a member of the episcopal college, the second bestowing the Spirit.⁵ However, the oddities increase if one also takes into account the other witnesses to the text, as they all make mention of other bishops being present in quite different ways. The Sahidic and Arabic translations as well as E2 have “deacons” in place of the phrase “those bishops who are present,” and they insert a clumsy reference to bishops in the next sentence: “all the bishops who have laid their hands on him giving consent.” *CH* does not mention bishops at all until the final sentence, when it rather oddly says: “They are to choose one of the bishops and presbyters; he lays his hand . . .”

As early as 1966, the English liturgical scholar E.C. Ratcliff had proposed that “discernible between the lines of the several versions of *Apostolic Tradition* there are signs which can be taken as indicating that, in its original form, the direction instructed the presbyters to conduct the proceedings.”⁶ It seems that he was right. It takes only a few minor adjustments to the text to see what the original apparently read:

Let him be ordained bishop who has been chosen by all the people, and when he has been named and accepted by all, let the people assemble together with the presbytery on the Lord's day. When all give consent, let the presbytery lay hands on him and let all keep silence, praying in the heart for the descent of the Spirit.

5. For further details, see Bradshaw, Johnson, and Phillips, *Apostolic Tradition*, 23–26, nn. 6, 23–27.

6. E.C. Ratcliff, “Apostolic Tradition: Questions concerning the Appointment of the Bishop,” *Studia Patristica* 8 (1966): 266–70, here at 269.

The later switch to “let him assemble the people” was no doubt the result of an accidental change of the noun from subject to object, nominative to accusative, made in the Greek by a copyist. The addition of “those bishops who are present” to the presbytery, and of the direction “and let the presbytery stand by, being still” would have been made in the third century when neighboring bishops had begun to attend the ordination of their fellow bishops. Cyprian of Carthage reported in the middle of the century that the consent of other bishops was required in “nearly all the provinces.” This consent could be expressed either by their presence or by their sending letters of approval.⁷ Their presence would quickly have led to their taking responsibility for the prayer and imposition of hands and their prohibition of presbyters being involved in that any longer.

The collective imposition of hands by either presbyters or bishops, however, seems to be almost unknown in any other early sources. All extant ancient ordination rites prescribe that the ritual action be performed by one bishop alone while he recited the ordination prayer. It was only the partial reproduction of the direction from *AT* in the fifth-century Gallican *Statuta ecclesiae antiqua* that eventually led to the collective imposition of hands by other bishops becoming a standard element in Western ordination rites for a bishop: “When a bishop is ordained, let two bishops put the book of the gospels on his head and hold it, and while one says the blessing over him, let all the rest of the bishops who are present touch his head with their hands.”⁸ If the corporate laying on of hands was practiced more

7. See Cyprian, *Ep.* 43.1; 55.8; 59.5–6; 67.5; 68.2. The quotation is from *Ep.* 67.5.

8. See Paul F. Bradshaw, *Ordination Rites of the Ancient Churches of East and West* (New York: Pueblo, 1990), 44, 222.

widely in ancient times, it has disappeared with virtually no other trace.⁹ This explains the supplement that was made somewhat later to the end of chapter 2 that resulted in the appearance of a double imposition of hands and the addition of a specific ordination prayer in chapter 3.

from whom let one of the bishops present, being asked by all, laying the hand on him who is being ordained bishop, pray, saying thus:

- [3] "God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of mercies and the God of all comfort, dwelling on high and looking on that which is lowly, knowing all things before their creation, You, giving [the] rules of [the] church through the word of your grace, having foreordained from the beginning a righteous race from Abraham, having appointed rulers and priests, and not leaving your sanctuary without a ministry, having been pleased from the creation of the world to be glorified in those whom you chose; and now pour forth the power from you of the spirit of leadership,¹⁰ which you gave through your beloved servant Jesus Christ to your holy apostles who established the church in every place as your sanctuary to the unceasing glory and praise of your name. Knower of the heart, grant to this your servant whom you have chosen for the episcopate to

9. There is evidence that at Alexandria presbyters presided at the ordination of their new bishop until at least the middle of the third century, if not later: see Albano Vilela, *La condition collégiale des prêtres au III^e siècle* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1971), 173–79, and the works cited in n. 5 there.

10. LXX Ps. 50:14.

shepherd your holy flock, and to serve as high-priest for you blamelessly night and day, unceasingly to propitiate your countenance, and to offer to you the gifts of your holy church; and in the high-priestly spirit to have authority to forgive sins according to your command, to give lots according to your bidding, to loose every bond according to the authority that you gave to the apostles, and to please you in gentleness and a pure heart, offering you a sweet-smelling savor; through your servant Jesus Christ, through whom [be] glory and power and honor to you, with the Holy Spirit, now and always and to the ages of ages. Amen.

The prayer is preserved in Greek in the fourth-century *Epitome of AC* 8,¹¹ with the translation here being primarily based on that text.¹² It is clearly formed of more than one layer.¹³ Although the composition of its core may well be as old as the rest of the earliest material in *AT*, it was proposed in the Introduction that there are good reasons to believe that prayer-texts were secondary *additions* to this church order. Hence what is thought to be the original core is still

11. Text in F.X. Funk, *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum* (Paderborn: Schoeninger, 1905; repr. Turin: Bottega d'Erasmus, 1979) 2:78–79.

12. The phrases, “in every place as your sanctuary,” “Knower of the heart,” and “through whom,” are emendations to the translation made in the light of readings in other versions.

13. The analysis of this prayer is developed from that by Eric Segelberg, “The Ordination Prayers in Hippolytus,” *Studia Patristica* 13 (1975): 397–408. See further Paul F. Bradshaw, “The Ordination Prayers in the So-Called *Apostolic Tradition*,” *Vigiliae Christianae* 75 (2021): 119–29.

printed in italics here, and what are judged later expansions are underlined. The biblical quotations near the beginning (2 Cor 1:3; LXX Ps 112:5-6; Dan 13:42) certainly belong to a later stratum of the prayer, as it is well known that the use of biblical quotations in ancient prayers was a later development than allusions, and quotations from the New Testament later than ones from the Old Testament. This is especially the case with the first of these, which also features at the beginning of the prayers for a presbyter and for a deacon and so appears to have been introduced as part of a harmonizing process when all three prayers had been brought together in this single collection.

Similarly, those elements in the prayer that attribute a sacerdotal character to the episcopal office must date from no earlier than the third century (and the expression “to propitiate your countenance” from no earlier than the fourth), as such language associated with Christian ministers is unknown before then,¹⁴ while the remainder of the prayer demonstrates parallels with other second-century Christian sources and in some cases even the first century. Thus, “through your beloved servant Jesus Christ” finds a parallel in *1 Clement* 59.2 (ca. 96 CE), but except for quotations and doxologies, the use of “servant” (Greek *pais*, Latin *puer*) as a descriptor of Jesus does not occur in texts

14. See Maurice Bévenot, “Tertullian’s Thoughts about the Christian Priesthood,” in *Corona Gratiarum* 1 (Bruges: Nijhoff, 1975), 125–37; “‘Sacerdos’ as Understood by Cyprian,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 30 (1979): 413–29. While Alistair C. Stewart, “The Ordination Prayers in *Traditio apostolica*: The Search for a *Grundschrift*,” *St. Vladimir’s Theological Quarterly* 64 (2020): 11–24, in other respects largely shares the analysis of the prayer offered here, he regards the sacerdotal material as belonging to the second century.

composed later than the mid-second century;¹⁵ the word “episcopate” is present in Acts 1:20; 1 Timothy 3:1; and *1 Clement* 44.1; and *1 Clement* 44.4 speaks of ministers who have “offered the gifts,” which both there and in the equivalent in this prayer appears to refer to the provisions brought by Christians for the shared eucharistic meal or for the relief of the poor (see chapter 23 below). Although the phrase “to give lots according to your bidding” has commonly been understood as referring to the appointment of clergy (“lots” = *klēroi* in Greek), Stewart’s suggestion that in this context it refers to the bishop’s responsibility for the distribution of the charitable gifts received from the people to appropriate persons in need (see also chapter 30) seems highly likely and justifies its place within the earliest material.¹⁶

It can be seen, therefore, that in the original the bishop was the leader of a single local Christian community, and his primary role was viewed as pastoral and not teaching or guarding the truth. Only later do his sacerdotal character and sacramental functions come to occupy a place in the prayer. It is also interesting to note that while the directions in chapter 2 speak of all praying in silence for the descent of the Spirit, the prayer does not explicitly seek the gift of the Holy Spirit, but only “the power of the spirit of leadership,” an expression almost unknown in early Christian literature. The preceding election by the whole community is not a sign that the democratic principle was fundamental to

15. The word can also mean “child” in both languages. It must be noted that when *AT* (and other sources) speak of ministers as “servants,” they use a different word than in the case of Jesus: *doulos* (Greek) or *servus* (Latin).

16. Stewart, “Ordination Prayers,” 14.

primitive Christianity, but the prayer affirms that it is God who has chosen the person for the episcopate, the election being simply the means by which that choice was revealed, and God is then asked to bestow the requisite abilities for the discharge of the office.

- [4] When he has been made bishop, let all offer the mouth of peace, greeting him because he has been made worthy.

The whole of chapter 4 is omitted from E1,¹⁷ as is the eucharistic prayer from the Sahidic and Arabic versions, leaving L as the only reliable witness. It might be thought that E1 represented an earlier stage of development of the church order before the eucharistic prayer was added, but it does retain chapters 5 and 6, albeit displaced, which seem to depend on the existence of the prayer. The reason for the omission, therefore, is probably that it was so different from the prayer(s) known to its translator as to be of no practical use.

It should also be noted that the divisions between chapters 2 and 3 earlier and between chapters 3 and 4 here are entirely the invention of modern scholars and are not present in the ancient versions. Here it can create the misleading impression that the exchange of the peace is simply part of the eucharistic rite and not the conclusion of the ordination, as the reference to the new bishop having been

17. Although absent from *AT* itself, a modified version of the eucharistic prayer does appear elsewhere in the Aksumite collection: see Emmanuel Fritsch, "New Reflections on the Image of Late Antique and Medieval Ethiopian Liturgy," in Teresa Berger, ed., *Liturgy's Imagined Pasts* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2016), 37–90, here at 43–54.

made worthy implies. Ancient ordination rites invariably ended with the exchange of a kiss between the new bishop and, at first, the people, then later only the bishops and clergy, and finally only the other bishops. The expression used in L, "mouth of peace," seems to be without parallel, although other versions, as well as AT 21, do include an explicit mention of the mouth in other ways.

The reference to worthiness is an allusion to the acclamation of assent, "Worthy," that was originally made by the people at the beginning of ancient ordination rites in response to the announcement of the candidate's nomination and to the question whether he was worthy to be ordained. There appears to have been a trend in some places, however, to transfer it to the conclusion of the rite, as the people's part in the election of the candidate began to be forgotten. The earliest example of this is in the fifth-century *TD*.¹⁸ It is unlikely that this is what was intended here at such an early date, but the association of the concluding kiss with that prior act seems to lay some groundwork for the subsequent transfer.

And let the deacons bring him the oblation, and let him, laying hands on it with all the presbytery, say, giving thanks: "The Lord [be] with you." And let them all say, "And with your spirit." "Up [with your] hearts." "We have [them] to the Lord." "Let us give thanks to the Lord." "It is worthy and just." And so let him then continue:

18. See Bradshaw, *Ordination Rites*, 118. Other later instances include the Coptic and Syrian Orthodox rites (Bradshaw, *Ordination Rites*, 155, 185).

This dialogue and the subsequent eucharistic prayer interrupt the flow of this part of the church order, where one might have expected the rites for presbyters and deacons to follow directly. This suggests that it is a later interpolation and that the original eucharistic celebration in this church order was the core of the supper described in chapters 25–29.¹⁹ It appears to have originated no earlier than the third century, because the term “oblation” as unequivocally denoting the eucharistic bread and wine is only known from Irenaeus onward and the first evidence we have for prefacing a eucharistic prayer with “Up [with your] hearts” comes from Cyprian in North Africa in the middle of that century (*De dom. orat.* 31). The same dialogue is referred to in chapter 25 below. On the other hand, a collective imposition of hands on the bread and wine by bishop and presbyters is not otherwise attested.

“We render thanks to you, God, through your beloved servant Jesus Christ, whom in the last times you sent to us as savior and redeemer and messenger of your will, who is your inseparable word, through whom you made all things and it was well pleasing to you, [whom] you sent from heaven into the virgin’s womb, and who conceived in the womb was incarnate and manifested as your Son, born from the Holy Spirit and the virgin; who fulfilling your will and gaining for you a holy people, stretched out [his] hands when he was suffering, that he might release from suffering those who believed in you;

19. A view shared by Alistair Stewart(-Sykes), *Hippolytus: On the Apostolic Tradition* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 2nd ed. 2015), 62, 173–75.

who when he was being handed over to voluntary suffering, that he might destroy death and break the bonds of the devil, and tread down hell and illuminate the righteous, and fix a limit and manifest the resurrection, taking bread [and] giving thanks to you, he said: 'Take, eat, this is my body that will be broken for you.' Likewise also the cup, saying, 'This is my blood that is shed for you. When you do this, you do my remembrance.'

Remembering therefore his death and resurrection, we offer to you the bread and cup, giving thanks to you because you have held us worthy to stand before you and minister to you. And we ask that you would send your Holy Spirit on the oblation of the holy church, gathering [us] into one, you will give to all who partake of the holy things²⁰ [to partake] in the fullness of the Holy Spirit, for the strengthening of faith in truth, that we may praise and glorify you through your servant Jesus Christ, through whom [be] glory and honor to you, Father and Son with the Holy Spirit, in your holy church, both now and to the ages of ages. Amen."

Just because the prayer has been said to have been a later addition to the church order and the dialogue preceding the prayer determined not to be older than the third century, this does not mean that some of the prayer itself cannot have been composed at an earlier date before it was attached to AT. Like the ordination prayer in chapter 3, it seems to be made up of more than one layer, some parts very ancient,

20. Alternatively, it might be translated "all the holy ones who partake."

like the archaic titles for Jesus of “servant” or “child” (in Greek, *pais*, in Latin, *puer*) and “messenger of your will” (an allusion to Isaiah 9:5 also found in Justin Martyr and once in Irenaeus²¹), and other parts not known before the fourth century. These latter parts include the Sanctus (with its introduction and often concluding Benedictus), which is still absent from this prayer, the institution narrative, and the invocation of the Holy Spirit or epiclesis. The earliest extant eucharistic prayer to include an institution narrative as such is in the mid-fourth-century Barcelona Papyrus,²² the version in the *Sacramentary of Sarapion* of a similar date not having it in a continuous form, while the older Anaphora of Addai and Mari does not have it at all.²³ It has been suggested that among the factors that influenced its adoption at that time were the need for catechesis within the rite itself and the cessation of martyrdom.²⁴

21. Justin Martyr, *First Apology*, 63; *Dialogue with Trypho*, 56, 76, 126–28; Irenaeus, *Epideixis*, 55–56.

22. Michael Zheltov, “The Anaphora and the Thanksgiving Prayer from the Barcelona Papyrus: An Underestimated Testimony to the Anaphoral History in the Fourth Century,” *Vigiliae Christianae* 62 (2008): 467–504. See also Nathan P. Chase, “The Antiochenization of the Egyptian Tradition: An Alternate Approach to the Barcelona Papyrus and Anaphoral Development,” *Ecclesia Orans* 34 (2017): 319–67.

23. See R.C.D. Jasper and G.J. Cuming, *Prayers of the Eucharist: Early and Reformed*, 4th ed., ed. Paul F. Bradshaw and Maxwell E. Johnson, Alcuin Club Collections 94 (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2019), 64–69.

24. See Paul F. Bradshaw, *Eucharistic Origins*, Alcuin Club Collections 80 (London: SPCK, 2004), 139–41; Maxwell E. Johnson, “Martyrs and the Mass: The Interpolation of the Narrative of Institution into the Anaphora,” *Worship* 87 (2013): 2–22. On the other hand, a recent work by Predrag Bukovec, *Die frühchristliche Eucharistie*, WUNT (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2022), challenges this dating.

As for the emergence of the epiclesis, in what has become a classic work on the subject, Sebastian Brock demonstrated its gradual evolution from forms that addressed Christ directly with an imperative, "Come!," through invocations to Christ to "Let your Spirit come," and later to God being asked that the "Spirit may come," and finally God being petitioned to "send the Holy Spirit."²⁵ This final form is again first found in the Barcelona Papyrus ("we ask and beseech you to send on them your Holy and comforter Spirit from heaven"), and is very similar to that in *AT* ("[we ask that] you would send your Holy Spirit on the oblation of the holy church"), though the version in *AT* is somewhat simpler in form and so probably slightly earlier.²⁶

It has been suggested that some other elements of the prayer also belong to this later period. The phrase "your inseparable word" recalls "inseparable from the Father," used by Justin Martyr (*Dialogue with Trypho* 128) and by (Pseudo-)Hippolytus (*Contra Noetum* 18). Markus Vinzent, however, has observed that "inseparable" was "not part of the debate against Noetus in the second century, nor in the early Arian controversy, but becomes a hallmark of the Marcellus of Ancyra, Eusebius of Caesarea, and Apollinarius of Laodicea discussion in the post-Nicene period." Even the seemingly innocuous quotation from Hebrews 1:2, "in these last times," a little earlier in the prayer "was introduced to the fourth-century debate by Asterius

25. Sebastian Brock, "The Epiklesis in the Antiochene Baptismal Ordines," in *Symposium Syriacum 1972*, *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 197 (Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 1974), 183–218.

26. Even Enrico Mazza, *The Origins of the Eucharistic Prayer* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1995), 170–74, admitted that this part of *AT*'s epiclesis belonged to a later redaction.

of Cappadocia, debated by Marcellus and Theophronius of Tyana, and repeated in three of the symbols associated with the 341 CE synod of Antioch.”²⁷ This suggests not only the later date but a more polemical reason for the addition of these phrases here.

The following clauses (“through whom you made all things and it was well pleasing to you”), though probably not as late as the fourth century, certainly represent a more advanced Christology than that displayed by the oldest stratum of material in *AT*, which makes no reference to a preexistent Christ. A further clause (“and who conceived in the womb was incarnate and manifested as your Son, born from the Holy Spirit and the virgin”) is more clearly a product of the fourth century. References to birth from both the Holy Spirit and the virgin are extremely rare before that time,²⁸ reference to birth from the virgin alone being more usual, as in the preceding clause (“you sent from heaven into the virgin’s womb”). It is also to be noted that in this part of the prayer Jesus is described as God’s Son rather than as servant/child, another sign of a later date.

The next part of the prayer (“who fulfilling your will and gaining for you a holy people, stretched out [his] hands when he was suffering, that he might release from suffering those who believed in you”) could very well have been part of its earliest stratum, as there is nothing in it inconsistent with a second-century date. Indeed, the concept of

27. Markus Vinzent, “The Reception of Jesus in the *Traditio Apostolica*,” in Chris Keith, Helen K. Bond, Christine Jacobi, and Jens Schröter, eds., *The Reception of Jesus in the First Three Centuries*, vol. 2 (London: T&T Clark, 2020), 539–54, here at 545.

28. For references to earlier examples, see Vinzent, “Reception of Jesus,” 545.

the stretching out of hands to God's people, expressed in Isaiah 65:2 ("I spread out my hands all day long to a rebellious people") and quoted in Romans 10:21, was widely interpreted as a prophecy of the crucifixion within the early Christian tradition.²⁹ Furthermore, Enrico Mazza noted that the same verbal link between suffering and release from suffering was made in several of the second-century paschal homilies.³⁰

The next section of the prayer ("who when he was being handed over to voluntary suffering, that he might destroy death and break the bonds of the devil, and tread down hell and illuminate the righteous, and fix a limit and manifest the resurrection") presents some difficulty. As it stands, this is grammatically dependent on the institution narrative that follows, and so one might naturally conclude that the two elements were added as a single unit. On the other hand, it is not impossible that the grammatical construction underwent a change when the narrative was inserted, and that this preceding part had already existed in the prayer in some form.

Certainly, the expressions used in this section are characteristic of the second century. Not only is the concept of destroying death already present in the New Testament (see 1 Cor 15:26; 2 Tim 1:10), but it recurs in other early literature: "he endured that he might destroy death and reveal the resurrection of the dead" (*Barnabas* 5.6); and

29. For example, *Barnabas* 12.4; Justin, *First Apology* 35; *Dialogue with Trypho* 97.2. See Bernard Botte, "Extendit manus suas cum pateretur," *Questions Liturgiques et Paroissiales* 49 (1968): 307–8; Emil J. Lengeling, "Hippolyt von Rom und die Wendung 'extendit manus suas cum pateretur,'" *Questions Liturgiques et Paroissiales* 50 (1969): 141–44.

30. Mazza, *Origins*, 117–19.

in a longer form in Irenaeus as “Our Lord by his passion destroyed death, and dispersed error, and put an end to corruption, and destroyed ignorance, while he manifested life and revealed truth, and bestowed the gift of incorruption” (*Adversus haereses* 2.20.3); and again more briefly in his *Demonstration of Apostolic Preaching* with “he destroyed death, releasing those bonds in which we had been chained, and manifested the resurrection” (*Epideixis* 38). Finally, Melito of Sardis in his *Peri Pascha* offers a more extensive witness to this vocabulary, including an early allusion to the descent into hell: “The Lord clothed himself with humanity, and with suffering on behalf of the suffering one, and bound on behalf of the one constrained, and judged on behalf of the one convicted, and buried on behalf of the one entombed, rose from the dead and cried out aloud: . . . I am he who destroys death, and triumphs over the enemy, and crushes Hades, and binds the strong man, and bears off humanity to the heavenly heights.”³¹

Although the use of the precise phrase “illuminate the righteous” with reference to those in the underworld is otherwise not known before the *Gospel of Nicodemus* (fourth century?)³² and the meaning of “fix a limit” continues to puzzle scholars,³³ there are enough second-century linguistic parallels with the material in this section of the prayer to support its probable presence in the early stratum, provided that the grammatical construction were once

31. 100, 102; quoted from *On Pascha: Melito of Sardis*, translated by Alistair Stewart-Sykes (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2001), 65.

32. But see also the warrant for prayer at the ninth hour in chapter 41 below.

33. See, for example, Stewart, *Hippolytus*, 83–84.

different. Moreover, the arrangement into pairs of terms—destroy death and break the bonds of the devil, and tread down hell and illuminate the righteous, and fix a limit and manifest the resurrection—is a characteristic of the pattern of some other early prayers. For instance, there is a similar pairing, “from darkness into light, from ignorance to knowledge of the glory of his name, from decay of death into incorruption,” in the Barcelona Papyrus, derived in part from *1 Clement* 59.2.

It also raises a further possibility. If the reference to manifesting the resurrection previously ended the section, it could have immediately preceded what liturgical scholars call the anamnesis, “Remembering therefore his death and resurrection,” prior to the institution narrative being added. That would have formed an ideal link between the two halves of the prayer. There has been a tendency to assume that anamnestic links of this sort were always connected to a preceding institution narrative. But it would function here equally well, or even better, without that, and its presence after the narrative in other early eucharistic prayers could simply have been the result of them following this model.

Apart from the obviously later insertion of the more trinitarian but ungrammatical phrase “Father and Son with the Holy Spirit” in the doxology in spite of the presence of the word “servant/child” just before it, the second half of the prayer raises no alarm bells about its primitive character and may be accepted as such. Even the expression “we offer to you the bread and cup” has parallels in Justin Martyr (*Dialogue with Trypho* 41.1.3; 70.4) and Irenaeus (*Adversus haereses* 4.17.5; 4.18.1).

On the basis of its presence in the corresponding part of the prayers in *AC*, *TD*, and the later Ethiopic translation, several scholars have argued that the Greek verb behind the

Latin *servare*, “minister,” had been *hierateuein*, “to exercise the priesthood,” and even that it referred exclusively to the episcopal ministry just conferred in ordination.³⁴ However, this seems much more likely to have been a change made by those later texts when the sacerdotal aspect of the episcopate had emerged, and that the original had meant by “us” the whole community on whose behalf the prayer was being said, especially as the Greek verb *leitourgein*, “to minister,” occurs in the Septuagint of Deuteronomy 10:8 and 18:3, 7 combined with “stand before the Lord” in a liturgical context.³⁵ The absence of a direct object for the participle “gathering” has also given rise to a number of proposed emendations,³⁶ but the parallel petition in *Didache* 10.5, that God might “gather it [the church] from the four winds,” suggests that the sense was similar here.

It is not just vocabulary, however, that points to an early date for much of this prayer. Its basic structure—thanksgiving, offering, and petition—is shared by other prayers that have totally different contents, especially that in the Strasbourg Papyrus, which is thought to belong to the third century,³⁷ and underlies other later prayers thought to have a similar ancient core.

34. See R.H. Connolly, “The Eucharistic Prayer of Hippolytus,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 39 (1938): 350–69, here at 363; Bernard Botte, “Ad stare coram te et tibi ministrare,” *Questions liturgiques* 63 (1982): 223–26; Stewart, *Hippolytus*, 79.

35. Ratcliff, “The Sanctus and the Pattern of the Early Anaphora,” 126–30; and Mazza, *Origins*, 151–52, who defends this position at length in a note.

36. See, for example, Stewart, *Hippolytus*, 79–81.

37. Jasper and Cuming, *Prayers of the Eucharist*, 87–89. See also Walter D. Ray, “The Strasbourg Papyrus,” in Paul F. Bradshaw, ed., *Essays on Early Eastern Eucharistic Prayers* (Collegeville, MN: Litur-

Thus, in its earliest form, this eucharistic prayer was exclusively concerned with the mission of Jesus and not with such themes as God's work of creation nor God's dealings with the Hebrew people. Nor are there any wider subjects of intercession but only petition for the fruits of communion. It may well be that other very early eucharistic prayers were quite different from this, but—even allowing for liturgical language usually to be somewhat archaic and continuing to employ some vocabulary after it had ceased to be used in other forms of discourse—here we have a unique insight into one apparently as old as the late second century—for which we have no other example—long before it was incorporated into *AT*.

[5] Concerning the Offering of Oil

If anyone offers oil, let him render thanks according to the offering of bread and wine—and let him say [it] not word for word but to similar effect—saying: “As sanctifying this oil, you give, God, health to those using and receiving [it], whence you have anointed kings, priests, and prophets, so also may it afford strengthening to all tasting [it] and health to all using it.”

Chapters 5 and 6 were presumably added to the church order here after the eucharistic prayer had been inserted because of their association with it. However, they have been displaced in E1, again presumably because the omission of chapter 4 in E1 left them isolated between the rite for a

gical Press, 1997), 39–56; Ágnes T. Mihálykó, *The Christian Liturgical Papyri: An Introduction*, Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 114 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019), 155–57.

bishop and the one for a presbyter. Their new location, after chapter 9, has some slight logic to it, whether intended or not, as the final part of that chapter deals with the forms of prayer. It is unclear whether this prayer concerning the oil was intended to stand alone or be inserted into a longer thanksgiving, and who was to say it—the person bringing the oil or the bishop, although the latter seems more likely. The prayer itself is also somewhat odd. Unlike the eucharistic prayer, it is not well constructed and its reference to oil used for anointing kings, priests, and prophets does not connect with this oil intended for the anointing of the sick and for the consumption of it by them, oil being commonly consumed medicinally in the ancient world. Stewart has suggested that the prayer could have been a later addition to the instruction and might have been an adaptation of a prayer originally intended for the anointing of those being baptized, as this imagery was sometimes related to baptism (see, for example, Tertullian, *De baptismo* 7).³⁸ This would certainly explain some of the confusion.

[6] Concerning the Cheese and the Olives

Likewise, if anyone should offer cheese and olives, let him say thus:

"Sanctify this milk that has been coagulated, coagulating us also to your love, and let us not depart from your sweetness."

"[Sanctify] also this fruit of the olive which is a symbol of your richness that you have poured from the tree of life for those who hope in you."

But in every blessing let there be said, "To you [be] glory, Father and Son with the Holy Spirit, in the

38. Stewart, *Hippolytus*, 91.

holy church, both now and always and to the ages of ages."

For the position of this in E1, see chapter 5 above. Stewart has similarly proposed that the prayers themselves here were later additions to a simple rubric, so that the original version of both chapters would have read: "If anyone offers oil he shall render thanks in the same manner as for the offering of bread and wine, not saying it word for word, but to the same effect; in the same way if anyone offers cheese and olives."³⁹

The final paragraph does nothing to lessen the confusion of these two chapters. Its presence here seems to be inspired by the link with the word "blessing," but elsewhere in *AT* that word appears to refer to the consecrated bread, which suggests that this passage is by a different and somewhat later hand. Whether it is intended to refer only to specific prayers of blessing such as these, or more generally to any prayers, is not clear. In its present form the prescribed doxology is addressed to the Trinity, "Father and Son with the Holy Spirit," but it seems probable that this was an emendation of an earlier version. Some other doxologies in *AT* contain the same expression in contexts in which it is clearly an ungrammatical insertion: see the eucharistic prayer in chapter 4, the ordination prayer in chapter 8, and the postbaptismal prayer in chapter 21.

[7] Concerning the Presbyter

And when a presbyter is ordained, let the bishop lay the hand on his head, the presbyters also touching [him], *and let him say according to those things*

39. Stewart, *Hippolytus*, 93.

that have been said above, as we have said above about the bishop, *praying and saying*:

This instruction appears in L and E1 in similar forms, but E1 then goes on to omit the prayer. It appears extremely likely that this chapter, like the one for the bishop which it would have originally followed directly, at first consisted only of this brief direction. When the prayer was then added, the unfortunate insertion of “and let him say” immediately before “according to those things that have been said above” rather than after it resulted in the words no longer making sense and confused twentieth-century scholars, many thinking that the prayer for a bishop was to be used in combination with that for a presbyter.⁴⁰ Like the communal imposition of hands on a bishop, the custom of presbyters joining in the imposition of hands on a new presbyter also disappeared from the tradition. Apart from *TD* copying *AT*, no other ancient rite prescribed this, and once again it was only the reproduction of this instruction in the *Statuta ecclesiae antiqua* that later introduced it to standard Western, but not Eastern, practice: “When a presbyter is ordained, as the bishop blesses him and holds his hand on his head, let all the presbyters who are present also hold their hands beside the hand of the bishop on his head.”⁴¹

“God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, look upon this your servant and impart the spirit of grace and of counsel of the presbytery that he may help and guide your people with a pure heart, just as you looked upon your chosen people and commanded

40. See Bradshaw, Johnson, and Phillips, *Apostolic Tradition*, 55.

41. Bradshaw, *Ordination Rites*, 222.

Moses that he should choose presbyters whom you filled with your Spirit that you gave to your servant.

And now, Lord, grant to be preserved unfailingly in us the spirit of your grace and make [us] worthy, that believing in you we may minister in simplicity of heart, praising you through your servant, Christ Jesus, through whom to you [be] glory and power, Father and Son with the Holy Spirit, in the holy church, both now and to the ages of ages. Amen."

The prayer is omitted from E1. As already noted in the case of the prayer for a bishop and the eucharistic prayer above, while fixed prayers may not have been part of the earliest stratum of *AT*, this does not mean that those prayers do not have independent roots that may be as old as the instructions to which they were later appended, even if in their present form they have undergone further development. The two parts of this prayer appear originally to have been two separate units, as they do not relate to one another in any way, except for a reference to "spirit."⁴² The first is a prayer for the candidate, the second for the congregation, or perhaps just for the other ministers. It was apparently this awkwardness that led to *AC* and *TD* attempting to change it into a petition for the candidate.⁴³

42. Segelberg, "Ordination Prayers," 403–4.

43. *AC*: "And now, Lord, preserve unceasingly the Spirit of your grace watching in us, so that, having been filled with works of healing and the word of teaching, he may teach your people in humility and serve you sincerely with a pure mind and a willing soul, and may fulfill without blemish the holy services of your people; through your Christ, through whom [be] to you glory, honor, and worship in Holy Spirit unto the ages. Amen."

The prayer is quite different in form and style from the one for a bishop. Fundamental to it is the use of Numbers 11:16-17 as the "type" or image of the presbytery, elders whose primary function was to share with Moses in the government of the people. This biblical allusion is hardly ever found in other extant ancient ordination prayers, except for the *Sacramentary of Sarapion* and those directly dependent on AT,⁴⁴ apparently therefore being an older concept of the presbyterate as a council of advisors to the bishop, chosen from the leading men in the community, that was later superseded by the view that they were his subordinates.

There are some other elements that look like later additions, including the ungrammatical trinitarian reference in the doxology. The quotation of part of 2 Corinthians 1:3 at the beginning follows the longer version in the prayer for a bishop and seems to be part of an attempt to harmonize all three ordination prayers; and the clause "that you gave to your servant," that is, Moses, has the appearance of an explanatory expansion and is absent from the versions in AC and its *Epitome*. The Latin word used for "servant" here is *famulus*, a perfectly normal word for a domestic servant that continued to be used in later liturgical texts but is not otherwise part of the vocabulary of L.

TD: "so now, O Lord, bestow on [this man] abundantly your Spirit, which you gave to those who were made disciples by you, and to all those who through them truly believed in you. And make them worthy, being filled with your wisdom and your hidden mysteries, to shepherd your people in holiness of heart; pure and true; praising, blessing, lauding. . . ."

44. See Bradshaw, *Ordination Rites*, 115, 119, 122.

[8] Concerning the Deacon

And when a deacon is appointed, let him be chosen according to those things that have been said above, the bishop alone likewise laying on hands [as we have prescribed].

Some earlier scholars agreed that this short direction was probably the original form here, with the rest of the chapter being a later amplification.⁴⁵ Although both L and E1 use the word “ordained” at the beginning, the translation has instead adopted the Greek loan-word *kathistanai*, “appointed,” found in the Sahidic version as most likely to have been the original verb. The implication of “chosen according to those things that have been said above” is that deacons were elected. Such a practice (also mentioned in *Didache* 15.1) cannot have lasted long because by the third century we find them simply being appointed by the bishop.

Modern translations have often accepted the reading *sicuti praecipimus* in L as the original and translated it along the lines of “as we have prescribed,”⁴⁶ but that would imply that the bishop alone laying on hands was something that had been prescribed for the ordination of bishops and presbyters, which is manifestly not the case. Moreover, it ignores the fact that the Latin verb in the manuscript

45. J.V. Bartlet, “The Ordination Prayers in the Ancient Church Order,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 17 (1916): 248–56, here at 250–54; W.H. Frere, “Early Forms of Ordination,” in H.B. Swete, ed., *Essays on the Early History of the Church and the Ministry* (London: Macmillan, 1918), 263–312, here at 285–86.

46. See Botte, *Tradition apostolique*, 23, n. 5; G.J. Cuming, *Hypolytus: A Text for Students*, Joint Liturgical Studies 8 (Nottingham: Grove Books, 1976), 13; B.S. Easton, *The Apostolic Tradition of Hypolytus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1934), 38.

of L is actually in the present tense, “we prescribe,” and also its absence from the Sahidic, Arabic, and Ethiopic versions, being replaced there by very different expanded readings. E1 has: “That which we have received as a tradition concerning the deacon—that the bishop alone lays [the] hand—this is due to the fact that they have not been ordained to the priesthood.” Thus, we propose to follow Stewart’s suggestion to adopt Gregory Dix’s solution and attach the verb instead to the subsequent sentence, which produces a more coherent result.⁴⁷

[We prescribe that] in the ordination of a deacon the bishop alone lays on hands, because he is not ordained to the priesthood but to the service of the bishop, that he may do those things that are ordered by him. For he is not a participant in the counsel of the clergy, but taking care of and indicating to the bishop what is necessary, not receiving the common spirit of the presbytery, that in which the presbyters are participants, but that which is entrusted to him under the power of the bishop. Wherefore, let the bishop alone make a deacon, but on a presbyter let the presbyters also lay on hands on account of the common and like spirit of the clergy.

For the presbyter has the power of this alone, that he may receive, but he does not have power to give. For this reason he does not ordain the clergy, but at the ordination of a presbyter he seals while the bishop ordains.

47. Dix, *Apostolic Tradition*, 15; Stewart, *Hippolytus*, 103.

This lengthy explanation would have been added, possibly in a piecemeal manner rather than all at once, at a time when the differing status of presbyters and deacons was beginning to be an issue, and the concept of priesthood was first being applied to the episcopal office. There are only very minor variations between L and E1 here, none of any significance. The translation follows L.

It presents three reasons why presbyters but not deacons participate in the imposition of hands on a presbyter. (a) They share in the priesthood of the bishop, a view first expressed by Cyprian in the middle of the third century.⁴⁸ (b) They participate in the “counsel of the clergy,” a concept articulated in the ordination prayer for a presbyter above. The term “clergy” (*klēros* in Greek) also came into use to denote ordained ministers in the third century but was generally used to describe either all ordained ministers or all ordained ministers apart from the bishop, and so its use here for bishop and presbyters but not deacons is unusual and does not feature in E1. (c) They receive the “common spirit of the presbytery” or “the common and like spirit of the clergy.” Deacons, on the other hand, have an individual ministry entrusted to them by the bishop and under his direction.

The final paragraph appears to come from a later hand and introduces a new concept, that of ordination bestowing

48. Cyprian, *Ep.* 57.3. Origen saw presbyters as exercising an inferior priesthood to that of the bishop (*Hom. in Exodum* 11.6; *Hom. in Leviticum* 6.6). This concept was probably inspired by 2 Kings 23:4, which mentions both the high priest and “priests of the second order,” and is one that recurs in later writings, including the classic Roman ordination prayer for presbyters, which equates them with the “men of a lesser order and secondary dignity” (*sequentis ordinis viros et secundae dignitatis*) chosen by God as assistants to the high priests in the Old Testament.

particular powers, which later became a standard part of the Western theology of orders, and also the understanding of the role of the presbyters at ordination as “sealing.”

And over a deacon let him say thus:

“God, who created all things and ordered [them] by [your] word, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ whom you sent to serve your will and manifest to us your desire, give the holy spirit of grace and caring and diligence to this your servant whom you have chosen to minister for your church, and to present in your sanctuary that which is offered to you by your high priest to the glory of your name, that serving blamelessly in a pure way of life, he may be counted worthy of this high office and may praise you through your servant Son Jesus Christ our Lord, through whom to you [be] glory and power and praise with the Holy Spirit, now and always and to the ages of ages. Amen.”

The prayer is omitted by E1, and a lacuna in L begins after the word “present,” so that the rest of the prayer has to be reconstructed from the less reliable versions in the only other witnesses, E2 and TD. The later additions to the prayer, however, seem quite clear. “The Father of our Lord” not only uses a christological title not present in the oldest layer of AT but also incorporates part of the quotation from 2 Corinthians 1:3 also found at the beginning of the prayers for bishops and presbyters, which, it has been suggested above, was introduced as a means of unifying the prayers. Similarly, the clause about presenting what was to be offered by the high priest (that is, the bishop) must belong to a later stratum, as does the similar expression in

the prayer for the ordination of a bishop. The relegation of the words “holy” and “and caring” to mistakes by L follows the suggestion of Botte,⁴⁹ and the expansion of the doxology, including the substitution of “Son” for servant and the addition of the title “Lord,” reflects the changes made in the later versions that form the basis of this second part of the prayer. Finally, it seems that the diaconate was not yet viewed as a transitional ministry leading to higher office in this prayer, as can be seen from the third century onwards, but the “high office” to which it refers was the diaconate itself, alluding to 1 Timothy 3:13.⁵⁰

L continues its lengthy lacuna until the middle of Chapter 21. Chapters 11–14 appear in a different order in the several versions of *AT*, and prior to the discovery of E1 the sequence numbered in this way was generally accepted as most likely to have been the original. E1, however, locates the chapters in a quite different order. Hence, the conventional numbering is maintained here, but the chapters are placed in the order of E1.

[13] Concerning the Subdeacon

The hand shall not be laid on a subdeacon, but he shall be named to follow the deacon, and perform the baptism for the bishop.

Subdeacons are first mentioned in a letter of Pope Cornelius in 251 (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 6.43), and frequently by

49. Botte, *Tradition apostolique*, 27, n. 2.

50. For later developments, see John St. H. Gibaut, *The Cursus Honorum: A Study of the Origins and Evolution of Sequential Ordination* (New York: Lang, 2000).

Cyprian (*Ep.* 8.1; 9.1; 29.2; 34.4; 36.1; 43.4; 47.2; 79.1). They perhaps originated in those churches, such as Rome, where the number of deacons was limited to seven (see Acts 6:5). Later in the East they were ordained by imposition of hands and prayer, in the West by the handing over of a symbol of office. The addition at the end of the sentence is unique to E1 and appears to be a later interpolation. It is not clear why it should be a subdeacon rather than a deacon or presbyter who was to act for the bishop in baptism.

[11] Concerning the Reader

A reader is appointed when the bishop gives him the book. For he is not ordained.

A Greek text of this chapter has been preserved in the *Epitome* of AC 8 and is translated here. "One who reads" is mentioned by Justin Martyr in the second century (*First Apology* 67.4), but it is unclear whether a formally appointed office is meant or it is more likely to be just a reference to a member of the Christian community who happened to read on that occasion. The earliest sure reference to a formally appointed reader is in the third century (Tertullian, *De praesc.* 41; Cyprian, *Ep.* 23; 29.2; 32.2; 35.1; 38; 39). The office of reader or *lector* continued to exist in later tradition, at least in theory, in the churches of the East and West. The "book" ritually handed over was the book from which the recipient would read in the liturgy and continued to be the symbol of office bestowed in later Western ordination rites.

[10] Concerning the Widow

When a widow is appointed, she is not to be ordained, but she is chosen by name if it has been a

long time since the loss of her husband. If instead she lost her husband a short time ago, let her not be trusted. But if she is an old woman, her emotions will be under control, because it is the time when passions grow old. Let the widow be appointed by the word, becoming enrolled with the rest, but she does not receive ordination by the hand because she does not teach but is appointed only for prayer, which is allowed to all.

A formal order of widows is mentioned in 1 Timothy 5:3-16, where a minimum age of sixty is prescribed. Similar directions to those in *AT* are given in the third-/fourth-century Syrian *Didascalia Apostolorum*: “Widows who are young should not be appointed to the office of widows, but they should be assisted and supported, so that they do not desire out of need to be married a second time” (3.2.1). “A widow should have no other concern except to pray for those who give and for the entire church” (3.5.2). “It is neither fitting nor necessary that a woman should teach” (3.6.1). “The widow should know that she is the altar of God, and she should sit constantly at home, not wandering” (3.6.3).⁵¹

The Sahidic version of *AT* expands the argument further against widows being ordained: “But a hand shall not be laid on her because she does not offer up the offering or the liturgy. But the ordination is for the clergy for the sake of the liturgies and the widow is appointed only for the sake of the prayer; and this belongs to everyone.” Widows were not only principal recipients of the church’s charity in early

51. ET from Alistair Stewart-Sykes, *The Didascalia Apostolorum* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2009), 183–86.

Christianity but also held in high regard because of their continence and perseverance in prayer, day and night (1 Thess 5:5).⁵² As the other ecclesiastical offices mentioned in the surrounding chapters appear to be third-century additions to the core text, this may be true also of this one, even though there is nothing in it that could not have been written in the second century.

[9] Concerning Imprisoned Confessors

The confessors, if they have been in bonds because of the name of Jesus Christ, let them not have the hand laid on them for the diaconate or the presbytery, for he has the honor of the presbytery by his confession. But if he is appointed bishop, let him have the hand laid on him. And if he is a confessor who was not taken before an authority, or punished in bonds, or shut in prison, or condemned by any judgement, but by chance was greatly abused for his Lord or otherwise punished under house arrest, let the hand be laid on him for every office of which he is worthy.

And let the bishop give thanks as we said before. It is not absolutely necessary for him to give thanks according to this teaching, but according to his ability. If he is able to give a grand and elevated [prayer], then good; but if something of lesser qual-

52. See further Carolyn Osiek, "The Widow as Altar: The Rise and Fall of a Symbol," *Second Century* 3 (1983):159–69; Bonnie B. Thurston, *The Widows: A Women's Ministry in the Early Church* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989). Charlotte Methuen, "The 'Virgin Widow': A Problematic Social Role for the Early Church?," *Harvard Theological Review* 90 (1997): 285–98.

ity, there is nothing to prevent it, if indeed it is sound and correct.

The earliest known use of the Greek word *homologētēs*, “confessor,” to describe one who had suffered for the faith occurs in the letter of the martyrs of Lyon in 177 CE (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 5.2.2–3). The recognition of confessors as members of the presbytery is not attested in any other ancient source.⁵³

The final paragraph has the appearance of being out of place, as it is unconnected to what has just gone before. It would seem more natural to belong after the eucharistic prayer and before chapter 5, but all the versions locate it here, so perhaps it was simply an afterthought, especially if the chapter concerning confessors was formerly the conclusion of the section on recognized ministries. Extemporization of prayer was normal practice in primitive Christianity, but fixed examples also began to appear, as in this church order, presumably chiefly for those who found the task difficult. By the fourth century written texts had become common.⁵⁴

[12] Concerning the Virgin

The hand shall not be laid on a virgin, but her choice alone is what makes her a virgin.

53. But see Allen Brent, “Cyprian and the Question of *Ordinatio per Confessionem*,” *Studia Patristica* 36 (2001): 323–37, who argued that it can be detected behind Cyprian’s opposition to presbyters reconciling those who had lapsed under persecution.

54. See Allan Bouley, *From Freedom to Formula: The Evolution of the Eucharistic Prayer from Oral Improvisation to Written Texts* (Washington, DC: Pastoral Press, 1981).

This chapter is not present in E1, and the title and text have been supplied from the Sahidic version. We do not know whether its omission was purely accidental, or whether it was never part of the oldest text of *AT* because an order of virgins was not known to the original compiler. Virgins are only otherwise referred to in the church order in chapters 18 and 23, where the references may also be late interpolations. Virgins, however, are widely mentioned in other early Christian literature.⁵⁵

[14] Concerning the Gift of Healing

If someone says, "I received the gift of healing through a revelation," the hand shall not be laid on him, for the work itself will reveal if he has truly received it.

This chapter is displaced in E1, to a position between chapters 15 and 16, probably the result of a scribal error of having accidentally skipped over the chapter and needing to insert it later. We do not know, therefore, what would have been its original location in this list.

[15] Concerning Those to be Baptized who Come for the First Time

Those to be baptized who come for the first time to hear the word, before they are admitted into the midst of all the people, let them be brought first to the teacher. And let them be asked about their activity, for what reason they have come to be admitted. And let those who have brought them be their wit-

55. See, for example, Susanna Elm, *'Virgins of God': The Making of Asceticism in Late Antiquity* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994).

nesses as to whether they are able to hear the word. And let them be questioned about their life: Does he have a wife? Is he a slave? Does his master permit him? If he is the slave of a believer, let him bear witness. If he does not witness in his favor, let him be rejected. If he [the master] is a pagan, teach him to please his master, so there shall be no scandal.

And if there is one who has a wife or a woman who has a husband, let them be instructed to remain with his wife or with her husband. And if there is one who is not married, let him be taught not to fornicate; either let him marry legally or if not, remain as he is. And if there is one who has a demon, let him not hear the word of the teacher until he is purified.

This chapter begins a new section of the church order, ending with chapter 21, that concerns the initiation of new Christians. Although detailed descriptions of this process are only known through fourth-century sources, sufficient information can be gleaned from earlier works to show the basic outline that was established in the preceding centuries. The lacuna in L continues until the middle of chapter 21, and so for most of this section E1 provides the basis of the translation. The primary layer of chapters 15–19 seems to be somewhat later than the oldest material in the first part of *AT*, since it is generally agreed that a formal pattern of baptismal preparation did not come into existence until the end of the second century. Moreover, it regularly uses the technical term “catechumen,” which is unknown before then.

No specific ministers are named in chapters 15–19, and so the “teacher” mentioned in this chapter may have been either an ordained or lay person (see also chapters 18 and

19). The reference to “those who have brought them” indicates that potential converts needed sponsors who could vouch for their good character and sincere intentions. Both Egeria (*Itinerarium* 45) and Theodore of Mopsuestia (*Baptismal Homilies* 1.14–15) attest that sponsors continued to be required in the late fourth century.

The oldest description of the process of initial discernment we are able to date is given by Origen in the mid-third century. Having said that philosophers who lecture in public do not pick and choose their hearers but allow anyone who wishes to listen, Origen contrasts the practice of Christians.

But as far as they can, Christians previously examine the souls of those who want to hear them, and test them individually beforehand; when before entering the community the hearers seem to have devoted themselves sufficiently to the desire to live a good life, then they introduce them. They privately appoint one class consisting of recent beginners who are receiving elementary instruction and have not yet received the sign that they have been purified, and another class of those who, as far as they are able, make it their set purpose to desire nothing other than those things of which Christians approve. Among the latter class some are appointed to inquire into the lives and conduct of those who want to join the community, in order that they may prevent those who indulge in secret sins from coming to their common gathering; those who do not do this they wholeheartedly receive and make them better every day.⁵⁶

56. Origen, *Contra Celsum* 3.51; ET from Henry Chadwick, *Origen: Contra Celsum* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965), 163.

Three particular issues are highlighted in this chapter: slavery, marriage, and demon possession. Christians had no difficulty in accepting slaves as members of the church, but *AT* requires that if they had Christian masters, they needed testimony from those masters as to their good character before being admitted. If they had a pagan master, on the other hand, it was important that they were obedient to him, lest they brought the Christian movement into public disrepute. The marriage discipline proposed does not go far beyond St. Paul's teaching in 1 Corinthians 7: those who are married should remain so; the unmarried should marry or remain celibate. Demon possession, which today would be called a form of mental illness, presented an obstacle to Christian discipleship, as it appeared to imply that such persons were not fully converted to Christian obedience but still subject to the power of the devil. Hence, they could not participate in the process until they had been purified.⁵⁷ By the fourth century, not only did the rites treat all potential converts as possessed by demons that needed expelling, but also acknowledge that this work of exorcism might take some time and need repeating more than once.

[16] Concerning the Craft and the Profession

Let it be asked what are the crafts and professions of those who will be admitted. If one is a brothel keeper who is a caretaker of prostitutes, let him abandon this activity or be rejected. If one is a

57. See further Eric Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism in the New Testament and Early Christianity*, WUNT 157 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002); Mikael Tellbe and Tommy Wasserman, eds., *Healing and Exorcism in Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity*, WUNT 511 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019).

sculptor or a painter, let him be taught not to make idols, and if he refuses, let him be rejected. If he is one who performs in the theatre, let him cease or otherwise be rejected. If he teaches young children, it is good thing for him to cease. If he does not have another profession, let it be conceded.

L's lacuna continues. The different versions vary in details and order throughout the chapter, but the translation follows E1. Most of it has been placed in italics, partly because its length suggests it might have been a separate source before later being incorporated into the church order, and partly because its wide-ranging and detailed provisions suggest a period when the church had been long established and facing hard cases and conflicts with the surrounding society among potential converts. On the other hand, there is little internal logic to the sequence of the chapter, which might mean that it gradually expanded over time.

The immorality of earning one's living from prostitutes was obvious and is briefly condemned by Tertullian in *De idolatria* 11. Being a sculptor or painter brought the risk of compromising one's faith by having to portray idolatrous figures as though they were true. Hence the requirement was made here to a potential Christian to refuse to engage in that sort of work. Tertullian also strongly attacks idol makers (*De idolatria* 5–7). Theatrical performances often took place in connection with pagan religious festivals, and in any case might involve immodest behavior (see Tertullian, *De spectaculis* 17), and hence the incompatibility of the acting profession with Christianity. School teaching would also require instruction in pagan myths and beliefs. But in this case the directive inserts a note of compassion. If teachers

have no other means of making a living, they may be excused the ban and allowed to become Christians. Tertullian devoted a whole chapter of his *De idolatria* to the incompatibility of the teaching profession with Christianity (chapter 10) but mentioned no exceptions, and when dealing with the general problem of being deprived of one's livelihood because of one's faith in chapter 12, he was unforgiving.

Again, one who competes with horses and enters the games, let him abandon this activity or be rejected. A gladiator or an instructor of gladiators, or one who fights with bears, who engages in public combat, let him be rejected. A priest of the idols or a custodian of the idols—that is, one who guards them—let him cease or be rejected.

Once more in these three cases, the underlying principle was the avoidance of idolatry. The games had a pagan religious dimension. Tertullian objected in particular to the racing colors, which were dedicated to pagan deities (*De spectaculis* 9). Gladiatorial contests had historically been connected to offerings for the dead and were condemned by Tertullian both for this reason and because of the extreme cruelty of the spectacle (*De spectaculis* 12, 19). Finally, a priest of idols or a custodian of a temple obviously fell under the same interdiction.

A soldier who finds himself in a certain authority, let him not kill; and also if he is ordered, let him not offer sacrifice, swear [the military oath], and not put wreaths on the head. One who executes with the sword, or a ruler of a city or one who wears the purple, let him cease or otherwise be rejected. A

catechumen or one of the faithful, if he desires to be enlisted [in the army], let him be rejected because he did a wrong to the Lord.

Military service is not forbidden outright, but the Christian was expected to avoid killing or offering sacrifices, swearing the military oath, or wearing the wreath (a military award or decoration). The last two prohibitions are only included in E1, but all of them involved an element of pagan idolatry. Yet it would seem to have been an unrealistic expectation that someone could have remained in the army and still refused to do any of these things. Although Tertullian claimed that low-ranking soldiers were not required to take part in sacrifices or capital punishment (*De idolatria* 19), he nevertheless judged that any military service was incompatible with being a Christian, because one could not serve two masters (*De corona* 11).⁵⁸ Similarly, accepting civil office was forbidden, as once again this involved idolatry by participating in pagan sacrifices and festivals (see Tertullian, *De idolatria* 17–18).

A prostitute or profligate man or one who castrated himself, if he abandons his activity, he can be admitted to hear. Let a sorcerer be rejected, because he does not come under consideration. A magician, one who practices incantations, an astrologer, one who interprets dreams, an enchanter, and one who makes phylacteries, let them cease, or if not, be rejected.

58. See further Alan Kreider, "Military Service in the Church Orders," *Journal of Religious Ethics* 31 (2003): 415–42.

In contrast to E1, the Sahidic version refuses under any circumstances to admit a prostitute or profligate or one who had been castrated. E1 then goes on say that a maker of statues should not be considered for admission, but as this craft has already been dealt with earlier in the chapter, this is surely an error for sorcerer, as in the Sahidic. Those engaged in other magical arts, however, may be admitted if they cease to practice them. Tertullian also condemns those with such practices (*De idolatria* 9). The denial of a maker of phylacteries appears to be because such a person would be working for Jewish masters.

Someone's concubine, if she raised the children that she gave him and is his alone, let her be admitted to hear, and if not, let her be rejected. A man really commits murder if he has a concubine; let him cease and let him marry legally. But if he is unwilling, let him be rejected.

If there is anything that we have overlooked, the fact itself will teach, for we all have the Holy Spirit in us.

This section about concubines is unlike the others in not strictly concerning a craft or profession. It may perhaps, therefore, have been older than the rest, and originally belonged with the material at the end of the previous chapter. Roman law recognized concubinage, but early Christians sought to limit its practice and promote marriage.⁵⁹ The reference to the Holy Spirit in connection with the ability to

59. See further Philip L. Reynolds, *Marriage in the Western Church: The Christianization of Marriage during the Patristic and Medieval Periods* (Leiden: Brill, 1994).

make moral decisions is reminiscent of 1 Corinthians 7:40, and it has been suggested that it may be a later interpolation based on chapter 43, especially as it marks a grammatical change from third person singular to first person plural.

[17] On the Time of the Hearers

Let the catechumen be a hearer for three years;
but if one is engaged in something and is dedicated
with perseverance, it is not judged according to the
time, but according to the character.

This short chapter is puzzling. There is no other explicit evidence for a catechumenate of such a length in early Christianity. Nevertheless, even in spite of the absence of any corroboration, very many modern writers have stated that this was the standard practice of the church everywhere in the first three centuries. There is, however, no manuscript support for a change as all the textual witnesses are agreed on the number of years.

In the past it was often argued that the tree-planting allegory used by Clement of Alexandria was referring to a three-year catechumenate.

[The law] orders newly planted trees to be nourished three years in succession, and the superfluous growths to be cut off, to prevent them being loaded and pressed down; and to prevent their strength being exhausted from want, by the nutriment being frittered away, enjoins tilling and digging round them, so that [the tree] may not, by sending out suckers, hinder its growth. And it does not allow imperfect fruit to be plucked from immature trees, but after three years, in the fourth year; dedicating the first-fruits to God after the tree has attained maturity.

This type of husbandry may serve as a mode of instruction, teaching that we must cut the growths of sins, and the useless weeds of the mind that spring up round the vital fruit, till the shoot of faith is perfected and becomes strong. For in the fourth year, since there is need of time to him that is being solidly catechized, the four virtues are consecrated to God, the third alone being already joined to the fourth, the person of the Lord (*Stromata* 2.18).

Clement, however, was here summarizing and reworking Philo, *De virtutibus* 156–58, which was itself an allegorical interpretation of Leviticus 19:23–25, which Philo intended as an illustration of the humanity or kindness of the Mosaic Law in granting this period of time for nurture. This makes it less likely that Clement had a three-year prebaptismal catechumenate in mind, and more likely that he meant the philosophical and theological training given in the famous Catechetical School at Alexandria.⁶⁰

There are occasional references to a three-year period for other purposes. Thus, Canon 1 of Peter of Alexandria (bishop 300–311 CE) spoke of such a period of penance for apostates (but not baptismal candidates). Josephus, the Jewish historian, described a similar probationary period for Jews wishing to join the Essene community (*Jewish War* 2.8.7). This could have served as a precedent for the Christian practice, but any firm evidence that it did so is lacking. And the fourth-century Council of Elvira (ca. 305) specified a two-year catechumenate (Canon 42). This latter, however, looks like an attempt at this period to increase the

60. See Annewies van den Hoek, "The 'Catechetical' School of Early Christian Alexandria and its Philonic Heritage," *Harvard Theological Review* 90 (1997): 59–87.

rigor of baptismal preparation from the lesser duration of earlier times. Thus, we have tentatively dated this chapter in *AT* to the same period as the Council of Elvira, viewing it as part of that same movement.

[18] Concerning the Prayer of the Hearers

Let the catechumens, when they have left the teacher, pray apart from the faithful. And let the women be standing by themselves. Let the faithful not exchange the sign of peace with the catechumens, for they are not yet holy. Let the faithful kiss each other, men with men and women with women; they kiss on the mouth.

Let all the women veil themselves with a veil on the head, not with soft linen, for this is not a covering; but the virgins do not veil themselves because their state as a believer is obvious.

The situation implied by this direction seems to be that both baptized church members and catechumens had met together with a “teacher” for instruction but were to divide into separate groups, which were also segregated by gender, while they prayed and then exchanged a kiss within their group and gender, “the sign of peace.” The major concerns of the chapter are with propriety and ritual purity.

Segregation by gender at public events for reasons of propriety was quite usual in the Roman Empire, and Christians also often followed this norm of society in their gatherings. So, for example, we find the third-/fourth-century Syrian *Didascalia* prescribing:

The presbyters are to be seated in the eastern part of the house with the bishops [sic], and then the laymen,

and then the women, so that when you stand up to pray, the leaders should stand first, and then the laymen, and subsequently the women. . . . Those who are young should sit separately, if there is room, and not stand on their feet. Those who are elderly are to sit separately. The children should stand on one side, or they should go to their fathers and mothers, and stand on their feet. The young girls should sit separately, and if there is no room they should stand on their feet behind the women. And the young women who are married and have children should stand separately. And the elderly women and widows should sit separately.⁶¹

In other Christian communities the genders were not so rigidly separated. Thus, Tertullian saw a problem for the Christian wife of an unbeliever exchanging the kiss with any of “the brothers” (*Ad uxorem* 2.4), and Clement of Alexandria complained that “there are those who do nothing but make the churches resound with a kiss, not having love itself within. For this very thing, the shameless use of a kiss (which should be mystical), causes foul suspicions and evil rumors.” He counseled expressing instead “the affection of the soul with a chaste and closed mouth” (*Paedagogos* 12).

Segregation of the baptized from the catechumens and others who were not baptized when it came to sharing in prayer and the exchange of the kiss had nothing to do with propriety and everything to do with purity. The unbaptized were ritually impure, having not received the Holy Spirit through baptism. In particular, exchanging a holy kiss meant literally exchanging *pneuma*, “breath” or

61. *Didascalia* 2.57.5, 8; ET from Stewart-Sykes, *Didascalia Apostolorum*, 175–76.

“spirit.”⁶² For the same reason, catechumens might attend the Lord’s Supper but had to sit apart and not partake of the blessed bread and common cup (see chapters 26, 27). The final paragraph has the appearance of a later addition not strictly germane to the subject, and the final sentence is unique to E1. Tertullian (*De virginibus velandis*) was a strong advocate of the convention of the full covering of the head of women in church, but he included unmarried teenage girls and young women in this, against the views of others, as here.

Justin Martyr in the middle of the second century also described a Christian assembly after a baptism in which were made prayers “in common for ourselves and for the illuminated person, and for all others in every place, that we may be counted worthy, now that we have learned the truth, by our works also to be found good citizens and keepers of the commandments, so that we may be saved with an everlasting salvation. Having ended the prayers, we salute one another with a kiss” (*First Apology* 65). Strangely, when describing a regular Sunday Eucharist a little further on, he mentioned the prayers but not the kiss, although it was very likely practiced, as in *AT*. Tertullian at the end of the century called the kiss the “seal of prayer” (*De oratione* 18).

[19] Concerning the Imposition of the Hand

Let the teacher, after they have prayed, lay a hand on the catechumens, and after having prayed, let

62. See further L. Edward Phillips, *The Ritual Kiss in Early Christian Worship*, Alcuin/GROW Joint Liturgical Studies 36 (Cambridge: Grove Books, 1996); Michael Penn, *Kissing Christians: Ritual and Community in the Late Ancient Church* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005).

him dismiss them. The one who teaches, even if he is a layperson, let him do so.

If there is a catechumen who is arrested for the name and perseveres, let him not be in two minds; For if there is a sudden attack and he is killed before he receives his forgiveness, he will have been baptized with his blood and is justified.

This is the only extant reference to the custom of the imposition of hands and dismissal before the abundant evidence of the fourth century (if we are dating the first half of the chapter correctly). It is certainly older than a time when the teacher would always have been an ordained person and the imposition of hands restricted to such a one.

The second half of the chapter has to do with catechumens in general and not with this particular ritual. Hence, it seems to be somewhat later, and it would not have been a major question before the Decian persecution of Christians in the middle of the third century. Tertullian, however, does refer to a second baptism by blood (*De baptismo* 16), but it is not clear that he intends it to refer to martyrdom or only to Christ's death (Luke 12:50). On the other hand, the account of the martyrdom of Perpetua and Felicity in 203 CE does contain an association of martyrdom with baptism. A leopard was let loose on a certain Saturus, "and with one bite of his he was bathed with such a quantity of blood, that the people shouted out to him, as he was returning, the testimony of his second baptism, 'Saved and washed, saved and washed'" (6.4). Origen also briefly refers to the "baptism of martyrdom" (*Exhortation to Martyrdom* 30), but it was Cyprian in the midst of the Decian persecution who developed the idea further:

Some . . . object to us the case of catechumens; asking if any one of these, before he is baptized in the Church, should be apprehended and slain on confession of the name, whether he would lose the hope of salvation and the reward of confession, because he had not previously been born again of water? Let men of this kind, who are aiders and favourers of heretics, know therefore, first, that those catechumens hold the sound faith and truth of the Church, and advance from the divine camp to do battle with the devil, with a full and sincere acknowledgment of God the Father, and of Christ, and of the Holy Ghost; then, that they certainly are not deprived of the sacrament of baptism who are baptized with the most glorious and greatest baptism of blood, concerning which the Lord also said, that He had another baptism to be baptized with. But the same Lord declares in the Gospel, that those who are baptized in their own blood, and sanctified by suffering, are perfected, and obtain the grace of the divine promise, when He speaks to the thief believing and confessing in His very passion, and promises that he should be with Himself in paradise. (*Ep.* 72.22)

[20] Concerning Those Who Come to be Baptized

When those who are to receive [baptism] have been chosen, after their life has been examined—if as catechumens they lived virtuously, if they honored the widows, and if they visited the sick, and if they did good works—let those who brought them testify for them, and thus let them hear the Gospel. From the time that they have been chosen, let hands be laid on them in the mornings, exorcising them. And when the day draws near, let the bishop exorcise each one of them so that he may be sure that they

have become pure. If any suspicion results, let him be turned away and disgraced because he did not hear faithfully; indeed an alien being cannot reside in him.

Chapters 20 and 21 move on to the initiation rites themselves, and, in contrast to the material in other chapters, there are clear indications of two particular stages of revision. The idea that this part of *AT* was composed of three different layers was first proposed by Jean-Paul Bouhot in 1968,⁶³ and the analysis here builds upon that. The basic text is a complete and coherent set of simple directions, with again no particular ministers being specified and being similar in style and content to the account of baptism given by Justin Martyr in the middle of the second century.⁶⁴ Interpolated into this are directives for further ceremonies that had been added later and are said to be performed by a bishop (marked by italics in the translation). This second layer cannot be any older than the end of the third century because it includes the general exorcism of baptismal candidates rather than just of those more evidently regarded as demon-possessed, something that is not evidenced until

63. Jean-Paul Bouhot, *La confirmation, sacrement de la communion ecclesiale* (Lyon: Chalet, 1968), 38–45.

64. Justin Martyr, *First Apology* 61: “As many as are persuaded and believe that what we teach and say is true, and undertake to be able to live accordingly, are instructed to pray and to entreat God with fasting, for the remission of their sins that are past, we are praying and fasting with them. Then they are brought by us where there is water, and are regenerated in the same manner in which we were ourselves regenerated. For, in the name of God, the Father and Lord of the universe, and of our Savior Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit, they then receive the washing with water.”

the fourth century. The final layer of additions, marked by underlining, are a partial set of instructions as to the modifications necessary when a presbyter presided in place of a bishop, together with a few further ritual developments that had occurred at a later date still.

As the beginning of chapter 20 shows, the final stage of the process in *AT* began with a scrutiny of the conduct, while they were catechumens, of those wishing to be baptized. Those who had originally brought them (see chapter 15) again bear witness to them. If successful in this examination, they then become “the chosen” (in Latin, *electi*), and are admitted to hear “the Gospel.” Was this some particular, secret text? Or gospel readings in general? It could have been quite possible that in their assemblies for instruction (see chapters 18–19) they had never previously heard readings from the gospels. The Syrian *Didascalia* describes this intermediate period as their being “received into the congregation so that they may hear the word” (2.39). How long such a period lasted is not specified here, but Maxwell Johnson has assembled evidence from a variety of sources that indicates that three weeks appears to have been usual.⁶⁵

The next section speaks of what appears to be a daily exorcism of the candidates by the laying on of hands, something that is described in the fourth century by Cyril of Jerusalem (*Procatechesis* 9), John Chrysostom at Antioch (*Baptismal Instructions*, Stavronikita 2.12), Theodore of Mopsuestia (*Baptismal Homilies* 2.1–2), and the pilgrim

65. Maxwell E. Johnson, “From Three Days to Forty Days: Baptismal Preparation and the Origins of Lent,” *Studia Liturgica* 20 (1990): 185–201, reprinted in Johnson, ed., *Living Water, Sealing Spirit: Readings on Christian Initiation* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1995), 118–36.

Egeria visiting Jerusalem (*Itinerarium* 46).⁶⁶ As we have already noted, prebaptismal exorcism was at first only practiced on those who appeared to be possessed by demons, and so an exorcism of all candidates would be anachronistic for a second-century rite. In any case, a *daily* exorcism is attested only in those later Eastern rites, while fifth-century evidence from the West reveals the existence of just three weekly exorcisms prior to baptism.⁶⁷ This suggests that this interpolation is by an Eastern redactor. The subject of the final sentence of this section is, of course, not the bishop but one who after exorcism is judged still to be demon-possessed, having failed to listen in faith. The clause “an alien being cannot reside in him” is badly expressed in E1: it is a little clearer in the Sahidic version, “it is never possible to hide the stranger,” that is, a demon will always be found out.

Let those who are intended to be baptized be instructed to take a bath on the fifth day of the week. But if there is a woman menstruating, let her be turned away and let her be baptized on another day. Let those who are to be baptized fast on the day of preparation and the Sabbath. On the Sabbath let the bishop, after having gathered those who are to be baptized, command them to kneel, and laying his hand on them, let him exorcise [them], saying, “Let

66. See E.C. Whitaker, *Documents of the Baptismal Liturgy* 3rd ed., ed. Maxwell E. Johnson, Alcuin Club Collections 79 (London: SPCK, 2003), 28, 34, 44, 48.

67. See Dominic E. Serra, “New Observations about the Scrutinies of the Elect in Early Roman Practice,” *Worship* 80 (2006): 511–27, esp. 520–21.

every alien spirit be cast out from them and not return again." When he has exorcised [them], let him blow, and having signed their foreheads and their ears and nostrils, let him raise them up.

In the night let them be read to and be instructed. Let there be no other thing that they bring, those who are to be baptized, except each a loaf for the Eucharist, because it is appropriate for those who participate to offer something at that time.

This is the first occasion on which we receive any indication as to when the baptisms were to take place. After bathing on Thursday, two days of preparatory fasting (a practice encouraged as early as *Didache* 7) that took place on Friday and Saturday, and a vigil the following night, the baptism happened at cockcrow on what would have been Sunday morning. There is nothing in *AT* to suggest that it was Easter Day that was intended, and so we may reasonably conclude that baptisms might be administered on a Sunday at any time of the year at this early period. The preference for Easter baptism is first found in Tertullian at the beginning of the third century (*De baptismo* 19). The exclusion of women who were menstruating at the time has no precedent in Judaism and certainly was not standard practice in early Christianity. *Didascalia* 6.21, for example, takes the opposite position, that neither menstruation nor nocturnal emissions rendered a Christian unclean because they possessed the Holy Spirit, though it says nothing about those as yet unbaptized. The restriction in *AT* was almost certainly the consequence of the continued observance by some early Christians of Levitical legislation against ritual impurity.

Tertullian is the first to imply the existence of a gathering with the bishop just prior to the baptism, perhaps even

on the day before. He speaks of a renunciation made in front of the congregation before its repetition without the presence of others just before the immersion: "When on the point of coming to the water we then and there, as also somewhat earlier in church under the bishop's hand, affirm that we renounce the devil and his pomp and his angels" (*De corona* 3). The expression "in church" here probably refers to the assembled people rather than to a building. It is not until the fourth century, however, that we have clear evidence for such a gathering on the day before baptism. John Chrysostom described it as taking place in Antioch on the Friday before baptism on Easter Eve and as involving a renunciation/act of adherence to Christ and an anointing with *myron* (*Baptismal Instructions* PK 3.19–27), but in the rite known to Theodore of Mopsuestia this ritual had become part of the baptismal rite itself (*Baptismal Homilies* 2). In the West, Ambrose of Milan is our only fourth-century witness to a ceremony taking place on the Saturday (*De sacramentis* 1.1–3). There it was known as "The Opening," which Ambrose relates to Jesus' healing of the man who was deaf and dumb (Mark 7:32–37).⁶⁸

Apart from the choice of the day before the baptism, neither of these provides much of a parallel to *AT*, where there is a further exorcism by the bishop. This again can hardly be any earlier than end of the third century, and some of the accompanying ceremonies may have been later still. Although Tertullian seems to indicate that exsufflation, blowing in the face to drive away evil spirits, was part of the Christian practice of exorcism (*Apologeticum* 23.16), the first report in the West of it as part of *baptismal* exorcism, together with the signings to seal up the orifices,

68. See Whitaker, *Documents*, 42–46, 48–49, 177–78.

is in a letter of a certain “John the Deacon” written from Rome sometime around the year 500. On the other hand, Cyril of Jerusalem does mention “blowing” in the middle of the fourth century (*Procatechesis* 9),⁶⁹ so if this section, like the daily exorcism, was inserted by a redactor familiar with Jerusalem practice, it might well be as old as the surrounding material, although it must be acknowledged that Cyril makes no reference to a Saturday morning gathering.

The vigil certainly resembles the practice at Easter, but vigils are also known to have taken place on other occasions in early Christianity (see, for example, Tertullian, *Ad uxorem* 2.4). Christians regularly contributed bread and wine at celebrations of the Eucharist. Other sources do not explicitly state that baptismal candidates did so too, but it must have been practiced in some places at least, because Ambrose forbids it in Milan, requiring the newly baptized to wait until the following Sunday (*Exposition in Ps 118*, prologue 2). The prohibition against bringing any other objects with them is no doubt intended to stop superstitious items being smuggled into the baptismal waters (see also chapter 21).

[21] On Anointing

At the time of cockcrow, let them come to the water. Let the water be flowing or at least running. And let it be so if there is no exigency. If there is concern about an exigency, do it with any water.

So let them take off their clothes. Give precedence to the small children and baptize them; let those who are able reply, or alternatively let their parents or another one from their family reply; after-

69. Whitaker, *Documents*, 28, 209–10.

wards, the grown men; and finally the women, loosening the hair and laying aside their jewelry. Let no one have anything with them, while they go down into the water.

The title in E1 is rather strange. The Sahidic version more logically has “Concerning the Tradition of Holy Baptism.” In the Roman Empire cockcrow was the third division or “watch” of the night, occurring at about 3 a.m. It would not have been unusual for a night vigil to have ended then, and no particular significance needs to be attached to the choice of the hour. Early Christians always preferred flowing or “living” water, continuing Jewish usage and reflecting the belief that it was where the Holy Spirit was thought to dwell. The instructions here are somewhat similar to those in *Didache* 7.⁷⁰ It was only when domestic pools or water tanks became the more usual location for baptism that prayer for the Spirit to come upon the water became necessary, and so was added in the Sahidic version (see also Tertullian, *De baptismo* 4).

The earliest explicit reference to the baptism of infants occurs in Tertullian, *De baptismo* 18, who opposed it. There has been a very longstanding debate between scholars as to whether or not the practice goes back to the first century.⁷¹

70. “Concerning baptism, baptize thus: having first recounted all these things, baptize in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, in living water. If you do not have living water, baptize in other water; if you cannot in cold, then in warm. If you do not have either, pour water on the head three times in the name of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.”

71. For a summary, see Anthony N. S. Lane, “Did the Apostolic Church Baptise Babies? A Seismological Approach,” *Tyndale Bulletin* 55 (2004): 109–30.

According to Roman law, children up to seven years of age would have been counted as *infantes* and required someone to speak for them—the forerunners of godparents. The women were baptized last for reasons of modesty, and the requirement that they should lay aside their jewelry and no one should take anything into the water with them follows on from what was said at the end of chapter 20, concerning charms, amulets, and suchlike with pagan associations.

When they are to receive the oil of exorcism, let the bishop give thanks over a vessel and let him exorcise another.

Let a deacon take the exorcised oil and stand near the presbyter; similarly the other, the oil of thanksgiving. Let him stand on the right, and the presbyter who exorcises stand on the left. Let him take them one by one and ask if he believes. Let him [the candidate] say, "I renounce you, Satan, all your works, all your service, and all your contamination." And once he has declared his profession, let him be anointed with the oil of exorcism, pronouncing [the words] for the purification from every alien spirit. Thus, let him deliver him to the bishop or the presbyter, to the one who baptizes him, [the candidate] standing naked in the water. Let the deacon also go down with him into the water.

The original instructions having reached the point of the immersion, an interpolated section now goes back to deal with a newer ritual involving oils before the immersion. Two amendments appear to be involved here. The first of these directs a bishop to prepare two oils, giving thanks over one and pronouncing an exorcism over the other. Only the oil of exorcism is to be used at this point. However, the

second amendment, which provides for a presbyter with the assistance of deacons to perform the exorcism in place of the bishop, has then intervened, directing those ministers where to stand. The sentences that follow, beginning "Let him take them one by one," would have served both in the case of the bishop and later also in the case of the presbyter replacing him. The reference to asking "if he believes" and later to "once he has made his profession" give the impression that the redactor expected not merely a renunciation to be made at this point but a profession of faith too, rather than in the water. However, confusion really begins when the participle "pronouncing" is reached. As it stands, it appears as though the subject is the one who has just been anointed, but this cannot be right. It must be either the bishop or the presbyter who pronounced the exorcism.

Further uncertainty follows when the text states, "let him deliver him." Who is delivering the candidate here? It cannot be the bishop or the presbyter, as they are specified as the ones to whom the candidate is delivered and in both instances have been the one performing the exorcism. Is some other unnamed person meant? But even then, it would appear that the candidate is being handed *from* the minister who has performed the exorcism *to* the same minister who is to baptize, whether bishop or presbyter. One might, of course, suggest that the exorcism had been delegated to another minister, but that is not what the text says. Or could it originally have meant that the candidate handed himself?

The closest parallel to this rite in *AT* is in the *Mystagogical Catecheses* (2.3–4), whether that work is by Cyril of Jerusalem or his successor John.⁷² It is the only fourth-century work explicitly to describe the prebaptismal anointing as

72. See the discussion of authorship in Maxwell E. Johnson, ed., *Lectures on the Christian Sacraments: The Protocatechesis and the Five*

done with exorcised oil, immediately after the renunciation/act of adherence, with the candidate naked just before entering the water, though there is no mention of an actual exorcism at this point. Ambrose of Milan also described an anointing with oil immediately after the entry into the baptistery (*De sacramentis* 1.4–5), which he likened to an athlete preparing for a wrestling match, but he makes no reference to exorcism, and the anointing here precedes the renunciation.⁷³

And when the one who is being baptized goes down into the water, let the one who baptizes him say, "Do you believe in one God Almighty?" Let the one who is being baptized say, "I believe." Having [his] hand laid on his head, let him baptize [him] once. And afterwards let him say, "Do you believe in Christ Jesus, the Son of God, who was born of the Holy Spirit from⁷⁴ the Virgin Mary and crucified under Pontius Pilate, and died and was buried and rose on the third day alive from the dead, and ascended into heaven and sits on the right hand of the Father, and will come to judge the living and the dead?" And when he has said, "I believe," let him be baptized again. And again let him say, "Do you believe in the Holy Spirit and the holy church and the resurrection of the flesh?" Then let the one who is being baptized say, "I believe," and let him be baptized a third time.

Mystagogical Catecheses Ascribed to St. Cyril of Jerusalem (Yonkers, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2017).

73. Whitaker, *Documents*, 31–32, 178.

74. EI reads "of," which seems more likely to have been original than L's "from."

The original material now returns. The absence from it of any reference to a renunciation of evil by the candidates does not necessarily mean that one did not take place at this early date, as it is not mentioned in Justin Martyr's account either. Three credal questions are put to each candidate while in the water, and after each answer, the candidate is immersed. This is the pattern known to Tertullian in North Africa at the beginning of the third century⁷⁵ and also revealed in later evidence for practice at Rome, but not in Eastern sources apart from its importation into the rite of Jerusalem (*Mystagogical Catechesis* 2.4). After the first question and answer, the long lacuna in L ends, and this version is used as the basis for the translation in the rest of this chapter.

There has been some debate as to whether the lengthy form of the second question is part of the original text or added by a later hand.⁷⁶ It is attested by both L and E1. On the other hand, there are several reasons to suppose

75. "When we have entered the water, we make profession of the Christian faith in the words of its rule" (*De spectaculis* 4); "We are thrice immersed, while we answer interrogations rather more extensive than our Lord has prescribed in the gospel" (*De corona* 3); "For not once only, but thrice are we baptized into each of the three persons at each of the several names" (*Adversus Praxean* 26). "Rather more extensive" probably means a few more words, for example, "the Father almighty," "Son of God," and "and in the holy church and the resurrection of the dead," and not a full-length creed at this early date.

76. See Maxwell E. Johnson, "The Problem of Creedal Formulae in *Traditio apostolica* 21.12–18," *Ecclesia Orans* 22 (2005): 159–75; Alistair Stewart-Sykes, "The Baptismal Creed in *Traditio Apostolica*: Original or Expanded?," *Questions liturgiques* 90 (2009): 199–2013; and Johnson's response, "The Interrogatory Creedal Formulae in Early Egyptian Baptismal Rites: A Reassessment of the Evidence," *Questions liturgiques* 101 (2021): 75–93.

that all three answers had originally been in a short form. First, the oldest form of prayers throughout *AT* describes Jesus as God's servant and not as God's Son. Thus, the Christology of the longer second answer is too advanced for the period to which we are assigning the earliest layer of this document. Second, there is evidence of the use of similar short responses in other baptismal sources, and in particular in Ambrose of Milan:

You were asked, "Do you believe in God the Father Almighty?" You said, "I believe," and you were immersed, that is, you were buried. Again you were asked, "Do you believe in our Lord Jesus Christ, and in his Cross?" You said, "I believe," and were immersed, therefore, you were also buried with Christ; for the one who is buried with Christ, rises again with Christ. A third time you were asked, "Do you believe also in the Holy Spirit?" You said, "I believe," and were immersed a third time. (Ambrose, *De sacramentis* 2.20; ET from Whitaker, *Documents*, 179)

Indeed, the baptismal questions and answers in the Roman Rite down to the eighth-century Gelasian Sacramentary reveal a less amplified form than in *AT*:

Do you believe in God the Father Almighty?

R. I believe.

And do you believe in Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord, who was born and suffered?

R. I believe.

And do you believe in the Holy Spirit; the holy Church; the remission of sins; the resurrection of the flesh?

R. I believe.⁷⁷

77. ET from Whitaker, *Documents*, 235.

What seems to have happened, therefore, is that a redactor of *AT* expanded the original short answers to correspond more closely to an early version of the Apostles Creed known as the Old Roman Symbol, which was emerging in both Greek and Latin during the fourth century, but cast it artificially in interrogatory form to fit the context.

Concerning the Anointing with Balsam

And afterward, when he has come up, let him be anointed by the presbyter with that oil which was sanctified, saying: "I anoint you with holy oil in the name of Jesus Christ."

E1 is alone in including a new heading at this point, using the word "balsam" rather than "sanctified oil," as in the body of the text. This section is another addition by an editor adapting the instructions for occasions when a presbyter presided in place of the bishop. From its position prior to the direction that the newly baptized are to dress, the implication might seem to be that a whole-body anointing was intended, or at least one in which various parts of the body were anointed, though this may not have been the case. The complete text thus gives the illusion of two postbaptismal anointings, whereas presumably all the remaining episcopal rituals were omitted when a presbyter was presiding.

A somewhat similar anointing was known to Tertullian: "After that, we come up from the washing and are anointed with the blessed unction, following that ancient practice by which, ever since Aaron was anointed by Moses, there was a custom of anointing them for priesthood with oil out of a horn" (*De baptismo* 7). Nothing is said about who performed this action, and it seems to have been an anointing of the head to signify it was priestly in character. Elsewhere Tertullian provides a simpler explanation for the anointing:

"The flesh is anointed that the soul may be consecrated"
(*De resurrectione carnis* 8).

And so individually drying themselves, let them now dress and afterward enter into the church.

And let the bishop, laying [his] hand on them, invoke, saying, "Lord God, who have made them worthy to receive the forgiveness of sins through the washing of regeneration of the Holy Spirit, send on them your grace, that they may serve you according to your will, for to you is glory, Father and Son with the Holy Spirit, in the holy church, both now and to the ages of ages. Amen." Afterward, pouring the sanctified oil from [his] hand and placing [it] on the head, let him say, "I anoint you with holy oil in God the Father Almighty and Christ Jesus and the Holy Spirit." And signing [him] on the forehead, let him offer [him] a kiss and let him say, "The Lord [be] with you." And let the one who has been signed say, "And with your spirit." Let him do this to each one.

The original text returns with its conclusion of the baptismal rite. At such an early period, "church" probably meant the Christian assembly rather than a building and implies that other Christians had not been present at the place of baptism.

Then comes a further section of addition to the rite, which has been a major focus of debate among scholars, as to the nature of the prayer said by the bishop while laying his hand on the newly baptized. The text given above follows that of L, but the other versions render it quite differently. E1 is typical:

Lord God, who have granted to these to receive the forgiveness of sins through the washing of regeneration, allow them to be filled with the Holy Spirit, sending on them your grace, so that they may serve you according to your will; to you be glory, Father and Son with the Holy Spirit in the holy church, now and always, and to the ages of ages.

Over the years these versions have consistently attracted the support of many scholars that they, rather than L, represent the original text, usually with the explanation that in one way or another the Latin had become corrupt and lost the petition for the Holy Spirit.⁷⁸ Support for this position could be sought in Tertullian, who already at the beginning of the third century understood the postbaptismal prayer and imposition of hands, and not the immersion or even the anointing, to be the means by which the Holy Spirit was invoked on the newly baptized: "Not that in the waters we obtain the Holy Spirit; but in the water under [the witness of] the angel we are cleansed and prepared for the Holy Spirit" (*De baptismo* 11.1); "Next follows the imposition of the hand in benediction, inviting and welcoming the Holy Spirit" (*De baptismo* 8); "The flesh is overshadowed by the imposition of the hand that the soul may be illumined by the Spirit" (*De resurrectione carnis* 8).

On the other hand, a corruption that neatly restored the prayer to a form that represented the theology of baptism in

78. For example, Dix, *Apostolic Tradition*, 38; Botte, *Tradition apostolique*, 35, n. 1; Cuming, *Hippolytus*, 20. See also Anthony Gelston, "A Note on the Text of the 'Apostolic Tradition' of Hippolytus," *Journal of Theological Studies* 39 (1988): 112–17; Geoffrey Cuming, "The Post-Baptismal Prayer in the *Apostolic Tradition*: Further Considerations," *Journal of Theological Studies* 39 (1988): 117–19.

the early Eastern rites, and possibly also elsewhere in the West, has an air of improbability about it, and if the change were instead thought to have been made deliberately, it becomes harder to see why anyone would do that at a later date, when baptismal theology nearly everywhere was moving in the direction of separating the gift of the Spirit from the water to some form of postbaptismal ceremony. Thus, the authenticity of L has also gained supporters.⁷⁹ It seems possible that it represents an earlier stage of development than E1, before the postbaptismal prayer and imposition of hands became associated with the gift of the Spirit. A somewhat similar development can be discerned in the Jerusalem rite, where a postbaptismal anointing originally apparently unrelated to the gift of the Spirit later became associated with it.⁸⁰ The anointing of the head that follows in AT makes no explicit reference to the giving of the Spirit in its accompanying trinitarian formula. The signing and kiss by the bishop complete the rite. Tertullian described the signing thus: "The flesh is signed that the soul too may be protected" (*De resurrectione carnis* 8).

And afterward let them pray together with all the people, not praying with the faithful until they have carried out all these things. And when they have prayed, let them offer the peace with the mouth.

We saw in chapter 18 that the unbaptized did not pray together with the baptized, and so as their first liturgical

79. For example, G.W.H. Lampe, *The Seal of the Spirit* (London: SPCK, 1967), 138–41; Aidan Kavanagh, *Confirmation: Origins and Reform* (New York: Pueblo, 1988), 47.

80. See Juliette Day, *The Baptismal Liturgy of Jerusalem* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), 111.

act the newly baptized join the rest of the baptized in prayer and exchange the kiss with them in this next section of original text after they have dressed. "Peace with the mouth" is an unusual expression.

And then let the oblation be presented by the deacons to the bishop and let him give thanks over the bread for the representation of the body of Christ, and over the cup of mixed wine for the representation of the blood that was shed for those who believe in him; and milk and honey mixed together for the fulfillment of the promise that was made to the fathers, which said, "I will give a land flowing [with] milk and honey."⁸¹ and which Christ gave as his flesh, through which, like little children, those who believe are nourished, the gentleness of his word making sweet the bitterness of the heart; and water for an offering as a sign of washing, that the inner person also, which is the soul, may receive the same as the body. And let the bishop give an explanation about all these things to those who receive.

Although one might presume that the original rite continued with a celebration of the Eucharist, or the eucharistic meal, nothing is said about that, and it is only in the augmented version, paralleling the beginning of chapter 4, that the deacons are said to present the oblation and the bishop to give thanks over it. The section continues with a mixture of instructions and theological reflections or catechesis. While it may be possible that this was added as a single unit, it is perhaps more likely that it was expanded by an even later hand, along the lines suggested by the

81. Exodus 3:17.

differing typography, because of the different character of the material. Some part of the reference to milk and honey may also have been included in the earlier stratum, as it is attested by Tertullian in North Africa at the beginning of the third century⁸² and at Rome at a later date, being first mentioned there by Jerome (*Altercation of a Luciferian with an Orthodox* 8). The letter of John the Deacon referred to earlier is the first explicit mention of the custom at the Easter Vigil at Rome, and it is not until the seventh-century Verona Sacramentary that we have a reference to the cup of water.⁸³ Milk and honey were also part of the baptismal rite of the Coptic Orthodox Church until the beginning of the eighth century and remain part of the rite of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church until the present.⁸⁴

And breaking the bread [and] distributing individual pieces, let him say, "Heavenly bread in Christ Jesus." And let the one who receives respond, "Amen." And if the presbyters are not sufficient, let the deacons also hold the cups, and let them stand in good order: first the one who holds the water, second the one who [holds] the milk, third the one who [holds] the wine. And let those who receive taste of each, three times, the one who gives saying, "In God the Father Almighty." And let the one

82. "Made welcome then [into the assembly], we partake of a compound of milk and honey" (*De corona* 3).

83. Whitaker, *Documents*, 207, 211.

84. See further Edward Kilmartin, "The Baptismal Cups Revisited," in Ephraim Carr et al., eds., *Eulogema: Studies in Honor of Robert Taft, SJ*, Studia Anselmiana 110 (Rome: Pontificio Ateneo S. Anselmo, 1993), 260–67.

who receives say, "Amen." "And in the Lord Jesus Christ." And let him say, "Amen." "And in the Holy Spirit and the holy church." And let him say, "Amen." So let it be done with each one.

Although the first two sentences of this section may perhaps belong to the same stratum as the instructions about the presentation of bread and wine and the giving of thanks, the rest certainly seems quite alien to that. The complex arrangements for distribution have no parallel, and E1 is considerably different from L here. It has no mention of a cup of water, and the three cups are of honey, of milk, and of wine. The accompanying words are, "In the Lord Father Almighty," "And in the body," "And in the blood," which is said to be an image of the Trinity.

And when these things have been done, let each one hasten to do good works pleasing to God, and to live uprightly, devoted to the church, doing the things that he has learned, advancing in the service of God.

It is therefore fitting to be given this in brief on the washing and on the offering, because they have already been taught. But concerning the resurrection of the flesh and concerning everything according to the Scriptures, as is convenient, let the bishop reveal and explain at the time when they are to be baptized, in contrast to what is given to catechumens. This is the white stone of which John said that on it is a new name that no one knows except the one who is baptized.

The first sentence seems to be the conclusion of the original rite of baptism. Another lacuna in L begins just

before the final paragraph and E1 has been used as the basis for this translation, though the text is rather unclear. The reference to John is to Revelation 2:17. This section seems to be a continuation of the catechetical source detected earlier and refers to aspects of teaching reserved to the *electi* and not divulged to catechumens.

[22] And on the Sabbath let the bishop with his own hand, if it is possible, distribute to all the people, as the deacons break [the bread]. And let the presbyters break the baked bread. And if the deacon offers to the presbyter, let him spread out his garment, and let him [the presbyter] take. But he [the deacon?] distributes to the people with his hand. And on the other days let them receive as the bishop has ordered.

This chapter exists only in the two Ethiopic versions, but its authenticity was defended by Dix and by Botte because of similarities to it in *CH* and *TD*.⁸⁵ Both these scholars, however, regarded the reference to the Sabbath as a later interpolation and rightly preferred an addition made in E2, “and on the first day of the week,” as the original reading. The translator of E1 had no doubt “corrected” it

85. Dix, *Apostolic Tradition*, 82–83; Botte, *Tradition apostolique*, 61, n. 1.

CH: “On Sunday, at the time of the liturgy, the bishop, if he is able, is to communicate all the people from his hand. If the presbyter is sick, the deacon is to take the mysteries to him, and the presbyter is to take [them] himself. The deacon is to communicate the people when the bishop or the presbyter allows him.”

TD: “The deacon does not give the offering to a presbyter. Let him open the disc or paten, and let the presbyter receive. Let the deacon give [the Eucharist] to the people in their hands.”

to correspond with the local tradition. The absence of the chapter from the Sahidic and Arabic versions is probably the result of its irrelevance to them. The lack of any separate chapter title is no doubt because the instruction was correctly viewed as an appendix to the baptismal Eucharist in the previous chapter. The preference for the bishop alone distributing the bread, which is assumed at the baptismal Eucharist in chapter 21, also occurs in the latter part of chapter 25. It may also be significant that Tertullian speaks of receiving the sacrament “from none but the hand of the presidents” (*De corona* 3).

The additions at the end of the chapter suggest some conflict over whether deacons or presbyters were to perform the fraction, no doubt indicative of a period when the importance of deacons was giving way to the increasing power of presbyters.⁸⁶ Hence, it was not thought proper for a deacon to distribute the sacrament to a presbyter, but the latter was to take it for himself. It seems more likely that “paten” in *TD* is an editor’s rationalization of “garment” and not the original reading of *AT*, as some scholars have proposed.⁸⁷

[23] On Fasting

Let the widows and the virgins fast often, and let them pray for the church. Let the presbyters fast

86. See, for example, David G. Hunter, “Rivalry between Presbyters and Deacons in the Roman Church,” *Vigiliae Christianae* 71 (2017): 495–510; and Canon 18 of the Council of Nicaea: “It has come to the knowledge of the holy and great Synod that, in some districts and cities, the deacons administer the Eucharist to the presbyters, whereas neither canon nor custom permits that they who have no right to offer should give the Body of Christ to them that do offer.”

87. See Dix, *Apostolic Tradition*, 44, n. 2; Botte, *Tradition apostolique*, 61, n. 5.

when they wish, and likewise lay people. A bishop is not able to fast except when all the people [fast]. For it happens when someone wishes to offer, he is not able to refuse, but having broken, he always tastes.

A Greek text of this chapter survives in just one manuscript of the *Epitome* of AC 8⁸⁸ and is translated here. The reference to virgins as well as widows may be a later interpolation, as virgins are not otherwise mentioned in E1 except at the end of chapter 18, which also seems to be a fourth-century addition by an editor familiar with that institution.

Frequent fasting and prayer were the primary duties of widows in return for their material support by the church (see further chapters 10 and 30). *AT* shows no knowledge of regular twice-weekly days of fasting for Christians in general, even though Wednesday and Friday fasts are mandated in *Didache* 8 and also mentioned in several second- and third-century writings.⁸⁹ The use of the Greek word *laikoi* as a technical term for lay people is found as early as *I Clement* 40.5. What a person might bring “to offer” must have been food for the poor, so that the bishop would have been required to join in the meal, a practice alluded to in the second half of the next chapter. The final words look like an amplification by a later hand to make the meaning clearer, but they may be part of the earlier text. Though not specified, the breaking must refer to bread.

88. Vind. hist. gr. 7, folio 12, first discovered by Funk and printed in his *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum* 2:112.

89. *Hermas*, Sim. 5.1; Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* 7.12; Origen, *Hom. in Leviticum* 10.2; Tertullian, *De ieiunio* 10; *De oratione* 19.

[24] On What is Given to the Sick

Let the deacon in an emergency give the sign to the sick promptly if there is no presbyter, and when he has given, as soon as possible let him take from what has been distributed and consume it straightaway.

Another chapter that exists only in the Ethiopic versions, but with confirmation of knowledge of it in *CH* and *TD*.⁹⁰ Along with chapter 25, it was displaced in E2 to a position after chapter 29.⁹¹ Botte, however, argued that the true position of both chapters was here,⁹² which the discovery of E1 has confirmed. Its obscurity, especially in the version in E2, may account for its absence from the Sahidic and Arabic versions. The word “sign,” for instance, is an unusual expression in this context. It more normally refers to anointing or baptism, but the final words clearly imply that it was something to eat—presumably consecrated bread. Similarly, the function of the deacon as an emergency substitute for the presbyter in this role is somewhat surprising, as the deacon was the normal minister to the sick (see chapter 34). For that reason, it is suggested that certain phrases marked above were later insertions made when there was conflict over the relative status of presbyters and deacons in the fourth century (see

90. *TD* interprets it to concern the deacon deputizing for the presbyter at baptism, but *CH* extends it more broadly: “if there is not a presbyter present in the church, the deacon is to replace him in everything, except for the offering of the great sacrifice and the prayer.”

91. Hence, it was numbered 29B in the commentary by Bradshaw, Johnson, and Phillips, *Apostolic Tradition*.

92. Botte, *Tradition apostolique*, xxxi–xxxii.

also chapter 22). On the other hand, a mid-third-century letter of Dionysius of Alexandria records the story of a boy having to substitute for a presbyter in conveying the Eucharist to a dying man (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 6.44). In an attempt to make better sense of the chapter, Reinhard Messner rendered the latter part of the text as “let him [the sick person] as often as necessary take from what has been distributed and use it up,” understanding the deacon to have left with the person sufficient consecrated bread to provide for communion over several days.⁹³

Concerning the One who Takes to Serve

Let him give the blessing diligently. If someone takes a gift which is to be given to a widow or to a sick person or one who is occupied with work for the church, let him bring it on that same day. And if he does not, let him bring it on the following day, after adding something of his own, because the bread of the poor remained with him.

E1 introduces a new title here, although it would be more logical if the first sentence had come before it, as “blessing” in *AT* normally means the consecrated bread (see the end of chapter 28). *CH* and *TD* continue to provide evidence for the presence of this part of the chapter in the original.⁹⁴ It concerns charitable giving by church

93. Messner, “Die angebliche *Traditio Apostolica*,” 31, n. 100.

94. *CH*: “if one gives an offering to be given as alms to the poor, it is to be distributed before sunset to the poor of the people. But if there is more that is needed, one is to give [it] the next day, and if anything remains, the third day. Nothing is to be credited to the donor alone. He is not to receive [anything] because the bread of the poor remain in his house by his negligence.”

members, requiring anyone who delays delivering it to add to the gift.

[25] On the Bringing in of the Light

At the [Lord's] Supper, when the bishop is present, after evening has come, let the deacon bring in the lamp, and after standing among the faithful who are there, let him [the bishop] give thanks. *Let him first offer a greeting thus, saying: 'The Lord [be] with you.' And let the people say: 'And with your spirit.' 'Let us give thanks to the Lord.' 'It is right and just.' But let him not say, 'Up with your hearts', because it is said at the oblation. And let him pray: 'We give you thanks, O God, through your Son Jesus Christ our Lord, through whom you have enlightened us, revealing to us the light that does not perish. Having, therefore, finished the length of the day and arrived at the beginning of the night, having been filled with the light of the day that you created for our satisfaction, and now, as we do not lack the evening light by your grace, we praise you and glorify you through your Son Jesus Christ our Lord, through whom [is] glory, might, and honor with the Holy Spirit, now and always and to the ages of ages. Amen.*

As claimed above in chapter 4, the original eucharistic celebration in this church order seems to have been the core

TD: "If anyone receives any service to carry to a widow or poor woman or anyone constantly engaged in a church work, let him give it the same day; and if not, on the morrow, let him add something to it from his own [property] and so give it. For the bread of the poor had been kept back in his possession."

of the evening meal described in chapters 25–29, and the eucharistic prayer in chapter 4 was a later addition to the text. Although chapter 25 exists only in the two Ethiopic versions, there is some confirmation of its authenticity by briefer allusions to a version that contained it in both *CH* and *TD*. As noted above, it was displaced in E2 along with chapter 24 to a position after chapter 29 (29C), but the discovery of E1 has restored it to its correct location. Unlike E1, however, *CH* and *TD* include mention of psalmody, as does the very much expanded version in E2.⁹⁵ There is no sign elsewhere in the church order that E1 usually excised

95. *CH*: “If there is a meal or supper made by someone for the poor—it is [a supper] of the Lord—the bishop is to be present at the time when one lights a lamp. The deacon is to light it, and the bishop is to pray over them and over the one who has invited them. . . . It is necessary [to do] for the poor the thanksgiving at the beginning of the liturgy. They are to be dismissed so that they depart before dark, and they are to recite psalms before their departure.”

TD: “Let the lamp be offered in the temple by the deacon, saying, ‘The grace of our Lord [be] with you all.’ And let the people say, ‘And with your spirit.’ . . . And let the little boys say spiritual psalms and hymns of praise by the light of the lamp. Let all the people respond ‘Hallelujah’ to the chant sung together with one accord.”

E2: “And when they have then risen after supper and have prayed, the children and the virgins are to say psalms. After this a deacon, holding the mixed cup of the oblation, is to say a psalm from the ones over which ‘Hallelujah’ is written. And after this a presbyter, if he has been commanded, [is to read] in this way from those psalms. And after this, the bishop, when he has offered the cup, is to say the psalm that is appropriate for the cup, with all of them saying every Hallelujah. When they read the psalms, they are to say ‘Hallelujah,’ that is to say, ‘We praise the one who is God glorified and praised, who established the entire world with one word.’ And in this way, when the psalm has been completed, he is to give thanks over the cup and he is to give some of the broken pieces to all the faithful.”

substantial portions of text, and E2 is far too detailed and advanced in its ceremonial to be regarded as an original second-century text. In any case, it describes a whole event, distinct from the bread and cup rituals that follow.⁹⁶

Ritual lamplighting as night fell was a common custom not only among Christians but also more generally around the ancient Mediterranean world. Tertullian describes a Christian supper at which the lamplighting took place when the eating had finished (*Apologeticum* 39.15) and was followed by singing by individual participants, but the instructions here apparently located it at the very beginning of the evening, and the meal was followed instead by a discourse from the bishop (see chapter 28). The absence of the chapter from the Sahidic and Arabic texts can be attributed both to their general tendency to omit prayer-texts and to the probability that ritual lamplighting in connection with supper or even evening prayer was unknown to them.

There are good reasons to believe that the prayer included here was a secondary addition to the core text, probably some time in the third century. Not only do prayers elsewhere in the church order appear not to have been part of the oldest materials, but this prayer in particular seems to belong to a later layer than the earliest forms of the ordination and eucharistic prayers. Rather than employing the formula "your servant Jesus," as they do, it uses the later expression, "through your Son Jesus Christ our Lord." In addition, the opening dialogue to the eucharistic prayer mentioned here is not attested before the middle of the third century (Cyprian, *De dom. or.* 31).

96. But cf. Messner, "Die angebliche *Traditio Apostolica*," 34, who regards the longer version in E2 as part of the original text and E1 as a contraction.

And let the faithful who are present at the Supper take from the bishop's hand a small piece of bread before they break their own bread. For this is a blessing and not the Eucharist like the body of our Lord.

Although E1 defers a new chapter title until the cup ritual, the other versions more logically insert it here, prior to the bread ritual (though oddly labeling it as “Concerning the Time of Eating”). These instructions are extremely brief, with no reference to a blessing or thanksgiving, but that does not mean such was not used. The intention seems to be simply to give directions about what the faithful are to do and not to provide a complete outline of the whole event. They are to take a piece broken from the bishop's loaf before eating from the bread that they have individually brought. The absence of any reference to other ministers assisting with the distribution of the loaf suggests that some importance was attached to it being done by the bishop directly (see the apparently reluctant concession if that is not possible in chapter 22). The final sentence appears to deny that this was a Eucharist, although it might possibly be interpreted as meaning only that the participants' own bread was not eucharistic.⁹⁷ That seems unlikely to have been its import, however, and it is more probable that it is a later interpolation made when eucharistic practice had changed.⁹⁸ In any case, material in the earliest stratum of the church order uses the word “blessing” to denote the

97. See Stewart, *Hippolytus*, 171.

98. The suggestion by Botte, *Tradition apostolique*, 67, n. 8, that the word *antitypos* had stood in the original Greek of this sentence would have been an anachronistic usage for something belonging to the second century.

eucharistic bread rather than to distinguish it from the sacrament (see chapters 24 and 28).⁹⁹

[26] On the Supper

Before they all drink, once they have washed [their hands], it is fitting that those who are present taste of the cup over which thanks have been given, and so feast. But to the catechumens let exorcised bread be given and let each one help themselves to a cup.

The lacuna in L ends part way through the chapter and the Latin text returns, but in the second person plural,¹⁰⁰ which suggests that it had a somewhat different construction for the missing part of the chapter, although it coheres with E1 for the final sentence. The standard practice at a Greco-Roman *symposium* was for the drinking of wine to follow the meal rather than accompany it,¹⁰¹ and that seems to be intended here. E1 is alone among the versions of AT in referring to the washing of hands after eating, but the practice is also mentioned by Tertullian (*Apologeticum* 39.15), and it should be regarded as a genuine part of the earliest text.¹⁰² Unlike the bread ritual, the prior thanksgiving over the common cup is explicitly mentioned.¹⁰³ Catechumens,

99. For the claim that the Eucharist continued to exist as an evening meal beyond the end of the second century, at least in North Africa, see Andrew McGowan, "Rethinking Agape and Eucharist in Early North African Christianity," *Studia Liturgica* 34 (2004): 165–76.

100. ". . . you who are present, and so feast."

101. See, for example, Dennis E. Smith, *From Symposium to Eucharist: The Banquet in the Early Christian World* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003).

102. Messner, "Die angebliche *Traditio Apostolica*," 39, n. 145.

103. For this rendering of E1, see Messner, "Die angebliche *Traditio Apostolica*," 39, n. 147.

on the other hand, are to receive only a piece of exorcised bread and drink from their own cups.

[27] On the Catechumens: Let Them not be Together [with the Faithful]

Let a catechumen at the Lord's Supper not sit together [with the faithful]. But through the whole meal, let the one who eats be mindful of the one who invited him, because for that reason he requested that he should enter under his roof.¹⁰⁴

L and E1 are substantially agreed on the text here. The chapter continues the subject of catechumens: they may attend the supper, but they must sit apart from the baptized. The expression "Lord's Supper" (in L, *cena dominica*) used here is almost unknown in early Christian literature: apart from 1 Corinthians 11:20, Tertullian alone uses *convivium dominicum* (*Ad uxorem* 2.4). The event apparently takes place in the home of one of the church members. L uses the noun *oblatio*, "offering" and the verb *offert*, "offers" in the second sentence. Several scholars have proposed that these were translating the Greek noun *prosphora*, which could mean "meal" as well as "offering," and the middle voice of the Greek verb *prospherein*, which meant "eat."¹⁰⁵

[28] Concerning that You are Orderly and Moderate

When eating and drinking, do it with moderation and not to the point of drunkenness and ridicule, or that the one who invited you blame himself because of

104. Cf. Matthew 8:8; Luke 7:6.

105. Dix, *Apostolic Tradition*, 46, n. 6; Botte, *Tradition apostolique*, 69, n. 3; Cumming, *Hippolytus*, 25.

your disorderliness, but that he may be pleased to have been worthy that saints may enter in to him, for "You," he said, "are the salt of the earth."¹⁰⁶ And if a portion is offered in common to all (which is called in Greek apophoreton), take it. But if it is so that all may eat, eat with moderation, so that some may remain and the one who invited you may send [it] to whomever he wishes, as from the leftovers of the saints, and may rejoice at your coming.

And let those who are invited to eat, do so in silence, not contending with words, except when the bishop allows, and if he asks anything, answer shall be given him. And when the bishop says a word, let everyone remain modestly silent, until he asks again.

Even if the faithful are at supper without the bishop, let them receive the blessing from the hand of a presbyter or, if not, of a deacon, but the catechumens [receive] exorcised [bread]. If the laity are together, let them act with moderation, for a lay person cannot make the blessing.

The translation of L in this chapter has been modified by variant readings in E1. Because the first part of it is in the second person plural rather than the third person singular of the surrounding material, it appears to come from a separate source. Similar advice about good manners when eating and drinking occurs in Clement of Alexandria (*Paedagogos* 2.2) and was part of a common defense against pagan accusations of drunkenness and excess occurring at Christian gatherings. The aside, "which is called . . .," is a later

106. Matthew 5:13.

interpolation by the Latin translator, the Greek word meaning “that which is carried away.” Two kinds of common offering are envisaged: food that is only intended to be shared among the participants, of which the diners may eat freely, and food that is also intended to feed the wider circle of all in need, of which the diners should eat more sparingly, so that enough may be left over for this purpose. “Rejoice at your coming,” means “be pleased that you are there.”

The chapter now turns to the subject of silence at the meal and finally to the situation in which the bishop might be absent. A presbyter or deacon could preside in his place, with his authorization. This coheres with the instruction by Ignatius of Antioch in the second century that the Eucharist was to be “administered either by the bishop or by one to whom he has entrusted it” (*Smyrnaeans* 8) and is similar to the statement by Tertullian that the right to confer baptism rested with the bishop, and then with presbyters and deacons with the bishop’s authorization (*De baptismo* 17). The words about the catechumens receiving “exorcised [bread]” indicate that what was originally in mind here was not simply “words of blessing,” as later translators understood it, but had to be the eucharistic bread. This passage must have predated the middle of the third century, as by then a deacon would not have given a blessing, still less presided at the Eucharist.

[29] Concerning that it is Proper to Eat with Thanksgiving

Let everyone eat in the name of the Lord. For this is pleasing to God, that we should be envied among the peoples, all alike and sober.

This short chapter is absent from E1, the title being supplied from the Sahidic. The reference to thanksgiving

in the title is absent from the content of the chapter in L. If the chapter is genuine, and the first part of chapter 28 were a later addition, it would have been the sole reference to conduct at the supper in the earliest text. As “Lord” is not generally used of Jesus but rather of God in the prayers in the church order, its reference is not clear here. Similar comments about behavior at such gatherings were made by Tertullian, *Apologeticum* 39.

[30] Concerning the Supper of the Widows

If someone wishes to feed those widows already mature in age, after they have eaten let him dismiss them before evening. But if this is not possible because of the lot he has been assigned, giving them food and wine, let him send them away and let them partake of it at their own homes, as it pleases them.

E1 lacks the reference to them being mature in age, while L lacks the reference to them eating. As all the other witnesses to the text (except *CH*) include both, Messner concluded that in each case the relevant words had just fallen out by copyists’ error.¹⁰⁷ Otherwise L and E1 are substantially the same in this chapter.

Widows were major recipients of the church’s charity and would require greater support than simply being fed from the regular Lord’s Supper; and hence the need for some wealthier Christians to host them during the week. Such suppers are also mentioned in *Didascalia* 2.28. For concern about their age, see chapter 10 above. The instruction to dismiss them before evening was to guard against their being exposed to danger on the streets after dark. The word “lot” translates the Greek word *klēros*, which was

107. Messner, “Die angebliche *Traditio Apostolica*,” 48, nn. 229–30.

used from the third century onward by Christians to denote the clergy or an ecclesiastical duty, but in this context that is problematic. It would imply that the donor had to be a member of the clergy and not a wealthy lay person and would cast doubts concerning whether this chapter could have been composed earlier than that century. We have suggested in chapter 3 above that the word might have been understood in the second century as a donation of foodstuffs, and that could be its meaning here. On the other hand, it seems somewhat odd that the host's responsibility to distribute the church's charity to the poor might preclude him from hosting a supper for widows, when they would have been among those recipients.

[31] Concerning the Fruit that it is Proper to Offer

Let each one hasten to bring to the bishop the fruits of the first harvest; and let the one who offers bless [them] and name the one who brought [them], saying: "We give thanks to you, God, and we bring to you the first of the fruits that you have given us to eat, [you] nourishing them by your word, ordering the earth to bear all fruits for the enjoyment and nourishment of people and for all animals. For all these we praise you, God, and in all things with which you have benefitted us, adorning for us the whole creation with varied fruits, through your servant Jesus Christ *our Lord*, through whom to you [be] glory to the ages of ages. Amen."

This chapter deals with a custom of some importance in primitive Christianity, the offering of first fruits (see *Didache* 13), derived from Old Testament practice (Exod. 23:16, 19; Lev. 23:9–14; Deut. 26:1–11). Its title and that

of the following chapter seem somehow to have been reversed in all versions. E1 corresponds to L substantially here. The prayer itself does not explicitly name the one who brought the fruits, as the preceding words instruct. Although its language, apart from “our Lord,” suggests an early date, could it therefore be a secondary addition, like the other prayers in *AT*? A version of it survived in the eighth-century Byzantine *Euchologion*, preserved in Barberini gr. 336.¹⁰⁸

[32] The Blessing of Fruits

Fruits indeed are blessed, that is, grape, fig, pomegranate, olive, pear, apple, mulberry, peach, cherry, almond, plum; not pumpkin, not melon, not cucumber, not onion, not garlic, or any of the other vegetables. But sometimes flowers are brought. Therefore let the rose and the lily be offered, but not others.

And in all things that are eaten, let them give thanks to the holy God, eating to his glory.

With regard to the title, see chapter 31 above. The restriction to fruit literally and not to any other produce, even vegetables, is very strange¹⁰⁹ and has the appearance of a secondary addition to the text, though a slightly shorter list of the fruits also forms part of what is included in Barberini gr. 336. Both L and E1 are substantially the same here, except that L introduces a new title, now illegible, before naming the permitted flowers. Again, the restriction to just

108. Critical edition by Stefano Parenti and Elena Velskovska, *L'Eucologio Barberini GR. 336* (Rome: Liturgiche, 2000).

109. For some suggestions as to the reason, see Stewart, *Hippolytus*, 184–86.

the rose and the lily seems to be an even later insertion. It may be related to the fact that these were viewed as Messianic symbols (see, for example, Cyprian, *Ep.* 8.5). The final sentence would have come more naturally at the end of chapter 31 and perhaps formed the conclusion before the prayer-text was added. "The holy God" is not a description used anywhere else in the church order.

[33] On not Eating Anything before the Proper Time at the Pascha

At the Pascha let no one eat before the oblation has been made. For whoever does so, for him the fast does not count. But if anyone is pregnant or sick and is not able to fast for two days, let them fast on the Sabbath because of [their] necessity, confining [themselves] to bread and water. *If anyone finding himself at sea or in some necessity did not know the day, when he learned of this, let him observe the fast after Pentecost. For the type has passed, because it ceased in the second month, and he ought to fast when he has learned the truth.*

Fasting on Friday and Saturday in preparation for Pascha (Easter) was one of several alternative practices already established before the end of the second century (see Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 5.24.12), but the Christian season of Pentecost is unknown before the beginning of the third century.¹¹⁰ The final sentence directs that any who were unaware of the correct date for Pascha should not keep the fast in the second month, which had been the occa-

110. See Gerard Rouwhorst, "The Origins and Evolution of Early Christian Pentecost," *Studia Patristica* 35 (2001): 309–22.

sion prescribed in Numbers 9:9-12 for those being unable to keep the Passover on the due date, because this would now fall within the fifty days of Pentecost during which no fasting was permitted.

[34] That it is Proper for the Deacons to Attend on the Bishop

Let each deacon *with the subdeacons* attend on the bishop. Let him also be told who are sick, so that, if it is pleasing to the bishop, he may visit them. *For a sick person is greatly consoled when the high-priest remembers.*

Chapter 39 presents another version of this chapter, which reveals that the mention of subdeacons was not present in the core text. The office of subdeacon was in any case no older than the third century (see chapter 13). Similarly, the description of the bishop as high-priest, which also appears in the ordination prayer in chapter 3, belongs to the same period. It is not clear however, whether the bishop himself was to visit, or the deacon on his behalf while the bishop prayed for the sick person.

[35] [Concerning the Hour when it is Proper to Pray]

Let the faithful, as soon as they have woken and risen, before they touch their work, pray to God and so hasten to their work. And if there is any instruction in the word, let him give preference to this so that he hurries and hears the Word of God for the comfort of his soul. Let him hasten to the church, where the Spirit flourishes.

This chapter, omitted from E1, is repeated as the beginning of chapter 41, which seems to be a later expansion of

it. The title is supplied from the Sahidic. The chapter is an odd mixture of plural and singular that makes one wonder whether it was composed in two stages. It is doubtful that prayer in the morning was intended to be the sole occasion in the day when a Christian was intended to pray. The gathering for instruction, which is regarded as a priority, can only have been an occasional event at an early date. It is probably the same assembly as that in chapter 18, and the word “church” here probably means the Christian community rather than a building.

[36] Concerning that it is Proper to Receive the Eucharist Before Anything

Let every faithful [person] try to receive the Eucharist before he tastes anything. For if he receives in faith, even if someone may give him something deadly after this, it will not overpower him.

This chapter may owe its place here in *AT* to the verbal link in the opening words to the previous chapter. A Greek version of it has survived in an eighth-century collection of patristic quotations, which exists in two manuscripts, Ochrid *Mus. nat.* 86 (13th century) and Paris BN *gr.* 900 (15th century) f. 112. It is translated here. Although some of the ancient translators understood it to concern the reception of communion at a celebration of the Eucharist, this and the following chapter really seem to be about receiving communion at home from consecrated bread brought from the Sunday celebration, which was a common practice in the third century, especially in North Africa. One of the reasons Tertullian gave for opposing the marriage of Christian women to an unbeliever was: “Will not your husband know what it is that you secretly taste before (taking) any food?”

(*Ad uxorem* 2.5). By this period the word “Eucharist” had come to mean the consecrated elements rather than the rite.

As early as Ignatius of Antioch in the second century, if not before, the eucharistic elements were understood to have power to protect believers and ward off evil. Ignatius described the eucharistic bread as “the medicine of immortality, the antidote preventing death” (*Ephesians* 20.2). The last sentence of the chapter also echoes the words in the addition to the end of Mark’s Gospel (16:18), “if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them.”

[37] Concerning that the Eucharist should be Watched over Diligently

Let everyone take care that an unbeliever does not taste of the Eucharist, nor a mouse or any other animal, nor that any of it falls and is lost. For the body of Christ is to be eaten by the faithful and not to be despised.

The link in subject matter with the previous chapter explains the location of this chapter here. The concern is with the careful preservation of the eucharistic bread at home. Not permitting it to fall on the ground is a common admonition in early Christian literature (see, for example, Tertullian, *De corona* 3.4). This was not for reasons of hygiene but to maintain ritual purity, keeping what was perceived as the body of Christ from being profaned.

[38] Concerning the Cup, that it should not be Spilled

For having blessed the name of God, you received it as the antitype of the blood of Christ. Therefore refrain from pouring out [any], as if you despised [it], so that an alien spirit may not lick it up. You will be

guilty of blood, as one who scorned the price with which he has been bought.

Because of the change from the usual third person to the second person, this chapter may come from a different—though equally ancient—source. It could be referring to the less common custom of taking consecrated wine home to be consumed daily there, but the remark about a blessing being said by the individual (or head of the family) before drinking it could mean that the wine simply came from the home. The word “antitype” would be problematic if this is a third-century text, as it was not used until the following century. It may have been the word chosen by the later translator of L, and E1’s use of “representation” instead closer to the original.

[SHORTER ENDING]

[38B] [Title?]

Always try to sign your forehead reverently. For this sign of the Passion is displayed against the devil, if anyone is to do [it] with faith, not to please human beings but through knowledge presenting [it] as a breastplate.¹¹¹ When the adversary sees the power of the Spirit from the heart clearly displayed in the likeness of baptism, he will flee trembling, with you not striking him but breathing [on him]. This is what Moses [did] typologically with the lamb that was sacrificed at the Passover: he sprinkled the blood on the threshold and anointing the two doorposts, signified that faith in the perfect lamb that is now in

111. An allusion to Ephesians 6:14?

us. Signing the forehead and eyes with the hand, let us escape from the one who is trying to destroy us. And so, when these things are heard with thankfulness and true orthodox faith, they provide edification for the church and eternal life for believers. I instruct that these things be kept by those who are wise. For to all who hear the apos . . .

It was the presence in L both of this short ending at this point and also of a duplicate of it in the longer ending that alerted earlier scholars to the fact that there had been at least two versions of AT. E1 entirely lacks the shorter ending, going directly from chapter 38 to chapter 39 without break or heading, indicating that it was only aware of the longer version. This shorter ending contains much of the material in chapters 42 and 43, with L breaking off into a lacuna before the ending is reached. There is space at the beginning for a title.

Botte proposed that the word “always” in the opening sentence was a corruption of the Greek word for “if,” and so the original sentence would have read, “If you are tempted, sign your forehead reverently.”¹¹² The “likeness of baptism” presumably refers not to water but to the sign of the cross that was made in the postbaptismal ceremonies, and the strange expression “not striking him but breathing” similarly refers to the prebaptismal ceremony of breathing or blowing on the devil (see chapter 21). Already in the second century Justin Martyr had used the account of Moses

112. Botte, “Un passage difficile de la ‘Tradition apostolique’ sur le signe de croix,” *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* (1960): 5–19. He acknowledged that this was how Dix, *Apostolic Tradition*, 68, had reconstructed the text.

anointing the doorposts with blood (Exod. 12:7, 22-23) as an image of Christ: “The mystery, then, of the lamb which God enjoined to be sacrificed as the passover, was a type of Christ; with whose blood, in proportion to their faith in him, they anoint their houses, i.e., themselves, who believe in him” (*Dialogue with Trypho* 40.1.1).

[LONGER ENDING]

[39] *And let the deacons with the presbyters gather in the early morning where the bishop has commanded, and let the deacons not miss being present always, unless they are prevented by an illness. Once they have gathered, let them tell it to the church, and so, after praying, let each one do what is right.*

As already indicated above, this chapter continues in E1 without break or heading from chapter 38. It is absent from L and is another version of chapter 34 in which presbyters are substituted for subdeacons. The mention of reporting on the sick in chapter 34 has been transformed into a reference to the possibility of the deacons themselves being sick. Nathan Chase understands these gatherings to be the same as those in chapters 18 and 35 rather than those in chapter 34,¹¹³ whereas it looks more like a transformation of 34 into a congregational morning service, especially with the repeated connection of prayer and going to work, as found in chapters 35 and 41. E2 and the Arabic version even more explicitly view it as an occasion for teaching

113. Nathan Chase, “Another Look at the ‘Daily Office’ in Apostolic Tradition,” *Studia Liturgica* 49 (2019): 5–25, here at 14–15.

the people and for prayer. Teaching, however, was not a usual role of deacons.

[40] Concerning the Cemeteries

Those who are buried in the cemeteries, let them not overcharge them, for this work is done for the poor; only the wage for the gravedigger and the price of the tiles. And let those who take care of the place and live there be supported by the bishop, so that it shall not be a burden for those who come.

This chapter has no parallel in the shorter version and is absent from L. In E1, it is placed at the end, after chapter 43, perhaps because a scribe had accidentally omitted it at its proper place and needed to add it subsequently. Its correct location was determined by reference to the other versions.

By the early third century there were already several Christian cemeteries in Rome and other cities, and the purchase of a grave site could be expensive because of the price of land. For that reason, financial assistance was needed from the wealthy for the poorer members of a Christian community. While the rich might be buried in a surface grave, the poor were usually accommodated in narrow holes dug in the walls of underground tunnels, as this enabled a large number of graves within a limited space. These were then sealed with stucco and tiles. "Those who take care of the place" seem to have been distinct from the gravediggers and apparently also resided there, supported by the bishop, in order to keep costs low for those needing funerals for their relatives.¹¹⁴

114. See further Ramsay MacMullen, *The Second Church: Popular Christianity A.D. 200–400* (Atlanta: SBL, 2009), esp. 69–80; Carolyn

[41] Concerning the Prayer

And let every faithful man and woman, at dawn when they have arisen from sleep, before doing anything, wash their hands and pray to the Lord, and so let them go to their work. But if it happens that there is instruction in the word of God, let each one always prefer to go there; let each one acknowledge to himself that he is hearing the universal word of the Lord; for having been seen in the church, you will be able to evade the evil of the day. Let the one who fears God therefore consider this a loss when he is not present at the proclamation of the word of instruction, or when the only one who can read arrived late, or the teacher comes. Do not leave the church while the instruction is being held, because then it is given to the speaker to say what will be profitable for all. While the Spirit gives [you] things you do not hope for, having heard, you will benefit and your faith will become firm through what has been said, and in your home say what you have heard. Because of this, let each one hasten to the church, where the Spirit flourishes. If there is a day when instruction is not held, let him also read in his home something from holy Scripture as far as is possible.

This first part of chapter 41 is a greatly expanded version of chapter 35, which was not included in E1. The lacuna in L only ends further on in the chapter. The composite character of this section can be seen from the mixture of the third person plural, third person singular, and

Osiek, "Roman and Christian Burial Practices and the Patronage of Women," in Laurie Brink and Deborah Green, eds., *Commemorating the Dead: Texts and Artifacts in Context* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008), 243–70.

second person singular. Possibly as a result of this fusion, the meaning of some expressions is opaque.

The “faithful” are specifically mentioned as being made up of both men and women, the only place in *AT* where that is done. The mention of washing the hands before prayer is also an addition to chapter 35 and occurs again later with reference to prayer at midnight. It was an established custom among the Pharisees but apparently not practiced by Jesus (Luke 11:38), and it seems to have had a mixed reception in early Christianity, being opposed both by Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata* 4.22) and by Tertulian (*De oratione* 13). There appears to be a hint of this opposition in the passage following the injunction to pray at midnight, where it is said that marriage does not defile. Most of the expansion of the opening section, however, is to stress the value of attending instruction “in the church.” The meaning of “when the only one who can read arrived late, or the teacher comes” is obscure, but “in your home say what you have heard” is probably an instruction to repeat the teaching to others in the household who were unable to attend. The final direction rather surprisingly presumes the Christian will be capable of reading and possesses a copy of the Scriptures, both of which could have been true of only a very small minority, and yet it is also recommended in some other early writings.¹¹⁵

At the time of the third hour, while you pray, if you are in your house, praise the Lord; if in another place, pray in your heart to God, having paid attention to the particular time, because at that hour we

115. Clement of Alexandria, *Paedagogos* 2.10.96; *Stromata* 7.7.49; Origen, *Hom. in Genesim* 10.1; 11.3; 12.5; *Hom. in Exodum* 12.2; *Hom. in Numeros* 2.1.

welcome Christ's return. Because of this also the Law commands that they offer the type of the lamb and of the bread in the image of the perfect lamb, Christ the shepherd, who is the bread of heaven.

So likewise at the sixth hour, for once Christ had been nailed [to the cross], the day divided and there was darkness. Because of this, let prayer be continued, like the voice of the one who prayed and that of the prophets, while the creation became dark for unbelievers.

At the ninth [hour] let the prayer be prolonged with praise because we are united in praising while the soul[s] of the righteous praise God, who does not lie, who was mindful of his saints and sent his Word to illuminate them. Therefore at that hour Christ, pierced in his side, poured forth water and blood, and illuminating the rest of the time of the day, he brought [it] to evening. Then, beginning to sleep [and] making the beginning of another day, he completed an image of the resurrection. Pray also before your body rests on the bed.

The chapter now turns attention to the practice of prayer three times a day, a custom established among Christians as early as *Didache* 8.2–3 and recommended by various early Christian authors, but with differing justifications for the choice of the hours.¹¹⁶ While the *Didache* does not specify

116. It may also have some Jewish antecedents: see Richard S. Sarason, "Communal Prayer at Qumran and among the Rabbis: Certainties and Uncertainties," in Esther G. Chazon, ed., *Liturgical Perspectives: Prayer and Poetry in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 151–72, here at 157, 167.

any particular times of day, morning, noon, and evening are sometimes mentioned, and more often the third, sixth, and ninth hours (see Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* 7.7.40), because these would be publicly announced in urban settings by the civic authorities. Later the two three-fold patterns were combined to form a more demanding and perhaps less widely observed cycle of prayer five times a day (see Tertullian, *De oratione* 25).

The justification for praying at the third hour—aloud when at home and silently when elsewhere—is most unusual in E1, omitting the hour of Christ's crucifixion (Mark 15:25), which is found in the other versions, and instead associating it with the hour of Christ's return, which is without parallel. This suggests some earlier textual corruption. All the versions then add the time of the temple offerings but in varied confused forms, including, in E1, references to Christ not only as the perfect lamb (see John 1:29, 36) but also as the "shepherd" (John 10:11) and as the "bread of heaven" (John 6:32, 51, 58). To justify the third hour for prayer, other third-century authors allude instead to the gift of the Spirit at Pentecost (Tertullian, *De oratione* 25; Cyprian, *De dom. or.* 34).

With regard to prayer at the sixth hour, E1 does relate it to the darkness over the land at the crucifixion from the sixth to the ninth hour (Mark 15:33), together with a somewhat obscure reference to "the voice of the one who prayed and that of the prophets." While it was customary among early Christian writers to connect the darkness at noon to various Old Testament prophetic texts,¹¹⁷ it is far

117. See Tertullian, *Ad Iudaeos* 13, citing Amos 8:9-10; Cyprian, *Ad Quirinum* 2.3, citing Jeremiah 15:9.

from clear whether “the one who prayed” was one of the prophets or Jesus himself.

Prayer at the ninth hour refers first to the soul[s] of the righteous praising God, at which point L returns from its lacuna and forms the basis for the translation of the rest of the chapter. This sentence is an allusion to Christ, the Word of God, being sent to “preach to the spirits in prison” (1 Peter 3:19) after his death. The righteous among those who had already died before his first coming, it was believed, would be raised at his second coming (see “illuminate the righteous” in chapter 4 above, and Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* 4.22.2). Christ at the ninth hour, pouring forth water and blood,¹¹⁸ returned the darkness to daylight at his death, and so “beginning to sleep,” created the “beginning of another day,” an image or type of the resurrection. *Didascalia* 5.14 also reflects this concept: “And they crucified him on the Friday. He suffered at the sixth hour on Friday. These hours in which our Lord suffered were reckoned as a day, and then there was darkness for three hours, and this was reckoned a night. And again, there were three hours, from the ninth hour until evening—a day, and afterwards the night of the sabbath of the passion.”¹¹⁹

Prayer at bedtime (or Compline, as it later came to be known) first makes an appearance in some fourth- and fifth-century monastic rules, the earliest being in the *Longer Rules* of Basil, and is thus an obvious late addition here to this otherwise early pattern of daily prayer.

118. Not a reference to John 19:34, “blood and water,” but to an interpolation in some manuscripts of Matthew 27:49, “water and blood” (see also 1 John 5:6, 8), attested by L and E1 and noted by Botte, *Tradition apostolique*, 95, n. 1.

119. ET from Stewart-Sykes, *Didascalia apostolorum*, 214.

And rising about midnight, wash your hands with water and pray. And if your wife is also present, pray both together; but if she is not yet a believer, withdrawing into another room, pray and return again to your bed. And do not be lazy about praying. The one who is bound in marriage is not defiled. For those who have washed do not have necessity to wash again, because they are clean. Through consignation with moist breath and catching your spittle in your hand, your body is sanctified down to your feet. For when it is offered with a believing heart, just as from the font, the gift of the Spirit and the sprinkling of washing sanctifies the one who believes. Therefore it is necessary to pray at this hour. For the elders who handed [it] on to us taught us so, because at this hour all creation is still for a moment, so that they may praise the Lord: stars and trees and waters stop for an instant, and all the host of angels [that] ministers to him praises God at this hour together with the souls of the righteous. Therefore those who believe ought to take care to pray at this hour. Also bearing witness to this, the Lord says thus, "Behold, a shout was made about midnight of those saying, 'Behold the bridegroom comes: rise to meet him.'" And he goes on, saying, "Therefore watch; for you do not know at what hour he comes."

Prayer also in the middle of the night was the normal accompaniment to the early Christian custom of prayer three times a day. Although the practice might sound challenging to modern ears, it needs to be noted that prior to the relatively recent invention of effective artificial lighting, it was usual for human beings to divide their night's sleep

into two, with a break in the middle, especially during the long winter hours of darkness.

As at prayer upon waking in the morning at the beginning of the chapter, so too the washing of hands is again prescribed upon waking in the night, because, as noted there, it was commonly believed that dreams caused ritual pollution. A Christian couple should pray together, but someone married to an unbeliever should go apart to pray. Tertullian saw that an unbelieving husband might object to that (*Ad uxorem* 2.5), and Origen doubted whether a place where sexual intercourse had taken place was suitable for prayer (*De oratione* 31.4).

Alistair Stewart has suggested that the section of the translation that is underlined is a later interpolation, as it interrupts the directions about prayer at midnight,¹²⁰ and that judgment appears to be correct. We have already noted earlier that it seems to suggest opposition to the washing of hands. On the contrary, it envisages that making the sign of the cross with a hand moistened with spittle will sanctify the whole person just as baptism does.

Prayer at midnight is then justified by reference to a tradition from the "elders." A specific source for this has been impossible to trace, but it seems likely that its root lies in Jewish legends about the praise of God by angels and all creation. Finally, a biblical warrant for prayer at this hour is given in the parable of the wise and foolish virgins from Matthew 25:1-13, though the point of the parable is about being constantly prepared rather than about midnight as such. Other early Christian writers looked elsewhere for a biblical warrant for prayer at night. Origen cited Psalm 119:62, which spoke of rising for prayer at midnight, and Acts 16:25, where Paul

120. Stewart, *Hippolytus*, 207.

and Silas pray in prison at midnight (*De oratione* 12.2); and Cyprian cites Luke 2:37, which refers to Anna the prophetess praying night and day (*De dom. or.* 36).

And rising about cockcrow, likewise. For at that hour, when the cock crowed, the sons of Israel denied Christ, whom we know by faith, looking toward this day in the hope of eternal light at the resurrection of the dead.

And acting thus, all you faithful ones, and making a remembrance of them and in turn teaching and encouraging the catechumens, you will not be able to be tempted or to perish, when you always have Christ in remembrance.

Cockcrow is first mentioned as a time of prayer in some fourth-century monastic sources in place of prayer at midnight (John Chrysostom, *Hom. in ep. I ad Timotheum* 14.4; John Cassian, *De institutis coenobiorum* 3.4-6; Egeria, *Itinerarium* 24.1), which certainly points to the probability of it being a later interpolation here.¹²¹ Furthermore, the justification offered for it is strange. It was not the “sons of Israel” who denied Christ at cockcrow but Peter (Mark 14:66-72). And there is no instruction to wash the hands, even though participants would again be rising from their beds.

The summary in the final paragraph changes from the second person singular to second person plural. The mention of catechumens here is somewhat surprising because

121. Both Stewart, *Hippolytus*, 208, and Chase, “Another Look,” 16, reject the idea that an additional time of prayer is intended here and believe it to be simply the repetition of the prayer on rising mentioned at the beginning of the chapter.

they have not been specified elsewhere in the chapter, and some of the instructions about prayer, especially the washing, suggest a baptismal dimension. The idea of daily prayer providing protection against perishing parallels the protection supposedly given by attending the daily instruction.

[42] Always take care to sign your forehead reverently. For this sign of the Passion is clear and approved against the devil, if you do it with faith, not so that you may be seen by people but through knowledge presenting [it] like a breastplate. For when the adversary sees the power that is from the heart of a person clearly displayed in the likeness of the washing, he will flee trembling, not by spitting but by breathing. This is what Moses earlier showed with the lamb of the Passover that was sacrificed, who sprinkled the blood on the lintels and smeared the doorposts, so he made known the faith that is now in us, which is in the perfect lamb. And signing the forehead and eyes with the hand, let us escape from the one who is trying to destroy us.

Chapters 42 and 43 largely reproduce the short ending after chapter 38. Because the text is rather obscure in places, both L and E1 have been used to reconstruct it. L adopts “likeness of the Word” here in place of “likeness of washing” (baptism), which Dix plausibly suggested was the result of confusing the Greek *loutrou* with *logou*.¹²² The phrase that follows, “not by spitting but by breathing,” in contrast to the shorter ending, has given rise to two theo-

122. Dix, *Apostolic Tradition*, 69, n. 2.

ries. One, by Botte, proposed that the words were simply a gloss on the Latin text,¹²³ but the discovery of E1 has ruled that out. The other, offered by Dix and Hanssens, was that there had been confusion in the original between the Greek for “striking,” *tuptontos*, and “spitting,” *ptuontos*,¹²⁴ which E1 seems to confirm.

[43] And so, if these things are received with thankfulness and true faith, they provide edification for the church and eternal life for believers. I instruct that these things be kept by all the wise. For to all who listen to the apostolic tradition, the heresies will not be able to draw any righteous one into error. For heresies have increased in this way because of you lacking the apostolic tradition, the leaders who love the doctrine and who abandon themselves to various passions of their own desire, not those things that are proper. (If we have abbreviated anything, our brothers, may God reveal [it] to those who are worthy, as he steers the holy church into the tranquil harbor.)

This chapter continues the material from the short ending, and there does not seem to be any logic to its division into a separate chapter by modern editors. In a bizarre coincidence L breaks off again at almost exactly the point that it did in the shorter ending, both of these occurring at the end of the last line of a page of the manuscript. The rest has thus been dependent on E1, which is not particularly clear here. The final sentence is also missing from E1 and

123. Botte, *Tradition apostolique*, 101, n. 3.

124. Dix, *Apostolic Tradition*, 69, n. 2; Hanssens, *Liturgie d'Hippolyte*, 165.

has been supplied from the Sahidic version. The words “true faith” seem to provide a more accurate rendering of the Greek than “true orthodox faith” of the shorter ending of L. The two endings are the only places in *AT* in which the first person singular is used.

Epilogue

The earliest version of *AT* appears to have been an attempt by one Christian community, or perhaps just one individual, to preserve old ways of ordaining ministers, initiating new converts, and holding eucharistic meals that were becoming obsolete—or even had otherwise already become obsolete. Later generations preserved this apparently ancient church order while, at the same time, inserting amendments in places in order to make it correspond more with the contemporary practices known to them, a process that to some extent also continued in the translations that were subsequently made of it. Although parts of *AT* may well have resembled what other Christian communities were doing in various places, it should not be viewed as ever having been an authoritative statement of early church practice in general.

Index of Biblical References

Exodus		119:62	112
3:17	79		
12:7, 22-23	104	Isaiah	
23:16, 19	96	9:5	26
		65:2	29
Leviticus		Jeremiah	
19:23-25	57	15:9	109
23:9-14	96		
Numbers		Daniel	
9:9-12	99	13:42	20
11:16-17	38		
Deuteronomy		Amos	
10:8	32	8:9-10	109
18:3, 7	32		
26:1-11	96	Matthew	
2 Kings		5:13	93
23:4	41	8:8	92
		25:1-13	112
Psalms		27:49	110
50:14	18	Mark	
112:5-6	20	7:32-37	67
		14:66-72	113

15:25	109	11:20	92
15:33	109	15:26	29
16:18	113		
Luke		2 Corinthians	
2:37	113	1:3	38, 42
7:6	92	Ephesians	
11:38	107	6:14	102
12:50	61		
John		1 Thessalonians	
1:29, 36	109	5:5	46
6:32, 51, 58	109		
10:11	109	1 Timothy	
19:34	109	3:1	21
		3:13	43
		5:3-16	45
Acts		2 Timothy	
1:20	21	1:10	29
3:13, 26	9		
4:25	9	Hebrews	
4:27, 30	9	1:2	27
6:5	44		
16:25	112	1 Peter	
		3:19	110
Romans			
10:21	29	1 John	
		5:6, 8	110
1 Corinthians		Revelation	
7	51	2:17	82
7:40	56		

Index of Other Ancient Literature

Addai and Mari,		9.2	9
Anaphora of	26	12.4	29
Ambrose of Milan		<i>Canons of Hippolytus</i>	
<i>De sacramentis</i>		(CH)	vii, ix, 6,
1.1-3	67		16, 82,
1.4-5	72		85, 86,
2.20	74		88
<i>Exposition in</i>		Cassian, John	
<i>Ps 118</i> , prologue		<i>De institutis coenobiorum</i>	
2	68	3.4-6	113
<i>Apostolic Constitutions</i>		<i>1 Clement</i>	
7.26	9	40.5	84
Athanasius, Pseudo-		44.1	21
<i>De virginitate</i>		44.4	21
12, 14	9	59.2-4	9
Barcelona Papyrus	9, 26,	59.2	9, 20, 31
	27, 31	Clement of Alexandria	
<i>Barnabas, Epistle of</i>		<i>Paedagogos</i>	
5.6	29	2.2	93

2.10.96	107	72.22	62
12	59	79.1	44
<i>Stromata</i>		Cyril of Jerusalem	
2.18	56-57	<i>Procatechesis</i> 9	64, 68
4.22	107	(see also: <i>Mystagogical</i>	
7.12	84	<i>Catecheses</i>)	
7.7.40	109	<i>Didache</i>	
7.7.49	107	7	66
Clementine		8	84
Octateuch	13	8.2-3	108
Cyprian of Carthage		9-10	9
<i>De dominica oratione</i>		10.5	32
31	24, 89	13	96
34	109	15.1	14, 39
36	113	<i>Didascalia Apostolorum</i>	
<i>Epistulae</i>		2.28	95
8.1	44	2.39	64
8.5	98	2.57.5, 8	59
9.1	44	3.2.1	45
23	44	3.5.2	45
29.2	44	3.6.1	45
32.2	44	3.6.3	45
34.4	44	5.14	110
35.1	44	6.21	66
36.1	44	Egeria	
38	44	<i>Itinerarium</i>	
39	44	24.1	113
43.1	17	45	50
43.4	44	46	65
47.2	44	Elvira, Council of	57, 58
55.8	17	<i>Epitome of Apostolic</i>	
57.3	41	<i>Constitutions</i> 8	19, 38,
59.5-6	17		44, 84
67.5	17		
68.2	17		

Eusebius		Stavronikita 2.12	64
<i>Historia ecclesiae</i>		<i>Hom. in ep. I ad Timotheum</i>	
5.2.2-3	47	14.4	113
5.24.12	98	John the Deacon	68, 80
6.43	43	Josephus	
6.44	86	<i>Jewish War</i> 2.8.7	57
Gelasian		Justin Martyr	
Sacramentary	74	<i>Dialogue with Trypho</i>	
<i>Hermas, Shepherd of</i>		40.1.1	104
Similitude 5.1	84	41.1.3	31
Hippolytus (Pseudo-)		56	26
<i>Contra Noetum</i>		70.4	31
18	27	76	26
Ignatius of Antioch		97.2	29
<i>Ephesians</i> 20.2	101	126-28	26
<i>Smyrnaeans</i> 8	94	128	27
Irenaeus		<i>First Apology</i>	
<i>Adversus haereses</i>		35	29
2.20.3	30	61	63
4.17.5	31	63	26
4.18.1	31	65	60
4.22.2	110	67.4	44
56, 76, 126-28	26	Melito of Sardis	
<i>Epideixis</i>		<i>Peri Pascha</i>	
38	30	100, 102	30
55-56	26	<i>Mystagogical Catecheses</i>	
Jerome		2.3-4	71
<i>Altercation of a</i>		2.4	73
<i>Luciferian with an</i>		Nicodemus,	
<i>Orthodox</i> 8	80	<i>Gospel of</i>	30
John Chrysostom		Origen	
<i>Baptismal Instructions,</i>		<i>Contra Celsum</i>	
PK 3.19-27	67	3.51	50

<i>De oratione</i>		<i>Adversus Praxean</i>	
12.2	113	26	73
31.4	112	<i>Apologeticum</i>	
<i>Exhortation to Martyrdom</i>		23.16	67
30	61	39	95
<i>Hom. in Genesim</i>		39.15	89, 91
10.1	107	<i>De baptismo</i>	
11.3	107	4	69
12.5	107	7	34, 75
<i>Hom. in Exodum</i>		8	77
11.6	41	11.1	77
12.2	107	16	61
<i>Hom. in Leviticum</i>		17	94
6.6	41	18	69
10.2	84	19	66
<i>Hom. in Numeros</i>		<i>De corona</i>	
2.1	107	3	67, 73, 80, 83
<i>Perpetua and Felicity,</i>		3.4	101
<i>passion of</i>		11	54
6.4	61	<i>De idolatria</i>	
<i>Philo, De virtutibus</i>		5-7	52
156-58	57	9	55
<i>Polycarp, Martyrdom of</i>		10	53
14	9	11	52
<i>Sarapion, Sacramentary</i>		12	53
<i>of</i>		17-18	54
	26, 38	19	54
<i>Statuta ecclesiae</i>		<i>De ieiunio</i>	
<i>antiqua</i>		10	84
<i>Tertullian</i>		<i>De oratione</i>	
<i>Ad uxorem</i>		13	107
2.4	59, 68, 92	18	18
2.5	101, 112	19	66, 84
		25	109

<i>De praescriptione</i>			36, 37,
41	44		38, 42,
<i>De resurrectione carnis</i>			82, 83,
8	76, 78		85, 86,
<i>De spectaculis</i>			87, 88
4	73	Theodore of Mopsuestia	
9	53	<i>Baptismal Homilies</i>	
12	53	1.14–15	50
17	52	2	67
19	53	2.1–2	64
<i>De virginibus</i>		Verona	
<i>velandis</i>	60	Sacramentary	5, 80
<i>Testamentum</i>			
<i>Domini (TD)</i>	vii, ix, 7,		
	23, 31,		

Index of Modern Authors

Page numbers in **bold** indicate the locations of full publication details.

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| Bartlet, J.V., 48 | Dix, Gregory, 15 , 40, 77, 82, |
| Bausi, Alessandro, 7 | 83, 92, 103, 114, 115 |
| Botte, Bernard, 11 , 15, 29 , | Duensing, Hugo, 6 |
| 32, 39, 43, 77, 82, 83, 85, | |
| 90, 92, 103 , 110, 115 | Easton, B.S., 39 |
| Bouhot, Jean-Paul, 63 | Elm, Susanna, 48 |
| Bouley, Allan, 47 | Engberding, Hieronymus, 2 |
| Bradshaw, Paul F., ix , 2 , 7 , | |
| 16, 17 , 19 , 23, 26 , 32 , 36, | Faivre, Alexander, 3 |
| 38, 85 | Frere, W.H., 39 |
| Brent, Allen, 47 | Fritsch, Emmanuel, 22 |
| Brock, Sebastian, 27 | Funk, F.X., 19 , 84 |
| | |
| Chadwick, Henry, 50 | Gelston, Anthony, 77 |
| Chase, Nathan P., ix , 26 , 104 , | Gibaut, John St. H., 43 |
| 113 | |
| Connolly, R.H., 14 , 32 | Hanssens, Jean Michel, 3 , |
| Cuming, G.J., 26 , 32 , 39 , 77 , | 115 |
| 92 | Hauler, Edmund, 5 |
| | Hoek, Annewies van den, 57 |
| Day, Juliette, 78 | Horner, George, 6 |

- Hunter, David G., **83**
- Jasper, R.C.D., **26, 32**
- Johnson, Maxwell E., **ix, 10, 16, 26, 36, 64, 65, 71, 73, 85**
- Kavanagh, Aidan, **78**
- Kilmartin, Edward, **80**
- Kreider, Alan, **54**
- Lagarde, Paul de, **6**
- Lampe, G.W.H., **78**
- Lane, Anthony N.S., **69**
- Lengeling, Emil J., **29**
- Lorenz, Rudolf, **2**
- MacMullen, Ramsay, **105**
- Magne, Jean, **2–3**
- Markschies, Christoph, **14**
- Mazza, Enrico, **27, 29, 32**
- McGowan, Andrew, **91**
- Messner, Reinhard, **7, 86, 89, 91, 95**
- Methuen, Charlotte, **46**
- Metzger, Marcel, **3**
- Mihálykó, Ágnes T., **33**
- Osiek, Carolyn, **46, 106**
- Parenti, Stefano, **97**
- Penn, Michael, **60**
- Périer, Jean and Augustin, **6**
- Phillips, L. Edward, **ix, 16, 36, 60, 85**
- Ratcliff, E.C., **2, 16, 32**
- Ray, Walter D., **32**
- Reynolds, Philip L., **55**
- Rouwhorst, Gerard, **98**
- Salles, Antoine, **2**
- Sarason, Richard S., **108**
- Segelberg, Eric, **19, 37**
- Serra, Dominic E., **65**
- Smith, Dennis E., **91**
- Sorensen, Eric, **51**
- Stewart(-Sykes), Alistair C., **20, 21, 24, 30, 32, 34, 35, 40, 45, 59, 73, 90, 97, 110, 112, 113**
- Taft, Robert F., **1, 80**
- Tellbe, Mikael, **51**
- Thurston, Bonnie B., **46**
- Tidner, Erik, **5**
- Till, Walter, **6**
- Velkovska, Elena, **97**
- Vilela, Albano, **18**
- Vinzent, Markus, **14, 28**
- Wasserman, Tommy, **51**
- Whitaker, E.C., **65, 67, 68, 72, 74, 80**
- Zhelotov, Michael, **26**

Index of Subjects

- adherence, act of, 67, 72
- anamnesis, 31
- anointing, 34, 67, 68, 70–78, 85, 102, 104
- baptism, 2, 4, 6, 10, 12, 34, 43–44, 48–49, 59–81, 102–3; of infants, 61–62
- bishop, 11, 14–24, 34–44, 46, 58, 62–67, 70–79, 81–84, 87–90, 93–94, 96, 99, 104, 105
- blood, 25, 61–62, 79, 81, 101–2, 104, 108, 110, 114
- bread, 12, 24, 25, 31, 33, 35, 60, 68, 79–87, 89–94, 98, 100, 101, 108, 109
- catechumen, 12, 49, 54, 56–62, 64, 81, 82, 91–94, 113
- cemeteries, 12, 105
- cheese, 12, 34–35
- church (noun), 4, 13, 18–19, 25, 27, 32, 35, 37, 42, 44, 45, 51, 52, 56, 59, 60, 62, 67, 72, 73, 76, 77, 80, 83–87, 92, 95, 96, 99–100, 103–4, 106, 107, 115, 117
- confessor, 12, 46–47
- deacon, 11, 12, 16, 20, 23, 24, 39–44, 70, 71, 79, 80, 82, 83, 85–88, 93, 84, 99
- demon possession, 51, 65
- electi*, 64, 82
- epiclesis, 26, 27
- Eucharist, 12, 60, 83, 86, 90, 91, 94, 100, 101 (*see also* prayer: eucharistic)
- exorcism, 51, 62–68, 70–72
- faithful, 54, 58, 78, 87–88, 90, 92–93, 99–101, 106–7, 113
- fasting, 12, 63, 65–66, 83–84, 98–99

- flowers, 97
- fruits, 12, 33, 56, 96–97
- gospel, 17, 62, 64, 73, 101
- hands, imposition of, 15, 17, 18, 24, 36, 41, 44, 60–61, 77–78; washing of 91, 106–7, 111–14
- healing, 12, 37, 48, 67
- hearers, 50, 56, 58
- initiation, Christian, 12, 49, 63
- institution narrative, 26, 29, 31
- kiss, 23, 58–60, 76–79
- laity, lay person, 49, 58–59, 61, 84, 93, 96
- lamplighting, 12, 89
- marriage, 51, 55, 100, 107, 111
- menstruation, 65–66
- milk (and honey), 10, 34, 79–81
- oil, 12, 33–35, 70, 72, 75–76
- olives, 12, 34–35, 97
- ordination, 6, 11, 12, 15, 17–18, 22–23, 25, 32, 35, 38–45, 89, 99
- Pascha/Easter, 12, 29, 66–68, 80, 98
- Pentecost, 98–99, 109
- prayer, 4, 8–9, 11, 12, 19, 34–35, 45, 58–60, 76–79, 84, 89, 97; daily 12, 46, 100, 104, 106–13; eucharistic 2, 4, 6, 10, 11, 12, 22–33, 35, 37, 47, 85, 88, 89; ordination 2, 6, 12, 17–22, 35–43, 89, 99
- presbyter, 11, 12, 15–18, 20, 23–24, 34–42, 44, 46–47, 58, 64–71, 75, 80, 82–83, 85–86, 88, 93–94, 104
- reader, 12, 44
- renunciation, 67, 71–73
- Sabbath/Saturday, 65–68, 82, 98, 110
- scrutiny, 64
- sick, visit the, 12, 34, 62, 82, 85–86, 98, 99, 104
- slave, 49, 51
- sponsor, 50
- subdeacon, 12, 43–44, 99, 104
- supper, 11, 12, 24, 60, 87–93, 95–96
- teacher, 48–49, 52, 58, 60–61, 106–7
- vigil, 66, 68–69, 80
- virgin, 12, 47–48, 58, 60, 83, 84, 88, 112; the virgin (Mary) 24, 28, 72
- widows, 12, 44–45, 59, 62, 83–84, 86–87, 95–96

wine, 12, 24, 33, 35, 68,
79–81, 91, 95, 102

women, 58–60, 66, 69–70,
100, 107