



Documents. A Hitherto Unpublished Prologue to the Acts of the Apostles (Probably by Theodore of Mopsuestia)

Author(s): Ernst von Dobschütz

Source: *The American Journal of Theology*, Vol. 2, No. 2 (Apr., 1898), pp. 353-387

Published by: [The University of Chicago Press](http://www.uchicago.edu)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3152769>

Accessed: 09/09/2011 10:04

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The University of Chicago Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The American Journal of Theology*.

DOCUMENTS.

A HITHERTO UNPUBLISHED PROLOGUE TO THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES (PROBABLY BY THEODORE OF MOPSUESTIA).

THE oldest manuscripts of the Bible contain, as is well known, only the text of the Holy Scriptures. Even the brief titles and subscriptions in the Codex Sinaiticus and the Vaticanus are in part added by a later hand. Soon, however, it began to be customary to add all sorts of explanatory material. The canons and sections of Eusebius, the brief prologues of Jerome, are familiar examples. The largest collection of such material passes under the name of Euthalius. But despite all the labor that has recently been devoted to this collection, despite even the acute investigations of Professor Robinson, of Cambridge,¹ the Euthalius question must still be regarded as an extremely confused and confusing problem. This arises chiefly from the fact that the first editor, Laurentius Alexander Zacagni,² prefect of the Vatican library under Pope Innocent XII, proceeded upon the principle that the greatest possible completeness was the chief thing to be sought, and accordingly based his work upon a manuscript which contained a very rich collection of introduction material, the greater part of which, however, made no claim whatever to the name of Euthalius. Gallandi³ and Migne⁴ simply reprinted his edition without critical revision. Only lately has the attempt been made to separate, by criticism, the genuine Euthalian elements of the collection from the others. In all probability we shall have to assume several authors

¹J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON, "Euthaliana," in *Texts and Studies*, Vol. III, No. 3, Cambridge, 1895.

²L. A. ZACAGNI, *Collectanea Monumentorum veterum ecclesie græcæ ac latinæ*. Tomus I (et unicus), Rom., 1698, contains: "Acta Archelai, S. Ephremi Syri sermones duo, S. Gregorii Nysseni scripta varia, Euthalius." I own the copy of Tregelles.

³A. GALLANDI, *Bibliotheca veterum patrum antiquorumque scriptorum*, Tom. X (Ven., 1774), pp. 197-320, xi-xiv.

⁴MIGNE, *Patrologiæ cursus completus, series græca*, Tom. 85 (Paris, 1860), pp. 619-790.

for the various parts of the work. On the one side this is in entire agreement with the fact, observable in the history of literature in general, that the lesser names disappear, their work being attributed to a more famous writer. Conspicuous examples are furnished by the names of Cyprian and Augustine in Latin literature, under which even writings of Novatian, Pelagius, and others are hidden. On the other side this appears in the notorious fondness of the scribes of biblical manuscripts in later centuries for bringing together the greatest possible variety of material in order to give higher value to their manuscripts.

The admirable descriptions of the New Testament manuscripts which we owe to Professor Caspar René Gregory, of Leipzig,⁵ are especially exhaustive with reference to this matter, and give an authentic picture of the way in which, in the course of time, materials have been heaped together in the manuscripts of the Bible. We do not now refer to the fact that biblical manuscripts have also been used for copying other and profane literature. We are concerned only with the introductory matter which stands in relation to the New Testament itself. One who would become acquainted with this material—and it is quite worth while to study the history of biblical interpretation which is embodied in it—can obtain a good impression of it from the older editions of the New Testament, especially from those of Mill and Matthæi, not to mention also the commentaries of Theophylact and Oecumenius, and the well-known catenæ. It would no doubt be a task worth undertaking, though not practicable for an individual or at private expense, to gather together and to sift critically all such introductory material as exists in the manuscripts and printed books, and thus to produce a *corpus introductorium Novi Testamenti*. Undoubtedly many treasures still await discovery.

The following pages will furnish an example of this hidden material.

The public library at Naples possesses a manuscript which contains the latter half of the New Testament, to whose significance for the Euthalian question Dr. Albert Ehrhard, professor of church history in the Roman Catholic faculty at the University of Würzburg (*Herbipolis*),

⁵ *Novum Testamentum Græce ad antiquissimos codices denuo recensuit . . . C. TISCHENDORF*: editio octava critica maior. Vol. III: *Prolegomena* scripsit CASPAR RENATUS GREGORY; additis curis † EZRÆ ABBOT. Lipsiæ (Hinrichs), 1884-1894; especially fasc. II (1890): "de codicibus minusculis et de lectionariis."

was the first to call attention. Gregory's description of the manuscript is as follows:

83. (P 93 Ap 99) Neapoli bibl. nationalis II. Aa. 7.
saec XII (al. X vel XI), 26.5 × 18.6, membr, foll. 123, coll. 2,
ll. 37, *σλιχων* numeri in mg notantur; prol, capp-t, tabulae multae:
Act Cath Paul (Heb Tim) *Apoc* (mut post Apoc 3 ?); 1 Ioh 5,7 in mg
habet. Textum olim cum codice Pamphili Caesareae conlatum esse
profitetur. Evagrius scripsit. Birch. et Scholz. *Bib.-kr. Reise*, p. 136 seq.
locc sell cont. Nescio quis in usum Burgonii cont. Vidi 24 Apr 1886.

The statement about the scribe rests upon an oversight easily explicable. As frequently occurs, the scribe of our manuscript has simply copied the subscription of his exemplar. The "Evagrius" is undoubtedly the same as the one mentioned in the subscription of Codex H of the Pauline letters, first pointed out by Ehrhard. To the same cause is due also the statement concerning a collation of the text with the Codex Pamphili in the library at Cæsarea. We may set aside the question of the relation of this Evagrius to Euthalius, whether, as Ehrhard thinks, he is the proper author whose name was later corrupted into Euthalius;⁶ or, as I have suggested,⁷ a later writer who audaciously put his name in the subscription in place of the author's name, a thing which occurs quite often; or, finally, as Robinson has recently suggested, an independent redactor of "Euthalius."⁸ For our present purpose it is likewise immaterial whether Codex Neap. is copied directly or indirectly from Codex H, or again is derived from a sister manuscript of Codex H. In any case the scribe of our manuscript had several exemplars before him, and from one of these that had no relation to Codex H and Euthalius he took the Prologue printed in the following pages.

According to the minute description which the royal librarian, Salvatore Cyrillus, gave in his catalogue of the Greek manuscripts of the Bourbon library (now the national library) in Naples,⁹ the manuscript

⁶ *Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, herausg. von Dr. O. HARTWIG; Vol. VIII., September, 1891, pp. 385-411; compare also SAM. BERGER, *Histoire de la Vulgate* 1893, p. 307.

⁷ *Ibid.*, Vol. X, February, 1893, pp. 49-70. Compare O. ZÖCKLER, "Euagrius Ponticus," in *Biblische und kirchenhistorische Studien*, IV, 1893, pp. 51 ff. GREGORY, *Theolog. Literaturzeitung*, 1895, no. 11, cols. 281 ff.

⁸ ROBINSON, "Euthaliana," in *Texts and Studies*, l. c.

⁹ *Codices Graeci MSS. Regiae Bibliothecae Borbonicae descripti atque illustrati a SALVATORE CYRILLO*. Neapol., 1726, I, pp. 13-24.

contains, on folio 1, the well-known Euthalian Prologue to the Acts of the Apostles (Zacagni, p. 403) without heading; then folio 3, a second preface to this book, likewise without superscription, of which Cyrill gives a small part.

Through the courtesy of two friends I am able to give this highly interesting Prologue in full. Dr. Erich Förster, pastor at Frankfort-on-the-Main, the well-known editor of the *Chronik der christlichen Welt*, and afterward Mr. James Hardy Ropes, instructor in Harvard University, had the great kindness to furnish me the entire text, partly in transcription and partly in collation. The manuscript is in places very much defaced and only with difficulty legible, which is no doubt the reason why only a part has been printed by Cyrill, and that in a very faulty way. Single words are even yet not read with perfect certainty. As I have not seen the codex myself, I cannot undertake the full responsibility, particularly where the two collations at my disposal do not agree. It is nevertheless better to print the text even with some mistakes than to leave scholars much longer in ignorance of it. I am indebted to several acquaintances, above all to Professor Blass, of Halle, and Dr. Koetschau, professor at the Gymnasium in Jena, well known by his studies in Origen, for various suggestions in the restoration of the text by conjecture.

The punctuation, accentuation, and orthography of the manuscript are those which were customary in that time; for these I have of course substituted those now prevalent. The scribe had a preference for the circumflex; he confused *o* and *ω* almost invariably, frequently *ε* and *ω*, and often wrote *ε* for *ι*. It is further worthy of mention that through oversight the manuscript did not come into the hands of the *rubricator*. The superscriptions of the Prologues are accordingly lacking, though space was left for them. For the same reason the large initial letters are lacking. The following is the text, with translation:

NOTE.—The portions already printed by Cyrill are inclosed between {}

[] indicates that the inclosed word, though in the codex, is to be omitted.

< > indicates that the inclosed word, though not in the manuscript, is supplied by me.

† indicates that the correct reading is uncertain and directs attention to the critical apparatus.

I. { Πάλαι καὶ πρόπαλαι θεοῦ χάριτι τὴν εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον
 τοῦ μακαριωτάτου Λουκᾶ ἐρμηνείαν συμπεπληρώκαμεν, ἥσπερ }
 οὖν καὶ τὴν βίβλον, καθὰ προσέταξας διὰ τοῦ γράμματος,
 οὐθὲν ἐνδοιάσαντες ἀπεστάλκαμεν, ὃ θαυμασιώτατε καὶ πάντων
 ἐμοὶ προσφιλέστατε ἐπισκόπων Εὐσέβιε, τῷ μακαρίῳ Εὐσεβίῳ 5
 κατὰ τόνδε στρεφομένῳ τὸν βίον ἐπὶ τῆς συγγραφῆς ἐκείνης ἐκτί-
 σαντες τὸ χρέος, ὃς οὐ προσηγορίαν σοι μόνον ἔσχε τὴν αὐτὴν,
 ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀρετῆς ἐπιμέλειαν· καὶ μὴν καὶ διάδοχόν σε τῆς ἐκκλη-
 σιαστικῆς προεδρίας ἐδέξατο. γέγονε δὲ ὑμῖν ἴση καὶ ἡ περὶ τὰς
 θείας γραφὰς σπουδὴ, ὥστε καὶ [ἡ] περὶ τοὺς τοῦ μακαρίου 10
 Λουκᾶ πόρους, οὓς ἐπὶ τῆς πρὸς Θεόφιλον ἐπεδείξατο συγγραφῆς,
 τό τε εὐαγγέλιον καὶ τὰς τῶν ἀποστόλων πράξεις ἐπὶ προσώπου
 ἐκείνου συνθεῖς, παραπλησίαν ὑμῖν τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν γενέσθαι·
 ἐκείνός τε γὰρ τὴν εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἐρμηνείαν ᾗτησε παρ' ἡμῶν
 ὡς ἐξῆς γε <καὶ> περὶ τῶν ἀποστολικῶν πράξεων δεησόμενος 15
 ἡμῶν· αὐτός τε τῆς εὐαγγελικῆς ἐρμηνείας περὶ [τῆς] πλείστου
 θέμενος τὴν κτῆσιν ὡς ἂν λείπουσιν ἐπ' αὐτοῖς τῶν ἀποστολικῶν
 πράξεων τὴν ἐξήγησιν ᾗτησας παρ' ἐμοῦ γενέσθαι.

II. { τὴν μὲν οὖν συγγραφὴν ταύτην ὅτι γε ὁ μακάριος
 πεποιήται Λουκᾶς, οὐ χαλεπὸν συνιδεῖν τῷ γε μὴ παρέργως ταῖς 20
 θείαις ἐντυγχάνοντι βίβλοις. καλῶς δ' ἂν ἔχοι καὶ παρ' ἡμῶν
 τὸν τοῦ βιβλίου ἐκ<τε>θῆναι σκοπόν. τὰ μὲν γὰρ εὐαγγέλια
 ἀκριβῆ τῆς κατὰ Χριστὸν οἰκονομίας τε καὶ πολιτείας παρέχεται
 τὴν γνῶσιν ἡμῖν· τίνα μὲν τὸν τρόπον ἐτέχθη, τίνα δὲ<τὰ> περὶ
 τὴν γέννησιν αὐτοῦ γεγονότα, ὅπως τε ὑπὸ τῆς τοῦ νόμου πολιτείας 25
 ἄχρι τῆς τριακονταετοῦς ἡλικίας μετὰ πολλῆς διαγεγονῶς τῆς
 ἀκριβείας προσελήλυθε τῷ βαπτίσματι κατὰ πρωτοτύπῳσιν τῆς

I Π a rubricatore om. | 4 ἐνδοιάσαντες cod., cf. Ps. 140 (141): 4 S^t, Blass corrigendum in ἐνδοιάσαντες censuit. | 5 προσφιλέστατε: cod. πρ^φ, cave legendum putes προφ.—cod. εὐσέβιε, item εὐσεβείῳ | 6-7 ἐκτίσαντες cod. vid. | 9 προέδρι cod.—ἐδέξατο cod. ut vid.—ἡμῖν cod.—ἴση cod. | 10 σπουδῇ cod.—ἡ delendum. | 13 ἡμῖν cod. | 15 ἐξ ἧς cod.—καὶ addidi ex conj., vel pro γε substituendum videtur. | 16 τῆς delendum. | 17 κτίσιν cod. ut vid.—ἐπ' αὐτοῖς cod., Blass fortasse ἐπ' αὐτῇ legendum putat. | 19 ταύτην cod. | 20 χαλαῖ cod.—συνιδεῖν cod.—τῷ γέ cod. | 22 ἐκθῆναι cod., requiritur passivum. | 24 τὰ addidi ex conj. | 25 γεγονῶτα cod. | 26 διαγεγονῶς = διαγεγονῶς cod.

καινῆς ἀπαρχόμενος διαθήκης, ἧς ἔργον μὲν ἡ ἀνάστασις, τὸ χρι-
στιανικὸν δὲ βάπτισμα τύπος, ἅτε θανάτου καὶ ἀναστάσεως ἔχον
30 σύμβολα κατὰ τὴν τοῦ μακαρίου Παύλου φωνὴν [σοι] λέγουσαν·

<Ὅσοι> ἐβαπτίσθημεν εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ ἐβαπτίσθη-
μεν· συνετάφημεν οὖν αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος εἰς τὸν θάνατον, ἵνα ὥσπερ ἠγέρθη
Χριστὸς ἐκ νεκρῶν διὰ τῆς δόξης τοῦ πατρὸς, οὕτως καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς περι-
πατήσωμεν· εἰ γὰρ σύμφυτοι γεγόναμεν τῷ ὁμοιώματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ καὶ
35 τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἐσόμεθα.¹

οὐ γὰρ ἄδηλον ὅτι ἐν τῷ βαπτίσματι, ὅπερ ὁ δεσπότης ἐβαπ-
τίσθη Χριστὸς, τὸ ἡμέτερον ἀποτελεῖτο βάπτισμα, ὅπερ οὖν καὶ
βαπτίζειν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις τοὺς κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην προσέταξεν
ἀνθρώπους, ἀφ' οὗ δὴ καὶ αὐτὸς ἔξω τῆς κατὰ νόμον γεγινῶς
40 πολιτείας τὸν εὐαγγελικὸν ἐπεδείκνυτο βίον, μαθητὰς τε ἐκλεξά-
μενος οὓς πρόειπε ὡς διδασκαλίᾳ ταύτῃ καὶ νόμοις ἐκθέμε-
νος τοὺς τῷ τοιοῦτῳ μάλιστα ἀρμόττοντας βίῳ· οὕτως τε αὐτοὺς
διὰ θαυμάτων καὶ λόγων πράξεών τε ποικίλων δεκτικούς ἀπο-
τελέσας τῆς τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος χάριτος, ὅφ' ἧς δὴ μάλιστα
45 πᾶσάν τε σὺν ἀκριβείᾳ τὴν γνῶσιν ἐδέξαντο καὶ πρὸς τὴν τῆς
οἰκουμένης ἤρκεσαν διδασκαλίαν, ὥς αὐτὸς ὁ κύριος ἐν μὲν τοῖς
εὐαγγελίοις·

*Ἐτι (φησί) πολλὰ ἔχω εἰπεῖν, ἀλλ' οὐ δύνασθε βαστάζειν ἄρτι· ὅταν ἔλθῃ
ἐκεῖνος, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, ὁδηγήσει ὑμᾶς εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν,²

50 ἐν δὲ ταῖς πράξεσι τῶν ἀποστόλων·

*Ἀλλὰ λήψαθε δύναμιν ἐπελθόντος τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐφ' ὑμᾶς καὶ ἔσεσθέ μοι
μάρτυρες ἐν τε Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ Ἰουδαίᾳ καὶ Σαμαρείᾳ καὶ ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς.³

ἅπασιν δὲ τούτοις ὥσπερ τινὰ κορωνίδα τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐπιτέθει-
κεν μήνυμα οὖσαν τῆς κοινῆς ἀναστάσεως τῶν ἀνθρώπων, μάλιστα

30 σοι λέγουσαν· ἐβαπτίσθημεν cod., videtur ex archetypo fluxisse male correcto; pro λέγου-
σαν² in mg. ¹ἔσοι: ²λέγουσαν in mg. ³σοι; vel ὁ evanuit, itaque librarius σοι potius
anteponendum esse putavit. | 35 ἐσόμεθα cod. | 36 <ο>ὁ, o a rubricatore omissum
(seu evanuit?). | 37 οὖν, Cyrill δεῖα legisse sibi videbatur! | 40 μαθητὰς τ' ἐκλ., perperam
Cyrill. | 41 διδασκαλίᾳ cod. | 42 μάλιστα cod. | 43-44 ἀποτελεῖσθαι cod., correxi
secundum l. 37. | 46 διδασκαλίαν cod. | 48 εἰπεῖν lectio singularis pro ὑμῖν λέγειν vel
λέγειν ὑμῖν. | 51 λειψασθαι cod. (Cyrill perperam λήψασθαι) dubium est utrum legendum
sit λήψασθε an λήμψασθε c. codd. **Σ** B A C D E.—ἐσεσθαι cod. | 52 Ἱηρουσαλὴμ
cod.—fort. legendum Σαμαρίᾳ, cf. Εὐσέβειος, διδασκαλίᾳ, etc. | 53 ἐπιτέθηκεν cod.

δὲ τῆς καινῆς κτίσεως, καθ' ἣν ἅπαντα ἡ κτίσις σὺν τοῖς ἀνθρώ- 55
ποις ἀνακτίζεσθαι ἤμελλεν·

Εἰ τις ἐν Χριστῷ, καινὴ κτίσις. τὰ ἀρχαῖα παρήλθεν· ἰδοὺ γέγονε τὰ πάντα καινά.⁴
ἀλλὰ ταύτην μὲν ἐκ τῶν εὐαγγελίων μεμαθήκαμεν ἀκριβῶς, ὅτε
ἀναστὰς ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν ὁ δεσπότης Χριστὸς προσέταξε τοῖς ἑαυ-
τοῦ μαθηταῖς παραδοῦναι μὲν πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις τὴν ἐπ' αὐτὸν 60
πίστιν·

Μαθητεύσατε αὐτοὺς βαπτίζοντες εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ
ἁγίου πνεύματος.⁵

διδάξαι δὲ ὅπως ἂν ἅπαντα σὺν ἐπιμελείᾳ φυλάττοιεν ἃ προσέτα-
ξεν. ἐλείπετο δὲ μαθεῖν ἡμᾶς λοιπὸν, τίνα τὸν τρόπον ἀγαγεῖν 65
εἰς πέρας ταῦτα τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἐγένετο δυνατόν, ἐπεὶ καὶ ἄγαν
καινὸν ἦν καὶ παντελῶς ἄπιστον τὸ ἀλίεας ἀνθρώπους, ἐν ἀγρῷ
τεχθέντας, τῆς Σύρων γλώττης ἐπιστήμονας μόνης, παντελῶς
ιδιώτας, δώδεκα ὄντας τὸν ἀριθμόν, οὕτως ἀπιθάνου λόγου τὴν
οἰκουμένην πληρῶσαι, ὅτι ἄνθρωπος ἐν Ἰουδαίᾳ σταυρωθεὶς ἀπὸ 70
νεκρῶν ἀνέστη πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ἐγγνώμενος τὴν ἀνάστασιν.

III. 1. τούτου γε ἕνεκεν ὁ μακάριος Λουκᾶς τήνδε τὴν βίβλον
ἐπὶ τῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου γραφῇ συνέθηκεν ἡμῖν διδάσκων μὲν ὅπως
εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς ἀνελήλυθεν ὁ δεσπότης Χριστός,⁶ ὅπως τε κατε-
λήλυθεν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀποστόλους τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον,⁷ τίνα δὲ τὸν 75
τρόπον τῇ τούτου χάριτι δυνατόν ἐγένετο τὴν οἰκουμένην ἅπασαν
τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ διδασκαλίας πλήρῃ γενέσθαι ἡτινί τε τάξει μετὰ
πολλῆς τῆς σοφίας εἵργασται ταῦτα ὁ θεός,⁸ πρότερον μὲν Ἰου-
δαίους τῇ εὐσεβείᾳ προσαγαγόν, ὥς ἂν μὴ ἐναντία τις οὖσα καὶ
πολεμία τῇ διατάξει τοῦ νόμου ἦτοι τῷ ἐκθέντι τὸν νόμον θεῷ 80
ἢ κατὰ Χριστὸν ἐπιδημία τε φαίνοιτο καὶ πίστις,} μετ' ἐκείνου
δὲ ἀπορρήτοις οἰκονομίαις ἐπὶ τοὺς λοιποὺς ἀνθρώπους τῆς εὐσε-

56 ἔμελλεν Cyrill contra codicis lectionem. | 57 ἡ τις cod. ut vid., εἰ τις correxi
secundum textum sacrum. | 64 διδάξαι δὲ e conj. cf. μὲν, l. 60, cod. διδάξατε vel
potius διδάξατε, sicque Cyrill, ac si oratio recta pergeret.—προσέταξεν recte cod.,
Cyrill perperam προσέταξα corrigendum esse censuit. | 67 ἀλίεας cod. | 69 ἀπειθά-
νου cod. | 71 ἐγγνώμενος cod. | 75 τὸ πνεῦμα ἅγιον perperam Cyrill.—τίνα δὴ
perperam Cyrill. | 77 διδασκαλείας cod.—ἡ τίνη τε τεξεῖ cod. ut vid. ἡ τίνη τῇ
τάξει Cyrill, fortasse legendum ἡ τίνι τῇ τάξει, sed potius ut supra ἡτινί τε
τάξει. | 78 πρότερον cod. | 79 προσαγών Cyrill, cod. προσαγαγών. | 81 ἐκεῖνω cod.

⁴ 2 Cor. 5: 17.

⁵ Matt. 28: 19; cf. Matt. 28: 20.

⁶ Cf. Acts 1: 9.

⁷ Cf. Acts 2: 1 ff.; 2: 33.

⁸ Cf. Rom. 1: 16; Acts 13: 46.

βείας τὴν παιδευσιν ἐκβαλὼν πολλοῖς τισι καὶ ποικίλοις ἄγαν
 τοῖς τρόποις. καὶ πρῶτον μὲν τῷ διασπαρῆναι πολλοὺς τῶν
 85 εὐσεβῶν ἀπὸ τῶν περὶ τὸν Στέφανον γεγνονότων.⁹ ἀφ' οὗ δὴ
 Φίλιππος μὲν Σαμαρείταις τε παραδέδωκε τὴν εὐσέβειαν¹⁰ καὶ
 τὸν ἐξ Αἰθιοπίας εὐνοῦχον ἐδίδαξε ταύτην.¹¹ Κύπριοι δέ τινες καὶ
 Κυρηναῖοι μέχρι τῆς Ἀντιοχείας γεγόνασιν οὐκ Ἰουδαίους μόνον
 ἀλλὰ καὶ Ἑλληνας τὰ κατὰ Χριστὸν ἐκδιδάσκοντες.¹² ἃ δὴ μαθόν-
 90 τες οἱ κατὰ τὴν Ἰουδαίαν ἐξεπλάγησάν τε ἐπὶ τῷ γεγνονότι καὶ
 τὸν Βαρνάβαν ἀπέστειλαν,¹³ ὃς ἐβεβαίωσε μὲν τοῖς οἰκείοις λόγοις
 τὰ πρόσθεν, παραλαβὼν δὲ τὸν Παῦλον¹⁴ σύνεργον τοῦ λόγου
 πλείονι διδασκαλίᾳ σὺν ἐκείνῳ παρεσκεύασε ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀντιοχείας
 πρῶτον Χριστιανοὺς χρηματίζειν τοὺς μαθητὰς εἰς ἔνδειξιν τοῦ
 95 τότε νόμου καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἁπείπομένους πᾶσι τῷ Χριστῷ
 ἁποσανέχειν <βούλ>εσθαι μόνον. καὶ ἔσω δὲ τούτων τοὺς
 περὶ Κορνήλιον¹⁵ ἐξ ἐθνῶν διὰ τοῦ μακαρίου Πέτρου τῷ τῆς εὐσε-
 βείας λόγῳ προσήγαγεν ἡ θεία τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος χάρις δι'
 ἐναργῶν ἀποδείξεων καὶ φοβερῶν ἄγαν δῆλον ἅπασιν ἐργασαμένη
 100 τοῦτο δὴ περὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν τῷ θεῷ δεδόχθαι,¹⁶ ὥς μηδὲ τοῖς ἐρίξειν
 ἀπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων πρὸς ταῦτα ἐθέλουσιν ἀντιλογίας κατα-
 λειφθῆναι τόπον.¹⁷

2. πολλοῖς μὲν οὖν, ὡς ἔφην, τρόποις ἐχρήσατο ὁ θεὸς πρὸς
 τοῦτο, οὓς οὐχ ἅπαντας μὲν ἐν τοῖς νῦν καταλέγειν καιρὸς, ἐν δὲ
 105 τοῖς κατὰ μέρος εἰσόμεθα μᾶλλον. ἐσχάτῳ δὲ καὶ μεγίστῳ τῷ
 ἀπ' αὐτοῦ γε τοῦ νόμου τὸν θερμότατον μὲν αὐτοῦ συνήγορον,¹⁸
 πολεμιώτατον δὲ τῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ διδασκαλίᾳ, τὸν μακάριον λέγῳ
 Παῦλον, μετὰ πάσης ἐκσπάσαι τε τῆς βίας καὶ πρὸς τὴν οἰκείαν

83 ἐκβαλλὼν cod. (cf. μάλλιστα, l. 42) corrigendum secundum προσαγαγών. | 84 το cod., requiritur dativus; cf. τρόποις. | 86 fortasse legendum Σαμαρίταις.— παραδ|||κε cod. | 87 post ταύτην spatium, Κύπριοι a linea. | 88 κυριναῖοι cod.—γεγόνασι cod. 90 ιουδαίαν (?) cod.—γεγονῶτι cod. | 93 πλιονι cod.—παρεσκεύασε fortasse addendum ὥστε—'Αντιοχείας (?), cf. l. 52. | 94 χριστάνους cod.—χρηματῆσαι cod. | 95 τοῖς λοιποῖς ἀντειπομένοις πᾶσι cod.: αντ non certe legi posse affirmat Ropes, coniicio ἀπειπομένους legendum. | 96 πρὸς αν χει|||θαι cod., αν dubium; fortasse προσανέχειν <βούλ>εσθαι, vel -εσθαι lectio varia pro -ειν, cf. l. 119. | 98 προσηγαγον cod. vid. | 99 ἐναργῶς cod.(?) 100 τοῦτω cod.—δεδέχθαι cod. vid., corr. Blass, cf. l. 9.—μυδε cod.—ἐρίζη cod. | 104 καιροῖς cod.(?) | 105 ισομεθα cod.—το cod., τῷ requiritur, cf. l. 84. | 107 διδασκαλεῖα cod.

⁹ Cf. Acts 8: 1, 4.

¹⁰ Cf. Acts 8: 5 ff.

¹¹ Cf. Acts 8: 26 ff.

¹² Cf. Acts 11: 19 ff.

¹³ Cf. Acts 11: 22.

¹⁴ Cf. Acts 11: 25.

¹⁵ Cf. Acts 10: 1 ff.

¹⁶ Cf. Acts 10: 44 ff.

¹⁷ Cf. Acts 11: 2 ff.

¹⁸ Cf. Gal. 1: 13 f.; Phil. 3: 6.

ἐπίγνωσιν ἀγαγεῖν, ὡς θερμότατον μὲν κήρυκα τοῦ Χριστοῦ κατὰ
πάσης γενέσθαι τῆς οἰκουμένης, ὑπερβαλεῖν δὲ ἅπαντας τῇ περὶ 110
τούτου σπουδῇ, μετὰ πολλῆς τε τῆς προθυμίας ἐλέσθαι πᾶν ὅτι-
οὖν ποιῆσαι καὶ παθεῖν, ὡς ἅπαντας διδάξειν ἀνθρώπους ἀπάντων
δὴ ἀφεμένους τῶν λοιπῶν Χριστὸν ἡγήσασθαι σωτήρ᾽ αὐτῶν τε καὶ
πάντων αὐτοῖς αἴτιον τῶν ἀγαθῶν. τοιοῦτου γὰρ ἔδει¹⁹ διδασκά-
λου τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, ὃς ἐξ ἄσεβους καὶ παρανόμου γνώμης χάριτι 115
προδήλως σωθεὶς προθύμως ἤμελλε τοῖς ἔθνεσι χάριτι σωζομέ-
νοις²⁰ παραδιδόναι τὴν εὐσέβειαν.

3. πολλῶν μὲν οὖν καὶ μάλα γε ἀναγκαίων ὁ μακάριος
Λουκᾶς καθέκαστα διήγησιν καὶ ὠφέλιμον τοῖς εὐσεβεῖσι προσαν-
έχειν ἐσπουδακόσι διδασκαλίαν πεποιήται. ἐφ' ἅπασιν δὲ ἐκείνο 120
μάλιστα διὰ τῆς παρουσίας ἡμᾶς ἐδίδαξε γραφῆς, ὅπως ταῖς
ἀπορρήτοις οἰκονομίαις τε καὶ διατάξεσι τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος
συνέστη τὸ δὴ χρῆναι παρὰ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις τὴν κατὰ Χριστὸν
πολιτείαν τε καὶ ἀγωγὴν δί<χ>α τῆς νομικῆς παρατηρή-
σεως ἀπάσης κρατεῖν. τούτου δὲ τοῦ λόγου κατὰ τὴν γεγο- 125
νύϊαν αὐτῷ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος χάριν ὁ μακάριος προέστη
Παῦλος· ἐπειδὴ γὰρ διὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων Ἰουδαίους προσαχ-
θῆναι τῇ εὐσεβείᾳ γέγονεν εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς πρὸς τὸν νόμον
οἰκειότητος τῶν κατὰ Χριστόν, ὡς ἔφην, μένειν τε ἐκείνους ἐπὶ
τῆς νομικῆς ἀγωγῆς ἣν ἀνάγκη, ὡς ἂν μὴ μεταβαλόμενοι τοῦ 130
πρόσθεν λόγου τοὺς ἐξ Ἰουδαίων προσεληλυθότας ἀποστήσειαν
τῆς εὐσεβείας, ἀναγκαίως τὸν μακάριον ἐπὶ τούτῳ Παῦλον ἢ θεία
προεχειρίσατο χάρις, κεχωρισμένως δίχα τῆς νομικῆς παρατηρή-
σεως κηρύττοντα τοῖς ἔθνεσι τὴν εὐσέβειαν.²¹ ὃ δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἀπο-
στόλους σὺν τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Ἰουδαίαν ἅπασιν μετὰ τῆς προσηκούσης 135
τάξεως συμψήφους γενέσθαι παρεσκεύασε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον.²²
καὶ γὰρ ἐποίει πρὸς ταύτην μάλιστα τὴν διδασκαλίαν αὐτὸν
ἀξιόπιστον τὸ διώκτην ὄντα πρότερον καὶ φονῶντα κατὰ τῶν

109 θερμότατον cod. | 112 διδάξην ανους· cod.—ἀπάντων e conj., cod. ἀπὸ τῶν.
114 τοιοντον cod. vid. | 119 καθεκά cod.—ωφελημων cod. | 120 ἐσπουδακῶσι cod.—
διδασκαλείαν cod.—ἐφ' ἅπασιν cod. in abbrev.—ἐκείνω cod. | 123 παρὰ πᾶσιν cod.
in abbrev. | 124 δια cod., δίχα conj., cf. ll. 133, 154. | 125 τούτου conj., cod.
ουτον. | 131 προσεληλυθότας cod. vid. | 133 προεχειρησατο cod.—κεχωρισαμενος cod.
134 φ δὲ conj.; αἰδη cod. ut vid. | 137 διδασκαλείαν cod. | 138 πρότερον cod.

¹⁹ Cf. Heb. 7: 26.

²⁰ Cf. Ephes. 2: 5.

²¹ Cf. Acts 15: 6 ff.

²² Cf. Acts 15: 28 f.; Gal. 2: 10.

- Χριστοῦ μαθητῶν ἐπὶ τὴν εὐσέβειαν μεταστῆναι, οὐκ ἂν γε
 140 αὐτοῦ <τοῦ> τοσαῦτα ὑπὲρ τοῦ νόμου πρότερον κατὰ τῆς
 εὐσεβείας τετολμηκότος νῦν ταῦτα ἀντ' ἐκείνων ἐλομένου διδάξαι
 <τε καὶ> χωρίσαι παντελῶς τῆς τοῦ νόμου πολιτείας τὴν
 Χριστοῦ μαθητείαν, εἰ μὴ ὑπ' αὐτῆς βιασθεῖς τῆς ἀληθείας
 ἀπέστη μὲν τῶν προτέρων, ἐπὶ ταύτην δὲ μετέστη. διὰ τοῦτο
 145 καὶ ὁ Λουκᾶς πρότερον μὲν αὐτοῦ τὴν κατὰ τῆς εὐσεβείας ὑπὲρ
 τοῦ νόμου γνώμην ἐκτίθεται· μετ' ἐκείνο δὲ τὴν κλήσιν τὰ τε
 ὑπὲρ τῆς εὐσεβείας παρ' αὐτοῦ γεγονότα λέγει καθεξῆς, τίνα τε
 τὸν τρόπον τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἄχρι τῆς Ῥώμης γεγονὼς παρέδωκε τὴν
 εὐσέβειαν.
- 150 IV. οὐ μικρὸν μέντοι τοῦ βιβλίου μέρος εἰς τὴν περὶ τού-
 των ἀναλώσας διήγησιν, οὕτω δὲ τὴν ὅλην συμπεράνας γραφὴν,
 ὥς ἂν ἔχοιμεν ἐξ αὐτῆς εἶδέναι, ὅπως μὲν ἀπὸ Ἰουδαίων ὁ τῆς
 εὐσεβείας ἤρξατο λόγος, ὅπως δὲ ἐπὶ τὰ ἔθνη μετελήλυθεν ἐξ
 155 ἐκείνων δίχα τῆς τοῦ νόμου τηρήσεως ὑποδεξάμενα τὴν εὐσε-
 βειαν, κατὰ δὴ τοῦτον τὸν σκοπὸν τὴν παροῦσαν ἡμῖν ἐκτίθεται
 βίβλον, ἥνπερ οὖν ἐρμηνεύσαι προθέμενοι νῦν πειρασόμεθα, ὥς
 ἂν ἡ θεία χάρις διδῶ, οὐ τῆς σαφηνείας μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς συν-
 τομίας τὴν ἐνδεχομένην ποιήσασθαι φροντίδα, τούτου γε ἔνεκεν
 πάντα μὲν διεξιόντες, ὥς ἂν μὴ τὸ τῆς ἐρμηνευομένης βίβλου
 160 διατέμοιμεν σῶμα, οὐχ ἀπάσας δὲ ἐκτιθέντες τὰς λέξεις, εἴτα τὴν
 καθ' ἑκαστον ἐπάγοντες ἐρμηνείαν, ὥστε μὴ πρὸς μῆκος ἐκτείνειν
 τὴν συγγραφὴν, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλαχοῦ μὲν τῶν ἀποστολικῶν
 μνησθέντες διαλέξεων, ἃς εἴτε πρὸς τοὺς ἐναντίους εἴτε πού καὶ
 πρὸς τοὺς οἰκείους πεποίηται, } πολλαχοῦ δὲ καὶ τῶν διηγή-
 165 σεων, [καὶ] τὸν τῶν λέξεων νοῦν ἐκτιθέντες μόνον, ὥς ἅμα τῇ
 σαφηνείᾳ καὶ τὸ σύντομον προσεῖναι δύναίτο τῇ γραφῇ.
 ὁ μὲντοι γε μακάριος Λουκᾶς ἀρχὴν τῆς βίβλου τῶν ἀπο-
 στολικῶν πράξεων πεποίηται ταύτην. }

(⁷⁵πρῶ). — φωνων τα cod., leg. φωνῶντα a φονάω “be of a murderous disposition.”
 140 τοῦ om. cod., add. Blass.—πρωτερον cod. | 141 ἐλωμῶ⁷⁵ cod. = ἐλωμένου. | 142 τε
 καὶ mitti potest; Blass χωρίσαι τε. | 144 πρῶ⁷⁵ cod. | 145 πρωτερον cod. | 146 ἐκείνων
 cod. | 147 γεγονῶτα cod. | 156 βιβλιον cod. (?) item 159 βιβλίον. | 157 σαφηνείας
 cod. | 160 διατέμοιμεν vid.; Ropes legit δια τέ μοι μελλ. | 161 ἐκτῆναι cod. | 163 διατάξεων
 cod., non quadrat ad πρὸς τοὺς ἐναντίους.—εἴτεπου cod. | 164 πεποίηντε cod. | 165 καὶ
 del. censuit Blass. | 166 προσῆναι cod.

I. Long ago, indeed very long ago, by the grace of God we finished the commentary upon the gospel of the most blessed Luke, and accordingly without delay sent to thee the book as thou didst request by letter, O most admirable Eusebius, of all bishops most dear to me, by that writing discharging my obligation to the blessed Eusebius who was at that time living, and who not only bore the same name as thou but had also the same zeal for virtue; and indeed he was also succeeded by thee in his ecclesiastical dignity. And you both have had like zeal for the sacred Scriptures, so that you manifested like desire for the labors of the blessed Luke which he expended in the writing addressed to Theophilus, dedicating to him both the gospel and the Acts of the Apostles. For he requested from us the commentary upon the gospel, intending, no doubt, later to ask also from us one upon the Acts of the Apostles; but thou prizing very highly the possession of the interpretation of the gospel, didst desire that the exposition of the Acts of the Apostles, still lacking, be undertaken by me.

II. Now that the blessed Luke composed this writing, it is not difficult for him who does not merely superficially glance over the sacred books to see; but it would be well that the scope of the book be set forth by us also; for the gospels afford us accurate knowledge of the economy (of salvation) and the (ideal of) conduct which are according to Christ; in what manner he was begotten, what were the circumstances which attended his birth, how submitting with great fidelity to the conduct prescribed by the law until he was thirty years of age, he came to his baptism, initiating the new covenant in prototype, the reality of which is the resurrection but the type of which is Christian baptism, as this symbolizes both death and resurrection according to the saying of the blessed Paul which saith, "As many of us as were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death; we were buried therefore with him through baptism into death, in order that as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life. For if we have become united with him by the likeness of his death we shall be also by that of his resurrection." For it is manifest that in the baptism with which the Lord Christ was baptized our baptism was accomplished; with which therefore he commanded the apostles also to baptize men throughout the world, since indeed he himself having withdrawn from the conduct that is according to the law set forth the gospel way of life, having chosen disciples whom he thought adapted to his teaching, and having set forth the laws which were especially adapted to such way of life, and thus having by wonders and various words and deeds rendered them fully receptive of the grace of the Holy Spirit, by which grace now especially they received all knowledge with accuracy and were made competent for the instruction of the whole world, as the Lord himself saith in the gospels, "Yet many things I have to say but ye cannot bear (them) now; when he, the Spirit of truth shall come he will lead you into all truth," and in the Acts of the Apostles, "But ye shall receive power when the Holy Spirit is come upon

you, and ye shall be my witnesses both in Jerusalem and Judea and Samaria and unto the ends of the earth." And to all these things as a crowning conclusion he added the resurrection, which is a token of the general resurrection of men, but above all of the new creation in which all creation is to be recreated with men—"If any man is in Christ he is a new creature. The old things have passed away, behold all things have become new." But this (*i. e.*, the resurrection, or perhaps the new creation) we learn perfectly from the gospels when the Lord Christ rising from the dead commanded his own disciples to transmit to all men the faith in him—"Make them disciples, baptizing into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit"—and to teach them that they should observe with carefulness all things which he has commanded. But it remained for us to learn in what manner it was possible for the disciples to bring these things to accomplishment, since it was a wholly new thing and altogether incredible that fishermen, born in the country, acquainted only with the language of the Syrians, altogether uneducated, twelve in number, should fill the world with a story so incredible that a man crucified in Judea rose from the dead, giving to all men assurance of the resurrection.

III. (1) On this account the blessed Luke, in addition to the writing of the gospel, composed this book for us, teaching how the Lord Christ has ascended into the heavens and how the Holy Spirit has come down upon his apostles, and in what way by his grace it became possible that the whole world should be filled with the teaching of Christ, and in what order God has wrought these things with much wisdom, having formerly brought Jews to piety (*i. e.*, Christianity) in order that it might be evident that the way of life and the faith which are according to Christ are not opposed or hostile to the ordinance of the law or rather to the God who put forth the law; and having after this with mysterious dispensations sent forth upon the rest of men the instruction in piety in many and very various ways; and first by the scattering of many of the pious in consequence of the things that happened in respect to Stephen; as a result of which then Philip brought piety (Christianity) to the Samaritans and taught it also to the eunuch from Ethiopia; and certain Cyprians and Cyrenians came as far as to Antioch teaching the things of Christ not to Jews only but also to Greeks; and when they that were in Judea learned these things they were astonished at that which had taken place, and sent Barnabas, who by his own words confirmed what had previously been taught them, and taking along Paul as a fellow-helper of the word, by his assistance brought it about by further teaching that at Antioch the disciples were first called Christians, for the manifestation of the law then in force, and that they renouncing all others chose to cleave to Christ only. And in the midst of these things the divine grace of the Holy Spirit brought Cornelius and those with him from the Gentiles, through the blessed Peter, to the doctrine of piety (Christianity), by clear and very fearful manifestations, making it plain to all that this even had been decreed by God concerning the

Gentiles in order that no place for gainsaying might be left for those who from among the Jewish Christians wished to strive against these things.

(2) Many ways, therefore, as I said, God used to this end, not all of which there is now time to enumerate, but we shall learn about them when we come to details: as last and greatest, however, this, that with all force he drew from the law itself its most zealous advocate and the one most hostile to the teaching of Christ — I mean the blessed Paul — and led him to the knowledge of himself so that he became the most zealous herald of Christ throughout the whole world, and exceeded all in his zeal for him, and with great eagerness chose to do and suffer anything whatever so that he might teach all men that, relinquishing all others, they should regard Christ both as Savior and as the author for them of all things which are good; for the Gentiles had need of such a teacher, who being plainly rescued by grace from an opinion godless and contrary to law, was then ready to transmit piety (Christianity) to the Gentiles that were to be saved by grace.

(3) Therefore the blessed Luke has composed a detailed narrative of many things very necessary to know and a teaching useful to those who are zealous to devote themselves to piety; but above all things through his present writing he taught us this especially, how by the mysterious dispensations and ordinances of the Holy Spirit it came to be necessary that among all men the Christian conduct and way of life should prevail apart from all legal observance. Now this doctrine the blessed Paul represented according to the grace of the Holy Spirit which was given to him; for since through the apostles Jews were brought to piety (Christianity) for the demonstration of the relation of Christians to the law, as I said, and it was necessary for them to continue in the legal way of life lest abandoning the former teaching they should lead those who were proselytes from among the Jews away from piety (Christianity), the divine grace was constrained to appoint the blessed Paul to this work, that wholly apart from legal observance he should preach piety (Christianity) to the Gentiles; and the Holy Spirit caused that the apostles also, together with all those (Christians) who were in Judea should with befitting readiness (or perhaps: obligation = the contribution for the poor of Jerusalem) agree with him. For precisely this made him in his task of teaching most worthy of credence, that having been formerly a persecutor and having spoken against the disciples of Christ, he had turned to piety (Christianity), who indeed having ventured so much formerly on behalf of the law against piety (Christianity), would not have chosen now to teach these things instead of those, viz., to separate Christian discipleship wholly from the legal conduct, if he had not been compelled by the truth itself and so abandoned the former things and went over to this doctrine. Therefore also Luke set forth first his (former) opinion which was against Christianity and in favor of the law, and after this he relates in order his calling and the things which were done by him on behalf of piety (Christianity), and how, having gone even to Rome, he delivered piety (Christianity) to the Gentiles.

IV. But having used no small part of the book for the narrative concerning these things and having thus composed the whole writing in order that we might be able to learn from it how the preaching of piety (Christianity) began among the Jews, and how from them it passed over to the Gentiles, they having without the observance of the law received piety (Christianity)—with this purpose, then, he put forth the book before us; which purposing to interpret we shall now try as the grace of God shall grant us, to give the necessary attention not only to clearness but also to brevity. On this account we shall on the one side investigate everything, in order not to mutilate the body of the book which is to be explained, and on the other hand shall not copy out all the sentences adding thereto the detailed interpretation, lest we unduly extend the writing; but recalling in many places also the explanations of the apostolic men which they have made, whether to their opponents or else also to their own people, and in many places also the narratives (we will be satisfied) to give only the meaning of the sentences, so that together with clearness there may also be brevity in the writing.

Now the blessed Luke makes the beginning of the book of the Acts of the Apostles as follows:

This introduction to the Acts of the Apostles, as can be readily seen, consists of four main parts:

1. The introduction and dedication.
2. The recapitulation of the gospels.
3. The statement of contents of the Acts of the Apostles.
 - (a) The mission of the first disciples.
 - (b) Paul.
 - (c) The gospel among the Jews and the Gentiles.
4. The principles of the ensuing interpretation.

This last part, especially the closing sentence, shows clearly that we have here not an independent prologue, but merely the introduction to a commentary, which unfortunately does not seem to be preserved in the manuscript. The plan of this commentary seems to have been this: a continuous explanation of a certain portion of the text was given; the text itself was not always quoted explicitly and in full and then commented upon, but was often merely incorporated in the form of a paraphrase into the exposition. This seems to be the meaning of the somewhat difficult closing paragraph, the only one that (as Professor Blass remarks) is not well and clearly written. The real explanation of the difficulty, however, may be that we are not sufficiently acquainted with the terminology of the school and period to which he belonged. Our author explicitly states that he follows

the hermeneutical method which, in distinction from that of the glossarists and catenists, laid most emphasis upon the understanding and exposition of the connection of thought; perspicuity and brevity are the objects that he rightly sought for. Quite in harmony with the method of ancient exegesis, he also, as it seems, sharply distinguishes the speeches from the narrative portions;¹⁰ one need but recall the statement of contents of the gospel of Mark by Papias, "Christ's sayings and deeds."¹¹ Our author is by no means a novice in the art of exegesis, for he informs us that he has already written a commentary on the gospel of Luke on the same principles, and we can discern from his whole method of handling his subject the trained master of interpretation, who wrote with rare mastery of his language.

From the point of view of linguistics we may mention especially the wealth of particles,¹² so characteristic of classic Greek literature, and so unusual in the later period; and the structure of sentences, often quite complex, but always thoroughly finished. There is scarcely a μέν in this prologue without a corresponding δέ, though the latter is sometimes separated from the former by many lines. Triple periods, in which, however, two parts usually appear in close connection, are a

¹⁰ τῶν ἀποστολικῶν διαλέξεων (instead of which the codex, to be sure, uses the more common διατάξεων, which, however, in connection with πρὸς τοὺς ἐναντίους is meaningless)—τῶν διηγήσεων, ll. 163 f.

¹¹ EUSEBIUS, *h. e.* III, 39, 15: τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα.

¹² The following table illustrates this clearly and may at the same time serve as a proof for the subsequent statements:

τε καὶ with noun, ll. 12, 23, 81, 122, 124.—τε καὶ with predicate, ll. 45, 86, 90, 108.—τε τε, ll. 14/16, 146/147.—τε καὶ τε, ll. 40-44 with participle.—. . . . καὶ τε, ll. 42/43 with noun.

μέν δέ, ll. 28/29, 58/65, 78/82 (πρότερον μέν μετ' ἐκείνο δέ), 84/96 (καὶ πρῶτον μέν καὶ ἔσω δὲ τούτων), 86/87, 91/92, 104, 106/107, 144, 145/146, 152/153, 162/164.—[μέν τε, ?] ll. 60/64.—μέν δέ τε, ll. 24 f., 109-111.—μέν τε δέ, ll. 73-75.

εἴτε εἴτε πον καὶ, l. 163.—[ἢ (= or rather), l. 77], ἥτοι, l. 80.

καὶ μὴν καὶ, l. 8.—μέντοι, l. 150; μέντοι γε, l. 167.—γε, ll. 15, 19, 20, 72, 106, 139, 158.—καὶ μάλα γε, l. 118.

δὴ, ll. 39, 44, 85, 100, 113, 123, 125, 155.—ὅπερ οὖν, l. 37; cf. ll. 2/3, 156.—μέν οὖν, ll. 19 (δ', 21), 103 (δέ, 105), 118 (δέ, 120).—μέν γάρ, l. 22.

ἄν with optative, l. 21.—ὥς ἄν with participle, l. 17; cf. οὐκ ἄν, l. 139; with (final) optative, ll. 79, 130, 152; (condit.) ll. 156/157.—ὅπως ἄν, l. 64; ὅπως (= how), ll. 73, 74, 121.

ἄγαν, ll. 66, 83, 99; παντελῶς, ll. 67, 68.

τὸ with infinitive, ll. 67, 123, 138; τῷ with infinitive, ll. 84, 105/106.

τίνα τὸν τρόπον, ll. 24, 65, 75/76, 147/148; cf. ll. 83/84, 103.—[τίνι τῇ τάξει, l. 77.]

peculiarity of our author's style. The wealth of linguistic resource¹³ is all the more remarkable because the whole piece is scarcely longer than Paul's first letter to the Thessalonians, which, according to the ancients, was about 200 στίχοι.¹⁴ Only in a few exceptional passages is this periodic structure, with its numerous participial constructions and intercalated phrases, replaced by a more concise style, and in just these passages, *e. g.*, the description of the apostolic preaching (at the end of chap. 2), does the author's consummate rhetorical power appear.

The exegetical skill of our author, shown most brilliantly in the whole conception of the problem of the Acts of the Apostles, appears likewise in some measure in the terminology of which we give examples.¹⁵

All this points to one of the great Greek commentators, and it is difficult to suppose that such a man should be unknown to us. The neglect of the rubricator, who failed to write the superscription with his minium, or, perhaps owing to the neglect of a predecessor, knew not what he should add here, has deprived us of the name of our commentator. It is highly improbable that this was done intention-

¹³Here belong also the numerous synonyms, *e. g.*, καινός (= unheard of) — ἀπιστος, l. 67 — ἀπίθανος, l. 69; ἐνάντιος — πολέμιος, ll. 79/80; πολλοί τινες καὶ ποικίλοι, l. 83. — Furthermore, the interchange of genitive and adjective, and prepositional attributes, *as, e. g.*, ἡ τοῦ νόμου πολιτεία, ll. 25, 142; ἡ νομικὴ ἀγωγή, l. 130; ἡ κατὰ νόμον πολιτεία, ll. 39/40.

¹⁴στίχοι ργγ (= 193) is the number usually given; *cf.* ZAHN, *Geschichte des new-testamentl. Kanons*, II, pp. 394 ff.

¹⁵The sacred scriptures commented upon are called: αἱ θέλαι γραφαί, l. 10; αἱ θέλαι βιβλοι, l. 21; — τὰ εὐαγγέλια, ll. 22, 46/47, 58; τὸ εὐαγγέλιον (= gospel of Luke), ll. 12, 14; ἡ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου γραφή, l. 73; — αἱ πράξεις τῶν ἀποστόλων, l. 50; αἱ τ. ἀπ. πράξεις, l. 12; αἱ ἀποστολικαὶ πράξεις, ll. 15, 17/18; ἡ βίβλος τῶν ἀποστολικῶν πράξεων, ll. 167/168; — ἡ παρούσα γραφή, l. 121; ἡ παρούσα βίβλος, ll. 155/156; ἡ ἐρμηνευομένη βίβλος, l. 159; ἡ ὅλη γραφή, l. 151; τὸ βιβλίον, ll. 22, 150; ἡ πρὸς Θεόφιλον συγγραφή (= Evang. + Act.), l. 11; ἡ συγγραφὴ αὕτη, l. 19. — συγγραφὴν ποιῆσθαι, ll. 19/20; ἐπὶ τῆς συγγραφῆς πόνους ἐπιδείκνυσθαι, l. 11. — ἐκτίθεσθαι βιβλίον (to edit), ll. 155/156; ἐκτίθεσθαι τι (= present, exhibit), l. 146; συντιθέναι βιβλίον ἐπὶ τινι, ll. 72/73 (*i. e.*, to write a book in addition to another). — συντιθέναι writings ἐπὶ προσώπου τινός, ll. 12/13, a unique expression = to somebody: dedicated to him; *cf.* Latin: ad personam alicuius, *e. g.*, Gennadius, chap. 47.

The author is called: ὁ μακάριος Λουκάς, ll. 10/11, 72, 118/119, 167; ὁ μακαριώτατος Λουκάς, l. 2; *cf.* ὁ μακάριος Πέτρος, l. 97; ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος, ll. 30, 107/108, 126/127, 132; ὁ μακάριος Εὐσέβιος (a deceased bishop), l. 5; ὦ θαυμασιώτατε καὶ πάντων ἐμοὶ προσφιλέστατε ἐπισκόπων Εὐσέβιε, ll. 4/5 (addressing a living man).

Our author calls his own work: ἡ βίβλος (*i. e.*, a copy of the gospel-commentary),

ally, as, for example, because the name was obnoxious as that of a heretic; for beside the superscription there are lacking also the large initial letters, which surely were dogmatically unobjectionable, and likewise the superscription to the preceding prologue. We are thus compelled to recover the name—at least hypothetically—by the help of conjecture. In doing this three points have to be considered:

I. The author's own historical statements in the dedication.

II. The statements preserved to us concerning Greek commentaries on these writings.

III. The character of the exegesis and of the whole, theological conception of the author, recognizable even in this preface.

I.

The commentary on the Acts of the Apostles is dedicated to a bishop Eusebius, whom our author describes as one very dear to him, and devoted to the study of the Sacred Scriptures. It is a more important fact for us that he calls him the successor to another bishop Eusebius, whom—as our author says—he resembled not only in name, but also in the striving after Christian virtues and the zeal for the Sacred Scriptures. This predecessor induced him to write his commentary on the gospel of Luke, while the successor requested him to continue it in the case of the Acts of the Apostles. Unfortunately the author does not say in what episcopal see we have to look for the two men. We should suppose it an easy matter to find two men named Eusebius who had occupied the same episcopal cathedra in immediate succession, but our knowledge of the history of the Greek church during the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries is so meager that we cannot on this basis determine anything with any degree of certainty. Aside

l. 3; ἡ γραφή, l. 166 (but γράμμα, l. 3 = letter); συγγραφή, l. 6 (commentary on the gospel); πρὸς μῆκος ἐκτείνει τὴν συγγραφὴν, ll. 161/162; ἡ εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἐρμηνεία, ll. 2, 14; ἡ εὐαγγελικὴ ἐρμηνεία, l. 16; ἡ ἐξηγήσεις τῶν ἀποστολικῶν πράξεων, ll. 17/18; ἐρμηνεύειν βιβλίον, l. 156; ἐρμηνείαν συμπληροῦν, l. 2.

τὰ νῦν (= prologue), l. 104; opposed to τὰ κατὰ μέρος, i. e., the running commentary (*Eisangelexegeese*), ll. 104/105; ἡ καθ' ἕκαστον ἐρμηνεία, l. 161.

τὰς λέξεις ἐκτιθέναι (= interpret), l. 160; τὸν τῶν λέξεων νοῦν ἐκτιθέναι, l. 165. τὸ σῶμα τῆς βίβλου διατέμνεται (= to destroy the connection), ll. 159/160.

σαφήνεια, ll. 157, 166; συντομία, ll. 157/158; τὸ σύντομον, l. 166.—σκοπὸς τοῦ βιβλίου (= argumentum, i. e., contents, with the doctrines contained therein), ll. 22, 155; σκοπὸν ἐκτιθέναι, l. 22.—κορωνίς (= main point): ὥσπερ τινὰ κορωνίδα ἐπιτιθέναι, l. 53.

τύπος, l. 29, opp. ἔργον, l. 28 (reality); κατὰ πρωτοτύπων, l. 27; σύμβολον, l. 30; μῆνυμα, l. 54.

from the great patriarchal sees there are but few instances in which we know the exact *διαδοχή* of a bishopric. The names of most bishops are known to us only in connection with some church council, and this knowledge does not extend beyond a certain year.

We know somewhat more only of the following seven Eusebii :

1. Eusebius of Rome, A. D. 309–310 (1).¹⁶
2. Eusebius of Cæsarea, *ca.* 313–339 (23 ; G. 452 *c*).
3. Eusebius of Nicomedia, 325–342 (60 ; G. 442 *c*).
4. Eusebius of Emesa, Phœnicia Secunda, 341–359 (35 ; G. 435 *a*).
5. Eusebius I of Samosata, 361–379 (77 ; G. 436 *c*).
6. Eusebius of Dorylæum, *ca.* 448–451 (34 ; G. 446 *c*).
7. Eusebius II of Samosata, 480–490 (78 ; G. 436 *c*).

As attending synods are mentioned also :

A. D. 325, *The Council of Nicæa.*

8. Eusebius of Miletus (57 ; G. 448 *a* ; M. II, 695 *d*).
9. Eusebius of Antioch, by the Mæander in the province of Caria (11 ; G. 447 *c*, M. II, 695 *d*).
10. Eusebius *παροικίας Ἰσαυροπόλεως* (Pitra, *anal. sacr.*, IV, 461 *n.* 191).

A. D. 341, *The Council of Antioch.*

11. Eusebius of Gadara (41 ; G. 453 *a* ; M. II, 1307 *a*).

(As well as Nos. 3 and 4 of this list.)

A. D. 343, *Synod of Sardica.*

12. Eusebius, bishop in Palestine (67 ; Athan. I, 169 *d* ; M. III, 69 *a*).

A. D. 343, *Conciliabulum of Philippopolis.*

13. Eusebius of Dorla (= Dorylæum ? , Eufenius ab Dorlani : M. III, 138 *d*).

¹⁶ The numerals 1, 23, etc., refer to the list in SMITH AND WACE, *Dictionary of Christian Biography* (Vol. II, pp. 303–75, London, 1880), where ninety-four bishops by the name of Eusebius are given. This number, it is true, could easily be reduced for our purpose, inasmuch as all the western bishops and those previous to A. D. 300 and later than A. D. 600 do not come into consideration. There are also in these lists, aside from minor incorrect statements, some mistakes, as, for instance, 1) the mention of a Eusebius, *sedis incerti* (2) at the synod of Sardica, 347 (to be corrected to 343 A. D.). Athan. I 133 = M P G 25, 337 means, no doubt, Eusebius of Nicomedia. 2) The Eusebius of Gabala (40 ; G 124 *a*) mentioned by SMITH AND WACE as attending the council of Constantinople, 381, is fictitious ; M III, 568 *d*, mentions Domnus Gaba-lensis as immediate successor to Eusebius Chalcedensis. G. indicates the columns in GAMS, *Series Episcoporum* ; M. = MANSI, *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova collectio* ; this last-mentioned work is the main source for our knowledge of the names of these bishops.

14. Eusebius of Magnesia, on the Mæander in the province of Asia, (53; G. 444 *a*; M. III, 139 *b*).

15. Eusebius of Pergamos (72; G. 444 *b*; M. III, 139 *a, c*).

A. D. 359, *The Synod of Seleucia*.

16. Eusebius of Sebaste (Samaria) (79; G. 453 *b*; M. III, 324 *a*).

17. Eusebius of Seleucia Pieria (80; G. 433 *c*; M. III, 321 *b*).

18. Eusebius, *sedis incerti*, deposed (3; Socr. *h. e.* II, 40; Athan. I, 726 *c*).

A. D. 381, *The Council of Constantinople*.

19. Eusebius of Epiphania in Syria Secunda (36; G. 436 *b*; M. III, 568 *d*).

20. Eusebius of Olba in Isauria (63; G. 438 *b*; M. III, 570 *a*).

21. Eusebius of Chalcis in Cœle-Syria, ordained by Eusebius of Samosata, A. D. 378 (26; G. 433 *c*; M. III, 568 *d*).

A. D. 431, *The Council of Ephesus*.

22. Eusebius of Aspona (18; G. 441 *b*; M. IV, 1128 *a*, 1217 *b*).

23. Eusebius of Clazomenæ (28; G. 444 *c*; M. IV, 1216 *e*; also A. D. 449: VI, 873 *c*; also A. D. 451: M. VI, 573 *b*, 945 *d*, 1085 *c*).

24. Eusebius of Heraclea Pontica (43; G. 442 *c*; M. IV, 1128 *a*, 1213 *c*; also A. D. 449: VI, 874 *a*).

25. Eusebius of Magnesia pr. Sipylum (54; G. 444 *c*; M. IV, 1216 *e*; also A. D. 449: VI, 873 *c*).

26. Eusebius of Nilopolis (61; G. 461 *c*; M. IV, 1128 *c*, 1220 *d*; also A. D. 449: VI, 874 *c* [Iuliopolis]).

27. Eusebius of Pelusium (71; G. 460 *c*; M. IV, 1128 *a*, 1220 *b*; also A. D. 449: VI, 874 *a*).

A. D. 449, *Latrocinium of Ephesus*.

In addition to Nos. 6, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, also:

28. Eusebius of Doberus (Topiritanus) in Macedonia (33; G. 429 *b*; M. VI, 847 *a*, 930 *b*; also A. D. 451: M. VI, 577 *d*, 952 *a*, VII, 161 *b*).

29. Eusebius of Ancyra (8; G. 441 *b*; M. VI, 836 *c*; also A. D. 451: M. VI, 565 *c*, 861 *c*).

A. D. 451, *The Council of Chalcedon*.

In addition to Nos. 23, 28, 29, also:

30. Eusebius of Apollonia in New Epirus (12; G. 404 *a*; M. VI, 577 *c*, 949 *e*, VII, 161 *a*).

31. Eusebius of Jabruda in Phœnicia Secunda (45; G. 435 *a*; M. VII, 169 *a*).

32. Eusebius of Maronopolis in Mesopotamia (55; G. ?; M. VII, 165 *d*).

33. Eusebius of Seleuco-Belus in Syria Secunda (81; G. 436 *b*; M. VI, 569 *b*, 944 *b*).

34. Eusebius of Cottina in Pamphylia (M. VII, 406 *b*).

A. D. 458. Signers of the Synodical Epistles to Emperor Leo, referring to the murder of Proterius at Alexandria.

35. Eusebius of Abida in Phœnicia Secunda (6; G. 435 *a*; M. VII, 559 *a*).

36. Eusebius of Arethusa in Syria Secunda (14; G. 436 *b*; M. VII, 551 *c*).

In addition to these we find mention of:

37. A. D. 257-270, Eusebius of Laodicea in Syria Prima (48; G. 434 *c*).

38. A. D. 362-370, Eusebius of Cæsarea in Cappadocia (24; G. 440 *a*).

39. A. D. *ca.* 400, Eusebius, bishop in Palestine (68; see *Epist. Synod. Theophili Alexandrini*. Hieron., *ep.* 92).

40. A. D. 400, Eusebius of Valentinianopolis, in Proconsular Asia (90; G. 444 *a*; see Palladius, *Dial.*, pp. 126-40).

41. A. D. 406, Eusebius, bishop in Macedonia (51; Chrysost., *ep.* 163, Innocentius I, *ep.* 17).

42. A. D. 420, Eusebius, bishop in Armenia (15; *cf.* Theodoret *epistula*, 78).

A few others, that, however, scarcely come into account, are:

43. A. D. 518, Eusebius of Larissa in Syria Secunda (49; G. 436 *b*; M. VIII, 1098 *a*).

44. A. D. 536, Eusebius of Cyzicus (32; G. 445 *a*; M. VIII, 1143 *a*).

45. A. D. 536, Eusebius of Palæopolis in Asia (66; G. ?; M. VIII, 1146 *e*).

46. A. D. 553, Eusebius of Tyre (89; G. 434 *a*; M. IX, 173 *d*).

From this list of forty-six names we can only throw out four, inasmuch as we know that their predecessors as well as their successors have different names. These are: Eusebius of Rome (1); of Cæsarea (2);¹⁷ of Cæsarea in Cappadocia (38); and of Emesa (4). Among the rest we find the name Eusebius repeated for the same see in only one instance; two Eusebii held the bishopric of Samosata (5 and 7), but they were separated by a hundred years. Besides this Eusebius I of Samosata (5) ordained illegally the bishop Eusebius of Chalcis (21, see Theodoret, *hist. eccles.*, V, 4, ed. Vales., p. 198). Yet it is scarcely permissible to interpret in such general manner the expression found in our prologue: *διάδοχον τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς προεδρίας σε ἐδέξατο* (*εδόξατο*?).

These scanty materials in determining our author's friend, to whom

¹⁷ Even in this case it is not certain whether Agapius was the immediate predecessor, or Agricolaus, who would then stand between the two.

he dedicated his commentary, must needs lead to a *non liquet*, and consequently we gain from this source no conclusive information concerning the author himself.

II.

If now we turn our attention to the question what commentaries on the Acts of the Apostles we know to have existed in the Greek church, we find that for the solution of this question also nothing has as yet been done. For little is gained from the few titles of leading works that are usually quoted in modern commentaries.¹⁸ The best help is afforded by the *catenæ*, but here we must be on our guard lest we number among commentators of the writing in question all names mentioned there; *e. g.*, there is no doubt that the three fragments of Theodore of Heraclea, mentioned in Cramer's *Catena in Acta Apostolorum* (Oxon., 1844, p. 145, 3, 9, 12), refer to his well-known commentary on Isaiah. If now we combine the quotations in *catenæ* and all accounts of commentaries handed down to us, we gain approximately the following list :

A. D. (*ca.*) 250. Origen. Only homilies to the Acts are certified; Jerome, *De vir. illustr.*, 17; *cf.* Harnack-Preuschen, *Geschichte der alt-christlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius*, I, 373. (The commentary mentioned there, after Verderius, is no doubt the result of a blunder.)

A. D. (*ca.*) 300. Pamphilus of Cæsarea. The well-known *ἐκθεσις κεφαλῶν τῶν πράξεων*, which passes in some manuscripts (Coisl. 25 [Ac. 15], Barb. VI, 21 [Ac. 81]) under the name of Pamphilus, is more correctly ascribed to Euthalius.

[(?) Eusebius of Emesa; mentioned by Fabricius.]¹⁹

A. D. (*ca.*) 350. Didymus "the Blind," ed. by J. Chr. Wolf in *Anecdota græca*, T. IV, Hamburg, 1724, from a *catena*.

A. D. (*ca.*) 370. Ephrem Syrus, preserved only in an Armenian *catena*; Venice, 1839. 8vo.

A. D. (*ca.*) 380. Diodorus of Tarsus, according to Suidas.

A. D. (*ca.*) 400. Theodore of Mopsuestia. (See below.)

¹⁸ The best list of commentaries on the Acts of the Apostles, known to me, is given by the very learned Hamburg professor, IO. ALB. FABRICIUS, in his work, so important for the history of missions, *Salutaris Lux Evangelii*, Hamburg, 1731, pp. 71 ff. I am indebted to Professor Drews, of Jena, for calling my attention to this book.

¹⁹ There is probably meant here Eusebius of Cæsarea, who, however, is the author of a commentary on the gospel of Luke only, but not on Acts.

A. D. 400-401. Chrysostom: 55 homilies; *opera* ed. Montfaucon, IX, 1731.

A. D. (*ca.*) 400. Severianus of Gabala († after 408), perhaps author of homilies; *cf.* Gennadius, chap. 21.

(?) A. D. (*ca.*) 430. Hesychius Presbyter († 433); fragment of *catena*. Migne, *Patrol. græca*, 93.

[A. D. (*ca.*) 440. Cyrill of Alexandria. The fragments of *catena* are probably not derived from a commentary on the Acts.]

[A. D. (*ca.*) 440. Theodoret of Cyrus. The same may be said with still greater certainty here.]

A. D. (*ca.*) 440. Theodotus of Ancyra, a partisan of Cyrill; fragments of *catena*.

A. D. (*ca.*) 450. Ammonius of Alexandria, fragments of *catena*.

After A. D. 500. Andreas of Cæsarea in Cappadocia; *scholia*, also to Acts, in cod. Athous 129. S. Pauli 2 (Ac. 374, Gregory, p. 650); *cf.* Ehrhard in Krumbacher, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur* (Iwan Müller's *Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Vol. IX), 2d edition, p. 130. *Andreas* is also the name of the compiler of the *catena* in cod. Coisl. 25 (= Ac. 15, Gregory, p. 618), Sæc. X, and Oxon. Nov. coll. 58 (= Ac. 36, Gregory, p. 621), Sæc. XII, which Cramer published in *Catena*, T. III, Oxon., 1844.

A. D. (*ca.*) 900. Leo Magister: Scholia to Matt., Luke, John, Acts, and Cath. Epp.; *cf.* Ehrhard, *l. c.*, 131, No. 4.

(Date unknown) Œcumenius: fragments in the following work:

Tenth century (?). *Œcumenius-Catena*, edidit Morellus, Par. 1631; Migne, *Patrol. græca*, 118, 119.

A. D. (*ca.*) 1078. Theophylact, archbishop of Achrida in Bulgaria. Ed. Foscari, Venice, 1754-63, wholly dependent upon the preceding.

(?) Nicetas of Naupaktos. Manuscripts mentioned by Ehrhard, *l. c.*, 137.

(?) Anonymi hom. 54 breves in cod. Vindob. 45, 4to, fol. 1-101^a; Lambeckius, III, 63.

This list, of course, does not pretend to be complete, for it is very probable that a reference may have escaped me. And, above all, it is very doubtful whether we have any knowledge of all the commentators on the Acts of the Apostles; and whether, perhaps, many anonymous scholia are not the work of still unknown exegetes. In view of this we must speak with a great reservation in attempting to say who among the persons mentioned above was the author of our prologue.

At the very outset we must exclude the Byzantine authors of com-

mentaries after 500 A. D., for they represent, in the great majority of instances, recensions wholly dependent on the earlier exegetical material, of value only in so far as they have preserved fragments of their predecessors of the classic period of Greek theology, otherwise lost. Compare the excellent description which Ehrhard has given of this exegesis in Krumbacher's *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur*, 2. Aufl., 1896, pp. 122 ff.

But also among the commentators preceding the fifth century we have to reject a considerable number. In the case of many, among these Cyrill and Theodoret, it cannot be shown at all that they ever composed a commentary on the Acts of the Apostles; others again, *e. g.*, Origen and Chrysostom, have left us only continuous homilies on this book, the nature of which excludes our prologue as an introduction; and again, commentators of the Alexandrian school, Didymus, Cyrill, Theodotus of Ancyra, and others, are decisively excluded by the character of the theological conceptions which pervade our prologue, which, it may be said here by way of anticipation, is strictly of the Antiochian school. This and the masterly character of the commentary lead us to think above all of Diodorus of Tarsus, or his yet more famous pupil, Theodore of Mopsuestia.

To the former Suidas, *Lexicon*, *sub voce* Διόδωρος (ed. Bernhardt, I, 1, 1379), following a catalogue compiled by Theodore Lector, ascribes, among other works, and especially after a *chronicon*, correcting the Eusebian chronology (χρονικὸν διορθούμενον τὸ σφάλμα Εὐσεβίου τοῦ Παμφίλου περὶ τῶν χρόνων), two volumes: εἰς τὰ δ' εὐαγγέλια and εἰς τὰς πράξεις τῶν ἀποστόλων.

Among the fragments of *catenæ* collected in Migne, *Patrologia græca*, T. 33, there is none at all belonging to writings on the New Testament, and although there are, as far as comparison is possible, several linguistic points of contact with our prologue, we nowhere find that originality of expression and conception which characterizes our document.

On the other hand, any one of the more numerous preserved fragments of the exegetical works of Theodore, *e. g.*, his prologue to the commentary on the minor prophets,²⁰ shows a surprisingly close linguistic relationship to our fragment.²¹

²⁰ MAI, *Nova Patrum Bibl.*, VII, 1854; ed. VON WEGNER (1834), pp. 3 ff. My citations are from this edition.

²¹ To mention only a few points, I call attention to πάλαι καὶ πρόπαλαι, p. 4, 128; καὶ μὴν καὶ, ὅπερ οὖν; very often μέν—δέ; the combination θεραπείας τε καὶ

To this may be added the decisive weight of an external testimony. The existence of a commentary of Theodore on the Acts of the Apostles is variously attested; in particular during the fifth œcumenical (or general) council, the second Constantinopolitanum, there were read, at the fourth session, held May 12 (or 13), A. D. 553,²² a number of extracts from Theodore's writings, and among these, beside passages of the commentaries on the gospels of Luke and John, also a passage from the first book of his commentary to the Acts of the Apostles:

"XVI Eiusdem Theodori ex commento quod est in Actus Apostolorum libro primo, in quo dicit quod baptizari in nomine Jesu Christi simile est scripto illi quod baptizati sunt in Moyse, et vocari Christianos simile est illi quod vocantur Platonici et Epicurei et Manichæi et Marcionistæ ab inventoribus dogmatum" (Giov. Dom. Mansi: *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, Florence and Venice, 1759-98, Vol. IX, p. 209 c.)—indeed a very incorrect regest of the ensuing passage, which nevertheless reminds us vividly of that portion of our prologue which treats of the name of the Christians. Still more striking is the at times almost literal agreement of the text of the quotation with thought and language of our prologue: "Ille autem dixit, oportere poenitentiam agentes eos pro crucis iniquitate et agnoscetes saluatorem et dominum et omnium auctorem bonorum Jesum Christum, quomodo propter ista peruenit et assumptus est de diuina natura, in ipsum quidem fidem suscipere et eius discipulos fieri ante omnia ad baptismum accedentes quod et ipse tradidit nobis præformationem quidem habens sperationis futurorum, in nomine autem celebrandum patris et filii et sancti spiritus. Hoc enim quod est: *ut baptizetur unusquisque in nomine Jesu Christi*, non hoc dicit, ut uocationem quæ in nomine patris et filii et sancti spiritus est relinquentes Jesum Christum in baptismo uocent, sed quale est hoc quod in Moyse baptizati sunt in nube et in mari, ut diceret quia sub nube et mari Ægyptiorum separati sunt liberati eorum seruitute ut Moysis leges attenderent, tale est: *et baptizetur unusquisque in nomine Jesu Christi* ut cum ad ipsum accessissent tamquam saluatorem et omnium bonorum auctorem et doctorem ueritatis ab ipso utpote auctore bonorum et doctore ueritatis uocarentur, sicut omnibus hominibus quamcumque sectam sequentibus consuetudo est ab ipso dogmatis inuentore uocari, γινώσκεις; always ὁ θεσπότης Χριστός. Especially characteristic is the transition from the introduction to the exegetical part, following it: ἀρχεται δὲ οὕτως.

²² Cf. HEFELE, *Conciliengeschichte*, II, 1856, p. 846.

ut Platonici et Epicurei, Manichæi et Marcionistæ et si quidam tales dicuntur. Eodem enim modo et nos nominari Christianos iudicauerunt apostoli tamquam per hoc certum facientes quod istius doctrinam oportet attendere; sic quod et ab ipso datum est susciperent baptisma in ipso quidem primo constitutum qui et primus baptizatus est, ab ipso autem et ceteris traditum ut secundum præformationem futurorum celebretur.”²³

The same passage is found as capitulum XVII, followed by a detailed refutation in the *constitutio* of Pope Vigilius, which he issued from Constantinople the fourteenth of May of the same year, and for which he used a selection from the works of Theodore almost identical with the one read at the council of Constantinople (Mansi, *l. c.*, p. 74 b; and Hefele, II, 856 f.). Also Pope Pelagius II (A. D. 578–90), in his third letter to Elias of Aquileja-Grado and the other bishops of Istria, makes reference to this same passage (Mansi, *l. c.*, 443 a; Hefele, II, 893).

It is to the Syrian fathers, however, that we owe a more accurate knowledge of the writings of Theodore “the exegete,” a title with which they rightly honored him. Already Ibas, the well-known Edessene, we are told, had his writings translated into Syriac, for which he was reproached by his adversaries. It is, therefore, not surprising that as late as the fourteenth century a learned Nestorian, Ebed-Jesu, the metropolitan of Zoba and Armenia († 1318), was able to incorporate a list of thirty-six writings of Theodore into his rhymed catalogue of 200 Syrian authors, in which it constituted chap. 19. This catalogue has been published by Assemani in his *Bibliotheca orientalis*, Tom. III, 1, 3–362, together with a Latin translation and excellent notes. We give herewith the whole chapter treating of Theodore’s writings, only using instead of the rhymed language the more convenient tabular order, as found in the occidental lists of writings. In addition to the inaccurate title, Ebed-Jesu always mentions the number of volumes (τόμοι),²⁴ and very wisely also the names of persons to whom they were dedicated, which, for the purpose of identification, may be of greatest service. Ebed-Jesu (Assemani, pp. 30–35) writes as follows:

²³ This is also given in FRITZSCHE, *Theodori Episcopi Mopsuesteni in Novum Testamentum Commentariorum quæ reperiri potuerunt*, Turici, 1847, pp. 43 f.

²⁴ τόμοι are more extensive than the books (βιβλοι); cf. BIRT, *Das antike Buchwesen*, p. 28. Thus the first τόμος of Theodore’s Commentary to Genesis consisted of seven books; Photius, *bibliotheca cod.* 38; the two τόμοι adv. Eunomium of 25 λόγοι; *ibid.*, cod. 4.

Theodorus Commentator composuit XLI tomos qui sunt Prophetæ centum et quinquaginta (*i. e.*, according to Assemani: tantæ molis sunt ut centies et quinquagies libros Prophetarum maiorum minorumque superent) quorum unusquisque capitibus triginta comprehenditur :

1. Commentarius in librum Geneseos	tom III ad Alphæum.	
2. Commentarius in Davidem (<i>i. e.</i> , Psalmos)	tom V ad Cerdonem et fratrem.	
3. Commentarius in XII Prophetas	tom II ad Tyrium.	
4. Commentarius in Samuelem	tom I ad Mamarianum.	
5. Commentarius in Job	tom II ad Cyrillum Alexandrinum.	
6. Commentarius in Ecclesiastem	tom I ad Porphyrium.	
7. Commentarius in Jesaïam	tom I	
8. Commentarius in Ezechielem	tom I	
9. Commentarius in Jeremiam	tom I	
10. Commentarius in Danielelem	tom I	
11. Commentarius in Matthæum	tom II ad Julium.	
12. Commentarius in Lucam	tom II ad Eusebium.	
13. Commentarius in Johannem		
14. Commentarius in Actus Apostolorum	tom I ad Basilium.	
15. Commentarius in Epistolam ad Romanos	ad Eusebium.	} tom V
16. Commentarius in II Epistolas ad Corinthios	tom II ad Theodorum.	
17. Commentarius in Ep. ad Gal., Eph., Phil., Col.	ad Eustratium (?)	
18. Commentarius in II Ep. ad Thessalonicenses	ad Jacobum.	
19. Commentarius in II Ep. ad Timotheum	ad Petrum.	
20. Commentarius in Ep. ad Titum et ad Philemonem	ad Cyrinum.	
21. Commentarius in Ep. ad Hebræos	ad Cyrinum.	
22. Liber de sacramentis, s. de fide		
23. Liber de sacerdotio	tom I	
24. Liber de spiritu sancto	tom II	
25. Liber de incarnatione ²⁵	tom I	
26. Libri adversus Eunomium ²⁶	tom II	
27. Libri adversus asserentem peccatum in natura insitum esse ²⁷	tom II	

²⁵ GENNADIUS, *De viris illustr.*, chap. 12, ed. Richardson, p. 65: "de incarnatione domini libros quindecim, ad quindecim milia versuum continentes."

²⁶ PHOTIUS, *bibl.*, cod. 4: ἀνεγνώσθη Θεοδώρου Ἀντιοχείως ὑπὲρ Βασιλείου κατὰ Εὐνομίον ἐν λόγοις κε' (κ' καὶ ἡ' λόγοι, cod. 177).

²⁷ PHOTIUS, *bibl.*, cod. 177: ἀνεγνώσθη βιβλίον οὗ ἡ ἐπιγραφή· Θεοδώρου Ἀντιοχείως πρὸς τοὺς λέγοντας φύσει καὶ οὐ γνώμῃ πταίνειν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους . . . ἐν λόγοις ε'.

28. Libri adversus magiam ²⁸	tom II
29. Liber ad monachos	tom I
30. Liber de obscura locutione	tom I
31. Liber de perfectione operum	tom I
32. Adversus Allegoricos	tom V
33. Pro Basilio ²⁹	tom I
34. De assumente et assumpto	tom I
35. Margaritæ (i. e., epistolæ)	tom I
36. Sermo de legislatione	tom I

Owing to the fact that only a very few fragments of the works of Theodore have been transmitted it is now impossible accurately to test the statements of Ebed-Jesu; for instance, the text of the commentary on minor prophets, the only one preserved entirely in the original Greek, does not show the name of Tyrius as the person to whom it was dedicated. It appears, moreover, from other indications that the main preface to the whole work, which undoubtedly contained the dedication, has been lost. In this "prologue" may have stood the passage read at the fifth œcumenical council: "ex principio commenti quod in duodecim prophetas scripsit abnegans prophetias de Christo esse prædictas" (Mansi, *l. c.*, p. 211 d). This passage is not found in our present text.³⁰

In like manner the Latin prefaces to the minor letters of Paul do not contain the names mentioned by Ebed-Jesu. Here also we must suppose that the translator, or redactor, omitted some material. The name "Cerdo,"³¹ which Ebed-Jesu mentions in connection with the commentary to the Psalms, is undeniably found in Theodore's preface to his work *De Historia et Allegoria*. This preface has been preserved for us by Facundus, bishop of Hermiane (Gallandi, *Bibl. Max.*, XI, p. 698; *Patrol. Lat.*, 67, 762 a). On the whole we may in general trust the statements of Ebed-Jesu, of course without denying that at times he may have been mistaken.

We are concerned only with what he says about the gospels and the Acts of the Apostles. Here is the verbatim translation of Assemani:

²⁸ PHOTIUS, *bibl.*, cod. 81: Θεοδώρου περὶ τῆς ἐν Περσίδι μαγικῆς καὶ τῆς ἐν εὐσεβείας διαφορᾶς, ἐν λόγοις τρισι.

²⁹ According to Photius it appears to be identical with (26) adversus Eunomium.

³⁰ A. MAI, *Scriptorum veterum nova collectio*, I (1825), p. xxvii, and A. VON WEGNER, *Theodori Antioch. quæ supersunt omnia*, I (1834), p. xvi, would rather place this passage in the lost introduction to the commentary on the Psalms. But why, then, charge the author of this selection from Theodore's works with such inaccuracy?

³¹ This name is not given in SMITH AND WACE'S *Dictionary*.

Matthæum uno tomo
explicavit ad Julium;
Lucam et Johannem
Duobus tomis ad Eusebium

Actus Apostolorum ad Basilium
uno commentatus est tomo.
Epistolam quoque ad Romanos
ad Eusebium exposuit.

Our prologue shows that its author dedicated two commentaries to two Eusebii, the one on the gospel of Luke to the older, that on the Acts of the Apostles to his successor. In Ebed-Jesu's list we have three commentaries of Theodore dedicated to a Eusebius, namely, those on the gospel of Luke, the gospel of John, and the epistle to the Romans. It appears to be almost like a provoking accident that the commentary on the Acts of the Apostles, standing between the last two, was not dedicated to a Eusebius, but to a Basilus. Is this really the case? or may we not have here merely a mistake of Ebed-Jesu or of one of his predecessors?³²

It appears to me certain that we have here a case of transposition of the Acts and the gospel of John, occasioned by the author's desire to preserve as far as possible the traditional order of the canon. The two *τόμοι* contain the gospel of Luke and the Acts of the Apostles; alongside of these the commentary on the gospel of John³³ occupied a much more independent place. And thus I suspect that this was dedicated to a Basilus, while the two were dedicated to an older and a younger Eusebius. We have to make, therefore, only a very slight correction in Ebed-Jesu's list of the writings of Theodore, in order to obtain a testimony that our prologue is the introduction to the commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Acts of the Apostles dedicated to Eusebius, better than we could have dared to wish for.

III.

Theodore's authorship of the prologue is confirmed finally by an analysis of the theological conceptions expressed in it.

³² We do not know the history of Syriac literature well enough to enable us to say whether Ebed-Jesu compiled his catalogue on the basis of personal inspection of Theodore's works, or whether he has simply collected it out of earlier sources. The well-known relation of Jerome to the *Church History* of Eusebius inclines us to accept the second as more probable. Assemani consulted, in addition, a similar Arabic catalogue of authors compiled by the Egyptian presbyter Abulbarcat, the son of Cabar, which, in his judgment, contained an imitation of that of Ebed-Jesu. This Abulbarcat mentions of Theodore especially: "Expositionem quarundam epistolarum Pauli et Actuum Apostolicorum" (Assemani, *I. c.*, pp. 3 and 30).

³³ Chabot announced in 1895 an edition of the Syriac translation of this commentary. I know not whether it has been published. At least I have not yet seen it.

The special points of controversy concerning Christology, so frequently discussed in the fifth century, are, to be sure, not mentioned in it. This very fact, however, may point to Theodore as the author of the discussion, inasmuch as this controversy was imposed upon him from the outside, rather than grew out of his own religious position. Proof of this is amply furnished in the fragment of the second book of Theodore's work *On the Incarnation*, published by Fritzsche in the *Zürcher Universitäts-Programm* of 1847, pp. 5 ff.: "Sed mei fratres, qui eiusdem mihi matris filii sunt, dicunt mihi, etc., . . . sed uehementer doleo quia mei fratres hæc mihi dicunt, ut loquar in ecclesia, quæ non est possibile dicere bene sapientes." Theodore proceeds throughout on the basis of the veritable humanity of Christ: "homo Jesus, similiter omnibus hominibus, nullam habens differentiam ad homines eiusdem generis præter ea quæ gratia ei dedit." (*Ibid.*, p. 6, ll. 3-6.) In the same manner our prologue speaks only of the human actions of Jesus, whom the author always designates ὁ δεσπότης Χριστός (ll. 36, 59, 74), just as Theodore did (in *Oseam*, præf. 2; Wegnern, p. 5, *et freq.*). Only in one quotation does he use the time-honored traditional ὁ κύριος ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις φησί (ll. 46 f.). He speaks of the fact that Christ was generated (ἐτέχθη, l. 24, just as τεχθέντας, l. 68, of the apostles); and of the peculiar circumstances connected with his birth (τὰ περὶ τὴν γέννησιν αὐτοῦ γεγονότα, ll. 24 f.; and compare the expression τὰ περὶ τὸν Στέφανον γεγονότα, l. 85). Especially important and characteristic is, furthermore, the view that Christ during his first thirty years submitted completely to the law (ὑπὸ τῆς τοῦ νόμου πολιτείας ἄχρι τῆς τριακονταετοῦς ἡλικίας μετὰ πολλῆς διαγεγονῶς τῆς ἀκριβείας, ll. 25-7). Only when he had completed this period did he exhibit in himself the new ideal of life (τὸν εὐαγγελικὸν ἐπεδείκνυτο βίον) and by the choosing of his disciples, and the setting up of laws corresponding to this ideal, provide for its spread (ll. 40 f.). His words and miracles simply serve the purpose of rendering the disciples susceptible for receiving the Holy Spirit (ll. 43-4). Throughout, emphasis is laid upon the activity of the Holy Spirit (ἡ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος χάρις, ll. 44, 76; ἡ θεία τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος χάρις, l. 98; ἡ θεία χάρις, 132 f.; 157); this is also a characteristic peculiarity of the theology of Theodore. The death of Christ is to the author of no special significance whatever. He even employs a form of statement almost unparalleled in a fourth-century Greek theologian: ὅτι ἄνθρωπος ἐν Ἰουδαίᾳ σταυρωθεὶς ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἀνέστη (l. 70). This resurrection is the main point (l. 53), inasmuch as it is both the assurance of the universal resurrection (ll. 28, 53 f., 71), and the antecedent of the ascension, and the

corresponding descent of the Holy Spirit (ll. 74 f.), a conception well grounded on Acts 2:33. Compare on ll. 44 ff. the fragment *ex libro de incarnatione* published by Sachau: *Theodori Mopsuestiae Fragm. syr.*, 1879, p. 63: "post resurrectionem autem, cum discipuli a spiritu perducerentur, tum reuelatione quoque cognitionem perfectam accipiebant."

When our author says of Christ that he is to be regarded as savior and author of all blessings for his followers (σωτήρ τε καὶ αἴτιον αὐτοῖς πάντων τῶν ἀγαθῶν, ll. 113 / 14), he has especially in mind two blessings: the new ideal of life and the resurrection, or, as he expresses himself in another place in imitation of Pauline phraseology, the new creation (l. 55), in which also the whole creation is to participate together with mankind (*cf.* Rom. 8:19 ff.). He sees this effectively foreshadowed in the resurrection of Christ, in the description of which he uses the deep thought of Paul concerning the connection of Christian baptism with Christ's death and resurrection. And when he calls the ἀνάστασις the ἔργον of the new covenant, and baptism its type, whose prototype, again, is Christ's own baptism, it is evident that by this word ἔργον he means "realization" or "reality." Of far greater concern to our author, however, than the blessings of Christianity still lying in the future is that other practical side of it: the new Christian ideal of life, the evangelic life, as he calls it (ὁ εὐαγγελικὸς βίος, l. 40; ὁ τοιοῦτος βίος, l. 42; ἡ κατὰ Χριστὸν ἐπιδημία καὶ πίστις, l. 81; ἡ κατὰ Χριστὸν πολιτεία τε καὶ ἀγωγή, ll. 123 f.). On the one side Christ has exemplified this in his own life (ἐπεδείκνυτο, l. 40; this is also said in the second part of the phrase ἡ κατὰ Χριστὸν οἰκονομία τε καὶ πολιτεία, in which οἰκονομία refers to the other element of salvation divinely constituted in the person of Christ); and on the other side he has taught it (ἡ τοῦ Χριστοῦ διδασκαλία, ll. 77, 107, to which corresponds τὰ κατὰ Χριστὸν ἐκδιδάσκειν, l. 89). For although this ideal of life is free from the spirit of Old Testament legalism (δίχα τῆς νομικῆς παρατηρήσεως, ll. 124, 133 f.; or δίχα τῆς τοῦ νόμου τηρήσεως, l. 154), it is itself nevertheless also based upon "laws" (l. 41; *cf.* ὁ τότε νόμος, ll. 94-5). Paramount with the belief in Christ, expressed in the trinitarian formula of baptism, is the keeping of his commands (ll. 60-65; a free rendering of Matt. 28:19, 20).

Our author's style reminds us strongly of the pastoral epistles, and with this resemblance is probably to be associated the important part given to the conception of the εὐσεβεία, which in many instances can only be accurately rendered by the word "Christianity." This is also seen in the equivalence of such formulas as: τῇ εὐσεβείᾳ προσανέχειν,

ll. 119 f., and τῷ Χριστῷ προσανέchein, ll. 95 f.; εὐσεβεῖς, l. 85, and οἱ κατὰ Χριστὸν, l. 129; or ἡ Χριστοῦ μαθητεία, l. 143. Our author says τὴν εὐσεβειαν διδάσκειν, ll. 86–7; κηρύττειν, l. 134; παραδίδοναι, ll. 86, 117, 148; as well as ὑποδέχεσθαι, l. 154; τῇ εὐσεβείᾳ or τῷ τῆς εὐσεβείας λόγῳ προσάγειν, ll. 79, 127 f.; 98 (cf. l. 153), and ἀποστήσαι τινα τῆς εὐσεβείας, ll. 131 f. The εὐσεβεια is to him a schooling (παίδευσις) for mankind (ll. 82–3).

Following the train of thought of the Acts of the Apostles our author distinguishes sharply between this εὐσεβεια, Christianity, and the Old Testament law (ὑπὲρ τοῦ νόμου—κατὰ τῆς εὐσεβείας, l. 140); he calls the pre-Christian position of Paul ἀσεβῆς καὶ παράνομος γνώμη, l. 115. Yet he is very careful to avoid a misconception which would favor the Marcionite heresy, on the one hand tracing the law back to God as its author (τῷ τὸν νόμον ἐκθέντι θεῷ, l. 80) and on the other hand strongly emphasizing the acceptance (οἰκειότης) of the law not only by Christ during his early period of life (l. 26), but also by the first Christian converts from Judaism (ll. 78 f., 128 f.).

The purpose of the Acts of the Apostles (its σκοπός, l. 155, and compare ll. 150 ff., a favorite *terminus technicus* with the Antiochian theologians) consists according to our author—and we must say that he is wholly right in this view—mainly in the presentation of the wonderful ways of God (ἀπόρρητοι οἰκονομίαι, l. 82), by which was made possible the passing over of Christianity from the Jews to the Gentiles, and, at the same time, the complete deliverance from subjection to the Old Testament law. That this transition could not be accomplished by a complete break with the law, but that God made use of many ways to bring it about, our commentator correctly explains, precisely in the manner of the author of the Acts of the Apostles himself (ll. 83–4). For that reason he begins by carefully enumerating all pre-Pauline missions to the Gentiles (ll. 84–104) and then strongly emphasizes, in the spirit of Acts, chap. 15,³⁴ the assent of the mother church to the Pauline missionary principles (ll. 134–6). At the same time he does full justice to the unique significance of Paul as the missionary to the Gentiles κατ' ἐξοχὴν (ll. 137–144) and praises him in a manner that is rhetorically most effective (ll. 105–17).

³⁴ The use of the expression μετὰ τῆς προσηκούσης τάξεως in this connection is not quite clear. He either intends to distinguish the several categories: apostles, leaders of the congregation, and the congregation (after Acts 15:6, 7 Peter; 12 πλῆθος; 13 James; 22; cf. Gal. 2:2, κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς δοκοῦσιν), or τάξις has the well-attested meaning: enactment, decision, command (e. g., ἡ τοῦ φόρου τάξις, Plato, Demosth.), and refers then to the prescription in the apostolic decree, perhaps also to Gal. 2:10.

It may perhaps be said that the development of Christianity in the apostolic age was nevertheless somewhat different from what the author represents it to have been; that the passing of Christianity from Judaism to the Gentiles was not accomplished so harmoniously as it appeared to the author, who conceived of it as the work of divine providence; that, in fact, sharp conflicts had occurred, of which, by the way, our author is by no means ignorant (l. 101); but we cannot apply to any of the Greek commentators the standard of modern critical methods. Even their greatest and most critical genius—for such was Theodore indeed—was biased in that direction, and to him the “Acts of the Apostles” was the primary historical source for the apostolic history, and what can be done on the basis of this source in the way of obtaining a clear picture of the conditions of that time our author has certainly succeeded in doing within the narrow bounds of our prologue. Living at a period when Christianity was supreme in the whole Roman empire, when the greatest minds had willingly placed themselves in its service, and when apologetics had been almost completely silenced by the controversies within the church, accompanying the final establishment of the christological dogma in the church, our author has yet put the question to himself and to his readers how it became possible to build up from so small beginnings with such material so gigantic a structure (ll. 65 f.). The very fact of propounding such a problem is to be considered an eminently scientific performance on the part of a Greek theologian of that period.

It remains yet briefly to gather together from the prologue all the data concerning the New Testament used by the author and its textual conditions. This is in some cases of decisive importance for literary criticism. Here we may congratulate ourselves on having attained already well-established results; for the outcome of our following investigation is in general quite meager.

Of the *θείαι γραφαί* or *βίβλοι* (ll. 10, 21) our author mentions the gospels (ll. 22, 58), a phrase at that time, to be sure, frequently used, even when only one of the four gospels is meant (just as here, ll. 46 f.: *ὁ κύριος ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις* = John 16:12 f.), in direct contrast to the earlier period, when even all the four together were designated *τὸ εὐαγγέλιον*. He mentions in particular the gospel of Luke, on which he had written a commentary, and quotes Matthew (28:19; ll. 62 f.) and John (16:12 f.; ll. 48 f.), evidently from memory, for he omits in Matt. 28:19, *πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*, and places *αὐτοὺς* before *βαπτίζοντες*, and mentions vs. 20 only in a paraphrastic manner. In quoting John 16:22 he

uses the wholly unique *εἰπεῖν* instead of *λέγειν ὑμῖν* or *ὑμῖν λέγειν*. We must of course not allow ourselves to use this as a variant reading for the purpose of New Testament textual criticism. Twice he quotes from letters of Paul, viz., Rom. 6: 3-5 (ll. 31 ff.), without a noteworthy variant, and 2 Cor. 5: 17 (ll. 57), with the additional words *τὰ πάντα*, so commonly found in the Antiochian text of the New Testament. We have already mentioned above that his entire conception reminds us in manifold ways of that of the pastoral letters. No mention is made of the catholic epistles and the Revelation. This, to be sure, is of no importance considering the brief compass of the prologue, but corresponds exactly with Theodore's otherwise well-known attitude. The prologue deals with the Acts of the Apostles; and yet we learn very little from it concerning the text used by the author. The only quotation, Acts 1:8 (ll. 51 f.), reads *μοι μάρτυρες* like all the texts except \aleph B A C Or $\frac{1}{2}$; the omission of *ἐν πάσῃ*, or rather *πάσῃ*, before *Ἰουδαία* may be explained on the basis of a free, careless quotation. It is noteworthy that our author calls the book always *αἱ πράξεις τῶν ἀποστόλων* (l. 50), *αἱ τῶν ἀποστόλων πράξεις* (l. 12), *αἱ ἀποστολικαὶ πράξεις* (ll. 15, 17 f.), *ἡ βίβλος τῶν ἀποστολικῶν πράξεων* (ll. 167 / 8).³⁵ It seems that, as far as we know the early literature, in Alexandria both titles, *πράξεις* and *πράξεις τῶν ἀποστόλων*, were used, while in Antioch only the latter. Furthermore, it appears to be a characteristic of our author, especially noticeable in the writings of Theodore, to use the adjective *μακάριος* in connection with the names of all the sacred writers (*Πέτρος*, l. 97; *Παῦλος*, ll. 30, 107 f., 126 f., 132; *Δουκᾶς*, ll. 10 f., 72, 118 f., 167; cf. *ὁ μακαριώτατος Δουκᾶς* in the introduction, l. 2, and also the phrase *ὁ μακάριος Εὐσέβιος* of a deceased bishop), while the adjective *ἅγιος* is used only of the Holy Spirit. Likewise we know that Theodore, *e. g.*, in his commentary on the minor prophets, speaks of *ὁ μακάριος Δαβὶδ* (Wegnern, pp. 4, 128), *ὁ μακάριος Ἰωήλ* (p. 128), *ὁ μακάριος Ὡσηέ* (p. 129), *ὁ μακάριος Ἀμώς* (p. 169), etc. Still another apparently small matter may be mentioned, viz., the emphasis on the *ιδιωτεύειν* of the apostles (cf. Acts 4:13). Although met with often (*e. g.*, Eusebius, *h. e.*, III, 24:3), this is nowhere else so strongly emphasized. It is, moreover, a unique feature of the representation in our prologue that only a knowledge of Syriac is ascribed to the apostles (l. 68). This points to a man who, in distinc-

³⁵ ROBINSON, *Euthaliana*, p. 16, has called attention to the importance of this title for the Euthalian question; to his remarks I will add that, of the only two passages containing *πράξεις τῶν ἀποστόλων* quoted by Robinson from Euthalius, the one is directly quoted and the other borrowed from Eusebius, *h. e.* II, 22, 1 and 6.

tion from the Greek language, of which he makes such masterly use, looked upon Syriac as the country dialect, *i. e.*, to an Antiochian. It may also be said that the author shows correct historical knowledge if by Syriac here he means the vernacular language spoken in Palestine at the time of Jesus, the Aramaic, in distinction from the Hebrew of the Old Testament, which existed then as the sacred tongue only. Thus Diodorus, *e. g.*, distinguishes between Σύροι and Ἑβραῖοι, ὁ Σύρος and ὁ Ἑβραῖος, as two different texts of the Old Testament. (Migne, *Patrol. græca*, 33, 1563 c, 1573 d, 1575 c, d, 1577 a, c, d.)

If we should go into further details, many more phrases of our prologue could be traced also in the other writings of Theodore, still extant. Yet there is no need of doing this. What has thus far been said will, I assume, amply prove my suggestion, expressed also on a former occasion,³⁶ that our prologue is a fragment of a work of Theodore. This being so, the commentary to the Acts of the Apostles by this exegete, κατ' ἐξοχήν, hitherto treated very slightly, receives at once great importance. The date of its composition, to be sure, cannot be determined on the basis of the prologue; but we can say so much that it must belong to a late period of Theodore's literary activity, because the author refers to his commentary on the gospel of Luke as having been written a long time ago. Theodore was probably born toward the middle of the fourth century. When scarcely twenty years old he began, we are told, his literary activity with the commentary on the Psalms. Not before A. D. 392 does he appear to have become bishop. After having held this office for thirty-six years, he died about A. D. 428. This long literary activity gives ample room for the *πάλαι καὶ πρόπαλαι* of our prologue, without assigning our commentary to the very last years of Theodore's life, when dogmatic controversies probably influenced him to a much larger extent.

Yet even more important than this precise location of a single writing of Theodore's is the observation that, notwithstanding the reproach of heresy, laid upon him by the orthodox church of the Justinian age, even as late as a hundred years after his death, though not without meeting with violent opposition, his writings have not been destroyed so completely as one might suppose and as was formerly believed by many. A careful research and examination of the *catenæ* will certainly yield also for this commentator some valuable material. It would be highly interesting to find out from what source the writer

³⁶ *Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, Vol. X, February, 1893, pp. 57 f.

of our *codex Neapolitanus* in the twelfth (or perhaps even in the tenth or eleventh) century took this prologue. We can hardly suppose any connection of it with "Euthalius," even if Mill's well-known supposition³⁷ that Euthalius in his prologue to the epistles of Paul alluded to Theodore as his source really rested on a sounder foundation than is actually the case.³⁸ The only question now is whether the writer of the codex had still before him the entire commentary of Theodore, or—and this is by far more probable—whether he found this fragment in one of his exemplars as an independent prologue to the Acts of the Apostles. One might feel provoked at the scribe, or his predecessor, for having saved for us only this introduction, instead of copying the entire commentary. Yet rather let us be thankful to him for having preserved at least so much for us; for we can justly say that such an introduction forms one of the most valuable parts of a commentary, the knowledge of which should stimulate us to further research and investigation. Contrary to their own will and intention, later writers, though fully persuaded of Theodore's pernicious and dangerous influence, have nevertheless unwittingly preserved many fragments of his writings which for the history of exegesis are far more valuable than all their other compilations together.

ERNST VON DOBSCHÜTZ.

UNIVERSITY OF JENA.

³⁷ Gregory also seems to agree with this, *Prolegomena*, p. 159.

³⁸ Entirely without foundation is Cyrill's theory that our prologue was written by Euthalius, for which reason he attributes to him also a commentary on the gospel of Luke.