Having described the methodologies which, so it seems to me, are necessary for an adequate and responsible "determination" and "evaluation" of the dominical logoi as cited in the original text of the Greek Didascalia Apostolorum,¹ I now attempt to demonstrate both the adequacy and the validity of those methodologies by applying them (1) to an extra-canonical dominical logos and (2) to a canonical dominical logos as each occurs in the extant versions of the Didascalia. The former is treated herein. The latter will be dealt with in the next article in this series.

At Didasc. 2.36.9, the Didascalist cites the extra-canonical dominical logos "Be approved money-changers,"² a logos which, although not cited in the canonical Gospels, is cited extensively in the Patristic writings (so, for example, Clement of Alexandria,

*Abbreviations employed in this article, which are not spelled out on the back cover of this journal, indicate the following series: CBM = Chester Beatty Monographs; CSEL = Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum; GCS = Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte; PS = Patrologia syriaca.


² In both the Syriac Didascalia and the Greek Constitutiones Apostolorum, the citation is introduced with the formula mtl dlhwn 'myr ("for to them it is said") (Lagarde, Didascalia Apostolorum, p. 42.29) = καὶ πάλιν [sc. εἴρηται αὐτοῖς] ("and again [to them it is said]") (Funk, Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum, 1:123.17), which formula, in both witnesses, is essentially equal to mtl d'mr mry' lhwn = ὃτι λέγει κύριος αὐτοῖς ("for to them the Lord says").
Stromata, 1.28, 177.2; Origen, In Johannem, 19.7; Dionysius of Rome, apud Eusebius, Historia ecclesiastica, 7.7.3; Pseudo-Clement, Homiliae, 2.51.1; 3.50.2; 18.20.4; Cyril of Jerusalem, Catecheses, 1.6.36; Apelles, apud Epiphanius, Adversus haereses, 44.2.6; Socrates, Historia ecclesiastica, 3.16; Cyril of Alexandria, In Joannis evangelium, 4.5.407a; Adversus Nestorium, 1.2c; and John of Damascus, De fide orthodoxa, 4.17.

This citation is extant in the Syriac Didascalia (Lagarde, Didascalia Apostolorum, p. 42.29), and in the Greek Constitutiones Apostolorum (Funk, Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum, 1:123.17f.). Concerning it several preliminary matters should be noted:

1. In both witnesses (the Syriac Didascalia, and the Greek Constitutiones Apostolorum), it occurs in essentially the same context: The “laymen” are not to judge. To them “it is said,” “Judge not, that you be not judged” (cf. Mt 7.1 = Lk 6.37a). That

---

1. There is no Latin parallel because of a rather considerable lacuna in codex Verotzensis. See Hauler, Didascaliae Apostolorum, p. 41; Tidner, Didascaliae Apostolorum, p. 46; and Connolly, Didascalia Apostolorum, pp. 99-121.

13. There is no real parallel in either the Arabic or Ethiopic Constitutiones Apostolorum. The Ethiopic texts have the following paraphrases: (i) “Be of understanding, and give judgment to every man with discernment” (so Ms P, see Platt, Ethiopic Didascalia, p. 73.3f. [text] and p. 73.1f. [translation]);
is the prerogative of the “bishops.” To them “it is said,” “Be approved money-changers” (Lagarde, Didascalia Apostolorum, p. 42.25ff.; Funk, Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum, 1:123.14ff.).

2. In both witnesses, it is introduced with essentially the same citation formula, namely, mt $\text{dhw}n$ 'myr (“for to them it is said”) (Lagarde, Didascalia Apostolorum, p. 42.29) = $\kappa \alpha i$ $\pi \alpha l\nu$ [sc. $\varepsilon i\rho\eta\tau a i$ $\alpha u t o i c$] (“and again [to them it is said]”) (Funk, Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum, 1:123.17).

3. In both witnesses, it is cited in essentially the same form: imperative + noun + adjective (Lagarde, Didascalia Apostolorum, p. 42.29; Funk, Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum, 1:123.17f.).

4. In both witnesses, it consists of essentially the same content: “Be approved money-changers” (Lagarde, Didascalia Apostolorum, p. 42.29; Funk, Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum, 1:123.17f.).

5. And finally, in both witnesses, it fulfills the same function, namely, to support the contention that it is the prerogative of the “bishop” alone to “judge.” See the first item above.

It is clear, from the foregoing, that any attempt to “determine” the form (in the less technical sense of the term) and the content

and (ii) “Be of understanding and judge the great of the people, each one of them” (so Ms A; see Harden, Ethiopic Didascalia, p. 57.25f.).

15 The Syriac term rendered “money-changers” means, literally, those who “separate,” “discriminate,” “judge,” etc. The translation given here is inferred from (a) the context (immediately following the citation, the Didascalist continues mtb' $lh$ $h k y l$ $l'$ $p y s q w p'$ 'yk $b h w r'$ $d k s p'$ $d n h w'$ $m p r s$ $b y s'$ $m n$ $l b'$ ["it is necessary for the bishop, therefore, as one who evaluates money, that he separate the bad from the good"] (Lagarde, Didascalia Apostolorum, p. 42.29ff.); (b) the parallel in the Greek Constitutiones Apostolorum (γίνεσθε τραπεζίται δόκιμοι ["Be approved money-changers"] (Funk, Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum, 1:123.17f.)); and (c) the parallels cited in the Patristic literature (for example, Clement of Alexandria [1/1] [Stromata, 1.28, 177.2 (Stählin and Früchtel, GCS 52*: 109.12ff.]); Pseudo-Clement [3/3] [Homiliae, 2.51.1; 3.50.2; 18.20.4 (Rehm and Paschke, GCS 42*: 55.11f; 75.19f.; 250.12f.]); Socrates [1/1] Historia ecclesiastica, 3.16 (Migne, PG 67: 421.30ff.)); etc.). See also Connolly, Didascalia Apostolorum, p. 101, n. 6.
of this citation, as it was cited in the original text of the Greek Didascalia, must take into consideration both the text of the Syriac Didascalia and that of the Greek Constitutiones Apostolorum.

A. THE VERSIONS

Didasc. 2.36.9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Lagarde, 42.29)</td>
<td>(Funk, 1:123.17f.)</td>
<td>(Reconstruction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡών</td>
<td>γίνεσθε</td>
<td>γίνεσθε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μπρίστ'</td>
<td>τραπεζίται</td>
<td>τραπεζίται</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βήρ'</td>
<td>δόκιμοι</td>
<td>δόκιμοι</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) (c) (d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(e)</th>
<th>(f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clem. Alex.,</td>
<td>Ps-Clem.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strom. 1.28, 177.2</td>
<td>Hom. 2.51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Stählin &amp; Früchtel,</td>
<td>(Rehm &amp; Paschke,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCS 52²: 109.12ff.)</td>
<td>GCS 42²: 55.11ff.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γίνεσθε</td>
<td>γίνεσθε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δόκιμοι</td>
<td>δόκιμοι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τραπεζίται</td>
<td>τραπεζίται</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δόκιμοι</td>
<td>δόκιμοι</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. THE ORIGINAL GREEK FORM

The questions which must be asked at this juncture have to do with the value of the versions (the Syriac version of the Didascalia, and the Greek version of the Constitutiones Apostolorum) for the determination of the original Greek form.

On the one hand, do the versions represent ad hoc translations of their respective Greek exemplars? If they do, they are obviously of real value for our purposes. On the other hand, are they

36 As noted above, there is no Latin parallel because of a lacuna in codex Veronensis. See n. 13, above.
37 As noted above, there is no real parallel in either the Arabic or Ethiopic Constitutiones Apostolorum. See n. 14, above.
38 This logos is cited three times in the Clementine Homiliae in precisely the same form: Homiliae, 2.51.1; 3.50.2; 18.20.4 (See Rehm and Paschke, GCS 42²: 55.11f; 75.19f; 250.12f. respectively).
39 These citations from Clement of Alexandria, Pseudo-Clement, and Socrates are given as representative of the many citations of the logos.
“dubbed in” equivalents of those Greek exemplars drawn on contemporary Gospel traditions? Or, further, are they constructions contrived by the authors of the versions to suit their respective contexts? If either of these, they are patently of little value for our purposes.

Furthermore, if we finally conclude that they do represent _ad hoc_ translations of their respective Greek exemplars, how precisely do they represent those Greek exemplars? Do they contain accommodations to contemporary Gospel traditions? If they do, to what extent? Do they contain accommodations to their respective contexts? If so, to what extent?

1. **Evaluation of the Versions as Evidence for the Original Greek Form**

In order to answer these questions I first compare the versions of the Didascalia and the _Constitutiones Apostolorum_ with their comparable extra-canonical parallels as they occur in the Patristic literature, for example, in Clement of Alexandria, _Stromata_ 1.28, 177.2, Pseudo-Clement, _Homiliae_ 2.51.1, and Socrates, _Historia ecclesiastica_, 3.16; and then analyze them in relationship to their respective contexts (the aim of both processes being to determine whether or not the versions represent _ad hoc_ translations of their respective Greek exemplars); and, finally, if it is clear that the versions are, in fact, _ad hoc_ translations, I examine them for possible accommodations both to their respective contexts and to their contemporary Gospel traditions.

For a comparison of the Syriac Didascalist’s citation with its comparable parallel in the Syriac Gospel traditions, I have been able to find only one parallel of the logos under discussion in the Syriac Patristic literature, namely, that found in Cyril of Alexandria’s _Contra Diodorum_, 1: _mwpv' ḫkym' nwh_’ (“Let us be wise money-changers”). The following distinctive features should be noted:

---

1. While Cyril of Alexandria employs the noun *mcrpn*’ (“money-changers”), the Didascalist employs the noun *mpršn*’ (“separators,” “discriminators,” etc.). Cf. the Greek Constitutor’s τραπεζίται (“money-changers”) (Funk, *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum*, 1:123.17f.).

2. While Cyril of Alexandria employs the adjective *hkym*’.

---


22 That the Didascalist’s term, “separators,” “discriminators,” etc. (*mpršn*) is to be interpreted as meaning “money-changers” (*mcrpn*) is implied by (a) the context, (b) the parallel in the Greek *Constitutiones Apostolorum*, and (c) the parallels cited in the Patristic literature. For the evidence, see n. 15, above.
The Didascalist employs the adjective *bhyri* ("approved"). Cf. the Greek Constitutor's ἀδυνάτου ("approved") (Funk, Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum, 1:123. 17f.).

3. While Cyril of Alexandria employs an exhortatory first person plural form of the verb "to be" (nhw'), the Didascalist employs the imperatival second person plural of the verb "to be" (hww). Cf. the Greek Constitutor's γίνεσθε ("be" [imperatival second person plural]) (Funk, Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum, 1:123.17f.).

The immediate implications of this comparison, as far as our questions are concerned, are that this citation, as employed by the Syriac Didascalist, is, on the negative side, not a "dubbed iny' form drawn on contemporary Syriac Gospel traditions, and, on the positive side, either an *ad hoc* translation of the Syriac Didascalist's Greek exemplar, or an *ad hoc* construction contrived by the Syriac Didascalist to suit the special needs of its particular context.

---

23 Cf. the adjective *prudentes* ("wise") (so Origen, In Matthaem, Comm 33 [Klostermann, GCS 38: 11.60.16ff.]) in the Latin traditions.

24 Cf. the adjectival *probati* ("approved") (so Jerome, Epistula, 119.11 [Hilberg, CSEL 55, 467.22ff.]), and the adjective *probabiles* ("approved") (so John Cassian, Conlataiones, 1.20; 2.9 [Petschenig, CSEL 13: 29.20ff.; 48.1ff.]) in the Latin traditions; and the adjective ἀδυνάτου ("approved") (so, for example, Clement of Alexandria (1/1) [Stromata, 1.28, 177.2 (Stahlin and Friichtel, GCS 52a: 109.12ff)]; Pseudo-Clement (3/3) [Homiliae, 2.51.1; 3.50.2; 18.20.4 (Rehm and Paschke, GCS 42e: 55.11ff.; 75.19f.; 250.12f.]); Socrates (1/1) [Historia ecclesiastica, 3.16 (Migne, PG 67: 421:30ff.)], etc.) in the Greek traditions.


26 Cf. the imperatival second person plural of the verb "to be" *estote* (so Origen, In Matthaem, Comm. 33 [Klostermann, GCS 38: 11.60.16ff.]; and Jerome, Epistulae, 119.11 [Hilberg, CSEL 55: 467.22ff.]) in the Latin traditions; and its equivalent γίνεσθε (so Clement of Alexandria (1/1) [Stromata, 1.28, 177.2 (Stahlin and Friichtel, GCS 52a: 109.12ff)]; Pseudo-Clement (3/3) [Homiliae, 2.51.1; 3.50.2; 18.20.4 (Rehm and Paschke, GCS 42e: 55.11ff.; 75.19f.; 250.12f.]); Socrates (1/1) [Historia ecclesiastica, 3.16 (Migne, PG 67: 421:30ff.)], etc.) in the Greek traditions.
As far as the latter alternative is concerned (namely, that the Syriac rendering is possibly a construction contrived by the Syriac Didascalist to suit the special needs of its particular context), the following factors are pertinent: (1) The parallel citation in the Greek Constitutiones Apostolorum is essentially identical. (2) Of the distinctive features of the citation (as compared with its comparable parallel in the Syriac Gospel traditions), none is determined by its particular context.

These factors, taken together, require the conclusions (a) that this citation is not, on the negative side, an ad hoc construction contrived to meet the special needs of its particular context, and (b) that it is, on the positive side, an ad hoc translation of the Syriac Didascalist’s Greek exemplar.

I turn then to a consideration of the former alternative (namely, that the Syriac rendering is an ad hoc translation of the Syriac Didascalist’s Greek exemplar). The question of possible accommodation calls for immediate attention.

Given the conclusion that the Syriac Didascalist’s citation is, in fact, an ad hoc translation, one question remains, that of possible accommodation either (a) to the context of the citation itself and/or (b) to the form of the comparable parallel in the contemporary Gospel traditions.

In regard to (a), the factors just considered (namely, that of the distinctive features of the citation [as compared with its parallel in the Gospel traditions], none is determined by its particular context; and that the parallel citation in the Greek Constitutiones Apostolorum is essentially identical) imply, not only, as we have argued above, that the Syriac Didascalist did not contrive the form of the citation to suit the special needs of its particular context, but also that, given the conclusion we have now reached (namely, that the Syriac rendering represents an ad hoc translation of its Greek exemplar), the Syriac Didascalist has not accommodated his translation to the context in which it occurs.
In regard to (b), the factors noted above (to the effect that the citation we are discussing is distinctly different from the form of its comparable parallel in the contemporary Syriac Gospel traditions) imply not only, as we have contended, that the Syriac Didascalist’s citation is not a “dubbed in” equivalent (drawn on contemporary Syriac Gospel traditions) of its Greek exemplar, but also that, given the conclusion that the Syriac rendering is indeed an ad hoc translation of its Greek exemplar, the Syriac Didascalist has not accommodated his translation to the form of its parallel in the contemporary Syriac Gospel traditions.

I take up now a comparison of the Greek Constitutor’s citation with its parallels in the Greek Gospel traditions.

The Greek Constitutor’s citation γίνεσθε τραπεζίται δόκιμοι (“Be approved money-changers”) (Constit. Apost. 2.36.9) is essentially identical in form and content to its parallels in the Greek Gospel traditions. Compare, for example, (a) Pseudo-Clement (3/3),²⁷ Socrates (1/1),²⁸ Chrysostom (1/1),²⁹ and Caesarius (1/1),³⁰ who render it precisely as does the Greek Constitutor; (b) Clement of Alexandria (1/1),³¹ Origen (1/3),³² Dionysius of Rome (1/1),³³ Apelles (1/1),³⁴ Palladius (1/1),³⁵ Cyril of Alexandria (2/4),³⁶ and Vita S. Syncleticae (1/1),³⁷ who render it in the form γίνεσθε δόκιμοι τραπεζίται; and (c) Cyril of Alexandria (1/4),³⁸ who renders it in the form

²⁷ Homiliae, 2.51.1; 3.50.2; 18.20.4 (Rehm and Paschke, GCS 42: 55.11f.; 75.19f.; 250.12f.).
²⁸ Historia ecclesiastica, 3.16 (Migne, PG 67: 421.30ff.).
²⁹ Opera, 5.844 (Resch, Agraphe, p. 116.3ff.).
³⁰ Quaestiones, 78 (Resch, Agraphe, p. 113.30ff.).
³¹ Stromata, 1.28, 177.2 (Stählin and Früchtel, GCS 52: 109.12ff.).
³² In Johannem, 19.7 (Preuschen, GCS 10: 4.307.5).
³³ Apud Eusebius, Historia ecclesiastica, 7.7.3 (Schwartz, GCS 9.1: 274.21).
³⁴ Apud Epiphanius, Adversus haereses, 44.2.6 (Holl, GCS 31: 2.192.16ff.).
³⁵ Dialogues de vita Joannis Chrysostomi (Resch, Agraphe, p. 114.14f.).
³⁶ In Ioannis evangelium, 4.5.407a; Adversus Nestorium, 1.2c (Pusey, Cyrilli Alexandrini, Opera, 3: 596.2f.; 6: 55.26ff.).
³⁷ Vita S. Syncleticae, 100B (Migne, PG 28: 1549.25f.).
³⁸ Fragmenta homiliarum, 14 (Pusey, Cyrilli Alexandrini, Opera, 5: 472.1ff.).
δόκιμοι γενέσθε τραπεζίται. Compare also Cyril of Jerusalem (1/1), who renders the logos under discussion in the same form as (b) but in the singular person, and John of Damascus (1/1), who renders it in a parallel form but in the first person plural, as does also Nicephorus Gregoras (1/1). Origen (2/3), Cyril of Alexandria (1/4), and Nicephorus Callistus (1/1) imply forms comparable to either (a), (b), or (c) above.

The immediate implications of this comparison, as far as our questions are concerned, are that this citation, as employed by the Greek Constitutor, is either a "dubbed in" form drawn on contemporary Greek Gospel traditions, or an ad hoc copy of the Greek Constitutor's Greek exemplar.

Since the Greek Constitutor is following his exemplar rather closely at this point, and since the Greek Constitutor's citation is identical with the Greek form presupposed by the Syriac Didascalist's citation, I conclude that the Greek Constitutor's citation is not a "dubbed in" form drawn on his contemporary Greek Gospel traditions but an ad hoc copy of the form which appeared in his Greek exemplar.

Furthermore, I find no evidence of accommodation either to the context in which the citation itself occurs or to its parallels in the contemporary Gospel traditions.

2. Reconstruction of the Greek Original

In view of the fact that, as has been demonstrated, the Syriac

---

39 Catecheses, 1.6.36 (Reischl and Rupp, Cyrilli Hierosolymarum, Opera omnia, 1.206.13).
40 De fide orthodoxa, 4.17 (Migne, PG 94: 1177.19f.).
41 Historia Byzantina, 23.3 (Migne, PG 148: 1365.9ff.).
42 In Jeremiam, Hom. 12.7 (Klostermann, GCS 6: 3.94.6); In Matthaeum, 17.31 (Klostermann, GCS 40: 10.673.28ff.).
43 In Joannis evangelium, 4.3.374c (Pusey, Cyrilli Alexandrini, Opera, 3: 549.4).
44 Historia ecclesiastica, 10.26.58 (Migne, PG 146: 513.56ff.).
45 Cf. the parallel passage in the Syriac Didascalia (Lagarde, Didascalia Apostolorum, p. 42.25ff. = Funk, Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum, 1: 123.16ff.).
46 See the discussion, below, on the reconstruction of the Greek original.
Didascalia and the Greek Constitutiones Apostolorum represent ad hoc renderings of their respective Greek exemplars, we may with some confidence conjecture the form of those exemplars and thereby determine the form of the original Greek text.

The implications of the evidence as set out above, are:

1. That the Greek Didascalist cited the logos under discussion in the form: imperative + noun + adjective. This is implied by both witnesses: *hww mpršn* bhyr' (“Be approved discriminators [= money-changers]”) (Didasc. Syr.) = γίνεσθε τραπεζίται δόκιμοι (“Be approved money-changers”) (Constit. Apost. Grk.).

2. That the Greek Didascalist employed the present imperative plural of γίνεσθαι (“to be”). This is implied by both witnesses: *hww* (= hwytwn) (“be”) (Didasc. Syr.) = γίνεσθε (“be”) (Constit. Apost. Grk.); and by the parallel Greek Gospel traditions.

3. That the Greek Didascalist employed the noun τραπεζίται (“money-changers”). This is implied by both witnesses: mpršn' (= mɛ’rpn’) (“separators,” “discriminators,” etc. [= “money-changers”]) (Didasc. Syr.) = τραπεζίται (“money-changers”)

47 Rather than the present imperative plural of ειναί which might be conjectured as lying behind the Latin estote (so Origen, *In Matthaeum, Comm.* 33 [Klostermann, GCS 38: 11.60.16ff.]; and Jerome, *Epistulae*, 119.11 [Hilberg, *CSEL* 55: 467.22ff.]). But compare the use of the infinitive fieri in John Cassian’s *Conlationes*, 2.9 (Petschenig, *CSEL* 13: 48.1f.).

48 The perfect of hw’ is “often used as an imperative” (so J. Payne Smith, *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary founded upon the Thesaurus Syriacus of R. P. Smith* [Oxford, 1903], s.v. hw’). Furthermore the verb hw’ is regularly used to translate γίνεσθαι. See, for example, Mt 10.16 (syrs p h); Mt 24.44 (syrs p h; syrs has hwytwn); and Lk 6.36 (syrs p h) where the imperative γίνεσθε is translated by the perfect hw (intended as an imperative). However, the Liber graduum, 17.7; 30.2 (M. Kmisko, *Liber graduum*, PS 3 [Paris, 1926]: 781.23; 864.17f.), citing Mt 10.16, on both occasions employs the imperative hwytwn.

49 The imperative γίνεσθε is employed consistently in the Greek Patristic witnesses. For the evidence, see ns. 27-44, above.

50 As has already been pointed out, the Syriac Didascalist’s term mpršn (“separators,” “discriminators,” etc.) is to be interpreted as meaning “money-changers” (mɛ’rpn’), the equivalent of the Greek Constitutor’s τραπεζίται (“money-changers”). For the evidence, see n. 15, above.
(Constit. Apost. Grk.); and by the parallel Greek Gospel traditions.\textsuperscript{31}

4. That the Greek Didascalist employed the adjective δόκιμοι ("approved").\textsuperscript{32} This is also implied by both witnesses: ἐδυρ’ ("approved") (Didasc. Syr.) = δόκιμοι ("approved") (Constit. Apost. Grk.); and by the parallel Greek Gospel traditions.\textsuperscript{33}

Given the above analysis and evaluation of the evidence, I conjecture that the dominical logos we are here discussing appeared in the following form in the original text of the Greek Didascalia: γίνεσθε τραπεζίται δόκιμοι.

C. COMPARISON OF THE GREEK DIDASCALIST’S CITATION WITH ITS COMPARABLE PARALLELS IN THE GREEK GOSPEL TRADITIONS

1. The Texts

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
& (a) & (b) & (c) \\
Didasc. Grk. 2.36.9 & Clem. Alex. & Ps-Clem. \\
(Reconstruction) & Stv. 1.28, 177.2\textsuperscript{51} & Hom. 2.51.1\textsuperscript{52} \\
γίνεσθε & γίνεσθε & γίνεσθε \\
τραπεζίται & τραπεζίται & τραπεζίται \\
δόκιμοι & δόκιμοι & δόκιμοι\textsuperscript{54} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{51} The noun τραπεζίται appears consistently in all the Greek Patristic witnesses. For the evidence, see n. 21, above.

\textsuperscript{52} And not, for example, the adjective φρόνιμοι ("wise") which might be conjectured as lying behind the Syriac ḫyrm’ ("wise") (so Cyril of Alexandria, Contra Diodorum, 1 [Pusey, Cyrilli Alexandrini, Opera, 5: 493.6]) and the Latin prudentes ("wise") (so Origen, In Mattheum, Comm. 33 [Klostermann, GCS 38: 11.60.16ff.]). Φρόνιμος is rather consistently translated by ḫyrm’ in the Syriac Gospel traditions. See, for example, Mt 7.24 (syrp h); Mt 10.16 (syrp h); Mt 11.25 (syr s p h); Mt 24.25 (syr s p h); Mt 25.2 (syr s p h); Lk 12.42 (syr p h); Ephraem (\textsuperscript{5}) (J. S. Assemani, Sancti Patris nostri Ephraemi Syri, Opera omnia, 1 [Rome, 1737]: 189AB); and Ephraem (Comm. Dialessavon, 10.14 [L. Leloir, Saint Éphrem: Commentaire de l’ Évangile Concordant. Text Syriaque (Manuscrit Chester Beatty, 709), CBM 8 (Dublin, 1963): 48:13]). It is also translated by ἐρυμ’ ("wise," "astute"). See Mt 10.16 (syr s); and Liber graduum, 17.7; 30.2, (Kmosko, PS 3: 781.23; 864.17f.).

\textsuperscript{53} The adjective δόκιμοι ("approved") occurs consistently in all the Greek Patristic witnesses. For the evidence, see ns. 27-44, above.

\textsuperscript{54} See Stählin and Früchtel, GCS 52\textsuperscript{e}: 109.12ff.

\textsuperscript{55} See Rehm and Paschke, GCS 42\textsuperscript{e}: 55.11f. This logos is cited on two other occasions in precisely the same form in the Clementine Homiliae, namely, Homiliae, 3.50.2 and 18.20.4. See Rehm and Paschke, GCS 42\textsuperscript{e}: 75.19f. and 250.12f. respectively.

\textsuperscript{56} These citations from Clement of Alexandria and Pseudo-Clement are
2. The Comparable Parallels in the Greek Patristic Literature

I take up now an “evaluation” with respect both to the form (in the more technical sense of the term) and to the function of the parallels in the Greek Patristic literature.

The Form

The logos ὑνεσθε τραπεζιται δόκιμοι belongs in the major “form-historical” category “wisdom sayings,” and, more specifically, the subcategory “exhortations.”\(^5^7\) The distinctive feature of the logoi which belong within the subcategory “exhortations” is that they are formed as “imperatives.” Rudolf Bultmann gives, as one illustration (among a number) of the “imperative form,” the “exhortation” in Mt 10.16b:

γνεσθε ψόνιμοι ὦς οἱ ὤφεις καὶ ἀκέραιοι ὦς αἱ περιστεραὶ and harmless as doves”.

The logoi we are discussing, apart from the fact that it has only one “strand,”\(^5^8\) is essentially identical, in form, to the Matthaean logos (Mt 10.16b).

Clement of Alexandria\(^5^9\) cites an expanded version: γνεσθε δόκιμοι τραπεζιται, τὰ μὲν ἀποδοκιμάζοντες, τὸ δὲ καλὸν κατέχοντες (“Be approved money-changers, rejecting those things which are [evil], holding on to that which is good”).\(^6^0\) If this is a fair indication of how the logos was understood in the given as representative of the many citations of this logos in the Patristic literature.

\(^5^7\) Rudolf Bultmann (The History of the Synoptic Tradition [2d. ed., New York, 1968], pp. 69ff.) divides the dominical logoi into three major categories: (i) “wisdom sayings” (or “logia”); (ii) “prophetic and apocalyptic sayings”; and (iii) “laws and community regulations.” The first of these three major categories he divides into three subcategories: (i) “Principles” (“declaratory form”); (ii) “exhortations” (“imperative form”); and (iii) “questions.” It is to the second of these subcategories that the logos under consideration belongs.

\(^5^8\) Bultmann speaks of Mt 10.16b as a “double stranded mashal.” See Synoptic Tradition, p. 81.

\(^5^9\) Stromata, 1.28, 177.2 (Stählin and Früchtel, GCS 52*: 109.12ff.).

\(^6^0\) Cf. I Th 5.21-22: πάντα δὲ δοκιμάζετε, τὸ καλὸν κατέχετε· ἀπὸ παντὸς εἴδους πονηροῦ ἀπέχεσθε (“Prove all things; hold on to that which is good; abstain from every form of evil”).
early Church, and I believe it is, then we may fairly reformulate it:

γίνεσθε δόκιμοι ὡς τραπεζίται ("Be approved as money-changers").

As Joachim Jeremias points out, the tertium comparationis in this logos is the ability to distinguish between that which is genuine and that which is false—in his words, "between genuine and valid coins and spurious forgeries."

The Function

In every context in which the extremely popular logos γίνεσθε τραπεζίται δόκιμοι is cited, it is employed, as one might expect, with a purely paraenetic function.

3. The Didascalist’s Citation

Before comparing the Greek Didascalist’s logos with its comparable parallels in the Greek Patristic literature, it will be necessary to “evaluate” his citation as to both its form (in the more technical sense of the term) and its function.

61 Others interpret it similarly, also, no doubt, under the influence of 1 Th 5.21-22. So, for example, Origen (2/2) (In Matthaeum, 17.31 [Klostermann, GCS 40: 10.673.28ff.]; In Johanneum, 19.7 [Preuschen, GCS 10: 4.307.5]); Cyril of Jerusalem (1/1) (Catecheses, 1.6.36 [Reischl and Rupp, Cyrilli Hierosolymarum, Opera omnia, 1: 206.13]); Socrates (1/1) Historia ecclesiastica, 3.16 [Migne, PG 67: 421.30ff.]; Chrysostom (1/1) (Opera, 5.844 [Resch, Agrapha, p. 116.3ff.]); and Cyril of Alexandria (2/4) (In Ioannis evangelium, 4.5.407a; Adversus Nestorium, 1.2c [Pusey, Cyrilli Alexandrini, Opera, 3: 596.2f.; 6: 55.26ff.]).

62 Or, perhaps, γίνεσθε κριτικοὶ ὡς τραπεζίται δόκιμοι ("Be discriminators as approved money-changers").


64 It is cited more often than any other extra-canonical dominical logos.

65 See, for example, Clement of Alexandria, Stromata, 1.28, 177.2 (Stählin and Früchtel, GCS 52: 109.12ff.); Origen, In Matthaeum, Comm. 33 (Klostermann, GCS 38: 11.60.16ff.); In Johanneum, 19.7 (Preuschen, GCS 10: 4.307.5); Cyril of Jerusalem, Catecheses, 1.6.36 (Reischl and Rupp, Cyrilli Hierosolymarum, Opera omnia, 1: 206.13); Socrates, Historia ecclesiastica, 3.16 (Migne, PG 67: 421.30ff.); Chrysostom, Opera, 5.844 (Resch, Agrapha, 116.3ff.); Cyril of Alexandria, In Ioannis evangelium, 4.3.374c; Adversus Nestorium, 1.2c (Pusey, Cyrilli Alexandrini, Opera, 3: 596.2f.; 6: 55.26ff.); John of Damascus, De fide orthodoxa, 4.17 (Migne, PG 94: 1177.19f.); and Nicephoras Gregoras, Historia Byzantina, 23.3 (Migne, PG 148: 1365.9ff.).
The Form

The dominical logos⁶⁶ γίνεσθε τραπέζιται δόκιμοι (Didasc. 2.36.9) belongs, as do its parallels in the Patristic literature, in the major “form-historical” category “wisdom sayings,” and, more specifically, the subcategory “exhortations.” It has precisely the same “imperative form.”

The Function

As to function, the dominical logos γίνεσθε τραπέζιται δόκιμοι is employed, in Didasc. 2.36.9, paraenetically. It is cited in a context in which the “laymen” are exhorted not to judge. To them “it is said,” “Judge not, that you be not judged” (cf. Mt 7.1 = Lk 6.37a). That is the prerogative of the “bishops.” To them “it is said,” “Be approved money-changers.”

4. The Comparison

The Greek Didascalist’s logos is essentially identical with its counterpart in the Greek Patristic literature in both structure and content.⁶⁷ It also fulfills the same general function. This

⁶⁶ The logos γίνεσθε τραπέζιται δόκιμοι is attributed variously in the Patristic literature—as a saying of “Jesus”: so, for example, Origen (In Matthaeum, Comm. 33 [Klostermann, GCS 38: 11.60.16ff.]; In Johannem, 19.7 [Preuschen, GCS 10: 4.307.5]); Pseudo-Clement (Homiliae, 2.51.1 [Rehm and Paschke, GCS 42: 55.11ff.]); Jerome (Epistulae, 119.11 [Hilberg, CSEL 55: 467.22ff.]); Socrates (Historia ecclesiastica, 3.16 [Migne, PG 67: 421.30ff.]); and Vita S. Synelitae, 100B [Migne, PG 28: 1549.25ff.]; as a word of the “Gospel”: so, for example, Apelles, apud Epiphanius (Adversus haereses, 44.2.6 [Holl, GCS 31: 2.192.16ff.]); Caesarius (Quaestiones, 78 [Resch, Agrapha, p. 113.30ff.]); and John Cassian (Conlationes, 2.9 [Petschenig, CSEL 13: 48.1ff.]); and as a citation from “Scripture”: so, for example, Clement of Alexandria (Stromata, 1.28, 177.2 [Stählin and Früchtel, GCS 52⁵: 109.12ff.]); Origen (In Matthaeum, 17.31 [Klostermann, GCS 40:10.673.28ff.]); and Palladius (Dialogus de vita Joannis Chrysostomi [Resch, Agrapha, p. 114.14ff.]).

In the Didascalia it is clearly a word of the “Lord.” See n. 2, above. It is also attributed to the “Lord” by John Cassian (Conlationes, 1.20 [Petschenig, CSEL 13: 29.20ff.]).

⁶⁷ There is no significant difference between the formulation γίνεσθε δόκιμοι τραπέζιται (with the adjective preceding the noun) so Clement of Alexandria [1/1], Origen [1/1], Dionysius of Rome, apud Eusebius [1/1], Cyril of Jerusalem [1/1], Apelles, apud Epiphanius [1/1], Palladius [1/1], Cyril
being the case, I turn immediately to the question of sources.

D. THE SOURCES

Regarding the sources, we must speak of both ultimate and immediate sources.

As far as the ultimate source is concerned, it seems to me that the logos γίνεσθε τραπεζίται δόκιμοι roots back into the earliest oral and written traditions—traditions that were transmitted independently of the traditions taken up into, or dependent upon, the canonical Gospels.

This logos was probably known already by Paul. His paraenesis in 1 Th 5.21-22: πάντα δε δοκιμάσετε, τὸ καλὸν κατέχετε· ἀπὸ παντὸς εἴδους πονηροῦ ἀπέχεσθε ("Prove all things; hold on to that which is good; abstain from every form of evil") is very likely an interpretation of it.68 One thing is clear—the early Patristic authors frequently quote the Pauline paraenesis as an interpretation of it.69

of Alexandria [2/3], Vita S. Syncleticae [1/1], John of Damascus [1/1], and Nicephorus Gregoras [1/1]) and the formation γίνεσθε τραπεζίται δόκιμοι (with the adjective following the noun) (so Ps-Clement [3/3], Socrates [1/1], Chrysostom [1/1], Caesarius [1/1], and Constitutiones Apostolorum [1/1]). For the references, see ns. 27-44, above.

The Didascalist's logos is formulated according to the latter pattern—imperative + noun + adjective.

68 So also M. R. James (The Apocryphal New Testament, [Oxford, 1955], p. 35), G. Kittel (G. Kittel, et al., Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, trans. G. W. Bromiley, 2 (Grand Rapids, 1965): s.v. εἰδος), and Jeremias (Unknown Sayings of Jesus, p. 92). Kittel holds that "this seems very likely in view of the strong verbal similarities and the use of εἰδος for a 'mint.' In this case v.21b and v.22 would be the positive and negative outworking of the main advice in v.21a: 'As good money-changers' test all things: keep the good and reject the bad.'" Cf. Resch, Agrapha, p. 125.

69 So, for example, Origen, In Matthaeeum, 17.31 (Klostermann, GCS 40: 10.673.28ff.); In Johanneum, 19.7 (Preuschen, GCS 10: 4.307.5); Chrysostom, Opera, 5.844 (Resch, Agrapha, 116.3ff.); and Cyril of Alexandria, Adversus Nestorium, 1.2c (Pusey, Cyrilli Alexandrini, Opera, 6.55.26ff.).

Others undoubtedly allude to it. So, for example, Clement of Alexandria, Stromata, 1.28, 177.2 (Stählin and Früchtel, GCS 52: 109.12ff.); Cyril of Jerusalem, Catecheses, 1.6.36 (Reischl and Rupp, Cyrilli Hierosolymarum, Opera omnia, 1: 206.13); and Socrates, Historia ecclesiastica, 3.16 (Migne, PG 67, 421.30ff.).
And, as far as the immediate source is concerned, I have argued elsewhere\textsuperscript{70} that it is highly probable that the Didascalist cited this logos, along with many other dominical logoi which he quotes, from a collection of dominical logoi similar in form to that collection of dominical logoi known as the Gospel of Thomas.\textsuperscript{71}

(To be continued)


\textsuperscript{71} I will deal more specifically with this point in a future article in this series.