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In an earlier article¹ in this series, I set forth the methodologies which I am persuaded 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; and in a more recent article² in the same series, I sought to demonstrate both the adequacy and the validity of those methodologies by applying them to the extra-canonical dominical logos, “Be approved money-changers,” as it is cited in the Didascalia (Didasc. 2.36.9). I now attempt a further demonstration of the adequacy and validity of the said methodologies
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by applying them to the canonical dominical *logos*,³ "For it is written in the Law, 'You shall not commit adultery.' But I say to you (that is, I spoke, in the Law, through Moses, but now I myself speak to you), Everyone who shall look at his neighbor's wife, to desire her, has already committed adultery with her in his heart," as it is similarly cited in the *Didascalia* (*Didasc. 1.1.4.*). Cf. Mt 5.27-28.

This citation is extant in the Syriac and Latin versions of the *Didascalia* (Lagarde, *Didascalia Apostolorum*, p. 1.23ff.; Tidner, *Didascaliae Apostolorum*, p. 3.8ff.), and in the Greek, Arabic, and Ethiopic *Constitutiones Apostolorum* (Funk, *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum*, 1:5.19ff.; Dawud, *'ldsqwlyt*, p. 17.9ff.; Harden, *Ethiopic Didascalia*, p. 3.18ff.). Concerning it several preliminary factors should be taken into consideration at the outset:

1. In all five witnesses (the Syriac and Latin *Didascaliae*, the Greek, Arabic, and Ethiopic *Constitutiones Apostolorum*), it occurs in essentially the same context: The "children of God" are to flee from "all avarice and evil dealing." They are not to "desire that which is any man's," for "he who desires his neighbor's wife, or his servant, or his maidservant, is already an adulterer, and a thief." This admonition is supported by two citations, the one (cf. Exod 20.17) from the Torah, and the other (the citation under consideration) from the "Gospel" (Lagarde, *Didascalia Apostolorum*, p. 1.11ff.; Tidner, *Didascaliae Apostolorum*, p. 2.14ff.; Funk, *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum*, 1:5.5ff.; Dawud, *'ldsqwlyt*, p. 16.10ff.; Harden, *Ethiopic Didascalia*, p.2.33ff.).

³ The author of this *logos* is designated mrn wml pnn ysw mshh ("Our Lord and Teacher, Jesus the Messiah") (Lagarde, *Didascalia Apostolorum*, p. 1.21) = dominus et doctor noster Iesus Christus ("Our Lord and Teacher, Jesus Christ") (Tidner, *Didascaliae Apostolorum*, p. 3.5f.) = κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός ("Our Lord Jesus Christ") (Funk, *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum*, 1:5.16) = "Christ" (Dawud, *'ldsqwlyt*, p. 17.8) = "Our Lord Jesus Christ" (Harden, *Ethiopic Didascalia*, p. 3.13).
2. In all five witnesses, it is introduced with similar citation formulae: 'yk ḍp b'unglywn mhdt wmšrr wmšml 'sr ptgm' dnmws [‘mr] ("as also in the Gospel, renewing and confirming and fulfilling the Ten Words of the Law, [he says]") (Lagarde, Didascalia Apostolorum, p. 1.22f.) = dicit enim in evangelio recapitulans et confirmans et conplens decalogum legis ("for he says in the Gospel, recapitulating and confirming and fulfilling the Decalogue of the Law") (Tidner, Didascaliae Apostolorum, p. 3.7f.) = λέγει γὰρ ἐν τῷ Εὐαγγελίῳ, ἀνακεφαλαοῦμενος καὶ στηρίζων καὶ πληρῶν τὴν δεκαδόγον τοῦ Νόμου ("for he says in the Gospel, summing-up and confirming the Decalogue of the Law") (Funk, Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum, 1:5.17ff.) = "for Christ says in one of the chapters of the Holy Gospel, and confirms and fulfills the "Ten Words' of the Law' (Dawud, 'ldsqwlyt, p.17.8f.) = "for he teaches us and gives us understanding and strengthens us by the Holy Spirit, that he may fulfill the Law, in which it is written, saying" (Harden, Ethiopic Didascalia, p. 3.15ff.).

3. In the Syriac and Latin Didascalieae, and in the Greek and Arabic Constitutiones Apostolorum, it has essentially the same form: part (i), an introductory citation formula, "for it is written in the Law" + part (ii), a citation from the Torah + part (iii), an introductory logos formula, "but I say to you" + part (iv), a parenthetical statement emphasizing the authority of the one who pronounces the logos which follows + part (v), the logos itself (Lagarde, Didascalia Apostolorum, p. 1.23ff.; Tidner, Didascalieae Apostolorum, p. 3.8ff.; Funk, Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum, 1:5.19ff.; Dawud, 'ldsqwlyt, p. 17.9ff.).

4. In the Syriac and Latin Didascalieae, and in the Greek and Arabic Constitutiones Apostolorum, it consists of essentially the

---

4 The Ethiopic Constitutiones Apostolorum renders the citation in a form essentially identical with the form of the Matthaean parallel (Mt 5. 27-28). See Harden, Ethiopic Didascalia, p. 3.18ff.
same content: "For it is written in the Law, ‘You shall not commit adultery.’ But I say to you (that is, I spoke, in the Law, through Moses, but now I myself speak to you), Everyone who shall look at his neighbor’s wife, to desire her, has already committed adultery with her in his heart.”

5. And finally, in all five witnesses, it fulfills the same function, namely, to support the contention that the Christian is not to “desire that which is any man’s.” 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 of this citation, as it was employed in the original text of the Greek Didascalia, must take into consideration, with the qualifications indicated, all the extant versions, both of the Didascalia and of the Constitutiones Apostolorum.

THE VERSIONS

Didasc. 1.1.4

(a) Didasc. Syr. (Lagarde, 1.23ff.)
(b) Didasc. Lat. (Tidner, 3.8ff.)
(c) Constit. Apost.4 (Funk, 1:5.19ff.)

(i) mtl dkyby bnmws' quoniam δτι
(ii) dl' tgwr Non moechaberis; οὐ μοιχεύσετες.
(iii) 'n' dyn 'mr 'n' 'lkwn hd' ego autem dico vobis ἐγὼ δέ λέγω ύμεν,

6 See n. 4, above.

6 The Arabic Constitutor renders the citation in a form essentially identical to that of the Greek text (see Dawud, 'ldsqwylyt, p. 17.9f.); but the Ethiopic Constitutor renders it in a form (probably as the result of accommodation) essentially identical to its Matthaean parallel (Mt 5.27-28).
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tōu plēsōn  
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(d) Didasc. Grk.  
(Reconstruction)

Mt 5.27-28  
(Legg, NTG:Matthaeum,  
ad loc.)

(i) διλ ἐν τῷ Νδῳψ γεγραπται·  

(ii) οὐ μουξέσεσαι.

(iii) 'Εγώ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν,

(iv) toût' 'estin ἐν τῷ Νδῳψ  
(τῷ) διὰ Μωϋσέως ἐγώ ἐλάλησα,  
nūn δὲ ὁ αὐτός ὑμῖν λέγω.

(v) Πᾶς, δότως ἐμβλέψει  
eīs tūn gυναίκα  
tōu plēsōn αὐτοῦ  
pρδē τὸ ἐπιλωμησαί αὐτήν,  
ἡδη ἐμοζχέουσαν αὐτήν  
ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ.

Πᾶς ὁ θλήσων  
γυναίκα  
pρδē τὸ ἐπιλωμησαί αὐτήν,  
ἡδη ἐμοζχέουσαν αὐτήν  
ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ.

(i) ἡκοδόσατε διλ ἐρρέθη·  

(ii) οὐ μουξέσεσαι.

(iii) 'Εγώ δὲ λέγω υμῖν διλ

(iv) τούτο έστων ἐν τῷ Νδῳψ  
(τῷ) διὰ Μωϋσέως ἐγώ ἐλάλησα,  
nῦν δὲ ο αὐτῶς υμῖν λέγω.

(v) Πᾶς ο βλέπων  
γυναίκα  
pρὸς τὸ ἐπιλωμησαί αὐτήν,  
ἡδη ἐμοζχέουσαν αὐτήν  
ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ.

THE ORIGINAL GREEK FORM

The questions with which we now concern ourselves have to do with the value of the versions (the Syriac and Latin versions of the Didascalia; the Greek, Arabic, and Ethiopic versions 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 "dubbed in" equivalents of those Greek exemplars drawn on contemporary Gospel traditions? Or, further, are they constructions contrived by the authors of the various 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 various versions of the Didascalia and the Constitutiones Apostolorum with their comparable canonical parallel, namely, Mt 5.27-28, as it occurs in their respective Gospel traditions, both in the Gospel manuscripts and in the Patristic literature; 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.

The Parallel in the Syriac Gospel Traditions

I turn immediately to a comparison of the Syriac Didascalist's citation with its comparable parallel in the Syriac Gospel traditions. The following distinctive features should be noted:

1. The formula *mty dktyb bnmws* ("for it is written in the Law") (*Didasc. Syr.*, part i) occurs nowhere else in the Syriac Gospel traditions. While the Gospel manuscripts and the Patristic citations employ either the formula *sn'twn d'tmr* ("you have heard that it was said") (so syr*'), *sn'twn d'tmr lqdmyn* ("you have heard that it was said to the ancients") (so syr*n*, cf. syr*p*), or *t'mr lqdmyn* ("it was said to the ancients") (so Titus of Bostra [1/1]* and Philoxenus of Mabbug [1/1]*), the *Didascalia* alone employs the formula *mty dktyb bnmws* ("for it is written in the Law").

2. The formula *n' dyn 'mr 'n' lkwn hd* ("but I say to you this") (*Didasc. Syr.*, part iii) occurs, in precisely this form, nowhere else in the Syriac Gospel traditions. While the Gospel manuscripts and the Patristic citations employ the clause *n' dyn 'mr 'n lkwn* ("but I say to you") without the demonstrative pronoun *hd* ("this") (so syr* c p h p*), Titus of Bostra [1/1]*), the *Didascalia* employs the same clause with the pronoun *hd* ("this").

---

8 *Contra Manichaeos, 4.r75* (P. A. de Lagarde, *Titi Bostreni, Contra Manichaeos libri quattuor Syriace* [Berlin, 1859 (reprint, Osnabrück/ Wiesbaden, 1967)], p. 120.31f.).


10 *Contra Manichaeos, 4.r75* (Lagarde, *Contra Manichaeos*, p. 120.31f.).
3. The parenthesis $hw$ $dnwmw$ $byd$ $mws$ $mlt$ $hs'$ $dn'$ $qmwmy$ $mr$ $n'$ $lkwn$ ("that is, I spoke, in the Law, through Moses, but now I myself speak to you") (Didasc. Syr., part iv) occurs nowhere else in the Syriac Gospel traditions. Cf. syr$^s$ c p h pal, Titus of Bostra (1/1).$^{11}$

4. The clause $dklmn$ $dnwr$ $b'ntt$ $qrybh$ ("everyone who shall look at his neighbor's wife") (Didasc. Syr., part v) occurs, in precisely this form, nowhere else in the Syriac Gospel traditions. While (a) the Gospel manuscripts and the Patristic citations employ, in the main, the active participle $hz'$ ("looks") (so syr$^s$ c p h, Titus of Bostra [1/1],$^{12}$ Philoxenus of Mabbug [1/2],$^{13}$ and Martyrius [1/1] $^{14}$, $^{15}$), the Didascalia alone employs the imperfect $nhwr$ ("shall look"),$^{16}$ while (b) the Gospel manuscripts and the Patristic citations employ, in the main, the construction of participle or finite verb (e.g. $hz'$ ["looks"] or $nhz'$ ["shall look"]$^{17}$) + noun ($'ntt'$ ["woman," "wife"]$^{18}$) (so syr$^s$ c p h pal, Ephraem[?] [1/1],$^{19}$ Titus of Bostra [1/1],$^{20}$ Philoxenus of Mabbug [1/2],$^{21}$ Martyrius [1/1],$^{22}$ and Dionysius bar Šalibi [1/1]$^{23}$), the Didascalia employs the construction of finite verb ($nhwr$ ["shall look"]$^{24}$) + preposition ($b$ ["on," "at"]$^{25}$) + construct noun

\[\text{References:}\]

$^{11}$ Contra Manichaeos, 4.r75 (Lagarde, Contra Manichaeos, p. 120.31ff.).

$^{12}$ Contra Manichaeos, 4.r75 (Lagarde, Contra Manichaeos, p. 120.31ff.).

$^{13}$ Hom. 13 (Budge, Discourses 2:600.9ff.).

$^{14}$ Book of Perfection, 2.6.20 (A. de Halleux, Martyrius [Sahdona]: Ouvres spirituelles, II: Livre de la Perfection, 2me Partie, CSCO 214/syr 90 [Louvain, 1961]: 71.21ff.).

$^{15}$ Syrpal has the active participle $hm'$ ("burns with desire"), and Philoxenus of Mabbug (1/2) (Hom. 13 [Budge, Discourses 2:555.6ff.]) the active participle $hr'$ ("looks").

$^{16}$ Ephraem (?) (1/1) (In Ezechielem 9.4 [J. S. Assemani, Sancti Patris nostri Ephraemi Syri, Opera omnia, 1 (Rome, 1737): 5.174c]) and Dionysius bar Šalibi (1/1) (Commentarii, ad loc. [I. Sedlaček and I.-B. Chabot, Dionysii bar Šalibi, Commentarii in evangelia, 1, fasc. 2, CSCO 77/syr 33 (Louvain, 1915): 219.13]) have the imperfect $nhz'$ ("shall look").

$^{17}$ In Ezechielem, 9.4 (Assemani, Ephraemi Syri, Opera, 1:5. 174c).

$^{18}$ Contra Manichaeos, 4.r75 (Lagarde, Contra Manichaeos, p. 120.31ff.).

$^{19}$ Hom. 13 (Budge, Discourses 2:600.9ff.).

$^{20}$ Book of Perfection, 2.6.20 (Halleux, CSCO 214/syr 90:71.21ff.).

$^{21}$ Commentarii, ad loc. (Sedlaček and Chabot, CSCO 77/syr 33:219.13).
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(‘ntt ["wife of"]);\(^{22}\) while (c) the Gospel manuscripts and the Patristic citations employ the emphatic form of the noun (‘ntt ["woman," "wife"]) (so syr\(\epsilon\) p h\(\psi\)al, Ephraem[?] [1/1],\(^{23}\) Titus of Bostra [1/1],\(^{24}\) Philoxenus of Mabbug [2/2],\(^{25}\) Martyrius [1/1],\(^{26}\) and Dionysius bar Šalibi [/1]),\(^{27}\) the Didascalia alone employs the construct form (‘ntt ["wife of"]); and while (d) the Gospel manuscripts and the Patristic citations, without exception, employ the noun without modification,\(^{28}\) the Didascalia employs the modifier q\(\chi\)rbh ("his neighbor").\(^{29}\)

The immediate implications of this comparison, so far as our questions are concerned, are that this citation, as employed by the Syriac Didascalist, is, on the negative side, not a "dubbed in" 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.

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 Latin Didascalia and in the Greek and Arabic

\(^{22}\) Philoxenus of Mabbug (1/2) (Hom. 13 [Budge, Discourses 2:555.6f.]) has the construction: participle (h\(\varepsilon\) ["looks"] + preposition (b ["on," "at"] + noun (‘ntt ["woman," "wife"]).

\(^{23}\) In Ez Chiel, 9.4 (Assemani Ephraemi Syri, Opera, 1:5.174c).

\(^{24}\) Contra Manichaeos, 4.15 (Lagarde, Contra Manichaeos, p. 120.31ff.).

\(^{25}\) Hom. 13 (Budge, Discourses 2:555.6f., 600.9ff.).

\(^{26}\) Book of Perfection, 2.6.20 (Halleux, CSCO 214/syr 90:71.21f.).

\(^{27}\) Commentarii, ad loc. (Sedláček and Chabot, CSCO 77/syr 33:219.13).

\(^{28}\) So all the witnesses cited under (c). See nn. 23-27, above.

\(^{29}\) Cf. the modifiers proximi sui ("his neighbor's") and τοῦ πλησοῦν ("[his] neighbor's") in the Latin Didascalia and the Greek Constitutiones Apostolorum respectively. There is an equivalent form in the Arabic Constitutiones Apostolorum.
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.

Since the four distinctive features discussed above\(^\text{30}\) have equivalent forms in the Latin Didascalia and in the Greek and Arabic Constitutiones Apostolorum, I conclude that they already existed in the original Greek Didascalia, and therefore they are not constructions contrived by the Syriac Didascalist.

There is only one feature, namely, the use of the demonstrative pronoun ḫḏʿ ("this"), that calls for attention here. As far as I can determine, there is nothing in the context that requires this particular element. Therefore, in view of the fact that it has no equivalent in its parallels in the Latin Didascalia and in the Greek and Arabic Constitutiones Apostolorum, I conclude that it is merely an editorial element added by the Syriac Didascalist and inspired by stylistic preference. An equivalent probably did not occur in the Syriac Didascalist's Greek exemplar.

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.

\(^{30}\) See pp. 143-145, above.
In regard to (a), the factors just considered (namely, that of the distinctive features of the citation [as compared with its comparable parallel in the Gospel traditions], none is determined by its particular context; and that the parallel citation in the Latin Didascalia and in the Greek and Arabic 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, both in structure and content, 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.

The Parallel in the Latin Gospel Traditions

I take up now a comparison of the Latin Didascalist's citation with its comparable parallel in the Latin Gospel traditions. Several distinctive, and significant, features should be noted:

1. The formula *quoniam in lege scriptum est* ("for it is written in the Law") (Didasc. Lat., part i) occurs, in precisely this form, nowhere else in the Latin Gospel traditions. While the Gospel manuscripts and the Patristic citations employ either the formula *auditis quia dictum est* ("you have heard that it was said")
(so ita b d f, Augustine [3/3],3¹ and Eugippius [1/1]3²), auditis quia dictum est antiquis ("you have heard that it was said to the ancients") (so itaur ff1 g1 h1 l, vg, Chromatius Aquileiensis [1/1],3³ Gregorius Magnus [1/1]3⁴), or dictum est (enim) antiquis ("[for] it was said to the ancients") (so Irenaeus [1/1],3⁵ and Origen [3/3]3⁶), the Didascalia employs the formula quoniam in lege scriptum est ("for it is written in the Law"). Only Jerome [1/1]3⁷ has anything comparable, namely, scriptum est, inquit, in lege ("it is written, it is said, in the Law").

2. The parenthesis id est in lege per Moysen locutus sum, nunc autem ipse vobis dico ("that is, I have spoken, in the Law, through Moses, now however, I myself speak to you") (Didasc. Lat., part iv) occurs nowhere else in the Latin Gospel traditions. Cf. it, vg, Irenaeus (1/1),3⁸ Origen (3/3),3⁹ Chromatius Aquileien-

3¹ De divinis Scripturis sive Speculum, 45 (F. Weihrich, S. Aurelii Augustini, Speculum, CSEL 12 [Vienna, 1887]: 479.10ff.); De sermone Domini, 1.12.33 (A. Mutzenbecher, S. Aurelii Augustini, De sermone Domini in monte, CCL 25.7 [Turnholti, 1967]: 35.21ff.); and Contra Faustum, 19.21 (I. Zycha, S. Aurelii Augustini, De utilitate credendi . . . contra Faustum, CSEL 25.1 [Vienna, 1891]: 520.5ff.).

3² Excerpta ex operibus Augustini, 303 (P. Knöll, Eugippius: Excerpta ex operibus S. Augustini, CSEL 9.1 [Vienna, 1885]: 976.5ff.).

3³ Tract. in evang. Matthaei, 9.1.1 (V. Bulhart, Chromatii Aquileiensis Episcopi, Tractatus XVII, CCL 9 [Turnholti, 1957]: 416.23ff.).

3⁴ In librum primum Regum, 3.156 (P. Verbraken, S. Gregorii Magni, Expositiones . . . In librum I. Regum, CCL 144 [Turnholti, 1963]: 284.27ff.).


3⁷ Tract. in Marci evangel., 1.1-12 (B. Capelle, et al., S. Hieronymi, Opera, II: Tractatus . . . in Marci evangelium, CCL 78 [Turnholti, 1958]: 455.1ff.).

3⁸ Adversus haereses, 4.13.1 (Rousseau, et al., SC 100:524.5ff.).

3⁹ See n. 36, above.
sis (1/1), Jerome (1/1), Augustine (3/3), and Gregorius Magnus (1/1).

3. The clause omnis, quicumque interderit in mulierem proximi sui ("everyone who shall look at his neighbor's wife") (Didasc. Lat., part v) occurs, in precisely this form, nowhere else in the Latin Gospel traditions. While (a) the Gospel manuscripts and the Patristic citations employ, in the main, either the simple relative pronoun qui ("who") (so Irenaeus [1/2], Tertullian [6/6], Origen [1/5], Hilary [1/1], Athanasius [1/1], Ambrose [4/5], Chrysostom [1/1], Jerome [7/9], Augustine [1/6], John Cassian [2/3], Claudianus Mamertu

40 Tract. in evangel. Matthaei, 9.1.1 (Bulhart, CCL 9:416.23ff.).
41 Tract. in Marci evangel., 1.1-12 (Capelle, et al., CCL 78:455.1ff.).
42 See n. 31, above.
43 In librum primum Regum, 3.156 (Verbraken, CCL 144:284.27ff.).
44 Adversus haereses, 4.16.5 (Rousseau et al., SC 100:572.10f.).
45 De anima, 15.4; 40.4; 58.6; De exhort. castitatis 9.2; De resurrectione mortuorum 15.4; De pudicitia, 6.6 (J. W. P. Borleffs, et al., Tertulliani, Opera, CCL 2.2 [Turnholti, 1954]: 801.28ff.; 843.28ff.; 868.33ff.; 938.14; 1027.16ff.; 1290.7ff.).
46 Comm. in evangel. Matthaei, 21 (Klostermann, Origenes: Werke XI: Matthäuserklaerung, 2: Die lateinische Übersetzung der Commentariorum, GCS 38 [Berlin, 1933]: 11.37.16f.).
47 Tract. in psalmum, 139.7 (A. Zingerle, S. Hilarii episcopi Pictaviensis, Tractatus super Psalmos, CSEL 22 [Vienna, 1891]: 781.29f.).
48 Epist. heortasticae, 11.7 (Migne, PG 26:1408.10ff.).
49 Exposit. psalmi, 118.1.12; 118.8.34; 118.16.3 (M. Petschenig, S. Ambrosii, Opera, V: Expositio Psalmi CXVIII, CSEL 62 [Vienna, 1913]: 13.20ff.; 169.28ff.; 353.8f.); Exposit. evangel. Lucae, 6.91 (C. Schenkl, S. Ambrosii, Opera, IV: Expositio evangelii secundum Lucam, CSEL 32.4 [Vienna, 1902]: 271.21ff.).
50 In Matthaeum, Hom. 7.7 (Migne, PG 57:80.33f.).
51 In Essaiam 118.66.18f. (G. Morin, S. Hieronymi presbyteri, Opera 1.2, In Esaia parvula abreviatio, CCL 73A.1 (Turnholti, 1963): 787.15ff); Tract. in Marci evangel., 1.1-12 (Capelle, et al., CCL 78:455.1ff. [twice]); Adversus Pelagianos 1.33 (Migne, PL 23:526.36ff.); Epistula, 22.5; 76.2; 125.7 (I. Hilberg, S. Eusebii Hieronymi, Opera I.1-3: Epistulae, CSEL 54 [Vienna, 1910]: 150.9ff.; CSEL 55 [Vienna, 1914]: 36.1f.; CSEL 56 [Vienna, 1918]: 125.15ff.).
52 Sermo 98.5 (Migne, PL 38:593.52ff.).
53 Conlatio. Patrum, 5.11; 12.2 (Petschenig, CSEL 13:133.7f.; 336.21ff.).
[1/1], 54 Faustur of Riez [1/1], 55 Salvian [1/2], 56 Fulgentius of Ruspe [1/1], 57 Caesarius of Arles [2/2], 58 Gregorius Magnus [2/2] 59), the construction omnis qui (“everyone who”) (so it, vg, Irenaeus [1/2], 60 Origen [1/5], 61 Augustine [2/6], 62 and Eugippius [1/1] 63), or the construction si quis (“if anyone”) (so Origen [3/5], 64 Ambrose [1/5], 65 Chromatius Aquileiensis [1/1], 66 Jerome [1/9], 67 Augustine [2/6], 68 and Salvian [1/2] 69), the Didascalia (with Pseudo-Clement [1/1], 70 Jerome [1/9], 71 Sulpi-

54 De statu animae, 1.24 (A. Engelbrecht, Claudiani Mamerti, Opera, CSEL 11 [Vienna, 1885]: 86.15ff.).
55 Ruricii epistularum, 2.17 (Engelbrecht, Fausti Reiensis, Opera, CSEL 21 [Vienna, 1891]: 401.14ff.).
56 De gubonatone Dei, 6.49 (F. Pauly, Salviani presbyteri Massiliensis, Opera omnia, CSEL 8 [Vienna, 1883]: 138.28ff.).
57 De incarnatione, 50 (J. Fraipont, S. Fulgentii Ruspensis, Opera, CCL 91A [Turnholti, 1968]: 353.7f.).
58 Sermo, 41.4: 5 (Morin, Caesarii Arelatensis, Sermones, CCL 103 [Turnholti, 1953]: 183.16ff.; 31ff.).
59 In librum primum Regum, 1.26; 3.156 (Verbraken, CCL 144:69.8f.; 284.27ff.).
60 Adversus haereses, 4.13.1 (Rousseau, et al., SC 100:524.5ff.).
61 In Canticum Canticorum 1 (Bachrens, GCS 33:8.95.3ff.).
62 De divinis Scripturis sive Speculum, 45 (Weirich, CSEL 12: 497.10ff.);
De sermone Domini, 1.12.33 (Mutzenbecher, CCL 25.7:35.21ff.).
63 Excerpta ex operibus Augustini, 303 (Knöll, CSEL 9.1:976.5ff.).
64 Hom. in Leviticum, 3.3 (Bachrens, Origenes: Werke, VI: Homilien zum Hexateuch in Rufins Übersetzung, 1: Die Homilien zu Genesis, Exodus, und Leviticus, GCS 29 [Leipzig, 1920]: 6.303.23ff.); Hom. in Jesu Nave, 9.3 (Bachrens, GCS 30:7.348.20ff.);
Comm. in evangel. Matthaei, 24 (Klostermann, GCS 40:10.244.17ff.).
65 De paenitentia, 1.14.70 (P. O. Faller, S. Ambrosii, Opera VII: De excessu fratis, de obitu Theodosii, de obitu Valentinianii, de paenitentia, de mysteriis, de sacramentis, CSEL 73 [Vienna, 1955]: 152.13ff.).
66 Tract. in evangel. Matthaei, 9.1.1 (Bulhart, CCL 9:416.23ff.).
67 Tract, de psalmo, 138.9 (Capelle, et al., CCL 78:300.21ff.).
68 Contra Faustum, 19.21 (Zycha, CSEL 25.1:520.5ff.); De civitate Dei, 14.10 (B. Dombart and A. Kalb, S. Aurelii Augustini, De Civitate Dei, CCL 48 [Turnholti, 1955]: 430.32ff.).
69 De gubernatione Dei, 3.37 (Pauly, CSEL 8:54.18ff.).
70 Recognitiones, 7.37 (B. Rehm and F. Paschke, Die Pseudoklementinen, II: Rekognitionen in Rufins Übersetzung, GCS 51 [Berlin, 1965]: 215.5ff.).
71 Tract. de Psalmo, 90.2f. (Capelle, et al., CCL 78:421.2f.).
cius Severus [1/1], and John Cassian [1/3] employs the pronoun *quicumque* ("whoever"), while (b) the Gospel manuscripts and the Patristic citations employ, in the main, the verb *viderit* ("shall look") (so it, vg, Irenaeus [2/2], Tertullian [5/6], Origen [4/5], Ambrose [5/5], Pseudo-Clement [1/1], Chromatius Aquileiensis [1/1], Jerome [9/9], Sulpicius Severus [1/1], Augustine [6/6], John Cassian [3/3], Claudianus Mamertu [1/1], Faustus of Riez [1/1], Sulpicius Severus [1/1], Augustine [1/1], Sulpicius Severus [1/1], John Cassian [3/3], Sulpicius Severus [1/1], Augustine [6/6], John Cassian [3/3], Claudianus Mamertu [1/1], Faustus of Riez [1/1], Salvin [2/2], Eugippius [1/1], Fulgentius of Ruspe [1/1], Caesarius of Arles.

73 Epistula, 2.11 (C. Halm, *Sulpicii Severi, Opera*, CSEL 1 [Vienna, 1866]: 240.9ff.)

74 *De instit. coenobiorum*, 6.12 (Potschenig, *Cassiani, Opera I: De institutis coenobiorum . . . de incarnatione Domini contra Nestorium*, CSEL 17 [Vienna, 1888]: 121.21ff.)

75 Augustine (1/6) (Sermo, 46.9 [C. Lambot, *S. Aurelii Augustini; Sermones de Vetere Testamento*, CCL 41 (Turnholti, 1961): 536.4ff.])

76 *Adversus haereses*, 4.13.1; 4.16.5 (Rousseau, et al., *SC* 100: 524.5ff.; 572.10ff.)

77 *De anima* 15.4; 40.4; 58.6; *De exhort castitatis*, 9.2; *De pudicitia*, 6.6 (Borleffs, *CCL* 2.2:801.28ff.; 843.28ff.; 868.33ff.; 1027.16ff.; 1290.7ff.)


79 *Exposit. psalmi*, 118.1.12; 118.8.34; 118.16.3 (Petschenig, *CSEL* 62:13.20f.; 169.28ff.; 353.8ff.); *De paenitentia*, 1.14.70 (Faller, *CSEL* 73:152.13ff.); *Exposit. evangel. Lucae*, 6.91 (Schenkl, *CSEL* 32:4:271.21ff.)

80 *Recognitiones* 7.37 (Rehm and Paschke, *GCS* 51:215.5ff.)


82 *In Esaiam*, 18.66.18f. (Morin, *CCL* 73A.1:787.15ff.); *Tract. de psalmo 138.9; 90.2f.; Tract. in Marcii evangel. 1.1-12 (twice) (Capelle, et al., *CCL* 78:300.21ff.; 421.2f.; 455.1ff.); *Adversus Pelagianos*, 1.33 (Migne, *PL* 23:526.36ff.); *Epistulae*, 22.5; 76.2; 125.7 (Hilberg, *CSEL* 54:150.9ff.; *CSEL* 55:36.1ff.; *CSEL* 56:125.15ff.)

83 Epistula, 2.11 (Halm, *CSEL* 1:240.9ff.)


85 *De instit. coenobiorum*, 6.12 (Petschenig, *CSEL* 17:121.21ff.); *Conlatio. Patrum*, 5.11; 12.2 (Petschenig, *CSEL* 13:133.7f.; 336.21ff.)

86 *De statu animae*, 1.24 (Engelbrecht, *CSEL* 11:86.15ff.)

87 *Ruricii epistularum*, 2.17 (Engelbrecht, *CSEL* 21:401.14ff.)

88 *De incarnatione*, 3.37; 6.49 (Pauly, *CSEL* 8:54.18ff.; 138.28ff.)

89 *Excerpta ex operibus Augustini*, 303 (Knöll, *CSEL* 9.1:976.5ff.)

90 *De incarnatione*, 50 (Fraipont, *CCL* 91a:353.7f.)
and Gregorius Magnus [2/2], the Didascalia employs the verb intenderit (“shall look”), while (c) the Gospel manuscripts and the Patristic citations employ the construction of finite verb (e.g. viderit [“shall look”]) + noun (e.g. mulierem [“woman,” “wife”]) (so it, vg, Irenaeus [2/2], Tertullian [2/6], Origen [5/5], Athanasius [1/1], Ambrose [5/5], Pseudo-Clement [1/1], Chromatius Aquileiensis [1/1], Chrysostom [1/1], Jerome [9/9], Sulpicius Severus [1/1], Augustine [6/6], John Cassian [3/3], Claudianus Mamertus [1/1], Faustus of Riez [1/1], Salvian [2/2], Eugippius [1/1], Fulgentius of Ruspe [1/1], Caesarius of Arles [2/2], and Gregorius Magnus [2/2]), the Didascalia alone employs the construction of finite verb (intenderit [“shall look”]) + preposition (in [“on,” “at”]) + noun (mulierem [“wife”]), and while (d) the Gospel manuscripts and the Patristic citations, without exception, employ the noun without modification (so all the witnesses cited under [b] and [c] above), the Didascalia employs the modifier proximi sui (“his neighbor’s”).

90 Sermo, 41.4; 5 (Morin, CCL 103:183.16f.; 31f.).
91 In librum primum Regum, 1.26; 3.156 (Verbraken, CCL 144:69.8f.; 284.27ff.).
92 Tertullian (1/6) (De resurrectione mortuorum, 15.4 [Borleffs, CCL 2.2:938.14]), has conspexerit (“shall have gazed”); Origen (1/5) (Hom. in Jesu Nave, 9.3 [Baehrens, GCS 30:7.348.20ff.]) has adspexerit (“shall have looked”); Athanasius (1/1) Epistolae heortasticae, 11.7 [Migne,PG 26:1408.10ff.] has spectat (“observes”); and Chrysostom (1/1) (In Mattheum, Hom., 7.7 [Migne, PG 57:80.33f.]) has respicit (“reflects”). Hilary (1/1) (Tract. in psalmum 139.7 [Zingerle, CSEL 22:781.29f.]) has vidit (“looks”).
93 Tertullian (4/6) (De anima, 40.4: 58.6; De resurrectione mortuorum, 15.4; De pudicitia, 6.6 [Borleffs, CCL 2.2, 843.28ff.; 868.33f.; 983.14; 1290.7ff.]) and Hilary (1/1) (Tract. in psalmum 139.7 [Zingerle, CSEL 22:781.29f.]) omit the object altogether.
94 See nn. 75-93, above, for the witnesses.
95 Cf. the comparable construction in both the Syriac Didascalia and the Greek and Arabic Constitutiones Apostolorum at this point.
96 Cf. the parallel modifiers qoryb (“his neighbor”) and ρῦθ έπηζουν (“[his] neighbor’s”) in the Syriac Didascalia and the Greek Constitutiones Apostolorum respectively. There is an equivalent form in the Arabic Constitutiones Apostolorum.
The immediate implications of this comparison, as far as our questions are concerned, are that this citation, as employed by the Latin Didascalist, is, on the negative side, not a "dubbed in" form drawn on contemporary Latin Gospel traditions, and, on the positive side, either an *ad hoc* translation of the Latin Didascalist's Greek exemplar, or an *ad hoc* construction contrived by the Latin Didascalist to suit the special needs of its particular context.

As far as the *latter alternative* is concerned (namely, that the Latin rendering is possibly a construction contrived by the Latin Didascalist to suit the special needs of its particular context), the following factors are pertinent: (1) The parallel citation in the Syriac *Didascalia* and in the Greek and Arabic *Constitutiones Apostolorum* is essentially identical. (2) Of the distinctive features of the citation (as compared with its comparable parallel in the Latin Gospel traditions), none is determined by its particular context.

Since the three distinctive features discussed above have equivalent forms in the Syriac *Didascalia* and the Greek and Arabic *Constitutiones Apostolorum*, I conclude that they already existed in the original Greek *Didascalia* and therefore they are not constructions contrived by the Latin Didascalist.

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 Latin Didascalist's Greek exemplar.

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

---

97 See pp. 147-152, above.
that the Latin 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 comparable parallel in the Gospel traditions], none is determined by its particular context; and that the parallel citation in the Syriac *Didascalia* and in the Greek and Arabic *Constitutiones Apostolorum* is essentially identical) imply not only, as we have argued above, that the Latin 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 Latin rendering represents an *ad hoc* translation of its Greek exemplar), the Latin 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, both in structure and content, the citation we are discussing is distinctly different from the form of its comparable parallel in the contemporary Latin Gospel traditions) imply not only, as we have contended, that the Latin Didascalist's citation is not a "dubbed in" equivalent (drawn on contemporary Latin Gospel traditions) of its Greek exemplar, but also that, given the conclusion that the Latin rendering is indeed an *ad hoc* translation of its Greek exemplar, the Latin Didascalist has not accommodated his translation to the form of its parallel in the contemporary Latin Gospel traditions.

**The Parallel in the Greek Gospel Traditions**

I take up now a comparison of the Greek Constitutor's citation with its comparable parallel in the Greek Gospel traditions. The following distinctive features should be noted:
1. The formula ὅτι ἐν τῷ Ἅγιῳ γέγραπται (“for it is written in the Law”) (Constit. Apost., part i) occurs nowhere else in the Greek Gospel traditions. While the Gospel manuscripts and the Patristic citations employ, in the main, either the formula ἐξώδειτε ὅτι ἔρρεθη (“you have heard that is was said”) (so A B D E K S U V W 1 209 22 1582 346 28 157 349 517 565 al plur.,98 and Cyril of Alexandria [1/3]99), ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἔρρεθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις (“you have heard that it was said to the ancients”) so L M Δ Θ 13 124 543 33 892 al. plur.,100 and Chrysostom [1/1]101, or ἔρρεθη (γι' ὅ) τοῖς ἀρχαίοις (“[for] it was said to the ancients”) (so Irenaeus [1/1],102 and Cyril of Alexandria [2/3]103, 104 the Constitutiones Apostolorum alone employs the formula ὅτι ἐν τῷ Ἅγιῳ γέγραπται (“for it is written in the Law”).105

2. The parenthesis τούτῳ ἐστιν ἐν τῷ Ἅγιῳ τῷ θαλά ἔκαθεν ἐκλάθη, νῦν δὲ οἱ αὐτοὶ οὐκέν λέγω (“that is, I spoke, in the Law, through Moses, but now I myself speak to you”) (Constit. Apost., part iv) occurs nowhere else in the Greek Gospel traditions. Cf. the Gospel manuscripts,106 Irenaeus (1/1),107 Clement of Alexandria (4/4),108 Origen (1/1),109

98 See Legg, NTG: Matthaeeum, ad loc.
100 See Legg, NTG: Matthaeeum, ad loc.
101 In Matthaeum, Hom. 61.2 (Migne, PG 58:594.2ff.).
102 Adversus haereses, 4.13.1 (Rousseau, et al., SC 100:525.5ff.).
103 In S. Joannem, 3.3.267a; 11.9.982d (Pusey, In D. Joannis Evangelium, 1:393.30ff.; 2:712.7ff.).
104 Origen (1/1) (Comm. on John, 20.17 [E. Preuschen, Origenes: Werke, IV: Der Johanneskommentar, GCS 10 (Leipzig, 1903): 4.349.33ff.]) has simply ἔρρεθη (“it was said”).
105 Clement of Alexandria (1/1) (Stromata, 3.11;71.3 [O. Stählin and L. Früchtle, Clemens Alexandrinus, II: Stromata I-VI, GCS 529 (Berlin, 1960): 3.228.15ff.]) has ἠκούσατε τοῦ νόμου παραγγέλλοντος (“you have heard the command of the Law”); and Dorotheus of Gaza (1/1) (Instructions, 1.6 [L. Regault and J. de Préville, Dorothee de Gaza: Oeuvres Spirituelles, SC 92 (Paris, 1963): 154.14ff.]) has ὁ νόμος εἶπε (“the Law has said”).
106 See Legg, NTG: Matthaeeum, ad loc.
107 Adversus haereses, 4.13.1 (Rousseau, et al., SC 100.525.5ff.).
Chrysostom [1/1], 110 Cyril of Alexandria (3/3), 111 and Dorotheus of Gaza (1/1) 112

3. The clause πᾶς, ὅστις ἐμβλέψει εἰς τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ πλησίου (“everyone who shall look at [his] neighbor’s wife”) (Constit. Apost., part v) occurs, in precisely this form, nowhere else in the Greek Gospel traditions. While (a) the Gospel manuscripts and the Patristic citations employ either the construction of adjective (πᾶς [“every (one)”]) + article (ὁ [“the” (“who”)]) + participle βλέπων [“looks”]) (so the majority of Gospel mss, 113 Theophilus of Antioch [1/1], 114 Irenaeus [1/2], 115 Clement of Alexandria [2/7], 116 Origen [1/5], 117 Eusebius [1/1], 118 Basil [1/1], 119 Macarius of Egypt [1/1], 120 Acta Philippi (2) [1/1], 121 Chrysostom [1/6], 122 and Cyril of Alexandria [1/1] 123), 124 article

110 Stromata 3.2;9.1; 3.21.1; 3.11;71.3; 4.18;114.2 (Stählin and Früchtel, GCS 52e:3.199.27f.; 210.9; 228.15f.; 298.24f.).
111 Comm. on John, 20.17 (Preuschen, GCS 10:4.349.33f.).
112 In Matthaevum, Hom. 17 (Migne, PG 57:255.1ff.).
113 In Zachariam, 768c (Pusey, In XII Prophetas, 2:468.17ff.; In S. Joannem, 3.3.267a; 11.9.482d (Pusey, In D. Joannis Evangelium 1:393.30ff.; 2:712.7ff.).
114 Instructions, 1.6 (Regault and Prévile, SC 92:154.14f.).
115 See Legg, NTG: Matthaevum, ad loc.
117 Adversus haereses, 4.13.1 (Rousseau, et al., SC 100:525.5ff.).
118 Stromata, 3.2;8.4; 3.14;94.3 (Stählin and Früchtel, GCS 52e:3.199.16; 299.18f.).
119 Comm. on John, 20.17 (Preuschen, GCS 10:4.349.33f.).
122 Homiliai pneumatikai, 26.13 (H. Dörries, et al., Die 50 geistlichen Homilien des Makarios, PTS 4 [Berlin, 1964]: 211.3ff.).
123 Acta Philippi (2), 142 (R. A. Lipsius and M. Bonnet, Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha, 2.2 [Darmstadt, 1959]: 80.26ff.).
124 In Matthaevum, Hom. 17 (Migne, PG 57:255.1ff.).
125 In Zachariam, 768c (Pusey, In XII Prophetas, 2:468.17ff.).
126 Theophilus (1/1) has πᾶς ὁ ἐξαθομ(“everyone who has looked”); Clement of Alexandria (1/2), πᾶς ὁ προσβλέπων (“everyone who looks”); Basil (1/1), πᾶς ὁ ἐμβλέπων (“everyone who looks”); Acta Philippi (2) (1/1), πᾶς ὁ ἐμβλέψας (“everyone who has looked”); and Chrysostom (1/1), πᾶς ὁ ἐμβλέπων (“everyone who looks”). All the other witnesses listed have πᾶς ὁ βλέπων (“everyone who looks”).
DOMINICAL LOGOI IN THE DIDASCALIA

(ὁ ["the" ("who")]) + participle (βλέπων ["looks"]) (so some Gospel manuscripts,125 Athenagoras [1/1],126 Irenaeus [1/2],127 Clement of Alexandria [5/7],128 Chrysostom [5/6],129 Nemesius of Emesa [1/1],130 and Theodoret of Cyr rh us [1/1],131 or indefinite relative pronoun construction (e.g. δ [ἐ]ῶν ["whoever"]) + finite verb in the subjunctive mood (e.g. ἐμπλέκων ["should look"] (so some Gospel mss,133 Justin Martyr [1/1],134 Origen [4/5],135 and Cyril of Jerusalem [1/1]136), 137, 138 the Consti tutiones Apostolorum alone employs the construction of adjective (πᾶς ["every (one)"]) + indefinite relative pronoun (ὅς τις ["who"]) + finite verb (ἐμπλέκων ["shall look"]); and while

125 See Legg, NTG: Matthaueum, ad loc.
126 Supplicatio pro Christianis, 32.8 (J. C. T. Otto, Corpus Apologetarum Christianorum Saeculi Secundi, 7 [Wiesbaden, 1888 (reprint, 1969)]: 166.7ff.).
127 Adversus haereses, 4.16.5 (Rousseau, et al., SC 100:573.9ff.).
128 Paedagogus, 3,33.2 (Stählin, Clemens Alexandrinus, I: Protrepticus und Paedagogus, GCS 12 [Leipzig, 1905]:177.22f.); Stromata, 2,11;50,2; 2,14;61,3; 2,15;66,1; 4,18;114,2 (Stählin and Früchte, GCS 52:3.199.18f.; 146.9f.; 148,13; 298,24f.).
129 In Matthaueum, Hom. 61,2 (Migne, PG 58:594.2ff.); In epistolam primam ad Corinthios, Hom., 7,7: 42,3 (Migne, PG 61:64.64ff.; 366.49f.); Catechesis, 1,32 (A. Wenger, Jean Chrysostome: Huit Catéchéses baptismales, SC 50 [Paris, 1970]: 124,30ff.); 2,5 (Migne, PG 49:240,17f.).
130 De natura hominis, 40,86f. (Migne, PG 40:769,24f.).
131 Graecorum affectionum curatio, 9,57 (P. Canivet, Theodoret de Cyre: Thérapeutique de maladies helléniques, SC 57 [Paris, 1958]: 354,10f.).
132 Athenagoras (1/1) and Irenaeus (1/2) have ὁ βλέπων ("who looks"); Clement of Alexandria (3/5), Chrysostom (5/5), Nemesius of Emesa (1/1), and Theodoret of Cyr rh us (1/1) have ὁ ἐμπλέκων ("who has looked"); and Clement of Alexandria has ὁ ὑπάρχων ("who has looked") and ὁ ἐπιθυμήσας ("who has desired")
133 See Legg, NTG: Matthaueum, ad loc.
134 Apologia, 1,15,1 (Otto, CAC 1:46,6ff.).
136 Catecheses, 1,13,5 (W. C. Reischl and J. Rupp, Cyrilli Hierosolymarum, Opera omnia, 2 [Munich, 1860 (reprint, 1967)]: 56,6f.).
137 Acta Philippi (I), 142 (Lipsius and Bonnet, AAA 2,2:80,12ff.) has πᾶς ὁς ὑπάρχων ἐμπλέκων ("everyone who should look").
138 All the witnesses listed employ the verb ἐμπλέκων ("should look").
(b) the Gospel manuscripts and the Patristic citations employ the construction of participle or finite verb (βλέπων ["looks"] or ἐμβλέψει ["shall look"]) + anarthrous noun in the accusative or dative case (e.g. γυναῖκα/γυναικί ["woman," "wife"]) (so the Gospel mss, Justin Martyr [1/1], Athenagoras [1/1], Theophilus of Antioch [1/1], Irenaeus [2/2], Clement of Alexandria [1/7], Origen [5/5], Eusebius [1/1], Basil [1/1], Cyril of Jerusalem [1/1], Macarius of Egypt [1/1], Acta Philippi (1) [1/1], Chrysostom [6/6], Nemesius of Emesa [1/1], Cyril of Alexandria [1/1], and Theodoret of Cyrrhus [1/1]), the Constitutiones Apostolorum alone employs the construction of finite verb (ἐμβλέψει ["shall look"] + preposition (εἰς ["on," "at"] + articular noun in the accusative case (τὴν γυναῖκα ["wife"])); and while (c) the Gospel manuscripts and the Patristic citations employ, in the main, the noun without modification (so all the witnesses, with the exception of Theophilus of Antioch [1/1], and Acta Philippi (2) [1/1], cited under (b) above), the Constitutiones Apostolorum employs the modifier τοῦ πλησίου ("[his] neighbor's").

The immediate implications of this comparison, as far as our questions are concerned, are that this citation, as employed by the Greek Constitutor, is, on the negative side, not a "dubbed in"

139 See Legg, NTG: Mattheum, ad loc.
140 For the references see nn. 114-136, above.
141 Acta Philippi (2), 142 (Lipsius and Bonnet, AAA 2.2:80.26ff.) has a very similar form, namely, πᾶς ὁ ἐμβλέψας εἰς γυναῖκα ("everyone who has looked at a woman/wife").
142 Theophilus of Antioch (Ad Autolycum, 3.13 [Bardy, SC 20:230.24ff.]) has the modifier ἀλλοτριον ("another's"). Cf. Clement of Alexandria (Stromata, 7.13:82.3 [Stählin et al., Clemens Alexandrinus, III: Stromata VII and VIII, GCS 172 (Berlin, 1970): 3.58.28]): Ἐμβλέψης πρὸς ἐπιθυμίαν ἀλλοτριός γυναῖκες ("You shall not look with desire at another's wife").
143 Acta Philippi (2), 142 (Lipsius and Bonnet, AAA 2.2:80.26ff.) has τοῦ πλησίου αὐτοῦ ("his neighbor's").
144 Cf. the parallel modifiers qrybh ("his neighbor") and proximi sui ("his neighbor's") in the Syriac and Latin Didascalie respectively. There is an equivalent form in the Arabic Constitutiones Apostolorum.
form drawn on contemporary Greek Gospel traditions, and, on the positive side, either an *ad hoc* copy of the Greek Constitutor's Greek exemplar, or an *ad hoc* construction contrived by the Greek Constitutor to suit the special needs of its particular context.

As far as the *latter alternative* is concerned (namely, that the Greek rendering is possibly a construction contrived by the Greek Constitutor to suit the special needs of its particular context), the following factors are pertinent: (1) The parallel citation in the Syriac and Latin *Didascaliae* is essentially identical. (2) Of the distinctive features of the citation (as compared with its comparable parallel in the Greek Gospel traditions), none is determined by its particular context.

Since the three distinctive features discussed above\(^{146}\) have essentially identical forms in the parallel citation in the Syriac and Latin *Didascaliae*, I conclude that they already existed in the Greek exemplar(s) on which all three versions drew.

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* copy of the Greek Constitutor's Greek exemplar.

I turn then to a consideration of the *former alternative* (namely, that the Greek rendering is an *ad hoc* copy of the Greek Constitutor's Greek exemplar). The question of possible accommodation calls for immediate attention. Given the conclusion that the Greek Constitutor's citation is, in fact, an *ad hoc* copy, 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.

\(^{146}\) See pp. 155-158 above.
In regard to (a), the factors just considered (namely, that of the distinctive features of the citation [as compared with its comparable parallel in the Gospel traditions], none is determined by its particular context; and that the parallel elements in the Syriac and Latin *Didascaliae* are essentially identical) imply not only, as we have already argued, that the Greek Constitutor 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 Greek rendering represents an *ad hoc* copy of its Greek exemplar), the Greek Constitutor has not accommodated his copy to the context in which it occurs.

In regard to (b), the factors noted above (to the effect that, both in structure and content, the citation we are discussing is distinctly different from the form of its comparable parallel in the contemporary Greek Gospel traditions) imply not only, as we have contended, that the Greek Constitutor’s citation is not a “dubbed in” equivalent (drawn on contemporary Greek Gospel traditions) of the form found in his Greek exemplar, but also that, given the conclusion that the Greek rendering is indeed an *ad hoc* copy, the Greek Constitutor has not accommodated his copy to the form of its parallel in the contemporary Greek Gospel traditions.

**The Text in the Arabic and Ethiopic Versions**

The text of the Arabic version reads as follows: “It is written in the Law, ‘You shall not commit adultery.’ But I say to you (it was I who spoke, in the Law, by the mouth of Moses, but now I say to you), Everyone who has looked at the wife of his friend, to desire her, has committed adultery with her in his heart.”

The same distinctive features which we have noted in the Greek version occur here: (1) the formula, “It is written in the Law”; (2) the parenthesis, “it was I who spoke, in the Law, by the mouth of Moses, but now I say to you”; and (3) the

\[\text{147} \] For the Arabic text see Dawud, *ldsqwlyt*, p. 17.8f.
unique reading, “Everyone who has looked at the wife of his friend.”

For reasons parallel to those given with respect to the Greek version, I conclude that the Arabic version represents an ad hoc translation of an exemplar essentially identical, in form and content, to that which the Greek Constitutor employed.

The text of the Ethiopic version reads as follows: “For he teaches us and gives us understanding and strengthens us by the Holy Spirit, that he may fulfill the Law, in which it is written, saying, ‘You shalt not commit adultery.’ But I say to you, Everyone who has looked at a woman and lusted after her has committed adultery with her already in his heart.”

Of the distinctive features of the Greek and Arabic versions, only a vestige of item (1) (the formula ὃτι ἐν τῷ ὅμω γέγραπται [“for it is written in the Law”] [Constit. Apost. Grk.] = “it is written in the Law” [Constit. Apost. Arab.] remains. It has been editorialized so that it no longer functions as an integral part of the logos itself, but as a part of the general introductory formula. The parenthesis, item (2) (τοῦτ’ ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ὅμω τῷ ὅμω θυσίν ἑκζών ἐκλάνωσα, χῦν δὲ ἢ ὁ αὐτῶς ὑπερὶ λέγω [“that is, I spoke, in the Law, by Moses, but now I myself speak to you”] [Constit. Apost. Grk.] = “It was I who spoke, in the Law, by the mouth of Moses, but now I say to you” [Constit. Apost. Arab.] no longer appears. Nor does the unique reading, item (3) (πᾶς, ὃς εἰμι ἐμβλέψω εἰς τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ πλησίου [“everyone who shall look at (his) neighbor’s wife”] [Constit. Apost. Grk.] = “Everyone who has looked at the wife of his friend” [Constit. Apost. Arab.]).

Apart from the past tense in the clause, ‘Everyone who has looked at a woman’ (instead of the present tense), and the coordinating clause “and lusted after her” (instead of a telic or

148 Cf. Harden, Ethiopia Didascalia, 3.15ff.
149 The majority of the Gospel manuscripts and Patristic citations have
consequential clause), the logos, as cited by the Ethiopic Constitutor, is essentially identical with its parallel in the first Gospel.

It is patent that the Ethiopic Constitutor has accommodated his translation to the form of the logos as it appeared in the contemporary texts of Matthew.

2. Reconstruction of the Greek Original

In view of the fact that, as has been demonstrated, the Syriac and Latin versions of the Didascalia, and the Greek and Arabic versions of the 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:

a present-tense participle (in addition to the majority of manuscripts, Athenagoras [1/1], Irenaeus [2/2], Clement of Alexandria [1/7], Origen [1/5], Eusebius [1/1], Macarius [1/1], and Cyril of Alexandria [1/7] have ὁ βλέπων ["who looks"]; Basil [1/1] and Chrysostom [1/6] have ὁ ἐμβλέπων ["who looks"]; Clement of Alexandria [1/7] has ὁ προοροβλέπων [who looks]). However, a number of witnesses have the aorist tense (in addition to K 28 117 157 243 477 1093 and 1606, Clement of Alexandria [3/7], Acta Philippi [2] [1/1], Chrysostom [5/6], Nemesius of Emesa [1/1], and Theodoret of Cyrrhus [1/1] have ὁ ἐμβλέψας ["who has looked"]; Theophilus of Antioch [1/1], and Clement of Alexandria [1/7] have ὁ ἔδω ["who has looked"]).

The majority of Gospel manuscripts and Patristic citations have a telic or consequential clause (in addition to the majority of manuscripts, Justin Martyr [1/1], Athenagoras [1/1], Theophilus of Antioch [1/1], Irenaeus [2/2], Clement of Alexandria [1/5], Origen [5/5], Eusebius [1/1], Basil [1/1], Cyril of Jerusalem [1/1], Macarius of Egypt [1/1], Chrysostom [6/6], Nemesius of Emesa [1/1], Cyril of Alexandria [1/1], and Theodoret of Cyrrhus [1/1] have ἐπιθυμήσας αὐτὴν ["to desire her"]: Clement of Alexandria [4/5] has ἐπιθυμήσας αὐτὴν ["with desire"]). Only the Acta Philippi (2), 142 has a form comparable to that of the Ethiopic Constitutiones Apostolorum, namely, καὶ ἐπιθυμήσας αὐτὴν ["and desired her"). Cf. the reading ὦρ'γ λὴ ["and desires her"] in codices Sinaiticus and Curetonianus, and Titus of Bostra (1/1).

As has been demonstrated, the Ethiopic version of the Constitutiones Apostolorum is considerably accommodated to its Matthaean parallel and therefore of little if any practical value in the determination of the original Greek text.
1. That the Greek Didascalist began his citation with the formula ὅτι ἐν τῷ Νῦμῳ γέγραπται ("for it is written in the Law") (and not as in the contemporary Gospel traditions, with the clause ἥκουσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη [τοῖς ἄρχασοις] ["you have heard that it was said (to the ancients")]). All four witnesses imply this: mti dktyb bnmws' ("for it is written in the Law") (Didasc. Syr.) = quoniam in lege scriptum est ("for it is written in the Law") (Didasc. Lat.) = ὅτι ἐν τῷ Νῦμῳ γέγραπται ("for it is written in the Law") (Constit. Apost. Grk.) = "it is written in the Law" (Constit. Apost. Arab.).

2. That the Greek Didascalist employed the parenthesis τούτ᾽ ἔστιν ἐν τῷ Νομῷ (τῷ) διὰ Μωϋsseως ἐγὼ ἐλάλησα, νῦν δὲ ὁ ἀυτὸς ὑμῖν λέγω ("that is, I spoke, in the Law, through Moses, but now I myself speak to you"). All four witnesses imply such: ἡν ὅδε bnmws' byd ὑμᾶς mlt ἡς ἀν 'ν' qnmy 'mr 'n' lkwn ("that is, I spoke, in the Law, through Moses, but now I myself speak to you") (Didasc. Syr.) = id est in lege per Moysen locutus sum, nunc autem ipse vobis dico ("that is, I have spoken, in the law, through Moses, now however, I myself speak to you") (Didasc. Lat.) = τούτ᾽ ἔστιν ἐν τῷ Νομῷ τῷ διὰ Μωϋσεώς ἐγὼ ἐλάλησα, νῦν δὲ ὁ ἀυτὸς ὑμῖν λέγω ("that is, I spoke, in the Law, through Moses, but now I myself speak to you") (Constit. Apost. Grk.) = "it was I who spoke, in the Law, by the mouth of Moses, but now I say to you" (Constit. Apost. Arab.).

3. That the Greek Didascalist employed the unique reading

---

152 The majority of the Gospel manuscripts and Cyril of Alexandria (1/3) (In Zachariam, 768c [Pusey, In XII Prophetas, 2:468.17ff.]) have ἥκουσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη ("you have heard that it was said"); a number of Gospel manuscripts and Chrysostom (1/1) (In Mattheum, Hom. 61.2 [Migne, PG 58:594.2ff.]) have ἥκουσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη τοῖς ἄρχασοις ("you have heard that it was said to the ancients"); Irenaeus (1/1) (Adversus haereses, 4.13.1 [Rousseau, et al., SC 100:525.5ff.]), and Cyril of Alexandria (2/3) (In S. Joannem, 3.3.267a; 11.9.982d [Pusey, In D. Joannis Evangelium, 1:393.30ff.; 2:712.7ff.]) have ἐρρέθη (γὰρ) τοῖς ἄρχασοις ("[for] it was said to the ancients").
πᾶς, ὁστις ἐμβλέψει εἰς τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ πλησίου αὐτοῦ (“everyone who shall look at his neighbor’s wife”) (and not one of the more common readings of the contemporary Gospel traditions, e.g. [πᾶς] ὁ ἐμβλέπων γυναῖκα [“everyone who looks on/at a woman/wife”]).153 All four witnesses imply this: dklmn dhwr b’ntt qrybh (“everyone who shall look at his neighbor’s wife”) (Didasc. Syr.) = omnis, quicumque intenderit in mulierem proximi sui (“everyone who shall look at his neighbor’s wife”) (Didasc. Lat.) = πᾶς, ὁστις ἐμβλέψει εἰς τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ πλησίου (“everyone who shall look at [his] neighbor’s wife”) (Constit. Apost. Grk.) = “everyone who has looked at the wife of his friend” (Constit. Apost. Arab.).

4. That the Greek Didascalist employed the construction: adjective πᾶς (“every[one]”) + indefinite relative pronoun ὁστις (“who”) + the finite verb ἐμβλέψει (“shall look”) (and not one of the more common constructions of the contemporary Gospel traditions, e.g. the adjective πᾶς [“every(one)"] + the article ὁ [“the” (“who”) ] + the participle βλέπων [“looks”]).154 That he employed the adjective πᾶς (“every-one”) is implied by the combined testimony of the Syriac Didascalist’s κλ (“everyone”) and the Latin Didascalist’s omnis

153 So the majority of Gospel manuscripts, Athenagoras (1/1) (Supplicatio pro Christianis, 32.8 [Otto, CAC 7:166.7ff.]), Irenaeus (2/2) (Adversus haereses, 4.13.1; 4.16.5 [Rousseau, et al., SC 100: 525.5ff.; 573.9ff.]), Clement of Alexandria (1/7) (Stromata, 3.14; 19.3 [Stählin and Früchtel, GCS 52:3.239.18f.]), Origen (1/5) (Comm. on John, 20.17 [Preuschen, GCS 10:4.349.39f.]), Eusebius (1/1) (Demonstratio Evangelica, 3.6.4 [Heikel, GCS 23:132.24f.]), Basil (1/1) Letter 46.1 [Deferrari, LCL 190:284.21ff.]), Macarius of Egypt, Homiliai pneumatikai, 26.13 [Dörries, et al., PTS 4:211.3ff.], Chrysostom (1/6) (In Matthaueum, Hom. 17 [Migne, PG 57:255.1ff.]), and Cyril of Alexandria (1/1) (In Zachariam, 768c [Pusey, In XII Prophetas, 2:468.17ff.]).

Chrysostom (5/6) (In Matthaueum, Hom. 17 [Migne, PG 57:255.1ff.]; In epistolam primam ad Corinthios, Hom. 7.7; 42.3 [Migne, PG 61:64.64f.; 366.49f.]; Catechesis 1.32 [Wenger, SC 50:124.30f.]; 2.5 [Migne, PG 49: 240.17f.]), Nemesius of Emesa (1/1) (De natura hominis, 40.86f. [Migne, PG 40:769.24f.]), and Theodoret of Cyrrhus (1/1) (Graecorum affectionum curatio, 9.57 [Canivet, SC 57:354.10f.]) have ὁ ἐμβλέψας γυναῖκι (“who has looked [at] a woman/wife”).

154 See n. 153, above.
"everyone"), supported by the Greek Constitutor’s πᾶς ("everyone") and the Arabic Constitutor’s عل ("everyone"); that he employed the indefinite relative pronoun ὅστις ("whoever") seems to be implied by the combined testimony of the Syriac Didascalist’s mn ("everyone") and the Latin Didascalist’s quicumque ("whoever"), supported by the Greek Constitutor’s ὅστις ("whoever") and the Arabic Constitutor’s عل ("everyone"); and, finally, that he employed the finite verb ἐμβλέψει ("shall look") seems to be implied by the combined testimony of the Syriac Didascalist’s finite verb nhwr ("shall look") and the Latin Didascalist’s finite verb intenderit ("shall look"), supported by the Greek Constitutor’s finite verb ἐμβλέψει ("shall look") and the Arabic Constitutor’s finite verb نَر ("has looked").

In view of the fact that the Greek Constitutor appears to be following his exemplar rather closely here, and in view of the fact that a Greek text identical with his would yield quite naturally constructions essentially identical with those of the Syriac and Latin translations, it seems unnecessary to conjecture any other possible construction such as that of the Acta Philippi (1) 142,155 namely πᾶς ὃς ἐὰν ἐμβλέψῃ ("everyone who should look").

5. That the Greek Didascalist employed the prepositional phrase εἰς τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ πλησίου αὐτοῦ ("on/at his neighbor’s wife") and not one of the more common readings in the contemporary Gospel traditions, e.g. the anarthrous noun in either the dative or accusative case without either preceding preposition or following modifier).156 That he employed the preposition

---

155 Lipsius and Bonnet, AAA, 2.2:80.12ff.
156 So the majority of Gospel manuscripts and Justin Martyr (1/1) (Apologia, 1.15.1 [Otto, CAC 1:46.6ff.]), Athenagoras (1/1) (Supplicatio pro Christianis 32.8 [Otto, CAC 7:166.7ff.]), Irenaeus (2/2) (Adversus haereses, 4.13.1; 4.16.5 [Rousseau, et al., SC 100:525.5ff.; 573.9ff.]), Clement of Alexandria (1/7) (Stromata, 3.14;94.3 [Stählin and Fruchtel, GCS 52a:3.298.24ff.]), Origen (5/5) (Contra Celsum, 3.44.[Koetschau, GCS 2:1.240.7ff.], Comm. on John, 20.17; 20.23 [Preuschen, GCS 10:4.349.33f.; 4.350.14f], De Principiis, 3.1.6 [Koetschau, GCS 22:5.202.7f.], Selecta in Ezekiel, 6 [Lommatzsch, Origenis, Opera, 14:195]), Eusebius (1/1) (Demonstratio Evangelica, 3.6.4 [Heikel, GCS


Gives 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: ὅτι ἐν τῷ Νόμῳ γέγραπται. Οὐ μοιχεύσεις. Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, τοῦτο ἔστω ἐν τῷ Νόμῳ (τῷ) διὰ Μωϋσέως ἐγὼ ἐλάλησα, νῦν δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς ὑμῖν λέγω. Πάς, ὅστις ἐμβλέψει εἰς τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ πλησίου αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτὴν, ἡδὲ ἐμοιχεύσεις αὐτὴν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ ("for it is written in the Law, 'You shall not commit adultery.' But I say to you [that is, I spoke, in the Law, through Moses, but now I myself speak to you], Everyone who shall look at his neighbor’s wife, to desire her, has already committed adultery with her in his heart.").

(To be continued)