# PROLEGOMENA TO A STUDY OF THE DOMINICAL LOGOI AS CITED IN THE DIDASCALIA APOSTOLORUM PART II: METHODOLOGICAL QUESTIONS (Cont.)* 
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In an earlier article ${ }^{1}$ 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 article ${ }^{2}$ 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

[^0]by applying them to the canonical dominical logos," "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.).

[^1]2. In all five witnesses, it is introduced with similar citation formulae: 'yk d'p b'wnglywn mhdt wmšrr wmšml' 'sr' ptgm' $d n m w s$ ' ['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.

 ("for he says in the Gospel, summing-up and confirming the Decalogue of the Law,") (Funk, Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum, $1: 5.17 \mathrm{f}$.) $=$ "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 Didascaliae, 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, Didascaliae Apostolorum, p. 3.8ff.; Funk, Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum, 1:5.19ff.; Dawud, 'ldsqwlyt, p. 17.9f.). ${ }^{4}$
4. In the Syriac and Latin Didascaliae, and in the Greek and Arabic Constitutiones Apostolorum, it consists of essentially the

[^2]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." ${ }^{5}$
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)
(b)
(c)

Didasc. Syr.
(Lagarde, 1.23ff.)
(i) $m t l$ $d k t y b$ bnmws'
(ii) $d l$
$t g w r$
(iii) ' $n$ ' dyn
' $m r$ ' $n$ '
lkwn
$h d^{\prime}$

Didasc. Lat.
(Tidner, 3.8ff.)
quoniam
in lege scriptum est:

Non
moechaberis;
ego autem
dico
vobis

[^3]
${ }^{7}$ S. C. E. Legg, Novum Testamentum Graece secundum Textum West-cotto-Hortianum: Evangelium secundum Matthaeum (Oxford, 1940), ad loc.

## 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 mtl 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 šm'tun d't'mr ("you have heard that it was said") (so syr ${ }^{\text {s }}$ ), šm'tun d't'mr lqdmy' ("you have heard that it was said to the ancients") (so syr ${ }^{\mathrm{c}}$, $\mathrm{cf}^{2}$ syr ${ }^{\mathrm{pal}}$ ), or ' $t$ 'mr lqdmy' ("it was said to the ancients") (so Titus of Bostra [ $1 / 1]^{8}$ and Philoxenus of Mabbug [ $\left.1 / 1\right]^{9}$ ), the Didascalia alone employs the formula mtl 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 $h d^{\prime}$ ("this") (so syr ${ }^{s c p h p a l}$, Titus of Bostra [ $\left.1 / 1\right]^{10}$ ), the Didascalia employs the same clause with the pronoun hd ("this").

[^4]3. The parenthesis $h w d b n m w s$ ' byd mws' mllt hs' dyn ' $n$ ' qnwmy '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. syrs ${ }^{\text {e p p pal }}$, Titus of Bostra ( $1 / 1$ ). ${ }^{11}$
4. The clause dklmn dnhwor 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 $h z^{\prime}$ ("looks") (so
 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. $h z^{\prime}$ ' "looks"] or $n h z z^{\prime}$ ["shall look"]) + noun ('ntt' ["woman," "wife"]) (so syrs cphpal, Ephraem[?] [1/1], ${ }^{17}$ Titus of Bostra [ $\left.1 / 1\right],{ }^{18}$ Philoxenus of Mabbug [ $1 / 2],{ }^{19}$ Martyrius [1/1], ${ }^{20}$ and Dionysius bar S Salibi [1/1] ${ }^{21}$ ), the Didascalia employs the construction of finite verb (nhwr ["shall look"]) + preposition ( $b$ ["on," "at"] + construct noun

[^5]('ntt ["wife of"]); ${ }^{22}$ while (c) the Gospel manuscripts and the Patristic citations employ the emphatic form of the noun ('ntt' ["woman," "wife"]) (so syrs chapal, Ephraem[?] [1/1], ${ }^{23}$ Titus of Bostra [ $1 / 1$ ],,$^{24}$ Philoxenus of Mabbug [2/2], 25 Martyrius $[1 / 1],{ }^{26}$ and Dionysius bar Salibi $\left.[/ 1]\right),{ }^{27}$ 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 qrybh ("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

[^6]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 ${ }^{30}$ 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 $h d^{\prime}$ ("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.

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 $\mathrm{it}^{\mathbf{a}} \mathrm{bdf}$, 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 it ${ }^{\text {aur }} \mathrm{ff}^{1} \mathrm{~g}^{1} \mathrm{~h}^{1} \mathrm{l}$, 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-

[^7]sis (1/1), ${ }^{40}$ Jerome ( $1 / 1$ ), ${ }^{41}$ Augustine (3/3), ${ }^{42}$ and Gregorius Magnus (1/1). ${ }^{43}$
3. The clause omnis, quicumque intenderit 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],44 Tertullian [6/6], ${ }^{45}$ Origen [ $1 / 5$ ], ${ }^{46}$ Hilary [1/1], ${ }^{47}$ Athanasius [ $1 / 1$ ], ${ }^{48}$ Ambrose [4/5], ${ }^{49}$ Chrysostom [1/1], ${ }^{50}$ Jerome [7/9],51 Augustine [1/6],52 John Cassian [2/3],53 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: Matthäuserklärung, 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): 13.20f.; 169.28ff.; 353.8f.); Exposit. evangel. Lucae, 6.91 (C. Schenkl, S. Ambrosii, Opera, IV: Expositio evangelii secundum Lucam, CSEL 32.4 [Vienna, 1902]: 271.21f.).
${ }^{50}$ 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 23:526.36f.); 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.).

[^8][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-

[^9]cius Severus [ $1 / 1]^{72}$ and John Cassian $[1 / 3]^{73}$ ) employs the pronoun quicumque ("whoever"); ${ }^{74}$ while (b) the Gospel manuscripts and the Patristic citations employ, in the main, the verb viderit ("shall look") (so it, vg, Irenaeus [2/2],75 Tertullian [5/6], ${ }^{76}$ Origen [4/5], ${ }^{77}$ Ambrose [5/5], ${ }^{78}$ Pseudo-Clement [1/1], ${ }^{79}$ Chromatius Aquileiensis [1/1], ${ }^{\text {s0 }}$ Jerome [9/9], ${ }^{81}$ Sulpicius Severus $[1 / 1],{ }^{82}$ Augustine $[6 / 6],{ }^{83}$ John Cassian [3/3], ${ }^{84}$ Claudianus Mamertu [1/1], ${ }^{85}$ Faustus of Riez [1/1], ${ }^{86}$ Salvian [2/2], ${ }^{87}$ Eugippius [ $1 / 1],{ }^{88}$ Fulgentius of Ruspe [ $\left.1 / 1\right],{ }^{89}$ Caesarius of Arles
${ }^{72}$ Epistula, 2.11 (C. Halm, Sulpicii Severi, Opera, CSEL 1 [Vienna, 1866]: 240.9ff.).
${ }^{73}$ De instit. coenobiorum, 6.12 (Petschenig, Cassiani, Opera I: De institutis coenobiorum . . . de incarnatione Domini contra Nestorium, CSEL 17 [Vienna, 1888]: 121.21ff.).
${ }^{74}$ Augustine (1/6) (Sermo, 46.9 [C. Lambot, S. Aurelii Augustini; Sermones de Vetere Testamento, CCL 41 (Turnholti, 1961): 536.4f.]).
${ }^{75}$ Adversus haereses, 4.13.1; 4.16.5 (Rousseau, et al., SC 100: 524.5ff.; 572.10f.).
${ }^{78}$ 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.).
${ }^{77}$ Hom. in Leviticum, 3.3 (Baehrens, GCS 29:6.303.23ff.); In Canticum Canticorum, 1 (Baehrens, GCS 33:8.95.3ff.); Comm. in evangel. Matthaei. 21; 24 (Klostermann, GCS 38:11.37.16f.; GCS 40:10.244.17ff.).
${ }^{78}$ Exposit. psalmi, 118.1.12; 118.8.34; 118.16.3 (Petschenig, CSEL 62:13. 20f.; 169.28ff.; 353.8f.); De paenitentia, 1.14.70 (Faller, CSEL 73:152.13f.); Exposit. evangel. Lucae, 6.91 (Schenkl, CSEL 32.4:271.21f.).
${ }^{79}$ Recognitiones 7.37 (Rehm and Paschke, GCS 51:215.5ff.).
${ }^{80}$ Tract. in evangel. Matthaei, 9.1.1 (Bulhart, CCL 9:416.23ff.).
${ }^{81}$ In Esaiam, 18.66.18f. (Morin, CCL 73A.1:787.15ff.); Tract. de psalmo 138.9; 90.2f.; Tract. in Marci evangel. 1.1-12 (twice) (Capelle, et al., CCL 78:300.21ff.; 421.2f.; 455.1ff.); Adversus Pelagianos, 1.33 (Migne, PL 23:526. 36f.); Epistulae, 22.5; 76.2; 125.7 (Hilberg, CSEL 54:150.9ff.; CSEL 55:36.1f.; CSEL 56:125.15ff.).
${ }^{92}$ Epistula, 2.11 (Halm, CSEL 1:240.9ff.).
${ }^{83}$ De divinis Scripturis sive Speculum, 45 (Weihrich, CSEL 12:497.10ff.); De sermone Domini, 1.12.33 (Mutzenbecher, CCL 25.7:35.21ff.); Contra Faustum, 19.21 (Zycha, CSEL 25:520.5ff.);Sermo 98.5 (Migne, PL 38:593.52ff.); De civitate Dei, 14.10 (Dombart and Kalb, CCL 48:430.32ff.); Sermo, 46.9 (Lambot, CCL 41:536.4F.).
${ }^{84}$ De instit. coenobiorum, 6.12 (Petschenig, CSEL 17:121.21ff.); Conlatio. Patrum, 5.11; 12.2 (Petschenig, CSEL 13:133.7f.; 336.21ff.).
${ }^{85}$ De statu animae, 1.24 (Engelbrecht, CSEL 11:86.15f.).
${ }^{86}$ Ruricii epistularum, 2.17 (Engelbrecht, CSEL 21:401.14f.).
${ }^{87}$ De gubernatione Dei, 3.37; 6.49 (Pauly, CSEL 8:54.18ff.; 138.28ff.).
${ }^{88}$ Excerpta ex operibus Augustini, 303 (Knöll, CSEL 9.1:976.5ff.).
${ }^{89}$ De incarnatione, 50 (Fraipont, CCL 91a:353.7f.).
[2/2], ${ }^{90}$ and Gregorius Magnus [2/2] ${ }^{91}$ ), the Didascalia employs the verb intenderit ("shall look");92 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], ${ }^{93}$ Origen [5/5], Athanasius [1/1], Ambrose [5/5], PseudoClement [1/1], Chromatius Aquileiensis [1/1], Chrysostom [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], Salvian [2/2], Eugippius [1/1], Fulgentius of Ruspe [ $1 / 1$ ], Caesarius of Arles [2/2], and Gregorius Magnus [2/2]), ${ }^{94}$ the Didascalia alone employs the construction of finite verb (intenderit ["shall look"]) + preposition (in ["on," "at"]) + noun (mulierem ["wife"]); ${ }^{95}$ 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"). ${ }^{96}$

[^10]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 ${ }^{97}$ 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

[^11]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 ${ }^{\circ} \tau \iota \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \tau \widetilde{\varphi} N \delta \mu \varphi \gamma \varepsilon \gamma \rho \alpha \pi \tau \alpha L$ ("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

 517565 al plur., ${ }^{98}$ and Cyril of Alexandria [1/3] ${ }^{99}$ ), $\dot{n}_{\text {ко }} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \alpha \tau \varepsilon$
 said to the ancients") so L M $\Delta \oplus 1312454333892$ al. plur., ${ }^{100}$
 ("[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 o $\tau \iota \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \tau \widetilde{\varphi} N \delta \bar{\mu} \mu \bar{\varepsilon} \gamma \rho \alpha \pi \tau \alpha \alpha$ ("for it is written in the Law"). ${ }^{105}$

 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), ${ }^{109}$
[^12]Chrysostom (1/1), ${ }^{110}$ Cyril of Alexandria (3/3), ${ }^{111}$ and Dorotheus of Gaza (1/1) ${ }^{112}$
 тоũ $\pi \lambda n \sigma$ Cov("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 ( $\pi \widetilde{\alpha} s[$ "every (one)"]) $+\operatorname{article}(\dot{o}[" t h e "(" w h o ")])+$ participle $\beta \lambda \varepsilon \pi \omega \nu$ ["looks"]) (so the majority of Gospel mss, ${ }^{113}$ Theophilus of Antioch [1/1], ${ }^{144}$ 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

[^13] 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 Cyrrhus [ $1 / 1^{131}$ ), ${ }^{132}$ or indefinite relative pronoun construction (e.g. o [ $\bar{\varepsilon}] \bar{\alpha} \nu$ ["whoever"]) + finite verb in the subjunctive mood (e.g. $\dot{\varepsilon} \mu \beta \lambda \varepsilon \psi_{\mathrm{g}}$ ["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 Constitutiones Apostolorum alone employs the construction of adjective ( $\pi$ व̃s ["every(one)"]) + indefinite relative pronoun ( óo $\sigma\llcorner s$ ["who"]) + finite verb ( $\dot{\varepsilon} \mu \beta \lambda \varepsilon \psi \varepsilon \iota$ ["shall look"]); and while

[^14](b) the Gospel manuscripts and the Patristic citations employ the construction of participle or finite verb ( $\beta \lambda \varepsilon \pi \omega \nu$ ["looks"] or $\dot{\varepsilon} \mu \beta \lambda \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \psi \varepsilon \iota$ ["shall look"]) + anarthrous noun in the accusative or dative case (e.g. $\gamma \cup v a \tau \nsim \alpha / \gamma \cup v a\llcorner x[$ ["woman," "wife"]) (so the Gospel mss, ${ }^{139}$ Justin Martyr [ $1 / 1$ ], Athenagoras [1/1], Theophilus of Antioch [1/1], Irenaeus [2/2], Clement of Alexandria [1/7], ${ }^{140}$ 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 Cyrrbus [1/1]), ${ }^{141}$ the Constitutiones Apostolorum alone employs the construction of finite verb ( $\varepsilon \mu \beta \lambda \varepsilon ́ \varepsilon \psi \varepsilon ᄂ[" s h a l l ~ l o o k "])+$ preposition ( $\varepsilon i s[$ ["on," "at"]) + articular noun in the accusative case ( $\tau \grave{\nu} \nu \gamma \cup \vee \alpha \tilde{L} x \alpha$ ["wife"]); ${ }^{142}$ 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], ${ }^{143}$ and Acta Philippi (2) [1/1], ${ }^{144}$ cited under (b) above), the Constitutiones Apostolorum employs the modifier тоข̃ $\pi \lambda$ noז̌ov ("[his] neighbor's"). ${ }^{145}$

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"

[^15]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.

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." ${ }^{147}$

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

[^16]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." ${ }^{148}$

Of the distinctive features of the Greek and Arabic versions, only a vestige of item (1) (the formula o̊ o七 $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu \tau \widetilde{\varphi} N \sigma \mu \varphi$ $\gamma \varepsilon \gamma \rho \alpha \pi \tau \alpha\llcorner$ ["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 formu-

 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) ( $\pi \tilde{\alpha} s$,
 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), ${ }^{19}$ and the coordinating clause "and lusted after her" (instead of a telic or

[^17]consequential clause,, ${ }^{150}$ 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, ${ }^{151}$ 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 [1/1] have $\dot{o} \beta \lambda \bar{\varepsilon} \pi \omega \nu$. ["who looks"]; Basil [1/1] and Chrysostom [1/6] have $\dot{o} \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \beta \lambda \varepsilon \pi \omega \nu$ ["who looks"]; Clement of Alexandria [1/7] has $\delta \pi \rho \circ \sigma \beta \lambda \varepsilon \pi \omega \nu$ [who looks"]). However, a number of witnesses have the aorist tense (in addition to K 28 1171572434771093 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 $\dot{\delta} \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \beta \lambda \hat{\varepsilon} \psi \alpha s$ ["who has looked"]; Theophilus of Antioch $[1 / 1]$, and Clement of Alexandria [1/7] have $\delta$ i $\delta$ б $v$ ["who has looked"]).
${ }^{150}$ 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
 Clement of Alexandria (4/5) has $\pi \rho$ òs $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi\llcorner\vartheta \cup \mu\lceil\alpha \nu$ ("with desire"). Only the Acta Philippi (2), 142 has a form comparable to that of the Ethiopic
 sired her"). Cf. the reading wr'g $l$ h ("and desires her") in codices Sinaiticus and Curetonianus, and Titus of Bostra (1/1).
${ }^{151}$ 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 öть $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu \tau \widetilde{\mu}$ No $\mu \psi \gamma \hat{\varepsilon} \gamma \rho \alpha \pi \tau \alpha L($ "for it is written in the Law") (and not, as in the contemporary Gospel traditions, with the clause
 that it was said (to the ancients")]). ${ }^{152}$ All four witnesses imply this: mṭl dktyb bnmws' ("for it is written in the Law") (Didasc. Syr.) =quoniam in lege scriptum est ("for it is written in the
 written in the Law") (Constit. Apost. Grk.) = "it is written in the Law" (Constit. Apost. Arab.).
2. That the Greek Didascalist employed the parenthesis
 $\nu \tilde{v} \nu \delta \bar{\varepsilon}$ ó $\alpha J \tau o ̀ s ~ נ \mu \tau \tau \nu ~ \lambda \bar{\varepsilon} \gamma \omega$ ("that is, I spoke, in the Law, through Moses, but now I myself speak to you"). All four witnesses imply such: hw dbnmws' byd mws' mllt hs" dyn 'n' qnwmy '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")

 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 ท่ ио $\sigma \alpha \tau \varepsilon$
 manuscripts and Chrysostom (1/1) (In Matthaeum, Hom. 61.2 [Migne, PG
 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 $\dot{\varepsilon} \rho \rho \varepsilon \vartheta \eta(\gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho)$ тo $\check{s} \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \propto$ ட́ous("[for] it was said to the ancients").
 ("everyone who shall look at his neighbor's wife") (and not one of the more common readings of the contemporary Gospel traditions, e.g.[ $\left.\pi \widetilde{\alpha}_{S}\right] \dot{\delta}[\varepsilon \in \mu] \beta \lambda \varepsilon \pi \omega \nu \gamma \cup \nu \alpha \tilde{\sim} \alpha \alpha[" e v e r y o n e ~ w h o ~ l o o k s$ on/at a woman/wife"]). ${ }^{153}$ All four witnesses imply this: $d k l m n$ dnhww 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")
 тоũ $\pi \lambda n \sigma$ โ́ov ("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 $\pi \tilde{\alpha} \varsigma$ ("every[one]") + indefinite relative pronoun ö $\sigma \tau\llcorner$ ("who") + the finite verb $\dot{\varepsilon} \mu \beta \lambda \varepsilon \psi \varepsilon \iota ~(" s h a l l ~ l o o k ") ~(a n d ~$ not one of the more common constructions of the contemporary Gospel traditions, e.g. the adjective $\pi \widetilde{\alpha} s$ ["every(one)"] + the article $\dot{o}$ ["the" ("who")] + the participle $\beta \lambda \varepsilon \pi \omega \nu$ ["looks"]). ${ }^{154}$ That he employed the adjective $\pi \tilde{\alpha} \varsigma$ ("every[one]") is implied by the combined testimony of the Syriac Didascalist's kl ("everyone") and the Latin Didascalist's omnis

[^18]("everyone"), supported by the Greek Constitutor's $\pi \widetilde{\alpha} s$ ("every[one]") and the Arabic Constitutor's kl ("everyone"); that he employed the indefinite relative pronoun oठ ous ("whoever") seems to be implied by the combined testimony of the Syriac Didascalist's $m n$ ("whoever") and the Latin Didascalist's quicumque ("whoever"), supported by the Greek Constitutor's öवtus ("whoever") and the Arabic Constitutor's mn ("whoever"); and, finally, that he employed the finite verb $\dot{\varepsilon} \mu \beta \lambda \varepsilon \psi \varepsilon \iota$ ("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 $\dot{\varepsilon} \mu \beta \lambda \varepsilon \bar{\varepsilon} \psi \varepsilon \iota$ ("shall look") and the Arabic Constitutor's finite verb $n d r$ ("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 $\pi \tilde{\alpha} S$ ös $\varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \tilde{\alpha} \nu \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \beta \lambda \varepsilon \bar{\varepsilon} \psi n$ ("everyone who should look").
5. That the Greek Didascalist employed the prepositional phrase $\varepsilon i$ s tìv ruvaǐua toũ $\pi \lambda n \sigma$ iov aủtoũ ("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

[^19]$i$ is ("on," "at") is implied by the combined testimony of the Syriac Didascalist's $b$ ("on," "at") and the Latin Didascalist's in ("on," "at") supported by the Greek Constitutor's $\varepsilon i s$ ("on," "at") (cf. the Arabic Constitutor's ' 1 ' ["on," "at"]); and that he employed the modifier toũ $\pi \lambda$ notov aútoũ ("his neighbor") is implied by the combined testimony of the Syriac Didascalist's qrybh ("his neighbor") and the Latin Didascalist's proximi sui ("his neighbor"), supported by the Greek Constitutor's то兀 $\pi \lambda n \sigma$ โov ("[his] neighbor") and the Arabic Constitutor's qrybh ("his friend").
6. The remaining phrases and clauses (such as $\dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \bar{\omega} \delta \bar{\varepsilon} \lambda \hat{\varepsilon} \gamma \omega$
 sire"]) seem to be so probable as not to require any further discussion.

Given the above analysis and evaluation of the evidence, I conjecture that the dominical logos we are here discussing

23:132.24f.]), Basil (1/1) (Letter 46.1 [Deferrari, LCL 190:284.21ff.]), Cyril of Jerusalem (1/1) (Catecheses, 1.13.5 [Reischl and Rupp, Cyrilli Hierosolymarum, Opera, 2:56.6f.]), Macarius of Egypt (Homiliai pneumatikai, 26.13 [Dörries, et al., PTS 4:211.3f.]), Acta Philippi (1) (1/1) (Lipsius and Bonnet, AAA, 2.2:80.12ff.), Chrysostom (6/6) (In Matthaeum, Hom. 17,61.2 [Migne, PG 57:255.1ff.; PG 58:594.2ff.], In epistolam primam ad Corinthios, Hom. 7.7;42.3 [Migne, $P G$ 61:64.64f.; 366.49f.], Catechesis, 1.32 [Wenger, SC 50: 124.30f.], 2.5 [Migne, $P G$ 49:240.17f.]), Nemesius of Emesa (1/1) (De natura hominis, 40.86f. [Migne, PG 40:769.24f.]), Cyril of Alexandria (1/1) (In Zachariam, 768c [Pusey, In XII Prophetas, 2:468.17ff.]), and Theodoret of Cyrrhus (1/1) (Graecorum affectionum curatio, 9.57 [Canivet, SC 7:354.10f.]). Clement of Alexandria ( $5 / 7$ ) omits the noun altogether.

Theophilus of Antioch (1/1) (Ad Autolycum, 3.13 [Bardy, SC 20:230. 24ff.]) has the construction $\gamma \cup v \alpha \tau \kappa \alpha \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda о \tau \rho[\alpha \nu$ ("another's wife") (but without the 'preceding preposition). Cf. Clement of Alexandria (Stromata,

 wife']).

Acta Philippi (2) (1/1) (Lipsius and Bonnet, AAA 2.2:80.26ff.) has the comparable construction, $\varepsilon$ ís $\gamma \cup v \alpha \tilde{\sim} \alpha \alpha$ тои̃ $\pi \lambda \eta \sigma$ íov $\alpha$ Útoũ ("on/at his neighbor's wife').
appeared in the following form in the original text of the




 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)


[^0]:    *Abbreviations employed in this article, which are not spelled out on the back cover of this journal, indicate the following series: AAA = Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha; CAC=Corpus Apologetarum Christianorum Saeculi Secundi; CCL = Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina; CSCO = Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium; CSEL = Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum; GCS = Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte; NTG=Novum Testamentum Graece; PTC= Patristische Texte und Studien; SC = Sources chrétiennes.
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    1 "Prolegomena to a Study of the Dominical Logoi as cited in the Didascalia Apostolorum, Part II: Methodological Questions," AUSS 15 (1977): 1-15.
    ${ }^{2}$ "Prolegomena to a Study of the Dominical Logoi as cited in the Didascalia Apostolorum, Part II: Methodological Questions (cont.)," AUSS 15 (1977): 97-113.

[^1]:    ${ }^{3}$ The author of this logos is designated mrn wmlpnn yšwe mšyh' ("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.) $=$ หÚp८oS $\dot{\eta} \mu \widetilde{\omega} \nu$ 'Inooũs Xplõós ("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]:    ${ }^{4}$ 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.

[^3]:    ${ }^{5}$ See n. 4, above.
    ${ }^{6}$ The Arabic Constitutor renders the citation in a form essentially identical to that of the Greek text (see Dawud, 'ldsqwlyt, 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).

[^4]:    ${ }^{8}$ Contra Manichaeos, 4.175 (P. A. de Lagarde, Titi Bostreni, Contra Manichaeos libri quattuor Syriace [Berlin, 1859 (reprint, Osnabrück/ Wiesbaden, 1967)], p. 120.31f.).
    ${ }^{9}$ Hom. 13 (E. A. W. Budge, Philoxenus of Mabbug: The Discourses. Syriac Text . . . Translation, Introduction, Appendix, Index, 2 [London, 1894]: 555.10f).
    ${ }^{10}$ Contra Manichaeos, 4.「75 (Lagarde, Contra Manichaeos, p. 120.31f.).

[^5]:    ${ }^{11}$ Contra Manichaeos, 4.575 (Lagarde, Contra Manichaeos, p. 120.31f.).
    ${ }^{12}$ Contra Manichaeos, $4 . \Gamma 75$ (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: Liure de la Perfection, 2me Partie, CSCO 214/syr 90 [Louvain, 1961]: 71.21f.).
    ${ }^{15}$ Syrpal has the active participle hm' ("burns with desire"), and Philoxenus of Mabbug (1/2) (Hom. 13. [Budge, Discourses 2:555.6f.]) the active participle $h^{\prime} r$ ("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 Ṣalibi (1/1) (Commentarii, ad loc. [I. Sedlacek and I.-B. Chabot, Dionysii bar Şalibi, Commentarii in evangelia, 1, fasc. 2, CSCO 77/syr 33 (Louvain, 1915): 219.13]) have the imperfect $n h z$ ' ("shall look').
    ${ }^{17}$ In Ezechielem, 9.4 (Assemani, Ephraemi Syri, Opera, 1:5. 174c).
    ${ }^{18}$ Contra Manichaeos, $4 . \Gamma 75$ (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 90:71.21f.).
    ${ }^{21}$ Commentarii, ad loc. (Sedlaček and Chabot, CSCO 77/syr 33:219.13).

[^6]:    ${ }^{22}$ Philoxenus of Mabbug (1/2) (Hom. 13 [Budge, Discourses 2:555.6f.]) has the construction: participle ( $h$ 'r ["looks"]) + preposition (b ["on," "at'"]) + noun ('ntt' ["woman," "wife"]).
    ${ }^{23}$ In Ezechielem, 9.4 (Assemani Ephraemi Syri, Opera, 1:5.174c).
    ${ }^{24}$ Contra Manichaeos, $4 . \Gamma 5$ (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. (Sedlaček 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 $\tau 0 \widetilde{ } \pi \lambda \eta \sigma$ โov ("[his] neighbor's") in the Latin Didascalia and the Greek Constitutiones Apostolorum respectively. There is an equivalent form in the Arabic Constitutiones Apostolorum.

[^7]:    ${ }^{31}$ 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]: 35.21 ff.); and Contra Faustum, 19.21 (I. Zycha, S. Aureli 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 evangel. 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.).
    ${ }^{35}$ Adversus haereses, 4.13.1 (A. Rousseau, et al., Irénée de Lyon: Contre les hérésies, liure IV, SC 100 [Paris, 1965]: 524.5ff.).
    ${ }^{36}$ Hom. in Jesu Nave, 9.3 (W. A. Baehrens, Origenes: Werke, VII: Homilien zum Hextateuch in Rufins Übersetzung, 2: Die Homilien zu Numeri, Josua, und Judices, GCS 30 [Leipzig, 1921]: 7.348.20ff.); In Canticum Canticorum, 1 (Baehrens, Origenes: Werke, VIII: Homilien zu Samuel I, zu Hohelied und zu den Propheten, GCS 33 [Leipzig, 1925]: 8.95.3ff.); and Comm. in evangel. Matthaei, 24 (E. Klostermann, Origenes: Werke, X: Matthäuserklärung, 1: Die griechisch erhaltenen Tomoi, GCS 40 [Berlin, 1935]: 10.244.17ff.).
    ${ }^{37}$ 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.).
    ${ }^{30}$ See n. 36, above.

[^8]:    ${ }^{52}$ Sermo 98.5 (Migne, PL 38:593.52ff.).
    ${ }^{53}$ Conlatio. Patrum, 5.11; 12.2 (Petschenig, CSEL 13:133.7f.; 336.21ff.).

[^9]:    ${ }^{54}$ De statu animae, 1.24 (A. Engelbrecht, Claudiani Mamerti, Opera, CSEL 11 [Vienna, 1885]: 86.15f.).
    ${ }^{55}$ Ruricii epistularum, 2.17 (Engelbrecht, Fausti Reiensis, Opera, CSEL 21 [Vienna, 1891]: 401.14f.).
    ${ }^{56}$ De gubernatione Dei, 6.49 (F. Pauly, Salyiani 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]: 183.16f.; 31f.).
    ${ }^{59}$ 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 (Baehrens, GCS 33:8.95.3ff.).
    ${ }^{62}$ De divinis Scripturis sive Speculum, 45 (Weihrich, 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 Ubersetzung, 1: Die Homilien zu Genesis, Exodus, und Leviticus, GCS 29 [Leipzig, 1920]: 6.303.23ff.);Hom. in Jesu Nave, 9.3 (Baehrens, 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 Valentiniani, de paenitentia, de mysteriis, de sacramentis, CSEL 73 [Vienna, 1955]: 152.13f.).
    ${ }^{68}$ 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.).
    ${ }^{89}$ De gubernatione Dei, 3.37 (Pauley, 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.).

[^10]:    ${ }^{90}$ Sermo, 41.4; 5 (Morin, CCL 103:183.16f.; 31f.).
    ${ }^{91}$ In librum primum Regum, 1.26; 3.156 (Verbraken, CCL 144:69.8f.; 284.27 ff .).
    ${ }^{92}$ 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 Matthaeum, 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.
    ${ }^{96} \mathrm{Cf}$. the parallel modifiers qrybh ("his neighbor") and $\tau 0 \widetilde{u} \pi \lambda \eta \sigma$ Lov ("[his] neighbor's") in the Syriac Didascalia and the Greek Constitutiones Apostolorum respectively. There is an equivalent form in the Arabic Constitutiones Apostolorum.

[^11]:    ${ }^{07}$ See pp. 147-152, above.

[^12]:    ${ }^{28}$ See Legg, NTG: Matthaeum, ad loc.
    ${ }^{99}$ In Zachariam, 768c (P. E. Pusey, Cyrilli Alexandrini, Opera: In XII Prophetas, 2 [Oxford, 1869 (reprint, 1965)]: 468.17ff.).
    ${ }^{100}$ See Legg, NTG: Matthaeum, 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): 4.349.33f.]) has simply $\varepsilon \quad \varepsilon \rho \varepsilon \vartheta n$ ("it was said").
    ${ }^{105}$ Clement of Alexandria (1/1) (Stromata, 3.11;71.3 [O. Stählin and L. Früchtel, Clemens Alexandrinus, II: Stromata I-VI, GCS $52^{3}$ (Berlin, 1960):
     the command of the Law'); and Dorotheus of Gaza (1/1) (Instructions, I. 6 [L. Regault and J. de Préville, Dorothée de Gaza: Oeuvres Spirituelles, SC 92 (Paris, 1963): 154.14f.]) has ó vб人○s $\varepsilon^{\text { }} \pi \varepsilon$ ("the Law has said").
    ${ }^{106}$ See Legg, NTG: Matthaeum, ad loc.
    ${ }^{107}$ Adversus haereses, 4.13.1 (Rousseau, et al., SC 100.525.5ff.).

[^13]:    ${ }^{108}$ Stromata 3.2;9.1; 3.2;31.1; 3.11;71.3; 4.18;114.2 (Stählin and Früchtel, GCS 52³:3.199.27f.; 210.9; 228.15f.; 298.24f.).
    ${ }^{109}$ Comm. on John, 20.17 (Preuschen, GCS 10:4.349.33f.).
    ${ }^{110}$ In Matthaeum, Hom. 17 (Migne, PG 57:255.1ff.).
    ${ }^{111}$ In Zachariam, 768c (Pusey, In XII Prophetas, 2:468.17ff.); In S. Joannem, 3.3.267a; 11.9.982d (Pusey, In D. Joannis Evangelium 1:393.30ff.; 2:712.7f.). ${ }^{112}$ Instructions, 1.6 (Regault and Préville, SC 92:154.14f.).
    ${ }^{113}$ See Legg, $N T G$ : Matthaeum, ad loc.
    ${ }^{114}$ Ad Autolycum, 3.13 (G. Bardy, Ad Autolycum, SC 20 [Paris, 1960): 230.24ff.).
    ${ }^{115}$ Adversus haereses, 4.13.1 (Rousseau, et al., SC 100:525.5f.).
    ${ }^{116}$ Stromata, 3.2;8.4; 3.14;94.3 (Stählin and Früchtel, GCS 52 ${ }^{3}: 3.199 .16 ;$
    239.18f.).
    ${ }^{117}$ Comm. on John, 20.17 (Preuschen, GCS 10:4.349.33f.):
    ${ }^{118}$ Demonstratio Erangelica 3.6.4 (I. A. Heikel, Eusebius: Werke, VI: Die Demonstratio Evangelica, GCS 23 [Leipzig, 1913]: 132.24f.).
    ${ }^{119}$ Letter, 46.1 (R. J. Defarrari, S. Basil: Letters, LCL 190 [London, 1926]: 284.21 ff.).
    ${ }^{120}$ Homiliai pneumatikai, 26.13 (H. Dörries, et al., Die 50 geistlichen Homilien des Makarios, PTS 4 [Berlin, 1964]: 211.3f.).
    ${ }^{121}$ Acta Philippi (2), 142 (R. A. Lipsius and M. Bonnet, Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha, 2.2 [Darmstadt, 1959]: 80.26ff.).
    ${ }^{122}$ In Matthaeum, Hom. 17 (Migne, PG 57:255.1ff.).
    ${ }^{123}$ In Zachariam, 786c (Pusey, In XII Prophetas, 2:468.17ff.).
    ${ }^{124}$ Theophilus (1/1) has $\pi \widetilde{\alpha} \varsigma$ ○ $¿ \delta \omega v($ "everyone who has looked"); Clement of Alexandria (1/2), $\pi \tilde{\alpha} \varsigma \dot{\delta}$ o $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \beta \lambda \tilde{\varepsilon} \pi \omega \nu$ ("everyone who looks"); Basil (1/1), $\pi \widetilde{\alpha} S \dot{o} \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \beta \lambda \varepsilon \pi \omega \nu$ ("everyone who looks"); Acta Philippi (2) (1/1), $\pi \tilde{\alpha} \varsigma \dot{j}$ $\dot{\varepsilon} \mu B \lambda \hat{\varepsilon} \psi \alpha S$ ("everyone who has looked"); and Chrysostom (1/1), $\pi \widetilde{\alpha} \varsigma \dot{\delta}$ $\dot{\varepsilon} \mu \beta \lambda \varepsilon \pi \omega \nu$ ("everyone who looks"). All the other witnesses listed have $\pi \widetilde{\alpha} S$ ó $\beta \lambda \varepsilon \pi \omega \nu$ ("everyone who looks").

[^14]:    ${ }^{125}$ See Legg, NTG: Matthaeum, ad loc.
    ${ }^{128}$ Supplicatio pro Christianis, 32.8 (J. C. T. Otto, Corpus Apolologetarum 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, 3.5;33.2 (Stählin, Clemens Alexandrinus, I: Protrepticus und Paedagogus, GCS 12 [Leipzig, 1905]:1.77.22f.); Stromata, 2.11;50.2; 2.14;61. 3; 2.15;66.1; 4.18;114.2 (Stählin and Früchtel, GCS 52³:3.139.18f.; 146.9f.; 148.13; 298.24f.).
    ${ }^{129}$ In Matthaeum, Hom. 61.2 (Migne, PG 58:594.2ff.); In epistolam primam ad Corinthios, Hom., 7.7; 42.3 (Migne, PG 61:64.64f.; 366.49f.); Catechesis, 1.32 (A. Wenger, Jean Chrysostome: Huit Catéchèses baptismales, SC 50 [Paris, 1970]: 124.30f.); 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. 19581: 354.10f.).
    ${ }^{132}$ Athenagoras ( $1 / 1$ ) and Irenaeus ( $1 / 2$ ) have ó $\beta \lambda \varepsilon \pi \omega \nu$ ('who looks'); Clement of Alexandria (3/5), Chrysostom (5/5), Nemesius of Emesa (1/1), and Theodoret of Cyrrhus (1/1) have $\dot{\delta} \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \beta \lambda \varepsilon \psi \alpha_{S}$ ("who has looked"); and Clement of Alexandria has $\dot{\delta} \dot{\iota} \delta \omega \nu$ ("who has looked") and $\dot{\delta} \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \iota \vartheta \cup \mu \eta \sigma \alpha S$ ("who has desired").
    ${ }^{133}$ See Legg, NTG: Matthaeum, ad loc.
    ${ }^{134}$ Apologia, 1.15.1 (Otto, CAC 1:46.6ff.).
    ${ }^{135}$ Contra Celsum, 3.44 (P. Koetschau, Origenes: Werke, I: Die Schrift vom Martyrium. Gegen Celsus I-IV, GCS 2 [Leipzig, 1899], 1.240.7ff.); Comm. on John, 20.23 (Preuschen, GCS 10:4.350.14f.); De Principiis, 3.1.6 (Koetschau, Origenes: Werke, V: Die Principiis, GCS 22 [Leipzig, 1913]: 5.202.7f.); Selecta in Ezechiel, 6 (C. H. E. Lommatzsch, Origenis, Opera omnia, 14 [Berlin, 1840]: 195).
    ${ }^{138}$ Catecheses, 1.13.5 (W. C. Reischl and J. Rupp, Cyrilli Hierosolymarum, Opera omnia, 2 [Munich, 1860 (reprint, 1967)]: 56.6f.).
    ${ }^{137}$ Acta Philippi (1), 142 (Lipsius and Bonnet, AAA 2.2:80.12ff.) has $\pi \tilde{\alpha} S$ öS $\dot{\varepsilon} \alpha{ }^{\alpha} \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \beta \lambda \hat{\varepsilon} \psi \eta$ ("everyone who should look").
    ${ }^{133}$ All the witnesses listed employ the verb $\dot{\varepsilon} \mu \beta \lambda \hat{\varepsilon} \psi \eta$ ("should look").

[^15]:    ${ }^{139}$ See Legg, NTG: Matthaeum, ad loc.
    ${ }^{140}$ Clement of Alexandria (5/7) omits the noun altogether.
    ${ }^{141}$ For the references see nn. 114-136, above.
    ${ }^{142}$ Acta Philippi (2), 142 (Lipsius and Bonnet, AAA 2.2:80.26ff.) has a
     who has looked at a woman/wife").
    ${ }^{143}$ Theophilus of Antióch (Ad Autolycum, 3.13 [Bardy,SC 20:230.24ff.]) has the modifier $\alpha \lambda \lambda \circ \tau \rho\lceil\alpha \nu$ ("another's"). Cf. Clement of Alexandria (Stromata, 7.13;82.3 [Stählin et al., Clemens Alexandrinus, III: Stromata VII
    
    
    ${ }^{144}$ Acta Philippi (2), 142 (Lipsius and Bonnet, AAA 2.2:80.26ff.) has тоヘ̃ $\pi \lambda \eta \sigma$ โov $\alpha \cup \mathfrak{\tau} 0 \tilde{( }$ ("his neighbor's").
    ${ }^{145}$ Cf. the parallel modifiers qrybh ("his neighbor'") and proximi sui ("his neighbor's") in the Syriac and Latin Didascaliae respectively. There is an equivalent form in the Arabic Constitutiones Apostolorum.

[^16]:    ${ }^{147}$ For the Arabic text see Dawud, 'ldsqwlyt, p. 17.8f.

[^17]:    ${ }^{148}$ Cf. Harden, Ethiopic Didascalia, 3.15ff.
    ${ }^{149}$ The majority of the Gospel manuscripts and Patristic citations have

[^18]:    ${ }^{153}$ 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 $\left.\left.{ }^{3}: 3.239 .18 \mathrm{f}.\right]\right)$, Origen (1/5) (Comm. on John, 20.17 [Preuschen, GCS 10:4.349.33f.]), 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 4:211.3f.]), Chrysostom (1/6) (In Matthaeum, 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 Matthaeum, 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, $S C$ 50:124.30f.]; 2.5 [Migne, PG 49: 240.17f.]), Nemesius of Emesa (l/1) (De natura hominis, 40.86f. [Migne, PG 40:769.24f.]), and Theodoret of Cyrrhus (1/1) (Graecorum affectionum curatio, 9.57 [Canivet, $S C$ 57:354.10f.]) have $\dot{o} \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \beta \lambda \hat{\varepsilon} \psi \propto \varsigma ~ \gamma \cup \nu \alpha \iota \chi$ ("who has looked [at] a woman/wife").
    ${ }^{154}$ See n . I53, above.

[^19]:    ${ }^{155}$ Lipsius and Bonnet, AAA, 2.2:80.12ff.
    ${ }^{150}$ 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., $S C$ 100:525.5ff.; 573.9ff.]), Clement of Alexandria (1/7) (Stromata, 3.14;94.3 [Stählin and Früchtel, GCS 52 ${ }^{\text {B }}$ 3.298.24f.]), 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 Ezechiel, 6 [Lommatzsch, Origenis, Opera, 14:195]), Eusebius (1/1) (Demonstratio Evangelica, 3.6.4 [Heikel, GCS

