

# "The testament of our lord"

Autor(en): **Sarum, John**

Objekttyp: **Article**

Zeitschrift: **Revue internationale de théologie = Internationale theologische Zeitschrift = International theological review**

Band (Jahr): **8 (1900)**

Heft 31

PDF erstellt am: **25.04.2024**

Persistenter Link: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-403481>

## **Nutzungsbedingungen**

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern.

Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden.

Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

## **Haftungsausschluss**

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

## “THE TESTAMENT OF OUR LORD.”

BY THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

---

The first scholar to introduce the text of this remarkable apocryphal book to the Western world was the well-known Orientalist Paul de Lagarde. In his *Reliquiæ iuris ecclesiastici antiquissimæ*, published in 1856, he incorporated a greek version, made by himself, of the extracts contained in the famous St. Germain Ms. 38, which he had already published in Syriac. These extracts shewed that the work called the *Testament of our Lord* was a book beginning with an Apocalyptic prelude and afterwards containing Church ordinances of a somewhat peculiar character, tending in fact to asceticism more distinctly than those of the Apostolic Constitutions or the Egyptian Heptateuch published by Tattam. Unfortunately the languid interest then felt in such matters did not extend so far as to incite other Western scholars to look for a fuller text of this book. Had they done so they would have found both Syriac texts and versions in other Eastern languages in no inaccessible places. Cambridge has a Syriac text in the Malabar Bible of the University Library (Oo. 1., 1, 2)<sup>1</sup>; so has the Laurentian Library at Florence in a book of Church ordinances; so has the Borgia Museum at Rome. The British Museum now at any rate has two Ethiopic Mss. which contain it (Ms. 361 and 362 in Dr Wright's Catalogue). A Coptic version is also known to have existed, and a Copto-Arabic Borgia Ms. is used by Rahmani.

The original Greek has however not yet been found; and only slight, though important, fragments of the Apocalyptic

---

<sup>1</sup>) For some account of this book see J. Rendel Harris' *On the origin of the Ferrar-Group*, pp. 11 f., 1893, and W. E. Barnes' *Apparatus criticus to Chronicles in the Peshitta version*, pp. XXVI f., Camb. 1897.

prelude exist in Latin. These were published by Dr M. R. James in his *Apocrypha Anecdota*, i. 154, in the *Cambridge Texts and Studies* for 1893, from a VIII<sup>th</sup> century Ms. at Treves.

It was therefore more creditable to Eastern than to Western scholarship that the task of first publishing a complete Syriac text—with Latin version—fell to the Uniate Patriarch Ignatius Ephraem II. Rahmani, who brought it out last year (1899) at Mainz in a handsome volume, well printed by Drugulin of Leipzig. The Mosul codex from which it was derived proves like the Cambridge Ms., to be a Bible. The *Testament* follows the Old and New Testament as the first part of the Syrian Octateuch, and so do the extracts from it in the St. Germain Ms., proving the high value set upon it in the Monophysite Churches.

Its Syrian Editor, though of course not going so far as to accept it as deuterocanonical, has gone farther than Western scholars have hitherto gone or are likely to go in his estimate of the antiquity, and therefore of the value, of the work which he has been fortunate enough to bring into daylight. While I can honestly congratulate him on the generally high standard of his work, so far as I am qualified to judge it, I cannot accept the early date which he assigns to it. Nevertheless the Prolegomena, the Dissertations and the Index shew no little scholarship. A second Index, of Scripture quotations and references, is a desideratum which I trust may be supplied in a second edition; and I am inclined to think that the Latin version rather frequently needs some revision.

Rahmani considers the date of the book, not merely in substance, but apparently as a composition, to be not later than the time of St. Irenæus, circa A. D. 180. This is obviously far too early as regards the composition of the book which has all the appearance of a collection of older material carefully edited by some theologian of very pronounced views of doctrine in the same period as the Apostolic Constitutions viz. the latter part of the fourth century. I shall speak on this point later on. But, even as regards the substance of the rules and Church ordinances contained in it, the date A. D. 180 is considerably too early. In order to arrive at a conclusion on this point it is necessary not merely to consider the relative antiquity of the *Testament* in comparison with other books of the same class, as if they were specimens existing *in vacuo*, but to

consider the place from which they have a common origin. If Rahmani had gone more deeply into this second question he might have arrived at more solid results as regards the first.

Now I venture to assert, without much fear of contradiction, that all the members of the family of Church orders to which the *Testament* belongs have their origin more or less remotely in Rome. This family consists of the so-called Canons of Hippolytus, part of the Egyptian Heptateuch first published by Tattam, the Canons of the Latin Didascalia of which fragments have been recently published at Leipzig (1900) by Hauler, parallel portions of the Didascalia in Syriac and Arabic as yet incompletely known to us, and the eighth book of the Apostolic Constitutions. The original Church order on which they are based is lost<sup>1)</sup>, and the forms derived from it have been all more or less interpolated, several of them in Egypt, a country, which had very close relations with Rome, and which adopted a large number of similar customs.

The *Apostolic Constitutions* on the other hand is a book now fairly well ascertained to have been finally edited in or near Antioch about A. D. 375, and to represent, in its present form, a Syrian rather than a Roman or Alexandrian tradition. But the source of its 8<sup>th</sup> book must be sought in the last resort with the rest. What then is the reason for calling the origin of these books Roman? It is, to name the most decisive reason, the character of the answers to the Baptismal interrogations which when put together form a Baptismal creed. In three of these documents, the Canons of Hippolytus, the Latin Didascalia (evidently translated from a lost Greek original) and the Testament of our Lord, the creed so reconstructed is clearly Western. It is impossible to suppose that in three documents so separate in character from one another this agreement can

---

<sup>1)</sup> It is impossible at present to say whether that original Church order was or was not Roman in actual origin. The continual influx of strangers, and the Greek or Eastern nationality of many or perhaps most of Roman Christians in the first two centuries, made the City open to impressions from the outside. This indeed was always the case. But it is characteristic of the Roman Church as it was of the Roman State from the time of the Twelve tables onwards, to take up customs from outside, and then after a time to send them out again as laws.



arise from anything but a common origin. But, given this common origin for the three, that of all the rest follows.

The question then arises which of the group stands nearest to the original Roman Church order? If Rahmani had approached the problem in this manner he could hardly have decided as he has done: for the characteristic archaic features of the *Testament*, which make great part of it seem to be ante-Nicene, are just those that are non-Roman. Rahmani sees that to prove his Church ordinances to be early he must prove the *Testament* to be earlier than the *Canons of Hippolytus*; but he has not seen that he must also prove the (supposed) early and peculiar features of the *Testament* to be Roman. But even on his own ground, abstracted from all questions as to place, he has failed to shew the relative antiquity of the *Testament*. I will mention some of the points which prove the *Canons of Hippolytus* to be earlier:—

1. The Canons have no apocryphal setting. The Testament has a most elaborate and audacious pretence of revelation from our Lord.

2. The Canons have only one prayer for ordination in the case of Bishops and Presbyters, which is to be applied to either rank by a simple change of title. The Testament has two, and in the second the Presbyter's office is much subordinated.

3. The prayer for a Bishop in the Canons is much simpler: and it is shorter and less sacerdotal than that in the Testament.

4. The Canons are much less ascetic both as to fasting and celibacy than the Testament.

5. The system of instruction of catechumens and of the "disciplina arcani" is much simpler in the Canons. It is highly elaborated in the Testament.

6. The position of a Deacon is more primitive in the Canons. The Testament embodies certain restrictions on ordinary Deacons, but speaks of an Archdeacon.

7. The ministry of women is much more elaborate in the Testament—which speaks amongst other things of "Presbyteresses with precedence" taking rank among the clergy, a later and certainly a non-Roman institution. Deaconesses also are non-Roman.

8. The scheme of festivals is less developed in the Canons than in the Testament, which in particular twice names Epi-

phany—an Eastern festival, unnoticed before about A. D. 300, and apparently not observed at Rome before the fifth century. The first mention of it in the West is at Vienne in Gaul, a region subject to Eastern influences, where it was kept by the emperor Julian in A. D. 361 just before his apostasy (Amm. Marc. XXI, 2). This is therefore in favour of the later and the Eastern compilation of the book.

The details with regard to the other seasons are somewhat noticeable. The Canons speak of the “forty days” as a time of fasting, but without any detail and so as to suggest an interpolation made in Egypt (XX, 154). The Testament speaks of them as “the forty days of Pascha” (II, 8) and with some detail as a season of vigil, prayer, listening to scriptures hymns and sermons—but not as a season of fasting—and as the time of preparation for Baptism. The usage described differs from the Roman, which in the fourth century was to fast for three weeks, and even more from that of the *Constitutions* which (VI, 13) order a forty days fast ending before holy week begins. The usage of the Testament seems to be the one that prevailed in Alexandria (till Athanasius introduced fasting in Lent circa A. D. 340) and at Jerusalem, and may well have been that of a part of Syria opposed to the usage of Antioch. The Canons imply that Holy week is spent in abstinence. The Testament (II, 18, 20) speaks only of the fast of the two last days, which was no doubt intended to be continuous. Maundy-Thursdays (*feria quinta ultimæ hebdomadæ paschæ*) is to be observed by a celebration and the offering of a lamp by the deacon (II, 11). The Paschal fast is to end at midnight between the Saturday and Sunday. During the fifty days (Pentecost) no one is to fast or to kneel (II, 12). The ending of the fast at midnight may be Roman but this is apparently the only detail which is definitely so.

When we add to these particular considerations the general reflection that the condition of things implied or described in the Canons is, speaking broadly, Roman, or agreeable to what we know of Roman arrangements and Roman tendencies, while that in the Testament is generally not so, we shall have said nearly all that is necessary to disprove Rahmani’s position. There are indeed points in the Canons which are evidences of a later date than about A. D. 200, the epoch to which they are generally assigned. This is not to be wondered at in a book

that was first translated into Coptic and then into Arabic before coming back into Europe. It is rather strange that these old rules have not been more altered especially in regard to the ordination prayer. But even as regards some of these supposed alterations e. g. the references to subdeacons, the evidence of interpolation is almost conclusive from the awkward and half-hearted sort of way in which they come in.

Whence then are we to suppose that the Testament obtained its apparently ante-Nicene but clearly non-Roman elements, its expectations of prophecy and of gifts of tongues, its widows who receive revelations? And whence come its presbyteresses, deaconesses and the like? The suggestion of Dom Germain Morin in the *Revue Bénédictine* for January 1900, pointing to Montanist colouring, seems to me a very reasonable one. The supposition that the Testament, in a second stage of its development, passed from Rome into Asia minor, would account for several other features, especially those of an ascetic character. I may record in this connection the frequent emphasis on spirituality and works of the spirit, the phrase "sons of light", the perfectionist tone of some of the prayers, "lambs and wolves" (I, 36 etc.), the striking prayer for the blessing of oil in which the Paraclete is mentioned (I, 24), the stress laid on fasting and on bearing the cross (i. e. not shrinking from meeting persecution), the severity with which post-baptismal sin is visited (I, 37) and the absence of any provision for penitents either as to place or rules of life, the dislike to second marriages, the references to the Apocalypse of St. John, the picture of the Church as a College of clergy and good women living together without family ties, the strange Tertulianesque passage about the visible shape of souls in heaven (I, 40). All these points, and I believe there are others, are suggestive of Montanist influence. Nor are we left altogether without reasonable conjecture as to the place and date where and when the book first began to take its present shape. The Apocalyptic prelude curiously enough omits Phrygia from the list of countries on which woes are denounced, at any rate in its Syriac form. This prelude may, in whole or in part, have been prefixed to the Montanized Roman Church order in that country. And the date (as Dr Harnack has pointed out) has been apparently revealed to us by the gloss at the end of the Latin frag-

ments „Dexius erit nomen antichristi. Explicit”. This gives us A. D. 250, the date of the great persecution of Decius. Of course there is no definite evidence that the Apocalyptic prelude has not been altered in the course of time or that it was prefixed to the Church ordinances at this early date. Indeed the Latin fragments themselves suggest that it was originally much shorter or at least that it has been remodelled and rearranged. These fragments answer to chapter 11 of the Syriac after which they put chapter 6 and 7 and then abruptly end with the first words of chapter 8, thus omitting most of 8 and all 9 and 10. As the description of the “unrighteous shepherds” and the gathering together of the godly and the denunciation of the woes on countries are in these omitted chapters, we may perhaps conclude that they belong to a later stage of the composition than the Latin fragments and therefore later than A. D. 250. This point may, I hope, some day be settled by the discovery of a complete text of the prelude in Latin or some other (perhaps Slavonic) language.

I may note, on the suggestion of a learned friend, who is specially familiar with the text of St. Cyprian, the Rev. E. W. Watson, that that father, writing in 252 A. D., may be making allusion to our Apocalypse. In his *ad Demetrianum* ch. 4, speaking of the signs of degeneracy and of the end of the world, he mentions “white-haired children”: cf. *T. D.* I, 7. It may also be remarked that the Apocalyptic prelude makes no reference to the great plague of 253 which might naturally have been quoted as a sign of the times. Both these observations of Mr. Watson’s go to confirm the date fixed by Dr Harnack.

But, if the *Testament* began to take something of its present shape as a book containing revelations in Montanist hands in the middle of the third century, it certainly had an after-history, which either obliterated or changed certain objectionable sectarian features or introduced others inconsistent with them. The most decisive instance of this is the strong assertion of the monarchical episcopate in *T. D.* I, 21. The “complete number of the prophets” is 21 (I, 19); and this seems to me to assign 20 to the Old Testament <sup>1)</sup> and 1, John the Baptist,

<sup>1)</sup> Possibly Moses, Samuel, Elijah, Elisha and the 4 Major and 12 Minor Prophets = 20.

to the New. This seems a fair inference from the counter-assertion of Tertullian in one of his Montanist treatises: "Seeing that we acknowledge spiritual charismata, we too have merited the attainment of prophecy, though we come after John" (*de anima* 9). The very phrase "complete number of the prophets" appears in the obscurely worded, but evidently anti-Montanist, sentence at the end of the "Muratorian Canon". Nor are the rules in the *Testament* about general public fasts Montanist, since that sect prescribed a fortnight's fast before Easter. The *Testament* only mentions two days and the usual weekly fasts—for its Lent was apparently not yet a definite season of fasting (II, 8 cf. p. 205)—except in the case of the clergy to whom an excessively severe and apparently ideal system is applied. Similar anti-Montanist or non-Montanist features might be named. We have therefore to consider the probable after-history of the book, and this we shall find to be even more interesting than that of its origin.

Dr Harnack after examining the internal evidence for the final composition of the *Testament*—the doctrinal phraseology, and the development of rites and organisation which it exhibits—puts it a little before or after A. D. 400—an opinion in which I quite concur (*Sitzungsberichte der K. Pr. Ak. d. Wiss.* xlix. 878-891, 1899). But I would go a step further and definitely connect its theology with the school of Apollinarius, Bishop of the Syrian Laodicea a few miles south of Antioch, who died about A. D. 390. For a fuller treatment of the interesting coincidences between his doctrine and the language of the *Testament*, and for other evidence pointing to the close connection of this book with his school, I may be permitted to refer those readers of the *International Review of Theology*, who have leisure to pursue the subject in detail, to an article in the April number of the *English Church Quarterly Review* (vol. 50 pp. 1-29) entitled "*The Testament of our Lord, its connexion with the School of Apollinarius of Laodicea*". His excessively anti-Arian position (in opposition to that of the compiler of the *Apostolic Constitutions* amongst others) and his assertion of a peculiar doctrine of the Incarnation, according to which our Lord took human flesh and an animal soul, but not a human intellectual soul or spirit, seem to be reproduced in various parts of the *Testament*. Such an enterprise in the



domain of apocryphal literature is also congruous to what we know from other sources of this school and its exceedingly able leader : and it is a striking fact that Gregory Nazianzen attributes to the followers of Apollinarius the assumption that they had, in his writings, “a third Testament”, in addition, that is, to the Old and the New Testaments (1 *Ep. ad Cleodonium*, n° 101 *ad fin.*). It is to be noticed (among other pieces of evidence) that the words which are interpolated into the Baptismal interrogations, which when put together form an otherwise Western creed, though by no means heretical, are clearly Syrian and may well be Apollinarian in character.

As the creed has been mentioned already it may be worth while to give it in full, printing the interpolated clause *in italics*.

“I believe in God, the Father Almighty ; and in Christ Jesus the Son of God, *who came from the Father, who from the beginning is with the Father*, who was born of Mary the Virgin by (per) the Holy Spirit, who was crucified in the days of Pontius Pilate, and died and rose on the third day living from the dead, and ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father, and is coming to judge the living and the dead; and in the Holy Spirit, the Holy Church”. *T. D.* 11, 8. p. 129.

In considering the problem of the final revision and composition of the *Testament* in its present form we are in a difficulty owing to the lack of full information about other members of the family particularly the Arabic Didascalia. We may look confidently forward to a complete edition—at anyrate in English—of the Ethiopic statutes of which Ludolf printed a part, from the competent hands of the Rev. George Horner, Editor of the Coptic New Testament. But for the Arabic Didascalia, which is evidently more closely allied to the *Testament* than any other of these books, we have only the preface and the latter portions translated by Socin for Funk and printed by the latter in his *Apostolic Constitutions*, 1891. It is much to be desired that the work should be separately edited in its complete form. There are eight known Mss. of it, four of which are in England, two in the British Museum (Rich. 7207 and 7211) and two at Oxford (Bodl. Huntingdon 31 and 458), of which the last named is I believe the oldest at any rate of our

English Mss. Grabe wrote a dissertation on the two Oxford Mss. and Whiston and Platt published the preface. It seems therefore natural that the work should be undertaken by some English scholar. I venture to express the hope that my friend Dr James Cooper, Professor of Church History at Glasgow, who is about to publish a translation of the *Testament* with notes, will incorporate in it the parallel portions of the Arabic.

This closely allied Didascalia reveals the late date of its final composition by its mention of incense in the Liturgy (ch. 38, 17)—a point in regard to which it stands alone in these Church orders. First comes the Thanksgiving, then an explanation of Scripture and an exhortation made to the people sitting. Then Psalmody. "And the Presbyter shall bring the bread and the cup of the Eucharist. The Bishop shall bring the incense and, in praise of the holy Trinity, shall three times encompass the altar, and he shall give the incense-vessel to the Presbyter and he shall with it go round the congregation." Then follow lections from the discourses of the Apostles and psalms &c. After the chapter describing the Liturgy comes the *Mystagogic instruction* (ch. 39) which is of the highest interest to students of the *Testament* and which seems to have been preserved in a rather older form than that which we have in the book lately discovered.

It is also worth noticing that the 35<sup>th</sup> chapter, summarised by Socin, which describes the arrangement of a Church and answers to *Ap. Const.*, 1, 57, and *T. D.*, I, 19, is the only ancient record besides that in the *Testament* of an oblong Baptistery, or, as far as these books, I believe, are concerned, of a separate Baptistery at all. But while the *Testament* measures its cubits by 21 and 12—the first being "the complete number of the prophets" and the second that of the preachers of the Gospel—the Arabic *Didascalia* makes the first number 24 to answer to the Elders (of the Apocalypse). This may be a point of connection with the *Apostolic Church order*, ch. 18, which also speaks of widows receiving revelations, ch. 21.

The points to be noticed about the Arabic *Mystagogia* are first, and most important, that it bears the title of *Testament* (Vermächtnis), and so may be considered the kernel from which the whole audacious apocryphal pretence of our book has grown; and, secondly, that it is free from the peculiar dogmatic ex-



pressions which appear to me to be Apollinarian in the *Testament of our Lord*. Thirdly it is not so much an instruction to be delivered by a preacher, as a hymn, in great part directly addressed in the second person to our Lord, and evidently to be sung by the whole congregation. It reminds us in part of the *Quicumque vult* and in parts even of the *Te deum*, though of course it is much more inflated and rhetorical. In both forms it appears to be Syrian, but representing the views of a sectarian community with perfectionist and ascetic, perhaps late Montanist, leanings. Funk suggests, and I think rightly, that where the persons (He, Thou) seem to be confused, it is largely due to the use of participles with the definite article in Greek, so that "He who" really means, in many cases, "Thou who".<sup>1)</sup>

*Testament of our Lord*, 1,28, p.59 f.

*Afterwards let the Bishop instruct the people about those things that are secret. But, if the Bishop be not present, let the Presbyter speak so that the faithful may know to whom they are about to draw near, and who is their God and Father.*

*Then let the instruction on the mysteries be delivered as follows.*

***Mystagogia delivered to the faithful before the oblation.***

1. He who was from the beginning, who *was* near and who *is and* is to come, He who *suffered*, and was buried, and rose again and was glorified by the Father.

*Arabic Didascalia*, c. 29,  
Funk, p. 234 f.

***The Mystagogia of Jesus Christ our God.***

*The faithful shall lift it up on high before the holy Liturgy, the Testament that He hath taught to the holy Apostles.*

1. He who was from the beginning, and who *is* present and who is to come, He who *died* and was buried and rose again and was crowned with glory by the Father;

---

<sup>1)</sup> In revising the version of the T. D. I have had access to a literal translation by Dean Maclean, lately of our Archbishop's East Syrian Mission, who is helping Dr Cooper. He begins: "[We confess] him who is pre-existent" etc., and considers sect. 1—7 to be grammatically in the accusative case after "We believing confess" in sect. 8. These sections are from Socin's text.

*Testament of our Lord.*

2. It is He who loosed our bonds from death, who rose again from the dead.

3. *He is not only son of man but is at the same time God,*

4. who by the Holy Spirit restored the flesh of Adam with its soul to immortality, because by (His) spirit he preserved Adam. It is He who put on Adam now dead and made him live, who ascended into heaven.

5. Under Him Death was overcome who was conquered by the cross; its bonds were burst by which once the Devil prevailed against us. *By His passion the Devil appeared powerless and weak,* when He tore away his cords and his power and his snares and struck him with a blow upon his face. So he who was full of darkness was shaken and was in terror, seeing the only begotten Son, *even the animated one, who in the Godhead went down to Hades, Him I say who from the pure heights which are, above heaven came down.*

6. He who is the indivisible mind, which is from the Father, and is coequal with His will, who with the Father is maker of the heavens, who is the crown of angels, the might of arch-angels, the robe of hosts, and the spirit of dominions; who is the king of the eternal king-

*Arabic Didascalia.*

He who hath loosed the bond of death, and who rose again from the dead;

3. and not only art thou man, but thou hast become man without change,

4. He who by the holy Spirit took possession of the body of Adam, and made him living, He who put on the Adam of death and made him awake and with the body has ascended up into heaven.

5. He who overcame Death and burst its bonds by His death, and shamed the Devil who this long time was set as Lord and king over us, after he had discovered His entrance and His power, and He had burst his bonds,

as his face was full of darkness, he grew fearful and was agitated when he saw the only-begotten Son of God put on a body from a Virgin and come down to Hades.

6. And He is the indivisible Counsel and the one shepherd with the Father, the maker of Heaven with the Father, the crown of angels, the order of the highest angels, the will of hosts, the spirit of the glory, the master of the eternal kingdom, the prince of the pure,

*Testament of our Lord.*

dom, the prince of Saints, the incomprehensible intellect of the Father.

7. He is the wisdom, He the power, He the *Lord*, He the counsel, He the intelligence, the hand, the arm of the Father.

8. We believing confess that He is our light, *health*, saviour, *protector*, *assister*, teacher, *liberator*, rewarder, helper, strengthener, fortress [*lit.* wall]. He is our shepherd, *entrance*, *door*, *way*, life, medicine, food, *drink* and judge.

9. *Him* we confess, passible and impassible, Son uncreated, dead (and) living, Son of the Father, *incomprehensible and comprehensible*.

10. Who being without sin bore our sins, and came forth from His paternal *heaven*. His body *when it is broken* becomes our salvation, and His blood and spirit, life and sanctification, and the water our purification.

11. Who *illuminates*(?) the hearts which fear Him, and is with them in all things. He has made us strangers to every *way* of the Devil. He is the renewer of souls, in whom we all *trust*.

*Arabic Didascalia.*

the incomprehensible intellect of the Father.

7. He is the wisdom of the Father, He is the power, He is the *right*, He the intelligence, He is the counsel, He is the hand, He is the arm of the Father.

8. We believe and confess that He is the light of our redemption, the helper, teacher, rewarder, who takes us up, *who has won the victory thereby*, our fortress, our shepherd, *our support*, *the founder* of life, our medicine, our food, our judge.

9. *The confession which* we confess is this: that He suffered and was born without being created; that He died while He was living, *Son of the living*, Son of the Father, *the indivisible*.

10. Who while He was without sin took upon Him our sins, who came forth from *the bosom* of the Father; *who distributed* His redeeming body and His *live-giving* blood, (being) the spirit of life and purity, who made us pure through the water of *Baptism*.

11. Who *makes glad* the hearts of those who fear Him, since He is with them at all times; who has removed us from all *onsets* of Satan, who has renewed our souls, since we all *exist* in Him.

*Testament of our Lord.*

12. Who being God and before the ages with God the eternal Father,

13. seeing the world in the chains of sin and going into ruin, and *trampled by the force of the crafty beast* and subject to *death* through ignorance and error, considering how to heal the human race, came into the *Virgins womb, hiding Himself from all the armies of heaven*, and cast the adversaries' legions *into ignorance*. And so when He put on corruptible *flesh*, He who is *incorruptible*, He made the *flesh* which was under death incorruptible.

14. By this He shewed a likeness (type) of incorruption in the *flesh* which He put on of Adam, who was dead, by which likeness things *which were corrupt were abolished*.

He delivered undefiled commandments by the Gospel, *which is the preaching of His kingdom, and by that same Gospel we have learned to pass a life like that of (His) kingdom*,

15. and by this Gospel the Devil's bonds are broken, in order that *out of death* we might earn immortality and acquire wakefulness *out of ignorance*.

*Arabic Didascalia.*

12. He is God before all times, and He was with God the eternal, the everlasting.

13. When He saw that the world was ruined through the chains of sin, and through the ignorance *and the blindness* that worked the error of those *hellish* thoughts(?), and when He desired to heal the human race, He made the Virgins *body His goal, and He placed Himself in union with it, and He healed all our senses*, and He made all the adversaries' hosts *disappear*, and He put on a weak *body*, He who is *incomprehensible* made the mortal *body* incorruptible.

14. And therefore he appeared in *the body of Adam*, in order to make manifest a likeness (Bild) of incorruption in the *body* of Adam, He who put on an incorruptible<sup>1)</sup> likeness and *died* in that likeness, and through the Gospel *freed those who had fallen into ruin* and gave them holy commandments, *He who* is the word of the kingdom of Heaven in this Gospel.

15. And the Devil's bonds are broken off *from men*, that we by *His death* might have a title to freedom from death, and wake up *in the real world*.

---

<sup>1)</sup> The German has «ein unverwüstliches Bild» but the sense almost seems to require «verwüstliches».

*Testament of our Lord.*

16. He therefore who became son of man is Son of God, (and) *the Lord*, who by *emptying Himself* took up the mortal race of Adam *in its properties*.

17. He who is the first came to nativity, He who is God became son of man, who was foreknown by the prophets, is preached by the Apostles, and is celebrated by the angels, and is glorified by the *Father of all*. He was crucified for us, whose cross is our life, our strength and salvation, which is the hidden mystery, undescribable joy, *by it the whole human race, always bearing it, cannot be separated from God*; which is a beloved power (virtus) and inseparable from God, and which cannot be uttered by these lips *as it ought to be*; which was *of old hidden, but now the mystery is opened, which is manifest to the faithful, not as it appears but as it is*.

*Arabic Didascalia.*

16. He who is *the Christ*, the Son of God, has become man, and has taken to Him our mortal *nature*, which belongs to Adam *and his race*.

17. He is the first who became man, and He is the God whom the prophets began to recognize, who is proclaimed to us by the Apostles, *and whom all men confess*, and by *God* is crowned with glory, and is celebrated by the angels, and for us was crucified, whose cross is our life, who is our support and our saviour, the hidden mystery, the undescribable joy, *who at all time stands on the highest grade of the perfection*, which is beloved, which is inseparable from God, whose worth (Wert) cannot be uttered by these lips, the hidden mystery which the faithful know *that they know though it is invisible*.

The passages quoted above are rather more than half the whole *Mystagogia*. The larger part of what remains is occupied by an address to our Lord on His descent into Hades made by Death who is vividly personified. The general tone is very like that of the address in the latter part of the *Gospel of Nicodemus*, ch. 6 (22), but the parallels are not close enough to suggest direct borrowing on either side. The striking topic "Who is this, who is so different from others who have come to my kingdom, who shines so brilliantly, who carries off my captives &c.?" may easily have been propagated orally in sermons, and have had a different treatment in different



Churches. Other instances of it may be found in the Pseudo-Athanasian (probably Syrian) tract *on Virginité*, c. 16, and in the Easter-Eve sermon attributed to St. Epiphanius and very probably elsewhere.

The last section of the *Mystagogia* shews an enthusiastic Apollinarian treatment in the *Testament*, which almost approaches Pantheism. In the Arabic the section is very concise, but the theology is also very strange. Our Lord's thanksgiving addressed to the "Word of God" implies a kind of gnostic position, and the "spiritual" claims of the worshippers are strikingly emphasised.

*Testament of our Lord*, p. 65.

31. And on the third day rising from the dead He gave thanks to the Father saying: To thee I give thanks, *my Father*, no longer with these lips which are joined together, nor with bodily tongue from which truth and falsehood issue, nor with this created and material word, but I give thanks to thee, O King, with that voice which through thee understands all things, which does not proceed from a bodily organ, nor falls upon ears of flesh, which is not in the world nor remains on earth,

32. but by that voice which is spirit, which is in us, and which speaks to thee, O Father, alone, loves thee, glorifies thee, by which (spirit) also the whole choir of perfect Saints proclaims thee (its) beloved Father, sustainer, helper, since thou art all things and all things are in thee, all things that are are thine and of none else, for thou art to the ages of ages. Amen.

*Arabic Didascalia*, Funk, p. 236.

31. And after His resurrection on the third day He thanked the *Word of God* the Father, while He said: I thank thee, O King, for the speech (Rede) through which the whole creation has come into existence from thy side.

32. That is the word that through the spirit is in us which speaks with thee alone.

I have spent more time than I should otherwise have done in pointing out the parallels in the Arabic Didascalia because, while I have only lately observed them myself, I am not aware that others have brought them into prominence. I have not seen any comment of Funk's on the book, and should welcome the news of one with interest, as he must clearly be aware of the close likeness between the Testament and the chapters which he published in 1891.

The Eucharistic anaphora in the Testament (I, 23) is clearly founded on the short and simple form preserved in the Ethiopic Statutes, which in my belief represents the oldest form of the Roman anaphora that has come down to us. It would be interesting to print the two in parallel columns, which would shew that the old form is there, and that its parts are in the same relative order, but that it is so amplified as to be almost unrecognizable without such a mechanical help to assist comparison. The striking phrase about our Lord stretching out His hands in suffering is however decisive at the first glance as to the connection between the two forms. Both Montanist and Apollinarian elements appear in the Liturgy. The following is the order of clergy at the oblation after the sermon, all being, within the veil, and all standing to take part in the celebration (I, 23). It is not quite clear whether the veil is closed or open.

Younger presbyters (on left)	BISHOP	Elder presbyters (on right)
Widows		Deacons
		Readers
		Subdeacons
		Deaconesses

Those who have spiritual gifts are mentioned just before, but no distinct place is assigned to them in the ritual order. Perhaps they stood behind the widows. The Bishop first lays his hand on the loaves, and then the Presbyters do so: this is apparently in order to bless the whole body of offerings but not to make them ready for communion.

Then comes the (kiss of) Peace and then the Deacon's proclamations <sup>1)</sup>, which are a very striking "fencing of the table" as the Scotch call it:—

---

<sup>1)</sup> A somewhat similar but shorter series of proclamations by the Deacon before the Litany is given on p. 35.



“To the heavens your hearts.

If any has hatred against his neighbour, let him be reconciled.

If any one walks in conscience of unbelief, let him confess it.

If any has a mind alien from the commandments, let him depart.

If any has lapsed into sin, let him not hide himself: he may not hide himself.

If any is sick in mind, let him not draw near.

If any is polluted, if any is not sound, let him give place.

If any is alien from the commandments of Jesus, let him go away.

If any despises the prophets, let him withdraw himself; let him preserve himself from the anger of the Only-begotten.

Let us not despise the cross.

Let us flee from the threatenings [of the Lord].

We have the Father of lights looking on us with the Son and angel visitors.

Look to yourselves lest you keep up hatred against your neighbours.

Look that no one walk in anger: God sees.

[Lift] up your hearts to offer for the salvation of life and holiness. In the wisdom of God let us receive the grace that has been bestowed upon us.

Then let the Bishop confessing and giving thanks say with a terrible voice:—

The Lord be with you.

Let the people say: And with thy spirit.

Let the Bishop say: [Lift] up your hearts.

Let the people say: They are [lifted up] unto the Lord.

Let the Bishop say: Let us give thanks to the Lord.

Let all the people say: It is meet and right.

Let the Bishop cry aloud: Holy things in (or amongst) the holy.

Let the people cry: In heaven and on earth without ceasing”.

The last versicle apparently represents a Greek *τὰ ἅγια ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις*, a remarkable variant, both in its place and mode of expression, from the *τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις* or “*Sancta sanctis*” which elsewhere comes before communion. But it agrees well with the solemn proclamations of the deacon, and with the

general tendency to look to the indwelling presence of spiritual life already existing and capable of further growth in the faithful present. It seems to me quite possible that it is placed in its original position here. It would be in a fit place as long as the anaphora went on visibly, i. e. in a sanctuary the veil of which was left open. When the oblation was considered so sacred as to require concealment, then the "Sancta sanctis" might well be transferred to a later moment in the rite.

Then follows the consecration prayer (p. 40), amplified as I said, yet retaining the old words, sometimes separated from each other by long paragraphs, sometimes only by clauses and verbal expansions. The most important part of it is as follows incorporating the old words which I have printed in Roman type.

"Thou *Lord* didst send thy Word, *the son of thy mind, the son of thy promise*, by whom thou madest all things, since thou wast well pleased *with Him*, into the Virgins womb. Who when He was conceived and incarnate appeared thy Son, born of the holy Spirit *and of the Virgin*. Who, fulfilling thy will and *preparing a holy* people stretched forth His hands to suffer that He might free from suffering *and corruption of death* those who hoped in thee. Who when He was delivered up to willing suffering that he might *lift up those who had fallen, find the lost, make the dead live*, abolish death, break the bonds of the Devil, *fulfil the Father's mind*, tread down Hades, *open the way of life*, direct the just *towards the light of truth, fix the boundary, illuminate the darkness, nurture the babes*, manifest the resurrection, taking bread, gave to His disciples saying 'Take eat, this is my body which is broken for you *for remission of sins. When ye shall make (or offer) this ye shall make (or offer) my resurrection*'. Likewise the cup of wine which He mixed He gave for a likeness (tupos) of the blood which He shed for us."

*Then let him say:—*

"Therefore mindful of *thy* death and of *thy* resurrection we offer to thee the bread and cup, thanking thee *who art God alone for ever and our saviour*, because thou hast made us worthy (?) to stand before thee and to serve as priests before thee. Wherefore we, thy servants, Lord give thanks to thee."

*And let the people say likewise. Then let (the Bishop) say:—*

"We offer to thee this thanksgiving, eternal Trinity, O Lord Jesus Christ, O Lord the Father, from whom every creature and all nature

*shrinks back upon itself in trembling, O Lord the Holy Spirit; Bring [to us] this drink and this food of thy holiness; cause it to be to us not for judgment nor disgrace nor perdition, but for the healing and support of our spirit."*

Everyone will notice here certain points. First is the bold and striking change of St. Paul's language, which language we may note is here attributed, as it sometimes is in other Liturgies, to our Lord. Instead of "Ye proclaim the Lord's death" it is "Ye shall make (or perhaps "offer") my resurrection"—a thought closely allied to the teaching of this book on the mystery of resurrection, and to the emphasis with which Apollinarius elsewhere speaks of the new life of Christ in the believer.

Secondly the words of our Saviour in regard to the cup are not quoted but only indirectly referred to, shewing that there was no feeling of their necessity to the validity of the prayer. A supposition that they are necessary is of course a late theological development.

Thirdly the cup is called a likeness or type very much as in Sarapion's Liturgy, and in other early writers—*figura, ἀντίτυπον* etc. Notice too that the thought of the covenant is not developed.

The oblation that follows is very much in the old form, except in the substitution of "thy" for "His". This and the Invocation addressed to the Trinity, beginning with the Son of God, may reasonably be supposed to have been one of the causes which gave rise to the African Canons of the close of the fourth century prescribing that "in the service at the altar prayer should always be directed to the Father" (Hippo 21, A. D. 393, Carthage III, 23, A. D. 397).

The intercession that follows is also remarkable for its references to the charismata, and the repeated prayers for the holy Spirit. The prayers before communion end:—

"Blessed be the name of the Lord for ever."

*R.* "Amen."

*Priest.* "Blessed be He that cometh in the name of the Lord; Blessed be the name of His glory."

*R.* "So be it: so be it."

*Bishop.* "Send out the grace of the Spirit upon us."

There is no direct mention of the Lord's prayer, but its thoughts are expanded in the private prayer of everyone before

communion, and in the form "may thy kingdom come upon us". No words are given here for administration, but the people (who have already answered "Amen" several times after the consecration prayer) are told to say "Amen". But remarkable words of administration agreeing with the general tone of the book are given later (II, 10) "The Body of Jesus Christ: holy Spirit for healing of soul and body". I am inclined to think that we have here *two* formulae, and that the second part was said at the administration of the Cup. Compare the *Mystagogia*, section 10.

I look to the readers of the *International Review* especially those in Greek and Slavonic lands to search in their treasures for manuscripts which will add to our exact knowledge of the branch of literature of which the Testament is a specimen. It has many points which still demand illustration, and scholars both older and younger who have more leisure than I, and more insight into these documents, will I trust kindly let me know of any reviews or articles which are published by themselves or others either to support or to criticize the views adopted and advanced in this paper.

Salisbury, 8 June 1900.

JOHN SARUM.

---