

HENK JAN DE JONGE

*J.J. SCALIGER'S DE LXXXV CANONIBUS APOSTOLORUM
DIATRIBE*

The Greek early Christian writing entitled *Eighty-five Canons of the Apostles* consists of 85 rules concerning the ordination of clergymen, their official duties, certain aspects of liturgical practice, and the conduct of laymen.* Most of the canons mention the sanction to which transgressors expose themselves (usually suspension or dismissal from office, or excommunication). Thus these *Canons of the Apostles* form an early code of ecclesiastical law, which was added to the comprehensive compilation of early ecclesiastical and liturgical ordinances known as the *Apostolic Constitutions*. In the latter work the *Eighty-five Canons of the Apostles* figure as the final chapter (47) of the last book (viii).¹

Not only in their title do the *Canons* purport to have been written by the Apostles. This authorship is also suggested in several canons by references to the Apostles in the first person singular or plural. Canon 29², for instance, prescribes that those who have obtained ecclesiastical office by paying for it should be excluded from the Christian community, « as Simon Magus was done by me, Peter ». In Canon 82 Onesimus is referred to as « our Onesimus ». And finally the opening words of the epilogue to the *Eighty-five Canons* are : « Let this be commended to you, Bishops, by us . . . »

Ever since the fourth century, when the *Eighty-five Canons* became known, their Apostolic origin has been disputed. Among those who considered the *Canons* as apocryphal were Hormisdas, bishop of Rome (514-523), and Hincmar, bishop of Reims (845-882). In the Byzantine world their apostolicity was generally accepted, for example by the œcumenic Council in Trullo (692), and by John of Damascus (c. 750). Photius (9th cent.), however, had his doubts about their authenticity. Cotelier³, Beveridge⁴, and Leclercq⁵ have shown

* Thanks are owing to A.T. Grafton of Cornell University (N.Y.) who checked the English of this article.

¹ The best and most recent edition of the *Apostolic Constitutions* is that of F.X. Funk, *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum* I, Paderborn 1905. In this edition the *LXXXV Canones Apostolorum* appear at pp. 564-594.

² In this introduction we quote the *Canones Apostolorum* according to their numbering in Funk's edition.

³ J.B. Cotelierius, « *Judicium de Canonibus Apostolicis* », *SS. Patrum qui temporibus Apostolicis floruerunt . . . opera*, ed. J. Clericus, Amsterdam 1724, I, 429-30.

⁴ G. Beveregius, « *De Canonibus Apostolicis iudicium* », *ibid.* 432-441.

⁵ H. Leclercq, « *Les Canons dits apostoliques* », in: C.J. Hefele, *Histoire des Conciles*. Traduction française. I, 2, Paris 1907, pp. 1203-1221. Leclercq gives an extensive bibliography of editions and studies of the *Canones*.

how authors from the fifth to the seventeenth century evaluated the *Canons*.

In the Byzantine Church the *Canons of the Apostles* became part of official canon law in the sixth century, when Johannes Scholasticus, patriarch of Constantinople (565-577) adopted them in his *Συναγωγή κανόνων*, one of the earliest official canonic codes of the Eastern Church. In the West, the *Canons of the Apostles* became known in the Latin translation of Dionysius Exiguus (c. 500 A.D.), which included only the first 50 canons. From Dionysius' earlier collection of sources of ecclesiastical law — he removed the *Canons* from his second collection — these 50 canons passed into other collections of canon law, especially into that of Pseudo-Isidore (9th cent.). And in 1559 the *Eighty-five Canons* were incorporated in the *Corpus juris canonici, editus jussu Gregorii XIII*.

Small wonder that the authors of the first extensive ecclesiastical history which appeared from the Protestant side, the *Ecclesiastica Historia . . . secundum singulas Centurias . . . congesta per aliquot . . . viros in urbe Magdeburgica*, Basel 1559, felt impelled to refute the Apostolic origin of the *Canons of the Apostles*. In a special chapter⁶ the Magdeburg centuriators pronounced that the Apostles had not written these *Canons*. They employed two sorts of arguments to support their contention. In the first place, they used the common-sense arguments that the *Canons* contradicted the Apostolic teachings in the N.T., that they contained internal contradictions, and that they were too rigid in their sanctions against rather unimportant transgressions. The Apostles could not have written so imperfect a work. In the second place, and more important, they used historical arguments. Thus they pointed out that the *Canons* were not quoted by such early authors as Justin, Irenaeus, Clement, and Origen. Furthermore, they argued, the *Canons* themselves referred to practices incompatible with the historical situation of the Apostolic age — an assertion which they backed up with four examples. Finally, many of the *Canons* reflected or depended on rules drawn up by the Councils of Antioch, Nicaea and Chalcedon.

In answer to this criticism, the Jesuit Franciscus Turrianus (Torrès) wrote his *Pro Canonibus apostolorum, et epistolis decretalibus pontificum apostolicorum, adversus Magdeburgenses centuriatores, Defensio*, Florence 1572.⁷ In this work Turrianus tried to uphold the authenticity of the *Canons*. He argued that they were decrees of the Apostolic Council of Jerusalem, held by 50 A.D.

It is well-known that a formal refutation⁸ of Turrianus' *Defensio* was written in 1628 by David Blondel, the French reformed church-historian, who was to become Gerard Vossius' successor in the Athenaeum Illustre at Amsterdam. But it is wholly unknown that the Apostolic origin of the *Canones Apostolorum* was also disproved by Joseph Scaliger, research scholar in Leiden

⁶ *Primae Centuriae, liber secundus, Cap. vii, col. 544-5*: « Iudicium de Canonibus qui vulgo Apostolorum appellantur. »

⁷ Leclercq (cf. n. 5) mentions the editions Florence 1572 and Cologne 1573. Leiden University Library preserves a copy of the edition Paris 1573. The book runs to more than 1000 pages, of which the first 120 deal with the *Canones Apostolorum*.

⁸ *Pseudo-Isidorus et Turrianus vapulantes*, Geneva 1628.

University from 1593 to his death in 1609. In a short treatise, which has remained unpublished until now, Scaliger attributed both the *Constitutiones Apostolicae* and the *LXXXV Canones Apostolorum* to the period after Constantine. He did this by showing that the words which the *Canones* had in common with the New Testament had a radically altered meaning, and that the *Canones* referred to ecclesiastical conditions which were completely unknown in the Apostolic age.

Scaliger's treatise is preserved in MS Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Nouvelles acquisitions françaises 1210, pp. 49-51. Apart from the short treatise which is published here, the MS contains a number of French letters written by Scaliger. It was copied by (or for) Jean Bouhier, President of the Parlement of Dijon (1673-1746), who dated it 1736. We have not been able to trace the source⁹ from which Bouhier copied Scaliger's treatise (the French letters were copied from MS Dupuy 496), but the text of Bouhier's transcript presents no serious difficulties.¹⁰

In Bouhier's copy Scaliger's tract has no title. It does have a superscription running « Ex Schedis Josephi Scaligeri », as well as a subscription reading « Scaligeri Judicium de Constitutionibus quae Apostolicae dicuntur ». It is impossible, however, to adopt the words « Judicium de Constitutionibus quae Apostolicae dicuntur » as the title of Scaliger's paper, as it deals mainly with the *Canones Apostolorum*, not with the *Constitutiones Apostolicae*. The latter work is only treated in passing in the first quarter of Scaliger's piece. The subscription must have been subjoined, therefore, by someone who did not know the *Constitutiones* well enough to see that in this essay Scaliger concerned himself principally with the *Canones*. The title which we propose, *De LXXXV Canonibus Apostolorum Diatribe*, has no MS basis, but it does correspond to the contents of Scaliger's tract.

Scaliger's treatise contains no explicit information as to when it was written. But several remarkable correspondences with the *Secunda Scaligerana* and the *Canones Isagogici* indicate that Scaliger wrote his tract on the *Canons of the Apostles* by or about 1604. These correspondences, which will be recorded in the notes to the Latin text, also confirm Scaliger's authorship of the tract in question.

There are indications that Scaliger wrote this essay rather hastily. At the very beginning he confused — though only once — the title of the *Apostolic Constitutions* with that of the *Canons of the Apostles*.¹¹ His confutation of the patristic evidence for 25 December as the date of Jesus' birth is very cursory and difficult to understand unless one compares it with the discussion of the same topic in his *Canones Isagogici*, where the problem is discussed at much greater length and in due detail. Furthermore, Scaliger points out that the word *κατηχούμενος* for a « novitius fidei » did not belong to the vocabulary of the Apostles. The observation is correct, but it is irrelevant

⁹ Bouhier simply states that the fragment derives « Ex Schedis Josephi Scaligeri ». These four words serve as heading to Scaliger's treatise in the MS.

¹⁰ For minor uncertainties see notes 2 and 30 to the Latin text.

¹¹ See note 2 to the Latin text.

as an objection against the Apostolic origin of the *Canons*, since the word does not occur in that work.¹² Even if Scaliger only meant to say that the Apostles never used the word *πιστοί* in the sense of «initiated, baptised Christians» as distinct from the catechumens, one cannot say that he expressed himself carefully. Finally, some sentences are composed somewhat elliptically: for example, the one beginning «Qui in oratione», a little beyond the middle of the second paragraph, in which a *verbum dicendi* is missing.¹³

Despite the speed with which Scaliger worked, the tract is for the most part admirably clear. It may be outlined as follows.

- I. Proposition: the *Apostolic Constitutions* and the *Canons of the Apostles* have been written after the time of Constantine.
- II. The *Apostolic Constitutions* prove to have been written long after Ambrose and Chrysostom, as they prescribe the celebration of Christmas on 25 December.
- III. The *Canons of the Apostles* are of recent date, as appears not only from the fact that they refer to the *Constitutions*, but also from:
 1. the meaning of certain words used in the *Canons*:
 - a. κληρικός.
 - b. θυσία.
 - c. κατηχούμενος and πιστός.
 2. the anachronistic mention of recent ecclesiastical practices and observances:
 - a. letters of recommendation;
 - b. excommunication for three or four years;
 - c. fasting;
 - d. synods;
 - e. baptism in the name of «the three-without-beginning»;
 - f. single baptismal immersion.
 3. errors that cannot have been committed by the Apostles:
 - a. a wrong exegesis of Tit. i.6;
 - b. quotations from the New Testament, as if the Apostles were so impertinent as to quote themselves;
 - c. references to actions of the Apostles recounted in the New Testament, as if the Apostles were so vain as to mention their own deeds;
 - d. the anachronistic prohibition of caesaropapism.
- IV. Conclusion.

Except for paragraph III.3.d on caesaropapism, which should be in the list of anachronisms in paragraph III.2, the organisation of the tract is admirable.

Much more important, however, is the strictly methodical way of reasoning which the tract displays. In fact, it is one of Scaliger's most methodical pieces of literary criticism. A remark like «recentissimum esse necesse est, qui rei

¹² For a somewhat unfortunate remark of the same kind, see note 17 to the Latin text.

¹³ It should be observed, however, that in sentences in which some ancient authority is added with a citation from his work, Scaliger omits the *verbum dicendi* very often, especially in his *Animadversiones ad Graeca Eusebii*. See e.g. *Anim. ad Gr. Eus.* (in *Thes. temp.*, Amsterdam 1658²), p. 159: «Virgilius de eadem re in fine primi Georgici: — pecudesque locutae.»

recentis meminerit, et illam vetustissimam esse crediderit » may seem trivial to the reader of the twentieth century. But during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries this kind of logic was far from common in literary criticism. It is true that a century and a half before Lorenzo Valla had already attacked the *Donatio Constantini* on linguistic, stylistic and historical grounds among others. But before the eighteenth century the linguistic arguments which Valla used and the internal criticism which Bernardo Giustiniani practised were seldom employed systematically. And even when the genuineness of the *Canons of the Apostles* was denied in the *Magdeburg Centuriae*, no linguistic arguments were adduced.

Scaliger, on the contrary, first distinguished in his exposé between the words (« nomina ») that were used differently and the matters (« res ») that did not exist in the Apostolic age, and then practised his lexicological and his historical criticism. His lexicological criticism is of semasiological nature and testifies to his familiarity with the early Christian and patristic vocabulary.

The literary genre to which Scaliger's treatise belongs is that of Valla's work on the *Donatio* and Bentley's *Dissertation* on Aesop and Phalaris. At the same time Scaliger's *Diatribes* has to be considered as a pendant to his critical expositions on Dionysius the Areopagite and the Letter of Aristeas.

Finally, as the *Canons* have been numbered in at least thirteen different ways in translations and editions, it may be observed that Scaliger availed himself of the third Greek edition of the *Canons*, edited by J. Tilius (= du Tillet), *Codex canonum seu canones sanctorum Apostolorum et priscarum synodorum decreta*, Paris 1540. Scaliger's references to distinct canons follow the numbering of Tilius' edition; and in one of his letters, an excerpt from which figures among the posthumously edited « Notae Iosephi Scaligeri in locos aliquot difficiliores Novi Testamenti », Scaliger himself mentions the « vetustissimi canones Graeci à Tilio editi. »¹⁴

JOSEPHI SCALIGERI
DE LXXXV CANONIBUS APOSTOLORUM
DIATRIBES

LXXXV *Canones* legentur hodie *Apostolorum*. Item *Διαταγαὶ διὰ Κλήμεντος*¹. Sed *Διαταγῶν* mentionem faciunt illi LXXXV², ut illae ante eos LXXXV

¹⁴ Cf. notes to the Latin text, n. 25. See also nn. 16 and 24. For a detailed discussion of the origin and authenticity of the « Notae in locos aliquot difficiliores », first edited at Geneva in 1619, see the chapter devoted to Scaliger in our « The Study of the New Testament », *Leiden University in the Seventeenth Century. An Exchange of Learning*. Leiden (Brill) 1975, 64-109, esp. 76-87.

¹ *Διαταγαὶ διὰ Κλήμεντος* is the title of the Greek text of the *Apostolic Constitutions*.

² In the MS the sentence runs: « Sed *διαταγαὶ* mentionem faciunt illorum LXXXV, ut illae ante eos LXXXV conscriptae sint. » As the 85th canon of the *Canones Apostolorum* mentions the *Διαταγαὶ δι' ἐμοῦ Κλήμεντος*, whereas the latter work does not mention the *Canones Apostolorum*, the reading of the MS cannot be correct. Scaliger seems to have confounded the titles of the two works, but succeeded in making the obvious mistake only once.

conscriptae sint. Quod autem utrumque opus sit *ψευδεπίγραφον*, et ab hominibus otiosis infra tempora Constantini Magni conscriptum, et affectatio vetustatis ridicula, quae in utrisque extat, et multa quae plus quam ducentis annis post Christi resurrectionem introducta sunt, fidem facere possunt.

Τὰς Διαταγὰς discutere longum est, quia et ipsum quoque opus longum. Praeter infinita, quae illarum falsitatem arguunt, unum prodere satis erit: nempe, inter alia Christianorum solennia, diem Christi natalem XXV Decembris observare praecipiunt³, quum tamen constet novitium esse commentum ecclesiae Romanae, quod ex ridicula hypothesi pendet, nempe quod Zacharias Joannis Baptistae pater fuerit pontifex maximus⁴, et dies illa, qua incensum obtulit, erat decima Tisri⁵. Quae ex hac hypothesi ipsi collegerint, ut natalem Domini in XXV diem Decembris conferrent, non minoris taedii fuerit colligere, quam quot absurditates hinc sequantur, ob oculos proponere. Hoc tantum impraesentia satis fuerit, quam recens sit illud commentum, vel ex uno Chrysostomo, colligi posse. Qui in oratione de natali Domini⁶ non solum Romanam ecclesiam natalem Domini in XXV die Decembris statuisset, sed etiam paucis annis antequam ille episcopus orationem illam ad populum haberet, hoc introductum fuisse a Latinis. Quum igitur non habeamus vetustiore scriptorum, qui illius diei XXV mentionem fecerit, praeter unum Ambrosium⁷, et circa eadem tempora Chrysostomus dicat pauculis annis antequam eam

³ *Constitutiones Apostolorum* V, 13 *Τὰς ἡμέρας τῶν ἑορτῶν φυλάσσετε, ἀδελφοί, καὶ πρώτην γε τὴν γενέθλιον, ἣτις ὑμῖν ἐπιτελείσθω εἰκοστῇ πέμπτῃ τοῦ ἐνάτου μηνός*. In his *Canones Isagogici* (in the *Thesaurus temporum*, ed. Amsterdam 1658², p. 308) Scaliger adduced exactly the same evidence against the early date of the *Apostolic Constitutions* and the *Canons of the Apostles*: «... die XXV Decembris Christum natum fuisse, et decima Tisri Iohannem conceptum, omnia sunt ab Ecclesia Occidentis... Vetustiore, qui eius (diei XXV Decembris) miminerit, Ambrosio habemus neminem. Unde manifesto colligitur quando Canones illi, qui nomine Clementis Graece editi sunt [= the *Apostolic Constitutions*], conscripti fuerunt. Quod enim in illis mentio XXV Decembris fit, in qua natalis Domini celebrari ab ipsis Canonibus praecipitur, satis hinc paret, quanta vetustas eorum sit, ... Quum hi Canones [= the *Apostolic Constitutions*] vetustatem suam tueri non possint, quanto minus et illi nomine Apostolorum [= the *Canons of the Apostles*], qui illorum meminerunt et quaedam in illis esse dicunt reprehensioni opportuna?»

⁴ In Luke i.5 Zechariah is only *ἱερεὺς τις*. In later sources he becomes *ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς*, e.g. in *Protevangelium Jacobi* viii.3 (MSS).

⁵ 10 Tisri is the Day of Atonement (Lev. xxiii.27). From Hebr. ix.3/7 («behind the second veil was... the Holy of Holies, containing the golden altar of incense, which... is entered only once a year by the high priest alone») and Luke i.9/11 («it fell to him [Zechariah]... to enter the sanctuary of the Lord and burn incense... And an angel of the Lord appeared to him, standing on the right side of the altar of incense») early Christian writers wrongly concluded that Zechariah entered the Holy of Holies as high priest on the Day of Atonement, i.e. on 10 Tisri. Thus, for instance, Ambrose, *Comm. ad Lucam* i.8-10 (Migne, *PL* 15, 1622). Then 10 Tisri was taken as starting-point for the calculation of the date of Jesus's birth. If Zechariah entered the temple on 10 Tisri, i.e. 24 September, Jesus must have been born 6 months (Luke i.26) plus 9 months (the period of Mary's pregnancy) later, i.e. in the night of 24-25 December. For details see Scaliger, *Thes. temporum*, 1658², pp. 305-8 of the *Can. Isag.*

⁶ Migne, *PG* 49, 351: *οὐπω δέκατόν ἐστιν ἔτος, ἐξ οὗ δὴλῆ καὶ γνώριμος ἡμῖν αὕτη ἡ ἡμέρα γεγένηται*.

⁷ *Sermo in die natalis Domini*, Migne, *PL* 17, 635-7: «Sanctum hunc diem natalis Domini «solem novum» vulgus appellat. ... oriente Salvatore, etiam solis ipsius claritas innovatur.»

orationem haberet, id in ecclesia Latina introductum fuisse, sequitur non solum recens commentum esse, sed etiam *Διαταγὰς* multo post tempore ab homine ineptissimo excogitatas fuisse. Nam recentissimum esse necesse est, qui rei recentis meminerit, et illam vetustissimam esse crediderit.

Si igitur *Διαταγαί* recentes, quanto recentiores *Canones* qui τῶν *Διαταγῶν* meminerint? Quod igitur illi *Canones* eas *Διαταγὰς* commendent, ex hoc quam veteres eos censere debeamus qui tam recentium *Constitutionum* meminerint, et quanto in precio habendi nobis sint qui tam ineptas *Constitutiones* commendent, si ego non dico, res ipsa loquitur.

Sed et multa alia novitiam et nuperam foeturam eorum *Canonum* produnt, ut, exempli gratia, primum nomina, deinde res longo tempore post apostolorum tempora introductae.

Ac de nominibus quidem, quis nescit *κληρικόν* pro episcopo, presbytero, diacono, nondum temporibus apostolicis in usu fuisse? Sub apostolis enim *κλήρος* significabat unam ecclesiam sub uno episcopo aut pastore⁸, *κλήροι* plures ecclesiae sub pluribus; I Petri v. 3⁹. Quando vero primum *κλήρος* pro *ordine sacerdotali* usurpatum sit, non est proclivius divinare quam quando *ιερεύς* dici coepit, qui *προεστώς* dicitur Justino¹⁰. Certe *clerus* apud Tertullianum in eandem significationem usurpatur, qua hodie in ecclesia¹¹.

Rursus in his *Canonibus* *θυσία* pro *eucharistiae functione* sumitur, res ignota illis ecclesiae primordiis, sed *θυσίας* tunc nomen introductum, quando et *pastores* ipsi *ιερείς* dicti sunt. Nam *μεταφορικῶς* tantum vetustissimus scriptor Justinus *θυσίαν* vocat ipsam *eucharistiam*¹². At Paulus ad Romanos xii.1 fideles ipsos, et eorum actiones vocat *θυσίαν ζώσαν, λατρείαν*, et Petrus eodem modo eosdem vocat *ιεράτευμα ἅγιον*¹³. Tantum abest ut ministri verbi dicti sint *κληρικοί, καὶ ἱερείς*, ut potius ipse fidelis populus vocetur *κλήρος, ιεράτευμα, θυσία*.

Deinde nunquam ab apostolis usurpatum, ut novitii fidei *κατηχούμενοι*, recepti et ad *eucharistiam* admissi *πιστοί* vocarentur¹⁴. Hoc longe post Apostolorum aevum institutum. Atque haec de nominibus.

De rebus, in quibus etiam et nomina nova sunt, ut et ipsae res quibus ipsa attributa, praeter alia haec satis sunt.

⁸ Cf. H. Windisch, *Die Katholischen Briefe* (Handb. z. N.T.), Tübingen 1911, ad I Petr. v.3: « κλήροι sind . . . die Einzelgemeinden, die den Presbytern der verschiedenen Gemeinden zur Leitung zugewiesen sind . . . »

⁹ Scaliger's views on the meaning of *κλήρος* in I Peter v. 3 were also transmitted in the *Secunda Scaligerana*, ed. Des Maizeaux p. 414: « κλήρος estoit appelé tout le peuple et toute l'Eglise (I Petri), etiam respectu Pastoris. Depuis le mot de *ιερεύς* et *κλήρος*, tout le mal est venu: statim ac venit illa distinctio Laicorum et Clericorum, statim Tyrannis, et cum vocati sunt sacerdotes *ιερείς* propter consecrationem. Clerus temporibus Apostolorum erant plebei, quod apparet ex I Petri, majestua epistola. »

¹⁰ Cf. *Secunda Scaligerana*, p. 386: « *Ἱερείς* sacerdotes dicti propter consecrationem: haec vox non reperitur apud Justinum M., sed apud inferiores Autores. » *Προεστώς* occurs in Justin, *Apol. I*, 65,3; 67,4-5.

¹¹ E.g., Tertullian, *Monogamia* 12.

¹² *Dialogus cum Tryphone*, cxvii.l. *Θυσία* occurs in *Can. Apost. 2*.

¹³ I Peter ii.5.

¹⁴ *Πιστοί* occurs e.g. in *Can. Apost. 9* and 46 in Funk's edition. The word *κατηχούμενοι* does not occur in the *Canones Apostolorum*.

Γράμματα συστατικά, *litterae formatae*¹⁵, quae introductae, quum per totum imperium Romanum frequentissimae essent ecclesiae.

Ἄφορισμός quidem habet aliquam speciem eius damnationis, qua Apostolus tradit incestum Satanae¹⁶; sed triennii aut quadriennii, aut longioris temporis¹⁷ interdictio locum adhuc non habebat; neque illa tyrannis ullum vestigium lenitatis apostolicae aut humanitatis christianae habet¹⁸.

Jeiunia quorum mentio LXIII, LXIX canonibus, ut ridicula, ita maiestate apostolica indigna.

Σύνοδοι episcoporum bis in anno, quarum XXXVII canon meminit, sunt infra aetatem Constantini, quum a persecutionibus ecclesia quievit¹⁹.

Et iam hoc ridiculum est. In canone XLIX τῶν τριῶν ἀνάρχων mentio indicat, quam recens sit impostor iste. Nam haec nata sunt ab Arrianismo²⁰, et aliis haeresibus ab Arrianismo propagatis.

Deinde *hypodiaconi*²¹ res ignota ante tempora Constantini, ut et archiepiscopus sive metropolitanus qui innuitur canone XXXIII. Quibus deprehenditur impostura illius qui hos *Canones* nomine apostolorum proscripsit.

Et quis ferat illa τρία βαπτίσματα canonis L? Nam post Arrium hic ritus introductus²².

Inscitiam quoque produnt loci Pauli non bene intellecti, in quibus ille *περὶ διγάμου κληρικοῦ*²³. Nam prave interpretati sunt illum locum ad Titum i.6 *unius uxoris virum*. Propter Judaeos enim hoc dictum, ibidem 10, quibus licebat, ut et nunc, duas aut tres uxores ducere. Multi, qui duas aut plures

¹⁵ Γράμματα συστατικά (letters of recommendation) are mentioned in *Can. Apost.* 12 and 33 in Funk's edition.

¹⁶ I Cor. v. 5. — « Παραδοῦναι τῷ Σατανᾷ. Extrema excommunicatio, qua etiam hodiéque Iudaei utuntur, ut castigatione carnis domitus salutem animae assequatur, quod tempus illi ad resipiscendum datum est, » thus Scaliger in the « Notae in locos aliquot difficiliore » published ten years after his death in *Novum Iesu Christi D.N. Testamentum*, Geneva 1619/20, p. 2.

¹⁷ Though ἀφορισμός (excommunication) as an ecclesiastical punitive measure is mentioned in most of the *Canones Apostolorum*, e.g. in 13 and 32, only canon 24 gives an indication as to the duration of the excommunication: ἀφοριζέσθω ἔτη τρία. Excommunication for four or more years is mentioned in none of the 85 canons.

¹⁸ The rigour of the penalty clauses in the *Canones* also figures in the *Centuriae* of Magdeburg as an argument against Apostolic origin (see introduction).

¹⁹ This argument is also adduced in the *Magdeburg Centuriae*.

²⁰ Canon 49 reads: Ἐἴ τις ... βαπτίση ... εἰς τρεῖς ἀνάρχους, ἢ εἰς τρεῖς υἱούς, ἢ εἰς τρεῖς παρακλήτους, καθαιρεῖσθω. As Arius denied that the Son was ἀναρχος. Scaliger's statement that the doctrine of the Three-without-beginning originated from Arianism is probably incorrect. In *Can. Apost.* VI, 8, 2 heretics are mentioned who worship the τρεῖς (θεοὺς) ἐναντίους, ἀνάρχους, δεῖ συνόντας ἑαυτοῖς. These heretics are commonly identified as Marcionites, see De Lagarde *ad loc.*, Funk *ad loc.*, and Lampe, *Patristic Greek Lexicon*, p. 119, s.v. ἀναρχος, under C7. But whether this latter identification is right, and whether the heretics baptising in the name of the « Three-without-beginning » (canon 49) are the same as those worshipping the « three opposed Gods without beginning... » (*Const. Apost.* VI, 8) is very much open to question.

²¹ *Hypodiaconi* are mentioned in canon 43 and 69; Scaliger's remark is correct.

²² By « hic ritus » Scaliger does not mean the threefold baptismal immersion, but the single immersion condemned in canon 50. As this was the baptismal practice of the Eunomians (cf. Funk *ad Can. Apost.* 50, and Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, s.v. *Εὐνομιανοί* and *κατάδουσις* 2), Scaliger's statement is correct.

²³ Canon 17: Ὁ δισὶ γάμοις συμπλακεῖς μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα ἢ παλλακὴν κτησάμενος οὐ δύναται εἶναι ἐπίσκοπος ἢ πρεσβύτερος ἢ διάκονος

uxores habebant, accedebant ad Christianismum ac post baptismum nolebant alteram ex duabus, aut duas ex tribus dimittere, quia ex aequo se omnium maritos dicebant, neque unam posse dimittere, quin alteri iniuria fieret. Et sane huic responso nihil est quod obiici possit. Propterea Judaei Christiani facti καὶ φωτισθέντες²⁴ uxores retinebant. De illorum numero episcopum eligi vetat Paulus. Ex quibus perspicui potest, quae tenebrae animos illorum veterum occuparint, qui tam perspicuam illius loci sententiam assecuti non sunt²⁵.

Quid dicam de locis Pauli, quos imprudenter citant hi *Canones*? *Τὶς συμφώνησις Χριστῷ πρὸς Βελίαν*²⁶; canon XLVI. Item *κεκαυτηρισμένην συνείδησιν*²⁷, canon LIII. In quo ridiculus est impostor, qui proverbium vetus²⁸ verum esse probavit: Mendacem memorem esse oportere. Itaque Paulus qui in his *Canonibus* introducor, ut canone LXXXII²⁹, se ipsum citat. Quem non pudeat tantae vanitatis?

Neque minor putiditas affectatorum nominum apostolorum, ὡς Σίμων Μάγος ὑπ' ἐμοῦ Πέτρου, XXIX; item ἡμέτερος Ὀνήσιμος ex persona Pauli; et Χριστόν μου ex persona Petri, LII³⁰. Valde imperitum et omnis sensus expertem esse

²⁴ Cf. «Notae in locos aliquot difficiliore» (see above, n. 16), p. 10: «το φωτίζεσθαι erat βαπτίζεσθαι, et φωτιστήριον, τὸ βαπτιστήριον. ... Vetustissimis enim Judaeis et Samaritanis circumcisio... cordis et animae illuminatio dicitur.»

²⁵ The exegetical error in canon 17 (quoted in n. 23) is, according to Scaliger, that in Tit. i.6 access to ecclesiastical offices is especially refused to any bigamous Jewish Christian who has married his second wife before being baptised, whereas canon 17 forbids Christians who commit bigamy «after their baptism» to become clergymen. Scaliger dealt with Tit. i.6 at much greater length in the letter excerpted in the «Notae in locos aliquot difficiliore» (see n. 16), pp. 7-8. A somewhat different interpretation of Tit. i.6 (and I Tim. iii.2/12) is preserved in the *Secunda Scaligerana* ed. Des Maizeaux, p. 402: «Judaei orientales plures ducunt uxores; occidentalibus quidem licet, sed honoris gratia non faciunt. Paulus noluit Christianos plures ducere, et praecipue episcopos, ut sic Judaeis os obturaret, qui Christianis haec objiciebant.» The traditional interpretation of Tit. 1.6 and I Tim. iii.2 as given by canon 17 (general exclusion of Christians who have practised bigamy or concubinage since their baptism from the pastoral office) was already attacked by Theodore of Mopsuestia (*In epistolas B. Pauli Commentarii*, ed. H.B. Swete, Cambridge 1882, II, pp. 99 ff.) who preferred to see in the Apostle's rule simply a rejection of all candidates who have at any time practised synchronous polygamy or concubinage. One of the variants of the traditional exegesis as followed by canon 17 is that according to which the *unius uxoris*-rule excluded men who, having lost their wives before being baptised, have contracted a second marriage after their baptism from ecclesiastical offices (thus, e.g., Erasmus, *Ecclesiastes*, ed. Froben 1535, p. 12; reference kindly provided by Th. Korteweg). Scaliger's view that the *unius uxoris*-rule was intended to exclude baptised Jews who continued to practise synchronous polygamy in accordance with Mosaic law, from pastoral offices, was also held by Theodore of Mopsuestia (*op. cit.*, p. 102), who in his turn attributed it to earlier exegetes.

²⁶ II Cor. vi.15.

²⁷ I Tim. iv.2. In Tilius's edition (which Scaliger used) the quotation from I Tim. runs: *κεκαυτηριασμένος τὴν ἰδίαν συνείδησιν.*

²⁸ Apuleius, *De magia* 69.

²⁹ In canon 82 ἡμέτερος Ὀνήσιμος is mentioned. The possessive pronoun refers to Paul.

³⁰ In Tilius's edition canon 52 runs as follows: *Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος ἢ πρεσβύτερος τὸν ἐπιστρέφοντα ἀπὸ ἁμαρτίας οὐ προσδέχεται, ἀλλ' ἀποβάλλεται, καθαιρείσθω. ὅτι μου λυπεῖ χριστόν...* In the editions of Cotelier-Clericus and Funk *μου* is omitted from the text and not recorded in the text-critical annotations. The MS. wrongly reads XLII in lieu of LII.

oportet, cui impostura non subleat. Onesimum fuisse episcopum non solum ex loco parum perspicuo Pauli³¹ hariolantur, sed etiam Ephesi episcopum se disse audacius commenti sunt³². Epistolae Ignatii supposititiae idem produunt³³.

In canone XXX agitur in illos, qui favore, aut potestate, aut vi magistratus in episcopatum irruerunt: quo nescio an aliud vanius in omnibus his *Canonibus* reperiri possit. Nam quum hoc fieret, plures in orbe Christiani erant quam gentiles, ut pote temporibus Anastasii Augusti³⁴, et infra. Quis credat temporibus apostolorum, quando adhuc paucissimi Christiani erant, praesertim eo tempore quo ad magistratum delati crudelibus suppliciis afficiebantur, ut Christianus ope eiusdem magistratus ad episcopatum vi et armis sibi viam faceret? O singularem audaciam.

Sed pudet mendaciorum. Liber mole parvus istis erroribus confutandis cresceret, si tanti essent, aut si tantum otii nobis esset. His paucis contenti reliqua majori otio reservabimus.

³¹ Philemon 16-17.

³² For the sources of the tradition which makes Onesimus bishop of Ephesus see *Acta Sanctorum*, ed. J. Bollandus, ad 16 February (Februarius, tomus II), Antwerp 1658, pp. 856-7.

³³ Ignatius of Antioch, *Ad Eph.* i.3; ii.1; vi.2. This is one of Scaliger's rare comments, if not the only one, on the letters of Ignatius. His categorical rejection of their authenticity is standard Protestant view of these letters at that time. They were considered forgeries, e.g., by the Magdeburg centuriators and by Calvin (*Institutio* I, 13,29: « There is nothing more corrupt than the fabrications published under the name of Ignatius »). It should be observed, however, that Calvin and Scaliger could know only the long, interpolated recension of Ignatius's letters. In their original form they were first edited by Isaac Vossius in 1646.

³⁴ Byzantine emperor, 491-518.