

THE SACRAMENTARY OF SERAPION
FROM A THESIS FOR THE DEGREE OF B. LIT.
WITHIN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

BY

ARCHIMANDRITE PANTELEIMON E. RODOPOULOS

1. ECCLESIASTICAL SITUATION IN ALEXANDRIA

The Sacramentary of Serapion belongs to the liturgical tradition of the Church in Egypt, in the middle of the fourth century. It belongs to a time of rapid transition and formation in the history of the Church.

In that time the bishops of the great cities of the Roman Empire possessed a dominant position over those of towns of less importance.

The bishop of Alexandria played a very significant part in the affairs of the Church. He intervened in the affairs of the Church not only in Egypt but also in the Libyan provinces; Thmuis was under his influence and jurisdiction. Of course Alexandria was the second city in the Roman empire and its bishop was second after the bishop of Rome, up to the time when Constantinople became the capital and in consequence its bishop gained increasing power. The victory against Arianism, also gave Alexandria more prestige.

The bishop of Alexandria had a great influence upon the people of that city and he was the eminent personality round whom the interest of the people was concentrated. Athanasius, a contemporary of Serapion, was the most important bishop of Alexandria, in that time. He was born and educated in Alexandria and, as it is supposed, distinguished himself in the discussions of the Council of Nicaea, where he participated as deacon of bishop Alexander. As bishop of Alexandria he became the chief protagonist in the struggle of orthodoxy against the Arians and the Meletians schismatics. He was «the zeal and prestige» of the monks, in Egypt. He was a friend and superior of Serapion and his adviser in pastoral work and doctrine.

Alexandria, being an ecclesiastical and theological centre, became, also a centre where heresies and schisms appeared in the Church.

Arianism, the heresy which shook violently the Church in the

fourth century and onwards, had its origin in Egypt and appeared first in the Church of Alexandria. The controversy which, perhaps had its origin in earlier theological speculations, and began about the year 318 when Arius taught his theories in church in his sermons ¹.

«His presupposition was the superiority of the Father to the Son, as also taught, although slightly veiled, by Origen. He took quite seriously the doctrine of the divine unity and monarchy» ². His position was against the Trinity of God.

All that was a blow against the new relation between God and human being, which was offered by christianity. «In denying the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father, Arius broke down the bridge which christianity had built between a transcendent Deity and the insignificance of man» ³.

Alexander, then bishop of Alexandria, condemned and excommunicated Arius and the clergy who supported him by a synodical decision. ⁴. Also, he tried to check him theologically by putting forward Origen's thesis of the eternal sonship of the Logos omitting, of course, Origen's theory of subordination.

The Arians refusing the eternal sonship of the Logos held later on the theory that the Spirit also was created. This teaching became more obvious when the quarrel about the Son began to weaken. Serapion, an Anti-Arian himself, had also to confront this last form of Arianism in his provincial Church, as we can deduce from the epistles of St. Athanasius to him.

Not only Arianism divided christendom at that time but other schisms also. In Egypt the Meletians were giving much trouble to the Church.

The question of the treatment of the lapsed was settled with much controversy in Egypt during the great persecution (probably in A. D. 305) ⁵.

The Meletians represented the strict attitude towards the apostates. Later on, the Meletians had an alliance with Arianism against the Church and Athanasius.

As we assume from the treatise of Serapion against the Mani-

1. Sozomen, *Eccl. Hist.*, 1, 15 P. Gr. 67, 905a.

2. H. Lietzmann, *A Hist. of the Early Church*, 3rd v., p. 109.

3. Teodoret, *Ecol. Hist.*, 1, 3 P. Gr. 82, 909, Sozom, *Eccl. Hist.*, 1, 15 P. Gr. 67, 905.

4. H. I. Bell, *Egypt*, p. 107.

5. H. I. Bell. *Jews and Christians in Egypt*, p. 39.

chees⁶, Manichaeism, a heresy coming from the third century, was still disturbing the peace of the Church in his days.

It seems, that it was a kind of gnosticism and it had a strong dualism. «For Mani the kingdom of evil was real and aggressive, and the imprisonment of light by the powers of darkness was a possible explanation for the original connection of the sublime with an evil element to which of itself it could not possibly have been attracted»⁷. It was also, docetic, ascetic, and anti-judaic, teaching that the God of the Old Testament was the chief power of darkness.

Dualism would have moral and practical consequences, so Serapion defended orthodoxy against Manichaeism and he mainly dealt with the practical consequences fearing the infiltration into his diocese of its bad influence.

The Manichees tried to spread their ideas among the Egyptian people using psalms, not, of course, biblical and composing liturgical rites⁸.

Certainly, the Ecumenical Council of Nicaea tried to save the whole Church from such an instability and especially tried to do so for the Church in Egypt. These heresies and schisms caused the Church uneasy times; especially Arianism caused a stormy controversy with many ups and downs for a long period up to the time of Theodosius (379-395). After that it suffered progressive decline and disappeared.

A new factor appeared in the Church, having its origin in the Church in Egypt which influenced her form and character. The christian monastic life is the result of the christian ideal of perfection and of the moral situation of the times of Constantine and onwards.

Monasticism flourished in Egypt. Withdrawal from the world may have been a tendency in the character of Egyptians⁹ but there is an ascetic element in christianity.

6. Cf. Titus of Bostra and his work against the Manichees.

7. R. P. Casey, Serapion of Thmuis against the Manichees, Harvard Theolog. Studies XV, 1931, p. 21.

8. Cf. C. R. Allberry, Manichean Studies, J. T. S. v. 39, pp. 343 and 345.

— It is probably that Serapion thought that he ought to reply by writing psalms or rubrics for psalms, whether those were biblical or not, as Jerome informs us. Also, it is probable that one of the purposes for which he collected the existing liturgical material of the Church, supplemented it, and composed his collection, was to protect his Church from the bad influence of the Manichees.

9. H. I. Bell, Egypt, p. 108.

Monastic life had a great part in the life of the Church, especially in Egypt. Most of the monks in the doctrinal quarrels of that time had been «true to the Catholic faith and affectionately loyal to their great Archbishop Athanasius»¹⁰. In addition, Monasticism had social interest as is apparent from papyri of that time¹¹. Many in trouble spiritual or physical or afflicted by any kind of misfortune turned to the ascetics for help and intercession. Athanasius himself was very sympathetic towards monasticism and in many times of danger had found shelter in the cells of monks.

Serapion also comes from its ranks.

In this period, also, we have a new formation and development of christian theology.

Theology had developed from an earlier time through fighting different heresies, so that there were different schools of thought in the Church. Each of them had its own way of dealing with theological subjects and each possessed some eminent personalities and leaders.

The Alexandrian theologians formed a real theological school. They would have liked to put against gnosis the christian gnosis. So they had to borrow elements from Greek philosophy. Alexandria was the centre of reconciliation between the best Greek thought of the past and the new christian teaching. Philosophy had an important revival in the fourth century and christianity having to confront a pagan philosophy, neoplatonism and gnosis had to fight on equal terms.

The Alexandrian theologians had as their base the Catechetical School of Alexandria which became a theological one. Pantaenus, Clement and Origen were distinguished members of it. Origen was famous and so the influence of the Theological School of Alexandria grew. Many of Origen's students became important ecclesiastical names and formed a theological tendency whether they had absolutely the same opinions as their teacher or not.

The Arians tried to rely on Origenism and that resulted in a reaction against in greater than that of the past. Now, it was a reaction not only against Origen's errors but also against his method in theology. But there were also theological moderates, who rejected the errors of Origen but used his method. The protagonists of Orthodoxy against Arianism such as Athanasius and the Cappadocians were amongst them.

10. W. Bright, *Hist. Writings of St. Athanasius*, p. LXXIV.

11. 1926, 9 - 11 in H. I. Bell's «*Jews and Christians in Egypt*», p. 102.

Thus in Alexandria itself the Theological School had a new epoch. Athanasius, bearing traces of Alexandrian theology and Origenism, relied on christian principles and approached the mystery of Christ as believer and as theologian¹², and became the main representative of the Alexandrian School in its new period. Into that school of thought we may also put Serapion.

2. THE SACRAMENTARY OF SERAPION AND ITS CHARACTER

Until recent times it was not an easy task to deal with the history of the Egyptian Liturgy of the early period as the evidence for it was very scarce. Some scanty and rather obscure verses in Alexandrian writings, were the only light to give guidance in the study of this subject.

The MSS. which were connected with the Church in Egypt and her Liturgy, belong to a rather late period making therefore the reconstruction of the Egyptian Liturgy a difficult task¹³.

Moreover we are short of liturgical texts earlier than the fourth century for all christendom. Apart from Rome with the rite in Hippolytus which comes from the third century there is no other text of such an early time connected with any other church. Of course we have from Jerusalem the Catecheses of St. Cyril (4th cent.) and from Edessa the older portions of the Liturgy of Addai and Mari which are of the fourth cent. and some of them of an earlier period¹⁴.

There are also the Apost. Constitutions in Antioch (2nd half of 4th cent.). Other liturgical evidence is alluded to by other christian writers. But «it is often hard to discern such material accurately or certainly in the course of patristic arguments on non-liturgical subjects»¹⁵.

The discovery, of course, at the end of the last century in the Monastery of Laura in Mount Athos, of a MS. with prayers of which some bear the name of Serapion bishop of Thmuis in the Nile Delta, has, however, thrown a fresh light on the history of the Liturgy in Egypt. Therefore it becomes one of the most important discoveries for liturgical studies.

12. Cf. Robertson, Athanasius, p. XIV.

13. Cf. J. H. Lrawley, The Early History of the Liturgy p. 41.

14. Cf. G. Dix, Primitive Consecration Prayers, Theology vol. 37, 1938, p. 264.

15. Ibid., p. 265.

That MS., which very probably comes from the eleventh century, was first published by Dimitrijewskij, in 1864 and afterwards by G. Wobbermin in *Texte und Untersuchungen* in 1899 (see P. Batiffol, *Une decouverte liturgique*, in *Bulletin of Litt. Eccles.* 1899, 69 - 81. Also F. E. Brightman, in *Journal of Theological Studies* vol. I, Th. Schermann, *Aegyptische Abendmahlsliturgien*, Paderborn 1912, p. 100 ff. ¹⁶, Joh. Quasten, *Monumenta Eucharistica et Liturgica etc. Pars I*, Fascic. VII, pp. 49 ff., 1935).

It contains a collection of thirty prayers which pertain to the Holy Communion, Baptism, Ordinations etc. These are confined to 18 leaves of the whole MS. of which the last four «contain a dogmatic treatise in a form of a letter to a brother without historical indications» ¹⁷. The reblics are scarce and the prayers are not arranged in their proper order. Only two or three notes are implied as «titles» of several prayers.

Wobbermin has described it as an *Εὐχολόγιον* (Eushologium). Of course, that title comes from a later period and we could add that in its wider meaning the term is more comprehensive, covering a much larger area of liturgical use than that of this collection, and in its narrower meaning it does not contain the Liturgy.

J. Wordsworth has described it as a Pontifical (Ἀρχιερατικὸν) a Prayer Book of the bishop. To strengthen the arguments in favour of that opinion he advanced the fact that apart from the lack of any people's part and their liturgical replies, and the absence of any deacon's part in the collection, the celebrant bishop is prayed for, by a concelebrant, as «this bishop» «ἁγίασον τὸν ἐπίσκοπον τόνδε». But it is not necessary for the bishop to be a celebrant and so to be prayed as for «this bishop» by his clergy. As in the liturgical practice of the Church the bishop would never say about himself: «ἁγίασον τὸν ἐπίσκοπον τόνδε», the clergy of his diocese would pray for him in this way whether he is a celebrant or not. Further on in the prayer (No 25) when prayer is offered for the presbyters, the latter are referred to as «συμπρεσβύτεροι». The bishop very rarely calls the presbyters «συμπρεσβυτέρους», at least in Greek, a term presupposing the same position and rank in priesthood (that of a presbyter). He would call them rather «σὺλλειτουργοὺς» which presupposes the concelebration in the Liturgy.

16. D. Balanos, *Patrology*, p. 411.

17. J. Wordsworth, *Sarapion's Prayer Book*. p. 9.

So, it does not seem to be correct to call it an «*Ἀρχιερατικὸν*» even if the bishop used it on most occasions.

For that reason, but also from the general structure of the prayers in this collection, one would think with Brightman¹⁸ that the terms «*Εὐχολόγιον*» (euchologium) and «*Ἀρχιερατικὸν*» (Pontifical) are titles too far developed to be used for this collection. It is in fact a celebrant's libellus, and, he would add, not only for use by the bishop, although he was the main celebrant of the Sacraments in that time. The collection was to be used by the presbyters as well, at least for the parts which were not an exclusive function of the bishop. The latter aspect is strengthened by the use of the term «*συμπροεσβύταρος*» (25) and on the other hand by the way of prayer for the bishop: «*ἀγίασον τὸν ἐπίσκοπον τόνδε*».

Therefore the term Sacramentary may be used for this collection of prayers and corresponde better with its character.

3. AUTHOR OF THE SACRAMENTARY

A serious question is that of the author of this collection of prayers. The question is whether there is one author of the whole Prayer - Book or many, and whether Serapion is that one author of the whole collection or one among many.

In order to arrive at a conclusion about the first point i. e. whether the author is the same person in every prayer or the collection is the production of more than one author, we should concentrate on the relation in style and language between the different prayers.

There is no doubt there is between the prayers an amazing unity of style, language and character. There are some differences in certain groups but those are rather unimportant. They can be explained by the difference of the subject and the purpose of the prayer and consequently of the content.

All the thirty prayers begin in nearly the same way and they end with the same phrase «*καὶ εἰς τοὺς σύμπαντας αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων*». «*Ἀμήν*».

Only two (18 and 25) have the simple: «*εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων*». «*Ἀμήν*», but with this exception I do not think that any question arises about the validity of the rule. Besides, the type of doxology at the end of every prayer is the same. There are some very unimportant differences in regard the position of the names of the three Persons

18, In Journal of Theolog. Studies, v. I, p. 89.

of the Holy Trinity. But generally the doxologies have the type of ascription of glory and strength to the Father «δι' Υἱοῦ, ἐν Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι».

The rather simple style which characterizes more or less every prayer of the Sacramentary, the repetition, many times, of the same epithets and characterizations, and the general structure of the prayers, join them in unity, and this weakens the view that there were many authors of the collection and it demonstrates that there was one author or redactor of the whole collection.

They are alle «prayers most pious, biblical and free from superstition». Certainly, no great variety of ideas characterizes them, but ideas such as that of pureness (καθαρότης), chastity (ἀγνότης), truth (ἀλήθεια) knowledge (γνώσις) and life (ζωή) etc. find expression in this collection of prayers. «Life» is a very favourite expression of the author and it is found in different ways: «Ζῶσα Ἐκκλησία» (1), «ζῶν ἄνθρωπος»; and the Eucharist is «ζῶσα θυσία» (1). It is also used in the petition for Christians to de grandet «ζῶντα σώματα» (14) by God.

Many epithets which characterize God the Father are repeated in several prayers. God is very frequently addressed as «Θεὸς τῶν οὐρανῶν»; it occurs many times (2, 3, 20, 26, 27, 30). Another frequent expression about God is that of «Θεὸς τῆς ἀληθείας» (1, 2, 6, 8, 9, 11, 14, 15, 27). God the Father is frequently called «Ἀγέννητος» and «φιλάνθρωπος», also «Θεὸς - Σωτήρ», «Κύριος τοῦ παντός» or «Δημιουργός», «Πατήρ» or «γεννήτωρ τοῦ Μονογενοῦς», «Δεσπότης». All these titles being repeated give a unity of style and vocabulary which demonstrates the existence of one author or redactor.

As all the prayers are addressed to God the Father they refer to the Son less often. Actually the Son is referred to in every prayer as «ὁ Μονογενής» and in some of them more than once. He is also called «Logos» mainly in the Anaphora and in the baptismal prayers. He is «ὁ παθὼν καὶ ὁ σταυρωθεὶς καὶ ὁ ἀναστὰς» (15, 17)..

The Church is referred to as Catholic. The repetition of verbs such as «ἐπικαλεῖσθαι», «ἐνεργεῖν», «ἐξημευεῖν» and its compounds, again supports the point that the collection came from one person.

The name of Serapion occurs in the title of two prayers (1 and 15). Is he also the author of the whole collection?

Wobbermin¹⁹ says that only those two prayers are of Se-

19. F. E. Brightman, The Sacramentary of Serapion, Journal of Theolog. Studies v. 1, p. 90.

rapion. He supports his view by referring to the singular «προσευχή» which is in the titles of the two prayers. But Brighman thinks that in the MS. the word «προσευχή» attached to Serapion ought to be read in the plural and therefore it refers to more than one prayer and perhaps to all.

Also he thinks that «it is not uncommon in liturgical documents to find the real or supposed author's name attached to the titles of individual prayers in a series, the whole of which is meant to be attributed to the same author».

It has been shown before from internal evidence, that one author or redactor very probably composed the whole collection, and therefore the title, referring to all the prayers of the Sacramentary, attributes them to Serapion of Thmuis.

Certainly, there is no reason why this collection should not be attributed to Serapion. This work is of great importance for the history of Liturgy; but apart from that it is not an excellent tract the authorship of which would probably be claimed by many. Neither is it a polemic treatise which has to confront a difficult situation nor does it contain ideas which are going to be introduced to the Church and need the name of Serapion to succeed in that purpose.

But we ought also to see the relation of the Sacramentary to the other works which are attributed to Serapion of Thmuis such as the Epistle to Eudaxius, the Epistle to Monks and even more the treatise against the Manichees. To understand the relationship the best criterion would be that of style and language.

It is true that there is no similarity of style between the Sacramentary of Serapion and his Epistle to Eudoxius or that to Monks or to his main work against the Manichees.

Especially in this last treatise the style is rhetorical and polemic with an inclination towards the use of antithesis. The sentences are well arranged and the exposition of the subject is carried on with epigrammatic expressions. The vocabulary is very rich and the philosophical discussion is technical and acute. The words are well arranged²⁰. It is not the same with the Sacramentary. Here we have a less elaborate style, the vocabulary is not so rich, we have no rhetorical forms, and neither the Greek language nor the syntax is of first quality. Therefore there is a quite considerable difference of style between

20. Cf. R. Casey, Serapion of Thm. against the Manichees, Harvard Theol. Studies v, XV, 1931, p. 6.

the Sacramentary and the treatise against the Manichees or the Epistles of Serapion.

But there are also differences between the Epistles themselves and between the Epistles and the treatise against the Manichees; and all these are unquestionably works of Serapion. These differences are explained by the fact that these works are addressed to different persons have different subjects, and serve different objects. For this reason they cannot have the same style or even language.

The same also applies to the Sacramentary and its difference in style from the other works of Serapion. The Sacramentary is a liturgical book, which may contain liturgical elements older than the time of Serapion; but it is not a polemic treatise like that against the Manichees, or a personal epistle like that to Eudoxius or a work praising monastic life like the edifying Epistle to Monks.

On the other hand there are points of similarity between the Sacramentary and the treatise against the Manichees.

Neither in the Sacramentary nor in the tract against the Manichees is there used a full Nicene terminology. Also author of each work uses biblical quotations. There is similarity in the epithets of God the Father such as «ἀγέν(ν)ητος», «δημιουργός», «ποιητής». The Son is called in both works «μονογενής», «Σωτήρ», «Ἀλήθεια», «Ἰησοῦς», «Χριστός», «Κύριος», «Υἱός». And if these are common characterizations, which are found also elsewhere, there is another epithet of Jesus Christ in both works not so common, that of «χαρακτήρ»²¹.

In the treatise against the Manichees the divine economy is referred to. In the Sacramentary God is called «οἰκονόμος» (22). Perhaps these are traces of the conception of divine economy²² and in some way they unite ideologically the two works.

The Holy Spirit is the inspiring power in the Scriptures (Ag. Manichees XXIV. 17, in Casey) and the perfecter of man's souls (ibid. XLVIII, 63). He is the power also inspiring «μαθεῖν τὰς θείας γραφάς . . . καὶ διερμηνεύειν καθαρώς» (Sacramentary, 19) also the power which blesses men's souls «εἰς μάθησιν καὶ γνῶσιν καὶ τὰ μυστήρια» (29) (of. also Sacram. 20; 1; 13; 14).

In the treatise against the Manichees and in the Sacramentary as well, the «knowledge» (of God) is repeatedly referred to as virtue and in its perfection it is met within the Son. This seems to be an

21. Hebr. 1/3.

22. Cf. R. Casey, op. cit. p. 25.

element due to the probable influence of anti-gnostic terminology in Egypt. The Alexandrian theologians of the early period opposed the christian gnosis to the «pseudonymous gnosis». But both Athanasius and Serapion generally confronted the heresy in a different way. Belonging to the new epoch of the theological school of Alexandria they are biblical in approaching doctrinal subjects, as we see from their terminology of the struggle between the christian gnosis and «pseudonym» gnosis. Also Serapion used the word gnosis in his Anti-Arian terminology; it is against the Arian position that the Son was ignorant of the substance of the Father and of His own also. Manichaeism is also a kind of gnosticism.

So in both works there is such a terminology; In the treatise against the Manichees there are expressions like this «Τῆς ἀδικίας τὸ χαλεπάτατόν ἐστι μέρος ἢ εἰς Θεὸν ἄγνοια» (XLVI, I).

In the Sacramentary God is asked to bestow on them «His knowledge» «γνώσιν αὐτοῖς τὴν σὴν ἐχαρίσω . . . βεβαιωθήτωσαν ἐν τῇ γνώσει etc.» 21; «Γραφήτω σου ἡ γνώσις ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν» 24; (cf. Prayers 19; 20; 28; 27; 29; 24; 25; 26; 1; 2; 12; 13; and the use in both works of the word «διάνοια».

Manichaeism had a dualism and as a result of it held the teaching that the human body and the whole material universe were evil and therefore could not be the result of God's creation. In the Sacramentary of Serapion we see an emphasis upon God as the creator of the universe and of all the creatures on it and, of course, of their bodies. This seems to be a teaching (through worship) against the Manichees and their dualism. (« . . . τὸν ἔφορον καὶ κύριον καὶ πλάστην τοῦ σώματος καὶ ποιητὴν τῆς ψυχῆς, τὸν ἀρμοσάμενον τὸν ἄνθρωπον 22; cf. also 19; 20; 23; «τὸν Θεὸν πάσης σαρκὸς καὶ κύριον παντὸς πνεύματος» 25; 1; 2; 5; 6; 7; 11; 12; 18).

In the Sacramentary, also we see an emphasis on virtue, purity, and sanctification. This seems to be also a sign against Manichaeism and its unsound, according to Serapion's treatise against it, moral implications to the people. («τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον . . . σώφρονα καὶ καθαρὸν ποιήσον . . . ὁ λαὸς σου οὗτος ἅπας ἅγιος καὶ σεμνὸς ἦ . . . » 19, 21; «ὄλοι ἐκλεκτοὶ καὶ ἅγιοι γενέσθωσαν» 27; «εὐλογηθεῖ τὰ σώματα τοῦ λαοῦ εἰς σωφροσύνην καὶ καθαρότητα» 29; «ἵνα ᾧσιν καθαρὸν καρδίᾳ καὶ σώματι» 25; cf. also 26; 2; 3; 6; 11; 12; 13;).

In the treatise against the Manichees, Serapion emphasizes the fact that human nature is not substantially evil, but evil action and had intention or will makes man a sinner. As a result of it he speaks

of the possibility of penitence for man and he gives many examples from the Biblelike those of St. Paul, St. Peter etc. In the Sacramentary, also, there is an extensive reference to penitence and to the return of the lapsed; («Σύγγνωθι τοῖς προγεγενημένοις ἁμαρτήμασιν καὶ ἄφες πάντα τὰ παρωχημένα σφάλματα καὶ ποίησον καινοὺς ἀνθρώπους . . . » 27; «πάντας οἴκτειρον καὶ πᾶσιν χάρισαι τὴν πρὸς σὲ ἐπιστροφὴν . . . » 27; cf. also 24; 26; 4; 15; 10; 17).

Words like «σωφροσύνη» and «φρόνησις», «μάθησις», «διδασκαλία», «βελτίωσις» and «ἀγιότης», «μετάνοια», «εὐσέβεια» and «σοφία» etc are met in both works of Serapion and therefore these words increase the similarity between them.

Perhaps these similarities of phraseology and partly of ideas, are not enough to maintain with certainty that the author of the Sacramentary is same person as of the treatise against the Manichees; nevertheless they support the assumption that Serapion is the author or redactor of the Sacramentary as well. This assumption becomes almost certain when we think of the difference of subject, content and purpose; when we add to this the evidence of the titles of the prayers which refer to Serapion, bishop of Thmuis in Egypt, and the internal evidence which places the work in Egypt at the time of Serapion; also that the author had to use the traditional liturgical material of his Church, which explains too the difference in style from the other works of Serapion.

The unity of style and phraseology of all the prayers in the collection points to the Serapion as the author or redactor of the whole of it.

4. SERAPION

Our information about Serapion is scarce and scattered, and we shall try with the hints which are found in different writings to build up an account of his life.

In the titles which are attached to the 1st and 15th prayers, we read in the one «ἐπισκόπου Σεραπίωνος», in the other «Σεραπίωνος ἐπισκόπου Θμούσεως». A bishop with the this name is indeed known to history. The name Serapion is related to Egyptian mythology²³. Actually the author of the Sacramentary is not the only person in the Church with this name.

Our Serapion would be born at the end of the third or in the beginning of the fourth century. He was an ascetic at first and was a

23. Cf. Serapeum in Alexandria.

friend of St. Anthony and St. Athanasius. He was called by Jerome «scholasticus» for his excellent education.

His friendship with Anthony was a close one, and the latter used to tell his visions to Serapion ²⁴. Anthony also at his death (about 356) left his two cloaks to Athanasius and to Serapion. «Divide my garments (he said to his disciples); give one sheepskin cloak to Athanasius the bishop, and the pallium on which I lay, which he gave me new, and which has grown old with my use; and give the other sheepskin cloak to Serapion the bishop» ²⁵.

When Serapion became bishop of Thmuis in Lower Egypt, near the Delta of the Nile, (before 339) he continued to be interested to the monastic life and he remained in contact with the monks.

His close friendship also with St. Athanasius was continued when both were bishops, as we can assume from the epistles of Athanasius to him and from other facts.

In 353, leading a delegation which was summoned by Athanasius, he went to the West to meet Constantius in order to refute the slanders against Athanasius ²⁶.

Constantius persecuted the Orthodox in 356 and during that persecution it seems that the confession of Serapion occurred to which Jerome refers (De vir. illust. 99 Migne P. L. 23, 699a).

In 359, Serapion must have received from St. Athanasius, when the latter was in the desert, his epistles about the Holy Spirit ²⁷. In 359 also, in the Council of Seleucia we find an Acacius Ptolemaeus as bishop of Thmuis. He must have taken the post of Serapion; about whom, we do not know whether he died in prison, or in exile, or whether he survived and returned to his diocese.

Serapion was the author of several writings, apart from the Sacramentary, and Jerome refers to the treatise against the Manichees and calls it excellent; he refers also to the titles of psalms and various letters as works of Serapion.

The work on the psalms was lost and of the letters only two survived, the one to Eudoxius and the other to the Monks. Also a fragment with the title «τοῦ Ἁγ. Σεραπίωνος ἐκ τῆς κγ' ἐπιστολῆς» survived. There is also a quotation in Socrates ²⁸. In Syriac there are two

24. Athanas., Vit. St. Anton., 82 P. Gr. 26, 957b.

25. The translation is taken from J. Wordsworth, op. cit. p. 12.

26. Sozomen, Eccl. Hist, 4, 9 P. Gr. 67, 1129b.

27. Athanas. I Epistle to Serapion, P. Gr. 26, 529a, 605c.

28. Cf. R. Casey, op. cit., p. 6.

fragments from an epistle and another from a work on virginity.

Serapion in his treatise against the Manichees admits that he does not describe the theology of the Manichees but refutes it, and therefore the treatise has a polemic character. His method has similarities not with the method of Augustine or Alexander of Lycopolis, but rather with that of Titus of Bostra. Serapion makes a general attack against dualism and «he develops it in detail by a series of suppositions claims and objections which he imagines his opponents might plausibly but ineffectively advance at different stages of their arguments».

Many times he is confused about their teaching and so he does not appear as an expert in its content. There is no doubt, and it is proved from this work, that his main reaction to the Manichees is a moral one. In the conception of the beginning of moral evil he is influenced by the Greek philosophical tradition, and with the help of that he elucidates the christian position. Manichaeism is for him «an interesting philosophical question with important practical consequences».

Serapion appears to say that he describes and exposes the teaching of Manichaeism in order to be able to confront it successfully «τὸν μῦθον στρέφω ἵνα τὸν μῦθον δυσωπήσω, καὶ εἰμὴ παράθωμαι ἃ ἐξηγοῦνται, ἐντρέψαι τὴν μυθοποιεῖαν οὐκ ἔχω» (XXVI, 7). The reason was, of protect his flock from its bad influence.

But, as becomes clear, in the treatise against the Manichees he confines himself in the exposition of the general lines of their theological teaching while from time to time he touches some important points of their teaching of which he disapproves. His style and vocabulary, his philosophic tendencies, his approach to ethics in an intellectual way, betray a well educated man who knew the philosophic issues of his time. He bore the marks of an educated Greek. So he appears connected with the older scholars of the Alexandrian School, while at the same time he appears connected more with Athanasius and the new epoch of the Alexandrian School, especially in regard to the Bible and the exegetical method.

The Bible is spiritual but only in the sense that it is inspired by the Spirit of God and that the reading of it removes alle evil from the minds and leads to a veritable conversation with God ²⁹ «τὸ γὰρ ἅγιον καὶ πνευματικὸν σεμνύνεται ταῖς ἀρεταῖς καὶ διαλέγεται τῷ Θεῷ. Ἡ

29. R. Casey, op. cit., p. 23.

γὰρ πρὸς Θεὸν ὁμιλία ἄλλης μὲν τάξεως οὐκ ἀνέχεται τῇ δὲ τοῦ πνεύματος ρυθμίζεται ἐπιστοσίᾳ . . . » (XLIII, 19-23).

He is very Scriptural. He gives a great number of examples from the Bible in order to strengthen his arguments, especially on penitence and change in life. Probably his biblicism as well as his avoidance of allegorical exegesis are the characteristics of his whole theology. He defends the Old Testament over against the anti-judaistic spirit of the Manichees and he regards it as the indispensable basis of the New Testament «τὴν ἀρχὴν τῶν μαθημάτων ἐκβεβλήκασι, τῇ ἀρχῇ τῶν μαθημάτων ἐμαχέσαντο, τὰ τελευταῖα ἐζήτησαν, εὐρεῖν οὐκ ἠδυνήθησαν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς τὴν ἀκολουθίαν μὴ παραδεξάμενοι» (XXX, 15-18).

The New Testament is based on the Old and the «Law contains Jesus' principal credentials» so that he who refuses it, refuses Christ. Apart from that the Old Testament contains an invaluable moral teaching and therefore it is impossible for it to have been composed by the Devil as the Manichees maintained. So, Serapion appears as a supporter of the Law «ἱεροὶ οἱ νόμοι, ἐπιμέλονται γὰρ τῆς ἐπιμελείας τοῦ πεπλασμένου. Μῖξον τῇ πλάσει τὸν νόμον, παὶ ὄψει τὸ πεπλασμένον, ἔοικὸς τῷ πεπλακότι καὶ μιμήσεται τὸν πεπλακότα» (XVIII, 19 ff.).

In regard to the problem of evil, he believes that evil does not exist substantially but is a negation of reality, it is an action the result of ill-intention or ill will «ἔστι μὲν οὖν ἡ κακία ἀνούσιος καὶ ἀνυπόστατος, πρᾶξις μᾶλλον ἢ οὐσία οὕσα καὶ πρᾶξις ἐκ προαιρέσεως συμβαινουσα περὶ τοὺς νενοσηκότας τὴν προαίρεσιν» (IV, fl.) and also «Υπόστασιν γὰρ κακίας εὐρεῖν ἀμήχανον . . . » (XIX, 18 fl.).

Therefore man is, by nature, good «καλὸν τὸ πεπλασμένον, δύναται γὰρ ὑπηρετῆσαι ἀρετῇ» (XVLL, 18) ; and when he commits sin he does so by his own initiative and mistaken judgement. So man becomes responsible according to the use of his will.

~~From all this we see that Serapion does not hold the idea of a corrupted human nature. God is the creator of the universe, of the matter, of the human soul and body which may be prudent and pure «ἡ γὰρ σωφροσύνη πρᾶξις οὕσα μαρτυρεῖ περὶ τοῦ σώφρονος σώματος» (X, 3).~~

The Holy Spirit is the inspiring power in Scripture and the perfecter of men's souls. In all this struggle, Serapion was guided and inspired by his warm love and faith in Christ and His Church ; «Εἰς δὲ μόνος Χριστός, ὁ ἐλευθερωτής . . . ».

Another writing of Serapion which has survived is the letter to Eudoxius was a bishop under the jurisdiction of the bishop of Alexan-

dria, who probably wished to retire or to get to a diocese similar to that of Serapion because he was ill. Serapion consoles him in his sickness, writing that sin is worse than sickness. Generally, this letter shows an educated author who is familiar with the use of antithesis in his work.

In the letter to the Monks we see another part of Serapion's personality. He writes to the Monks who, generally, were faithful to the Church of Alexandria, its great bishop Athanasius, and to the orthodox faith. He praises the monastic life and his emphasis is on sexual asceticism, in the belief that, that is an advantage of monasticism in comparison with worldly life. He exposes the disadvantages of city life, its responsibilities, the burden of expenses and taxes, and he gives a very pessimistic picture of family life. The style is suited to the educational level of monks; he does not persist in philosophical conceptions, but he gives place to more ecclesiastical and devotional tone.

The fragment which is in Sostates ³⁰ from Euagrius Ponticus, bears traces of Alexandrian christian gnosis ³¹ and of the conception of purity which was very dear to Serapion.

The fragment in Syriac come from a letter to bishops who were confessors and from a work on virginity as well. The last is a very interesting subject to Serapion as we may assume also from his letter to the Monks.

From the epistles of Athanasius to Serapion we learn of the high regard which Athanasius had for Serapion and of their frequent contact. He calls him «ἀγαπητὸν καὶ ἀληθῶς ποθεινώτατον» ³², and a great part of the work of refutation of heretical ideas is left to Serapion «κατὰ τὴν προσοῦσαν (αὐτῷ) σύνεσιν. . .» ³³. The first epistle des-

30. Athanas. I Letter to Serap., P. Gr. 26, 532b. 26, 605c.

cribes the death of Arius, and the others are doctrinal; they are mainly against the new form of Arianism which is against the Holy Spirit (Πνευματομαχία) and which seems to have disturbed Serapion a great deal in his diocese, making him ask for instructions.

From all these works we get an idea of the personality of Serapion. He was bishop of his diocese but at the same time of the whole Church and he was in close contact with Alexandria.

In the personality of Serapion we see clearly the combination of

30. Eccl. Hist. 4, 23 P. Gr. 27, 520 c.

31. Cf. R. Casey, op. cit., p. 15.

32. Athanas, I, Letter to Serap., P. Gr. 26, 529 a.

two tendencies. The one is Greek philosophical thought, and the other ascetic ideals. «His style and literary manner, his inclination toward philosophical discussion and his evident familiarity with contemporary philosophical ideas are all works of an educated Greek».

So he continues the tradition of the Catechetical School, that of Pantaenus, Clement and Origen, and its traditional conception of christian gnosis. He is also a scholar of the Alexandrian School in its new epoch and he uses the Scriptures as a main argument in doctrinal quarrels.

Besides «he was of the inner circle of Anthony's disciples and this has also contributed substantially to his development in his admiration for asceticism and in that, unlike Clement and Origen, he has no taste for allegorizing Scripture»³⁴. Serapion approaches the Bible

34. R. Casey, op. cit., p. 22.

with a simpler view.

5. DATE OF THE SACRAMENTARY

The composition of the Sacramentary is dated in the middle of the fourth century.

As we connect the Sacramentary with Serapion we connect also its date with period of this Father of the Church. This does not mean that Serapion did not use earlier sources and liturgical usage; on the other hand, the Sacramentary preserves its individuality as a personal production. At any rate Serapion can be taken as indicative of the date of the Sacramentary from internal evidence.

Ecclesiastical organization seems to be less developed than in the Apost. Constitutions, which belong to a later period (2nd half of 4th cent.), or in the Liturgy of St. Mark. Also the Sacramentary comes from an earlier period than that when great the mass of people had been converted to christianity (in the days of Theodosius). We can assume that from the many pagans in Serapion's Church; so prayer No 20 speaks about their conversion: «κτῆσαι λαὸν καὶ ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ, κτῆσαι ποίμνιον γνήσιον».

It reflects the situation during the reign of Constantine and his immediate successors. The «γνήσιον» of course, is over against the supposed «μη γνήσιον» flock of Arians and other schismatics of Serapion's time.

Also, according to Brightman the consecration of water and oil, which are characteristic of the collection, is explained by the usages of the early Fathers of the desert and corresponds to them.

The Prayer for lords (27) corresponds, also, to the abnormal pe-

riod of the successors of Constantine. It speaks «ὕπερ τῶν ἀρχόντων εἰρηνικῶν τὸν βίον ἐχέτωσαν, ὑπερ ἀναπαύσεως τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας». It is the period of successive royal murders and the successive changes of king which had their effect on the peace and stability of the Church.

The doxologies in every prayer have the form ; «τῷ Πατρὶ . . . δι' Υἱοῦ . . . ἐν Ἁγ. Πνεύματι». But when this type of doxology was used by the Arians with the meaning of the inferiority of the Son and the Holy Spirit, then the Orthodox abandoned it³⁵. It is the time when doxologies are used for the proclamation of the doctrinal teaching of the Church ; they are a sign of orthodoxy or of heretical teaching, and this type of doxology has since disappeared from liturgical documents. Athanasius uses that type in some writings ; it occurs also in the Apost. Constitutions. but these are not destitute of Arian influence³⁶. Didymus, in 370, thinks of this doxology as an heretical one. «Its use therefore . . . points to the middle of the fourth century as its latest possible date»³⁷.

Meanwhile although perhaps there is no great theological development in the Sacramentary, nevertheless it has evidently an anti-Arian theology. This becomes clear especially in the epithets which declare the relation between the «γεννήτορος Πατρὸς» and the «μονογενοῦς» Son. The emphasis on the mutual knowledge of the Father and the Son is probably an answer to Arianism, as the Arians taught the ignorance of the Son about the Substance of both the Father and of Himself.

The teaching about the Holy Spirit is not developed ; He is simply referred to as «Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα». About 359, when Serapion had to confront the Macedonians in his ecclesiastical province, and their teaching against the Holy Spirit, he asked instructions from Athanasius, who sent the epistles referred to above.

The Sacramentary must therefore come from an earlier period. Thus, the theological content of the Sacramentary is in favour of the view that it belongs to the middle of the 4th century, perhaps to an earlier but not to a later period.

Thus this collection of prayers is the earliest liturgical document of its kind, and it becomes unique in importance for the understanding of liturgical development in Egypt at an early period.

35. Sozomen, Eccl. Hist. 3, 20 P. Gr. 67, 1101a.

36. Cf. 2nd Canon of the Council of Trullo (692), (Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Chr. Church v. XIV, p. 361).

37. Brightman, op. cit, p. 92.

6. THE SACRAMENTARY OF SERAPION AND OTHER TEXTS

Although local bishops were free to formulate their own prayers, even those of the Holy Eucharist, nevertheless they would be obliged to use older liturgical material. Putting it in another way, their composition has not to differ a great deal from the liturgical tradition to which the congregation was used.

There is no doubt that all liturgies are the product of a continuous organic life not only of the local churches but in some way of the whole Church³⁸. The life of the whole Church as such is concentrated in worship; therefore it is very difficult for individuals to control Liturgy or to compose it originally in an absolute way, even if those individuals possess an important ecclesiastical post or great authority. On the other hand even classic rites which are specimens of beauty, power and genius, cannot remain unchangeable and immobile and without any influence from outside.

Men of liturgical genius like Serapion reorder and compose the existing liturgies of their churches; but their compositions do not survive fully. What is best remains; meanwhile the several churches, in the course of time, exchange what good liturgical material they have produced.

Therefore the approximate original unity of Liturgy which had been provided by the visits of the Apostles, especially of Paul and his fellow workers; to the several churches, gives place to a variety of rites which came into existence by local liturgical use in the centres of christendom and other churches. But the exchange of liturgical elements between the Churches, and the leading position and power of the Churches of great centres, especially of the capitals of East and West, lead to the unity of worship and the domination of the rites of the great Churches.

Although the Sacramentary of Serapion is in part a personal product nevertheless the liturgical usage of the Church in Egypt of that period is reflected and contained in it. There is no doubt that usage is not destitute absolutely of influence from outside. Actually in Egypt there is a great proportion of elements of original independence and of radical individuality. Nevertheless this liturgical usage excepte, in some way, mainly in the fourth century, influences from Syria³⁹.

³⁸. Cf. G. Dix, *Primitive Consecration Prayers*, Theologu v. 37, 1938, p. 282.

³⁹. Cf. H. Lietzmann, *A History of the Early Church*, v. 3, p. 295.

Thus the Sacramentary of Serapion has some similarity with Syrian documents but at the same time it has the stamp of Egyptian production. Perhaps this shows that a type which is «Syrian in the fourth century was not merely Syrian, and secondly that the special Egyptian type had already emerged by the middle of the century»⁴⁰ and undoubtedly earlier. Later on, Syria, with its capital Antioch, and with the holy city of Jerusalem, became a powerful liturgical centre which at the end of the fourth century and the beginning of the 5th influenced other Churches more than did Rome⁴¹.

In the Sacramentary of Serapion, in the Anaphora between the words of institution there is the following phrase, rather irrelevant to the context: «καὶ ὡσπερ ὁ ἄρτος οὗτος ἐσκορπισμένος ἦν ἐπάνω τῶν ὀρέων καὶ συναχθεὶς ἐγένετο εἰς ἓν, οὕτω καὶ τὴν ἁγίαν σου ἐκκλησίαν σύναξον ἐκ παντὸς ἔθνους καὶ πάσης χώρας καὶ πάσης πόλεως καὶ κόμης καὶ οἴκου καὶ ποιήσον μίαν ζῶσαν καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν».

This comes almost literally from the *Didache* of the twelve Apostles (ch. 9,4). It shows that Serapion used that source in some way.

The *Didache* is a source for the study of the worship, the form of government and the life of the primitive Church. It has the teaching of the two ways; that of life which must be followed and that of death which must be avoided. Also it speaks about worship i. e. of Baptism, fasting, prayer, Holy Eucharist and the ecclesiastical form of government and the coming judgment as well. The unknown author, in order to give authority of its content, calls it «*Didache* of the Lord through the Apostles».

The place of origin of the *Didache* is doubtful. It seems that its main source is the Epistle of Barnabas. But we can assume also that it was used at first in Syria. It is true that there is doubt whether Egypt or Syria is its place of origin, but the reference to wheat «on the mountains» leads to the conclusion in favour of Syria as Egypt does not provide such a picture of mountains.

It seems that it spread quickly in every direction. Later on the *Didache* was embodied in several texts, so that its preservation as an independent text was not necessary and it disappeared up to the time when Bryennius discovered it⁴². The Greek *Didache* as it is in the MS. Bryennius seems to be the work of one man and it has been tran-

40. Brightman, op. cit., p. 94.

41. G. Dix, *Primitive Consecr. Prayers*, Theology v. 37, p. 281.

42. Cf. F. C. Vokes, *The Riddle of Didache*, p. 87.

slated and adapted by many et various times. Of course, there are rival theories on the date and value of this document.

It seems to have been constructed from a great number of verses of other sources. All these verses have been Compiled harmoniously into a whole and the genius of the compiller is shown by the unitl of language and spirit throughout the whole Didache. The author is perhaps a Montanist of a very mild who tries to expresse his ideas in apostolic language as far as this is possible⁴³.

The Didache has been used by the authors of the Didaskalia, the Apost. Constitutions, the African adv. Aleatores, and by the Romans Jerome and Rufinus, the Egyptian Serapion, Atmanasius, Apostolic Church etc. Also it is referred ro in many authors by its name. So, Eusebius puts it among the apocryphal Scriptures and Nicephorus Callistus repeats the words of Eusebius.

Athanasius in his Hestal Letter 39⁴⁴, which had been written at Easter in 367, wrote: «Ἔστι καὶ ἕτερα βιβλία . . . οὐ κανονιζόμενα μὲν τετυπωμένα δὲ παρὰ τῶν πατέρων ἀναγινώσκεισθαι τοῖς ἄρτι προερχομένοις καὶ βουλομένοις κατηχεῖσθαι τὸν τῆς εὐσεβείας λόγον, Σοφία Σολομώντος καὶ Σοφία Σιράχ καὶ Ἑσθήρ καὶ Ἰουδίθ καὶ Ἰωβίας καὶ Διδαχὴ καλουμένη τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ ὁ Ποιμὴν . . . ». Apart from that trer is also other witness to it.

The MS. which was discovered by Bryennius belongs to the 11th century and it seems to be a Byzantine work. But apart from this, another papyrus was discovered in Oxyrhynchus, an Egyptian work of the fourth century⁴⁵. Coptic and Ethiopic fragments show that the Didache was known in Egypt in the 5th century. Also, other witness proves that this document was known in Egypt from an earlier period. The apost. Church Order which is an Egyptian compilation and was probably composed at the end of the 3rd or the beginning of the 4th cent., also contains the «the meals». That means that the compiler knew the Didache. Also, there are some weak evidences that it was used by Clement of Alexandria or Origen.

There is no doubt that the quotations of St. Athanasius in De Virginitate and of Serapion in his Anaphora, which are from the Didache 9, 4, are very interesting and informative.

Athanasius refers to it in the grace of the meals of Vingsins. Serapion puts it between the words of institution. This use by Athana-

43. Ibid., p. 209.

44. P. GR. 26, 1437 c.

45. Cf. F. Vokes op. cit., p. 67.

sus and Serapion shows also that the Didache was known in Egypt ; and perhaps it was known as a whole. Therefore it is proved that the Didache was imported into Egypt from an early period, and it was an edifying book not only of an ecclesiastical party (that perhaps of the Montanist) but it was used everywhere.

The ethical part of it was good for instruction and probably was used for the Catechumens before Baptism ; and fragments referring to christian worship had been imported into the Egyptian rite. It seems that certain liturgical parts became very popular and so they became naturalized into christian worship in Egypt and elsewhere. Thus the quotation of the scattered bread as wheat on the mountains etc. is used in Egypt but also by other authors elsewhere.

Actually in Egypt it has been imported not only into the Eucharist but for other occasions as well. So St. Athanasius has it in his grace to be used at the meals of the Virgins.

Therefore one arrives at the conclusion that this quotation is used without discrimination in the blessing of bread whether it takes place at the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist or at meals as the usual grace. Or perhaps, the double use of it i. e. in the Eucharist and in a common meal, is a trace of the grace to the bread when Eucharist and Agape were one rite. Thus Serapion got the above quotation and imported it into his Anaphora after the blessing of bread and before the blessing of the Cup although this quotation is not related essentially with the context. He imported something which was connected with the bread and its blessing and which was already known (from the Didache) in his Church and did not try to compose something new.

Serapion does not use the Didache elsewhere apart from the above quotation. If he had wished to import a new element from the Didache into the worship of his Church there is no doubt that this quotation about bread would not be the only one. He would have tried to profit by the importation of more elements into the Eucharist, the Baptismal office and generally into the rite of Thmuis as it appears in the Sacramentary. But such traces of the Didache are difficult to find in the Sacramentary of Serapion apart from the scattered bread on the mountains which becomes a picture of the desirable unity of the whole Church.

The Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus which was previously called the Egyptian Church Order appears to influence to

a great extent the liturgical documents which come from Egypt and elsewhere, generally called the «Church Orders».

The Apost. Tradition comes from Rome from the beginning of the 3rd century. «Here from the pen of a disciple of St. Iranaeus is what claims to be an accurate and authoritative account of the rites and organization of the Church as the men of the later second century received them from the sub-apostolic age . . . »⁴⁶. It deals with «charismata», ordinations, neophytes, catechumens, Baptism, fasting, the Eucharist, Worship and apostolic tradition.

In the time of Hippolytus a theological problem was the relation between the incarnate Son and the transcendent God - Father, and this relation was formulated under the influence of theologians who came from Asia Minor to Rome, such as Epigonus, Praxeas etc. (this proves communication between the parts of the early Church).

Hippolytus made use of the doctrine of the Logos which had been used before by Justin and had been elucidated by Theophilus of Antioch and Clement of Alexandria. «God had ever possessed within Himself His Logos . . . At a period in time determined by Himself God «manifested» the Word to Himself and by the Word created all things. Thus the Word was truly God within and of the One Divine Nature, but «Another» over against the Father, by Whom and from Whom He was manifested»⁴⁷. Hippolytus does not call the creative Logos «Son»; according to him, Logos became Son only in the incarnation.

Hippolytus caused a schism in the Roman Church largely because of his personal quarrel with Zephyrinus and Callistus and he attached Callistus' decree on Penance. «In writing the Apost. Tradition Hippolytus the schismatic has in view chiefly the adherents of the contemporary legitimate Pope».

~~Lietzmann⁴⁸ thinks that Hippolytus' Order underwent alterations by the importation of Egyptian elements which in turn show Syrian influence. Certain elements in the Liturgy come from the East and through Alexandria go to Rome. He thinks also that Athanasius was the mediator in this.~~

On the other hand we have evidence about the circulation of the Apost. Tradition in Syria where it is almost repeated in the Apost. Constitutions B ch. 8 (c. A. D. 375) and in the Testament of our Lord

46. G. Dix, The Treatise on the Apost. Tradition, p. XI.

47. G. Dix, The treatise on the Apost. Tradition, p. XX.

48. A Hist. of the Early Church, v. III, p. 296.

(5th c.), where there are eschatological teachings and ecclesiastical constitutions given by the Lord, as they say.

Apart from Syria we see the Apost. Tradition in Egypt and we see it to be contained in the Egyptian canonical collection which is known as Sahidic Heptateuch and which belongs to the 5th century⁴⁹. Also the Epitome of the Apost. Constitutions 8 and the Canons of Hippolytus use a great deal of the Apost. Tradition.

There is the phenomenon that all these documents of this kind of ecclesiastical literature are adapted from each other to some extent, renewing older documents. Most of them are of Syrian or Egyptian origin⁵⁰ apart from the Testament of our Lord which originated in Asia Minor.

49. Cf. G. Dix, *The Treatise on the Ap. Tradition*, p. XLV.

50. G. Dix, *ibid.*, P. XLVII,

κὴ μαχέουζ *