

### III

#### THE DIDACHE

**T**HE Didache, or Teaching of the Apostles, was first published by its discoverer, the Greek bishop Bryennius, at the end of the year 1883. With remarkable rapidity Dr Harnack produced in 1884 an edition with a learned commentary and full *prolegomena*. The Didache has been edited again and again, and critically investigated by scholars of all lands; but no agreement has been reached as to its date, or the sources of its composition, or its historical value as a witness to the early organisation of the Christian Church. Its date has been placed by capable critics in every decade of the century from A.D. 60 to A.D. 160. It has been regarded as the work of a single author from beginning to end; as a composition of the first century which has been modified by subsequent interpolation; or as the elaboration of a Jewish manual of instruction for proselytes, which has been adapted and expanded for Christian use. Its historical importance has been variously estimated according to its assignment to an earlier or a later date; but with hardly an exception scholars have regarded it as a document of the highest value for the history of early ecclesiastical institutions.

The work consists of two main sections: (1) a brief manual of morals designed for the instruction of candidates for Holy Baptism; (2) a Church Order

#### 44 BARNABAS, HERMAS AND THE DIDACHE

of a primitive type, giving directions for Baptism, Fasting, Prayer, and other ecclesiastical institutions. The first section is in fact a considerably expanded recension of the Two Ways, which we have met with in a briefer and less systematic form at the close of the Epistle of Barnabas. This is followed by the injunction, "having first said all these things, baptise in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, in living water." Thus a link is formed between the first section and the second, which goes on to describe various ordinances, and to give a remarkable account of Apostles, Prophets and Teachers; after this the Sunday Eucharist is mentioned, and Bishops and Deacons are briefly noticed: then the book closes with eschatological warnings.

Eight years ago I endeavoured, in an article in the *Journal of Theological Studies* (April, 1912),<sup>1</sup> to show that in this second section the writer has striven to confine himself as far as was practicable to such injunctions as might fairly be presumed to have been actually given by the Apostles themselves; and that accordingly his account of the Christian ordinances and ministry is not to be taken as representing the Church of his own time or place, but rather as an imaginative picture of the primitive Church, as it was planted by the Apostles in Gentile lands. What he professed to give was according to his own title of the work, "The teaching of the Lord, through the Twelve Apostles, to the Gentiles." Such a view of the book deprives it indeed of most of its historical value; but it explains the fact that the picture of the Church which is there drawn remains, after nearly forty years of eager investigation, isolated and unique: history has found no time and no locality to which such a representation can be reasonably assigned.

In the article to which I have referred the first

<sup>1</sup> See below, Appendix A.

section of the Didache did not come under treatment. I was myself at that time prepared to maintain what had come to be the almost universal belief, that the Two Ways of the Didache, when certain obviously Christian passages were set aside as interpolations, represented in substance a Jewish manual of moral teaching, which had been embodied in somewhat different forms by Barnabas in his Epistle and by the writer of the Didache. It is the object of the present lectures to set aside that view, and to establish the judgment of Bryennius the first editor, and of Dr Harnack himself in his edition of 1884, that the writer of the Didache took the Two Ways from Barnabas, and also made use of the Shepherd of Hermas; and that consequently he cannot have written at an earlier date than between 140 and 160 A.D.

The Teaching of the Apostles is the work of a writer who has chosen to remain anonymous. The full title of his work tells us what he wishes it to be regarded as being—"The teaching of the Lord, through the Twelve Apostles, to the Gentiles." This remarkable title he no doubt composed with the last verses of St Matthew's Gospel before him: "Go ye therefore and instruct all the nations (*the Gentiles*, τὰ ἔθνη), baptising them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, *teaching them* to observe all that I have *commanded* you." We find echoes of this verse later, in such a phrase as "the second *command* of the *teaching*," and again in the words, "Having first said all these things, baptise in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost."

Though the book was called in early times quite briefly "The Teaching of the Apostles," the author's own claim is to have put on record what the Apostles had handed down as that "teaching of the Lord" which in His parting words He had bidden them

give to their Gentile converts. Other writers who professed to present to their readers our Lord's unrecorded teachings sought to commend their inventions by describing a scene in which Christ conversed with His disciples after the Resurrection; or else they boldly attributed their work to an Apostle or a disciple of the Apostles. Our author adopts no such pretence. He prefers to be anonymous. He is content to let his work stand on its merits: it is "The teaching of the Lord, through the Twelve Apostles, to the Gentiles." And so without further preface he proceeds: "There are two ways, one of life and one of death; and there is great difference between the two ways."

Such a beginning might well seem to be in our Lord's own manner; for had He not spoken (Matt. vii. 13 f.) of "a narrow way which leadeth unto life," and "a broad way that leadeth to destruction"? Well therefore might the Apostles convey our Lord's teaching to the Gentiles under such an image as this. But more: these were, with but slight modification, the actual words of an Apostle—the Apostle Barnabas, as Clement of Alexandria constantly called him—who in the last section of the Epistle attributed to him wrote thus: "There are two ways of teaching and power, that of light and that of darkness; and there is great difference between the two ways." Barnabas indeed goes on to explain wherein the "great difference" consists: "For on the one are stationed light-giving angels of God, but on the other angels of Satan: and the one is Lord from eternity and unto eternity, but the other is ruler of the time of iniquity that now is"; then he proceeds: "The way therefore of light is this."

But the Didachist—if I may be allowed for brevity's sake the use of the term—has no intention of merely copying the words of a particular Apostle: it is enough that what he writes should be such as Apostles might very well have said. He has changed

“ the way of light ” and “ the way of darkness ” into “ the way of life ” and “ the way of death ” ; probably with the words of Jeremiah (xxi. 8) in his mind : “ Thus saith the Lord : Behold, I set before you the way of life and the way of death.” Then he omits altogether the explanation of the “ great difference between the two ways,” and so leaves the sentence which asserts it in the air. It is curious to note in this connexion that nowhere in his book does he mention either angel or devil : such a silence is almost, if not quite, unique in the early Christian writers.

His next words, however, are still derived from Barnabas : “ The way of life therefore is this.” He then drops two more sentences of Barnabas, though he will take up part of one of them later ; and he proceeds : “ First, thou shalt love the God that made thee ; secondly, thy neighbour as thyself.” Now Barnabas had said : “ Thou shalt love Him that made thee, thou shalt fear Him that formed thee, thou shalt glorify Him that redeemed thee from death ” ; and much later he will say : “ Thou shalt love thy neighbour more than thine own soul.” This excess of language and warmth of emotion does not commend itself to the Didachist, who has a good deal to add to what Barnabas says, and who is moreover desirous of getting his precepts into a more systematic order. So he cuts down the flowing rhetoric, and, keeping only the phrase “ Him that made thee,” remodels on the lines of the First and Second Commandments of the Gospel : “ First, thou shalt love the God that made thee ; secondly, thy neighbour as thyself.” He compensates for this brevity by adding in a negative form the Golden Rule of the Sermon on the Mount. This negative precept was pre-Christian, being found, for example, in Tobit iv. 15 : “ What thou hatest, do to no man.” It occurs, in forms modified by a recollection of the Golden Rule itself, in

various places in early Christian literature; but nowhere is the form so close to the words of St Matthew (vii. 12) as here: "And *all things whatsoever thou wouldst* not have done to thee, do not thou to another."

But if the Didachist plainly had St Matthew's wording before him, why should he perversely change the Golden Rule from the positive to the negative form? I believe that we can show that, so far from acting from perversity, he is following his own fundamental principle.

The Apostolic Decree contained in the fifteenth chapter of the Acts has been the subject of a striking dissertation by Gotthold Resch, the son of the veteran compiler of the "Agrapha" or Unwritten Sayings of our Lord. Whether we are convinced or not by his powerful pleading for the originality of the "Western text" of this passage, we must at any rate recognise that this extra-canonical text, as he calls it, had a very early and wide circulation. The essential point of difference between the canonical text and the extra-canonical is this—that the former is in the main a regulation as to food, whereas the latter is concerned only with moral prohibitions. "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things: that ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication: from which if ye keep yourselves ye shall do well." Such is the accepted text, attested by all the great Greek manuscripts save one. But Codex Bezaë, with strong support from early Fathers, reads: "that ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from fornication: and whatsoever ye would not have done to yourselves, do not to another; from which keeping yourselves do ye well, being carried forward by the Holy Ghost" (xv. 29). In like manner in v. 20, instead of "that they abstain from pollutions

of idols, and from fornication, and from things strangled, and from blood," Codex Bezae has "from pollutions of idols, and from fornication, and from blood; and whatsoever they would not have done to themselves, do not to another." The earliest Fathers interpreted "blood" in the sense of "homicide," and did not suppose that the Apostles had laid down any law of food; they simply forbade "idolatry, fornication and murder." But we must leave this interesting problem and return to the Didache.

We may be confident that the text of the Acts which our author used contained twice over (xv. 20, 29) the negative form of the Golden Rule. This, then, was the teaching given by the Apostles, on a most solemn occasion, as summing up those necessary prohibitions which the Gentile converts must by all means accept. It was emphatically a part of "the teaching of the Lord through the Twelve Apostles to the Gentiles." What words could be more appropriately added to the two great commandments of the Gospel? So he writes: "First, thou shalt love the God that made thee: secondly, thy neighbour as thyself; and all things whatsoever thou wouldst not have done to thee, do not thou to another."

He has however made slight changes in wording, sufficient to show that he is no mere copyist. He has prefixed the phrase "all things," and he has, contrary to Greek idiom, put the negative after instead of before the verb. The text of Codex Bezae runs: *Καὶ ὅσα μὴ θέλετε ἑαυτοῖς γείνεσθαι, ἑτέρῳ μὴ ποιῆν.* But he writes: *Πάντα δὲ ὅσα ἐὰν θελήσῃς μὴ γίνεσθαι σοι, καὶ σὺ ἄλλῳ μὴ ποίει.* The explanation is given when we look at the Golden Rule in Matt. vii. 12, which begins, *Πάντα οὖν ὅσα ἐὰν θέλῃς.*<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> It is interesting to find that the "Apostolic Church Order" in reproducing this sentence of the Didache prefers to give the natural order of the Greek construction: *πάντα δὲ ὅσα ἂν μὴ θέλῃς.* So too in the Apostolic Constitutions we read: *πάν ὃ μὴ θέλεις.*

## 50 BARNABAS, HERMAS AND THE DIDACHE

We see at once where the changes have come from : he has conformed the negative rule which he found in the Acts of the Apostles so far as was possible to the wording of the positive rule in the Sermon on the Mount. And his having done so has a special interest when we observe that he immediately passes on to expand his opening clauses by introducing a series of precepts which are mainly derived from the Sermon itself.

The Didachist goes on thus : "Now of these words the teaching is this : Bless them that curse you," etc. Barnabas had written, very characteristically, concerning "the way of light" : "The *gnosis* therefore which has been given to us to walk therein is such as this : Thou shalt love Him that made thee," etc. This is plain enough : for Barnabas has given us his little parable of the two ways and the two kinds of angels ; and he now begins its interpretation—the *gnosis* of it. But the Didachist's clause is less clear. What are "the words" of which he will give us "the teaching" ? and why "the teaching," and not "the interpretation" ? We must look on, and hope for some light from the context.

What follows is a series of precepts, mainly founded on the Sermon on the Mount, the language of St Matthew being blended with that of St Luke, and the sentences so recast as to avoid the appearance of exact quotation from either Gospel. These precepts are then expanded and modified by phrases borrowed from the Shepherd of Hermas ; and they are supplemented by a strange citation from an unknown source.

Then a fresh start is made thus : "The second command of the teaching : Thou shalt not kill, thou shalt not commit adultery," etc. Here we come back to precepts of Barnabas, rearranged, and added to from the Ten Commandments, and otherwise improved in our author's manner. The precepts thus

introduced under the heading, "The second command of the teaching," are mainly negative, just as those which were introduced by "Now of these words the teaching is this" were positive. The positive precepts belong to the lofty morality of the Sermon on the Mount; the negative precepts represent rather the morality of the Old Testament. The positive and the negative standards had both been given in the opening words, in the demand for love to God and the neighbour, followed by the negative form of the Golden Rule: "Love . . . love . . . and do not." It may be that his idea is thus to divide "the teaching," or fuller exposition, "of these words" into a first and second "command." It is unfortunate that he had used "first" and "secondly" of the two Great Commandments: for it obscures the meaning of "the *second* command of the teaching," which otherwise is quite easy to explain as the expansion of the negative form of the Golden Rule.

We go back again now to the group of positive precepts which is introduced by the phrase, "Now of these words the teaching is this." The whole of the section is dismissed as an interpolation by those critics who desire to give an early date to the Didache; and necessarily, of course, by those who regard the Two Ways as a Jewish document. It runs as follows:

*Bless them that curse you, and pray for your enemies, and fast for them that persecute you: for what thank is it, if ye love them that love you? Do not even the Gentiles the same? But do ye love them that hate you, and ye shall not have an enemy.*

We may pause here to note that the words of St Matthew and St Luke are welded together, so that express quotation is avoided; and strange additions are made (no doubt to add to the appearance of originality and independence of any written Gospel)

## 52 BARNABAS, HERMAS AND THE DIDACHE

—"fast for them that persecute you," and again, "and ye shall not have an enemy." After this the commands are in the second person singular instead of the second person plural: they still come from the Sermon on the Mount, where there is the same distinction between singular and plural. But the passage from plural to singular is here made by the introduction of a command which seems curiously out of place and recalls the language of 1 Pet. ii. 11.

*Abstain thou from fleshly and bodily lusts. If any man give thee a blow on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also, and thou shalt be perfect; if a man impress thee to go with him one mile, go with him twain; if a man take away thy cloak, give him thy coat also; if a man take away from thee that which is thine, ask it not back, for neither art thou able.*

Here we have a similar conflation of St Matthew and St Luke. A suggestion has been made that the writer used Tatian's Diatessaron: but the evidence for this completely breaks down under examination. We have again two supplements introduced. The first of these, "and thou shalt be perfect," is no doubt derived from Matt. v. 48: "Ye therefore shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect." It is of interest as an indication of unity of authorship, because we read in vi. 2, "If thou art able to bear the whole yoke of the Lord, thou shalt be perfect; but if thou art not able, do that which thou art able." The second supplement, "for neither art thou able," might possibly again suggest unity of authorship; but it is too small a point to press. We need only note that it seems curiously futile to say, "Ask it not back, for neither art thou able." This is not the only place where the Didachist's eagerness to appear original has led him into futility. Indeed we have another instance in the passage which follows, where

he blends the language of the Sermon on the Mount with that of the Shepherd of Hermas, and ends by contradicting them both.

*To every man that asketh of thee give, and ask not back ; for to all the Father desireth that there should be given of His own free-gifts. Blessed is he that giveth according to the commandment ; for he is guiltless. Woe to him that receiveth ; for if a man receiveth having need, he shall be guiltless ; but he that hath no need shall give satisfaction why and wherefore he received ; and being put in confinement he shall be examined concerning the deeds that he hath done, and he shall not come out thence until he have paid the uttermost farthing. But indeed concerning this it hath been said : Let thine alms sweat into thy hands, until thou know to whom thou shouldst give.*

At this point we must remind ourselves of the Second Mandate of the Shepherd. In enjoining Simplicity in giving Hermas started from the words of St James which speak of God "giving to all simply" (*ἀπλῶς*, unconditionally). "Give to all," he says, "for to all God desireth that there should be given of His own bounties." The receivers will give account to God for what cause and to what end they received. Those who received because they are in need will not be punished ; but those who receive under pretence will pay the penalty. So the giver is not responsible ; he, in any case, is "guiltless." For the giver had received of the Lord a ministration to fulfil, and he fulfilled it simply, not doubting to whom he should give or not give. Here the sequence of thought is perfect : Hermas knows what he wants to say and he says it. He faces the problem of indiscriminating charity and finds his own solution.

How then does the Didachist treat the matter ? He has been giving us garbled passages from the Sermon on the Mount, and has gone on : "*If a man*

## 54 BARNABAS, HERMAS AND THE DIDACHE

*take away from thee that which is thine, ask it not back, for neither art thou able. To every man that asketh of thee give, and ask not back.*" This is evolved out of the simpler statement of St Luke (v. 30): "To every one that asketh of thee give, and from him that taketh away that which is thine ask it not back." Hermas had not started from this text: he has nothing about asking or asking back. All who are in want he must help, whether they come and ask or not. So far then there is no point of contact between the two documents. But the Didachist proceeds: "for to all the Father desireth that there should be given of His own free-gifts." The corresponding sentence in Hermas was apposite enough; for he had started from the words of St James, though he had not quoted them: "God who giveth to all simply." No such connexion is to be found in the Didache. Moreover two words are changed: "the Father" is put instead of "God," and "free-gifts" (*charismata*) instead of the word which for sake of distinction we have rendered "bounties" (*doremata*). The former change is explicable, if we remember that the Didachist starts from the Sermon on the Mount, whereas Hermas starts from St James. But the change from "His own *doremata*" to "His own *charismata*" is strange. The word *doremata* is a striking one, and Hermas borrowed it from St James's "every perfect gift (*dorema*) is from above." But God is not spoken of as having *charismata* of "His own": it is men who have *charismata* from God. There is only one passage in the New Testament in which the expression "his own *charisma*" occurs (1 Cor. vii. 7): "Each man hath his own *charisma* of God" (ἐκαστος ἰδίον ἔχει χάρισμα ἐκ θεοῦ); and, considering the frequent borrowings from the First Epistle to the Corinthians in the latter part of the Didache, it would seem likely that this verse was in the writer's mind.

In any case it cannot reasonably be doubted that the passage as it stands in *Hermas* is original, and that as it stands in the *Didache* it is secondary.

The *Didachist* proceeds: "Blessed is he that giveth according to the commandment; for he shall be guiltless. Woe to him that receiveth." We may observe that the injunction to "give according to the commandment" occurs twice in the latter part of the *Didache* (xiii. 5, 7). Whatever "the commandment" there intended may be—and this has puzzled the commentators—"giving according to the commandment" cannot well have occurred independently to two writers; so that again we have an indication of unity of authorship.<sup>1</sup>

It has been suggested that in our present passage "the commandment" (ἡ ἐντολή) may actually refer to the Second Mandate or commandment (ἐντολή) of *Hermas*: but this is not very probable. The next words, however, are certainly from *Hermas*: "for he shall be guiltless." We understand the statement of *Hermas* that the giver shall be guiltless, because we know what he has said in defending indiscriminate giving, or "giving simply," as he calls it. But as the words stand in the *Didache* they are hardly intelligible.

In constructing the sentences, "Blessed is he that giveth according to the commandment; for he shall be guiltless. Woe to him that receiveth," the *Didachist* is again influenced by the great Sermon as it is recorded by St. Luke, where Blessings are balanced by Woes. But in the latter clause, "Woe to him that receiveth," we see how the love of paradox has betrayed the writer into absurdity. Blessed are the poor, Woe to the rich—this contrast and those which follow in Luke vi. 20 ff. are paradoxes indeed,

<sup>1</sup> It is very unlikely that a later interpolator would have picked out this phrase from the latter part of the book.

but full of spiritual meaning. We cannot set on the same level the Didachist's invention: Blessed is the giver, Woe to the receiver.

But we must hear him further: "Woe to him that receiveth; for if a man receiveth having need, he shall be guiltless"—but then why "Woe to the receiver"? "But he that hath no need shall give satisfaction (*δώσει δίκην*) why and wherefore he received; and being put in confinement he shall be examined concerning the deeds that he hath done." The phrase here rendered "give satisfaction" is compounded of two phrases in *Hermas*: "they shall render account (*ἀποδώσουσιν λόγον*) why they received and to what end," and "they who received under pretence shall pay the penalty" (*τίσουσιν δίκην*). To say, as the Didachist does, *δώσει δίκην*, "he shall give penalty (in the sense of "give account") why and wherefore," may not be quite impossible Greek, but at least it is very unusual.

The Didachist goes on with words from the Sermon on the Mount about "the uttermost farthing" (Matt. v. 26); and then adds his curious and unidentified quotation, which directly contradicts the teaching of *Hermas* as to giving unconditionally: "But indeed concerning this it hath been said: Let thine alms sweat into thy hands, until thou know to whom thou shouldst give." This was the doctrine of *Ecclesiasticus* (xii. 1): "If thou do good, know to whom thou doest it . . . Do good to the godly, and thou shalt find recompense, if not from him, yet from the Most High." But it is not the teaching of *Hermas*, who distinctly says, "not doubting to whom thou shouldst give or not give"; nor is it the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount.

We have now come to the end of what is commonly called the great Christian interpolation. We have observed in it two phrases which suggest that it is

written by the same hand as the latter part of the Didache. One is the phrase "thou shalt be perfect"; the other, "giving according to the commandment." Such evidence might seem to be slight, if we did not remember how small is the field in which we have to look for resemblances, and how different is the subject matter of the two parts of the book—the moral precepts and the ecclesiastical regulations. The whole passage occupies but eighteen lines of Lightfoot's text. Moreover most of the sentences can be directly traced either to the Sermon on the Mount or to the Shepherd of Hermas. Indeed only six are entirely the writer's own :

- (1) And ye shall not have an enemy.
- (2) And thou shalt be perfect.
- (3) For neither art thou able.
- (4) Blessed is he that giveth according to the commandment . . . Woe to him that receiveth.
- (5) And being put in confinement he shall be examined concerning the deeds that he hath done.
- (6) But indeed concerning this it hath been said.

We might fairly add this last also to our observed resemblances : for the same method of introducing a quotation (*εἶρηται*, "it hath been said," instead of the more usual *γέγραπται*, "it hath been written") recurs in the closing words of the Didache (xvi. 6), where a quotation from Zechariah is introduced by "it was said" (*ἐρρίθη*). And we shall remember that *ἐρρίθη* is thus used six times in the fifth chapter of St Matthew—"it was said to them of old time." We may also compare Did. ix. 5 : "for indeed concerning this the Lord hath said : Give not that which is holy to the dogs." In the Greek the parallel is striking : i. 6, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τούτου δὲ εἶρηται : ix. 5, καὶ γὰρ περὶ τούτου εἶρηκεν.

If we are to treat the Two Ways as a document

by itself, whether it was written by Barnabas or was a Jewish manual from which both Barnabas and the Didachist drew, then no doubt this passage may be called an interpolation; and in that case it will be an interpolation made by the author of the Didache as a whole. But it is surely much simpler to state the matter thus: The Didachist has begun with the scheme of the Two Ways, which as coming from Barnabas he regards as apostolic teaching. But he quickly shows his independence of a particular Apostle by making verbal changes, and by omitting all reference to angel or devil; then by adding a group of precepts, not worded exactly as in the Gospels, but such as Apostles might well have handed down to the Gentiles as their recollections of the great Sermon of our Lord. To these he appends precepts on almsgiving derived from Hermas, whom he may have considered a writer of the apostolic age, and who was undoubtedly quoted as "Scripture" in certain circles. Then with a quotation which we cannot identify he closes this first section of the Way of Life, which he had introduced by the words: "Now of these words the teaching is this."

We pass on now to the section which deals mainly with negative precepts: "The second command of the teaching." Here we come back to the Epistle of Barnabas, the language of which is followed somewhat closely, though the order of the sayings is much altered and a good many small insertions are made. Thus the Didachist proceeds:

*Thou shalt do no murder, thou shalt not commit adultery, thou shalt not corrupt boys, thou shalt not commit fornication, thou shalt not steal, thou shalt not practise magic, thou shalt not use drugs,<sup>1</sup> thou shalt not murder a child*

<sup>1</sup> Οὐ φαρμακείσεις might be rendered "thou shalt not practise sorcery"; but the words which follow suggest rather the use of poisonous drugs.

by abortion nor kill it when it is born, *thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's goods, thou shalt not forswear thyself, thou shalt not bear false witness, thou shalt not speak evil, thou shalt not bear a grudge.*

Barnabas had begun with quite a different set of precepts : some of these the Didachist drops, such as : "Thou shalt be simple in heart and rich in spirit. Thou shalt not be joined with them that walk in the way of death" : others he embodies later, some of them in a remodelled form. After eight of such precepts Barnabas had said : "Thou shalt not commit fornication, *thou shalt not commit adultery*, thou shalt not corrupt boys." But the Didachist prefers to make a much fuller catalogue, embodying the shorter precepts of the Ten Commandments. He also inserts "Thou shalt not practise magic, thou shalt not use drugs," which are not in Barnabas, but apparently are suggested by the *φαρμακεία, μαγεία*, "poisoning" (or "sorcery") and "magic," which occur later in the description of the Way of Darkness. We may note as characteristic of the Didachist that he has taken over "thou shalt not forswear thyself" (*οὐκ ἐπιιορκήσεις*) from the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. v. 33, the only place where it occurs), of which he has made so large a use already. Though he gives from Barnabas "thou shalt not bear a grudge," he omits the words "against thy brother." Barnabas, as we have seen, had framed his precept on Zechariah, from whom he got the words "against thy brother." Thus again the Didachist is seen to be secondary : he has abbreviated the precept of Barnabas, and has made it of general application.

To carry out fully this comparison of the Didache with Barnabas would take us too long, and we should need to have before us a complete table of parallels.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Such a table is given in Appendix B.

## 60 BARNABAS, HERMAS AND THE DIDACHE

We should find that the Didachist has rearranged the precepts so as to bring like to like, that he has recast many of them and omitted a few : his own additions are not very considerable. It must suffice here to give some instructive examples to show the method and the result of his alterations.

At the end of c. ii we read :

Thou shalt not hate any man, but some thou shalt reprove, and for some thou shalt pray, and some thou shalt love more than thine own soul.

Here we have a remarkable conglomerate. In Lev. xix. 17 f. we find the precepts : "Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thy mind : thou shalt surely reprove thy neighbour, and not bear sin because of him. And thy hand shall not take vengeance, and thou shalt not be wroth with the children of thy people, and thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." In Jude 22 f. we read, according to some early MSS : "But some reprove when they dispute with you, and some save plucking them out of the fire, and on some have mercy with fear, hating even the garment spotted by the flesh." The Didachist has taken the precepts of Leviticus without the limitation to the "brother" or "neighbour" : but he seems to borrow his construction from the passage in Jude. Most noticeable however is the debt to Barnabas. Barnabas had said, using a phrase which he had twice used before : <sup>1</sup> "Thou shalt love thy neighbour more than thine own soul" : but this sentiment would not suit the Didachist, who has already given the precept "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." Yet he knows and likes the phrase "more than thine own soul," and so he works it up into a new and less enthusiastic precept : "Some thou shalt love more than thine own soul."

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 18.

The passage which next follows (iii. 1-6) is not in Barnabas at all. It consists of the prohibition of five mortal sins—murder, adultery, idolatry, theft, and blasphemy. These prohibitions are constructed on a uniform and highly artificial plan, which presents several contrasts to all that has gone before. Each is introduced by the words “My child”: then follows the imperative “be not” (*μὴ γίνου*); whereas the future, “thou shalt not,” has been used hitherto. Further we are told that one sin “leadeth to” some other; and this is repeated by saying, “for from all these things” certain others “are engendered.” Such is the framework. But we must read the whole passage.

My child, flee from all evil, and all that is like unto it. Be not angry, for anger leadeth to murder; nor jealous nor contentious nor wrathful: for of all these things murders are engendered.

My child, be not lustful, for lust leadeth to fornication; nor foul-speaking nor with uplifted eyes: for of all these things adulteries are engendered.

My child, be not a dealer in omens, since it leadeth to idolatry; nor an enchanter nor an astrologer nor a magician, neither be willing to look at them: for of all these things idolatry is engendered.

My child, be not a liar, since lying leads to theft; nor avaricious nor vainglorious: for of all these things thefts are engendered.

My child, be not a murmurer, since it leadeth to blasphemy; nor selfwilled nor a thinker of evil thoughts: for of all these things blasphemies are engendered.

This group of five prohibitions has no counterpart in the Two Ways of Barnabas, and it is not like anything else in the whole of the Didache. Barnabas in his Epistle could not well have said “My child”; and the Didachist, if writing with a free hand, would hardly have introduced the pronoun of the first person

singular into the Teaching of the Apostles. It is true that, having used the phrase "My child" five times in this passage, he does use it again a few lines further down, where he is modifying a precept which he has taken over from Barnabas: but this need not cause us surprise; for, once it had come in, it could easily be used again. When we have realised how great a borrower the Didachist is, and how very few sentences of the Two Ways come entirely from his own pen, we are strongly inclined to think that he found this whole passage elsewhere, and transferred it with but little if any modification into his own book. Dr Taylor has insisted on the rabbinic character of the passage, which is in the spirit of the well-known injunction to "make a hedge about the Law," *i.e.* to forbid lesser sins as a security against the greater sins which are of a similar nature. Some apocryphal book, Jewish or early Christian, may have been the source from which the Didachist was borrowing.

Now Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* I. 25. 100) says: "This man is called by the Scripture a thief: it saith, Son, be not a liar, for lying leadeth to theft." This is the only passage in Clement of Alexandria in which it can be thought at all probable that he has used the Didache. Is it not perhaps more likely that the Scripture of which he speaks is some lost apocryphal book of which both he and the Didachist have made use? If this be so, we should no longer be faced with the difficulty that Clement quoted the Didache as Scripture on this one occasion, and yet never used it again; and that Clement's successor, Origen, should nowhere show any knowledge at all of the existence of the Didache.

The words which next follow in the Didache (iii. 7 f.) are an expansion of what Barnabas has said—"Thou shalt be meek, thou shalt be *quiet*, thou shalt be *trembling at the words* which thou hast heard."

This, as we saw, was based on Isa. lxvi. 12. The Didachist greatly expands it; and we note that the imperative is used instead of the future, as the result of his use of the imperative in the preceding passage.<sup>1</sup>

But be meek, since *the meek shall inherit the earth*. Be longsuffering and pitiful, without malice and *quiet* and kindly (*ἀγαθός*), and *trembling at the words* continually which thou hast heard.

It has been suggested by those who desire to make the Two Ways a Jewish document that "the meek shall inherit the earth" has been taken from Ps. xxxvii. 11. This is of course possible: but, in view of what we have already seen of the Didachist's method, it is needless to go beyond the familiar words of the Sermon on the Mount.

We pass on to the beginning of c. iv., a passage where the alterations of the language of Barnabas made by the Didachist are of a wider interest.

My child, him that speaketh unto thee the word of God thou shalt remember night and day, and shalt honour him as the Lord; for whencesoever the Lordship is spoken of, there the Lord is. And thou shalt seek out daily the persons of the saints, that thou mayest find rest in their words.

Here a wholly different turn is given to the striking exhortation which we found in Barnabas, who says:

Thou shalt love as the apple of thine eye every one that speaketh unto thee the word of the Lord. Thou shalt remember the day of judgment night and day, and shalt seek out each day the persons of the saints, either labouring by word and going forth to exhort them and studying to save a soul by the word, or with thy hands shalt thou work for a ransom of thy sins.

Barnabas is living in days of stress, and under a

<sup>1</sup> ἵσθι, followed by γίνου (cf. φεῦγε, followed by ἡ γίνου, above); whereas Barnabas has ἔσθ . . . ἔσθ.

sense of approaching judgment. The Christian Society must hold together, and each member of it must strive to help the rest. Some can do this by words of counsel, others have but humbler functions. But none must be idle and unhelpful. Towards all who bring messages of divine encouragement the warmest affection should go forth.

But the Didachist knows of no stress and feels no emotion. By the simple process of omission the stress and the emotion disappear. The first sentences had run: "Thou shalt love as the apple of thine eye every one that speaketh unto thee the word of the Lord. Thou shalt remember the day of judgment night and day." Omit "Thou shalt love as the apple of thine eye," and omit "the day of judgment": then join up the two sentences, and you have: "Every one that speaketh unto thee the word of the Lord thou shalt remember night and day." This is what the Didachist gives us, with a slight modification in the wording: he prefixes "My child," which he has used five times already just before; he omits "every one," and changes "the word of the Lord" into "the word of God": so that we now read, "My child, him that speaketh unto thee the word of God thou shalt remember night and day."

We can hardly doubt that in making this transformation he was guided by a recollection of Heb. xiii. 7: "Remember your leaders, who spake unto you the word of God." It is true that there the injunction was to cherish the memory of leaders who had passed away: but the temptation to manipulate the sentences of Barnabas in accordance with this text was too great for the ingenious compiler: he drops the enthusiastic phrase "Thou shalt love as the apple of thine eye"; and he takes "Thou shalt remember night and day" out of its context, where it was appropriately used of "the day of judgment," and joins

it incongruously enough with "him that speaketh unto thee the word of God." Then he compensates for his omissions by a strange insertion: "and thou shalt honour him as the Lord: for whencesoever the Lordship is spoken of, there the Lord is." The phrase "as the Lord" recurs twice in the latter part of his work, in one case of a teacher, in the other of an apostle: Did. xi. 2 and 4, "receive him as the Lord," and "he shall be received as the Lord." The presence of the Lord where "the Lordship is spoken of," or where the Lord's name is named, may be an eccentric paraphrase of the promise in the Gospel: "Where two or three are gathered in My name, there am I."

In the remainder of the passage the Didachist distorts yet more grossly the sentiment of the original. The command now is "to seek out daily the persons of the saints," not in order to help them, but to get the comfort of their words. The duty of warning and encouragement no longer rests on every member of the society who is capable of thus helping others: it has passed over to the professional teacher. The final clause is omitted altogether, and reappears as a separate precept a little lower down in the obscure form: *Ἐὰν ἔχῃς διὰ τῶν χειρῶν σου δώσεις λύτρωσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν σου*, which may mean: "If thou hast ought passing through thy hands, thou shalt give a ransom for thy sins"—the original idea of labouring with the hands having been obliterated.

Barnabas had closed his description of the Way of Light thus:

Thou shalt not make division, but shalt be at peace, bringing together them that contend. Thou shalt make confession of thy sins. Thou shalt not draw near to prayer in an evil conscience. This is the way of light.

We observed that the word *εἰρηνεύσεις* should be

## 66 BARNABAS, HERMAS AND THE DIDACHE

rendered "be at peace" or "keep the peace," and not "pacify"—the transitive use being rare and late. The Didachist however prefers the transitive use, and joins εἰρηνεύσεις with τοὺς μαχομένους, "thou shalt pacify them that contend." He has thus no use for συναγαγών, "bringing together": so he drops it out. Moreover he alters the position of the precept, giving it much earlier (iv. 6). The remainder of the passage he has in a modified form in iv. 14, as follows:

In church thou shalt confess thy transgressions, and shalt not come to thy prayer in an evil conscience. This is the way of life.

The phrase "in church," or "in the assembly" (ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ) is not found in Barnabas: but, oddly enough, the word that stands in the same position, though at the end of the previous sentence, is συναγαγών. Is it conceivable that the Didachist may have understood this as meaning "assembling together"? or may it have suggested to his mind the word συναγωγή? This is perhaps too fanciful; but it is just worth mentioning, for the coincidence is certainly remarkable.

Finally we may note that the Didachist speaks of confessing "transgressions" rather than "sins"; so too, when he is referring in a later passage to the Sunday Eucharist, he says (xiv. 1): "first confessing your transgressions"—another small item to be added to the evidences of unity of authorship between the first and second sections of the book.

On the Way of Death in the Didache we need not dwell. Here Barnabas is much more closely followed; but the Didachist has changed the order in the list of sins, and he has added some sins to the list, thus bringing it more into line with his own presentation of the Way of Life.

In the closing chapter of the Didache we have a

series of warnings as to the last times and the end of the world. It is necessary that we should glance at some of these, because we find in them clear proof that the Didachist borrowed from the earlier part of the Epistle of Barnabas, and not only from the Two Ways at its close.

*Be watchful for your life : let your lamps be not quenched and your loins not ungirded, but be ye ready, for ye know not the hour when our Lord cometh.*

We observe as before, that he will not quote directly : he will not say, for example, with St Luke (xii. 35) : " Let your loins be girded about and your lamps burning." He proceeds thus :

And frequently shall ye be assembled together, seeking what is fitting for your souls. For the whole time of your faith will not profit you, if ye be not perfected in the last time. For in the last days the false prophets shall be multiplied, etc.

Now Barnabas had said, near the beginning of his Epistle (iv. 9) :

Wherefore let us take heed in the last days. For the whole time of our faith will profit us nothing, if we do not now, in the iniquitous time and in the offences that are to come, resist as becometh sons of God, that the Black One may not effect a subtle entrance.

This is characteristic of Barnabas. "The last days" are those in which he and his readers are living. "Now, in the iniquitous time," they must hold together and keep out the Black One. They have no right, he goes on to say, to withdraw themselves in solitary superiority : they must come to the common meeting and take counsel for the common good. But for the Didachist "the last time" and "the last days" are in the future—not in the present, as they were for Barnabas, who was dealing with a real

## 68 BARNABAS, HERMAS AND THE DIDACHE

situation of anxiety and peril. The Didachist's "last days" are a literary reminiscence of Matt. xxiv. 10 ff. : "And they shall hate one another ; and many false prophets shall arise and shall deceive many ; and because iniquity is multiplied the love of many shall wax cold." So the Didachist, picking up from Barnabas "the last days," writes :

For in the last days the false prophets and corrupters shall be multiplied ; and the sheep shall be turned into wolves, and love shall be turned into hate : for as iniquity increaseth they shall hate one another.

He has in mind another reference in St Matthew (vii. 11) to false prophets, who "go about in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves." When they divest themselves of their disguise, "the sheep shall be turned into wolves." So too the love, which in the Gospel is said to wax cold, is here said to be turned into hate.

The remainder of this chapter has several points of interest, but it would not be to our purpose to consider them now. Enough has been said to show that the method of the Didachist in recasting sentences of the Gospel is the same as in his great insertion at the beginning of the Way of Life ; and also that he was acquainted with the Epistle of Barnabas as a whole, and not merely with the Two Ways which comes at its close.

## IV

### EPILOGUE

**W**HERE now do we stand at the end of our inquiry? In all investigations dealing with the origin and historical significance of literary works large allowance must be made for the subjective element. We all start with our presuppositions, and we all find it difficult to abandon conclusions to which our former studies may have led us. Moreover in this region it is specially true that arguments which appeal to one mind are by no means convincing to another: so that a consensus of opinion is not easily attained. The problem of the Didache will perhaps never be completely solved: its mysterious author at any rate has done his best to make it insoluble. Some new document may possibly be discovered which will throw a fresh light on the history of its composition. Meanwhile we must contribute what we can to the process of elucidation, conscious of the imperfection of our own treatment of the subject, and hoping that where we are wrong others by their unsparing criticism will help to set us right.

With these reserves, which are due to the importance of the matter in hand, we may state our results in the briefest form as follows:

1. The Two Ways is the original work of the author of the Epistle of Barnabas.

2. It was known to Hermas in this its earliest form, which spoke of angels of good and evil.

## 70 BARNABAS, HERMAS AND THE DIDACHE

3. The writer of the Didache found the Two Ways in Barnabas, and adopted it as the scheme of the moral teachings which form the first section of his book. He used it with great freedom, amplifying it with precepts from the Old Testament, from the Sermon on the Mount, from the Shepherd of Hermas and from elsewhere. He rearranged its clauses so as to produce a more satisfactory order, and he gave his own interpretation to passages which he found obscure or uncongenial. Notwithstanding his omission or abbreviation of many sentences of the original, he increased the bulk of the Two Ways by more than one-third. He placed it at the head of his work as an instruction to be given to candidates for Holy Baptism. In so doing his intention was to put it forward as a part of that "Teaching of the Lord through the Twelve Apostles to the Gentiles," which was presumably given in obedience to the Last Command recorded in the Gospel according to St Matthew.

Something must now be said to draw out the significance of these conclusions, and to meet the objections which may reasonably be brought against them.

The Two Ways, thus borrowed from Barnabas and recast by the Didachist, entered on a new history. It was embodied in various forms by subsequent writers; as, for example, in a Church Order, in a homily, in a manual of instruction for ascetics. These writers abbreviated it and otherwise modified it for their own purposes; in some instances recurring to the original form in the Epistle of Barnabas, and also in one case at least inserting words from the Shepherd of Hermas.

In 1886 Dr Charles Taylor, then Master of St John's College, Cambridge, struck by the rabbinic character of much of the Didache, propounded the

view that the Two Ways was originally a Jewish manual intended for the instruction of proselytes. We need not give examples of the parallels which he collected, for we have no interest in denying the rabbinic cast of much of the Two Ways. This is indeed just what we should expect after our study of the earlier part of the Epistle of Barnabas.

The very wide acceptance at once given to this theory led to a much earlier dating, not only of the Two Ways, but also of the second part of the Didache. For the theory of a Jewish origin necessarily involved the rejection, as a Christian interpolation, of a considerable passage near the beginning which was largely derived from the Sermon on the Mount and contained sentences of the Shepherd of Hermas. If this passage was a later addition, the reasons which had made it impossible to give an earlier date than from 140 to 160 were no longer cogent. Then again, if the Epistle of Barnabas had not after all been used—if both Barnabas and the Didachist had embodied, each after his own fashion, the earlier Jewish Two Ways, the date of the uninterpolated Didache might be fixed without reference to Barnabas at all.

The new theory gained support from the absence of what was called the Christian interpolation from almost all the later writers who had made use of the Two Ways. It was absent from the Epistle of Barnabas, and from the fragmentary manuscript which gave a Latin translation of the first portion of the Two Ways: it was absent from the curious manual commonly spoken of as "The Apostolic Church Order," in which the Two Ways is divided into sections assigned to the various Apostles: it was absent also from the *Syntagma* attributed to St Athanasius, and from the *Fides Nicaena* dependent on this *Syntagma*: it was absent, lastly, from the Arabic version of a discourse delivered by the Egyptian

## 72 BARNABAS, HERMAS AND THE DIDACHE

abbot Schnudi. The one writer who recognises it is the compiler of the Seventh Book of the Apostolic Constitutions, which is founded on the Didache in the final and "interpolated" form in which we know it.

The most able exponent of this change of view was Dr Harnack, and we shall find it instructive to trace the process of his thought upon the subject. In 1884, when he brought out his remarkable edition, he had affirmed the judgment of the first editor, Bryennius, maintaining that the Didache embodied the language both of Barnabas and of Hermas, and therefore could not be earlier than c. 140–160. The fact that the precepts of the Two Ways were an incongruous medley in Barnabas, whereas in the Didache their order was far more systematic, convinced him that Barnabas must give us the original and the Didache the ordered recension. It was inconceivable, he held, that if Barnabas had the more systematic form in front of him he could have deliberately thrown it into such confusion. The strange picture of ecclesiastical institutions which the second section of the Didache presented was of course exceedingly difficult to reconcile with so late a date. Hence it came to pass that Harnack and other excellent critics—Dr Salmon among them—enthusiastically welcomed the relief offered by Dr Taylor's theory. Before the end of 1886 Harnack had implicitly accepted it,<sup>1</sup> and he presently developed it in the article "Apostellehre" in the *Realencyclopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*. His latest judgment, so far as I know, is to be found in the second issue (1896) of his smaller edition entitled "The Teaching of the Apostles and the Two Ways." He there sums up the results of critical investigation as follows :

1. The Didache, as we have it, shows use of

<sup>1</sup> *Texte u. Unters.*, II. 5. 1.

Barnabas and probably of Hermas. It probably belongs to the period 140–160—not later than 160, since Clement of Alexandria quotes it as “Scripture.”

2. But a Jewish Manual, “The Two Ways,” lies behind both this and Barnabas.

3. It is reasonable to postulate a Christianised “Two Ways” with an enlargement on Church Ordinances, issued as “The Teaching of the Apostles”—without the section near the beginning which borrows from the Sermon on the Mount and from Hermas. This may go back to 120 A.D.—but not earlier, for two generations of Christianity must lie behind it.

4. He offers a tentative reconstruction of the Jewish “Two Ways” from the various documents enumerated above.

This presentation of the literary history enables him to take back the Church Ordinances contained in the Didache to 120 A.D.—a date at which he considers they might still have been current in some remote corner of Christendom, possibly somewhere in Egypt. They would thus be important witnesses to an early stage of Church development beyond which other regions had by this time advanced.

There are two arguments urged in favour of this theory which deserve to be carefully considered, even by those who are already convinced by our present investigations that the Didache as it stands is the work of a single author, who has borrowed both from Barnabas and from Hermas, and who therefore cannot have written before the period c. 140–160: (1) the absence of the so-called interpolation from a number of writers who have made use of the Two Ways; and (2) the exclusively Jewish character of the Two Ways, when purged of this “interpolation” and of one or two minor insertions of a Christian type.

(1) The absence of this “interpolated” section

## 74 BARNABAS, HERMAS AND THE DIDACHE

from Barnabas needs no explanation for those who believe that Barnabas was the original author of the Two Ways, and that the Didachist borrowed his work and modified it in the way that we have described.

Its absence from the Latin version of the Didache is at first sight a serious objection. But when Dr Harnack was writing in 1896 only a fragment of this was known. Since that date the whole has been discovered, and we now find that it is not strictly speaking a Latin version of the Didache, but a Latin homily based on the first part of the Didache only. It occurs among a number of other Latin homilies, and is headed, *De Doctrina Apostolorum*. At the end the homilist has added some brief sentences of his own, and he concludes after the manner of a preacher with the formula : "through the Lord Jesus Christ, who reigneth and ruleth with God the Father and the Holy Spirit, world without end. Amen."

But there is more than this to be said. Not only has he used great freedom in omission and alteration, but he has gone on his own account both to Barnabas and to Hermas to supplement what he presumably found in his copy of the Didache. Thus he begins :

There are two ways in the world, of life and of death, of light and of darkness. On these are stationed two angels, one of equity, the other of iniquity. But there is great difference between the two ways. The way therefore of life is this : first, thou shalt love the eternal God who made thee ; secondly, thy neighbour as thyself. But all that thou wouldst not have done to thee, do not to another.

Now the interpretation of these words is this : Thou shalt not commit adultery, thou shalt do no murder, etc.

The first thing we observe is that he has gone back to Barnabas for the terms "of light and of darkness," adding them to those which the Didachist had preferred, "of life and of death." Secondly, he gives

us back the angels of good and evil, whom the Didachist had removed. But like Hermas he gives us only two, an angel of righteousness and an angel of unrighteousness; and he uses the rather peculiar phraseology of the Old Latin version of Hermas, "of equity" and "of iniquity" (*aequitatis* and *iniquitatis*).

That the homilist omits the so-called interpolation, which begins "Bless them that curse you," may be due to the fact that he saw that it was not in Barnabas. He may also have been influenced by his desire to abbreviate, which appears elsewhere; and he may have been glad to be relieved of a passage which gave the words of the Gospel in so strangely garbled a form.

It is further to be noted that, though the homilist has omitted the so-called interpolation, yet at a later point he introduces a sentence which occurs in it: "For to all the Lord desireth that there should be given of His own gifts." The sentence was borrowed by the Didachist from Hermas, and we must allow for the possibility that the homilist took it independently from the same source.<sup>1</sup>

The absence of the "interpolation" from the document called "The Apostolic Church Order" (or the *Ἐπιτομή ὁρων*) is quite as readily accounted for as its absence from the Latin homily. Here again the writer has the Epistle of Barnabas before him. Indeed his opening words, "All hail, sons and daughters," are the first words of the Epistle itself; and presently

<sup>1</sup> The homilist has: "Omnibus enim dominus dare vult de donis suis." Hermas has "God," and the Didachist has "the Father," whereas the homilist has "the Lord." It is to be observed that the homilist has a preference for using the word "Lord." Thus for "the fear of God" in the Didache he says "the fear of the Lord"; for "the word of God," "the word of the Lord God"; for "the same God," "the same Lord"; and for "fearing God," "fearing the Lord." The order of the words follows Hermas rather more closely than the Didache; but it is doubtful whether much stress should be laid on this.

we find that he has restored words of Barnabas that the Didachist had dropped. The fact that the "interpolation" was not in Barnabas may have been his reason for omitting it. Moreover he gives but selections from the Two Ways, and distributes them among the different Apostles; "John said: There are two ways," etc.; "Matthew said," "Peter said," and so forth. We can well understand that he might shrink from assigning to any particular Apostle such words as "Bless them that curse you," etc. We may the more readily believe that he had the whole passage before him and consciously omitted it, when we note that he omitted the whole of the latter part of the Didache, though his acquaintance with it is shown by his including at an earlier point the words "spiritual food and drink and life eternal," which come in the tenth chapter of the Didache.

Little stress can now be laid on the other instances of omission, such as the *Syntagma* of St Athanasius and the discourse of Abbot Schnudi: the writers took what they wanted, and left out what did not attract them—perhaps even repelled them. Thus the external evidence for the "interpolation" theory, which for the moment looked so strong, breaks down when it is carefully examined.

(2) We have now to consider the argument which is drawn from the exclusively Jewish character of the Two Ways, when it has been purged of the great "interpolation" and of some minor insertions of a Christian type.

We have already said that there is no reason for surprise if the Two Ways, as originally written by Barnabas at the close of his Epistle, should offer characteristically rabbinic features. For the earlier portion of the Epistle is saturated with Jewish doctrine of the rabbinic type. It is worth while to emphasise his point by an example which is exactly on a par

with some of the parallels which Dr Taylor produced. In c. xi Barnabas is seeking for Old Testament references to the Water and the Cross, and he quotes from the First Psalm: "He shall be like the tree planted at the parting of the waters, which shall give his fruit in his season; and his leaf shall not fall off, and whatsoever he doeth shall prosper." He goes on to comment thus:

Ye perceive how He pointed out the water and the cross at the same time. For this is the meaning: Blessed are they that set their hope on the cross, and go down into the water. For He speaketh of the reward *in his season*. Then, saith He, I will repay. But now what saith He? *His leaves shall not fall off*. He meaneth by this that every word which shall come forth from you through your mouth, in faith and love, shall be for the conversion and hope of many.

Here we have a Christian *gnosis* of Baptism, the Cross, and the Future Reward "in due season." But the passage is not exhausted; it has a promise for the present also: "But now what saith He? *His leaves shall not fall off*." This is explained to mean that even now the Christian's faithful and loving words of counsel shall not be uttered in vain. The interpretation seems to us far fetched. It is for that reason all the more interesting to compare with it the Talmudic saying:

Whence comes it that the common words of the learned deserve notice and attention? From the word of the Scripture, *His leaf withers not, and all that he doeth is effectual*.<sup>1</sup>

With such passages as these in our mind we shall not be disposed to deprive Barnabas of the authorship of the Two Ways on the ground that its language has

<sup>1</sup> "Succa. 21, Abod. sar. 19": quoted by Hilgenfeld from Guedemann.

a decidedly rabbinic cast. But we must pass on to our immediate task of examining the statement that the original Two Ways, as critically reconstructed by those who have adopted Dr Taylor's theory, proves to be an exclusively Jewish document.

Fortunately for our purpose Dr Harnack has printed a tentative reconstruction made from a comparison of all the documents in which the Two Ways finds a place.<sup>1</sup> This reconstruction contains certain passages in square brackets, which it is thought may perhaps have been absent from the Jewish original: with these doubtful portions we shall not in the first instance concern ourselves. We shall take certain passages about which no doubt is expressed, and consider whether they do not suggest the hand of a Christian rather than a Jewish writer. Some repetition of what has been already said about these passages will be inevitable.

1. The negative form of the Golden Rule, in the words in which we find it in the Didache, is accepted as a part of the original Jewish work. But we have suggested that the Didachist took this negative precept from the Apostolic Decree, as it is given in the "Western text" of the Acts of the Apostles; and that he altered it so as to bring it into a closer verbal conformity to the positive precept in the Sermon on the Mount—from which Sermon he goes on to make considerable borrowings in the immediate context.<sup>2</sup> The words "All things whatsoever thou wouldst not" are moulded on the "All things whatsoever ye would" in Matt. vii. 12. Among the various forms in which this negative precept is preserved, none which is independent of the Didache shows this point of contact with the wording of the Sermon on the Mount.

<sup>1</sup> *Die Apostellehre und die Jüdischen Beiden Wege* (1896), pp. 57 ff.

<sup>2</sup> See above, pp. 47 ff.

2. In Did. ii. 3 we have the command, *Ὁὐκ ἐπιτορκήσεις*, "Thou shalt not forswear thyself." This command appears in the presumed Jewish document. But it is another of the Didachist's additions to Barnabas. There is no such command in the LXX. Surely it has come from the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. v. 38).<sup>1</sup>

3. In ii. 12 of the reconstructed document we read : " But some thou shalt reprove, and on some thou shalt have mercy, and for some thou shalt pray, and some thou shalt love more than thine own soul." We have spoken already of this combination of a characteristic phrase of Barnabas with words suggested by Jude 23.<sup>2</sup>

4. In iv. 2 we have : " Thou shalt seek out daily the persons of the saints." This use of the word " saints " is certainly more natural in a Christian than in a Jewish book. We have dealt above with the whole context of this passage, which confirms our view that we have here a Christian hand.<sup>3</sup>

5. In iv. 8 we read : " Thou shalt share in all things with thy neighbour, and shalt not say that they are thine own " (*οὐκ ἐρεῖς ἴδια εἶναι*). Is it reasonable to doubt that these last words come from Acts iv. 32 ?

This list of examples could easily be increased if we were to consider the passages inserted in the reconstructed document within square brackets ; as, for example, in iv. 10 : " For He cometh not to call according to persons, but to those whom the Spirit hath prepared "—a sentence derived from Barn. xix. 7, where the language is still nearer to that of Matt. ix. 13.<sup>4</sup> But it is not necessary to press the matter further. We may be confident that no reconstruction,

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 59.

<sup>2</sup> See above, p. 60.

<sup>3</sup> P. 63.

<sup>4</sup> It is possible that doubt would not have been cast on this clause, if it had been known in 1896 that the words were in the Latin homily.

## 80 BARNABAS, HERMAS AND THE DIDACHE

based on a critical comparison of the various texts, will give us a purely Jewish Two Ways—especially since the evidence of the remainder of the Latin homily has become available. The only process by which such a result could be reached would be the elimination of Christian elements on the sole ground that they were Christian ; but this would be merely a form of begging the question, and such a method could not be adopted by the scholars who have hitherto dealt with the matter.<sup>1</sup>

The result of this examination is that neither external nor internal evidence supports the theory of a Jewish manual which has been variously embodied in the Epistle of Barnabas, in the Didache, and possibly in other early writings. We are thus free to maintain the belief of the earliest editors of the Didache that the Two Ways was borrowed from Barnabas and reduced to a more formal order by the Didachist, who moreover enlarged it by the insertion of matter taken from the Sermon on the Mount, from Hermas and from other writers, and prefixed it to his treatise on apostolic ordinances, as representing the instructions which were given in apostolic times to candidates for Baptism. An investigation of the remainder of his treatise would confirm our impression of his peculiar method of composition and of the general purpose of his work. Such an investigation has, as I have said, been partially attempted elsewhere, but it is beyond the scope of our present inquiry.<sup>2</sup>

It will, however, be natural to ask in conclusion how far, in view of what we have seen, it is now possible

<sup>1</sup> In a valuable work entitled "The Oldest Christian Catechism and the Jewish Propaganda-Literature" (Berlin, 1909), Dr. Klein has adopted the theory of a Jewish Two Ways, and has sought to illustrate it afresh out of the stores of his rabbinic learning. His book contains much that is of extraordinary interest, and that cannot readily be found elsewhere : but on this particular problem he does not appear to me to throw any further light.

<sup>2</sup> See Appendix A.

to suggest limits of date for the composition of the Didache. The use of Barnabas and Hermas prevents our putting it earlier than the middle of the second century. But how much later we might reasonably go, it is not easy to say. For once we have perceived that the writer's aim is to represent the teaching and practice not of his own but of apostolic days, we need no longer ask what part of the Church could have maintained so primitive an organisation to so late a date. We must look for guidance rather to the vocabulary which the author employs, and more especially to the references which later writers make to his work.

It has been held, as we have said already, that a passage of the Didache is quoted as "Scripture" by Clement of Alexandria.<sup>1</sup> If this be so, then the Didache cannot be put later than about the year 170. But we have seen good reason for thinking that both the Didachist and Clement borrowed the passage from elsewhere. In three other passages Clement uses language which can be paralleled from the Didache,<sup>2</sup> but it can be more naturally accounted for by his use of the Epistle of Barnabas to which he frequently refers. There is one other passage which calls for our consideration, a passage in which an allusion to one of the Thanksgivings in the second part of the Didache has been found.<sup>3</sup> Clement in his interpretation of the parable of the Good Samaritan speaks of Christ as pouring in "wine, the blood of David's vine." Now in the Didache we read: "We thank thee, O our Father, for the holy vine of David Thy servant, which Thou hast made known to us through Jesus Thy servant." In Clement "the vine of David" would seem to be Christ Himself, who pours in the

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 62.

<sup>2</sup> *Paed.* II. 10 (89, 1): III. 12 (89, 1): *Protrept.* 10 (108, 5).

<sup>3</sup> Clem. Alex. *Quis dives salvetur* ? 29, 4.

wine that is His own blood. But in the Didache this can hardly be intended: for "the vine of David" is "*made known* to us *through* Jesus"; and thus it stands parallel to "the life and knowledge," and again to "the knowledge and faith and immortality," which are also said to be "*made known* to us *through* Jesus." Nor is there any suggestion in the Thanksgiving of the Didache that the Cup is connected with the Blood of Christ. It seems, then, hardly conceivable that Clement should have been indebted to the Didache for his phrase, "wine, the blood of David's vine." The same may be said of a passage in Origen where we read: "before we are inebriated with the blood of the true vine which rises up from David's root."<sup>1</sup> By the mention of "blood" this passage is more nearly allied to the words of Clement of Alexandria than to those of the Didache: but "David's vine" is a figure of speech which might readily occur to more than one writer.

If indeed Clement had once quoted the Didache as "Scripture," it would be strange that he should never have quoted it again, and not less strange that in the voluminous works of Origen no certain trace of it should anywhere be found. If neither Clement of Alexandria nor Origen was acquainted with the Didache—and this, if not quite certain, seems very probable—it may be a third-century document. Some points of vocabulary, which cannot be dealt with here, would be more easily explained if that were the case.

But the date has become a matter of comparatively small moment, when once we have recognised the author's ruling principle. He is deliberately constructing an apostolic monument: he is describing what presumably was the apostolic ordering of the Gentile Churches. Incidentally he betrays himself

<sup>1</sup> Homily VI. on *Judges* (Lomm. XI. 258).

here and there by using the language of post-apostolic writers, or by attributing to the apostolic age practices which undoubtedly belong to a later period. His object may have been to recall the Church of his own day to a greater simplicity by presenting this picture of the primitive Christian Society. If so, he was following an instinct which has guided good men in later times, though their methods have been less imaginative than his. We may admire his diligence in research and the ingenuity with which he presents his results : but we must be exceedingly wary if we look to him for history.



## APPENDIX A

### THE PROBLEM OF THE DIDACHE <sup>1</sup>

THE Didache, or Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, has been before the world nearly thirty years. It was published in 1883 by its discoverer Bryennius, who showed in his learned Greek commentary that the new book had many points of contact with Christian documents already known. Further parallels were soon collected by Harnack, Rendel Harris, and other scholars. Harnack with amazing rapidity issued his great edition in 1884, and appended to it a full discussion of the origins of the Christian Ministry, basing on the new document a theory which he has since but little modified, and which in its main features has been widely accepted. A few years later Dr C. Taylor argued that the first part of the book was derived almost entirely from a Jewish manual of ethical instruction, called from its opening words the Two Ways. Criticism was then directed to the reconstruction of this Jewish manual, and to the question whether it had already been in circulation as a Christian manual before it was embodied in the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles. Moreover the whole series of quotations and references in patristic literature had to be examined afresh, to see how far they were explained by the use of the Two Ways alone, and how far they implied an acquaintance with the Teaching in its fuller form. In 1900 Joseph Schlecht published a complete text of the Latin version of which a small

<sup>1</sup> This essay appeared as an article in the *Journal of Theological Studies* in April, 1912. The opening paragraphs are in part contradicted by what I have said in the present Lectures: but I have thought it best to reprint it without change, although its argument could now be considerably amplified and strengthened.

fragment only was already known. This version offers us the Two Ways in what appears to be very nearly its original form, but as a Christian manual bearing the title *De Doctrina Apostolorum*.

The result of these and other investigations has been to show that the Two Ways, either as a Jewish or as a Christian manual, had a considerable vogue in early times ; but that the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles has left comparatively few traces of its circulation—hardly any, indeed, which are of value for determining its date. Much light has been thrown on the antecedents of the first part of the book ; but the second part, which deals with Church order, is still an unsolved riddle. It does not seem to fit in anywhere, in either time or place. The community which it presupposes is out of relation to all our knowledge of Church history. It is as much an isolated phenomenon after all our researches as when it surprised us at its first appearance. We still ask, Where was there ever a Church which celebrated the Eucharist after the manner here enjoined ? Where was there ever a Church which refused to allow Apostles more than a two days' stay ?

The object of the present paper is to attack the problem afresh through an investigation of the author's indebtedness to the writings of St Paul and St Luke. Such an inquiry may seem to be foredoomed to failure : for Harnack has declared that there is no decisive instance of any acquaintance with St Paul's Epistles ; and that, even if it be admitted that the author had seen them, he certainly did not regard them as in any sense authoritative : moreover quite recently the late Bishop John Wordsworth pronounced a similar judgment. Now I believe that this conclusion is one which the writer fully intended should be drawn ; but I shall be disappointed if I cannot show that he has used the writings of St Paul, St Luke, and even St John, though he has been at great pains to conceal his obligations.

We must begin with an examination of the title, and an inquiry into the author's intention in framing it. Although the book is frequently referred to as the Teaching of the Apostles, it is possible that this short title ought now to be

confined to the Christian recension of the Two Ways, which is preserved to us in the Latin version. The manuscript which Bryennius discovered gives us two titles: first of all, *Διδαχὴ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων*, and then, as the first line of the text itself, *Διδαχὴ Κυρίου διὰ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων τοῖς ἔθνεσιν*.

The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles may have been the brief title by which the author himself proposed that his work should be familiarly known; for it was the Apostolic tradition—the instructions delivered by the Twelve—that he claimed to record. But the ultimate sanction of the tradition is expressed in the fuller title which is an integral part of the book itself: "The teaching of the Lord through the Twelve Apostles to the Gentiles."

The substance of this longer title is undoubtedly drawn from Matt. xxviii. 19 f., the commission to "the eleven disciples": *Πορευθέντες οὖν μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίζοντες (v. l. βαπτίσαντες) αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, διδάσκοντες αὐτοὺς τηρεῖν πάντα ὅσα ἐνετειλάμην ὑμῖν*. The same passage is referred to after the conclusion of the moral precepts which constitute the first part of the Teaching (namely the Two Ways), when the writer in speaking of Baptism says: *Ταῦτα πάντα προειπόντες, βαπτίσατε εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος*.

It is plain that the writer professes to record what the Apostles taught to the Gentiles (*πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*), whom they were commissioned to instruct and baptise. The "eleven disciples" who are the repository of the Lord's teaching for the instruction of the Gentiles, become, by the addition of St Matthias, the Twelve Apostles; and thus we have the full explanation of the title, "The Teaching of the Lord through the Twelve Apostles to the Gentiles."

How then does the writer proceed in order to produce a book which shall correspond to this title? He starts off with the words "There are two ways," and he embodies apparently the whole of a pre-existing manual of moral instruction. It is quite possible that it lay before him in its Christian form, already entitled the Teaching of the Apostles: indeed, this title may have given him the cue for his own more elaborate work. After copying

a few sentences he introduces a considerable interpolation (i. 3 b–ii. 1), which is largely taken from the Sermon on the Mount. He does not, however, quote our Lord's words exactly; for it is not his purpose to give us the Sayings of the Lord, but rather His precepts as conveyed through His Apostles: so he purposely blends the language of the First and Third Gospels, and further shows his independence by such a modification as "Fast for them that persecute you." We note at once this characteristic of his method: we shall have opportunities of observing it further as we proceed.

Having thus, with the welcome aid of the Two Ways, constructed a representation of the teaching given by the Twelve Apostles to the Gentiles as preliminary to Baptism, he enters upon a task demanding more originality: namely the presentation of their teaching as to the method of Baptism, the celebration of the Eucharist, and other points of Church order. It is of the first importance that we should bear in mind that what he sets himself to record is the teaching given by the Apostles to the Church of their day. It is not as his own book, but as theirs, that he puts out this manual of Church discipline. He has no care, as other authors had, to invent a plausible situation to explain how this teaching was formulated or came to his knowledge: he prefers to remain in the background, and allow the Teaching to win its way to acceptance on its merits. The book no doubt is coloured by the circumstances of his own time and place; and yet so little coloured that no one has ever been able to give convincing proof either of its locality or of its date. In attempting to interpret it we must constantly remember that two elements are everywhere present: the writer's desire to say nothing that might not be supposed to have been said by the Apostles, and his desire to issue instructions which should have some bearing on the Church life of his day. It is just because he has combined these elements so skilfully, that we cannot either date or locate him.

Our author's obligations to the Two Ways end with the warning: "See that none make thee err from this way of teaching; otherwise he instructeth thee apart from

God." The Latin version contains a few more clauses after this :—

"Hæc in consulendo si cottidie feceris, propo eris vivo deo : quod si non feceris, longe eris a veritate. hæc omnia tibi in animo pone, et non decip(i)eris de spe tua ; sed per hæc sancta certamina pervenies ad coronam ; per dominum Iesum Christum regnantem et dominantem cum deo patre et spiritu sancto in sæcula sæculorum. Amen."

Our author has nothing of this. Indeed, he has quite another message : for, in contrast to the requirement that all the precepts must be observed, he introduces the principle of a higher and a lower standard of Christian living. Two passages of St Matthew's Gospel are ringing in his ears : "Ye shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect" (v. 48), and "If thou wilt be perfect, go, sell that thou hast, and give to the poor" (xix. 21). On the first he has already played in his interpolation from the Sermon on the Mount : "Turn to him also the other cheek, and thou shalt be perfect" ; and both are in his mind in the words which follow here :—

Εἰ μὲν γὰρ δύνασαι βαστάσαι ὅλον τὸν ζυγὸν τοῦ κυρίου, τέλειος ἔσῃ· εἰ δ' οὐ δύνασαι, ὃ δύνῃ, τοῦτο ποίει.

Περὶ δὲ τῆς βρώσεως, ὃ δύνασαι βάσταςον· ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ εἰδωλοθύτου λίαν πρόσεχε· λατρεία γάρ ἐστι θεῶν νεκρῶν.

These words form the transition from the first to the second part of the Teaching, and they deserve to be studied with care. We must begin by asking ourselves, What Apostolic sanction could the writer have found for this doctrine of a higher and a lower observance, and for the precept "Do what thou canst" ? We naturally think first of the Conference at Jerusalem, which refused to lay on the Gentiles a yoke that even Jews found too heavy to bear, but yet insisted that they must by all means abstain from meats offered to idols. Here we discover much of the phraseology of our passage : ἐπιθεῖναι ζυγὸν ἐπὶ τὸν τράχηλον τῶν μαθητῶν, ὃν οὔτε οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν οὔτε ἡμεῖς ἰσχύσαμεν βαστάσαι, Acts xv. 10 ; and in v. 28, ἀπέχεσθαι εἰδωλοθύτων, κ.τ.λ. Further, "the yoke of the Lord" recalls "My yoke" (Matt. xi. 29).

But although the passage in the Acts is indubitably in the writer's mind, it does not really sanction two possible courses, a higher and a lower, but rather makes a distinction between Jewish and Gentile converts in regard to ritual requirements. Such a sanction is, however, found in St Paul's advice concerning Virgins in 1 Cor. vii. 25-40, where we have a series of examples in which the Apostle offers two permissible courses, of which one in his judgment is the better and more consonant with Christian devotion. I should not venture to put St Paul's *ὃ θέλει, ποιείτω* (1 Cor. vii. 36) side by side with our author's *ὃ δύνῃ, τοῦτο ποίει*, if it were not that there is strong reason for believing that considerable use has been made in the Teaching of this part of the Corinthian Epistle.<sup>1</sup> The very next topic to which the Apostle turns is the question of idol-meats, and there is a curious coincidence, if it be nothing more, in the language of 1 Cor. viii. 4, *περὶ τῆς βρώσεως οὖν τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων, οἶδαμεν ὅτι οὐδὲν εἶδωλον ἐν κόσμῳ, κ.τ.λ.*

But indeed I think we shall have to admit that there is more than coincidence, or at any rate that there are at this point more coincidences than one. Let us observe how the Apostle divides this part of his Epistle into sections introduced by the formula "Now concerning . . ."

- Περὶ δὲ ὧν ἐγράψατε . . . vii. 1.*  
*Περὶ δὲ τῶν παρθένων . . . vii. 25.*  
*Περὶ δὲ τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων . . . viii. 1* (with subsection *Περὶ τῆς βρώσεως οὖν . . . vii. 4*).  
*Περὶ δὲ τῶν πνευματικῶν . . . xii. 1.*  
*Περὶ δὲ τῆς λογίας . . . xvi. 1.*  
*Περὶ δὲ Ἀπολλῶ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ . . . xvi. 12.*

It is certainly curious that, as soon as our author has done with his document, the Two Ways, and begins to write with a free hand, he adopts a similar method:—

- Περὶ δὲ τῆς βρώσεως . . . vi. 3.*  
*Περὶ δὲ τοῦ βαπτίσματος . . . vii. 1.*

<sup>1</sup> St Paul's argument is based on the transitoriness of the present world: *παράγει γὰρ τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ κόσμου τούτου* (1 Cor. vii. 31): a thought which finds expression later in the Teaching (x. 6), in the strange *παρελθέτω ὁ κόσμος οὗτος*.

## THE PROBLEM OF THE DIDACHE 91

Περὶ δὲ τῆς εὐχαριστίας . . . ix. 1 (with subsections Πρῶτον  
περὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου . . . ix. 2: Περὶ δὲ τοῦ κλάσματος . . . ix. 3).  
Περὶ δὲ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν . . . xi. 2.

The observation of this parallel in structure may incline us to give more weight than we otherwise should to the parallels in language which we have already noted, and to those which will presently come before us.

Our author now proceeds to treat the subject of Baptism. We have already observed that the earlier portion of the book is regarded as the instruction which the Apostles gave to the Gentiles before baptising them, and that the formula is that which is given in Matt. xxviii. 19. We have only to add that, in view of later correspondences, there is reason to think that the "living water" (ὑδὼρ ζῶν), which is ordered to be used if possible, is a phrase which has been borrowed from St John.

The mention of the pre-baptismal fast leads our author on to speak of fasting more generally. He is now back again at the Sermon on the Mount; and the injunction, "Let not your fasts be with the hypocrites; for they fast on the second day of the week and on the fifth; but do ye fast the fourth day and the preparation," shows how he can seize upon the sacred words and yet depart entirely from their spirit in the new application which he is concerned to make of them.

"Fasts" and "hypocrites" suggest the next topic: "Neither pray as do the hypocrites; but as the Lord hath commanded in His Gospel, so pray ye: Our Father . . ." "The Gospel" is mentioned again in xi. 3, xv. 3, 4. The Twelve Apostles can assume that the Gospel in a written form is already in the hands of their converts. It is probable that the writer supposed that St Matthew's Gospel was in circulation in the lifetime of the Twelve Apostles; for it is to that Gospel that he is plainly referring. But it is certain that he himself was acquainted also with the Gospels of St Luke and St John. He will not even give the Lord's Prayer without a difference: for he changes ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς into ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ and τὰ ὀφειλήματα into τὴν ὀφειλήν, and the doxology which he adds is in the unusual form, ὅτι σοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς

αἰῶνας. He does not add Ἀμήν, a word which he reserves for the Eucharist. It is of course possible that his variations represent a liturgical tradition, for which he thus claims Apostolic sanction.

The precept to pray three times a day (τρίς τῆς ἡμέρας, as in Dan. vi. 11) would find sufficient Apostolic authority in the Acts: at the third hour, when the Apostles are assembled, presumably for prayer, the Holy Spirit descends at Pentecost (ii. 15); at the sixth hour Peter prays at Joppa (x. 16); at the ninth Peter and John go up to the temple (iii. 1), and the Gentile Cornelius prays at Cæsarea (x. 3).

We now come to the Eucharist: Περὶ δὲ τῆς εὐχαριστίας, οὕτως εὐχαριστήσατε· πρῶτον περὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου. Then after a brief Thanksgiving we have περὶ δὲ τοῦ κλάσματος, followed by another brief Thanksgiving. Here two points surprise us: first, the Cup is placed before the Bread; secondly, the word κλάσμα in such a connexion is exceedingly odd. The first point is illustrated by 1 Cor. x. 16, 17:—

Τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας ὃ εὐλογοῦμεν, οὐχὶ κοινωνία ἐστὶν τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ χριστοῦ; τὸν ἄρτον ὃν κλῶμεν, οὐχὶ κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος τοῦ χριστοῦ ἐστὶν; ὅτι εἷς ἄρτος, ἐν σῶμα οἱ πολλοὶ ἐσμεν, οἱ γὰρ πάντες ἐκ τοῦ ἐνὸς ἄρτου μετέχομεν.

The only other parallel for this order in early Christian literature is Lk. xxii. 14 f. We have seen enough of our author to be ready to believe that this is a piece of literary perversity on his part, and does not represent the practice of any Christian community. A few lines later he recurs to the usual order when, he writes, Μηδεὶς δὲ φαγέτω ἢ πιέτω ἀπὸ τῆς εὐχαριστίας ὑμῶν, ἀλλ' οἱ βαπτισθέντες κ.τ.λ.; just as, indeed, St Paul himself does in xi. 28, δοκιμαζέτω δὲ ἄνθρωπος ἑαυτόν, καὶ οὕτως ἐκ τοῦ ἄρτου ἐσθιέτω καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ποτηρίου πινέτω.

The passage in St Paul has provided our author with something more than this derangement of the usual order. It is possible that it has suggested to him the blessing of the Cup and of the Bread separately, each with a special Thanksgiving. And it is very probable that his picturesque

illustration of the grains of corn scattered on the mountains and brought together into one loaf is a fancy elaborated to match St Paul's illustration of the unity of those who partake of the portions of the one loaf. We shall return to our author's illustration presently and examine its phraseology.

Meantime we must consider κλάσμα. To such a use of the word as we have here there is no parallel, says Harnack, to be found in the literature of the first two centuries. Again our author is perverse: if he does not use οἶνος but ποτήριον, according to custom, he will not use ἄρτος but invents a new technical term κλάσμα. What has suggested it to him? The plural κλάσματα is used in all the Gospels for the fragments which remain over when the multitude has been fed. St John who regards the incident as a symbol of the Eucharist uses κλάσματα twice in the passage: he also says εὐχαριστήσας (instead of εὐλόγησεν); and ἐνεπλήσθησαν (instead of ἐχορτάσθησαν), which is to be compared with the μετὰ δὲ τὸ ἐμπλησθῆναι which has raised much discussion in the Teaching (iv. 1). That this is the source of κλάσμα we shall probably be prepared to admit, when we have examined the language of the Prayer which follows the second of the Thanksgivings. Let us first set the two Thanksgivings side by side:—

<i>For the Cup.</i>	<i>For the Broken Bread.</i>
Εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, πάτερ ἡμῶν, ὑπὲρ τῆς ἁγίας ἀμπέλου Δαβὶδ τοῦ παιδός σου, ἧς ἐγνώρισας ἡμῖν διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου σοὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.	Εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, πάτερ ἡμῶν, ὑπὲρ τῆς ζωῆς καὶ γνώσεως, ἧς ἐγνώρισας ἡμῖν διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου σοὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

It has been held that the Eucharistic formulæ of the Teaching were probably borrowed from some current liturgical use and were not the free composition of our author. This view has been based on the unmistakable signs of Johannine vocabulary which they present, and the supposed absence of any traces of St John's Gospel in the rest of the book. It has further been held that the phraseology is to be accounted for not by direct use of the

Fourth Gospel, but by the prevalence of such phraseology in the district in which both these formulæ and the Johannine writings came into existence. But I think we shall find that the Gospel of St John has been directly used here and elsewhere in the book, and that these Thanksgivings are quite characteristic of our author.

We note first that *πάτερ ἡμῶν* comes from the Lord's Prayer, which has already been given in full. Next we observe the use of *παῖς* as a title of our Lord. This is not what we should expect in a Johannine *milieu*. But our author is familiar with the Acts, and with the Apostolic prayer of Acts iv. 24-30: and there (though probably nowhere else in all literature) we find the same juxtaposition of *Δαυεὶδ τοῦ παιδὸς σου* and *τὸν ἅγιον παῖδά σου Ἰησοῦν* (also below, *διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ ἁγίου παιδὸς σου Ἰησοῦ*).

We proceed to examine the Prayer which immediately follows the Thanksgiving for the *κλάσμα*:—

*Ὡς περ ἦν τοῦτο (τὸ) κλάσμα διεσκορπισμένον ἐπάνω τῶν ὁρέων, καὶ συναχθὲν ἐγένετο ἓν· οὕτω συναχθήτω σου ἡ ἐκκλησία ἀπὸ τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς εἰς τὴν σὴν βασιλείαν· ὅτι σοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ δόξα καὶ ἡ δύναμις διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.*

This Prayer is a literary *tour de force*. We have seen that St Paul, in the passage quoted above, after speaking of the blessing of the Cup and the breaking of the Bread, added words which concern the Bread alone; and we have suggested that our author's metaphor is a perverse imitation, almost a parody, of St Paul's metaphor of the unity of the loaf. We have traced the *κλάσμα*, which is here said to be *συναχθὲν*, to an equally perverse use of St John's *Συναγάγετε τὰ κλάσματα*. But we have yet to account for the awkward participle *διεσκορπισμένον*, which apparently means to say that the *κλάσμα* is composed of grains of wheat which once were widely scattered and then were brought together into one loaf (*συναχθὲν ἐγένετο ἓν*). When we observe that the exposition of the metaphor is the gathering together of the Church from all parts of the world, we cannot mistake the reference to St John's interpretation of the prophecy of Caiaphas (xi. 52): *ἵνα καὶ τὰ τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ τὰ διεσκορπισμένα συναγάγῃ εἰς ἓν.*

And we shall find further reason later for thinking that the high priest's prophecy had taken hold of our author's imagination.

We have now to consider the closing group of Thanksgivings and Prayers, ordered to be said μετὰ τὸ ἐμπλησθῆναι. It is really fruitless to inquire whether the writer had in view the combination of the Eucharist with a meal or not : such a situation would be offered to him by 1 Cor. xi. But the word ἐμπλησθῆναι cannot be pressed to indicate this, now that we have traced it back together with κλάσμα to St John's narrative of the Feeding of the Multitude.

First, then, we have two Thanksgivings :—

Εὐχαριστοῦμέν σε, πάτερ ἅγιε, ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἁγίου ὀνόματός σου, οὗ κατεσκήνωσας ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν, καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς γνώσεως καὶ πίστεως καὶ ἀθανασίας, ἧς ἐγνώρισας ἡμῖν διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου· σοὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

Σύ, δέσποτα παντοκράτορ, ἔκτισας τὰ πάντα ἕνεκεν τοῦ ὀνόματός σου· τροφήν τε καὶ ποτὸν ἔδωκας τοῖς ἀνθρώποις εἰς ἀπόλαυσιν, ἵνα σοὶ εὐχαριστήσωσιν· ἡμῖν δὲ ἐχαρίσω πνευματικὴν τροφήν καὶ ποτὸν καὶ ζωὴν αἰώνιον διὰ τοῦ παιδός σου. πρὸ πάντων εὐχαριστοῦμεν σοι, ὅτι δυνατὸς εἶ· σοὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

We observe that the writer is systematic in the use of his doxologies : the short form (beginning with σοὶ) he uses four times in Thanksgivings ; the longer form (beginning with ὅτι σοῦ ἐστιν) is used at the close of the two Prayers, as he has already used it with the Lord's Prayer.

Next we note echoes of St John : comp. xvii. 11, πάτερ ἅγιε, τήρησον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου, ᾧ δέδωκάς μοι, and 26, ἐγνώρισα αὐτοῖς τὸ ὄνομά σου καὶ γνωρίσω. Also Pauline echoes : comp. 1 Tim. vi. 16, ἀθανασίαν, and 17, ἐπὶ θεῷ τῷ παρέχοντι ἡμῖν πάντα πλουσίως εἰς ἀπόλαυσιν (cf. iv. 3, 4, βρωμάτων ἃ ὁ θεὸς ἔκτισεν εἰς μετάληψιν μετὰ εὐχαριστίας . . . ὅτι πᾶν κτίσμα θεοῦ καλόν, καὶ οὐδὲν ἀπόβλητον μετὰ εὐχαριστίας λαμβανόμενον) : and in 1 Cor. x. 4, πνευματικὸν βρῶμα and πνευματικὸν πόμα.

The phrase ὀνόματός σου οὗ κατεσκήνωσας is found in the LXX. of Neh. i. 9, Jer. vii. 12 ; and δυνατὸς εἶ, Κύριε, is in Ps. lxxxviii. (lxxxix.) 9. With Σύ, δέσποτα παντοκράτορ,

ἐκτίσας τὰ πάντα we may compare the Apostolic prayer from which our author has already drawn : Acts iv. 24, Δέσποτα, σὺ ὁ ποιήσας τὸν οὐρανόν, κ.τ.λ.

After these two Thanksgivings comes the following Prayer :—

Μνήσθητι, Κύριε, τῆς ἐκκλησίας σου τοῦ ῥύσασθαι αὐτὴν ἀπὸ παντὸς πονηροῦ καὶ τελειῶσαι αὐτὴν ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ σου· καὶ σὺνάξον αὐτὴν ἀπὸ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων τὴν ἁγιασθεῖσαν εἰς τὴν σὴν βασιλείαν, ἣν ἡτοίμασας αὐτῇ· ὅτι σοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

With this we may compare Matt. vi. 13, xxiv. 31, xxv. 34, and 1 John iv. 18 (οὐ τετελείωται ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ).

Last of all, we have a remarkable group of ejaculations :—

Ἐλθέτω χάρις καὶ παρελθέτω ὁ κόσμος οὗτος.

Ὡσαννὰ τῷ θεῷ Δαβὶδ.

Εἴ τις ἁγίος ἐστίν, ἐρχέσθω· εἴ τις οὐκ ἔστι, μετανοεῖτω μαρὰν ἀθά.

Ἀμήν.

The first of these ejaculations may remind us of 1 Cor. vii. 31, παράγει γὰρ τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ κόσμου τούτου. The second is plainly from Matt. xxi. 9, 15; but with a modification, after our author's manner, probably based on Matt. xxii. 45, "If David therefore calleth him Lord, how is he his son?"

With the third we must compare, for structure as well as phraseology, 1 Cor. xvi. 22, Εἴ τις οὐ φιλεῖ τὸν κύριον, ἦτω ἀνάθεμα· μαρὰν ἀθά. After what we have seen of our author's indebtedness to 1 Corinthians we can have no doubt that this verse is in his mind at this point.

Lastly, the Ἀμήν with which he closes his Eucharistic formulæ, and which he has carefully refrained from using up to this point, doubtless comes from 1 Cor. xiv. 16, Ἐπεὶ ἐὰν εὐλογῇς ἐν πνεύματι, ὁ ἀναπληρῶν τὸν τόπον τοῦ ιδιώτου πῶς ἐρεῖ τὸ Ἀμήν ἐπὶ τῇ σῇ εὐχαριστίᾳ; This passage also gives us the clue to the brief sentence with which he ends his directions as to the Eucharist—one of the most unexpected sentences in the whole of the book: Τοῖς

δι' προφήταις ἐπιτρέπετε εὐχαριστεῖν ὅσα θέλουσιν. Why are the Prophets suddenly introduced here, when no mention of them has been made hitherto? And what warrant is there anywhere for the celebration of the Eucharist by a Prophet? If εὐχαριστία in this passage of St Paul be taken in the later technical sense of the Eucharist, and if by "blessing in the spirit" St Paul is supposed to mean the blessing of the elements by a Prophet, we have at once the required Apostolic sanction not only of the celebration of the Eucharist by Prophets, but also of a certain freedom in their performance of the rite.

When we have travelled thus far, and have recognised how intimately acquainted the writer of the Teaching was with the First Epistle to the Corinthians, how he has imitated its subdivisions, borrowed its words and phrases, and modified its thoughts to suit his own purposes, we are inclined to ask whether certain other notable features of his book, besides the celebration of the Eucharist by the Prophets, may not be derived from the same source. For example, the fact has been much insisted on that he addresses his injunctions to the community and not to any officers of the community, even when he prescribes rules for Baptism and the Eucharist. The Two Ways is addressed to a single disciple (τέκνον μου): when the close of this is reached, the singular number is kept for a couple of sentences; but then we come to Περὶ δὲ τοῦ βαπτίσματος, οὕτω βαπτίσατε, and with a few exceptions the plural is henceforth employed. It is quite likely that this mode of giving injunctions even as to ecclesiastical ceremonies in the form of an address to the whole community is simply taken over from St Paul, and is therefore to be regarded as a trick of the writer and no proof at all that he recognised any "sovereignty of the community" in such matters.

I am tempted to go a step further and enter on more controversial ground. The Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers, of whom so much has been written since the book was discovered, have appeared to me increasingly unreal the longer I have contemplated them and the more I have tried to find any true parallel to them in any part of the Church. The Apostles are particularly shadowy

personages, and the little that is said of them is simply grotesque. Here is the whole of it :—

“Now concerning the apostles and prophets, according to the command of the Gospel, so do ye. And let every apostle coming to you be received as the Lord. But he shall not remain save one day, and if there be necessity a second also ; but if he remain three, he is a false prophet. And when he goeth forth let the apostle take nothing, save only bread till he find lodging ; but if he ask for money, he is a false prophet.”

Who are these extraordinary beings, bearing an honoured name, of whom nothing but a most depreciatory warning is uttered ? Hilgenfeld was driven to think they were Montanist apostles : “Harnack,” he says, “regards them as itinerating evangelists, but he cannot show that such evangelists were called apostles by Catholic writers.” I confess that I think it more probable that they are a free creation of the writer, who had in his mind St Paul’s words in 1 Cor. xii. 28, “God hath set in the church first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers.” How was his picture of the Church to which the Twelve Apostles addressed their injunctions to be duly drawn, if he left out Apostles and proceeded at once to Prophets, of whom doubtless he knew something, though but little to their advantage ? He knew, as we know, that in the New Testament other Apostles are mentioned besides the Twelve ; not only true Apostles, but also “false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into apostles of Christ” (2 Cor. xi. 13). He may possibly have known of travelling evangelists, passing to mission-fields, and may have thought the term “apostle” applicable to them : but if so, his experience of their kind was not fortunate, for he thought it quite likely that they might only prove to be another form of false prophet. At any rate, St Paul had given to Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers the first places in the Church : therefore something must be said about Apostles.

The Prophet was more of a reality. He is somewhat in awe of him, and is afraid to judge of his utterances. St Paul, indeed, had spoken of *διακρίσεις πνευμάτων* (1 Cor. xii. 10), and had given the injunction, *προφῆται δὲ*

δύο ἢ τρεῖς λαλείτωσαν, καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι διακρινέτωσαν (xiv. 29). It may be that our author limited οἱ ἄλλοι to the other Prophets; at any rate he forbids the community to judge: πάντα προφήτην λαλοῦντα ἐν πνεύματι οὐ πειράσετε οὐδὲ διακρινεῖτε—for this, he adds from Matt. xii. 31, is the unforgivable sin. Some of them acted in a way that ordinary men would not be justified in imitating: yet perchance they were but following the precedent of some of the Old Testament prophets, whose strange actions were meant for a sign: their judgment was with God. His only resource against the numerous class of deceivers is to enjoin that they be well tested before they are accepted as true prophets, and to lay down the simple rule that greediness is the sure sign of the false prophet.

From St Paul he had gathered, as we have seen, that Prophets might "bless in the spirit" at the Eucharist, and therefore could not be limited to prescribed formulæ. This is a sufficiently surprising statement, but now follows something more startling still: "they are your *high priests*." This is not said in reference to the Eucharist, though he twice speaks of that as a sacrifice, borrowing the word from Malachi. It is said in reference to the reception of firstfruits. He is making provision for a Prophet who desires to settle in a community. To him the Lord's words will apply, "he is worthy of his meat." "Every firstfruit therefore of the produce of wine-press and threshing-floor, thou shalt take and give to the prophets; αὐτοὶ γάρ εἰσιν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς ὑμῶν." In further enumerating kinds of firstfruits he twice uses the expression "give according to the commandment." No such commandment can be deduced from our Lord's words in St Matthew's Gospel: where then has he found his sanction for transferring the Jewish system of firstfruits to provide for the sustenance of Christian Prophets? If we turn again to the First Epistle to the Corinthians, we find what we want in a command of the Lord which was certain to attract his attention (ix. 13):—

Οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι οἱ τὰ ἱερὰ ἐργαζόμενοι τὰ ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἐσθίουσιν, οἱ τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ παρεδρεύοντες τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ συνεμερίζονται; οὕτως καὶ ὁ κύριος διέταξεν τοῖς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον καταγγέλλουσιν ἐκ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ζῆν.

The Lord had said that they who preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel, and St Paul had given as the reason for this that the priests in the temple were accustomed to live of the altar. This is enough for our author, who transfers a list of firstfruits from the Book of Numbers, where they are ordered to be given to the priests, and thus makes an abundant provision for the Prophets, "for they are your high priests." We have thus accounted for the provision, but not altogether for the designation. Why ἀρχιερείς, and not simply ἱερείς as in the Old Testament passage from which he has drawn? We have already seen how he has borrowed a striking phrase from the interpretation given by St John to the words of Caiaphas (xi. 51 f., ἵνα . . . τὰ δισκορπισμένα συναγάγῃ εἰς ἓν). Now the very same passage declares that the high priest, in virtue of his office, spoke as a prophet: τοῦτο δὲ ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ οὐκ εἶπεν, ἀλλὰ ἀρχιερεὺς ὢν τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐκείνου ἐπροφήτευσεν. If their high priests were prophets, the Prophets "are your high priests."

The Teacher is added to the Prophet in a rather perfunctory way. He is just mentioned in xiii. 2, ὡσαύτως διδάσκαλος ἀλήθινός ἐστιν ἄξιός καὶ αὐτὸς ὥσπερ ὁ ἐργάτης τῆς τροφῆς αὐτοῦ. Our author knows that Teachers come next to Prophets in St Paul's list, and he links them with Prophets in xv. 1, 2. But he has nothing to tell us about them as a separate class.

But if Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers are the prominent personages of the Church, whether as occasional visitors or as making a prolonged stay, what of the ordinary government of a Christian community? Had the Twelve Apostles left no directions about that? When he has done with the Prophets, and has given some rules as to the Sunday Eucharist and its preliminaries of confession and reconciliation, he proceeds to speak of those who would ordinarily be responsible for worship and discipline: "Appoint therefore for yourselves bishops and deacons, worthy of the Lord, men who are gentle and without covetousness and true and proved: for they also minister to you the ministry of the prophets and teachers. Therefore despise them not, for they are your honoured ones together with the prophets and teachers." He had

Apostolic warrant for Bishops and Deacons in Phil. i. 1 and in the Pastoral Epistles. From the latter source he draws his epithets, though somewhat in disguise; in 1 Tim. iii. 3 we find ἐπιεικής and ἀφιλάργυρος of the Bishop, and of the Deacons we read (v. 10) δοκιμαζέσθωσαν πρῶτον. But what chiefly interests us is the ground which he assigns for their authority: ὑμῖν γὰρ λειτουργοῦσι καὶ αὐτοὶ τὴν λειτουργίαν τῶν προφητῶν καὶ διδασκάλων. How are we to explain λειτουργεῖν in such a connexion? We have seen that he could find but little to say about Teachers, and that he merely linked them on to the Prophets. Now apart from 1 Cor. xii. 28 there is only one passage which brings Prophets and Teachers immediately together: for in Eph. iv. 11 Evangelists and Pastors come in between. This passage is Acts xiii. 1, 2, "There were at Antioch, in the church there, *prophets and teachers* . . . and as they were *ministering* to the Lord," etc. St Luke has derived his phrase λειτουργούντων τῷ κυρίῳ from the LXX. after his manner, taking it over from 1 Sam. iii. 1, where the young prophet Samuel was "ministering to the Lord" (ἦν λειτουργῶν τῷ κυρίῳ). It is interesting to see how far the phrase has travelled.

The writer of the Teaching had doubtless to face the fact that the functions which he ascribes to Prophets were in his own day being performed by Bishops. But he had no Apostolic warrant for the celebration of the Eucharist by a Bishop, such as he had contrived to find in St Paul for its celebration by a Prophet. He succeeds, however, by the aid of Acts xiii. 1, 2, in building a sort of bridge between Prophets and Teachers on the one side and Bishops and Deacons on the other. What was the actual constitution of the Church in which he lived, he does not enable us to determine. He may have identified Bishops and Presbyters, as he makes no mention of the latter; but such a conclusion is precarious. And as the instructions which he gives are those of the Twelve Apostles who are addressing "the Gentiles" generally and not any particular community, we can draw no argument from his use of the plural "bishops and deacons" to decide whether he thought of a single Church as ruled by one Bishop or by several.

If our conclusions are justly drawn, it must be recognised that the writer of the Teaching, so far at any rate as matters of Church organisation are concerned, confines himself as strictly as he can to what the Twelve Apostles might reasonably be held to have enjoined, and bases his instructions on what he believes he can draw from the Apostolic writings. He disguises his borrowings indeed; but he also disguises the actual conditions of his own time. The result is that he contributes almost nothing, except doubtful exegesis, to advance our knowledge of the early Christian ministry.

This inquiry is far from being exhaustive. I have pointed to a method of composition which the writer of the Teaching has certainly employed. That method can be traced farther than I have traced it here: for I have not attempted to cover the whole ground, and indeed have not touched upon the apocalyptic section with which the book closes. My purpose has been to indicate an element which has been strangely overlooked in the criticism of this much-quoted manual. I wish to provoke discussion.

If what I have said be in the main accepted, certain prominent features of the book will cease to be more than literary curiosities. And then we must ask what notable features remain unexplained, and incapable of explanation, on the principle of deduction from Apostolic writings. The kinds of water allowable for Baptism, and the bi-weekly fast—these at once suggest themselves: and (though the writer perhaps thought he found Apostolic sanction for them) the custom of praying thrice a day and the recognition of the professional Prophet may also be regarded as positive features, characteristic of the writer's situation. On the other hand "silences" of the Teaching will be no secure guide. We shall not be at liberty to conclude that the writer knew nothing of a liturgical consecration of the eucharistic elements as the Body and Blood of the Lord, or of carrying the Eucharist to the absent, or of the Paschal fast and the Easter festival. For he may have been quite familiar with these things, and have omitted them simply for want of what he considered a definite Apostolic sanction.

Other questions to be considered afresh will be: Why

is there no reference to Christian theology or soteriology in connexion with the preparation for Baptism? Why are there no allusions to persecution by the heathen? Why is St Paul never mentioned, although his epistles are laid under contribution? What after all was the writer's object in composing the book?

I do not propose to follow Dr Bigg, who for quite different reasons from any which I have been suggesting placed the Teaching in the fourth century.<sup>1</sup> I should find it rather hard to conceive that it was written after Montanism had attained any considerable vogue. For from the orthodox standpoint there is too much said about Prophets, and from the Montanist standpoint there is too little; and there is nothing at all about women. Apart from pointing this out I make no suggestion as to a date, though I am ready to believe that both Barnabas and Hermas have been used.

I ask for a reconsideration of the problem. The question is not whether this or that feature of the book is susceptible of a better explanation than I have offered, but whether the writer's method was in reality such as I have supposed. Some of the points which I have taken may be dismissed as over-subtle; but if even half of what I have put forward be admitted by serious students, the pen must be drawn through many a sentence, and indeed through whole pages, of some recent descriptions of early Church life and organisation.

<sup>1</sup> It may be well to add that I had not seen Dr Bigg's little book, "The Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles" (London, S.P.C.K., 1898), until after I had written the above. The popular form in which his work was published may perhaps be the reason why his trenchant criticisms have received so little attention.

## APPENDIX B

### TABLE OF PARALLELS

#### BARNABAS

- xviii. 1 *a* But let us pass on to another knowledge  
(*gnosis*) and teaching.  
„ 1 *b* There are two ways of teaching and power,  
that of light and that of darkness ;  
„ 1 *c* and there is great difference between the  
two ways.  
„ 1 *d* For on the one are stationed light-giving  
angels of God, but on the other angels of Satan.  
„ 2 And the one is Lord from eternity and unto  
eternity, but the other is ruler of the time of  
iniquity that now is.  
xix. 1 *a* The way of light then is this ;  
„ 1 *b* if any be willing to travel on the way and  
speed by his works to the appointed place.  
„ 1 *c* The knowledge (*gnosis*) then that has been  
given to us to walk therein is as follows :  
„ 2 *a* Thou shalt love Him that made thee,  
„ 2 *b* thou shalt fear Him that formed thee, thou  
shalt glorify Him that redeemed thee from  
death.

[B. xix. 5 *c*.]

[*Cf.* B. xix. 1 *c*.]

## DIDACHE

- i. 1 *a*    There are two ways, one of life and one of death ;  
 „ 1 *b*    and there is great difference between the two ways.
- „ 2 *a*    The way of life then is this ;
- „ 2 *b*    *[Cf. D. i. 3 a : Now of these words the teaching is this.]*  
           First thou shalt love the God that made thee ;
- „ 2 *c*    secondly thy neighbour as thyself.
- „ 2 *d*    And all things whatsoever thou wouldst not have done to thee, do not thou to another.
- „ 3 *a*    Now of these words the teaching is this.
- „ 3 *b*    Bless them that curse you (Lk. vi. 28),
- „ 3 *c*    and pray for your enemies (*cf.* Mt. v. 44, Lk. vi. 28, 27),
- „ 3 *d*    and fast for them that persecute you (*cf.* Mt. v. 44) :
- „ 8 *e*    for what thank is it (Lk. vi. 32)

## BARNABAS

[Hermas, *Mand.* ii. 4-7. Work that which is good, and of thy labours which God giveth thee, give to all that are in want simply (ἀπλῶς), not doubting to whom thou shalt give and to whom thou shalt not give. Give to all: for to all God desireth that there should be given of His own bounties. They then that receive shall render account to God, why they received, and to what end: for they that receive in distress shall not be judged, but they that receive by pretence (ἐν ὑποκρίσει) shall pay the penalty. He then that giveth is guiltless; for as he received from the Lord the ministration to perform it, he hath performed it in simplicity (ἀπλῶς), making no distinction to whom he should give or not give.]

xix. 2 c    Thou shalt be simple in heart and rich in spirit.

## DIDACHE

- i. 3 *f* if ye love them that love you (Mt. v. 46, Lk. vi. 32) ?
- „ 3 *g* Do not even the Gentiles the same (Mt. v. 47)?
- „ 3 *h* But do ye love them that hate you (Mt. v. 44, Lk. vi. 27),
- „ 3 *i* and ye shall not have an enemy.
- „ 4 *a* Abstain thou from fleshly and bodily lusts (1 Pet. ii. 11).
- „ 4 *b* If any man give thee a blow on thy right check, turn to him the other also (Mt. v. 39),
- „ 4 *c* and thou shalt be perfect (*cf.* Mt. v. 48) ;
- „ 4 *d* if a man impress thee to go with him one mile, go with him twice (Mt. v. 41) ;
- „ 4 *e* if a man take away thy cloak, give him thy coat also (Lk. vi. 29, *cf.* Mt. v. 40) ;
- „ 4 *f* if a man take from thee that which is thine, ask it not back (Lk. vi. 30) ;
- „ 4 *g* for neither art thou able.
- „ 5 *a* To every man that asketh of thee give, and ask not back (Lk. vi. 30) ;
- „ 5 *b* for to all the Father desireth that there should be given of His own free-gifts. Blessed is he that giveth according to the commandment ; for he is guiltless. Woe to him that receiveth ; for if a man receiveth having need, he shall be guiltless ; but he that hath no need shall give satisfaction why and wherefore he received ; and being put in confinement he shall be examined concerning the deeds that he hath done, and he shall not come out thence until he have paid the uttermost farthing (Mt. v. 26).
- „ 6 But indeed concerning this it hath been said : Let thine alms sweat into thy hands until thou know to whom thou shouldst give.
- ii. 1 And the second commandment of the teaching (is this) :

## BARNABAS

- xix. 2 *d*    Thou shalt not be joined with them that walk in the way of death.
- „ 2 *e*    Thou shalt hate everything which is not pleasing to God. Thou shalt hate all hypocrisy.
- „ 2 *f*    Thou shalt not forsake the commandments of the Lord.
- „ 3 *a*    Thou shalt not exalt thyself,
- „ 3 *b*    but shalt be humble-minded in all things. Thou shalt not assume glory to thyself.
- „ 3 *c*    Thou shalt not take evil counsel against thy neighbour.
- „ 3 *d*    Thou shalt not give daring to thy soul.
- „ 4 *a*    Thou shalt not commit fornication, thou shalt not commit adultery, thou shalt not corrupt boys.
- „ 4 *b*    The word of God shall not go forth from thee in the uncleanness of some.  
[B. xix. 5 *d*.]
- „ 4 *c*    Thou shalt not respect persons to reprove any for a transgression.  
[B. xix. 6 *a*.]

[Cf. B. xix. 5 *b*.]

[B. xix. 4 *g*.]

[B. xix. 7 *a*.]

[Cf. B. xix. 8.]

[B. xix. 6 *b*.]

# TABLE OF PARALLELS

109

## DIDACHE

[D. iv. 12 : *Thou shalt hate all hypocrisy and everything which is not pleasing to the Lord.*]

[D. iv. 13 a : *Thou shalt not forsake the commandments of the Lord.*]

[D. iii. 9 a : *Thou shalt not exalt thyself.*]

[D. ii. 6 c : *Thou shalt not take evil counsel against thy neighbour.*]

[D. iii. 9 b : *Thou shalt not give daring to thy soul.*]

ii. 2 a    Thou shalt do no murder, thou shalt not commit adultery, thou shalt not corrupt boys, thou shalt not commit fornication.

„ 2 b    Thou shalt not steal, thou shalt not practise magic, thou shalt not use drugs.

„ 2 c    Thou shalt not murder a child by abortion, nor shalt thou kill it when it is born.

[D. iv. 3 c : *Thou shalt not respect persons to reprove for transgressions.*]

„ 2 d    Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's goods.

„ 3 a    Thou shalt not forswear thyself (Mt. v. 33), thou shalt not bear false witness, thou shalt not speak evil.

„ 3 b    Thou shalt not bear a grudge.

„ 4 a    Thou shalt not be double-minded nor double-tongued ;

„ 4 b    for the double tongue is a snare of death.

„ 5      Thy word shall not be false nor empty, but fulfilled by action.

„ 6 a    Thou shalt not be greedy of gain,

„ 6 b    nor a plunderer nor a hypocrite nor evil-disposed nor arrogant.

## APPENDIX B

BARNABAS

[B. xix. 3 c.]

[Cf. B. xix. 5 c.]

xix. 4 *d*      Thou shalt be meek,

„      4 *e*      thou shalt be quiet,

„      4 *f*      thou shalt be trembling at the words which  
              thou hast heard.

[B. xix. 3 *a.*]

[B. xix. 3 *d.*]

## DIDACHE

ii. 6 *c*      Thou shalt not take evil counsel against thy neighbour.

„ 7 *a*      Thou shalt not hate any man,

„ 7 *b*      but some thou shalt reprove, and for some thou shalt pray,

„ 7 *c*      and some thou shalt love more than thine own soul.

iii. 1-6      My child, flee from all evil and all that is like unto it. Be not angry, for anger leadeth to murder; nor jealous nor contentious nor wrathful: for of all these things murders are engendered.

My child, be not lustful, for lust leadeth to fornication; nor foul-speaking nor with uplifted eyes: for of all these things adulteries are engendered.

My child, be not a dealer in omens, since it leadeth to idolatry; nor an enchanter nor an astrologer nor a magician, neither be willing to look at them: for of all these things idolatry is engendered.

My child, be not a liar, since lying leads to theft; nor avaricious nor vain-glorious: for of all these things thefts are engendered.

My child, be not a murmurer, since it leadeth to blasphemy; nor self-willed nor a thinker of evil thoughts: for of all these things blasphemies are engendered.

„ 7 *a*      But be thou meek,

„ 7 *b*      since the meek shall inherit the earth (Mt.v.5).

„ 8 *a*      Be thou longsuffering and pitiful and without malice

„ 8 *b*      and quiet

„ 8 *c*      and kindly (*ἀγαθός*)

„ 8 *d*      and trembling at the words continually which thou hast heard.

„ 9 *a*      Thou shalt not exalt thyself

„ 9 *b*      nor give daring to thy soul.

## BARNABAS

- xix. 4 *g*    Thou shalt not bear a grudge against thy brother.
- „ 5 *a*    Thou shalt not be of a double mind, whether it shall be or no.
- „ 5 *b*    Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord in vain.
- „ 5 *c*    Thou shalt love thy neighbour more than thine own soul.
- „ 5 *d*    Thou shalt not murder a child by abortion, nor again shalt thou kill it when it is born.
- „ 5 *e*    Thou shalt not withdraw thy hand from thy son or from thy daughter, but from their youth up thou shalt teach them the fear of God.
- „ 6 *a*    Thou shalt not be found coveting thy neighbour's goods,
- „ 6 *b*    thou shalt not be greedy of gain.
- „ 6 *c*    Neither shalt thou be joined from thy soul to the lofty, but shalt have thy conversation with the humble and just.
- „ 6 *d*    The operations which befall thee thou shalt accept as good, knowing that nothing cometh to pass without God.
- „ 7 *a*    Thou shalt not be double-minded nor double-tongued.
- „ 7 *b*    Thou shalt be subject to masters as to a type of God in shame and fear.
- „ 7 *c*    Thou shalt not command thy servant or handmaid in bitterness, who set their hope on the same God, lest haply they should not fear the God who is over you both : for He came not to call with respect of persons, but unto those whom the Spirit had prepared.
- „ 8 *a*    Thou shalt share in all things with thy neighbour, and shalt not say that they are thine own : for if ye are sharers in that which is incorruptible, how much more in the corruptible things.

## DIDACHE

[D. ii. 3 b : *Thou shalt not bear a grudge.*]

[D. iv. 4 a : *Thou shalt not be of a double mind, whether it shall be or no.*]

[Cf. D. ii. 3 a : *Thou shalt not forswear thyself* (Mt. v. 33).]

[D. ii. 7 c : *and some thou shalt love more than thine own soul.*]

[D. ii. 2 c : *Thou shalt not murder a child by abortion, nor shalt thou kill it when it is born.*]

[D. iv. 9 : *Thou shalt not withdraw thy hand from thy son or from thy daughter, but from their youth up thou shalt teach them the fear of God.*]

[D. ii. 2 d : *Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's goods.*]

[D. ii. 6 a : *Thou shalt not be greedy of gain.*]

iii. 9 c     Thy soul shall not be joined to the lofty, but thou shalt have thy conversation with the just and humble.

„ 10     The operations which befall thee thou shalt accept as good, knowing that nothing cometh to pass apart from God.

[D. ii. 4 a : *Thou shalt not be double-minded nor double-tongued.*]

[D. iv. 11 : *And ye servants shall be subject to your masters as to a type of God in shame and fear.*]

[D. iv. 10 : *Thou shalt not command thy servant or handmaid, who set their hope on the same God, in thy bitterness, lest haply they should not fear the God who is over you both : for He cometh not to call with respect of persons, but unto those whom the Spirit had prepared.*]

[D. iv. 8 : *Thou shalt not turn away from him that is in want (cf. B. xx. 2, D. v. 2—the Evil Way), but thou shalt share all things with thy brother, and shalt not say that they are thine own : for if ye are sharers in that which is immortal, how much more in the mortal things.*]

## BARNABAS

- xix. 8 *b*    Thou shalt not be forward in tongue,  
 „ 8 *c*    for the mouth is a snare of death.
- „ 8 *d*    So far as thou canst, thou shalt be pure for  
 thy soul's sake.
- „ 9 *a*    Be not found stretching out thy hands to  
 receive, and drawing them in to give.
- „ 9 *b*    Thou shalt love as the apple of thine eye  
 every one that speaketh unto thee the word of  
 the Lord.
- „ 10 *a*    Thou shalt remember the day of judgment  
 night and day,
- „ 10 *b*    and thou shalt seek out each day the persons  
 of the saints,
- „ 10 *c*    either labouring by word
- „ 10 *d*    and going forth to exhort them and studying  
 to save a soul by the word,
- „ 10 *e*    or with thy hands shalt thou work for a  
 ransom of thy sins.
- „ 11 *a*    Thou shalt not doubt to give nor murmur in  
 giving, but shalt know who is the good recom-  
 penser of the reward.
- „ 11 *b*    Thou shalt keep the things that thou hast  
 received, neither adding nor taking away.
- „ 11 *c*    Thou shalt utterly hate that which is evil.
- „ 11 *d*    Thou shalt judge justly.
- „ 12 *a*    Thou shalt not make a division, but shalt  
 be at peace, bringing together them that  
 contend,

[B. xix. 11 *d*.][B. xix. 4 *c*.]

## DIDACHE

[D. ii. 4 b : *[(thou shalt not be double-minded nor double-tongued),<sup>1</sup> for a double tongue<sup>2</sup> is a snare of death.]*

[D. iv. 5 : *Be not found stretching out thy hands to receive and drawing them in to give.*]

- iv. 1 a My child, him that speaketh unto thee the word of God
- „ 1 b thou shalt remember night and day,
- „ 1 c and shalt honour him as the Lord; for whencesoever the Lordship is spoken of, there the Lord is.
- „ 2 a And thou shalt seek out daily the persons of the saints,
- „ 2 b that thou mayest find rest in their words.

[D. iv. 6 : *If thou hast (ought) through (? the work of) thy hands, thou shalt give a ransom of thy sins.*]

[D. iv. 7 : *Thou shalt not doubt to give nor murmur in giving, for thou shalt know who is the good recompenser of the reward.*]

[D. iv. 13 b : *but thou shalt keep the things that thou hast received, neither adding nor taking away.*]

- „ 3 a [D. iv. 3 b : *Thou shalt judge justly.*] Thou shalt not make a division, but thou shalt pacify them that contend.
- „ 3 b Thou shalt judge justly.
- „ 3 d Thou shalt not respect persons to reprove for transgressions.

<sup>1</sup> See B. xix. 7 a.

<sup>2</sup> ἡ διγλωσσία.

## APPENDIX B

## BARNABAS

[B. xix. 5 *a.*][B. xix. 9 *a.*][B. xix. 10 *e.*][B. xix. 11 *a.*][*Cf.* B. xx. 2—the Evil Way.][B. xix. 8 *a.*][B. xix. 5 *e.*][B. xix. 7 *c.*][B. xix. 7 *b.*][B. xix. 2 *c.*][B. xix. 2 *f.*][B. xix. 11 *b.*]

xix. 12 *b*    Thou shalt make confession of thy sins.  
 Thou shalt not draw near to prayer in an evil  
 conscience.

    This is the way of light.

## DIDACHE

- iv. 4 *a*    Thou shalt not be of a double mind, whether it shall be or no.
- „ 5    Thou shalt not be found stretching out thy hands to receive, and drawing them in to give.
- „ 6    If thou hast (ought) through (? the work of) thy hands, thou shalt give a ransom of thy sins.
- „ 7    Thou shalt not doubt to give nor murmur in giving, for thou shalt know who is the good recompenser of the reward.
- „ 8 *a*    Thou shalt not turn away from him that is in want (*cf.* B. xx. 2, D. v. 2—the Evil Way),
- „ 8 *b*    but thou shalt share all things with thy brother, and shalt not say that they are thine own: for if ye are sharers in that which is immortal, how much more in the mortal things.
- „ 9    Thou shalt not withdraw thy hand from thy son or from thy daughter, but from their youth up thou shalt teach them the fear of God.
- „ 10    Thou shalt not command thy servant or handmaid, who set their hope on the same God, in thy bitterness, lest haply they should not fear the God who is over you both: for He cometh not to call with respect of persons, but unto those whom the Spirit hath prepared.
- „ 11    And ye servants shall be subject to your masters as to a type of God in shame and fear.
- „ 12    Thou shalt hate all hypocrisy and everything which is not pleasing to the Lord.
- „ 13 *a*    Thou shalt not forsake the commandments of the Lord,
- but thou shalt keep the things that thou hast received, neither adding nor taking away.
- „ 14 *a*    In church thou shalt confess thy transgressions, and thou shalt not draw near to prayer in an evil conscience.
- This is the way of life.

## BARNABAS

- xx. 1 *a* But the way of the Black One is crooked and full of curse :
- „ 1 *b* for it is the way of death eternal with punishment, wherein are the things that destroy their souls :
- „ 1 *c*. (1) idolatry D. (5).  
 (2) boldness D. (19).  
 (3) exaltation of power, *cf.* D. (20).  
 (4) hypocrisy D. (10).  
 (5) doubleness of heart D. (11).  
 (6) adultery D. (2).  
 (7) murder D. (1).  
 (8) plundering D. (8).  
 (9) arrogance D. (13).  
 (10) transgression.  
 (11) craft D. (12).  
 (12) malice D. (14).  
 (13) self-will D. (15).  
 (14) sorcery D. (7).  
 (15) magic D. (6).  
 (16) covetousness D. (16).  
 (17) absence of the fear of God D. (Lat.)<sup>1</sup>

[In the list of evil persons which follows, D. v. 2 agrees with B. xx. 2 both in text and order, except in these cases :—

B. (3) loving lies ; D. loving a lie.

B. (7) paying no heed to the widow and the orphan ;  
 D. *omits*.

B. (8) wakeful not unto the fear of God but for that which is evil ; D. wakeful not unto *that which is good* but *unto* that which is evil.

B. (9) from whom gentleness and forbearance are far off and removed ; D. *omits* “ and removed.”

B. (10) loving vain things ; D. *has the verb second*.

B. (14) ready in scandal ; D. *omits*.]

<sup>1</sup> Deum non timentes ; thus heading the list of evil persons which follows in § 2.

## DIDACHE

v. 1 *a* But the way of death is this : first of all it is evil and full of curse :

- „ 1 *b* (1) murders B. (7).  
 (2) adulteries B. (6).  
<sup>2</sup>(3) lusts.  
 (4) fornications.  
 (5) idolatries B. (1).  
 (6) magic arts B. (15).  
 (7) sorceries B. (14).  
 (8) plunderings B. (8).  
<sup>3</sup>(9) false testimonies.  
 (10) hypocricies B. (4).  
 (11) doubleness of heart B. (5).  
 (12) craft B. (11).  
 (13) arrogance B. (9).  
 (14) malice B. (12).  
 (15) self-will B. (13).  
 (16) covetousness B. (16).  
<sup>2</sup>(17) foul speaking.  
<sup>2</sup>(18) jealousy.  
 (19) boldness B. (2).  
 (20) exaltation, *cf.* B. (3).  
 (21) boastfulness.

\* These three vices (not in B.) would seem to be drawn from the interpolated passage D. iii. 1-6.

\* See D. ii. 3 *a*, "Thou shalt not bear false witness" (not in B.).