

THE TEACHING OF THE APOSTLES

AND THE

SIBYLLINE BOOKS.

BY

J. RENDEL HARRIS,

FELLOW OF CLARE COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

*Εἶπε δὲ Ἰσαὰκ τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ Τί τοῦτο ὁ ταχὺ εἶρες, ὦ τέκνον;
ὁ δὲ εἶπεν Ὁ παρέδωκε κύριος ὁ θεός σου ἐναντίον μου.*

GEN. XXVII. 20.

CAMBRIDGE:

H. W. WALLIS.

1885

THE TEACHING OF THE APOSTLES AND THE SIBYLLINE BOOKS.

IN the following pages there are collected a number of hitherto unnoticed coincidences between the language and thought of the Teaching of the Apostles and the so-called Sibylline Oracles, from a consideration of which it seems likely that important consequences will follow in the interpretation of the books which are subjected to the comparison, in the more accurate determination of their places and times of production, and above all in the view which is thus acquired of the genesis of the faith, practice and discipline of the Christian Church.

Bryennios' little tract is increasing in recognized importance, almost from day to day. It is no longer a question of mere identification between a lost book and a found book by means of the number of lines in a MS. and the record of a stichometric table of the middle ages: *non numerandi sed ponderandi sunt versus*; and being weighed, they require for a counterpoise the largest stones which the Ecclesiastical Historian can find in his bag. In fact the *Διδαχὴ τῶν Ἀποστόλων* is the key-stone of Church history, whether we include under that term the New Testament records or those of the first four centuries of the Faith; and, if we widen our conception of Church history so as to include the Semitic origins of Christianity, it is the bridge that spans the gulf between the Church and the Synagogue from which it was so early divided.

It is surprising that so small a book should have so much to say. We can understand that a book of primitive doctrine and discipline should have been a small one: for as the writer

of the so-called Phocylidea (to which we shall presently allude) points out,

οὐ χωρεῖ μεγάλην διδαχὴν ἀδίδακτος ἀκουή.
οὐ γὰρ δὴ νοέουσ' οἱ μηδέποτ' ἐσθλὰ μαθόντες¹.

But we can hardly explain the wide diffusion of so small a book both geographically and chronologically unless it indeed were closely connected with the origins of Christianity and had met with an almost universal acceptance; and its importance is not diminished when we consider that we are a long way yet from the place where we can assert that the last word has been said either on the text or its interpretation.

The parallelisms to which I have drawn attention are probably a part of a larger future phenomenon: if, in the providence of God, we should recover any further portions of primitive Christian literature, there would be a harvest of explanations of obscurities both in the New Testament and in the sub-Apostolic writings which are at present insoluble. In particular the *Doctrina Petri* which forms a companion volume to the recovered Teaching seems to have had analogous relations with the Sibylline books, if we may judge from its few remaining sentences, and may even have a nexus internal and external with the Teaching of the Apostles.

But until we know more about the Teaching or Preaching of Peter we must confine ourselves to the elucidation of the Teaching of the Apostles by means of the study of those early documents which are accessible to us, such as the earlier parts of the Talmudic literature and those Greek books, the Sibyllines to wit, in which we find a collocation or a fusion of Hebrew, Greek and Christian ethics. With regard to the Talmud, I am too ignorant to say more than that I believe there are passages in the Teaching of the Apostles which only the Mishna can explain; what the Sibyllines have to say will appear in the following remarks.

Now in dealing with quotations from or by the Pseudo-Sibyllines we have to remember that there are peculiar difficulties in

¹ Ps. Phocylides 89. Perhaps referring to a written Teaching.

the determination of the periods to which the separate books and portions of books contained in the collection are to be assigned. The majority of them are generally admitted to be Christian in origin and sentiment and of various centuries, from the first onward; but there are other parts which are as distinctly Jewish or heathen, and to some of these we are obliged to assign a date much earlier than the Christian era. It appears therefore that the fashion of writing religious history and teaching religious truth in hexameter verse under the assumed authority of an inspired Sibyl, must have been common to all classes of believers at certain times in the world's history; and in the early Christian Church, in particular, few writers are so authoritatively appealed to as those who concocted the Sibylline verses. This is especially true of authors in the second and third centuries, such as Justin, Theophilus, Athenagoras and Clement of Alexandria, in discussions with Greek or Jewish opponents.

Some idea of the extent of Pseudo-Sibylline literary activity may be gathered from the following table given in Alexandre's *Excursus ad Sibyllina*¹. According to this learned writer, we must divide the third and eighth books of the Sibyllines into four parts respectively and remove the portion of the second book which is known by the name of the *ποίημα νουθετικόν* of Phocylides (which the writer of the second book has worked up, perhaps with some additions, from an earlier source), and then we may arrange the existing Sibylline books in the following order:

Book iii. §§ 2 and 4 of Jewish origin, written in Egypt, under Ptolemy Philometor, about 165 B.C.

Book iv. the oldest of the Christian Sibyls, written in Asia, in the first century, under Titus or Domitian.

The Proœmium to the collection and the second section of the eighth book were written by a Christian author in Egypt, under Trajan or Hadrian.

The first section of the eighth book is also Christian, and was written in Egypt in the reign of Antoninus Pius.

The third section of the third book and the fifth book are to

¹ P. 439.

be referred to the same time and place, but Alexandre thinks them more Jewish than Christian.

The sixth and seventh books were written in Asia by a Christian hand about A.D. 234.

The third and fourth parts of the eighth book are to be referred to the middle of the third century.

The first two books and the third book, § 1, are of Christian origin, written in Asia in the middle of the third century, but subsequently rehandled.

The other books, xi. xii. xiii. xiv., were written in Egypt about A.D. 267, by a Jew rather than a Christian, according to Alexandre's judgment.

The foregoing table gives also a notion of the extent to which critical methods have been applied to the collection of Sibylline books; and (it need not be said) the conclusions arrived at are not perfectly coincident with those found in other writers on the subject. We shall presently return to the questions of authorship and date, so far as they come under the scope of our enquiry: but for us it is a necessary preliminary to present first the parallelisms between the Sibyllines and the Teaching of the Apostles, for these form an important part of the evidence by which the dates are decided. The following are the chief coincidences to which our attention should be directed. The references are respectively to the Bryennios edition of the Teaching and to Friedlieb's edition of the Oracles. In cases where a citation is made from Pseudo-Phocylides the reference is to the edition of Jacob Bernays.

a. Teaching i. Διδαχὴ Κυρίου διὰ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων τοῖς ἔθνεσιν. ὁδοὶ δ' ὅσοι εἰς κτέ.

Orac. Sib. vi. 9

δείξει δ' ἀνθρώποισιν ὁδούς, δείξει δὲ κελεύθους
οὐρανίους· πάντας δὲ σοφοῖς μύθοισι διδάξει.

β. Teaching i. ὁδοὶ δ' ὅσοι εἰσὶ, μία τῆς ζωῆς καὶ μία τοῦ θανάτου.

Orac. Sib. viii. 399

αὐτὸς ὁδὸς προέθηκα δ' ὅσοι, ζωῆς θανάτου τε,
καὶ γνώμην προέθηκ' ἀγαθὴν ζῶν προέλεσθαι.

Cf. *Orac. Sib.* viii. 487

εὐσεβίης τε καὶ ἀτρεκίης βαίνοντες ἀταρπούς.

γ. *Teaching* i. πρῶτον, ἀγαπήσεις τὸν θεὸν τὸν ποιήσαντά σε· δεύτερον, τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν.

Orac. Sib. viii. 481

ἐν κραδίῃ τε ταπεινοφρονεῖν, πικρὰ τέρματα μισεῖν
καὶ πάντως ἀγαπᾶν τὸν πλησίον ὥσπερ ἑαυτόν·
καὶ θεὸν ἐκ ψυχῆς φιλέειν, αὐτῷ δὲ λατρεύειν.
τοῦνεκ' ἄρ' ἡμεῖς, ὅσῃς χριστοῦ γενέθλης
οὐρανίης πεφυῶτες, ἐπικλεόμεσθα σύναιμοι,
μνηστὴν εὐφροσύνης ἐπὶ θρησκείῃσιν ἔχοντες,
εὐσεβίης τε καὶ ἀτρεκίης βαίνοντες ἀταρπούς.

The expression of the last line, βαίνοντες ἀταρπούς, renders it likely that the first three lines have a reference to the Teaching concerning the Two Ways. To the foregoing we may add the following, which belongs really to the Phocylidea.

Orac. Sib. ii. 60 = *Ps. Phocyl.* 8

πρῶτα θεὸν τίμα, μετέπειτα δὲ σείο γυνῆας.

δ. *Teaching* i. παντὶ τῷ αἰτοῦντί σε δίδου καὶ μὴ ἀπαίτει·
πᾶσι γὰρ θέλει δίδοσθαι ὁ πατὴρ ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων χαρισμάτων.

Orac. Sib. ii. 88 = *Ps. Phocyl.* 29

πλοῦτον ἔχων σὴν χεῖρα πενητεύουσιν ὄρεξον·
ὧν τοι ἔδωκε θεός, τούτων χρήζουσι παράσχου.

The sentiment will also be found in the Preaching of Peter with close parallelism to the Διδαχή. Cf. Hilgenfeld, *Prædicatio Petri*, p. 57.

ε. *Teaching* i. ἰδρωτάτω ἡ ἐλεημοσύνη σου εἰς τὰς χεῖράς σου, μέχρῃς ἂν γνῶς τίτι δῶς.

Orac. Sib. ii. 77, cf. *Ps. Phocyl.* 23

πτωχοῖς εὐθὺ δίδου μητ' αὔριον ἐλθέμεν εὔπης·
ἰδρῶσι σταχύων χειρὶ χρήζοντι παράσχου·
ὃς δ' ἐλεημοσύνην παρέχει, θεῷ οἶδε δανείζειν.

The passage quoted from the Teaching is one of the most difficult in the whole tract, and numerous unsatisfactory emendations have been proposed for the peculiar ἰδρωτάτω of

the MS. which we retain in preference to the slightly modified *ἰδρωσάτω* of Bryennios. [The suggestion that we have here a peculiar form *ἰδρωτάω* is, I believe, due to Dr Hort. Dr Hort also proposes to prefix a negative *μὴ* in order to maintain the continuity of the passage with what has gone before. It may be doubted whether this is necessary in order to make the passage intelligible.]

The passage taken from the Sibyllist shews a curious parallelism with the Teaching in the conjunction of *ἰδρώς* and *ἐλεημοσύνη*. But it is unfortunate that the second line is as it stands unintelligible¹, and the three unconnected datives get in one another's way. Some primitive difficulty in the passage must have existed, since the parallel in the common Phocylidean text writes for these two lines

πληρώσας σέο χεῖρ' ἔλεον χρήζοντι παράσχου

in which the first word looks like a curious misreading or correction of *ἰδρώς*. The lines, however, become quite intelligible if we make a very slight modification and read

ἰδρῶσι στάζων χεῖρα χρήζοντι παράσχου.

Cf. Soph. *Ajax* 10

κάρα

στάζων ἰδρῶτι καὶ χέρας ξιφοκτόνους,

and when this correction is made, the parallelism with the language of the Teaching shews that in the latter the main idea is the connexion between personal charity and one's earnings.

5. *Teaching* ii.

οὐ φονεύσεις, οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ παιδοφθορήσεις.

Ps. Phocyl. 3

μήτε γαμοκλοπέειν, μήτ' ἄρσενα κύπριν ὀρίνειν·

μήτε δόλους ῥάπτειν μηθ' αἵματι χεῖρα μιαίνειν.

Similar conjunctions are found in the Sibyllines, *passim*.

ζ. *Teaching* ii. *οὐ μαγεύσεις, οὐ φαρμακεύσεις.*

Ps. Phocyl. 149

φάρμακα μὴ τεύχειν· μαγικῶν βίβλων ἀπέχεσθαι.

¹ Friedlieb translates courageously,

Von der Erndte Ertrag mittheile dem Armen freigebig.

This passage is found in the part of the Phocylidea beyond that appropriated by the Sibyllist.

η. *Teaching* ii. οὐ φονεύσεις τέκνον ἐν φθορᾷ οὐδέ γεννηθὲν ἀποκτενεῖς.

Orac. Sib. iii. 762

μοιχείαν πεφύλαξο καὶ ἄκριτον ἄρσενος εὐνήν·
τὴν δ' ἰδίαν γένναν παίδων τρέφε μὴδὲ φονεύσης.

Orac. Sib. ii. 280 ὅσσαι δ' ἐνὶ γαστέρι φόρτους

ἐκτρώσκουσιν, ὅσοι τοκετοὺς ῥίπτουσιν ἀθέσμους,
φαρμακοὶ ἢ καὶ φαρμακίδες.

Ps. Phocyl. 184

μὴδὲ γυνὴ φθείροι βρέφος ἔμβρυον ἔνδοθι γαστρός,
μὴδὲ τεκοῦσα κυσὶν ῥίψῃ, καὶ γυνὴν ἔλωρα.

The coincidence of the last sentence with the Teaching is very striking.

θ. *Teaching* ii. οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις τὰ τοῦ πλησίον.

Orac. Sib. ii. 57 = *Ps. Phocyl.* 6

ἀρκεῖσθαι παρευῶσι καὶ ἀλλοτρίων ἀπέχεσθαι.

The interest in the last quotation lies in the fact that it is in verbal agreement with Heb. xiii. 5, where the injunction against covetousness follows upon that which regards marriage-sanctity, the order of thought being the same as in the Teaching.

ι. *Teaching* ii. οὐκ ἐπιорκήσεις, οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις.

Orac. Sib. ii. 68 = *Ps. Phocyl.* 16

μὴδὲ ἐπιорκήσης, μήτ' ἀγνῶς μήτ' εἰκαῖος.

Orac. Sib. ii. 64 = *Ps. Phocyl.* 12

μαρτυρίην ψευδῆ φεύγειν, τὰ δίκαια βραβεύειν.

ια. *Teaching* ii. οὐκ ἔση διγνώμων οὐδὲ δίγλωσσος· παγὶς γὰρ θανάτου ἢ διγλωσσία· οὐκ ἔσται ὁ λόγος σου ψευδής...οὐκ ἔση πλεονέκτης οὐδὲ ἄρπαξ οὐδὲ κακοήθης οὐδὲ ὑπερήφανος.

Orac. Sib. iii. 37, 38, 40

ἀνθρώπων ψευδῶν διγλώσσων καὶ κακοηθῶν,
λεκτροκλόπων, εἰδωλολατρῶν, δόλια φρονούντων,

· · · · ·
αὐτοῖς ἀρπάζοντες, ἀναίδεα θυμὸν ἔχοντες.

Oracl. Sib. ii. 58 = *Ps. Phocyl.* 7

ψεύδεα μὴ βάζειν τὰ δ' ἐτήτυμα πάντ' ἰγορεύειν.

This is perhaps the best place to draw attention to the beautiful emendation made by Bernays in the 13th line of the Phocylidea, = *Oracl. Sib.* ii. 65, where the MSS. and texts read,

παρθενίην τηρεῖν, πίστιν δ' ἐπὶ πᾶσι φυλάσσειν.

If we put *παρθεσίην* for *παρθενίην*, we not only restore the broken continuity of thought in the passage, and get rid of the discordance between the sentiment involved in the ordinary reading and that of the 175th line of the Phocylidea,

μὴ μείνης ἄγαμος μὴ πὼς νόνυμνος ὄλῃαι,

but we also throw some light on the ethical engagements of the early Christians. For in the celebrated letter of Pliny to Trajan we find that the covenant entered into by the members of the new fraternity (which, by the by, is almost certain to be based upon some written book of doctrine) was to the following effect: *sed ne furta, ne latrocinia, ne adulteria committerent, ne fidem fallerent, ne depositum appellati abnegarent*. The last clause is exactly versified in the Phocylidea, as emended (cf. also *Sib.* ii. 278); and while I do not think there is anything closely corresponding to it in the Teaching, it seems likely to have formed a part of some early oral or written *Διδασκαλία*.

ιβ. *Teaching* ii. οὐ λήψῃ βουλήν πονηρὰν κατὰ τὸν πλησίον σου.

Ps. Phocyl. 4 μὴτε δόλους ῥάπτειν.

ιγ. *Teaching* iii. τέκνον μου, φεῦγε ἀπὸ παντὸς πονηροῦ καὶ ἀπὸ παντός ὁμοίου αὐτοῦ.

Oracl. Sib. ii. 145 = *Ps. Phocyl.* 76

σωφροσύνην ἀσκεῖν, αἰσχροῶν δ' ἔργων ἀπέχεσθαι,
μὴ μίμοῦ κακότητα.

ιδ. *Teaching* iii. μὴ γίνου ὀργίλος· ὀδηγεῖ γὰρ ἡ ὀργὴ πρὸς τὸν φόνον.

Oracl. Sib. ii. 126 = *Ps. Phocyl.* 57

μὴ προπετὴς ἐς χεῖρα· χαλίνου δ' ἄγριον ὀργήν.
πολλάκις γὰρ πλήξας, αἰέκων φόνον ἐξετέλεσσε.

I think we may remark in each of the immediately preceding instances, that the Teaching has been directly versified by the Sibyllist or Ps. Phocylides. (This conclusion will be of the highest importance.) For instance we see that the Teaching of the Apostles has a number of similar progressions from one sin to another, an idea which underlies the whole of the third chapter, and could hardly have been arrived at by the mere translation into prose of two lines of Phocylides. We may be sure, too, that prose ethics have preceded verse ethics, and that in the present case it is not sufficient to remark the use of the ethical portions of the Pentateuch in order to explain the coincidences of language between the Teaching and the Phocylidea.

ιε. *Teaching* iii. μὴ γίνου ὀργίλος..μηδὲ ζηλωτὴς μηδὲ ἐριστικὸς μηδὲ θυμικός.

Orac. Sib. ii. 135 = *Ps. Phocyl.* 63

θυμός ὑπερχόμενος μανίην ὀλοόφρονα τεύχει.
ὀργὴ δ' ἐστὶν ὄρεξις, ὑπερβαίνουσα δὲ μῆνις.
ζῆλος γὰρ ἐσθλῶν ἀγαθός, φαύλων δ' αἰδής.

Orac. Sib. ii. 147 = *Ps. Phocyl.* 78

πείθω μὲν γὰρ ὄνειαρ, ἔρις δ' ἔριν ἀντιφυτεύει.

I do not think it will be maintained that this coincidence in the description of ὀργή, θυμός, ζῆλος, ἔρις is a mere accident.

ις. *Teaching* iii. τέκνον μου, μὴ γίνου οἰωνοσκοπός· ἐπειδὴ ὁδηγεῖ εἰς τὴν εἰδωλολατρείαν· μηδὲ ἐπαιδοὺς μηδὲ μαθηματικός.

Orac. Sib. iii. 225

οὐ μάντεις, οὐ φαρμακοὺς¹, οὐ μὴν ἐπαιδοὺς,
οὐ μύθων μωρῶν ἀπάτας ἐγγαστριμύθων,
οὐδὲ τὰ χαλδαίων τὰ προμάντια ἀστρολογοῦσιν
οὐδὲ μὲν ἀστρονομοῦσι.....

234 τοῦ πεπλανῆσθαι ὁδοῦς τ' ἀγαθῆς...

Both these passages follow Leviticus xx. 26, 31, but the last line seems to have a consciousness of the Two Ways.

¹ I.e. φαρμακείας.

ιζ. *Teaching* iv. κρινεῖς δικαίως, οὐ λήψῃ πρόσωπον ἐλέγξαι ἐπὶ παραπτώμασιν.

Teaching v. πλουσίων παράκλητοι, πενήτων ἄνομοι κριταί.

Orac. Sib. ii. 61 = *Ps. Phocyl.* 9

πάντα δίκαια νέμειν, μηδὲ κρίσιν ἐς χάριν ἔλκε
μὴ ῥίψῃς πενήτην ἀδίκως, μὴ κρίνε πρόσωπον.

ιη. *Teaching* iv. εἰ ἔχῃς, διὰ τῶν χειρῶν σου δώσεις
λύτρωσιν ἁμαρτιῶν σου.

Orac. Sib. ii. 81

ῥύεται ἐκ θανάτου ἔλεος, κρίσις ὁππότ' ἂν ἔλθῃ;

Ps. Phocyl. 23

πληρώσας σέο χεῖρ' ἔλεον χρήζοντι παράσχου.

The parallel passages lead us to infer that the text of the *Teaching* would be better punctuated if the comma were removed and placed after σου.

ιβ. *Teaching* iv. οὐ διστάσεις δοῦναι οὐδὲ διδούς γογγύσεις, γνώσῃ γὰρ τίς ἐστὶν ὁ τοῦ μισθοῦ καλὸς ἀνταποδότης.

Orac. Sib. ii. 78 = *Ps. Phocyl.* 22 πτωχοῖς εὐθὺς δίδου.

Orac. Sib. ii. 91

μήποτε ἄνδρα πένητα ἰδὼν σκώψῃς ἐπέεσσι.

Orac. Sib. ii. 274 ὅποσοι δ' ἰδίῳ ἀπὸ μόχθων

δόντες ὀνειδίζουσιν.

Orac. Sib. ii. 80

ὅς δ' ἐλεημοσύνην παρέχει, θεῷ οἶδε δανείζειν¹.

κ. *Teaching* iv. συγκοινωνήσεις δὲ πάντα τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου καὶ οὐκ ἐρεῖς ἴδια εἶναι.

¹ The coincidence between 'knowing who is one's rewarder' and 'knowing that one lends to the Lord' is striking. The following passage, from an early anonymous writer (or collection of writers), containing references to the *Teaching*, is in the same direction: τινὲς φασιν ὅτι οὐ δεῖ ἀνεξέταστον παρέχειν ἐλεημοσύνην ἀλλ' ἐρωτᾶν μετὰ ἀκριβείας εἰ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ ἐνδεὴς ἐστὶν ὁ ἡμῖν προσερχόμενος. Λέγει γάρ, φήσιν,

ὁ Σολομών ὅτι εἰς ποιῆς ἀγαθόν, βλέπε τίς ποιεῖς. Οὕτω καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς γραφὰς οἱ κακῶς νοοῦντες διαστρέφουσιν· οὐ γὰρ περὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τοῦ πτωχοῦ τοῦτο εἶπεν ὁ Σολομών· ἀλλὰ βλέπε τίς ποιεῖς, τούτεστιν ὅτι τῷ θεῷ ποιεῖς· εἰ γὰρ πρὸ τοῦ ἀνακρίνειν τοὺς αἰτοῦντας τοῦτο φησι, πῶς ὁ κύριος λέγει, παντὶ τῷ αἰτοῦντί σε δίδου;

Quest. in Antiochum,

Migne, Patr. Gr. xxviii. 649.

Orac. Sib. ii. 90, *Ps. Phocyl.* 30

κοινὸς πᾶς ὁ βίος μερόπων· ἄνισος δὲ τέτυκται·
ἔστω κοινὸς ἅπας ὁ βίος καὶ ὁμόφρονα πάντα.

And here it will be remembered that the Sibyllines are full of communistic sentiments of the most pronounced kind, and of lamentations over human inequalities, which undoubtedly preserve early Essene and Christian teaching.

κα. Teaching vi. περὶ δὲ τῆς βρώσεως, ὃ δύνασαι βάστασον. ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ εἰδωλοθύτου λίαν πρόσεχε.

Orac. Sib. ii. 96 = *Ps. Phocyl.* [32]

αἷμα δὲ μὴ φαγέειν, εἰδωλοθύτων δ' ἀπέχεσθαι.

κβ. Teaching vi. λατρεία γάρ ἐστι θεῶν νεκρῶν.

Orac. Sib. viii. 46 καὶ πάντων ὧν ἐσεβάσθης
δαίμονας ἀψύχους νεκρῶν εἰδωλα καμώντων.

Orac. Sib. viii. 393

ταῦτα γὰρ ἐς μνήμην βασιλῶν ἢ δὲ τυράννων
δαίμοσι ποιήσουσι νεκροῖς ὥς οὐρανίοισι.

With this striking instance we conclude the cases which we have noted of coincidence between the first part of the Teaching of the Apostles (the Doctrine of the Two Ways) and the Sibyllines (including Pseudo-Phocylides). The next step is to point out a few illustrations of the liturgical sections of the Teaching, and then to pass on to the remarkable parallelisms which occur in the Sibylline doctrine of the Second Advent, as compared with the closing section of the Teaching of the Apostles; and first of all with regard to the custom of immersion in running water:

κγ. Teaching vii. βαπτίσατε εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐν ὕδατι ζῶντι.

Orac. Sib. iv. 165

ἐν ποταμοῖς λοῦσασθε ὅλον δέμας ἀενάοις,
χεῖρας τ' ἐκτανύσαντες ἐς αἰθέρα, τῶν πάρος ἔργων
συγγνώμην αἰτεῖσθε καὶ εὐσεβίαις ἀσεβείαν
πικρὰν λύσασθε.

And the connected idea of baptism in the water of a fountain is preserved in the symbolical language,

Orac. Sib. viii. 247

ὑδασι φωτίζων κλητοὺς ἐν δώδεκα πηγῇς,

where the reference is to the ministry of the twelve Apostles. To the foregoing we may add :

Orac. Sib. viii. 315

ἀθανάτου πηγῆς ἀπολουσάμενοι ὑδάτεσσι
τὰς πρότερου κακίας ἵνα γεννηθέντες ἄνωθεν
μηκέτι δουλεύωσιν ἄθεσμοις ἢθεσι κόσμου,

a passage which recalls also the language of the fourth gospel.

κδ. *Teaching* vii. εἰν δὲ ἀμφότερα μὴ ἔχῃς, ἔκχεον εἰς τὴν κεφαλὴν τρίς ὕδωρ εἰς ὄνομα Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ καὶ ἁγίου Πνεύματος.

Orac. Sib. vii. 87

οὐδὲ θύρην κλείσεις ὅτε τις σοι ἐπήλυτος ἄλλος
ἥξει δυνόμενος, περίης ἀπερυκέναι λιμόν,
ἀλλὰ λαβὼν κεφαλὴν τοῦδ' ἀνέρος, ὕδατι ράνας,
εὗξαι τρίς.

The passage quoted is somewhat obscure: if we could understand ἐπήλυτος in the sense of a proselyte, it would be more intelligible; but it seems rather to refer to the visit of a needy stranger who has to receive some kind of baptism before he can sit at the table. But in any case we have an allusion to trine aspersion and accompanying prayer.

κε. *Teaching* xi. καὶ πᾶς προφήτης ὀρίζων τράπεζαν κτέ.

Orac. Sib. v. 266

καὶ γλώσσαις ἁγλαῖς ἐπιστήσονται τράπεζαν.

The reference is to some festival to be celebrated in the future days of Jerusalem's prosperity. It may be interesting to note here that the somewhat similar expression ὀρίζων βάπτισμα is found several times in Hippolytus' *Philosophumena*.

κς. *Teaching* xi. οὐ φάγεται ἀπ' αὐτῆς [πρὸ τῆς εὐχῆς],

where the words in brackets are inserted conjecturally, in

order to harmonize the sentence with what precedes (*ἀλλ' ἐὰν ἔχη τοὺς τρόπους κυρίου κτέ*), and to conform it to Josephus' description of an Essene meal (*Bell. Jud.* II. viii. 5), *προκατεύχεται δὲ ὁ ἱερεὺς τῆς τροφῆς καὶ γεύσασθαι τινα πρὸ τῆς εὐχῆς ἀθέμιτον*. Cf. also *Pirge aboth* iii. 3: "Three that have eaten at one table, and have said over it words of Thorah, are as if they had eaten of the table of Maqom" (i.e. God). The following sentence from the Parallels of John Damascene and cited variously as *ex patre* (p. 453 Lequien), *ex sancto seno* (Cod. Rup.), and *ex libro sanctorum senium* (Cod. Reg. 923), contains the same sentiment; *Τράπεζα μὴ ἔχουσα μνήμην θεοῦ, φάτνης ἀλόγων οὐδὲν διενήνοχεν*.

Orac. Sib. iv. 25

*ἔσσοι δὴ στέρξουσιν θεὸν μέγαν εὐλογέοντες
πρὶν φαγέειν πινέειν τε.*

To the foregoing suggestions and illustrations with regard to the Baptism and Agape, we subjoin one on the necessity of personal labour.

κζ. Teaching xiii. *τεχνίτης ὦν, ἐργαζέσθω καὶ φαγέτω· εἰ δὲ οὐκ ἔχει τέχνην κατὰ τὴν σύνεσιν ὑμῶν προνοήσατε πῶς μὴ ἀργὸς μεθ' ὑμῶν ζήσεται χριστιανός.*

Ps. Phocyl. 154

*πᾶς γὰρ ἀεργὸς ἀνὴρ ζῶει κλοπίμων ἀπὸ χειρῶν.
τέχνη τοι τρέφει ἄνδρας, ἀεργὸν δ' ἔψατο λιμός.
εἰ δέ τις οὐκ δεδάηκε τέχνην, σκάπτοιτο δικέλλη.*

It is interesting to observe that Phocylides has settled the difficulty with regard to occupation in the same way that presented itself to the Unjust Steward in the Gospel, when the prospect of losing his place was before him (*οὐκ ἰσχύω σκάπτειν*¹).

¹ This alternative of digging (for the man without a craft) comes out more clearly in an interesting tract attached to the works of Athanasius, called *Syntagma Doctrinae*, which has preserved a great many of the sayings of the *Διδαχή*. The writer of the tract

is extremely opposed to trade as a means of living, and regards it as only permissible in cases where a man has no craft and the land around him is not in cultivation.

Migne, *Patr. Gr.* xxviii. col. 840. *καὶ ὅλως μὴ πραγματεύων· πολλαὶ χώραι*

We come now to the doctrine of the Last Things.

κη. *Teaching* xvi. ἐν γὰρ ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις πληθυνθήσονται οἱ ψευδοπροφῆται καὶ οἱ φθορεῖς.

Orac. Sib. ii. 165

ἡ δὲ συναίρεσις ἐγγὺς ὅταν τινὲς ἀντὶ προφητῶν
ψευδαπάται πελάσωσιν ἐπὶ χθονὶ φημίζοντες.

κθ. *Teaching* xvi. καὶ τότε φανήσεται ὁ κοσμοπλάνης ὡς υἱὸς θεοῦ καὶ ποιήσει σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα.....καὶ τότε φανήσεται τὰ σημεῖα τῆς ἀληθείας.

Orac. Sib. ii. 167

καὶ Βελιὰρ δ' ἥξει καὶ σήματα πολλὰ ποιήσει.

Orac. Sib. iii. 52

ἐκ δὲ Σεβαστηνῶν ἥξει Βελιὰρ μετόπισθεν

.

καὶ νέκυας στήσει καὶ σήματα πολλὰ ποιήσει

εἰσι μὴ σπειρεῖσαι καὶ οἱ οἰκοῦντες ἐὰν τέχνας μὴ ἔχωσιν ἀναγκάζονται πραγματεύειν.

And the writer expresses himself to the same effect in col. 841: πρὸ παντὸς δὲ τέχνην ἐπιχειρεῖν· ἐν ἀγρῷ ἐργάζου ἵνα μὴ ἐσθίῃς ἄρτον ἀργόν· μάλλον δὲ ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν σου ἔχε πρὸς τὸ ἀναπαύειν ἀδελφοὺς καὶ ξένους καί, εἰ δυνατόν, χήρας καὶ ὀρφανοὺς καὶ μετρίους.

I think we may conclude from this that the only interpretation which the Church put upon the language of the Teaching was that the alternative for a craft was agriculture. Nor is it to be neglected that in the preceding we find the expression ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν σου ἔχε of the person who is in a position to help others just as in the Διδαχὴ we have ἐὰν ἔχῃς διὰ τῶν χειρῶν σου.

As remarked above, this tract is certainly modelled on the Teaching; the following coincidences may be noted:

Col. 836. Κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἀγαπήσεις ἐξ ὅλης καρδίας σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης

τῆς ψυχῆς σου καὶ τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτὸν· Οὐ φοιεύσεις, οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ πορνεύσεις, οὐ παιδοφθορήσεις, οὐ φαρμακεύσεις, οὐ διχοστατήσεις κτέ· cf. Διδ. i. ii.

Col. 837. φυλάττεσθαι τε μὴ εἶναι δίλογον μὴ δίγνωμον μὴ ψεύστην μὴ κατάλαλον.

Cf. Διδ. ii. οὐκ ἔση διγνώμων οὐδὲ δίγλωσσος...οὐκ ἔσται ὁ λόγος σου ψευδής.

Col. 837. μὴ μαγεύειν, μὴ φαρμακεύειν...μὴ ἀπέρχεσθαι πρὸς ἐπασιδὸν μῆτε φυλακτήριον ἐαυτῷ περιτίθεναι μηδὲ περικαθαίρειν.

Cf. Διδ. ii. iii.

Col. 840. γίνου ταπεινὸς καὶ ἡσυχίος, τρέμων διὰ παντὸς τὰ λόγια τοῦ κυρίου.

Cf. Διδ. iii. γίνου...ἡσυχίος καὶ ἀγαθὸς καὶ τρέμων τοὺς λόγους διὰ παντὸς οὓς ἤκουσας.

Col. 841. εἰ δέ τις ἀντιλέγει τοῖς προειρημένοις θεῷ ἐστὶν ἀντιλέγων. Cf. Διδ. vi.

Col. 841. δικαίως συνάγων καρποὺς καὶ μὴ ἔχων τι ἀδικίας πρῶτον μὲν τὰς ἀπαρχὰς τοῖς ἱερεῦσι πρόσφερε.

Cf. Διδ. c. xiii.

ἀνθρώποις, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ τελεσφόρα ἔσσειτ' ἐν αὐτῷ
ἀλλὰ πλάνη κτέ.

Belial or Beliar, as is well known, is the common name for Antichrist, who is to precede Messiah (at his second advent, according to Christian belief). Alexandre observes that he is said to come from Rome, the city of the Augusti. Ewald however thinks that we are here to understand Samaria, in which case Simon Magus presents himself, the ignis fatuus of early Church history¹.

λ. *Teaching* xvi. τότε ἥξει ἡ κτίσις τῶν ἀνθρώπων εἰς
τὴν πύρωσιν τῆς δοκιμασίας.

Orac. Sib. iii. 86 καὶ κτίσιν αὐτὴν
εἰς ἓν χωνεύσει καὶ εἰς καθαρὸν διαλέξει.

Orac. Sib. viii. 412
χωνεύσω γὰρ ἅπαντα καὶ εἰς καθαρὸν διαλέξω.

Orac. Sib. ii. 217 ἀλλ' ἅμα πάντα
εἰς ἓν χωνεύσει καὶ εἰς καθαρὸν διαλέξει.

In these quotations the Sibyllists of the second and third books seem to have imitated the earlier Sibyllist of the eighth, who himself presents a text very like a versification of the Teaching. Friedlieb, however, believes the portion of the third book from which the quotation is made, vv. 46—96, to be præ-Christian! (Die Verse 46—96 gehören einem Verfasser

¹ A very interesting discussion as to the place where Antichrist will appear is found in the *Questiones ad Antiochum*, bound up with the Works of Athanasius (Migne, *Patr. Gr.* xxviii.). In this treatise, which has many suggestive analogies with the Teaching, it is argued that Antichrist is distinguished from Christ at his second Advent, by the fact that he appears in one special place, whereas the Son of Man appears as the lightning from East to West. It is agreed that he will raise the dead (cf. the νέκρας στήσει of the third Sibylline); and his place

of appearing is Galilee, or more exactly Scythopolis, because it is written, 'Dan is a lion's whelp, he shall leap from Bashan.' Here we have another early belief, namely that the Antichrist comes of the tribe of Dan, because this tribe is not mentioned in the sealing of the 144,000 in the Apocalypse (cf. Irenæus, v. xxx. 1). It is worth notice that, although most of these beliefs are early, the Teaching does not contain them, and confines itself to a much more simple statement.

an, der nicht viel früher als 31 v. Chr. gelebt haben kann. p. xxxvii.)

λα. *Teaching* xvi. οἱ δὲ ὑπομείναντες ἐν τῇ πίστει αὐτῶν σωθήσονται ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ καταθέματος.

Orac. Sib. ii. 253

καὶ τότε δὴ πάντες δι' αἰθομένου ποταμοῦ
καὶ φλογὸς ἀσβέστου διελεύσονται, οἱ δὲ δίκαιοι
πάντες σωθήσονται.

Here it will be observed that the Sibyllist regards all the human race as involved in the fiery destruction of the world, but the righteous as able to find deliverance. This may perhaps confirm us in the belief that the difficult passage in the Teaching is to be translated: "But they that have been stedfast in their faith shall be saved *from under the curse itself*," i.e. the common curse of the destruction of the old order by fire of which the writer of the Teaching has been speaking in the early part of the sentence: in which case we escape the idea that τὸ κατάθεμα is here a veiled allusion to Christ.

λβ. *Teaching* xvi. καὶ τότε φανήσεται τὰ χημεῖα τῆς ἀληθείας, πρῶτον, σημεῖον ἐκπετάσεως ἐν οὐρανῷ, εἶτα σημεῖον φωνῆς σάλπιγγος, καὶ τὸ τρίτον ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν.

Orac. Sib. ii. 187

καὶ τόθ' ὁ θεσβίτης γε ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἄρμα τιταίνων
οὐράνιον, γαίῃ δ' ἐπιβὰς τότε σήματα τριπλὰ
κόσμῳ ὅλῳ δείξει.

The belief in the appearance of Elias before the Advent (coming first to restore all things) is common both to Jews and Christians. What is curious in the foregoing is that the triple signs of the Teaching are exactly imitated in the Sibyllines; though it is not easy to tell from the context what were the special signs that the writer had in mind.

λγ. *Teaching* xvi. ἥξει ὁ κύριος καὶ πάντες οἱ ἅγιοι μετ' αὐτοῦ. τότε ὄψεται ὁ κόσμος τὸν κύριον ἐρχόμενον ἐπάνω τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.

Orac. Sib. ii. 242

ἥξει δ' ἐν νεφέλῃ πρὸς τ' ἄφθιτον ἄφθιτος αὐτὸς
ἐν δόξῃ Χριστὸς σὺν ἀμύμοσιν ἀγγελτῆρσι.

These passages shew conclusively, as it seems to me, that there must have been amongst some of the Sibyllists a very close acquaintance with the Teaching of the Apostles. A few of the coincidences noted may be imaginary, and no doubt there are others not here noted which present various traces of parallelism; but the majority of the quoted cases cannot be accidental. Let us analyse them and see in what parts of the Sibylline books they are most frequent.

If we arrange the books in the chronological order suggested by Alexandre we have the following result:

| | Number of allusions. | Period assigned by Alexandre. |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Book iii. § 2 (97—294) | 1 | 165 B.C. |
| Book iii. § 4 (489—fin.) | 1 | 165 B.C. |
| Book iv. | 2 | Titus |
| Proœm. | 0 | Trajan |
| Book viii. § 1 (1—216) | 4 | Trajan |
| Book viii. § 2 (217—429) | 1 | Antoninus Pius |
| Book iii. § 3 (295—488) | 0 | Antoninus Pius |
| Book v. | 1 | Antoninus Pius |
| Book vi. | 1 | 234 A.D. |
| Book vii. | 1 | 234 A.D. |
| Book viii. § 3 (430—480) | 0 | 250? A.D. |
| Book viii. § 4 (481—fin.) | 1 | 250? A.D. |
| Book i. | 0 | 250 A.D. |
| Book ii. | 30 | 250 A.D. (except Ps. Phocyl.) |
| Book iii. § 1 (1—96) | 3 | 250 A.D. |
| Book xi. | 0 | 267 A.D. |
| Book xii. | 0 | 267 A.D. |
| Book xiii. | 0 | 267 A.D. |
| Book xiv. | 0 | 267 A.D. |

It will be observed in the foregoing that there are considerable difficulties connected with the determination of the quoter and quoted in the successive coincidences. Nor are these difficulties diminished if we adopt the conclusions of other critics. For instance the following are the conclusions arrived at by Ewald (*Entstehung, Inhalt und Werth der Sibyllinischen*

Bücher, Göttingen, 1858). There are eight separate compositions in the collection : viz.:

| | DATE. |
|--|---------------|
| i. Book iii. 97—828 | c. 124 B.C. |
| ii. Book iv. | c. 80 A.D. |
| iii. Book v. 52—530 | c. 80 A.D. |
| iv. Books vi. vii. and v. (1—51) | 138 A.D. |
| v. Book viii. 1—360 | c. 211 A.D. |
| vi. Book viii. 361—500 (non-Sibylline) | Second cent. |
| vii. Books i. ii. iii. (1—96) | c. 300 A.D. |
| viii. Books xi.—xiv. | Seventh cent. |

Friedlieb however (*Oracula Sibyllina*, Lipsiæ, 1852) arrives at the following conclusions:

| | | |
|-----------------------------|---|------------------------------|
| Proem. | } | 160 B.C. |
| Book iii. 97—807 | | |
| Book iii. 46—96 | | Just before Actium = 31 B.C. |
| Book iii. 1—45 | | ? |
| Book iv. | | 80 A.D. |
| Book xi. | | 115—118 A.D. |
| Book v. | | Hadrian |
| Book viii. 1—216, 337—429 | | Marcus Aurelius |
| Book vii. | | Last half of second cent. |
| Books i. ii. | | c. 200 A.D. |
| Book viii. 217—336, 430—501 | | c. 200 A.D. |
| Book vi. | | ? |
| Book xii. | | Middle of third cent. |
| Book xiii. | | After 260 A.D. |
| Book xiv. | | Third cent. |

It will be observed that all these critics place a part of the Third Book (which we have credited with two quotations from the $\Delta\iota\delta\alpha\chi\eta'$ or conversely) in the second century before Christ. One of these (η') may perhaps be a fragment of the commonly received ethics of the time, upon which the Teaching undoubtedly builds. The other ($\iota\varsigma'$), however, is a more striking reference to the Teaching, and I do not see how to reconcile it with the date assigned to this part of the book, except by assuming that the Sibyllist has been re-handled by some early Christian or that both the Sibyllist and the writer of the Teaching are working up the same passages in Leviticus. The parallels from the Fourth Book present no difficulty. The passages need not even be regarded as Christian: probably

they express Essene characteristics which this book has absorbed in common with the Teaching. The Baptism, &c. to which allusion is made would thus be the initiatory (or repeated) rites of the most enlightened of the Jewish sects.

No other difficulty presents itself in the existence of quotations from the Teaching, except in so far as relates to the Second Book from which more than 60 per cent. of our illustrations are derived. If these quotations were only found in the text of the Second Book and not in the poem of Phocylides, a large part of which has been inserted in the text, all would be clear. There is nothing strange in the versification of the sentiments of the Teaching by a writer of the second or third century. Pseudo-Phocylides has however been commonly reckoned as an Alexandrian Jew of a period perhaps as early as the second century before Christ: and it would be strange indeed if an ethical poem written at such a time should present very close imitations of the Teaching. No such supposition, however, is necessary; and we are surprised that the belief in the antiquity of the so-called Pseudo-Phocylides should ever have been so widely diffused. For instance we find Ewald placing it at a date equal to and perhaps earlier than the earliest portions of the Third Book of the Oracles¹.

Not that this early date is by any means universally agreed upon. One of the things that has further surprised me in the writing of the present tract is the fact that my friend Paul Sabatier, who has written such an excellent pamphlet upon the Jewish colouring of the Teaching of the Apostles, assigned the poem of Pseudo-Phocylides to the middle of the first century and indicated its relation to the Teaching but seems to have missed the coincidences which are here pointed out. For instance he remarks on p. 51 of his

¹ P. 41. "Vorzüglich haben sich noch die etwa 230 Zeilen gnomischer Dichtung unter Phokylides' Namen erhalten, welche im Grunde einen ähnlichen Zweck verfolgen und die in griechischer Sprachfarbe und dichterischer Kunst eine so grosse Ähnlichkeit

mit unserm Gedichte haben, dass man leicht vermuthen könnte, sie seien von demselben Dichter, wenn nicht andre Gründe zeigten dass sie doch vielmehr von einem andern und von einem etwas ältern Dichter abstammten."

pamphlet, "L'auteur de la Didaché eût été, sans doute, plus explicite s'il avait voulu parler des Montanistes. Les conclusions auxquelles il arrive *sont très voisines de celles du Pseudo-Phocylide, qui écrivit vers le milieu du premier siècle un manuel de morale juive simplifiée pour les païens.*" And again on p. 78, "Nous voyons dans l'auteur de notre document un des représentants de cette école assez nombreuse au premier siècle qui voulait faire du judaïsme et plus tard du christianisme une religion déiste pour tous les peuples. Un homme qui, vers le milieu du siècle, écrivit, sous le nom usurpé du célèbre moraliste grec Phocylide, un petit cours de morale naturelle juive, simplifié à l'usage des nons-Juifs, *s'arrêtait à des solutions analogues.* Cet honnête faussaire n'essaye nullement de convertir son lecteur au judaïsme, il cherche seulement à lui inculquer les préceptes noachiques et quelques règles juives, bien adoucies sur les viandes et sur le mariage." I regard these sentences as containing some of the most important things yet said with regard to the Teaching; and it will probably be before long an accepted conclusion that M. Sabatier and the authorities whom he has followed, have assigned the date of Phocylides more nearly than has been usually given, if it is not also agreed that Phocylides is an actual simplification of an earlier ethical treatise.

It is largely upon the investigations of Jacob Bernays that this view of the early date of the Phocylidea has been established. Now Bernays goes to work to determine the inferior and superior limits of time within which the *ποίημα νουθετικόν* from which the Sibyllist borrowed must be confined, and he concludes that the circulation of the LXX. translation of the Scriptures is a superior limit, while the absence of all traces of the New Testament and of Christianity furnishes us with an inferior limit somewhere in the time of Nero. (Verbietet also zunächst das Fehlen jeder neutestamentlichen Spur über 150 n. Chr. hinaufzusteigen, so zwingt dann ferner das deutliche Absehen auf Besserung der Heiden hinter 70 n. Chr. zurück. Mithin bilden die zwei Jahrhunderte von der Regierung des Philometor bis auf die des Nero der Bereich welcher für die Abfassung des Gedichts mit Wahrscheinlichkeit

sich abstecken lässt¹.) Beyond this point Bernays does not go except to make a guess that the writer of the poem was either a contemporary or a successor of the Alexandrian Jew Aristobulus.

The fact is that Bernays was carried too far in his opposition to Scaliger's theory that the poem was more likely to have had a Christian origin. He maintained that there was not only no trace of the New Testament but also that *one would look in vain for any traces of the early Christian Διδασκαλία*. (In dem ganzen Gedicht findet sich keine einzige, die Prüfung aushaltende Beziehung auf das Neue Testament; nirgends ist eigenthümlich christliche Redeweise zu entdecken: vergebens wird man nach christlichen Einflüssen auf die Moral forschen: und ebenso *vergeblich ist das Suchen nach Spuren irgend eines der concreten christologischen Lehrstücke* wie sie in den Zeiten vor Fixirung der christlichen Urkunden weit mehr noch als die Moral von Freund und Feind gepredigt oder angegriffen wurden².) The examination of our quotations will, I believe, enable us to meet this statement with a strong negative. Not only does it appear that the Teaching of the Apostles has been directly versified, but a little further investigation will shew that the Sibyllist knew that the book he was appropriating was a versification of the Teaching. For he concludes his extract with the words

οἶτος ἀγών, ταῦτ' ἐστὶν ἀέθλια, ταῦτα βραβεῖα,
τοῦτο πύλη ζωῆς καὶ εἰσόδος Ἀθανασίας.

And these remind one at a glance of the Doctrine of the Two Ways. (Compare the ending of the Fourth Chapter of the Teaching.) Not only does he quote Phocylides where Phocylides quotes the Teaching but he quotes or has analogies with the Teaching in places where no parallel is found in Phocylides, just as Phocylides has one or two passages which remind one of the Teaching in the part of the book which the Sibyllist did not appropriate, and even seems to refer to it in a passage quoted at the beginning of the present paper. Both writers, therefore, should be held to be subsequent to the *Διδαχή*: and

¹ *Das Phocylidische Gedicht*, p. 11.

² *l. c.* p. 11.

it is no longer necessary, with Bernays, to omit certain lines from the Phocylidean text on account of an assumed Christian flavour: such a line as (32) which Bernays rejects,

αἶμα δὲ μὴ φαγέειν εἰδωλοθύτων ἀπέχεσθαι,

may very well be a part of the original Phocylidea. And now what will be the effect of these remarks upon our verdict with regard to the date of the *Διδαχὴ*? When we regard the traces of its use in the various early Sibyllists, allow time for its diffusion and its subsequent translation into poetical language, and again for the diffusion of the versified form so that it might come into the hands of a Sibylline writer of (let us say) the middle of the third century, I think we must admit that the hypothesis that the *Διδαχὴ* is a document of the second century is no longer tenable and must be abandoned.

But then the question arises as to whether the writer who thus presents his ethics under the attractive pseudonym of Phocylides¹ has fairly handled the book of doctrine which we have assumed him to versify? Why has he omitted all references to the Gospels which are found in the Teaching, and why is his morality so often inferior, as in such a case as line 31 where it is hard to believe that the writer has reached the point where he is prepared to turn the cheek to the smiter?

τὸ ξίφος ἀμφιβαλοῦ μὴ πρὸς φόνον ἀλλ' ἐς ἄμυναν.

It is only in a modern sense, since the lambs have been more or less turned into wolves, that we can regard this sentiment as

¹ We are assuming the antiquity of the pseudonym on the faith of the mss. which add it to their margin. There is not sufficient evidence for the use of this name by the author, and it may only have been attached from the aphoristic character of the writing and the incorporation of the sentiments and maxims of the real Phocylides into the text: e.g. in the fragments of Phocylides as edited by Bergk, we find:

*οὐδένα θωπεύω πρὸς ὑπόκρισιν· οὗς ὁ
ἄρα τιμῶ,*

τούτους ἐξ ἀρχῆς μέχρι τέλους ἀγαπῶ:
which is like the following in Ps. Phoc. 218:

*στέργε φίλους ἄχρις θανάτου, πίστις γὰρ
ἀμείνων.*

The 87th line of Ps. Phocylides (which Bernays rejects),

*μηδὲ δίκην δικάσης πρὶν ἄμφω μῦθον
ἀκουσῆς,*

is also edited among the fragments of Phocylides.

Christian. It expresses, however, with perfect accuracy the Essene morality. (*Bell. Jud.* II. viii. 4.) Nor are there wanting other traces of Essenism. Josephus tells us of the Essenes, τοῖς ἐτέρωθεν ἡκουσιν αἰρετισταῖς ἀναπέπταται τὰ παρ' αὐτοῖς ὁμοίως ὥσπερ ἴδια κτέ, and we find what looks like a versification of it in Ps. Phocylides¹ 39 ἔστωσαν δ' ὁμότιμοι ἐπήλυδες ἐν πολιήταις, and the Essene sentiment as I think we may take it to be which is found in 1 Tim. vi. 10 is in exact correspondence with Ps. Phocylides 40 ἡ φιλοχρημοσύνη μήτηρ κακότητος ἀπάσης.

It seems to me, therefore, that we must either assume that the Phocylidist of the First Century has produced a morality to be described in M. Sabatier's way, as "simplifiée pour les païens," or we must fall back upon the existence of an earlier and more rudimentary Teaching, ethically more continuous with the Jewish Schools and perhaps somewhat earlier than the Christian era. There is no reason in the nature of things against the existence of a Jewish or Essene *Διδαχή* when we consider how actively proselytism was being carried on about the time of the Christian Era and reflect that our own Apostolic Teaching must have been called into existence by somewhat similar circumstances. I see that M. Massebieau has made a similar suggestion (*Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* x. 2, p. 158), "Dans ces prescriptions qui sanctionnent un certain nombre de coutumes juives j'ai cru pouvoir distinguer les traces d'un enseignement destiné aux prosélytes juifs avant d'être utilisé pour les catéchumènes chrétiens." I think we may be confirmed in this view by a study of the ethics of the works of Philo.

For example, it is interesting to observe that Philo in his treatise *De Specialibus Legibus* includes under the discussion of the Law against Murder the case of those who use poisons and magic arts, and of persons who destroy unborn children or expose those that have been born. (Ed. Mangey ii. 314 εἰς τὸ

¹ It makes little difference whether the origin of such hospitalities be found in the Pentateuch: for we have still

to explain the agreement of the separate writers in emphasizing the same Levitical precepts.

δὲ ἕτεροι πονηρότατοι, χερσὶ καὶ γνώμαις ἐναγείς, οἱ μάγοι καὶ φαρμακευταί. id. ii. 318 εἰ γὰρ τοῦ μηδέπω ταῖς ὀρισμέναις τῶν καιρῶν περιόδοις ἀποκυθηέντος προνοητέον, ὥς μὴ ἐξ ἐπιβουλῆς τι δειρὸν πάθοι, πῶς οὐχὶ μᾶλλον τοῦ τελειογονηθέντος ;)

In the case last mentioned he refers to carnivorous birds and beasts that may prey upon exposed infants just as does the Phocylidist.

Or let us compare the rules given for the distribution of the firstfruits in Philo's treatise *de Præmiis Sacerdotum* with the similar passage in the Teaching. Philo describes the firstfruits as being the priest's dues in dough and wine and oil and every other form of property. (Mangey ii. 233 κελεύει γὰρ τοὺς σιτοποιοῦντας ἀπὸ παντὸς στέατός τε καὶ φυράματος ἄρτον ἀφαιρεῖν ἀπαρχὴν εἰς ἱερέων χρῆσιν.....Δεύτερον δὲ προστάττει καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ἄλλης ἀπάσης κτήσεως ἀπάρχεσθαι, καθ' ἐκάστην μὲν ληνὸν οἶνον, καθ' ἐκάστην δὲ ἄλωνα σίτον τε καὶ κριθήν, ὁμοίως δὲ ἐξ ἐλαιῶν ἔλαιον.....ὥς γοῦν ἡγεμόσι φόρους ἀπὸ παντὸς μέρους κτήσεως δίδοσθαι κελεύει.)

The parallelism is close between the way in which Philo describes the Mosaic rights of the priesthood and the language of the Teaching. Is there anything at all unlikely that the Teaching has incorporated the sentences as to firstfruits from a current book of discipline for the Jewish proselytes of the day, who could not be supposed to extract for themselves from the Scriptures the precepts which were especially binding upon them?

Perhaps it will be said that if this supposition be correct, there is no need to dispute Bernays' date for the Phocylidea, to which we can give any date we please by pushing back the assumed book of discipline to a sufficiently early period. The answer to this is that Ps. Phocylides can only by extremely rough criticism be divested of sentiments which are either Christian or differ very slightly therefrom; and that the whole tenor of the writing is exactly what can be illustrated by the first century. Take for example the following parallels with the language of one of the earliest Christian books, the epistle of James, and one can feel the period to which the book belongs:

- Ps. Phoc. 19. *μισθὸν μοχθήσαντι δίδον· μὴ θλίβε πένητα.*
 144. *ἐξ ὀλίγου σπινθήρος ἀθέσφατος αἴθεται ὕλη.*
 116. *οὐδεὶς γινώσκει τί μεταύριον ἢ τί μεθ' ὥραν.*

The question which arises as to the portions of our present Teaching to which a somewhat earlier date should be assigned is more difficult and must be left to better heads than mine. It is probable that some one will see his way to make the necessary analysis. On the other hand it is scarcely to be doubted that exceptions will be taken by some to the conclusions drawn in the foregoing pages and it may be denied that Ps. Phocylides has versified either our *Διδαχή* or an earlier form. Let the matter be referred to those who are in seats of judgment. In any case I do not think it will be longer contended that the two writings in question which shew such similarity of thought, are to be referred, one to the second century before Christ, and the other to the second century of the Christian era.

APPENDIX.

I. *On the Tract De Virginitate ascribed to Athanasius.*

Mr De Romestin has given in his book on the Teaching, an extract from the above treatise, which he quotes from a review in the *Church Quarterly* for July 1884. The quotation shews that when the early prayer of the Church gave way to more theological forms, it was preserved for use at the daily meal of communities of virgins, which we may thus regard as survivals of the early Christian Agape. But this is not all, for the little tract in which the prayer is found contains other traces of the Teaching, such as a positive reference to the Doctrine of the Two Ways, a second prayer with much in common with the last prayer of the Thankmeal, and it concludes with injunctions to vigilance, and the trimming of the lamp of the spiritual life and service, just as the Teaching does.

The tract in question may be some time later than Athanasias; the quotations in it will be valuable as coming from all parts of the Teaching. The passages referred to are subjoined; the references being to Volume XXVIII. of Migne's *Patrologia Græca*.

Col. 265. καὶ ὅταν καθεσθῇς ἐπὶ τὴν τραπέζην καὶ ἔρχῃ κλᾶσαι τὸν ἄρτον, σφραγίσασα αὐτὸν τρίτον¹ τὸ σημεῖον τοῦ σταυροῦ οὕτως εὐχαριστοῦσα λέγε. εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, Πάτερ ἡμῶν, ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀγίας ἀναστάσεώς σου· διὰ γὰρ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου ἐγνώρισας ἡμῖν αὐτήν. καὶ καθὼς ὁ ἄρτος οὗτος διεσκορπισμένος ὑπῆρχεν ὁ ἐπάνω ταύτης τῆς τραπέζης καὶ συναχθεὶς ἐγένετο ἓν, οὕτως ἐπισυναχθίτω ἡ Ἐκκλησία ἀπὸ τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν σου, ὅτι σοῦ ἐστιν ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, ἀμήν. καὶ ταύτην μὲν τὴν εὐχὴν ἐν τῷ κλᾶν τὸν ἄρτον καὶ θέλειν ἐσθίειν, ὀφείλεις λέγειν.

¹ Query τρις.

Col. 268. καὶ μετὰ τὴν δοξολογίαν πάλιν τὴν εὐχὴν πλήρως λέγουσα οὕτως. ὁ Θεός, ὁ παντοκράτωρ, καὶ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πᾶν ὄνομα, εὐχαριστοῦμεν καὶ αἰνοῦμέν σε ὅτι κατηξίωσας ἡμῖν μεταλαβεῖν τῶν ἀγαθῶν τῶν σῶν, τῶν σαρκικῶν τροφῶν, δεόμεθα καὶ παρακαλοῦμέν σε, Κύριε, ἵνα καὶ τὰς ἐπουρανίους τροφὰς ἡμῖν δωρήσῃ. καὶ δὸς ἡμῖν τρέμειν καὶ φοβεῖσθαι τὸ φρικτὸν καὶ ἔντιμον ὄνομά σου, καὶ μὴ παρακοίειν τῶν ἐντολῶν σου. τὸν νόμον σου¹ καὶ τὰ δικαιώματά σου ἐγκατάθου ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν. ἀγίασον δὲ ἡμῶν τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν καὶ τὸ σῶμα, διὰ τοῦ ἡγαπημένου Παιδός σου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν κτέ.

Col. 273. τί λέγεις, ἄνθρωπε; Ἴδου δύο ὁδοὶ παρετέθηκαν ἐνώπιόν σου, ἡ ζωὴ καὶ ὁ θάνατος· ὅπου ἐὰν θέλῃς πορεύου.

Col. 279. πάσῃ ὥρᾳ μὴ λειψάτω ἔλαιον τῇ λαμπάδι σου, μὴ πότε ἔλθῃ ὁ νύμφιος καὶ εἴρῃ αὐτὴν σβεσθεῖσαν.

It is easy to see the influence of the Teaching in these passages, when we are sure, as from the first quotation, that the writer had that book in his head or hand.

II. *Some traces of the Teaching in early apocryphal writings.*

Precisely in the same way as we find the sentiments of the early Jewish parties in their apocryphal writings, and the survival of primitive Christian manners and communism in monastic organisations, we may notice some traces of early Christian ways in the legendary accounts of the lives of its early teachers. Nowhere else shall we find, for instance, such clear statements of the simplicity and the independence of the apostolic life. And the Teaching of the Apostles may often be directly illustrated from these apocryphal itineraries. For example, in the so-called Acts of John, which we possess in two forms, attributed to his disciples Prochorus and Leucius respectively, we almost always find that the Apostle goes through the process of initiation with his converts in the following order; he teaches them, he baptizes them, he eats with them, and frequently accepts their hospitality for a day or two. In no case have I noted more than a three days' stay, which it will be

¹ Perhaps for τὸ ὄνομά σου.

remembered is just over the superior limit set by the *Διδαχὴ* to keep the Apostle from turning into a false prophet.

The following passages, with references to Zahn's edition, may be found acceptable.

p. 32. μετὰ οὖν τὸ διδαχθῆναι ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου τὸν Διοσκορίδην...ἔπescen Διοσκορίδης εἰς τοὺς πόδας Ἰωάννου λέγων αὐτῷ, ἄνθρωπε τοῦ θεοῦ, βάπτισον καὶ ἐμέ...καὶ λαβὼν ἡμᾶς πάλιν Διοσκορίδης ἀπήγαγεν ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ καὶ παρέθηκεν ἡμῖν τράπεζαν καὶ εὐχαριστήσαντος τῷ θεῷ μετελάβομεν τροφῆς καὶ ἐμείναμεν παρ' αὐτῷ τὴν ἑσπέραν.

p. 35. καὶ ἐδίδαξεν αὐτοὺς τὰ περὶ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος καὶ ἐβάπτισεν...καὶ παρέθηκεν ἡμῖν τράπεζαν.

p. 112. καὶ κατήχησεν αὐτὸν καὶ ἐβάπτισεν εἰς ὄνομα πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ καὶ ἁγίου πνεύματος καὶ ἐμείναμεν παρ' αὐτῷ τὴν ἡμέραν ἐκείνην.

p. 127. καὶ ἐδίδαξεν αὐτοὺς τὰ περὶ πατρὸς υἱοῦ καὶ ἁγίου πνεύματος καὶ ἐβάπτισεν αὐτοὺς καὶ πάντα τὸν οἶκον αὐτῆς καὶ ἐμείναμεν παρ' αὐτῇ ἡμέρας τρεῖς.

And so *passim*.

III. *On χάρις as a name of the Messiah.*

In the tenth chapter of the Teaching, among the ejaculatory utterances at the close of the final prayer of the Thankmeal, we have ἐλθέτω χάρις καὶ παρελθέτω ὁ κόσμος οὗτος. Ὡσαννά τῷ υἱῷ Δαβίδ...Μαριναθά. In his tract upon the Teaching, M. Bonet-Maury made the following remark upon this passage, "Que la grâce, c'est à dire, le Christ, paraisse;" upon which I remarked, as follows, in the *American Journal of Philology* (Vol. VI. I. 103), "the thought suggests itself to us, may not the word χάρις be an actual misreading of the abbreviated $\overline{\chi\rho\varsigma}$?" It will be seen from this that I accepted M. Bonet-Maury's view, that the reference to grace has nothing to do with the benediction at the close of the meeting, but that it is chiliastic. It seems to me that this view is supported by the reference

which immediately follows to the "Son of David" and by the Maranatha. It may, however, be doubted whether there is any need to emend the text, as suggested by me; for *χάρις* may perhaps be an actual early title of the Messiah. Thus, in the Acts of John already quoted, we have on p. 220 a scrap of a Christian hymn, containing

δόξα σοι λόγε. δόξα σοι χάρις,

and on p. 223 we have a list of titles of our Lord beginning with *σταυρὸς* (readers of the Sibylline books will remember the acrostic, Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς Θεοῦ Υἱὸς Σταυρὸς) and ending with *χάρις*.

ὁ σταυρὸς ὁ τοῦ φωτὸς ποτὲ μὲν λόγος καλεῖται ὑπ' ἐμοῦ δι' ὑμᾶς, ποτὲ δὲ νόος, ποτὲ δὲ χριστός, ποτὲ θύρα, ποτὲ ὁδός, ποτὲ ἄρτος, ποτὲ σπόρος, ποτὲ ἀνάστασις, ποτὲ Ἰησοῦς, ποτὲ πατήρ, ποτὲ πνεῦμα, ποτὲ ζωή, ποτὲ ἀληθεία, ποτὲ πιστὴς, ποτὲ χάρις.

It has been pointed out to me that the Talmud (Sanhedrin, 98 b) on Jer. xvi. 13 ("I will not give you *הַנִּיחַ*") makes Chanina to be one of the names of the Messiah; now this word is only a modification of *יח* = *χάρις*¹.

IV. *On the Maranatha Cry in the early Christian Assemblies.*

The following additional remarks may be made upon this subject beyond the explanations and references given elsewhere. First there seems to have been a correct tradition among early Christian writers as to its meaning. The following passages have come under my notice. Ps. Athanasius, *Quest. in ep. Pauli* (Migne, *Patr. Gr.* xxviii. 760), *τί λέγει· εἴ τις οὐ φιλεῖ τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἥτω ἀνάθεμα. Μαράν ἀθά. Τούτεστι· χωρίσατε αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας καὶ τῶν πιστῶν*

¹ Cf. Philo, *Quod deus immutabilis*, 2. *Τούτου γίνεται μαθητρὶς καὶ διάδοχος Ἄννα τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ δώρημα σοφίας· ἐρμηνεύεται γὰρ χάρις αὐτῆς.* It is conceivable that this interpretation which was certainly common at an early date

in the Church (cf. Jerome *de Nom. Heb.* Anna, gratia ejus, and *Lex. Gr. Nom.* Ἄννα χάρις αὐτῆς) may be the reason for the division *ὡς ἀννά* which we find in Greek mss. and in early printed Greek Testaments.

καὶ ἔστω κεχωρισμένος ἀπὸ τοῦ λαοῦ ὁ μὴ πιστεύων· Ὁ γὰρ κύριος ἦλθε· τοῦτο γὰρ ἐρμηνεύει τὸ Μαράν ἀθά.

John Damascene: (Migne xciv. 706) ἐπειδὴ πάντων τῶν κακῶν ὁ τύφος αἵτιος ἦν καὶ τούτων δὲ τὸν τύφον ἡ ἔξωθεν σοφία ἐποίει καὶ τοῦτο τὸ κεφάλαιον ἦν τῶν κακῶν, καταστέλλων αὐτὴν οὐδὲ Ἑλλάδι κέχρηται φωνῇ ἀλλὰ τῇ Ἑβραϊδί, δεικνὺς ὅτι οὐ μόνον καταισχύνεται τὴν ἰδιωτείαν ἀλλὰ καὶ μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς θερμότητος ἀσπάζεται. Τί δέ ἐστὶν τὸ Μαράναθά; ὅτι ὁ κύριος ἦλθεν.

More interesting is the remark (if it should turn out to be correct) that this cry was known to the mob in Alexandria as early as the year 38. We are informed by Philo in his treatise against Flaccus (ed. Mangey ii. 522) that the rabble in Alexandria amused themselves by mocking at a half-witted creature, of the name of Carabas, whom they adorned with a paper crown and rush sceptre and saluted with cries of Μάριν. εἰτ' ἐκ περιστώτος ἐν κύκλῳ πλήθους ἐξήχει βοή τις ἄτοπος, Μάριν ἀποκαλούντων· οὕτως δέ φασι τὸν κύριον ὀνομάζεσθαι παρὰ Σύροις· ἤδειςαν γὰρ Ἀγρίππαν καὶ γένει Σύρον κτέ.

We observe in this account that Philo does not profess any acquaintance with Aramaic but takes his interpretation from the crowd: and the question arises as to how the mob knew more Aramaic than Philo. Further the assumption made by Philo that in thus mocking the madman as a Syrian king, the people were intent on insulting King Agrippa, is probably or at least partly gratuitous; for the details of the sport of the boys shew traces of an imitation of facts recorded in the Gospels. Is it unreasonable to suppose that we have here the earliest trace of the circulation of oral accounts describing the fate of the founder of Christianity and the manner of worship of his followers¹?

¹ Of course if the popular Syrian word which the Alexandrians shouted is Μαράν, there is no room for a conjecture that we should divide the words Μαράν ἀθά differently. Such a suggestion is made by Dr Halévy on the faith of a form 𐤌𐤊𐤍𐤁 = κύριος ἡμῶν in a Nabathean inscription, so that he

would read 𐤌𐤊 𐤌𐤊𐤍𐤁 = our Lord, come. See Neubauer in the recently issued *Oxford Studia Biblica*, p. 73. Also remark that our interpretation of the story is (to my no small satisfaction) substantially the same as that of Prof. Mayor in the recent number of the *Journal of Philology*, Vol. xlv. no. 27.

V. *On the Christ-monger of the Teaching.*

In the fragments of Athanasius we find the following comment on the passage in Matt. vii. with regard to the discrimination of false prophets from the true:

πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων ὀφείλεις δοκιμάζειν τοὺς χριστεμπόρους.

The sentence is headed *περὶ ψευδοπροφητῶν* and may be found in Migne, *Patr. Gr.* xxvi. 1253 and xxvii. 1381; and I think when we contrast the language with the *Διδαχή* c. xi. ἀπὸ οὖν τῶν τρόπων γνωσθήσεται ὁ ψευδοπροφήτης καὶ ὁ προφήτης, and again πᾶς δὲ προφήτης δεδοκιμασμένος, and remark the existence of the curious word *χριστέμπορος*, we must admit that we have here a trace of the Teaching. The remark is not without importance: it shews that Athanasius referred the injunctions against idleness and on the necessity of a craft, not to the mere private Christian on his wanderings, but to the prophet travelling on spiritual service.

VI. *On the Signs of the Truth.*

The true signs, according to the Teaching, are i. *ἐκπέτασις* in heaven, ii. the sound of the trumpet, iii. the resurrection of the dead. The only difficulty lies in the first of these: it has been variously interpreted, but generally so as to mean an opening or unfurling in heaven. That the early Christians attached a different meaning to it, and understood by it the appearing of the cross in the heavens, will be clear from the following considerations: *ἐκπέτασις* is the proper term for the crucifixion, or rather for the attitude of the crucified. In the epistle of Barnabas c. x. the writer makes, out of Moses praying in the battle with Amalek, a type of Christ crucified, *ἐξέτεινε τὰς χεῖρας καὶ οὕτως πάλιν ἐνίκα ὁ Ἰσραὴλ· εἶτα, ὁπότε πάλιν καθεῖλε, πάλιν ἐθανατοῦντο· πρὸς τί; ἵνα γνῶσιν ὅτι οὐ δύνανται σωθῆναι εἰ μὴ ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἐλπίσωσι· καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ προφῆτῃ λέγει· "Ὁλην τὴν ἡμέραν ἐξεπέτασα τὰς χεῖράς μου πρὸς λαὸν ἀπειθοῦντα καὶ ἀντιλέγοντα ὁδῷ δικαίᾳ μου. And*

the very same language is employed in the Sibylline books viii. 302 in reference to the crucifixion,

ἐκπέτασει δὲ χέρας καὶ κόσμον ἅπαντα μετρήσει·
εἰς δὲ τὸ βρῶμα χολὴν καὶ πίνειν ὄξος ἔδωκαν.

Cf. also *Sib.* viii. 251

ὃν Μωσῆς ἐτύπωσε προτείνας ὠλένας ἀγνάς,
and *Sib.* i. 372

ἀλλ' ὅταν ἐκπετάσῃ χειρας καὶ πάντα μετρήσῃ.

The ἐκπέτασις in heaven is then the sign of the Son of Man of Matt. xxiv. 30. The following additional references will shew how common was the belief that the Cross is the sign spoken of, and that the figure of the Crucified is the ἐκπέτασις.

Justin *Dial.* 90. Μωϋσῆς γὰρ πρῶτος ἐξέφανεν αὐτοῦ ταύτην τὴν δοκοῦσαν κατάραν δι' ᾧ ἐποίησε σημείων· τίνων τούτων, ἔφη, λέγεις; ὅτι ὁ λαός, φημί, ἐπολέμει τῷ Ἀμαλήκ καὶ ὁ τοῦ Ναυῆ υἱός, ὁ ἐποιομασθεὶς τῷ Ἰησοῦ ὀνόματι, τῆς μάχης ἦρχεν, αὐτὸς Μωϋσῆς ἠΰχετο τῷ θεῷ τὰς χεῖρας ἐκατέρως ἐκπετάσας... ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς μάχης τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ὄντος, αὐτὸς τὸ σημεῖον τοῦ σταυροῦ ἐποίει.

Dial. 91. διὰ τε τοῦ τύπου τῆς ἐκτάσεως τῶν χειρῶν τοῦ Μωϋσέως.

Cf. *Dial.* 97. καὶ διὰ Ἡσαίου ὁμοίως εἶρητο περὶ τούτου, δι' οὗ τρόπου ἀποθνήσκειν ἔμελλεν, οὕτως· ἐξεπέτασά μου τὰς χεῖρας κτέ.

Dial. 111. ὁ μὲν γὰρ αὐτῶν τὰς χεῖρας ἐκτείνας ἐπὶ τοῦ βουνοῦ μέχρ' ἐσπέρας ἔμενεν, ὑποβασταζομένων τῶν χειρῶν, ὃ οὐδενὸς ἄλλον τύπον δείκνυσιν ἢ τοῦ σταυροῦ ὁ δὲ κτέ.

Dial. 112. οὐχὶ δὲ ἀνοίσομεν ἐπὶ τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ σταυρωθέντος Ἰησοῦ τὸ σημεῖον, ἐπεὶ καὶ Μωϋσῆς διὰ τῆς ἐκτάσεως τῶν χειρῶν κτέ.

1 *Apol.* 55. τὸ δὲ ἀνθρώπειον σχῆμα οὐδενὶ ἄλλῳ τῶν ἀλόγων ζώων διαφέρει, ἢ τῷ ὀρθόν τε εἶναι καὶ ἔκτασιν χειρῶν ἔχειν...καὶ οὐδὲν ἄλλο δείκνυσιν ἢ τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ σταυροῦ.

Irenæus *Adv. Hær.* v. 17. ἐπεὶ γὰρ διὰ ξύλον ἀπεβάλομεν αὐτόν, διὰ ξύλον πάλιν φανερόν τοῖς πᾶσιν ἐγένετο, ἐπιδεικνύων τὸ μῆκος καὶ ὕψος καὶ βάθος καὶ πλάτος ἐν ἑαυτῷ καὶ ὡς ἔφη

τις τῶν προβεβηκότων, διὰ τῆς θέλας ἐκτάσεως τῶν χειρῶν, τοὺς δύο λαοὺς εἰς ἓνα θεὸν συνάγων κτέ.

Tertullian *adv. Marc.* iii. 18. Iam vero Moyses, quid utique tunc tantum, cum Jesus adversus Amalech præliabatur, *expansis manibus* orabat residens,...nisi quia illic ubi nomen Domini Iesu dimicabat, dimicaturi quandoque adversus diabolum, crucis quoque erit habitus necessarius, per quam Iesus victoriam esset relaturus?

Cf. *De Idololatria* xii. Corpus solum, *quod in modum crucis est.*

I. *Ad Nationes* xii. Crucis qualitas, signum est de ligno; etiam de materia colitis penes vos cum effigie; quanquam sicut vestrum humana figura est, ita et nostrum propria...quoniam *ipsi quoque corpori nostro tacita et secreta linea crucis situs est...* *Si statueris hominem manibus expansis imaginem crucis feceris.*

Cyprian *Testim.* ii. 20. Quod cruci illum fixuri essent Judæi, apud Esaiam: Expandi manus meas tota die, etc.

Cyprian *Testim.* ii. 21. Hoc signo crucis et Amalech victus est ab Jesu per Moysen, etc.

De Exhort. Mart. 8. Moyses ad superandum Amalech qui figuram portabat diaboli in signo et sacramento crucis allevabat supinas manus etc.

The author of the *Opus Imperfectum* in Matt. comments as follows: "Quidam putant crucem Christi ostendendum esse in cælo; verius autem est ipsum Christum in corpore suo habentem testimonia passionis." Jerome comments much in the same strain: "Signum hic aut crucis intelligemus ut videant Judæi quem compunxerunt: aut vexillum victoriæ triumphantis." And Chrysostom, *Homil.* LXXVII. in Matt., *τότε φανήσεται τὸ σημεῖον τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν τῇ οὐρανῷ· τότεστιν ὁ σταυρὸς τοῦ ἡλίου παιδρότερος ὢν.*

Ps. Hippolytus, *de Consummatione Mundi*¹, gives the order

¹ This book, which seems to have played an important part in mediæval theological discussions, is interesting in its parallels with the Teaching.

In c. 3 (col. 906, 7 of Migne) the writer proposes to bring forward faithful witnesses with regard to the doctrine of the end of the age; καὶ μετέπειτα

of signs as in Matthew (Migne, *Patr. Gr.* x. 940), τὸ γὰρ σημεῖον τοῦ σταυροῦ ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν ἕως δυσμῶν ἀνατελεῖ ὑπὲρ τὴν λαμπρότητα τοῦ ἡλίου καὶ μηνύσει τοῦ κριτοῦ τὴν ἔλευσιν καὶ τὴν ἐμφανείαν, τοῦ ἀποδοῦναι ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ... τότε γὰρ ὁ σάλπιγξ ἠχήσει καὶ ἐξυπνήσει τοὺς κεκοιμημένους κτέ. Numerous other references might be given to Cyril of Jerusalem, Augustine, Bede, Theophylact, &c. Finally the sentiment has crept into the *Imitatio Christi* (I suppose from the Catholic service-book), so that we read (Bk. ii. c. 12), "atque hoc erit signum Crucis in cælo quum Dominus ad judicandum veniet¹."

καὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων τὴν διδαχὴν, μᾶλλον δὲ προφητείαν, πῶς πανταχοῦ τῆς οἰκουμένης σαλπίζουσι τῆς συντελείας τὴν ἡμέραν. Among these signs are the following: ἐγερθήσονται ψευδοπροφῆται... οἱ ποιμένες ὡς λύκοι γενήσονται. He follows closely Hippolytus *de Christo et Antichristo* in the explanation that the Antichrist comes of the tribe of Dan, and shews him to be a continual misrepresentation of Christ (ὁ κοσμοπλάνος ὡς υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ).

(Col. 921). κατὰ πάντα γὰρ ἐξομοιοῦσθαι βούλεται ὁ πλάνος τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ θεοῦ. Λέων ὁ Χριστὸς καὶ λέων ὁ ἀντίχριστος. Βασιλεὺς ὁ Χριστὸς τῶν οὐρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ βασιλεὺς γενήσεται ἐπὶ γῆς ὁ Ἀντίχριστος. Ἐδείχθη ὁ Σωτὴρ ὡς ἄρνιον καὶ αὐτὸς φανήσεται ὡς ἄρνιον, λύκος ὢν ἐνδोधεν κτέ. He is especially favourable to the Jews.

(Col. 925). μετὰ δὲ τούτων ἀπάντων σημεῖα ἐπιτελέσει καὶ θαύματα φοβερά ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀληθῆ ἀλλ' ἐν πλάνῃ; a description which recalls again the language of the Teaching.

¹ Since writing the foregoing explanation it has been pointed out to me that Dr John Wordsworth had already given the same in one of his Articles in the *Guardian*. An enquiry elicited the following courteous and valuable

reply, from which I have derived several of the passages referred to:

"ROCHESTER, Aug. 8, 1885.

"...The explanation you refer to was suggested to me first by Archdeacon Edwin Palmer, and referred to in a note which I wrote to the *Guardian* (printed, March 26th, 1884). The early expositions of Exod. xvii. 12, and Is. lxx. 2 (= Rom. x. 21), in Barnabas 12, Justin *Dial.* 90, Tertullian *adv. Marc.* iii. 18, have no doubt occurred to you with many others, e.g. Cyprian, *Testimon.* 2. 21, *de exhort. Martyrii*, 8 &c.

"But the most important I have come across is the Ethiopic liturgy translated by Rudolfus; in the opening prayer of which we read a sort of paraphrase of the creed, in which 'et filius tuus manifestatus fuit a Spiritu Sancto, ut impleret voluntatem tuam et populum tibi efficeret *expandendo manus suas*,' &c. is an equivalent of 'crucifixus est.' This liturgy is given in Bunsen's *Christianity and Mankind*, Vol. ii. p. 108, London, 1854.

"I could easily add to these references but doubt not that you have all that I have, though perhaps this liturgical one may be new to you."