

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

THE DIDACHÉ AND THE EPISTLE OF
BARNABAS.

AN ARGUMENT FOR THE PRIORITY OF THE DIDACHÉ.

A COMPARISON of the *Epistle of Barnabas* with the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, so far as relates to the Way of Death, has been shown in the EXPOSITOR for April last (p. 316), to point clearly to the conclusion that Barnabas drew, if not from the *Teaching*, from an original of which it has preserved the true form. This conclusion will be found to be confirmed by a comparison of the two documents in their entirety.

It is possible that the nucleus of the extant *Teaching* was a separate document on the *Two Ways*, agreeing substantially with its chapters i.-vi., but that several clauses of these were not included in the first draft of the manual. Be this as it may, I shall here simply take the so-called *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* as it stands, and examine how far the phenomena of the *Epistle* can be accounted for on the hypothesis that the writer was acquainted with the manual or its contents.

Thus far nothing has been said of the character and peculiarities of Barnabas. It has only been assumed that he was a writer of passably idiomatic Greek. But we must now take account of what is known of him, as a means of judging what sort of use he was likely to make of his materials.

To begin with, I will give some extracts from Dr. Donaldson's *Apostolical Fathers*, published in 1874, nine

years before Bryennios gave the lost *Teaching* again to the world.

“First (writes he), and most remarkable, are the numerous mistakes and inaccuracies that characterize the writer’s statements with regard to the facts of Judaism. . . . He *repeats* frequently the same idea, most unnecessarily, [in chap. xviii. sq.], though this is rather like himself as he appears in the first part. . . . He very frequently misquotes and alters the Old Testament, *jumbles passages together* most unwarrantably, appeals to apocryphal books using the same introductory formulas as he uses in introducing the canonical books of the Old Testament, and not unfrequently quotes as Scripture passages that cannot now be recognised as similar to any in our Bibles.” As to the date of the *Epistle*, he concludes “that it must have been written after the destruction of Jerusalem, that it could not have been written after the close of the second century, but that there is no certain way of fixing on any intervening date as the period of its composition.”

Turning next to Mr. Cunningham’s edition of the *Epistle*, in which the text and notes are by Mr. Rendall, we read in the editor’s preliminary *Dissertation*, that the quotations from the Old Testament are “very numerous and very inexact, as the sense is frequently given rather than the actual words. . . . Nor does the author always care strictly for the sense of the passage from which he quotes words that suit his purpose. . . . We can see from the whole tone of the *Epistle* that the silence in regard to the Holy Communion is no accidental omission, but is in strict accordance with the general vein of his thought. . . . The religious life which he contemplated was hid in the recesses of the human heart, and found no expression in religious ordinances.” Where the ancient rites “dimly declare the true way of salvation through Christ, they are valuable: where no such purpose is served, the object of

the command was not served by actual performance, but lay solely in the spiritual significance."

A few typical examples of his mode of dealing with the Old Testament will suffice to illustrate these remarks.

In chap. x. he flatly repudiates the literal sense of the prohibition of the flesh of swine, birds of prey, and fish without scales, saying, *So then there is no commandment of God to abstain from eating, but Moses spake in the spirit.* The meaning is, "Thou shalt not be joined unto such men as are like to swine. . . . Thou shalt not be joined, neither *likened* to such men as know not how by labour and sweat to provide for themselves sustenance, but in their lawlessness make prey of other men's goods."¹

According to chap. xii., "Esaias saith, The Lord said τῷ Χριστῷ μου κυρίῳ, etc.," instead of . . . *unto mine anointed Cyrus* (Isa. xlv. 1), the proper name Κύριον being corrupted into κυρίῳ.

In chap. xv. it is said twice over, that it is written in the Decalogue, "And sanctify ye the Sabbath of the Lord *with pure hands and pure heart.*" This is a case in which he "jumbles" things together; and not only so, but reads his own sense into words of Scripture, and then, never doubting its accuracy, does not hesitate to say that they were spoken as he interprets them.

We are now in a position to discuss the relation of the *Epistle* to the *Teaching*, with which it so closely agrees from chap. xviii. onward, not to mention other resemblances which only reveal themselves when we look below the surface.

On the authority chiefly of the Old Latin version of the *Epistle*, which breaks off just before chap. xviii., it has been maintained that the following chapters do not properly

¹ This is in the style of the Midrash, which remarks on the words, "God seeketh that which is *pursued*" (Eccl. iii. 15), that He accepts for sacrifice, not birds and beasts of prey, but the innocent and persecuted ones.

belong to it. But as von Gebhardt and Harnack remark, in their edition of 1878, "Rendall authentiam horum capitum bene defendit." Something more, however, remains to be said after the discovery and publication (1883) of the *Teaching*; and this matter of the disputed integrity of the *Epistle* is now seen to be one of the cases in which "Not second thoughts are best, But first and third, which are a better first."

In the original Greek, chap. xvii. ends with the words, *ταῦτα μὲν οὕτως*. These lead up to the *μεταβῶμεν δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ ἑτέραν γνῶσιν καὶ διδαχὴν*, with which the following chapter commences. But the Old Latin version of the *Epistle* breaks off abruptly with a rendering of the former words, *Hæc autem sic sunt*, and at once concludes with a doxology, which is thus introduced: *Habes interim de majestate Christi, quomodo omnia in illum et per illum facta sunt. Cui sit honor, virtus, gloria, nunc et in sæcula sæculorum. Explicit Epistola Barnabæ.*

The preamble to the doxology (it should be remarked) properly belongs to chap. xii., where the discourse of Barnabas on the mystery of the serpent of brass is rounded off with the words, *ἔχεις πάλιν καὶ ἐν τούτοις τὴν δόξαν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ πάντα καὶ εἰς αὐτόν*, to which there is nothing that corresponds in the Latin.

This, in its place, would have been rendered, "*Habes iterum*" (not *interim*). Compare in the same chapter, *Habes iterum de cruce. . . . Dicit autem iterum in Moyse . . . Et iterum dicit in alio propheta. . . . Quid dicit iterum Moyses? . . . Ecce iterum Iesus. . . . Iterum dicit Esaias.*

The ending in the Latin is clearly an artificial one; and now that the *Didaché* has been discovered, there is no difficulty in accounting for the premature conclusion of this version.

Eusebius, writing on the Canon in lib. iii. 25 of his

Ecclesiastical History, names as books open to objection or spurious, The Acts of Paul, The Shepherd, and the Apocalypse of Peter; and then mentions in addition, *The Epistle of Barnabas, and the so-called Teachings of the Apostles*. Suppose this pair to have been transcribed, say in Latin, in one codex, in the order in which he names them; and it would not be surprising that the last chapters of the *Epistle* should be omitted, when it was noticed that they were merely an indifferent recension of part of the work following, added indeed to the *Epistle* by its author, but not in substance his own.

Now it so happens that we have a fragment of a Latin version of the *Didaché*, which was brought to light by von Gebhardt, and is published in an appendix to Harnack's edition of the manual (1884); and further, that this version, so far as it goes, corresponds in a remarkable manner with the description of the Two Ways by Barnabas. For it speaks of them as ways of light and darkness, and adds that there are two angels, one appointed over each; not to mention its omission of the greater part of chap. i., according to the text of Bryennios, of which omitted matter, whether or not any use was made by Barnabas, there is certainly at first sight no trace at all in his *Epistle*. And this makes it a not unnatural hypothesis, that the abbreviated letter of Barnabas may have been followed in some manuscripts by a *Doctrina Apostolorum*, like von Gebhardt's, which commences:

“Viæ duæ sunt in seculo, vitæ et mortis, *lucis et tenebrarum*. In his *constituti sunt Angeli duo, unus æquitatis alter iniquitatis*. Distantia autem magna est duarum viarum. Via ergo vitæ hæc est. . . .”

But in any case we may fairly say that the abbreviator of the *Epistle* was acquainted with some form of the *Didaché*.

To return to Barnabas, we find him introducing his Two

Ways as follows: "But pass we on to yet another Knowledge and Teaching. *There are two ways of Teaching and Authority, that of light and that of darkness. And there is much difference between the two ways.* For over the one are set φωταγωγοὶ ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ, and over the other ἄγγελοι τοῦ σατανᾶ. And the one is Lord from ages and unto ages; and the other Prince of this present season of lawlessness."

The Knowledge which he had been previously dilating upon was a knowledge of the mysteries of the Old Testament. From this he passes on to another *Gnosis*,¹ which is embodied in simple rules of duty; in both cases doubtless resting upon an authoritative teaching. This is sufficiently evident in the matter of the Two Ways, which he calls ways of *teaching and authority* (διδασχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας). At the end of his exposition of them, if the reading ὅσα γεγράμματα in chap. xxi. 1 be correct, he refers to the *Didaché* apparently, or to some part of it, as already written.

This point will be further considered in its place, when chap. xix. on the way of "light" has been discussed.

Chap. xix.—1 *The way then of light is this—whosoever, as willing to pursue a way to the appointed place, would be diligent in his works. The Knowledge then that is given us to walk therein is on this wise.* 2 *Thou shalt love Him that made thee; thou shalt fear Him that formed thee; thou shalt glorify Him that redeemed thee from death. Thou shalt be single in heart, and rich in spirit. Thou shalt not cleave together with them that walk in the way of death.*

A variety of designations of the two ways were current, and Barnabas uses several of them, more or less at random. That he should show a leaning towards the names, way of *light*, and way of *darkness*, is in keeping with his ten-

¹ Notice the thanksgivings, ὑπὲρ τῆς γνώσεως in chaps. ix. and x. of the *Didaché*.

dency to mysticism. But since in this same context (not to mention chap. xx.) he speaks of the "way of death," we need not doubt that this essentially simpler designation¹ was used in the tradition or writing on which his exposition of the ways is founded.

As in the case of the way of death (p. 316), so here the grammatical construction points to the *Didaché* as the original from which he drew, or at least as a true copy of it. He again interpolates in such a way as to alter the syntax, and *Apost. Const.*, vii. 1, after its own fashion, does likewise, reading: "First then is *the way of life*. And it is *this*, which the law also sets forth, *To love* (ἀγαπᾶν) the Lord thy God, from all the heart, and from all the soul, the One and only one, beside whom there is none other, and thy neighbour as thyself."

Notice its "first" (πρώτη) without a *second*, which is an unmeaning survival from the balanced statement of the *Didaché*: "The way then of life is this. First (πρώτον) thou shalt love God that made thee. Secondly (δεύτερον) thy neighbour as thyself."

Barnabas omits the latter precept, and he expands the former by working into it, in his discursive way, sundry expressions suggested by his description of the way of death. "Thou shalt *fear* Him that *formed* thee," springs out of its, οὐκ εἰς φόβον θεοῦ . . . φοβεῖς πλάσματος θεοῦ, and, "Be *single* in heart," out of its διπλοκαρδία, etc. He lets us know that he is mixing up the two ways

¹ What does he mean precisely by the way "of light?" He combines the image of a path leading ἐπὶ τὸν ὠρισμένον τόπον with that of "walking in the light," and he superadds angelic guides. But if angels are wanted to bring light to a path, or to bring those who walk in it to the light, what becomes of it as in itself the "way of light?" These φωταγωγοί have no proper opposites in Barnabas; nor yet in Didymus, who writes τοὺς μὲν ἁγίους φωταγωγοὺς φυλάττουσιν ἄγγελοι τοὺς δὲ φαύλους σκοπεῖν (Joan. Damasc., *Op.*, tom. ii. 309, ed. Lequien, 1712). In Barnabas, *Epist.* xx., the way of darkness becomes the way of the Black One. Angels or no angels, the figure of a way "of light" or "of darkness" is complex, and cannot have been primary.

by his express reference by anticipation to *the way of death*.

2 *Thou shalt hate all that is not pleasing to God, thou shalt hate all hypocrisy, thou shalt not forsake the commandments of the Lord.*

The *Teaching* adds, *But shalt keep what thou didst receive, neither adding nor taking away*, and places the whole near the end of chap. iv. Whereas Barnabas separates, *Thou shalt not forsake, etc.* from *Thou shalt keep, etc.*, and places the one in chap. xix. 2, and the other in xix. 11.

This "remarkable dislocation," when once explained, is convincing testimony to the priority of the *Teaching*. Its explanation requires the reading, εἰς τέλος μισήσεις τὸ πονηρόν, in chap. xix. 11, instead of the εἰς τέλος μισήσεις τὸν πονηρόν, which has so exercised the commentators.

This reading was first arrived at by way of conjectural emendation, as follows. The precepts, *Thou shalt hate all hypocrisy; Thou shalt hate all that is not pleasing to God;* taken in connexion with the phrase, *Not cleaving to that which is good* (from the Way of Death), bring to mind the verse Rom. xii. 9: ἡ ἀγάπη ἀνυπόκριτος· ἀποστυγούντες τὸ πονηρόν, κολλώμενοι τῷ ἀγαθῷ, the second clause of which suggested to me the reading τὸ πονηρόν in chap. xix. of the *Epistle* of Barnabas.

The whole saying comes in most appropriately as part of the peroration to the Way of Life. But it falls in with the plan of Barnabas to introduce it almost at the beginning. He altogether omits the saying, *Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself*, and only introduces this topic in § 5. He writes: *Thou shalt love Him that made thee;* and then as soon as he has finished his digression springing out of the "way of death" and ending, οὐ κολληθήσῃ μετὰ πορευομένων ἐν ὁδῷ θανάτου—he adds, *Thou shalt hate all that is not pleasing to God, etc.* That is to say, he makes this follow as nearly as may be on the command to *love God*.

The connexion is a not unnatural one. But when he comes to the end of the "way of light," he is conscious that the saying, *μισήσεις κ.τ.λ.*, is wanted again in the peroration. According he *repeats* it, in the abbreviated form, *εἰς τέλος μισήσεις τὸ πονηρόν*, and not only so, but he prefixes to it a fragment of its proper context in the *Didaché*, *φυλάξεις ἅ παρέλαβες μήτε προσθεῖς μήτε ἀφαιρῶν*.

For further confirmation of this hypothesis, see below on the penultimate section of the chapter.

3 *Thou shalt not exalt thyself (but shalt be lowly-minded in all things. Thou shalt not take glory to thyself.) Thou shalt not take evil counsel against thy neighbour. Thou shalt not allow insolence to thy soul.*

"Thou shalt not take evil counsel against thy neighbour," is a good example of a saying thrust in out of its proper place. By the words in brackets he further exemplifies his tendency to reduplicate. For a simple case of this, see in chap. xx., "*Far and at a distance from whom are meekness and patience,*" where he expands the *ὦν μακράν* of the *Didaché*, into *ὦν μακράν καὶ πόρρω*.

4. *Thou shalt not commit fornication, thou shalt not commit adultery, thou shalt not corrupt youths. The word of God shall not go forth from thee among any that are unclean. Thou shalt not have respect of persons in rebuking any for a transgression. Thou shalt be meek, thou shalt be peaceable, thou shalt stand in awe of the words which thou hast heard. Thou shalt not bear malice against thy brother.*

The commandment, *Thou shalt not murder*, is omitted or taken for granted.

Those which next follow are not only stated in simple terms in this chapter, but are made to be the true and only meaning of certain prohibitions of unclean meats, on which he discourses in the manner of the Midrash in chap. x. The word *corrupt-youths* (*παιδοφθορήσεις*) is of

rare occurrence, and is found first in the *Didaché* or the *Epistle*, whichever be the earlier.

In the above-mentioned chapter he explains, *Thou shalt not eat of the hare*, to mean, "Thou shalt not become a corrupter of youths (*παιδοφθόρος*)."¹ And he continues, "*Neither shalt thou eat at all of the hyena*, thou shalt not (saith he) become an adulterer or corrupter." Herein he exemplifies his tendency to *repeat*, and to *spiritualise*. He will not allow that there is any literal meaning at all in the command not to *eat* of this or that.

We next come to the saying, which has occasioned some difficulty, *οὐ μὴ σου ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξέλθῃ ἐν ἀκαθαρσίᾳ τινῶν*. With this compare in chap. x.: "*Moreover he hath rightly abominated the weasel*. Thou shalt not (saith he) become such as those of whom we hear that they practise lawlessness with their mouth for uncleanness sake (*δι' ἀκαθαρσίαν*). . . . For this animal conceives with the mouth." Is there anything in the *Didaché* out of which he may have evolved the saying, *οὐ μὴ σου ὁ λόγος κ.τ.λ.*, by this method?

The saying at once recalls the familiar text (Matt. vii. 6) on not casting *pearls before swine, etc.*, a clause of which is thus introduced in the *Didaché*: "But let none *eat* or drink of your Eucharist but such as have been baptized in the name of the Lord.¹ For concerning this the Lord hath said, *Give not that which is holy to the dogs*" (chap. ix.).

On this Barnabas would have said: "So then there is no commandment of God with respect to eating, but the Lord spake in the spirit." "Man shall not live by bread alone." What it is commanded not to impart to the unclean is the Divine word.

¹ The uncircumcised might not eat of the Passover (Exod. xii. 48). These are joined with the *unclean* in Isaiah lii. 1. As for such as thought that there ever was anything in actual circumcision, Barnabas is of opinion that "a wicked angel beguiled them" (chap. ix. 4).

If he had had in mind the saying, *But let none eat of your Eucharist, etc.*, we may safely say that he would have spiritualised it into something like, οὐ μὴ σου ὁ λόγος κ.τ.λ. It has been noticed above that he deliberately avoids all direct mention of the Eucharist.

5 *Thou shalt not be of doubtful mind whether a thing shall be or not. Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord in vain. Thou shalt love thy neighbour above thy life. Thou shalt not slay a child by abortion, nor again shalt thou put to death one that is born. Thou shalt not withhold thine hand from thy son or from thy daughter, but from youth up thou shalt teach them the fear of God.*

He quotes the Third Commandment as the equivalent of, *Thou shalt not forswear thyself.*

His saying, *Thou shalt love thy neighbour above thy life*, brings out two of his characteristics. He *exaggerates*, and he *repeats* anything that makes an impression upon him. The *Teaching* says: "Thou shalt hate no man; but some thou shalt rebuke, and for some thou shalt pray, and *some* thou shalt love above thy life." It is in the style of a writer who describes those whom the Lord chose for His own apostles as the most abandoned of sinners, ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν ἀμαρτίαν ἀνομιώτερος (chap. v.), that he should here throw aside all limitations, and say generally, *Thou shalt love thy neighbour above thy life*. Consistently with this, he does not condescend to write in its place, after, *Love God*, "*and thy neighbour as thyself*," which must have been included in any manual or ordered scheme of instruction. He prefers his more rhetorical form of words. And he writes in chap. i., "I am utterly constrained to love you *above my life*"; and in chap. iv., "Furthermore, I beg of you this also, as being one of your own selves, and loving you *all severally above my life.*"

6 *Thou shalt not become a luster after the things of thy neighbour. Thou shalt not become one that grasps at gain.*

Neither shalt thou be joined of thy soul's desire with the lofty, but with lowly and just men shalt thou converse. The visitations that befall thee thou shalt accept as good, knowing that without God nothing comes to pass.

Notice his use of *γένη*, *become*, to which I shall have occasion to recur.

It has been pointed out by Professor Thomas S. Potwin, in the *New York Independent* (Jan. 21, 1886), that Origen (according to the Latin) quotes this saying as Scripture, thus: "Propterea docet nos *Scriptura divina*, omnia quæ accidunt nobis tanquam à Deo illata suscipere, scientes quod sine Deo nihil fit."

It is assumed that Origen's quotation is from the *Teaching*; but it may be from Barnabas, who is referred to by name in the same chapter (*De Princip.*, lib. III. 2).

It is worth while to add in illustration of the saying as it stands in the *Teaching*, that a man is said, in the last chapter of the Mishnah on *Berakhoth*, to be bound to say a benediction over what is *evil*, or calamitous, just as he does over what is *good*,

חייב אדם לברך על הרעה כשם שהוא מברך על הטובה.

7 *Thou shalt not be double minded, neither double tongued; for to be double tongued is a snare of death. Thou shalt order thyself lowly to masters, as to an image of God, in shamefastness and fear. Thou shalt not give commandment to thy bondman or thy maidservant, that hope on the same God, in bitterness, lest they fear not Him that is God over you both. For He came not to call with respect of persons, but to them whom the Spirit did prepare (or for whom He prepared the Spirit).*

Here the reading, as assumed above, is: . . . οὐδὲ δίγλωσσος· παγίς γὰρ θανάτου ἐστὶν ἡ δίγλωσσία.

Von Gebhardt, in his text of 1878, reads briefly, . . . οὐδὲ γλωσσώδης. But Harnack, taking into account the

then unknown *Didaché*, writes in his commentary upon it (*Prolegom.*, p. 87), with reference to the text of the *Epistle*:—

“Der Text, wie ihn von Gebhardt constituirt hat, erweist sich als vortrefflich; nur ist c. 19, 7 mit G und *Διδαχή* (gegen *NC*), *παγίς γὰρ θανάτου ἐστὶν ἡ διγλωσσία*, vielleicht zu halten.”

Barnabas, in the next paragraph, shows his tendency to repeat things (to some extent even with the reading of von Gebhardt), by saying, *οὐκ ἔση πρόγλωσσοσ παγίς γὰρ τὸ στόμα θανάτου*.

The clause, *For He came not, etc.*, is not quite free from ambiguity. Barnabas reads *ἦλθεν*, instead of *ἔρχεται*. Does the one refer to our Lord (Matt. ix. 13), and the other to such passages as, *I will come unto thee, etc.* (Exod. xx. 24)? Compare John xiv. 23.

8 *Thou shalt give a share in all things to thy neighbour, and shalt not say that they are thine own; for if ye are sharers in that which is imperishable, how much more in the things that are perishable. Thou shalt not be forward tongued; for the mouth is a snare of death. So far as thou art able, thou shalt be pure for thy soul's sake.*

He writes, *κοινωνήσεις ἐν πᾶσι τῷ πλησίον σου*, instead of *συγκ. πάντα τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου*, which has the appearance of priority. His construction is that of Gal. vi. 6, where the command is to “communicate unto him that teacheth.”

The phrase *ἴσον δύνασαι*, in *ἴσον δύνασαι ὑπὲρ τῆς ψυχῆς σου ἀγνεύσεις*, is quite characteristic of the *Didaché*, which teaches: “For if indeed thou art able¹ to bear the whole yoke of the Lord, thou shalt be perfect. But if thou art not able, what thou art able, do. And concerning food, what thou art able, bear. But beware exceedingly of what is sacrificed to idols, for it is a service of dead gods.”

It cannot be maintained that such teaching, the equivalent of Acts xv. 28, 29, was suggested by the *Epistle*. On the

¹ *εἰ δυνατὸν, τὸ ἐξ ὑμῶν κ.τ.λ.* (Rom. xii. 18).

other hand, knowing how Barnabas is accustomed to deal with precepts "concerning food," we can see in it the basis of his *ὅσον δύνασαι κ.τ.λ.* The moderation of this phrase, naturally interpreted, is quite foreign to his style; but he may intend it to be taken in the sense, "To the uttermost of thy powers, etc," *ἐφ' ὅσον ἐστὶν ἐν ἡμῖν . . . ἀγωνιζόμεθα* (chap. v. 11). Compare his exaggeration of the precept, to love *some* above one's life.

9 *Become not one that stretches out the hands to receive, but draws them in when he should give. Thou shalt love as the apple of thine eye every one that speaketh to thee the word of the Lord.*

Here the *Teaching* reads: "*My child, him that speaketh to thee the word of the Lord thou shalt remember night and day, and thou shalt honour him as the Lord, ὅθεν γὰρ ἡ κυριότης λαλεῖται ἐκεῖ κύριός ἐστιν.*"

The presumption is entirely in favour of the originality of this unique saying. The substitute for it in the *Epistle* is commonplace, the phrase *ὡς κόρη κ.τ.λ.* being such as any person acquainted with the Old Testament might use to adorn his discourse.

The key to the transformation is the word *πάντα, every one*, interpolated by Barnabas. His individualism revolts at the ascription of high honour to a teacher *ex officio*; and he will only admit that any person whatsoever who has the gift of teaching is to be loved. "I, then (writes he in chap. i.), not as a teacher, but as one of yourselves, will show forth a few things." "Wishing to write many things, not as a teacher, but as beseemeth one that loveth, I, your off-scouring, etc." (chap. iv.). He will not recognise the Christian prophets as an order, but speaks of "Himself prophesying *in us*" (chap. xvi.). The *Teaching* is for the "child"; the *Epistle* for the *ἀνὴρ τέλειος*. "Be your own lawgivers, your own counsellors. . . . Be ye taught of God" (chap. xxi.)

Given now, as we have seen (p. 403), that when he has a bias in favour of a reading *κυρίω* he can see this in the proper name *Κύρω*, conversely when it is against his principles to write *ὡς κύριον*, what can he do better than (so to say) change the pointing, *more rabbinico*, and write *ὡς κόρην*?

10 *Thou shalt remember the day of judgment night and day, and shalt seek out day by day the faces of the saints; either by word going on toiling to exhort, and meditating for to save a soul by the word; or by thy hands thou shalt work for ransom of thy sins.*

The variation, *Remember*, not thy teacher, but *the day of judgment, night and day*, follows naturally upon his previous improvements of the *Teaching*, of which he betrays a knowledge in its true form in chap. xxi., where he writes: "And be ye taught of God, *seeking out* what the Lord seeks of you, and make that ye be found in the *day of judgment*. And if there is any remembrance of good, *remember me* as ye *meditate* on these things, that your desire and *watchfulness* may turn unto somewhat good."

His *ἀγρυπνία εἰς τι ἀγαθόν* is clearly a reminiscence of *ἀγρυπνοῦντες οὐκ εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν*, in chap. v. of the *Teaching* (for which he writes, in chap. xx. 2, . . . *ἀγρ. οὐκ εἰς φόβον θεοῦ*), and the other words in italics prove that he is thinking of the passage which we are discussing, and that he knows it as it stands in the *Teaching*; for he now says, *Remember*, not the day of judgment, but *me* that speak unto you the word of the Lord.

The remainder of chap. xix. 10 springs out of the two sayings of the *Teaching*, which he runs together:

(1) "Thou shalt seek out day by day the faces of the saints, that thou mayest rest thee on their words, *ἐπαναπαῆς (sic) τοῖς λόγοις αὐτῶν.*"

(2) "If thou have in thine hands, thou shalt give in ransom for thy sins."

First consider (2), of which the Greek is :

ἐὰν ἔχῃς διὰ τῶν χειρῶν σου, δώσεις λύτρωσιν ἁμαρτιῶν σου.

Write this, with a transposition :

ἐὰν διὰ τῶν χειρῶν σου ἔχῃς δώσ—εις [or, as in *Apost. Const.*, δὸς εἰς] κ.τ.λ.

It is a light thing for Barnabas to transform ἔχῃς δώσ [or δός] into ἐργάση, and he can do it without doing violence to the sense; for whereas the original means, "Give alms for ransom of thy sins," his saying would mean, "Earn—labour with thy hands, that thou mayest have to give (Eph. iv. 28)—for ransom of thy sins." Two verbs having been made into one, the syntax requires ἐὰν to be changed into ἦ. This he does, and he gives as an alternative to a somewhat unspiritual precept: ἦ διὰ λόγου κοπιῶν καὶ πορευόμενος εἰς τὸ παρακάλεσαι καὶ μελετῶν εἰς τὸ σώσαι ψυχὴν τῷ λόγῳ, on which von Gebhardt and Harnack aptly refer to James v. 19, 20.

Notice that the word λόγος is a connecting link between this and the saying (1); and further, that he uses the rather uncommon compound, ἐπαναπαυόμενοι (Rom. ii. 17) towards the end of his fourth chapter, where it is not strictly appropriate.

Thus far all is intelligible. By saving souls, and by giving alms of the labours of his hands, the man may hope to "hide a multitude of sins." All difficulty would now be removed by reading, "Thou shalt seek out day by day the faces of *publicans and sinners*," to exhort and to save souls by the word. But the reading is *saints*, not *sinners*; and the catechumen, or person under instruction, is directed in the *Didaché* to frequent the company of the saints, that by their godly counsel he may be kept in the right way.

11 *Thou shalt not doubt whether to give, neither shalt thou grudge when thou givest; but thou shalt know who is the good recompenser of the reward. Thou shalt keep what*

thou didst receive, neither adding nor taking away. Thou shalt altogether hate evil. Thou shalt judge righteously.

The saying, *εἰς τέλος μισήσεις τὸ πονηρόν*, preceded by *φυλάξεις ἃ παρέλαβες κ.τ.λ.*, has been explained as one of the repetitions which are so frequent in the *Epistle*. It fits here into the place of a longer saying of the *Didaché*, which Barnabas has already given near the beginning of the chapter (p. 408).

The reading *τὸ πονηρόν* is now confirmed by the Bryennios manuscript, which also gives significance to the fact that *Ν* reads simply *πονηρόν*, with neither *τό* nor *τόν*. Thus there is no preponderance of documentary evidence for the reading *τὸν πονηρόν*. Neither does this so well agree with the usage of Barnabas elsewhere. Compare in chap. iv., *φύγωμεν οὖν τελείως ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔργων τῆς ἀνομίας . . . καὶ μισήσωμεν τὴν πλανὴν τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ*, and again, *φύγωμεν ἀπὸ πάσης ματαιότητος, μισήσωμεν τελείως τὰ ἔργα τῆς πονηρᾶς ὁδοῦ*.

Notice also in the Way of Death, *μισοῦντες ἀλήθειαν . . . ἀγρυπνοῦντες . . . εἰς τὸ πονηρόν*.

Considering further how aptly the saying, *Thou shalt altogether hate evil*, comes in as part of the peroration to the Way of Life, we need not hesitate to accept a reading which, while defensible on documentary grounds, is distinctly preferable on all others.

It is worth noting that the Coptic "Church Order" has the saying, "Flee from all evil, and *hate all evil*;" for it is a document which borrows from Barnabas, as when it writes, *Be ye lawgivers to your own selves; be ye teachers to yourselves alone, as God hath taught you*.

12 Thou shalt not cause division, but shalt reconcile and set at peace them that are at strife. Thou shalt not come to prayer with an evil conscience. This is the way of light.

The *Didaché* enjoins confession of sins "in the congregation," while Barnabas writes simply, *ἐξομολογήση*, in

accordance with Matt. iii. 6. The word itself implying *open* confession, no great stress need be laid on the addition or omission of *ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ*, but it is perhaps under the influence of an unconscious reminiscence of the *Didaché*, that Barnabas in chap. vi. quotes, as from some Psalm, but not quite exactly, *ἐξομολογήσομαί σοι ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ κ.τ.λ.* Compare Levit. v. 5, 6, and chap. xiv. of the *Didaché*. To omit *ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ*, because it seemed to limit the duty of confession, would have been entirely characteristic of Barnabas.

We thus see that everything in the "way of light" may be explained as a working up of the "way of life," in accordance with the known characteristics of Barnabas. There are some things in the latter of which we have as yet found no trace in the *Epistle*; but it will be considered in due course, whether he does not show signs of an acquaintance with these also.

His "way of the Black One," has been shown (p. 316) to be a later recension of something identical in form with the "way of death" according to the *Didaché*.

The next point to be considered is, whether he was acquainted with a *written* form of the *Two Ways*, if not of the *Teaching* as a whole.

The Way of Light was introduced with the words, *ἐστὶν οὖν ἡ δοθείσα ἡμῖν γνώσις τοῦ περιπατεῖν ἐν αὐτῇ τοιαύτη.*

At the end of the *Two Ways* he writes: *καλὸν οὖν ἐστὶν μαθόντα τὰ δικαιώματα κυρίου, ὅσα προγεγραπται (?)*, *ἐν τούτοις περιπατεῖν* (chap. xxi.).

The *δικαιώματα κυρίου* would primarily be sought in the Old Testament; but the phrase covers also the *ἐντολαὶ τῆς διδαχῆς*, which he joins in chap. xvi. 9 with the *σοφία τῶν δικαιωμάτων*. Notice that the *Didaché* consists of *ἐντολαί*, and compare his *ὁδοὶ διδαχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας* in chap. xviii., and this with *ὁδ. τῆς διδαχῆς* in the *Didaché* (chap. vi).

The impression that in chap. xxi. he is looking back upon

the precepts of the *Two Ways*, is confirmed by the chapter taken as a whole, which shows that these are still in and uppermost in his thoughts; as might have been expected, seeing that they immediately precede.

The following words and phrases of chap. xxi. are plain proof of this: διὰ τοῦτο ἀνάστασις, διὰ τοῦτο ἀνταπόδομα . . . ἔχετε μεθ' ἑαυτῶν εἰς οὓς ἐργάσησθε· τὸ καλὸν μὴ ἐγκαταλείπητε . . . ἄρατε ἐξ ὑμῶν πᾶσαν ὑπόκρισιν . . . ἐκζητούντες . . . ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως . . . μνημονεύέτε μου μελετώντες ταῦτα . . . ἀγρυπνία εἰς τι ἀγαθόν . . . ἐκζητεῖτε . . . σώζεσθε ἀγάπης τέκνα κ.τ.λ.

The Way of Death ends with, *Be ye delivered, children, from all these.* Barnabas, in view of the speedy termination of his *Epistle*, omits this in its place, and writes at the end, σώζεσθε τέκνα κ.τ.λ.

It would not be doubted that he includes the teaching of the *Two Ways* under his δικαιώματα κυρίου, but for the reading ὅσα γεγράφται, which the latest editors adopt, instead of ὅσα προγεγράφται. How does this really affect the matter?

The strong presumption that he is referring to the *Two Ways* remaining as before, we must suppose him (unless γεγράφται means προγεγράφται) to include a written Διδαχή under his ὅσα γεγράφται. If this means that he classed it in a sense with Holy Scripture, he thereby prepares the way for Clement of Alexandria, who distinctly quotes one of its sayings as such; not to mention that Origen quotes a saying common to the *Teaching* and the *Epistle* as *Scriptura divina* (p. 412).

If by his ὅσον δύνασαι κ.τ.λ. and his οὐ μὴ σου ὁ λόγος κ.τ.λ., or either of them, he allegorizes a saying or sayings of the *Teaching* (pp. 410, 413), this of itself is to treat it as he does the Old Testament, and to rank it with Scripture; for he must simply have rejected sayings which he utterly repudiates in their literal sense, if he had not placed them on a level with *Scriptura divina*.

Noticing by the way that his *διὰ τοῦτο ἀνάστασις* (implying a partial resurrection) may have sprung out of the *ἀνάστασις ἀλλ' οὐ πάντων* of the *Didaché*, I pass on to consider whether the two apparent gaps in his citations from chaps. i.–vi. of the manual as we have it can be supplied.

(1) He seems to cite only the beginning of chap. i., and to make no use of the probably later additions to it, from *Bless them that curse you*, to the end.

(2) Nothing is (so to say) so original in the *Two Ways* as the series of sayings commencing, *My child*, in chap. iii. Can he have been unacquainted with these?

(i.) The most remarkable saying in chap. i. is, *ἰδρωτάτω ἡ ἐλεημοσύνη σου εἰς τὰς χεῖράς σου*. In my *Two Lectures* on the *Διδαχή* I have interpreted this as meaning, *Give alms of thy toil and sweat*. Any homily or scheme of instruction on almsgiving would be incomplete without some such precept. Compare Acts xx. 35 and Eph. iv. 28. The precept *ἰδρωτάτω κ.τ.λ.* is quoted in substance in the *Shepherd of Hermas* and in the *Apostolical Constitutions*, but without the expression “sweat,” for *toil*. Barnabas, in chap. xix. 10, combines the two precepts, *Labour to have to give*, and *Give for ransom of thy sins*, writing, *ἡ διὰ τῶν χειρῶν σου ἐργασία εἰς λύτρωσιν ἁμαρτιῶν σου*, and in chap. xxi. 2 he writes, *Have with you those, εἰς οὓς ἐργάσησθε*, saying in effect, *ἰδρωτάτω κ.τ.λ.*, though not using the word *sweat* in this connexion. But whereas the *Teaching* inculcates the duty of working for one’s living in the words, *ἐργαζέσθω καὶ φαγέτω* (chap. xii.), in this sense he uses the expression “toil and sweat” (p. 403). Thus, like the *Teaching*, he says, *Labour to live*, and *Labour to give*; and he uses the same two expressions for “labour,” but transposes them.

As the precept *ἰδρωτάτω κ.τ.λ.* is preceded in the *Teaching* by *παντὶ τῷ αἰτοῦντί σε δίδου*, so in the *Epistle* (chap. xix. 11) there is a reading: “Thou shalt not *doubt* (*διστάσεις*) whether to give, neither shalt thou grudge when thou givest.

To every one that asketh of thee give." This (it should be remarked) is in close agreement with the words of Hermas in *Mand.* 2, . . . *μη̄ διατάζων τινι δω̄ς η̄ τινι μη̄ δω̄ς πᾱσι δῑδου.*

Mr. Rendall, on Barnabas, writes (1877): "On the whole, I incline to retain the words (*To every one*, etc.). Whether they should be regarded as an accidental coincidence, or as a quotation from Luke vi. 30, or as an adaptation of Matt. v. 42, or as derived from some written or oral source independent of either Gospel, may be left undecided."

The Bryennios text must now be added to the authorities for the omission of the words. But his text of the *Didaché* is a witness on the other side. The authorities are divided very much as in the case noticed under chap. xix. 7 (p. 413).

If Barnabas really quotes the contrasted sayings on almsgiving, *Give to every one*, etc., and *Let thine alms sweat*, etc.; and if, as is quite possible, these were added only at the final redaction of the *Teaching*; the presumption is that he was acquainted with the whole of it. If, on the contrary, he did not quote both or either of them, then it is only not proven that he knew the *Teaching* in its *latest and fullest form*.

(ii.) The most characteristic section in the first part of the *Teaching* is the series of sayings on the Commandments (from the Sixth onward), commencing, *My child, flee from all evil, and from all that is like to it. Become not (μη̄ γίνου) irascible*, etc. To this belongs, *My child, him that speaketh unto thee the word of the Lord . . . thou shalt honour as the Lord*. It springs out of the Fifth Commandment (as *Apost. Const.*, vii. 9, indicates, by adding *οὐχ ὡς γενέσῃς αἰτίου*); and the Fifth takes the place of the last in the second table, as in Matt. xix., *Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Honour thy father and thy mother*.

If these sayings form a connected series, and if, as has been shown, Barnabas knew the last of them, it seems to follow that he knew the whole series. It was not to be expected that a writer of his spiritualising turn of mind would draw the line between evil tendencies and actual transgressions, as the *Teaching* does; but he gives us further reason to think that he was acquainted with its third chapter when he writes (chap. iv.), "*Flee* we then completely from all the works of lawlessness. . . . *Flee* we from all vanity: let us hate completely the works of the *evil way*"; and when in chaps. iv. and x. he reiterates the caution not to be *made like*, not *even* like, to sinners. Neither is it without significance that he writes, "Thou shalt not *become* one that lusts after (instead of *ὄκ ἐπιθυμήσεις*) the things that are thy neighbour's" (p. 412), the repeated *μὴ γίνου* being characteristic of chap. iii. of the *Teaching*.

The citations (if such they be) of Barnabas from the *Teaching* have now been shown to range over the whole of chaps. i.-vi.; and it remains to compare his *Epistle* with the second part of the *Teaching*, chaps. vii.-xvi.

In his fourth chapter, in which we have found allusions to the "evil way," and to chap. iii. of the *Teaching*, there is also a well-known passage agreeing with its chap. xvi. on the last things: "Wherefore take we heed in the last days; for the whole time of your (life and) faith shall profit you nothing, except now in the lawless season, and in the coming offences, as becometh sons of God ye withstand," etc. If here the *Epistle* quotes the *Teaching*, and not *vice versâ*, this raises more or less of a presumption that Barnabas knew the whole of it. It may be held to be a sufficient refutation of this to say that he does not quote at all from chaps. vii.-xv. But, on the other hand, (1) these are chiefly made up of ordinances relating to the Sacraments and the Ministry of the Church, which we know that he

would have passed over in his *Epistle* if he had them before him, and (2) he does take up and illustrate the leading *ideas* of the second part of the *Teaching*, and explains those very sayings in it which have troubled all the commentators, and which some have thought it necessary to emend.

THE ΔΙΔΑΧΗ. CHAPTERS VII.—XVI.

Chap. vii. *On Baptism*. There is nothing in this chapter that Barnabas would have cited. He has a good deal to say in a mystic way about baptism, but would not have dwelt on distinctions between warm and cold water, and the like.

Chap. viii. He does in effect say, "Let not your fasts be with the hypocrites" (chap. iii.); but it was certain, *a priori*, that he would not write, "Be careful to fast every Wednesday and Friday." Neither is there any reason to think that he would have quoted the complete Lord's Prayer, or any other.

Chaps. ix., x. *The Eucharist*. We have seen that he deliberately avoids all mention of the Eucharist, and it was not to be expected that he would quote forms of prayer or thanksgiving as such. But there are reasons to think that he may have been acquainted with both of these chapters. If he was familiar with the thanksgivings ὑπὲρ τῆς ζωῆς καὶ γνώσεως ἧς ἐγνώρισας, and ὑπὲρ τῆς γνώσεως καὶ πίστεως, this would account for his reading, τῆς ζωῆς καὶ τῆς πίστεως (instead of τῆς πίστεως), in chap. iv. 9 (p. 422); and for his use of all those words in chap. i. 5-7.

Chap. ix. On the saying οὐ μὴ σου ὁ λόγος κ.τ.λ., see p. 410.

Chap. x. Nothing is more characteristic of Barnabas than his doctrine that the individual heart is the true spiritual temple. "The one central temple is wholly done away; the term is preserved only metaphorically; each man's heart became a temple" (Rendall). This, it may be

said, is the idea of Eph. iii. 17, *κατοικῆσαι τὸν Χριστὸν διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν*, but something more is wanted to account for his way of putting it; and that is found only in one of the forms of thanksgiving in the *Didaché*.

According to chap. xvi. of the *Epistle*, "It is written, *And it shall be when the week is ending, the temple of God shall be built gloriously upon the Name of the Lord*. I find, then, that there is a temple. How then it shall be built upon the Name of the Lord, learn ye. Before that we believed in God, the habitation of the heart was corrupt and sickly, a temple truly built with hands: because it was full of idolatry, and was a house of devils, in that we did all things contrary unto God. But *it shall be built upon the Name of the Lord*. How? Learn ye. Having received the remission of sins, and having hoped upon the Name of the Lord, we became new, being created again from the beginning; wherefore in that habitation of ours God truly dwelleth within us."

No one can say in what Scripture this building of the temple is predicted. Barnabas has been speaking of the Creation week (chap. xv.), of which he makes each day to be a thousand years; and he may therefore have evolved his *τῆς ἑβδομάδος συντελουμένης* from the *συντελέσειν* of Gen. ii. 2. In any case it is more than possible that his Scripture never existed quite as he quotes it, except in his quotation; for he makes bold to give even the command to "sanctify the sabbath," with his own addition, *χερσὶν καθαρῶν καὶ καρδίᾳ καθαρᾷ*.¹ This (as I have said) he does twice over; and in the second case (chap. xv. 6) "actually proceeds to build an argument on words which are an arbitrary addition of his own to the Mosaic enactment" (Rendall).

¹ Compare the *θυσία καθαρᾷ* appointed for the service of the Lord's Day, in chap. xiv. of the *Teaching*.

A text for his discourse in the passage under discussion is supplied by chap. x. of the *Teaching*: "We give thanks to Thee, holy Father, for Thy holy Name which Thou hast made to dwell in our hearts." The heart is the $\psi\chi\mu$ or *σκήνωμα* (Ps. lxxiv. 7) of the Name; a true *ναός* or spiritual temple. But this form of expression is too pronounced a Hebraism for Barnabas. Accordingly he prefers to say that "God" dwells in the heart. But he adds and reiterates that this temple of the HEART is built upon the NAME of the Lord.

Chaps. xi.-xv. *On the Christian Ministry*. The individualism of Barnabas shows itself in relation to the ministry. He feels with Moses: "Would God that all the Lord's people were prophets, and that the Lord would put His spirit upon them." Every true Christian should be a *προφήτης* or *πνευματικός* (1 Cor. xiv. 37). "Become we spiritual: become we a perfect temple to God" (chap. iv. 11). . . . *αὐτὸς ἐν ἡμῖν προφητεύων* (chap. xvi. 9). Accordingly he has nothing to say about orders of prophets, and the like, under the new dispensation. But he has one point of contact with this section in "the prophets of old time," *οἱ ἀρχαῖοι προφῆται*, and he gives an illustration which shows what is meant by the saying on the "cosmic mystery."

The *Teaching* lays down that a Christian prophet is not to be judged of men, if he does something, *εἰς μυστήριον* . . . *ἐκκλησίας*, which it is not lawful to do in a private way and without such reference, *for even so likewise did the prophets of the former dispensation*. They did such things, *εἰς μυστήριον Χριστοῦ*, as another writer puts it. But let Barnabas speak for himself.

(1) He says generally that the words and acts of the prophets had reference to Jesus:

οἱ προφῆται, ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἔχοντες τὴν χάριν, εἰς αὐτὸν ἐπροφήτευσαν (chap. v. 6).

ἔχεις πάλιν καὶ ἐν τούτοις τὴν δόξαν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ πάντα καὶ εἰς αὐτόν (chap. xii. 7).

(2) The latter passage, ἔχεις πάλιν κ.τ.λ., refers to the brazen serpent, which Moses made, in defiance of his own prohibition of images, "that he might show a type of Jesus," ἵνα τύπον τοῦ Ἰησοῦ δείξῃ. He did something which he expressly taught others not to do; and his justification was that he did it εἰς μυστήριον.

This special illustration might be taken to sanction the use of art and symbolism in religious teaching. But the principle that "all things were εἰς αὐτόν" is, of course, of wider application. It was in fact used generally to explain anomalies in what the ancient "prophets" taught by word or deed.

Chap. xvi. *On the last things.* Difficulties have been found in two expressions in this chapter. Barnabas explains both of them.

(1) "Then shall mankind come into the furnace of trial, and many shall be offended and perish; but they that endure in their faith shall be saved by the very curse."

He gives several illustrations of this; but I will notice only one, which itself was felt to be a difficulty before the discovery of the *Didaché*.

Speaking of the red heifer (Num. xix.) he says:—

"But wherefore the wool withal and the *hyssop*? Because . . . he that is sick in the flesh is healed by the pollution (ῥύπον) of the *hyssop*" (chap. viii.).

On this Mr. Rendall writes: "ῥύπον presents great difficulties. No good emendation to the passage has been proposed."

The same word ῥύπος, in chap. xi. 11, means the defilement of sin, which is removed by baptism. That corruption should be the means of healing is a case of the paradox of Salvation by the Curse. A volume might be filled with illustrations of this. The *Didaché* explains itself by say-

ing, in chap. iii., that visitations (*ἐνεργήματα*) which are *prima facie* evil are to be accepted as good. To them that continue in faith, "All things work together *εἰς ἀγαθόν*" (Rom. viii. 28).

(2) Lastly, the "sign of outspreading (*ἐκπετάσεως*) in heaven" is explained in chap. xii. of the *Epistle* by the application of Isaiah lxxv. 2, "*All the day long have I spread out (ἐξεπέτασα) my hands,*" etc., to the Crucifixion. For further illustrations of this, and of the saying on the *μυστήριον κοσμικόν*, and of the salvation *ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ καταθέματος*, I must again refer to my *Two Lectures* on the *Διδαχή*.

And now, to return to the point from which we started, Barnabas writes in chap. xx. : *ἡ δὲ τοῦ μέλανος ὁδὸς ἐστὶν σκολιὰ καὶ κατὰρας μεστή. ὁδὸς γάρ ἐστιν θανάτου αἰωνίου μετὰ τιμωρίας, ἐν ᾗ ἐστὶν τὰ ἀπολλύντα τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτῶν εἰδωλολατρεία κ.τ.λ., ἀφοβία. διώκται τῶν ἀγαθῶν κ.τ.λ., πανθαμάρτητοι.*

He omits *ῥυσθείητε, τέκνα, ἀπὸ τούτων ἀπάντων*, because he purposes to write shortly after at the end of his *Epistle*, *σώζεσθε ἀγάπης τέκνα κ.τ.λ.* The curious transition to *διώκται κ.τ.λ.*, which is not at all his style, raises a distinct presumption that he is here a copyist; and this is confirmed by the clause, *ὁδὸς γάρ ἐστιν θανάτου κ.τ.λ.*, which is a palpable *addition* of his own. On a bare comparison of the two documents, one can see no reason why the Way of Death, according to the *Didaché*, should not be said to be the archetype of chap. xx. of the *Epistle*.

The "way of light" differs much more from the "way of life"; but all the variations are in the proper style of Barnabas. He reduces order to chaos by his free handling of his subject matter, his inveterate habit of repetition, and his purpose of writing not merely for the neophyte but for the *πνευματικός*, who is to preach and save souls by the word, instead of sitting at the feet of the saints.

What remains of the *Διδαχή* does not contain much that he could have made use of. But he does write as he must have written if he had the latter part of it (chaps. vii.–xvi.) also before him. He is impressed by its most striking ideas; he explains the very sayings in it which were least transparent; and he altogether omits little or nothing except what it might have been safely predicted that he would omit.

Thus far it does not appear why Barnabas should not have drawn from the *Διδαχή* in its entirety. Something might be said on extraneous grounds in favour of a hypothetical common original to which both were indebted; but as against the view of the earlier editors of the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, I am disposed to go a step further than to hold it “kaum für glaublich” that one of its main sources should have been the *Epistle of Barnabas*.

C. TAYLOR.

A MISUNDERSTOOD PARABLE.

OUR Saviour's parables are not chance similitudes gleaned from the surface of things; they are living analogies, drawn from the core of nature. This stamp of Divine authorship belongs to the figurative language of Scripture generally; but it pre-eminently characterises our Lord's symbolic lessons. Such images, for example, as the Sower and the Seed, the Shepherd and the Sheep, the Vine and its Branches, do not flash a momentary lustre and then vanish. They are fixed stars of wisdom, by whose light we may always guide our thoughts. The mere poetic simile is a picture, which must not be touched or taken from its frame. The true parable is an instrument which yields to the familiar touch ever fresh music.