

THE DIDACHE RECONSIDERED.

IN the Preface to his *Barnabas, Hermas, and the Didache*,¹ the Dean of Wells writes that 'The ultimate aim of these Lectures is to reach a point of view from which the literary character and the historical value of the Didache, or Teaching of the Apostles, can be justly estimated'. He had already essayed the same task in this JOURNAL for April 1912. But inasmuch as he then held the theory of an original Jewish 'Two Ways', he did not attempt to apply the principle which is now 'the master light of all his seeing' to the whole of our *Didache*, but only to its second part, that dealing with the ordering of Church life. Here, however, he is quite thoroughgoing in his theory of literary fiction, according to which 'the Didachist'—to use his own artificial title for so artificial a person as he imagines—'was endeavouring to present a picture of the way in which the Gentile Churches were ordered by their Apostolic founders', and to that end 'sought to confine himself, so far as he could, to such precepts and regulations as could be authenticated, directly or indirectly, by writings of the Apostolic age'.

The *Didache*, then, is an antiquarian mosaic, most elaborately and artificially constructed, with a deliberate purpose of fictitious verisimilitude or *camouflage*, yet in such a way as to convey an impression of primitive simplicity, in spirit as well as in content, which has led astray modern scholars of all schools, as it did those among whom the forgery was first launched. 'His object may have been to recall the Church of his own day [which Dr Robinson now rather inclines to bring down later than Origen, instead of c. A. D. 160, as when he wrote in 1912] to a greater simplicity by presenting this picture of the primitive Christian Society' (p. 83).

In pursuance of his newly reached conviction that there never was 'a Jewish manual' setting forth the 'Two Ways', as Dr C. Taylor had induced him and others to believe, Dr Robinson proceeds to adduce proofs that 'the moral instruction', like the ecclesiastical ordinances, was not what had come to the compiler of the *Didache* as actual Apostolic tradition, either orally preserved or in a written 'Two Ways' such as he incorporates in his work. It was simply what 'the Apostles might reasonably be supposed to have sanctioned for their Gentile converts' (p. v). The sources from which he derived his materials for such an ideal representation were 'the "Two Ways" of the Epistle of Barnabas'—their original form, albeit 'an incongruous medley' (p. 72),

¹ *Barnabas, Hermas, and the Didache* being the Donnellan Lectures delivered before the University of Dublin in 1920 by J. Armitage Robinson, D.D. S.P.C.K., 1920.

to which the Didachist imparted 'an improved arrangement'—along with 'matter taken from the Sermon on the Mount, from Hermas, and from other writers' (p. 80). Such is the thesis which the present lectures are meant to prove, with the support of the analogy as to the Didachist's characteristic method which an earlier essay on the second part of the Didache (here reprinted as an Appendix) is claimed to furnish. The results of the two investigations are summarized in the Epilogue to the present work.

Before dealing with the fresh argument, we must take some space to challenge the cogency of those parts of the Appendix which most concern the thesis as a whole, a thesis which places the composition of the Didache completely outside the first century and denies to it all real relevance to historical conditions in the Apostolic and early sub-Apostolic ages. First, then, it is alleged that the Didachist 'betrays himself here and there . . . by attributing to the Apostolic age practices which undoubtedly belong to a later period'. If the Dean includes in these the use in Did. vii of the three-fold Name, found at the end of Matthew, as an actual baptismal formula, the present reviewer is not concerned to deny that such was a post-Apostolic practice; yet it may well have arisen, in circles where Matthew's Gospel was current, as early as c. 80-100, the date to which Lightfoot was content to refer our Didache. But as regards the casuistry of the forms of baptism which follow in vii 2-4, with the probable exception of the reference to fasting on the part of the baptizand and others (which leads on to the next section), the secondary character of this section is manifest even in the wording, addressed as it is to a single minister, whereas Church actions elsewhere have a plural address to the community as a body. And this is only one clear case of a tendency to supplemental addition to which such bodies of rules are most liable, and of which there are probably other instances not only in Part ii but also in Part i of our Didache, notably i 3^b-ii 1.¹ Further, there is no reason why the end of Matthew's Gospel may not have contributed, as Dr Robinson argues, to the title of our Didache, 'Teaching of the Lord through the Twelve Apostles to the Nations' (not necessarily to the original form of vii 1, which probably read 'into the name of the Lord', as in ix 5), and even to

¹ Probably also vi 2 f and the last sentence in v, 'May ye be delivered, children, from these one and all' (*ἀπάρτων*), where the plural address, not elsewhere in the 'Two Ways' (iv 11 being no real exception), comes badly just before the 'See thou lest any one cause thee to stray from this way of (the) Teaching'. As regards Part ii, 'through Jesus Christ' (absent from the Ps-Athanasian *De Virginitate* xiii and *Ap. Const.* vii), and probably also 'and the power' (not in *Ap. Const.*, and reversing the order of the *δύναμις* and *δόξα* in viii 2), may be cited as an insertion in ix 4. Those which may be suspected (like i 3^b-ii 1 in Part i) of being parts of an early revision or fresh edition are referred to below.

some sections in Part ii as it now stands. But it is another matter to say that when the Didache refers to 'the Gospel' as the sanction for this or that precept (viii 2, xi 3, xv 3 f), it refers to any written Gospel at all. Still more doubtful, in spite of the Dean's ingenious combinations—the very ingenuity of which tells somewhat against their probability as *verae causae*—is the use of the Fourth Gospel inferred from the Eucharistic sections (ix-x). There the use of κλάσμα is perfectly natural as arising directly from κλῆν ἄρτον (xiv 1, cf. Acts ii 46, and κλάσις τοῦ ἄρτου, Acts ii 42); while few of those familiar with Jewish modes of thought will feel it needful to resort to that Gospel because verbal parallels can be found in it to the Eucharistic prayers. The shades of meaning in the use of words are what really count most, and they are always *more Hebraic* in the Didache than in the Johannine Gospel (e. g. in 'the holy Vine of David' = the Messianic Kingdom, as compared with 'I am the true Vine', John xv 1)—a fact which tells against the Didache being the later in date, as alleged by Dr Robinson. In fact one may apply to his theory of artificial compilation¹ here the phrase which he himself applies to one of the prayers in question: it is 'a literary *tour de force*'. They are far too natural and religiously impressive to have had the origin suggested, rather than have grown up in the same atmosphere as that of Acts ii-iv, in connexion with the semi-domestic sort of Eucharistic meals² described in Acts ii 42, 46. Finally, to suggest that the 'remarkable group of ejaculations' in Did. x 6, including even the Ἀμήν at the end of the whole Eucharistic series, is made up eclectically out of scattered expressions in 1 Cor. and a phrase in Matt. xxi 9, modified in the light of xxii 45 (though, even so, we hardly get τῷ θεῷ Δαβὶδ), seems only to shew the dangers of 'vigour and rigour' in the carrying out of a line of thought, uncontrolled by sufficient use of the historic imagination.

Much the same 'over-subtle' adducing of verbal parallels without explaining the element of diversity, or other independent features associated with them in the Didache, marks the attempt to explain

¹ Here, as elsewhere, we have in fact to recognize cases of that over-subtlety which our critic himself anticipates (p. 103) as likely to be found in some of his points. Such are the denial of any historical significance to the type of Eucharist depicted so vividly in chh. ix-x, on the score of the parallelism of μετὰ τὸ ἐμπληθῆναι with the ἐνεπλήσθησαν (instead of ἐχορτάσθησαν) of the Johannine story of the Feeding of the Multitude; and again of the order, Cup *before* Bread, in the Didache and in Paul's allusion to the Eucharist in 1 Cor. x 16 f, although in the latter's *more explicit* account in the next chapter he has the usual order! Further, the sense of τελεῖωσαι αὐτήν ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ σου is by no means clearly the same as that of the phrase in 1 John iv 18.

² So to depict the primitive Eucharist after A. D. 150 would only shock sentiment and frustrate the Didachist's assumed aim.

away, as tags from Pauline Epistles, the Didache's witness to the charismatic ministries of Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers. 'But *suffer the Prophets* to give thanks *as much as they will*' has nothing that is characteristic in common with 'Else if thou (any Christian) bless in Spirit, how shall he that filleth the place of the ordinary person (*ιδιώτρον*) say the Amen at thy thanksgiving?' And so on, through most of the series of supposed borrowings, up to what is perhaps the climax of the incredibilities created by a too verbal method, viz. the explanation of the maxim 'for they (the prophets) are your high-priests' by reference to John xi 51: 'being high-priest that year, he (Caiaphas) prophesied (in the sense of 'predicted') that Jesus should die for the nation'.

Having thus eliminated the Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers of the Didache from serious consideration as historical entities (though they seem implied in Hermas at an earlier date than is here assigned to the Didache, and in much the same sense), Dr Robinson has still to 'ask what notable features remain unexplained, and incapable of explanation, on the principle of deduction from Apostolic writings'. Under this head he allows that 'the recognition of the professional Prophet may be regarded as' a positive feature 'characteristic of the writer's situation'. But surely the concrete references to such prophets in Did. xi 9, 11, 12 at least, must be taken as also from the life; and this seems to carry us half-way back towards taking the whole section at its face value, and as primitive in date as well as in conditions. To many the very *naïveté* of the tests of the genuineness of such 'apostles' as the Didache contemplates will appear to be a mark of historical truth rather than the opposite, as also the absence of 'reference to Christian theology or soteriology in connexion with the preparation for Baptism', not to speak of the theological simplicity of the work generally. These and other matters make the question of 'the writer's object in composing the book' a greater problem, on the Dean's theory, than he seems to realize.

Thus far we have found no real proof that Part ii of the Didache demands the hypothesis of historical fiction, made by literary camouflage to look like primitive fact. What, then, of Part i, that dealing with the 'Two Ways?' Here, again, on sound critical principles, one must at first rule out a portion of our Didache in this connexion, as not belonging to the original work, though in the end we may find that it too is really first-century matter. For both external evidence of other documents, prior to the Apostolic Constitutions late in the fourth century, and internal evidence derived from the lack of homogeneity with its context, shew that i 3^b-ii 1 is a secondary section. In particular it follows badly on 'All things whatsoever thou wouldest not should be done to thee, do thou also not do to another'. This negative form,

which the Didache adds to the positive form of this Golden Rule, leads naturally to ii 2 ff with its 'shalt nots', but most awkwardly to 'Bless them that curse you and pray for your enemies', &c.

Leaving, then, i 3^b-ii 1 out of account for the present, we come now to the Dean's main thesis, that the Epistle of Barnabas was the one true original of the 'Two Ways', and that our Didache depends directly on 'Barnabas' for the matter common to both. The present writer has long held, as Dr Robinson holds, that there never was a Jewish manual for instruction of proselytes in the 'Two Ways'. But to deny that there ever was a body of such Jewish instruction current orally, which passed over with some modification into Christian catechesis for Gentile converts, is a very different thing. In fact such a theory seems needed to explain the highly Jewish character of the 'Two Ways', including its largely negative form, even as found in Barnabas—with the more positive and evangelical genius of which it seems but ill to accord. Thus it does in very truth involve 'transition' to 'another sort of knowledge (*gnosis*) and instruction' (*didache*), when 'Barnabas' passes from his allegorizing but Evangelic *gnosis* to his exposition of the 'Two Ways'. Indeed, perhaps the most serious and radical defect in the Dean's whole treatment is the degree to which he fails to recognize the fundamentally Jewish point of view and quality of the 'Two Ways' so far as common to Barn. and Did., and the significance of the fact that the former's distinctive touches are of a more positively Christian kind, while the latter (in its original sections) contains much extra matter of the Jewish type,¹ and so cannot be a much later Christian compilation based mainly on Barnabas. This applies particularly to the very Jewish series (iii 1-6) of negative precepts introduced by 'My son', each backed with appeal to the fruits of the vice in question, the whole being followed by four precepts continuous in thought with the last of that series. But whereas the latter series appears in Barn. in various contexts, there is no sign of the former one—owing surely to its unacceptable Jewish style of thought.

The case is similar with the opening of the next section in the Did. (iv 1 f), which offers a point of comparison between it and Barn. of which the Dean makes a good deal, but in a way which seems to reverse the true relations of the matter. For it, too, begins with 'My son', followed by 'him that speaketh unto thee the Word of God thou shalt remember night and day, and shalt honour him as the Lord; for in the quarter whence the Lordship is spoken of, there is the Lord. And thou shalt seek out daily the persons of the saints, that thou mayest find rest in their words.' This seems thoroughly Jewish in conception (though as

¹ e. g. ii 5 οὐκ ἔσται ὁ λόγος σου ψευδής, οὐ κενός, ἀλλὰ μεμεστομένος πράξει, which is supported even by Barn., where the Evil Way is *κατὰρ μεστή*.

adapted to Christian conditions), and is continuous with the foregoing not only in virtue of the address 'My son', but also as taking up the words in iii 8, 'trembling continually at the words which thou hast heard.' In Barn., however, its equivalent (adjusted to its new context by needful omission of 'My son') reads as follows: 'Thou shalt *love as (the) apple of thine eye everyone* that speaketh unto thee the word of the *Lord*. Thou shalt remember *the day of Judgement* night and day, and shalt seek out each day the persons of the saints, *either labouring by word and going on thy way to exhort and studying to save a soul by (the) word, or with thy hands shalt thou work* for a ransom of thy sins.' Here the differences may most easily and naturally be viewed as enhancements, after Barnabas's characteristic manner, for his purpose of urgent exhortation, with the Judgement Day ever in view. Most notable is the change from the attitude of a convert towards his regular teacher in the things of God and towards 'the saints' who have words of experience to impart to him, to that of a full member of the Church towards his peers. Such a one is indeed to love all who can remind him of 'the word of the Lord' that is their common rule of life: but he is also and especially to seek out 'the saints' *in order to do them good*, whether by word or by the alms which avail as ransom for one's own sins. It is easy to understand how the more rudimentary exhortation found in the Didache might be developed in the hands of such a teacher as 'Barnabas' (the Dean's characterization of whom is perhaps the best part of his lectures), into meat fit for more advanced Christians, as he conceived things; but it is hard to imagine the reverse process, especially as the *motif* of the last clause in Barn. was a most popular one in the second and third centuries. This does not necessarily mean that Barnabas used our Didache; but at least it means that both used the 'Two Ways', in a form like that in our Didache, and that the Didache preserves more faithfully its original contents and order, while Barnabas handles it in both respects more freely. This would be quite in keeping with his strongly subjective genius and the fresh use he is making of the 'Two Ways', as applied to more mature Christian readers than those originally contemplated by such instruction.

As to the order of the 'Two Ways' in Barnabas, the Dean seems to agree with Bryennius in thinking it 'inconceivable that if Barnabas had the more systematic form in front of him he could have deliberately thrown it into such confusion' (p. 72). To me, on the contrary, it is psychologically inconceivable that 'the Didachist' should have succeeded so well in putting together the 'incongruous medley in Barnabas' into so coherently ordered a whole, and that *relative to a Jewish* rather than later Christian point of view—such as Dr Robinson has to postulate for him. Barnabas's disordering procedure, however, would be quite natural

if he saw Christian life and duty in a different perspective, while he did not care for a good deal of the original contents of the 'Two Ways', those, namely, most Jewish in style of thought. As he glossed some of the precepts he cites and adds others (which our Didache would have no similar motive for omitting), so he might instinctively alter the order *to suit his own emphasis in the description of the Christian ideal*.¹

So, too, with the opening of the 'Two Ways' in each. It is almost inconceivable that the fuller and more vivid form in Barnabas should be the source of the simple and more colourless form of the common conception in the Didache. As to the negative form of the Golden Rule, added in the Didache as a paraphrase of the positive form found in Lev. xix 18 (not first in Matt. xxii), it was probably, from the first, part of the oral 'Two Ways', so as to adapt the Second Table (like the definition of God as 'Him who made thee' does the First) to the use of Gentiles, already familiar with this form of the principle (see Hastings *D.B.* v 444 note). Here, then, Barn. seems to amplify the less distinctively Christian language of the 'Two Ways'—its First Table by 'thou shalt glorify Him who rescued thee from death', and, later on, the Second, by 'thou shalt love thy neighbour *beyond thy soul*' instead of 'as thyself'. He also relapses at times from his own special categories, e. g. 'the Way of Light, and the Way of Darkness', to those of his more Jewish basis, as in the phrase 'from death' just cited, and still more in his section on the Way of Death (where we get several ideas which occur in both 'Ways' in the Did. but are lacking in Barnabas's 'Way of Light'). Thus we read, 'The Way of the Black One is crooked *and full of cursing* (so Didache, cf. 'filled full with deed', ii 5). For the Way is (one) of *Death* eternal, along with penalty'—a characteristic blend of the original and of Barnabas's own glosses.

Space does not allow further testing in detail. But the net result is that everything points, if not to the use of the Didache by Barnabas, then at least to common use, as basis, of a Jewish-Christian catechism on the

¹ Further, I do not agree that Barn.'s order is such a medley as is assumed. I seem to discern in it a certain progressive movement of thought in two main stages, the first (xix 2-5 a) developing the First Table in precepts expressive of a right Godward attitude, the second the manward, introduced by 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour above thy soul'. This is the second half of Did. i 2, with the substitution for 'as thyself' (followed by the minimizing Negative Golden Rule) of 'above thy soul,' a more Evangelic clause, from ii 7. This phrase appealed to him, as we see from his use of it elsewhere (i 4, iv 6). Similarly for 'the Evil (*πονηρά*) Way', which stands in Did. v 1, Barn. has substituted 'crooked' along with his characteristic phrase 'the Black One'. But the phrase is found at an earlier point (iv 10), where Barn. has special affinity with the Did., in the words 'Let us hate completely (*τελείως*) the works of the Evil Way' (see next note, on Barn. iv 9 f and Did. xvi 2).

Two Ways, possibly entitled 'Teaching (Διδαχή) of the Lord'. This was probably known to the author of our Didache in its original form, and also to Barnabas (possibly in a rather different shape). If there are any traces of Barnabas in the present text of our Didache, these can best be explained as secondary glosses, like those from Barnabas (and once at least from Hermas, see iv 8) in the text of the Latin *Doctrina Apostolorum*. For our Didache certainly underwent modification: witness the considerable interpolation (in a more Christian interest) i 3^b-ii 1, and possibly also vi 2-3 ('thou shalt be perfect', as a motive for bearing the full demands of 'the yoke of the Lord', i. e. Christ's Gospel ideal, being common to both). Even at this stage, however, it was probably prior to, not based on, Hermas. For certain central ideas of Mand. iv do not appear at all in Did. i 5: for instance, that God's gifts (δωρήματα, as James i 16, while Didache has the more distinctive χαρίσματα), from which He (ὁ θεός, whereas Didache has ὁ πατήρ) would have alms given without reserve (ἀπλῶς) to those who ask, are what one obtains by one's labours (ἐκ τῶν κόπων σου). On the other hand Did. i 5 and especially i 6, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τούτου δε (? δὴ) εἰρηται, Ἰδρωσάτω ἡ ἐλεημοσύνη σου εἰς τὰς χεῖράς σου, μέχρις ἂν γνῶς τίνι δῶς (perhaps a current form of an idea in Eccus. xii 1 ἐὰν εὖ ποιῆς γνῶθι τίνι ποιεῖς), would explain Hermas's emphasis on the opposite view, with his μὴ διατάζων τίνι δῶς ἢ τίνι μὴ δῶς. Further, Mand. xi, with its maxim 'By his life test the man who hath the Divine Spirit', suggests knowledge of Did. xi 8, 'By their ways (τρόπων), then, shall the false prophet and the prophet be recognized.'

To the same completed edition, rather than the original Didache, might even belong the one passage where any substantive use of Barnabas has any real plausibility. This is Did. xvi 2, compared with Barn. iv 9. But Barn. iv 9 is remote from chh. xix-xx, which contain the Two Ways in 'Barnabas'. Thus it is antecedently more probable that Barnabas took the common matter from the eschatological close of the Didache (Part ii of which was otherwise not to his purpose) than that 'the Didachist' adopted it from its distant context in Barnabas, omitting, too, some of the most striking features in that context, whereas Barnabas has there several touches which look like echoes of phrases in Did. xvi 2 and its context.¹ Be this as it may, it would be possible to

¹ The thick type in the following citation of Barn. iv 9-11 will suggest how the case stands. Explaining that he was writing 'not as a Teacher (διδάσκαλος, in the special or quasi-prophetic sense of Did. xiii 2, xv 1 f, cf. xi 10, which the Dean tends to call in question), but as it befits one who loves not to omit (anything) from the resources at his disposal (ἀφ' ὧν ἐχομεν)', Barn. goes on: Διὸ προσέχωμεν ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις (so Did. xvi 3, and ἐσχάτῃ in 2). Οὐδὲν γὰρ ἀφελήσει ἡμᾶς ὁ πᾶς χρόνος τῆς ζωῆς (cf ζωῆς in Did. xvi 1) ἡμῶν, ἐὰν μὴ νῦν ἐν τῷ ἀνόμῳ (ἐσχάτῳ Did. xvi 2, but cf. αὐξανομένης τῆς ἀνομίας, below) καιρῷ καὶ τοῖς μέλλονσι σκανδάλοις (Did. goes on to specify such), ὡς πρέπει υἱοῖς θεοῦ, ἀντιστάμεν . . . Μισήσωμεν τελείως

admit dependence of Did. xvi 2 on Barn. iv 9 f rather than *vice versa*—especially if Did. xvi belonged to a second edition of the Didache, like i 3^b-ii 1, where similar phenomena of dependence on our Matthew and Luke also appear—without any presumption that the ‘Two Ways’ of the Didache came from Barnabas xix-xx.

Nor does the hypothesis just hinted at, that the original Didache did not include all our text of it (apart even from the clearly late interpolations in the section on Baptism in ch. vii), apply only to the manifest insertion in ch. i, and its probable fellow, vi 2-3. Once it is established in the first and chief of these cases, it is natural to ask whether it does not apply also to instances of marked dependence on our Gospel of Matthew elsewhere. That this is so in ix 5^b, *καὶ γὰρ περὶ τούτου εἶρηκεν ὁ Κύριος· Μὴ δῶτε τὸ ἅγιον τοῖς κνσί*, is rendered the more probable by the similarity of its introduction to that in i 6, *Ἄλλὰ καὶ περὶ τούτου δὲ (δῆ, Bryennius) εἴρηται κτλ.*, which, if not integral to the section of Evangelic matter i 3^b-5, at least pre-supposes it. But the most important case calling for consideration is the section (ch. viii) dealing with Fasting and Prayer, and citing the Lord’s Prayer with the introduction, ‘Nor yet pray ye as the hypocrites; but as the Lord enjoined in His Gospel so pray ye, Our Father, &c.’ It is not that this Prayer itself is quoted from the Gospel of Matthew,¹ for the wording ‘differs somewhat and was probably the local form in current use (with the local doxology, found also in the Eucharistic prayer which follows). But the way in which Christian fasting and prayer in the whole section are contrasted with those of ‘the hypocrites’ points to a context like that in Matt. vi 5, ‘And whensoever ye pray, ye shall not be as the hypocrites’; and also in vi 16 as regards fasting. It is natural, then, to suppose that Matthew’s Gospel was known to the writer, though the point in which he contrasts Christian fasting in particular with that of ‘the hypocrites’ (in Matthew the Lord’s Prayer is in immediate contrast to that of ‘the Gentiles’) is its seasons, Wednesday and Friday instead of Monday and Thursday (as among the Jews), not its manner and spirit, as in Christ’s teaching. The strong anti-Judaism of this section, too, contrasts with the tone of the rest of the Didache, even vi 3 (which we saw reason to regard as part of the revision to which i 3^b-ii 1 belongs), where the Jewish food rules (probably as regards use of ‘blood’, as in Acts xv,

(cf. Did. *ἐὰν μὴ ἐν τῷ ἐσχάτῳ καιρῷ τελειωθῆτε*, in the sense of Heb. xii 23 *πνεύμασι δικαίων τετελειωμένων*) τὰ ἔργα τῆς πονηρᾶς ὁδοῦ (cf. Did. v 1, Barn. xx 1)· μὴ καθ’ ἑαυτοῦς ἐνδύνοντες μονάζετε ὡς ἦδη δεικναιωμένοι (in sense of *τετελειωμένοι* in Hebrews above), ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συνερχόμενοι συζητεῖτε περὶ τοῦ κοινῆ συμφέροντος (Did. τὰ ἀνήκοντα ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν) . . . Γενώμεθα πνευματικοί, γενώμεθα ναὸς τέλειος τῷ θεῷ.

¹ ‘The Gospel’ here, as in xi 13, xv 3 f, means the substance of the Gospel, however known.

where also 'food offered to idols' is referred to, as is the case here) are half relaxed in the case of Gentiles. Again, in this section the expression 'the hypocrites' seems even to be applied no longer to certain formalists among the Jews, presumably Pharisees, but to devout Jews generally, very much as 'the Jews' is used in a sweeping way in the Fourth Gospel for those opposed in spirit to Christ and His Gospel.

It looks, then, as though ch. viii, where fasting precedes prayer—as we should not expect of one ordering his matter freely—were attached, as an after-thought, to the peg afforded by the reference to fasting before baptism, which may quite well in some form (without the address to the minister in baptism) have stood originally at the end of section vii. If this be so, one would be inclined to assign this interpolation, suggested in part at least by Matthew's Gospel, to the same hand that probably glossed the reference to baptism¹ 'in the name of the Lord' in terms of Matt. xxviii *fin.*; turned the title of the *Didache*, in keeping with the same, into 'Teaching of the Lord *through the Twelve Apostles to the Nations*'; and possibly even added certain other touches² which we have not the means of identifying. Whether it was responsible for the Evangelic additions to ch. i seems an open question.³ The like may be said touching identity of authorship between the Gospel echoes in i 3^b-ii 1 and in xvi 1, in both of which Lucan matter is found alongside Matthean.

But these literary phenomena, as well as the historical data,⁴ are quite

¹ The second reference to the baptismal formula, without definite articles, in vii 3, points to vii 2, 3, and part of 4, as coming from another and later hand.

² Possibly the pseudo-apostolic apostrophizing of the readers as 'children' (τέκνα), at the end of ch. v, may be one of these; and xi 7^b, with its artificial application to the testing of Prophets of the saying in Matt. xii 31 about the Unforgivable Sin, may be another.

³ The answer may depend partly on whether those additions themselves are from one hand. As to this I am most uncertain. For it is noteworthy that, while the plurals of § 3 are no doubt due to the fact that its precepts stood in that form in the Gospels, there was no such external reason why § 4, 'Abstain from fleshly and bodily passions', should be couched in the singular; and the less so, that the plural address occurs in 1 Pet. ii 11, if indeed this was in mind at all, as becomes the more doubtful in view of this very contrast in form, as well as of σωματικῶν, to which σαρκικῶν καί may have been added later. The fact is that the contents, as well as the form, of § 4 follow far more naturally on the negative form of the Golden Rule, which immediately precedes the insertion and determines the true sequel in ii 2; while § 3, with its references to Love, goes back rather to the positive form of that rule, which was first quoted and then narrowed down by the other. It would be easier for a second interpolator to overlook this when a beginning of more positive precepts (those of non-resentment), enjoining restraint of 'bodily' or natural passions, had already been made by an earlier hand.

⁴ Dr Robinson strangely overlooks the support here supplied to the *Didache* by the picture of the sub-apostolic age as given in the *Ascension of Isaiah*, a work generally unknown to scholars until after the first discussions on the *Didache*.

consistent with a date for this fuller Didache before or about A. D. 100, the lower limit which Lightfoot inclined to assign to the whole work. And so—apart from the later insertions in vii 2-4 (possibly also in ix 5^b and 4^c, 'and the power, *through Jesus Christ*')—we are free to re-affirm that dating, after giving due weight to all that Dr Robinson has proved or made probable, as distinct from what he has failed to prove or render probable. The 'method' which he attributes to 'the Didachist' breaks down in nearly every instance when applied to the genuine Didache, though it holds good in a large part of 'Barnabas' and Hermas, as he expounds them. In particular he fails to enable us to conceive the motives for a fiction such as he imagines, unless its main features had more relevance to the actual conditions amid which it was put forth than would be the case at the date he assigns to it.

Yet, after all, Dr Robinson only pleads 'for a reconsideration of the problem'. It may indeed be doubted if 'even half' of what he has put forward will 'be admitted by serious students'; also whether these lectures 'will suffice to clear away' as many 'serious misconceptions' as they tend to create—let alone 'open a new path for the criticism and interpretation' of the Didache for those who had already given it careful attention. But it may at least be admitted that he has directed attention afresh to some problems connected with it which have not bulked sufficiently in general estimation, nor met with solutions commonly accepted among special students of this most important monument of the sub-apostolic age. In a similar spirit of enquiry the above contribution to its reconsideration is submitted to the Dean or other students of the subject, for testing and criticism.

VERNON BARTLET.