

NOTES AND STUDIES

CANON STREETER ON THE DIDACHE

[This article was already in print when I learned, to my dismay and deep regret, that Canon Streeter was killed in an aeroplane accident on September 10 last. It is a further cause of regret to me that this paper, written in the form of an answer to a recent article of Dr Streeter's should be fated to appear after his death. I believe, however, that it contains nothing in the way of criticism which can possibly give pain to his friends, and therefore I leave it as it was written.—R. H. C.]

CANON STREETER'S article on the Didache in the JOURNAL for October 1936 has the great virtue of being concise and keeping to points which really matter. It is for that reason that I have taken the liberty of placing his name in the title of the present paper.

Canon Streeter upholds the prevailing views: (1) that the section i 3 b-ii 1 of the Didache is an interpolation, taking his stand on the evidence of the Latin version and the Apostolic Church Order, which have not the section, and on the character of the section itself as being 'the most specifically Christian in the whole of "The Two Ways"' (p. 370);¹ (2) that the 'Two Ways' in the Didache has behind it a text other than that found in the Epistle of Barnabas.

To the second of these points I replied briefly in the JOURNAL for April 1937. Here I offer some considerations, old and new, on the theory of interpolation. As to this, Canon Streeter begins by pointing to an analogy between the disputed section of the Didache and the twelve verses at the end of St Mark's Gospel. He admits that the interpolation is an early one, since it 'can be carried back to the fourth century';² but the verses added to St Mark can be taken back still further, being quoted as from St Mark's Gospel by St Irenaeus in the second century.

Analogies of this kind are well enough, as Canon Streeter uses them,

¹ Did he perhaps mean that it is 'the most specifically *evangelic* in the whole of the *Didache*'? At any rate the section should be judged in its relation to the Didache as a whole and not to the 'Two Ways' merely.

² Canon Streeter mentions the Apostolic Constitutions and the Oxyrhynchus fragments; he makes no mention of the third-century Didascalia, which quotes as from the Gospel: 'Love them that *hate* you, and pray for them that curse you, and ye shall not have an enemy' (i 2)—and this, as in the Didache, in the course of comment on a negative text of the Golden Rule. For other evidence of use of the Didache in the Didascalia, see *J. T. S.* xxiv, January 1923, pp. 147 ff.

to indicate possibilities; but there is some danger of their being mistaken for evidence. That a passage in one document can be shewn to be an interpolation in spite of very early attestation does not help to prove that the same is true of a passage in another document which is found in several early authorities but is absent from some others. And in the present case the parity between the longer ending to St Mark and the 'Interpolation' of the Didache is confined to an accidental similarity in the matter of external attestation. St Mark's Gospel cried out from the first for an addition to give it at least the semblance of having reached a conclusion; there was no such urgent demand for the addition of the 'interpolated' passage in the Didache, and if motives can be assigned for its later insertion, others can be suggested for its later omission.

Nor is it always a safe presumption that the shorter of two texts is to be preferred. Examples are not wanting, and especially in the field of this 'Church Order' literature, of wrong as well as of right omission, of omission in the strict sense as against 'non-interpolation'. I will instance only two which are pertinent to the present subject-matter.

(a) The old Latin version of the Epistle of Barnabas omits the last four chapters, that is to say, the whole of the 'Two Ways' (xviii-xx) and the closing chapter xxi. It places a doxology and *Explicit Epistola Barnabae* after ch. xvii. A 'Western non-interpolation'? If we could say so, this would greatly ease the problem of the Didache by excluding Barnabas as a possible source of its 'Two Ways'. But the internal evidence for the genuineness of these chapters has forbidden the adoption of that tempting solution. As it is, we can only say that Barnabas found one editor who had no use for his 'Two Ways'.

(b) One of the chief witnesses called against the passage Did. i 3 b-ii 1 is the Apostolic Church Order, which passes it over. But (to say nothing of the second part of the 'Two Ways', the Way of Death, of which this document has nothing) it lacks also a considerable passage from the Way of Life (viz. Did. iv 9-14), closing its 'Two Ways' with Did. iv 8. And much the same thing meets us in the discourse attributed to Abba Schnudi (saec. v): he, too, passes over the 'Interpolation' and formally closes the Way of Life after Did. iv 8.¹ Yet the clauses Did. iv 9-14 are not only found in the Latin version and the Apostolic Constitutions, but are all represented in Barnabas. Here, then, is a real *omission*; and it is obvious that the same omission in Schnudi cannot be independent of that in the Church Order. It is also noteworthy that, whereas the 'Interpolation' begins with excerpts

¹ Schnudi, unlike the Apost. Ch. Order, goes on to speak of the Way of Death, though he dismisses it very briefly; and he has a phrase based on Did. vi 1. See *Texte u. Untersuch.* xiii 2 pp. 9-10.

from the Gospel, Did. iv 9-14 begins with (and largely consists of) the duties of parents, masters, and servants, which are formally treated of by St Paul in the Epistle to the Ephesians (vi 4 ff, cf. Col. iii 19 ff). In a document therefore in which the 'Two Ways' of the Didache is divided up amongst the Apostles, and in which curtailment was desirable, it is easily conceivable that the author would select for omission such parts as were to be found in more authentic form in the New Testament itself.

If space allowed, further examples of omission of genuine matter could be brought from another group of Church Order documents, those which derive from the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus and themselves present a highly instructive 'synoptic problem'. We may recall, too, the effect of Cureton's publication of the Syriac abridgement of the Ignatian Epistles: how he and other scholars jumped to the conclusion that here alone was the genuine Ignatius.

The witnesses *against* the disputed passage are, as at present known, the Apostolic Church Order (date?);¹ the Latin version (date?);² Schnudi (saec. v); and perhaps the *Syntagma* attributed (doubtfully) to St Athanasius.

Those *for* the passage are, the Didascalia (saec. iii); the Apostolic Constitutions bk. vii (saec. iv); the Oxyrhynchus fragment (saec. iv); the MS of Bryennius (A.D. 1056); and a Georgian version of the whole Didache (saec. v?).³

¹ This I believe to be more likely of the fourth than the third century. I refer to what I have said on the matter in *J.T.S.* xxiv 155-156; also to the notes on pp. 30-31, 32-33, 86-87, 93, and 130 of my edition of the Syriac and Latin versions of the Didascalia (1929), and p. lxxxiv f of the Introduction. Either the Order has used the Didascalia or *vice versa*, and I am decidedly of the opinion that the former is the true alternative.

² Canon Streeter treats this as in some sort an independent 'Western' witness supporting the Egyptian evidence of the Apost. Ch. Order (p. 370 of his article), comparing it to the Old Latin of the Gospels (p. 374); for he takes it to be the *Duae Viae vel Iudicium Petri* mentioned by Rufinus. But Hilgenfeld, Funk, and Bardenheuer more probably identify the work spoken of by Rufinus with the Apost. Ch. Order itself, which satisfies both titles, *Duae Viae* and *Iudicium Petri*, while the Latin version satisfies only the first: in the Order Peter is not only the most frequent speaker, but he opens the discussion in the second part of the work (c. 15) and also contributes the final word. The Apost. Ch. Order is among the Verona Latin fragments edited by E. Hauler (though unfortunately only the latter part is there preserved), and accordingly was translated into Latin towards the close of the fourth century—the date assigned by experts for the translation, though the MS is a century later. But Rufinus need not have seen it *in Latin*.

³ First made known by Dr Gregor Peradse in *Zeitschr. f. d. neuest. Wissenschaft*, xxxi, 1932, pp. 111 ff. On pp. 115-116 the variations from the Greek MS of Bryennius are given with considerable minuteness. The version omits Did. i 5-6, but not i 3-4, nor apparently ii 1. It is thought by Peradse to have been made in the first half of the fifth century (p. 114).

Where the external evidence¹ is thus divided, the first thing to do in trying to form a judgement is to examine the internal evidence. Does this suggest that the 'Interpolation' comes from a hand other than that of the rest of the Didache? Is it the kind of addition that we should expect from some unsophisticated Christian of a somewhat later date whose only aim was to raise the tone of the 'Two Ways' by supplying it with some of the loftier maxims of the Gospel? Or does it require us to believe that the supposed interpolator was one who had entered into the spirit of the Didache as a pseudo-apostolic composition (which it is), and not only tried his hand at 'camouflaging' the Gospel texts, to give them an appearance of coming indirectly through the Apostles, but was also at pains to pick out certain of the Didachist's own expressions and ideas and work them in, with intent, as we can only suppose, to create the illusion that his new patch was part and parcel of the original work? And is such proceeding on the part of an interpolator at all probable?

I take first the evidence suggestive of intentional colouring of the Gospel text, and next that which points to identity of authorship or, if not that, to conscious imitation of the Didachist's thought and language. Where the material is so small there will necessarily be overlapping in these two lines of enquiry, most of the texts requiring to be handled twice over.

I

(a) '*Fast* for them that persecute you' (i 3).

(b) '*But love them that hate you, and ye shall not have an enemy*' (i 3). This addition has the witness of the Didascalia, the Oxyrhynchus fragment, and the Apostolic Constitutions.

(c) '*If a man give thee a blow (σοι δὲ ῥάπισμα) on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also, and thou shalt be perfect*' (i 4). Besides the addition marked by italics, we notice the phrase 'give a blow', which is neither in St Matthew nor St Luke, but is used twice by St John (xviii 22, xix 3) of our Lord being struck by the servant of the high

¹ I say nothing above of Hermas or Clement of Alexandria as witnesses to the 'Interpolation', though both have been claimed as such by eminent scholars, as Funk, Rendel Harris, Bartlet, Hitchcock, and others. As to Hermas, the present view of most critics is, if I am not mistaken, that he has been used, but only by an interpolator. As to Clement, it is very doubtful whether he knew the Didache at all. It is commonly stated that he quotes as 'Scripture' the words 'Son, be not a liar, for lying leads to theft' (Did. iii 5); but whether he is using the Didache or not, O. Stählin has shewn that what he calls 'Scripture' in that passage is not the source of the words which he quotes, but John x 8 (*Z.N.W.* xiv, 1913, p. 271 f). This seems to have escaped even J. Muilenburg, and I confess that I was ignorant of Stählin's note until a few months ago.

priest and by the soldiers. The Apost. Const. preserve this expression but drop the unscriptural addition. The latter, however, seems to have inspired the comment which stands in its place, viz. 'Not that self-defence is wrong, but that unresentfulness is more excellent', which clearly makes the Gospel precept no more than a 'counsel of perfection'.

(d) 'If a man take from thee that which is thine, ask it not back; for neither art thou able' (i 4). We do not find, nor expect to find, this addition in the Apost. Const.

(e) There follows in i 5 the passage based on Hermas *Mand.* ii¹ and ending: 'But if (one receive) not having need, he shall give satisfaction (*δώσει δίκην*) why and wherefore he received; and being put in confinement (*ἐν συνοχῇ γενόμενος*) he shall be examined concerning the things which he hath done, and shall not come out thence until he pay the uttermost farthing.' The last sentence is a far-fetched application, to the non-necessitous receiver of an alms, of Matt. v 25 f, which may have been suggested by the forensic language in the parallel passage of Hermas, *οἱ μὲν γὰρ λαμβάνοντες θλιβόμενοι οὐ δικάσθήσονται, οἱ δὲ ἐν ὑποκρίσει λαμβάνοντες τίσονται δίκην.*

Finally, there is the strange saying, quoted in i 6, about letting an alms 'sweat in thy hand until thou know to whom thou shouldst give'.

These further passages (i 5-6) shew that the 'interpolator' had no intention of restricting himself to excerpts from the Gospel, but was ready to avail himself of external sources which might pass for 'apostolic'; and they thus afford good evidence that his previous, shorter, insertions into the Gospel texts were consciously made. He wishes his 'Interpolation' to appear apostolic rather than directly evangelic: no other motive for such insertions can reasonably be assigned when we remember the title and character of the book in which they appear. Free quotation from memory is in their case out of the question; we have an example of that kind of quotation in Justin Martyr *Apol.* i 15-16 (as to which more will be said below), but though the extracts from the Sermon on the Mount there given are more extensive than those in our 'Interpolation', they contain nothing comparable to any of the items noted above.

I now turn back to notice a textual point arising out of (b) above. There we read: 'But love (*ἀγαπάτε*) them that hate you'; and the immediately preceding clause in the Didache is 'For what thank is it

¹ Of this and what follows to the end of i 6 the Apost. Const. preserve only the words 'for to all the Father willeth that there should be given', omitting 'of his own *charismata*', and replacing this with words from Matt. v 45, 'who (*sc.* 'your Father who is in heaven') maketh his sun to rise on bad and good', &c. But the words retained are enough to shew that the whole passage was before the author.

if ye love (*ἀγαπᾶτε*) them that love (*τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας*) you? Do not even the Gentiles the same?' Such is the reading of the MS—with *ἀγαπᾶν* for 'love', as in the Gospels. But in the Apostolic Constitutions we find here in each case the verb *φιλεῖν* instead of *ἀγαπᾶν*; which is all the more remarkable because just before—correcting '*pray for your enemies*' to '*love your enemies*'—the author of the Constitutions has kept the Gospel verb *ἀγαπᾶτε*. But further, the text of (*β*) appears in the Oxyrhynchus fragment also as *ὑμεῖς δὲ φιλεῖτε τοὺς μισοῦντας ὑμᾶς, καὶ οὐκ ἕξετε ἐχθρόν*.¹ There is strong reason, therefore, to think that *φιλεῖν* in all three places was the original verb used by the 'interpolator' of the Didache, and that *ἀγαπᾶν* of the MS is a later assimilation to the Gospel text. But, if so, is not this another example of wilful 'colouring', to create an air of independence on the part of the Apostles? The suspicion at least is justified by what we have already seen.

In the foregoing paragraph nothing was said of the departures from the Gospel text involved in '*pray for your enemies*' and '*love them that hate you*' (i 3), because such variants might easily be explained as memory quotations: it would be natural enough to set 'hate' over against 'love', and with that to supply another verb in place of '*love your enemies*'; and what more natural for an early Christian to say than '*pray for your enemies*'? But still we hardly expect to find two writers making both these changes *independently*. It is remarkable, therefore, that we find Justin Martyr (*Apol.* i 15) quoting 'But I say unto you, *Pray for your enemies, and love (ἀγαπᾶτε)*² them that *hate you, and bless them that curse you*'. And that this was the form of these sayings that was fixed in his mind is shewn further by *Dial.* 133 *fin.*: 'as by our Christ and Lord we were taught, who enjoined us to *pray for our enemies, and love them that hate us, and bless them that curse us.*'³

This agreement between Justin and Did. i 3 does not enter into the question of the relation of the 'Interpolation' to the rest of the Didache; yet it is a matter which can hardly be passed over in the present discussion, and it may possibly have an important corollary. If the agreement is not purely accidental, we must conclude either that the Didache, *with the 'Interpolation'*, was known to Justin, or that Justin was known to the writer of Did. i 3. If the former were true,

¹ Of the previous clause all that remains is *οὐχὶ καὶ τὰ ἔθνη τοῦτο* (so Apost. Const.—*τοῦτο*) *ποιοῦσιν*;

² We have just seen that in Did. i 3 the original reading was probably *φιλεῖτε*; but that hardly affects the present point, beyond providing a further indication of Justin's independence of the Didache.

³ 'Pray for enemies' occurs also in *Apol.* i 14 and *Dial.* 96, but 'love enemies' is found in *Dial.* 85.

then this passage of the Didache would have earlier attestation even than the twelve verses at the end of St Mark. But there is nothing to suggest or favour this alternative, for (1) Justin quotes considerably more of the Sermon on the Mount than is contained in the Didache i 3-4, and (2), though he departs in several places from the wording of the Gospel—quoting, for example, ‘If ye love them that love you, what *new thing* do ye? for even *the fornicators* do this’—and fuses St Matthew and St Luke, yet he reproduces none of the additional phrases noted above. His recollection (if it be only that) may be faulty, but it is recollection *of the Gospel*. We are thus left with the interesting question: Did the ‘interpolator’ of the Didache—or possibly even the Didachist himself—know Justin?

II

I pass on to consider the ‘Interpolation’ in its relation to the main body of the Didache, and to ask whether it does not contain evidence strongly suggestive of its having been written by the same hand as the rest. Anything on a large scale we shall not expect to find, since in this passage the personal contribution of the writer amounts to little more than the half-dozen short phrases already noticed. What do these provide in the way of parallels to the Didachist’s own language, ideas, or method?

(a) ‘Fast for them that persecute you’ (i 3).

This strange importation into the Sermon on the Mount is to be compared with the no less strange parody of our Lord’s words about fasting in the same Sermon (Matt. vi 16) which meets us in Did. viii 1: ‘But let not your fastings be with the hypocrites; for they fast on the second and fifth day of the week; but do ye fast the fourth (Wednesday) and the Preparation (Friday).’ That two such liberties should be taken with the Gospel texts, and in the same subject-matter, seems to indicate the same mind and hand at work. It is perhaps worth noting that the Didascalia, in which the Didache has been used, has a combination of both these texts: ‘But (fast) not after the custom of the former People, but according to the new testament which I have appointed you: that you may be fasting *for them* (the Jews) on the fourth day of the week. . . . But fast *for them* also on the Friday’ (v 14, p. 184, of my edition).

It is further to be remarked that the substitutions ‘fast’ for ‘pray’ in Did. i 3, and *φιλεῖν* for *ἀγαπᾶν* in the following clauses (if that be, as I think, the original reading), are wholly in character with two others in the body of the Didache: (1) *τὴν ὀφειλὴν* for *τὰ ὀφειλήματα* in the Lord’s Prayer (viii 2): suggested no doubt by Matt. xviii 32, ‘all that debt (*ὀφειλὴν*) I forgave thee’; and (2) ‘Hosanna to the *God* of

David' (x 6): regarded by Harnack and Rendel Harris as connected with Barnabas xii 10-11, 'See how David calls Him Lord, and calls Him *not* Son'.

(b) 'But love them that hate you, *and ye shall not have an enemy*' (καὶ οὐχ ἔξετε ἐχθρόν) (i 3).

Are these last words to be read as a promise (= 'and no man will be your enemy'), or, in the active sense, as a further command (= 'and you are not to have an enemy')? Taken as a promise, they are at variance with the context and with the whole of the Sermon on the Mount. Clement of Alexandria might hold out such a promise to his ideal Gnostic¹, but Christ's disciples are nowhere in the Gospel encouraged to hope that they will be without enemies and persecutors. Taken as a command, on the other hand, the words would be a legitimate restriction of the sense in which a Christian's 'enemies' could be spoken of. They might even be read as a gloss on the substitution of 'them that hate you' for 'your enemies'. The second interpretation is that preferred by Funk, who compares Did. ii 7 οὐ μισήσεις πάντα ἄνθρωπον. And the same view was taken centuries before by the author of the Apostolic Constitutions, who makes the same connexion with Did. ii 7: καὶ ἐχθρόν οὐχ ἔξετε οὐ μισήσεις γάρ, φησί, πάντα ἄνθρωπον, οὐκ Αἰγύπτιον, οὐκ Ἰδουμαίων (cf. Deut. xxiii 7 οὐ βδελύξῃ Ἰδουμαίων . . . οὐ βδελύξῃ Αἰγύπτιον).² Was he not right? Is not the phrase in Did. i 3 merely a forestalling of what the Didachist will presently say in other words? For similar anticipations see (c) and (e) below.

(c) 'If a man give thee a blow on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also, *and thou shalt be perfect*' (καὶ ἔσῃ τέλειος) (i 4).

This is to be read beside the Didachist's saying in vi 2, which appears to be only a fuller enunciation of the same idea³: 'If thou art able to bear the whole yoke of the Lord, *thou shalt be perfect* (τέλειος ἔσῃ); but if thou art not able, what thou art able that do.'

In connexion with this thought of moral or spiritual *perfection* we must also note Did. xvi 2: 'For the whole time of your faith shall not profit you, unless in the last season *ye be perfected*' (τελειωθῆτε). The first part of this sentence is taken nearly verbally from Barnabas iv 2⁴;

¹ Cf. *Eclog. prophet.* § 30 οὐδὲ ἐχθρόν ἐχόντος τὸ παράπαν (unless this also should be thought to bear the active sense); and *Strom.* vii § 69 'And who could reasonably be the enemy of a man who affords no possible excuse for enmity?' (Hort and Mayor p. 120-121).

² 'Thou shalt not hate any man' is repeated further on at its proper place, followed by ἐλεγμῶ ἐλέγεις τὸν ἀδελφόν σου, κτλ. (cf. Lev. xix 17).

³ As to this I would refer to Dr Bartlet's article in Hastings's *Dict. of the Bible*, Extra Vol., p. 446b. Harnack (*Die Apostellehre*, 1896, p. 65) actually regards Did. vi 2 and most of vi 3 as an insertion *by the same hand as i 3 b-6*.

⁴ See *J.T.S.* xxxviii, April 1937, p. 166.

the second part reduces to one word what Barnabas had said at length, viz. : 'unless now, in the lawless season and in the offences to come, we resist as becometh sons of God, that the Black One gain no side-entrance;' and the summary is effected by the comprehensive verb 'be perfected'.

(d) 'If a man take from thee that which is thine, ask it not back; for neither art thou able' (οὐδὲ γὰρ δύνασαι) (i 4).

This unexpected supplement to the words from Luke vi 30 is less surprising when we notice the Didachist's fondness for weighing possibilities—whether 'thou art' or 'art not able'. Thus in chapters vi and vii we have in close succession: 'If thou art able to bear the whole yoke of the Lord, . . . but if thou art not able, what thou art able that do' (vi 2); 'But concerning food, bear what thou art able' (vi 3); 'But if thou art not able (to baptize) in cold water, then in warm' (vii 2); 'and if any others are able'—let them fast (vii 4).

(e) 'Blessed is he that giveth according to the commandment (ὁ διδοὺς κατὰ τὴν ἐντολήν); for he is guiltless' (i 5).

In this passage our 'interpolator' is now working with Hermas, not with the Gospel. Dr Robinson comments¹:—

'It has been suggested that in our present passage "the commandment" (ἡ ἐντολή) may actually refer to the Second Mandate (Ἐντολή) of Hermas, upon which the Didachist is here working; but that is not very probable. What, however, seems not improbable is that the Mandate or Commandment in question may have suggested to him the use of the phrase "according to the commandment".'

This appears to me the less improbable in that the last sentence of *Mand.* ii begins with the words φύλασσε οὖν τὴν ἐντολήν ταύτην, and that similar reminders are found at the end of some of the other Mandates. Dr Robinson continues:—

'The injunction to "give according to the commandment" is found twice in the latter part of the Didache [δὸς κατὰ τὴν ἐντολήν, xiii 5, 7]. Whatever "the commandment" in those passages may be, "giving according to the commandment" cannot well have occurred independently to two writers.' To which I would add: 'still less within the compass of a single short treatise.' If the Didachist himself is not responsible for the phrase in all three places, then his interpolator has very artfully picked it out—as also the other phrase 'thou shalt be perfect'—in imitation of the original.

(f) 'But indeed concerning this also it hath been said' (ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τούτου δὲ² εἶρηται) (i 6).

¹ *J.T.S.* xxxv (July 1934) p. 237.

² Bryennius, followed by Rendel Harris, would read δὴ for δέ, the adversative particle being unexpected after ἀλλὰ καί.

Apart from the Lord's Prayer, which is introduced by the words 'but (pray ye) as the Lord commanded in His Gospel' (viii 2), there are four explicit quotations in the Didache, for none of which does the writer employ *γράφεται, λέγει ὁ κύριος, λέγει ἡ γραφή*, or the like, but in every case uses parts of the verb *ἔρω*. This manner of citation is not met with in the Apostolic Fathers, and in the Gospels it is nearly confined to St Matthew, occurring particularly before quotations introduced by the evangelist himself. Such agreement with St Matthew is not surprising, since it is generally recognized that the author of the Didache was thoroughly familiar with that Gospel: But whether the Didachist is dependent on St Matthew here is a matter of no great importance; the point is that he has a particular method of citation, and that this appears in the 'Interpolation' also. The formula given above is that used in the 'Interpolation' to introduce the saying about alms 'sweating in the hand', and to this the next that occurs bears a striking resemblance:—

'For concerning this also the Lord hath said (*καὶ γὰρ περὶ τούτου εἶηκεν ὁ κύριος*): Give not that which is holy to the dogs' (ix 5).

Canon Streeter (*The Four Gospels* p. 508) regards this passage as one of three (the others being the 'Interpolation' and the command to baptize 'in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit', vii 1 and 3) 'the text of which is not sufficiently certain to bear the weight of an important conclusion'. But the reason alleged against the passage—its absence from the *Apost. Const.*—seems hardly sufficient; for the author of the Constitutions might well feel chary of applying the epithet 'dogs' to *all* those excluded from communion, among whom would be many pious catechumens; and indeed the previous words in the Didache would naturally have been read by him as having special reference to catechumens: 'But let no one eat or drink of your eucharist but they that have been baptized in the name of the Lord.' Tertullian uses the text *Matt. vii 6*, but with express reference to the heathen (*De praescr.* 41).

Have we been tithing mint and cumin? Are these contacts too small or too commonplace to have any real significance? Small they are, because the residue of original writing in the 'Interpolation' is minute; yet they cover nearly the whole of the material there available. 'Commonplace' they can hardly be called, and two of them, (c) and (e), are arresting.

If I may be allowed an analogy, I would point to the series of short insertions introduced by the author of the Apostolic Constitutions bk. viii into the Hippolytean prayer for ordination of a bishop (answering to the phrases intercalated between the Gospel texts in the first chapter

of the Didache), practically every one of which can be shewn to be characteristic of the 'Constitutor' himself. (For details I refer to my book *The so-called Egyptian Church Order* pp. 28-33.) Just so, almost all the supplementary phrases in Did. i 3-6 find their echoes in the body of the document and appear to be the author's own.

It remains to observe that the kind of repetitions found in the Didache as compared with the 'Interpolation' recur frequently in all parts of the document.¹

If we now take a somewhat wider view and compare the first chapter of the Didache as a whole with the last, we can hardly fail to recognize the same *method* of treatment in both. In the first chapter we have a string of thinly disguised phrases from the Sermon on the Mount (with fusion of Matt. and Luke), followed by a passage adapted from Hermas, with another Gospel phrase attached, and then a saying from an unknown source. In the last apocalyptic chapter we have a series of Gospel phrases, plainly recognizable, though here more successfully because more easily disguised, into which (at xvi 2) a sentence from Barnabas (iv 9-10) is dovetailed in like manner as the piece from Hermas in i 5. And further, in both chapters there is apparent use of the first Epistle of St Peter.² The workmanship of the first and last chapters is the same, and they must stand or fall together. And I would add that Did. i 2 b (the Two Commandments and the Golden Rule) is as much 'interpolation' as i 3 b-ii 1: the whole is the Didachist's own insertion into the 'Two Ways' of Barnabas, and use of the Gospel has begun before the disputed passage is reached.

For a brief discussion of ch. xvi I refer to Dr A. Robinson's book p. 67 f. He concludes that 'the method of the Didachist in recasting sentences of the Gospel is the same as in his great insertion at the beginning of the Way of Life.' One point only calls for special notice here, the use of St Luke's Gospel. The chapter begins:—

'Be watchful for your life³: let your lamps not be quenched and your loins not ungirded.'

'We observe as before', says Dr Robinson, 'that he will not quote directly: he will not say, for example, with St Luke (xii 35): "Let

¹ Compare iv 1 with xi 2, 3; iv 14 with xiv 1; vii 1 with xi 1; viii 2 with xi 3, xv 3, 4; ix 3 with x 2; ix 4 with x 5; xi 5 with xii 2. But though the Didachist repeats phrases and ideas, I believe that he nowhere treats twice over of the same *subject*: he takes one topic at a time in orderly sequence, dismisses it, and passes on to something new.

² ἀπέχου τῶν σαρκικῶν καὶ σωματικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν Did. i 4 (cf. 1 Pet. ii 11); εἰς τὴν πύρωσιν τῆς δοκιμασίας Did. xvi 5 (cf. 1 Pet. iv 12 τῇ ἐν ὑμῖν πυρώσει πρὸς πειρασμὸν ὑμῖν γινομένη—πύρωσις not elsewhere in N.T. or Apost. Fathers).

³ For the form of this expression comp. Barn. xix 8 ὅσον δύνασαι ὑπὲρ τῆς ψυχῆς σου ἀγγεύσεις.

your loins be girded about and your lamps burning”.’ The order of the clauses is inverted, and they are thrown into a negative form.

Canon Streeter, however (*The Four Gospels* p. 510), takes the first of the two clauses in the Didache as from the parable of the Virgins (Matt. xxv 8, ‘for our lamps are going out’—‘being quenched’), *independently of Luke*. That I cannot think legitimate in view of the facts (1) that the two equivalent clauses are found together in Luke, (2) that there also they have the form of an injunction (ἔστωσαν Luke, μὴ σβεσθήτωσαν . . . μὴ ἐκλείσθωσαν Did.), and (3) that one of them is found in Luke alone.¹ But Canon Streeter will not allow that the Didachist has any knowledge of St Luke; he suggests accordingly that the writer is here using, not Luke alone, nor even Matthew *plus* Luke, but Matthew *plus* Q; and he adds this footnote to meet the contingency of the ‘Interpolation’ being genuine after all:—

‘The section Did. i 2–iii 1 [a slip of the pen for i 3–ii 1] presents close parallels with both Matt. v 39–47 and Luke vi 27–33. If not an interpolation, this also is best explained as a conflation of Matthew and Q, since . . . Luke is here nearer to Q than Matthew’ (p. 511).

Half the good will needed for the adoption of this conjecture would enable us to believe that both the first and last chapters of the Didache involve knowledge of St Luke. And yet, a few pages earlier (p. 507), Canon Streeter has spoken of the difficulties of the Didache as being increased by the ‘fancy solutions’ which ‘certain distinguished scholars have allowed themselves the luxury of proposing’; and as against these ‘fancy solutions’ (which are not further specified) he has postulated for the Didache (a) a Syrian or Palestinian origin, and (b) a date ‘not later than A.D. 100.’ Such an early date would no doubt find support if the author was acquainted with *only one* of our Gospels—even though that one was St Matthew (assigned by Canon Streeter to about A.D. 85); and the latter hypothesis would in all likelihood exclude the section i 3 b–ii 1 as a later insertion, therewith also eliminating Hermas as a possible source of the original work. The early date, again, would render less probable any use of Barnabas: though Barnabas *may* be as early as the reign of Vespasian (earlier therefore than Matthew), and consequently no bar, even if used, to a first-century date for the Didache. Even Hermas, Canon Streeter is inclined to think, may be as early as A.D. 100 (*op. cit.* pp. 340, 528). But Hermas is

¹ I am not concerned to deny that Matt. xxv 8 may also have been at the back of the Didachist’s mind; but primary use of Matthew here is by no means implied by the use of the same verb σβέννυμι. The change from the positive to the negative form of injunction necessitated a change of *both* the Lucan verbs, and those substituted are the natural opposites of those in Luke.

rather more dangerous ; and use of *both* Barnabas and Hermas in a 'Teaching of the Apostles' could hardly fail to arouse serious misgivings.

In attempting to find an approximate date for the Didache, on which so much depends for its interpretation, the first question of all to be faced (so it seems to me) is, whether or not Barnabas and Hermas, or either of them, have in fact been used.

That there has been copying on one side or the other between Barnabas iv 9-10 and the Didache xvi 2-3 is recognized by Harnack, who held the Didache to be the borrower, and by Taylor, Funk and Rendel Harris, who maintained the reverse dependence. I have already printed out the parallel texts (*J.T.S.* April 1937, p. 166), and I do not see how the case can be explained otherwise than as one of direct literary borrowing. But Canon Streeter has said that it is now no longer possible to argue that Barnabas used the Didache (*J.T.S.* Oct. 1936, p. 372). So far, then, we may take it as admitted that the Didachist has used Barnabas even outside the 'Two Ways'. Harnack and Harris, and I dare say others, have noted some further points of contact between the two writings, but these need not detain us here.

Use of Barnabas outside the 'Two Ways' would seem to be sufficient proof that he was used for that section also ; though Harnack, accepting far too hastily the learned ingenuities of Dr Charles Taylor, adopted the paradoxical view that the Didachist indeed knew Barnabas but derived his 'Two Ways' from a Jewish document which happened to have been read, but not accurately remembered, by Barnabas also. With the question of the dependence of the Didache on Barnabas in the 'Two Ways' I have dealt in part elsewhere (*J.T.S.* April 1932, p. 237 ff), and I do not propose to repeat now any of the arguments there used. There is one pair of passages, however, which has not hitherto, to my knowledge, received the attention that it deserves ; and this I proceed to discuss.

Barnab. xix 4 ἔση πραῦς, ἔση ἡσύχιος, ἔση τρέμων τοὺς λόγους οὓς ἤκουσας.

Did. iii 7-8 (I bracket what is additional to Barnabas) ἴσθι δὲ πραῦς [ἐπεὶ οἱ πραεῖς κληρονομήσουσι τὴν γῆν. γίνου μακρόθυμος καὶ ἐλεήμων καὶ ἀκακος] καὶ ἡσύχιος [καὶ ἀγαθὸς καὶ] τρέμων τοὺς λόγους [διὰ παντὸς] οὓς ἤκουσας.¹

The words in Barnabas are a free adaptation of Isa. lxvi 2, which in most MSS of the LXX stands thus : καὶ ἐπὶ τίνα ἐπιβλέψω, ἀλλ' ἢ ἐπὶ τὸν ταπεινὸν καὶ ἡσύχιον καὶ τρέμοντα τοὺς λόγους μου ; But in 1 Clem.

¹ This passage of the Didache has been used in the Didascalia ii 1. 5, where the words 'since the meek shall inherit the earth' are assigned to the Gospel (see *J.T.S.* xxiv, January 1923, p. 150) ; and so, too, apparently in the Apost. Ch. Order, which for 'the earth' has 'the kingdom of heaven'.

xiii 4 the passage is thus quoted: ἐπὶ τίνα ἐπιβλέψω, ἀλλ' ἢ ἐπὶ τὸν πραῦν καὶ ἡσύχιον καὶ τρέμοντά μου τὰ λόγια; and the reading ἐπὶ τὸν πρᾶον καὶ ἡσύχιον is found in Clem. Alex. *Strom.* ii 19. 101 (vol. ii p. 168 in Stählin's edition); and so also in the Didascalia ii 1. 5, the Greek preserved by the Apost. Const. agreeing with the Latin version which has 'super mansuetum et quietum'. It is evident, therefore, that the reading πραῦν or πρᾶον for ταπεινόν had a considerable early currency, and that this underlies the passage in Barnabas.¹ But the free adaptation of the whole text is so entirely in keeping with this writer's mode of quotation elsewhere in his Epistle that it would be simply perverse to suggest that it is not his own but was taken over by him from an earlier version of the 'Two Ways'. And, on the other hand, it is plain that what lay before the author of the Didache was nothing else than the text as curtailed and adapted by Barnabas. Every word of Barnabas is reproduced (πραῦς . . . ἡσύχιος . . . τρέμων τοὺς λόγους . . . οὗς ἤκουσας, and of the original nothing more) but forced almost out of recognition with additions from elsewhere, and with the two key-words 'meek' and 'quiet' now so far apart that they no longer appear to be part of the quotation. It remains only to observe that the imperatives in the Didache, instead of the futures which are characteristic of the 'Two Ways', are accounted for by the fact that this passage follows immediately upon the section iii 1-6 which has a whole series of imperatives, but which is not found at all in Barnabas and is certainly no part of any underlying text of the 'Two Ways' but an insertion from some other writing.

I now turn to Hermas. On page 370 of his article Canon Streeter says that apart from the interpolation, i.e. Did. i 3 b-ii 1, 'there is no reason whatever to suppose that the Didachist had read Hermas'. Even if that were true, the case for Hermas would not be closed, as I imagine that I have shewn in the body of this paper. But I think the statement is perhaps a little too strong in view of the following.

(a) In the Didache xi 7-8 we are told how to distinguish between a false and a true prophet:—

'And any prophet speaking in the Spirit ye shall not try neither discern. . . . Yet not every one that speaketh in the Spirit is a prophet, but only if he have the ways (τρόποις) of the Lord. *From his ways therefore the false prophet and the prophet shall be known.*'

Hermas in *Mand.* xi has a lengthy discussion of the same subject, in the course of which we read:—

'How then, Sir, say I, shall a man *know which of them is a prophet and which a false prophet?* Hear, saith he, concerning both prophets;

¹ For the collocation of the two adjectives πραῦς and ἡσύχιος see also 1 Pet. iii 4, and Hermas *Mand.* v 2, 3, vi 2, 3, and xi 8.

and as I shall tell thee, so shalt thou *prove the prophet and the false prophet*. From his life *prove* the man that hath the divine Spirit (§ 7). . . . Prove therefore from his life and his works the man who says that he is endowed with the Spirit' (§ 16).

Opinions will differ, but it strikes me that we have here something more than a common dependence on Matt. vii 15 ff. The prophets of Hermas have not the status of those in the Didache—they have no place in his hierarchy of apostles, bishops, teachers, and deacons (cf. *Vis.* iii 5. 1, *Sim.* ix 25 ff); yet *Mand.* xi is a discussion which would readily attract the attention of any one who had a special interest in prophets.

(b) We have seen just above that in the Didache iii 7–8 a free quotation from Isaiah which appears in Barnabas xix 4 is interrupted by a whole series of insertions, one of which in all reasonable probability was drawn from the second Beatitude (Matt. v 5). Another contains the words *γίνου μακρόθυμος καὶ ἐλεήμων καὶ ἄκακος*. The first of these three adjectives is not found in the New Testament, and in the Old it occurs only as a divine epithet, except in the Book of Proverbs. In the Apostolic Fathers the same is the case, except only with Hermas, who uses the word four times in speaking of forbearance towards one's fellow men. With *γίνου μακρόθυμος*, therefore, we must compare *Mand.* v 1. 1 *μακρόθυμος, φησί, γίνου καὶ συνετός*.¹ Again, *γίνου . . . ἄκακος* finds an exactly similar parallel in *Mand.* ii 1 *ἀπλόγητα ἔχε καὶ ἄκακος γίνου*. The adjective *ἄκακος* occurs twice in the New Testament, but in contexts of quite a different character, and the substantive *ἀκακία* not at all. In the Apostolic Fathers both words are (except in O.T. citations) peculiar to Hermas, who employs each four times in the extant Greek—but the adjective probably seven times in all, for to the references in Goodspeed should doubtless be added *Sim.* ix 30. 3 and 31. 2, where the Latin has *innocuum*, and ix 31. 3, where the Latin has *innocentes*: *ἄκακοι* is the word a little before in the same context (30. 2). It should be added that the two phrases from Hermas occur in the opening words of the Mandates referred to, where they would be most apt to attract attention, and that the second of them is from *the same short Mandate* which has been drawn upon in Did. i 5, the 'Interpolation'. It will be allowed also that the phrases in themselves are somewhat singular.

When equally striking (and of course independent) parallels to *γίνου μακρόθυμος . . . καὶ ἄκακος* are produced from elsewhere, I shall be more ready to believe that those from Hermas may also be accidental.

¹ It may be noted that the same Mandate, at 2. 3, speaks of *μακροθυμία* as *παρὰ μένουσα διὰ παντός πραεὶα καὶ ἡσύχιος*: with which compare the Didachist's addition of *διὰ παντός* in the same text of Barnabas.

In the meantime I cannot forget that Hermas is used in Did. i 5, and that there is good external and internal evidence for regarding that section as an original portion of the Didache. R. H. CONNOLLY.

THE TRUSTWORTHINESS OF PALLADIUS

THE days are gone in which a serious student of religious history could dismiss hagiology as containing nothing of real importance for his purposes. No one now imagines that he can afford to neglect the studies of the Bollandists, and in particular their periodical *Analecta Bollandiana*. But it is not always possible to tell from the table of contents what may be the range of interest of its articles. And the heading 'Une vie Copte de S. Jean de Lycopolis' to an article by Père Peeters in the autumn number, 1936, hardly suggests that the contents would interest any but hagiological specialists. It has, however, considerable general interest, in that it exposes cogent reasons for doubting the trustworthiness of Palladius as a witness for the history of his own times. For this reason the present note has been drafted. It adds nothing to the substance of Père Peeters's article but aims at reiterating his warning in the same language in which Dom Cuthbert Butler's *Lausiaca History* and *Palladiana* have, for thirty years, advocated a most favourable view of Palladius. If there is another side to the question from that which Butler represents, it is well that it should have publicity in English. In 1935 the Pontifical Institute of Oriental Studies published, in its series *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*, a volume edited by M. Walter Till of *Koptische Heiligen- und Märtyrerlegenden*. In this volume were published fragments of a Coptic *Life of St John of Lycopolis*, taken from five parchment leaves preserved in the National Library at Vienna. These leaves can be identified as having belonged to two legends that became dismembered, of which other leaves are preserved at Paris and Naples. One of these legends can be dated as late tenth century. No date can be assigned to the other, but in text it seems superior to the first. Four Parisian leaves are from the same *Life* in the same legend as the Vienna fragments. Thus we are able to get a fair impression of a Coptic *Life of St John*, of small enough merit historically, hagiographically, or from the literary point of view. The Coptic hagiographer was, however, of sufficient culture to draw his matter from the known Greek sources. This is important, since it suggests that he wrote at a date earlier than that of the complete and final severance of the Coptic from the Imperial church. And the suggestion is strengthened by the observation that he does not share the belief, represented in the Alexandrine Synaxary, that St John, equally