ARTICLE VI.

THE VOCABULARY OF THE "TEACHING OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES."

BY PROF. LEMUEL S. POTWIN, ADELBERT COLLEGE, CLEVELAND, OHIO.

I. ITS VOCABULARY COMPARED WITH THAT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. ¹

The agreement between the New Testament and the Teaching in the use of words is in general so obvious and so much a matter of course that it is only necessary to notice the points of disagreement. Are there any words in the Teaching not found in the New Testament? Also, are there words in the former with a meaning different from that which they bear in the latter? The following notes are in answer to the first of these questions. The second question seems to allow an almost unqualified negative. The word φθορά, which has in the New Testament its classical meaning of corruption, destruction (e.g. δύσι δουλείας τῆς φθοράς, Rom. viii. 21), in the Teaching (chap. ii.), means abortion, as in the Epistle of Barnabas. Also σνωχτ (chap. i.), is to be taken more literally than in the New Testament.

In the following list I have intended to include all the words in the Teaching that are not found in the New Testament, however unimportant they may seem, or however close the connection or resemblance. The numbers following each word give the chapter and the line in Scribner's edition. In the remarks in regard to usage no notice is taken of the Epistle of Barnabas, the Apostolical Constitutions, or the Epitome, if the word is used elsewhere.

ἀβαρος, iv. 94. Classical, and in Septuagint. The New Testament adjective is ἀφθαρσ (1 Tim. i. 17), which is perhaps not used earlier than Aristotle. It also has both the substantives ἀφθαρσία (post-classical and in Septuagint) and ἀβαρσία, which is classical.

¹ [On account of a resemblance between some passages in the first part of this Article and portions of an excellent paper upon the same subject in the Journal of Christian Philosophy, by Dr. Isaac H. Hall, it is due to the author to say that this was intended for the July number of the Bibliotheca Sacra, and all except the last two pages stands as it was then written.—Eds.].
aliphológos, iii. 56. Post-classical. The New Testament has alishholóyia (classical) in Col. iii. 8, and alishxórrs (classical), referring to the same thing, in Eph. v. 4.

dómuβolía, xiv. 270. Classical. In Herodotus 5, 74 it means an attack from both sides — Peloponnesians on one side and Boeotians and Chalcidians on the other. In Aristotle's Poetic (25. 13) it means a verbal ambiguity, used together with the adjective dómuβolos. In Plutarch it means doubtfulness. The meaning in the Teaching would come from the later usage, and the word might be rendered "a misunderstanding" — a delicate euphemism for ἐψι or μομφή. See Col. iii. 13, ἐάν τις πρός τινα ἔχει μομφήν. In Matt. v. 23, 24 — the parent passage — the expression is ὁ ἄδισφος σου ἔχει τι κατὰ σου ἀνταπόδοτης, iv. 91. Found elsewhere only in the Epistle of Barnabas (ch. 19), and Epitome (Bryennios Proleg., p. 77). The New Testament has ἀνταπόδομα, ἀνταπόδοσιν, and ἀνταπόδωμι.


γόγνυσις, iii. 66. Post-classical. The New Testament has γογνύσις in Jude 16; also γογνύω and γογνυσσός, all post-classical.

diázopho, ἡ 2. Classical and in Septuagint. The New Testament has the adjective diázophos (classical), but the substantive is either διαστολή (post-classical), or διάφορος (classical). See Rom. iii. 22.; 1 Cor. xii. 4, 5, 6, et al.

digxosía, ii. 42. Found elsewhere only in Epistle of Barnabas (ch. 19) and Epitome (Bryennios Proleg. p. 74).

digxosías, ii. 42. Classical and in Septuagint. In Thucydides it means speaking two languages (4. 109; 8. 85). In the Septuagint it means deceitful. The New Testament has διάλογος (post-classical), 1 Tim. iii. 8.

dínvwmwov, ii. 41. Found elsewhere only in the Epistle of Barnabas, chap. 19. The Epitome (Bryennios, Proleg., p. 74) has δύναμος, as also some texts of Barnabas. The New Testament has δύναμος (post-classical), James i. 8; iv. 8.


ektírasis, xvi. 313. The origin of the word is doubtful, also whether it occurs elsewhere or not. If it is from ἐκτείνεσιν it means "expansion," and is found, according to the older texts, in Plutarch's.
De Sera Numinis Vindicta, chap. 23. The disembodied souls expressed joy and pleasure “by expansion and diffusion,” ἐκτεταμένας ἔτι καὶ δια-
χίσται. The Didot edition (1868), however, reads ἐπικτάσει. If the word comes from ἐκτεταμένας, which is a later as well as poetic form of ἐκτεταμένος, then it means “flying away.” The only use of it cited by Sophocles is dated about 950 A.D. Bryennios, followed by Canon Farrar (Cont. Rev. May 1884), adopts the latter meaning, and identifies it with the Ἀραγγή of 1 Thess. iv. 17.1 Farrar translates, “First the sign of the flying forth (of the saints) in heaven, then the sign of the voice of the trumpet, and the third, the resurrection of the dead.” But it requires altogether too much ingenuity to make this “flying forth” to come first. Why not refer it to the flying forth of the angels sent out to gather the elect? This view would make the above harmonize with Matt. xxiv. 31: “And he shall send forth his angels [cf. Rev. xiv. 6, ἀγγελον πετόμενον ἐν μετουργάματι] with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other.” Perhaps the ἐκτεταμένος refers to some unexplained “sign of the Son of Man in heaven” mentioned in the previous verse in Matthew. This the paraphrase in the Apostolical Constitutions favors (chap. 32). If so, the meaning of “expansion” would seem more probable. According to Alford, on Matt. xxiv. 30, the Fathers generally supposed the “sign” to be a cross in the sky. In any case, the word can hardly mean an “opening” in heaven. In the Septuagint ἐκτετάμενος means to spread out, having for its object a cloud in Job xxvi. 9, and the hands in 2 Esdras ix. 5. Canon Farrar says: “Some suppose it to mean the sign of Christ with arms outstretched as on the cross”; but he cites no evidence that the early Christians looked for such a sign. If any justification could be found for tampering with the manuscript, one would like to read ἐπιφάνειας for ἐκτετάμενος.


ἐπανέδοσις, iii. 59. In Septuagint and classical in the form ἐπανώδος. The New Testament seems not to contain the idea of enchantment, i.e. using the magic spell. We find μαγεύω, Acts viii. 9; μαγία.

1 I take this from Bryennios’ note on p. 55 of his edition. The copy received by Dr. Ezra Abbot contains ms. corrections of this note which entirely, and most happily, change its meaning making, ἐκτεταμένος refer to the appearing of the Lord. The corrections are supposed to be by Bryennios himself. They erase ἀ... ἐπικτάσει (line 4), and ἐπέρ ἐλ (line 9), and add an illustrative quotation from 2 Thess i. 7.
viii. 11; μάγος, xiii. 6, 8. The Septuagint applies the word ἐφαιδος to the "magicians" of Pharaoh and of Nebuchadnezzar.

ἐρυστικός, iii. 53. Classical. The New Testament has ἑρως and ἐρίζω, both classical.


θερμός, viii. 144. Class. and Sept. The New Testament has θέρμη (Acts xxviii. 3) and θερμαίνω, but for the adjective, ξετός (post-classical). feruidus, used only figuratively, Rev. iii. 15, 16.

θάρσος, iii. 73. Classical and in Septuagint. The New Testament has θάρσος once (Acts xxviii. 15), used, as generally in the classics, in a good sense.

θρασύτης, v. 118. Classical. The Septuagint has θρασύς, θρασύνω, and θρασύκάρδιος.

θυμικός, iii. 53. In Arist., and the adverb in Polyb. 18. 37 (20), 12. ἰδρόω, i. 32. Classical. The New Test. has the noun, Luke xxii. 44.

κακοψήνη, ii. 45. Classical. The New Testament has κακοψήνη once, Rom. i. 29.

κοσμοπλάνος, xvi. 304. Found only here and in Apostolical Constitutions, τότε φανήσεται ὁ κοσμοπλάνος, and κατακρίναι τῶν κοσμοπλάνων δίαζολον, Bk. 7, chap. 32. See Bryennios, Proleg. p. 50. Compare 2 John 7, πολλοὶ πλάνοι ἥξις θεῶν εἰς τὸν κόσμον.

κυριακή, xiv. 267. Later than New Testament as substantive. The New Testament has the adjective (post-classical) once of the Lord's supper (1 Cor. xi. 20), and once of the Lord's day, Rev. i. 10.

μαθηματικός, iii. 60. Classical as adjective. Polybius has the substantive, meaning mathematician, in 9. 19, 9. In Sextus Empiricus (A.D. 205) it means astrologer (Sophecles, Lex. s.v.). Tacitus and Juvenal (died A.D. 120) call astrologers mathematici. Tertullian (died A.D. 220) classes together "leones, perductores, aquarioli, sicarii, venenarii, magi, haruspices, harioli, mathematici," Apol. 43. For astrologers the Septuagint, in Isa. xlviii. 18, has ἀστρολόγος τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῖ. In Daniel the king calls τοὺς ἐπαινοῦς καὶ τοὺς μάγους καὶ τοὺς φαρμακοὺς καὶ τοὺς χαλδαίους (ii. 2), but the word μαθηματικός is not found. May not the word, in the sense of astrologer, have been re-borrowed from the Latin?

μύος, xvi. 301. Classical and in Septuagint. The New Testament has μυός, but for the noun uses ἀφρα, not a precise equivalent, but the opposite of φιλία, James iv.
μνησικάκω, ii. 41. Classical and in Septuagint, which has also μνησικάκος, Prov. xii. 28.

οἶνοσκότος, iii. 58. Classical. The Septuagint has οἰνοσκότος and οἶνος σκότος of Joseph's divining cup, Gen. xlv. 5. Also τεταρτοσκότος, Deut. xviii. 11. Neither the word nor the idea appears in the New Testament.

παδοφόρος, ii. 36. In Epistle of Barnabas and later. Compare Juvenal x. 804:

“Non licet esse viro, nam prodiga corruptoris
Improbatus ipsos audet temptare parentes.”

παρθαμάρτητος, v. 130. Not in Stephanus, Liddell and Scott, or Sophocles. Appears to be found only here and in the corresponding passages in Epistle of Barnabas (chap. 20) and Apostolical Constitutions (7, 18).

παρόδος, xii. 245. Post-classical. Not in the Septuagint, which, however, has πάροδος with the meaning of traveller, 2 Kings xii. 4 — this from the influence of the Hebrew.

περικαθαρίζω, iii. 60. Classical, and in Septuagint, of Moloch-worship, Deut. xviii. 10.

ποθεώ, iv. 83. Classical and in Septuagint. The New Testament has ἐπιθεώ (classical). But is not ποθήσεις in the Teaching an error of text for ποιήσεις? The corresponding passage in Epistle of Barnabas is οἱ ποθήσεις σχέσα (chap. 19), and in the Apostolical Constitutions is οἱ ποθήσεις σχέσατα πρὸς τοὺς ἁγίους.

πονεώ, v. 125. Classical and in Septuagint. The New Testament uses κοπίω (classical); also καταποκέω (post-classical), but not with the meaning of labor; also τόνος (classical).

πονηρόφρων, iii. 67. Found elsewhere only in the Apostolical Constitutions, Μή ἐσο αἰθάδης, μηδὲ πονηρόφρων (7, 7), and in the Epitome (Bryennios, Proleg. p. 76).

πρόηστευκός, vii. 147. Classical. In Herodotus, of the sacrificial ceremonies of the Egyptians, 2, 40.

προσεξομολογέω, xiv. 268. I find no examples of this compound referred to in the lexicons. The New Testament and Septuagint have ἡμολογέω (classical), and ἤμολογέω (post-classical), which also is used in the Teaching iv. 108.

στίς, xiii. 261. This word is found in the Apophthegmata Patrum which Sophocles dates about A.D. 500. The meaning is plain from the following, to which he refers: Θέλω πληρώσαι τὸν λόγον μου μετὰ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ λαβὼν στίς εἰς τὸ ἄρτοκοπεῖν ἐποίησεν ἄρτους.
192, A. 'Διπλώνον οὖν εἰς τὸ ἀρτοκοπεῖν ποιήσαι δύο στιάς καὶ εὐρον ἐκα ὀδύφον ἀνάλογα ποιήσαι ἄρτον, καὶ οὐκ εἴξε τυα δοῦναι. αὐτῷ χείραν, 196, B. For the Ἡδν στῖάν ποιῆς, τὴν ἁπαρχῆν of the Teaching, we find in the Apostolical Constitutions (7, 29), πᾶσαν ἁπαρχῆν ἄρτων θερμῶν, "hot cakes."

συστάω, iv. 88. Classical. The word properly means to draw together, contract; but as in Latin contrahere, as well as retrahere, is the opposite of portrigere, so here συστάω is the opposite of ἐκτείνα. Again, συστάν τὰς χεῖρας is not the same as συστάν τῶν δακτύλων, so that Canon Farrar's "clenches them tight" must be called an "improvement." The New Testament has συστάλλω (classical), which is sometimes the opposite of ἐκτείνα, but in Acts v. 6 describes the preparation of the body of Ananias for burial — Latin, component. Συστάλλω is the word used in the remarkable parallel passage cited by Bryennios from the Wisdom of Sirach: Μὴ ἐστῶ ἡ χείρ σου ἐκτειμὴν ἐις τὸ λαβέαν καὶ ἐν τὸ ἀποδόνοι συνεσταλμήνη, 4, 31. Also in the corresponding passage in the Apostolical Constitutions (7, 11).


ψηλόφθαλμος, iii. 56. Found elsewhere only in the Epitome (Bryennios, Proleg. p. 75). Bryennios points out that where the Teaching has μηδὲ αἰσχρολόγος μηδὲ ψηλόφθαλμος the Apostolical Constitutions has οὐκ ἐστὶν αἰσχρολόγος, οὐδὲ ραβόφθαλμος. The Septuagint has ψηλοκάρδους, Prov. xvi. 5; also κυρίε, οὐχ ψυθῇ ἡ καρδία μου, οὐδὲ ἐμετεφροθηκαν οἱ δύθαλοι μου, Ps. cxxx. (cxxx.) 1. But these expressions refer to haughtiness, and ραβόφθαλμος means leering, a meaning which the context seems to fasten upon ψηλόφθαλμος—ἐκ γὰρ τούτων ἀπάντων μοιχεία γενέωται. Perhaps the exhortation has women chiefly in mind, and condemns the opposite of modest, downcast eyes. Here the Septuagint furnishes an exact parallel in the use of the noun μετεφρομένος. See Wisdom of Sirach, xxvi. 9, Πορνεία γυναῖκος ἐν μετεφρομοίς δύθαλοις, καὶ ἐν τοῖς βλεφαρικοῖς αὕτης γυναθήκησαν. Compare xxiii. 4.


χροστήματος, xii. 251. I find no example cited in the lexicons
that is earlier than A.D. 326. Bryennios cites two examples from the longer Greek Ignatian epistles, which Bishop Lightfoot refers to the latter half of the fourth century. See Contemporary Review, Feb. 1875. The passages containing these examples are not in the shorter epistles,—the Vossian,—which are referred by the same authority to the middle of the second century. The word might possibly be suggested by 1 Tim. vi. 5, νομιζόντων πορευμάτων ἐνε τῷ εἰσίβεων.

REMARKS.

1. Number and classification. The whole number is forty-five, of which two are found twice,—ἐνίδεω, φθορεῖς,—all the rest only once. Nineteen are substantially the same as New Testament words: ἀισχυρολόγος, ἀδάνατος, ἀνταποδώτης, αἰθίδεα, γόγγυςος, διαφορά, διαφυσία, ἐνίδεω, ἐρωτικός, θερμός, θράσος, ἵδρως, κακοήθης, κυριακή, μύσος, προςευμολογέω, τετράς, φαρμακείον, φθορεῖς. As to their distribution in the Teaching, two are in chap. i., διαφορά, ἱδρώς; seven in chap. ii., παιδοθερών, φαρμακείον, μυστικάκε, δργνώμων, διγλώσσων, δειμαστὶς, κακοήθης; eleven in chap. iii., ἐρωτικός, θεμικός, αἰσχυρολόγος, δυσθλόθαλμος, οἰωνοσκόπος, ἐπαυγώς, μαθηματικός, τευμαθεία, γόγγυςος, πονηρόφρος, θράσος; six in chap. iv., ποθέω, διαφυσία, συντάξιον, ἀνταποδῶτης, ἐνίδεω, ἀδάνατος; seven in chap. v., διπλοκραία, αἰθίδεα, ζηλωτικὰ, ἑρωτική, πονέω, φθορεῖς, παιδομάρτητος, with a repetition of ἐνίδεω; two in chap. vii., θερμός, προνιγητεύω; one in chap. viii., τετράς; two in chap. ix., παρόδιος, χριστεύμπορος; one in chap. xiii., στία; three in chap. xiv., κυριακή, προσευμολογέω, ἀμφιβολία; three in chap. xvi., μύσος, κοσμοπλάνος, ἐκτάσεις, with a repetition of φθορεῖς. Thirty-three of the forty-five occur in the first five chapters. As to usage, twenty-five are classical, of which fifteen are found in the Septuagint, ἄδανατος (Sept.), ἀμφιβολία, αἰθίδεα, διαφορά (Sept.), διγλώσσως (Sept.), ἐνίδεω (Sept.), ἐπαυγώς (ἐπαυγώς) (S.), ἐρωτικὸς, ζηλωτικὰ (Sept.), θερμός (Sept.), θράσος (Sept.), χριαντίτης, ἵδρως, κακοήθης, μαθηματικός (as adjective), μύσος (Sept.), μυστικάκε (Sept.), οἰωνοσκόπος, περικαθαίρω (Sept.), ποθέω (Sept.), πονέω (Sept.), προνιγητεύω, συντάξιον, τετράς (Sept.), φαρμακείον (Sept.). Four are post-classical, without being ecclesiastical merely, αἰσχυρολόγος, χριαντίτης, παροδιός, φθορεῖς. Four are found in the early Christian fathers, γόγγυςος, διαφυσία, κυριακή, παιδοθερών. Two are not found earlier than the fourth century, στία, χριστεύμπορος. Eight are not found outside of that tetralogy which contains so many identical passages, viz. the
Teaching, the Epistle of Barnabas, the Apostolical Constitutions, and the Epitome: ἀποστολή, διάλογος, and διστάμων (-os) being in Barnabas and Epitome, πανθεαμάρτητος in Barnabas and Apostolical Constitutions, τοντρόφων in Apostolical Constitutions and Epitome, διπλοκαρδία in Barnabas, κεκουμπλάνος in Αpostolical Constitutions, and ὑψηλόφθαλμος in the Epitome. The only word found nowhere except in the Teaching is προσεξομολογεῖ. This Hilgenfeld changes to προεξ. One word, ἐξέτασις, is doubtful.

2. To make the best use of this list of words, let us assume that no other writing stands, as the source of its vocabulary, between the Teaching and the New Testament, whatever may have been the interval of time. Let us, for the moment, forget the existence of the Epistle of Barnabas, the Apostolical Constitutions, and the Epitome. Assuming that the connection with the New Testament is immediate, and not at second hand, we can see that the vocabulary of the Teaching, with the exception of two or three words, marks it as a natural and early successor, if not a companion in origin, of the New Testament writings. First, there is largely the same word-list. Secondly, the words that are substantially, but not exactly, identical indicate a writer whose mind is filled with New Testament ideas, but is not anxious, as a forger might well be, to reproduce the exact New Testament forms. Thirdly, the classical words were, the most of them certainly, the rest probably, still in current use in the first and second centuries of our era. Fourthly, more than half of these classical words are in the Septuagint, which must have joined with the New Testament writings in forming the early Christian vocabulary. Fifthly, the eight ecclesiastical words given above — not included among those which are substantially in the New Testament — are compounds which might easily arise without leaving any other trace in the scanty remains of early Christian writing. This leaves three words, ἐπιτέτασις, στρία, and χρυσ.μπορος. If the first is from ἐπιστέαμαι, then it is found in Plutarch, and falls into line with the rest. If it is from ἐπιστέαμαι, then, as a derivative in the common formative ending -σις, it need not be held very strictly to contemporary usage; for it might be formed at any time, by any writer, as readily as we form words in -ing. It is not so easy to explain the other two words in harmony with the second-century origin of the Teaching. Στρία is not a word that would be likely to be coined by a writer, like some rhetorical compounds that flash upon the mind in the heat of composition. It has the appearance of
a genuine late word, later, even than the Apostolical Constitutions, which has ἀπροσ instead. Κρυπτήμωρος might be the coinage of a vigorous writer; but the connection hardly suggests this. These words are only two among many; but in such cases majorities do not rule. These two do not necessarily prove that the Teaching is of late date, but they demand an explanation. If in the Anglo-Saxon Gospels one should find the word "biscuit," it would not prove that the Gospels were as late as the French word; the French word would be thrown out as spurious. So these words may be thrown out as interpolations, or they may be proved to have existed as early as the second century, or they may be left as doubtful; but they require to be considered. If they belong to a later addition, then the limits of the addition must be sought for. As to χρυπτήμωρος, if it should turn out to be an interpolation, it would not be the only time that it has figured in that capacity, as the Ignatian Epistles testify. Leaving all this undecided, let us pass to the second part of our subject.

II. The Vocabulary of the Teaching Compared with that of the Epistle of Barnabas.

The comparison of the Teaching with the New Testament in respect to vocabulary will yield little of value, if we are shut up to the opinion that the Teaching is later than the Epistle of Barnabas. Before we go further, then, this question must be considered.

The Epitome and Apostolical Constitutions need not be taken into account, as it may be assumed that they are both later than the Epistle. I will confine the comparison to the vocabulary only. Difference of vocabulary, where the course of thought is substantially the same, may be either rhetorical or grammatical and lexical. In the case before us both these kinds of difference can best be seen by examining the two writings in parallel arrangement. The comparison is not between the whole of both, but between the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth chapters of Barnabas, which are given entire, and portions of the first six chapters of the Teaching, which are detached from their connection. The figures preceding the extracts in the right hand column denote the lines in Scribe's edition. The text of Barnabas is taken from the Prolegomena of Bryennios' edition of the Teaching, and the arrangement deviates but very little from that which is indicated by his marginal references and special type.
BARNABAS.

18. Metabómen de kai épi étérarn

γνώσιν kai didáchyín. 'Odoi dúo éstoi

didákhs kai ékouías, òste tòu phwòs

kai ò tòu skóstoun: diapròs ò pollh

tòn dúo òddwv. 'Efp' òstè mév yárs

tetagyénov fwtagwv ou ággeloi tòu

Theou, éfp' òstè ò ággeloi tòu saganá:

kai ò mév ésti kórios ap' aiónwv kai

eis tòus aiónas, òn ò árrhen kairoú

tòu wív tòs ánomías.

19. Ê ouv òddw tòu phwòs òstèn

aútì òn tis thélwv òddw òddwv épi tò

ónwfrwmenov tòpon spésv òous

érwos aútov. 'Estw ouv òn h dévlewsa

hèn gnwsw tòu peripatév en aútì
touautì. 'Agaphtéssse tòn òn poúi-

sasava, fwbththg tòn òn plwíasanta,

dofásseis tòn òn apiwrswmenov òk th-

nátou. 'Esth áploús tì kárddia kai

plwúsia tòw pneúmati. Ò o kolhl-

thghì metà tòn pereunoméón òn òdd

thnátou. Mesúseis páw ò ouk òstos

áreostòn tòw Theou, mesúseis pásw

uppórrwsw, ou òh égkalaliòsse énto-
làs Kyrwv. Oùx ùpsóswse seautón,

èst òt tapanwfrwv òtò pánta, ouk

áreis épi seauton ðoxan. Où l'hýs

boulhç poñhran kató tòw plwrwv

sou. Où diwseis tì ùpsi tòu brá-

sos. Où poñneusseis, ou moiexeusseis,

ou padothorhseis. Ou òh sou ò

lògos tòw Theoú xèlthi òn ákatharwì

twv. Où l'hys prewòswon òlégxai

tw òtì parapptómati. 'Esth prwòs,
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(3) 'Odoi dúo elsw, miá tòs òwòs

kai miá tòv thwnáton, diapròs ò
pollh metaux tòn dúo òddwv.

(5) 'H mév ouv òddw tòs òwòs

èstw aútì.

(9) Tovtw de tòn lògywv ò

didáchì èstw aútì. Eiwlogeti tòus

kataramwmenous òmwn k.t.l.

(5) Prótoj, agaphtésseis tòn The-

òw tòn poúisasv òtò deúterwv,

tòn plwrwv sou òs seautonw pá-

nà de ðsa òwv òkhlhìsws òh géwswbai

sou, òtò òllw òh ðoxei.

(105) Moiéseis páswn ùpó-

rrwsw kai páw ò òh ðreóstòn tò

Kyrwì. Òh òh égkalaliòsse énto-
làs Kyrwv.

(72) Oùx ùpsóswse seautón.

(46) Où l'hýs boulhç poñhran

kató tòw plwrwv sou.

(73) Oùde diwseis tì ùpsi tòu

brásws.

(35) Òlhpç òs poñhrì tòw

didáchì. Où foneusseis, ou moiexe-

usseis, ou padothorhseis, ou poñ-

neusseis, ou klèfëseis, ou mageusseis,

ou fwmakéusseis.

(84) Où l'hys prèswowen òlég-

xia òtì parapptómatw.

(69) 'Isthì òtì prwòs, òpëi òi prw-
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εἰς ἡγώνιος, ἑκτερισμὸν τοὺς λόγους

οὗ ἢκούσας. Οὗ μηνισκακῆς τῷ

ἀδελφῷ σου. Οὗ μή δυσφησίης, τό-

τερον ἔσται ἢ οὔ. Οὗ μή λάβῃς ἐκ

ματαίῳ τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου. Ἐἀγαθή-

σεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὑπὲρ τὴν ψυχήν

σου. Οὗ φονεύσεις τέκνον ἐν φθορᾷ,

οὐδὲ πάλιν γεννηθὲν ἀποκτενεῖς. Οὗ

μή ἁρπᾷς τὴν χειρὰ σου ἀπὸ τοῦ υἱοῦ

σου ἢ ἀπὸ τῆς θυγατρός σου, ἀλλὰ

ἀπὸ νεότητος διδάξεις φόβον Κυ-

ρίου. Οὗ μὴ γένῃ ἐπιθυμιῶν τὰ

τοῦ πλησίον σου, οὗ μὴ γένῃ

πλεονέκτης, οὐδὲ κολληθῆς ἐκ ψυ-

χῆς σου μετὰ ψυχῆς, ἀλλὰ μετὰ

ταπεινων καὶ δυκαῖν ἀναστραφῆς. Τὰ

συμβαίνοντά σου ἐνεργήματα ὡς ἀγαθὰ προσδέξῃ, εἰδὼς ὅτι ἀνέν Θεοῦ

οὐδὲν γίνεται. Οὗ ἐστὶ γεννήμονον

οὐδὲ διάλυσον: παγίς ὄρα θανάτου

ἐστίν ἡ διαλυσία. Υποταγήτης κυ-

ρίον ὡς τύπῳ Θεοῦ ἐν αἰωνίῳ καὶ

φόβῳ: οὗ μὴ ἐπιτάξῃς δούλῳ σου ἡ

πανίκη σου ἐν πικρία τοῦ ἐπὶ

τοῦ αὐτῶν Θεοῦ ἐλπίζουσιν, μὴπότε οὗ

φοβηθῶσι τὸν ἐπὶ ἀμφότερον Θεῶν

TEACHING.

αἰς κληρονομισάντων τὴν γῆν. Γένον

μακρόθυμοι καὶ ἔλεημον καὶ ἄκα-

κος καὶ φιλήμον καὶ ἀγαθὸς καὶ

τρέμων τοὺς λόγους διὰ πατέως,

οὗ ἢκούσας.

(40) Οὗ κακολογήσεις, οὗ μη-

νισκακῆς.

(85) Οὗ δυσφησίης, πότερον

ἔσται ἢ οὔ.

(40) Οὐκ ἐπιρρήσεις, οὗ ψα-

δομαρτυρήσεις.

(47) Οὗ μισήσεις πάντα ἀν-

θραπόν, ἀλλὰ οὗ μὲν ἐλέης,

περὶ δὲ ὄν προσεῖψη, οὗ δὲ Ἐα-

γαθήσεις ὑπὲρ τὴν ψυχήν σου.

(37) Οὗ φονεύσεις τέκνον ἐν

φθορᾷ οὐδὲ γεννηθὲν ἀποκτενεῖς.

(95) Οὗ ἀρείας τὴν χειρὰ σου

ἀπὸ τοῦ υἱοῦ σου ἢ ἀπὸ τῆς θυγα-

τρός σου, ἀλλὰ ἀπὸ νεότητος δι-

δάξεις τὸν φόβον τοῦ Θεοῦ.

(39) Οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις τὰ τοῦ

πλησίον.

(44) Ο恝 ἐστὶ πλεονέκτης οὐδὲ

ἀρτάς.

(73) Οὐκ κολληθῆσαι ἡ ψυχὴ

σου μετὰ ψυχῆς, ἀλλὰ μετὰ δι-

καϊν καὶ ταπεινῶν ἀναστραφῆς. Τὰ

συμβαίνοντὰ σου ἐνεργήματα ὡς

ἀγαθὰ προσδέξῃ εἰδὼς ὅτι ἑτέρ

Θεοῦ οὐδὲν γίνεται.

(41) Ο恝 ἐστί δινόμονον οὐδὲ

διάλυσον: παγίς ὄρα θανάτου ἡ

διαλυσία. Οὐκ ἔσται ὁ λόγος σου

ψευδῆς, οὗ κενός, ἀλλὰ μεμοστε-

μένος πράξει.

(98) Ο恝 ἐπιτάξῃς δούλῳ σου

ἥ πανίκη, τοῖς ἐπὶ τῶν αὐτῶν Θεῶν

ἐλπίζουσιν, ἐν πικρίᾳ σου, μὴπότε

οὗ μὴ φοβηθήσονται τὸν ἐπὶ ἀμ-
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ὅτι ἦλθεν οὖν κατὰ πρόσωπον καλέσαι, ἀλλ' ἐφ' οὖς τὸ πνεῦμα ἠτοίμασεν.

Kομνηνήσεις ἐν πάσι τῷ πληρών σου καὶ οὐκ ἔρεις ἴδια εἶναι· εἰ γὰρ ἐν τῷ ἀφθάρτῳ κομνηνῷ ἔστε, πόση μάλλον ἐν τοῖς φθαρτοῖς; Οὐκ ἦτη πρόγλωσσος· παρίς γὰρ στόμα βαράτου.

"Ὅσον δύνασαι ὑπὲρ τῆς ψυχῆς σου ἀγνεύσεις. Μὴ γίνου πρὸς μὲν τὸ λαβεῖν ἐκτείνων τὰς χεῖρας, πρὸς δὲ τὸ δοῦναι σωστῶν. Ἀγαπήσεις ὡς κόρην τῷ ἄφθαρτῳ σου πάντα τὸν λαλοῦτά σου τὸν λόγον τοῦ Κυρίου. Μνησθήσῃς ἡμέραν κρίσεως ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτὸς καὶ ἔκκριτήσεις καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν τὰ πρόσωπα τῶν ἁγίων, ἢ διὰ λόγου κοιτίων καὶ πορευόμενος εἰς τὸ παρακάλλησαι καὶ μελετήν εἰς τὸ σώσαι ψυχῆν τῷ λόγῳ ἢ διὰ τῶν χειρῶν σου ἐργάσῃς εἰς λύτρων ἄμαρτων σου. Οὐ διστάσεις δοῦναι, οὐδὲ διδοῦς γογγύσεις· γνώσῃ δὲ τῆς ὧν τοῦ μισθοῦ καλὸς ἀνταπόδοτης.

ΤΕΑCHING.

phins τῶν ὅρων, οὕτως ἔχετε κατὰ πρόσωπον καλέσαι, ἀλλ' ἐφ' οὖς τὸ πνεῦμα ἠτοίμασεν. "Ὑμεῖς δὲ οἱ δύο ὑποταγήσατε τοῖς κυρίοις ὑμῶν ὡς τίτῳ Θεοῦ ἐν αἰσχύνῃ καὶ φόβῳ.

(92) Οὐκ ἀποστραφήσῃς τὸν ἐνδειμένον, συγκοινωνήσεις δὲ πάντα τῷ ἄθλιῷ σου καὶ οὐκ ἔρεις ἴδια εἶναι· εἰ γὰρ ἐν τῷ ἀθανάτῳ κομνηνῷ ἔστε, πόση μάλλον ἐν τοῖς ἄθροισι.

(134) Εἰ μὲν γὰρ δύνασαι βαστάσαι δολὸν τὸν ζῆν τοῦ κυρίου, τέλειος ἦτη· εἰ δὲ οὐ δύνασαί, δὲν ἦν τούτο τοίοι.

(86) Μὴ γίνου πρὸς μὲν τὸ λαβεῖν ἐκτείνων τὰς χεῖρας, πρὸς δὲ τὸ δοῦναι σωστῶν.

(78) Τέκνον μου, τοῦ λαλοῦντος σοι τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ μητοθήσῃς νυκτός καὶ ἡμέρας, τυμησεὶς δὲ αὐτῶν ὡς Κύριος· θέν γὰρ ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ λαλεῖται, ἐκεῖ Κύριος ἐστιν. Ἐκκριτήσεις δὲ καθ' ἡμέραν τὰ πρόσωπα τῶν ἁγίων, ἵνα ἐπαναπαυθή τοῖς λόγοις αὐτῶν.

(88) Ἐὰν ἄχρηστος διὰ τῶν χειρῶν σου δώσῃς λύτρωσιν ἄμαρτων σου. Οὐ διστάσεις δοῦναι οὐδὲ διδοῦς γογγύσεις· γνώσῃς γὰρ τίς ἐστιν ὁ τοῦ μισθοῦ καλὸς ἀνταπόδοτης.

(107) Φυλίζεις δὲ τὰ παρέλαβες, μὴ προστιθεῖς μὴτε ἄφαρνν. Εἰς τέλος ματισθὲς τὸ πονηρόν. Κρανεὶς δικαίως. Οὐ ποιήσεις σχῶμα, εἰρρήνεις δὲ μαχαίρινον συναγαγόν. Ἐξομολογήσῃς ἐπὶ ἄμαρτης σου, οὐ προσήχεις ἐπὶ
The Vocabulary of the Teaching

1. The most striking fact in the comparison is, of course, the close resemblance, amounting in many sentences to absolute identity. The resemblance is closer than between the Sermon on the Mount in Luke and the corresponding passages in Matthew. It is very different, however, from the resemblance between the Teaching and the seventh book of the Apostolical Constitutions. The latter has the same language as the Teaching, in almost exactly the same order, from beginning to end; a large amount of additional matter being interspersed, so that it is a sort of running
commentary on the Teaching. The Epitome, also, so far as it goes, has the same order. But the Epistle of Barnabas, in the portions here compared, has, without much difference in amount, marked differences of arrangement. The Teaching has a more natural and logical order, as will appear not by this parallel arrangement, but by the comparative reading of both in course.

2. The differences that are merely grammatical or strictly verbal, without affecting the sense, are the following:

**BARNABAS.**

ch. 18. ἕ τε ... καὶ ἕ
τῶν δύο ὑδῶν

c. 19. δ' οἷς ἔστων ἄρεστον
ἐλέγξει τινὰ ἐπὶ παραπτώματι
ἐστὶ πραθή, ἐστὶ ἡγούχιος, ἐστὶ τρέμων

οὐ μὴ δυσφυκήσης
οὐ μὴ ἄρης
φόβων
οὐ μὴ γένη τεθυμών
οἵδε κολληθήση ἐκ ψυχῆς
ἀνευθεύ

ἐστὶν ἡ δειλισσία
ὑποταγήσῃ κυρίος
οὐ μὴ ἐπιτάξης
μὴ ποτὲ οὐ φοβηθῶς
οὐτὶ ἤλθαν οὐ
κοινωνήσεις ἐν πάσι
ἀφαίρῃ ... φθάρτως
ὅσον δύνασαι

καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν
ἐργάσῃ εἰς λύτρον

**TEACHING.**

μία ... καὶ μία
μεταξὺ τῶν δύο ὑδῶν

δ' οἷς ἄρεστον
ἐλέγξει ἐπὶ παραπτώματι

ἰσθι δὲ πραθή ... γίνου ἡγούχιος ...

καὶ τρέμων

οὐ δυσφυκήσεις
οὐκ ἄρεις
τὸν φόβον
οὐκ ἐπιθυμήταις
οὐ κολληθήσεται ἡ ψυχή
ἀτερθεύ

ἡ δειλισσία
ὑποταγήσῃς τοῖς κυρίοις
οὐκ ἐπιτάξεις
οὐ μὴ φοβηθήσονται

οὐ γάρ ἔρχεται

συνκοινωνήσεις πάντα
ἀθανάτῳ ... ἀνθρώποις
ei μὲν γὰρ δύνασαι

καθ' ἡμέραν
dósteis lútrwson

γνώσῃ γὰρ τὸς ἔστιν

εἰρηνεύεις

ἐξ. τὰ παραπτώματα σοι'

οὐ προσελεύσῃ

Plural.

**ch. 20.** εἰσδιδασκαλεῖα, ἐπάρμοσι,

μοιχεία, φόνος, ἀρπαγή, φαρμακεία,

μανία

diōxetai tōn ãgathōn

σοὶ κρίσει

ἐπὶ τὸ πονηρόν

diōxetai ãgathōn

οὐδείς κρίσει

eis τὸ πονηρόν
The most of these differences are quite compatible with a memoriter quotation of either by the writer of the other. Similar variations are heard in the pulpit every Sunday in quoting the Bible. There is also nothing in them to indicate a different period of time in the writers. Are the differences consistent with the supposition that a copy was made with the manuscript before the writer? Certainly not, unless a different text was followed, as is also shown by the difference of order. Is there anything thus far to show which is the original? The indications of working over into a new style are very slight. In one marked case the Teaching has the imperative, ἵσθι ...... γένο, while the other has the Hebraistic future, ἦγε; this certainly cannot be called a change into the style of Barnabas. Four times Barnabas has ὄ μῆ with the aorist, where the Teaching has ὄ with the future. On the whole, considering only these verbal resemblances and differences, it seems to me that they show that the one writing did certainly come from the other, but without determining which. To say that they came from some common source is an easy makeshift; but must not that common source have been substantially the one or the other?

3. The differences that are more than merely verbal need not be here culled out and repeated, as they are obvious. I do not see how one can read the two columns carefully without the strongest impression that this part of the Epistle is derived from the Teaching. First, the Teaching is simpler, less figurative and ornate: ὅδος τῆς ζωῆς, τοῦ θανάτου instead of ὅδος τοῦ φωτός, τοῦ σκοτος, τοῦ μελαος; πονηρά instead of σκολά; μηνοθήσῃ instead of ἀγαπήσῃ ὦ κόρη τοῦ ὄφθαλμον σου. Secondly, the Teaching is more closely biblical. The exact phraseology for the "two ways" is furnished by Jeremiah (xxi. 8), and is not far from Matt. vii. 13, 14; and a large part of chap. i. is from the Sermon on the Mount. Thirdly, the Epistle has the appearance of an amplification of the Teaching. The "two ways" of the latter become two ways διδάχης καὶ ἔκκλησις, and the difference between them is illustrated by the guardian angels set over each. The simple διδάχη becomes ἡ δοξία μὴν γνώση τοῦ περιπλεκόντων. Not satisfied with διακήδες τον σε τοιήσατα, Barnabas adds φοβηθήσῃ τὸν σε πλάσατα, δοξόσει τὸν σε ἀντρωπώμενον ἐκ θανάτου. Other examples follow. Even the ὄ μῆ λάβης ἐν ματαίῳ τὸ δύναμα κυρίου seems like a translation of ἐνυρτάσκεις (derived from Matt. v. 33, and found only there in the New Testament, and but twice in the Old) into the language of the Decalogue. It is
true that some passages in the Teaching are fuller than in Barnabas. The list of sins in chap. 20 of the latter contains only two not in the Teaching, while the Teaching has seven not in Barnabas. Where Barnabas has πραθεῖς, ἡσύχασ, τρεῖς, the Teaching has besides μακρόθυμος, ἀληθινός, ἀκακος, ἄγαθος. But a fuller enumeration is a very different thing from an intentional amplification; and in no case, I think, in which the Teaching is fuller is there the appearance of a comment upon the Epistle or a confirmation of it. The quotation from Matt. v. 5, that “the meek shall inherit the earth,” is in harmony with the other quotations from the Sermon on the Mount, and is plainly due simply to the word πραθεῖς. This case suggests the one feature in these chapters of the Epistle which favors their priority to the Teaching — they seem to ignore the Sermon on the Mount. If they were written after the Teaching, why should they avoid the quotations from the Sermon? Further, if they were written before the Teaching, why not before the Sermon on the Mount? and what is there then left to show that they are not an ante-Christian writing incorporated into the Epistle? 1

4. This comparison of the Teaching with certain chapters of the Epistle of Barnabas leaves out of view the late words considered in the first part of this article. If the first five chapters of the Teaching are earlier than Barnabas, then those late words belong either to a large addition to the first five chapters or to short interpolations. The word στίχων might have been substituted for ἀργων or ἀργως θερμος by a copyist, without the change of another word. The word χρωστήματος might have been introduced without necessarily carrying with it more than its own sentence. Even if the first five chapters are later than Barnabas, they cannot, for various reasons, be put at a date that will satisfy these late words. The same appears to be true of the remaining chapters. Perhaps the strongest point against the genuineness of χρωστήματος is that so striking a word is ignored, together with its immediate context, by the Apostolical Constitutions. Cannot some reader of the Greek Fathers tell us whether or not Gregory Nazianzen coined the word?

5. It may seem superfluous to speak of forgery, when it has not been seriously charged. Indeed, it may be asked, How can an

1 A most tantalizing Latin fragment, published in Harnack's Prolegomena, seems to combine, in the opening sentences, the Teaching with the Epistle. Does this prove that there were widely varying texts of the Teaching, or that some writer had confused it with the Epistle?
anonymous writing be the subject of forgery? The answer is, that the silent claim of a certain age to authorship can be simulated as well as the handwriting of a man. On the supposition that the Teaching is prior to the Epistle of Barnabas, I have already said that a forger would have produced closer resemblances to New Testament diction. But how about a more modern, scientific, and scholarly forgery? Is not the Teaching a "cunningly devised" prototype, drawn from the Epitome and the Apostolical Constitutions? We may answer, first, that a forger would hardly have left its relation to the Epistle of Barnabas in so much doubt; or perhaps I should say, that the existence of that Epistle, with its variations from the Epitome and the Apostolical Constitutions, would have successfully baffled the efforts of a forger. But secondly, suppose this difficulty in some way removed, we should expect the Teaching, if it be a fabrication, to be more closely conformed to its sources. In the first chapter more than one quarter, mostly at the close, will be searched for in vain in the three parallel writings. No modern

1 Even if we add Hermas to these three, the illustration of the argument still holds, since the variations from Hermas, at the close of chap. i., are considerable. The following are the portions of Hermas bearing the closest resemblance (Second Commandment. Bry. Proleg., p. 89): Πάτει γάρ ο Θεός διδοντας δίκαια εκ των δικων δικαιμάτων. Οι άδικοι άλμαντοι άποδάσωσι λαόν τῷ Θεῷ διὰ τὰ δάξαι καὶ εἰς τί; οἱ μὲν γὰρ λαμβάνοντες θλιβόμενοι οὐ δικασθήσονται. Οι δὲ εἰς ἅπασας λαμβάνοντες πίσωσι δίκην. Ο άδικος άδικός εστίν. In the Independent of July 3, p. 9, Prof. Orris suggests that the close of chap. i., may have been added, or modified, at a later date; and finds evidence of this in the words, δώσει δίκην ἵστιν ἡλαθεν καὶ εἰς τί. One can readily agree with him (and thank him for proving it) that δώσει δίκην should not be rendered "shall give account"; but why not give the usual rendering, "shall pay the penalty," "shall suffer for it"? The connection with ἵστιν, etc., would be harsh, but perfectly intelligible, for the idea of giving account, or of being detected, would naturally be supplied. The usual meaning of δώσει δίκην is the proper antithesis of ἄδικος ἔσται, just preceding, as the reader will plainly see by stopping at δίκην. The next five words have close connection logically with what follows referring to the mode of trial and punishment. In Hermas τίσωσι δίκην (cf. 2 Thess i. 9) takes the place of δώσει δίκην, and is affirmed of those who receive alms hypocritically. This writing and the Teaching are at one in leaving the responsibility with the receiver and not the giver. Hence one feels bound to interpret the figurative language—"Let thine alms sweat," etc.—in harmony with this. The lines containing δώσει δίκην may be read thus: "Blessed is he that gives according to the commandment, for he is guiltless [even if the gift be found to be a mistake]. Woe to him that takes [if the gift is not needed, or is misused] ; for, while the receiver, if needy, is guiltless, the one who is not needy shall pay the penalty [for it will be found out] why he took alms, and for what use he intended
forger would have left this so. This is well illustrated by Dr. Krawutzky's attempted restoration, referred to in Professors Hitchcock and Brown's Introduction. The matter of it—the Two Ways—is found in the first five chapters of the Teaching. Although the restoration appears only in a German translation, its wonderful skill is apparent. But it is the skill of omission. Not a word is added to the Epitome so far as that is followed, or to the Apostolical Constitutions where the Epitome fails.

In conclusion, some of the points raised in this article cannot, of course, be settled by the mere examination of the vocabulary. I do not press them; for my object has been simply to help in preparing material for a final decision.

ARTICLE VII.

CURRENT PERIODICAL LITERATURE.

I. AMERICAN.

The current periodical literature of the United States is much less important, as well as less abundant, than the periodical literature of England and France of the last three months. In this section, therefore, we content ourselves with an allusion to an article of the July number of the Methodist Quarterly Review. This Review, now conducted by the Rev. Dr. Daniel Curry, succeeding the Rev. Dr. D. D. Whedon, devotes its leading paper to the higher criticism of the Pentateuch. Of an historical form, the article considers briefly the various theories, as those of documents, fragments, supplements, and ethnic development. As to the authorship and origin of the Pentateuch, the author, Rev. Milton S. Terry, regards "these propositions as fairly settled": "1. The Pentateuch contains a number of passages which cannot, without doing violence to sound critical principles, be attributed to Moses as their author. 2. The Pentateuch, especially the Book of Genesis, contains documents of various dates and authorship, which have been worked over into an orderly and homogeneous whole. 3. The laws of the Pentateuch were either unknown or else very largely neglected and violated during most of the period it; and when he is brought to trial [or prison] he will be closely examined concerning his conduct, and will not come out until he has paid back the last farthing." I see no way out of the "sweat" and toil of the next sentence but by supposing that the 
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