



Notes on the Didache

Author(s): B. B. Warfield

Source: *Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis*, Vol. 6, No. 1 (Jun., 1886), pp. 86-98

Published by: The Society of Biblical Literature

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3268751>

Accessed: 07/03/2010 15:58

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=sbl>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The Society of Biblical Literature is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Notes on the Didaché.

BY PROF. B. B. WARFIELD, D.D.

I. *The Pseudo-Athanasius and the Didaché.*

THE very interesting parallels between the Pseudo-Athanasian tract, *Σύνταγμα Διδασκαλίας*,¹ and the Didaché, which Prof. J. Rendel Harris has adduced in his little pamphlet,² deserve some separate study. When attention has once been called to it, indeed, this whole tract appears an adaptation of the moral teaching of the Didaché to a different time and changed circumstances, as truly, if not as fully, as the Seventh Book of the Apostolical Constitutions itself: it is the Didaché calculated to another meridian. Its very name carries its character with it; it professes to detail the manner of life which ought to characterize the sons of the Catholic Church, although it has especially in mind its anchorites or monks. It opens by telling us that although we are saved by grace, yet grace itself desires its children to be willing sons of wisdom and of every good work; and calls on us to live worthy of our faith. The way having been thus prepared, the tract proceeds to set forth what requirements we must keep. We perceive at once that the author's rule of life corresponds to the "two ways" sections of the Didaché, for he opens his body of commandments thus: "The Lord thy God shalt thou love with all thy heart and with all thy soul, and thy neighbor as thyself. Thou shalt not kill; thou shalt not commit adultery; thou shalt not commit fornication; thou shalt not corrupt boys; thou shalt not practice sorcery; thou shalt not be dissentious; abstain from what is strangled, and idol sacrifice, and blood." The wording of the command to love God here has been deflected into closer agreement with Deut. vi. 4 (or Mark xii. 29), and it has thus received a form such as stands in

¹ Cf. Migne, Vol. XXVIII., col. 836 sq.; although I have more particularly used the edition of Athanasius' works published by Weidmann at Cologne in (Vol. II.) MDCLXXXVI.

² *The Teaching of the Apostles and the Sibylline Books*, Cambridge: H. W. Wallis, 1885, pp. 15, 16, notes.

no other witness to the Didaché. But the Didaché is clearly the source from which the whole has been drawn, and the Didaché in that form of its text, represented by Barnabas, the Ecclesiastical Canons and the Latin Version, in which i. 3 εὐλογεῖτε to ii. 1 is omitted, and the discourse passes immediately over from i. 3 to ii. 2. The order in which the first four prohibitions of Didaché ii. 2 are here reported is worth remarking in that they are very variously transmitted to us, and this exact order is found nowhere else but in the Ecclesiastical Canons. The addition at the end of the extract may be Jewish in origin, but is probably rather drawn here from Acts xv. 29, where, as well as in verse 20, the Western text adds the negative form of the golden rule as found in the opening verses of the Didaché.

Returning, however, to the *Syntagma*, it proceeds immediately with a probable reference to Didaché iii. 1: "These things are indeed plain sins; but the commandments which appear as if less than the least, an account of which also we shall give, are these." Here, first turning to the monks, the author gives counsels as to the care they must take not to sin with heart or eyes in looking at a woman, and then drops naturally again into the precepts of the Didaché: "Take care, too, not to be double-speeched, nor double-minded, nor a liar, nor a slanderer,"—where the relation to Didaché ii. 4 is unmistakable. The *Syntagma* prolongs the list freely from this point, now taking up items found in the Didaché ii. and iii., and now introducing new ones.¹ It next condemns oaths and immodesty, and proceeds again: "Take not part in the feasts of the Gentiles; keep not Sabbaths; use not witchcraft; practice not sorcery; nor [suffer] another to do these things for thee in sickness or pain of calamity; go not forth to an enchanter (ἐπαιιδν), nor place a phylactery about thyself, nor be a purifier, neither of course do these things for thyself, nor let them be done for thee by another; keep thy body from every filthiness and lasciviousness," etc.² Amid much other matter, reference to Didaché ii. and iii. 4 is here plain enough. Next follow warnings against subintroduced women,—'ἀγαπηταί men call them, but they quickly become μισηταί;—and against all hate, and then we come to a reminiscence of Didaché viii. 1-2: "Pray not with a heretic nor

¹ φυλάττεσθαι τε μὴ εἶναι δίλογον, μὴ δίγνωμον, μὴ ψεύστην, μὴ κατάλαλον, μὴ ἀκεροπερίσπαστον, μὴ ἀναίσχυντον, μὴ βίμβον, μὴ ἀναίσθητον, μὴ αὐθάδη, μὴ σαπρὸν λόγον ἐκ χειλέων προφέροντα, μή τε ὕρκον ὄλων τὸ παραίταν ἀλλὰ ναί ναί, οὐ οὐ κ. τ. λ.

² The main matters here run: μὴ μαγεύειν, μὴ φαρμακεύειν . . . μὴ ἀπέρχεσθαι πρὸς ἐπαιιδν . . . μὴ τε περικαθαίρειν κ. τ. λ.

along with Gentiles ; omit not the fast, that is, the fourth [day] and the preparation (unless thou hast been weighed down somewhat by sickness), Pentecost only and the Epiphanies being excepted," etc., after which the yearly fasts are mentioned, of which, as will be remembered, there is no mention in the Didaché. The celebration of the Lord's Supper is commended next, and then money affairs receive a pretty full treatment—"sharing with him that hath not" being commanded, and money-lending allowed, provided no interest is taken ; and then once more we catch a glimpse of the Didaché (iii. 8) ; "Be humble and quiet, trembling continually at the oracles of the Lord," to which is immediately added, "Be not warlike, neither strike a man, or only thy little child for training, and that most circumspectly (*παρατηρημένως*), considering lest mayhap murder come from thee : for many are the occasions of death," to which a rather odd parallel exists in the Pseudo-Phocylides.¹ Meat and dress next come in for treatment, but nothing else that recalls the Didaché in other than a general way except a single phrase parallel with vi. 1, towards the close of the tract, where also the tradition (*παράδοσις*) of the church is spoken of with the highest respect.

Now an interest attaches to all this that is greater than would be raised by the mere fact that the Pseudo-Athanasius has based his treatise on the Didaché. For he has preserved enough of the Didaché to enable us to perceive not only that his Didaché was of the general type of that text which was used by the author of the Canons, but also that it stood particularly close to the text used by the Canons,—closer than any other known form of the text. It might be suspected that the Pseudo-Athanasius has drawn from the Canons and not directly from the Didaché : but this is excluded by the presence in this tract of phrases from the Didaché which have not been abstracted by the Canons. For instance, its parallel with Didaché iii. 8 (Migne, col. 840) reads, *γίνου ταπεινὸς καὶ ἡσύχιος, τρέμων διὰ παντὸς τὰ λόγια τοῦ κυρίου*. The passage involves a quotation from Isa. lxvi. 2, to which Pseudo-Athanasius conforms more closely than either the Didaché or the Canons. Thence is derived the *ταπεινὸς καὶ* and apparently the *τοῦ κυρίου* (cf. Isa. lxvi. 2, *μου* and verse 5, *αὐτοῦ* = *κυρίου*). But the *διὰ παντὸς* is found nowhere except in the Didaché itself and this quotation. It seems clear that the Pseudo-Athanasius thus gives us an additional witness to a Didaché text such as that from which the Canons drew its quotations.

¹ *Νηπίαχων ἀπαλῶν μὴ ἄψη χειρὶ βιαίῳ κ. τ. λ.*

The matter cannot be fully elucidated, however, until we glance at another Pseudo-Athanasian tract, for knowledge of the relation of which to the Didaché I am indebted to Prof. S. S. Orris.¹ This tract, which is entitled *Faith of the 318 Holy Nicene Fathers*, has drawn practically the same matter from the Didaché which the *Syntagma Doctrinae* has. It requires only a glance at the two to see that there is close relationship between them. Not only does the extract in the *Faith of the Nicene Fathers* also pass from i. 2 directly to ii. 2, but it adds a similar reminiscence of Acts xv. 29;² and this is characteristic of the relation between the two throughout,—the same general borrowings and the same additions meet us everywhere. Yet it is equally clear that neither of the tracts has borrowed this matter from the other: amid their striking samenesses there are numerous petty divergences, and especially each tract has words of the Didaché which are not found in the other. For instance, the *Syntagma Doctrinae* has a part of Didaché iii. 4, and the *Nicene Fathers* draws several items from ii. 4–iii. 6, and in particular gives vi. 1 almost *verbatim*, without the support of the other tract. We appear, then, to be shut up to the hypothesis that these Pseudo-Athanasian tracts preserve to us knowledge, either of a new reworking of the Didaché hitherto unknown, from which they both quote independently, or else (less probably) of a considerable quotation from the Didaché in some lost book from which they both draw. In either case, when we put them together we get a new witness to the text and scope of the Didaché. I say “new” witness, for when we put them together the inferences at which we formerly hinted, when speaking of the *Syntagma Doctrinae* alone, receive new strength. The *Faith of the Nicene Fathers* preserves for us, for instance, in a completeness found nowhere else except in the Didaché itself, the opening of Didaché vi. 1: “See, O man, that no one seduce thee from this faith, since apart from God he teacheth thee” (ἐπεὶ παρέκτός θεοῦ σε διδάσκει). So that we may be certain that the common source of the quotations in the two tracts is a hitherto unknown witness to the circulation and text of the Didaché.

It might be an interesting task to reconstruct so much of this

¹ *The Pseudo-Athanasius and The Teaching in The* [New York] *Independent* for April 15, 1886. The tract itself may be consulted in Migne, Vol. XXVIII., col. 1639 sq.

² In the *Syntagma* the words run, ‘Abstain from what is strangled and idol sacrifice and blood’; in the *Faith of the Nicene Fathers*, ‘We must abstain from what is strangled and from blood and from covetousness.’

common source as has been used by our tracts. This would, however, be difficult and in parts impossible; and it is not necessary for using its witness for reconstructing the original *Didaché*. We may be certain that it contained *Didaché* i. 2–ii. 2 in this form: Κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἀγαπήσεις ἐξ ὅλης καρδίας σου, καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου, καὶ τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν· οὐ φονεύσεις, οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ πορνεύσεις, οὐ παιδοφορήσεις, οὐ φαρμακεύσεις, οὐ κλέψεις, οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις, οὐ διχοστατήσεις· ἀπέχε πικτοῦ, [καὶ εἰδωλοθύτου], καὶ αἵματος, [καὶ πλεονεξίας]. The words, “thou shalt not steal, thou shalt not bear false witness,” are witnessed by the *Faith of the Nicene Fathers* only, and the position of *false witness* at this point may be compared with the position given the same item in the Latin Version of the *Teaching*, though both deflections are probably independent and due to the natural reminiscence of the Decalogue in its Old Testament, or one of its New Testament forms. Then our document contained prohibitions of certain sins prohibited in *Didaché* ii. 4, ii. 6, and iii. 1–6. The items are “double-speech” and “double-mindedness,” from ii. 4; covetousness and haughtiness, from ii. 6; proneness to anger, from iii. 2; filthy talking, from iii. 3; lying, from iii. 5; self-will, from iii. 6. There is no certainty, however, that these items were arranged in the artistic form in which they appear in the *Didaché*; and there are other items connected with them, such as ‘slander’ (cf. *Didaché* ii. 3, *καταλογήσεις*) and ‘proneness to wine’ (cf. *Hermas*, *Mand.* viii. 3–5; *Constt.* vi.) and the like which have no place in the *Didaché*. Next it contained the striking sentence in *Didaché* iii. 8; and at an earlier point, apparently, the opening words of *Didaché* viii. It also certainly contained *Didaché* vi. 1; and there is a hint that c. xiii. may have also been known to its compiler. Finally both documents hint, at beginning and end, that they are dealing with ‘tradition’ and ‘teaching.’

If we may sum up what we gain by the unearthing of this new witness in a word or two, we should say first that it gives us a new witness to the circulation of the *Didaché* in that form which is testified to by Barnabas, the Latin Version, and the Canons, and which we have elsewhere ventured to call the ‘Egyptian’ text. Next, in doing this, it gives a new witness to the spuriousness of i. 3, *εὐλογεῖτε* — ii. 2. Next, it assures us that the peculiar and most logical order in which the Canons arrange the sins of lust in ii. 2 is not an individualism of that document, but an inheritance. Perhaps a word here will not be out of place. There are four orders in which the first four prohibitions of ii. 2 have come down to us: —

1. 2. 3. 4. Bryennios' MS. and Apostolical Constitutions.
 [1]. 4. 2. 3. Barnabas and Clement of Alexandria (*Paed.* ii. 10).
 1. 2. 4. 3. Ecclesiastical Canons and Pseudo-Athanasius.
 2. 1. [3]. [4]. Latin Version.

The Latin Version is in some confusion in this context, and that casts some doubt on its testimony. The original order is pretty sure to have been 1. 2. 3. 4. or else 1. 2. 4. 3., and now there is good reason to believe that the latter is the order of the Egyptian recension of the text; but which is the original order is more doubtful. It is worth noting, too, that the Pseudo-Athanasian source contained Didaché iii. 1-6 and vi., to both of which as parts of the original Didaché, objections have recently been raised; and further that its scope included more than chapters i.-vi., and embraced chapter viii. and perhaps also chapter xiii.¹

II. *The Book of Jubilees and the Didaché.*

A very strong tendency has developed itself among students of the Didaché to look for a Jewish form of it on which our present Didaché was based, and from which it was christianized by more or less interpolation or rewriting. The original incitement to this opinion was the difficulty of accounting for the complicated relations that exist between the *Teaching* and Barnabas; and as Barnabas's borrowings practically confine themselves to the first six chapters of the *Teachings*, the hypothesis has usually taken the form of supposing the pre-existence of a Jewish *Two Ways*. Dr. Lightfoot, at the Church Congress of 1884 (see *Expositor*, January, 1885, p. 8), in commending this hypothesis, says: "The idea of the *Two Ways* was familiar to Greek philosophers. May not some pious Jew, then, have taken up this idea and interwoven into it the moral code of the Old Testament, writing perhaps under the mask of a heathen philosopher, who thus was made an unwilling witness to the superiority of Jewish ethics? The adoption of a heathen pseudonym was not an uncommon device with the literary Jew before and about the time of the Christian era, as, for instance, in the maxims of the Pseudo-Phocylides

¹ The possible hint of chapter xiii. is found on col. 841, and runs, *δικαίως συνάγων καρπὸς καὶ μὴ ἔχων τι ἀδικίας πρῶτον μὲν τὰς ἀπαρχὰς τοῖς ἱερέεσσι πρόσφερε.* It may be added that the *Syntagma* borrows from Did. i. 2; ii. 2, 4; iii. 3, 4, 6, 8; vi. 1; viii. 1; and possibly xiii. 1; and that the *Faith of the Nicene Fathers* borrows from Did. i. 2; ii. 2, 4, 6; iii. 2, 3, 5, 6, 8; vi. 1; viii. 1; and possibly xiii.

and the predictions of the Pseudo-Sibyllines." From this original Jewish work he supposes both Barnabas and the *Teaching* to have drawn. Dr. C. Taylor, in his two lectures on the *Teaching*, recently published, but delivered so long ago as the early summer of 1885, perceives that the document which Barnabas quotes is either the *Teaching* itself or a tradition or writing of which it has preserved the original form (pp. 7 and 44), but is led, on critical grounds, to "postulate the existence of an earlier form of the manual of the *Two Ways*, of Jewish character and possibly pre-Christian in date, on which our chapters 1-6 were framed" (p. 22). Similarly, Prof. J. Rendel Harris, in his pamphlet on the *Teaching* and the Sibyllines, while holding that the Pseudo-Phocylides has versified the *Teaching*, and wrote late enough to have had before him such a book as our *Teaching*, yet, because he "has omitted all references to the gospels which are found in the *Teaching*," and because his "morality is so often inferior," thinks "that we must either assume that the Phocylidist of the first century has produced a morality to be described in M. Sabatier's way, as *simplifiée pour les païens*, or we must fall back upon the existence of an earlier and more rudimentary *Teaching*, ethically more continuous with the Jewish schools, and perhaps somewhat earlier than the Christian era." "There is no reason, in the nature of things," he adds, "against the existence of a Jewish or Essene $\Delta\delta\alpha\chi\acute{\iota}$, when we consider how actively proselytism was being carried on about the time of the Christian era, and reflect that our own apostolic *Teaching* must have been called into existence by somewhat similar circumstances. I see that M. Massebieau has made a similar suggestion (*Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, x. 2. p. 168). 'Dans ces prescriptions qui sanctionnent un certain nombre de coutumes juives j'ai cru pouvoir distinguer les traces d'un enseignement destiné aux prosélytes juifs avant d'être utilisé pour les catechumènes chrétiens.' I think we may be confirmed in this view by a study of the ethics of the works of Philo" (p. 25).

Now it appears to be perfectly manifest, that the affinities of our *Teaching*, especially if we will confine our attention to its first six chapters, are intensely Jewish. It seems equally clear that the roots of this treatise are set in Jewish soil, and that we may hope to trace back the matter here given us to a Jewish beginning. But I do not at all share the hopes of those who are seeking traces of a Jewish writing which could justly be called the source of our *Two Ways*, — which is sufficiently like it to have furnished the matter in Barnabas that gives to that epistle so much of what is also found in our *Two*

Ways, or to have furnished the precepts which the Pseudo-Phocylides has versified and so come to seem to have versified our treatise. The common source of Barnabas and the *Teaching* as given to us in Bryennios's MS., is a Christian, not a Jewish volume, as the character of the Latin version suggests, and as Dr. Taylor sees, when he says that the source of Barnabas was either our *Teaching* or "a tradition or writing of which it has preserved the original form." The Pseudo-Phocylides, too, had apparently our *Two Ways* and not a similar Jewish book before him; and his omission of the references to the gospels in i. 3-ii. 1, is due to the failure of that section in the earliest Christian *Teaching*—in other words, to its being a later interpolation into the Christian treatise itself. Neither do I think it accurate to describe our *Two Ways* as containing, after the omission of i. 3-ii. 1, nothing which is distinctly Christian. Its essence seems to me to be Christian; it appears to me to be still based on Matthew's Gospel in a real sense, and to be throughout the free composition of a hand that was at once Jewish and Christian. I look for the discovery of Jewish models on which this treatise was fashioned, of Jewish parallels by which it is illustrated, of Jewish nuclei, even, about which it has been deposited, but not of a Jewish form in which also practically this same treatise circulated. The true state of the case seems to me to be adumbrated in some words of Dr. Egbert G. Smyth, printed as long ago as April, 1884 (*The Andover Review*, April, 1884, p. 432, *note*), although I cannot agree that the diversity between Barnabas and the *Teaching* can be so explained. Dr. Smyth having spoken of the familiar use of the simile of the *Two Ways* among Jews and Gentiles alike, adds: "It looks as though a conception so readily adapted to didactic purposes early gathered about it appropriate materials, which were worked up on the basis of the Decalogue, and where the Christian spirit prevailed, by a free use of the Sermon on the Mount and other preceptive instruction, both oral and written." If this be understood in a purely general sense, it perfectly expresses just what seems to have taken place. There is no difficulty in finding traces of Jewish treatises on the *Two Ways*, but they very remotely resemble our *Two Ways*; and in Christian times, while our *Two Ways* alone seems to have had much circulation, it continued to be added to, and generally just from the material found in the Sermon on the Mount or other bodies of Christian precepts. The great interpolation which was so early intruded into chapter i. is one example; the various reworkings in Barnabas, the Canons, the Constitutions, and the Pseudo-Athanasius furnish others.

Certainly all traces of a Jewish use of the parable of the *Two Ways* which have been adduced heretofore, are illustrative of our treatise rather than basal to it. That there were "detailed descriptions (as in the *Teaching*) of the evil way" in circulation, seems to be often implied (cf. Taylor, p. 45); but not that there was this special detailed description of it. The canonical books gave the incitement to the formation of such treatises (Jer. xxi. 8, and Deut. xxx. 15 *sq.*), and the Jewish writers were not slow in following out the hint. How it was done may be seen as well as anywhere in the *Testaments of the XII. Patriarchs*, 'Aser' and 'Benjamin.' The former of these testaments is entitled, "Concerning the two faces, of vice and virtue," and begins: "Two ways God gave to the sons of men, and two minds and two doings and two places and two ends. On this account all things are two, one opposite the other. Two ways there are of good and evil; with respect to which there are two minds in our breasts distinguishing them. If, therefore, the soul desireth the good, its every act is in righteousness; and if it sin, immediately it repenteth. For considering righteous things and casting away malice, it overthroweth immediately the evil thing and uprooteth the sin. But if the mind inclineth to evil, its every act is in malice; and driving away the good, it taketh to it the evil and is ruled over by Beliar, and though it do the good thing, it perverteth it in evil. For whenever it beginneth as though to do good, it bringeth the end of its action to do evil; since the treasure of the devil is filled with the poison of an evil spirit." With this beginning, Aser makes his testament a development of the thesis that these two ways and two minds are opposite to one another in such a sense that the presence of the one vitiates the other. Its message is that good men are *μονοπρόσωποι*, and therefore we must guard against becoming *διπρόσωποι*, of goodness and wickedness, and cleave unto goodness only. There is much in the details with which this thesis is illustrated that stands alongside the *Teaching*, and the whole reminds us of it; as, *e.g.*, in the stress laid on the sin of double-facedness (cf. Did. ii. 4); but we have here illustration, not a trace of a source. The ethical part of the testament of Benjamin, which is entitled "of a pure mind," opens (ch. iii), thus: "And you, my children, love ye the Lord, the God of heaven, and keep his commandments, . . . and let your mind be unto good. . . . Fear the Lord and love your neighbor; and even though the spirits of Beliar allure you into every wickedness of trouble, yet shall no wickedness of trouble have dominion over you. . . . Know ye, my children, the end of a good man?" And then follows a descrip-

tion of the end and character of the good man, full of beautiful conceptions, but not suggestive to us of anything beyond a rather remote illustration of the ethical teaching of our Didaché.

Whether these portions of the Testaments are the product of a Jewish-Christian or of a Jewish pen, their relation of resemblance to our *Teaching*, and yet of essential disconnection from it, is somewhat characteristic of the ethical teaching of Jewish writings of about the time of Christ. Much use, for instance, is made in the very meagre parenetic parts of the book of Enoch of the figure of the two ways of life and death (cf. *e.g.*, xii. 71, 16; xv. 82, 4; xviii. 91, 3; xix. 99, 10, and 105, 2). The most interesting passage, probably, is the following, which I quote in Professor Schodde's translation (xix. 94, 1 *sq.*, p. 247): "And now I say to you, my children, love justice and walk in it, for the paths of justice are worthy that they be accepted; and the paths of injustice are destroyed suddenly and cease. And to certain men of a *future* generation the paths of violence and of death will be revealed, and they will retreat from them, and will not follow them. And now I say to you, the just: Do not walk in the wicked path and in violence, and not in the paths of death, and do not approach them, that ye be not destroyed. But love and choose for yourselves justice and a pleasing life, and walk in the paths of peace, that ye may live and have joy. And hold in the thoughts of your hearts, and let not my words be eradicated from your hearts; for I know that the sinners will deceive men to make wisdom wicked, and it will not find a place, and all kinds of temptations will not cease." The way having been thus prepared to speak of individual sins, woes are next pronounced on certain classes of sinners, — those that build injustice and violence, and found deception; who build their houses in sin, and acquire gold and silver, and trust in riches; who revile and shed blood and pronounce curses, repay evil to their neighbor, and witness untruth, and pursue the just and tread down the lowly, and practise injustice and destruction and reviling, — a long and very interesting list, in which attention is also paid to abortion and child-murder and idolatry and the like, but again which only illustrates, and does not account for our *Teaching*.

A similar passage in the book of Jubilees stands somewhat nearer to our *Teaching*. Indeed, I have sometimes fancied that it might even suggest a reminiscence one way or the other, or possibly preserve knowledge of a nucleus out of which our treatise may have grown. It is found in the testamentary discourse of Noah (Jubilees vii. 16 *sq.*), and closes with a sentence which lays the strongest stress on tradition.

The peculiarity of it which suggests our *Teaching* is, that it connects the commands to love God and our neighbor with the simile of the two ways. Moreover, in several of its phrases it presents a rather odd resemblance to the *Teaching* in some of the forms in which it has come down to us. For instance, near the beginning Noah commands his children "that they should bless him that created them" — just the phrase in Did. i. 2. "And," it continues, "should honor father and mother"; and we are struck with the conjunction that occurs in Pseudo-Phocylides 8 (Orac. Sib. ii. 60): "First honor God and after that thy parents," — a conjunction of commandments which has probably arisen from the Jewish arrangement of the "ten words," by which the fifth commandment stood last on the first table; and these two might easily be considered the summing up of the first table of the Law. In accordance with this conception, Noah is made to proceed immediately: "and each should love his neighbor and should preserve their souls from fornication and from all uncleanness and unrighteousness," — the progress being from the first to the second table, which the following sentences deal with. Next, after a somewhat diffuse sanction to these demands, drawn from the fate of the Watchers, Noah proceeds: "Behold, I am the first to see your works, that ye do not walk in righteousness, for in the paths of destruction have you commenced to walk." Now, while we should not rashly draw conclusions from such parallels, they appear to me to be eminently worth noting, and at all events, unless we except Tobit iv., this is as close a parallel to our *Teaching* as has yet turned up in a Jewish writing. I quote the passage in full from Dr. Schodde's translation (in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, April, 1886, p. 358 *sq.*): —

"And in the 28 Jubilee he [Noah] began to command the sons of his sons the ordinances and the commandments, all as he had learned them, and the judgments, and he testified to his sons that they should observe righteousness, and that they should cover the shame of their flesh, *and that they should bless him that created them,*¹ *and should honor father and mother,*² *and each should love his neighbor,*³ and

¹ Did. i. 2: "Thou shalt love God who made thee." Cf. Barnabas xix. 2 (also xvi. 1); and Canons: "Thou shalt love God who made thee and glorify him." . . . Justin, Apol. i. 16: "The greatest commandment is, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God and Him only shalt thou serve, with all thy heart and with all thy strength, the Lord God that made thee." Cf. also 2 Clem. xv. 2.

² Pseudo-Phocylides 8 (Orac. Sib. ii. 60): "First honor God and after that thy parents."

³ Did. i. 2: "Thou shalt love . . . thy neighbor as thyself." Cf. Canons 4 and Constt. vii. 2.

should preserve their souls from *fornication* and from all uncleanness and unrighteousness.¹ For on account of these three things the deluge came over the earth, namely, on account of *fornication* in which the Watchmen indulged against the commandments of their law with the daughters of men, and took to themselves wives from all whom they chose and made the beginning of uncleanness. . . . And the Lord destroyed everything from the face of the earth on account of their deeds, and on account of the *blood* which was spilt over the earth. And we were left, I and you, my sons, and behold I am the first to see your works that ye *do not walk in righteousness, for in the paths of destruction have you commenced to walk,*² and are *separating yourselves each from his neighbor,*³ and are *envious* the one of the other, and are not in harmony, each with his neighbor and his brother.⁴ And yet, my sons, for I see and behold the Satans⁵ have commenced to lead astray you and your children; and now I fear on your behalf that after my death ye will spilt the blood of men over the face of the earth and that ye too will be destroyed from its face. For every one that sheds the blood of any man and every one that eats the blood in any flesh,⁶ shall all be destroyed from the earth. . . . With regard to all blood over you which is in all the days that ye sacrifice an animal or a beast or whatever flies over the earth, and do a good deed concerning your souls,⁷ in your covering of that which has been spilt over the face of the earth. And ye shall not be like him that eats with blood,⁸ be strong that no one eat blood in your presence. . . . And now, my children, obey and practice righteousness and justice so that ye be planted in righteousness upon the whole face of the earth, and that your renown be elevated before

¹ Did. ii. 2 (cf. also iii. 1) and the following verses. Note here the distribution into fornication and murder especially, and the prominence of these points in Did. ii. 2. Cf. the order in the Latin version and also the Pseudo-Athanasius.

² Did. i. 1, v. 1; Barn. xix. 1, 2, xx. 1., etc.

³ Did. iii. 2, and iv. 3: "Thou shalt not make division." Barn. xix. 11, Canons 3. Pseudo-Athanasius: "Thou shalt not be dissentious."

⁴ Do., also Barn. xix. 2: "Thou shalt not cleave to those that walk in the way of death."

⁵ Barn. xviii: "But over the other [the way of darkness, are] angels of Satan"; xx. 1: "But the way of the black one is crooked and full of curse."

⁶ Pseudo-Athanasius *ad init.*: "Thou shall not kill. . . . Abstain from blood." (*See above.*)

⁷ Cf. Did. iv. 6; Barn. xix. 11; also Barn. xix. 8: "As much as thou canst, thou shalt make purification for thy soul,"

⁸ Pseudo-Athanasius, as above.

my God who has saved me from the water of the deluge. . . . And the first fruits¹ that they gather shall be brought before the Lord our God, the most high, who created heaven and earth and all things, so that they bring in fatness, the first of the wine and oil as first fruits upon the altar of the Lord who receives it, and what is left the servants of the Lord shall eat before the altar which he has accepted. . . . For this did Enoch, the father of your father Methuselah, command his sons, and Methuselah his son Lamech, and Lamech commanded me all the things which his father commanded him ; but I command it to you, my children, just as Enoch commanded his son in the first Jubilee ; while he was alive, in his generation, the seventh, he commanded and testified to his sons and to the sons of his sons, until the day of his death.”

¹ Did. xiii, 3, etc.