

Pantheism, and that can only be adequately described as personalistic and Christian.'

Like Nicodemus—winner of the Indian people's heart—he came, by night, yearning for the How of what he knew must be, yet was not his: 'How can a man be born again?' The answer was as it had been, 'The Spirit bloweth where it listeth'. . . . Perhaps his friend did not trust that answer quite absolutely; perhaps the conclusion of his book would have shewn he did.

A. NAIRNE.

BARNABAS AND THE DIDACHE¹

DR JAMES MUILENBURG is Associate Professor of the History and Literature of Religion at Mount Holyoke College, and he presented this thesis as a Ph.D. Dissertation at Yale University as long ago as 1926. If it has not yet received the public attention it deserves, that may be because the work, notwithstanding its unexciting title, might necessitate, if its conclusions be adopted, very serious reconstructions in current views about early Church History and Worship.

Readers of this JOURNAL will remember the article by Dr Armitage Robinson called 'The Problem of the Didache', which appeared in April 1912. It was reprinted in the book called *Barnabas, Hermas, and the Didache*, which formed the Donellan Lectures of 1920. Professor Muilenburg's general conclusions are much the same as those of the Dean of Wells, but it is the singular merit of his Dissertation that he keeps steadily to one point out of the many questions at issue. Throughout the 170 pages of his book he is occupied in proving that the Didache is dependent upon Barnabas and not *vice versa*. Both documents he holds to be extant in their original form: the original Barnabas contained chaps. 18–21 as well as chaps. 1–17, and the original Didache contained i 3 b–ii 1, often called 'the Gospel (or, the Christian) Interpolation'. He finds no trace of the use of a hypothetical Jewish manual for proselytes in either document.

In the matter of text, the most important question about the Epistle of Barnabas is the value of the Latin version, which is preserved in the Corbie MS now in Leningrad. The final chapter (21), as well as chaps. 18–20 (which contain the 'Two Ways' material parallel to the Didache), is omitted in this Latin text. But it is elsewhere paraphrastic and given to omissions, and Muilenburg points out very well (p. 135) that chap. 21 is entirely in the style of Barnabas, while its connexion with chaps. 18–20 is undoubted. The whole section, pp. 113–135,

¹ *The Literary Relations of the Epistle of Barnabas and the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, by James Muilenburg, Ph.D. (Marburg 1929).

which demonstrates the close linguistic ties between chaps. 18-21 and 1-17, places the unity of the two parts of 'Barnabas' on what seems to me an unshakeable basis.

It is the same with the so-called 'Christian interpolation' (i 3 b-ii 1) in the Didache. That it is absent from what is called the Latin version of the Didache (i.e. the text published by Schlecht) is accounted for by the fact that this is a mere extract made for homiletic purposes (p. 18). On the other hand, the 'interpolation' is in the fourth-century fragment from Oxyrhynchus (*O. P.* 1782), and, as Dom Connolly has conclusively shewn, in the form of the Didache used in the Didascalia (*J. T. S.* xxiv 148).

With these preliminaries settled the main question can be studied on a surer basis. Professor Muilenburg's conclusions agree, as stated above, with Dr Armitage Robinson's. We see in Barnabas an artless writer, not ill-informed or stupid, but with very little power of expression and liable to continual digressions. What he brings forward, whether allegorical exegesis or direct moral instruction, is all *γνώσιον*, authoritative religious instruction. In the Didache, on the other hand, we have the work of a neat and methodical compiler. The strong point of the Didache is its excellent arrangement, exactly where Barnabas is weakest. What Barnabas has put down haphazard as counsels for Christians the Didachist reduces to order.

Nevertheless the Didachist from time to time betrays the fact that he is a compiler, not an original. This is clearest in the Scriptural allusions. Barnabas (c. xii) says: The Israelites were killed when Moses dropped his hands (Exod. xvii)—'Why? That they may know that they cannot be saved, except they hope in it (i.e. the Cross). And again in another Prophet it says "All day long I stretched out (*ἐξέπέρασα*) my hands". We may smile at the explanation, but at least the passage referred to is quite clear: *ἐξέπέρασα* is the actual word used in the LXX of Isaiah lxx 2. And further, when we consider the early date of Barnabas, there is little reason to deny him the honour of having been the first to apply this passage to the Cross. But in Didache xvi 6, where the signs of the Second Coming are enumerated, we find 'first, the sign of stretching-forth in heaven. . . .' What is this *σημείον ἐκπεράσεως*? Clearly it is explicable if the passage in Barnabas was in the mind of the Didachist, but otherwise it is as obscure as it has been to most of the modern commentators on the Didache (see Muilenburg, p. 162).

It may be noted here that Professor Muilenburg agrees with Harnack in dating the Epistle of Barnabas 131 A.D. (p. 167). The Didascalia, in which the Didache is used, may be dated about the middle of the third century, so that the Didache must have been compiled between these dates, and no earlier. It may not be out of place to point out

that the beginnings of Christian Archaeology, of an interest in 'primitive' Christian times, can be dated round about 200 A.D. It was then that 'the places', the Palestinian sites, began to be visited; it was in that generation that Irenaeus appealed to the Roman heritage of Apostolic Scriptures as the norm of teaching. A little later came the 'Ἀποστολικὴ παράδοσις' of Hippolytus,¹ a work based on what the author at least believed to be Apostolic tradition. This work, like the Didache, gives directions how Christian services are to be conducted and how Christians should order their lives. It was only too successful, for it was so much used as an actual manual of Christian praxis that it was re-edited and brought up to date in all sorts of ways, so that its original form only survives as palimpsest fragments in a Latin translation, i.e. Hauler's *Verona Canonum Reliquiae*. The Didache, its earlier rival, has been more fortunate, owing to the preservation of the MS discovered by Bryennius, now at Jerusalem. But for the existence of that MS we should know less about the Didache than we do about the work of Hippolytus.

All the last paragraph, of course, is generalized deduction, and goes far beyond the scope of Professor Muilenburg's modest Dissertation. But it is directly connected with it. He has, so it seems to me, proved what Dean Armitage Robinson had indicated and rendered extremely probable, viz. that the Didache depends upon Barnabas, and that Barnabas is an original document, which there is little reason to suppose dependent upon any other writings than Scripture itself. In any case he has produced a full and methodical study of the literary connexion of Barnabas and the Didache, and any one in the future who treats the Didache otherwise than as directly dependent upon Barnabas must take serious account of his work.

F. C. BURKITT.

THE 'IRISH' AND 'ROMAN' TEXTS OF THE CANON OF THE MASS

I HAVE read with interest, and for the most part with agreement, Professor Burkitt's paper on 'St Felicity in the Roman Mass', in the *JOURNAL* for April last. The parallel he draws between the 'Irish' and 'Roman' types of the text for the Canon of the Mass and the 'Western' and 'Alexandrian' texts of the New Testament strikes me as a very happy one. The 'Irish' text, as he says, 'represents a very old

¹ See Connolly *The So-called Egyptian Church Order* p. 147.