

'Father, into Thy Hands I commend my Spirit; Thou hast redeemed me, O Lord, Thou God of Truth' (St Luke xxiii 46, Ps. xxx 6).

St Jude will have nothing of Achamoth and Sophia in his view of the last things. He says 'Keep yourselves in the love of God, looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life' (Jude 21).

VI. *The Verses against Marcus.*

The iambic verses cited above are interesting not only as corroborating the evidence brought forward by Irenaeus in his chapters on the Marcossian heresy, but because, if the identity between this heresy and that of the Epistle of St Jude be established by the foregoing study, they help to shew the identity of thought and responsibility between the 'elder' of Asia and the writer of the Epistle, in their treatment of the apostate magician.

THOMAS BARNES.

NOTES ON THE DIDACHE.

III.

THERE are some other points in the *Didache* that call for notice.

Let us look at xvi 3 'Ἐν γὰρ ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις πληθυνθήσονται οἱ ψευδοπροφήται καὶ οἱ φθορεῖς καὶ στραφήσονται τὰ πρόβατα εἰς λύκους καὶ ἡ ἀγάπη στραφήσεται εἰς μῖσος. αὐξανούσης γὰρ τῆς ἀνομίας μισήσουσιν ἀλλήλους καὶ διώξουσι καὶ παραδώσουσι.

The passage is modelled upon Matt. vii 15, xxiv 10; but the word *παραδώσουσι* is the only one which in any way suggests danger from heathen magistrates. The writer would hardly have expressed himself thus, if he had lived within range of Nero, Trajan, Decius or Diocletian. What he appears to have in his mind is the persecution of Christians by Christians, when sheep turn into wolves. Now he was certainly not a Gnostic nor a Quartodeciman, but he may have been a Montanist. The Montanists were persecuted by Christians in the second century (see the words of Maximilla *Eus.* v. 16, 17 *διώκομαι ὡς λύκος ἐκ προβάτων*, and Tert. *adv. Prax.* 1), by Constantine (*Soz.* ii 32; vii 19; *Eus. V. C.* iii 63-66; *Epiph. Haer.* xlvi 14), and by later emperors (see *Cod. Theod.* xvi 5, 59, 65), and are classed with heathen in what is given as the seventh canon of the council of Constantinople.

Immediately after this passage on persecution comes the prophecy

about the End. It is the work of one who professed to be himself a prophet, and to know many other prophets, but it does not exhibit the faintest trace of ecstatic fervour; it is in fact nothing but a bald reproduction of what the author had read in the New Testament. It is bookish, and further it is critical. Its significance lies in the points which it omits. It leaves out the return of Nero, which was expected by St John, the *Sibylline Oracles*, and Commodian; and it knows nothing of the *rex alienigena* of the *Testamentum Domini* (Rahmani, p. 7). The author makes no attempt to connect the End with the history of his own time, because he is critical and has come to see the futility of such endeavours. Again, he is evidently not a Chiliast, and here again we have an indication that he wrote after the time of the Alexandrines. He tells us of the sound of the trumpet, but makes no mention of the angels; indeed, one of the most peculiar features of the book is the entire absence of allusion to good or evil spirits. What Barnabas entitled 'the Way of the Black One', is in the *Didache* 'the Way of Death'; the petition in the Lord's Prayer is understood apparently to mean 'deliver us from evil', not from 'the Evil One' (see x 5). Again, there is no resurrection for the wicked, nor does the author speak of a resurrection of the body. He refers to Zech. xiv 5, but whether he means that the wicked perish at death, or that when they die they enter at once into everlasting punishment, and have no share in the resurrection (this, according to Josephus, was the teaching of the Pharisees), is not clear. He may be following Enoch (see the article *Eschatology* in Hastings' Dictionary, by R. H. Charles). But it is noticeable that, while copying the Way of Death from Barnabas, the author of the *Didache* has omitted the words ὁδὸς γὰρ ἐστὶν θανάτου αἰωνίου μετὰ τιμωρίας, and from this we might infer that he believed in the extinction of the wicked at death.

The prophecy is studied, dull and unreal; there is no existing specimen of the kind that is so uninteresting. The author is devoid not only of inspiration but of imagination. He has seen too many predictions falsified by the event, and is too timid to let himself go. He does not believe in others, and he does not believe in himself, but just repeats in a perfunctory official kind of way the two or three things that he thought might possibly still come to pass. It is surely hardly conceivable that this bankrupt seer should have lived in the first century. The second century begins with Hermas and ends with Perpetua, produced the *Apocalypse* of Peter, and abounded in Gnostic and Montanist visionaries, who, whatever else we may think of them, did not want fire, conviction, matter or power. Even in the third century we find Cyprian and Gregory Thaumaturgus, who were prophets, and Commodian, who though not a prophet, knew and believed

what other prophets had said. The exaltation of Pentecost was followed by the exaltation of the times of persecution, and this again by the exaltation of asceticism. Prophecy was rife in the Egyptian monasteries. But nowhere along the whole line shall we find any one who talks so much and knows so little about prophecy as the author of the *Didache*. The afflatus was not dying, but dead, in the community to which he belonged.

There are a few words in the *Didache* which may help us to fix its date.

Κλάσμα, used (ix 3) of the bread broken in the Eucharist. It is taken from the story of the feeding of the Five Thousand, and is an appropriate term for the 'fragment' given to a communicant. Nevertheless it does not appear to have been so employed. Harnack says that no instance can be found in the first or second century, and, so far as I am aware, none has been produced from the third. But the word occurs, used in this particular sense, in the Coptic Liturgy (see Brightman *Liturgies E. and W.* p. 464 line 5, and *Glossary of Technical Terms*, s. v. 'Particle'). Add *Acta Andreae* (Tisch. p. 109) where τὸ κλάσμα τοῦ ἄρτου is used of the sop which our Lord gave to Judas. The attestation is probably at earliest of the fourth century, and points to Egypt.

Σιτία. See xiii 5 ἐὰν σιτίαν ποιῆς. The only lexicon I have seen which notices the word is that of Sophocles, where two passages from the *Aprophthegmata Patrum* are cited—Migne lxx 192 A καὶ λαβῶν σιτίαν εἰς τὸ ἀρτοκοπεῖον, and 196 B ἀπήλθεν οὖν εἰς τὸ ἀρτοκοπεῖον ποιῆσαι δύο σιτίας. Here we find ourselves again in Egypt and in the fourth century, for both passages occur in sayings of Abbot Theodore, who was a contemporary of Athanasius. The word was strange to the compiler of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, for he replaces it by θερμοὶ ἄρτοι (vii 29).

Χριστέμπορος (xii 5). It is so used as to form an epigram, 'not a Christian but a Christmonger'. The epigram is found in pseudo-Ignatius *Trall.* vi 2, and in Basil *Epp.* 240; the words χριστέμπορος or χριστεμπορία in ps.-Ign. *Magn.* ix 5; Greg. Naz. *Orat.* xl 11 (i p. 698); *Carm. de Vita sua* 1756 (ii p. 766); Chrysost. *Hom.* vi in 1 *Thess.* (vol. v p. 378 of Field's edition); Theodoret *Hist. Eccl.* i 3 (in letter of Alexander of Alexandria); *Epp.* i 4 (Migne iii 729); ps.-Clement *de Virg.* i 10, 4; 11, 4; 13, 5. From the fourth century onwards the word appears to be fairly common, but it is not to be found before. Indeed it belongs to that later age when almsgiving has become a dubious virtue.

These three words are probably all late. It may be of course that our information is defective; the 'leopards' of Ignatius may warn us

not to be too positive. But, if we found the word 'starvation' in an English document, we should know at once that it was not written before the time of Mr Dundas, and taking these three words together we may suspect that the *Didache* was not compiled before the beginning of the fourth century. But this is not a popular view. Mr Vernon Bartlet, in his article on the *Didache* in the extra volume of Hastings' Dictionary, calls it a paradoxical view, but I think he means rather heterodox, or unpopular. He concedes that the word 'Christmonger' may be suspected of being late in origin, and that in consequence 'the early date of xii 5, or even of xii 2-5, is rather less certain than that of the work as a whole'. He finds the trace of a later hand in the baptismal injunctions, but still will not allow that affusion has anything to do with clinic baptism. As to this point the reader must now judge for himself. My own belief is that, setting aside the very rare and exceptional case of confessors in prison, baptism by affusion was allowed by the primitive church only to sick persons whose life was in imminent danger, and that, even when so allowed, it was not generally regarded as satisfactory. Some are disposed to think that all language implying immersion is to be treated as conventional, and that affusion or perfusion was in fact the general practice from very early times; but, if this is so, it is difficult to see what reliance we can place upon any statements about anything. Finally, Mr Vernon Bartlet would place the date of the completed *Didache* about 100, and possibly between 80 and 90 A. D.

My own view, if I may venture to give it here in outline, is

1. That the *Two Ways* is the work of Barnabas. Mr Bartlet does not quite admit this, but he allows that it may have been 'written down for the first time at his request and for his benefit'.

2. That the *Way of Life* was circulated as an independent tract, under the title of *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*. See Mrs Gibson's translation of the Harris codex of the Syriac *Didascalia* p. 12: the Syriac Text and translation of *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, by J. P. Arendzen in *J. T. S.* iii p. 60: and the Greek text of the *Apostolical Church Order*. In these free revisions the Greek of Barnabas was a little varied and elaborated and a few verses were omitted.

3. Some time after the cessation of persecution an Egyptian writer took up this revised *Way of Life*, added to it from Barnabas the *Way of Death* and the omitted verses, and inserted a passage of his own composition (i 3—ii 1), in which he made use of the *Didascalia*, of Hermas, of Clement of Alexandria, and of an unknown Gospel. He then proceeded to append to this nucleus a church manual, exhibiting the practice, doctrine and organization of the sect to which he belonged.

What this sect was it is hardly possible to say. The author has

little or no interest in the Humanity of our Lord, or in angels or demons. He was strongly ascetic and draws a distinction between the 'perfect' Christian, who bears the 'whole yoke of the Lord', and the 'imperfect' Christian, who does not (vi 1-3). While on this side exceedingly Judaic, he yet detests the Jews, and is remarkably free from scholasticism, formalism or mechanism. Affusion, perfusion, immersion are quite indifferent, and his view of the Eucharist is that of Clement of Alexandria or Origen. Church organization he would remodel in the light of Alexandrinism and of the Pauline Epistles. That he was acquainted with the whole of the New Testament need not be doubted, but he masquerades as a contemporary of the Apostles, and is therefore, like the author of the Clementine *Homilies*, debarred from formal quotation, except as regards 'the Gospel'. Somewhere in Egypt there may have been a sect answering to this description. But it is possible that this strange book merely expresses the ideas of a solitary thinker. For it never came to anything, and nobody appears to have read it except the compiler of the *Constitutiones Apostolicæ*.

C. BIGG.

NOTES ON THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST JOHN.

I.

iv 23 *Ἐρχεται ὥρα καὶ νῦν ἐστίν, ὅτε οἱ ἀληθινοὶ προσκυνηταὶ προσκυνήσουσι τῷ πατρὶ ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ.

v 25 *Ἐρχεται ὥρα καὶ νῦν ἐστίν, ὅτε οἱ νεκροὶ ἀκούονται τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ οἱ ἀκούσαντες ζήσονται.

I wish to suggest that in both of these passages the clause καὶ νῦν ἐστίν is not a part of our Lord's words, but an editorial comment added by the Evangelist to point out the fulfilment of the prophecy contained in the previous words ἔρχεται ὥρα. 'An hour is coming'—aye and it is now present—'when,' &c. I quite admit that there is no necessity for such an interpretation, for our Lord may quite naturally indicate the germs of the future in the present; nay, there are arguments against it: the absence of the words in iv 21 and xvi 2, where it would have been equally natural for the Evangelist, though not for our Lord, to add this note, and the analogy of xvi 32, where the additional words καὶ ἐλήλυθεν seem to be the Lord's own, both make for the common view.