

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. *ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς*, Rom. viii. 21), in the Teaching (chap. ii.), means abortion, as in the Epistle of Barnabas. Also *συνοχή* (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.

ἀθάνατος, iv. 94. Classical, and in Septuagint. The New Testament adjective is *ἀφθαρτος* (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 *ἀθανασία*, 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.]

αἰσχρολόγος, iii. 56. Post-classical. The New Testament has *αἰσχρολογία* (classical) in Col. iii. 8, and *αἰσχροτύτης* (classical), referring to the same thing, in Eph. v. 4.

ἀμφιβολία, 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 *ἀμφίβολος*. 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 *ἔρις* or *μομφή*. See Col. iii. 13, *εἰάν τις πρὸς τινα ἔχη μομφήν*. In Matt. v. 23, 24 — the parent passage — the expression is *ὁ ἀδελφός σου ἔχει τι κατὰ σου*.

ἀνταποδοτής, iv. 91. Found elsewhere only in the Epistle of Barnabas (ch. 19), and Epitome (Bryennios Proleg., p. 77). The New Testament has *ἀνταπόδομα*, *ἀνταπόδοσις*, and *ἀνταποδιδῶμι*.

αἰθάδεια, v. 117. Classical. The New Testament has *αἰθάδης* (classical) in Tit. i. 7; 2 Pet. ii. 10.

γόγγυσος, iii. 66. Post-classical. The New Testament has *γογγυστής* in Jude 16; also *γογγύζω* and *γογγυσμός*, all post-classical.

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

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

δίγλωσσος, 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 *δίλογος* (post-classical), 1 Tim. iii. 8.

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

διπλοκαρδία, v. 116. Found only here and in the Epistle of Barnabas, chap. 19.

διψυχέω, iv. 86. Post-classical. The New Testament has *δίψυχος*. See *διγνώμων* above.

ἐκπέτασις, xvi. 313. The origin of the word is doubtful, also whether it occurs elsewhere or not. If it is from *ἐκπετάννυμι* 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," *ἐκπετάσει δὲ καὶ δαχύσει*. The Didot edition (1868), however, reads *ἐπεκτάσει*. If the word comes from *ἐπέταμαι*, which is a later as well as poetic form of *ἐπέτομαι*, 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 *ἀρπαγή* 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, *ἄγγελον πετόμενον ἐν μεσουρανήματι*] 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 *ἐπέτασις* 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 *ἐκτετάσει* 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 *ἐπιφάσεως* for *ἐκπετάσεως*.

ἐνδύω, iv. 92; v. 128. Classical and in Septuagint. The New Testament has *ἐνδύης*, Acts iv. 34.

ἐπαϊδός, iii. 59. In Septuagint and classical in the form *ἐπαϊδός*. The New Testament seems not to contain the idea of enchantment, i.e. using the magic spell. We find *μαγεία*, 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, *ἐπέτασις* refer to the appearing of the Lord. The corrections are supposed to be by Bryennios himself. They erase *ἡ* *ἐκπέτασις* (line 4), and *ἕθεν δὲ* (line 9), and add an illustrative quotation from 2 Thess i. 7.

viii. 11; *μάγος*, xiii. 6, 8. The Septuagint applies the word *ἐπαιδός* to the "magicians" of Pharaoh and of Nebuchadnezzar.

ἐριστικός, iii. 53. Classical. The New Testament has *ἔρις* and *ἐρίζω*, both classical.

ζηλοτυπία, v. 118. Classical and in Septuagint, in Num. v., of the law of jealousy. The New Testament has *ζήλος* and derivatives (classical), but no compounds; also *φθόνος* (classical), Acts xiii. 45; Matt. xxvii. 18, et al.

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

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

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

θυμικός, iii. 53. In Arist., and the adverb in Polyb. 18. 37 (20), 12.

ιδρώ, i. 32. Classical. The New Test. has the noun, Luke xxii. 44.

κακοήθης, ii. 45. Classical. The New Testament has *κακοήθεια* once, Rom. i. 29.

κοσμοπλάνος, xvi. 304. Found only here and in Apostolical Constitutions, *τότε φανήσεται ὁ κοσμοπλάνος*, and *κατακρίναι τὸν κοσμοπλάνον διάβολον*, Bk. 7, chap. 32. See Bryennios, Proleg. p. 50. Compare 2 John 7, *πολλοὶ πλάνοι ἐξήλθον 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 (Sophocles, *Lex. s.v.*). Tacitus and Juvenal (died A.D. 120) call astrologers *mathematici*. Tertullian (died A.D. 220) classes together "lenones, perductores, aquarioli, sicarii, venenarii, magi, haruspices, harioli, mathematici," Apol. 43. For astrologers the Septuagint, in Isa. xlviii. 18, has *ἀστρολόγοι τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*. In Daniel the king calls *τοὺς ἐπαιδούς 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?

μισός, xvi. 301. Classical and in Septuagint. The New Testament has *μισέω*, but for the noun uses *ἔχθρα*, not a precise equivalent, but the opposite of *φιλία*, James iv.

μνησικακέω, ii. 41. Classical and in Septuagint, which has also μνησικάκος, Prov. xii. 28.

οἰνωσκόπος, iii. 58. Classical. The Septuagint has οἰωνίζομαι and οἰωνισμός of Joseph's divining cup, Gen. xlv. 5. Also τερατοσκόπος, Deut. xviii. 11. Neither the word nor the idea appears in the New Testament.

παιδοφθορέω, ii. 36. In Epistle of Barnabas and later. Compare Juvenal x. 304:

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

πανθαμάρτητος, 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).

παρόδιος, 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.

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

ποθέω, iv. 83. Classical and in Septuagint. The New Testament has επιποθέω (classical). But is not ποθήσεις in the Teaching an error of text for ποιήσεις? The corresponding passage in Epistle of Barnabas is οὐ ποιήσεις σχίσμα (chap. 19), and in the Apostolical Constitutions is οὐ ποιήσεις σχίσματα πρὸς τοὺς ἀγίους.

πονέω, v. 125. Classical and in Septuagint. The New Testament uses κοπιᾶω (classical); also καταπονέω (post-classical), but not with the meaning of labor; also πόνος (classical).

πονηρόφρων, iii. 67. Found elsewhere only in the Apostolical Constitutions, Μὴ ἔσο αὐθάδης, μηδὲ πονηρόφρων (7. 7), and in the Epitome (Bryennios, Proleg. p. 76).

προνηστεύω, 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 ὁμολογέω (classical), and ἐξομολογέω (post-classical), which also is used in the Teaching iv. 108.

σιτία, 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 πληρῶσαι τὸν λογισμὸν μου μετὰ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ λαβῶν σιτίαν εἰς τὸ ἀρτοκοπεῖον ἐποίησεν ἄρτους.

192, A. Ἀπῆλθον οὖν εἰς τὸ ἄρτοκοπέιον ποιῆσαι δύο σιτίας καὶ εἶρον ἐκεί ἀδελφὸν θέλοντα ποιῆσαι ἄρτους, καὶ οὐκ εἶχέ τινα δοῦναι αὐτῷ χεῖρα, 196, B. For the Ἐὰν σιτίαν ποιῆς, τὴν ἀπαρχὴν of the Teaching, we find in the Apostolical Constitutions (7, 29), πᾶσαν ἀπαρχὴν ἄρτων θερμῶν, "hot cakes."

σοσπᾶω, iv. 88. Classical. The word properly means to draw together, contract; but as in Latin *contrahere*, as well as *retrahere*, is the opposite of *porrigere*, so here σοσπᾶω is the opposite of ἐκτείνω. Again, σοσπᾶν τὰς χεῖρας is not the same as σοσπᾶν τοὺς δακτύλους, so that Canon Farrar's "clenches them tight" must be called an "improvement." The New Testament has σοστέλλω (classical), which is sometimes the opposite of ἐκτείνω, but in Acts v. 6 describes the preparation of the body of Ananias for burial—Latin, *componere*. Σοστέλλω is the word used in the remarkable parallel passage cited by Bryennios from the Wisdom of Sirach: Μὴ ἔστω ἡ χεὶρ σου ἐκτεταμένη εἰς τὸ λαβεῖν καὶ ἐν τὸ ἀποδιδόναυ συνοσταλμένη, 4, 31. Also in the corresponding passage in the Apostolical Constitutions (7, 11).

τετράς, viii. 153. Classical and in Septuagint. The New Testament has τετράδιον (post-classical), Acts xii. 4, meaning a company of four.

ὑψηλόφθαλμος, iii. 56. Found elsewhere only in the Epitome (Bryennios, Proleg. p. 75). Bryennios points out that where the Teaching has μηδὲ αἰσχρολόγος μηδὲ ὑψηλόφθαλμος the Apostolical Constitutions has οὐκ ἔσθ' αἰσχρολόγος, οὐδὲ ῥυψόφθαλμος. The Septuagint has ὑψηλοκάρδιος, Prov. xvi. 5; also κύριε, οὐχ ὑψώθη ἡ καρδία μου, οὐδὲ ἐμετεωρίσθησαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοί μου, Ps. cxxx. (cxxxii.) 1. But these expressions refer to haughtiness, and ῥυψόφθαλμος means leering, a meaning which the context seems to fasten upon ὑψηλόφθαλμος—ἐκ γὰρ τούτων ἀπάντων μοιχείαι γεννῶνται. 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 μετεωρισμός. See Wisdom of Sirach, xxvi. 9, Πορνεία γυναικὸς ἐν μετεωρισμοῖς ὀφθαλμῶν, καὶ ἐν τοῖς βλεφάροις αὐτῆς γνωσθήσεται. Compare xxiii. 4.

φαρμακεύω, ii. 37. Classical and in Septuagint. The New Testament has φαρμακεία and φαρμακός.

φθορεύς, v. 127, xvi. 300. Post-classical. The New Testament has φθορά and φθείρω, both classical.

χριστέμπορος, 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 κορισμὸν εἶναι τῆ εὐσέβειαν*.

REMARKS.

1. Number and classification. The whole number is forty-five, of which two are found twice, — *ἐνδέω, φθορεῖς*, — all the rest only once. Nineteen are substantially the same as New Testament words: *αἰσχρολόγος, ἀθάνατος, ἀταποδότης, αἰθάδεια, γόγγυσος, διαφορά, διψυχέω, ἐνδέω, ἐριστικός, θερμός, θράσος, ἰδρώ, κακοήθης, κυριακή, μῖσος, προσεξομολογέω, τετράς, φαρμακεύω, φθορεῖς*. As to their distribution in the Teaching, two are in chap. i., *διαφορά, ἰδρώ*; seven in chap. ii., *παιδοφθорέω, φαρμακεύω, μνησικακέω, δεγνάμω, δίγλωσσος, διγλωσσία, κακοήθης*; eleven in chap. iii., *ἐριστικός, θυμικός, αἰσχρολόγος, ὑψηλόφθαλμος, οἰνωσκοπός, ἐπαιδός, μαθηματικός, περικαθαίρω, γόγγυσος, πονηρόφρων, θράσος*; six in chap. iv., *ποθέω, διψυχέω, συσπᾶω, ἀταποδότης, ἐνδέω, ἀθάνατος*; seven in chap. v., *δεκλοκαρδία, αἰθάδεια, ζηλοτυπία, θρασυτής, πονέω, φθορεῖς, πανθαμάρτητος*, with a repetition of *ἐνδέω*; two in chap. vii., *θερμός, προνηστεύω*; one in chap. viii., *τετράς*; two in chap. xii., *παρόδιος, χριστέμπορος*; one in chap. xiii., *σιτία*; three in chap. xiv., *κυριακή, προσεξομολογέω, ἀμφιβολία*; three in chap. xvi., *μῖσος, κοσμοπλάνος, ἐκπέτασις*, 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, *ἀθάνατος* (Sept.), *ἀμφιβολία, αἰθάδεια, διαφορά* (Sept.), *δίγλωσσος* (Sept.), *ἐνδέω* (Sept.), *ἐπαιδός* (ἐπιδός) (S.), *ἐριστικός, ζηλοτυπία* (Sept.), *θερμός* (Sept.), *θράσος* (Sept.), *θρασυτής, ἰδρώ, κακοήθης, μαθηματικός* (as adjective), *μῖσος* (Sept.), *μνησικακέω* (Sept.), *οἰνωσκοπός, περικαθαίρω* (Sept.), *ποθέω* (Sept.), *πονέω* (Sept.), *προνηστεύω, συσπᾶω, τετράς* (Sept.), *φαρμακεύω* (Sept.). Four are post-classical, without being ecclesiastical merely, *αἰσχρολόγος, θυμικός, παρόδιος, φθορεῖς*. Four are found in the early Christian fathers, *γόγγυσος, διψυχέω, κυριακή, παιδοφθорέω*. Two are not found earlier than the fourth century, *σιτία, χριστέμπορος*. 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: ἀνταποδότης, διγλωσσία, and διγνώμων(-ος) being in Barnabas and Epitome, πανθαμάρτητος in Barnabas and Apostolical Constitutions, πονηρόφρων in Apostolical Constitutions and Epitome, διπλοκαρδία in Barnabas, κοσμοπλάγος in Apostolical Constitutions, and ὑψηλόφθαλμος in the Epitome. The only word found nowhere except in the Teaching is προτεξομολογέω. This Hilgenfeld changes to προεξ. One word, ἐκπέτασις, 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, ἐκπέτασις, σιτία, and χριστιμπος. If the first is from ἐκπετάννιμι, then it is found in Plutarch, and falls into line with the rest. If it is from ἐκπέταμαι, 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. Σιτία 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 *ἀπρως* instead. *Χριστέμπος* 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 *χριστέμπος*, 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 Scribner'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. Μεταβιώμεν δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ ἐτέραν γνώσιν καὶ διδαχῇν. Ὅδοι δύο εἰσὶ διδαχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας, ἥτε τοῦ φωτός καὶ ἡ τοῦ σκότους· διαφορά δὲ πολλῆ τῶν δύο ὁδῶν. Ἐφ' ἧς μὲν γὰρ εἰσι τεταγμένοι φωταγωγοὶ ἄγγελοι τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐφ' ἧς δὲ ἄγγελοι τοῦ σατανᾶ· καὶ ὁ μὲν ἐστὶ κύριος ἀπ' αἰῶνων καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, ὁ δὲ ἄρχων καιροῦ τοῦ νῦν τῆς ἀνομίας.

19. Ἡ οὖν ὁδὸς τοῦ φωτός ἐστὶν αὕτη· εἰάν τις θέλων ὁδὸν ὀδεύει ἐπὶ τὸν ὠρισμένον τόπον σπεύσῃ τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτοῦ. Ἔστιν οὖν ἡ δοθεῖσα ἡμῖν γνώσις τοῦ περιπατεῖν ἐν αὐτῇ

τοιαύτη· Ἀγαπήσεις τὸν σε ποιήσαντα, φοβηθήσῃ τὸν σε πλάσαντα, δοξάσεις τὸν σε λυτρωσάμενον ἐκ θανάτου. Ἔσῃ ἀπλοῦς τῇ καρδίᾳ καὶ πλούσιος τῷ πνεύματι. Οὐ κολληθήσῃ μετὰ τῶν πορευομένων ἐν ὁδῷ θανάτου. Μισήσεις πᾶν ὃ οὐκ ἐστὶν ἀρεστὸν τῷ Θεῷ, μισήσεις πᾶσαν ὑπόκρισιν, οὐ μὴ ἐγκαταλίπῃς ἐντο-

λὰς Κυρίου. Οὐχ ὑψώσεις σεαυτὸν, ἔσῃ δὲ ταπεινόφρων κατὰ πάντα, οὐκ ἀρεῖς ἐπὶ σεαυτὸν δόξαν. Οὐ λήψῃ βουλήν ποιηρᾶν κατὰ τοῦ πλησίου σου. Οὐ δώσεις τῇ ψυχῇ σου θρά-

σος. Οὐ πορνεύσεις, οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ παιδοφθορήσεις. Οὐ μὴ σου ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐξέλθῃ ἐν ἀκαθαρσίᾳ

τινῶν. Οὐ λήψῃ πρόσωπον ἐλέγξαι

τινὰ ἐπὶ παραπτώματι. Ἔσῃ πραῦς,

Vol. XLI. No. 164.

TEACHING.

(3) Ὅδοι δύο εἰσὶ, μία τῆς ζωῆς καὶ μία τοῦ θανάτου, διαφορά δὲ πολλῆ μετὰ τῶν δύο ὁδῶν.

(5) Ἡ μὲν οὖν ὁδὸς τῆς ζωῆς ἐστὶν αὕτη·

(9) Τοῦτων δὲ τῶν λόγων ἡ διδαχὴ ἐστὶν αὕτη· Εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμῖν κ.τ.λ.

(5) Πρῶτον, ἀγαπήσεις τὸν Θεὸν τὸν ποιήσαντά σε· δεύτερον, τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτὸν· πάντα δὲ ὅσα ἐὰν θελήσῃς μὴ γίνεσθαί σοι, καὶ σὺ ἄλλω μὴ ποίει.

(105) Μισήσεις πᾶσαν ὑπόκρισιν καὶ πᾶν ὃ μὴ ἀρεστὸν τῷ Κυρίῳ. Οὐ μὴ ἐγκαταλίπῃς ἐντολὰς Κυρίου.

(72) Οὐχ ὑψώσεις σεαυτὸν.

(46) Οὐ λήψῃ βουλήν ποιηρᾶν κατὰ τοῦ πλησίου σου.

(73) Οὐδε δώσεις τῇ ψυχῇ σου θράσος.

(35) Δευτέρα δὲ ἐντολὴ τῆς διδαχῆς Οὐ φονεύσεις, οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ παιδοφθορήσεις, οὐ πορνεύσεις, οὐ κλέψεις, οὐ μαγεύσεις, οὐ φαρμακεύσεις.

(84) Οὐ λήψῃ πρόσωπον ἐλέγξαι ἐπὶ παραπτώμασιν.

(69) Ἴσθι δὲ πραῦς, ἐπεὶ οἱ πρα-

BARNABAS.

ἔση ἡσύχιος, ἔση τρέμων τοὺς λόγους

οὓς ἤκουσας. Οὐ μνησικακήσεις τῷ

ἀδελφῷ σου. Οὐ μὴ διψυχήσης, πό-

τερον ἔσται ἢ οὐ. Οὐ μὴ λάβης ἐπὶ
ματαίῳ τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου. Ἀγαπή-
σεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὑπὲρ τὴν ψυχὴν

σου. Οὐ φονεύσεις τέκνον ἐν φθορᾷ,
οὐδὲ πάλιν γεννηθὲν ἀποκτενεῖς. Οὐ
μὴ ἄρης τὴν χεῖρά σου ἀπὸ τοῦ υἱοῦ
σου ἢ ἀπὸ τῆς θυγατρὸς σου, ἀλλ'
ἀπὸ νεότητος διδάξεις φόβον Κυ-

ρίου. Οὐ μὴ γένη ἐπιθυμῶν τὰ

τοῦ πλησίον σου, οὐ μὴ γένη
πλεονέκτης, οὐδὲ κολληθήσῃ ἐκ ψυ-
χῆς σου μετὰ ὑψηλῶν, ἀλλὰ μετὰ
ταπεινῶν καὶ δικαίων ἀναστραφήσῃ.
Τὰ συμβαίνοντά σοι ἐνεργήματα ὡς
ἀγαθὰ προσδέξῃ, εἰδὼς ὅτι ἄνευ Θεοῦ

οὐδὲν γίνεται. Οὐκ ἔση διγνώμων
οὐδὲ δίγλωσσος· παγίς γὰρ θανάτου
ἐστὶν ἡ διγλωσσία. Ὑποταγήσῃ κυ-
ριοῖς ὡς τύπῳ Θεοῦ ἐν αἰσχύνη καὶ

φόβῳ· οὐ μὴ ἐπιτάξῃς δούλῳ σου ἢ
παιδίσκῃ σου ἐν πικρία τοῖς ἐπὶ
τὸν αὐτὸν Θεὸν ἐλπίζουσι, μήποτε οὐ
φοβηθῶσι τὸν ἐπ' ἀμφοτέροις Θεόν·

TEACHING.

εἰς κληρονομήσουσι τὴν γῆν. Γίνου
μακρόθυμος καὶ ἐλεήμων καὶ ἄκα-
κος καὶ ἡσύχιος καὶ ἀγαθὸς καὶ
τρέμων τοὺς λόγους διὰ παντός,
οὓς ἤκουσας.

(40) Οὐ κακολογήσεις, οὐ μνη-
σικακήσεις.

(85) Οὐ διψυχήσεις, πότερον
ἔσται ἢ οὐ.

(40) Οὐκ ἐπιорκήσεις, οὐ ψα-
δομαρτυρήσεις.

(47) Οὐ μισήσεις πάντα ἄν-
θρωπον. ἀλλὰ οὓς μὲν ἐλέγξῃς,
περὶ δὲ ὧν προσεΐξῃ, οὓς δὲ ἀγα-
πήσεις ὑπὲρ τὴν ψυχὴν σου.

(37) Οὐ φονεύσεις τέκνον ἐν
φθορᾷ οὐδὲ γεννηθὲν ἀποκτενεῖς.

(95) Οὐκ ἄρεις τὴν χεῖρά σου
ἀπὸ τοῦ υἱοῦ σου ἢ ἀπὸ τῆς θυγα-
τρὸς σου, ἀλλὰ ἀπὸ νεότητος δι-
δάξεις τὸν φόβον τοῦ Θεοῦ.

(39) Οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις τὰ τοῦ
πλησίον.

(44) Οὐκ ἔση πλεονέκτης οὐδὲ
ἄρπας.

(73) Οὐ κολληθήσεται ἡ ψυχὴ
σου μετὰ ὑψηλῶν, ἀλλὰ μετὰ δε-
καίων καὶ ταπεινῶν ἀναστραφήσῃ.
Τὰ συμβαίνοντά σοι ἐνεργήματα
ὡς ἀγαθὰ προσδέξῃ εἰδὼς ὅτι ἄνευ
Θεοῦ οὐδὲν γίνεται.

(41) Οὐκ ἔση διγνώμων οὐδὲ
δίγλωσσος· παγίς γὰρ θανάτου ἡ
διγλωσσία. Οὐκ ἔσται ὁ λόγος σου
ψευδής, οὐ κενός, ἀλλὰ μεμωστο-
μένος πράξις.

(98) Οὐκ ἐπιτάξεις δούλῳ σου
ἢ παιδίσκῃ, τοῖς ἐπὶ τὸν αὐτὸν Θεὸν
ἐλπίζουσιν, ἐν πικρία σου, μήποτε
οὐ μὴ φοβηθῶσιν τὸν ἐπ' ἀμ-

BARNABAS.

ὅτι ἦλθεν οὐ κατὰ πρόσωπον καλέσαι, ἀλλ' ἐφ' οὓς τὸ πνεῦμα ἠτοίμασεν.

Κοινωνήσεις ἐν πᾶσι τῷ πλησίον σου καὶ οὐκ ἔρεις ἴδια εἶναι· εἰ γὰρ ἐν τῷ ἀφθάρτῳ κοινωνοὶ ἐστε, πόσῳ μᾶλλον ἐν τοῖς φθαρτοῖς; Οὐκ ἔση πρόγλωσσος· παγὶς γὰρ στόμα θανάτου.

Ὅσον δύνασαι ὑπὲρ τῆς ψυχῆς σου

ἀγνεύσεις. Μὴ γίνου πρὸς μὲν τὸ λαβεῖν ἐκτείνων τὰς χεῖρας, πρὸς δὲ τὸ δοῦναι συσπῶν. Ἀγαπήσεις ὡς κόρην τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σου πάντα τὸν λαλοῦντά σοι τὸν λόγον τοῦ Κυρίου. Μνησθήσῃ ἡμέραν κρίσεως ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός καὶ ἐκζητήσεις καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν τὰ πρόσωπα τῶν ἁγίων, ἢ διὰ λόγου κοπιῶν καὶ πορευόμενος εἰς τὸ παρακαλεῖσαι καὶ μελετῶν εἰς τὸ σῶσαι ψυχὴν τῷ λόγῳ ἢ διὰ τῶν χειρῶν σου ἐργάσῃ εἰς λύτρον ἁμαρτιῶν σου. Οὐ διατάσεις δοῦναι, οὐδὲ διδοὺς γογγύσεις· γνώσῃ δὲ τίς ὁ τοῦ

μισθοῦ καλὸς ἀναποδότης. Φυλάξεις ἃ παρέλαβες, μήτε προστιθεῖς μήτε ἀφαιρῶν. Εἰς τέλος μισήσεις τὸ πονηρὸν. Κρνεῖς δικαίως. Οὐ ποιήσεις σχίσμα, εἰρηνεύσεις δὲ μαχομένους συναγαγῶν. Ἐξομολογήσῃ ἐπὶ ἁμαρτίᾳ σου, οὐ προσήξεις ἐπὶ

TEACHING.

φοτέροις Θεόν· οὐ γὰρ ἔρχεται κατὰ πρόσωπον καλέσαι, ἀλλ' ἐφ' οὓς τὸ πνεῦμα ἠτοίμασεν. Ὑμεῖς δὲ οἱ δούλοι ὑποταγήσεσθε τοῖς κυρίοις ὑμῶν ὡς τύπῳ Θεοῦ ἐν αἰσχύνῃ καὶ φόβῳ.

(92) Οὐκ ἀποστραφήσῃ τὸν ἐνδεόμενον, συγκοινωνήσεις δὲ πάντα τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου καὶ οὐκ ἔρεις ἴδια εἶναι· εἰ γὰρ ἐν τῷ ἀθανάτῳ κοινωνοὶ ἐστε, πόσῳ μᾶλλον ἐν τοῖς θνητοῖς;

(134) Εἰ μὲν γὰρ δύνασαι βασιτάσαι ὅλον τὸν ζυγὸν τοῦ Κυρίου, τέλειος ἔση· εἰ δ' οὐ δύνασαι, ὁ δόνη τοῦτο ποίει.

(86) Μὴ γίνου πρὸς μὲν τὸ λαβεῖν ἐκτείνων τὰς χεῖρας, πρὸς δὲ τὸ δοῦναι συσπῶν·

(78) Τέκνον μου, τοῦ λαλοῦντός σοι τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ μνησθήσῃ νυκτός καὶ ἡμέρας, τιμήσεις δὲ αὐτὸν ὡς Κύριον· ὅθεν γὰρ ἡ κυριότης λαλεῖται, ἐκεῖ Κύριός ἐστιν. Ἐκζητήσεις δὲ καθ' ἡμέραν τὰ πρόσωπα τῶν ἁγίων, ἵνα ἐπαναπαύῃ τοῖς λόγοις αὐτῶν.

(88) Ἐὰν ἔχῃς, διὰ τῶν χειρῶν σου δώσεις λύτρωσιν ἁμαρτιῶν σου. Οὐ διατάσεις δοῦναι οὐδὲ διδοὺς γογγύσεις· γνώσῃ γὰρ τίς ἐστὶν ὁ τοῦ μισθοῦ καλὸς ἀναποδότης.

(107) Φυλάξεις δὲ ἃ παρέλαβες, μήτε προστιθεῖς μήτε ἀφαιρῶν.

(83) Οὐ ποθήσεις σχίσμα, εἰρηνεύσεις δὲ μαχομένους· κρνεῖς δικαίως.

(108) Ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐξομολογήσῃ τὰ παραπτώματά σου, καὶ

BARNABAS.

προσευχὴν ἐν συνειδήσει πονηρᾷ.
Αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ὁδὸς τοῦ φωτός.

20. Ἡ δὲ τοῦ μέλανος ὁδὸς σκολιά ἐστι καὶ κατάρas μεστή· ὁδὸς γάρ ἐστι θανάτου αἰωνίου μετὰ τιμωρίας, ἐν ᾗ ἐστι τὰ ἀπολλύντα τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτῶν εἰδωλολατρεία, θρασύτης, ὕψος δυνάμεως, ὑπόκρισις, διπλοκαρδία, μοιχεία, φόνος, ἀρπαγή, ὑπερηφανία, παράβασις, δόλος, κακία, αὐθύδεια, φαρμακεία, μαγεία, πλεονεξία, ἀφοβία Θεοῦ· δῶνται τῶν ἀγαθῶν, μισοῦντες ἀλήθειαν, ἀγαπῶντες ψεῦδος, οὐ γινώσκοντες μισθὸν δικαιοσύνης, οὐ κολλῶμενοι ἀγαθῷ, οὐ κρίσει δικαίᾳ, χήρᾳ καὶ ὀρφανῷ οὐ προσέχοντες, ἀγροπνοῦντες οὐκ εἰς φόβον Θεοῦ, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὸ πονηρὸν, ὡν μακρὰν καὶ πόρρω πραΐτης καὶ ὑπομονῆς ἀγαπῶντες μάταια, διώκοντες ἀναπόδομα, οὐκ ἐλεοῦντες πτωχόν, οὐ πονοῦντες ἐπὶ καταπονουμένῳ, εὐχερεῖς ἐπὶ καταλαλιᾷ, οὐ γινώσκοντες τὸν ποιήσαντα αὐτοῦς, φονεῖς τέκνων, φθορεῖς πλάσματος Θεοῦ, ἀποστρεφόμενοι τὸν ἐνδεόμενον, καταπονοῦντες τὸν θλιβόμενον, πλουσίων παράκλητοι, πενήτων ἄνομοι κριταί, πανθαμάρητοι.

TEACHING.

οὐ προσελύθη ἐπὶ προσευχὴν σου ἐν συνειδήσει πονηρᾷ. Αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ζωῆς.

(112) Ἡ δὲ τοῦ θανάτου ὁδὸς ἐστὶν αὕτη· πρῶτον πάντων πονηρὰ ἐστὶ καὶ κατάρas μεστή·

φόνοι, μοιχεία, ἐπιθυμῖαι, κρνεῖαι, κλοπαί, εἰδωλολατρεῖαι, μαγείαι, φαρμακείαι, ἀρπαγαί, ψευδομαρτυρίαι, ὑποκρίσεις, διπλοκαρδία, δόλος, ὑπερηφανία, κακία, αὐθάδεια, πλεονεξία, αἰσχρολογία, ζηλοτυπία, θρασύτης, ὕψος, ἀλαζονεία· δῶνται ἀγαθῶν, μισοῦντες ἀλήθειαν, ἀγαπῶντες ψεῦδος, οὐ γινώσκοντες μισθὸν δικαιοσύνης, οὐ κολλῶμενοι ἀγαθῷ οὐδὲ κρίσει δικαίᾳ, ἀγροπνοῦντες οὐκ εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν, ἀλλ' εἰς τὸ πονηρὸν ὡς μακρὰν πραΐτης καὶ ὑπομονῆς μάταια ἀγαπῶντες, διώκοντες ἀναπόδομα, οὐκ ἐλεοῦντες πτωχόν, οὐ πονοῦντες ἐπὶ καταπονουμένῳ, οὐ γινώσκοντες τὸν ποιήσαντα αὐτοῦς, φονεῖς τέκνων, φθορεῖς πλάσματος Θεοῦ, ἀποστρεφόμενοι τὸν ἐνδεόμενον, καταπονοῦντες τὸν θλιβόμενον, πλουσίων παράκλητοι, πενήτων ἄνομοι κριταί, πανθαμάρητοι· ἴσοθειήτε, τέκνα, ἀπὸ τούτων ἀπάντων.

REMARKS.

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. ἡ τε . . . καὶ ἡ
τῶν δύο ὁδῶν
ch. 19. ὁ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀρεστόν
ἐλέγξει τινὰ ἐπὶ παραπτώματι
ἔση πραῦς, ἔση ἡσύχιος, ἔση τρέμων

οὐ μὴ διψυχήσης
οὐ μὴ ἄρης
φόβον
οὐ μὴ γένη ἐπιθυμῶν
οὐδὲ κολληθήσῃ ἐκ ψυχῆς
ἄνευ θεοῦ
ἔστιν ἡ διγλωσσία
ὑποταγήσῃ κυρίως
οὐ μὴ ἐπιτάξῃς
μὴ ποτε οὐ φοβηθῶσι
ὅτι ἦλθεν οὐ
κοινωνήσεις ἐν πᾶσι
ἀφθάρτω . . . φθάρτοις
ὅσον δύνασαι
καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν
ἐργάσῃ εἰς λύτρον
γνώσῃ δὲ τίς
εἰρηνεύσεις . . . συναγαγῶν
ἐξομολόγησῃ ἐπὶ ἁμαρτίᾳ σου
οὐ προσήξῃς
ch. 20. εἰδωλολατρεία, ὑπόκρισις,
μοιχεία, φόνος, ἀρπαγή, φαρμακεία,
μανεία
διώκται τῶν ἀγαθῶν
οὐ κρίσει
ἐπὶ τὸ πονηρόν

TEACHING.

μία . . . καὶ μία
μεταξὺ τῶν δύο ὁδῶν
ὁ μὴ ἀρεστόν
ἐλέγξει ἐπὶ παραπτώμασιν
ἴσθι δὲ πραῦς . . . γίνου ἡσύχιος . . .
καὶ τρέμων
οὐ διψυχήσεις
οὐκ ἀρεῖς
τὸν φόβον
οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις
οὐ κολληθήσεται ἡ ψυχὴ
ἄτερ θεοῦ
ἡ διγλωσσία
ὑποταγήσεσθε τοῖς κυρίως
οὐκ ἐπιτάξεις
οὐ μὴ φοβηθήσονται
οὐ γὰρ ἔρχεται
συγκοινωνήσεις πάντα
ἀθανάτῳ . . . θνητοῖς
εἰ μὲν γὰρ δύνασαι
καθ' ἡμέραν
δώσεις λύτρωσιν
γνώσῃ γὰρ τίς ἐστιν
εἰρηνεύσεις
ἐξ. τὰ παραπτώματά σου
οὐ προσελεύσῃ
Plural.

διώκται ἀγαθῶν
οὐδὲ κρίσει
εἰς 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, ἴσθι γίνου, while the other has the Hebraistic future, ἔσθ; this certainly cannot be called a change into the style of Barnabas. Four times Barnabas has οὐ μὴ with the aorist, where the Teaching has οὐ 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: ὁδὸς τῆς ζωῆς, τοῦ θανάτου instead of ὁδὸς τοῦ φωτός, τοῦ σκότους, τοῦ μέλαος; πονηρά instead of σκολιά; μνησθήσῃ instead of ἀγαπήσεις ὡς κόρυμψ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ 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 διδαχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας, and the difference between them is illustrated by the guardian angels set over each. The simple διδαχὴ becomes ἡ δοθείσα ἡμῖν γνώσις τοῦ περιπατεῖν. Not satisfied with ἀγαπήσεις τὸν σε ποιήσαντα, Barnabas adds φοβηθήσῃ τὸν σε πλάσαντα, δοξάσεις τὸν σε λυτρωσάμενον ἐκ θανάτου. Other examples follow. Even the οὐ μὴ λάβῃς ἐπὶ ματαίῳ τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου seems like a translation of ἐπιρκήσεις (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 *πραῖς, ἡσύχιος, τρέμων*, the Teaching has besides *μακρόθυμος, ἐλεήμων, ἄκακος, ἀγαθός*. 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 *πραῖς*. 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 *σιτία* might have been substituted for *ἄπρους* or *ἄπρους θερμούς* by a copyist, without the change of another word. The word *χριστέμπορος* 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 *χριστέμπορος* 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.¹ 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*. *Brv. Proleg.*, p. 89): Πᾶσι γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς διδασθαι θέλει ἐκ τῶν βίων δωρημάτων. Οἱ οὖν λαμβάνοντες ἀποδώσουσι λόγον τῷ Θεῷ διὰ τὸ ἔλαβον καὶ εἰς τί· οἱ μὲν γὰρ λαμβάνοντες θλιβόμενοι οὐ δικάσθησονται, οἱ δὲ ἐν ὑποκρίσει λαμβάνοντες τίσουσι δίκην. Ὁ οὖν διδοὺς ἀθῶός ἐστιν. 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 ἰνατί ἔλαβε 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 ἰνατί, 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 ἀθῶός ἐστιν, 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* τίσουσι 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,¹ 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 *Ἰσπάρδα* of the ms. is for *Ἰεσπάρδα*, *sacrosancta*.

¹ Theologische Quartalschrift, Tübingen. 1882. Drittes Quartalheft. pp. 433-445.