IV. 1 [1]Ecce dies Domini venit ardens velut clibanus, eruntque *Cyprian.*
omnes alienigenae et omnes iniqui stipula, et succendet illos ad-
veniens dies, dicit Dominus [*Lucif. Cal.*] et non derelinquetur ex eis *Luc. Cal.*
2 radix nec vitis. [2]Vobis autem timentibus meum nomen orietur sol *Cyprian.*
iustitiae et sanitas in alis eius . . . . . .
4 . . . [4]Et ecce mittam vobis Helian Thesbiten . . *Tertullian.*
. . . . . .

IV 1 Cypr. *Testim.* ii 28; *Ad Demet.* 22; Lucif. Cal. *De sanct. Athan.* i 38
IV 2 Cypr. *Ad Vig.* 6; *De Pascha Computus* 19; Tycon. *Reg. Sept.* iv 4; Tert. *De Anima* v

IV. 1. Quia ecce dies venit Domini ardens sicut clibanus et uret eos et erunt omnes alienigenae et omnes qui faciunt scelera ut sarmenta et succendet eos dies Domini quae venit dicit Dominus omnipotens *L* Ecce] *pr* διοτι 𝔊 𝔙 *pr* οτι 𝔏 ℵ$^{c.\,b}$ *om* A^{*} (διοτι ιδου *in mg. et sup ras* A^{a} ?) Domini] *om* 𝔊^{B} 𝔏 eruntque] *pr* και φλεξει αυτους 𝔊 𝔏 (*exc* 62 147) 𝔙 iniqui] *pr* οι ποιουντες 𝔊 Dominus] + Παντοκρατωρ 𝔊 ex] *om* 𝔏 ℵ$^{c.\,b}$ 2. Timentibus oritur sol iustitiae et sanitas in pinnis eius *T* Vobis . . . orietur] και ανατελει υμιν τοις φοβουμενοις το ονομα μου 𝔊 timentibus] *al* qui timetis *C* meum nomen] *al* nomen Domini *C* orietur] *al* + vobis *C* sanitas] *al* curatio *C* alis] *al* pinnis *C* eius] αυτων *A* 106 4. Et] *om* Γ mittam] *pr* εγω 𝔊 αποστελλω *Q* 22 36 49 51

W. O. E. Oesterley.

NOTES ON THE DIDACHE.

I.

On Baptism by Affusion.

Where and when did Baptism by Affusion come to be regarded as perfectly adequate and legitimate? We need not pursue the question beyond the first five centuries.

1. Tertullian *de Cor. Mil.* 3 says 'ter mergitamur'. In several places he uses the word 'tinguo', which means 'to dip' (Virg. *Georg.* i 246 'Arctos Oceani metuentes aequore tingui'); or to dip cloth in vats and so 'to dye'. The word does not appear to be used of bathing. Dipping which imparts a colour or character seems to be its common sense, and hence it came to be used of Baptism.

2. In the third century Cornelius, Bishop of Rome, says that the whole of the clergy and many of the laity of that church objected to the ordination of Novatian (Eus. *H. E.* vi 43, 17) ἐπεὶ μὴ ἐξὸν ἦν τὸν ἐπὶ κλίνης διὰ νόσον περιχυθέντα (= *perfusum*), ὥσπερ καὶ οὗτος, εἰς κλῆρόν τινα γενέσθαι. It has been thought that the ground of the

objection is to be found in the words διὰ νόσον, and that what the objectors really meant was that Novatian had been baptized only because he was sick, from fear and not in faith. For this reason the later canon of Neocaesarea (12) lays it down as a general rule that *clinici* ought not to be ordained. But this does not appear to be the meaning of Cornelius. Just before he says ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ κλίνῃ ᾗ ἔκειτο περιχυθεὶς ἔλαβεν· εἴ γε χρὴ λέγειν τὸν τοιοῦτον εἰληφέναι. What he dislikes is the informality and apparent irreverence of administering Baptism by affusion to a person lying on a bed. It is to be noticed that Novatian had not delayed his Baptism (this is the offence against which the Neocaesarean canon is aimed), for his sickness and his conversion coincided in point of time. Cornelius goes on to say that Novatian had not after his recovery received the σφραγίς; this was another additional defect. But the fact that he had been baptized by affusion was in itself an irregularity.

3. In this Cornelius quite agrees with Magnus, an African Christian, who wrote to Cyprian to ask him whether those who had been baptized in sickness were 'legitimi christiani, eo quod aqua salutari non loti sunt sed perfusi'. Here there can be no doubt that what Magnus objects to is the form of Affusion. Cyprian replies (*Ep.* 69) that it makes no difference 'quod adspergi vel perfundi videntur aegri'. Let us notice that he uses *adspergi* and *perfundi* as synonyms, and that he does not add, as he certainly would have done if it had been true, that he knew cases when people who were not sick had been baptized by affusion. Later on in this same Epistle he writes 'non interrogentur utrumne loti sint an perfusi, utrumne clinici sint an peripatetici', thus identifying the *peripateticus* with the *lotus*. Cyprian corresponded with the Bishops of Rome, Gaul, and Spain in the West, and with Firmilian of Cappadocia in the East, and was well acquainted with the different usages of the two divisions of the Church in respect of re-baptism. But he does not appear to be aware of any difference in the method of administration.

4. So far things appear to be quite clear. It has, however, been thought by high authorities that we have a picture of Baptism by Affusion, dating from the second century, and therefore long before Magnus wrote to Cyprian, in the Roman catacombs. Let us pave the way for its consideration by observing that in the *Canons of Hippolytus* (Achelis, p. 96) the priest is directed to keep his hand upon the head of the baptized throughout the three immersions, an attitude which would be difficult in the case of baptism by affusion, for it was the right hand. Tertullian puts the rule differently, *de Bapt.* 8 'dehinc (after immersion) manus imponitur per benedictionem advocans et invitans sacrum spiritum.' Now in the fresco in question (it is in the Chapel of the Sacrament in the Cemetery of Callistus), this appears to be the

moment selected for representation. The reader may consult the chromo-lithographs given by de Rossi *Roma Sotterranea* ii plate 16, and by Wilpert *Die Malereien der Katakomben Roms* ii plate 27. The scene is a river with rocky bank. The Baptist, naked save for an apron round his loins, touches with outstretched right hand the head of our Lord, round which water is seen flying off in great quantities. Behind the Baptist is the Dove (not in de Rossi). The Lord is standing in the river. In Wilpert's reproduction the right foot of the Baptist is in the water, the left is raised as if he were just stepping on to the bank. In that of de Rossi both his feet are visible and he appears to have just emerged.

Wilpert gives four other pictures representing Baptism of which three are quite parallel to this, except that they do not attempt to draw the water dripping from the head (plate 39—second century, plate 58—third century, plate 228—fourth century). In all the moment chosen for representation is the same, and the priest is seen laying his hand on the head of the baptized. It appears to me that Mr Marriott (in *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, article *Baptism*), de Rossi, and Wilpert are quite mistaken in supposing that what we have in the first fresco is a picture of Baptism by affusion. The moment selected by the artist is that which immediately follows the act of Baptism, and the picture does not tell either one way or the other.

5. Perpetua and some of her companions were baptized in prison: so was Donatianus (*Passio S. Montani* in Ruinart): not necessarily by affusion; there was a *labrum aquarum* in the jail. All these cases are African; in the East martyrs appear to have been taught that the baptism of blood sufficed. In the Acts of St Laurence a soldier is baptized in prison from a pitcher, but the Acts are later. Such cases were quite extraordinary.

6. Early in the fourth century we find a passing phrase in Lactantius *div. inst.* iv 15 'ut gentes baptismo, id est . . . purifici roris perfusione salvaret'. We can hardly build an argument on these words. Lactantius is a stylist, whose language is largely affected by reminiscences of Virgil. Now Virgil uses *perfundo* of dipping sheep—*Georg.* iii 445 'Dulcibus idcirco fluviis pecus omne magistri Perfundunt'; cp. with this *Georg.* i 272 'Balantumque gregem fluvio mersare salubri'. It is not quite certain what Lactantius means, but, if he means that Baptism might in all cases be administered by *perfusio* in the strict sense of the word, he does not agree with Cornelius, Cyprian, or Magnus.

7. About the middle of the fourth century Cyril of Jerusalem appears to contemplate Baptism by immersion only. The font is the κολυμβήθρα, the baptized go down into the water and rise up from it (καταδύειν, ἀναδύειν), the immersion signifies the burial of Christ. While

under the water, the baptized see nothing, as if it were night; when they emerge they see again clearly as in the day (*C. M.* ii 4). Cp. *C.* xvii 13.

8. Basil, in Cappadocia, writes *de S. S.* 15 *οἱονεὶ γὰρ ἐνθάπτεται τῷ ὕδατι τῶν βαπτιζομένων τὰ σώματα . . . τὸ ὕδωρ ὥσπερ ἐν ταφῇ τὸ σῶμα παραδεχόμενον*, words which would seem to be conclusive in favour of immersion, if it were not for the next quotation.

9. For Basil's brother, Gregory of Nyssa, *Cat. Or.* xxxv (vol. iii p. 98 D ed. Paris 1638), writes *ἀντὶ γῆς τὸ ὕδωρ ἐπιχεάμενος καὶ ὑποδὺς τὸ στοιχεῖον*: again (ibid. p. 99 D) *τὸ ὕδωρ τρὶς ἐπιχεάμενοι καὶ πάλιν ἀναβάντες ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος*: again in *Bapt. Christi* (vol. iii 372 B) *ἐπὶ γὰρ τὸ συγγενὲς τῆς γῆς στοιχεῖον τὸ ὕδωρ ἐρχόμενοι ἐκείνῳ ἑαυτοὺς ἐγκρύπτομεν*: and again (ibid. p. 376 D) *ὕδατι γὰρ ἀνήφθη τὸ πῦρ τρίτον ἐπαντληθέντι*.

Gregory agrees with all the other authorities in requiring the candidate to go into the water and stand there. But the water is then apparently poured, from the hand, or rather from a vessel (*ἐπιχεῖν*, *ἐπαντλεῖν*), in considerable quantity, so that the man may be said to 'go under the element', to 'hide himself in the water'. Further, as in the phrase last quoted he is speaking of the baptism in Jordan, he regards our Lord Himself as having been baptized in this manner. In this he is followed by the Ravenna mosaics (see Marriott's article *Baptism* in *D. C. A.*; the date is said to be about 450) in which the Baptist is seen pouring water from a scallop on the Lord's head. It is just possible that the expressions of Basil, strong as they appear, are to be understood in this way. But the words of Cyril, that while under the water the man 'sees nothing as in the night', would in this case be a rather violent hyperbole.

10. About the end of the fourth or beginning of the fifth century we have Chrysostom—*in Ep. i ad Cor. Hom. xl* (vol. x p. 379 C, Paris 1738)—*τὸ γὰρ βαπτίζεσθαι καὶ καταδύεσθαι εἶτα ἀνανεύειν τῆς εἰς ᾅδου καταβάσεώς ἐστι σύμβολον καὶ τῆς ἐκεῖθεν ἀνόδου*. Here again the words are most easily understood of immersion.

11. About the same period Jerome *adv. Luciferianos* (vol. ii p. 180, Venice 1767) says 'Nam et multa alia, quae per traditionem in Ecclesiis observantur, velut in lavacro ter caput mergitare'. The words are put into the mouth of the Luciferian, but as a statement of undisputed fact.

12. Later we have Theodoret, who speaks of those who are baptized by Arians as *βαπτιζόμενοι μᾶλλον δὲ βυθιζόμενοι* (Schultze, vol. i part 2, p. 985).

Again *Haer. Fab.* iv 35 (Schultze, vol. iv part 1, p. 356), he gives a curious description of Baptism as practised by the Eunomians. They

violate τὸν ἀνέκαθεν παρὰ τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων παραδοθέντα θεσμόν. They immerse (καταδύειν, βαπτίζειν) only once 'into the death of Christ'. 'They baptize and wet with the water only as far as the breast, and forbid the water to be applied to the other parts as unclean. For this reason, when they baptized in a font (πύελος), they made the man stand outside it, and plunged his head as far as the breast once into the water.' Another of their methods was to swathe the body from the feet to the breast in a consecrated bandage (ταινία), and then pour water (προσφέρουσι τοῦ ὕδατος τὴν κατάχυσιν) on the head and shoulders. We may gather from this that, in the belief of Theodoret, the θεσμός of Baptism required that there should be three applications of the water, that the man should not stand outside the font, that the water should lave the whole body. But further Theodoret appears to have in his mind not perfusion but immersion as the right form. Certainly βυθίζειν is a strong word.

13. Add Zeno Veron. (Galland, v 148) 'Vos constanter immergite . . . Balneator praecinctus . . . Nudi demergimini . . . Superfluentis amnis undae subiecti.'

The conclusions which I draw are—(1) That down to the time of Cyprian Baptism was administered by immersion, except in the case of sick people. (2) That Baptism, not by mere sprinkling but by a very copious affusion of water, came into use, at any rate in certain churches, in the fourth century. (3) That, even in this case, the candidate went into the water, and stood there during the administration of the rite. (4) That immersion continued to be the general use.

Now let us turn to the *Didache*. In chapter vii 1 it is directed that Baptism shall be administered as a rule by three immersions 'in living water'. Harnack is right, I think, in holding that by living water is meant running water. In the next section we read—'But if thou hast not living water, baptize in other water, and, if thou canst not in cold, then in warm.' Living water was not essential, see Tertullian *de Bapt.* 4 'Nulla distinctio est, mari quis an in stagno, flumine an in fonte, lacu an alveo diluatur'. But the feeling that the water ought, if possible, to be in movement was very strong. See *Canons of Hippolytus* (Achelis) p. 94 'consistant prope fluctuantem aquam maris puram paratam sacram'. Even when a font was used it was so managed that the water flowed in and out. See the Egyptian Church Order (*ibidem*). But it is noticeable that the compiler of the *Didache* introduces a new point of casuistry. In the case of invalids warm water might be used. In the third section he goes a step further. Ἐὰν δὲ ἀμφότερα μὴ ἔχῃς, ἔκχεον εἰς τὴν κεφαλὴν τρὶς ὕδωρ. 'If thou have neither hot nor cold water in sufficient quantity (I suppose that this is what he means), then it will suffice to pour water three times upon the head.' The rule may be

relaxed simply on the ground that no sufficient supply of water for the more regular mode of administration is at hand, whether the candidate is sick or whole. Bryennius thought that the compiler must have meant to restrict this indulgence to extreme cases, ἐὰν ἀνάγκη ἐπιστῇ τοῦ βαπτίσματος. But Schaff and Harnack do not find this proviso in the text, and indeed it is not there.

'Here', says Harnack, 'we have the oldest testimony for the lawfulness of Baptism by aspersion; it is especially important to notice that the author betrays not the slightest doubt as to its validity.' It is true that he has no doubt upon the point, and it is also true that in this he takes a very wise and liberal view. But in the middle of the third century Magnus and many others would have doubted whether a person baptized in this way, even under stress of necessity, was *legitimus christianus*, and even Cyprian and Cornelius, and probably Tertullian also, would hardly have said that the difference between immersion (or, if the reader chooses, such a perfusion as Gregory of Nyssa describes) and the pouring of a small quantity of water on the head of a sick person lying on a bed, or of a whole person standing on the ground, made 'nulla distinctio'.

To us moderns the teaching of the *Didache* on this point seems quite unobjectionable. But this is not the impression which it would have produced in the ante-Nicene church. It struck the editor of the *Constitutiones apostolicae* as novel and risky; hence, when he came, probably after no great lapse of time, to work over this passage of the *Didache*, he refused to consider the possibility of an insufficient supply of water. 'First,' he says, 'thou shalt anoint with holy oil, then thou shalt baptize with water, and lastly thou shalt seal with ointment... But if there be neither oil nor ointment, the water is sufficient' (*Const. Apost.* vii 22).

II.

On certain points in the First Chapter.

The *Didache* is of course a compilation, like the *Apostolical Church Order*, the *Canons of Hippolytus*, the *Egyptian Church Order*, the *Didascalia*, the *Apostolical Constitutions*, the *Testamentum Domini*. All such collections contain materials of very different dates, some of great antiquity. In this they all resemble our own Book of Common Prayer. The date at which the collection was made is fixed not by the earliest material but by the latest. Thus the date of any edition of our Common Prayer is ascertained not by the *Gloria in Excelsis*, but by the name of the sovereign.

One comparatively modern feature of the *Didache* is Baptism by Affusion. Others may be detected in the first chapter. I may be pardoned for writing out at some length familiar passages upon which the argument turns.

Hermas, Ἐντολὴ Β΄: Ἐργάζου τὸ ἀγαθόν, καὶ ἐκ τῶν κόπων σου, ὧν ὁ Θεὸς δίδωσίν σοι, πᾶσιν ὑστερουμένοις δίδου ἁπλῶς, μὴ διστάζων τίνι δῷς ἢ τίνι μὴ δῷς. πᾶσιν δίδου· πᾶσιν γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς δίδοσθαι θέλει ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων δωρημάτων. οἱ οὖν λαμβάνοντες ἀποδώσουσιν λόγον τῷ Θεῷ διατί ἔλαβον καὶ εἰς τί· οἱ μὲν γὰρ λαμβάνοντες θλιβόμενοι οὐ δικασθήσονται, οἱ δὲ ἐν ὑποκρίσει λαμβάνοντες τίσουσιν δίκην. ὁ οὖν διδοὺς ἀθῷός ἐστιν· ὡς γὰρ ἔλαβεν παρὰ τοῦ κυρίου τὴν διακονίαν τελέσαι ἁπλῶς αὐτὴν ἐτέλεσεν, μηθὲν διακρίνων τίνι δῷ ἢ μὴ δῷ. ἐγένετο οὖν ἡ διακονία αὕτη ἁπλῶς τελεσθεῖσα ἔνδοξος παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ. ὁ οὖν οὕτως ἁπλῶς διακονῶν τῷ Θεῷ ζήσεται. φύλασσε οὖν τὴν ἐντολὴν ταύτην, ὡς σοι λελάληκα.

The reader will observe here (1) that there are no Biblical quotations, (2) that the *ἐντολή* is the Mandate of the Angel of Repentance, (3) that great stress is laid upon the repeated word *ἁπλῶς*. Almsgiving is an absolute duty; the giver is to ask no questions, the responsibility lies entirely upon the recipient.

Didascalia (*Verona Fragments*, Hauler, no. xxxvii p. 53): 'Vae autem his qui habent et cum dolo accipiunt aut qui possunt sibi iuuare et accipiunt. Unusquisque uero de accipientibus dabit rationem domino Deo in die iudicii, quare acceperit. Si enim in orfanitate constitutus est aut in paupertate aut per senectutis defectionem aut propter aegritudinis infirmitatem aut propter filiorum, quia multi sunt, nutrimenta accipit, qui talis, inquit, est et laudabitur: altar is enim Dei deputatus est et honorabitur, quoniam sine dubitatione pro his qui dant illi frequenter orat. . . . Qui habent autem et in hypocrisi accipiunt, aut iterum cum sint pigri et cum debeant operari et iuuare sibi et aliis, ipsi accipientes praestabunt rationem. . . . Qui ergo dat simpliciter omnibus, bene dat, sicut est illi, et est innocens. Qui autem propter tribulationem accipit, se pascet scitus et bene accipit et a Deo in uita aeterna constitutus glorificabitur.'

Compare Mrs Gibson's translation of the Syriac text, p. 80.

Probably it will not be disputed that the author of the *Didascalia* is here amplifying what Hermas had said. It will be observed that he has both the *ἁπλῶς* (*simpliciter*) and the *ἀθῷος* (*innocens*) of Hermas, not to dwell upon other points. The new features which he introduces are (1) the *Woe*, (2) the Day of Judgement, (3) the Widows and Orphans, (4) who are the Altar of God (Heb. xiii 10; Polycarp. *Phil.* 4; Tert. *ad Ux.* i 7), (5) the recipient will pray for the giver. I do not understand qui talis, *inquit*, est et laudabitur. The word *inquit* is not found in the Syriac, nor in the *Constitutiones Apostolicae* (iv 3), where the

Didascalia is very closely reproduced. But it will be observed that the *Didascalia* still holds that Almsgiving is an absolute duty.

The *Constitutiones Apostolicae* again expands the *Didascalia*. The most important change is to be found in the beginning of the parallel passage (iv 3), *ἐπεὶ καὶ ὁ κύριος μακάριον εἶπεν εἶναι τὸν διδόντα ἤπερ τὸν λαμβάνοντα. καὶ γὰρ εἴρηται πάλιν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ Οὐαὶ τοῖς ἔχουσιν καὶ ἐν ὑποκρίσει λαμβάνουσιν ἢ δυναμένοις βοηθεῖν ἑαυτοῖς καὶ λαμβάνειν παρ' ἑτέρων βουλομένοις· ἑκάτερος γὰρ ἀποδώσει λόγον κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως.* Here we have first a quotation from Acts xx 35, and then the compiler goes on to quote the *Didascalia* verbally as scripture. But still Almsgiving is enforced without restriction.

But where did the *Woe* and the prayers of the recipient come from? From Clement of Alexandria. See the Fragment (Dindorf vol. iii p. 492; Zahn *Forschungen* iii pp. 49, 50; Resch *Agrapha* p. 99). We have two quotations of the same passage of Clement, one in Anastasius (this is given only by Zahn) and another in the Catena of Nicetas on Matt. v 42. Let us take the latter first. *Ποιητέον ἐλεημοσύνας, ἀλλὰ μετὰ κρίσεως καὶ τοῖς ἀξίοις, ἵνα εὕρωμεν ἀνταπόδομα παρὰ τοῦ ὑψίστου. οὐαὶ δὲ τοῖς ἔχουσι καὶ ἐν ὑποκρίσει λαμβάνουσιν ἢ δυναμένοις βοηθεῖν ἑαυτοῖς καὶ λαμβάνειν παρ' ἑτέρων βουλομένοις. ὁ γὰρ ἔχων καὶ δι' ὑπόκρισιν ἢ ἀργίαν λαμβάνων κατακριθήσεται.*

In Anastasius *Quaest.* 14 the passage runs thus: *Ἐλεημοσύνας δεῖ ποιεῖν ὁ λόγος* (Matt. v 42) *φησί, ἀλλὰ μετὰ κρίσεως καὶ τοῖς ἀξίοις. ὥσπερ γὰρ ὁ γεωργὸς σπείρει οὐκ εἰς ἁπλῶς γῆν ἀλλ' εἰς τὴν ἀγαθήν, ἵ' αὐτῷ καρποφορήσῃ, οὕτω δεῖ σπείρειν τὴν εὐποιίαν εἰς εὐλαβεῖς καὶ πνευματικούς, ἵνα τῆς ἀπ' αὐτῶν εὐκαρπίας διὰ τῶν εὐχῶν ἐπιτύχῃς. γέγραπται γάρ· εὐποίησον εὐσεβεῖς καὶ εὑρήσεις ἀνταπόδομα, καὶ εἰ μὴ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ παρὰ τῷ ὑψίστῳ* (Sir. xii 2). Nicetas appears to have omitted several clauses and to have carried on the quotation a little farther. In Clement, then, we find for the first time the prayers of the recipient (this is his reason for giving only to people whose prayers are likely to be heard), and the phrase *Οὐαὶ δὲ τοῖς ἔχουσι καὶ ἐν ὑποκρίσει λαμβάνουσι*, which, having been borrowed from him by the *Didascalia*, is quoted from that book as scripture by the *Constitutiones Apostolicae*. Clement no doubt was thinking of Hermas, an author with whom he was familiar, though the only phrase which he has borrowed is *ἐν ὑποκρίσει λαμβάνειν*.

Resch (*Agrapha* p. 146) thought that the editor of the *Constitutiones* in this place (iv 3) made use of three sources, the *Didache*, the *Didascalia*, and an extra-canonical gospel. For the admission of the last-named source he gives two reasons: (1) that the *Woe* is given in the *Constitutiones* in fuller form than in the *Didascalia* (this, however, is an error due to the fact that Resch did not employ the full text of the latter document); (2) that in the *Constitutiones* the *Woe* is introduced

by the words καὶ γὰρ εἴρηται πάλιν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ (that is to say, by the Lord). Except for this fact there is no reason for thinking that the editor of the *Constitutiones* had here in his mind more than one book, and that one the *Didascalia*. The εἴρηται is probably nothing more than a hasty inference, suggested by a loose recollection of the Woes in St Luke's Gospel. How easily such a slip might occur will appear from the insertion of the *inquit* in the text of the *Verona Fragments*.

We may now pass on to the *Didache* (i 5, 6): Παντὶ τῷ αἰτοῦντί σε δίδου, καὶ μὴ ἀπαίτει· πᾶσι γὰρ θέλει δίδοσθαι ὁ πατὴρ ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων χαρισμάτων. Μακάριος ὁ διδοὺς κατὰ τὴν ἐντολήν· ἀθῷος γάρ ἐστιν· οὐαὶ τῷ λαμβάνοντι· εἰ μὲν γὰρ χρείαν ἔχων λαμβάνει τις, ἀθῷος ἔσται· ὁ δὲ μὴ χρείαν ἔχων δώσει δίκην, ἵνατί ἔλαβε καὶ εἰς τί, ἐν συνοχῇ δὲ γενόμενος ἐξετασθήσεται περὶ ὧν ἔπραξε, καὶ οὐκ ἐξελεύσεται ἐκεῖθεν μέχρις οὗ ἀποδῷ τὸν ἔσχατον κοδράντην. Ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τούτου δὲ εἴρηται· ἱδρωσάτω ἡ ἐλεημοσύνη σου εἰς τὰς χεῖρας σου, μέχρις ἂν γνῷς τίνι δῷς.

In this last sentence the emendation of Bryennius (ἱδρωσάτω for ἱδρωτάτω) has been confirmed by a passage of Cassiodorus, to which Professor Loofs first directed attention. It will be found in the *Expositio in Psal. xl* and runs thus: 'Omni petenti te tribue. Scriptum est etiam Desudet eleemosyna in manu tua donec inuenias iustum cui eam tradas. Sed si omnes iustos quaerimus, imperatam constringimus largitatem. . . . Sufficit nobis ut nos dare aliquid malis artibus nesciamus. . . . Qui sic dederit, etsi iustis non det, iuste tamen omnibus erogabit.' Resch is probably right in thinking (*Agrapha* p. 288) that the way in which Cassiodorus insists upon the word *iustum* shews that he is quoting not from the *Didache*, but from some common source. This however is immaterial; in the *Didache* itself the precept is given as a quotation, and the book from which it is drawn can hardly be of the first antiquity, for it contains a criticism and a limitation of our Lord's command, which had not occurred to 2 Clement (see chap. 16).

We have then in this passage of the *Didache* (1) a quotation from St Luke (vi 30), (2) close verbal resemblances to Hermas, including in particular the uncommon word ἀθῷος, which in the *Didache* is doubled, (3) the *Woe* (Clem. Alex., *Didascalia*, *Const. App.*) in a shortened form, (4) a quotation from St Matthew (v 26), (5) a quotation probably from some extra-canonical Gospel of latish date.

Three of these phrases are manifestly quotations, and the last can hardly be older than the second century. The *Woe* may be older than Clement, but there is no good reason for thinking that it is; and as to Hermas, it is only necessary to point out that his simple πᾶσιν δίδου is in the *Didache* changed into a definite quotation from the Gospel. But it may also be suspected that the κατὰ τὴν ἐντολήν, which in the

Didache is made to refer to Luke vi 30, was suggested by the φύλασσε τὴν ἐντολὴν ταύτην of Hermas.

It is worth adding that the curious variation on Luke vi 27, which occurs in *Didache* i 3, ὑμεῖς δὲ ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς μισοῦντας ὑμᾶς καὶ οὐχ ἕξετε ἐχθρόν, is found also in the *Didascalia*; see Mrs Gibson's Translation p. 3; *Verona Fragments* p. 4 'diligite odientes uos et orate pro maledicentibus uos et inimicum nullum habebitis'. Here it might be supposed that the *Didascalia* is following the *Didache*. But just above, in the same verse, we have a very remarkable perversion of Scripture in the words νηστεύετε δὲ ὑπὲρ τῶν διωκόντων ὑμᾶς. For the explanation of this precept we must turn to chap. xxi of the *Didascalia*; see especially the words 'Therefore know, brethren, that our fast which we keep in the Passover because our brethren have not obeyed, ye shall keep even if they hate you', but the whole of this chapter underlies the audacious change which the *Didache* has made in the Sermon on the Mount. The Wednesday and Friday fasts, and the fast of Holy Week are all to be kept on behalf of the Jews. This is not to be regarded as a mark of sympathy with the Jews. The author of the *Didache* has a strong dislike of the Jews whom he calls 'hypocrites'; see viii 'Let not your fasts be with the hypocrites, for they fast on the second day of the week and on the fifth'. He condemns Quartodecimanism, and for a parallel to his language we must turn to the words of the Emperor Constantine (Socrates i 9) 'Let there be nothing in common between you and the most hateful mob of the Jews'. Such things were not said in the first century (not even by Barnabas), nor even in the second. Even the *Didascalia* (see Mrs Gibson's Translation p. 96) is not as fierce as the *Didache*; it speaks of the Jews as 'brethren', and adds 'It is required of us therefore to have pity upon them, and to believe, and to fast and pray for them'. Here, again, it might be replied that the *Didascalia* is expanding the hint given in the *Didache*. But the opposite presumption is exceedingly strong, and in any case the corruption of the text of the Sermon on the Mount cannot be earlier than the insertion of νηστεύειν in Matt. xvii 21, Mark ix 29, Acts x 30. It is surely later; otherwise it would have left some traces in the Apparatus Criticus.

Attention may here be directed to another point. In *Didache* 9 the Eucharistic Cup is called 'the Holy Vine of David'. It is an expression which causes some surprise, for there is reason for thinking that the compiler agreed with Barnabas (xii 10, 11), Tatian (Theod. *Haer. Fab.* i 20), and the Monophysites (Theod. *Inconfusus*, Schultze vol. iv part 1 p. 96) in believing that our Lord was not the Son of David according to the flesh. At any rate he speaks of Him as 'God of David' (ch. 10; see Harnack's note). But commentators have asked why Vine

of David? because there is nothing in the Hebrew psalms from which such a phrase could easily be formed. The answer to this question is supplied by Origen (*in Lib. Iud.* Hom. vi 2, Lomm. xi 258) 'antequam verae vitis, quae ascendit de radice David, sanguine inebriemur'. Origen is clearly referring to the Greek psalm xxii (xxiii) 5 *τὸ ποτήριόν σου μεθύσκον ὡς κράτιστον.*

Clement has the same phrase (Q. D. S. 29), *οὗτος ὁ τὸν οἶνον τὸ αἷμα τῆς ἀμπέλου τῆς Δαβὶδ ἐκχέας ἡμῶν ἐπὶ τὰς τετρωμένας ψυχάς, ὁ τὸ ἐκ σπλάγχνων πατρὸς ἔλαιον προσενεγκὼν καὶ ἐπιδαψιλευόμενος.* Clement is here speaking of the Lord as the Physician and allegorizing the parable of the Good Samaritan. He may, of course, have seen the *Didache* prayer or one like it—the prayer is in all probability older than the *Didache* as a whole. But, on the other hand, the phrase may have been taken up from Clement into the prayer, and this seems to me the more probable view. We have seen that there is some substantial reason for thinking that the words 'Woe to him that receiveth' were borrowed by the *Didache* from Clement, and traces of Alexandrine influence upon the Liturgy (in the emphasis laid upon 'knowledge' and in the comparative neglect of the Atonement) may be found in *Didache* 9, 10, or in the *Sacramentary* of Sarapion of Thmuis (see de Faye *Clément d'Alexandrie* p. 252; F. E. Brightman, *J. T. S.* vol. i). But we greatly want a critical examination of the *Didache* in its liturgical relations.

C. BIGG.

STROPHICAL STRUCTURE IN ST JUDE'S EPISTLE.

IN 1896 Prof. David Henry Müller of Vienna published a book on the original structure of the Prophets[1], shewing how far poetical forms predominated in ancient Semitic literature, from the Cuneiform inscriptions down to the Suras of the Koran. A great many publications have appeared since, treating biblical books from the same point of view. Special mention must be made of the work of the Rev. F. K. Zenner, S.J.[2], who, independently of Prof. Müller's discovery, had noticed the same fundamental principle of *responsio* in the Book of Psalms. In England it was chiefly R. G. Moulton who, by his various writings[3], called attention to the literary aspect of the different books embodied in Holy Scripture.

[1] *Die Propheten in ihrer ursprünglichen Form* Wien (Hölder), 1896.

[2] *Die Chorgesänge im Buche der Psalmen* Freiburg (Herder), 1896.

[3] *The Literary Study of the Bible* London (Isbister), 1896, 2nd ed. 1899; and *A Short Introduction to the Literature of the Bible*, 1901.