

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for the *Journal of Theological Studies* (old series) can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[1st page of article]

The Journal of Theological Studies

APRIL, 1934

NOTES AND STUDIES

THE EPISTLE OF BARNABAS AND THE DIDACHE

Two years ago, that is at the beginning of 1932, the late Dr Armitage Robinson, Dean of Wells, projected a new and enlarged edition of his little book *Barnabas, Hermas, and the Didache*, which contained the Donnellan Lectures delivered by him before the University of Dublin in 1920 and was published the same year by the S.P.C.K. As I shared many of his views about the Didache, and had been in communication with him while the book was being written, it was agreed that I should collaborate, in a minor capacity, in the preparation of the new edition.

What animated Dr Robinson to undertake this work was a recent indication of some revival of interest in the problem of the Didache, and of a willingness to reconsider certain conclusions which had long been accepted as final. The first signal was given by Professor Muilenburg's dissertation on 'The literary relations of the Epistle of Barnabas and the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles' (Marburg, 1929). Then, in calling attention to Muilenburg's essay, Professor Burkitt (in the JOURNAL for October 1931) expressed the opinion that it 'proved what Dean Armitage Robinson had indicated and rendered extremely probable, viz. that the Didache depends on Barnabas, and that Barnabas is an original document, which there is little reason to suppose dependent upon any other writings than the Scripture itself'. It was Professor Burkitt's paper that prompted me in turn to write an article on 'The *Didache* in relation to the Epistle of Barnabas', in which attention was drawn to some curious evidence provided by the second part of the 'Two Ways' as it appears in the Epistle and the Didache, a section that hitherto had not received much attention. The article appeared in the JOURNAL for April 1932. I had sent it in manuscript to Dr Robinson shortly after Christmas, and on January 10 he wrote me his criticisms: it was, he said, so overweighted with argument at certain points that the facts were overlaid and lost their effect. The remedy suggested was a drastic pruning with some other alteration, which was duly carried out. He ended

on a less discouraging note, saying that the evidence pointed to in the paper was 'enough in itself to stake our whole case on', and he signed himself, as he had never done before, 'Your very sincere friend'. His interest in the criticism of the *Didache* seemed now to be thoroughly alive again, for within a few days he informed me of his determination to set about a new edition of his book, asked for my co-operation, and suggested the inclusion, in some appropriate form, of the article just mentioned, and of one or two others that I had written with a bearing on the problem of the *Didache*.

Unfortunately, the preparation of the new volume was doomed to be cut short after barely six months, and even during that time the results achieved were relatively small. Just before the undertaking was begun the Dean had had a severe attack of influenza, from which he never completely rallied, but remained in a weak condition that made regular and sustained work impossible. Yet his mind was as keen and alert as ever, and I think that the accession of this new interest was rather a help than a hindrance to his physical recovery, for by the end of July he seemed stronger and better. He then took a few weeks' holiday, after which he was busy for a time with other matters. Then suddenly came the beginning of his last illness, and his work was at an end. He died on 7th May, 1933, at Upton Noble, Somerset, in the beautiful old Manor House which he had acquired the year before as a place of retreat for periods of rest and change.¹

After the Dean's death, Mrs Armitage Robinson, in accordance with his understood wishes, placed in my hands all the papers connected with his work on the *Didache*, asking me to ascertain what there was that could be printed and to advise as to the form and place in which it might appear. It seems desirable, therefore, especially for the satisfaction of those who were aware of the projected new edition, that a brief account should be given of the principal papers at present entrusted to my keeping.

1. Two chapters of the original book, and no more, were fully revised and are left in a typewritten form that appears to be practically final, namely the first and third chapters—the one a study of the Epistle of Barnabas, the other a study of the first part of the *Didache*, or the 'Two Ways' as presented in that document. As to the rest of the book, the case stands thus.

2. There is in manuscript a short preface or 'Introductory', which is in good order and in which the Dean says: 'In 1920 I was invited by my friend the late Dr Bernard to give the Donnellan Lectures at Trinity

¹ Characteristically, he wished to know the story of this old house, and it was an investigation of its origin (which I think he traced back to the famous Robert Burnell, bishop of Wells, †1292) that had occupied him before his last illness.

College, Dublin. The Lectures were published, under the title *Barnabas, Hermas and the Didache*, in the same year and are now out of print. I owe it to the courtesy of the S.P.C.K. that I am able to reissue them in a revised form and with substantial additions.' This preface was written at an early stage of the revision, and was intended, I think, only as a provisional draft. Still, in my opinion it deserves to be printed.

3. The few and slight changes indicated in the margins of the second chapter of the book, that on 'The Shepherd of Hermas', make so little difference that a reprint of this chapter—it would hardly be more—would be justified only in case the whole volume were to be reissued with such corrections as are available. No doubt Dr Robinson intended to develop the chapter on Hermas, but he postponed its revision till he should have dealt with the Didache. However, the passage of Hermas (*Mandate* ii) which brings the 'Shepherd' into direct relation with the Didache is discussed at some length in treating of the latter document (in chapter iii).

4. The fourth chapter, called an 'Epilogue', sketched the history of the criticism of the Didache and shewed how the judgement of Bryennius, its first editor, and of Harnack in his edition of 1884—who both recognized borrowing from Barnabas and Hermas, and accordingly assigned the document to about 140-160 A.D.—came to be abandoned and earlier dates adopted. It dealt also with the external evidence for the 'Two Ways' according to the Didache, and its bearing on the authenticity of a manifestly Christian passage (i 3b-ii 1) which is commonly taken for a later interpolation on the ground of its absence from the Latin 'Two Ways' and some other authorities. This chapter has not been touched at all: in his working copy of his book Dr Robinson has written 'Enlarge on subsequent documents', while on a set of proofs used for preliminary corrections he wrote 'omit'. The chapter was intended to have been entirely recast, with emphasis laid on two important pieces of evidence which came to notice only after the book was written in 1920: I refer to the support given to the disputed passage by the Didascalia and the Oxyrhynchus fragments.¹

5. There remains the Appendix A. This is a simple reprint of an article which appeared in the JOURNAL for April 1912, entitled 'The

¹ The new treatment was to embody the substance of two papers which I had contributed to this Journal, January 1923 and January 1924, the one entitled 'The use of the *Didache* in the *Didascalia*', the other 'New fragments of the *Didache*'. The witnesses for the disputed passage are now five: the MS from which the Didache was published, the Didascalia (*saec.* 3), the Apostolic Constitutions (*c.* 375 A.D.), the Oxyrh. fragments (*c.* 400 A.D.) and a Georgian version quite recently brought to light by Dr Gregor Peradse (*Zeitschrift f. d. neuest. Wissenschaft* vol. xxxi pp. 111-116); so that the balance of evidence in its favour is more than redressed.

Problem of the Didache'; but a footnote warns the reader that 'the opening paragraphs are in fact contradicted' by what is now said in the Lectures. The allusion is to Dr Robinson's altered view in regard to the origin of the 'Two Ways': even so late as 1918 he could speak of this as 'a Jewish work'.¹ The portion of the Didache handled in this article is the second or ecclesiastical part of the document, cc. vii-xv, with which is included c. vi which forms the link between the 'Two Ways' and the rest. The article had for its object 'to attack the problem afresh through an investigation of the author's indebtedness to St Paul and St Luke' (Appendix A, p. 86): perhaps he might have added 'and St John', for the parallels brought from the Fourth Gospel are not easily set aside.

This Appendix has received a preliminary revision by means of marginal annotation and slips pasted on to some old proofs. But after going through it carefully I am more than doubtful whether Dr Robinson would have wished it to appear in print as it now stands. The changes introduced are designed chiefly to adapt it to its new setting as an integral part of the book, continuing chapter iii on the 'Two Ways' of the Didache; while the additions, beyond supplying translations where the text had been quoted in Greek, do not appear to add much that is of real weight.² The paper was written at the first with a minute care that left little room for addition, so far as its main object is concerned, which was to trace the Didachist's indebtedness to the New Testament. Should it be reissued, there would certainly be need of some editorial readjust-

¹ See *Essays on the Early History of the Church and the Ministry* (ed. Swete) p. 71. He continues there: 'The proof of this which was given by Dr C. Taylor is now generally accepted, and is a most important contribution to the history and interpretation of the book', sc. of the Didache. A year later his personal study of the question was to lead him to quite other conclusions.

² Two additional observations of special interest may be mentioned here. (1) On the omission of the word *βασιλεία* in the doxology to the Lord's Prayer Dr Robinson notes: 'The Sahidic version [of the Gospels] and *k* omit *βασιλεία*, as does the Didachist here: "Western" readings are frequent in Egyptian MSS; and to Egypt the Didache appears to belong'. (2) On the words of the prayer in c. ix 'Even as this fragment (*κλάσμα*), having been scattered upon the mountains and gathered together, became one; so let Thy church', &c., he remarks: 'That the *κλάσμα* should be scattered on the mountains is a surprising conception. It has been used by the critics to shew that the Didachist was acquainted not with Egypt but with the Transjordanic highlands'. He then refers to John xi. 52, which he had cited already, and continues: 'And behind both writers are the familiar passages of the O.T., "I saw all Israel scattered on the mountains (*διεσπαρμένους ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν*)" (1 Kings xxii 17): "My sheep were scattered on every mountain" (Ezek. xxxiv 6).' In the prayer, the words 'scattered upon the mountains' are a poetical conception based on reminiscences of Scripture and might have been written anywhere. Harnack, too, favoured Egypt.

ment. For instance, the discussion of the longer title of the Didache makes *double emploi* with the beginning of chapter iii; the treatment of c. vi of the Didache must be carried back to form the end of the same chapter iii;¹ and, *vice versa*, the last two pages of chapter iii, which deal with the concluding chapter of the Didache, should find their place at the end of what is at present Appendix A.

From what has now been said it seems to follow that the collection of these papers into a volume would hardly be feasible, if at all justified; for two only of the five have reached the form in which the author wished to present them, and of the rest two remain almost untouched. It seemed, therefore, that the best course was to secure, if possible, that the fully revised chapters (those on Barnabas and the first part of the Didache), and with them the short preface or 'Introductory', should be printed separately, and in some journal that would make them accessible abroad as well as in England. That conclusion reached, there could be no question but that the appropriate place for them was the JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES.

Something perhaps should be added as to a number of notes and detached papers left by Dr Robinson. These consist mainly of short extracts, often only a word or phrase, from the Apostolic Fathers and a few other early writers, jotted down on loose slips of paper for use if occasion should offer. Some of them have already been employed in the revision of chapters i and iii. As for the rest, it may be possible to give a selection from them later on; but most of them are so slight that it is unlikely they would ever have been put to further use.

I cannot close this formal statement without a personal word. I came to know Dr Armitage Robinson—though very slightly, as was natural—when I was an undergraduate at Cambridge and he a Professor of Divinity; and I confess that then I was in considerable awe of him, both as an impressive personage in himself and as one of the greater luminaries of the University, far removed from the sphere of my ignorance. This personal awe subsided when some years later I was brought into closer touch with him through becoming a contributor to 'Texts and Studies'; but it was then succeeded by a veritable terror of his editorial pen. His comments on manuscript or proofs, as I dare say others can testify, were not as a rule calculated to foster self-esteem in a young author; but they were very salutary to those who were able to digest them. They were often severe, sometimes withering, but they were never unjust or uncalled for, and their value could soon be appreciated. The fear was, how far a book or paper would have to be rewritten, and what the press would think of a set of proofs when he had done with them. It was

¹ The revised form of ch. iii evidently presupposes this.

when he passed from the Deanery of Westminster to that of Wells, and we thus became neighbours, that I began to know him as he truly was : a man of great simplicity and kindness behind a manner which I had once imagined to be a pose, but which I came to realize was a natural part of himself and largely unconscious. Let me say in short that in him I found a true and generous friend, one who was ready to do much for his friends, and to whom I owe very much. And he had other friends at Downside : especially Abbot Butler, who knew him most intimately and has dedicated some pages to his memory in the *Downside Review* for July 1933 ; and then again Dom Ethelbert Horne, who shared his antiquarian interests, and who had taken photographs for him of every detail of the ancient glass in Wells Cathedral, thus supplying the illustrations to his monumental paper on 'The Fourteenth-century Glass at Wells', and to another article on 'The Great West Window at Wells'.¹

R. H. CONNOLLY.

INTRODUCTORY

THE Didache, or Teaching of the Apostles, has been before the world just fifty years. It was published at the end of the year 1883 by its discoverer Bryennius the Metropolitan of Nicomedia, who shewed in his learned Greek commentary that the new book had many points of contact with Christian documents already known. Dr Harnack with amazing rapidity issued his great edition in 1884, and appended to it an elaborate discussion of the origins of the Christian Ministry, basing on the new document a theory of the early constitution of the Church which he afterwards but little modified, and which in its main features has found a wide acceptance.

The earliest editors of the Didache recognized at once that its writer had made considerable use of the so-called Epistle of Barnabas and also of the 'Shepherd' of Hermas, and drew the conclusion that for this reason his work could not be placed earlier than c. 140-160. But the question of date was obscured by a theory propounded in 1886 by Dr C. Taylor, the Master of St John's College, Cambridge, who was impressed by the rabbinic cast of much of the Didache, and accordingly suggested that the first part of it was derived almost entirely from a Jewish Manual of instructions for proselytes, called from its opening words 'The Two Ways'. This manual had been embodied with various modifications in the Epistle of Barnabas and in the Didache. The references to the Sermon on the Mount and to the Shepherd of Hermas were disposed of

¹ The first of these papers appeared in *Archaeologia* vol. lxxx1 1931, the other in the *Journal of the British Society of Master Glass-Painters* for the same year.

by the assumption that the section of the Didache in which they occurred was a Christian interpolation, introduced to make the manual more suitable for the instruction of candidates for Holy Baptism. As the interpolation might have been made, not by the author of the Didache himself, but by a later reviser of it, both Barnabas and Hermas could be left out of account in fixing the date of the book in its uninterpolated form. Some critics were therefore courageous enough to assign it to the first century, though Dr Harnack who accepted the new theory still refused to go back behind the time of Hadrian.

In 1920 I was invited by my friend the late Dr Bernard to give the Donnellan Lectures at Trinity College, Dublin. The Lectures were published, under the title *Barnabas, Hermas and the Didache*, in the same year and are now out of print. I owe it to the courtesy of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge that I am able to reissue them in a revised form and with substantial additions. It was not easy to present in a brief course of Lectures an argument which needed for its full appreciation a constant reference to the original Greek. The larger scale of the present edition allows me to some extent to obviate this disadvantage, while still appealing to the wide circle of serious students who without a specialized training are ready to follow with eager interest the results of historical criticism in regard to the earliest institutions of the Christian Church.

The ultimate aim of the Lectures was to reach a point of view from which the literary character and the historical value of the Didache could be justly estimated. This remarkable addition to our scanty store of post-apostolic literature has been welcomed from the first moment of its appearance as an authoritative document of primary importance for the history of the primitive Church. In an age when the authenticity of every early Christian document has in turn been called in question, the Didache has gone its way unmolested. It has been, to use Dr Bigg's phrase, 'the spoiled child of criticism'. Its very title, which purports to describe the author's aim, has been strangely overlooked; its indebtedness to the phraseology of New Testament writers has been minimized or explained away; and the clue offered at the outset by the exact verbal parallels which link it with two of the most considerable documents of the period has not been followed up.

What has now been said will explain the prominence here given to the Epistle attributed in ancient times to the Apostle Barnabas, and to the moral romance called the Shepherd, composed as it was said by that Hermas to whom St Paul sends a greeting in his Epistle to the Romans. Our study of the Epistle of Barnabas goes to shew that its closing chapters which treat of the Two Ways are wholly in character with the rest of the book, and are undoubtedly the original composition of this

rabbinically minded author.¹ The study of the Shepherd makes it equally clear that Hermas knew the allegory of the Two Ways in the form in which it is found in the Epistle of Barnabas. The Didache in its opening section offers us the Two Ways of Barnabas with an improved arrangement of its precepts and with modifications introduced from the Shepherd of Hermas as well as from the Sermon on the Mount.

For those who accept these preliminary conclusions the theory of a Jewish manual disappears altogether, and the ground is cleared for a new consideration of the whole problem. Twenty years ago I suggested, in an article in the *Journal of Theological Studies* (Apr. 1912), that the aim of the writer of the Didache was to be gathered from the title which he himself prefixed to his work: 'The Teaching of the Lord, through the Twelve Apostles, to the Gentiles.' In other words, he was endeavouring to present a picture of the way in which the Gentile Churches were ordered by their Apostolic founders, and he sought to confine himself, so far as he could, to such precepts and regulations as could be authenticated, directly or indirectly, by writings of the Apostolic age. The substance of that article is reproduced here in an enlarged and amended form: for I am now more than ever convinced that the writer of the Didache was trying to represent the moral instruction and the ecclesiastical ordinances which the Apostles might reasonably be supposed to have sanctioned for their Gentile converts; and that accordingly we may not assume that the whole of the picture which he has drawn corresponds to the actual conditions of his own time, whatever that time may have been. Much remains to be done before the problem of the Didache finds an agreed solution. I can but express the hope that what is here said will help to clear away some serious misconceptions, and to open a new path for the criticism and interpretation of a document the discovery of which has had an extraordinary influence upon the modern presentation of early Christian institutions. [J. A. R.]

IMMEDIATE SOURCES OF THE DIDACHE.²

I.

The Epistle of Barnabas.

THE contrast in spiritual power and in literary merit between the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Epistle which has come down to us under the name of Barnabas has quite justly thrown the latter work into

¹ The same result has been reached by Dr James Muilenburg in a dissertation entitled *The Literary Relations of the Epistle of Barnabas and the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* (Marburg 1929).

² A revision and amplification of the first chapter of the book *Barnabas, Hermas and the Didache*. Footnotes in square brackets and initialled 'R. H. C.' are by Dom Connolly.

the shade. Yet the same problem, though under different aspects, was before each of these writers. The Gentiles, through the teaching and labours of St Paul, had claimed and secured equal privilege with the Jews in the Christian Society. It was becoming evident that the future of Christianity was mainly with the Gentiles, and that the Jews, as a people, had finally refused to admit that in this joint inheritance lay the fulfilment of the Promise to the Fathers. Even after the Temple had fallen Judaism as a religion persisted, devoting itself to an observance of such parts of the Mosaic Law as were not interfered with by the loss of the unique centre of sacrifice, and upholding a morality far superior to that of the surrounding heathenism ; claiming, moreover, to be the only true exponent of the doctrine of the One God, and to possess sacred books inspired by divine wisdom.

Christianity could not forget its Jewish origin. The Law and the Prophets had been treated as divine utterances by Christ and His Apostles. The ceremonial obligations of Judaism had indeed been relaxed for Gentile converts ; but it might still be urged that some of the ancient ordinances, if not obligatory, were yet of value to all Christian believers, if only as the symbols and precepts of a higher standard of sanctity. In the period of reflexion which necessarily succeeded to the first enthusiasm of the Gospel message, grave questions arose. Was God's old Covenant a reality, or had the Jews been under a delusion all through their history? If it was a reality, and if it had never been formally set aside by any direct words of Christ, how did Christians stand in regard to it? How could the Old Testament be accepted by them as their Bible, and at the same time practically rejected by their refusal to obey its precepts? What if a grave and pious Judaism, with its treasures of holy memory and its careful rules of conduct, were perhaps after all a nobler and a more sustaining creed than the Christianity which, since it had broken away from its original stock, was already shewing signs of decay and failing to hold the baptized to the high ideals of their regeneration?

The problem was to have very various answers during the coming years. One, quite decisive in its clearness, was given by Marcion, who maintained that the Old Testament religion was false from beginning to end. The world had been created by a Being who, though divine, was less than the Highest. The Demiurge, or Creator—the Just God of the Old Testament—had deceived the Jews until the Good God of the New Testament had sent forth His Son to bring them out of their darkness. Therefore the Old Testament must be discarded altogether, and of the New Testament only St Paul's Epistles and the Pauline Gospel of St Luke—and these only after some severe amputations—could be accepted as the authentic scriptures of the Christian Church.

That such an answer could have been suggested at all shews how real the difficulty was, and how persistently it troubled Christian minds. But in the first century, and in the early years of the second, no one proposed so drastic a purge. For had not the Old Testament been treated with unflinching reverence by the Master Himself? Had He not in all His teaching constantly appealed to Moses and the prophets? Had He not even after His Passion and Resurrection led back His doubting disciples to 'Moses and all the prophets, and expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning Himself'? And how could a Christian of a later day meet his opponent, whether Jew or Gentile, if the argument from prophecy were no longer at his disposal?

The value of the Old Testament was too obvious to admit the suggestion that it could be abandoned. It must be explained, and at all costs retained. On the other hand it was vital to the Christian Church that its superiority to Judaism, both as a system of thought and as a way of life, should be placed beyond doubt. Two anonymous writings of this earlier period have survived to shew us in what different ways the problem was attacked. The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews addressed himself to Jewish readers, who had accepted Christianity, but under the pressure of some great crisis were looking wistfully back to the religion of their fathers. With passionate earnestness he warned them against apostasy. And he brought a great message of hope. He made them see that the Christ was more than they had ever supposed, even in the enthusiasm of their first acceptance of Him. He was the Fulfiller of the past—that sacred past in which fragments of the eternal truth had been enshrined in temporary ordinances, whose only abrogation lay in their complete fulfilment. One great thought he was inspired to give them—the Eternal Highpriesthood of Christ. Here was the justification of the sacrificial system, and at the same moment its perpetual abrogation. The sacred past was theirs because it was taken up and fulfilled: to honour the record of it was a part of their loyalty to its Fulfiller. The Old Testament thus remained among the essential title-deeds of the Christian Church: its holy precepts and its inspiring examples, freed from the ceremonial limitations of their first appearance, would for ever be the guides of Christian life and devotion.

Strange to say, this great Epistle had for a long time but a narrow circulation and a restricted influence. Clement of Rome at the end of the first century knew it and made some use of its language, but failed to reach the height of its thought. Apart from this we hear little of it. At the end of the second century it still lingered on the outskirts of the Canon. The uncertainty of its authorship weighed against its internal merit: and not till the fourth century was its claim universally admitted.

Curiously different was the fate of the Epistle to which the name of

Barnabas came to be attached. It was not an epistle to Hebrews, but essentially an epistle to Gentiles. It was the offspring of a warm heart, but of a narrow mind, stored with Jewish traditions. Its writer was vigorous indeed in his rejection of Judaism, but yet wholly unappreciative of those loftier issues of Christianity which form the great argument of the writer to the Hebrews. Yet it made its appeal with a success of which the author could hardly have dreamed. We find it used by Hermas in the Shepherd, probably by Justin Martyr, certainly by Irenaeus, and then frequently by Clement of Alexandria, who definitely assigns it to Barnabas, the apostle and the companion of St Paul.¹ Like the Epistle to the Hebrews this Epistle also lingered for a while on the outskirts of the Canon. In the great Sinaitic Codex of the fourth century it stands with the Shepherd of Hermas at the close of the New Testament. But after this its glory fades, and indeed it narrowly escaped complete destruction. When Archbishop Ussher was preparing what would have been the *editio princeps*, had not a fire at Oxford consumed the University Press and all but a few sheets of his work, he had but scanty materials for constructing his text. All that could be found was an ancient Latin translation and a Greek manuscript imperfect at the beginning. This manuscript was descended from a copy which had lost certain leaves, in such a way that what remained of the Epistle of Barnabas was joined up with a portion of the Epistle of Polycarp, as though it were the conclusion of this latter work. The Sinaitic Codex remained unknown until the middle of the nineteenth century, and it was not until many years later that another copy of the Epistle in Greek was found by Bryennius in the codex from which he gave us the *Didache* or Teaching of the Apostles.

It was plain then that Barnabas—for so we must for convenience call the writer, though he nowhere reveals his name—made an appeal, such as the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews had failed to make, to the general mind of the early Church. This in itself entitles him to a respectful hearing. Let us take him for what he claims to be, a simple man, ‘no teacher’, ‘one of yourselves’; with a firm belief in the Incarnation and the Resurrection, and a conviction that the sufferings of Christ were foretold by the prophets, even to the details of His death upon the Cross; with a sense, moreover, that the days are so evil that the final judgement cannot long be delayed: let us read him with sympathy, as one who, with however imperfect a mental equipment, approached a real difficulty in a spirit of sincerity and with an honest desire to be helpful; and we shall understand how it came about that, though his main thesis regarding the Jewish Covenant could not possibly be accepted, yet much

¹ Clem. Alex. *Strom.* II vi 31, xx 116.

of his argument and many of his illustrations passed into the common stock of Christian apologetic. Refined and elaborated by abler minds, they remained to dominate the interpretation of the Old Testament long after his book had been forgotten; and they have hardly yet been altogether superseded by that larger view of the truth which the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews still waits to bring home to the Church in days when the historical criticism of the ancient Scriptures has restated the old problem in a scarcely less disquieting form.

The date of the Epistle of Barnabas remains an open question. Bishop Lightfoot inclined to place it as early as A.D. 79, Dr Harnack as late as A.D. 130; but neither of them would speak with confidence. The tone of the work is such as makes one eager to place it early; yet we cannot be sure that the conditions which called it forth may not have existed in some part of the Church as late as the time of Hadrian.

(i 1) The warm heart of the man shews itself in his opening words: 'All hail, sons and daughters, in the name of the Lord who loved us. The ordinances of God are great and rich towards you.'¹ This phrase, 'the ordinances of God', repeats itself again and again. It is one of the two notes of the Epistle: the other is 'knowledge' (*gnosis*).² The divine purpose running through the past, and leading up to themselves in the present—that is what he means by the ordinances of God towards them. The deeper meaning of the past, which has only come to light through Christ—that is the *gnosis* which he has to offer them. He proceeds in words to this effect:

(i 4-ii 1) The wonder of your spiritual endowment made me feel, as I spoke in your midst, that the Lord travelled with me in the way of righteousness; and I am wholly constrained to love you more than my own soul. To minister to such spirits must bring me a reward. Therefore I am sending you somewhat, that with your faith you may have knowledge (*gnosis*) to the full. Our Master has made known to us through the prophets things past and things present, with a foretaste also of things to come. As we observe the working out of all the details just as He foretold them, we shall be enriched and uplifted in our devotion. I am no teacher, but just one of yourselves: yet I have a few things which may give you cheer at the present season. For the days indeed are evil; he that worketh (*ὁ ἐνεργῶν*) hath the power. Therefore must we the more search out the ordinances of the Lord.

Here we must pause to note the Pauline background of the writer's language. Again and again it is the Epistle to the Ephesians that supplies him with his phrases. We recall Eph. v 16, 'Redeeming the

¹ Where a citation is abbreviated or freely rendered, the marginal reference is given within brackets.

² We find the two brought together at the end of the Epistle (xxi 5): *γνώσιν τῶν δικαιομάτων αὐτοῦ*.

time, because *the days are evil*' ; and Eph. ii 2, 'the spirit that now *worketh* in the children of disobedience'. Barnabas is profoundly impressed by the superhuman working—the *ἐνέργεια*—of a personal power of evil. Twice he names him the Black One (iv 9, xx 1) ; elsewhere the Evil Ruler (iv 13), the Ruler of the present time of iniquity (xviii 2), and once at least the Evil One (ii 10) : moreover he speaks of an Evil Angel (ix 4), and of the Angels of Satan (xviii 2).

The helpers of our faith in this extremity, he continues, are fear and patience ; our allies are longsuffering and self-restraint. If we have these, then in joyful train come wisdom, understanding, learning, knowledge. So he comes again to *gnosis*. *Gnosis* is especially the true understanding of the prophets whom God fore-ordained as our teachers.

He begins with what the prophets say about sacrifice. Here he distinguishes between what God says to the Jewish people and what He says to us. To them He says that their sacrifices are vain, are even an abomination. To us He says : 'The sacrifice of God is a broken heart : a sweet-smelling savour to the Lord is a heart that glorifieth Him that formed it.' As to fasting the prophets have like words, spoken in turn to them and to us. Barnabas shews no bitterness against the Jews, but he is insistent in his warnings that *we* must not 'be made like unto *them*'. God has prepared for Himself 'a new people in His Beloved' : here again we have an echo of the Epistle to the Ephesians (i 6, ἐν τῷ ἡγαπημένῳ), the only place where the word 'Beloved' is so used in the New Testament. Then follows one of his many exhortations : 'Let us flee utterly from all the works of iniquity, lest the works of iniquity overtake us : let us hate the error of the time that now is, that we may be loved in that which is to come.' 'The final offence (τὸ τέλειον σκάνδαλον) is at hand. The Lord hath cut short the times and the days, that His Beloved may hasten and come to the inheritance.'

Then as to the Covenant :

Again I ask you as being one of yourselves, and in particular loving (you) all more than my own soul, to take heed now unto yourselves and not be made like unto some, by adding to your sins in saying that the Covenant is theirs and ours. Ours indeed it is ; but they lost their Covenant when Moses broke the Tables of the Law because of their apostasy. Their Covenant was broken to pieces, that the Covenant of Jesus the Beloved might be sealed in our hearts . . . I say it again, I am no teacher ; but I love you, I am your slave. The whole period of our faith will profit us nothing, unless now in the iniquitous time and in the offences that are to come we resist as becometh sons of God, that the Black One get no entrance. Let us flee from all vanity, let us hate utterly the works of the evil way. Go not in by yourselves nor abide alone, as though ye were already justified : but assemble together and take joint counsel for the common good.

iv 14 So his exhortation runs on, till he reminds them of the fall of Israel, after all the signs and wonders God had wrought for *them*, and adds the warning : ' Let *us* take heed lest haply *we* be found, as it is written, many called but few chosen.'

Hereupon follows a new topic, introduced with a strange abruptness, such as indeed is characteristic of the author's untrained style.

v 1 For to this end the Lord endured to give over the flesh to destruction, that by the remission of sins we might be purified, to wit by the blood of His sprinkling. For it hath been written concerning Him, partly regarding Israel, and partly regarding us, &c.

Here is the same contrast ; He suffered at their hands, but He suffered for our sake. There is no bitterness of reproach ; but these are facts, he tells us, and they were foretold long ago. How then, he seems to imply, can you look towards them after all ?

vi 5 But he has to answer a question such as we might suppose some Jew to have put to his readers : If Christ be the Lord of all the world, to whom God said at the creation, ' Let Us make man after Our image and likeness', how could He endure to suffer at the hands of men ?

It would take too long to follow his rambling discussion in answer to this question. Enough to say that he urges the following points : He suffered for our purification ; He suffered that the sin of Israel might be consummated : He must needs have come in flesh, or men could not have looked on Him and been saved, even as they cannot look on the sun in his strength : the good Lord shewed it us beforehand, that we might know it as a part of His purpose.

vi 8 f., 17 Some strange *gnosis* is introduced, which we can only note in passing. Thus ' the land ($\eta\ \gamma\eta$) flowing with milk and honey ' is the Lord's flesh : for ' man is earth suffering ' ($\gamma\eta\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\chi\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha$), and ' milk and honey ' are the food of the newborn children. More remarkable still is the exposition of the scape-goat, ' spat upon and pricked and cast out, crowned with scarlet', which shews that the writer had a knowledge of Jewish ritual beyond the injunctions of Leviticus. The influence of rabbinic lore comes out again when he plays with letters, numbers, and names. ix 8 f. For Abraham's household whom he circumcised consisted of eighteen and three hundred souls : but the Greek numerals for eighteen are *iota*, *eta* (I H), which stands for JESUS ; and three hundred is the letter *tau* (T), which signifies the Cross. He prizes this as his own discovery : ' No man hath ever learned from me a more genuine word ; but I know that ye are worthy.' We may smile at such a *gnosis* : but it is only fair to Barnabas that we should remember that dark verse of the Apocalypse (xiii 18) : ' Here is wisdom : let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast : for it is the number of a man.'

He next proceeds to explain the Mosaic ordinances concerning clean and unclean meats. 'It is not a commandment of God that literally x 2 they should not eat; but Moses spake it in spirit.' We must not follow him now into the moral distinctions between the greedy pig, the idle and rapacious vulture, and the quiet ruminating cow. But it is important to observe that here again Barnabas is not original in his method of interpretation. The like distinctions were drawn two centuries before Christ by an Alexandrine writer, who sought to commend the Mosaic legislation to the thoughtful Gentiles of his day.¹ But there is this difference between the Letter of Aristeas and the Epistle of Barnabas, that the former justifies the literal command as a constant reminder of the need of moral purity, while the latter utterly rejects the literal meaning as never having been intended by God.

Ye see how wise a lawgiver Moses was. But whence should *they* per- x 12 ceive and understand these things? Howbeit we, having justly perceived the commandments, declare them as the Lord hath willed. To this end He circumcised our ears and hearts, that *we* might understand these things.

Then at once he starts on yet a new topic. 'But let us inquire xi 1 whether the Lord took care to signify beforehand concerning the water and concerning the cross.' Barnabas finds these in several Scriptures, as in the first Psalm: 'the tree planted by the streams of water.' After this he gives us a quotation from an unknown source:

In like manner again He defineth concerning the cross in another xii 1 prophet, who saith: 'And when shall these things be accomplished? the Lord saith, when a tree shall be bended and rise up; and when blood shall drop from a tree.'

The second part of this saying is found in 4 Esdras v 5, among a number of portents which shall usher in the end (*et de ligno sanguis stillabit*): but there seems to be no proof that Barnabas knew that book. The first part (ὄραν ξύλον κλιθῆναι καὶ ἀναστῆναι), which perhaps should here be rendered 'When a tree shall lie down and rise up', has not been traced to its source. Nor is it found later, except among the *Testimonies against the Jews* ascribed to Gregory of Nyssa, where it is doubtless quoted from Barnabas.² But there is a passage of Irenaeus which seems

¹ The Letter of Aristeas was edited by H. St J. Thackeray in 1900 at the end of Swete's Introduction to the LXX: see esp. pp. 543, 547, where the high priest Eleazar at Jerusalem is represented as saying: Παντόθεν ἡμῶς περιέφραξεν ἀγνεύειαι καὶ διὰ βρωτῶν καὶ ποτῶν . . ., and there are striking coincidences of thought with Barnabas: as, e.g., when of ἡ γαλή it is said τεκνοποιεῖ δὲ στόματι. The whole of the passage in question is quoted by Hilgenfeld in his edition of Barnabas (Leips. 1877) pp. 99-105, from Schmidt's edn. in Merx's *Archiv für A. T.* i iii 39 ff.

² See Hilgenfeld, ed. 3, p. 109; cf. Zacagni *Collect. Monum. Vet.* p. 309.

capable of explanation only if we suppose that he has this saying in mind. He is speaking of the way in which 'the cup that has been mixed and the bread that has been made out of the natural elements of the earth become Eucharist and the Body of Christ'; and he says:

Iren. *adv.*
haer. v ii 3 Just as *the tree* of the vine, *having been bended* to the earth (τὸ ξύλον τῆς ἀμπέλου κλιθὲν εἰς τὴν γῆν), bore fruit in its own season, and the grain of wheat, having fallen into the earth and been dissolved, was raised manifold by the Spirit of God which holdeth together all things . . . so our bodies, fed by the Eucharist and laid in the earth, *shall rise up* in their own season.¹

Though he uses it in a different way, it is this saying which seems to be in his mind—'When a tree shall be bended and rise up.' It is not unlikely that he too knew it from Barnabas.

xii 2
Ex. xvii
8 ff. After this Barnabas goes on to the outstretching of the hands of Moses in the battle with Amalek, when he was instructed to make a type of the cross, and 'standing on higher ground than any he extended his hands (ἐξέτεινεν τὰς χεῖρας),' and Israel was victorious.² With this he compares the prophecy 'All day long did I stretch out my hands (ἐξέπετασα τὰς χεῖράς μου) to a disobedient people that did gainsay my righteous way' (Isa. lxx 2, cf. Rom. x 21). Then he justifies Moses for having made a serpent of brass contrary to his own express prohibition.

From this he passes to the naming of the son of Nun as Joshua or (in the Greek) Jesus:

xii 10 f. Behold again it is Jesus, not son of man but Son of God, and He was revealed in the flesh in a figure. Since therefore men were to say that Christ was son of David, David himself prophesies, fearing and perceiving the error of sinners: The Lord said unto my Lord . . . See how David calls him Lord, and does not call him son.

xiii f. He then goes on to shew that the Covenant is for *us* and not for *them*; and he repeats what he had said before of Moses breaking the Tables of the Law. After this he passes on to the Sabbath. The true meaning of this he finds by explaining the six days of Creation as signifying the six thousand years after which all things shall come to an end. Then shall we truly hallow the Sabbath when we have been justified and have received the promise. God's meaning is that He will make the eighth day the beginning of a new world. 'Wherefore also we keep the eighth day for rejoicing, in the which also Jesus rose from the dead, and having been manifested ascended into the heavens.'

xv 9 Finally, he comes to the Temple, lately destroyed but to be builded again 'by the very servants of their enemies'. An attempt has been

xvi 4

¹ It is interesting to compare Clem. Alex. *Protr.* xii (P. 86): ὦ θαύματος μυστικῶς κέκλιται μὲν ὁ κύριος, ἀνέστη δὲ ἄνθρωπος.

² Cf. John xxi 18 f., ἐκτενεῖς τὰς χεῖράς σου . . . σημαίνων ποίῳ θανάτῳ, κτλ.

made to fix a date for the Epistle by means of this passing phrase. But it is reasonably certain that Barnabas refers to the spiritual Temple, 'which is being gloriously builded in the name of the Lord'.

This is indeed a great passage, and it forms a worthy climax to the main argument of what we may call the controversial portion of his Epistle. It is less fanciful than most of his interpretations have been, and it rests on a more solid basis of New Testament conceptions. He has been claiming that the true significance of the sacred institutions of God's ancient people—Sacrifice, Fasting, the Covenant, the Promised Land, the Distinction of Meats, and the Sabbath—is not to be found in Judaism at all; it belongs exclusively to the Christian faith to which the Jewish prophets pointed. He now proceeds to make the same astonishing claim for the Temple itself. Our Lord had foretold its coming destruction, and had even hinted at its reconstruction in an incredibly short space of time. St Paul had boldly declared that the true Temple was to be found in human hearts: 'Know ye not that ye are God's temple and the Spirit of God is dwelling in you?'; and again, 'a holy temple in the Lord . . . a habitation of God in the Spirit'.

1 Cor. iii
16
Eph. ii 21 f.

Such thoughts are at the back of the writer's mind,¹ but the nature of his argument precludes him from appealing here to any but strictly Jewish testimonies. It is to the prophets as heretofore that he will go.

Yea more, I will speak to you also concerning the Temple, how that these miserable men in their error set their hope on the building—and not on their God that made them—as being the house of God. For almost as the heathen have they consecrated Him in the Temple. But how speaketh the Lord in abolishing the Temple? Learn ye. 'Who hath measured the heaven with a span, or the earth with his hand? Have not I? saith the Lord.' 'Heaven is My throne and earth the footstool of My feet: what manner of house will ye build for Me? or what shall be the place of My rest?' Ye perceive that their hope is vain. Furthermore, He saith again, 'Behold they that pulled down this temple themselves shall build it'. So it cometh about: for because they went to war it was pulled down by their enemies. Now also the very servants of their enemies shall build it up. Again, it was revealed how that the city and the Temple and the people of Israel should be delivered up. For the scripture saith, 'And it shall be in the last days that the Lord

xvi 1-16
Isa. xl 12
Isa. lxvi 1
cf. Isa.
xlix 17

cf. Enoch
lxxxix 56,

¹ Cf. iv 11, γενώμεθα πνευματικοί, γενώμεθα ναὸς τέλειος τῷ θεῷ, and vi 15 ναὸς γὰρ ἅγιος, ἀδελφοί μου, τῷ κυρίῳ, τὸ κατοικητήριον ἡμῶν τῆς καρδίας. The way in which Barnabas repeats the same ideas and phrases is well illustrated by his repetitions in xvi 7 and 10: πρὸ τοῦ ἡμᾶς πιστεῦσαι τῷ θεῷ ἦν ἡμῶν τὸ κατοικητήριον τῆς καρδίας φθαρτὸν καὶ ἀσθενές, ὡς ἀληθῶς οἰκοδομητὸς ναὸς διὰ χειρός. The suggestion has been made that there is some literary connexion between these passages on the spiritual Temple and the Epistle of St Ignatius (*Eph.* ix 1 f., xv 3; *Magn.* vii 2; *Philad.* vii 2). But Barnabas does not so far depart from St Paul as to use the plural and say ἵνα ὤμεν αὐτοῦ ναοί (*Eph.* xv 3).

will deliver up the sheep of the pasture and the fold and the tower thereof to destruction'. And it came about as the Lord had spoken.

Dan. ix 24 Let us enquire therefore if there be a Temple of God. There is: in the place where He saith that He Himself doth make and finish it. For it is written, 'And it shall be when the week is accomplished that the Temple of God shall be builded gloriously in the Name of the Lord'. I find therefore that there is a Temple. How then shall it be 'builded in the Name of the Lord'? Learn ye. Before we believed in God the habitation of our heart was corruptible and weak, veritably a temple builded by hand; for it was full of idolatry and was a house of demons, through our doing whatsoever was contrary to God. But it shall be builded in the Name of the Lord. Give heed that the Temple of the Lord be 'gloriously' builded. How? Learn ye. By receiving the remission of sins and hoping on the Name, we were made new, being created afresh from the beginning. Wherefore in our habitation God truly dwelleth within us. How? The word of His faith, the calling of His promise, the wisdom of the ordinances, the commandments of the teaching, He Himself prophesying within us, He Himself dwelling within us, opening for us who had been in bondage to death the door of the Temple, which is the mouth, granting us repentance He bringeth us into the incorruptible Temple. For he that desireth to be saved looketh not to the man (that speaketh), but to Him that dwelleth and speaketh in him, being amazed at him, for that he has never at any time heard these words from the mouth of the speaker, nor himself ever desired to hear them. This is the spiritual Temple that is builded to the Lord.

xvii 1 Here he draws his long argument to a close. He has done his best thus far, he assures his readers, to make clear all that plain words can disclose. There are indeed mysteries beyond, mysteries of things present and of things to come.

xvii 2
xviii 1 But were I to write of them ye would not understand, because they are put in parables. So much then for this (*ταῦτα μὲν οὕτως*). But let us pass over to another knowledge and teaching (*εἰς ἑτέραν γνῶσιν καὶ διδαχὴν*). Two Ways there are. . . .

So, following the Pauline model, he passes from the doctrinal to the practical portion of his Epistle—from argument to exhortation.

If we read the Epistle rapidly through up to this point, in such a translation as we find in Lightfoot's *Apostolic Fathers*, we are not surprised at the sudden turn when the writer passes, as he says, to 'a different knowledge and teaching': for he has made many such sudden transitions before. And if what follows is a disjointed medley of moral sayings, if their tone is predominantly Hebraistic, this is just what we have learned to expect of our Barnabas whose mind is full of the warnings of the ancient prophets and of the sapiential literature of the later Judaism.

i 4 He has spoken already of 'the way of righteousness' in which 'the

Lord journeyed with him'; he has bidden his readers 'hate utterly the iv 10 works of the evil way'; he has warned them that 'a man shall justly v. 4, cf. 2 perish, who having the knowledge of the way of righteousness forceth him- Pet. ii 21 self into the way of darkness'; he has referred in quotations from Scripture to 'the way of sinners' 'the way of the righteous, and the way of the ungodly', and God's 'righteous way'. We are not surprised, then, that he takes up his parable at the last and gives us a picture of Two Ways, a way of light with light-bearing angels of the Lord who is for ever and ever, and a way of darkness with angels of Satan, the ruler of the present time of iniquity. This parable has a *gnosis*, which he will proceed to declare.

The importance to our general subject of the actual wording of this final portion of the Epistle makes it desirable to give a literal translation of the original interspersed with a running comment.

Two ways there are of teaching and power, that of light and that of xviii 1 darkness; and there is a great difference in the two ways. For on the one are stationed light-giving angels of God, but on the other angels of Satan. And the one is Lord from eternity and unto eternity, but the other is ruler of the time of iniquity that now is.¹

Why does he speak of the two ways as ways of teaching and power (*διδασχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας*)? All through his Epistle he has recognized a background of spiritual agencies, good and evil. If we are guided to a right understanding, it is by God's gift of enlightenment: if the Jews were deceived, it was by an evil angel. The unusual word *ἐσόφισεν* is used twice: in v 3, 'the Lord instructed us'; and in ix 4, 'they went astray, because the evil angel instructed them'. Thus there is a *power* that goes with the *teaching*. The words of the Gospel may have been in the writer's mind (Mt. vii 29, Mc. i 22); 'for he was *teaching* them as having *power* (*ἐξουσίαν*).' And on the other hand the use of *ἐξουσία* in the evil sense is found in Eph. ii 2, 'according to the ruler of the *power* of the air', and elsewhere.²

This power of evil is under the personal control of the Prince of Darkness, 'the ruler of the time of iniquity that now is'. Every word of the phrase is characteristic of Barnabas. 'The time of iniquity that now is' (*καιροῦ τοῦ νῦν τῆς ἀνομίας*) recalls the sense of immediate stress which found expression at the outset of his Epistle: 'We ought therefore to iv 1 investigate deeply the things present (*τῶν ἐνεστώτων*) and to search out those things that have power to save us. Let us flee utterly from all the works of iniquity (*τῆς ἀνομίας*), lest the works of iniquity overtake us; let us hate the error of the time that now is (*τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ*), that we may be

¹ Cf. ii 1, iv 9, 13.

² For other reminiscences of the Ep. to the Ephesians see below pp. 135-6.

loved in that which is to come (*εἰς τὸν μέλλοντα*).’ So again just below :
 iv 9 ‘The whole period of our faith will not profit us unless now, in the
 iniquitous time and the offences that are to come (*νῦν ἐν τῷ ἀνόμῳ καιρῷ
 καὶ τοῖς μέλλουσιν σκανδάλοις*), we resist’, &c. And that this ‘iniquitous
 time’ has a ‘ruler’ (*ἄρχων*) he tells us in the same chapter, warning us
 iv 13 lest ‘the evil ruler (*ὁ πονηρὸς ἄρχων*) get the power over us (*τὴν καθ’
 ἡμῶν ἐξουσίαν*) ;’ even as he has warned us already (see above pp. 124-5),
 ii 1 that ‘the days are evil (*πονηραὶ*), and he himself that worketh (*αὐτοῦ τοῦ
 ἐνεργοῦντος*) hath the power (*τὴν ἐξουσίαν*)’. If this point shall seem to
 have been somewhat unreasonably laboured, it should be borne in mind
 that the literary unity of the Epistle has been called in question in recent
 controversy, and the latter portion which we are now considering has
 been regarded by some critics as a spurious addition derived from an
 already existing manual of instruction. But in view of what has been
 here said can any one doubt that the passages which we have cited are
 all by one-hand ?

xix 1-2a The way of light then is this, if any one desiring to travel on the way
 to the appointed place would be zealous in his works. The knowledge
 (*gnosis*) then that has been given to us¹ to walk therein is as follows :
 Thou shalt love Him that made thee, thou shalt fear Him that formed
 thee, thou shalt glorify Him that redeemed thee from death.

Barnabas begins, as he needs must, with love to God ; and at once
 his somewhat rhetorical phraseology challenges comment. We may com-
 pare Eccclus. vii 30 f. : ‘With all thy strength *love him that made thee*, and
 forsake not his ministers. *Fear* the Lord and *glorify* the priest.’ Here
 we have the same three verbs—love, fear, glorify ; as well as the exact
 phrase ‘love him that made thee’. Next we note that the phrase ‘that
 redeemed thee from death’ has a parallel in the twice repeated phrase
 ‘that redeemed us from darkness’ (xiv 5 f.).² Yet more interesting is it
 to recall at this point the noteworthy addition which Barnabas had made
 in ii 10 to his quotation from Ps. li 19 : ‘The sacrifice of God is a
 broken heart : *a sweet-smelling savour to the Lord is a heart that glorifieth
 Him that formed it.*’ We can hardly doubt that these last words were
 again in his mind when he wrote, ‘fear *Him that formed thee*, glorify Him
 that redeemed thee from death’.

With many writers it would be absurd to analyse with such minute-
 ness ; but Barnabas has a limited vocabulary, and he is constantly pick-
 ing up words and phrases that he has used before, especially when he has
 drawn them from a scriptural source.

xix 2b-3 Thou shalt be simple in heart and rich in spirit. Thou shalt not be

¹ ἡ δοθεῖσα ἡμῖν γνῶσις : so earlier in the Epistle (ix 8) *τίς ἡ δοθεῖσα αὐτῷ γνῶσις*.

² A few lines lower down he quotes Isa. xlix 6 f., changing *ὁ βυσάμενός σε* of the LXX into *ὁ λυτρωσάμενός σε*.

joined with them that walk in the way of death. Thou shalt hate everything which is not pleasing to God. Thou shalt hate all hypocrisy. Thou shalt not forsake the commandments of the Lord. Thou shalt not exalt thyself, but shalt be humble-minded in all things. Thou shalt not assume glory to thyself. Thou shalt not take evil counsel against thy neighbour. Thou shalt not give daring to thy soul.

This is a mere string of counsels, with as little connexion as we find in some chapters of the Book of Proverbs. The writer is himself 'simple in heart and rich in spirit'. He probably wishes to begin with that duty towards God which consists in humility and straightforwardness. But he is imperceptibly passing on to our duty towards our neighbour.

Thou shalt not commit fornication, thou shalt not commit adultery, ^{xix 4a-b} thou shalt not corrupt boys. Thy word †of God† shall not go forth in the uncleanness of some.

This last sentence is unintelligible as it stands. The Greek has Οὐ μὴ σου ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξέλθῃ ἐν ἀκαθαρσίᾳ τινῶν. The emphatic position of σου suggests that it belongs to ὁ λόγος. If we strike out τοῦ θεοῦ, as being the writer's or a copyist's error, due to familiarity with the phrase 'the word of God', we are left with an awkwardly expressed but quite apposite prohibition of improper language. We have a close parallel in Eph. iv 29, 'Let no corrupt word go forth from your mouth', where the context (Eph. iv 19, v 3) twice mentions 'uncleanness'. The only other place where Barnabas uses this word 'uncleanness' (ἀκαθαρσία) is in his strange *gnosis* regarding unclean meats (see above, p. 127); and there ^{x 6-8} also he has the precept 'Thou shalt not be a corrupter of boys'. However we regard the coincidence, one thing is plain: we are dealing with the same writer in the *gnosis* of c. x and in the 'Two Ways' of c. xix.

Thou shalt not respect persons ¹ to reprove any for a transgression. ^{xix 4c-d} Thou shalt be meek, thou shalt be quiet, thou shalt be trembling at the words which thou hast heard.

This last counsel is based on Isa. lxvi 2: 'To whom will I look, save to him that is humble and quiet and trembling at my words.' Though he has not quoted this verse before, he has in xvi 2 quoted the verse which immediately precedes it: 'The heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool', &c.

Thou shalt not bear a grudge against thy brother.

^{xix 4e}

This comes from Zech. vii 10, quoted above in ii 8, where he has linked it up with Zech. viii 17. Thus we have a fresh example of his picking up words which he has used before.

Thou shalt not be of a double mind, whether it shall be or no.

^{xix 5a}

¹ The phrase οὐ λήμψῃ πρόσωπον is found in Lev. xix 15; cf. Eccus. xxxii 16.

There is nothing in the context to help us to the meaning of this saying (οὐ μὴ διψυχίσης πότερον ἔσται ἢ οὐ). The word διψυχος does not come in Old Testament Greek, and the only writer of the New Testament who has it is St James: 'A double-minded man' (ἀνὴρ διψυχος), he says, will receive nothing of the Lord; and again, 'Purify your hearts, ye double-minded'.¹ But Clement of Rome uses it: Lot's wife, we are told, was turned into a pillar of salt 'to make it known unto all that the double-minded and those who doubt concerning the power of God' shall come into judgment: and this language clearly comes from an apocryphal passage which he quotes later: 'Wretched are the double-minded, who doubt in soul (οἱ διψυχοι, οἱ διστάζοντες τῇ ψυχῇ) and say: These things we have heard even in the days of our fathers; and lo, we have grown old, and none of them has happened unto us.' This same quotation is found in an independent form in the second century homily known as the second Epistle of Clement (ix 2). So that it would seem that 'double-mindedness' frequently in early days carried the suggestion of scepticism in regard to the divine warnings or promises; and in this sense Barnabas seems to use the word here.¹

jas. i 8, iv
8

1 Clem. xi
2

1 Clem.
xxiii 3

xix 5b

Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord in vain.

This is the second quotation he has made from the Ten Commandments, but he has no intention of following their general scheme.

xix 5c

Thou shalt love thy neighbour more than thine own soul.

Here we have a more than 'evangelic' counsel: it has no parallel in earlier writers. But it is his own phrase: twice has he assured his readers that he loves them more than his own soul (i 4, iv 6).

xix 5d-6b

Thou shalt not murder a child by abortion, nor again shalt thou kill it when it is born. Thou shalt not withdraw thy hand from thy son or from thy daughter, but from their youth up thou shalt teach them the fear of God. Thou shalt not be covetous of thy neighbour's goods; thou shalt not be greedy of gain. Neither shalt thou be joined from thy soul to the lofty, but shalt have thy conversation with the humble and the just.

iii 5

To the precept regarding the bringing up of children, with its evident allusion to Eph. vi 4, we shall return presently. Meanwhile let us note the phrase 'from thy soul' (ἐκ ψυχῆς σου), which has an awkward sound in the context. It has occurred before, and almost as awkwardly, in the quotation which he has made from Isa. lviii 10: 'If thou give thy bread to the hungry from thy soul'. It is, therefore, of interest as another indication of unity of authorship.

¹ Cf. Hermas, *Vis.* iii 4, 3, and Hippol. in *Dan.* II 13 (ed. Bonwetsch and Achelis, p. 70).

The trials¹ which befall thee thou shalt accept as good, knowing that *xix 6c* nothing cometh to pass without God.

What we should call accidents or misfortunes are to Barnabas the 'workings' or operations (*τὰ ἐνεργήματα*), for good or for evil, of a superhuman power. In the New Testament the verb *ἐνεργεῖν* is regularly used of superhuman action, whether of God or of an evil power. At the very outset of his Epistle (*ii 1*) Barnabas, following St Paul (*Eph. ii 2, v 16*), has spoken of 'him that worketh' (*αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἐνεργοῦντος*) in these 'evil days'. The results of such operation would seem, to judge from the context, to be the *ἐνεργήματα* intended here: ² in any case such things are meant as are beyond human control. The general sentiment comes from *Ecclus. ii 4*, though the phraseology is different: 'Whatsoever is laid upon thee, receive.'

We have called attention more than once to the debt which Barnabas in the earlier part of his Epistle owes to St Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians.³ The obligation by no means ceases when he comes to shape the precepts of his 'Two Ways'. The very names by which he describes them, the Way of Light and the Way of Darkness, remind us of St Paul's exhortation, 'Ye were once darkness, but now are ye light *Eph. v. 8* in the Lord: walk as children of the light'. If Barnabas speaks of them as Ways of teaching and power (*ἐξουσία*), and tells us that they are presided over by supernatural agents of good and evil, by angels of God and angels of Satan, adding that 'the one is Lord from eternity and unto eternity, but the other is ruler (*ἄρχων*) of the time of iniquity that now is': ⁴ is it not St Paul who bids us 'put on the armour of God, that *Eph. vi 12* we may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil: for our wrestling is . . . with the principalities, with the powers (*τὰς ἐξουσίας*), with the world-rulers (*κοσμοκράτορας*) of this darkness, with the spiritual (forces) of wickedness in the heavenly places⁴, who speaks also of 'the ruler of the power (*τὸν ἄρχοντα τῆς ἐξουσίας*) of the air, of the spirit that now *Eph. ii 2* worketh (*τοῦ νῦν ἐνεργοῦντος*) in the children of disobedience'? And if Barnabas speaks of 'the knowledge which is given us to walk' in the way of light, is he not using St Paul's own word (*περιπατεῖν*), which comes so often in the Epistle to the Ephesians?—'walk worthily of the calling *Eph. iv 1f.*

¹ [Dr Robinson was much perplexed to find a rendering of *ἐνεργήματα*. I think in the end he intended to adopt either 'visitations' or 'afflictions'.—R. H. C.]

² The word *ἐνέργημα* is by no means a common one. An example of its use in the adverse sense has been found in a fragmentary Oxyrhynchus papyrus (Grenfell and Hunt, vi p. 16, no. 850, 33 f.) identified as part of the Gnostic Acts of St John. After deliverance from an onslaught of the fiend in disguise, who attempted to prevent him from crossing a bridge, the Apostle says: *κλίνωμεν γόνατα πρὸς τὸν κύριον καὶ τοῦ μεγάλου ἐχθροῦ ἀόρατον ἐνέργημα καταργήσαντα.*

³ See pp. 124 f., 129, 135-6.

⁴ Barnabas has spoken earlier of 'the evil ruler getting the power over us' (*iv 13*).

wherewith ye were called, with all humbleness of mind and meekness, with longsuffering'; 'walk no longer as the Gentiles walk'; 'and walk in love'; 'look therefore carefully how ye walk'. We have already cited his injunction, 'walk as children of the light', addressed to those who were 'once darkness' but are now 'light in the Lord'. We must also note the words 'You who were dead in your trespasses and sins, wherein ye once walked according to the course of this world', and the contrast that quickly follows of 'the good works which God hath prepared beforehand¹ that we should walk in them'. Could the Apostle have told us more plainly (to use the words of Barnabas) that 'there are Two Ways, the one of light and the other of darkness', and that 'there is a great difference between the two ways'?

As Barnabas goes forward to interpret his 'Two Ways' the same indebtedness meets us. At the very outset his precept 'Thou shalt be simple in heart (*ἀπλοῦς τῇ καρδίᾳ*) and rich in spirit (*πλούσιος τῷ πνεύματι*)' reminds us of 'with simplicity of heart' (*ἐν ἀπλότητι τῆς καρδίας*), and perhaps also of 'be filled with the spirit' (*πληροῦσθε ἐν πνεύματι*). 'Thou shalt be humble-minded in all things' takes us back to St Paul's 'with all humble-mindedness and meekness'. 'From thee the word shall not go forth in the uncleanness of some' has its parallel in 'Let no corrupt word proceed out of thy mouth'. 'Thou shalt be meek' picks up the word 'meekness' which had been passed over before. After a sentence or two St Paul's command to bring up children 'in the nurture and admonition of the Lord' is echoed in the precept of Barnabas, 'From their youth thou shalt teach them the fear of God'.

Have we perhaps overestimated the significance of these parallels with the Epistle to the Ephesians? Our next passage will help to decide that question; for Barnabas here gives us admonitions concerning the mutual obligations of family life: *

xix 7 Thou shalt not be double-minded (*διγνώμων*) nor double-tongued (*δίγλωσσος*).² Thou shalt be subject to masters, as to a type of God, in shame and fear. Thou shalt not command thy servant or handmaid in bitterness, who set their hope on the same God, lest haply they should not fear the God who is over you both: for He came not to call with respect of persons, but unto those whom the Spirit had prepared.

Let us now read St Paul's injunctions to servants and masters.

Eph. vi 5ff. Servants, be obedient to them that are your masters according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in simplicity of your heart, as unto Christ; not with eye-service as men-pleasers; but as servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart; with good will doing service, as unto the

¹ As a matter of phraseology it is worth while to compare *οἱς προητοίμασεν ὁ θεός* here, and *ἐφ' οὓς τὸ πνεῦμα ἠτοίμασεν* in Barn. xix 7.

² *Δίγλωσσος* is read by all MSS except **Σ** (*γλωσσώδης*).

Lord and not unto men : knowing that whatsoever good thing any man doeth, the same shall he receive of the Lord, whether he be bond or free. And, ye masters, do the same things unto them, forbearing threatening : respecting that both their and your Master is in heaven ; neither is there respect of persons with Him.

St Paul's words 'with fear and trembling' are in Barnabas represented by 'with shame and fear'. If Barnabas omits the Apostle's next words *ἐν ἀπλότητι τῆς καρδίας ὑμῶν*, it is perhaps because he has said above (xix 2) *ἔση ἀπλοῦς τῇ καρδίᾳ*. Then St Paul says 'as unto Christ', and presently 'as unto the Lord'; and Barnabas says 'as to a type of God'.¹ St Paul says (to the masters) 'forbearing threatening, knowing that both their and your Master is in heaven', Barnabas says 'Thou shalt not command . . . in bitterness (*ἐν πικρίᾳ*),² . . . lest haply they should not fear the God who is over you both'. St Paul continues: 'neither is there respect of persons (*προσωποληψία*) with Him'; and Barnabas continues: 'for He came not to call with respect of persons (*κατὰ πρόσωπον*),³ but unto those whom the Spirit had prepared'. Here however he has recast St Paul's final clause, giving it a more direct application to the Christian Society, and at the same time merging it with a saying of the Gospel which he has already adduced: 'He did not come to call righteous men, but sinners'. His own last clause, 'but unto those whom the Spirit had prepared' (*ἐφ' οὓς τὸ πνεῦμα ἠτοίμασεν*), is a strange one, but it also has a parallel in the earlier part of his Epistle; for those from whom the stony hearts have been taken away are 'those whom the Spirit of the Lord hath foreseen' (*ὧν προέβλεπεν τὸ πνεῦμα κυρίου*).⁴

Barn. v. 9

Mt. ix 13

Barn. vi 14

¹ Cf. Ignatius *Magn.* vi: *προκαθημένου τοῦ ἐπισκόπου εἰς τύπον θεοῦ*. Compare also the *Didascalia* ii 26 (ed. Connolly pp. 88 f.). Barnabas himself, in tracing Old Testament figures of Christ, has several times used the words *τύπος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ* (vii 7, 10, 11, xii 5, 6).

² Cf. Eph. iv 31, 'Let all bitterness (*πικρία*) and wrath . . . be put away from you'.

³ Cf. Barn. iv 12: *ὁ κύριος ἀπροσωπολήπτως κρινεὶ τὸν κόσμον* (cf. 1 Pet. i 17: *τὸν ἀπροσωπολήπτως κρίνοντα*).

⁴ We have dwelt in the text on the points of contact between Barnabas and the Epistle to the Ephesians in the treatment of the social duties of a Christian household. It is hardly less instructive to observe the difference in method. St Paul is systematic and inclusive: Barnabas is rambling and incomplete. St Paul has started with the general maxim: 'submitting yourself (*ὑποτασσόμενοι*) one to another in the fear of God' (v 21). Then, with no new verb, he proceeds: 'wives to your own husbands, as to the Lord'; and the exposition of this injunction with its counterpart 'Husbands, love your wives' occupies the next ten verses; for the Apostle cannot refrain from grounding his admonitions on the mystical relation between Christ and the Church. Of all this we find nothing in Barnabas.

St Paul proceeds, as we might expect, to the duty of children to their parents and the corresponding duty of fathers to their children. The latter duty alone

We conclude: there can be no reasonable doubt that in this passage on social duties Barnabas was consciously using St Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians; and the parallels with that Epistle, which we have traced both in his 'Two Ways' and elsewhere, afford one more indication, and a strong one, that in the Epistle of Barnabas we are dealing throughout with the original composition of a single writer.

xix 8

Thou shalt share in all things with thy neighbour, and shalt not say that they are thine own: for if ye are sharers in that which is incorruptible, how much more in the corruptible things?

It is sufficient to recall Acts iv 32, 'none of them said that any of the things which he had were his own'; Rom. xv 27, 'if the Gentiles have shared in their spiritual things, they ought also to minister to them in the carnal things'; 1 Cor. ix 11, 'if we have sown unto you the spiritual things, is it a great thing if we shall reap your carnal things'. The contrast in Barnabas is between 'that which is incorruptible' and 'the corruptible things': compare 1 Pet. i 4, 'an inheritance incorruptible', and i 18, 'not with corruptible things (as) silver or gold'. Barnabas has given us the same contrast already in speaking of the Temple.¹

xix 8b

Thou shalt not be forward in tongue (*πρόγλωσσος*): for the mouth is a snare of death. So far as thou canst, thou shalt be pure for thy soul's sake.

Barnabas introduces, and that in a curiously modified form. St Paul had said 'Fathers, provoke not your children to wrath, but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord (Eph. vi 4); Barnabas says—using the second person singular, as he does throughout this whole series of precepts—'Thou shalt not withdraw thy hand from thy son or from thy daughter, but from (their) youth thou shalt teach (them) the fear of God' (xix 5). We may note the oddness of the phrase *οὐ μὴ ἀρης τὴν χεῖρά σου ἀπὸ . . .*, which must surely be of his own coinage; but what is of more importance is to observe that he seems desirous of urging the duty of parental discipline, rather than anxious to moderate its severity. Was he perhaps painfully conscious that the milder maxims of Christian teachers had produced already, almost within the limits of a generation, a reaction from the sterner régime of both Christian and Jewish homes, a reaction which was a peril to the very existence of family life? The sternness of parental discipline enjoined in the Wisdom literature of later Jewish teachers is illustrated by a passage of Ecclesiasticus (vii 23 f.) which was not improbably in the mind of Barnabas at this point: 'Hast thou children? correct them. And bow down their neck from their youth. Hast thou daughters? give heed to their body, and make not thy face cheerful toward them.'

Finally, the random arrangement of Barnabas is seen when, instead of proceeding at once to the duties of masters and servants, as St Paul does, he interposes a series of apparently disconnected precepts, ending with 'Thou shalt not be double-minded or double-tongued', which his editors have placed somewhat incongruously at the head of a new section.

¹ Barn. xvi 7, 9: *ἦν ἡμῶν τὸ κατοικητήριον τῆς καρδίας φθαρτὸν . . . εἰς τὸν ἀφθαρτον ναόν.*

In Proverbs vi 2 we read : ' A strong snare to a man are his own lips ; and he is caught by the lips of his own mouth '.

Be not (found) stretching out thy hands to receive, and drawing them xix 9a in to give.

This is an inexact quotation from Ecclus. iv 31: ' Let not thy hand be stretched out to receive, and drawn in to give back.'

Thou shalt love as the apple of thine eye every one that speaketh xix 9b-10 unto thee the word of the Lord. Thou shalt remember the day of judgement night and day, and shalt seek out each day the persons of the saints, either labouring by word and going forth to exhort them and studying to save a soul by the word, or with thy hands shalt thou work for a ransom of thy sins.

In the Christian Society every one is to help others by exhortation and encouragement in these days of stress. If any one so helps you, give him the full return of your love. And remember that the time is short and the day of account is at hand. You must do your part, seeking out your brethren and toiling in the word of edification ; or, if that is beyond your power, at least you may not be idle: work with your hands, so that you may give in alms for the ransom of your sins.¹

'The apple of the eye' is a familiar Old Testament phrase—Deut. xxxii 10, Ps. xvi (xvii) 8, Zech. ii 8 (12). In saying, 'Thou shalt love as the apple of thine eye', Barnabas may have been seeking even 1 Thess. to out-do St Paul's emphatic expression, 'Esteem them very highly' v 13 (ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ) in love for their work's sake'. For the doctrine of the last clause we may compare Ecclus. iii 30, 'Almsgiving will make atonement for sins'.²

Thou shalt not doubt to give nor murmur in giving, but shalt know xix 11-12 who is the good recompenser of the reward. Thou shalt keep the things that thou hast received, neither adding nor taking away. Thou shalt utterly (εις τέλος) hate the evil one.³ Thou shalt judge justly. Thou shalt not make division, but shalt live peaceably, bringing together them that contend. Thou shalt make confession of thy sins. Thou shalt not draw near to prayer in an evil conscience. This is the way of light.

¹ The same insistence on helping others on account of the nearness of the day of judgement is found in xxi 2 f.: "Εχετε μεθ' εαυτῶν εἰς οὐδὲν ἐργάσησθε τὸ καλόν· μὴ ἐλλείπητε. ἐγγὺς ἡ ἡμέρα . . . (6, ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως). Cf. also Heb. x 24 f.: Κατανοῶμεν ἀλλήλους εἰς παροφυσμὸν ἀγάπης καὶ καλῶν ἔργων, μὴ ἐγκαταλείποντες τὴν ἐπισυναγωγὴν εαυτῶν, καθὼς ἔθος τισίν, ἀλλὰ παρακαλοῦντες, καὶ τοσοῦτῳ μᾶλλον ὄσφ βλέπετε ἐγγίζουσαν τὴν ἡμέραν. And so later in *Hermas Vis.* iii 9. 5: Βλέπετε τὴν κρίσιν τὴν ἐρχομένην· οἱ ὑπερέχοντες οὐδὲν ἐκζητεῖτε τοὺς πεινῶντας.

² See also Tobit iv. 10, xii 9 (quoted in Ep. Polyc. x 2); and Lightfoot's notes on 2 Clem. xvi.

³ Cf. iv 10; μισήσωμεν τελείως τὰ ἔργα τῆς πονηρᾶς οὐδοῦ.

It is usual to translate the words *εἰρηνεύσεις δὲ μαχομένους συναγαγών* as 'thou shalt pacify them that contend, bringing (them) together'. This rendering is open to two objections: (1) the verb *εἰρηνεύειν* is intransitive in the LXX and in the New Testament, meaning 'to be at peace' or 'live peaceably';¹ whereas the transitive use 'to pacify' is comparatively rare and late; (2) if the transitive rendering be adopted, the addition 'bringing (them) together' becomes otiose. We shall have to return to this point when we consider the subsequent history of the saying.² The phrase 'an evil conscience' is found in Heb. x 22, 'hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience'.

This brings to an end the description of the way of light. That which he has called at the outset 'the way of darkness' Barnabas treats much more briefly:

xx 1 But the way of the Black One is crooked and full of curse; for it is the way of death eternal with punishment, wherein are the things that destroy their souls.

In iv 9 he has spoken of 'the Black One', adding immediately the precept, 'Let us flee from all vanity, let us hate utterly the works of the evil way'. Here by a combination of these earlier terms he gives us 'the way of the Black One'. He then declares this way to be 'the way of death eternal' (*θανάτου αἰωνίου*), using a phrase which is not found in Holy Scripture nor indeed elsewhere in the Apostolic Fathers.³ Upon this way men meet 'the things which destroy their souls'.⁴ Thereupon he proceeds to enumerate seventeen grievous sins:

xx 1 Idolatry, boldness, haughtiness of power, hypocrisy, double-heartedness, adultery, murder, plundering, arrogance, transgression, guile, malice, audacity, sorcery, witchcraft, covetousness, absence of the fear of God.

This list of sins he follows up with a longer list of sinners:

xx 2 Persecutors of the good, hating truth, loving lies, not knowing the reward of righteousness, not *cleaving to that which is good*, nor to Ro. xii 9 reward of righteousness, *paying no heed to widow or orphan*, wakeful not cf. Isa. i 23 righteous judgement, *unto the fear of God but for that which is evil, from whom meekness and patience are far off and away, loving vain things, pursuing a* Isa. *ibid.*

¹ Cf. Ecclus. xlv 6: 'Rich men furnished with ability, living peaceably (*εἰρηνεύοντες*) in their habitations'; and Rom. xii 18: 'If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably (*εἰρηνεύοντες*) with all men'.

² See below [i.e. the place where the parallel passage in the Didache is to be treated.—R. H. C.].

³ In contrast with 'eternal life' St Matthew (xxv 46) speaks not of 'eternal death' but of 'eternal punishment' (*κόλασις*), and elsewhere (xviii 8, xxv 41) of 'the eternal fire'. St Paul speaks once (2 Thess. i 9) of 'eternal destruction' (*ὄλεθρος*), and the Epistle to the Hebrews (vi 2) of 'eternal judgement' (*κρίμα*). In Mc. iii 29 for *κρίσεως* the best MSS have *ἀμαρτήματος*.

⁴ Contrast the expression *τὰ δυνάμενα ἡμᾶς σώζειν* (iv 1).

recompense (ἀνταπόδομα), not pitying the poor man, not sorrowing for him that is oppressed by sorrow, ready with slander, not knowing Him that made them, murderers of children, destroyers of that which God hath fashioned, turning away from him that hath need, oppressing him that is afflicted, advocates of rich men, unjust judges of poor men, sinful with all manner of sins (πανθαμάρτητοι).¹

With this high-sounding and all-inclusive epithet² he ends his brief description of the Evil Way. It only remains for him to bring to a formal close his 'Two Ways', that 'other *gnosis* and teaching' to which he introduced us in c. xviii. All that is needed is a sentence or two emphasizing the opposite courses and insisting on the completest observance of the divine precepts which he has been at pains to set forth; and here his contrast between 'these' and 'those' reminds us of the reiterated 'theirs' and 'ours' of the earlier part of the Epistle.

It is good therefore to learn the ordinances of the Lord, even as xxi 1 many as have been written, and to walk in these. For he that doeth *these* shall be glorified in the kingdom of God: he that chooseth *those* shall perish together with his works. This is why there is a resurrection; this is why there is a recompense.

May we not properly regard these grave words as the formal close of the 'Two Ways', rather than as merely a transition to the final salutations of the Epistle? If we look back we shall see that in xviii 1, after passing on to another *gnosis* and teaching (μεταβῶμεν δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ ἑτέραν γνῶσιν καὶ διδαχὴν), he has led off with a general statement as to the great difference between the Two Ways; but thereafter, as he proceeds to his detailed exposition, he has couched his admonitions without exception in the second person singular—'Thou shalt love', &c.—in accordance with biblical precedent. Corresponding with the formal opening is the formal close. The personal address to the individual disappears, and in general terms the writer enforces the duty of understanding and obeying these sacred ordinances (τὰ δικαιώματα τοῦ κυρίου), the glorious future promised to him who accepts them, and the irretrievable loss that awaits him who chooses to reject them: it is for the very purpose of this final discrimination that a resurrection has been appointed, followed by a requital of good or evil done: διὰ τοῦτο ἀνάστασις, διὰ τοῦτο ἀνταπόδομα.

Every word of this paragraph recalls the thought and language of the

¹ Of these lists of sins and sinners more will be said later. Their bearing on our general subject requires a detailed discussion which cannot properly be entered upon at this point. [It was proposed to include in the volume the substance of my paper on this part of the 'Two Ways' which appeared in the *JOURNAL* April 1932, pp. 237 ff.—R. H. C.]

² Surely of his own coinage. The nearest parallel in formation is πανθαμάρτωλος, 'an utter sinner', in 2 Clem. xvii 1, where see Lightfoot's note.

i 2 writer. Does Barnabas here tell us that it is a good thing to 'learn the
 ii 1 ordinances of the Lord'? At the outset he has said that 'great and rich
 are the ordinances of God towards us': and again, 'We are bound to
 take heed unto ourselves to seek out the ordinances of the Lord'; and
 iv 11 yet again, 'Let us strive to keep His commandments, that we may
 rejoice in His ordinances'. Twice more the same word occurs, and
 xvi 9 then we are told of 'the wisdom of the ordinances, the commandments
 of the teaching'; and at the very close of his Epistle he prays that God
 xxi 5 will give his readers 'the knowledge (*γνώσιν*) of His ordinances'.

And all this means that we must learn and keep learning. This too
 vi 9 is what he has been saying all the time: 'What saith the *gnosis*?
 ix 7, 8 Learn ye' (*μάθετε*). 'Learn therefore, children of love, concerning all
 things richly.' 'What then is the *gnosis* that was given him? Learn
 xiv 4 ye. . .'. So it runs on, 'Learn ye', 'Learn ye'. And so when he has
 xvi 7, 8 finished his 'other knowledge and teaching'—his *γνώσις* and *διδασχὴ*—he
 xxi 1 clinches the matter with 'It is a good thing to learn the ordinances of
 the Lord, even such as have been written'.

In view of a modern theory that this closing passage is no genuine
 portion of the Epistle, it is of interest to note farther that we have here
 several illustrations of our author's fondness for picking up again words
 and phrases which have once taken his fancy. Thus when he says,
 'He that doeth these things shall be *glorified* (*δοξασθήσεται*) in the
 Kingdom of God,' he uses a word which reminds us of his quotation of
 vi 16 Ps. xli (xlii) 3 in the form *καὶ ἐν τίνι ὀφθήσομαι τῷ κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ μου καὶ*
δοξασθήσομαι; where the LXX rendering has not got *δοξασθήσομαι* at
 all.¹ It would seem that Barnabas through a trick of memory has
 taken over the word from Isa. xlv 3: *Συναχθήσομαι καὶ δοξασθήσομαι*
ἐνώπιον κυρίου, and having once been impressed by it gives it us now
 over again.

The word *συναπολείται* which he here employs twice within a few
 lines, is found not infrequently in the LXX: in the New Testament it
 occurs only once (Heb. xi 13), and it is not found again in the Apostolic
 Fathers. Its use has become rare enough to deserve our attention.
 We have the thought indeed (and the verb in its simple form) in an
 early passage, in which Barnabas speaks in advance of the Two Ways:
 v 4 'A man will justly perish (*ἀπολείται*), who having knowledge of the way
 of righteousness (*ὁδοῦ δικαιοσύνης γνώσιν*) constrains himself into the way
 of darkness (*εἰς ὁδὸν σκότους*).'

xx 1 Finally, he closes the passage with the word *ἀνταπόδομα*. In his list
 of evildoers he has included *διώκοντες ἀνταπόδομα* (cf. Isa. i 23); in
 xiv 9 he has quoted from Isa. lxi 1 'the day of *recompense* (*ἡμέραν*
ἀνταποδόσεως)': and in xix 11 he has spoken of 'the good recompenser

¹ *πότε ἤξω καὶ ὀφθήσομαι τῷ προσώπῳ τοῦ θεοῦ;*

of the reward (*ὁ τοῦ μισθοῦ καλὸς ἀνταποδότης*), reminding us once again of the Epistle to the Hebrews: 'He is the rewarder of them that diligently seek Him (*τοῖς ἐκζητοῦσιν αὐτὸν μισθαποδότης γίνεται*).'¹ Of these three notable words not one finds a place elsewhere in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers.

With the mention of Resurrection and Retribution—for here the *ἀνταπόδομα* is not confined to the reward of the righteous—Barnabas has brought his Two Ways to a close. It remains that he should bid his readers farewell. His final appeal is but a repetition of what he has said before: 'I beseech you do good while you can; the Judge is at the door. Be true to your own selves, and God will give you knowledge (*γνώσιν*) of His ordinances and the joy that comes from keeping them.'

I beseech such as have more than others (*τοὺς ὑπερέχοντας*), if ye take any counsel of good advice from me, have with you them towards whom ye may work that which is good.¹ See that ye fail not. The day is nigh wherein all things shall perish together with the Evil One: the Lord is nigh, and His reward.

The duty of helping others, and this the more in view of the approaching day of judgement, has found clear expression in his 'Two Ways'. The personal form of appeal, 'I beseech you (*ἐρωτῶ ὑμᾶς*)', has made its appearance at a much earlier point, and he will use it twice more in the present chapter. The exhortation, 'See that ye fail not (*μὴ ἐλλείπητε*)', which also occurs below, reminds us of his own anxiety 'not to fail (*μὴ ἐλλείπειν*)' in imparting his message to them.

The next clause, 'The day is at hand (*ἐγγὺς ἡ ἡμέρα*) wherein all things shall perish together with the Evil One', is clearly based on the words of Isaiah, who remains to the end his favourite prophet: 'For the day of the Lord is at hand (*ἐγγὺς γὰρ ἡμέρα κυρίου*); it shall come as a destruction from the Almighty', together with a verse just below, 'Behold, the day of the Lord cometh . . . to lay the land desolate; and He shall destroy the sinners thereof out of it'. Barnabas adds 'The Lord is at hand (*ἐγγὺς*) and His reward', quoting the same prophet indeed, but supplying us with a fresh instance of his fondness for repeating a word on which he would lay stress, even at the cost of inaccuracy of quotation. For in this place Isaiah had not used the word *ἐγγὺς*, but had written: 'Behold, the Lord God will come . . . behold, His reward is with Him, and His work before Him.'

Again and again I beseech you, be your own good legislators, cease not to be your own trusty counsellors, put away from you all hypocrisy.

¹ With *ἔχετε μεθ' ἑαυτῶν εἰς οὓς ἐργάσηθε τὸ καλόν* cf. Gal. vi. 9, *ἀρα οὖν ὡς καιρὸν ἔχωμεν, ἐργαζώμεθα τὸ ἀγαθὸν πρὸς πάντας*: Mt. xxvi 10, *ἐργον γὰρ καλὸν ἠργάσατο εἰς ἐμέ: πάντοτε γὰρ τοὺς πτωχοὺς ἔχετε μεθ' ἑαυτῶν*.

And God who is Lord over all the world give you wisdom, understanding, intelligence, knowledge of His ordinances (*γνώσιν τῶν δικαιωμάτων αὐτοῦ*), patience. And be ye taught of God, seeking out what the Lord seeketh from you,¹ and do (it) that ye may be found in the day of judgement.²

xix 2 In his 'Two Ways' Barnabas has already written 'Thou shalt hate all *hypocrisy*'. The very same heavenly gifts, *σοφία, σύνεσις, ἐπιστήμη, γνώσις*, as well as *ὑπομονή*, he has promised at the outset to those who will 'take heed to seek out the ordinances of the Lord' (*ἐκζητεῖν τὰ δικαιώματα κυρίου*). The phrase 'taught of God' (*θεοδιδάκτοι*) is familiar to us from 1 Thess. iv 9, 'taught of God to love one another': comp. John vi 45, 'And they shall be all taught of God' (*θεοδιδάκτοι*), a free citation from Isa. liv 13.

xxi 7 f. But if there be any remembrance of good, call me to mind as ye apply yourselves to these things (*μελετῶντες ταῦτα*), that both my desire and my watchfulness may lead to some good result. I beseech you, as asking a favour. So long as the good vessel is with you, fail not any of your number, but constantly seek out those things, and fulfil every commandment; for they deserve it. For this reason I was the more eager to write unto you so far as I was able, to bring you joy. Fare ye well, children of love and peace. The Lord of glory and of every grace be with your spirit.

i 8 'The good vessel' (of the body) reminds us of vii 3, where our Lord is spoken of as offering 'the vessel of the spirit' (*τὸ σκεῦος τοῦ πνεύματος*) as a sacrifice for our sins, and xi 9, 'He glorifieth the vessel of His spirit'. 'To bring you joy' was the writer's expressed desire at the very outset of the Epistle: 'I will set forth a few things whereby in the present times ye may be made to rejoice (*εὐφρανθήσεσθε*).'¹ So our good Barnabas ends where he began.

Looking back on the Epistle as a whole, we think of Barnabas as a man of earnest piety, claiming no position as a leader or teacher, yet accustomed to pour out his peculiar wisdom for the edification of such as would hear him. He has a wide acquaintance with the Greek Old Testament; but probably none with the Hebrew original—or he would not have given the meaning of Abraham's 318 servants from the Greek letters as he does. He quotes very inaccurately, perhaps always from memory: he combines texts from various prophets, and adds words not found in the Canon at all. He has an acquaintance with Jewish ceremonial practices which are not attested by the Pentateuch, and with

¹ With *ἐκζητοῦντες τί ζητεῖ κύριος ἀφ' ὑμῶν* comp. iv 1, *Δεῖ οὖν ἡμᾶς ἐραυνῶντας ἐκζητεῖν τὰ δυνάμενα ἡμᾶς σώζειν* and with this again cf. 1 Pet. i 10 f., *περὶ ἧς σωτηρίας ἐξεζητήσαν καὶ ἐξηραύνησαν προφήται . . . ἐξεραυνῶντες, κ.τ.λ.*

² With the *καὶ ποιεῖτε ἵνα εὐρεθῆτε ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως* we may compare Matt. xxiv 46, *μακάριος ὁ δοῦλος ἐκεῖνος ὃν ἐλθὼν ὁ κύριος εὐρήσει οὕτως ποιοῦντα.*

the Jewish Alexandrine exegesis of Mosaic precepts. He applies the Alexandrine method freely on his own account, and produces a new Christian *gnosis*.

But he is no original thinker. His aim is moral purity throughout. The Wisdom Books of the Old Testament, especially Ecclesiasticus, and the practical parts of St Paul's Epistles, especially of that to the Ephesians—these are his quarries for precepts of conduct. The Epistle to the Hebrews he had read; but he certainly found it too difficult, too remote in its own lofty *gnosis*: a few of its phrases abide in his memory, but he has no use for its high argument. When he has done with exposition, he follows the manner of the New Testament Epistles and passes from doctrinal to practical teaching.

Though almost certainly a Gentile by birth,¹ he has the mind of an Alexandrian Jew, whose Judaism had helped him but little, and had been wholly abandoned in favour of the Christian faith which had really met the needs of his soul. He disavows Judaism altogether, as having proved an utter failure notwithstanding all that God had done for His rebellious people. He belongs to the New People whom God's Spirit foresaw and prepared as the true heirs of the covenant which the Jews had rejected from the first. He is convinced that the end of the world is at hand. It is an evil world, ripe for judgement. His fear is lest Christians may fail, as the Jews as a people have failed, and be rejected after all. It is not apostasy under stress of persecution that he dreads: there is no allusion to persecution of any kind in the Epistle. It is moral failure, due to a want of recognition of God's purpose for the New People, and issuing in laxity of conduct, neglect of the bond of Christian fellowship, self-satisfaction, and a selfish disregard for the poorer brethren. To counteract this moral decadence he calls for strenuousness of life and constant watchfulness, lest the Evil One effect a subtle entrance and rob them of their hope.

After reading the Epistle again and again I find no trace of animosity against the Jews. Severe things are said about them as a people, but with the definite purpose of shewing that they have forfeited their privilege in the divine covenant, which has thus passed justly from them to the New People whom God foresaw. This much at least of historical insight pervades the Epistle: from the beginning, and all through the tragic failure of Judaism, God has been working out a purpose. Later writers indeed recognized more fully the saints and heroes of Judaism, who waited for their reward and for the fulfilment of 'the promise to the fathers'—to use our author's own phrase—in the coming of Christ. This had been duly emphasized in the Epistle to the Hebrews, where

¹ This seems to follow of necessity from xvi 7 (quoted above p. 130), where he writes: 'Before we believed in God', &c.

the historical sense is much stronger. But to Barnabas Judaism is blank failure from the very beginning, when Moses broke the Tables of the Law in despair. Every ceremonial ordinance of Judaism was but the witness of a spiritual precept: it had no value, even temporarily, in itself. This is the extreme to which no New Testament writer proceeds. Nor was Barnabas followed in this respect.

The immediate purpose of our survey of the Epistle of Barnabas will have been attained if we have made it reasonably certain that the description of the Two Ways is an integral part of the document, conceived in the same spirit as the rest, marked by the same clumsiness of construction, drawing upon the same literary sources, and repeating again and again phrases which the writer has previously employed. There is no reason *a priori* for imagining that this section of the Epistle is borrowed from an earlier author: on the contrary, all the internal evidence goes to shew that the Two Ways, which plays so great a part in later Christian literature, is the original composition of the writer whom we call Barnabas.

The chapter on the Didache will follow in the next number.

THE EVIDENCE OF ASTRONOMY AND TECHNICAL CHRONOLOGY FOR THE DATE OF THE CRUCIFIXION¹

IN this paper I deal with questions connected with the regnal years of Tiberius, the Jewish calendar and the astronomical phenomena that governed it, and the eclipse mentioned in Luke xxiii 45, so far as they affect the determination of the date of the Crucifixion. I do not discuss questions connected with the accuracy of the different gospels or notes of time other than those given in terms of regnal years, days of the week, or Jewish festivals. For instance, the age of Jesus at the beginning of his ministry (Luke iii 23) and the forty-six years of John ii 20 do not concern me. There is little or nothing new in this paper, but the standard discussions seem always to have overlooked some part or other of the published material, and I hope, therefore, that it may be of service to review what is given us by the lines of evidence which I have mentioned.

In Luke iii 1, 2 we read 'Now, in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judaea, and Herod being tetrarch of Galilee, and his brother Philip tetrarch of Iturea and

¹ A lecture delivered to the University of Oxford, December 4, 1930, and to the Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies, October 17, 1933.