

LIC
MAR 2 1915
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

THE
OLDEST CHURCH MANUAL

CALLED THE

Teaching of the Twelve Apostles

ΔΙΔΑΧΗ ΤΩΝ ΔΩΔΕΚΑ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ

THE DIDACHÈ AND KINDRED DOCUMENTS
IN THE ORIGINAL

WITH TRANSLATIONS AND DISCUSSIONS OF POST-APOSTOLIC TEACHING
BAPTISM WORSHIP AND DISCIPLINE

AND

WITH ILLUSTRATIONS AND FAC-SIMILES OF THE
JERUSALEM MANUSCRIPT

BY

PHILIP SCHAFF

NEW YORK
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

1885

[All rights reserved]

Entered according to Act of Congress in the year 1885,
BY FUNK & WAGNALLS,
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress at Washington, D. C.

	<i>Non malè loqueris. Non eris memormalorum factorum. Non eris duplex in consilium dandum, neque bilinguis; tendiculum enim mortis est lingua. Non erit verbum tuum vacuum nec mendax. Non eris cupidus nec avarus, nec rapax, nec adulator, nec. . . .</i>	<i>covet anything of thy neighbour's goods. Thou shalt not forswear thyself. Thou shalt not revile. Thou shalt not cherish the memory of evil deeds. Thou shalt not be false in giving counsel, nor double-tongued; for such a tongue is a snare of death. Thou shalt not be vain nor false in thy speech. Thou shalt not be covetous, nor extortionate, nor rapacious, nor servile, nor. . . .</i>
[II. 4.]		
[II. 5.]		
[II. 6.]		

Cetera in Codice desiderantur.

(The rest in the MS. is wanting.)

A Critical Estimate of this Latin Fragment.

[The Rev. Dr. B. B. WARFIELD, Professor in the Western Theological Seminary, Allegheny, Penn., kindly places at my disposal the following critical discussion of this Latin *Didache* Fragment. He arrives independently at conclusions somewhat similar to those advocated by Dr. Holtzmann. I give the essay in full, and let it speak for itself.—P. S.]

THE very modest way in which Dr. von Gebhardt expresses himself when pointing out the value of the fragment of a Latin translation of the *Didache* which he discovered, has perhaps prevented its real importance from being noted. "It is at once clear," he says, "that an old Latin translation must be of high value not only for the text criticism of the *Διδαχή*, but also for the discussion of the integrity of that form of it which has been transmitted by the Constantinopolitan MS. But that it may be successfully turned to account, the translation should be complete, or, at least, should cover the greater part of the work. A fragment of such narrow extent as the one that we have ought to be used only with great circumspection."* He immediately adds that, nevertheless, it is impossible not to draw certain general conclusions from it. Among these general conclusions is one, perfectly simple in itself, while the corollaries that flow from it are such as to constitute this little fragment the key of the whole question of the origin, antiquity and value of the text of the *Didache* as given to us in the Constantinopolitan Codex. I shall try to point out very briefly how this happens.

It has been plain to every one from the beginning that the central problem concerning the *Didache* is its relation to the Epistle of Barnabas. Scholars have been all along divided on the question as to whether Barnabas originated the matter which was afterwards worked up into so neatly

* Harnack, p. 278.

ordered a treatise, or blunderingly borrowed it from the *Didache*. Only a few of the most discerning spirits—Drs. Lightfoot and Holtzmann, especially—saw that on the one hand Barnabas bears all the marks of a copier, and on the other the *Didache* fails to furnish the matter which he borrowed; and therefore felt bound to assume that they both borrowed their common matter from a third source. In this state of the controversy the Latin fragment comes in and lays before us a recension of the *Didache* text, of the type of the quotations in Barnabas. Only two theories are possible with regard to it: it may be a copy of the Bryennios *Didache* conformed to Barnabas; or it may be the representative of that form of the *Didache* from which Barnabas' quotations are taken.

The first of these theories appears to me exceedingly unlikely. All the proof (which seems not only adequate, but irresistible) that Barnabas is not here its own original is against it. There is no appearance of reworking visible in the fragment itself. There are several indications that Barnabas has borrowed from just such a text as this presents—one instance of which (of equal significance with the one that "E. L. H." gives from II. 4) must suffice for an illustration here: The Latin fragment reads near the beginning: "In his constituti sunt Angeli duo, unus æquitatis, alter iniquitatis." Barnabas, quite after his fashion elsewhere, develops this into the long statement that "over one way are stationed light-bringing angels of God, over the other the angels of Satan; and he indeed is Lord from eternities even to eternities, but the other, prince of the present time of iniquity." It is very difficult to believe that the Latin phrase could have been made from this; but it is quite after Barnabas' habit to multiply the angels, describe their character by their masters, and then off at the end of an awkwardly added sentence drop a hint of the neglected 'iniquitatis.' More important, however, than any of these considerations is the fact that the most characteristic point in the old Latin fragment—the omission of the passage from I. 3 (ἐὐλογεῖτε) through II. 1—is common not only to it and Barnabas, but also to the Apostolical Canons, and, indeed, in part, to all the documents representing the *Didache*, except the Bryennios MS. That this omission, moreover, was not a conscious one with the framer of the Canons is clear from the sequence of the apostolic names. As it is certain, then, that the Canons are here simply following their copy there is no reason to doubt that Barnabas is doing so too, and equally none that the Latin fragment is doing so too. Apart from this reasoning, it would be very unlikely that a copyist or translator, reproducing a text like that of Bryennios' MS., and adding to it here and there from Barnabas, should omit a long passage merely because it was not found in such a fragmentary compound as that given in Barnabas. It becomes, then, very highly probable that the Latin fragment is a representative of the type of *Didache* text from which Barnabas borrowed.

The following collation probably includes all the variations which may be attributed to the Greek text that underlay the Latin version:

Title: Latin omits ΔΩΔΕΚΑ with Eusebius, Athanasius, Anastasius, Nicephorus, and all known witnesses.

Latin omits the second title.

I. 1. Latin inserts *in seculo* against all known authorities. Cf., however, Lactantius, *Epist. div. instit.* c. lix. “*Duas esse humanæ vitæ vias;*” also *Divin. Instit.* vi. 3. “*Duæ sunt viæ . . . per quas humanam vitam progredi necesse est.*”

Latin apparently omits *μὴ* before *τῆς* and before *τοῦ*. If so, it is against all witnesses.

Latin inserts “*lucis et tenebrarum*” with Barnabas, cf. Lactantius (Harnack, p. 286); against Constitutions and Canons.

Latin inserts a long sentence beginning, “*In his—*” with Barnabas and Hermas, cf. Lactantius (do. p. 285); against Constitutions and Canons.

Latin apparently omits *μεταξὺ* with Barnabas; against Canons.

I. 2. Latin inserts *æternum* after “*Deum;*” against all known witnesses.

I. 3 sq. Latin omits from *εὐλογεῖτε* to II. 1, inclusive with Barnabas, Canons, and partly Constitutions; against (in part) Hermas, Clems. Alex. and Constitutions. Lactantius (do. p. 285.) also apparently omits. Note: all witnesses apparently omit latter part of I. 5.

II. 2. Latin transposes *οὐ φανεύσεις* and *οὐ μοιχεύσεις* against all witnesses.

Latin misplaces *οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις* of II. 3, against all.

II. 5. Latin reverses order of *ψευδῆς* and *κενός* with all witnesses extant (Constitutions, Canons).

Latin omits *ἀλλὰ μεμεστωμένος πράζει* with all (Constitutions, Canons).

II. 6. Latin inserts *cupidus* (cf. iii. 3) against all.

In estimating the meaning of this collation, it is important to remember that the Latin is a *version*, and may present more variations than the underlying Greek would. Furthermore, we must neglect all obvious clerical errors that may have affected but a single document.

A careful examination of all the various readings between the old Latin fragment and the corresponding parts of Bryennios' codex not only confirms this conclusion, but enables us to state it more broadly, thus: We have two well-marked recensions of the *Didache* text,—the one represented by the old Latin, Barnabas, and the Canons, and the other by the Bryennios MS. and the Apostolical Constitutions. We need no longer ask doubtfully with Bishop Lightfoot: “*May not both Barnabas and the Doctrine derive the matter which they have in common from a third source?*” Recognizing them as representing variant recensions of a common work, we simply seek the original form of that work.

We proceed but a single step when we affirm, next, that the recension represented by the Latin translation is probably the older form of the *Didache* text. This is *a priori* likely: if the Latin represents a form of text which was already used by Barnabas,—the date of which can scarcely be brought lower than A. D. 106,—it is only barely possible to put another Christian text still behind it; and not at all likely that such a text as that represented in the Bryennios recension could be back of it. The meagre historical hints that are in our hands point to the same conclusion: the Latin form of text was already in circulation when Barnabas was written (A. D. 106), while the other recension is first met with in Hermas, which after Dr. Hort's dis-

covery of its connection with Theodotion's Daniel, must be placed in the second half of the second century. There is more of importance in this historical argument than appears at first sight. For Hermas apparently quotes not from a text wholly like that of the Bryennios MS., but from one intermediate between the two recensions. At *Mandate* vi. 2, the angel clause at the opening of the *Didache* (which is peculiar to the Latin recension) is quoted: while at *Mandate* ii. 4-6 the alms-giving clause in *Didache* I. 5 (which is peculiar to the Bryennios recension) is quoted. We apparently see here the Bryennios recension in the act of formation. There is even reason to suspect that the actual Bryennios text is later in form than that which underlies any of the ancient reworkings—even than that used in the Apostolical Constitutions. Clement of Alexandria (*Frag. ex Nicete. Catena in Mat.* v. 42. Cf. also *Paed.* iii. 12) may have used either the transitional form that Hermas used, or the more settled form extracted by the Apostolical Constitutions, which presents still some variations from that of the Bryennios MS. Some instances of these Harnack gives at p. 210,—where the Constitutions and Canons agree against Bryennios; a marked instance (see v. Gebhardt. in Harnack, p. 280) concerns this early portion in which the Latin is preserved. These readings prove either that the Constitutions used the Canons, or that they were founded on a text of the *Didache* slightly differing from that of Bryennios, in the direction of the Canons. The latter appears more probable; and if this be so we again actually see the *Didache* text growing from the form represented by the recension given in the Latin, Barnabas, and the Canons, through that which underlies Hermas, to that which underlies the Constitutions, on to that which is given in the Bryennios MS. It must be observed that this does not prove that the type of *Didache* given in the Constantinople MS. is later than the Apostolical Constitutions themselves. It only suggests that the MS. of the *Didache* used by the compiler of these Constitutions was of a somewhat earlier type than that which the scribe Leon copied. The recension to which both belong, on the testimony of Clement of Alexandria and Hermas, must be as old as the first decade or two of the second half of the second century.

It will be observed that we are thus far in substantial agreement with Dr. Holtzmann, who writes: "It seems to me that Barnabas and the *Didache* should be coördinated Barnabas as the older but more carelessly and arbitrarily made, the *Didache* as the probably later but at all events much more exact recension of the allegory of the two ways" (p. 155). I differ with Holtzmann only in considering the type of text that underlies Barnabas not only the older, but also the more exact representation of the *Didache*—in fact, the original text from which the Bryennios type of text was developed. Whereas he says, "Among the still unknown and unnamed must the common root of Barnabas and the *Didache* be sought" (p. 159), I think that it is found, by the aid of the Latin fragment, in the recension that underlies Barnabas, the Canons, and it may be added Lactantius. This is in itself a reasonable supposition: when two types of one text are discoverable, and one appears older than the other, the natural supposition is that they are genealogically connected. There are no valid internal objections to this supposition: so far as the Latin text carries us, the most marked difference

between the two recensions consists in additions in the Bryennios type to the title, and especially a long addition in the body of the document. Dr. v. Gebhardt suggests that this passage may have been accidentally omitted from the *exemplar* of the Latin translation: and points out that it may have been about two pages long, and thus may have been all on one leaf. But he himself points out also that it is not likely to have been all on one leaf. And in the course of this paper I have pointed out reasons for supposing it was inserted rather by the other recension. It may be added that Dr. v. Gebhardt's explanation becomes still more unlikely if we suppose that I. 5 was a still later insertion.

There are some internal hints in the Bryennios document itself that these additions are additions to the original form of that text; *e. g.*, II. 1 is very awkward; both of the commandments given in I. 2, concerning our duty to God and our neighbor, had been developed in the immediately succeeding context. Must we not suspect that the passage from *εὐλογεῖτε*, I. 3, having been inserted, a new start was needed, and this ill-fitting phrase was invented to take the place at the head of the list of prohibitions in II. 2 sq. which the opening sentence of I. 3 originally occupied? Again, if the development of the Bryennios text through Hermas and the Apostolical Constitutions, traced above, is judged to be rightly read, the genealogical affiliation of this text to the Latin type is proved. The fact that the Latin text is fuller in I. 1 than that of the Constantinopolitan Codex is not fatal to this finding: the general rule that the shorter reading is the more original, is not without exceptions.

If on these grounds we assume that the original *Didache* is represented by the Latin version, we may trace its propagation through a twofold transmission. One appears in Barnabas, and later in the Canons, the author of which knew also Barnabas (the opening sentence is taken from the opening sentence of Barnabas; and an occasional reading, such as the insertion of *καὶ δοξάζεις τὸν λυτρωσάμενόν σε ἐκ θανάτου* in I. 2 is common to Barnabas and the Canons against Bryennios and the Latin) and still later in Lactantius,—gathering something, no doubt, to itself on the way. It may be called the Gentile recension, and seems to have been in circulation chiefly in Egypt and the West. The other appears half-formed in Hermas, in Clement of Alexandria, in the Apostolical Constitutions, and is preserved in the Constantinopolitan Manuscript, and may be called the Jewish-Christian recension. Its origin (which like some other Jewish-Christian books, notably the Gospel according to the Hebrews, presupposes and is based on a Catholic original) belongs to the middle of the second century, and its complete development, as we have it in our *Didache*, to a time probably anterior to Clement of Alexandria. A great deal of its almost Ebionitic tone may have been acquired in this process of growth: as its completion cannot be placed earlier than Hermas, its last interpolator may have engrafted some Montanistic traits. I am anxious, however, that what I have just said shall not be misunderstood: the differences between the two recensions are wholly *textual*,—and the latest form, as given in the Bryennios MS., is not much further removed from the original than say Codex D of the Gospels from

Codex B. The *scope* of the original is preserved intact through the whole transmission ; as is shown by the two facts, (1) that Barnabas (iv. 9) already knows the end as well as the beginning, and (2) the disposition of the matter is artistic and neat. But though the *Didache* is never so altered as to cease to be substantially the *Didache*, it appears in two well-marked textual forms.

Some support may be gained for this from the fact that the Church writers who mention the *Didache* sometimes mention it in the plural. This is true of Eusebius, Anastasius of Sinai, and Nicephorus Callistus. The significance of this is increased by the coupling by Anastasius of *Περίοδοι* and *Διδασχαι τῶν ἀποστόλων*. We all know what the plural *περίοδοι* imports. It is barely possible that the Syriac "*Teaching of the Apostles*," published by Cureton, may also be included in this plural.*

The reconstruction of the original text of the *Didache* is comparatively easy for the short section where we have the Latin version. We have only to correct it by the preponderance of the other documents of its class: *e.g.*, omit *in seculo* in I. 1 and *aternum* in I. 2, correct the order of prohibitions in II. 2 sq., insert the appropriate words omitted in its *lacuna*, and omit *cupidus* at the end. When it fails us, we are in more difficulty. All words found in both recensions may be accepted as certainly parts of the original. This will give us the kernel ; but not the whole document. And this was Krawutzcky's error in 1832. It is the same error that leads some students of the Synoptic Gospels to lay stress on the Triple Tradition as the whole original tradition. We can indeed be sure that this common matter was part of the original; but we can be equally sure that it was not all. So far as the matter extracted in Barnabas, the Canons, and Lactantius, goes, we are justified in adding this to the common matter as part of the original. The affiliations of the Latin fragment teach us this. When it fails, there is nothing for us but to provisionally accept the other Recension as a corrupt but substantial text. Here, too, we must keep in mind that the differences between the recensions scarcely rise above the ground of textual criticism; and it is only a question of purity of text that we are dealing with. We have the *Didache* competently exact in the latest text.

The bearing of this discussion on the value of the document given to us by Bryennios is obvious. It lowers its value for those who believed that it was in this exact form the basis of Barnabas' quotations. It immensely raises its value for those—perhaps the majority of critics—who believed it to have been made out of Barnabas. It prevents us from using it as it lies in the Constantinopolitan Codex as a purely first-century document, and warns us that it has elements and details that have crept in during the second century, possibly even somewhat late in it. But it vindicates for its general substance a first-century origin, and enables us to reconstruct the first-century form of text in a not inconsiderable portion.

* Concerning this book, see Gordon in the 'Modern Review,' July, 1884.