

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:



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

EARLY·CHURCH CLASSICS

THE·DOCTRINE·
OF·THE
TWELVE·APOSTLES·



281-1
B16

THE DOCTRINE
OF
THE TWELVE APOSTLES

Early Church Classics

THE DOCTRINE
OF
THE TWELVE APOSTLES

*TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH
WITH INTRODUCTION AND NOTES*

BY THE LATE
CHARLES BIGG, D.D.

CHRIST CHURCH, OXFORD

LONDON:
SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE,
NORTUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.; 43, QUEEN VICTORIA STREET, E.C.
BRIGHTON: 129, NORTH STREET.
1914

THE DOCTRINE OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES

INTRODUCTION

THE *Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles*, or the *Doctrine of the Lord through the Twelve Apostles to the Gentiles*, exists in a single MS., written in 1056 A.D. by one "Leon, notary and sinner." It was first published in 1883 by Philotheus Bryennius, Metropolitan at that time of Serrae in Macedonia, and afterwards of Nicomedia, who had discovered the precious volume in the library of the Jerusalem Monastery of the Most Holy Sepulchre at Constantinople.

The MS. is of great value because it contains, among other things, the only perfect Greek text of the *Epistle of Clement of Rome* and of what is generally known as the *Second Epistle of Clement*. But by far the most sensational part

of its contents is the *Doctrine*. It was soon perceived that, if this remarkable document belongs to the apostolic or sub-apostolic age, the early history of the Church must be practically rewritten, and accordingly we have of late seen very sweeping changes introduced into the current conceptions of early Christian life.

It is obvious that the historical significance of this treatise depends almost entirely upon its date. There is a time after which we can say with confidence that the state of things here described did not exist as the rule of the Church; there is a time again after which we can say with equal confidence that it did not exist even as a natural development or degradation of the apostolical polity. And the date must be ascertained in the usual manner, by a rigorous application of the usual tests. It will be fixed not by any historical theory, certainly not by a historical theory largely based upon the book itself, but by the latest feature to which we are able, by help of external knowledge, to assign a definite, or approximate, time-value.

It will be observed that what we have to do is to find a date for the book as a whole. The *Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles* is of course a pseudepigraphic work. This no one disputes. It is not, as it professes to be, the production of

the Apostles themselves. To this extent, at any rate, it is undoubtedly a kind of romance. Nor is it the production of one who was personally acquainted with any of the Apostles. The author had clearly no knowledge of the Twelve beyond what we possess ourselves. But the present point is that his book is a compilation of the loosest kind. It consists of three parts. The first (chapters i.—v.) contains the Two Ways. The second (chapters vi.—x.) treats of Fasting, Prayer, and the Sacraments. The third gives regulations concerning the hierarchy and winds up with a brief prophecy of the End. Of these parts the first and second are more ancient than the book itself. The description of the Two Ways exists separately in many editions, and has been thought by Dr. Taylor to run back to a Jewish original, but as given in the *Doctrine* it contains a section (i. 3-6) of much later date. The second part—which is a sort of communicant's manual—is also older than the book itself, though it presents features, for instance the absence of all reference to the Life, Passion, Death, or Resurrection of our Lord, which can on no hypothesis be regarded as primitive. The date of the third part is the real question in dispute.

What we are to investigate then is the point

of time at which these various elements were combined so as to form the book which we have before us, and in pursuing this inquiry we shall have to provide an answer to four questions—

1. What is the “attestation” of the *Doctrine*—in other words, by what ancient authors is it named or quoted?

2. What is the relation of the *Doctrine* to other documents of early Christianity? If we cannot fix its exact date, can we assign it a place in the row?

3. What traces does the *Doctrine* exhibit of ideas, usages, or words, to which we can from other sources assign an approximate date?

All these questions depend not on theory, but on fact, and they will give us firm ground to rest upon. When we have solved them as best we can, we shall be in a position to approach another—

4. How far does the organization described in the *Doctrine* agree or disagree with what we know on this point from the New Testament, or from other sources?

I

It is generally admitted that the *Doctrine*, in a modified expurgated shape, forms the groundwork of the first part of the Seventh Book of the *Apostolical Constitutions* (chapters i.—xxxiii.). This book may have been composed about the end of the fourth, or beginning of the fifth century. Here then we are provided with a fixed posterior limit. But here also we meet the first of the many singular phenomena that embarrass the history of the *Doctrine*. It was seen by the author of this Seventh Book of the *Apostolical Constitutions* (possibly also by the author of the earlier books), it was seen by Leon in the eleventh century. But it cannot be proved, or even made probable, that it was ever seen by any other eye till the day of its discovery in Constantinople. Let us consider the facts. I borrow them largely from Harnack, Bryennius and Funk.

Eusebius in his *History* (III. xxv. 4) mentions among "spurious" writings, "the so-called *Doctrines of the Apostles*;" Athanasius (*Epist. Fest.* ed. Bened. I. ii. 963) speaks of a certain "so-called *Doctrine of the Apostles*" as useful for the instruction of catechumens. Both these refer-

ences belong to the fourth century, and the titles used are not precisely the same as that of the *Doctrinæ of the Twelve Apostles*. This is not perhaps in itself a grave objection, but there are other difficulties. It is not easy to suppose that such a bishop as Athanasius would recommend to his catechumens so peculiar a book as our *Doctrine*. Again, Rufinus, repeating in Latin this statement of Athanasius, substitutes for the *Doctrine of the Apostles* the *Duæ Viæ vel Judicium Petri* (*Comm. in Symb. Ap.* 38, Migne 374), by which he may mean—it is not quite certain—to denote the same book. Further, Nicephorus, Patriarch of Constantinople in the ninth century, makes mention of a *Doctrine of the Apostles*, adding that it contained 200 “lines.” The “line” was an accurate tradé measurement, by which the copyists of MSS. were paid and the price of books was regulated, and it consisted of thirty-five letters (see Dr. Sanday, in *Studia Biblica*, iii. 263). But the *Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles* makes, upon Professor Harnack’s computation, 294 lines. It cannot therefore be the book of which Nicephorus is speaking.

I may observe that, upon counting the letters, I find that the first two parts of the *Doctrine* (chapters i.—x.) make up almost exactly 200

lines, and it is just possible that this portion of the book may have been in the hands of Nicephorus. But the probability is that the book spoken of by him, by Athanasius and Eusebius, and the *Doctrina* or *Doctrinæ Apostolorum* referred to in the *De Aleatoribus* of pseudo-Cyprian, and in two ancient catalogues cited by Funk, was a different work. Two references in Zonaras (twelfth century) and in Blastares may be set aside, as the *Doctrine of the Apostles* spoken of by these two writers is what we know as the *Constitutions of the Apostles*.

All these references show that as early as the time of pseudo-Cyprian there existed a book known as the *Doctrine*, or *Doctrines of the Apostles*. But they show also that the title was applied to a book which was not the *Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles*. There is nothing surprising in this. Even so peculiar a title as *Stromateis* was given to more books than one.

There is, however, a fact which many have thought to be decisive. It has been maintained that the *Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles* is quoted by Clement of Alexandria and by Origen.

Clement alludes more than once to the Two Ways, but he also quotes (*Strom.* I. xx. 100) the words, "My son be not a liar; for lying leads to

theft." These words are found both in the *Doctrine* (iii. 5) and in a document known as the *Apostolical Church Order*. I shall give reasons below for thinking that Clement borrowed them from the latter source.

Clement again (*Q. D. S.* 29) and Origen (*in Lib. Jud. Hom.* vi. 2) use the phrase Vine of David of the Sacramental wine. It occurs also in the second part of the *Doctrine*, in a prayer (chapter ix.). I shall discuss this remarkable phrase in the Notes; here it is sufficient to remark that an allegorism of this kind is common property.

Professor Harnack and Bryennius, holding that the *Doctrine* is unquestionably quoted by Clement, place its date accordingly within the second century (120-160 or 165; *after* Hermas and *before* Clement).

II

The next point which calls for consideration is the relation of the *Doctrine* to other documents of early Christianity, and first to the *Epistle of Barnabas* with which it has undoubtedly a literary connection.

That the *Doctrine* borrows from *Barnabas* is

maintained by Bryennius and Dr. Harnack. Other eminent authorities, among them Lightfoot, Holtzmann, and Lipsius, modify this view so far as to think it more probable that both *Barnabas* and the *Doctrine* drew from a common source. A considerable number of other writers, especially English and American, affirm without hesitation that the *Doctrine* is older than *Barnabas*.

Dr. Lightfoot thought that the date of the *Epistle of Barnabas* is probably between 70 and 79.

I shall not enter into this point separately, because it is involved in what I have to say later on, with respect to the *Apostolical Church Order*, and will be best dealt with there. But here it may be noticed, as the fact has been called in question, that the description of the Two Ways forms an integral part of the *Epistle of Barnabas*. It is true that it is omitted in the old Latin translation, but it is true also that the translation does not profess to be complete. It ends with the words *Habes interim de majestate Christi*, etc. The translator sent his patron all that he had been able to finish, as an instalment (*interim*). Passages from the concluding chapters of the *Epistle* are quoted as from *Barnabas* by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* II. xviii. 84 ;

Barn. xxi. 5), and by Origen (*de Princ.* III. ii. 4; *Barn.* xviii. 1).

Another disputed point is the relation of the *Doctrine* to Hermas. Dr. Harnack and Bryennius admit that the *Doctrine* borrows from Hermas, and this, as noticed above, is one of the two cardinal points by which they fix the date. On the other hand, Dr. Schaff and many others maintain that Hermas borrows from the *Doctrine*. But it is capable of absolute demonstration that Professor Harnack is in the right.

In the *Doctrine* (i. 5) we read: "Give to every one that asketh thee, and ask it not again; for the Father wills that we should give to all from His own gifts. Blessed is he that giveth according to the commandment; for he is *guiltless* ($\acute{\alpha}\theta\acute{\omega}\varsigma$). *Woe to him that receiveth*; for, if he receives because he hath need, he shall be *guiltless* ($\acute{\alpha}\theta\acute{\omega}\varsigma$), but he that hath no need shall give account why he received and for what."

In Hermas (*Mand.* ii. 4, 5), "Give to all, for God wills that we should give to all from His own gifts. They then that receive shall give account to God, why they received and for what. For they that receive because they are in affliction shall not be judged, but they that receive in hypocrisy shall be punished. He then that giveth is *guiltless*" ($\acute{\alpha}\theta\acute{\omega}\varsigma$).

But we also find (see Resch, *Agrapha*, p. 99) a saying which has been thought to come from an apocryphal Gospel, but occurs in what appears to be its earliest form in Clement of Alexandria, who gives the words as his own, and may very well be their author. The passage as found in Clement runs thus—"But *woe to them that have and receive* in hypocrisy, or are able to help themselves and yet receive from others. For he that hath and receiveth through hypocrisy or idleness shall be condemned."

Probably Clement had Hermas in view when he wrote these words, and possibly the *Woe* may come from an apocryphal Gospel. But it is evident that the author of the *Doctrine* had seen both Hermas and the other quotation. He has interwoven both together. The reader will notice in particular how the distinctive word of Hermas (*guiltless*) comes in the *Doctrine*, both before and after the distinctive words of the Clementine passage (*Woe to him that receiveth*).

The date of the *Shepherd* of Hermas is not certain, but according to the *Muratorian Canon* it would fall between 140 and 155 A.D.

The author of the *Doctrine* appears to have known and used also the *Diatessaron* of Tatian. The facts on which this inference rests will be best pointed out in the Notes. The date of the

Diatessaron also is not certain. It is probably not earlier than 150 nor later than 175 A.D. The Harmony was in common use in the East as late as the fifth century.

The foregoing considerations bring the *Doctrine* down to the middle of the second century. But now we meet another problem. What is the relation of the *Doctrine* to that document which Bickell called the *Apostolical Church Order*? It will be found in the editions of the *Doctrine* published by Bryennius, Harnack, and Schaff, and is given by Hilgenfeld in his *Novum Testamentum extra Canonem Receptum*. Hilgenfeld identifies it, perhaps rightly, with the *Duæ Viæ vel Judicium Petri* mentioned by Rufinus and by Jerome (*De Vir. Ill. i.*), and it is possibly the *Doctrine of the Apostles* spoken of by Athanasius and others. It contains what it calls the Two Ways, though the Way of Evil is omitted, and certain Church ordinances, which for the present purpose are of no importance. The text is parcelled out among the Twelve Apostles, each paragraph beginning with John said, Matthew said, Peter said, and so on; but the list of the Apostles is very singular; Peter, Cephas, Nathanael, and Bartholomew are reckoned as distinct persons, and the order of the first three is John, Matthew, Peter.

The full text of the *Apostolical Church Order*, as it is given in the Vienna MS., is thought to show signs of fourth-century additions. But one part (chapters iv.—xiv.), which alone concerns us, exists separately in the Syrian edition, and in the Moscow and Ottobonian MSS. It contains the Way of Light. This part Professor Harnack considers to belong to a date not later than 230 A.D. Harnack regards it as borrowed from the *Doctrine*. But the textual facts, which are most clearly given by Harnack himself, really compel us to the opposite conclusion. It is obvious that this text of the Way of Life was known to the author of the *Doctrine*. It is not possible to quote largely here, but the reader can easily verify the facts for himself, and he should by all means do so, for the point at which we have now arrived is absolutely crucial.

Barnabas gives both Ways. So also does the *Doctrine*. The *Church Order* gives the Way of Life only, and omits a handful of verses from this.

The text of the Way of Life is substantially identical in the *Doctrine* and in the *Church Order*. It differs from that of *Barnabas* in two points, in arrangement and in fulness of style. But the verses omitted by the *Church Order* are added by the *Doctrine* at the end of the Way of Life (iv. 9-14). This is not the place

that they occupy in *Barnabas*, but in these verses *Barnabas* and the *Doctrine* are substantially identical in text. In the Way of Death, again, *Barnabas* and the *Doctrine* exhibit the same text.

There can be little doubt as to the explanation of these plain facts. The author of the *Doctrine* made use of both sources. He took the more attractive text of the Way of Life from the *Church Order* as far as it is there given. Then he turned to *Barnabas*, and from him drew the omitted verses and the Way of Death. This is the only possible manner in which the peculiar resemblances and differences in arrangement and in expression can be accounted for.

It may be added that the very title *Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles* seems to show that the author had before his eyes a work in which the names of the Twelve were inserted. At the same time, the extraordinary nature of the list, as given in the *Church Order*, furnishes a sufficient reason why he omitted it, though by dropping out the names he left his oft-recurring phrase "my child" without any meaning. Further, the *Church Order* is a book with a remarkable history. It became the foundation of Egyptian ecclesiastical law, and is the parent of a numerous and flourishing offspring. It is not easy

to suppose that such a book is a mere derivative from one which is liable to many grave suspicions, and never made any mark in the world at all.

If this argument is correct, it follows that what Clement of Alexandria quoted may have been the short edition of the *Church Order*, and there remains no reason for supposing that the *Doctrine* existed in the second century. That it is later than *Barnabas* is proved *a fortiori* by the same considerations.

But now there is another step that we can take.

We find in the *Doctrine* (i. 3) a singularly audacious addition to the Sermon on the Mount, "Fast for them which persecute you." These words certainly call for an explanation, and this is forthcoming in the *Didascalia*, a third-century document, which underlies the first six books of the *Apostolical Constitutions*. The reader may turn to the second volume of Bunsen's *Analecta Ante-Nicæna*, and he will there find the following directions. "Therefore, when ye fast, pray for them which are perishing" (v. 12, 13, p. 312). Again, "I directed you to fast on the fourth day of the week for them . . . and again fast on Friday . . . pray for your enemies. . . . Therefore know, brethren, that ye keep our fast, which we observe in the Passover, on account

of the disobedience of the brethren. . . . For them therefore, and because of the judgment and destruction of the land, we ought to fast and mourn. . . . We ought therefore to have pity on them, and to believe and fast and pray for them" (v. 15, p. 314).

The Wednesday and Friday fasts, and the Lenten fast, are here declared to be held for the sake of the unbelieving Jews. It may be suspected that these words of the *Didascalia* were actually before the eyes of the author of the *Doctrine*. But at any rate they are the necessary explanation of his interpolation in the Sermon on the Mount. Before this peculiar rationale of the Lenten fast became current, the *Doctrine* cannot have been compiled. But now the words imply not only the Lenten fast, but the Quartodeciman Controversy. The very point is that the Christian was fasting on the feast of the Passover. The author of the *Doctrine* therefore was not a Quartodeciman. He had settled this point, or it had been settled for him, and he kept his Easter on the Sunday. This is quite in harmony with the strong dislike of Judaism which he manifests more than once. But if he was an Eastern, as is commonly supposed, these features are peculiar. They can hardly belong to an early stage of the Quarto-

deciman dispute. Clearly the strife had lasted long enough to engender considerable bitterness, and we have reached a time later than Pope Victor.

III

Thus we are carried well down into the third century. But now we pass on to our third heading and ask what ideas, usages, or words can be detected in the *Doctrine* to which some sort of a date can be assigned? The answer is that, short as this treatise is, it abounds in points which in the case of any other document would certainly have been thought to indicate a late origin. But, for some reason or another, the *Doctrine* has been the spoiled child of criticism. Here, and here only, suspicion has slept, and instead of the facts proving the youth of the book, the book has been held to show the age of the facts.

Most of the points in question have been dealt with in the Notes, and it will suffice here to recapitulate them without further comment. Some are mere phrases, and some no doubt are not so weighty as others. We may notice—
1. Idolatry described, as in the Apologists, as the service of "dead gods." 2. The clause in the

Lord's Prayer, understood as meaning not "deliver us from the Evil One," but "deliver us from evil." 3. The repeated phrase "the Gospel." 4. The phrase "Confess in church." 5. The three hours of prayer, and the fixed Wednesday and Friday fasts. 6. The Eucharistic use of the text, "Give not that which is holy to the dogs." 7. The singular way in which the Agape is mentioned (xi. 9). 8. The stress laid upon the persecution of Christians by Christians. 9. The absence of all reference to persecution of Christians by heathen. 10. The absence of Chiliasm. 11. And of all interest in the humanity of our Lord. 12. The traces of Alexandrine thought in the prayers. 13. On Baptism by Affusion I have spoken in the Notes. It affords the most precise and conclusive time-indication of all.

Two points require yet a special word.

At what date would it be thought lawful to publish the Lord's Prayer and a collection of Eucharistic prayers in a book of this description, which could be purchased by anybody for a few pence? Even in Origen there is great difficulty in picking out here and there a phrase which may possibly belong to the Liturgy, and the Lord's Prayer was not sold in cheap manuals.

Finally we have the word "Christmonger" (*Χριστέμπορος*, xii. 5). It is so used as to form an

epigram—"Not Christians but Christmongers." The epigram is found in Pseudo-Ignatius (*Trall.* vi. 2) and in Basil (*Epist.* 240). Χριστέμπορος or Χριστεμπορία occurs also in Pseudo-Ignatius (*Magn.* ix. 5); in a letter of Alexander of Alexandria (Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl.* i. 3); in Athanasius (*In Matt.* vii. 15, i. 1026), and also, it is said, in Chrysostom and Gregory Nazianzen (to these passages I have not been able to find the references). The epigram was, in fact, a current fourth-century byword, and dates the book in which it is found as certainly as the "tragedy" of the Pseudo-Phalaris.

IV

Taken together these considerations justify the belief that the *Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles* did not exist as a book before the fourth century. It is earlier than the seventh book of the *Apostolical Constitutions*, but more than this cannot safely be maintained.

But if this conclusion be just it must, as a matter of course, affect fundamentally our estimate of its contents. If the state of things described in the *Doctrine* belongs to the age of Athanasius, it can have existed only in the imagination of an individual, or in some eccentric

community on the outer verge of the Church. But this Introduction would be incomplete without some remarks on the peculiar organization here described.

It is held by Dr. Harnack and others that the *Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles* affords a strong confirmation of that theory of the Christian hierarchy which was propounded by Dr. Hatch in his *Bampton Lectures* for 1880. In its extreme form, this theory maintains that the Bishop or Presbyter was a successor in title of the Jewish Elder—that he was, in fact, a sort of churchwarden with administrative and judicial but no spiritual functions—that the care of the spiritual life of the community belonged entirely to the Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers, and that these had no administrative or judicial functions. The Presbyter was “elected” or “appointed” (*χειροτονεῖν*), but not ordained. The others were called to their work by the Holy Spirit Himself, and needed and received no commission of any kind from man.

In this extreme form Dr. Hatch's theory appears to be quite untenable. At no time was there this sharp and peremptory distinction between the administrative and the spiritual. St. Paul was an Apostle, a speaker with tongues, a preacher and a prophet, but we also find him

taking an active part in the financial affairs of the Church, and supervising the great collection for the saints. Nor can it easily be denied that in the Epistles to the Corinthians he appears as judge and ruler. On the other hand, the Presbyter was also pastor. "Take heed unto yourselves," says St. Paul to the elders of Ephesus (Acts xx. 28), "and to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the Church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood." The appointment of the Bishop or Presbyter was made, in some sense or another, by the Holy Ghost; it was in itself a *charisma*, though a mediate *charisma*, inasmuch as it was conveyed through the hands of man; and it was pastoral; the bishop was "to feed the Church," not surely with alms alone, but with the bread of life. Why, again, did St. Paul summon to Miletus only the Presbyters of the Ephesian Church? The answer must be that he regarded them as sufficient representatives, for all purposes, of the community to which they belonged. Hence it is possible for St. Peter, whose *First Epistle* was known to the author of the *Doctrine*, to compare the Elder to the Chief Shepherd, and to speak of Christ Himself as the Bishop of souls (1 Peter ii. 25; iii. 1-4).

The *Doctrine* does not deny that the Bishop

was a spiritual officer. What it says is that "they too," the Bishop and Deacons, "minister to you the ministry of the Prophets and Teachers," therefore they are not to be despised. Indeed it appears to reserve the celebration of the Eucharist entirely to the clergy (xv. 1, 2), though the Prophet is to be allowed to return thanks, if he be so minded, after Communion (x. 7). How is this to be explained? Can we suppose that the *Doctrine* represents a state of things which grew naturally out of that proper to the Apostolic age, that, as the Prophet disappeared, the Bishop gradually succeeded to his functions, and that what we have described in the *Doctrine* is that brief period in which the two classes were in a sort of equilibrium? Only if it is a mistake to think that the Bishop was at his first appearance a spiritual personage. And only if the *Doctrine* is an exceedingly ancient book. It has been argued above that it belongs to the fourth century, but in any case it cannot be placed before Hermas. And, even if it be dated very shortly after Hermas, its authority cannot be relied upon. For it describes a state of things of which Hermas had not the slightest cognizance.

Let us observe at starting the extraordinary vagueness of the *Doctrine*. Its hierarchy consists

of Apostles, Prophets, Teachers, Bishops, Deacons. Of these titles that of Apostle is surely the highest, yet the Apostle is here the merest phantom. Three things only are said about him, that he is an itinerant, that he is to stay nowhere more than two days, and that he is to accept, or at any rate ask for, no money. If he were neither Prophet, Teacher, nor Bishop, what were his functions? He is left without either place or meaning, in the air, so to speak. He is apparently first in dignity, yet we read immediately "the Prophet is your high-priest" (xiii. 3). What title can possibly be higher than that of High Priest? Again, does the name Teacher denote a separate function or not? Sometimes apparently it does, for, in the passage already referred to (xv. 1), Prophet and Teacher are set against Bishop and Deacon. But at the head of this section of the book (xi. 3), we read only of Apostles and Prophets. Are we to suppose, then, that the Prophet and possibly the Apostle also was always a Teacher? There is no doubt that this combination of gifts existed always in the case of the New Testament Apostles, though certainly not always in the case of the New Testament Prophets. But I do not feel quite clear whether the *Doctrine* means that it often exists or that it always exists.

As to the Apostle it will be sufficient to refer to Bishop Lightfoot's *Excursus* in his edition of the *Epistle to the Galatians*. The one point that concerns us is, that neither the name nor the office exists outside of the New Testament.

The function of Teaching naturally lasted on in the Church. It might be exercised by any man, Apostle, Prophet, or Presbyter. Even as late as the third century Origen, while yet a layman, was not only a teacher, but was allowed to teach or preach in church at Cæsarea. The lawfulness of lay preaching in church was denied by Demetrius of Alexandria, but Alexander and Theoctistus could allege precedents for the liberty which they had granted to Origen, and they were probably in the right. Teaching was by no means necessarily a clerical function. At the same time there might be false teaching, and the teacher must obviously have been subject to some authority; it is needless here to inquire what that authority was. (On this point the reader may consult Routh, ii. 167, 199.)

With regard to the Prophet there is more to be said.

In the New Testament we find repeated mention of prophets, first at Jerusalem and Antioch, afterwards in other churches, notably at Thessalonica and Corinth. But there were

many communities in which prophecy does not appear to have existed at all, and, as a popular common manifestation, it seems to have followed mainly in the wake of St. Paul. At Corinth we see a Church, in a state of abnormal excitement, on the very point of bursting asunder, and going to ruin.

If we ask what the Christian prophet was, the New Testament gives us a very clear answer. Sometimes the prophet read the secret thoughts of the heart—thus Peter detected the falsehood of Ananias. Sometimes he conveyed to the Church a special direction from the Holy Spirit—"Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them." Sometimes he foretold a particular event; thus Agabus warned the Church of an impending famine. Sometimes some special truth was conveyed to him in a vision, as to St. Peter at Joppa. But his great theme was Eschatology; the main instances of prophecy in the New Testament, outside of the Gospels, are to be found in Thessalonians, I Cor. xv., and the Apocalypse.

But the Prophet, as such, was not a Teacher. This is evident from the fact that women might and did prophesy (Acts xxi. 9; I Cor. xi. 5), but were forbidden to teach.

The two gifts were radically different. The

prophet's *charisma* was immediate ; he uttered what he could not have known but for a direct revelation from the Holy Spirit. The *charisma* of the teacher was mediate ; its organ was the human intelligence, quickened, no doubt, and fertilized by the Holy Spirit, but appearing always as a form of reason. He reasoned with men out of the Scriptures, he opened the Scriptures, he preached, taught, confirmed, exhorted, persuaded. There is but one point in which the two gifts may conceivably have met, that which was afterwards known as Allegorism. By this art the teacher discovered in Scripture vaticinations, "mysteries," which were hidden from the eyes of others. But it may be doubted whether Allegorism was enough to constitute a prophet. Apollos was very probably an Allegorist, but he is not called a prophet. Similarly great preachers of our own time, such as Maurice or Robertson, were not prophets, though all great preachers find in Scripture light which is not discerned by men of lower spiritual endowments.

The word "ecstasy" is used, though very rarely, of the Christian Prophet, but he was subject to at least two stringent limitations—he might never personate the Holy Spirit, and his utterances were always intelligible. But he might contradict other prophets, and he might

make mistakes (2 Thess. ii. 1-3); he might even be a false prophet (1 John iv. 1). Hence it was necessary that his spirit should be tried. The test would be, first of all, the doctrine delivered by the Apostles, and, secondly, the enlightened conscience of the Church. The verdict would be collected and pronounced by the presiding officer.

There was a sense, no doubt, in which the Prophet stood above the mere Presbyter or Bishop. He belonged to the same family as the great prophets of the Old Testament. Accordingly St. Paul gives him precedence over all but Apostles—"Some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers." Even in the ancient liturgies he retains his place of dignity. In the *Clementine Liturgy* the order is saints, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, confessors, bishops, priests, and much the same order is observed in the *Armenian* and *Coptic Liturgies*, and in those of *St. Mark* and *SS. Addæus and Maris* (see Hammond, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, pp. 18, 156, 182, 208, 274). But the Prophets were not, properly speaking, an order, they held no office, they had no special seat in the Church, and, above all, they were not paid. The Christian community would have thought it a great sin for a prophet, as such, to accept either fees or salary.

What part was given to the Prophet in the worship of the Church is not quite clear. No doubt he was allowed to speak, either during or after the service, but what this service was is not certain.

The gift of prophecy remained in the Church under similar or the same conditions. Irenæus (v. 6), who was himself a prophet (see Lightfoot, *Ignatius*, p. 1008), knew many prophets. So did Justin (*Trypho*, lxxxii.); both add that among them were false prophets. Many names are on record, both of women and men, such as Ammia, Quadratus, Melito, Attalus of Pergamum, Dionysius of Alexandria, Pionius, Perpetua, Gregory Thaumaturgus. Cyprian was guided by visions which some of his brethren ridiculed (*Epp.* xvi. 4; lxvi. 10). Ignatius was a prophet, and exhorts Polycarp to pray for the same grace (*Polycarp*, i. 11). Polycarp modestly confessed that this favour had not been granted to him (*Phil.* xii.). But afterwards he had a vision of his own death, and he too takes rank among the Prophets. In the communities addressed in the *Apostolical Church Order* there were three widows on the staff, two of whom were "to wait for revelations" (xxi.). Here we have the starting-point of Montanism; Priscilla and Maximilla were the staff prophetesses of

Montanus. The Quintillians also had official prophetesses who prophesied during service seven at a time (Epiph. *Hær.* xlix). The *soror* of Tertullian (*de An.* 9) had her visions on Sundays after service. On the other hand Origen (*Celsus*, vii. 11) knew no prophets. One of the main objects of his Allegorism was to supply, by means of exegesis, the deficiency of inspired communications as to the future life.

What Hermas tells us on this subject calls for special notice. Hermas was himself a prophet. He lived and wrote before the author of the *Doctrine*, who quotes him and knew all about him. Further, Hermas was rather a touchy, jealous person, who thought a good deal of his dignity. If in his time, or not long before it, there were prophets holding the position described in the *Doctrine*, he must have been aware of the fact, and he would not have failed to make his voice heard. Whatever went on in the Church was known at Rome, and apostles and prophets wandering about with extravagant pretensions from city to city must have come into contact with him, and aroused his susceptibilities. He was himself the most eminent prophet of his day, and why should he have submitted to be ordered about by the Church officials if he knew that their claims to govern

him were of quite recent date? From what he lets us see of his character and pretensions we may say with great confidence that he was not the man who would have tamely given way, and, if he accepted the discipline of the Church, it was because he had never heard of any different state of things.

Now what does he tell us about Prophets? He tells us (*Mand.* xi.) that there were false prophets as well as true. The signs of the false prophet are that he desires to have a seat upon the official bench (*πρωτοκαθεδρίαν ἔχειν*), that he will answer questions, acts, that is to say, as a fortune-teller, and that he takes money. The true prophet will not answer questions, and prophesies only in church, when the Holy Spirit comes upon him from God, in response to the prayers of the brethren. Two points at any rate are here quite clear. The true prophet is not paid, and is not an official, has, that is to say, no recognized place on the bench where the clergy sit. The latter point is of particular importance, for there is another remarkable passage which deals with this very question. The Lady, who personifies the Church, says to Hermas in one of his visions (*Vis.* iii. 1. 8, 9), "Sit here," on the bench (*συμφέλιον*) on which she is herself seated. "I say unto her, Lady,

suffer the priests first to sit. Sit, says she, as I tell thee. I was minded then to take my seat on the right hand, but she suffered me not, and beckoned with her hand that I should sit on the left. When I doubted then and was grieved that she suffered me not to sit on the right hand, she saith to me, Art thou grieved, Hermas? The place on the right hand belongs to others, who have already pleased God and suffered for the Name." To sit on the right hand belongs to the martyrs, and it is clear therefore that Hermas is here thinking of thrones in the kingdom of heaven (cf. Matt. xx. 21). But it is also clear that he had never heard of true prophets who sat upon the earthly bench of office, and that he would not have hesitated to claim a place there for himself, if he had had the least idea that such a claim had ever or anywhere been sanctioned by the usage of the Church.

Now, in the light of all this, let the reader consider the position of the prophet as described in the *Doctrine*. He is always a man, the prophetess is not contemplated at all. He is an officer. He is paid; and not only that, but he alone is paid, for if there be no prophet in the community, the first fruits are to be given neither to Apostle, Bishop nor Deacon, but to the

poor (xiii. 4). What was the precise nature of his "ecstasy" is not quite clear, but apparently (the text of xi. 11 is dubious) he gives "signs" which may be of a very ambiguous character. But, above all, he is not to be tested. "Every prophet, who speaks in the spirit, ye shall not test nor question : for every sin shall be forgiven, but this sin shall not be forgiven." If he has "the manners of the Lord," he is to be accepted (xi. 7, 8). We may go so far as to say that if a false prophet were struggling to justify his position and save his salary, this is the language that he would employ. It is true that our Lord Himself said, "By their fruits ye shall know them." But a prophet who would have charged any simple priest, who dared to challenge his pretensions, with "sin against the Holy Ghost"—for this is what is meant—would not have been regarded with favour by St. John.

It does not seem possible to regard the prophet of the *Doctrine* even as a successor in title of the New Testament Prophet. He is in essential points a different person, and bears the appearance rather of a resuscitation or later imitation. And here I cannot forbear calling attention to a very remarkable passage in the recently-discovered *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* (ed. H. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, 1898). In this most interesting

volume No. 5 is "a fragment of a Christian Homily or Treatise on the spirit of Prophecy." According to the editors "the papyrus, which is a leaf out of a book, is written in a good-sized, informal, uncial hand of the late third or early fourth century."

The translation of so much as is intelligible runs thus (I alter in some unessential points that given by the editors)—"And that man, being filled with the Holy Spirit, speaks as the Lord wills; the spirit of the divinity will thus be manifest. For the prophetic spirit is the body (*σωματεῖον*) of the prophetic order (*τῆς προφητικῆς τάξεως*), which is the body of the flesh of Jesus Christ, which was mingled with the humanity through Mary."

We see here that about the beginning of the fourth century, and most probably in Egypt, there was, or was imagined to be, "a prophetic order," which lived in an atmosphere of very peculiar theological thought. For none but a very peculiar thinker could speak of the fleshly Body of our Lord as blended with His Humanity, and, by virtue of this blending, constituting the body, or essence, of the order of prophets. But it is evident that this "prophetic order" claimed to be in some sense the Body of our Lord, that is to say, the Church. It is greatly to be hoped

that in the yet unpublished portion of their treasure-trove Mr. Grenfell and Mr. Hunt may chance upon other leaflets which will throw light upon this very remarkable fragment.

As yet nothing has been said about the twofold ministry of bishops and deacons. This appears, no doubt, to carry us back to the date of the *Epistle to the Philippians*, and is precisely that feature of the *Doctrine* which has led many writers to assign the book a date within the limits of the first century. But why, we ask, does the author never so much as allude to the title Presbyter? Unless he wrote actually within the lifetime of St. Paul, and even before the date of the *Pastoral Epistles*, this omission is inexplicable. The *Doctrine* is a short treatise, but this is no sufficient reason.

Here too we are in the region not of nature, but of art. At any rate we must stick to facts, and if it is certain that the *Doctrine* was compiled neither in the first, nor in the second, nor even in the third century, the twofold ministry will lie under much the same kind of suspicion as the prophetic order.

V

Beyond this it is not safe to go. Where the author of the *Doctrine* lived and wrote we cannot tell with any certainty.

But some curious facts may be brought together here ; many of them have already been noticed.

The author avoids in a very marked manner all mention of angels or demons. He expressly denies that there will be any resurrection of the wicked. He did not look for a millennium, and, as Chiliasm was in the main destroyed by the Alexandrines, this fact lends colour to the suspicion that he was influenced by Alexandrine philosophic thought. The grace which he looks for in the Eucharist is "life and knowledge," which is exactly the teaching of Clement. What view he held of our Lord's Person it is not easy to say. But he omitted in the opening of the Way of Life the reference to Christ's Atonement, which he certainly found in that place in Barnabas, and in the Eucharistic prayers there is no reference whatever to Forgiveness, to the Birth, or Passion, or Death, or Resurrection, or Ascension of our Lord, nor are the elements regarded as even a type of the Body

and Blood. If the author was not a Docetist it must be admitted that he does himself the gravest injustice. Unless the doubtful word "spreading out," the first sign of the Second Coming, be taken to mean the Body spread out upon the Cross, there is not from first to last an allusion of any kind to the earthly existence of Jesus.

He was certainly an Ascetic, and would gladly have seen all his brethren abstain from flesh food (vi. 2, 3). We may infer from this with tolerable confidence that he used no wine, and looked upon marriage as belonging to the lower morality. The community for which he wrote—unless he was a mere romancer—dwelt in a country district among flocks and herds, vines and olive trees. They lived in peace and feared no trouble; the only enemies to be dreaded were their fellow Christians (xiii. 3-7; xvi. 4). All this seems to tell of a late date.

The community, if it existed at all, must have been small and insignificant, or we should have known more about it. The imaginative sketch of a body of Apostles, who wander about from town to town, and never stay more than two nights in the same place, gives an idea of almost limitless space—Europe would be too narrow for it,—but the Apostle of the *Doctrine* is a mere

phantom, not meant to be taken seriously. The Prophet is a slightly more lifelike figure, yet where, except in cloudland, can we look for him as he is here described, settled in the midst of simple-minded farmers, and taking toll of all their possessions, even down to their clothes ?

Is the *Doctrine*, then, a romance pure and simple, or does it contain a certain substratum of reality viewed through a highly imaginative medium ? We seem to be left with these two alternatives, and it is not easy to choose between them.

Nevertheless there were in the fourth century a great number of prophetic sects. Notably there were Montanists in Phrygia and the adjacent districts, who had bishops in every village, and some of whom were persecuted by the Christian Emperor Constantine (Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.* ii. 32 ; vii. 19 ; Eus. *Vita Const.* iii. 63-66 ; Bonwetsch, *Montanismus*, p. 171 ; Epiphanius, *Hær.* xlviii. 14). If the *Doctrine* ever had a local habitation we might look for it here without absurdity.

Certainly we should have here a reasonable explanation of the facts before us. There are many Montanist features in the *Doctrine*. The Montanists were anti-Judaic, ascetic, enthusiastic, highly spiritual. The sacraments and the

humanity of Christ can have had no more meaning for them than they have in the system of George Fox. Here again, among Sozomen's Montanists, we find bishops, and doubtless deacons, but no presbyters. The later Montanists had no prophets and no apostles, but they lived, as they always had lived, in an ideal past, and still hoped to see some inspired figure appear in their village street with staff and scrip, and perhaps bless them by taking up his abode in their midst. What he would be, what he would say, what he would do they knew not. Doubtless he would give strange signs of his strange authority, but though his actions should be as mysterious and perplexing as those of Hosea, they were ready to receive him with open arms, if only he brought with him a fresh supply of "life and knowledge."

It is not hard in this way to explain the curious vagueness of the apostle and prophet in the *Doctrine*. They were heroes of the past, much longed for but never seen. Nor is it difficult to imagine one of these Montanist bishops in the days when Constantine's hand was heavy upon his harmless Church, when even Christians had become persecutors, and the sheep were turned into wolves, putting forth this book, weaving together dreams and realities,

holding up once more before his brethren the image of their simple Quaker-like faith, exhorting them to stand fast in their ancient ways, and comforting them with the thought of Christ's return to judge.

But there is yet another tempting conjecture. We might regard the *Doctrine* as a stern Montanist protest against the persecution of Julian. Who is that world-deceiver who appears as Son of God, into whose hands the earth is delivered up, who brings the race of man into the fiery trial of testing, and commits iniquities which have never been seen from the beginning? What deep significance is breathed into these words, if we suppose them to be inspired by the actual sight of the great Apostate, seated on the imperial throne, worshipped as all the heathen Cæsars were, dipping his hands in the blood of Christians, and offering, as was believed, human sacrifices to his wicked gods!

All this may be incapable of proof, and the reader will accept it for what it is worth. But even if it be rejected, it will serve to show that it is perfectly easy to find in the fourth century circumstances in which precisely such a book as the *Doctrine* might have been compiled.

POSTSCRIPT

SINCE this Introduction was put into type Professor Harnack's *Chronologie* has at last reached my hands. Like the Montanists of Sozomen the English Midlands are a little belated, and German books come slowly down this way.

In this latest utterance Professor Harnack retracts his earlier and better view as to the relation of the *Doctrine* to Hermas. Now he thinks with Resch that the fragment quoted above on p. 15 is the source of the two passages quoted on p. 14. I had not thought it necessary to comment upon Resch's opinion, but since it has received such eminent support a few words are desirable.

On this theory there is no immediate connection between the passage in Hermas and that in the *Doctrine*. But this cannot be maintained. The two passages have in common—1, the sentence, "God (the Father) wills, etc.;" 2, the phrase, "why he (they) received and for what;" 3, the remarkable word *guiltless*. Not one of these is in the fragment.

It can hardly be denied that these two passages stand to one another as borrower and lender, and, if this is so, Resch's view falls at once to the ground.

We are left then to choose between two alternatives.

Did Hermas borrow from the *Doctrine*? This Harnack still regards as impossible, as does Resch also.

Did the *Doctrine* then borrow from Hermas? This is not only possible but highly probable. I observe that—

1. The *Doctrine* passage (i. 5, 6) is a cento of loose quotations from memory. The author quotes (a) St. Luke; (b) *Woe to him that receiveth*; (c) St. Matthew; (d) an apocryphal gospel, *Let thine alms sweat*, etc.—all inaccurately. Why should he not also have used his recollection of Hermas?

2. Hermas begins, "Give to all, for God wills." The *Doctrine* has, "Give to every one that asketh thee, and ask it not again, for the Father wills." That is to say, the *Doctrine* substitutes a Gospel text for the simple "Give to all" of Hermas. The rule generally applied in such cases would certainly compel us to regard Hermas as the original here.

3. The *Doctrine* harps upon the word *guiltless*

just as men do upon a telling word from a favourite author. See how he drags it into the middle of the Clementine passage, where he certainly did not find it, and with what gusto he repeats it in the next line. It is as if he were saying to himself, "The giver is always *guiltless*; Hermas is quite right there; but the needy receiver is also *guiltless*." He is improving his author.

4. The *Woe to them that receive* is, I think, best explained as a comment made by Clement upon Hermas, and I see no difficulty in supposing that the author of the *Doctrine* is here quoting Clement. But even if this phrase comes from an apocryphal Gospel the conclusion is not altered. The *Doctrine* is here amalgamating two authorities, and is later than both.

DOCTRINE OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES

DOCTRINE OF THE LORD THROUGH THE TWELVE APOSTLES TO THE GENTILES

CHAPTER I

1. There are two Ways, one of Life and one of Death, and there is much difference between the two Ways. 2. The Way then of Life is this: Firstly, thou shalt love God who made thee:

The book, it will be seen, has two titles, a longer and a shorter. It is to be distinguished, probably, from the *Doctrine* or *Doctrines of the Apostles* to which there are several references (see Introduction, p. 10).

The Twelve Apostles. In the *Apostolical Church Order* the names of the Twelve are inserted (see Introduction, p. 16). Here they are omitted, but a trace of them remains in the repeated phrase My child.

To the Gentiles. The book is strongly anti-Judaic (see notes on i. 3; viii. 1).

i. 1. *Two Ways.* Both are given in the *Epistle of Barnabas*, chapters xviii. *sqq.* The Way of Life is given also in the *Apostolical Church Order*. See Introduction. In Barnabas the Ways are presided over by good and evil angels. These are here omitted.

2. *who made thee.* After these words in Barnabas and ACO we read "and glorify him that redeemed thee from death."

secondly, thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself: and whatsoever thou wouldest not have done to thyself, do not thou either to another.

3. Now the doctrine of these words is this: Bless them which curse you, and pray for your enemies, and fast for them which persecute you. For what thank have ye, if ye love them which love you? Do not even the Gentiles the same? But do ye love them which hate you, and ye shall have no enemy. 4. Abstain from fleshly and bodily lusts. If any one give thee a blow on the right cheek, turn to him the other also, and thou shalt be perfect. If any compel thee to go one mile, go with him two: if any take thy cloak, give him also thy tunic: if any take from thee what is thine, ask for it not again: for indeed thou canst not. 5. Give to every one that asketh thee, and ask it not again; for the Father wills that we

Do not. The negative form of the Golden Rule. See Resch, *Agrapha*, p. 95.

3. *Bless.* Matt. v. 44, 46; Luke vi. 28, 32. The author follows in the main the text of Luke, but "Gentiles" (not *sinner*s) is from Matthew. The same peculiarity occurs in Tatian: see Zahn, *Forschungen*, i. p. 133.

Fast for them. See Introduction, p. 19.

4. *Abstain.* 1 Pet. ii. 11.

Blow. In Tatian also the order is Matt. v. 39b, 41, 40b, Luke vi. 30b, and the verb used with tunic is *give*, not *let him have*. Zahn, *Forschungen*, i. p. 134.

5. *Give.* Luke vi. 30a. In the following words a passage from Hermas is blended with another from some apocryphal gospel (see Introduction, p. 14).

should give to all from his own gifts. Blessed is he that giveth according to the commandment: for he is guiltless: woe to him that receiveth: for if one receiveth because he hath need, he shall be guiltless: but he that hath no need shall render account why he received and for what, and being cast into straits shall be examined concerning what he did, and shall not come out thence till he have paid the uttermost farthing. 6. But about this it hath also been said: Let thine alms sweat into thy hands, until thou know to whom thou art to give.

CHAPTER II

I. And the second commandment of the doctrine is this: 2. Thou shalt not kill, thou shalt not commit adultery, thou shalt not corrupt boys,

Farthing. Matt. v. 26.

6. *Sweat.* A quotation from an apocryphal gospel. It is used also by Cassiodorus: *desudet eleemosyna in manu tua, donec invenias justum cui eam tradas.* The word *justum* shows that Cassiodorus was not borrowing from the *Doctrine*. See Resch, *Agrapha*, p. 288.

ii. 1. *Second.* Above (i. 2) the author divides his second law (duty to one's neighbour) into a positive and a negative, and goes on to explain the positive (verses 3-6). All this is his own addition, not found in Barnabas or ACO. Hence what he calls here the second commandment is really the second division of the second.

thou shalt not commit fornication, thou shalt not steal, thou shalt not use magic, thou shalt not practise sorcery, thou shalt not procure abortion, nor kill the new-born child. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's goods. 3. Thou shalt not forswear thyself, thou shalt not bear false witness, thou shalt not slander, thou shalt not bear malice. 4. Thou shalt not be double-minded nor double-tongued : for a double tongue is a deadly snare. 5. Thy word shall not be false, nor empty, but fulfilled in deed. 6. Thou shalt not be covetous, nor extortionate, nor a hypocrite, nor spiteful, nor arrogant. Thou shalt not take evil counsel against thy neighbour. 7. Thou shalt hate no man, but some thou shalt reprove, and for some thou shalt pray, and some thou shalt love more than thy soul.

CHAPTER III

1. My child, flee from all evil and from all that is like it. 2. Be not wrathful : for wrath

5. *Fulfilled in deed* : μεμestωμένως πράξει, a very singular phrase, which is not Greek.

6. *Covetous, extortionate*. 1 Cor. v. 10.

iii. 1. Perhaps a reminiscence of 1 Thess. v. 22. Throughout the *Doctrine* the careful reader will detect constant fleeting allusions to the New Testament ; but the author never quotes verbally except from the Gospels.

guideth to murder : nor a zealot, nor contentious, nor quick to anger : for from all these things murders are begotten. 3. My child, be not lustful, for lust guideth to fornication : nor a filthy talker, nor one of high looks : for from all these things adulteries are begotten. 4. My child, be not an augur : for it guideth to idolatry : nor an enchanter, nor an astrologer, nor a purifier, nor

The reason is that the Twelve Apostles are supposed to be speaking at a time when the rest of the New Testament was not yet written. The same peculiarity, arising from the same reason, exists in the Clementine *Homilies*, where the Pauline Epistles are often alluded to but never precisely quoted.

4. *A purifier.* The word refers to heathen lustrations and rites of expiation. They were much practised in the nursery ; thus Augustine (*Confessions*, I. vii. 2), speaking of the faults of childhood, says, " Mothers and nurses say that they make atonement for these faults—by what remedies they know best." The augur was one who divined by the flight of birds, the enchanter used magical words and amulets. In the Way of Death the faithful are warned also against witchcraft, that is, necromancy and various forms of magic, and against sorcery, or the use of philtres and magic potions. The word here translated *astrologer* is *mathematician*. *Mathematicus* is so used in Juvenal (vi. 562). Aulus Gellius (I. ix. 6) tells us that this is a vulgar use of the word. The Greek word retained the sense of *astronomer* (see Philo, *de Mut. Nom.* i. 589 ; Plutarch, *de facie in orbe lunæ*, ix. ; *de Is. et Os.* xli. ; Porphyry, *vita Plotini*, 15). Perhaps this passage and the parallel in ACO are the first instances of the use of the Greek word in the restricted sense of *astrologer*. The Church was always on its guard against magic, no doubt with good reason. The Emperor Hadrian in his *Epistle to Servian* says, " nemo Christianorum presbyter non

do thou consent to look on these things : for from all these things idolatry is begotten. 5. My child, be not a liar : for the lie guideth to theft : nor a lover of money, nor vainglorious ; for from all these things thefts are begotten. 6. My child, be not a murmurer : for it guideth to blasphemy : nor self-willed ; nor evil-minded ; for from all these things blasphemies are begotten. 7. But be meek, for the meek shall inherit the earth. 8. Be longsuffering, and merciful, and harmless, and quiet, and good, and trembling always at the words that thou didst hear. 9. Thou shalt not exalt thyself, nor give boldness to thy soul. Thy soul shall not cleave to the lofty, but with the just and lowly shalt thou walk. 10. The providences that befall thee thou shalt welcome as good, knowing that without God nothing cometh to pass.

mathematicus, non haruspex, non aliptes." This need not be taken too seriously, but it shows how great was the danger. See also the *Canons of Hippolytus* (ed. Achelis, p. 83).

5. *My child, be not a liar.* Quoted as scripture by Clement of Alexandria, but more probably from the ACO in which the same words are found (see Introduction).

7. *Meek.* Matt. v. 5.

8. *Trembling* (Is. lxvi. 2, Sept.).

10. *Providences.* ἐπισηματα, the operations of God's providence.

CHAPTER IV

1. My child, night and day shalt thou remember him that speaketh to thee the Word of God, and thou shalt honour him as the Lord, for in him by whom the Lordship is spoken of is the Lord. 2. And daily shalt thou seek out the faces of the saints, that thou mayest rest on their words. 3. Thou shalt not desire division, but shalt set at peace them that strive: thou shalt judge justly; thou shalt not regard persons, when thou rebukest for transgressions. 4. Thou shalt not be double-minded, whether it shall be or not. 5. Be not one that holdeth out his hands to receive and shutteth them for giving. 6. If thou have aught in thy hands, thou shalt give a

iv. 1. *Remember.* Heb. xiii. 7, "Remember them which have the rule over you, who have spoken unto you the word of God." Barnabas has "thou shalt remember the day of judgment day and night." The ACO agrees with the *Doctrine*, and both appear here to be later than Barnabas. There is a touch of exaggeration in the injunction to remember the preacher in the night.

Lordship. So again the ACO, but not Barnabas. Apparently the word means here the nature and work of the Lord.

4. *Double-minded* is probably a reminiscence of St. James i. 8; iv. 8.

5. *Holdeth out.* A loose quotation from Ecclesiasticus iv. 31.

ransom for thy sins. 7. Thou shalt not doubt to give, nor shalt thou murmur when thou givest: for thou shalt know who is the good requiter of the reward. 8. Thou shalt not turn away from him that hath need, but shalt share all things with thy brother, and shalt not say that aught is thine own: for, if ye are partners in the eternal, how much more are ye partners in the perishable? 9. Thou shalt not remove thy hand from thy son, or from thy daughter, but from youth up shalt teach them the fear of God. 10. Thou shalt not command thy servant or thy handmaiden, who hope on the same God, in thy bitterness, lest they fear not the God who is over both: for he cometh not to call according to respect of persons, but on those whom the Spirit prepared. 11. And ye, servants, shall be subject to your masters, as to a type of God, in modesty and fear. 12. Thou shalt hate all

6. *Ransom for thy sins.* This is a singularly bold phrase. It comes from Barnabas, but "giving" is the only ransom spoken of in the *Doctrine* (see note on i. 2).

7. *Murmur.* Compare 1 Peter iv. 9.

8. *Turn away.* Matt. v. 42.

Thine own. Acts iv. 32. "Neither said any of them that ought of the things which he possessed was his own." Compare also Romans xv. 27.

9-14. On the importance attaching to these verses see Introduction, p. 17. They are taken practically verbatim from Barnabas, but in that Epistle the arrangement is different. In the ACO they are for some reason omitted.

hypocrisy, and all that is not pleasing to the Lord. 13. Thou shalt not forsake the commandments of the Lord, but shalt keep what thou didst receive, neither adding thereto nor taking aught away. 14. Thou shalt confess thy transgressions in church, and shalt not come to thy prayer in an evil conscience. This is the Way of Life.

CHAPTER V

1. But the Way of Death is this : first of all it is wicked and full of curse : murders, adulteries, lusts, fornications, thefts, idolatries, witchcrafts,

13. *Adding.* Deut. iv. 2

14. *In church.* Clement of Alexandria uses the word *church* in the same way. *Strom.* VII. v. 29, he says, "For by church I do not mean just now the place, but the assembly of the elect." A somewhat similar use is found in 1 Cor. xi. 18, where the Apostle speaks of "coming together in church," yet it is not quite the same, and it is noticeable that the words "in church" are not in Barnabas. As used here the words imply that the Christians worshipped no longer in private houses, but in definite buildings set apart for the purpose. On the exomologesis or public confession see Bingham, or the *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*.

v. 1. *Way of Death.* In Barnabas, from whom it is taken almost verbatim, it is called the *Way of the Black One*, that is to say, of the Devil. Here again the *Doctrine* omits the angel, and at the same time gets rid of a peculiar and obscure expression.

sorceries, ravengings, false witnesses, hypocrisies, a double heart, guile, arrogance, malice, self-will, covetousness, filthy talking, jealousy, boldness, pride, boasting. 2. Persecutors of good men, haters of truth, loving a lie, not knowing the recompense of righteousness, not cleaving to good, nor to just judgment, watching not for that which is good, but for that which is evil: from whom meekness is far off and patience, loving vanity, hunting after reward, not pitying the poor man, not sorrowing over him that is weighed down by sorrow, knowing not him that made them, murderers of children, destroyers of God's handiwork, turning aside from him that hath need, grinding down the afflicted, advocates of the rich, unjust judges of the poor, steeped in sin. May ye be delivered, my children, from all these.

CHAPTER VI

1. See that no man lead thee astray from this Way of the doctrine, for he teacheth thee without God. 2. For, if thou canst bear the whole yoke of the Lord, thou shalt be perfect; but, if

vi. 2. *The whole yoke.* See for the "yoke" Acts xv. 10. Professor Harnack is right in thinking that in this and the following verse Asceticism is inculcated, though the author does not call upon all men to practise it. The

thou canst not, do what thou canst. 3. And as regards eating, bear what thou canst, but of meat offered to idols beware thou diligently: for it is a worship of dead gods.

CHAPTER VII

1. And concerning baptism, baptize ye thus. Having first declared all these things, baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of

three great counsels of perfection were abstinence from flesh, wine, and marriage; of these only the first is here directly mentioned. There was a tradition (Clem. Alex. *Pæd.* II. i. 16) that Matthew the Apostle was an ascetic.

3. *Eating.* The distinction of clean and unclean meats is not here in question. What the author means is that it is better to eat no meat at all, but that in any case the Christian is bound by the decree of the Council of Jerusalem. The decree, in spite of St. Paul's authority, was for long observed in the West, and is still observed in the East.

Dead gods. Compare the so-called *Second Epistle of Clement*, iii. "We, who live, do not sacrifice to dead gods." So Melito (ed. Otto, vol. ix. p. 425,) "Ego vero dico, quod etiam Sibylla de iis dixit, eos simulacra regum mortuorum adorare." The tomb of Jupiter was said to be shown in Crete: see Athenagoras (ed. Otto, vol. vii. p. 158).

vii. 1. *Baptize ye.* No special officer is mentioned, but it would be going too far to maintain that none is implied.

These things. The preparatory teaching for baptism consisted apparently solely of the Two Ways and the directions given in chapter vi. This is quite unparalleled. Wherever the Three Names were used there must have been some definite instruction as to their meaning.

the Holy Ghost in living water. 2. But if thou have not living water, baptize into other water ; and, if thou canst not in cold, in warm. 3. But if thou have neither, pour water thrice upon the head in the name of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. 4. And before the baptism let the baptizer and him that is baptized fast, and such others as can : and thou shalt enjoin the baptized to fast for one or two days before.

Living water. Does this mean running as opposed to stagnant, or fresh as opposed to salt? Tertullian says (*de Bapt.* iv.): "Nulla distinctio est, mari quis an stagno, flumine an fonte, lacu an alveo, diluatur," and in the Clementine *Homilies* people are baptized in the sea.

2. *If thou canst not in cold.* No doubt cases of sickness are here contemplated.

3. *If thou have neither.* He means, in sufficient quantity. Down to the middle of the third century baptism by aspersion was administered only in cases of sickness (hence called *clinic* baptism), and was regarded as valid, but irregular and imperfect. (See Tertullian, *de Poen.* vi. ; *de Bapt.* xii. ; Cyprian, *Epp.* lxix. 12 *sqq.*; Bingham, iii. 601-605 ; i. 479.) In particular, baptism by aspersion was regarded as a bar to ordination, unless the circumstances were very exceptional. There are few points about which we are more certain than this. The author of the *Doctrine* has not the least doubt that baptism by aspersion is as perfect as any other : hence his date must be placed after the time of Cyprian.

4. *Before the baptism.* According to Justin (*Apol.* i. 61) the whole Church fasts at the time of baptism. The fasting of the baptizer is not expressly mentioned by Tertullian (*de Bapt.* xx.) nor the *Apostolical Constitutions* (vii. 22) nor in the *Canons of Hippolytus* (p. 93). The author of the *Doctrine* speaks as if there were no fixed season or day for baptism, and each case were treated singly. He does not use the words catechize or catechumen, and appears to contemplate only adult baptism.

CHAPTER VIII

1. And let not your fasts be with the hypocrites: for they fast on the second and fifth days of the week: but do ye fast on the fourth and on Friday. 2. Neither pray ye as do the hypocrites, but as the Lord commanded in his gospel, so pray ye. Our Father which art in heaven, hallowed be thy name, thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth, as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread, and forgive us our debt, as we also forgive our debtors, and lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil.

viii. 1. *The hypocrites.* From Matt. vi. 16, but to our author all Jews are hypocrites. The Jews fasted on Monday and Thursday, because on those days Moses was thought to have gone up to and come down from Mount Sinai. Hermas (*Sim.* v. 1) speaks of a fast which he calls "a station," for which there is apparently no fixed day. Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* VII. xii. 75), Origen (*Hom. x. in Levit.*), and Tertullian (*de Jejun.* 2) speak of Wednesday and Friday fasts.

2. *Our Father.* The text of the Lord's Prayer here given differs from that given in St. Matthew in four points only, ἐλθέτω (for ἐλθάτω), ἀφίεμεν (for ἀφήκαμεν), ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ (for ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς), and τὴν ὀφειλήν (for τὰ ὀφειλήματα). In the Doxology "kingdom" is omitted as it is by Gregory of Nyssa (see Chase, *The Lord's Prayer in the Early Church*, p. 174).

From evil. From x. 5, below, it would appear that the words are to be translated thus; not "from the Evil One." The *Doctrine* never mentions either good or evil angels.

For thine is the power and the glory for ever

3. Thrice in the day pray ye thus.

CHAPTER IX

1. And as regards the Eucharist, give thanks in this manner. 2. First for the cup. We thank thee, our Father, for the holy vine of David, thy

3. *Thrice in the day* the Christian is to pray, using the Lord's Prayer. Tertullian speaks of prayer at the third, sixth, and ninth hours (*de Orat.* 25 ; *de Jejun.* 10). Clement of Alexandria speaks of prayer at the same three hours (*Strom.* VII. vii. 40), but seems to say that the usage was not general. It may be gathered from the words of Tertullian that the Lord's Prayer was used at each of the hours.

ix. 1. *The Eucharist.* The author (1) does not here mention the Agape ; (2) does not describe the Liturgy, though he gives certain indications which will be noticed further on. The thanksgiving prayers which follow may be meant to be recited, either silently or aloud, by the congregation in response to the bidding of the deacon. See the Clementine Liturgy in Hammond, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, p. 21. A prayer to be said after communion by the deacons and people, is found in the Liturgy of St. James, *ibid.* p. 52. The prayers in chapter ix. are apparently to be used before communion, those in chapter x. after, but the latter close with an invitation to communicate, and possibly the prayers have been transposed.

2. *First for the cup.* The cup is mentioned first, 1 Cor. x. 16, and a cup, but not *the* cup, in Luke xxii. 17. In verse 5, below, *eating* comes before *drinking*. In Justin (*Apol.* 65) the bread comes first, and this appears to have been the universal order.

servant, which thou didst make known to us through Jesus, thy servant. Glory be to thee for ever. 3. And for the broken bread. We thank thee, our Father, for the life and knowledge which thou didst make known to us

The holy vine of David. This title, not of our Lord, but of the Eucharistic cup, is found also in Clement (*Quis Dives Salvus*, 29), and in Origen (*in Lib. Jud.* Hom. vi. 2, Lomm. xi. 258), "antequam veræ vitis, quæ ascendit de radice David, *inebriemur.*" The word *inebriemur* points us to the true source of the phrase which is in Ps. xxii. (xxiii) 5, τὸ ποτήριόν σου μεθύσκον ὡς κρᾶτιστον. Hence *Vine of David.* But no doubt there is a reference also to other passages, such as Gen. xlix. 11; John xv. 1. The allegorism is not an obvious one, probably not early, and possibly the invention of Clement.

Jesus thy servant. Acts iii. 13, 26; iv. 27, 30. Harnack refers to Barnabas, vi. 1; ix. 2; 1 Clement lix. 2, 3, 4. The word, παῖς, comes from Is. lii. 13. It means in Greek both *servant* and *son*. It has no doctrinal significance here; the author uses *son* in the Baptismal formula. It may be added that by the phrase παῖς Θεοῦ the heathen understood the Christians to mean *Son of God*; see Libanius (in Socrates, *H. E.* iii. 23) and Celsus (*Origen contra Celsum*, v. 2). It is an archaic phrase, characteristic of Ante-Nicene theology, but it is still found in the Clementine Liturgy (Hammond, p. 22).

3. *Broken bread.* The word used is κλάσμα (see Matt. xiv. 20; Mark vi. 43; viii. 19, 20; John vi. 12, 13). Appropriate as it is, this word is not used elsewhere of the Eucharistic Bread.

Life and knowledge. So Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* V. x. 66), "For the meat and drink of the Divine Word is knowledge of the Divine Essence." *Strom.* V. xi. 70, "Our reasonable meat is knowledge." There is no allusion here, as there usually is in the Liturgies, to the remission of sins (see, for instance, the Liturgy of St. James, Hammond, p. 52, or the Clementine Liturgy,

through Jesus, thy servant. Glory be to thee for ever. 4. As this bread that is broken was scattered upon the mountains, and gathered together, and became one, so let thy Church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into thy kingdom: for thine is the glory and the power through Jesus Christ for ever. 5. And let none eat nor drink of your Eucharist, but they that are baptized into the name of the Lord; for as touching this the Lord hath said: Give not that which is holy to the dogs.

ibid. 22). Nor are the Bread and Wine spoken of as even types of the Body and Blood of our Lord; nor is the Resurrection ever mentioned. The writer might quite well be a Docetist.

4. *Scattered.* In a work attributed to Athanasius, the *de Virginitate*, 13 (in Migne, iv. 266), there is found a prayer, evidently intended to be used as a private post-communion by a virgin, which, except for a few words, is the same as this. It will be found in Schaff. The same idea of the "many grains" making "one loaf" is to be found also in Cyprian (*Epp.* lxiii. 13, 10; lxix. 5).

Upon the mountains. There is a reference to the sheep lost upon the mountains, Matt. xviii. 12.

From the ends of the earth. The same phrase is found in the Clementine Liturgy, in the Liturgy of St. Mark, and in the Ethiopic Liturgy (Hammond, pp. 18, 180, 251).

5. *Baptized.* There was therefore in the Liturgy of the *Doctrine* a dismissal of Catechumens in the usual place.

To the dogs. Matt. vii. 6. The verse is applied to the Eucharist by Clement of Alexandria probably (*Strom.* II. ii. 7), and by Tertullian (*de Præscr.* xli.). It implies the use of the *Sancta Sanctis* in the Liturgy.

CHAPTER X

1. And, after ye are filled, give thanks thus. We thank thee, Holy Father, for thy holy name, which thou hast made to dwell in our hearts, and for the knowledge, faith, and immortality, which thou didst make known to us through Jesus, thy servant. Glory be to thee for ever. 3. Thou, Almighty Lord, didst create all things for thy name's sake, and gavest meat and drink for men to enjoy, that they might give thanks unto thee, and to us didst vouchsafe spiritual meat and drink and life eternal, through thy servant. 4.

x. 1. *Are filled.* The word used by St. John of the Feeding of the Five Thousand (vi. 12). It has been supposed here to indicate that the Eucharist of the *Doctrine* was a regular meal, was, in fact, the Agape; but (1) the word is Scriptural and equally applicable to the Eucharist; (2) in its literal sense, "when ye have eaten as much as ye can," it could hardly be used of either; (3) in the Agape, as it was celebrated about 200 A.D. there was no cup of blessing (see *Canons of Hippolytus*); (4) in the *Doctrine* account there is no word which clearly implies the Agape, or which need have been written before 200 A.D.

Holy Father. John xvii. 11.

3. *Lord.* δέσποτα. Luke ii. 29; Acts iv. 24; 2 Pet. ii. 1; Jude 4; Rev. vi. 10; 1 Clem. vii. 5 (see Harnack's note on this last passage). Δεσπότης παντοκράτωρ in the Clementine Liturgy, in that of St. James and St. Mark, and in the Ethiopic Liturgy (see Hammond, pp. 22, 32, 187, 236).

Spiritual meat and drink, and life eternal. The phrase occurs in the ACO in the passage corresponding to *Doctrine*, iv. 2. This is the one point on which it is

Above all we thank thee because thou art mighty. Glory be to thee for ever. 5. Remember, Lord, thy Church, to deliver her from all evil, and to perfect her in thy love, and gather together from the four winds her that is sanctified into thy kingdom which thou didst prepare for her. For thine is the power and the glory for ever. 6. Come grace, and let this world pass away. Hosanna to the God of

possible to argue the priority of the *Doctrine*. But the author of the *Doctrine* may have omitted the phrase in the earlier passage, because it was coming in this prayer. Or the ACO may have borrowed it from the prayer, which does not belong exclusively to the *Doctrine*.

5. *Deliver her from evil.* See note on viii. 3.

Perfect in love. Cf. 1 Clem. I. 3. "They which are perfected in love." It is a favourite thought of Clement of Alexandria that faith is the beginning, love the perfection of the Christian life (see xvi. 2, below).

From the four winds. Matt. xxiv. 31.

Sanctified. Eph. v. 25.

Kingdom which thou didst prepare. Matt. xxv. 34.

Hosanna. When this word makes its appearance in the Liturgy (it is not found in the Ethiopic or Nestorian) it comes *before* Communion.

6. *Come grace.* A prayer for the speedy coming of God's kingdom. Tertullian (*Apol.* 39) says that the Church prayed *pro mora finis*; but in a later treatise on the Lord's Prayer (*de Orat.* 5) he blames this practice.

The God of David. Professor Harnack has an instructive note on this remarkable phrase. Barnabas (xii. 10, 11) regards it as "an error of sinners" to call Christ the *Son of David*, no doubt on the ground of a misinterpretation of Matt. xxii. 45, and Theodoret tells us that Tatian in his *Diatessaron* suppressed the title. Here again we see a want of interest in our Lord's Humanity. The

David. If any is holy, let him come: if any is unholy let him repent. Maranatha. Amen.

7. But suffer the prophets to give thanks as much as they will.

CHAPTER XI

1. Whosoever then shall come and teach you all these things aforesaid, receive him. 2. But, if the teacher himself turn and teach another

expression *Vine of David*, as pointed out in a previous note, does not imply fleshly descent. But clearly the author of the *Doctrine* held, in some sense, the divinity of our Lord.

Let him come. The words seem to be an invitation to communicate: and the prayer may really be meant to come before communion.

Maranatha. 1 Cor. xvi. 22.

Amen. Here only; not after the Lord's Prayer. See the note of Dr. Achelis in *Canones Hippolyti*, p. 189. He thinks that the Amen here comes *before* communion. It is so placed in Justin and in the Eastern Liturgies. At Rome it came *after*.

7. *The prophets.* Prof. Harnack thinks the meaning to be that any Christian might preside at the administration of the sacrament, that one who was not a prophet was bound to use the prayers as here given, but that a prophet was allowed to make an extempore thanksgiving. But (see below, xv. 1) the right of celebration appears to be restricted to the clergy, and the prescribed prayers are for the use of the whole congregation (see note on ix. 1 above). The state of things seems to be that described in 1 Clem. xli. 1: "Let each of us in his own order give thanks to God, not transgressing the appointed rule of his ministry." These words would allow full liberty to the prophet at this point of the service. Traces of this liberty of improvisation are found in the Roman Liturgy as late as the sixth century (see Duchesne, *Origines du Culte Chrétien*. p. 171).

doctrine to pervert, hear him not. But unto the increase of righteousness and of the knowledge of the Lord, receive him as the Lord. 3. And as touching the apostles and prophets, according to the decree of the gospel, so do ye. 4. But let every apostle that cometh unto you be received as the Lord. 5. And he shall stay one day, and, if need be, the next also, but, if he stay three, he is a false prophet. 6. And, when the apostle goeth forth, let him take nothing save bread, till he reach his lodging, but if he ask money, he is a false prophet. 7. And every prophet that speaketh in the spirit ye shall not try nor judge :

xi. 3. *Apostles.* The term was applied to others beside the Twelve : see Lightfoot's Excursus in his edition of the *Epistle to the Galatians*. But outside of the New Testament none are known. The *Doctrine* mentions them only in these four verses, and they are mere lay-figures. They labour under severe restrictions, but have no privileges nor duties. They are supposed to be always on the move, but come from space and disappear into space. The whole stress is laid upon the prophet. By the "decree" (*δῶγμα*) is probably meant Matt. x. 5-12, 40-42 ; Luke ix. 1-6 ; x. 4-16. These instructions were not observed by any of the Apostles after the Resurrection, nor were they so intended.

5. *He shall stay.* The MS. has "He shall *not* stay one day," but this perhaps is too severe, and the insertion of the negative slightly embarrasses the Greek.

6. *His lodging.* No doubt the place where his day's journey ends, and he is to pass the night. This exaggerated picture of Apostolic poverty may be regarded as a satire upon the clergy of the day.

7. *In the spirit.* Dr. Schaff says that this means in ecstasy, but the question arises what is meant by ecstasy ?

for every sin shall be forgiven, but this sin shall not be forgiven. 8. But not every one that speaketh in the spirit is a prophet, but if he have the manners of the Lord. By their manners then shall the false prophet and the prophet be known. 9. And no prophet that † orders † a table in the spirit shall eat of it, else is he a false prophet. 10. And every prophet that teacheth the truth

In Jewish, and presumably in Christian prophecy, the Holy Spirit speaks *through* the prophet, but the prophet never impersonates the Spirit. This was done by Simon Magus (Acts viii. 8). So Montanus said, "I am the Lord God Almighty coming down in man." See the relics of Montanist prophecy collected in Bonwetsch, *Montanismus*, p. 197. It was this "possession," involving the claim to speak infallibly on all topics, and even to override *other prophets*, that the Church resisted in the Montanists (see Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* v. 16, 17).

This sin. To question the utterances of a prophet is sin against the Holy Ghost (Matt. xii. 31). Contrast 1 John iv. 1, "try the spirits whether they are of God." The test of St. John is, "Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God." It is doubtful whether the *Doctrine* could meet this test, but at any rate St. John's test is doctrinal.

8. *The manners.* There is a reference to Matt. vii. 15-20.

9. *Orders.* The MS. has $\delta \rho \iota \zeta \omega \nu$, which is probably an error for $\delta \rho \iota \zeta \omega \nu$, and may be translated thus. Here at last we have a reference to the Agape, but in a very singular form. It is no longer the public common feast, but the charity dinner, and it is given not by private munificence but on the command of a prophet. And here the prophet is to be sharply watched, lest he should impose on the charity of the people. The reader should contrast with this the account of the Agape in the *Canons of Hippolytus*.

if he doeth not what he teacheth, is a false prophet. 11. But every approved true prophet, who † doeth for an earthly mystery of the church, † but teacheth not others to do what he himself doeth, shall not be judged among you, for he hath his judgment with God: for even so did the ancient prophets also. 12. But whosoever shall say in the spirit: Give me money, or any other thing, ye shall not hearken to him: but, if he bid you give for others that are in need, let no man judge him.

CHAPTER XII

1. Let every one that cometh in the name of the Lord be received, and then, when ye have proved him, ye shall know, for ye shall have

11. *An earthly mystery.* The text (*ποιῶν εἰς μυστήριον κοσμικὸν ἐκκλησίας*) is probably corrupt. The words can hardly be translated, but the sense is fairly clear. Like "the ancient prophets," the prophet of the *Doctrine* does something, which others are not to copy, but which is not to be judged. The reference is possibly to such signs as that given by Hosea (i. 2). Even the moral test therefore is not applicable without grave exceptions to the Prophet of the *Doctrine*. Harnack thinks that "the ancient prophets" are the first Christian prophets. But no questionable signs are attributed to these, and, if they are really meant, there must have been time for a very singular tradition to grow up.

12. *Give.* The prophet might take money (xiii. 7), but he may not ask for it, except on behalf of the poor.

understanding [to distinguish] between the right hand and the left. 2. If he that cometh is a passer-by, succour him as far as ye can ; but he shall not abide with you longer than two or three days unless there be necessity. 3. But if he be minded to settle among you, and be a craftsman, let him work and eat. 4. But, if he hath no trade, according to your understanding provide that he shall not live idle among you, being a Christian. 5. But, if he will not do this, he is a Christmonger : of such men beware.

CHAPTER XIII

1. But every true prophet, who is minded to settle among you, is worthy of his maintenance. 2. In like manner a true teacher also is worthy, like every workman, of his maintenance. 3. Thou shalt take therefore all first fruits of the produce

xii. 1. *To distinguish.* This word may be supplied from the *Constitutions of the Apostles*, vii. 28. See Jonah iv. 11.

3. *Work and eat.* Compare 2 Thess. iii. 10.

5. *Christmonger.* See Introduction, p. 22.

xiii. 1. *Settle.* The Prophet was allowed to settle ; the Apostle was not.

2. *Teacher.* Here and below (xv. 3) the teacher is distinct from the prophet. In chapter xi. apparently he is not.

3. *First fruits.* Payment is almost entirely in kind. There is nothing impossible in this. Under the Empire

of winepress and threshing floor, of oxen and sheep, and give them to the prophets; for they are your high priests. 4. But if ye have no prophet, give to the poor. 5. If thou art making bread, take the first fruits and give according to

high officials on service in the provinces received a great part of their appointments in articles of use (see *Hist. Aug. Claudius*, xiv). The description given here is no doubt coloured by passages in the Mosaic Law (Schaff refers to Ex. xxii. 29; Num. xviii. 12; Deut. xviii. 3, 4), but it would be quite inapplicable to a prophet settled in Rome, Alexandria, or any city. A rustic community is contemplated. There were Bithynian villages where Christians abounded when Pliny wrote his letter to Trajan. The *Doctrine* professes to be of universal application. Really it must either refer to some little group of villages, or be a romance.

Your high priests. The *your* is emphatic. Are we to understand "though not those of the Jews," or "though not those of the Church"? If the first we have here another illustration of the anti-Judaic tone which we have noticed elsewhere. The Christian High Priest in the *Epistle to the Hebrews* is Christ Himself. To whom Clement of Rome (i. 40) applies the title is disputed (see Lightfoot's note on the passage). In the *Apostolical Constitutions*, ii. 25, the Bishop is the High Priest. Here, and here only, the title is given to the prophet, though he is inferior to the apostle. But see the Oxyrhynchus Fragment given in the Introduction. The prophet alone takes the first fruits—not apostle, bishop, nor deacon.

5. *Bread.* Harnack refers to Num. xv. 20-22; Neh. x. 37. The word actually used here (*σάρια*) is said to occur in Byzantine Greek; Dr. Schaff refers to the Lexicon of Sophocles; but it seems to have been strange to the author of the *Apostolical Constitutions* (vii. 29) who replaces it by *θερμὸν ἄρτον*.

The commandment. Harnack thinks that the reference is probably to Matt. x. 10.

the commandment. 6. In like manner, when thou openest a jar of wine or oil, take the first fruits and give to the prophets. 7. And of money, and raiment, and of every chattel, take the first fruits, as seemeth thee good, and give according to the commandment.

CHAPTER XIV

1. And on the Lord's day of the Lord come together and break bread and give thanks, having † first † confessed your transgressions, that our sacrifice may be pure. 2. But whoso hath a dispute with his fellow, let him not come together with you, until they be reconciled, that our sacrifice be not polluted. 3. For this is that which was spoken of by the Lord. In every

xiv. 1. *Of the Lord.* A curious pleonasm. "Lord's day" is found, Rev. i. 10. Ignatius (*Mag.* ix.) directs his people to keep the Lord's day, and not the Sabbath. Similarly the *Doctrine* (here again it is anti-Judaic) directs the Eucharist to be celebrated exclusively on the Lord's Day. Even that book of the *Apostolical Constitutions*, which embodies the *Doctrine*, orders the Sabbath to be kept as a feast (vii. 23). Clement of Alexandria repeatedly insists on the superior sanctity of the Lord's Day (*Strom.* IV. xvii. 109; V. vi. 36; xiv. 106; VI. xiv. 108; xvi. 138), and Professor Harnack notes that Melito wrote a treatise *περὶ κυριακῆς*.

First. The reading of the MS. is *προσεξομολογησάμενοι*, but this is probably an error.

place and time offer me a pure sacrifice: for I am a great King, saith the Lord, and my name is wonderful among the Gentiles.

CHAPTER XV

1. Elect therefore for yourselves bishops and deacons worthy of the Lord, men meek and not

3. *A pure sacrifice.* Malachi i. 11. "This passage," notes Prof. Harnack, "is frequently quoted in the second century, and certainly with reference to the Eucharist, see Justin, *Trypho*, 28; 41; 116; Iren. IV. xvii. 5; xviii. 1; Tert. *adv. Jud.* 5; *adv. Marc.* iii. 22; Clem. Al. *Strom.* V. xiv. 136." The Second Pfaffian Fragment of Irenæus refers for the application of this prophecy to the Eucharist to the Second Ordinances of the Apostles, but whether by this phrase is meant a book or tradition is not known. Indeed the date and authorship of the fragment are disputed.

xv. 1. *Therefore.* In order that the Sunday Eucharist may be duly celebrated. It seems to be clearly implied in this word that the bishops and deacons preside over the administration of the Eucharist.

Bishops and Deacons. "The Didachographer and Clement of Rome . . . wrote in the short period of transition from the Presbytero-Episcopate to the distinctive Episcopate."—Schaff. If so the *Doctrine* was compiled within the first century, which Professor Harnack regards as impossible. The author does not use the name Presbyter (cf. Phil. i. 1). The Presbyter is familiar to Clement of Rome. The *Doctrine* is very short, but it seems clear that either the author had never heard of Presbyters, or that he left the title out designedly. There can be little doubt that he had read both Acts and 1 Peter, and the latter is the correct inference.

covetous, and true and approved: for they also minister unto you the ministry of the prophets and teachers. 2. Therefore despise them not: for these are they which are honoured of you with the prophets and teachers. 3. And reprove one another, not in wrath but in peace, as ye have it in the gospel: and to him that behaveth amiss against another let no man speak, neither let him hear a word from you, until he repent. 4. But your prayers and alms and all that ye do, do so as ye have it in the gospel of our Lord.

Ministry. There is perhaps a reference to Acts xiii. 2, where the word *λειτουργεῖν* is used of prophets and teachers. The author does not say that the prophets do the work of the bishops, but that the bishops do the work of the prophets, as it has been described above, extempore thanksgiving, perhaps ordering the Agape, teaching; but he can hardly mean that the bishop was always a prophet in the strict sense of the word.

Prophets and Teachers. Here the two are balanced against bishops and deacons, and clearly distinguished.

2. *Despise them not.* Here again the commentators find a trace of the transition epoch. The prophet (so Harnack, Schaff) was becoming rare; the bishop was gradually stepping into his place, and at first there would be a painful sense of the spiritual inferiority of the latter. Hence the admonition not to despise him. This, however, cannot be the meaning of the *Doctrine*, which represents both orders—that of apostles, and that of prophets—as still in full bloom.

3. *Behaveth amiss.* The word used is *ἀστροχεῖν* (see 1 Tim. i. 6; vi. 21; 2 Tim. ii. 18).

CHAPTER XVI

1. Watch over your life: let not your lamps be extinguished, neither let your loins be ungirt, but be ye ready: for ye know not the hour in which our Lord doth come. 2. But ye shall be frequently gathered together, seeking the things that belong unto your souls. For the whole time of your faith shall not profit you, except ye be perfected in the last time. 3. For in the last days false prophets and corrupters shall abound, and the sheep shall be turned into wolves, and love shall be turned into hate. 4.

xvi. 1. Matt. xxiv. 42a; Luke xii. 35; Matt. xxiv. 44a, 42b. The order of the clauses of Luke xii. 35, is inverted and different verbs are used. It cannot be clearly shown that Tatian was used here, but Matthew and Luke are interwoven in the passage of the *Diatessaron* in a very similar fashion (see Zahn, *Forschungen*, i. 80, p. 200).

2. *For the whole . . . last time.* A very close quotation from Barnabas, iv. 9. It is evident from this that the author of the *Doctrine* knew the whole of Barnabas. But the *Doctrine* gives its own peculiar turn to the passage. Faith will not profit except ye be "perfected" in love (cp. x. 5, above).

3. *False prophets.* Matt. xxiv. 11.
Wolves. There is a reference to Matt. xxiv. 10; vii. 15. But it is highly remarkable that the author should lay so much emphasis on the persecution of Christians by Christians. He appears to be thinking of attempts on the part of the Church, or of the Christian state, to put

For, as lawlessness increases, they shall hate and persecute and deliver up one another; and then shall appear the World-deceiver as son of God, and shall do signs and wonders, and the earth shall be delivered up into his hands, and he shall commit iniquities which have never been seen from the beginning. 5. Then shall the race of man come into the fiery trial of testing, and many shall be offended and perish, but they who endure in their faith shall be saved by the Curse himself. 6. And then shall appear the signs of

down the prophets to whom he was attached (see Introduction, p. 41).

World-deceiver. 2 Thess. ii. 3-12.

Son of God. That is to say, as Antichrist. Observe that the word used here is *Son*, not *Servant*.

5. *Fiery trial.* πύρωσις, perhaps from 1 Pet. iv. 12.

Endure. Matt. x. 22; xxiv. 13.

By the Curse himself. The word κατάθεμα is found in Rev. xxii. 3, in the Liturgy of St. Basil, Migne, xxxi. 1649, and in Clem. Hom. *Contestatio*, 4. The phrase is obscure; it may mean "by Him whom men curse" (see 1 Cor. xii. 3); this is Professor Harnack's explanation; or "by Jesus who was made a curse for us" (see Gal. iii. 13). But possibly the interpretation belongs to some peculiar view of which we have no knowledge.

6. *Signs.* They are (1) *ἐκπέτασις*, a very obscure word which may mean the Hands outspread on the Cross (cf. the Ethiopic Liturgy, Hammond, p. 257, extendit manus suas ad passionem); the word may thus form an explanation of "the sign of the Son of Man," Matt. xxiv. 30. But, if this interpretation is correct, we have here the one allusion in the *Doctrine* to our Lord's Passion, or to any event in His earthly life; and this fact weighs

the truth: first a sign of spreading out in heaven, then a sign of the sound of a trumpet, and the third the resurrection of the dead. 7. But not of all, but as it was said: The Lord shall come and all the saints with Him. 8. Then shall the world behold the Lord coming on the clouds of heaven.

heavily against it. (2) The trumpet, Matt. xxiv. 31; 1 Cor. xv. 52; 1 Thess. iv. 16. And (3) the Resurrection.

7. *As it was said.* By Zechariah (xiv. 5). There is no Resurrection of the wicked. The author is not a Chiliast; there is no hint of a Millennium. Further, the angels (Matt. xxiv. 31) are omitted. For a possible interpretation of this prophecy see the Introduction. It will be observed that the prophecy is of the most threadbare description. Every point in it is borrowed from the Gospels or Epistles, and its character depends not on what it says, but on what it leaves out.

INDEX OF SCRIPTURAL PASSAGES

QUOTED OR ALLUDED TO IN THE DOCTRINE

| | | | |
|--|---------|------------------------|-----------|
| NUMBERS, xviii. 12 . . . | xiii. 3 | Matt. xxiv. 30 . . . | xvi. 6 |
| Deut. iv. 2 . . . | iv. 13 | „ xxiv. 31 . . . | x. 5 |
| Is. lxvi. 2 . . . | iii. 8 | „ xxiv. 42, 44 . . . | xvi. 1 |
| Jonah iv. 11 . . . | xii. 1 | „ xxv. 34 . . . | x. 5 |
| Zech. xiv. 5 . . . | xvi. 7 | „ xxviii. 19, 20 . . . | vii. 1, 3 |
| Mal. i. 11, 14 . . . | xiv. 3 | Luke vi. 28, 32 . . . | i. 3 |
| Ecclesiasticus iv. 31 . . . | iv. 5 | „ vi. 30 . . . | i. 4, 5 |
| Matt. v. 5 . . . | iii. 7 | „ xii. 35 . . . | xvi. 1 |
| „ v. 23, 24 . . . | xiv. 2 | John vi. 12 . . . | x. 1 |
| „ v. 25, 26 . . . | i. 5 | „ xvii. 11 . . . | x. 1 |
| „ v. 39-41 . . . | i. 4 | Acts iii. 13 . . . | ix. 2 |
| „ v. 44, 46 . . . | i. 3 | „ iv. 32 . . . | iv. 8 |
| „ vi. 1, <i>sq.</i> . . . | xv. 4 | „ xiii. 2 . . . | xv. 1 |
| „ vi. 5, 9-13 . . . | viii. 2 | „ xv. 10 . . . | vi. 2 |
| „ vi. 16 . . . | viii. 1 | 1 Cor. v. 10 . . . | ii. 6 |
| „ vii. 6 . . . | ix. 5 | „ xvi. 22 . . . | x. 6 |
| „ vii. 15 . . . | xvi. 3 | Eph. v. 25 . . . | x. 5 |
| „ x. 10 . . . | xiii. 2 | 1 Thes. v. 22 . . . | iii. 1 |
| „ xii. 31 . . . | xi. 7 | 2 Thes. ii. 3-12 . . . | xvi. 4 |
| „ xiv. 20 (with parallel passages) . . . | ix. 3 | „ iii. 10 . . . | xii. 3 |
| „ xviii. 15-17 . . . | xv. 3 | 1 Tim. i. 6 . . . | xv. 3 |
| „ xxi. 9 . . . | x. 6 | Heb. xiii. 7 . . . | iv. 1 |
| „ xxii. 37 . . . | i. 2 | James i. 8 . . . | iv. 4 |
| „ xxiv. 10, 11 . . . | xvi. 3 | 1 Peter ii. 11 . . . | i. 4 |
| | | „ iv. 12 . . . | xvi. 5 |

GENERAL INDEX

- AGAPE**, 22, 60, 63, 67
 Alexandrinism, 22, 39, 61
 Allegorism, 12, 33
 Amen, 65
 Ammia, 32
 Angels, 39, 47
 Antichrist, 43, 73
 Anti-judaic tone of the *Doctrine*,
 19, 47, 59, 70, 71
 Apologists, 21
 Apostle, 27, 66
 Apostles, List of, in Apostolical
 Church Order, 16
 Apostolical Church Order, 12,
 16, 32
 Apostolical Constitutions, 9, 70
 Asceticism, 40, 56
 Athanasius, 9
 Athenagoras, 57
 Atonement, 39, 47
 Attalus of Pergamum, 32
 Augustine, 51
- BAPTISM**, 57
 ,, by Affusion, 22, 58
 ,, Fasting before, 58
 Barnabas, 12, 17, 47, 49, 53, 74
 Bishop, 24, 38, 42, 72
 Bryennius, 5, 9, 12, 13
 Bunsen, 19
- CASSIODORUS**, 49
 Catechumens, Dismissal of, 62
- Chiliasm, 22, 39, 76
 Christmonger, 23, 69
 Church (the building), 22, 55
 Clement of Alexandria, 11, 15,
 46, 61, 64
 Clement of Rome, 61, 65
 ,, Pseudo, 57
 Clementine Homilies, 58
 Confession, 55, 71
 Constantine, 41
 Cup in the Eucharist, 60, 61
 ,, not in Agape, 63
 Curse, The, 75
 Cyprian, 32, 58, 62
- DAVID**—God of, 64
 ,, Vine of, 61
 Deacon, 26, 38, 42, 72
 Dead Gods, 21, 57
 Δεσπόρης, 63
 Didascalia, 19
 Dionysius of Alexandria, 32
 Divinity of our Lord, 65
 Docetism, 39
 Doctrine or Doctrines of the
 Apostles, 9
 Doxology, 59
 Duæ Viæ, 10
 Duchesne, 65
- ECSTASY**, 30, 66
 Ἐκπέτασις, 75
 Elder, 24, 25, 38, 72

- Eucharist, 60
 " celebrated by clergy
 only, 26, 72
 " distinct from Agape, 63
 Eusebius, 9, 41
 Evil One, 22, 59, 64
 Exomologesis, 55
 Extempore Prayer, 65

 FASTING, 19, 58, 59
 First fruits, 69
 Funk, 9, 11

 GOLDEN RULE, Negative Form
 of, 48
 Gospel, the (His), 22, 59, 66, 73
 Gregory of Nyssa, 59
 " Thaumaturgus, 32

 HADRIAN, 51
 Harnack, Professor, 12, 13, 17,
 24, 44, 68, 70, 73
 Hatch, Dr., 24
 Hermas, 14, 33
 High Priest, 70
 Hippolytus, Canons of, 58, 63,
 65, 67
 Holtzmann, 13
 Hosanna, 64
 Hours of Prayer, 22
 Humanity of our Lord, 22, 39, 64

 IGNATIUS, 32, 71
 Irenæus, 32, 72

 JUDICIUM Petri, 10, 16
 Julian, 43
 Justin, 32, 72

 Κατάθεμα, 75
 Κλάσμα, 61

 LATER Prophets, 32
 Lent, 20

 Leon the Notary, 5
 Lightfoot, Bishop, 13, 28, 66, 70
 Line (the book-measure), 10
 Lipsius, 13
 Liturgies, 31, 60-64
 Living Water, 58
 Lord's Day, 71
 " Prayer, 22, 59, 60
 Lordship, 53

 MAGIC, 51
 Maranatha, 65
 Mathematician, 51
 Matthew, St., an Ascetic, 57
 Maximilla, 32
 Melito, 57, 71
 Montanism, 32, 41
 Montanus, 67

 NICEPHORUS, 10

 ORIGEN, 12, 28, 33, 61
 Oxyrhynchus Papyri, 36

 PERPETUA, 32
 Persecution of Christians by
 Christians, 22
 Pionius, 32
 Pliny, 70
 Polycarp, 32
 Presbyter, 24, 25, 38, 72
 Priscilla, 32
 Prophet in New Testament, 30
 " Liturgies, 31
 " Post-Apostolic times,
 32
 " Hermas, 34
 " Doctrine, 35, 66
 Pure Sacrifice, 72

 QUADRATUS, 32
 Quartodeciman, 20
 Quintillians, 32

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>RANSOM (Almsgiving not the Atonement), 54 Resch, 44, 48, 49 Resurrection (not of the wicked), 76 Rufinus, 10</p> <p>SANCTA Sanctis, 22, 62 Sanday, Dr., 10 Schaff, Dr., 14, 66, 72 Servant—applied to our Lord, 61 <i>Σπρια</i>, 70 Sozomen, 41 Station, 59</p> | <p>TATIAN, 15, 48, 64, 74 Taylor, Dr., 7 Teacher 27 <i>sq.</i>, 73 Tertullian, 33, 58, 59, 60, 62 Trajan, 70 Two Ways, 7, 11</p> <p>VINE of David, 12, 61 Virgin—Post-communion for a, 62</p> <p>ZAHN, 48, 74.</p> |
|---|--|