the Prayer of Quiet. Moreover, the important question of the relation between religious emotion and the sex instinct does not seem to be adequately dealt with by considering only those expressions of religious emotion which are couched in language which is obviously erotic. It seems probable that the dependence of the emotions of religious love on those of human love is much more fundamental than this treatment would lead us to suppose. It is possible that the erotic language of the mystics is in part due to the paucity of language when required to express emotion and to the influence of the Song of Songs. But the psychologist may go on to ask why just this language is chosen by the mystic to fill the blank, and why the Song of Songs was chosen as their model. The most probable answer would appear to be that it was because the language of human love is expressing something fundamentally related to the religious emotion of the mystic.

These, however, are expressions of a difference of opinion on questions which are not yet settled, rather than criticisms of Professor Pratt's book. This is a great work, probably the greatest that has yet appeared on the subject. It should be read by all who are interested in the application of psychology to theological speculation or to pastoral work. The psychology of religion is not, of course, a complete science. Much remains to be done. But we may safely say that future workers will find it necessary very largely to build on the work which has been so excellently carried out by Professor Pratt in this volume.

R. H. THOULESS.

BARNABAS, HERMAS, AND THE DIDACHE. Being the Donnellan Lectures delivered before the University of Dublin in 1920. By J. Armitage Robinson, D.D., Dean of Wells. S.P.C.K. Price 6s.

In these lectures the Dean of Wells proposes as his aim "to reach a point of view from which the literary character and the historical value of the Didache . . . can be justly estimated." For many years past we have been told, and have learned to accept as a safe historical tenet, that the Didache is a Christian manual of the early second century (say, of about the year 120), and that it incorporates a still earlier Jewish manual for proselytes, known as the *Two Ways*, which was used also by the author of the *Epistle of Barnabas*.

The presumption of a Jewish origin for the *Two Ways*, and the view that it was used (in a slightly Christianized form) by "Barnabas" and the "Didachist," provided the ground for assigning so early a date to the Didache, and consequently for regarding as real and historical the picture which it presents of Christian worship and organization. But are these assumptions justified? The Dean of Wells answers: "No; the *Two Ways* is not a Jewish composition,

but the work of a rabbinically-minded Christian, 'Barnabas,' of whose epistle it is one integral part, and from whom the author of the Didache derived it." And I believe that the Dean has established this point finally.

If we read Barnabas through, we must recognize that chapters xviii.-xx. (containing the *Two Ways*) reproduce ideas, words, and expressions that mark the thought and style of the epistle throughout. Some of these features might possibly be explained by supposing that Barnabas imparted to an earlier form of the *Two Ways* a certain colouring of his own. But (1) the closer examination to which the document is subjected in these lectures reveals a relation between chapters xviii.-xx. and the rest which is too intimate and organic to be explained by any theory short of unity of authorship. Especially remarkable is the manner in which the author reverts in these later chapters to Scripture texts which he has used earlier. Further, (2) some of the most characteristic touches of Barnabas are found also in the *Two Ways* of the Didache. There are in addition very clear indications that the Didache gives us a form of the *Two Ways* in which that found in Barnabas has been modified and "improved," both as regards general arrangement and the treatment of particular passages.

Harnack would explain the inferior arrangement in Barnabas (as compared with that in the Didache) by supposing that Barnabas quoted the *Two Ways* only from memory. But the answer to this must be that he remembered it too well to have remembered it so badly. In chapter xx. 2 he has a list of some twenty evil persons in the very order of the Didache, and with the slightest variations in text; yet we are to think that in chapter xix. he upset the more orderly arrangement found in the Didache, and altogether omitted the striking passage (Did. iii. 1-6) on the five mortal sins; omitted also the Golden Rule. Now, as the Dean points out (p. 61), the passage iii. 1-6 is constructed "on a uniform and highly artificial plan," and is unlike anything else in the *Two Ways*. It is also unlike anything else in the Didache or in Barnabas. Its absence from the latter may, therefore, be regarded as good evidence that it is an insertion due to the Didachist—not of his own composition, but added by him from some other literary source.* As to the Golden Rule, its omission by Barnabas would be strange indeed if it had stood in an earlier *Two Ways* known to him. But here, again, the Dean has shown that the form of the Rule in the Didache goes back upon that in Matt. vii. 12. To this observation we must add that the setting together of love to God and neighbour as the first two Commandments, and their introduction by *πρῶτον* and

* It is from this passage that Clement of Alexandria quotes a sentence as "Scripture"; it is now unnecessary to suppose that he derived it from the Didache.

δεύτερον, certainly come from the Gospel. In chapter i. 2, then, the Didache shows an alteration of Barnabas based on the Gospel.

The recognition of this fact goes far to discount the well-known objection to the immediately following passage (i. 36 to ii. 1) as an interpolation later than the rest of the Didache. The Dean has dealt with this point fairly and judiciously in his fourth lecture, and has shown that the difficulty is rather apparent than real. It lies, of course, not in the absence of this passage from Barnabas, but in its omission by the Latin version and some later documents. If this omission had included the two Commandments and the Golden Rule (in the previous verse), it would have proved a real difficulty; as it is, it begins, I believe, too late, for the Didachist has already begun to draw upon the Gospel, and the "interpolation" appears to me to hang together with what immediately precedes it. We must remember, also, that the author of the Apostolic Constitutions had the "interpolation" in his copy of the Didache; and (what is of much more weight) so had the third-century author of the Didascalia, who quotes as written in the Gospel: "*Love them that hate you, and pray for them that curse you, and ye shall not have an enemy*" (i. 2, ed. Funk). In a later passage we read again: "Væ autem his qui habent et cum dolo (ἐν ὑποκρίσει, Ap. Const.) accipiunt," etc. (iv. 3), where the text seems to show dependence on Hermas (*Mand.* ii. 5), but the "woe" is found only in the Didache.

In an article in the *Journal of Theological Studies* for April, 1912 (reprinted as an Appendix in this volume), the Dean of Wells had suggested that the aim of the writer of the Didache was "to present a picture of the way in which the Gentile Churches were ordered by their Apostolic founders, and sought to confine himself, so far as he could, to such precepts and regulations as could be authenticated, directly or indirectly, by writings of the Apostolic age." In other words, the picture offered by the Didache is in no little degree archaic and fanciful. The Dean now declares himself "more than ever convinced" that this is the truth. He has, I venture to think, succeeded in gaining a point of view from which "the historical value of the Didache . . . can be justly estimated." That point of view is that, as it has reached us, it is the compilation of a single writer (though he drew from many sources), and that it cannot be earlier—though it may be later—than the second half of the second century.

R. H. CONNOLLY.

ST. IRENÆUS: THE DEMONSTRATION OF THE APOSTOLIC PREACHING.

Translated from the Armenian, with Introduction and Notes,
by J. Armitage Robinson, D.D., Dean of Wells. S.P.C.K.
"Translations of Christian Literature." 1920. Price 7s. 6d.

In book v., chapter xxvi., of his *Ecclesiastical History*, Eusebius mentions, among other works of St. Irenæus, one on *The Demon-*