

THE
ANDOVER REVIEW:
A RELIGIOUS AND THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. IV. — DECEMBER, 1885. — No. XXIV.

THE "THÉODICÉE" OF LEIBNITZ.

III. CRITICISM.

THERE are three ideas which ultimately control human thought: the True, the Beautiful, the Good. But although each is an original impulse and a final authority, each is limited to a certain sphere of its own, and the sphere of each has its rank. Primacy belongs to the Good. In dignity, Truth is above Beauty, but the Good is above both. As Plato insisted, the Good is the sun in the kingdom of ideas. Accordingly, any solution of the problem of evil which does not satisfy the demands of this supreme idea is inadmissible. The theodicy which adjusts itself completely to the unconditional requirements of the moral reason is the only one which can be entertained.

At the beginning of the "Théodicée" of Leibnitz, and in the course of the argument, the author suggests that the presence of evil in the world may be explained upon æsthetic principles. The explanation does not here turn on the intrinsic nature of evil, but on its relation to the whole system of things. What is in itself bad may be tolerated if it serve to set the good in relief, and so enhance its value and impressiveness. Discordant notes or passages, if judiciously placed in a piece of music, will heighten the effect of harmony. All art requires contrasts, and beauty a foil. The grotesque, the absurd, the ugly have their place and function. Even a world-harmony may be the more impressive upon the æsthetic sense if it be disturbed at intervals by the notes of sorrow and of sin, or even if there be heard throughout the solemn undertone of pain and guilt. There is, however, one decisive objection to this way of looking at the matter,—the problem of evil is not a question of taste. The beautiful is not the principle which here finds legitimate application. Whether evil

Copyright, 1885, by Houghton, Mifflin & Co.



of Protestant theology with all its excellences and its faults; and it became the mighty spring of their whole marvelous missionary activity upon which they entered immediately after the Renewal of the *Unitas* in 1727, and which to-day yet constitutes their greatest field of usefulness and brightest crown of glory.

J. Max Hark.

LANCASTER, PA.

THREE PAGES OF THE BRYENNIOUS MANUSCRIPT, etc., reproduced by photography for the Johns Hopkins University. Edited, with notes, by J. RENDEL HARRIS, Associate Professor of New Testament Greek and Palæography. Small 4to; three photographic plates and nine pages of letter-press. Baltimore: Publication Agency of the Johns Hopkins University. 1885.

THE TEACHING OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES. *Διδαχή τῶν δώδεκα Ἀποστόλων*. A translation with notes; and excursus (i. to ix.) illustrative of the "Teaching;" and the Greek text. By CANON SPENCE, M. A., Vicar of St. Pancras. Small octavo, pp. vi., 183. London: James Nisbet & Co. 1885.

ΔΙΔΑΧΗ ΤΩΝ ΔΩΔΕΚΑ ἈΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ. TEACHING OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES, etc. Edited, with a translation, introduction, and notes, by ROSWELL D. HITCHCOCK and FRANCIS BROWN, Professors in Union Theological Seminary, New York. A new edition, revised and greatly enlarged. 8vo, pp. cxv., 85. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1885.

THE OLDEST CHURCH MANUAL, called THE TEACHING OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES. *Διδαχή τῶν δώδεκα Ἀποστόλων*. The Didache and kindred Documents, in the original, with translations and discussions of post-apostolic teaching, baptism, worship, and discipline, and with illustrations and facsimiles of the Jerusalem MS. By PHILIP SCHAFF. 8vo, pp. viii., 301. New York: Funk & Wagnalls. 1885.

ΔΙΔΑΧΗ ΤΩΝ ΙΒ' ἈΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ. LA DIDACHE, OU L'ENSEIGNEMENT DES DOUZE APÔTRES, texte Grec — publié pour la première fois en France, avec un commentaire et des notes. Par PAUL SABATIER, ancien élève de la Faculté de théologie protestante de Paris. 8vo, pp. 167. Paris: Librairie Fischbacher. 1885.

THE five titles given above represent (with the exception, if we mistake not, of Volkmar's characteristic treatise alone) the latest work on the "Teaching of the Apostles," and prove that valuable work may still be expected even on so much studied a treatise. The literature of the book is, indeed, already immense. Dr. Schaff devotes in Drs. Hitchcock and Brown's book twelve pages of fine type to what he calls a "digest of the Didache literature," which are increased in his own book to fourteen pages. Nor are these mere repetitions of each other. The former gives a fuller list of the minor publications, and the latter a fuller account of the contents of the more important ones. The two thus happily supplement each other, and thereby symbolize the general relations of the two books; and the two together, it may be added, practically cover the whole ground, although a few titles have been missed. Neither book has been published therefore in ignorance of the extent of what had already been given to the public, and neither has been published without adding something of value. To the critical scholar who has kept himself informed of what was doing with reference to the Didache, equally welcome with these two publications are Dr. Harris's photographs, which, taken with Bryennios's notes, supply the palæographer with all that he needs to know of the MS. in which the Teaching was found; and M. Sabatier's book, which, without exception, is the most readable treatise that the Didache

has called out, — entirely French as it is in its purity of style, brilliancy of presentation, and unity of aim.

The treatises before us, taken together, illustrate very clearly the position that discussion has brought us to with reference to the origin, date, and character of the *Didache*. It is worth noting that all of these latest laborers agree in their solution of the central problem, — the relation of the treatise to Barnabas. Without exception, they look upon Barnabas as the borrower, and some of them even express surprise that any one could have ever imagined the contrary. In this the present writer cannot help believing that they have rightly judged; and with all respect for those scholars who prefer to consider Barnabas the originator of the matter which the *Didachographer* subsequently reduced to order, it seems to him, too, that the argument has gone not only decidedly but decisively the other way, and it may now be accepted as a critical result that the *Didache* is older than Barnabas. If so, it belongs in date to the verge of the first century at the latest, and this our present treatises unanimously recognize. Stragglers have to be beaten in indeed, not from the side that would set the composition of the work too late, but rather from the side that would set it too early. Dr. Schaff and Drs. Hitchcock and Brown with just sobriety assign it to the years about 100 A. D. Canon Spence thinks the last quarter of the first century more likely, and looks upon the book as one which John may have read. M. Sabatier is not satisfied with even this: about A. D. 50 is the date he prefers (p. 159), — before any of Paul's letters were written, and even before the beginning of his missionary journeys! The antiquity of the treatise is so hoary, indeed, according to him, that it comes to us from a time before there were any church offices (p. 126), — before the Lord's Supper had come to be thought a commemoration of the Lord's death (pp. 104, 108, 113), — before there was any church worship distinct from that of the synagogue (p. 94 sq.), — before, in fact, we may add in our own words, distinctive Christianity had been born! The untenableness of this extreme view is already evident in that it necessarily places the origin of the treatise within twenty years of the death of our Lord, and yet presupposes a flourishing church among the Gentiles, needing precise instruction in church order and practices. The theory is, moreover, self-contradictory. Wandering apostles and missionaries are assumed going everywhere among a large and widely scattered body of Gentile believers, — so numerous and so long settled as to require protection against the impostors which their already famous hospitality and generosity called out — before Paul began his missionary journeys. Numerous settled and strong churches among the Gentiles are assumed with all the Christian rites — baptism, the Lord's Supper, Sabbath services, tithing, etc. — before the deacons of Acts vii. have been appointed or the elders of Acts xi. invented, or that theory of the Eucharist been dreamed of, which was well settled in 57. This is no caricature of the situation. M. Sabatier distinctly recognized that our *Didache* is not the effort of an individual to reduce disorder into order; it is the church speaking. "We have here," he says (p. 154), "not the work of a Christian, writing for a restricted number of persons, making a letter or an edifying treatise. We have, in the strictest sense of the word, a work of the church; it is a sort of official manual of liturgy and catechism." But if so, the treatise was not written before the church had the usages here described; and in reading it we are certainly not "assisting" at the birth of ecclesiastical organization. In the face of so radical a difficulty

we need not seriously discuss the arguments that are advanced for so early a date. Canon Spence's view is more plausible, just because less extreme; but even it must, in our present light, give way to the soberer judgment that finds the time when the treatise originated at about the year 100.

The place whence it was sent forth is divergently determined by our authors. Dr. Brown assigns it to Egypt; Dr. Schaff and M. Sabatier to Syria; and Canon Spence to Palestine. The evidence scarcely permits us to choose confidently between Egypt and Syria, and it is not impossible that the final decision will divide the honor between the two, — assigning the original composition of the work to Egypt, and an early though probably gradually formed recension of its text, by which it reached the form in which it lies in the Constantinople MS., to Syria. There are many converging considerations that point to this conclusion: among others, the early use of it in Egypt by Barnabas, and its later crystallization, in practically the same form which he used, into the book of order of the Egyptian churches on the one hand, and, on the other, the Syrian flavor of certain passages which seem to be interpolations into the original text. The discussion of this question in this form involves, however, a thorough-going discussion of the text of the document, and this has not been seriously attempted heretofore by any one except, perhaps, Hilgenfeld. Our present treatises have passed over this important matter almost wholly. Dr. Brown alone devotes a — no doubt unsufficing — chapter to it (§ 2, pp. xiv.—xxiii.). There are really two textual points quite distinct from one another which require settlement before the indications of the treatise as to the place whence it was sent forth can be classified with any confidence. We must know whether the text has suffered interpolation since it was published as a complete whole. And we must know whether the author of this treatise used any previous matter in his work. The first subject belongs under the head of textual transmission, while a discussion of the second should find place in the section devoted to the sources of the treatise. Under the head of "Sources of the Teaching" Dr. Brown does not discuss, however, this subject, although he elsewhere betrays his suspicion that the author may have adopted certain prayers, for instance, which were already in use when he wrote: "The prayers were no doubt found by the author in actual use" (p. lxxvii.). On the other hand, he appears to mention Hilgenfeld's belief, that the author found also chapters i.—vi. ready to his hand, only to reject it (p. xv. 87.). It is obvious, however, that it must be definitely settled whether the author wrote or incorporated these prayers and this catechism before we can use hints in them to determine the place of composition of the treatise. For instance, Mr. Rendel Harris ("American Journal of Philology," vol. i. 104) and others object to Egypt that such a phrase as "as this broken bread was scattered over the mountains" could not naturally have found place in a treatise composed in the lowlands of Egypt. But this occurs (chap. ix.) in one of the prayers; and if the prayers were already in general use, and only adopted by the author of the treatise, whatever strength may be thought to reside in this argument completely fails us in determining the place of writing of the treatise as distinguished from the prayers. A thorough-going discussion of the textual transmission is equally important, and this none of the works now before us pretend to give. Dr. Brown, who alone touches on the matter, justly concludes that the "Jerusalem Codex gives us, on the whole, a true copy of the Teaching,"

and then finds evidence of "the existence of various later recensions of the text" (p. xviii.), some of them partial editions, some variant texts. The evidence on which all of these (how many of them has Dr. Brown found?) are declared to be "later" is not stated, but we are told the most interesting of them is found in the Latin version discovered by Dr. V. Gebhardt, of which it is declared, "a different recension of the text, and one which already showed some of the striking peculiarities of Barnabas and the Canons, seems to underlie this version" (p. xxii.). Even a cursory examination of the readings for the short section for which alone the Latin is extant will suffice to convince any student of the truth of this remark. It is not so obvious that the recension represented by the Latin was made out of Barnabas and the Canons, and did not rather underlie them, as Dr. B. goes on to state (cf. also p. xlii. note 1): "The presence of peculiarities marking these works and distinguishing them from each other" may be accounted for as due to common inheritance as easily as and in this case more easily than as due to promiscuous borrowing. Any close examination of the mutual relations of the three documents — the Latin, Barnabas, and the Canons — will result in conclusively showing that the text underlying the Latin did not borrow from Barnabas, but *vice versa*, and that the Canons are less closely related to either than the two are to one another; in a word, in establishing a recension divergent in some important points from that preserved in the Constantinople MS., separated further into two sub-recensions, Barnabas and the Latin on the one side and the Canons on the other. This I have already had the opportunity of stating in Dr. Schaff's book (pp. 220 *sq.*). But this recension, it should be remembered, while, as used by Barnabas, it must be admitted to be the most anciently attested recension, is not on that account necessarily the purest transmission of the text. This fact can be established only by a detailed examination. On its recognition, however, the formation of a text of the Didache becomes something very different from merely copying the Bryennios edition or even the text of the Constantinople MS., which is all that any of our present editors attempt. A close examination soon establishes a considerable interpolation in the latter: i. 3, εὐλογεῖτε — ii. 1, which on internal grounds can scarcely have been part of the original text, and which fails in the whole divergent recension. But if this one interpolation has been suffered, others may have also found their way into the text, and a very careful examination is necessary before we can use its details for any purpose of history, dogmatics, or controversy. It is a mere accident that we have spoken of this very important matter in connection with the question of place where the treatise was composed. But it has its bearing on it, too; for instance, the interpolation i. 3 — ii. 1 is apparently based, in its evangelical quotations, on Tatian's "Diatessaron." But this fact will not help to prove that the treatise was written in Syria, but only that it received its present textual form there.

Our authors are agreed again — with the exception of Dr. Brown — that the Teaching was composed by a Jewish Christian. Dr. Schaff ventures to declare this to be certain; and Canon Spence is satisfied that it was sent forth into the world from such a community of Jewish Christians as were gathered together at Pella, and belongs to that Jewish Christian triolette, the Epistle of St. James, the Teaching of the Apostles, and the Testaments of the XII. Patriarchs, which represent the broader and more truly Christian element of the Jewish Church, — nay,

he can even conjecture that Symeon, the Lord's kinsman, may have been its writer. M. Sabatier's whole treatise is devoted to the establishment of the one proposition that the Didache is the representative of early Jewish Christianity, that its affinities are wholly Jewish, and that it can best be explained out of Jewish remains. He has so far succeeded in this task as to place the essentially Jewish Christian character of the document as a whole beyond dispute, and it is sufficient for our present purpose to set off his treatise against Dr. Brown's somewhat ill-considered statement. Indeed, the passage in which Dr. Brown denies the Jewish character of the treatise shows signs in its very structure of less careful revision than is usual in his valuable treatise. He says (p. lxxxv.) : "The author evidently laid hold of Christianity not so much on its dogmatic as on its ethical side, and his book resembles, in this respect, the Epistle of James. This is the more remarkable because *there is no evidence that he was himself of Jewish origin*. This would appear to indicate DISTINCTLY a circle of Gentile Christians (individuals or communities) in which the same preponderance was given to the ethical over the dogmatic" (the emphases are ours). The passage from "it cannot be proved that he was a Jew" to "he was distinctly a Gentile" is quite a German leap.

These words of Dr. Brown suggest another important question. What right have we to assume that the writer "laid hold of Christianity not so much on the dogmatic as on the ethical side?" Any modern "Directory of Worship" is apt to contain very little doctrine. We desire to distinctly protest against the assumption that no doctrine was held or considered imperative above what was given expression in such a treatise. Dr. Brown had Zahn's protest before him, that the Teaching was not designed to be a complete description of Christianity and church life, but only a practical assistant to other sources of instruction and edification, and yet can say, "This certainly does not appear in the treatise itself; it makes the impression that the author supposed himself to be giving the substance of that which Christians need concern themselves about" (p. lxxxvi., note). On the contrary, the treatise is conspicuously a book of church order, not of the Christian faith, and has to do emphatically with practice, not belief. Does Dr. Brown really suppose that chaps. i.-vi., which, according to chap. vii., *initium*, were to be taught to the catechumens before baptism, contain all that the author of the treatise thought the catechumens needed to know before entering upon the Christian life, and not rather only the final instruction or solemn declaration to them, as they took this serious step, of the mode of life that they were to live in the gospel? Why, it is commanded that the catechumen be baptized with reference to the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. But what is baptism? On this theory, the catechumen has been taught nothing as to that. Is he to appear and be baptized without ever having heard of it? And again, who is the Son? He has not even been once mentioned in the whole catechism, where the name of Jesus does not once occur, and where the fact of his sonship is not even once in the most remote way alluded to. And who is the Holy Ghost? Except in one somewhat obscure clause, he is not alluded to in the faintest way in the whole catechism. Truly, on the theory that this catechism contains all that the author supposed Christians need concern themselves about before receiving baptism, the candidates would be in worse case than those whom Paul found in Ephesus, who had not so much as heard whether there was a Holy Ghost. These would be called upon to receive

a rite that they had never heard mentioned and the significance of which was a riddle to them, and to have names named on them in a threefold enigma which would necessarily be insoluble to them. But, by as much as it is certain that the baptismal formula implies more knowledge than is given in the preceding catechism, and that of a doctrinal kind, by so much is it certain that the preceding catechism excludes doctrine, not because it had not yet been "developed" or was not considered "essential," but because it lay outside of the purpose of the treatise, and by so much is it certain that this catechism does not represent the total training of the candidate, but something like a formal and solemn declaration to him, on the moment of baptism, of the mode of external life which this new and solemn step involved. The calling of this catechetical section by Dr. Schaff, "*The Doctrinal or Catechetical Part*," and the insertion of his chapter on "*The Theology of the Didache*," immediately after his discussion of it, as if it had some very close connection with it (whereas the doctrinal teaching of the treatise is actually found by him mostly in other portions), illustrate the force of the error.

The zeal to find in the Didache a "more primitive form" of Christianity than ever existed is illustrated again in the treatment which M. Sabatier gives of the Eucharist. Comparing in a very interesting and instructive way the prayers here given (chaps. ix. and x.) with certain Jewish prayers, and noting the absence from them of any reference to the death of Christ, he concludes that we have here the Christian Eucharist before it was a commemoration of the death of our Lord, — which it already was, however, when Paul wrote his Corinthian letters (57 A. D.). "In the Didache," he writes, "we have nothing like this; its Christian repast did not have as its special object to recall the death of Jesus. It seems to confirm the hypothesis proposed by M. Renan. This celebrated critic has thought that the Lord's Supper carries us back, not to a single sacramental act performed by Jesus on the eve of his death, but to the habit which He had of breaking bread with his disciples. This rite, after having obtained even during the life of Jesus a great importance, became the great symbol of Christian communion." "It was natural, no doubt," he continues, "that the last occasion when they had enjoyed this communion with their master should be vividly remembered by his followers on its repetition, and so, gradually, the feast that was at first only a symbol of communion should become first associated with and then theologically inseparable from the Lord's death. But in the Didache there is absolutely nothing of all this yet; the participation in the same bread and wine is only a reciprocal bond. And we catch in it the word *Eucharist* just at the moment when it was commencing the evolution which changed its sense. Consequently we have another proof that our treatise belongs to a time before that evolution had taken place which Paul thinks of as primeval, and which the Gospels represent to be such!" Surely, these are grave conclusions, involving much historical result. On what are they founded? A dream of M. Renan's and the assumption of the extreme antiquity of the Didache, — for outside of the Didache there is no support for them. It is no doubt true that the eucharistic prayers of our treatise are astounding — almost inexplicable — when considered as eucharistic prayers. And the position of M. Sabatier is more logical than that of say Dr. Schaff or Canon Spence or Dr. Hitchcock, who can apply these prayers to the Eucharist, properly so called, and yet assign them to an orthodox writer of about 100 A. D. It is simply impossible that

such an eucharistic service could have been held in an orthodox Christian church at that date. The key to the whole matter seems to be the phrase "after being filled," in chapter x., and the concluding verses of that chapter. Dr. Schaff discusses Zahn's remarks upon these words, but rejects his conclusions. But what right has any one to follow the Constitutions in transmuting "after being filled" into "after having partaken," especially when the invitation to the table is apparently given in ix. 6? The truth of the matter seems to be that the Lord's Supper is not to be placed at the end of chap. ix., but at the end of chap. x.; that the prayers here given are not "eucharistic" in our sense of the word, but belong to the sacred feast or *agapé*, after which the Lord's Supper was celebrated. It was, no doubt, not probably the most primitive custom to thus celebrate the Lord's Supper in marked separation from the *agapé*; but, then, this only shows that the Didache does not belong to A. D. 50 but to A. D. 100. After all said, I believe Zahn's arguments remain unanswered, and the view commended by him as yet far the most likely one. M. Sabatier's investigations are, moreover, a strong corroboration of it, inasmuch as they show that these prayers are quite the natural ones for Jewish Christians to use at their feasts, and are very strikingly paralleled by those preserved for us in Jewish literature. That the blessing of the cup precedes here the blessing of the bread follows Jewish analogies; but in the Lord's Supper the other order was followed, even according to the Didache (ix. 5). The lack of formal communication of what was said at the supper itself is characteristic of the fragmentary character of the treatise and parallel to the omission of the doctrinal teaching before baptism.

There is much else in the works before us that calls for discussion, or at least mention. It is already time, however, to close this notice. In closing, we should like to reiterate that all five of the treatises are worth the attention of the scholar. Mr. Harris gives us important paleographical material. M. Sabatier discusses the teaching of the treatise from the standpoint of the Jewish analogies with a richness of illustration that leaves little to be desired, and with a freshness and spirit that carry the reader with him, even at times against his better judgment. Canon Spence's is the most popular treatise of the number, and presents much fresh matter in a very pleasant form. Dr. Schaff's and Drs. Hitchcock and Brown's works are mutually supplementary, the latter being an edition with critical prolegomena, and the former a discussion from the point of view of the historian, with supporting documents adjoined. America may well be satisfied with her part. No edition in English can stand comparison in value with either of these. Between them choice is difficult because of their very unlikeness. Dr. Brown made a mistake in not giving place to the Greek texts of the parallels in Barnabas, the Canons and Constitutions; Dr. Schaff in not discussing the critical questions more fully. As it is, neither book is complete, and the English-speaking student should purchase both.

Benj. B. Warfield.

WESTERN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, ALLEGHANY, PA.

American Men of Letters. Nathaniel Parker Willis. By Henry A. Beers. 16mo, pp. 365. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. New York: 11 East Seventeenth Street. The Riverside Press, Cambridge. 1885. \$1.25. This Life is