

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



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



<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

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

been strong. Such conditions in themselves are not therefore enough to explain the peculiar tendency of Syrian Christianity, in spite of its leaders, to hang upon the Jews. They would be explained if, in Syria, a Judaizing secession-church had for long survived, as a *tertium quid* between the catholics and the Jews, drawing individual Gentile Christians into conformity with Jewish practices.

The Didachist may therefore be credited with speaking directly to the men of his own time, in calling for the observance of what were by then the established catholic days for fasting, and for strict non-observance of days of Jewish public fasting.

A parallel may be drawn between the tendency of the rank and file to Judaize in Antioch and the tendency of the Alexandrine rank and file to follow particular Gnosis. In either case the history seems to go right back to the local Christian origins.

W. TELFER.

(*To be continued.*)

ΠΕΡΙΚΑΘΑΙΡΩΝ (*Didache* iii 4)

Didache iii 4 is a warning against certain practices which are not in themselves idolatrous, but which lead dangerously towards it. (The technical term of traditional moral theology would be *vana observantia* as against *idololatria*.) The practices forbidden are augury, incantation (presumably for medical purposes), astrology, and a practice prohibited in the terms (*μη γίνου*) *περικαθαίρων*.

Obviously the estimate of these practices is just, so far as the first three are concerned; they are not formally incompatible with belief in one God, but they are entirely contrary to the spirit of Christianity and tend dangerously towards a worship of strange gods. But what is a *περικαθαίρων*? Lightfoot translates 'magician' but this is a counsel of despair. The word might mean 'one who goes round purifying' after the manner of the low-class Orphic practitioners of Plato *Rep.* 364 b. But we have no clear evidence for the survival of such vendors of *καθάρσεις* in the Christian era. Apollonius of Tyana practised purifications on his travels (Philostr. *Vita* 6. 6, 'the rites sanctioned by Pythagoras and Empedocles' suggest the Orphic tradition); but this is hardly the same thing as travelling in them professionally. We have plenty of evidence for travelling magicians (Tert. *de Idol.* 9, *Apol.* 23, Apuleius *Metam.* 1. 4. 20, Lucian *Alexander* 9, 217), but no allusion to purification as part of their stock-in-trade, though it may have been. But would not 'Orphic' rites have involved an explicit invocation of a pagan deity, and so have been formal idolatry?

It seems clear that the allusion is rather to rites intended to remove

the contagion of sin or ritual impurity, particularly as manifested in disease, by rubbing the patient with an object calculated to absorb the contagion; a collection of references to such practices going down to the Hellenistic age is given by Rohde *Psyche* app. v p. 588 (Eng. Tr. 1925); running water, the plant *σκίλλα*, black figs, dead dogs, and eggs are favourite objects for the purpose. It appears that similar practices are found in Judaism. Lauterbach in *Hebrew Union College Annual* xi 262 sqq. deals with them at some length, and at times rather speculatively; but he quotes Talmud *Sabb.* 66 b for the practice of filling a new pitcher with water and swinging it seven times round the head with suitable formulae as a cure for sickness; after the swinging the water is thrown back to the river with the face averted. He further describes rites known as 'Kapparot' and 'propitio' used on the Day of Atonement. In the former a cock is swung round the head, in the latter a basket of palm-leaves, sown with beans or peas; a formula beginning 'May this be my substitute' is recited, and in the case of 'propitio' the *περικάθαρμα* is thrown into the sea or a river. Lauterbach suggests that, although we do not hear of the latter two rites until about A.D. 650 (when we hear of them as well-established practices), they may go back to very early times. The silence of the rabbis may well be due to the fact that they disliked the ceremonies but did not feel strong enough to put them down. In any case they are merely Jewish variations of ordinary quasi-magical practice; they might have been borrowed from pagan practice after the destruction of the Temple to make up for the loss of the official *περικάθαρμα* or *περίψημα* of Judaism, the scapegoat of the Day of Atonement, but if so they must have been familiar practices of the religion or magic of Syria and Babylonia.

On the other hand, Christian literature is not familiar with such rites. Origen in *Ev. Joann.* 28. 14 rightly interprets 2 Cor. v 21 as meaning that Jesus became a *περικάθαρμα* or *περίψημα*, but rather curiously fails to note that St Paul has in mind the scapegoat of the Day of Atonement. He explains the language by a reference to the stories of particular individuals who offered themselves as victims to save mankind from pestilence or famine as related by the histories of Greeks and barbarians, in other words to the aetiological myths, which explained such rites (normally involving in the primitive form human victims) in classical literature. Obviously there can be no allusion here to such public rites; even where the human victim had been abolished, they had been acclimatized to Greek mythology and would therefore be definitely idolatrous.

The phrase appears in the *Apostolic Church Order* (chap. 10) and also *Apostolic Constitutions*, which quotes the *Didache* at 7. 6. 2, and

enlarges on the various superstitions in language borrowed from Deut. xviii 10. His borrowings shew that he did not understand the *Didache*; he writes (οὐκ ἔσθ) *περικαθαίρων τὸν υἱόν σου*. He may have been right in thinking that the *Didache* was inspired by Deuteronomy; but if so the *Didache* by omitting 'thy son' entirely changed the meaning of *περικαθαίρων*. In Deut. xviii 10 the word means 'make thy son or thy daughter to pass through the fire', a prohibition of the Phoenician rite of child-sacrifice. It is quite likely that the *Didache* changed this into a prohibition of a superstitious rite of purification either because its author did not understand the LXX or because he thought it pointless to preserve a prohibition of an obsolete practice. (Tert. *Apol.* 9 states that the rite though prohibited by Tiberius was still secretly practised in Africa in his time, but this would hardly be true of circles which were in any close contact with Judaism or Christianity; in any case the *Didache* could not describe as 'leading to idolatry' a practice which even idolaters condemned.) The Apostolic Constitutions obviously did not understand to what the *Didache* was referring and introduced 'thy son' because it was in Deuteronomy; but it is quite possible that he intended his words to mean 'thou shalt not circumcise thy son', since the LXX in deference to the Greek dislike of circumcision softens down 'will circumcise thy heart' in Deut. xxx 6 into *περικαθαριεῖ τὴν καρδίαν σου*, and described the 'uncircumcised fruit' of Lev. xix 23 as *ἀπερικαθαρός*. (It may be noticed that Philo *de Spec. Legg.* 1 (*De Mon.*) 9 (60 M 2. 221) also changes Deut. xviii 10 into a prohibition of 'sacrificers and purifiers' (*θύτας, καθαρούς*) as well as augurers and the like; this enables him to condemn pagan religion in general without reference to the question of the existence in Judaism of rites of purification as well as sacrifice. In view of the fact that child-sacrifice was obsolete it would have been pointless to follow Deuteronomy.) The lack of contact between this section of the *Apostolic Constitutions* and real life may be judged from the fact that the prohibition of astrology (*μὴ γίνου*) *μαθηματικός* becomes the entirely meaningless *οὐ μαθήσῃ μαθήματα πονηρά*. The word reappears at 8. 32. 11 in a long list of similar 'vain observances' which reveals an exhaustive knowledge of such practices; if it is not from another hand it must be a list incorporated whole from a source: it cannot emanate from the blunderer who is responsible for 7. 6. 2.

I cannot help thinking that the word has a certain bearing on the question of the origin of the *Didache* discussed by Prof. Creed in *J. T. S.* Oct. 1938 vol. xxix pp. 370 sqq. The passage may be taken over from an older source. But it was not taken over from a Montanist, even the curious 'Montanist of a very mild type' of Mr Vokes (p. 209), whom I find something of a contradiction in terms. Ter-

tullian (*de Idol.* 9) has no doubt that wandering magicians as typified by Simon Magus are agents of idolatry; astrology and similar practices are species of the genus magic and therefore also idolatrous. I cannot envisage a Montanist who would simply say that these practices 'lead to' idolatry. Nor do I find it easy to suppose that the work is a fragment from a popular Jewish manual, since orthodox Judaism, though it did not regard *περικαθάρσεις* with favour, did not apparently make any serious attempt to condemn them. The passage seems to me to date from the period *c.* A.D. 100, when the Church had broken with the synagogue, but was finding it difficult to deal with all sorts of extraneous influences, such as the Gnosticism of Simon and Menander or the cults alluded to in Eph. v 6 sqq.; even Ignatius *ad Trall.* 5. 2 is a trifle vain about his knowledge of astrology. It suggests the situation in Bithynia described by Pliny *ad Tra.* 96. 6, when there are many converts who lapse at the first sign of persecution, not that in the adjoining region of Pontus and Paphlagonia described by Lucian (*Alexander* 25. 232) less than a century later when the Christians are the only people except instructed Epicureans who can be relied on not to follow an impostor. It is not for me to say whether the stylistic differences referred to by Prof. Creed (*loc. cit.* p. 374) are decisive in favour of a separate source for this section. I can only express a considerable doubt as to the probability of the insertion by an archaizer of a passage which introduces a term which later Christian writers seem not to understand. The earlier use of the phrase in *Apost. Const.* shews that the compiler could only give a wrong explanation; the later use is in a long list of practices each described by a single word, in which one might easily be left in even though it was not intelligible. I find it hard to suppose that the *Didache* would have left an unintelligible word with no attempt at an explanation in so short an insertion, though it cannot be said that it is impossible.

WILFRED L. KNOX.

THE MEANING OF *EKKΛΕΙΕΙΝ* IN GALATIANS iv 17

Ζηλοῦσιν ὑμᾶς οὐ καλῶς, ἀλλὰ ἐκκλεῖσαι ὑμᾶς (ἡμᾶς, Beza) θέλουσιν ἵνα αὐτοὺς ζηλοῦτε. The A.V. renders 'exclude you' (M 'us'), the R.V. 'shut out'. These meanings are too indefinite. They at once raise the question, From what are these people to be excluded?, which has been answered in various ways: 'from Christ' (Lightfoot); 'from me' (Luther); 'from perfect knowledge' (Chrysostom); 'from Christian freedom' (Erasmus). At its face value the word would be an insult to the Galatians. Beza avoided that by reading *ἡμᾶς*. The key word is

ἐκκλείσαι, but ζῆλοισι is the ward of the key. Bengel (*Gnomon* ii 244) gives the right meaning definite and direct—'non putarim eo sensu dici ut Latinis *excludi* dicuntur pulli'. In Rom. iii 27 Paul uses ἐξεκλείσθη in the sense of exclusion, but he often uses a word in different senses. I submit that he used ἐκκλείειν in the Latin sense of 'excludere', hatch out, and ζηλοῦν after the Latin use of 'fovere' in the same connexion. Lucretius v 802 has 'ova relinquebant exclusae', Cicero *N. D.* 2. 52 'excludere' of young birds, and, *de Oratore* iii 21, metaphorically of hatching out stump orators 'pulos excludere clamatores'. This idea is supported here by ζηλοῦσι (in 2 Cor. xi 2 of favouring people). Cicero *N. D.* 2. 48 has 'excludere' and 'fovere' together of birds—'pulli a matribus exclusi fotique'. In Suetonius (*Tib.* 14) Livia kept warm ('fovit') in her hands an egg—'ovum fovit quoad pullus exclusus est'. 'Fovere' of supporting a person often in Latin, e.g. Cicero *Fam.* 1. 9. 10 'fovebant hostem in eum'. 'Exclusion' is the technical name for the process by which the chick leaves the egg. This rendering gives point to the context. 'They are cultivating you but not for an honourable purpose, for it is their intention to bring you out to exploit you, so that you may cultivate them.' These people had made the Galatians regard him (Paul) as their enemy. This metaphor of a bird hatching out her young leads to another expression of the same sort—τέκνα μου, οὗς πάλιν ὠδίω, 'I have been your *mother* twice over.' In 1 Cor. iv 15 he used the figure of a father, ἐγέννησα. With the former compare the *logion*, ὃν τρόπον ὄρνις τὴν ἑαυτῆς νοσοῖαν ὑπὸ τὰς πτέρυγας (ἐπισυνάγει), Lk. xiii 34, Matt. xxiii 37. Our Lord here is the mother bird. ὠδίω has also a point. Euripides (*Her.* 1039) has ὡς τις ὄρνις ἀπτερον καταστένων ὠδίω τεκνων. Nicander (*Al.* 165) ὄρταλίχων ὠδίς of an egg. Eurip. *Electra* 897 οἰωνοῖσιν αἰθέρος τέκνοις. Thus birds can be called τέκνα.

All the *labour* of the apostle must be gone through again μεχρὸς οὐ μορφωθῆ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν. The idea of the mother bird can be read here, for it is her incubation over the fertilized eggs that gives the embryo strength to be completely formed in the egg. So the Galatians need the fostering care of the apostle (καλὸν ζηλοῦσθαι (i.e. by me) ἐν καλῶ) if the image of Christ, the germ already sown in their hearts, but whose developement has been arrested, is to be brought to matured reality. See a similar metaphor of the *brooding* spirit (raḥaph) (Gen. i) and the *protecting* eagle, Deut. xxxii 11. In 1 Thess. ii 7 we have the same simile ἦπιοι ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν ὡς ἐὰν τροφὸς θάλπη τὰ ἑαυτῆς τέκνα. Cf. Deut. xxii 6 ἡ μήτηρ θάλπη ἐπὶ τῶν νοσοῶν ἢ ἐπὶ τῶν ὠν. τροφὸς is not nurse, for a nurse is gentle to other people's children—her 'alumni'—but mother. The mother bird is a τροφός. Aristoph. *Aves* 323 ἐγράφη 'I was hatched'; *Nub.* 199 νεοττοτροφέι. A mother who

gives her children τροφεία μητρός (milk, *Ion* 1493) is a τροφός. Cf. τροφοί in *Isa.* xlix 23 of 'nursing fathers'. ἡπιος denotes the gentleness of a parent. In *Odys.* ii 47 it is used by Telemachus of Odysseus. νήπιος is due to dittography. Paul would not have contemplated a second childhood then. A on Acts xiii 19 has ἐτροφοφόρησεν bore them as a nursing mother. Philo used ὠδίνω metaphorically and Plato μαιεύεσθαι (ἡ μαιευτικὴ τέχνη). There are a number of terms Romans would appreciate more than Greeks, e.g. iv 4 ἐξηγόρασεν ἵνα τὴν υἰοθεσίαν ἀπολάβωμεν. Cf. 'emancipare filium in adoptionem' (Cicero and Pliny); iii 1 προεγράφη, 'proscribe' is used of putting up notices, laws, verses, &c., in public places; iv 10 ἡμέρας . . . καὶ μῆνας καὶ ἐνιαυτούς, the Roman state religion was regulated by such, e.g. 'dies fasti' and 'nefasti', the monthly festivals (see *Fasti* of Ovid), the 'lustrum'. In A.D. 48 the 'lustrum' of Claudius would have been observed by Claudio-Derbe and Claudio-Iconium. iv 1 'minors' (νήπιοι) under 'tutores' (ἐπίτροποι) and 'curatores' (οἰκονόμοι) freed by 'lex quina vicenaria' (200 B.C.). See *Pseudolus* I. 3. 69. τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐξορύξαντες (iv 15); 'effodere oculos', frequent in Comedy, often used by slaves (see Plautus). οὐκ ὀρθοποδοῦσι ii 14 'praevaricantur' (walk 'curibus varis'); 'stigmata' (vi 17 often in Latin prose, as well as in Greek) of brands of slaves and marks of disgrace. Here metaphorical, of 'perpetua stigmata imposita' (Suet. *J. C.* 73). These Galatians were very probably not Celts but converted descendants of Roman 'coloni' intermarried with natives (Ramsay *Expositor* Sept. 1899). Among them would be poultry farmers who would appreciate the Latin use of ἐκκλείειν as 'excludere', hatch out.

F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK.

TEXTUAL OBSERVATIONS ON THE APOCALYPSE OF BARUCH

EVERY student of the pseudepigraphic literature of the Old Testament is beholden to R. H. Charles for his scholarly and pioneering work in the Apocalypse of Baruch. It was he who maintained in 1896, much against the current assumptions of the times, that the Apocalypse was written in Hebrew and not in Greek. Other scholars, as Wellhausen (*Skizzen und Vorarbeiten* vi 234), Ryssel (*Apok. und Pseudepig.* A.T. 1900 ii 411), and Ginzberg (*Jewish Encyc.* ii 555), subsequently upheld his contention with additional data.¹

¹ For the evidence of a Hebrew original see R. H. Charles *The Apocalypse of Baruch* London 1896 p. xlv f. A later edition of the book appeared in the *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* ii Oxford 1913, with many additions and corrections.