

## THE DIDACHE'S USE OF THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS

William Varner  
Professor of Biblical Studies  
The Master's College

*The Didache has attracted widespread attention among scholars interested in early Christian writings since being discovered in 1873. Of particular interest has been the way it uses the Old and New Testaments because it reflects the way earliest Christian leaders approached the same issue. The document shows a special familiarity with the Gospel of Matthew and cites passages frequently from that source. Evidence supports the conclusion that the Didachist had access to the canonical Gospel as currently known and not just to oral tradition about Jesus. His use of Matthew often followed very closely to the exact wording of that Gospel. His only use of noncanonical works was in a negative way. He also cited two OT passages and apparently followed the wording of the LXX most closely. He did not endorse an allegorical interpretation of the OT as came to be the practice in other early Christian writings. A personal translation of the Didache is included.*

\* \* \* \* \*

### Introduction

The discovery of the Didache in 1873 has been acclaimed in many a eulogy, in many a language and by many a scholar. And rightly so. For this work has cast a spell over even the most cautious who, finding its magic irresistible, seek time and again to prise its secrets. For however else can one explain the unending fascination expressed in such an abundance of words for a work written with so few—a bibliography which exceeds any reasonable expectation?<sup>1</sup>

If Professor Walker was amazed at the size of the bibliography on the Didache in 1981, what amazement would she express today about the continued scholarly interest in this little document that is shorter than Paul's epistle to the Galatians? In the last decade alone, two major commentaries on the Didache have appeared, the most recent being 800 pages in length.<sup>2</sup> Furthermore, three major collections of scholarly articles on the Didache by multiple authors have been issued,

---

<sup>1</sup>Joan Hazelden Walker, "Reflections on a New Edition of the Didache," *Vigiliae Christianae* 35 (1981):35.

<sup>2</sup>Kurt Niederwimmer, *The Didache* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1998); Aaron Milavec, *The Didache: Faith, Hope & Life of the Earliest Christian Communities, 50-70 C.E.* (New York: Newman, 2003).

again in the last decade.<sup>3</sup> The journal articles continue to appear at a regular pace.<sup>4</sup> In April 2004, an international conference at Oxford University was convened to discuss "The New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers." No less than five of the twenty-five papers presented dealt directly with the Didache and a number dealt indirectly with issues raised by the document.<sup>5</sup>

The present writer is one of those people whom Walker describes, over whom the spell of the "Teaching" has been cast. As I have translated it, I have been captured by its profundity in simplicity and its obvious characteristic of *multum in parvo*. It has been a major focus of my sabbatical research. Yet, evangelicals by and large neglect the study of the Didache and the Apostolic Fathers in general, and usually leave such study to the more liturgical traditions of the church. In that regard, surprisingly, even Jewish scholars are contributing their unique perspective to this area of study (e.g., Flusser, n. 3). The evangelical commitment to "sola scriptura" and a general lack of engagement with the tradition of the church probably limit participation in such discussions. Only when patristic or apocryphal writings directly address issues raised in the canonical books do evangelicals usually involve themselves in this area of research. But the Didache and other early church writings constantly discuss many issues related to Old and New Testament studies. Should not evangelicals listen to and interact with what earliest Christians wrote about?

One of the most important recent issues in biblical interpretation among evangelicals is the New Testament's use of the Old Testament and its impact on inspiration and hermeneutics.<sup>6</sup> The attitude of early noncanonical Christian writers should at least be considered when learning how citations of sacred Scripture should be handled. Do the Apostolic Fathers cite the OT in the same way as the NT writers? Furthermore, how did they cite the NT? This article will discuss briefly how the Didache used the Old and the New Testaments. The two main issues are: 1. In what *form* does the writer cite Scripture (LXX or MT?), and 2. In what *manner* does the writer use Scripture to make his point? Both questions (the linguistic and the hermeneutical) are essential in discovering how to handle such citations.

<sup>3</sup>*The Didache in Context: Essays on its Text, History and Transmission*, ed. Clayton Jefford (New York: E.J. Brill, 1995); *The Didache in Modern Research*, ed. Jonathan A. Draper, (New York: E. J. Brill, 1996); *The Didache: Its Jewish Sources and Its Place in Early Judaism and Christianity*, eds. Huub van de Sandt and David Flusser, (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002).

<sup>4</sup>See, only as a recent sample, Neville Tidwell, "Didache XIV:1 ("kata kuriaken de kuriou") revisited," *Vigiliae Christianae* 53/2 (1999):197-207; Jonathan Draper, "Ritual Process and Ritual Symbol in Didache 7-10," *Vigiliae Christianae* 54/2 (2000):121-58; Clayton Jefford, "Conflict at Antioch: Ignatius and the Didache at Odds," *Studia Patristica* 36 (2001):262-69; Huub van de Sandt, "Do not give what is holy to the dogs (Did. 9:5d and Matt. 7:6a); the Eucharistic Food of the Didache in its Jewish Purity Setting," *Vigiliae Christianae* 56/3 (2002):223-46.

<sup>5</sup>"The New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers," Oxford University, April 5-7, 2004. The conference was called to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the publication of a seminal volume titled *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* produced in 1905 by the Oxford Committee on Historical Theology. Oxford University Press plans to publish the conference papers in two volumes in 2005.

<sup>6</sup>Recent works illustrating the hermeneutical implications of the "Old in the New," include Greg Beale, ed., *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts?* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994); Steve Moyise, *The Old Testament in the New* (New York: Continuum, 2001); Robert L. Thomas, "The New Testament Use of the Old Testament," in *Evangelical Hermeneutics: The New Versus the Old* (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2002); Craig Evans, *From Prophecy to Testament: Function of Old Testament in the New* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2004).

Before the addressing of the above subject, acknowledging other important questions about the Didache is important. Some of those questions are: 1. When was it discovered, and what has been its history in the church? 2. Who was its author and when was it written? 3. What is the theological framework of the Didache? 4. What implications for liturgy, sacraments, and ministry does it have since it appears to be a "church manual" in its literary genre? 5. What is its eschatological teaching, since the last chapter is an apocalypse? 6. How do the things that are taught in the Didache compare with teachings of the NT? Such related issues deserve separate treatments, which this writer hopes to undertake. What is of concern here, however, is how the "Didachist" (or the "Didachogapher" as Philip Schaff styled the unnamed author<sup>7</sup>) quoted and used the canonical (and noncanonical?) writings.

A summary of suggested conclusions about some Didache issues will provide the reader with a framework for how this writer approaches the document. Without elaborating on the arguments, a first-century date for its writing is accepted, with its provenance probably being Syria, although some suggest Egypt. A strong case can be made for its compositional unity and that it represents a Jewish-Christian frame of reference and is orthodox in its theology.<sup>8</sup> Later papers and articles will explore those questions as well as the document's theological substructure.

Though scholars have occasionally proposed a *very* early date (prior to A.D. 70) for the writing,<sup>9</sup> it seems safer to follow Lightfoot and a number of other scholars in recognizing that it is a document that reflects views of a group of Jewish Christians who lived and ministered during the last decades of the first century. The strongest arguments for a first-century date are, 1. the primitive simplicity of the Didache's teaching on Jesus and the church's leadership, and 2. its silence about any persecution experienced by its readers or writer(s). An even earlier date, however, is still possible. In his highly influential volume on the history of NT interpretation, Bishop Stephen Neill had this to say as he reflected on the volume by Audet (n. 9) that had recently appeared and which argued for a date prior to A.D. 70.

On the basis of an immensely learned survey of all the materials, Fr. Audet comes to the conclusion that the Didache was written in Syria between AD 50 and 70. It is hardly likely that this conclusion will meet with general acceptance; *but it is exciting to consider the possibility that we have here a work outside the New Testament which may have been written earlier than most of the New Testament books.*<sup>10</sup>

One hopes that the same spirit of excitement and anticipation will

---

<sup>7</sup>Philip Schaff *The Oldest Church Manual called the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1887).

<sup>8</sup>See the following standard works for treatments of these important "introductory" issues: J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers* (London: Macmillan, 1893), 2d ed., ed. Michael Holmes (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1999); Schaff, *Oldest Church Manual*, chapters I-XXXIII; Niederwimmer, *The Didache*, chapters 1-7; Milavec, *The Didache*, Parts 1 and 2. Although Milavec follows some highly individualistic approaches to some Didache issues, his opinions need to be heard since he has thought long and hard about these issues.

<sup>9</sup>See, e.g., Milavec, *The Didache* vii-xxv. As early as 1885 the French scholar Sabatier defended this early date (*La Didache* [Paris: Librairie Fischbacher]). Jean Paul Audet in *La Didache: Instruction des Apotres* (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1958) has provided the most scholarly defense of a very early date, although he does acknowledge a number of later editorial additions to the document.

<sup>10</sup>Stephen Neill and N. T. Wright, *The Interpretation of the New Testament, 1861-1986*, 2d ed. (Oxford: Oxford University, 1988) 64. [emphasis added]

characterize an approach to how the Didache uses the Scriptures.

### Use of the New Testament

The reader of the Didache who is familiar with the Gospels is struck by its preference for the Gospel of Matthew. Possibly the Didachist clearly cites *only* that Gospel to the exclusion of the other Gospels and probably to the exclusion of all other NT books. The question of how writers cite Scripture is complicated by the question of what constitutes a quotation from an earlier work. How close to the original source does it have to be to qualify as a “quotation”? As a working model, the following paradigm is proposed, a paradigm suggested by many writers and cogently described by David Aune:

In *citations*, a portion of text (is) reproduced word for word from a source, often prefaced with an introductory formula such as “As it is written” (Rom. 9:13), “For the scripture says to Pharaoh” (Rom. 9:17), “Have you not read this scripture” (Mark 12:10-11). Distinguished from citations are *quotations*, word-for-word reproductions of a text without any introductory markers. *Allusions* are references that the writer assumes the reader will recognize . . . consisting of one or more words sufficiently distinctive to be traced to a known text, but not a verbatim reproduction of any part of that text. . . . An *echo* is subtler than an allusion and is a relatively faint reference to a text.<sup>11</sup>

Dogmatism about authorial intent tends to diminish the more one progresses through that paradigm from *citations* to *echoes*. In any case, the paradigm remains useful not only for how the NT refers to the Old but also how the Didachist or any other later writer refers to the canonical books. The Didache has examples of each of the ways of referring to Scripture suggested by Aune.

Before an examination of some examples of how the Didachist refers to Matthew, a listing of the number of times he does just that is helpful. The following table, limiting references to citations and quotations only, shows how often verses from Matthew appear in the Didache.

The Didache and Matthew<sup>12</sup>

<i>Didache Reference</i>	<i>Matthew Reference</i>
Title	28:16,19,20
1:1	7:13,14
1:2	22:38,39
1:2e	7:12
1:3b	5:44
1:3c	5:46,47
1:4b	5:39,48,40,41

<sup>11</sup>David E. Aune, *The Westminster Dictionary of New Testament and Early Christian Literature and Rhetoric* (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 2003) 395. [emphasis added]

<sup>12</sup>The information in this table was adapted from a more detailed table in Alan Garrow, *The Gospel of Matthew's Dependence on the Didache* (Sheffield, Eng.: T and T Clark, 2004) xiv-xxxiii. One does not have to accept Garrow's novel thesis that the Didache actually antedates Matthew to benefit from his detailed research.

1:5a	5:42,45
1:5b	5:26
2:2	5:21;19:18
2:3	5:33
3:2	5:21,22
3:3	5:27,28
3:7	5:5
3:8	5:7
5:1b	15:19
7:1	28:19
8:1	6:16
8:2a	6:2,5,16
8:2c	6:9-13
9:5b	7:6
11:1,2	5:17,19,20
11:7	12:31
13:1	10:10
14:2	5:24
16:1	24:42;25:13
16:3	24:11,12
16:4	24:10,12
16:5	24:10
16:6	24:30,31
16:8	24:30

One may not agree that every one of the verses in the Didache constitutes a deliberate attempt by the author to refer to a Matthean passage. For example, some of the references from Didache 2:2–3:7 in the table could possibly be to various verses in the LXX text of their OT source (see Didache 3:7, e.g., for a possible quotation from Ps 37:11). Nevertheless, the Didache quotations of these possible OT verses match Matthew's version of them in Greek. In any case, the overwhelming presence of the first Gospel in the Didache is quite evident.

Upon further examination of such a table one must notice that the bulk of the quotations are from the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 5–7) and the Olivet Discourse (Matthew 24–25), the two longest discourses of Jesus in Matthew's Gospel. Another striking fact is that there is really only one other passage in the Didache in which it appears that a quotation agrees more closely with a Synoptic Gospel other than Matthew. That is in Didache 1:5a:

<i>Didache text of 1:5a</i>	<i>Luke 6:30</i>	<i>Matthew 5:42</i>
παντὶ τῷ αἰτοῦντι σε δίδου καὶ μὴ ἀπαίτει	παντὶ αἰτοῦντι σε δίδου καὶ . . . μὴ ἀπαίτει	τῷ αἰτοῦντι σε δὸς καὶ . . . μὴ ἀποστραφῆς

Though such a variation may prohibit blind dogmatism about the Didache's sole usage of Matthew, its rarity of occurrence illustrates the point that the Didachist used Matthew almost exclusively.

Addressing the question of whether the Didachist (or any Apostolic Father for that matter) knew the Gospel of Matthew or any Gospel in its current canonical form is necessary. In this matter, Didache scholars are divided. Until the 1950s writers on the Didache universally held that the Didachist knew and used the current canonical Matthew. With the publication of Helmut Koester's doctoral thesis under Rudolph Bultmann in 1957, the terrain began to change.<sup>13</sup> The Bultmann/Koester "school" declares that since our canonical Gospels did not take final shape until the latter part of the second century, it is impossible that any Apostolic Father could have used them.<sup>14</sup> They usually point to the fluidity in the tradition and how sometimes the verses from the Gospels do not appear exactly the way they are found now. They explain away the exact quotations that do appear as redactions to bring the quotations in line with their later written form. Therefore, according to this approach, all that the Apostolic Fathers had at their disposal was the oral tradition of Jesus' words, which was heavily marked by fluidity and diversity. That diversity, they say, is illustrated by the very citations in the Fathers' writings.

However, not all scholars have surrendered to that current view. Many argue that the Didache and other early Fathers like Ignatius and Polycarp did certainly utilize material from the Synoptic Gospels. If they did not always do so by direct quotation, then certainly they did by strong enough allusions to indicate their knowledge of the Gospels. Such writers have also provided the hard evidence to show this to be the case.<sup>15</sup> One recent work from a contemporary German scholar affirms, "The Didache means by 'the gospel' [8:2; 11:3; 15:3, 4] the Gospel of Matthew; thus the Didache . . . documents the emerging authority of the one great Gospel."<sup>16</sup> Schnelle's references to those places in the Didache where τὸ εὐαγγέλιον appear indicate that the writer had a written Gospel before him. Note especially the expression in 15:3 and repeated in 15:4: ὡς ἔχετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ. And since the words that he quotes from that εὐαγγέλιον are words that are found in canonical Matthew only, it appears that the presupposition that Matthew could not have existed at the turn of the first century is the only thing that keeps some scholars from admitting that it is quoted in the Didache. The only response to such evidence from the Didache is a theory that these verses were added by a later redactor. The evidence, however, points in another direction.

<sup>13</sup>Helmut Koester, *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den apostolischen Vätern*, TU, vol. 65 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1957).

<sup>14</sup>See, for example, Jonathan Draper, "The Jesus Tradition in the Didache," in *Gospel Perspectives*, vol. 5, *The Jesus Tradition Outside the Gospels*, ed. David Wenham (Sheffield, Eng.: JSOT, 1985) 269-87. Papers at the "New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers" conference mentioned previously presented by Arthur Bellinzoni, William Peterson, and Helmut Koester still advocated this position (volume forthcoming).

<sup>15</sup>Christopher Tuckett, "Synoptic Tradition in the Didache," in *The Didache in Modern Research*, ed. Jonathan Draper (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996) 92-128. See also the massive work done by Edouard Massaux, *The Influence of the Gospel of Saint Matthew on Christian Literature before Saint Irenaeus*, Book 3, "The Apologists and the Didache," ed. by Arthur Bellinzoni (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University, 1993).

<sup>16</sup>Udo Schnelle, *The History and Theology of the New Testament Writings* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1998) 355.

But what about the differences in detail when the Didachist cites Matthew? How is this explained? An examination of Didache 1:3-5a, for example, indicates that these verses are not verbatim from Matthew's Gospel. They appear to be adapted freely from Matt 5:39-41 and 44-48 (see accompanying text). The differences are explainable by recognizing that the Didachist adapted the passages for his own didactic purpose, much like what some NT authors do. Modern teachers and preachers may adapt a passage for their purpose without necessarily changing the authorial intent of the passage. Tuckett persuasively argues this way in his article cited in n. 15, an argument that accords with common sense practice also. After a detailed analysis of Didache 1:3-5a, Tuckett concludes, "The Didachist was using his sources here with a certain degree of faithfulness. This suggests very strongly that the Didache here presupposes the gospels of Matthew and Luke in their finished forms. Further, this result seems to apply to all parts of the Didache examined here."<sup>17</sup>

Should exactness in quotation be expected from all ancient writers? Should the same precision in the biblical writers that meets modern scholarly standards be expected? The Fathers wrote what they did, not to be read as academic term papers graded by pedantic teaching assistants, but for the practical purpose of instructing and exhorting their readers. This teaching proceeded from passionate hearts, sometimes possibly as they quoted from memory. Lest one think this is the view of this writer only, consider the words of the great textual scholar, Bruce Metzger, about the quoting habits of the Fathers:

After the true text of the Patristic author has been recovered, the further question must be raised whether the writer intended to quote the scriptural passage verbatim or merely to paraphrase it. If one is assured that the Father makes a bona fide quotation and not a mere allusion, the problem remains whether he quoted it after consulting the passage in a manuscript or whether he relied on his memory.<sup>18</sup>

Metzger illustrates how Origen hardly ever quoted the same passage in the same way twice! Enough has been said to grant the Didachist the benefit of the doubt if he occasionally fashioned Matthew's verses to fit his teaching purposes. When he changes the wording slightly, he appears always to be consistent with the authorial intent of Jesus as recorded in Matthew.

Perhaps too much attention has been given to the differences between the Didache text and that of Matthew, since the differences are actually few compared to the similarities. For most of his citations/quotations, no discernible difference between the texts exists. Consider, for example, two specific examples of the Didachist's quoting of Matthew in later chapters.

Intense ethical instruction composes most of chaps. 1-5 of the Didache. This material appears to be a pre-baptismal catechetical manual (note the phrase used before the command to baptize: *ταῦτα πάντα προειπόντες*, "having said all these things beforehand," i.e., the things contained beforehand in the first six chapters, 7:1). The Didachist proceeds to describe how a church should conduct its ministry of sacraments, prayer, teaching, and hospitality (chaps. 7-15). He does this by using the discourse marker *περὶ δὲ* five times, to mark off the sections in which he gives instruction on 1. dietary restrictions (6:3); 2. baptism and prayer (7:1); 3.

---

<sup>17</sup>Tuckett, "Synoptic Tradition in the Didache" 128-29.

<sup>18</sup>Bruce Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament* (New York: Oxford University, 1968) 87.

the eucharist (9:1,3); and 4. the treatment of apostles and prophets (11:3) (see accompanying text). This resembles Paul's use of the same discourse marker to introduce successive subjects he addressed in 1 Corinthians (7:1; 7:25; 8:1; 12:1; 16:1; 16:12).

In the section on prayer, he introduces what has been called for many years "The Lord's Prayer." Here is this writer's translation with the accompanying Greek text from the Didache and the corresponding text in the UBS 4th ed. Greek text:

8:2 "(And) dō not pray like the hypocrites but like the Lord commanded in his gospel.

Präy this way:

Our Father, who is in heaven,  
 may your name be made holy,  
 may your kingdom come,  
 may your will be done upon earth as in heaven, (Jer. ms: γεννηθήτω)  
 give us today our daily bread,  
 and forgive us our debt  
 as we also forgive our debtors,  
 and do not lead us into trial  
 but deliver us from the evil one,  
because yours is the power and the glory forever."

[Didache: Πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, ἀγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου, ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου, γεννηθήτω τὸ θέλημα σου ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς· τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον, καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὴν ὀφειλὴν ἡμῶν ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφίεμεν τοῖς ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν, καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν, ἀλλὰ ῥύσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ· ὅτι σοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ δύναμις καὶ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

UBS: Πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ἀγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου· ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου· γεννηθήτω τὸ θέλημα σου, ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς· τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον· καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν, ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν τοῖς ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν· καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν, ἀλλὰ ῥύσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ.]

The words underlined indicate some differences between the Didache text and that in Matthew. As one can see, the differences are minimal. The Didache has the singular "heaven" and "debt" while the Matthew text has those words in the plural. There is also a slight change in the tense of the Greek word for "forgive." No differences, however, affect in the least the meaning conveyed in the prayer.

There is an addition at the end of the prayer in the Didache that is not in our modern critical text since it is not in the earliest Greek manuscripts of Matthew. It is similar to but shorter than the addition familiar to many Christians that is found in the later Byzantine addition to the prayer (see textual apparatus in UBS or Nestle-Aland for the details). Though this addition to the prayer in the Didache initially may appear to encourage Byzantine text advocates since it could support an early date for this ending, the truth is just the opposite. The doxological ascription appears later in the Didache in almost the exact same form and is appended to the Eucharistic prayers in 9:2, 3, 4 and 10:2, 4, 5. It is very similar to a common ending



to prayers in the Jewish liturgy which exist even to day.<sup>19</sup> A better explanation of the manuscript tradition is that the Didache is an early witness to the tendency of scribes to add doxological ascriptions, which increased in Byzantine times when the doxological ascription crystallized and, in the Middle Ages, became part of the received text—at least in the Byzantine section of the church (Western and Latin texts along with the Alexandrian text-type omit the doxology).

Another apparently direct citation from Matthew appears in the Didache where the eucharist is explained. The Didachist supports his point that only believers should partake of the eucharist in the following manner:

9:5 (And) lēt no one eat or drink from ÿour eucharist  
except those baptized in the name of the Lord,  
for also the Lord has said concerning this:  
“Do not give what is holy to the dogs.”

[Didache of Didache 9:5: Μῆ δῶτε τὸ ἅγιον τοῖς κυσί.  
UBS text of Matt 7:6: Μῆ δῶτε τὸ ἅγιον τοῖς κυσίv.]

The issue about the form of this text citation is simple. The texts are identical (unless one fusses about the “movable nu” in Matthew). Authority for this saying is traced directly to the “Lord.” Occasionally, that title has a general sense in the Didache, but as it does here, it often clearly refers to Jesus (see also 6:2; 8:2; 11:2, 4, 8; 12:1; 14:1; 15:4; 16:1, 8). It is not the “form” issue but the “hermeneutical” issue that arises this text. Would the reader of the Sermon on the Mount think of “closed communion” for believers only as the original intention of this Dominical saying in Matt 7:6? Probably not. Does that indicate that the Didachist has ripped this saying from its original Matthean context and applied it wrongly to the issue of correct participation in the Eucharistic observance? Proponents of the non-use of the Gospels by the Apostolic Fathers have no problem here. They affirm that this saying was taken either from the oral tradition or from a Jewish milieu, and was used by the Didachist in this way for his purpose and also by the “Matthean” author for his purpose.<sup>20</sup> Is there another way to approach this?

The context of this saying is the Sermon on the Mount at the end of Jesus’ warning against hypocritical judging of others (7:1-5). It then precedes a pericope on prayer (7:6-11). The first five verses of Matthew 7 comprise a strong warning against harsh and wrongful discernment. To balance that warning, Jesus in v. 6 gives what could very well have been a proverbial Jewish saying to teach that there is such a thing as correct discernment about those who in reality are “dogs” and “pigs.” That is the legitimate connection between 7:1-5 and 7:6, and the commentators bear this out.<sup>21</sup> If this is the case, the Didachist makes a point that it is also a correct act of discernment to deny the eucharist to unbaptized nonbelievers. It is not a harsh or unkind act to keep them from partaking. As a matter of fact, the leaders of the assembly have a moral and spiritual responsibility to do so. Though this verse was

---

<sup>19</sup>Oskar Skarsaune, *In the Shadow of the Temple: Jewish Influences on Early Christianity* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2002) 406-21. Skarsaune’s chapter is very helpful in tracing the Jewish background of many of the early church’s practices, as is also his entire volume.

<sup>20</sup>Draper, “Jesus Tradition in the Didache” 78.

<sup>21</sup>E.g., D. A. Carson, “Matthew,” in *Expositors Bible Commentary*, ed. Frank E. Gaebelin (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984) 8:185.

not originally given in Matthew to limit participation in the eucharist to believers, the Didachist's use of it is consistent with the way Jesus used it to make His point in the Sermon on the Mount.

### Use of Noncanonical Material

More could be written about the Didache's use of NT citations and allusions,<sup>22</sup> but the above-mentioned texts evidence the author's agreement with the broad scope of NT theology and practice as well as his adapting some NT verses for his own specific purposes. Before an examination of his use of the Scriptures from the canonical Old Covenant, some notice should be given to the question of whether or not the Didachist refers to non-canonical literature, and if he does, how he uses it.

For years scholars have noticed that Didache 1–5 develops the theme of the “two ways.” Didache 1:1 opens with “There are two ways: one of life and one of death! (And) [there is] a great difference between the two ways.” Later he concludes the first part of this section with “This is the Way of Life!” (4:14b). He then launches the second section this way: “The way of death, on the other hand, is this . . .” (5:1–2). Some have claimed that the Didachist adapted an existing Jewish “two ways” ethical treatise for his “Jewish Christian” purposes. Such a claim has arisen specially since the discovery and publication of the Dead Sea Scrolls, some of which reflect such an ethical treatise in the Community Rule of that sect.<sup>23</sup>

However, after initially being positive about the possibility of the Didachist's adaptation of a Jewish document to his purpose, this writer has become convinced that the comparison and relationship has been greatly overdrawn. Such an effort, in my opinion, suffers from what has come to be called “parallelomania,” the unjustified effort to see parallels and borrowings from one body of literature by another, based on either anachronistic or very slim analogies between the two.

The simple fact of the matter is that no clear example of a Jewish “two ways” document from the period antedating the Didache has ever been produced. To postulate the existence of such a document is easy, but such a document has not been found. A careful Didache scholar recognized this when he wrote about attempts to make the Qumran material a source for the Didache.

One must not lose the unique perspective that the comparison between the *Manual of Discipline* from Qumran and the different forms of the Christian *duae viae* brings concerning the *dualistic framework* (which is absent in the Didache!) and concerning the general literary genre of instruction which places side by side a list of virtues and a list

---

<sup>22</sup>One thinks of the “little apocalypse” (chapter 16) and its relationship to Matthew 24–25 as well as the eucharist liturgy (chaps. 8–9) and its relationship, if any, to the eucharistic words of Jesus in Matthew 26.

<sup>23</sup>The DSS source most often referred to is IQS 3:13–4:26. I can offer only a summary of some of the main books and articles on this subject of the Jewish context of the “Two Ways” section in recent years. Audet (see n. 9); van de Sandt and Flusser (n. 3); Jean Danielou, *The Theology of Jewish Christianity I* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1964) 28ff., 315ff.; Gedaliah Alon, “The Halacha in the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles,” in Draper, *Didache* 165–94; Jean-Paul Audet, “Literary and Doctrinal Affinities of the Manual of Discipline,” in Draper, *Didache* 129–47. This is only a representative summary of works which seek to affirm a relationship between Didache 1–5 and IQS to one degree or another.

of vices; *but in the detail of content and vocabulary, resemblances are missing.*<sup>24</sup>

Just three years after the Didache's publication, the great scholar, Benjamin Warfield, warned against any effort to argue for a Jewish "two ways" *vorlage*, in light of the meager evidence of such ever existing.<sup>25</sup> This writer challenges anyone to read the appropriate section of "The Community Rule" (1QS) 3:13–4:26 and find anything that would make one think of Didache 1–5, unless he or she had been preconditioned to do so. In my opinion, the only similarity in the two documents is the word "two." The Scroll speaks of "two" angels, one of darkness and one of light and how men are ruled by one of "two" spirits. This may be parallel to the rabbinic concept of the two inclinations in man—the "yetzer hara" and the "yetzer hatov"—but it bears only a slight resemblance to the Didache's description of the two ways, mainly in the word "two!"<sup>26</sup>

It should be noted that the "two ways" ethical pattern is very Jewish and has deep roots in Jewish Scripture. Consider Deut 30:19: "I call heaven and earth to witness against you today, that I have set before you life and death. . . ." Psalm 1 describes the two ways with their contrasting results very graphically. The wisdom literature of the Hebrew Bible is replete with this contrasting comparison. Consider Proverbs 1–9 with its comparison of the "Way of Wisdom" with the "Way of Folly."

Seeing the Didache and the Hebrew Scriptures as employing a literary pattern ingrained in pre-Christian Jewish thinking is more reasonable. It served as a pattern for the Didachist to employ in his Jewish Christian ethical treatise. If there was literary dependence, it makes much more sense again to see it in the statement of one thoroughly versed in the Hebrew "two ways" thinking: "Enter by the narrow gate. For the gate is wide and the way is easy that leads to *destruction*, and those who enter by it are many. For the gate is narrow and the way is hard that leads to *life*, and those who find it are few" (Matt 7:13,14). Sometimes things may be simpler than people try to make them.

If the Didachist did not employ a non-canonical source as he composed the whole of chapters 1–5, his second verse may still present a challenge to that general conclusion. There one encounters what has often been called the "Negative Golden Rule." Didache 1:2b states, "[A]s many [things] as you might wish not to happen to you, likewise, do not do to another." This is certainly similar to Jesus' statement in Matt 7:12, where it is expressed positively. A pre-Christian history to this piece of ethical advice exists, however. Tobit's advice to his son in 4:15 is similar: "And what you hate, do not do to anyone." Furthermore, the famous dictum of Hillel to the inquiring Gentile in Babylonian Shabbat 31a also sounds very similar to Didache 1:2b. Did the Didachist deliberately alter the Dominical saying in accord with Jewish tradition, or could this be an example of a genuine *agraphon*—an unwritten saying of Jesus? No one knows, but anyone should recognize this as a further example of the definitely Jewish character of the Didache, even in its Christian dress.

One of the most perplexing statements in the Didache concludes a treatment

<sup>24</sup>Willy Rordorf, "An Aspect of the Judaeo-Christian Ethic: The Two Ways," in Draper, *The Didache* 151. [emphasis added]

<sup>25</sup>B. B. Warfield, "Notes on the Didache," *Journal of the Exegetical Society* [June 1886]: 92-93.

<sup>26</sup>For the text in English, see Geza Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (London: Penguin, 1997) 101-3. For a brief summary discussion of the rabbinic concept of the two inclinations in man, see Jacob Neusner, ed., *Dictionary of Judaism in the Biblical Period* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1996) 312, 668.

of the possible non-canonical citations in the book. It comes at the end of chapter 1, concluding a previously noted passage that encourages giving, with many quotes from the Sermon on the Mount (1:3-5). Didache 1:6 states, “But also, concerning this [rule], on\_the\_one\_hand, it has been said: ‘Let your alms sweat in your hands, until you know to whom you might give [it].’” This appears to be a warning against indiscriminate almsgiving: the worthiness of the potential alms-receiver is a very important consideration before the alms-giver acts. Many commentators have noted a similar sentiment expressed in Sirach 12:1, but the wording is quite different from this (the Didachist uses the “citation formula” εἶρηται, “it has been said”).

The best suggestion is that he did use Sirach, but not in the way he is often understood to have done. In one of the most brilliant examples of linguistic detective work this writer has ever read, the Dead Sea Scrolls scholar Patrick Skehan has shown, in light of a Hebrew copy of Sirach found in the Cairo Geniza, that it is possible that an ancient scribe mistook a Hebrew word for “truth” for the same initialed word for “sweat.” That mistake could have led to the strange translation in the Didache, which apparently utilizes only the Greek translation of the OT.<sup>27</sup>

One more facet of linguistic phenomena helps to see *why* the Didachist chose this strange text from a non-canonical book—something he did not do elsewhere in his work. The introduction to the quotation in Greek is, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τούτου δὲ εἶρηται. The strong adversative conjunction ἀλλὰ plus the conjunction καί and later a milder adversative conjunction δέ combine to make a rather involved Greek construction. Elsewhere in the Didache, the adversative ἀλλὰ always introduces a strong contrast with what has gone before (see 2:5; 2:7; 3:9; 4:9; 8:2; 16:1). The explanation is that the same strong adversative idea is found here. What the Didachist does is to contrast the generous giving commanded by Jesus with the “tight-fisted” attitude commended by Sirach in 12:1-7, a further pessimistic tone about giving to unworthy people. In addition, the verse’s advice as it is quoted is totally opposite the spirit and practice of giving that is commended elsewhere in 4:8:

- [C] You will not turn\_away the one\_in\_need;  
 [1] but, on\_the\_other\_hand, you will share together,  
     all things with your brother,  
 [2] and you will not say that such things are your own.  
     For, if ὧu are partners in the immortal [things],  
     how\_much more [are you partners] in the mortal [things].

It appears that the Didachist did actually use a non-canonical work, even quoting it. But he did so, not as a positive witness to confirm what he had just taught, but as a negative witness to a practice he intends his readers to avoid.

### Use of the Old Testament

This study of the Didache’s use of Scripture concludes by noting its two direct citations from the OT.<sup>28</sup> The first is a significant citation from Mal 1:11, 14.

---

<sup>27</sup>Patrick Skehan, “Didache 1, 6 and Sirach 12, 1,” *Biblica* 44 [1963]:533-36.

<sup>28</sup>Space does not allow for a consideration of how the Didachist adapts many of the Torah commandments in Exodus into his ethical treatise in chaps. 2–5. He presents his commands with a wisdom motif similar to that used in Proverbs. Consider, for example, his use of the repeated τέκνον μωυ phrase in 3:1, 3, 5, 6, and 4:3 and its echoes in Solomon’s address to “my son” 15 times in Proverbs

The Didachist employs it at the end of a section in chap. 14 in which he exhorts the brethren to be at peace with one another lest they mar their participation in the eucharist. After alluding to the statement in Matt 5:23-24 regarding one's sacrifice being defiled by unreconciled differences between brethren (14:2), he cites the OT text that he believes prophesies about sacrifices to be offered by the Gentiles.

- 14:3 For this is that which was spoken by the Lord: (ἡ ῥήθειςσα)  
 "In every place and time, offer to me a pure sacrifice."  
 "Because I am a great king," says [the] Lord,  
 "and my name is wondrous among the Gentiles." (Mal 1:11, 14)

A comparison of the text form of the Didachist's citation reveals some differences from both the Masoretic and LXX renderings of the verses.

[Didache: Ἐν παντὶ τοπῶ καὶ χρόνῳ προσφέρειν μοι θυσίαν καθαρὰν ὅτι βασιλεὺς μέγας εἰμι λέγει κύριος καὶ τὸ ὄνομά μου θαυμαστὸν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.

MT: הַיְהוָה הַיְהוָה וּמִנְחָה לְשָׂמִי מִגִּזְרֵי מִקְוֵי מְקוֹם מְקוֹם  
 כִּי מִן הַיְהוָה אֲנִי אֶמְרֵה הִנֵּה צְבָאוֹת וְשָׂמִי נֹרָא בְּגוֹיִם:

LXX: ἐν παντὶ τοπῶ θυσίαμα προσάγεται τῷ ὀνόματί μου καὶ θυσία καθαρὰ.  
 διότι βασιλεὺς μέγας ἐγὼ εἰμι λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ  
 καὶ τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐπιφανὲς ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.]

The Didache omits the title "Almighty" from Mal 1:11 (אֱלֹהֵי אֱלֹהִים in MT; παντοκράτωρ in LXX) and uses a functionally equivalent word (θαυμαστὸν) for the אֱלֹהֵי of Mal 1:14 in the MT and the ἐπιφανὲς in the LXX.

Of greater interest is why he may have chosen Mal 1:11, 14 and how he saw its function in redemptive history. The Didachist probably seized on the Malachi prophecy because of its reference to the Gentiles (ἔθνεσι) in verse 14. It should be kept in mind that he sees his work as the "Teaching of the Lord through the Twelve Apostles to the Gentiles" (title). The prophecy about Gentiles offering a pure sacrifice when Malachi's Jewish people were offering defiled sacrifices (see Mal 1:6-10) implied a reversal of what the Jewish people of Malachi's day knew and observed. The Didachist saw these future sacrifices as spiritual, fulfilled in the Eucharistic observances commemorating the one great sacrifice for Christians through Jesus. A large number of church Fathers followed the Didache in viewing the Malachi prophecy as finding its fulfillment in the eucharistic observance in the

---

1-9. In addition to the similarity in Didache 3-5 to the wisdom tradition in Proverbs, there is a similar approach in the non-canonical wisdom book, Jesus ben Sirach. Throughout the book a τέκνον is addressed no less than 19 times and then instructed in behavior similar to that prescribed in Didache (Sirach 2:1; 3:12, 17; 4:1; 6:18, 23, 32; 10:28; 14:11; 16:24; 21:1; 30:9; 31:22; 37:27; 38:9, 16; 40:28). No one claims that the Didachist is quoting Proverbs or Sirach. But he is utilizing a literary pattern that was prevalent in Hebrew wisdom teaching.

assemblies of (predominantly) Gentile believers.<sup>29</sup> Though not limiting the fulfillment to Gentiles nor to the Eucharist, the NT writers (not citing the Malachi text but probably echoing it) see believers in the new age as offering spiritual sacrifices.<sup>30</sup>

The last instance of the Didache citing an OT text is in the final chapter of the work. Chapter 16 has often been referred to as a “little apocalypse” and deserves a full treatment in itself due to the hermeneutical issues it raises.<sup>31</sup> The present discussion looks only at how the Didachist grounds his point about the bodily resurrection at the second advent in a prophecy from Zech 14:5.

16:6 [4] And then the signs of the truth will appear:  
 [a] [the] first sign [will be] an opening in heaven,  
 [b] then [the] sign of a trumpet sound,  
 [c] and the third [sign will be] a resurrection of dead ones—  
 16:7 but not of all [the dead], (οὐ πάντων δέ)  
 but as it was said: (ἐρρέθη)  
 “The Lord will come and all the holy ones with him.”

[Didache: ἦξει ὁ κύριος καὶ πάντες οἱ ἅγιοι μετ' αὐτοῦ.

MT: :יְהוָה יָבֹא וְיָחִיב עִמּוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ כָּל הַקְּדוֹשִׁים

LXX: ἦξει κύριος ὁ θεός μου καὶ πάντες οἱ ἅγιοι μετ' αὐτοῦ.]

The Didachist does not claim that his “teaching” in this chapter is a special and new revelation. That would be inconsistent with his goal to present the “teaching of the Lord through the Apostles.” He simply takes material, mainly from the “Olivet Discourse” of Matthew 24–25 plus OT parallels, and adapts it to his perception of the order in which those events will transpire. The Didachist does not envision Scripture teaching a future “general” resurrection, but one that consists of believers only (οὐ πάντων δέ, 16:7a). He believes this to be consistent with the prophecy in Zech 14:5 about “the holy ones” who will accompany the Lord (κύριος) when he will come (ἦξει). The only issue of textual form here is that the Didache quotation agrees with the LXX reading “with Him” (μετ' αὐτοῦ) instead of the reading “with you” (ἔμελλε) of the MT. The Didachist evidently sees the “holy ones” of Zech 14:5 as believers, not angels (cf. 1 Thess 3:13). Elsewhere, the NT sees angels as also accompanying the Lord at His advent (Matt 25:30).

Though this is not the place to engage in an exegesis of the whole passage,

<sup>29</sup>A sampling of Patristic authors and their works utilizing this Malachi text as prophetic of the eucharist in the same way as the Didachist include Justin Martyr, *Dialogue with Trypho* 41:2; 116.3; 117:1,4; Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* 5.136.2,3; Irenaeus, *Heresies* 4.17.5,6; and Tertullian, *Adversus Judaeos* 5.4; 5.7; idem, *Against Marcion* 3.22.6; 4.1.8; Lactantius, *Divine Institutions* 4.11.8; Origen, *Homily on Genesis*, 13.3; Eusebius, *Demonstratio* 1,10,35; 3,2,74; and Cyril of Alexandria, *Catechesis ad Illuminados* A 18,25. This listing includes Fathers only through the early fourth century who cite the text this way.

<sup>30</sup>Phil 2:17; 4:18; Heb 13:15, 16; 1 Pet 2:5.

<sup>31</sup>Didache scholars, while not ignoring this chapter, have not given it the attention it deserves. In this regard, it is interesting to take note of a doctoral dissertation devoted chiefly to this chapter by George Eldon Ladd, “The Eschatology of the Didache” (Harvard University, 1949).

some writers have seen strong chiliastic implications in the Didachist's view of a resurrection at the parousia limited to believers only (cf. Rev 20:1-6).<sup>32</sup> One cannot be dogmatic about such "evidence" for chiliasm, however, since the Didache reading breaks off at this point, and no one knows what followed in the original ending, which is missing in the manuscript discovered in 1873.<sup>33</sup>

### Summary and Conclusions

The discussion above has surveyed the way in which the Didachist used the canonical Scriptures to transmit to Gentile believers what he believed was the teaching of the Twelve Apostles. A few observations about how he does that follows.

1. The Didachist, while sometimes creatively re-arranging canonical material, knew that authority lay in those Scriptures, not in himself. He makes no attempts to present himself as a channel of revelation. He looked to the inspired Scriptures of the OT and to the words of Jesus for his authority in transmitting that "teaching."

2. The Didachist was not only aware of Matthew's Gospel, but he used it extensively in its canonical form. He did not hesitate to adapt some of the sayings of Jesus by arranging them in an order to argue effectively his point of ethical behavior and sacramental observance. Yet even when he did rearrange material, he always remained consistent with the authorial intent of those passages.

3. The Didachist utilized two of the three ancient divisions of the Hebrew Bible, the "Law" and the "Prophets." He apparently knew and used that form of the OT Greek Bible called the Septuagint. The LXX, as was the case with most of the NT writers and the vast majority of Patristic writers, was his Bible, along with the words of Jesus in Matthew. The canonical/hermeneutical implications of this pervasive Christian use of the LXX needs to be explored further by evangelical scholarship.<sup>34</sup>

4. From the OT passages that he used, the Didachist apparently did not employ the allegorical method that became so popular in the second century, as exemplified in the Epistle of Barnabas. He did not hesitate to see a change from literal sacrifices under the Old Covenant to spiritual sacrifices under the New; in this he was consistent with the practice of NT writers, although he was unaware of most of those writings. He follows, therefore, a redemptive historical hermeneutic in seeing progression in meaning. He did not, however, evidence an authorially intended allegorizing of the OT passages with a hidden meaning different from the historical-grammatical meaning.

5. The methodological paradigm of *citations, quotations, allusions, and echoes*, as ways in which NT writers referenced the Old, appears also to be the way

---

<sup>32</sup>Ladd, "The Eschatology of the Didache" 145-55.

<sup>33</sup>For a suggestion about the content of that missing ending, see Robert Aldridge, "The Lost Ending of the Didache," *Vigiliae Christianae* 53 [1999]:1-15. I plan to write another article exploring these and other eschatological issues in the Didache as well as further studies of various issues in the document. For example, I regret that here I cannot examine the Didachist's reference to Jesus as God's παῖς (9:2,3) in light of the early view of Jesus as the Isaianic Servant (טַדַּי, cf. Acts 3:13, 26).

<sup>34</sup>See Martin Hengel, *The Septuagint as Christian Scripture; Its Prehistory and the Problem of Its Canon* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 2002), and Mogens Muller, *The First Bible of the Church: A Plea for the Septuagint* (Sheffield, Eng. : Sheffield Academic, 1996) for serious efforts in this area.

in which the Didachist used authoritative Scripture available to him. Examples of each of those ways of referring to Scripture are present in the little book. Though this writer in no way espouses its inspiration nor calls for its inclusion in the canon, his conclusion is that the Didache accomplished what it set out to do: provide a faithful, if not complete, record of the teaching *of* the Lord *through* the apostles to the Gentiles.

**AN ANALYTICAL TRANSLATION OF THE DIDACHE**  
(with Scripture citations and references noted)

**Teaching (Didache) of the Lord  
through the Twelve Apostles to the Gentiles**

- 1:1 There are two ways: one of **life** and one of **death!**  
(And) [there is] a great difference between the two ways.  
(see Mat 7:13,14; Dt 30:19; Proverbs 1–9)
- 1:2 [A] **On\_the\_one\_hand**, then, the way of life is this:  
[1] **first: you will love the God** who made you;  
[2] **second: [you will love] your neighbor as yourself.**  
(**Matt 22:37-39; Deut 6:5; Lev 19:18**)  
[B] **On\_the\_other\_hand** [the way of life is this]:  
**as many [things] as you might wish not to happen to you,  
likewise, do not do to another.** (cf. Matt 7:12; Tob 4:15; Hillel; v.l.  
Acts 15:29)
- 1:3 (And) concerning these matters, the teaching is this:  
[A] **spēak\_well of the ones speaking\_badly of ÿou,**  
[B] **and prāy** for ÿour enemies,  
[C] (and) **fāst for the ones persecuting ÿou;**  
**For what merit [is there] if ÿou löve the ones loving ÿou?  
Do not even the Gentiles do the same thing?**  
[D] **ÿou, on\_the\_other\_hand, löve the ones hating ÿou,** (**Matt 5:44, 46, 47**)  
and ÿou will not have an enemy.
- 1:4 Abstain from fleshly and bodily desires. (cf. 1 Pet 2:11)  
[A] **if anyone should strike you on the right cheek,  
turn to him also the other, (Matt 5:39) and you will be perfect; (Matt  
5:48)**  
[B] **if anyone should press\_you\_into\_service for one mile,  
go with him two;**  
[C] **if anyone should take away your cloak,  
give to him also your tunic;**  
[D] **if anyone should take from you [what is] yours,  
do not ask\_for\_it\_back; (Matt 5:41, 40)**  
for you are not even able [to do so].
- 1:5 **To everyone asking you [for anything], give [it]  
and do not ask\_for\_it\_back; (Luke 6:30/ /Matt. 5:42)**  
for, to all, the Father wishes to give  
[these things] from his\_own free\_gifts.  
[A] Blessed is the one\_giving according to the commandment;  
or he is blameless.  
[B] Woe to the one\_taking;  
[1] for, on\_the\_one\_hand, if anyone having need takes,



- he will be blameless;  
 [2] on\_the\_other\_hand, the one not having need  
 [a] will stand trial  
 [as to] why he received and for what [use];  
 [b] (and) being in prison, he/she will be  
 examined\_thoroughly  
 concerning the things he has done,  
 [c] **and he will not come\_out from there**  
**until he pays\_back the last cent.** (cf. Matt 5:26;  
 Luke 12:59)
- 1:6 [C] But also, concerning this [rule], on\_the\_other\_hand, it has been said:  
 "Let your alms sweat in your hands,  
 until you know to whom you might give [it]." (see Sirach 12:1,7)
- 2:1 (And) the second rule of the teaching [is this]:
- 2:2 [A1] **You will not murder,**  
 [A2] **you will not commit adultery,**  
 (Matt 19:18; 5:33; the following vv. elaborate Exod 20:13-17)
- [A3] you will not corrupt\_boys,  
 [A4] you will not have\_illicit\_sex,  
 [A5] you will not steal,  
 [A6] you will not practice\_magic,  
 [A7] you will not make\_potions,  
 [A8] you will not murder a child by\_means\_of abortion,  
 [A9] nor you will kill one\_that\_has\_been\_born,  
 [A10] you will not desire the things of [your] neighbor.
- 2:3 [B1] you will not swear\_falsely, (Matt 5:33 ?)  
 [B2] you will not bear\_false\_witness,  
 [B3] you will not speak\_badly [of anyone],  
 [B4] you will not hold\_grudges.
- 2:4 [B5] You will not be double-minded nor double-tongued,  
 for being double-tongued is a snare of death.
- 2:5 [In sum] your word will not be false nor empty,  
 but will be fulfilled by action.
- 2:6 [C1] You will not be covetous,  
 [C2] (and) not greedy,  
 [C3] (and) not a hypocrite,  
 [C4] (and) not bad-mannered,  
 [C5] (and) not arrogant.  
 [In sum] you will not take an evil plan against your neighbor.
- 2:7 You will not hate any person,  
 [1] but some you will reprove,  
 [2] and concerning others you will pray,  
 [3] and some you will love more than your soul.
- 3:1 My child, flee from every evil  
 and from everything like it.
- 3:2 [A] Do not become angry,  
 for anger leads to murder;  
 nor envious,  
 nor contentious,  
 nor hot-headed,  
 for, from all these, murders are begotten.

- 3:3 [B] My child, do not become lustful,  
     for lust leads to illicit\_sex;  
 nor one\_using\_foul\_speech,  
 nor one lifting up the eyes,  
     for, from all these, adulteries are begotten.
- 3:4 [C] My child, do not become a diviner,  
     since [this] leads to idolatry;  
 nor an enchanter,  
 nor an astrologer,  
 nor a purifier,  
 nor [even] wish to see these things,  
     for, from all these, idolatry is begotten.
- 3:5 [D] My child, do not become false,  
     since falsehood leads to theft;  
 nor a\_lover\_of\_money,  
 nor a\_seeker\_of\_glory,  
     for, from all these, thefts are begotten.
- 3:6 [E] My child, do not become a grumbler,  
     since [this] leads to blasphemy;  
 nor self-pleasing,  
 nor evil-minded,  
     for, from all these, blasphemies are begotten.
- 3:7 But be gentle,  
 since **the gentle will inherit the earth. (Matt 5:5; Ps 37:11)**
- 3:8 [A] Become long-suffering  
     and merciful  
     and harmless  
     and calm  
     and good  
     and trembling through all [time] at the words  
         that you have heard. (allusion to Isa 66:2?)
- 3:9 [B] You will not exalt yourself,  
     (and) you will not give boldness to your soul.  
     Your soul will not be joined with [the] lofty,  
     but with [the] just and [the] lowly you will dwell.
- 3:10 [C] You will accept the experiences befalling you as good things,  
     knowing that, apart from God, nothing happens.
- 4:1 [A] My child, the one speaking to you the word of God,  
     [1] you will remember night and day, (cf. Heb 13:7)  
     [2] (and) you will honor him as [the] Lord,  
         for where [the] dominion [of the Lord] is spoken of,  
         there [the] Lord is.
- 4:2 [3] (And) you will seek every day the presence of the saints  
     in order that you may rest upon their words.
- 4:3 [B] You will not cause division:  
     [1] (And) you will reconcile those\_fighting;  
     [2] you will judge justly;  
     [3] you will not take [into account] social\_status  
         [when it comes time] to reprove against failings.
- 4:4 [C] You will not be double-minded whether it will be or not.
- 4:5 [A] Do not become one,

- [1] on\_the\_one\_hand, stretching out your hands for\_the\_purpose\_of taking,  
 [2] on\_the\_other\_hand, pulling [them] back for\_the\_purpose\_of giving.
- 4:6 [B] If you should have [something] through [the work of] your hands,  
 you will give a ransom of your sins.
- 4:7 [1] You will not hesitate to give,  
 [2] nor will you grumble when you give;  
 for you will know who will be  
 the good paymaster of your reward.
- 4:8 [C] You will not turn\_away the one\_in\_need;  
 [1] but, on\_the\_other\_hand, you will share together,  
 all things with your brother,  
 [2] and you will not say that such things are your own. (cf. Acts 4:32)  
 For, if you are partners in the immortal [things],  
 how\_much\_more [are you partners] in the mortal [things]. (cf. Rom  
 15:27)
- 4:9 [A] You will not take away your hand  
 from your son or from your daughter,  
 but from youth you will train [them] in the fear of God.
- 4:10 [B] You will not command your male or female\_slave  
 who are hoping in the same God [as you]  
 in your bitterness,  
 lest they should never fear the God [who is] over both [of you],  
 for He does not come to call according\_to one's social\_status,  
 but [He calls] those whom the Spirit has made-ready.
- 4:11 [C] And you, the slaves, will be\_subject\_to your masters  
 as to the image of God in shame and fear.
- 4:12 [A] You will hate all hypocrisy,  
 and everything that is not pleasing to the Lord.
- 4:13 [B] Never forsake the commandments of [the] Lord,  
 (but) you will guard the things that you have received,  
**neither adding nor taking [anything] away.** (allusion to **Deut 4:2  
 or 12:32**)
- 4:14 [C] In church, you will confess your wrongdoings,  
 and you will not go to your prayer with an evil conscience.  
 This is the Way of Life!
- 5:1 The way of death, on\_the\_other\_hand, is this:  
 first of all, it is evil and full of accursedness:  
 [A1] murders, [A12] double-heartednesses,  
 [A2] adulteries, [A13] trickery,  
 [A3] lusts, [A14] arrogance,  
 [A4] illicit\_sexual\_acts, [A15] malice,  
 [A5] thefts, [A16] self-pleasing,  
 [A6] idolatries, [A17] greed,  
 [A7] magic, [A18] foul-speech,  
 [A8] potions, [A19] jealousy,  
 [A9] robberies, [A20] audacity,  
 [A10] perjuries, [A21] haughtiness,  
 [A11] hypocrisies, [A22] false-pretension; (Matt 15:19?)
- 5:2 [B1] [those] persecutors [B11] [those] not showing\_  
 of the good, mercy to the poor,

- [B2] [those] hating [the] truth, [B12] not working for the oppressed  
 [B3] [those] loving a lie, [B13] not knowing the one\_who  
 made them,  
 [B4] [those] not knowing [B14] murderers of children,  
 [the] wages of righteousness,  
 [B5] not cleaving to [the] good, [B15] destroyers of what God has  
 formed  
 [B6] nor with just judgment, [B16] turning away the one in need,  
 [B7] [those] being on the alert  
 not for the good,  
 but for the evil [thing], [B17] oppressing the afflicted,  
 [B8] [those] far from being gentle [B18] advocates of the rich,  
 and patient,  
 [B9] [those] loving empty [things], [B19] lawless judges of [the] poor,  
 [B10] [those] pursuing retribution [B20] totally\_sinful.  
 May you be delivered, [Oh] children, from all of these!
- 6:1 Look\_out, lest anyone make you wander  
 from this way of teaching,  
 since he is teaching you without God.
- 6:2 [1] For, on\_the\_one\_hand, if you are able to bear  
 the whole yoke of the Lord, you will be perfect;  
 [2] but if, on\_the\_other\_hand, you are not able,  
 that which you are able, do this.
- 6:3 And concerning eating,  
 [1] bear that which you are able,  
 [2] from the food, on\_the\_other\_hand, sacrificed to idols,  
 very\_much keep\_away  
 for it is worship of dead gods.
- 7:1 And concerning baptism, baptize this way:  
 Having said all these things beforehand,  
**immerse in the name of the Father  
 and of the Son  
 and of the Holy Spirit (Matt 28:19)**  
 in flowing water—
- 7:2 [1] if, on\_the\_other\_hand, you should not have flowing water,  
 immerse in other water [that is available];  
 [2] (and) if you are not able in cold,  
 [immerse] in warm [water];
- 7:3 [3] (and) if you should not have either,  
 pour out water onto the head three times  
 in the name of [the] Father  
 and [the] Son  
 and [the] Holy Spirit.
- 7:4 (And) prior to the baptism,  
 [1] let the one\_baptizing fast;  
 [2] and [let the] one\_being\_baptized;  
 [3] and if any others are able,  
 [let them fast also].  
 (And) order the one\_being\_baptized to fast  
 one or two [days] prior [to the baptism].
- 8:1 (And) let your fasts

- not be with the hypocrites, (cf. Matt 6:16)  
 for they fast on the second  
 and on the fifth days of the week (cf. Lk. 18:12)  
 ÿou fast, on the other hand, during the fourth [day]  
 and the [sabbath] preparation [day].(see Mk15:42; Jn19:14, 31)
- 8:2 (And) dō not pray like the hypocrites (cf. Matt 6:5)  
 but like the Lord commanded in his gospel.  
 Prāy this way:  
**Our Father, who is in heaven,  
 may your name be\_made\_holy,  
 may your kingdom come,  
 may your will be done upon earth as in heaven,  
 give us today our daily bread,  
 and forgive us our debt  
 as we also forgive our debtors,  
 and do not lead us into trial  
 but deliver us from the evil one, (Matt 6:9-13)**  
 because yours is the power and the glory forever.
- 8:3 Three times daily prāy this way. (cf. Ps. 55:17)
- 9:1 And concerning the eucharistic thanksgiving, give thanks thus:
- 9:2 First, concerning the cup:  
 We give you thanks, our Father,  
 for the holy vine of your **servant** David  
 which you revealed to us through your **servant** Jesus.  
 To you is the glory forever.
- 9:3 And concerning the broken bread:  
 We give you thanks, our Father,  
 for the life and knowledge  
 which you revealed to us through your **servant** Jesus.  
 To you is the glory forever. (**Isa 52:13**)
- 9:4 Just as this broken bread was scattered  
 over the mountains,  
 and, having\_been\_gathered\_together, became one;  
 in this way, may your church be\_gathered\_together  
 from the ends of the earth into your kingdom.  
 Because yours is the glory and the power  
 through Jesus Christ forever.
- 9:5 (And) lēt no one eat or drink from ÿour eucharist  
 except those baptized in the name of the Lord,  
 for also the Lord has said concerning this:  
**“Do not give what is holy to the dogs.” (Matt 7:6)**
- 10:1 And after being filled [by the meal], give thanks in this way:
- 10:2 We give you thanks, holy Father,  
 for your holy name,  
 which you tabernacle in our hearts,  
 and for the knowledge and faith and immortality  
 which you revealed to us through your **servant** Jesus.  
 To you [is] the glory forever.
- 10:3 You, almighty Master, created all things  
 for the sake of your name,  
 both food and drink you have given to people for enjoyment

- in order that they might give thanks;  
to us, on the other hand, you have graciously bestowed  
Spirit-sent food and drink for life forever  
through your **servant**.
- 10:4 Before all [these] things, we give you thanks  
because you are powerful [on our behalf].  
To you [is] the glory forever.
- 10:5 Remember, Lord, your church,  
to save her from every evil  
and to perfect her in your love  
and to **gather her together from the four winds (Matt 24:31)**  
[as] the sanctified into your kingdom  
which you have prepared for her,  
because yours is the power and the glory forever.
- 10:6 [A] May grace come  
and may this world pass away!  
[B] Hosanna to the God of David! (cf. Matt 21:9)  
[C] If anyone is holy, let him come!  
If anyone is not, let him repent!  
[D] **Come Lord** [maran atha]! Amen! (cf. 1 Cor 16:22)
- 10:7 (And) turn towards the prophets [allowing them]  
to “give thanks” as much as they wish.
- 11:1 [A] Therefore, whoever teaches you all these things said beforehand,  
receive him.
- 11:2 [B] If, on the other hand, the one teaching,  
if he has been turned around,  
should teach [you] another doctrine  
[1] for the destroying [of those things said beforehand],  
do not listen to him;  
[2] but, [if it is] for the bringing of righteousness  
and knowledge of the Lord,  
receive him as the Lord!
- 11:3 And concerning apostles and prophets, in accord with the decree of the  
gospel, act thus:
- 11:4 [A] (And) every apostle coming to you, let him be received as the Lord:  
11:5 [1] (but) he will not remain, on the other hand, more than one day;  
[2] (and) if there is a need, also another [day];  
[3] (but) if ever he should remain three [days], he is a false prophet
- 11:6 [B] (And), when he departs,  
[1] let the apostle take nothing except bread [that he needs]  
until he is lodged.  
[2] if, on the other hand, he asks for money, he is a false prophet.
- 11:7 [A] And every prophet speaking in the Spirit  
you should not put on trial nor judge,  
**for every sin will be forgiven,**  
**but this sin will not be forgiven.** (cf. Matt 12:31)
- 11:8 [B] (But) not everyone speaking in the Spirit is a prophet,  
but if he is, he should have the habits of the Lord.  
Therefore, from these habits should be known the false prophet and the  
the [true] prophet.
- 11:9 [A] And every prophet ordering a table in the Spirit

- will not eat from it, (and) if he does otherwise, he is a false prophet.
- 11:10 [B] (And) every prophet teaching the truth,  
if he does not do what he teaches, he is a false prophet.
- 11:11 [C] (And) every prophet having been put to the test and [found] true,  
doing an earthly mystery of the church,  
but not teaching [you] to do what he himself does,  
he shall not be judged by you;  
for he has his judgment from God,  
for also the ancient prophets so acted.
- 11:12 [D] (But) whoever should say in the Spirit,  
[1] "Give me silver or any other thing,"  
you will not listen to him;  
[2] (but) if, he should say to give to others in want  
let no one judge him.
- 12:1 (And) everyone coming in the name of the Lord,  
let him be received;  
(and) then, having put him to the test,  
you will know,  
for you will have understanding of right and left [i.e., good or bad].
- 12:2 [A] If, on\_the\_one\_hand, the one coming is a traveler,  
[1] help him as much as you are able.  
[2] he will not remain, on\_the\_other\_hand, among you,  
except for two or three days,  
if there should be a necessity.
- 12:3 [B] If, on\_the\_other\_hand, he wishes to settle down among you,  
and if he is a craftsman, let him work and let him eat.
- 12:4 [C] If, on\_the\_other\_hand, he does not have a craft,  
according to your own understanding, plan beforehand  
how a **Christian** will live among you, without being idle.
- 12:5 [D] If, on\_the\_other\_hand, he does not wish to act thus,  
he is a Christ-peddler.  
Beware of such ones!
- 13:1 [A] (And) every genuine prophet wishing to settle down among you  
is worthy of his food;
- 13:2 [B] likewise a genuine teacher is **worthy,**  
**just as the laborer, of his food. (Matt. 10:10)**
- 13:3 [A] So, you shall take every first\_fruits of the produce  
from the wine\_vat and threshing\_floor,  
of both cattle and sheep,  
[1] [and] you will give the first\_fruits to the prophets;  
for they themselves are your high-priests.
- 13:4 [2] (But) if you should not have a prophet,  
give [it] to the poor.
- 13:5 [B] If you should make bread,  
take the first\_fruits,  
and give according to the commandment.
- 13:6 [C] Similarly, when you open a jar of wine or of oil,  
take the first\_fruits,  
[and]give it to the prophets.
- 13:7 [D] (And) of silver and of clothing and of every possession,  
take the first\_fruits,

- as it seems good to you, and give according to the commandment.
- 14:1 (And) on the divinely instituted [day] of [the] Lord,  
when you are gathered together, br  ak bread.  
[A] And give thanks, having beforehand confessed   our failings,  
so that   our sacrifice may be pure.
- 14:2 [B] Everyone, on the other hand, having a conflict with a companion,  
d   not let [him] come together with   ou  
until they have been reconciled,  
in order that   our sacrifice may not be defiled. (cf. Matt 5:23,24)
- 14:3 For this is that which was spoken by the Lord:  
**“In every place and time, offer to me a pure sacrifice.”**  
**“Because I am a great king,” says [the] Lord,**  
**“and my name is wondrous among the Gentiles.” (Mal 1:11,14)**
- 15:1 [A] App  oint, then, for   ourselves,  
overseers and deacons worthy of the Lord, (cf. Phil 1:1; 1 Clem 42,44,57)  
 [1] gentle men  
 [2] and not money-loving  
 [3] and truthful  
 [4] and tested;  
 for they likewise minister among   ou  
 the ministry of the prophets and teachers.
- 15:2 [B] D   not, then, look down upon them;  
for they themselves are your honored ones  
along with the prophets and teachers.
- 15:3 [A] (And) r  prove one another! Not in anger, but in peace!  
as   ou have [it] in the gospel. (see Matt 18:15-18?)
- [B] And to everyone wronging a neighbor,  
 [1] l  t no one speak [to him]  
 [2] nor [l  t anyone] hear from   ou [about him]  
 until he should repent.
- 15:4 (And) **d     our prayers and alms and all   our actions**  
thus as   ou have [it] in the gospel of our Lord. (see **Matt. 6:1-4; 5-15**)
- 16:1 [A] B   watchful over   our life;  
 [1] do not let   our lamps be quenched,  
 [2] and do not let   our waists be ungirded. (Matt. 25:8; Luke 12:35?)
- [B] But b   prepared;  
**for   ou do not know the hour in which our Lord is coming.**  
**(Matt 24:42)**
- 16:2 [C] (And) frequently b   gathered together,  
seeking the things appropriate for   our souls;  
for the whole time of   our faith will not be of use to   ou  
if in the end time   ou should not have been perfected.
- 16:3 [1] For, in the last days,  
 [a] **the false prophets and corrupters will be multiplied,**  
 [b] **and the sheep will be turned into wolves,**  
 [c] **and the love will be turned into hate.**
- 16:4 **For, when lawlessness increases,**  
 [a] **they will hate each other**  
 [b] **and they will persecute**  
 [c] **and they will betray [each other]. (Matt 24:10-12)**
- [2] And then will appear the world-deceiver as a son of God,



- [a] and he will do signs and wonders, (**Matt 24:24**)  
 [b] and the earth will be delivered into his hands,  
 [c] and he will do unlawful things  
 that never have happened from eternity.
- 16:5 [3] Then the human creation will come  
 into the burning-process of testing,  
 [a] and **many will be led into sin** and will perish,  
 [b] the **ones remaining firm in their faith,**  
**on\_the\_other\_hand,**  
**will be saved (Matt 24:10,13)** by the curse itself.
- 16:6 [4] And then the signs of the truth will appear: (cf. Matt 24:30)  
 [a] [the] first sign [will be] an opening in heaven,  
 [b] then [the] sign of a trumpet sound, (cf. Matt 24:30; 1 Thess  
 4:16)  
 [c] and the third [sign will be] a resurrection of dead ones—  
 but not of all [the dead],  
 but as it was said:  
**“The Lord will come and all the holy\_ones with him.”**  
**(Zech 14:5; cf. 1 Thess 3:13)**
- 16:7 [5] Then the world will see the Lord **coming atop the clouds of**  
**heaven . . .** (cf. Matt 24:30; 26:64; Dan 7:13 LXX)

NOTE: The translation and Scripture annotations are my own. For the sentence analysis, I gratefully acknowledge the suggestions of Aaron Milavec in his recent books on *The Didache*. Words with a dieresis above their first letter (e.g., ÿou) are plural in the original Greek.